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SIR John Faithfull Fleet was appointed as Epigraphist to the Government of India from 1883 to 1886 for the purpose of preparing the volume on the Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and the volume prepared by him was published in 1888 as volume III of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum series. The question of bringing out a revised edition of this volume was first mooted in January 1928 by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, then Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture in Calcutta University and an eminent Sanskritist and epigraphist, to Sir John Marshall, the then Director General, Archaeological Survey of India, who readily approved the proposal in principle. The actual proposals for the same were, however, sent by Dr. Bhandarkar in November 1928 to Mr. Blackiston, the then Officiating Director General. After prolonged correspondence in the matter and some interruption, Mr. Blackiston informed Dr. Bhandarkar in January 1935 that the Government of India had sanctioned the proposal for the revised edition of the Gupta Inscriptions and has also decided to entrust the work to him.

When Fleet published his volume in 1888, he wrote in his Preface that he intended to bring out a second part of the volume containing the Historical chapters but also expressed his fears that his official duties in the Revenue Department would not enable him to do so. His fears were, unfortunately, proved true and the Historical chapters were never written by him. So it was left to Dr. Bhandarkar to write these Historical chapters in his revised edition of the volume. Dr. Bhandarkar started the work in right earnest by preparing the list of inscriptions to be included in the revised edition, by collecting the required impressions of inscriptions through the Archaeological Survey of India and other sources, by studying and preparing notes, etc. After working for a few years, he had to face a number of difficulties in his work including the second world war during which period all the impressions collected by him were removed to a place of safety with the result that the work did not make much progress. After the end of the war, when he was nearing 70 years, he resumed his work actively and concentrated his attention to edit the inscriptions of the Imperial Guptas first and also to write the connected Historical chapters as part one of the revised volume. But the illness in his family as well as his own illness prevented him from devoting his entire attention to this work. However, by the end of 1949, he had prepared the rough draft of the volume and he wanted to revise this draft, dress-up and prepare the press-copy by re-typing the entire matter under his personal supervision. But the advancing age and illness prevented him from doing so and, alas!, he passed away in May 1950 without completing the task which was very dear to him and on which he had worked for many years. But before his death, in March 1950, he had sent the manuscript of his draft-copy to Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra, the then Government Epigraphist for India at Ootacamund, for dressing up and preparing the press-copy of the volume. Dr. Chhabra had earlier met Dr. Bhandarkar on a few occasions and had discussed with him about the publication of this volume.

After the death of Dr. Bhandarkar, the task of finalising and preparing the press-copy of the revised edition was entrusted to Dr. Chhabra who, however, thought of bringing the volume up-to-date by incorporating all the latest views and discussions of several scholars relating to Gupta history and also by including the later discoveries of the Gupta inscriptions in it. He worked for some time in sorting out the materials received from Dr. Bhandarkar,
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preparing notes, references, etc. but his work was also interrupted due to several reasons like his transfers from Ootacamund to Delhi first as Deputy Director General of Archaeology and again as Joint Director General of Archaeology from which post he retired in 1963 and joined the Panjab University, Chandigarh, as Professor of Ancient Indian Culture and Archaeology. After his assignment at Chandigarh was over and after he came to settle down at Ootacamund, Dr. Chhabra resumed his work on the revision of the Gupta volume in 1972. In the meanwhile, the Epigraphical Branch of the Archaeological Survey of India was shifted from Ootacamund to Mysore in June 1966 when Dr. G. S. Gai was its Head as Government Epigraphist for India (which designation has been subsequently changed as Chief Epigraphist). So Dr. Chhabra was required to visit Mysore from Ootacamund in connection with his work on Gupta volume.

In order to expedite this work, Dr. Chhabra suggested, in 1975, to Shri M. N. Deshpande, the then Director General of Archaeology, to associate Dr. Gai as Co-Editor to which the Director General readily agreed. Dr. Gai also retired from service in March 1976 but as he settled down in Mysore only where the Office of the Chief Epigraphist is located, he could take up and concentrate on this work earnestly. He worked continuously for over eight months and filled up the references, gaps, etc. in Dr. Bhandarkar’s draft, dressed up and prepared the press-copy by re-arranging and getting the entire matter re-typed under his personal supervision. Dr. Gai also edited and included in the volume four newly discovered inscriptions of the rulers of the Imperial Gupta dynasty, viz. Nos. 5, 23, 32 and 37.

It will be noticed that Dr. Bhandarkar has largely followed Fleet in the introductory portion of each inscription and also in giving the texts of the inscriptions, though he has given his own readings and interpretations wherever he differed from Fleet. But he has thoroughly revised the translations of the texts. And the Historical chapters written by him and forming his original contribution undoubtedly bear the stamp of his great scholarship and erudition. The editors have restricted their comments to the barest minimum in order to retain and make available Dr. Bhandarkar’s views and comments on various topics in their original to the scholars. The work of consolidation of the different and latest views and comments of various scholars on many topics has not been attempted here, as originally intended, and has been left to a future date.

The manuscript of the press-copy was sent to the Sree Saraswaty Press Ltd., Calcutta, towards the end of 1976 but, due to some unavoidable difficulties in the press, the printing of the volume was delayed. And, at last, after a chequered career extending over a period of about fifty years (thirty years after the death of Dr. Bhandarkar), this long awaited revised volume of the Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings has now been printed and placed in the hands of the scholars. There is a saying in Sanskrit—śrīvānśi bahu vighnāni which means “there are many obstacles in good undertaking” which fits very well in the case of this volume. And, as a token of our great regard for that veteran scholar Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, who toiled hard in the preparation of this volume till the end of his life, we dedicate this revised volume to his revered memory.

We are grateful to Shri M. N. Deshpande, former Director General of Archaeology, for seeing that suitable accommodation and other necessary facilities were provided in the office of the Chief Epigraphist to Dr. Gai which enabled him to carry on the work relating to this volume and also for arranging for its publication in the Sree Saraswaty Press Ltd., Calcutta. We are also thankful to the present Director General of Archaeology, Shri B. K. Thapar, for evincing keen interest in the expeditious printing of the volume. Our thanks are also due to Dr. K. V. Ramesh, Superintending Epigraphist, who rendered much assistance to Dr. Gai in the initial stages and to Dr. S. S. Iyer, Senior Epigraphical Assistant, who has
taken great pains in preparing the Index to the volume in a short time. We would also like to express our appreciation and thanks to the authorities of the Sree Saraswaty Press Ltd., Calcutta, for their kind co-operation and neat and efficient printing of the volume.

Mysore
18th October, 1930

B. CH. CHHABRA
G. S. GAI
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Plates</th>
<th>xiii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>xiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigenda</td>
<td>xiv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INTRODUCTION

### Political History
- Preliminary: 1
- Chandragupta I: 2
- Samudragupta: 3
- Kāchagupta-Rāmagupta: 46
- Chandragupta II: 52
- Kumāragupta I: 72
- Ghatotkachagupta and Skandagupta-Prasagupta: 79
- Successors of Skanda (Puru)gupta: 84

### Administration
- 90

### Social History
- 108

### Religious History
- 122

### Literary History
- 146

### Gupta Era
- 176

### Kṛta Era
- 186

## TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allahābād Stone Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ėraṅ Stone Inscription of Samudragupta</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Nālandā Copper-Plate Inscription of Samudragupta: The year 5</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Gayā Copper-plate Inscription of Samudragupta: The year 9</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vidiśa Stone Image Inscriptions of Rāmagupta</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Mathurā Pilaster Inscription of Chandragupta II: The year 61</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Chandragupta II: The year 82</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Gaḍhwa Stone Inscription of Chandragupta II: The year 88</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Sāñchi Stone Inscription of Chandragupta: The year 93</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mathurā Stone Inscription of Chandragupta II</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Chandragupta II</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Meharauli Iron Pillar Inscription of Chandra</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Basārh Clay Seal Inscription of Dhruvasvāminī</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Mandasor Inscription of Naravarman: The Kṛta year 46</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Bihār Kōtrā Inscription of Naravarman: The (Kṛta) year 474</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Bilsad Stone Pillar Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 96</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Gaḍhwa Stone Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 98</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Mathurā Image Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 107</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Plates</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>Dhamāidaha Copper-plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 113</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Tumain Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 116</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>Karamāţhāṇḍa Stone Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 117</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 124</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>Mathurā Image Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 125</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 128</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>Mankuwar Stone Image Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 129</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>Gaţhwā Stone Inscription of Kumāragupta I</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>Basāţh Clay Seal Inscription of Ghatotkachagupta</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>Junāgaţh Rock Inscription of Skandagupta: The years 136, 137 and 138</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>Kahāum Stone Pillar Inscription of Skandagupta: The year 141</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Indore Copper-plate Inscription of Skandagupta: The year 146</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>Bhitarī Stone Pillar Inscription of Skandagupta</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>XXXII</td>
<td>Supīa Pillar Inscription of the Time of Skandagupta: The year 141</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seal of Vainyagupta</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>XXXIV</td>
<td>Sāmnāţh Stone Inscription of Kumāragupta II: The year 154</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>XXXV</td>
<td>Mandasor Inscription of Kumāragupta (I) and Bandhuvarman: The (Krita) years 493 and 529</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>Sāmnāţh Stone Inscriptions of Budhagupta: The year 157</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>XXXVII</td>
<td>Vārānasī Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta: The year 159</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>XXXVIII</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate inscription of Budhagupta: The year 163</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>XXXIX</td>
<td>Ėraṇ Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta: The year 165</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Budhagupta</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>XLI</td>
<td>Bihār Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>XLII</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seal of Budhagupta</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>XLIII</td>
<td>Ėraṇ Stone Pillar Inscription of Bhānugupta: The year 191</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seals of Narasiinagupta</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>XLV</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seals of Kumāragupta III</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>XLVI</td>
<td>Bhitarī Copper-Silver Seal of Kumāragupta III</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>XLVII</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Vishnugupta: The year 224</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>XLVIII</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seal of Vishnugupta</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index                                  | 365  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Facing page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Allahābad Stone Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ėraṇ Stone Inscription of Samudragupta</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Nālandā Copper-plate Inscription of Samudragupta: The year 5</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Gaya Copper-plate Inscription of Samudragupta: The year 9</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vidiśā Stone Image Inscriptions of Rāmagupta</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Mathurā Pilaster Inscription of Chandragupta II: The year 61</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Chandragupta II: The year 82</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Gādhwā Stone Inscription of Chandragupta II: The year 88</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Sānchi Stone Inscription of Chandragupta: The year 93</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mathurā Stone Inscription of Chandragupta II</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Chandragupta II</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Meharauli Iron Pillar Inscription of Chandra</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Basārhw Clay Seal Inscription of Dhruvasvāminī</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Mandasor Inscription of Naravarman: The Kṛta year 461</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Bihār Kōtrā Inscription of Naravarman: (The Kṛta) year 474</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Bilsād Stone Pillar Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 96</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Gādhwā Stone Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 98</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Mathurā Image Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 107</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>Dhanādāha Copper-plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The year 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Tūmain Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 116</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>Kāramdānḍa stone Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 117</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The year 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>Mathurā Image Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 125</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The year 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>Mankuwar Stone Image Inscription of Kumāragupta I: The year 129</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>Gādhwā Stone Inscription of Kumāragupta I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>Basārhw Clay Seal Inscription of ṇaṭikākhaugupta</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>Junāgaḍhi Rock Inscription of Skandagupta: The years 136, 137 and 138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>Kāhāum Stone Pillar Inscription of Skandagupta: The year 141</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Indore Copper-plate Inscription of Skandagupta: The year 146</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>Bhītari Stone Pillar Inscription of Skandagupta</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII</td>
<td>Supīta Pillar Inscription of the Time of Skandagupta: The year 141</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seal of Vainyagupta</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV</td>
<td>Sārnāth Stone Inscription of Kumāragupta II: The year 154</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV</td>
<td>Mandasör Inscription of Kumāragupta (I) and Bandhuvarman:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The (Kṛta) years 493 and 529</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>Sārnāth Stone Inscription of Budhagupta: The year 157</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII</td>
<td>Vārāṇasi Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta: The year 159</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIII</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Budhagupta: The year 163</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Facing page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIX</td>
<td>Ėraṇ Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta: The year 165</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Budhagupta</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLI</td>
<td>Bihar Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLII</td>
<td>Nālandā clay Seal of Budhagupta</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLIII</td>
<td>Ėraṇ Stone Pillar Inscription of Bhānugupta: The year 191</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLIV</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seals of Narasimhagupta</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLV</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seals of Kumāragupta III</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLVI</td>
<td>Bhitāri Copper-Silver Seal of Kumāragupta III</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLVII</td>
<td>Dāmōdarpur Copper-plate Inscription of Vishṇugupta: The year 224</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLVIII</td>
<td>Nālandā Clay Seal of Vishṇugupta</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.O.R.I.</td>
<td>Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.S.W.I.</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Western India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Bombay Gazetteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.O.R.I.</td>
<td>Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.S.I.R.</td>
<td>Cunningham, Archaeological Survey of India Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I.I.</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.H.I.</td>
<td>Vincent Smith, Early History of India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.p.Ind.</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O.S.</td>
<td>Gaekwad Oriental Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.</td>
<td>Indian Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.H.Q.</td>
<td>Indian Historical Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A.H.R.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A.I.H.</td>
<td>Journal of Ancient Indian History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A.S.B.</td>
<td>Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A.S.B. (N.S.)</td>
<td>Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal (New Series)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.A.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Bengal Asiatic Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.B.R.A.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.O.R.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.R.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Bihar Research Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.G.J.R.I.</td>
<td>Journal of the Ganganath Jhah Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.I.H.</td>
<td>Journal of Indian History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.N.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Numismatic Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.N.S.I.</td>
<td>Journal of the Numismatic Society of India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.P.A.S.B.</td>
<td>Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.O.R.</td>
<td>Journal of Oriental Research, Madras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.A.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.U.P.H.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Uttar Pradesh Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.S.I.</td>
<td>Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.I.A.</td>
<td>New Indian Antiquary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.I.H.C.</td>
<td>Proceeding of Indian History Congress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.R.A.S., N.C.</td>
<td>Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Northern Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.R.A.S., W.C.</td>
<td>Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.T.S.</td>
<td>Pali Text Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B.E.</td>
<td>Sacred Books of the East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel. Ins.</td>
<td>D.G. Sircar, Select Inscriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z.D.M.G.</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Page 25, line 24.—For Pārbaṭi Read Pārvati.
,, 28, f.n. 1, line 1.—For septs Read sects.
,, 39, line 34.—For Rahtore Read Rathore.
,, 53, line 33.—For Westren Read Western.
,, 74, line 9.—For Rishidatta Read Rishidatta.
,, 98, f.n. 7, line 2.—For Mahāpratihāra Read Mahāpratihāra.
,, 99, line 32.—For Pratihāra(rā)kshi Read Pratihāra(rā)kshi.
,, 187, line 7.—For Byānā Read Bayānā.
,, 189, line 30.—For exactly Read exactly.
,, 189, lines 44-45.—For inscription Read inscription.

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

Page 264, f.n. 4.—For mėghē pranṣṭita Read mėghē pranṣṭiti
,, 270, line 36.—For Inscription Read Inscription.
,, 297, line 45.—For Prausthapada Read Praushṭhapada
,, 317, line 28.—For 1943-44¹ Read 1943-44².
,, 340, line 20.—For Āryā Read Āryā.
,, 347, f.n. 1.—For Pleidaes Read Pleiades.
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POLITICAL HISTORY

Preliminary

It is well-known that prior to the rise of the Guptas, the Kushānas exercised sovereignty over North India. For a long time the coins and inscriptions of Kanishka and his successors had been found at Mathura and the adjoining districts. And it was thought by scholars that the Kushāna power had not spread far to the east of that place. In the winter of 1904-05, however, during the course of excavations carried on by F. O. Oertel at Sarnath near Varanasi, a considerable number of epigraphs came to light along with a wealth of other archaeological material. Two of these have been incised on a colossal standing Boddhisattva statue and one on a stone umbrella originally placed over the image. They are dated in the third year of Kanishka and say that the image and umbrella were the gift of the Bhikshu Bala, with whom, *inter alia*, were associated *Mahākṣatriya* Kharapallāna and *Kṣitrapa* Vanashpara. This shows that the dominions of Kanishka extended so far eastward as to include Varanasi at least. As Vanashpara was a mere *Kṣitrapa*, he must have been in charge of Varanasi and the surrounding district. The jurisdiction of Kharapallāna, who was a *Mahākṣatriya*, must have been of a wider extent and certainly included the Varanasi District, but where his headquarters exactly were we do not know. What, however, cannot be incontestably proved by inscriptions may be proved almost conclusively through numismatic finds. There is a class of copper coins termed "Puri Kushān", which were so called by the late A. F. R. Hoernle, because the earliest known specimens that he examined came from a site from the Puri District. They are, however, found from Singhbhum to Ganjam. They are generally uninscribed, and seem to have been issued in the 4th or 5th century A.D. "All numismatists acknowledge that they exhibit a reminiscence of the characteristic Kushān type." For a long time it was a mystery how the Kushāna coinage exercised influence on this class of coins, because no Kushāna coins had actually been found in that region or in Bengal. Not long ago, however, a hoard of coins was discovered in the erstwhile Mayurbhanj State, Orissa, containing 282 copper coins, of which 170 were Puri Kushānas and 112 Imperial Great Kushānas of Kanishka and Huvisha. And, further, R. D. Banerji informs us that the coinage, both gold and copper, of the Later Great Kushānas is still extremely abundant in the markets of Patna and Gaya, showing that Bihar, too, was under the domination of the Later Great Kushānas. In Bengal also three coins have subsequently come to light, one from Malda and two from Mahasthan in Bogra District.

---

1 The exact name of the race to which Kanishka and his successors belonged was for long not known. The discovery of the Māś inscription which is in Brāhmī and presents the Sanskrit form *Kushāna-patrā* (A. R. ASI, 1911-12, Pt. II, p. 124) now leaves no doubt as to Kushāna being the correct name of this race. This name has therefore been adopted throughout this book. In *JRAS*, 1914, pp. 79 ff. and pp. 754 ff., Baron A. von Stael-Holstein ingeniously seeks to show that this name was Kusha or Kusa, and not Kushāna. But his view has been strongly disseminated from by scholars like J. F. Fleet (*ibid.*, pp. 369 ff., pp. 1000 ff.), J. Allan (*ibid.*, pp. 405 ff.) and others.
3 R. D. Banerji, however, surmises that Kharapallāna was in charge of North-eastern India, and Vanashpara, of Magadha (*The Age of the Imperial Guptas*, Benares, 1933, p. 2). As Vanashpara was the smaller officer and is associated with the benefaction, presumably he was in charge of the Varanasi District.
7 *The Age of the Imperial Guptas*, p. 2. The statement was confirmed later by the excavations of Spooner at Patna, as we shall presently see.
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Two of these, again, belong to Vāsudēva, and one is a Later Great Kushāṇa. This last is a coin of the third century a.D. and seems to have been issued from some part of Eastern Bengal. It thus appears that when the tide of Kushāṇa conquest broke in upon North India, it did not stop till it swept off Bihar, Bengal and Orissa also.

The Imperial Great Kushāṇas must have ruled over Āryāvarta and East India for a century or so, that is, up till c. 230 a.D. They were succeeded by the Later Great Kushāṇas, whose power, however, was considerably weakened, with the result that many of the provinces in Central and East India became more or less independent of the Kushāṇa family. The western part of Āryāvarta was held by rulers of the Nāga race. As we shall see subsequently, three Nāga houses had risen to prominence about this time, with capitals situated at Mathurā, Padmāvatī and Dharā. The central part was ruled over by the Bhāraśivas, who are known only from the copper-plate grants of the Vākṣṭa dynasty. According to them, the Bhāraśivas performed ten Aśva-mādhavas. And they are said to have obtained possession of the Bṛādrathī through their valour and were anointed to sovereignty with her holy waters. As there is such a site as Daśa-vamśedha at Varanasi and as the river Gāṅgā is considered to be particularly holy at this place, it is difficult not to agree with the late K. P. Jayaswal in saying that it was the Varanasi province which was occupied by the Bhāraśivas.2 Years ago George Bühler3 identified the Bhāraśivas with Bhārā Ṛājputī, who are found chiefly in Eastern Oudh and the Basti District in the U.P.4 Only one prince is known to us of this race, namely Bhavanāga, from the Vākṣṭa records. It is true that this name ends in nāga; but it is not quite safe merely on this ground to assert that the Bhāraśivas were Nāgas, especially as the Bhārs are not known to be a branch of the Nāgas. The eastern part, consisting principally of Bihar, seems at this time to have owned the sway of the Lichchhavīs, who, as we shall presently see, ruled at Pāṭaliputra. Such was the political condition of North India when the Guptas came to power. The Purāṇas are by no means our safe guide for this period. They make no mention of the Kushāṇa dynasty, or, for the matter of that, any one of its celebrated monarchs such as Kanishka, Huvishka and Vāsudēva. There is no mention, again, of the Bhāraśivas or of the Lichchhavīs, whose existence, nay, importance, at this epoch is attested by epigraphic records. The Purānic accounts present but a jumbled mass of dynastic names and regnal years, the confusion of which no scholar has yet been able satisfactorily to reduce to order.

Chandragupta I

The first king of the Gupta dynasty who raised himself to eminence is Chandragupta I. This may be seen from the fact that he is the first of the Gupta family who has been styled Mahārājādhirāja, his father and grandfather, Ghaṭōktūka and Gupta, being called simply Mahārāja. The former of these titles at this time denoted an overlord, and the latter, a feudatory chieftain. In the Allahabad pillar inscription (No. 1 below), the actual name given of Chandragupta’s grandfather is Śrīgupta. But Fleet has adduced cogent reasons to show that here īrī is an honorific prefix and does not form an integral part of the name.5 His real name is thus, according to this record, not Śrīgupta, but Gupta. To supplement Fleet’s arguments, John

2 JBORS, Vol. XX, pp. 5-6.
3 ASI, Vol. IV, p. 119.
5 K. P. Jayaswal in JBORS, Vol. XX, p. 8. In the Chaulukya line of Anahilapāṭaka, we have not one, but two, kings, Kumārapāla and Ajayapāla, whose names end in -pāla. But we cannot on that evidence assert that they were Pālas. As a matter of fact, we know that they were Sūraṇikīs.
Allan has quoted examples of the use of ‘Gupta’ as a proper name. Gupta was thus the name of the father of the celebrated Buddhist saint, Upagupta. Rapson, again, has published a seal with the legend Gutasya (=Gautasya) in mixed Sanskrit and Prakrit, standing, of course, for the Sanskrit Gautasya. Similarly, Hoernle possessed a clay seal reading Śrī-Gautasya and belonging apparently to the third century A.D. Basak is of opinion that not the first, but the second, of these seals belongs to Gupta, the grandfather of Chandragupta. Allan points out that I-Ts'ing, the Chinese pilgrim, who travelled in India in the seventh century A.D., speaks of a ‘great king’ (mahārāja), Śrī-Gupta, who built a temple near Mrigasikāhāvana for the benefit of Chinese pilgrims and who lived some five hundred years before his own time of pilgrimage in India. This statement of I-Ts'ing has already been noted by Fleet, who, however, rejects the identification of this Śrī-Gupta with our Gupta, first because the former’s name is Śrīgupta, and not Gupta, and secondly because I-Ts'ing’s date would place him about 175 A.D., which is too early. “It is not, however, necessary,” says Allan by way of reply, “to regard the Śrī here as an integral part of the name (śrīyā guptaḥ); it is frequently used as an honorific by the Chinese writers.” He, however, admits that the chronological difficulty is more serious, but argues that the chronological part of I-Ts'ing’s statement is vague and may not be taken too literally. He further argues that “it is unlikely that we should have two different rulers in the same territory of the same name within so brief a period.” “But have we not,” asks H. C. Rayachaudhuri pertinently, “two Chandra Guptas and two Kumāra Guptas within brief periods?” There is thus no good reason to identify Śrī-Gupta of I-Ts'ing who lived about 175 A.D. with Chandragupta’s grandfather who flourished a century later. It is again very doubtful whether Gupta with which the Gupta lineage begins can really be the proper name of any prince of this dynasty. For his son is Ghaṭōtkacha, his son Chandra, and his son Samudra. As these are genuine proper names, they can be joined to their dynastic names so as to form the complete names, Ghaṭōtkachagupta, Chandragupta, and Samudragupta. If Gupta, the name of the first prince of this family, is a proper name, we ought for the same reason to call him Gupatagupta, which, however, sounds fanciful to a degree. Besides, we have in this connection to note what the Poona Plates of Prabhāvatigupta* have to say on this point. Prabhāvatigupta, as we shall see later on, was a daughter of Chandragupta II and grand-daughter of Samudragupta. She was thus not far removed from the latter. And yet, her record, while describing her pedigree,distinctly says that the first king of the Guptas is, not Gupta, but the Mahārāja Ghaṭōtkacha. The exact wording of the inscription is: āśīr-sūryā Mahārāja-Ghaṭōtkachas (lines 1-2), which can mean only “there was the Mahārāja, the illustrious Ghaṭōtkacha, the first king among the Guptas.” No reasonable doubt can thus be entertained as to Ghaṭōtkacha being really the first ruler of this dynasty. And it appears that Gupta has been mentioned at all, because it is customary to introduce an illustrious personage by specifying details about the two generations preceding him. Chandragupta was the first independent king of the Gupta family. His father’s and grand-father’s names had thus to be specified. His father’s name was well-known, namely, Ghaṭōtkacha. But the latter’s father’s name, it seems, was not so. He was practically a nonentity. At any rate, it served no useful purpose to reveal his name, and so he has been mentioned by his family name, Gupta, and the title Mahārāja was appended to it, it seems, by way of courtesy.

---

2 JRAS., 1905, p. 814, Pl. VI. 23.
3 The History of North-easter Indian, etc., p. 5.
5 Ibid.
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That Gupta as a family name was current before 300 A.D. is known to everybody who is conversant with epigraphy. Thus the Ichchāwar Buddhist statuette inscription speaks of the gift of Mahādevī, queen (rājī) of Harišāsa, sprung from the Gupta race. In still earlier times the Gupta figured as prominently as any Brāhmaṇa gōtra, as we have pointed out elsewhere. The celebrated Bhārhatū tūra inscription records that it was erected by Vatsiputra Dhanabhūti, son of Gauptiputra Anāradyut (Gōtiputa Āgarajuh), and grandson of the king (rājan) Gārgiputra Visvādeva, while the Śunigas were wielding sway. As Visvādeva is here called a rājan, there can be no doubt that his son and grandson pertained to a ruling family. Further, it is worthy of note that whereas Visvādeva and Dhanabhūti are styled Gārgiputra and Vatsiputra respectively, showing that their mothers belonged to these Vedic gōtras, Anāradyut alone is styled Gōtiputa (Gauptiputra) showing that his mother belonged to the Gupta clan which was anything but a Vedic gōtra. As a Gupta lady could be married into a ruling family, it is no wonder if matrimonial relations prevailed between the Guptas and the nobility. Thus a Kārle cave inscription informs us that the column in front of the cave was set up by one Agimitraṇaka (Agnimitra) who was not only a Mahāraṭhi but also a Gōtiputra. Here also Lüders has rightly taken Gōtiputra to mean 'son of a Gaupti'. And the appellation Mahāraṭhi is a title found borne about this time by some feudal chiefs. The conclusion is irresistible that Gupta, though it was not a Brāhmaṇa gōtra, denoted a clan of high dignity, which could enter into matrimonial alliances with the ruling classes and the nobility. But this is not all, because Gupta is a name which is found among families of lower status also. Thus an inscription4 of Sāvīcī Stūpa No. 1 speaks of the royal scribe (rāja-liṭikāra) Subāhita as Gōtiputa (=Gautiputra), ‘son of a Gōti (i.e. of a mother of the Gupta family).’ Similarly an inscription on a Lucknow Provincial Museum sculpture speaks of one Utara (Uttara), son of a Gōti (Gautpi), as Śraṇikā, ‘goldsmith’. Thus, like the Abhiras and the Gurjaras, the Guptas seem to have originally been a tribe which was merged into the Hindu population leaving a trace of its name in the various castes into which it was lost.

It is not very difficult to surmise how Chandragupta rose to power. It was doubtless through his marriage with the Lichchhavi princess, Mahādevī Kumāradēvi. Their son, Samudragupta, in his Allahabad pillar inscription, calls himself with pride Līchchhavi-dauhītra, ‘the daughter’s son of the Lichchhavi (King).’ The same epithet has been applied to him by his successors in their records. The union of Chandragupta with the Lichchhavi clan was thus considered to be an event of great importance by the members of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. The same conclusion is pointed to by a series of coins, on the obverse of which are the figures of Chandragupta and his queen Kumāradēvi, known by the names appearing on them, and on the reverse the legend Līchchhavayaḥ, ‘the Lichchhavis’. As mention is made of the Lichchhavis on the reverse, the inference is obvious that they were subordinate to both Chandragupta and Kumāradēvi. And as Kumāradēvi was a Lichchhavi princess, it was through her that he became a ruler of the Lichchhavis, or, rather, a joint ruler of the Lichchhavi territory. It seems that the father of Kumāradēvi was the last male chief of the Lichchhavi clan in East India and that Kumāradēvi was his only child, and when he died, Kumāradēvi succeeded him to the kingdom of the Lichchhavis, in which function she was naturally associated with her husband. The series of coins referred to above has been described

---

1 Lüders’ List, No. 11.
2 Ibid., No. 687.
3 Ibid., No. 1088.
4 Ibid., No. 271.
by Allan as memorial medals struck by Samudragupta in honour of his parents, but without any cogent grounds. His contention is that Samudragupta’s Standard Type of Coins is a very close, almost slavish, imitation of those of the Later Great Kushāṇas. In fact, there is no other type of Gupta coins, which comes so close to this prototype. On the other hand, the Chandragupta-Kumāradēvi Type is one step further removed from the Kushāṇa prototype. Again, Allan maintains that there is no evidence that Kushāṇa coins circulated in the Gupta territory about this time. In fact, he says that they belong to the north-west part of India, and are rarely found outside the Panjab. We have therefore to place the origin of the Gupta coinage at a period when the Guptas came into contact with the Later Great Kushāṇas. This was not possible before the time of Samudragupta, because it was he who first came in touch with them, or with the Shāhi-Shāhānushāhīs as they have been described in his Allahabad inscription. The Chandragupta-Kumāradēvi coins cannot thus be attributed to Chandragupta I, as has been done by V. A. Smith and others, but must be considered to have been issued by Samudragupta in commemoration of his parents and his Lichchhāvī descent. This is no doubt what Allan wrote in 1914. We are not sure, however, whether he still clings to the view in the light of the knowledge we possess at present. We have already stated on the authority of R. D. Banerji that the gold and copper coins of the Later Great Kushāṇas are to this day abundant in the markets of Patna and Gaya and that subsequently a hoard of coins came to light in the erstwhile Mayurbhanj State containing 170 Puri Kushāṇas and 112 Imperial Great Kushāṇas. If this is not considered sufficient evidence, we may turn to the account given by D. B. Spooner of his own excavations at Basārī in the A. R. ASI., 1913-14. On page 122 thereof, while speaking of clearly legible coin of Kadphises picked up in these excavations, Spooner says: “Coins of Kadphises II have certainly been found as far east as Benares, but I am under the impression that no coin apart from the present specimen, is known from a site so far east as Vaiśālī. The point, however, is of no particular importance, as the difference between Banaras and Vaiśālī is inconsiderable, and the Honourable Mr. Burn whom I have consulted, tells me he seems to remember having heard of specimens recovered even at Patna.” And on the same page in a footnote he gives us the following further and more important information: “Since writing the above, I have found large numbers of Kushana coins, copper and gold (2 specimens), at Pātaliputra.” No detailed report of this find has been published, so far as we now know. But under the heading “Mr. Tata’s Excavations at Pataliputra”, Spooner has given a brief account of it in the Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Eastern Circle, for 1913-14, p. 71. From it, it appears that he found there a hoard of Kushāṇa copper coins fiftytwo in number. And he remarks further: “This is presumably the largest find of Kushana coins at so easterly a point as Patna. They have not yet been cleaned, however, and cannot individually be assigned as yet. Coins of Kadphises II, of Kanishka and Huvishka appear to be among the lot, but very few are now distinguishable. The majority are not in good condition.” This leaves not even the shadow of a doubt as to Kushāṇa coins having been prevalent just in that province of Bihar where the Imperial Gupta power sprang into existence. No historian or even numismatist will now subscribe to the view that Gupta coinage originated with Samudragupta and at a time when he came into contact with the Later Great Kushāṇas in East Panjab, because no Kushāṇa coins ever circulated in East India when Chandragupta rose to power. It is safer and more natural to say that the Gupta coins were first issued by Chandragupta and Kumāradēvi themselves and that, as the figures of both

2 Our attention to this was first drawn by the late Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit of the Archaeological Department.
occur on the obverse, they must be taken to be joint rulers and further that, as the Lichchhavvis are mentioned on the reverse, it was their territory that both ruled over, to begin with. It is true that when we, for the first time, hear of the Lichchhavvis, that is, in the time of the Buddha from the scriptures of both Northern and Southern Buddhists, they were a tribal oligarchy, with their capital at Vaśāli (=Baśar). But instances are not unknown of tribes changing their forms of constitution, oligarchic becoming monarchical and monarchical oligarchic. And that, as a matter of fact the Lichchhavvis, who were originally an oligarchy in the time of the Buddha, became later a monarchical tribe, is evident to any scholar who studies the Nēpāl inscriptions published by Bhagwanlal Indrajī. When the Lichchhavvi father-in-law of Chandragupta lived, the Lichchhavvis must have ceased to be oligarchic and assumed a monarchical constitution.

And as Kumārādēvī apparently was his only child, she naturally succeeded him to his kingdom and administered it along with her husband. But where could the capital of this Lichchhavvi kingdom have been? The Allahabad inscription speaks of Samudragupta as amusing himself at a place called Pushpa, that is, Pushapura, which can be no other than Pātaliputra. And the presumption is that the capital of his father Chandragupta, and, previous to him, of his Lichchhavvi father-in-law also must have been Pushapura. And it may reasonably be asked whether there is any evidence in support of it. As was first pointed out by Bühler, “Dr. Bhagwanlal’s Nepal inscription No. XV4 informs us that the Lichchhavvi ruled before the conquest of Nepal, and possibly also after that event, at Pushapura or Pātaliputra, the ancient capital of India north of the Ganges.” No reasonable doubt can thus be entertained as to Chandragupta having formed a marriage alliance of extreme political importance which enabled him to push his fortune and attain to the proud and coveted position of a Mahārājādhirāja. Evidently his son and successors had good reasons to remember it.

It must not, however, be supposed that the rule of Chandragupta did not extend beyond Bihar or that he struck only one type of coins, namely, that commemorating his union with the Lichchhavvis. The Lichchhavvi territory was no doubt his matrimonial acquisition. But it seems exceedingly improbable that his sway was confined only to that small region. This is unmistakably controverted by the title of Mahārājādhirāja which is coupled with his name and which indicates his imperial rank. Surely with the help and prowess of the Lichchhavvis he must have extended the bounds of the Lichchhavvi territory which he had acquired through marriage. In this connection may be quoted the well-known Puranic verse defining the Gupta dominions which Allan6 has rightly taken as referring to his reign:

\[
\text{anu Vaśālīn Prayāgan cha Sākētaṁ Magadhāṁ} = \text{tathā} | \\
\text{ētān} = \text{janapadān sarvān bhākṣyantā Gupta-vanśajāḥ} ||
\]

It must be confessed that these lines have been badly composed, because Prayāga and Sākēta are towns and not countries (janapadāḥ) as no doubt follows from the wording ētān = janapadān sarvān. Besides, Sākēta is not situated on the Ganges. The meaning of the verse, however, is clear enough. It means that kings of the Gupta family will enjoy all territories

---

5. *Vasu Ori. Jour.*, Vol. V, p. 225. Following Fleet, V. A. Smith at first thought that Chandragupta’s alliance was with the Lichchhavvi family of Nepal (*JRA*, 1899, p. 55), but afterwards agreed with Bühler in that this royal family was that of Pātaliputra (*ibid.*, 1899, p. 81).
along the Ganges and that their might will spread not only over the Magadha country but also beyond as far as Prayāga and Sākēta. Magadha here denotes the Lichchhavi territory with Pātaliputra as its capital. So the Gupta dominions herein described extended as far westward as Prayāga (Allahabad), and even Sākēta (Ayōdhyā), that is, much beyond Magadha. This description of the extent of the Gupta territory cannot possibly fit his son, Samudragupta, because his kingdom, as we shall see shortly, had spread over a much wider area, and was practically co-extensive with the whole of Aryāvarta, excluding only West Panjab, Sind, and some parts of Rajputana. Chandragupta thus seems to have obtained East India through his marriage alliance with the Lichchhavis and to have uprooted the Bhārāśivas of Varanasi and annexed their territory to his own dominions.

Allan aptly remarks about Chandragupta I that “it is unlikely that, as he was a mahārājādhikāra, he was content to issue a ‘joint’ coinage throughout his reign” especially as it extended over “a comparatively long period.” In this connection we have to bear in mind that there were two Chandraguptas of this imperial dynasty and that it is not at all improbable that coins that were really issued by Chandragupta I have been foisted upon his grandson who was his namesake. We may thus select for our consideration what is called the Chhattra Type of Chandragupta II. This is the type to which V. A. Smith has given the name ‘Umbrella’. But “it seems better,” says Allan, “to retain the Indian term, as it has the technical meaning of a symbol of royal power.” On the obverse, the king stands sacrificing at an altar with his right hand, his left leaning on a sword hilt. Behind him is a boy or dwarf attendant who holds a chhatta over him. If any king of the Imperial Gupta dynasty had the first claim to issue this coinage, it was Chandragupta I, as he was the first ruler of this family who made himself a mahārājādhikāra with whose rank alone the chhatta symbol agrees best. Secondly, it is worthy of note that this coin type was not struck by any other Gupta sovereign. The only Gupta sovereign that was therefore pre-eminently fitted to issue the Chhatta Type must be Chandragupta I. Thirdly, we have to bear in mind that this Type presents “a number of varieties” which suits excellently for the long reign of Chandragupta I. All evidence thus points to this sovereign being responsible for the striking of this Chhatta Type. We have again to note that there is one coin type which is common to all kings of this imperial dynasty, namely, the Archer Type. We find it issued not only by Samudragupta, Chandragupta II, Kumāragupta I and Skandagupta, but also by the successors of Skandagupta with the solitary exception of Prakāśāditya. It is inconceivable that it was not struck by Chandragupta I, although he was a mahārājādhikāra. The natural conclusion is that some of the specimens of this type that have so long been attributed to Chandragupta II must now be attributed to Chandragupta I, especially as Allan tells us that the “Archer coins of Chandragupta are by far the commonest of the whole series, and a considerable number of varieties may be distinguished . . . .” We shall therefore not be far from right if we say that Chandragupta I struck coins not only of the Chandragupta-Kumāragadēvi Type but also of the Chhatta and Archer Types. The last two types give him the title of Vikrama and Vikramāditya. This does not run counter to any established conclusions, because this title was not the monopoly of Chandragupta II, and we know

---

2 Ibid., p. lxxxii.
4 This line of argument was first advanced by Krishnaswami Aiyangar, though with some difference, in his Studies in Gupta History (JHH., Vol. VI, University supplement), p. 12.
6 Ibid., p. lxxviii.
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Skandagupta and Purugupta\(^1\) also style themselves *Vikramaditya* and *Vikrama* on their coins respectively.\(^2\)

**Samudragupta**

Chandragupta was succeeded by his son, Samudragupta. In the Allahabad pillar inscription there is a stanza which refers to this succession. Once when the Durbar was being held, the father seeking for real worth, called the son to him in the open assembly, and, having embraced him with his hair standing on end, addressed the words: “do protect the whole earth,” with the consequence that the other princely claimants cast jealous looks of disappointment though the courtiers themselves breathed cheery. Fleet takes this verse “to indicate that Chandragupta I specially selected Samudragupta, from among several brothers, to conquer the land and to succeed him on the throne.”\(^3\) What Fleet apparently means is that Chandragupta selected Samudragupta to succeed him to the throne forthwith. The words in question are denuded of all meaning, if we suppose that Samudragupta was appointed merely as heir-apparent. It, therefore, seems that after leading a hard and strenuous life, during which he raised himself to the rank of *Mahārājādhirāja*, Chandragupta abdicated the throne\(^1\) after formally appointing Samudragupta as his successor. It thus appears that Samudragupta was not the only son of Chandragupta, or even the eldest amongst them, and that he was so chosen for his valour, tact, and other extraordinary powers.

If Samudragupta was thus selected as immediate successor to the empire, to the exclusion of other princes of equal birth, it must have naturally created jealousy amongst them and consequently incited some of the frontier kings also to challenge his accession, at such a supremely psychological moment. This, in fact, follows from stanza 7 of the Allahabad inscription. In this verse there is a clear mention of Achyuta and Nāgasēna, and along with them has been associated in one compound word (in line 13) a third prince whose name is lost. The initial letter of his name, however, has been preserved, and is *ga*. In this connection it is worthy of note that the names of Nāgasēna and Achyuta have been mentioned also in line 21 of this record and in this order in the list of the Āryāvarta rulers destroyed by Samudragupta. And it is further worthy of note that continguously with, and immediately preceding, Nāgasēna, occurs the name of Ganapatināga, which doubtless begins with the letter *ga*. The conclusion is almost irresistible that the name of the third prince mentioned along with Achyuta and Nāgasēna in verse 7 (line 13) in the same compound word, must be restored to Ganapati or some such word. And, as has been pointed out below, where the text of the inscription has been set forth, it can be easily and safely restored to Ganapa which is synonymous with Ganapati. We have thus three princes, namely, Achyuta, Nāgasēna and Ganapati mentioned together in one Sanskrit compound. And we are further told that through the prowess of his arm which was at once overflowing and imperious, Samudragupta, singly (ekēna) and in a moment (kshatāt), uprooted the three kings just mentioned. Here the words


\(^2\) It is worthy of note that in the Gupta inscriptions Ghatotkachā has been called *Mahārāja*, but Chandragupta I, Samudragupta, Chandragupta II, etc., have been styled *Mahārājādhirāja*. In the Vākāṭaka plates, however, whereas the Poona plates designate Ghatotkachā and Chandragupta I, *Mahārāja*, Samudragupta and Chandragupta II, *Mahārājādhirāja*, the Riddapura plates call Chandragupta II alone as *Mahārājādhirāja* and the rest simply *Mahārāja*. It seems that the Vākāṭaka court writers were not great sticklers in regard to the royal formulary.


\(^4\) The idea of a king entrusting the royal insignia to one of his sons and betaking himself to a forest like Vānaprastha has been repeatedly expressed by Kālidāsa in his *Raghuveśa* (I. 8; III. 70; XIX. 1).
ékëna and kshayāt leave no doubt as to this Gupta monarch having met the three foes at one and the same time and on one and the same battle-field. Evidently, Achyuta, Nāgasesa and Gaṇapatināga had formed a coalition to put down Samudragupta, apparently at a time when there were jealousy and dissatisfaction created amongst his brothers and half-brothers at his being promoted to the throne by his father. But Samudragupta broke it down by killing them in a well-pitched battle. It was not, however, a three-membered confederacy. There was a fourth prince also who had joined the coalition. He has no doubt been mentioned in the same stanza, but in the next line (line 14). His name is not given, and he is spoken of merely as “a scion of the Kōta family”. And Samudragupta, we are told, caused him to be captured through his forces while he himself was sporting at a place called Pushpa, that is, at Pātaliputra. What this means is that after exterminating the three princes mentioned above, Samudragupta returned to Pātaliputra, convinced that he had practically finished the game and won it, but sent part of his army in pursuit of the fourth prince. This last foe was finally made a captive and brought to Pātaliputra where the monarch had been amusing himself as before.

We thus see that a hostile confederacy had been organised against Samudragupta, apparently when he ascended the throne. His first act, therefore, that turned the scales of political fortune in his favour, was the battle he forthwith gave to the three of the four princes that had formed the coalition. The most important personality of the group is Gaṇapatināga. He has been correctly identified with Gaṇapati or Gaṇendra whose coins have been found at Narwar, Gohad, Doab, and Besnagar in Central India.1 There is a poetic work entitled Bhāva-śataka, or rather Nāgarājāsata which was printed long ago in Kāvyamālā, part iv, pp. 37-52. Verse 2 thereof runs as follows:

\[\text{Nāgarājāsataḥ granthāṁ Nāgarājēna tarvalā} \]
\[\text{akāri Gajavaktra-śrīrāḥ Nāgarājē girām gurāḥ} \]

In the printed text the second half of the Anushtubh śloka has Gajavaktra which does not yield good sense, but, in a Mithilā manuscript, which the late K. P. Jayaswal2 was so fortunate as to secure, it is Gajavaktra which is obviously the correct reading and becomes identical with the name of (king) Gaṇapati mentioned in verse 80 of that work. What we thus learn from verse 2 is that the work in question, namely Nāgarājāsata, was composed by Nāgarāja, who thereby rendered Gajavaktra Nāgarāja, the venerable personage of his praise. Evidently two Nāgarājas are here referred to—one the poet and panegyrist and the other the king who is the subject of the praise. The first is Nāgarāja by proper name. The second is Nāgarāja by epithet, meaning ‘the king of the Nāga clan’, his proper name apparently being Gajavaktra, that is Gaṇapati. At the end of the book has been given very briefly the family history of the poet Nāgarāja. There was one Vidyādha, who belonged to the Karpaṭi gōtra. His son was Jālapa, the most praiseworthy of the Ṭaka family.3 From him sprang up Nāgarāja, the ornament of the Ṭaka race. Further information about the king is also supplied by two verses in

---


2 Hist. of India 150 A. D. to 550 A. D., pp. 38 ff. See in this connection also the views of Dasharatha Sharma expressed in his article: The Nāgarāja of the Bhāvasataka published in JIH., Vol. XIII, pt. 3, pp. 303-05. So far as we could see, both of them were unable to distinguish between the two Nāgarājas, causing some confusion in their thought.

3 Ṭaka is the same as Ṭakka, which, as an ethnic designation, is used in connection with the name of certain persons in the Rājaratnāgīrī, vii, 520, 1001, 1064 and 1207. In the time of Huien Tsang, the Ṭakka kingdom was well-known and was situated somewhere between the Chenab and Ravi (Stein’s translation of Kalhana’s Rājaratnāgīrī, Vol. I, p. 205, note 150). CASIR., Vol. II, pp. 8-10.
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This work. Verse 80 tells us that all the lords of the Nāgas looked up to Ganapatī, being afraid of the Mayūras, presumably the Mauryas. As he has again been called Dhārādhāsa in verse 62, it appears that his capital was Dhāra, apparently modern Dhar, headquarters of the Dhar District, Madhya Pradesh.

The second prince of the confederacy quelled by Samudragupta is Nāgasena. In this connection Hall was the first to draw our attention to a passage in the Harshacharita of Banya, which says that there was one Nāgasena in Padmavati belonging to the Nāga house, whose fall was caused by the disclosure of his policy by a sārikī bird. This is just what Banya has actually told us. And the commentator Śaṅkarāryya further informs us that this Nāgasena took counsel, in the presence of a sārikī bird, to restrain one of his ministers who had possessed himself of one-half of the kingdom but that the minister having come to know about it in confidence from the bird managed to kill the king with a club (daṇḍa). It is no doubt possible to argue that as this Nāgasena was killed at Padmavati on account of some political intrigue, he cannot be identical with Nāgasena who met with his end on a battlefield. There is nothing, however, in the statement of Banya or his commentator to show that he was murdered in the palace. And the battle in which Samudragupta confronted the confederated kings may have taken place at or near Padmavati itself, and the Gupta king may have been here joined by the minister of Nāgasena who perhaps killed his own master and thus helped the Gupta ruler to get rid of his one enemy. Padmavati has been satisfactorily identified with Pawāya in the Gwalior territory by M. B. Garde, the Archaeological Superintendent of the former Gwalior State.

The third member of the confederacy against Samudragupta was Achyutanandin. Some copper and bronze coins, bearing the syllables acīya and found in the site of Ahichhatra (Ramnagar, Bareilly District, Uttar Pradesh), were years ago attributed by V. A. Smith and Rapson to this Achyuta. In their general character they resemble the coins of the Nāga kings found in Central India, and it is possible that Achyuta may himself have been a Nāga, but belonging apparently to the Nāga house of Ahichhatra. Formerly the compound Achyutanandin was divided into two parts, each part denoting a separate prince (Achyuta and Nandin) destroyed by Samudragupta. It is, however, much better, like Ganapatīnāga, to take Achyutanandin as one name. The Purans represent Bhūtīnandin, Śīśunandin and Yaśōnandin as ruling over Vidiśā after the Śuṅgas. The second component of these names is -nandin, and, so far as we can judge, they seem to have pertained to the Nāga clan. This strengthens the conclusion that Achyutanandin is one name and that he was in all likelihood a member of the Nāga race. The fourth ruler who had joined the coalition, as we have seen, belonged to the Kota family. Smith tells us that "the rude copper coins with Śiva and bull on the obverse, and the monogram reading Kota—are common in the Delhi Bazar and in the Eastern Panjab. They are copied obviously from the money of Vāsuḍēva Kūshāṇa, and some of the reverse devices may be an echo of the Sassanian type." Rapson, however, was the first to connect the Kota coins with

---

1 Dhāra has been very well known ever since the ascendency of the Paramāra. But even before the rise of the Paramāra power, Iivaravarmar, a Maukharī king, who ruled in circa 550 A.D. is known from a Jaunpur stone inscription to have expelled the attack of a prince of Dhāra, situated not far from the Vindhyas; CLX, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 226-30.
3 For the text of and commentary on this work, see Harshacharita (Bo. Sk. and Pt. Series), pp. 267-68. See also translation by Cowell and Thomas, p. 192, where Nāgasena is said to be an "heir to the Nāga house", which, however, is not warranted by the text.
7 Purpater, Dyn. Kali Age, pp. 49 and 72-73. Compare also the variants of these names given in the foot-note.
the Kõta-kula of our epigraph. The Kõtas may thus be placed in some region where North-Eastern Rajputana and Eastern Panjab meet.

It will thus be seen that the confederacy that sprang up against Samudragupta soon after his accession to the throne consisted of four members, three of whom belonged to the Nõga race and one to the Kõta clan. At the head of this coalition was Ganaçati, who was a Taka Nõga by extraction and who ruled over Dhârâ. Where the battle actually took place is not known with any certainty. Probably it came off in the vicinity of Padmâvati, the capital town of Nõgasêna, himself a Nõga and one of the confederate princes. It seems that the fourth ruler, a Kõta by clan, was not allowed to meet the Nõga kings, as perhaps their armies reinforced by the troops of the Kõta king would have proved too formidable a combination for Samudragupta to encounter and vanquish. Like a clever tactician Samudragupta therefore seems to have given battle to the Nõga rulers before the Kõta could join them, and not only worsted but actually killed them in the fight. The game was thus practically over, and Samudragupta returned triumphant to Pâtaliputra, taking care, however, to see that the fourth member of the confederacy was not allowed to remain free and unpunished. He therefore sent some forces in pursuit of him. The Kõta king was before long captured and presumably taken in chains to Pâtaliputra where Samudragupta had already plunged himself into his usual round of pleasures and amusements. That the formation of this confederacy was a great menace to the Gupta power and that its destruction was consequently regarded as the greatest of Samudragupta's military feats is inferred from the fact that this achievement alone has been described in the verse portion with which the Allahabad pillar inscription begins although the Nõga princes of this coalition have again been mentioned in the prose portion of the same record enumerating the list of the Aryavarta rulers whom this Gupta sovereign exterminated.

Two records are known of Samudragupta, one engraved on the Asõkan pillar, now standing in the Allahabad fort, and, the other, on a stone originally found at Erân in the Sagar District, Madhya Pradesh. The latter is not only a fragment but a small inscription and tells us hardly anything about him. The former, on the other hand, is a very long record, although the upper part of it has suffered very much, partly from the peeling off of the stone surface in several places and partly from the mediaeval inscriptions indiscriminately engraved on and between the original lines, nothing of historical importance has been obliterated. Practically speaking, it is our only and most important source of information for Samudragupta, and, for the matter of that, for the political condition of India in the fourth century A.D. The inscription is a historical composition of the prâsasti or panegyrical type setting forth not only the mighty monarch's military achievements but also his personal accomplishments. It calls itself a kâtyâ or poetic composition, and was drawn up by Harishêna, son of Dhruvabhûti. Harishêna was without doubt a officer of high position, as he bears the threefold designation, Sândhivigrhaika, Kumârâmâya and Mahâdânânâyaka. His father also was a man of no mean rank, because he, too, was a Mahâdânânâyaka. As Harishêna was a Sândhivigrhâika or Minister of Peace and War, he must have come into intimate contact with Samudragupta. It is, therefore, no wonder if he has described himself as "the slave of the very same venerable Bhâttâraka, whose mind has expanded through the favour of staying near (him)." Harishêna also calls

1 J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 450.
2 Krishnaswami Aiyangar is the first to suspect the formation of this confederacy against Samudragupta. He says: "The achievement of Samudragupta against Acharya, Nágasêna and the ruler of the Kõta family in Pushpapura may have been an attack by these monarchs in combination against the capital Patna." (Studies in Gupta History, II, Vol. VI, University Supplement, p. 27; also p. 37). K. P. Jayaswal has taken up the idea and in his own way developed it by saying that Samudragupta confronted the Naga rulers at Kausâmibhi, while another Gupta army laid siege to Pushpapura and captured Kõta's descendant who was the ruler of Pátaliputra at the time" (History of India 150 A.D. to 530 A.D., pp. 182-33).
himself Khādiyaṭapākika which shows that he was a native of Khādiyaṭapākika. It may be observed that the Allahabad pillar inscription is not a posthumous record as supposed by Fleet. For this rather egregious conclusion he relies upon lines 29-30 where the king’s fame is described as itas�-tridāpati-bhārama-gamana-vaapta-lalita-sukha-viṣherṣaṇa, which he renders by “(has departed) hence (and now) experiences the sweet happiness attained by (his) having gone to the abode of (Indra) the lord of the gods.” The most serious fault in this translation is the word ‘(his)’ which Fleet has imported into it, but, which is not warranted by the passage quoted above. The person that went to the abode of Indra is not he, that is, Samudragupta, but his kīrti or Fame which is invariably personified as a female in Sanskrit poetry. And Sanskrit poets are always in the habit of describing the Fame of their hero king as first pervading the whole earth and, when she finds it impossible to spread any further on the earth, as thereafter ascending to heaven. But this does not mean at all that their hero king is defunct. And, further, if Samudragupta had really been deceased when this record was put up, Harishena would certainly have mentioned the name of the monarch who was then ruling, especially as he speaks of his mind having been expanded in consequence of his always staying near the Bhattacharaka, who cannot but stand for the ruling monarch. These reasons make it abundantly clear that the Allahabad pillar inscription is not a posthumous record, composed at the bidding of Samudragupta’s successor, but a contemporary epigraph, containing an account of his reign and achievements.

The Allahabad pillar inscription is historically a most important document, because it throws light not only on the expeditions of conquest undertaken by Samudragupta but also upon the historical geography of the period, and, above all, the system of political organisation that had developed in India at that time. Let us, in the first place, see what it tells us about the Gupta monarch, his military achievements and his personal accomplishments. It covers thirty-two lines and a half, consisting of eight verses at the beginning (lines 1-16), a long prose passage (lines 17-30), a concluding verse (lines 30-31), a subscription of the author (lines 31-32) in which he specifies details about himself (and these we have already considered), and lastly a postscript (line 33) added by the officer of Samudragupta who saw to the engraving of this prāśasti on the Asokan column. The first part of the epigraph which consists of eight verses occupying the first sixteen lines of it is badly preserved. It tells us something of his character and accomplishments, and, above all, the unique military glory he attained by putting down the Confederacy of Four by a coup de main, killing three and fettering one member thereof. As three of the princes that formed this Confederacy have been mentioned again in the prose passage of the record where the list of the Aryavarta rulers destroyed by him is given and as nevertheless all the members of the Confederacy have been thought fit to be mentioned in the verse portion of the inscription which again does not speak of any other of his conquests, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this military achievement of Samudragupta was then considered to be of supreme importance. This matter, however, we have already dealt with in extenso.

The next passage which is in prose describes the many and manifold conquests achieved by Samudragupta in the different parts of India. It begins with the kings of Dakshinapatha whom he captured but released. Not only their names but also those of their kingdoms have been specified. They are as follows: (1) Mahendra of Kosalā, (2) Vyaghrarāja of Mahākāntāra, (3) Maṇṭarājā of Kurāla, (4) Mahendragiri of Pishāpura, (5) Svāmidatta of Koṭṭāra, (6) Damana of Eruṇḍapalla, (7) Vishnuḍopa of Kāñchī, (8) Nilarāja of Avamukta, (9) Hastivarman of Veṅgi, (10) Ugrasena of Pālakka, (11) Kubera of Dēvarāhṣtra, and (12) Dhanañ-
jaya of Kusulapura. Before we make an attempt to identify these rulers or locate their territories, we have to bear in mind the fact that they were all kings of Dakshināpatha, that is, of India to the south of the Narmadā. No ruler, whose kingdom was to the north of the Narmadā, could here be described as a king of Dakshināpatha and could not thus have been mentioned in this list.

Let us now see, very briefly, what is known about these kings and kingdoms of South India. The first is Mahendra of Kōsala. This Kōsala must be Dakṣiṇa (or South) Kōsala, or Mahākōsala as it is also called. "Mahā-Kōsala" says Cunningham "comprised the whole of the upper valley of the Mahānadi and its tributaries, from the source of the Narbada at Amar-kantak, on the north, to the source of the Mahānadi itself, near Kānker, on the south, and from the valley of the Wen-Gangā, on the west, to the Hasda and Jonk rivers on the east. But these limits have often been extended, so as to embrace the hilly districts of Mandala and Bālāghār, on the west up to the banks of the Wen-Gangā, and the middle valley of the Mahānadi, on the east, down to Sambalpur and Sonpur."1 In other words, it comprises the greater portions of the modern districts of Raipur and Bilaspur in Madhya Pradesh and of such former native states of Orissa as Sonpur and Patna. The country of Kōsala is intimately associated with the Ikshvākus. Thus the Rāmāyaṇa speaks of Kōsala with its capital Ayōdhya, where reigned Daśaratha and his son Rāma who belonged to the Ikshvāku race. In the time of the Buddha, the boundaries of Kōsala had extended. It had then become co-extensive with practically the eastern half of Uttar Pradesh and was ruled over by Pasenadi (Praśenajit) and his son Viḍūṭabha, both scions of the Ikshvāku family. Their capital, however, was not Ayōdhya, but Śrīvasti.2 When we, therefore, hear of Kōsala being situated in Dakshināpatha, the question naturally arises whether the Ikshvākus had proceeded southward and established their kingdom there also. Fortunately, both tradition and epigraphy support the conclusion. The two well-known provinces of Dakshināpatha were Mālaka and Aśoka. According to the Purāṇas, they were so called after two Ikshvākus rulers, son and father, of these names. This clearly shows that according to tradition South India was being colonised long ago by scions of the Ikshvāku race. We have epigraphic evidence also consisting of records found at two Buddhist Stūpas, one at Jaggaṇāyapēṣa in the Krishna District and the other at Nāgarjunīkonda in the Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh. They speak of three Ikshvākus Mahārājas, namely, Vāsishṭhiputra Chāṃtamūla (I), his son Mādhariputra Viṇapuruṣhadatta, and the latter's son Vāsishṭhiputra Ehuvala Chāṃtamūla (II).3 And further what we have to note is that the first of them is eulogised for having celebrated Agnihōtra, Agniśītoma, Vājaḍeyya, and, above all, Aśvamēdhā. The last of these sacrifices is particularly important, as it shows that he was a very powerful ruler. This indicates that the Krishna and Guntur Districts where their monuments have been found were but a tiny part of the mighty kingdom, which was held by these Ikshvākus and which must have embraced Kōsala, which, as its very name indicates, was prima facie the Ikshvāku country of Dakshināpatha. But which was the capital town of this Ikshvāku kingdom—the Southern Kōsala? In this connection we have to note that the Sonepur Plates of Mahābhavagupta II-Janamejaya speak of a place called Kōsala,4 Kōsala cannot but mean 'the city of Ayōdhya', the capital of North Kōsala. It is therefore clear enough that Southern Kōsala also had Kōsala as its capital. Where could it be? It seems tempting to iden-
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1 CASIR., Vol. XVII, p. 68.
2 Car. Lee., 1918, pp. 65 ff.
3 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, pp. 3-4; see also the various transcripts, pp. 16 ff.
4 Ibid., Vol. XXIII, p. 251, line 13. This Kōsala is more centrally situated than Ayōdhya six miles from the capital of the former Nilgiri State in Orissa (Nagendra Nath Vasu's The Archaeological Survey of Mayurbhanj, Vol. I, pp. 87 ff.).
tify it with Kōsala found in the former Patna State, Orissa. Now, Burgess expressed the opinion that the Jaggayyaṇa inscriptions "belong to about the third or fourth century A.D., but are possibly earlier." Vogel, while editing them, placed the reign of King Purisādata in the third century of our era, and "before the accession of the Pallavas to the throne of Veṅgli." And perhaps we shall not be far from right if we suppose that hardly two generations separated the Ikshvāku ruler, Chāṇṭamāla I, from Samudragupta. We may, therefore, take it that these Ikshvākus had carved a powerful kingdom for themselves in the south, that their principal territory was Dakshina Kōsala, but that their might had spread as far south as the Telugu country, and that chronologically they were not much anterior to the Guptas. We may, therefore, safely take it that, in all likelihood, Mahēṇdra, king of Kōsala, who is mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription was a member of the Ikshvāku family and was most probably a son or grandson of Chāṇṭamāla II. What the capital of Kōsala was in the time of Samudragupta we do not know. But about the eighth century A.D. it was certainly Śrīpura, modern Sirpur, because it was from this place that Tivaradēva (c. 800 A.D.), who styled himself 'Supreme Lord of Kōsala', issued two charters. Possibly Śrīpura was the capital of Kōsala even in the time of the Ikshvākus.

The second king of Dakshināpatha that has been mentioned in our inscription is Vyāghraraṇa of Mahākāntāra. It no doubt seems tempting to identify this Vyāghraraṇa with the ruler of that name who is mentioned in the Nāchē-kī-talāī and Gaṇī inscriptions as a feudatory of the Vākṣṣaka king Pṛthivishēṇa, and to say that his principality consisted of portions of the erstwhile Jaso and Ajaigarh States of Bundelkhand. According to Dubreuil, however, the Nāchē-kī-talāī epigraph belongs rather to the fifth than to the fourth century A.D. The late V. S. Sukthankar, who edited the second record, assigns it to about the seventh century. The late Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit agrees with Dubreuil. R. D. Banerji, however, strongly dissents from their view, and maintains the identification of Vyāghraraṇa of the Allahabad inscription with Vyāghrādeva of the Bundelkhand epigraphs. Notwithstanding the criticism of such an authority on palaeography as R. D. Banerji, we feel inclined to ascribe the latter records to the fifth or even the sixth, but not to the fourth century A.D. The overlord of Vyāghrādeva is thus Pṛthivivēṇa II, and not Pṛthivivēṇa I of the Vākṣṣaka line. Besides, the former Jaso and Ajaigarh States, which are supposed to comprise the chieftainship of Vyāghrādeva, are situated to the north, rather than to the south, of the Narmadā. His principality could thus scarcely be taken as forming part of Dakshināpatha. Though Vyāghraraṇa cannot be identified, the province over which he ruled can be located with some degree of probability. We have here to distinguish Mahākāntāra from Sam-Āavika-raṇa referred to later in the record (line 21). This latter, as we shall soon see, corresponds to the forests spread over Bundelkhand and Baghelkhand. Mahākāntāra, therefore, in all likelihood, denotes the forests ranging between Kōsala and Kaliṅga. It no doubt denotes the area of Viśākhapattanam and Gaṇjam, which in a copper plate grant of Narasimhadēva II is called dākshina-jihādakhanḍa. Jhādakhanḍa in Oriya signifies 'a forest region', and the Northern Jhādakhanḍa probably denoted the forest range which separates Bihar from Bengal. This easily explains
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how Samudragupta after passing through Mahākāntāra proceeded immediately southwards to defeat the rulers of Kūrāḷa and Pīṣṭāpurā.

The third prince vanquished by Samudragupta in South India was Māntārāja of Kūrāḷa. The correction of Kūrāḷaka into Kairālaka proposed by Fleet is too egregious to carry conviction, because it involves corrections in two syllables of a name which consists of three.1 Manṭārāja has therefore to be taken as a king, not of Kērāḷa, but of Kūrāḷa or Kōrāḷa. Dubreuil2 thinks the latter to be the correct form of the name, but he makes no attempt to identify it. Barnett, however, identifies it with Kōrāḷa,3 and Aiyangar with Kurdda, the Railway junction Khurda,4 perhaps the same as Khurda on the South-Eastern Railway from Calcutta to Madras. Kielhorn, on the other hand, taking Kūrāḷa as the correct form, identifies it with Kunāḷa, mentioned in the Ahole inscription, as having been reduced by Pulakēśin II of the Chalukya family.5 And both have been identified by him with the well-known Kollēru (Collair) lake between the Godavari and the Krishna rivers. Dubreuil, however, sees no reason why Kūrāḷa should be identified with Kunāḷa. The only argument he urges in support of his position is that the names themselves do not resemble each other.6 But this is just what they do, the three names Kunāḷa, Kūrāḷa and Kollēru corresponding so closely in sound. Kielhorn himself has asked us to compare āḷāna—āṇāla, Aśkalapura—Aḥaṭapura, and karēṇa—kareṇi. And we may also note that l and n are interchangeable in Pāli and the Prakrits. No philological scruples can thus upset the equation Kunāḷa = Kūrāḷa = Kuḷāra = Kollēru. And we have further to note that after conquering Kōsala, whereas Pulakēśin subjugates Kalūga, Pīṣṭāpurā and Kunāḷa from north to south, Samudragupta subjugates Kūrāḷa, Pīṣṭāpurā and Kuṭṭūra from south to north.

The fourth king of Dakshiṇāpatha that we have to consider is Mahēndragiri of Pīṣṭāpurā. Pīṣṭāpurā is the same as the fortress of that name captured by the Chalukya king Pulakēśin II,7 and is the modern Pīṣṭāpuram in the East Godavari District of Andhra Pradesh. Fleet admits that it is natural to divide the text in such a manner as to give us the names Mahēndragiri of Pīṣṭāpurā and Śvāmaddta of Kuṭṭūra. But giri or giv, he says, is a denominational suffix attached to the names of Gōśāvis and cannot be accepted as a suitable termination for a king's name. He has, therefore, divided the text into most embarrassing names, and has been followed by other scholars, setting at naught both grammar and common sense. This textual question has been treated at length elsewhere by us, and here we simply consider whether Mahēndragiri is an unsuitable name for a king as Fleet has thought it to be. In the first place, it is not clear why giri is taken by Fleet as a suffix of an individual name. He should have taken Mahēndragiri as one name denoting the mountain Mahēndra which is looked upon as an object of sanctity, especially in the Telugu country. And if the names of the sacred rivers have been adopted as individual names among Hindu females, the names of the sacred mountains have similarly been adopted among Hindu males. Thus mountain names like Himāḍri, Hēmāḍri and Śēśāḍri are found used as proper names not only in modern but also in ancient India.8 If Śēśāḍri (Vēṅkaṭagiri) is a sacred mountain in the Tamil, Mahēndragiri is so in the Telugu country. And if Śēśāḍri can be the name of an individual, there is
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no reason why Mahēndragiri should not similarly be taken to be so. Unfortunately, however, this Mahēndragiri of Pishṭapura has not been identified.

After Mahēndragiri of Pishṭapura comes Svāmīdatta of Kōṭṭūra. Fleet rightly says that Kōṭṭūra is a very common Dravidian place name. He, moreover, identifies Kōṭṭūra of the inscription with Kōṭṭūr in the Pollachi subdivision of the Coimbatore District, at the foot of one of the passes in the Ānaimalai Hills. Smith agrees with him and gives us further information that “the beryl mines of Padiyūr, which were famous in the Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era, were probably included within the limits of this kingdom.” This Kōṭṭūr, however, is too far south to be a likely identification. Dubreuil’s suggestion is more probable. He identifies it with Koṭhoor in the Ganjam District. We do not, however, know who its ruler, Svāmīdatta, was. Then comes Damana of Ėraṇḍapalla. Fleet identifies Ėraṇḍapalla with Ėraṇḍol, the chief town of a subdivision of the same name in the Khandesh District, Maharashtra. According to Dubreuil, it is the same as Ėraṇḍapali mentioned in the Siddhāntam plates of the Gaṅga king Dēvēndravarman. Both the grantee and the writer of this charter, we are told, hailed from this town which therefore seems to be of some importance. Ėraṇḍapali was thus not far from Chicacole (Śrīkākulam) in the former Ganjam District, but now in Andhra Pradesh.

After subjugating the Kōṣala kingdom which most probably included the Kaliṅga and the Telugu territory, Samudragupta proceeded very much down to the south and defeated Vishṇugōpa of Kāṇcī. Kāṇcī is undoubtedly the modern Conjeeveram (Kāṇchipuram) in the Chingleput District, Tamil Nadu. And Vishṇugōpa seems to be identical with the earliest Pallava king of that name, for whom Dubreuil has assigned the period 325-350 A.D. The next ruler of Dakṣinapatha mentioned is Nīḷarāja of Avamukta. Nothing is known about him and his territory. Thereafter has been mentioned Hastivarman of Vēṅgi. “Vēṅgi was a country on the east coast, of which the original boundaries appear to have been, towards the west, the Eastern Ghauts, and, on the north and south, the rivers Gōḍāvāri and Krishnā; an indication of the position of its original capital is probably preserved in the name of Vēgi or Pedda-Vēgi, a village in the Ellore tāluka of the Gōḍāvāri District.” As regards Hastivarman, he seems to be the same as Hastivarman of the Śālāṅkāyana family, as has been pointed out by Aiyangar. The next king attacked was Ugrasesāṇa of Pālakka. The kingdom of Pālakka has been identified by Smith with the division of Palghat or Pālakkādu in the south of the Malabar District. Dubreuil, with greater probability, identifies Pālakka with a capital of the same name which was situated to the south of the Krishna river and which is mentioned in many Pallava copper-plates. Nothing, however, is known about Ugrasesāṇa. The next ruler mentioned is Kubēra of Dēvarāṣṭra. Smith takes Dēvarāṣṭra to be identical with Mahārāṣṭra. But there is no authority for it. It had better be identified with the province of Dēvarāṣṭra mentioned in one of the eight copper-plate grants found in the District of Visakhapatnam and examined
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by Krishna Sastri. The grant is of Eastern Chāluṣya Bhima I and refers to a village in Elamāṇchi-Kalingadēsa comprised in Dēvarāṣṭra-vishaya. Elamāṇchi-Kalingadēsa is perhaps to be interpreted as "the Kālinga-country of which Elamāṇchi (the modern Yallamanchili) was the chief town." Another reference to this Dēvarāṣṭra is furnished by the Kindoppa plates of Anantavarman who ruled at Piṣṭapura though his father Gunavarman held Dēvarāṣṭra. We thus have Kalinga, Dēvarāṣṭra and Piṣṭapura somehow connected with one another. The ruler of Dēvarāṣṭra in the time of Samudragupta was Kubēra. The last king of Dakṣināpatha that has been named in the Allahabad inscription is Dhanāṇjaya of Kusthalapura. Kusthalapura is taken by Smith as a mistake for Kuṣasthalapura, a name of the holy city of Dwārkā. This does not, however, seem likely, as it is situated, not on the east, but on the west coast. Barnett opines that it is probably Kuttalur, near Polur, in North Arcot District, Tamil Nadu. Aiyangar, on the other hand, draws our attention to the existence of a river Kuṣasthali, south of the Krishna, mentioned in the Kaliṅgaṇaṭṭuparṇa poem.

The question is nowadays asked: what was this Samudragupta's expedition to the south like? According to V. A. Smith, it was a very glorious one. The invader, marching due south from the capital, through Chūtā Naģpur, directed his first attack against South Kōsala. Passing on, he subdued the Chief of the Forest Country. Still advancing southwards, by the east coast road, Samudragupta vanquished the chieftains of Piṣṭapura; King Maṅṭarāja of the Kollēru (Colair) lake; the neighbouring king of Vēṅgi between the Krishna and Godavari rivers; and Viṣṇugōpa, king of Kāṅchi or Conjeeveram, to the south-west of Madras, almost certainly a Pallava. Then turning west-wards, he subjugated Ugrāśena, king of Pālakka, a place perhaps situated in the Nellore District. Samudragupta returned homewards through the western parts of the Deccan, subduing on his way the kingdom of Dēvarāṣṭra or the modern Maharatta country, and Ėraṇḍapalla or Khandesh. It was thus a wonderful campaign, in the estimation of Smith.

According to Dubreuil, however, the Allahabad pillar inscription contains a detail which indicates the exact contrary, because it has therein been stated that Samudragupta captured the kings and afterwards released them. And it is confirmed by the fact that none of the Deccan kingdoms remained in the possession of the Guptas. It is probable that Samudragupta first subjugated some kings, but that very soon he encountered superior forces which obliged him to relinquish his conquests and return rapidly to his kingdom. The expedition of Samudragupta presents itself to us in a quite different form. It is no more a new Alexander marching victoriously through South India. It was simply the unfortunate attempt of a king from the north who wanted to annex the coast of Orissa but completely failed. Leaving his capital Pāṭaliputra, Samudragupta marched directly to the south. He first conquered South Kōsala and then crossed the forests to the south of Sonpur, reaching the coast of Orissa. Maṅṭarāja of Kōrāla, Mahēndra of Piṣṭapura, Svāmīdatta of Kōṭṭūra and Damana of Ėraṇḍapalla tried to stop him, but were captured. Samudragupta now prepared himself for new conquests, but was opposed by a confederacy of all the kings that ruled near the mouths of the Gōdāvarī and the Krishṇā, the most powerful of them being Viṣṇugōpa, the Pallava king of Kāṅchi. The other kings were Nilarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Vēṅgi, Ugrāśena of Pālakka,
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Kubéra of Dévarāṣṭra and Dhanaṇjayaya of Kusthalapura. Samudragupta, being repulsed by the kings of the Eastern Deccan, abandoned the conquests he had made in the coast of Orissa, and returned home.

Let us first consider Dubreuil’s estimate of the expedition of Samudragupta in Dakshināpatha. His remarks may be summed up as follows: Samudragupta did at first achieve conquests on the coast of Orissa, but when he encountered the superior forces of the confederacy of Eastern Deccan kings headed by Vishnugopa, he was repulsed and had to relinquish his former Orissan conquests and return to his capital forthwith. The only statement in the Allahabad inscription that bears on the point is in lines 19-20 which enumerate the names of the rulers of Dakshināpatha and further inform us that they were at first captured but were afterwards released by Samudragupta. And if it is this statement which has enabled Dubreuil to say that Samudragupta subdued the kings of Kōsala, Mahākāntāra and also of countries on the coast of Orissa, it is not at all clear why it should not enable him to say further that the Gupta monarch subdued also the kings of the Eastern Deccan headed by Vishnugopa. And when, instead of drawing this natural and perfectly logical inference, he deduces the conclusion that Samudragupta, not himself conquered, but was himself conquered by these rulers of the Eastern Deccan, we confess that our amazement knows no bounds. Surely, there is absolutely nothing in this epigraphic record which makes this invidious distinction between the kings of Orissa and those of Eastern Deccan, whether in lines 19-20 or any other lines of this inscription. And we are perfectly justified in asserting that Samudragupta vanquished not only the kings of Kōsala, Mahākāntāra, Kurāla, Pishṭapura, Kōṭṭūra and Ēraṇḍapalla, but also those of Kāñchi, Avamukta, Viṅgī, and so on. Again, we are quite unable to understand what Dubreuil means when he says that Samudragupta seized the kings of Dakshināpatha and afterwards released them and that it is confirmed by the fact that none of the kingdoms ever remained in the possession of the Guptas. What he probably implies is that his capture of the Deccan princes was of an ephemeral character, that they were released because they had to be released, and that this explains why no part of their territories was incorporated in the Gupta empire. He is probably not aware that many modes of conquest were known in ancient India, of which one is that of the Dharma-vijeyin or Righteous Conquercor, who conquers his enemies but does not seize their territory and liberates them on the receipt of some rich spoils. This mode of conquest has been described not only in works of Arthaśāstra but also in other books of Sanskrit literature. This point we shall soon have occasion to expatiate upon. Even then, that some such conquest was intended by the Allahabad pillar pṛāṣṭi is clear from the phrase graha-paṁkṣh-āṅugrāha which occurs in line 20. And, as a matter of fact, it was this interpretation which V.A. Smith has put upon it, though it did not suggest itself to Dubreuil. “No attempt,” says Smith, “was made to effect the permanent annexation of these southern states; the triumphant victor admitting that he only exacted a temporary submission and then withdrew. But beyond doubt he despoiled the rich treasures of the south, and came back laden with golden booty, like the Muhammadan adventurer who performed the same military exploit nearly a thousand years later. Malik Kāfūr, the general of Alā-ud-dīn, Sultan of Delhi, during operations lasting from 1309 to 1311 A.D., repeated the performance of Samudragupta, and penetrated even farther south than his Hindu predecessor seems to have done.”

It will thus be seen that there are absolutely no grounds to suppose that Samudragupta’s expedition to the south was an ignominious failure. What was it then like? Did he bring his triumphant march to a finish, returning homewards through Dévarāṣṭra or the modern Maharatta country via Ēraṇḍapalla or Ēraṇḍöl in Khandesh as Smith describes it? Un-
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fortunately there is nothing to support Smith’s identification of Dēvarāṣṭra with Mahā-
raṣṭra or Fleet’s identification of Ėraṇḍapalla with Ėraṇḍōl. There is no epigraphic or
documentary evidence of any kind in favour of it. Again, even if we regard these identifications
as correct, one would naturally expect Ėraṇḍapalla at least to be mentioned last in the list
of the rulers of Dakshināpatha. As a matter of fact, this place is seen in the list, not last, but
somewhere in the middle preceding Kāñchi and Vēṅgi. The names of this list could not have
been strung together in a haphazard fashion,—if not in their geographical order, at least
according to their political importance. This has been very shrewdly guessed by no less a
scholar than Dubreuil. For, it was he who first scented in the air the Eastern Deccan Confed-
earcy that opposed Samudragupta and of which Vishnugōpa, the Pallava king of Kāñchi,
was the most powerful member. It seems that Vishnugōpa was the overlord and that the rulers
of Avamukta, Vēṅgi, Pālakka, Dēvarāṣṭra and Kusṭhalapura were his feudatories in this
descending order. This alone can explain why Vēṅgi has been mentioned after Kāñchi. If
Samudragupta is represented as marching victoriously southward and encountering the
king of Kāñchi, it becomes inexplicable why the ruler of Vēṅgi is not mentioned first, for one
would naturally expect him to meet Vēṅgi first and Kāñchi afterwards as Kāñchi is to the
south of Vēṅgi. This mystery is, however, dispelled if we suppose that the rulers in this list
have been arranged according to the political hierarchy to which they belonged. One such
political hierarchy is indicated by the group of states headed by Kāñchi. Is there any other
in the states named placed prior to Kāñchi? If our line of argument has any weight and as
the list of the Dakshināpatha rulers itself begins with Kōsala, the conclusion is irresistible that
another such group of states in the Deccan was that with Kōsala as the feudal superior. And
we have already pointed out that in the Krishna and Guntur Districts of Andhra Pradesh
many inscriptions connected with Buddhist stūpas have been brought to light which furnish
us with the names of three kings of the Ikshvāku line, one of whom is credited with the per-
formance of several Vedic sacrifices, the most pre-eminent of which was the Asvamedha;
that, as they were very powerful rulers, their might must have spread far beyond the two
Telugu Districts named; and that, as they were Ikshvākus, they must have been the hereditary
rulers of (South) Kōsala itself. Samudragupta is only two generations posterior to the last
of these Ikshvāku kings. We have thus another political circle with Kōsala as lord paramount
and Mahākāntāra, Kurāla, Pīshapura, Kōṭṭāra and Ėraṇḍapalla as subsidiaries in this
descending order. It will be seen that the region where the Kōsala and Kāñchi empires met
was the Telugu country, the northern half of which owed fealty to Kōsala and the southern
half to Kāñchi.

If this line of reasoning has any force in it, it means that Samudragupta tackled and
reduced to submission two political confederacies whose territory was co-extensive with
Orissa and practically the whole of the Telugu and Tamil Districts. But what about the
Pāṇḍya and the Kērala Countries? Perhaps these countries were subordinate to the para-
mount sovereign of Kāñchi. And the defeat of the Kāñchi overlord presupposed the defeat
of all states subsidiary to him, though they might not have taken actual part with him in his
fight against Samudragupta. But what about the whole of the Deccan plateau? There is
absolutely no reference to any part of it in the list of the kingdoms mentioned as being situated
in South India though it must have formed a most conspicuous part of Dakshināpatha. As
stated above, the identification of Dēvarāṣṭra with Mahāraṣṭra and of Ėraṇḍapalla with
Ēraṇḍōl in Khandesh is anything but satisfactory. What then becomes of the central and
western Deccan, which at this time seems to have been held by the Vākāṭakas? This subject
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has been handled at length a little further in the sequel, and an attempt has been made to show that the Vākāṭakas not only had been in subordinate alliance, but had also established blood relationship, with the Imperial Guptas; and that, though the founder of this dynasty, Pravarasena I, was a paramount sovereign himself, they soon lost all their power till Rudrasena I revived it in a modified form because in his time the Vākāṭakas were not a suzerain power but were feudatories; and that most probably he owed his rise to Samudragupta, whose granddaughter Prabhavati was married to his grand son, Rudrasena II. This explains why Samudragupta's invasion of Dakshināpatha was confined to the eastern and south-eastern parts of the Deccan only.

The next passage in the Allahabad pillar inscription sets forth a list of the rulers of Āryāvarta whom, we are told, Samudragupta forcibly uprooted. They are (1) Rudradēva, (2) Matila, (3) Nāgadatta, (4) Chandravarman, (5) Gaṇapatināga, (6) Nāgasena, (7) Achyutanandin and (8) Balavarman. It has been customary to divide Achyutanandin into the two names, Achyuta and Nandin, and assumes that not eight but nine princes of Āryāvarta have been specified here. But surely Nandin like Nāga is still a surname among the Kāyasthas of Bengal. And that Nandin formed the second component of a name even in ancient times may be seen from Bhūtinandin and Śūrumundin, mentioned in the Purāṇas as the names of two rulers of Vidiśa who flourished between the Śungra and Gupta epochs. Achyutanandin looks exactly analogous to Gaṇapatināga that occurs in this passage, where Nandin and Nāga are doubtless to be taken as the names of the clans or families to which these kings belonged. This point we have already dwelt upon. We have also noted above that three of these Āryāvarta kings, namely, Gaṇapatināga, Nāgasena and Achyutanandin, have been mentioned in the verse portion of the praśasti as co-operating with a Kōta prince to form a confedecacy against Samudragupta. We have, in that connection, made an attempt to identify them and locate their kingdoms. Here and now, we shall say something about the remaining five. As regards Rudradēva, the late Rao Bahadur Dikshit identifies him with Rudrasena I of the Vākāṭaka dynasty. This seems improbable, as the Vākāṭakas belonged to Dakshināpatha, and not to Āryāvarta. The second name, Matila, may be identical with the Matilda of the seal found in Bulandshahr, and published by F. S. Growse, "but the absence of any honorific on the latter," says Allan, "suggests that it is a private seal and not one of a royal personage." But instances are not unknown of princes being named on their seals without any title. Thus the well-known Gaṇjam plates of Saṅkha dated Gupta year 300 bear a seal with the legend Śri-Sainyabhistya. Similarly, the seal of the Lār plates of the Gāḍaḍavāla king, Gōvindachandra has the legend Śrīmad-Gōvindachandrādēvah. The mere absence of the honorific on the Bulandshahr seal should not thus preclude us from identifying the name Matilda on it with Matila, the Āryāvarta ruler, exterminated by Samudragupta.

Nothing is known about the third ruler of Āryāvarta, namely, Nāgadatta. But as regards the fourth, that is, Chandravarman, Smith at first correctly proposed that he was the Mahārāja of that name who is mentioned in the rock inscription of Susūnī in the Bankura District of West Bengal. Chandravarman is therein called "lord of Pushkaraṇa". He, however, gave
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up this view in the third edition of his *Early History of India*, and maintained with Haraprasad Sastri who edited the record that Pushkaraṇa was the same as Pokharan in Marwar and that Chandravarman was identical with the sovereign Chandra of the Mehrauli pillar inscription. This view cannot commend itself to us, because the title borne by an overlord at this period is *Mahāraja Mahāraja*, whereas Chandravarman, like his father Sīhavarman, is designated simply as *Mahāraja*. And what is strange is that Sastri maintains that Sīhavarman was a mere chieftain and Chandravarman a supreme ruler, though both have been styled *Mahārajas*. What appears to be the fact is that both father and son were feudatories. Besides, Pushkaraṇa of the Susunia inscription has now been satisfactorily identified by Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit with Pokharan, a village situated about 25 miles to the north-east of Susunia itself on the south bank of the river Damodar. It is thus more reasonable to say that this Chandravarman was a chief of Pokharan in West Bengal and was identical with Chandravarman, contemporary of Samudragupta.

The next three Aryavarta rulers that have been mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription are Gaṇapatināga, Nāgaśēna and Achyutanandin. We have already shown at length who they were and why they were exterminated by Samudragupta. Nothing need, therefore, be said about them here. The eighth and last prince of Aryavarta, who is mentioned in the *prāśasti*, is Balavarman. According to Dikshit he is most probably identical with Balavarman, an ancestor of Bhāskaravarman, who pertained to the Vajrada family of Prāgyotisha. But Kāmarūpa or Assam has been distinguished from Aryavarta by our epigraph. Hence Balavarman of Aryavarta cannot be identified with Balavarman of Kāmarūpa.

The kings of Aryavarta destroyed by Samudragupta were formerly taken to be nine in number, and it was then suggested by Rapson that possibly they might all have been Nāgas and denoted the *Nava-Nāgas* of the *Vishnu-Purāṇa*, which expression is taken by him to denote, not a dynasty of nine successive rulers, but rather a confederation of nine princes belonging to the Nāga race. But, as we have pointed out above, the actual number of the Aryavarta rulers named is, not nine, but eight. Secondly, the *Vishnu-Purāṇa* speaks of *Nava-Nāgah* as ruling over Padrāvati, Kāntipuri and Mathurā. As these are only three and not nine cities, *Nava Nāgas* cannot signify nine Nāgas but rather *new* Nāgas, the *old* Nāgas being those mentioned earlier by the *Purāṇas* in connection with Vidiśā. And, as a matter of fact, it was a confederation of three Nāga kings that opposed the accession of Samudragupta to the throne. One of them, namely, Nāgaśēna certainly reigned at Padrāvati, another, Achyutanandin, most probably at Mathurā, and the third, Gaṇapatināga at Dhārā which may be another name of Kāntipuri.

After specifying the names of the kings of Aryavarta who were violently uprooted by Samudragupta, the Allahabad pillar inscription proceeds to say that the Gupta monarch reduced to servitude all the rulers of Forest Countries. As we have pointed out above, we have to distinguish Ātavirājya from Mahākāntāra mentioned in line 19. One copper-plate grant
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1 P. 290, note 1.
3 *A. R. ASI*, 1927-28, p. 188.
6 *JRAS*, 1897, p. 421.
describes a Parivājaka king, Hastin, as master of the Čabhāla kingdom included in the Eighteen Forest kingdoms (aśtādaś-ātavi-vāja). Čabhāla must be the older form of Dahāla, the modern Bundelkhand, which practically coincided with the territory held by the Kalachuris of Tripurī in later times. The Ātavi Country, which comprised no less than eighteen tiny kingdoms, must correspond to the forests spread through and along with Bundelkhand and Baghelkhand, whereas Mahākāntara must have extended from the south of Madhya Pradesh right up to the seacoast of Orissa.

The inscription thereafter (lines 22-23) enumerates the names of the frontier (prayanta) countries and also of the tribes that propitiated the monarch by payment of all tributes (sarva-kara-dāna), execution of commands (ajña-karaṇa), and attendance at his court to offer homage (praśām-āgamana). The prayanta countries specified are as follows: (1) Samatāṭa, (2) Daśākā, (3) Kāmarūpa, (4) Nēpāla and (5) Kārtrīpura. Varāhamihira places Samatāṭa in the Eastern Division. But that does not help us to locate it properly. According to Yuan Chhwang, Samatāṭa was to the east of the Tāmrālipī and to the south of the Kāmarūpa country, and bordered on the sea. On the strength of these data and also the Bāghāūrā image inscription, N. K. Bhattasali has satisfactorily identified it with the natural geographical unit "comprising the eastern half of the present Mymensingh and Dacca districts lying east of the Brahmaputra, the greater part of Sylhet, and the whole of the Tippera and Noakhali districts." He further holds the opinion that Bādkāmṭa, twelve miles west of modern Comilla was the capital of Samatāṭa.

Fleet suggests that Daśākā may be another form of Dacca. According to Smith it corresponded to the modern Districts of Bogra, Dinajpur and Rajshahi in Bengal. Yuan Chhwang informs us that in this region five countries were conterminous, Pudravardhana; to its east or rather north-east, Kāmarūpa; to the south of Kāmarūpa, Samatāṭa; to the east of Samatāṭa, Tāmrālipī; and to the north-west of Tāmrālipī, Karṇasuvarta. Daśākā cannot thus be coextensive with Dacca or with Bogra, Dinajpur and Rajshahi, which must have then been included, in part, in Pudravardhana, Suhma, Samatāṭa and Kāmarūpa. It seems more reasonable to locate Daśākā somewhere in the eastern half of Assam. For the same reasons Kāmarūpa seems to have comprised the western half of Assam and parts of the northern districts of Bengal so as to make it contiguous with Pudravardhana, Samatāṭa and Tāmrālipī provinces. The suggestion of the late K. L. Barua seems thus worthy of all consideration in regard to the location of Daśākā. "Very probably, the present Cachar District, including the north Cachar hills and the Kopili valley which in later times constituted the Cachari kingdom, was known as Davaka. Even now the Kopili valley, comprising an area of about 400 square miles, is known as Davakā. Nēpāla is too well-known to require any identification. It forms the mountainous country bordering, on the north, Magadha, Ayōdhya and so forth. As regards Kārtrīpura, Fleet suggests that the name may survive in Karthāpur in the Jullundur District, Panjab. C. F. Oldham refers to the Katuria Rāj of Kumaon, Garhwal and Rohilkhand. To speak more accurately, Kārtrīpura denotes the Katyrū Valley with

1 K. P. Jayaswal's *Hist. of India*, etc., p. 139. The Ātavi kingdom was known also in the time of Aśoka who refers to it in Rock Edict XIII.
5 *JRAS*, 1897, p. 879.
7 *Early History of Kāmarūpa*, p. 42, note.
9 *JRAS*, 1898, p. 193.
BAIJANATH OR KÄRTIKĘYAPURA AS THE CAPITAL OF THE KATYUREI RÄJÄS IN THE ALMORA DISTRICT, AS WE SHALL SEE LATER ON.

It will thus be seen that the pratyanta kingdoms bordered the Gupta dominions on the east and the north and that they were called pratyanta because they were on the frontiers of Æryavarta. But on the west and north-west of these dominions were many tiny states which in this period seem to have been governed by various tribes of whom as many as nine have been named. The list is headed by the Mâlavas, who were originally the same as the Malli of the Greek writers and were living in the time of Alexander near the confluence of the Akesinos (Chenab) and the Hydraotis (Ravi) in the erstwhile Panjab. They appear afterwards to have migrated southwards and were in occupation of a province called Nâgarchâl in the southeastern portion of the Jaipur State, where their coins are found in numbers. As these range approximately from B.C. 150 to 250 A.D., they seem to have been settled in that province during that period.1 In the Gupta epoch, however, they appear to have migrated still further southward. This is indicated by the findspots of the inscriptions of this period which are dated according to Mâlava-kâlå. At this time they seem to have occupied Mewar and Kotah in Rajasthan and parts of Madhya Pradesh adjoining them, in fact, the whole of the region indicated by long. 75-76° and lat. 24-25°.2 Originally they no doubt were a gana or tribal oligarchy, as is clearly indicated by their coins, but in the later period they seem to have assumed a monarchical constitution, because there are some inscriptions where their Mâlava-kâlå is spoken of as being the era Mâlavistamam ‘of the Mâlava lords’.3 The Ârjunâyanas are known from Varâhamihira’s Brihatatsahrî4 and also from their coins, of which, however, only a few specimens have been found. The joint cabinets of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Indian Museum contain only two which may be assigned to circa 100 B.C.5 They are closely related, in one way or another, to the money of the Northern Ksatrâpas, Yaudhêyas and other ancient powers. “And the Ârjunâyanas country,” says Smith, “may reasonably be regarded as corresponding to the region, ...roughly speaking, the Bharatpur and Alwar States, west of Agra and Mathura, the principal seat of the Northern Satrâpas.”6 “Cunningham classed the Ârjunâyanas with those of Mathurâ, because they are procurable in that city.”7 But the exact provenance of their coins has not been recorded. In these circumstances, as they have been placed by our inscription between the Mâlavas and the Yaudhêyas, they may be taken as occupying the region consisting of the erstwhile Bundi and Karauli States and the eastern half of Jaipur.8

The Yaudhêyas seem to have been in existence from the time of Pânini, who speaks of them as an ãyudha-juvin Sañgha.9 This expression is the same as ñastra-ñapajitin used by Kâtyâya. And both denote a tribal corporation “subsisting on arms”. Originally they seem to have been a tribal band of mercenaries and constituted one kind of a king’s army. In the time of Pânini they were an eka-rāja Kshatriya tribe which means that so far as their tribal constitution was concerned they were governed by one ruler, but exercised no political

2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, p. 404; D. R. Bhandarkar’s A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 3, 5-7 and 9.
3 D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 18 and 345.
6 J.R.A.S., 1897, p. 886.
8 B. C. Law suggests that as Yaudhêya is given as one of the sons of Yudhishthira in Adi-P., ch. 95, v. 76, Ârjunâyana may be taken as a descendant of Ârjuna (NIA, Vol. I, p. 460). Prârjuna may similarly be connected with Ârjuna. The same thing happened in the case of the Ishvâkus.
power. About the beginning of the Christian era, however, they appear to have risen to the rank of a political Sangha. This is indicated by the issue of their coins which "are found in the Eastern Panjab, and all over the country between the Sutlej and the Jumna rivers. Two large finds have been made at Sonpath, between Delhi and Karnal." 1 This coinage ranges between 50 and 350 A.D. Like the Malavas they style themselves Gaṇa on their money. It is thus clear that they were a political Sangha and especially of the type of tribal oligarchy when they struck these coins. This inference is established beyond all doubt by a stone inscription found at Bījaiyagāḍh near Bāyānā in the Bharatpur District. It is true that it is only a fragment of an inscription, but enough of it has been preserved to show that it is the record of a personage who was Mahārāja and Mahāśeṇapāti and also a leader (purasakṛita) of the Yaudhēya Gaṇa. The title Mahārāja and the word Gaṇa show that in the year 371 A.D., the date of the inscription, the Yaudhēyas were not only an oligarchy but also a rāja-sabd-āpajivin Sangha, every member of which styled himself a Rājun or Mahārāja. 3 Further, the personage in question was one of the Gaṇa-mukhyas or 'heads of the Gaṇa' as he has been designated purasakṛita, 'a leader'. 4 Further still as he has also been designated Mahāśeṇapāti, it means that he was a leader of the Yaudhēya Gaṇa as the general of their forces. It was, however, shortly before 150 A.D. that the Yaudhēyas were in the heyday of their glory, for it is in the Junaγāḍh rock inscription of Rudradāman dated in this year that they are described as assuming the epithet of virā in consequence of the prowess they displayed against all Khatriyas and spoken of as being mowed down by the Kshatrapa ruler. The Yaudhēyas still survive in the Panjab and Sind. Cunningham has identified them with the Johiyas settled on the banks of the Sutlej, which tract is consequently called Johiyyā-bār. "They have become Musalmans and inhabit the banks of the Indus from Bahawalpur and Multan to the Kohistān talūka of the Karachi district. Parts of Bahawalpur State and the Multan district are still called Johiyyāwār. Remnants of the tribe still inhabit the Kohistān talūka of the Karachi district under their own chief who is known as Johiyyā-jo-Jām." 5 It seems that when they were at the height of their power, that is, slightly prior to 150 A.D., they overran Sindhu and Sauvira and were settled down there and it was apparently in these provinces that Rudradāman came into collision with, and inflicted a crushing defeat on them. In the time of Samudragupta, however, they appear to have been confined to their original habitat between the Sutlej and the Jumna going as far south as Bharatpur.

As regards the Madrakas, their country corresponds roughly to modern Sialkot and surrounding region between the Ravi and Chenab rivers. 6 Its capital was Šākaka which has been identified with Sialkot. The Madrakas are no doubt the same as Madras and denoted rather a people and not a tribe as seems to be the case here. The latter, probably, were the Jatrikas or Jāts who are described as Mlečchhas in the Karna-Parvan (chs. xl and xlv) of the Mahābhārata. The Ābhiras or Ahirs are spread as far east as Bengal and as far south as the Khandesh District of Maharashtra. The correct location of the Ābhira tribe during Samudragupta's regime is thus a matter of some difficulty. The earliest epigraphic reference to this tribe is contained in the Gunda inscription of Kshatrapa Rudrasimha dated Śaka 103, which records the construction of a well by Sēnāpati Rudrabhūti, who was a son of Sōna-patī Bāpaka and who is therein described as an Ābhira by extraction. 7 But this Bāpaka was a Sēnāpatī, and

---

1 Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India, p. 76; Casir, Vol. XIV, p. 140.
3 Cor. Lcc., 1918, pp. 148 and 156.
not a ruler. The record therefore tells us nothing about the political power exercised anywhere by the Abhiras. The second epigraph known about this tribe is a Nasik cave inscription which refers itself to the ninth regnal year of Isvarāsena, son of Śivadatta, who are both called Abhirā.1 This alone shows that the Abhiras held sway over the Nasik District at some time in the third century A.D. to which period the record belongs. But there is nothing to show that their sway lasted for a century more over this province so that any successor of theirs might reasonably be thought to be a contemporary of Samudragupta.2 Besides, in the time of this Gupta sovereign the Abhiras must have wielded power, not in Dakshaṇapatha but rather in Āryāvarta. So none of these inscriptions helps us as to the exact location of the Abhirā tribe in Samudragupta’s time. In these circumstances we are thrown upon other resources to find out where precisely they were ruling in North India. In this connection we have to note that in the Musala-Parvan3 of the Mahābhārata Arjuna is represented to have been waylaid by Abhiras in the Pañchanadēsa or the Panjab, as he was going from Dvārakā to Mathurā with the widowed females and treasures of the Yādavas after burning the dead bodies of Krishna and Balarama. These Abhiras are therein called Dasus and Mīchchhas. But we are not told where exactly in the Panjab they were settled about the beginning of the Christian era when the Musala-Parvan was probably composed. Attention may here be drawn to a verse in the Śalya-Parvan4 which tells us that the Sarasvatī disappeared on account of her hatred for Sudras and Abhiras and was known as Vinaśanā for that reason. As the Sarasvatī is represented to have disappeared in consequence of her intense dislike for the Abhiras, the latter cannot but be taken as the Abhiras considered Dasus and Mīchchhas by the Śalya-Parvan. We have therefore to suppose that the Abhiras, early in the Christian era, were settled somewhere in the Karnal District of the Panjab. Or they may be located, with V. A. Smith, in the province of Ahirwādā between the Pārbi and the Betwā in Central India.5 But we do not know when precisely this province was occupied by the Abhiras and was called Ahirwādā after them. On the other hand, the concurrent testimony of the Śalya- and the Musala-Parvans is enough to show that the Abhiras were living on the banks of the Sarasvatī in the early centuries of the Christian era.

As regards Prājrjuna, Raychaundhuri6 is the first to point out that they are the same as Pājānaka of Kauṭilya’s Arthāśāstra.7 Although here they are mentioned along with Gāndhāras, they have to be located much far southwards. In fact, Smith places them in the Narsinghpur District, Madhya Pradesh. But, as they are here associated with the Sanakānikas and as we know that these last have for certain to be placed not far from Bhīsā, it is safer to put the Prājrjunas somewhere near Narsingarh in Madhya Pradesh. A chief of the Sanakānika tribe or clan has been mentioned as a feudatory of Chandragupta II in an Udayagiri cave inscription (No. 7 below) near Besnagar, ancient Vidiśa. The inscription describes three generations of his family, who have all been styled Mahārājas. The Sanakānikas, therefore, appear to have held the province of Vidiśa. The first of them was known as Chhiagalaga, which, according to A. M. T. Jackson, “has a Turki look.”8 According to the same scholar “Kāka may be Kākā-
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2 The Abhiras were known long before the Christian era (JC., Vol. I, p. 16).
3 Chapter 7; also Wilson’s Vīshnus-Puṇḍara, Bk. 5, Chapter 38.
4 Chapter 37, verses 1-5. It is worthy of note that the actual expression used is Śudr-Abhirān, which may also mean “the Abhiras, who were Śudras”. A similar compound word Śudr-Abhirān has been used by Patañjali in his gloss on Pārītikā 5 on Pāñjikā 1.2.72.
5 JRAS., 1897, pp. 890-92.
7 III. 18. 15.
8 B. G., Vol. 1, part i, p. 64, note 3.
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pur near Bhīrū (Cunningham, Anc. Geog., 386)." But the identification seems unlikely as this Bhīrū is in Kanpur District, Uttar Pradesh, and not somewhere in Central India, as may naturally be expected. Smith says: "The name Kāka (‘crow’) may be locally associated with Kākanāda (‘crow’s voice’), the ancient name of Sānci, the celebrated Buddhist site 5-1/2 miles south-west of Bhilsa." This name occurs once in the lid of the steatite casket found in Sūpā No. 2 at Andher near Bhilsa and thrice as Kākanāyā or Kākanāvā in inscriptions of Sānci (Sūpā No. 1). The hill of Sānci on which the stūpas stand has been called Kākanādabōta in two epigraphs of the Gupta period (No. 9 below and CIL., Vol. III, 1888, No. 62). Further, as Jayaswal has pointed out, about twenty miles north of Bhilsa, is a large and ancient village called Kākapur, situated on a river, and a hill opposite the village has two square temples and a few Gupta sculptures. This Kākapur he identifies as the ancient seat of the Kākas. The Kāka family or clan is frequently mentioned in the Rājatarangini and has survived in Kashmir to this day. It seems that like the (Takā-) Nāgas, Kākas had migrated from this country and settled down round about Bhilsa in Madhya Pradesh shortly before the time of Samudragupta. The last tribe that we have to consider is Khāraparika. As pointed out by Hiralal, they are probably identical with Kharpars mentioned apparently as a people in the Baṭhāgarh inscription of the Damoh District, Madhya Pradesh. Kharpars, according to this record, are evidently to be located in that district.

These wonderful achievements of Samudragupta must have spread his name and fame far and wide so that the neighbouring independent monarchs entered into diplomatic relations with him. We are here furnished not only with the enumeration of these foreign kings but also with a description of the modes in which they sought his friendship and alliance. The first form of alliance was that of self-effacement (ātma-nivēdana). The second consisted in offering daughters in marriage (kanyā-pāhyana-dāna). The third was a request (yāchānā) for the governance (jātana) of their own districts and provinces (rōg-vishaya-blukii) by means of the Garuḍa badge (Garunmade-anak), which was, no doubt, the royal insignia of the Gupta family. It was by one or another of these measures that they, we are told, established friendly relations with him. As regards these distant monarchs, they fall into two groups. One of these comprised the rulers of Siēhhala (Ceylon) and such other Islands (dvipa) which were situated to the south and south-west of India. The other consisted of Daivaputra-Shaḥi-Shāhāushahāti-Śaka-Muraṇḍa. The identification of the foreign independent kings enumerated in this long compound is a matter of some difficulty and cannot be made with perfect certainty. There can, however, be little doubt that they were the descendants of the Śaka and Kushāṇa kings, who invaded India.
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1 JRAS., 1897, p. 893.
2 Cunningham, Bhīs Chhote, p. 241, Pl. XVI, No. 39.
6 Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 46, verse 5. See also his Descriptive Lists of Inscrips. in C. P. and Berar (2nd ed.), pp. 58-59, where, however, the name has been spelt Kharpura.
8 According to Jayaswal, "All the dvipas" here meant "all the Indian colonies of Bharatavarsha, of the Bhrātrī pratap. His India or Prtihihi, therefore, embraced within its bounds Further India" (Hist. of India, 150 A.D. to 530 A.D., p. 156). This view is, however, strongly dissented from by Miss Karunakara Gupta (JC., Vol. II, p. 65). As this list is headed by Siēhhala (Ceylon), it is safer to take suras-dvipa to denote such islands as Laccadive, Maldives and others which have been referred to as Lakshadweep and Malayadweep in Sanskrit works dealing with Geography (IHQ., Vol. II, pp. 346 ff.).
about the beginning of the Christian era. There was a time when their might had spread over
the whole of Northern India, as is evidenced by the find of their coins as far east as Mayur-
blanj. This point we have already dwelt upon. About the beginning of the fourth century,
however, their power, and the sphere of their suzerainty, had considerably shrunk up. Let us
now see who these foreign rulers were. The whole of this compound is susceptible of a number
of divisions. The different divisions proposed by different scholars have been considered else-
where. In our opinion, it is practically certain that two distinct rulers only are here adverted
to. The first three members of the compound are obviously titles, but the question is: whether
they are to be considered jointly as the titles of one great suzerain, or each as the peculiar title
of the ruler of a smaller state? The solution is indicated by its first component, which is Daiva-
putra, and not Dēvaputra. Daivaputra is Dēvaputrasya = ēdam (padaṁ) = Dēvaputram, according to
Pāṇini IV. iii. 120. It cannot stand by itself, and so it cannot be taken to denote an individu-
ral ruler, as some scholars have done. It has to be taken in conjunction with Shāhi-Shahānu-
shāhi which follow it. These three components, namely, Daivaputra-Shāhi-Shahānushāhī, must
therefore be taken together as indicating one of these distant monarchs. Who could he be?
He was presumably a Kushāna ruler, because the titles Dēvaputra, Shāhī and Shāhānushāhī are
found used by the Kushān as only. It may be observed that Dēvaputra is the Indian equivalent
of the Chinese imperial title tiēn-tzu, ‘son of heaven’, which, so far as we know, was adopted
from the Chinese by the Kushāna rulers only. In the epigraphic records we find it assumed
not only by Kanishka I but also by Huvishka and Vāsudēva I. It is true that the title Shāhī
was not much used by the Kushānas. But it is a mistake to say that they never used it. Thus,
in a Mathurā inscription of the year 8, we notice Kanishka I adopting this title along with
Mahārāja and Rājātirāja.1 As regards Shāhānushāhī it is obviously an attempt to transliterate the
Persian Shahānushah, ‘king of kings’, the well-known Iranian title of suzerainty adopted by the
Kushānas from their Scythian predecessors of Bactria and India. It is true that this title is not
traceable in any Kushāna epigraphs, but it is exceedingly familiar to us from their coin legends
from the time of Kanishka I to that of Vāsudēva I.2 Nay, it is traceable in a corrupt form on the
coins of Kanishka II and Vāsudēva II also, who were doubtless the Later Great Kushānas.
It will thus be seen that the three titles Dēvaputra, Shāhī and Shāhānushāhī were used by the
Kushānas only and regularly correspond to the Indian titles Dēvaputra, Mahārāja and Rājātir-
rāja which are invariably and conjointly associated with the names of the Earlier Great Kushā-
nas in Sanskrit records. But Samudragupta could not be a contemporary of any one of these
Kushānas. We know that the latter were succeeded by the Later Great Kushānas such as
Kanishka II and Vāsudēva II, who seem to be scions of the family of Kanishka I. A Sanskrit
epigraph of one of these kings has been discovered at Māl near Mathurā. It speaks of a Kushā-
naputra who receives the titles Mahārāja Rājātirāja Dēvaputra exactly as the Earlier Great
Kushānas do.3 The name Kushānaputra reminds us of Bhōjaputta and Vīdēhaputta of the
Pāli Jātakas,4 and Kāralaputra and Sātīyaputra of Aśoka inscriptions.5 The ending putta
(¼ putra) obviously denotes new branches or septs of old clans. If Kushāna stands for the
Earlier Great Kushānas, Kushānaputra must stand for their descendants, the Later Great

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XVII, p. 11.
2 These titles were for a long time not correctly read until A.uril Stein pointed out that Scythic p represented
the same letter as the šh of the Indian forms and that the character ṁ was sometimes found as ṁ with a slight up-
ward stroke (Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII, pp. 94 ff.).
3 A. R. ASJ., 1911-12, p. 124.
4 For Bhōjaputta mentioned as a country, see Fausboll, Jātaka, Vol. I, p. 43, line 26; for Vīdēhaputta, see
ibid., Vol. V, p. 90, line 3.
Kushānas. And further, as the Gupta coinage has been struck after the model of that of the Later Great Kushānas, it is reasonable to suppose that it is the latter who have been adverted to as *Daivaputra-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhī* in the Allahabad pillar inscription. Their power about this time extended not only over the Panjab but further westward as far as Kabul, if not further still up to the Oxus.

How far did it extend to the east of the Panjab? In this connection we have to take note of the Mathurā pedestal inscription of the *Mahārāja Daivaputra* Kanishka edited by Daya Ram Sahni. The record is more probably in Eastern Gupta script than in Kushāna characters, because *ma* and *ha* are invariably like those of the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta though *sa* is sometimes as in this inscription and sometimes of the Kushāna type. The date is read 10 4 by Sahni, but the first sign is almost certainly 80 and not 10. The date is thus 84 and not 14. And further we take it as a year of the Kalachuri era and as equivalent to 332 A.D. so as to bring it close to the time of Samudragupta in whose reign the Allahabad pillar inscription was engraved. It thus clearly shows that as far east as Mathurā a Kushāna king called Kanishka (II) ruled who was a contemporary of the Gupta monarch. We shall not, therefore, be far from right if we suppose that the Kushāna rule extended up to Mathurā when Samudragupta was alive and that *Daivaputra Shāhi Shāhānushāhī* refers to one of the Later Great Kushānas.

The question that now arises is: where was the necessity to distinguish the (Later Great) Kushāna emperor from the Sassanian Emperor who, at this time, was Shāpuhr II (309-379 A.D.) and who was the immediately next neighbour of the Gupta empire. Both were Shāhān-Shāhs and had contiguous kingdoms. They had therefore to be differentiated, one from the other. And this was done by the use of the term *Daivaputra* which was the peculiar title of the Kushānas.

We have now to account for Śaka-Murunḍa. Are we to understand by it 'the Śaka king and the Murunḍa king', or, 'the Śaka lords' where the word *murunḍa* is to be taken as a Scythic word meaning 'lord'. More than forty years ago various scraps of information about the Murunḍas were brought to a focus by Sylvain Levi, in his paper entitled *Deux Peuples Monnayes*. There was an embassy from China to Fu-Nan (Siam) in the third century A.D. Just at that time had returned from India the envoys sent thither by the king of Fu-Nan. The Chinese thus met these Siamese envoys in Fu-Nan, and received an account of India from them. Naturally, therefore, in the account of this Chinese embassy to Fu-Nan we find mention made also of the king of a country in India, called *Meou-loun* which Levi equates with Murunḍa. The Chinese account represents this Murunḍa as a suzerain of great power to whom distant kingdoms owed fealty and whose capital was apparently Pātaliputra. But the Murunḍas seem to be known even earlier, for, the French scholar thinks them to be the same as the *Maroûndai* of Ptolemy who flourished in circa 150 A.D. and who locates them 'on the left bank of the Ganges, south of the Gogra, down to the top of the delta'. The Jaina books also, he tells us, speak of Murunḍjarāja once as ruler of Kanyakubja and once as residing at Pātaliputra. The Purāṇas have similarly been brought into requisition, for the Marunḍas or the Murunḍas are found mentioned there in the dynastic lists among the foreign tribes by side with the Śakas, Yavanas, Tukhāras and so forth. And while the Vāyu describes them as *Ārya-Mitiśchhas*, the *Matsya Purāṇa* speaks of them as *Mīcheckha-sanibhava*. Piecing together these scraps of...
information we arrive at the conclusion that the Muruṇḍas were of a foreign origin and ruled over the greater portion of the Ganges Valley in the first three centuries of the Christian era. Now, it is strange, very strange, that not a single inscription or even a coin has been found of these Muruṇḍas, whosoever they were, that is, whether they were a tribe, a clan or a family, although they exercised sway over the greater part of Northern India, for nearly three centuries. What, however, we do find is the supremacy of the Kushāṇas established precisely over this region and during this period, as has now been clearly demonstrated by the find of their coins. That they were a foreign race cannot possibly be denied. It is, therefore, difficult to avoid the conclusion that it is they who are intended by the use of the term, Muruṇḍa. If this position is once accepted, it becomes intelligible why the Jaina books mention them as being stationed once at Kanyākubja and once at Pāṭaliputra. Evidently they were the Satrapies of the Kushāṇa empire. But the question arises: how can we identify the Muruṇḍas with the Kushāṇas? It is possible to say in reply that Muruṇḍa was the name of the tribe, and, Kushāṇa, of the family. But there is not a shred of evidence in support of it. It thus becomes a mere assumption. On the other hand, Sten Konow has adduced good evidence to show that muruṇḍa was a Scythic term signifying ‘a lord’ and corresponding to the Sanskrit svatāmin.1 This word is actually found used in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, more than once, with reference to the Scythian rulers of India. If this suggestion of the Norwegian scholar is accepted, we can easily understand how the Kushāṇa sovereigns, or rather, their Satraps, came to be styled Muruṇḍas. What was originally a designation or title became afterwards a family name, instances of this kind being furnished by the Peshwas of Poona and Nizams of Hyderabad (Deccan) of later history. To come back to our main point, Šaka-Muruṇḍa of the Allahabad pillar inscription had better be thus understood to denote ‘the Šaka and the Muruṇḍas’ and not merely ‘the Šaka lord or lords’. There is nothing to prevent us from taking Šaka-Muruṇḍa in the plural, and perhaps it accords better with what we know about the Šakas of this period, as we shall soon see.

The question that now confronts us is: who were the Šaka rulers could be in the time of Samudragupta? One such must certainly be a Western Kshatrapa. But the Western Kshatrapas were no longer the kings of Ujjain that they were originally. Their power had been considerably reduced and seems to have been confined, at this period, to Kāṭhiāwar and possibly North Gujarat. The Mahākshatrapas of Surāśṭra are known from their coins to have been in existence up till 388 A.D. And as the title Mahākshatrapa shows, they appear to have maintained some sort of independence till then. Nothing, therefore, precludes us from supposing that Šaka of the phrase Šaka-Muruṇḍa denotes, among others, the Mahākshatrapa of Surāśṭra who was a contemporary of Samudragupta. Šaka, again, may designate, as Allan2 observes, those Šakas in the north-west who struck coins of Kushāṇa types with Ardokhsho reverse. Some of these, which bear the clan name Shāka, bear also the letters Srayatha, Sita and Šṛṣṭi under the arm of the royal figure on the obverse, which must, therefore, be taken to be the names of individual rulers.3 Others, again, contain the clan name Shālada, also read as Pālada, and the individual names Bhadra and Pāṣaka.4 Of these Shāka looks like a taddhita form of Šaka or Shaka, and means ‘descendants of Šakas’. We meet with similar taddhita forms in later history also. Thus certain clans of South India, when they first rose to power, were known as Chalukya, Kadamba and so forth. Afterwards they lost their power for a time, but later, when their scions re-asserted it, they called themselves Chalukya, Kādamba and so on. It is thus perfectly intelligible why the descendants of the earlier Šakas should style themselves Shākas.

4 Ibid., pp. 88-89.
when they again established their power. In regard to the other clan, the correct form seems to be not Shâlada, but Pâlada. At any rate, it is only in this form of the name that we can recognise the foreign tribe Pârada, which is consequently associated and appears to be allied with the Śaka.\(^1\) Possibly the Śaka tribe comprised many clans, two of which were Śaka and Pârada. There is another class of coins found in the extreme north-west of India and outside, which we have to consider in this connection and to which our attention was drawn by Jayaswal. They are coins of the Gaḍahara or Gaḍakhara tribe or rather family. One type of Gaḍahara coinage is represented, says R. D. Banerji, by “Samudra.—The resemblance between this coin and the coin of Samudra Gupta No. 10 (Spearman type, variety a, Cat. I, p. 102) is so great that it is possible to say that the Gaḍahara tribe at last acknowledged the suzerainty of the great conqueror and placed his name on their coins.”\(^2\) “This seems to have been continued,” says Jayaswal, “to the next generation.... The coin (No. 13356, at p. 65 of Rodgers’ Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Part III, Plate III) is evidently a Shâlada coin. Rodgers read the legend as शलद जयस्वाल and rightly described it as ‘allied to Gupta coins’. The figure is Hindu and of Chandragupta.”\(^3\) Elsewhere he says that they print “the effigy of Samudragupta and his... name also similarly stamped. As to the identity of these Gupta kings there cannot be any doubt, for the kings wear ear-rings or kundala on these coins, while Kusânas never used them.”\(^4\) This agrees with one of the modes in which the distant foreign monarchs are reported in the Allahabad pillar inscription to have maintained friendly relations with Samudragupta, viz., a request (yāchana) for the governance (śāsana) of their own districts and provinces (spa-visâhia-bhukti) by means of the Garuḍa badge (Garutmaud-aṅka). As these coins bear the representation of Garuḍa besides the effigy of Samudragupta, there can be no doubt as to these foreign rulers also being intended by the term Śaka-Muruṇḍa. There thus seems to be no exaggeration in the enumeration of these distant independent monarchs in the form of the friendly relations they sought to establish with the sovereign of Pâtaliputra. They were all on a footing of equality. There is nothing of subordination even in the rulers of foreign states on the north-west frontier of India, imitating Gupta coinage and using the Garuḍa badge, not simply for numismatic but also administrative purposes. Surrounded as they were by Kusâna and Sassanian kingdoms which could at any moment swallow them up, these comparatively tiny Śaka States were in a way compelled by this form of flattery to enter into entente cordiale with Samudragupta. And that these Śaka or foreign states succeeded in preserving their independence not for one generation but for two generations is clear from the fact that their coins bear the effigy and name not only of Samudragupta but also of his son Chandragupta II. Similarly, if we turn to the south of India, there is no improbability or impropriety in the ruler of Simhâla also seeking for his good-will and friendship. That, as a matter of fact, there was an embassy from Simhâla to Pâtaliputra at this time we know from the account of the Chinese Wang Hien ts’ê, for which we are indebted to Sylvain Levi.\(^5\) The king of Ceylon, who was a contemporary of Samudragupta, was Mêghavarṇa, who, according to the Sinhalese chronicle, reigned from 325 to 352 A.D. During his rule, two Buddhist monks, the senior of whom was the king’s own brother, repaired to Bôdh-Gayâ on a pilgrimage and

\(^{1}\) See e. g., Harivamsa, 1.767 ff., where the Pàradas have been associated with the Hâlâyas (=Tâlajarighas), Śakas, Yavanas, Kâmbojás, Pañlavas and Khaśas and where the Pàradas have been described as mukta-kâlás, ‘those who let loose the hair’. See also Nundolal Dey’s Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India, sub voce.

\(^{2}\) JPSBS., Vol. IV, pp. 92-93.

\(^{3}\) JBORS., Vol. XVIII, p. 209.

\(^{4}\) Hist. of India, 150 A.D. to 350 A.D., p. 146.

were put to considerable inconvenience and discomfort during their stay there. On their return home, they made a representation to the king that such a holy place of the Buddhists as Bōdh-Gayā, where the founder of their religion obtained Enlightenment, had yet remained without any accommodation for the Sinhalese pilgrims. Thereupon Mēghavāraṇa, we are told, sent an embassy, with presents to the Magadha Court and obtained the permission of Samudragupta to erect a monastery and a rest-house for the convenience of travellers from Ceylon.

The same story with variations has been told also by-Hiiuen Tsang. From this it appears that the monastery was built outside the northern gate of the wall of the Bōdhī Tree. It was three storeys in height, included six halls, was adorned with three towers, and surrounded by a strong wall thirty or forty feet high. The statue of the Buddha was cast in gold and silver and was studded with gems. The monks exceeded one thousand in number, and belonged to the Sthāvira school of the Mahāyāna. The site is now marked by an extensive mound on the northern side of the Bōdhī Tree. According to the Mahāvamsa, Mēghavāraṇa (Mēghavāraṇa) succeeded his father Mahāśēna and ruled from 836-863 A.B., which, according to the reckoning of the era accepted by Geiger, correspond to 352-379 A.D. This makes Mēghavāraṇa an exact contemporary of Samudragupta.

In between the list of the countries and tribes who were situated on the outskirts of Samudragupta’s dominions and who paid him tribute and homage and the list of the distant foreign monarchs who entered into diplomatic relations with him occurs a line in the Allahabad pillar prāṣasti which says that the fame of this Gupta sovereign became tired with wandering over the whole earth and re-establishing the royal families that had been overturned and had been dispossessed of their realms. It is a pity that Harishcēna, the author of the prāṣasti, tells us nothing as to which royal houses had lost their kingdoms but were reinstated by Samudragupta. He gives us details about all other achievements of his lord and master, but curiously enough, does not give the name of any royal dynasty that had been so restored to power by the Gupta monarch. Presumably he had good reasons to observe reticence over this point. These royal families, it seems, were now on terms of great intimacy with the Gupta House, and it was probably considered to be a positively bad taste to mention their names and thereby revive the memories of their unfortunate past and remind them of their subordinate present. Harishcēna’s silence is thus perfectly intelligible. Can we, however, make a shrewd guess about any one of these royal families? Now, it is worthy of note that Harishcēna has given us a detailed account of Samudragupta’s conquests but has not said a word about the Vākāṭakas. What was the position of the Vākāṭakas about this time? For a long time there was nothing to show that the Vākāṭaka family was in any way connected with the Gupta family. Nay, nothing was known about the exact period when the Vākāṭakas flourished. Of course, there was palaeography to help us in the matter. But palaeography is not an exact science. And it is no wonder if Fleet and Kielhorn differed widely from Bhagwanlal Indraji and Bühler in regard to their correct time, though all of them were erudite scholars. It was the discovery of the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta that established a synchronism. She was the chief queen of the Vākāṭaka Mahārāṇa Rudrāśēna (II) and daughter of the Imperial Gupta sovereign Chandragupta II. The father of Rudrāśēna (II) was Prīthivishēna I, who was thus a contemporary of Chandragupta II. Their fathers, consequently, were contemporaries, namely,

2 The Mahāvamsa (trans.), Intro., pp. xxxviii and ff.
3 Bhagwanlal Indraji and Bühler correctly assigned the Vākāṭakas to an earlier period (ASWT, Vol. IV, pp. 116-17; Bühler’s Indian Palaeography (trans. by Fleet, p. 64, note 8). For Fleet’s view, see CIL, Vol. III, 1888, Intro., pp. 15-16. Kielhorn was practically of the same opinion (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 270).
the Vākāṭaka *Mahārāja* Rudrasēna I and the Gupta *Mahārājādhirāja* Samudragupta.\(^3\) Now, this Rudrasēna was a son of Gautamiputra with whose name no royal title of any kind has been coupled. Gautamiputra, we are further informed, was son's son to Pravarasēna I. About this Pravarasēna we are told not only that he was a *Mahārāja* but also that he belonged to the imperial (*samrād*) Vākāṭaka family or clan. And quite in keeping with it has been mentioned the fact that he celebrated four aśvamedhīhas. There can therefore be no doubt as to the Vākāṭakas having attained to the imperial rank in the time of Pravarasēna. This receives confirmation, if any is required, from the fact that the Vākāṭakas are nowhere described as *samrād*-Vākāṭakas in the time of any prince of this line after Pravarasēna I. It will thus be seen that the Vākāṭaka rulers from the time of Rudrasēna I onwards occupy a subordinate position, namely, that of the *Mahārāja*, whereas in their own copper-plates the Gupta sovereign, Chandragupta II, has been actually styled *Mahārājādhirāja* in consonance with his imperial position. Again, what we have to note about this family is that there is a break in the line between Pravarasēna I and Rudrasēna I. It is true that the name of Rudrasēna I's father has been mentioned, namely Gautamiputra, but he receives no royal title at all. Further, the father and grandfather of Gautamiputra have not been even so much as named. The conclusion is irresistible, then, that after Pravarasēna I the Vākāṭakas lost their kingdom and remained desitute of power for three generations till Rudrasēna I, who belonged to the fourth, became a *Mahārāja*. The title *Mahārāja*, about this time, that is, three generations prior to Samudragupta, was in a transitional stage. Its significance had not yet become fixed. It could be assumed by an imperial ruler, or a feudatory chieftain. Thus Pravarasēna was, no doubt, a *Mahārāja*, but that he was a suzerain is proved by the appositional phrase *samrād*-Vākāṭakānām, which occurs in all Vākāṭaka charters. Similarly, Rudrasēna I or his son Prithivishēna I has been styled *Mahārāja*, but that they were subordinate princes is indicated by the appositional phrase shrinking up into Vākāṭakānām with the prefix *samrād*- dropped invariably. It will thus be seen that when, after the overthrow of the Vākāṭaka supremacy after Pravarasēna I, the Vākāṭakas again rise to power in the fourth generation, they are, not suzerains, but feudatories. How could they have been brought to power again? And to whom, again, could they have remained subordinate? The only plausible reply is that as, after Pravarasēna, Rudrasēna first became a ruler and as Rudrasēna was a contemporary of Samudragupta, it was this Samudragupta who was responsible for raising him and the Vākāṭakas to power. This inference is strengthened by the fact that in the Allahabad pillar *prasasti* Samudragupta is credited with having re-established some royal families that were shorn of power. We do not know whether Chandragupta's daughter Prabhāvatiguptā was married to Rudrasēna II, son of Prithivishēna, in the time of Samudragupta. There is nothing inherently impossible in this supposition. On the contrary, it is a most likely one, because his Eraṇi inscription speaks of his possessing not only many sons, but many sons' sons. Nevertheless, even supposing that this event took place after the demise of Samudragupta, this much cannot be denied that the two royal families must have already been on terms of great intimacy, as a marriage alliance took place between them practically in one generation from the rise of the Vākāṭakas to power. This probably explains why Harishēna refrained from giving specific instances of the royal families reinstated by Samudragupta. Of all such families the Vākāṭaka was the most prominent. And if he had named it, that would surely have reminded the Vākāṭaka Rudrasēna I of the imperial power which his family once enjoyed and of the subordinate position it now held, notwithstanding the fact that it was restored to some power at all by Samudragupta. The ancestral dominions of the Vākāṭakas, again, comprised the western half of Madhya Pradesh, Berar and Mahārāṣṭra, thus practically the

\(^3\) See in this connection the view of S. K. Bose who for the first time successfully tackled this synchronism (*JC*, Vol. II, pp. 53 ff.).
whole of the tableland of the Deccan, which by no means was an insignificant portion of Dakshināpatha. No part of this vast region is mentioned in any one of the lists, given by Harishēṇa, of kingdoms, reduced to subordination, or put under tributary alliance, or brought into diplomatic relations with Samudragupta. This was a flagrant omission which would scarcely be expected of such an accurate historiographer of Samudragupta's conquests as Harishēṇa. Once, however, the cause of his reticence can be guessed, one can easily understand why no mention is made at all of this vast Deccan plateau held by the Vākāṭakas, who were, no doubt, in secure, but, nevertheless, subordinate, alliance with the Imperial Gupta House.

We thus obtain a fairly accurate conception of the military achievements of Samudragupta. They were of six or seven different types. The first of these was that of fresasah-śuddharaya or 'violent extermination', which was practised upon eight kings of Āryāvarta. This was absolutely necessary for the preservation and safeguarding of the Gupta empire. As this type of conquest involved also the annexation of the kingdoms of the rulers forcibly uprooted, this automatically led to the enlargement also of the Gupta dominions. The second type consisted of parichārakī-karaya which was inflicted upon the rulers of all Āṭāvika principalities who were thus made 'slaves' of Samudragupta. This was a milder type of conquest than the first, as imposition of slavery is less violent in character than extermination. The third is represented by the payment of tribute (kara-dāna), execution of orders (ājitā-karana) and visits to the Gupta court for offering homage (prajām-āgamana) which Samudragupta exacted from the princes ruling on the east and north frontiers of Āryāvarta, and from the tribes that formed the west and south-west fringe of the Gupta dominions. By this three-fold measure alone they were able to mollify his stern rule (paritilōṣṭha-praγhaṇḍo-Īśānasaya). They were all states that became part of the Gupta empire though they were situated on its outskirts. This gives us an idea of the extent of that empire. On the north it was bounded by the Himalayas, on the south by the Vindhayas, on the east by a line running from the mouths of the Ganges through Tripura-Cachar-Assam to the Himalayas, and on the west by a line running through East Panjab and East Rajputana down to the Vindhayas.

The fourth type of Samudragupta's conquests consisted of grahaṇa-moṣkha, 'capture and release' which he carried out in Dakshināpatha. It is true that only twelve rulers of South India are mentioned by Harishēṇa. But we have to remember that whereas he speaks of only anākī-Āryāvarta-rāja he speaks of sarva-Dakshināpatha-rāja. The contrast between the words anākī and sarva is worthy of note, and it shows that whereas in the case of Āryāvarta the Gupta monarch uprooted only some, in the case of Dakshināpatha he vanquished and set free all kings. But what could be the meaning of this mode of conquest styled grahaṇa-moṣkha by Harishēṇa? This reminds us of a verse in the Raghuvamśa, where Kālidāsa describes the dig-vijaya of Raghu. In his expedition of conquest Raghu is represented to have defeated the ruler of the Mahēndra mountain. And his defeat of this king is thus described by Kālidāsa:

Gṛihīta-pratimuktasa sa dharma-vijayi utīpah
śriyāṁ Mahēndra-nāṭhasya jahāra na tu médinim

(IV. 43)\(^1\)

Gṛihīta-pratimuktā of Kālidāsa is obviously identical with grahaṇa-moṣkha of Harishēṇa. It is thus quite clear that Samudragupta like Raghu is represented as Dharma-vijayin, 'the Righteous Conqueror', because neither of these rulers deprived the conquered foe of his dominions. And, in fact, the phrase Dharma-vijayin is not of Kālidāsa's own coinage, and is found used as early as the time of Kauṭalya, for he, in his Arthaśāstra,\(^2\) distinguishes between three types of

\(^1\) Our attention to this verse was drawn by Raychaudhury as early as 1927 in his second edition of Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., p. 339.

\(^2\) XII. 1. 11.
conquerors of whom *Dharma-vijayin* is doubtless one. He further tells us that of these conquerors *Dharma-vijayin* is the best, because he does not despoil the vanquished ruler of his possessions, meaning that his object is neither money nor annexation, but rather obeisance, that is, the ambition of becoming a *Chāituranta* or *Chakravartin*, the goal placed before a king by the *Arthaśāstra*. In *Kālidāsa*'s time, however, this goal seems to have undergone a slight change; for, the poet says that Raghu seized, if not the kingdom, at any rate, the wealth (*śrī*) of the ruler of the Mahāendra mountain. Mallinātha, the commentator, explains *śrīyaḥ jahāra* by *dharma-ārtham=iti bhūvah*. It is thus clear that in the Gupta period it was customary for the *Dharma-vijayin* to exact at least a tribute from the worsted enemy. The precious metal, so acquired, was most probably, used not so much to overstock the royal treasury as to celebrate some politico-religious ceremony at the end of the expedition and distribute it in largesses to the Brāhmaṇas. This point we will come to very shortly. Suffice it here to say that Samudragupta appears to have undertaken his campaign in South India with a view to establishing himself as a supreme ruler of India and that he could thus afford to be a *Dharma-vijayin* for Dakshināpatha.

The nature of the fifth type of Samudragupta's military achievements is revealed by the expression *utsanna-rājavanśa-pratiskhīpāna* 'restoration of overthrown royal families'. This point we have already dwelt upon. This need not therefore occupy us here very long. It is true that Harishēna does not specify the names of these families. But we have already remarked that he must have had very good reasons for refraining from this specification, especially as we know he has not spared himself from such enumerations elsewhere in describing the conquests of his lord and master. Although he has not thus thrown any light on this point, purposely we think, we have already surmised that one of these families was the Vākāṭaka, whose ancestral kingdom was practically co-extensive with the tableland of the Deccan. And when this extensive region is once taken into consideration, the enumeration of the twelve kings of South India vanquished and liberated by Samudragupta does not, after all, look a meagre and incomplete one so as to cast a reasonable doubt upon the wide extent of his *dig-vijaya*, so absolutely necessary for the position of the Paramount Sovereign to which he was aspiring. Who seized upon this Vākāṭaka territory between the time of Pravarsēna I and that of Samudragupta, we do not know definitely. We can only guess that it was not one king, but perhaps a combination of neighbouring rulers, that partitioned the Vākāṭaka kingdom. There was the ruler of Kōśala in the east, the Nāga confederacy in the north, the Kshatrapas in the west, and the Pallavas and others in the south. These must have conspired jointly and severally to pounce upon the Vākāṭaka empire and seize every one for himself a sumptuous morsel. When this whole array of formidable princes was confronted, singly and severally, and destroyed or subdued by Samudragupta during the various types of conquests he carried out, it was not difficult at all to unify and restore the dismembered Vākāṭaka power, which, however, now in its regenerated form had to enter into a subordinate alliance with the Imperial Gupta House.

The sixth and perhaps the last type of military achievements which stands to the credit of Samudragupta is the diplomatic relations which sprang up between him and the distant independent states on the frontiers and beyond. We have seen who they were. Here we are supplied with two lists by Harishēna, one consisting of foreign independent rulers settled on the west and north-west of India and the other of those situated beyond the extreme south of the country such as the princes of Sinhala (Ceylon) and other island countries. The very fact that the rulers of Sinhala and adjoining islands exchanged international courtesy with him shows that the *dig-vijaya* of Samudragupta was complete over the whole of Dakshināpatha.

---

In fact, he was the paramount sovereign of the whole of India except those small provinces held by the Kushâṇa and Śaka rulers on the outskirts. If Harishêṇa has not exaggerated, they were, indeed, afraid of "the onrush of the prowess of his arms (bâhu-vîya-prasara) and therefore constructed 'earthen embankments' (dharani-bandha) to arrest it by way of various diplomatic devices, such as âtma-nirâdana, kany-âpâyana-dâna, etc. These last we have carefully considered and explained.

The natural culmination of these India-wide conquests was, of course, the celebration of the Âsvamêda sacrifice with which Samudragupta is credited. There is, however, absolutely no mention of it in any one of his epigraphic records, above all, in his Allahabad pillar inscription where it would be naturally expected. The reasonable conclusion is that the Âsvamêda sacrifice must have been performed after this inscription had been put up. It is worthy of note that this record has been engraved on a pillar which had already been inscribed with three different types of Aśoka's edicts. From one of these it is also quite clear that originally this pillar was standing at Kauśâmbi, identified with Kosam, about 26 miles west by south from Allahabad. Kauśâmbi was then the centre of the main routes that ran from east to west and north to south. And it seems that Samudragupta had just then completed his expedition of conquest in South India and was returning to his capital Pâtaliputra, east Kauśâmbi. Of all the victories of this Gupta monarch, those of Dakshinâpatha must have been the last to achieve. They were not at all needed for the preservation of the Gupta empire, and must have been undertaken at a time, when everything was quiet and firm in North India, and, when as Dharma-vijayin, Samudragupta had only to capture and liberate the different princes of that region to establish his claim to sarvabhaumaata with a view to celebrating the Âsvamêda which he had now set his heart upon. As Kauśâmbi was the meeting point of the two great arteries of communication in India, Samudragupta must have naturally rested himself for some time along with his sacrificial steed, before he could resume the onward march to Pâtaliputra. It was here and at this time that the idea of setting up a record of all his multifarious achievements presumably suggested itself to him. And as Kauśâmbi was itself known for a stone column inscribed with the edicts of Aśoka which handed down the name of the Maurya sovereign from one generation to another, Samudragupta must have thought this column to be the fittest place where his panegyric record also could be engraved so that his fame, like that of his Mauryan compeer, could endure from one age to another till the sun and the moon shine in their orbs.

We have shown that this prasasti of Samudragupta was composed by Harishêṇa, his Minister for Peace and War. The actual work of executing it, that is, of engraving it on the pillar, was done by another officer, called Tilakabhaṭṭa, a Mahâdaṇḍanâyaka, who was apparently the officer in charge of Kauśâmbi and the surrounding districts. On reaching Pâtaliputra Samudragupta must have performed the Âsvamêda sacrifice.

"Verily," says the Satapatha-Brâhmana (XIII. 1.6.3), "the Âsvamêda means royal sway; it is after royal sway that those strive who guard the horse. Those of them who reach the end become ( sharers in) the royal sway, but those who do not reach the end are cut off from royal sway. Therefore let him who holds royal sway perform the horse-sacrifice; for, verily, whoever performs the horse-sacrifice, without possessing power, is poured (washed) away." The late Eggeling, who has translated this Brâhmana rightly says that "the Âsvamêda . . . . involved an assertion of power and a display of political authority such as only a monarch of undisputed supremacy could have ventured upon without courting humiliation; and its celebration must
therefore have been an event of comparatively rare occurrence." 1 The *Baudhāyana-Srautasūtra* (XV. 1.1) also says that the king, who is desirous of *Āśvamēdha* must be a conqueror and (ruler) of all land (*Āśvamēdhēṇa yakṣyamādō bhavati rājā vijīti sārvabhaumāḥ*). This is further corroborated by the *Apastamba-Srautasūtra* (XX. 1.1), which says: *rājā sārvabhaumō = āśvamēdhēṇā yajēta, "the king who is (ruler) of all land may perform *Āśvamēdha*." It will thus be seen that originally an *Āśvamēdha* sacrifice was considered worthy of celebration by a sārvabhauma king only. Things were, however, changing, even in the (Śruti) Sūtra period. For the *Apastamba-Srautasūtra* just quoted is followed immediately by *apy = āśravabhauṇah, "Even (a king) who is not (ruler) of all land (may perform it)." *Āśvamēdha* was not thus the be-all and the end-all of a universal ruler only, as it doubtless was to start with. Its performance must thus have come in later times to be associated with a variety of purposes. One of these was certainly *putraprāpti, "attainment of a son*, and the well-known instance of it is the *Āśvamēdha* celebrated by Daśaratha, king of Kōśala. At the very beginning of the Rāmāyaṇa, Daśaratha is made to declare this his intention with the words *putrārthāṁ hāyamēdhēṇa yakṣyām = iti matir = māma, in front of Vaśishtha, Rishyaśāṅgīna and others. And it was done, and the expected fruition also obtained.2 Another object with which the sacrifice is performed is pointed to by stanza 4 of Act I of the *Mṛciṇ-chhakaṭika*, where Śūdraka, the reputed author of the drama, is represented to have performed the *Āśvamēdha* after abdicating his throne in favour of his son, and thereby apparently to have lived for one hundred years and ten days before he cremated himself in a sacred fire.3 A third end in view is indicated by the *Āśvamēdha* celebrated by Yudhishthira, the account of which constitutes one whole *parvan* of the *Mahābhārata* called the *Āśvamēdhika-parvan*. Yudhishthira had already performed the Rājāśūya for attaining to the rank of Sārvabhauma. Nevertheless, after regaining the kingdom from Duryodhana who had wrested it from him, he performs the *Āśvamēdha*, with the express object, we are told, of washing off "the sin committed in consequence of the slaughter of kinsmen" (*jñāti-vadha-kṛiṇāḥ pāpaḥ*).4 Elsewhere in the same *parvan*, that is, in the *Āśvamēdhika-parvan*, the *Āśvamēdha* is described as "purification of all sins*.5 This leaves no doubt as to the main purpose of performing an *Āśvamēdha*. Even Manu expresses the same opinion, when he says *yathō āśvamēdhaḥ kruṭu-rūṭ sarva-pāp-āpanōdanāḥ* (XI. 260). Nevertheless, after reconquering his dominion, it was necessary for Yudhishthira to proclaim his position as Sārvabhauma through the performance of Rājāśūya. If we carefully study the movements of the sacrificial steed of Yudhisthira, we find that the animal goes from Hastinapura, the capital of the Pāṇḍavas, first to the Trigarta country, in the extreme north-west of India, from there to Prāgyōṭisha in Assam in the extreme east, from Prāgyōṭisha again to Sindhu (Sind) in the extreme west, from Sindhu to the country of Manipura in the extreme east again, from there to Magadha, and then only to the south to such countries as Kōśala, Taṅgana, Dravida, Andhra, Raudra, Māhishaka, Kaulagiri, thence northwards to Surāshṭra, Prabhāsa, Dvārāvatī, Pañchanada, and lastly to Gandhāra.6 If such was the progress of the sacrificial steed, the conclusion is irresistible that the horse was taken from one frontier province to another in order that the *Āśvamēdha* should be combined with the *dig-śūya*.

Now, there can be no doubt as to the motive with which Samudragupta performed his *Āśvamēdha*. We have already remarked that his Allahabad pillar inscription makes no mention of it at all. But the same record leaves no doubt whatever that when the *prasāṣti* was composed,
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3 Upon this commentator Prithividara gives the following gloss: *agni-prasāṭī = jīpi Sarvavāna-nāmakā yajñāviśātāh yatāh Sarvabhūgan ha kṛitil = tathā boddhaye yah. As regards Sarabhaguna, see *Rāmāyaṇa*, III. 5. 33.
4 *Mahābhārata*, XIV, 88.16.
5 *Ibid.*, 71.16.
he had already attained to the rank of paramount sovereign. The Horse Sacrifice must have been celebrated very soon after the record was incised on the column, as the obvious culmination of his assertion of undisputed supremacy over the whole of India. This view is confirmed by a critical study of the coins he issued to signalise this event of extreme political importance. On the reverse of the coin, as Allan informs us, is a representation of the sacrificial steed standing before a decorated sacrificial post (yāha) and apparently bound to it. On the reverse is a female figure standing, wearing loose robe and jewellery and holding chowrie over her right shoulder in her right hand. Presumably she is the mahishā or Chief Queen of Samudragupta, namely, Dattadēvi, who must have played a more important part in the sacrifice than the other wives of the king. On the left is a sacrificial spear bound with fillet. Around her feet is what looks like a chain extending also round the spear. At her feet, again, is an uncertain object which seems to be a gourd. On the reverse, again, is the legend Aśvamēdha-pārākramah, which is no doubt the appellation he assumed after the performance of the sacrifice and which signifies "one whose valour is Horse Sacrifice." This means that when he performed Aśvamēdha, he exhibited valour, that, in other words, it was through his valour that he was able to celebrate the sacrifice. This Aśvamēdha of Samudragupta, therefore, must have been an achievement worthy of a Sārvabhauma. It could not have been performed with a purely secular motive, such, for example, as putra-prāpti, or a purely religious purpose, such as the expiation of sins. This is corroborated also by the distich which occurs on the reverse of his coins, namely, rājāhārajaḥ prithivaṁ vijitaṁ divāṁ jayant-. Aparaiva-vaśyaḥ, "The Overlord of lords, having conquered the earth, being of irresistible prowess, conquers heaven". This indicates that his conquests all over India have developed into Aśvamēdha which has now enabled him to conquer heaven also.

It has been stated above that though the coins of Samudragupta commemorate his celebration of Horse Sacrifice, no reference to it is traceable in his epigraphic records. The inscriptions of his descendants, however, do refer to it. Thus the Bilsā and Bihār stone pillar inscriptions of Kumāragupta and Budhagupta respectively (Nos. 16 and 41 below) speak of Samudragupta as chir-ōśam-āśvamēdh-āhartā. This expression Fleet has rendered by "who was the restorer of the aśvamēdha-sacrifice, that had been long in abeyance." When this English savant published his classical work Gupta Inscriptions, there was little epigraphical evidence to show that there was any other king except Šātakarnī,² or rather his queen, who performed the Horse Sacrifice before the time of the Gupta monarch. But their name is now legion. Because now we know that Aśvamēdha was performed twice by the Śūṅga Pushyamitra,³ once by Pārāśariputra Gājāyana Sarvataṭa,⁴ twice by Vēdiśi Śātakarnī,⁵ ten times by the Bhāraśivas,⁶ four times by the Vākāṭaka Pravarasēna I,⁷ and once by the Ikshvāku Vāsiśthiputra Chārīntamula.⁸ Besides, we have the evidence of a seal that the same sacrifice was celebrated by Vishuddēva⁹ about 150 B.C. If, therefore, Harishēṇa gives us to understand that Samudragupta restored Aśvamēdha which had for long been in abeyance, it is an exaggeration, pure and simple, of a court panegyrist. But does the phrase chir-ōśam-āśvamēdh-āhartā necessarily mean this? Is

² ASWI., Vol. V, p. 60.
³ Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 57. [Cf. also the brick inscription of Dāmamitra, Ibid., Vol. XXXIII, pp. 99-100.—Ed.]
⁵ ASWI., Vol. V, p. 60, No. II.
⁷ Ibid., No. 55, p. 236, text line 2 and No. 56, p. 245, text line 2.
⁸ Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, pp. 18 ff. (Āyaka-piller inscription B 2, line 1; C 2, line 3; C 4, line 3; E line 1; G lines 2-3; H lines 4-5); Ibid., Vol. XXXV, pp. 18-19.
⁹ JRAS., 1893, p. 97.
Fleet’s translation the only one possible? In this connection attention may be drawn to what Krishnaswami Aiyar1 has said about the word utsanna, used of the Āsvamēdha in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. But the pity of it is that he did not think it worth his while to develop this point at all. And what is more pitiful is that he does not even tell us in which part of this Brāhmaṇa the word utsanna has been employed with reference to Āsvamēdha. Nevertheless, we will try and develop this point as best as we can. It is in Kāṇḍa XIII of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa that Āsvamēdha has been called utsanna-yajña iṣva. We will quote the whole passage bearing on this point: Śauṅkṛity = Achehchhāvāka-sāma bhavati utsanna-yajña iṣva va ēsha yad Āsvamēdhaḥ kīm va hy etāya kṛiyāte kāṁ va na kāṁ Śauṅkṛity = Achehchhāvāka-sāma bhavati āvasya = āvaya sarvētvāyām.2 “The Śauṅkṛity (tune) is the Achchhāvāka’s Śaman. Verily what is (called) Āsvamēdha is, as it were, a decayed sacrifice. Because something thereof is performed, and something not. When the Śauṅkṛity is the Achchhāvāka’s Śaman, it is for (bringing about) the completeness of the Horse (Sacrifice).” This translation follows in the main that given by Eggeling.3 In the footnote to his translation he has quoted some commentary bearing on this passage. Part of it is worth repeating here: utsanna-yajña ēsha yah Āsvamēdhaḥ kāthām utsanna ity = āta āta kīm va hīti yasya dharmāḥ pūreya-yaṃv (yugā?) prayājyante āsthāṃ kūṁchit kalau kṛiyāte kūṁchit = na kṛiyāte tatāt = ācha Śauṅkṛity = Achehchhāvāka-sāma bhavati.4 In the same footnote Eggeling says that a similar passage is found also in the Taṭātya-saṁhitā (V. 4.12.3). If we examine it, we find that it also contains the words: utsanna-yajña vai ēsha yad Āsvamēdhaḥ Śaṅkāya in his gloss upon it explains it by saying that it is utsanna-yajña, because some parts of it (asayaa) were either vinashita, ‘utterly lost’, or ativismita, ‘completely forgotten’, and that it was consequently necessary to chant the Śauṅkṛity, namely, the Achchhāvāka’s Śaman, in order that the Āsvamēdha may be restored to sarvātuka-sākalya, “completeness through the totality of elements”.5 If we thus take into our careful consideration the two Vedic passages relating to the Āsvamēdha together with commentaries thereupon, it is clear that some parts of the sacrifice were long ago either lost or forgotten,6 that the whole and entire sacrifice could not thus be performed and that hence arose the necessity of chanting the Śauṅkṛity, just adverted to, to rectify this defect. This is why Āsvamēdha was known as utsanna-yajña “a dilapidated sacrifice”. It will thus be seen that it is not simply the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa but also the Taṭātya-saṁhitā where the sacrifice has been so designated. And the commentaries concur practically as to the signification of the term utsanna. When therefore the Gupta inscriptions speak of Samudragupta’s Āsvamēdha as chiror-ūtsanna, the term utsanna in this phrase cannot but be taken in the same sense. We have therefore to suppose that Āsvamēdha had remained utsanna for a long time, up till the time of this Gupta sovereign, but that, whether on account of his expedition in the south where Vedic lore and practices are still better preserved or on account of some other circumstances about which we know nothing at present, the elements of this sacrifice which were so long taken as lost or forgotten were recovered beyond all doubt and that in consequence thereof he celebrated the Āsvamēdha, whole and entire, without any one of its original elements missing.

We have remarked above that although the records of Samudragupta do not speak about his Āsvamēdha, the inscriptions of his descendants make prominent mention of it. But they do so in two different phrases. One of these, namely, chiror-ūtsanna-Āsvamēdha-āhartā, we have just

---

1 Studies in Gupta History, pp. 44-45.
2 Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, XIII, 3.3.6.
5 This explains why we have a double description of the Āsvamēdha in the XIII Book of the Śatapatha-Bṛ. (Adhyāyas 1-3 and 4-5), as has been so lucidly pointed out by W. Calland (Asia Orientalis, Vol. X, pp. 126 ff.). This double description naturally involves repetitions, discrepancies and even contradictions, though an attempt has been made to bring both the descriptions into harmony one with the other.
considered. We will now consider the other expression namely, anēk-Āśamēḍha-yājī, which occurs in the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta, who, we have already seen, was the Chief Queen of the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II and daughter of the Gupta sovereign Chandragupta II. What does the word anēk of this expression mean? Does it mean that Samudragupta celebrated more than one Horse Sacrifice? This is practically contradicted by the other expression which we have already considered, namely, chīr-ōtsann-Āśamēḍha-saṁhitā. Surely this new expression cannot be appropriately translated by “the performer of (many) Āśamēḍhas which had for long become dilapidated”. The words chīr-ōtsanna are opposed to the idea of Samudragupta having performed more than one Horse Sacrifice. What then becomes of the statement, anēk-Āśamēḍha-yājī, which is made about him in the copper-plate charter of his grand-daughter? In this connection we have to note that epigraphic records credit some princes with the performance of many Āśamēḍhas. If the Śuṅga king Pushyamitra and the Śātavāhana ruler Vēdiṣrī Sātakarni celebrated Āśamēḍha twice, as reported in their inscriptions, it is intelligible enough, though there is no evidence to show that their might extended over the whole of India as was the case with Samudragupta. But when Pravaraśena I is represented to have performed four Āśamēḍhas, it demands a very high stretch of imagination to believe it, even though in his time the Vākāṭakas were samrād or suzerains, as their inscriptions inform us. When, however, we are told that the Vīshnukūḍa king, Mādhavavarman I, celebrated no less than eleven Horse Sacrifices, it becomes an absolutely incredible proposition, if it means that they were performed one after another till they numbered eleven. This Mādhavavarman may have been an independent prince, for aught we know to the contrary, but certainly he must have ruled over a small dominion, occupying scarcely one sixth of South India. Besides, he was not a suzerain. Nevertheless, we can conclude that he was entitled to the performance of an Āśamēḍha. Because the Āpastamba-Srautasūtra lays down that the Āśamēḍha may be celebrated even by a-sārabhauma rulers, who must inter alia include ‘feudatory chieftains’. If any proof is needed, it is furnished by Harivāmania, which, as was first pointed out by J. C. Ghosh, adduces the instance of Vasudēva, father of Kṛishṇa, who, although a kara-dāyaka or ‘tributary’, is represented as performing a Vājīmēḍha. In later history the case is very well known of Savāi Jayasimha, the Kachchhāhā founder and ruler of Jaipur in Rajputana, who celebrated an Āśamēḍha, but whose men, we are informed, took care that the stallion did not stray beyond the region of his political influence. James Tod, therefore, rightly says that “although, perhaps, in virtue of his office, as the satrap of Delhi, the horse dedicated to the sun might have wandered unmolested on the bank of the Ganges, he would most assuredly have found his way into a Rahtore stable had he roamèd in the direction of the desert: at the risk of both jiva and gaddi (life and throne), the Hara would have seized him, had he fancied the pastures of the Chambal.” This shows clearly that a feudatory could perform this sacrifice, only if his attendants, who escorted the steed, saw that the animal never wandered away from the boundaries of his principality. We are not therefore to be surprised at all if the Vīshnukūḍa prince, Mādhavavarman I, celebrated an Āśamēḍha after all. But the most incredible feature of this statement would be that he celebrated as many as eleven such sacrifices, if we understand by it that he performed them all successively. It is incredible first, because, every single performance is of a long duration, and secondly because, the preparations for it are tedious
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and exacting and would swell into abnormal and prohibitive expenses. We are therefore compelled to suppose that Mādhavavarman had a long reign and that he spent the whole of it in the performance of sacrificial rites. The only way out of this difficulty is that suggested by the remark which Vyāsa makes to Yudhishthira in connection with his Aśvamēṭha. "Let thy sacrifice, O the best of kings," says Vyāsa, "be performed in such a way that it shall not be defective. In consequence of the large quantity of that gold (having to spend which) it is called Bahuṣwarnaṅka (Profuse-Gold Sacrifice). Increase here the daksinā threefold, O great king, and thy (sacrifice) shall become threefold. The Brāhmaṇas are competent for this purpose. Having thus accomplished three Aśvamēṭhas each with profuse daksinā, thou shalt be freed, O king, from the sin committed in consequence of the slaughter of thy kinsmen."1 This is a most significant passage, because it clearly says that he, who gives daksinā that is triple of what is enjoined, is looked upon as having performed three different Horse Sacrifices and consequently as having attained to triple the spiritual merit. May we not therefore infer that Pravarasena I and Mādhavavarman I disbursed daksinā four and eleven times respectively, of that actually prescribed for that sacrifice, and were credited with having performed four and eleven Aśvamēṭhas respectively, when, as a matter of fact, the ceremony was performed but once? The same may have happened in the case of Samudragupta. We do not know the exact value of anēka in the epithet anēk-Aśvamēṭha-yājī which has been applied to him in his granddaughter’s copper-plate grant. It may be ‘four’; it may be ‘eleven’; it may be even two. We have only to presume that he distributed daksinā among Brāhmaṇas just so many times more than laid down for the sacrifice, but that he performed only one solemn rite.

One of the many epithets by which Samudragupta is known is nyāy-āgata-anēka-gō-hiraṇya-kōti-prada, “the giver of many crores of lawfully acquired cows and gold”. This may not be an exaggeration, as from the verses just cited from the Aśvamēṭha-parvan of the Mahābhārata we learn that the Aśvamēṭha is called Bahuṣwarnaṅka, because profuse quantities of gold are given by way of daksinā. That cows also were bestowed upon the Brāhmaṇa priests is too wellknown to require any proof. Of the epigraphic records that have been hitherto published, the Nānāghāṭ cave inscription is the most important in this connection. There the Śatavāhana king, or rather, his queen, is represented as having celebrated Śravaṇa sacrifices of various kinds, and the various daksinās distributed by this charitable monarch in connection therewith have also been described.2 Even a cursory glance is enough to show that the kine formed an important item of daksinā in the case of most of his sacrifices. But there is no mention of swarna except in the case of the Aśvamēṭha performed by him.3 Vēṭiśrī performed two Aśvamēṭhas, but the details of the second of them alone have been preserved, and these again only partially. Nevertheless, what has been preserved indubitably points to the conclusion that the precious metal or coin that was associated with Horse Sacrifice is Swarna as we also know from the Mahābhārata, and not silver or Kārshāpanas which we find invariably associated with all other sacrifices of Vēṭiśrī in the Nānāghāṭ cave inscription.

It is but natural that the memory of such an important event as the celebration of Aśvamēṭha by Samudragupta should be preserved in a variety of ways. We have already described what is called the Aśvamēṭha type of coins, which he issued to commemorate this event. Some scholars are of opinion that they were struck for distribution to the Brāhmaṇas who took part in the Aśvamēṭha ceremony.4 But this seems unlikely, because these coins,
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2 ASWI, Vol. V, pp. 60-64.
3 Ibid., p. 60, line 1, (No. II-B Right Wall).
though so few of them have yet been found, seem to present three or four different varieties, showing that they were struck in different mints. On the other hand, if they had really been intended as largesses to the Brahmaṇa priests who participated in the solemn rite, they would have come from one and the same mint, and presenting one variety only. It is safer to say that they were issued by Samudragupta to signalise the universal sovereignty presupposed in the performance of the Horse Sacrifice and indicated by the new title that he now assumed, namely, Āstamētha-parākrama. The memory of this performance has persisted in another way also. As early as 1901, E. J. Rapson brought to our notice a circular seal, containing the representation of a horse looking towards a sacrificial post and the legend Parākrama below.  

As Rapson remarks, the title Parākrama is distinctive of Samudragupta and occurs alone without any addition on some of his coins. As this seal is a clay impression, it is clear that it must have been originally attached to some document despatched from Samudragupta's Sacrificial Hall. It is, however, a pity that nothing is known about the provenance of the seal. Seals or sealings from sacrificial grounds are by no means unknown. One such was picked up by me during excavations at Besnagar from a site which appears to have been once a Sacrificial Hall. A third memorial also of Samudragupta's Āstamētha has come down to us. It is the life-size stone figure of a small horse, which was dug many years ago near the ancient fort of Khairigah in the Khērī District, on the border between Oudh and Nepal. The stone horse bears on the right side of its neck in faintly incised and partly defaced Gupta characters an inscription of which . . . . . . . . . . . . ddayathassa dayadhamma are legible. The first word must clearly be restored to Samuddayatassā, and this line translated by "the religious benefaction of (Samu)-dragupta." It is true that the artistic merits of this sculpture are contemptible. Still the word dayadhamma used shows that the stone horse was considered to be an object of some religious significance. It is possible that representations of the steed sacrificed and thus hallowed were put up by Samudragupta at important places in his empire as souvenirs of this celebration of extreme politico-religious importance. Again, the fact that this brief mutilated inscription is in Prakrit has puzzled V. A. Smith and even suggested a shade of doubt, because all other Gupta inscriptions are in pure classical Sanskrit. But pure classical Sanskrit must have been the language of the learned, and for the half-literate and the illiterate, Prakrit must have continued to be the medium of expression especially in the earlier part of the Gupta epoch.

The Gupta inscriptions and coins give us some insight into the royal style of the dynasty. In this respect numismatics is of greater importance than epigraphy. In the Allahabad pillar inscription, we have seen that, whereas Gupta and Ghaṭotkacha have been called simply Mahāraja, Chandragupta I and Samudragupta are given the suzerain title of Mahārajaḥdhāraja. All other inscriptions follow suit, except one. This exception is the Mathurā inscription of Chandragupta II, dated Gupta year 61, where both this monarch and his father Samudragupta have been styled Mahārajaḥ-Rājadhirāja, doubtless after the Kushāna Mahārajaḥ-Rājāṭhirāja prevalent in that locality. But this Kushāna formula is not met with in any other Gupta inscription, which invariably calls the Gupta sovereign Mahārajaḥdhāraja. The coins of Samudragupta, however, present the three forms Mahārajaḥdhāraja on the Lyrist type, Rājadhirāja on the Āstamētha type, and rājan on the Tiger type. The last two forms may have been forced on the mint-master by the exigencies of versification or shortage of ground in the margin of the coins. So far in regard to the actual titles. But there were many epithets which were borne by Samudragupta, expressive of his multifarious achievements. Such are the appellations (1) Aprāśāratha, (2) Kṛitrīna-parāśu, (3) Parākrama, (4) Vīṣāghra-parākrama and (5) Āstamētha-

1 J.R.A.S., 1901, p. 102.
2 Casir., 1914-15, pp. 77-78.
parākrama. Of these the first is found on his coins of the Archer type, and in the amplified form of prithiyām -apratiratha in line 24 of the Allahabad pillar inscription and epigraphic records of his successors. The second, Kriṣṇa-parāśu, occurs on the Battle-axe Type coins of the monarch, and is associated with the name of Samudragupta in the inscriptions of his successors. The next three epithets of this monarch are connected with the term Parākrama. In the first place, he was Parākrama or Valour Incarnate, and is, therefore, called Parākrama on his coins. The Allahabad pillar inscription gives the epithet Parākramānīka, which must mean “he whose appellation (ānka) is Parākrama.” Then this Parākrama has also been joined to vyāghra, and he becomes Vyāghra-parākrama. What this appellation signifies may be seen from how he figures on the coins which give him this designation. There the king is represented as “trampling on a tiger which falls backwards as he shoots it with bow.” This means that Samudragupta was fond of hunting and took particular delight in tiger hunting. Even now when guns and powder are used for hunting a tiger, it is by no means considered to be a small feat to bag that wild animal. What daring, sharpness of aim and quick action are required of a huntsman who shoots a tiger with an arrow can easily be imagined. It is, therefore, no wonder if an appellation like Vyāghra-parākrama is coined and is assumed by a king who is always encouraged by the Arthaśāstra to develop a liking for hunting. If Samudragupta’s parākrama was thus remarkable on hunting grounds, it was equally remarkable on the battle fields. It is therefore no wonder, if he brought the whole of India under his sway, celebrated a Horse Sacrifice, and assumed another appellation expressive of this valour, namely, Aśvamēha-parākrama. As the common factor of these combinations, namely, of Vyāghra-parākrama and Aśvamēha-parākrama is Parākrama, and as Parākrama by itself also forms his epithet, Samudragupta appears to have been regarded as Parākrama par excellence just as his son, Chandragupta II was Vīkrama, and his grandson, Kumāragupta I, Mahēndra, pre-eminently.

There were other epithets and apppellations which we find conjoined to the name of Samudragupta in later Gupta inscriptions. Thus the fragmentary Mathura inscription (No. 10 below) and the Bilsad record (No. 16 below) of the time of Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I respectively, and the Nālandā plate of Samudragupta (No. 3 below) couple the following with the name of the last mentioned king: (1) Saṃra-ṛāj-ōchhehitā, (2) Prithiyām =apratirathāḥ, (3) Chatur-adadhi-salil-āsvadita-yaśāḥ, (4) Dhanada-Varun-Ēndr-Āntaka-samah, (5) Kriṣṇa-paraśuḥ, (5) Nyāy-āgat-ānēka-gō-ḥiraya-koṭi-pradah, and (7) Chir-ōtsarn-Āśvamēhāvhitā. Of these the fourth appellation, namely, Dhanada-Varun-Ēndr-Āntaka-samah, occurs in line 26 of the Allahabad inscription and the fifth, namely, Kriṣṇa-paraśuḥ, on his coins. It is worthy of note that some of these epithets are found associated with the name of Chandragupta II in the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta. They are (1) Prithiyām =apratirathaḥ, (2) Saṃra-ṛāj-ōchhehitā, (3) Chatur-adadhi-salil-āsvadita-yaśāḥ, and (4) Aṃeka-gō-ḥiraya-koṭi-sahasra-pradaḥ. The first three of the latter group are identical with the first three of the former, and the fourth of the latter is practically the same as the sixth of the former. The third epithet in the first group, again, is associated with the name of Kumāragupta I in inscription No. 21 below, and the fourth is of such a generic character that it may be borne by any king, Gupta or non-Gupta, and, was, in fact, borne even by a Chalukya feudatory in the south, as we will see shortly. The fifth and the seventh may alone be taken to be epithets peculiar to Samudragupta.

But what about the three epithets common to Samudragupta and Chandragupta II,
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1 See note on this appellation in the translation of the Allahabad pillar inscription (No. 1, below).
3 Arthaśāstra, ed. by Shanker Sastri, Mysore, 1919, 3.3.119 (p. 329).
namely, (1) Sarva-rāj-ōchchhētā, (2) Prihīvyām—aprairathaḥ, and (3) Chatur-udadhi-salil-āsvādita-yasāḥ ? What should these epithets be common at all to these two Gupta sovereigns? A reply to this question is furnished by a consideration of the titular formulary of later royal dynasties, e.g. the Rāshtrakūtas of Mālkhēd. Those, who have studied the history of this dynasty, know full well that while, on the one hand, there are epithets which are peculiar to every name, such as Akālavārsha, Prabhālavārsha or Amāghāvārsha, there are others which are common to them all, namely, Prihīvyācchētā, Vallañhārāja, and so forth. The same may have been the case with the appellations of the Gupta dynasty. While Parākrama and combinations formed out of it are peculiar to Samudragupta, and Vihrāma and its combinations to Chandragupta II, there are other epithets which were common to them all, such as the three referred to above. And, in fact, these last are of such a character that they could be borne by powerful kings of any family. And this is just what we find about the Kaṭachhuri prince Śaṅkarāgaṇa, with whose name are coupled these three Gupta epithets in the Sarasavē plates. Not far removed from Śaṅkarāgaṇa was the Chalukya chieftain Vijayarāja of Gujarāt known from his Kairā grant dated Kalachuri year 394. Curiously enough this grant applies to his name the following epithets: (1) Prihīvyām—aprairathaḥ, (2) Chatur-udadhi-salil-āsvādita-yasāḥ and (3) Dhānada-Kavun-Endr-Antaka-sama-prabhāsoḥ. It thus seems that this Gupta titular formulary was imitated by other royal families and was prevalent up till the middle of the seventh century.

Samudragupta was not only a first-rate soldier but also a king of exceptional ability. He was also endowed with varied gifts. By his praiseworthy qualities and good deeds, Harishēṇa tells us, he wiped out the fame of other monarchs. He was master alike in causing the prosperity of the good and the destruction of the wicked. His heart melted easily at the exhibition of genuine devotion and obeisance. His mind had taken up the solemn vow to raise the miserable, the humble, the forlorn and the distressed. Much other general and vague praise has been lavished by Harishēṇa upon Samudragupta. Praise of this character is just what might be expected in a composition of the praśasti type, such as the Allahabad pillar inscription, no doubt, is. And consequently when the court panegyrist goes further, and says that Samudragupta "put to shame (Bṛhāspati) the preceptor of the lord of gods, Tumburu, Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and musical performances respectively" (No. 1, line 27), one is apt to think that this is exaggeration, pure and simple, and contains no grain of truth at all. But he cannot but be agreeably surprised when he considers one type of the king’s coins, where Samudragupta is represented as wearing a waistcloth, close-fitting cap, necklace, earrings and armlets, and seated, cross-legged, on a high-backed couch, with a musical instrument lying on his knees, the left hand pressing it on the left thigh and the right playing on the strings. Surely, the monarch would not have figured as a lyrist on his coins, if he had not been something like an expert in instrumental music. In fact, no other Gupta sovereign is represented as playing on a lyre. When Harishēṇa, therefore, says that the king surpassed the heavenly musicians in his musical performances, we cannot help admitting that, after all, there is a kernel of truth in the shell of his poetic hyperbole. And for the same reason it must be admitted that there is some grain of truth also in the other statement, namely, that he excelled Bṛhāspati in respect of his sharp and polished intellect. We know that

1 It is worthy of note that this epithet has been associated also with Kumāragupta I in the Karamdanā stone inscription (No. 21 below).
Bṛhaspati was the counsellor of Indra, the ruler of the gods. Bṛhaspati was also the reputed founder of a school of Dvandavātī. Consequently, when Harishēna compares his lord and master to Bṛhaspati, what he apparently means is that Samudragupta surpassed the counsellor of Indra in point of diplomacy and state-craft. This is obviously indicated by the differences noticeable in the nature of his conquests and invasions. This we have expatiated upon above, but these we may briefly recapitulate here. In regard to some kings, he followed the policy of prasābhi-tūḍharaṇa, ‘violent extermination’. These were the rulers of Āryāvarta, whose dominions were conterminous with those of the Gupta family which he had inherited from his father. In regard to the tribes and princes who formed the outer fringe of the Gupta kingdom, his policy was that of prachanda-śāsana, that is, of exacting tribute, obedience and obedience of various kinds. So far, in regard to North India. It was, however, absolutely necessary for him to conquer also, as his aspiration was that of a Chāturanga, or Chakravartin, the ideal set before a king by the Arthaśāstra. He therefore subjugated Dakshiṇāpatha by means of grahaṇa-mūkṣha, which, as we have seen above, was the policy of a dharma-vijayin. Pari passu with these modes of conquest he adopted the policy of utsaṇa-rāja-varṇa-pratisītkhāpana, ‘the re-establishment of the royal families (already) overthrown’. This naturally involved a reshuffling of kingdoms which must have made the Gupta government much stronger than it was ever before. This was one great triumph of his foreign policy. When, in this manner, he succeeded in making himself master of practically the whole of India, the distant independent monarchs, who were ruling over provinces on the outskirts of this country, became panicky and entered into various kinds of alliances with the Gupta sovereign. It was by these multifarious policies that Samudragupta raised himself to the indisputable rank of the Supreme Ruler of India. He was thus an adept in state-craft and foreign policy. It is but just and proper that he should be compared to Bṛhaspati by Harishēna. The keynote to his phenomenal success was ‘severity tempered with mercy’. This is clear from another statement of Harishēna where he informs us that Samudragupta’s “Āyukta Officers were always occupied with the restoration of the wealth (vibhava) of many of the kings conquered by the strength of his own arms.” His policy was thus that of a foresighted ruler with an iron hand in velvet glove.

Let us, however, return to the consideration of the varied gifts of imagination that he possessed. One of these was certainly the musical sense that had been developed in him to an eminent degree. This trait of his artistic calibre we have already touched upon. He displayed proficiency also in another fine art. He was an ardent devotee not only of the Muse of Music but also of the Muse of Poetry. In the verse portion of the Allahabad inscription, Harishēna tells us that the king’s “poetry outdistances the glory of the genius of the poets.” In the prose portion (line 27) we are informed that the monarch’s “title to Kavirāja was established through many poetical compositions which would be a source of living to the literate class.” Kavirāja literally means ‘a king of poets’, but is also a technical term. It has been defined by Rājaśekhara as follows: Yās = tu tatra tatra bhāṣā-vaśishṭhaḥ teṣu teṣu prabandhāḥṣu, tasmāṁ = tasmāṁ = cha raśe svatantraḥ sa kavirājah te yadi jagat = api katipyē. But that (person) is a Kavirāja who is a master of manifold specific languages, of manifold forms of composition, and of manifold sentiments. If they (exist), they are very few in the world.” The specific languages here referred to denote apparently Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa. As regards the various forms of composition and the various sentiments with which a Kavirāja

1 D. R. Bhandarkar, Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, pp. 6, 12, 25, etc.
3 Kātyāyanīśānta (G.O.S., No. 1) ed. by C. D. Dalal, p. 19. See also Intro., p. xiv, where Dalal informs us that “Rājaśekhara calls himself not a Mahākavi, but a Kavirāja” and quotes in support of it bāla-kān kri-rāk from Karpuravamahājvari, I. 9.
is expected to be conversant, they are all detailed in works of poetics. Suffice it to say, the term Kaviṛāja bears a specific signification, and it must be in this sense that Samudragupta has been called a Kaviṛāja. It is, however, a pity that no work or stray poems composed by the king are known at present. Perhaps as more anthologies come to light, some poems in the name of Samudra, Sāgara or Parākrama may be traced. Though we are not so fortunate just at present as to discover any poetic composition of Samudragupta, this much cannot be doubted that he wanted to live in the poetic atmosphere. It is now well-known that “like the distichs on many of the coins of the Mughal emperors, the legends on Gupta coins are metrical.”1 It is further well-known that these metrical legends on Gupta coins began with Samudragupta. When once he set this fashion going, it was natural for his successors to follow it. If he had not been passionately fond of poetry, the idea of inscribing distichs on his coins would never have occurred to him. Such a poetic king must have been a patron of literature. Here also it is our misfortune that we do not know what different poets and literate flourished in his reign and what kind of patronage he distributed amongst them. Into this firmament of utter darkness, however, a ray of light is introduced by Vāmana, the author of the Kavyā-lāvariśa-sūtra-sūtra, who flourished in circa 800 A.D. He quotes the first half of a stanza2 as an example of sādhita-pratibhāvatam or ‘Significance’ and remarks that it contains a reference to the ministership of Subandhu. The couplet in question is as follows:

Sō—yayā samprati Chandragupta-tanayaḥ chanda-prakāśō yuva
jātō bhūpatir—āśrayaḥ kṛitā-dhiyam dishyā kṛitā-ārthā-śramah

“That same son of Chandragupta, young and shining like the moon, whose effort has luckily attained its object, has now become king and is patron of men of talents.”

Now, who could be this son of Chandragupta? Was he a son of Chandragupta I or of Chandragupta II? Haraprasad Sastri, who first drew our attention to this couplet, Hoernle, and K. B. Pathak have taken him to be Chandragupta I. But what the verse means is that this son of Chandragupta is not only a king but also a support of the learned. The implication is that the father of this young king was not a ‘support of the learned’, as otherwise he would have extended his patronage to the literate. This implication can hold good only in the case of Chandragupta I, who, while engaged upon founding an empire, could have no time for patronising any votaries of the Muses and who, at any rate, is not known from any source to have bestowed any such patronage. On the other hand, there is good reason to suppose that Chandragupta II is the Vikramāditya of Hindu tradition, who is celebrated as a munificent patron of arts and literature.3 It is thus very likely that the patron of Subandhu was a son of Chandragupta I. He must have thus been Samudragupta. The attributes yuva and kṛitā-ārthā-śramaṇaḥ also fit him excellently. For he succeeded Chandragupta I, when young, and had at once to encounter hostilities that had sprung up in the wake of his accession to the throne. All things considered, Samudragupta seems to be the king who was the patron of Subandhu, as hinted in the couplet cited above. It is true that for Subandhu there is another reading,
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namely, Vasubandhu. But Vasubandhu was a Buddhist mendicant. He could not have been spoken of with favour by a Brahmanical Hindu writer on rhetoric; above all, he could hardly be described as ‘a minister’ of any sovereign, as this, no doubt, is the primary signification of sāchīna. As we shall see later on, most of the big officers in the Gupta period were men of letters. This suits Subandhu admirably, as his work Vāsavadattā is looked upon as a literary production of great merit. He must have begun to rise in the time of Samudragupta and attained fame in the reign of his successor Chandragupta II. This agrees with the note of wail which he strikes in verse 10 of his introduction to the Vāsavadattā—wail at the passing away of Vikramāditya.

The late V. A. Smith remarks that Samudragupta “was in fact a man of genius, who may fairly claim the title of the Indian Napoleon.” Krishnaswami Aiyangar, however, says: “It should be the most inappropriate description of him to call him ‘a Napoleon who regarded kingdom-taking as the duty of kings’.” Samudragupta was not only a fearless warrior and astute general like Napoleon but also a statesman like Brihaspati who conceived and carried through a scheme of political reconstruction which evolved an empire and kept it together. He thereby not only secured peace and tranquility but utilised the same for fostering and preserving culture by developing his own poetical genius and musical talents and distributing unstinted patronage to artists and literature. He thus endeavoured to realise the old ideal to which the kings and ministers of Ancient India constantly aspired,—the ideal of bringing about a unison between Śrī (Wealth-Power) and Sarasvati (Learning-Wisdom).

Kachagupta

Samudragupta had up till now been supposed to have been succeeded to the throne by his son Chandragupta II. But evidence has recently come to light which shows that not Chandragupta, but his elder and co-uterine brother, Rāmagupta, or, rather Kachagupta, as we shall soon see, was really the immediate successor. This evidence consists of some extracts from a Sanskrit drama called Deviśākhandaguptam, a production of Viśakhadatta, apparently the same as the author of the Mudrārakshā. Three extracts from this play are contained in the Śrīnāgarprakāśa of Bhūja, and were brought to light by Ramakrishna Kavi and A. Rangaswami Sarasvati. Five more were traced by Sylvain Levi in a new work on dramaturgy, called the Nāyadarpaṇa, a joint production of Rāmachandra and Gunachandra, pupils of Hēmachandra who was the well-known Jain preceptor of the Chaulukya king Kumārapāla (1145-71 A.D.). No systematic attempt, however, was made at reconstructing the history of the time until A. S. Altekar wrote and published a most informing article on the subject, which was followed by another, in which he drew the attention of scholars to the story of Rawwāl and Barkamāris as narrated in the Mujmal-ul-Tawārikh by Abul Hassan 'Ali (1126-93 A.D.). This Arab writer, we are told, translated a Hindu book into Arabic, which was
rendered into Persian in 1026 A.D., from which is quoted ad verbatim this story of Rawwäl and Barkamāris by Abul Hassan 'Ali. The Muhammadan version is thus older than even 1026 A.D. This story has such a close resemblance to the plot of the Dēvīchandraguptam that it may be safely and judiciously used to fill in the details on which the extracts shed no light.\(^2\)

Sylvain Levi does not believe in the historicity of the Dēvīchandraguptam, because the Gupta inscriptions do not speak of any Rāmagupta intervening between Samudragupta and Chandragupta II. Besides, they mention Dhruvavādēvi as the wife of this last Gupta king only. But grounds will be adduced in the course of this account, showing that Sylvain Levi’s arguments are not convincing. Winternitz, on the other hand, believes in the truth of the story, but assigns its author Viśākhadatta, not to the fourth century A.D., as he did formerly, but to the sixth, that is to say, not to the reign of the Gupta sovereign Chandragupta II but to that of the Maukhari king Avantivarman. This suits excellently, because there was an interval of just two centuries between the incident dramatised in the Dēvīchandraguptam and its composer Viśākhadatta. There is thus every likelihood of the events narrated in the play being correctly reported and being therefore worthy of all credence. Such does not, however, appear to be the case in regard to the Muddrārākṣaka, the events recorded in which came off in the third century B.C., that is, at least eight hundred years before the time of the same author. And, as a matter of fact, much of the plot of that drama is incongruous with the history of the Maurya king Chandragupta such as has been compiled from reliable sources, and does not seem to have made much impression upon posterity. On the other hand, the sensational events connected with Chandragupta II and Dhruvavādēvi made such a deep impression upon the people living in the eighth century, that is, in the period of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa of Mānyakhēta that they are referred to even in their copper-plate charters, as we shall see later on. All things considered, the plot of the Dēvīchandraguptam, may be taken as being drawn from actual history.

Let us, first of all, see what we know from the Indian sources. It seems that hostilities were going on between Rāmagupta (Kāchagupta) and a Śaka ruler, or rather, the Śaka preceptor at a place called Alīpurā, in which the former was worsted. The enemy at first wanted Rāmagupta to surrender his younger brother, Chandragupta, but the Gupta king refused to comply with the demand for fear of causing grave dissatisfaction among his people.\(^3\) This led to the idea of the compromise of the queen Dhruvasvāminī being handed over to the enemy. Chandragupta, however, did not like the compromise and hit upon the expedient of meeting the enemy in the garb of the queen and killing him. Accordingly, at dead of night, he retired to a solitary place where, by previous arrangement, a dress worn by Dhruvasvāminī was waiting for him. This he put on, and he saw his elder brother before his departure. In spite, however, of the remonstrances of Rāmagupta, Chandragupta left for the enemy’s camp, but, not without a female retinue, consisting of males dressed as female attendants. Further light is thrown on this point by the Tāvārkhī referred to above. From this account it appears that Rawwāl’s (Rāmagupta’s) officers dressed their sons in like manner as damsels. Every one of them concealed a knife in his hair, and Chandragupta, besides, carried a trumpet also concealed. When they reached the enemy’s camp, they distributed themselves as previously settled, Chandragupta to the rebel king and his attendants to the latter’s officers. When the
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2 Since the above was written two attempts at the reconstruction of the history were made, once by V. Raghavan in Bonnure Hindu University Magazine, Vol. II, pp. 23 and ff. and the other by N. N. Das Gupta in IC., Vol. IV, pp. 215 and ff.
3 Prokrūtānāmājñānānāyā is taken by Raghavan following Jayaswal as “Council of ministers”. Why then did they allow Rāma (Kāchagupta) to set aside Chandragupta in the first instance and usurp the Gupta throne?
king retired, and met Chandragupta, dressed as Dhruvasvāmini, the latter ripped his belly with the knife and sounded the trumpet. When the other youths heard it, they did their work similarly in an instant. All the officers of the army were thus slain. On hearing the trumpet, Rāmagupta’s soldiers also sallied forth and exterminated the foe. Chandragupta’s ruse succeeded wonderfully.

The first question that now arises here is: Where could these hostilities have taken place between Rāmagupta and Śakāchārya? The enemy’s camp, as we have already stated, was stationed at Alipura, which has wrongly been changed once into Aripura. But where was this Alipura? No such place has yet been known to us. Perhaps some help is forthcoming from the Mujmal-at-Tawārīkh, where, we are told, a former rebel of his father attacked Rawwāl, that is, Rāmagupta, and put him to flight. Rawwāl with his brother and nobles went to the top of a mountain where a strong fortress had been built. But the enemy got possession of the mountain by stratagem, besieged the fort, and was near upon taking it. Rawwāl then sued for peace and the enemy asked him to send his queen for himself and compel his chiefs to send their girls for his officers. Just at this juncture his brother Barkamāris came in and proposed to go to the enemy’s camp dressed like the queen, in accordance with his scheme which was explained and approved. This account shows that Rāmagupta and his brother were hemmed in and defeated, not on the plains in their capital at Pāṭaliputra, but on some mountain where they had gone on an expedition of conquest to punish some rebel king. Further light is thrown upon this point by a stanza in Rājaśēkhara’s Kāyamāmānsā which Altekar was the first to bring to our notice. The stanza is addressed to a king and says that his praises are sung by the women of Kārttikēya-nagara just in that Himālaya from where Śarma (Śēna)gupta, being besieged, was found to surrender his queen Dhruvasvāmini to the king of the Khašas. The name Dhruvasvāmini, and the incident of a king being compelled to give up his queen to the enemy leave no doubt as to its being the political episode dramatised in Dēvi-chandragnālam. There is, however, difference of name to be accounted for namely, Śarma (Śēna)gupta instead of Rāmagupta. But both of these seem to be a misreading for Kāchagupta, as we shall see later on. As regards Khašas, it is almost the letters Śa-ka reversed. And as Khašas were perhaps known better than Śakas, especially in the Himālayan region, the letters which were originally Śa-ka came naturally to be reversed and turned into Kha-ja with a slight change. Unfortunately, Altekar separates Kārttikēya from nagara and takes the former to denote Kumāragupta, who, in his opinion, is the person addressed in this stanza. But why Kārttikēya should stand for Kumāragupta, and not for Skandagupta, is far from clear. Secondly, why should the Himālayan caves be taken to reverberate with the exploits of Kumāragupta or Skandagupta about which we know nothing? On the other hand, the stanza attains to its fullest significance if we take it as addressed, not to Kumāragupta or Skandagupta, but to Chandragupta II. For, in that case, we can easily understand why the praises of this Chandragupta are sung just in those Himālayan caves from where his brother had to think of an ignominious retreat by promising to surrender Dhruvasvāmini who was then his wife. This seems to be the natural sense of this stanza. It is therefore advisable to take Kārttikēyanagara as one word. Now, Gazetteer, N.W.P., tells us that Kārttikēyapura lay in the valley of the Gōmatī and near the present village of Bajināth which is comprised in the Almora District of U.P. and thus situated in the Himālayas. It is mentioned in the Dēvi-Purāṇa. The town and district of

1 Dattăcuddha-gatiḥ Khaś-udalatataśvăn bhavān dhruvasvāminī yamānī khaśūttāvaihān niyamitanī
Śita-Surākha(G.O.S.)gupta nṛṣṇā cīpaḥ

tanmīnaṃ =śan śiśi śiśi śaśaś guhā-haśa-hom-kavesa-Kinnarī yavastha dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna dhavāna


3 Chap. IX.
Kārttikeyapura are mentioned in the Pāṇḍukēśvar copper-plate grant of Lalitaśūradēva, assigned to about the middle of the ninth century A.D. Kārttikeyapura is also mentioned in the two Talēśvara charters of Dyunīvarman, which have been ascribed to about the sixth century. It will thus be seen that a place is still known in the Himalayas namely, Bājnāth which is still called Kārttikeyapura and that it was in existence at least as early as the sixth century A.D. The Imperial Gazetteer also says that “Bājnāth lies in the centre of the Katýūr valley, and was formerly known as Kārttikeyapura, a capital of the Katyūr Rājās.” Further, as pointed out above, Katýūr seems identical with Kartripura which is mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta as one of the frontier states that were tributary to him. It is possible that the ruler of Kartripura, who was the Preceptor of the Śakas, if not, himself, of Śaka extraction, rose in rebellion after the demise of Samudragupta and that it was to quell his revolt that Rāma (Kācha) gupta and his brother Chandragupta with their family repaired to the Himalayas—with what result we have seen.

The second half of the story is thus told by the Mujmal-ul-Tawārikh. Rawwāl’s Wazir, Safar, that is, the prime minister of Rāmagupta, thereupon excited the king’s suspicions against Barkamāris (= Vikramārka) or Chandragupta, and that the latter was therefore compelled to feign madness. This receives confirmation from the fragment, small as it is, that has been preserved of Act V of the Dēvichandrāgapam. It seems that Chandragupta had to remain in hiding to counteract the malicious intentions of his elder brother, in the house of a courtezan called Mādhavāšenā with whom he had apparently fallen in love and came in public in the role of a lunatic presumably to secure information about any plans that may have been formed by Rāmagupta and his prime minister to detect and arrest him. What happened ultimately we know from a stanza from the Sānjin copper plate grant which tells us that Chandragupta killed his brother and seized not only his throne but also his queen. A glimpse into the nature of this occurrence is afforded us by the Tawārikh. No fragment from the above-mentioned play has, however, come down to us to vouch for the correctness of the account. One day in the hot season, the narrative goes on, Barkamāris (= Vikramārka), that is, Chandragupta, was wandering barefoot in the city as a mendicant, and came to the gate of the king’s palace and found him and the queen sitting on a throne sucking sugarcane. When Rawwāl, that is, Rāmagupta, saw him, he took pity on him and gave him a bit of sugarcane. The mendicant took it, and picked up a bit of the cane shell to strip and clean it with. When the king saw that he wanted to clean the cane, he told the queen to give him a knife. She rose and gave one to Barkamāris, who cleaned the sugarcane with it, and craftily watched until the king was off his guard. Then he sprang upon him, and, plunging the knife into his navel, ripped him up.

As regards the Wazir, Barkamāris admitted that although he counselled his brother in all his dealings against him, he did not his duty and requested him to continue to govern the kingdom as he did for his brother. But Safar replied that he was with Rawwāl in life, he would
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2 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIII, pp. 115 and 118. It seems that Kārttikeyapura was also known as Alipura.
3 Vol. VI, p. 217.
4 Raghaavan has cited two passages to show that somewhat the Mālechhika rulers are called Mālechh-laṭhāryāḥ in the epics (loc. cit., pp. 45-47).
5 She seems to be the Śitrādhārī (the wire puller) who is mentioned in two extracts from the drama in the Nāyikaśāstra. She was in the camp and helped the prince with the dress and ornaments of Dūruvaśāvē and later on concealed him in her house in Pāṭaliputra and caused him to be in touch with the queen and the palace. Dasgupta rightly compares her to Kamalā, courtezan of Paumādravardhana, who helped Jayāpida (JC., Vol. IV, p. 217).
be with him in death also. Barkamāris, however, told him to write a book on the duties of kings. Safar consented, and wrote a book called "Instruction of kings". Could it be the Nītiśāra of Kamandaka? It is a mistake to identify Safar with Śikharasvāmin who was a Maṇtrin and Kūmadānāyika of Chandragupta II (No. 21 below). Because Kamandaka, or, more accurately, Kāmāntaka is, like Kauṭalya,1 a gōtra name, and, as a matter of fact, is a branch of the Viśvāmitra gōtra, but Śīkharasvāmin belonged to the Asavājīn gōtra. Besides, Safar does not appear to have served Chandragupta II. When the book was finished, read and praised, Safar, says the Tawarīkh, burnt himself.

The story of the Dévichandraguptam raises three questions of importance. The first is: What was the degree of moral turpitude involved in Chandragupta murdering his brother and marrying his wife? That question is fairly well answered by the Mujmal-ut-Tawarīkh, which tells us that Dhrusvasvāmini had really chosen Chandragupta in a svayamvara ceremony for his wisdom and handsome form, but that when he brought her home, his brother snatched away the girl from him, so that he was forced to give himself to study and associate with the learned. Besides, Chandragupta was already a favourite with the people. He became much more so, when he killed the preceptor of the Śakas and saved Dhrusvasvāmini from insult and ignominy. That made his elder brother intensely jealous of him and carry on machinations against his life. It is therefore no wonder if Chandragupta killed him and married her, though she was then his brother's wife, for, as a matter of fact, she had already chosen Chandragupta but was compelled to marry his brother instead. This is a straight reply to the first question, namely, the moral aspect of Chandragupta's course of conduct. The second question is something like this. When Chandragupta married Dhrusvasvāmini, she was a widow; and how could he marry a widow. Nothing is more shocking than this to an orthodox Hindu of the modern day. This, however, is a purely social question and will be discussed in the chapter which describes the social life of the Gupta period. The third is the historical question, namely, whether Rāmagupta represents the correct form of the name of the Gupta sovereign who was the elder brother of Chandragupta II. This question arises, because this name is not yet traceable in any of the inscriptions and coins of the Imperial Gupta dynasty.2 It is true that this is an argument ab silentio, and, as such, is not always to be relied upon. Nevertheless, we have to remember here that up till now so many epigraphic records, above all, coins, of the Gupta sovereigns have been found that it cannot but be considered strange that the name Rāmagupta has not yet been traced. On the other hand, of just about the time of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II, we have found coins issued by a ruler who calls himself Kācha. This Kācha has been taken as a title of Samudragupta, because on his coins we notice the epithet Sarvarājōchchhētā, which in inscriptions had been associated with Samudragupta and Samudragupta alone. This was the view which was once propounded by V. A. Smith3 and has been endorsed by Allan. There was no doubt some force in this argument before the plates of Prabhavatigupta came to light. She was, we know, the Chief Queen of the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II, and daughter of Mahārājādhirāja Chandragupta II from his queen Kūberanāgā. Now, these plates, while describing this Gupta sovereign, coupled with his name just those four epithets which, according to Smith, are coupled with Samudragupta alone in inscriptions. And one of these is Sarvarājōchchhētā. If Sarvarājōchchhētā thus becomes an epithet not only of Samudragupta but also of Chandragupta II, then the question of the correctness of this form of name is completely settled. 

1 D. R. Bhandarkar, Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, pp. 40-41. Kauṭalya or Kauṭilya is a branch of both Bhrigu and Anūras gōtras.
2 [See the editorial note below, p. 52—Ed.]
gupta II, there is no reason why it should not be an epithet of a third Gupta king also. Nothing is, therefore, more absurd now than to suppose that Kāča is the same prince as Samudragupta, simply because Kāča assumes the epithet of Sarvajñāchchhēttā on the reverse of his coins. On the contrary, there is every reason to hold that Kāča was a ruler separate from Samudragupta or Chandragupta II. For on Gupta gold coins the name which appears on either side of the standing figure of a king on the obverse, especially below his left arm, is the personal name of the king who issues them. This is how the names Samudra, Chandra, Kumāra and Skanda are found on the obverse, and if these are considered the individual names of separate Gupta kings, for the same reason we ought to take Kāča also as separate from those just mentioned. All evidence thus points to Kāča being regarded as the personal name of a king distinct from Samudragupta. On the grounds of type and fabric, numismatists connect his coins in time with those of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II. The conclusion is, therefore, not unreasonable that Rāmagupta, the elder brother of Chandragupta II, is a misreading for or another name of Kāchagupta. Many Gupta kings seem to have had at least two names: one, proper name, and the other, familiar name. Thus Chandragupta (II), Kumāragupta (I) and Skandagupta were proper names and appeared on coins. But they had familiar names also, namely, Dēvagupta, Gāvindagupta and Purugupta. Similarly Kāča was the proper, and Rāma the familiar, name.

The existence of Kāča or Kācha is known to us solely by means of his gold coins, which, as remarked above, are found with, and closely related to, those of Samudragupta. One hoard, that of Tānda in Oudh, consisted of twenty-five coins, only two of which belonged to the ‘King and Queen’ type of Chandragupta I, the remainder being divided between the ‘Standard’ type of Kāča and the ‘Asamādha’ and ‘Battle-axe’ types of Samudragupta. The fact that the coins of Kāča are closely related in weight, fabric and type to those of Chandragupta I and Samudragupta shows that he not only was a Gupta ruler but also was not long separated from either. This agrees with the fact that, according to Devoichandraguptam, Samudragupta was succeeded by Rāmagupta, which, as pointed out before, must be a mislecion for Kāchagupta. Two objections may, however, be raised to this view. The first is the omission of Kāča’s name from the genealogies. But this is explained by the fact that he left no son, as he was murdered by his brother Chandragupta II, who immediately succeeded him to the throne. The name of Kāča was omitted from the dynastic list, as being irrelevent, as that of Skandagupta was from the Bhitiari seal inscription of Kumāragupta III, as we shall see later on. Secondly, it may be argued against the view that as Chandragupta II is represented to have been selected as heir-apparent by his father, he must have succeeded him directly. But the adage: “there is many a slip between the cup and the lip” is as true in the political world as in ordinary life, if not even truer. It is quite possible that when Samudragupta died, his chosen heir was far from the capital in charge of a remote province or engaged in invading some foreign territory, and that Kāča, being on the spot, was in a position to seize the throne, of which he maintained possession for a brief space. The paucity of Kāča’s coins, and their occurrence in only one type, indicate that his reign was brief. This further agrees with the fact that his coins are the lightest and are inferior in purity of metal to those of Chandragupta I and Samudragupta.¹

¹The coins of Kāča were at first attributed by Princep and Thomas to Ghatotkacha, the second prince of the Gupta dynasty, and in 1834 V. A. Smith followed them (JASB., Vol. LIII, 1888, p. 2, note 4). Thereafter Fleet pointed out good reasons to show that they could not have been struck by Ghatotkacha and that they must be assigned to Samudragupta (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, p. 95; CII., Vol. III, 1888, p. 27, note 4). And Smith agreed with him (JRAS., 1889, pp. 74-76). Rapson threw out the suggestion that Kāča or Kācha was not, as Fleet and Smith supposed, identical with Samudragupta, but was, in all probability, his predecessor and brother (N. Chr., Vol. XI, 3rd series, pp. 48-64). And, in 1893, Smith veered round to this view (JRAS., 1893, p. 81), but
INTRODUCTION

[About the beginning of 1969, three Jaina images, containing inscriptions on their pedestals, were discovered at a village named Durjanapura in the Vidisha District of Madhya Pradesh. Two of these inscriptions are fairly well preserved and mention Mahārājādhirāja Rāmagupta as responsible for making the images of Chandraprabha and Pushpadanta respectively (No. 5 below). Since the characters of these inscriptions have to be referred to the 4th century A.D. and since Rāmagupta is endowed with the imperial title Mahārājādhirāja, the king is identified with his name-sake mentioned in the Sanskrit drama Deviśchandraçagam and with the son of Samudragupta and elder brother of Chandragupta II. Thus these Vidisha image inscriptions furnish the first epigraphical reference to Rāmagupta and establish the existence and historicity of this king. The question regarding his identity with Kācha of the gold coins and with Rāmagupta of the copper-coins found in the Vidisha region has to be left open until further and more definite evidence is made available.—Ed.]

Chandragupta II

Chandragupta was the son of Samudragupta by Dattadevi. He was one among his many sons and was not even the eldest. This is the reason why in some inscriptions he is described as parigrahita or selected as tvamāra by his father. In spite of his selection, there was opposition to his accession after the demise of his father. We have pointed out what exactly were the circumstances connected with this case. We have seen above how his elder brother Kāchagupta interloped, seizing the Gupta throne and snatching away even the bride affianced to him. How his machinations were foiled and how ultimately Chandragupta ascended the throne rightfully his own and won back the damsel, also his own through svayānvara, are details which have also been narrated above.

For his reign we possess a number of inscriptions. The earliest of these is the Mathurā pilaster inscription which is dated Gupta year 61, and the latest is the Sāñcāhi railing inscription, giving the year 93. He must have thus enjoyed a reign of at least thirty-two years. The first of these again contained the specification of the regnal year, but unfortunately that part of the record which comprised this detail has been obliterated. It thus seems that Chandragupta must have reigned for more than thirty-two years.

Two inscriptions of his time have been found engraved in two different caves of Udayagiri near Besnagar. One of these records the excavation of a cave and dedication of it to the god Šambhu by a hereditary minister (ameya-prāpta-sāchāya) of Chandragupta II. The minister is named Viraśena and surnamed Šāha. He belonged to the Kautsa gotra and was thus a Brāhmaṇa by caste. But the most noteworthy point about the inscription is that we are told that Viraśena had come to that part of India in the company of his sovereign when he was seeking to conquer the whole of the earth (kṣitsa-prithvi-jay-ārthena). This is confirmed
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reverted in 1902 to his original opinion which was that of Fleet (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXI, p. 259 and note 9; see also Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Vol. I, p. 96). He and Fleet were followed by Allan in his Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty in 1914. But, in the same year, that is, in the 3rd ed. of his Early History of India (p. 281, note 1 and p. 331, note), Smith remarks: "Some authors suppose Kācha to be identical with Samudragupta, but the better opinion regards him as a rival brother of that king." (See also 4th ed. revised by S. M. Edwardes, p. 297, note 1.). "The better opinion referred to here is apparently that of Rapson. At any rate, it is refreshing to find that even before the discovery of extracts from Deviśchandraçagam Kācha was taken to be a Gupta ruler, almost contemporaneous with, but different from, Samudragupta. [For a recent article on the Kācha problem wherein he is regarded as a feudatory of Samudragupta, see Journ. Ep. Soc. Ind., Vol. I, pp. 75-84.—Ed.]
by the fact that Virasena, as we are informed, had been entrusted with the Office of Peace and War. If any further confirmation is required, it is furnished by the fact that Virasena has been called *Pātaliputra*ka, “an inhabitant of Pataliputra”. It thus seems that Virasena Śāba was Minister of Peace and War of the emperor Chandragupta II and came to Vidiśā from Pātaliputra in the company of his master during his expedition of conquest of the whole world. It may, however, be asked: where was the necessity of this India-wide conquest, again, on the part of Chandragupta, when his father, Samudragupta, had once conquered the whole country, put his seal to it by the celebration of the *Aśamidhā* sacrifice, and left a compact empire to his successors? But, in the political history of ancient India, we often find that as soon as a prince of the imperial dynasty comes to the throne, some of his feudatories are sure to rebel, being disaffected by the rival claimants to the throne or by his conterminous sovereigns. Soon after assuming the reins of government and consolidating his power over the territory directly under his control, the new ruler was therefore compelled to start on an expedition of conquest, first with a view to reclaiming or putting down the disaffected tributaries, and secondly, to war with the independent neighbours whose ambition and aggression were always feared. These reasons must have weighed with Chandragupta in undertaking this expedition of conquest. We have already pointed out that although he was chosen by his father to succeed to the Gupta throne, his elder brother, Kāchagupta, nefariously intercepted and forestalled him. We have also perceived how Chandragupta ultimately triumphed over his brother and managed to occupy the throne, rightfully his own. It must have taken him a pretty long time to make his position firm and secure at the centre of the Gupta empire before he could safely leave Pātaliputra for putting down the malcontents and bringing round the recalcitrants among his tributaries and neighbouring princes. In this connection we have to take note of one event of his reign to which attention has been drawn by some scholars, namely, his conquest of the Western Kshatrapas, which added Surāśṭrā to his dominions. It is true that, to begin with, these Kshatrapas exercised sway over Malwa, part of Rajputana and Gujarāt and practically the whole of Kāṭhiāwār and Cutch. But about the time when the Guptas rose to eminence, they were shorn of their power over all these territories except Kāṭhiāwār and Cutch. The date of this event, namely, the conquest of Surāśṭrā, has not yet been ascertained, but can be fixed within fairly narrow limits. The latest dated coins of the Western Kshatrapas are those of the Mahākṣatrapa Śvāmī Rudrasimhiha III, son of Śvāmī Satyasimhiha. They bear one date only, namely, 310 or 31X = 388 or 388 plus X A.D., which cannot have been separated by a long interval from the Gupta conquest of the Western Kshatrapa dominions. But, on the other hand, we have to note that “evidence of the conquest

1 All the coins of the later Kshatrapas have been found in Kāṭhiāwār and Cutch only. The latest hoard of their coins outside these provinces was found at Sarvānā in the earstwhile Banswara State, Rajputana, with coins ranging from those of Rudrasimhiha I (Śaka 101-14) to Rudrasimhiha III (Śaka 270-73) (A. R. ASL, 1913-14, pp. 227 ff.). As regards Malwa no Kshatrapa coins have been discovered except perhaps of the Mahākṣatrapa Īvara-datta at Besnagar (ibid. 1914-15, p. 85). On the other hand, an inscription has come to light at Kānṅikārē (Śāṅchī) which is dated 241 and is of the reign of the Mahādāṇḍanāyaka Śāka Śrīdhara-varman, son of Śāka Nanda (D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 1077). The inscription was first published by R. D. Banerji in Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, p. 232 but was afterwards thoroughly revised and critically re-edited by N. G. Majumdar in JPASB, Vol. XIX, pp. 343 ff. The record gives the regnal year 13 of Śrīdhara-varman and describes it as *sva-rājya-abhiṣeyadhih kaśtram uṣṇakāraṇa viśvadāna tayādayastam*. This shows that Śrīdhara-varman was an independent king though he was styled Mahādāṇḍanāyaka. The case is not unlike that of Śrīṇ āga of Pushyamitra, the founder of the Śunga family (Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 57). Further palaeographic considerations require that the date 241 of Śrīdhara-varman should be referred to the Śaka era. It thus seems that when the foundation stone of the Gupta empire was being laid by Chandragupta I, the province of Malwa, at any rate, of Eastern Malwa, was being ruled over not by a Kshatrapa but by Śrīdhara-varman, who, though he was a Śaka by extraction was styled Mahādāṇḍanāyaka. As regards Western Malwa, it was held by the Nāga families of Dhārā and Pahāvār.
of Surāśṭra during the reign of Chandragupta II is to be seen in rare silver coins which are more directly imitated from those of the Western Kshatrāpas and are found in Kāśi only. The only date that has been read on his coins is 90 or possibly 90 plus X of the Gupta era—409 or 409 plus X A.D. There is thus a gap of nearly twenty years between the only dated coin of the Western Kshatrāpas (=388 or 388 plus X A.D.) and the earliest dated coin of the Guptas struck in Kāśi (409 or 409 plus X A.D.). When then did the Gupta conquest of Surāśṭra take place, circa 388 or 409 A.D.? It seems very unlikely that it came off about 409 A.D., that is, circa Gupta year 90, because the last date for Chandragupta is 93, and the earliest for his son and successor, Kumāragupta I is 96. Chandragupta thus appears to have ceased to be king between Gupta year 93 and 96. We have therefore to suppose that his expedition of conquest of the earth and with it his conquest of Surāśṭra came off nearly thirty years after his accession to the throne and just four years before his demise or retirement. This is a most unlikely supposition. It is far more reasonable to hold that he undertook it nearly eight years after his occupation of the Gupta throne during which period he was able to establish his power thoroughly at Pāṭaliputra. The only argument that may be urged against this inference is that there is a gap of some twenty years between the last Kshatrāpa Rudrasimha III who was overthrown and his conqueror Chandragupta issuing their coins respectively. But this can by no means be a serious objection, because, as a matter of fact, we know that the conqueror does not always strike coins in the territory conquered by him. To take one instance, Malwa was incorporated into the Gupta dominions not only in the time of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II but also of Kumāragupta I. And yet no coin of any one of these Gupta monarchs has yet been picked up from any part of this province. Even if no coins of Chandragupta II had been discovered in Kāśi, it would not thus have been a matter of surprise at all. How should it constitute a surprise if they are found about twenty years after the overthrow of the Kshatrāpa power? Nothing consequently precludes us from supposing that Chandragupta left the Gupta capital, Pāṭaliputra, some eight years after his coronation, on an expedition of conquest, to establish all round his position as paramount sovereign of India.

It is a great pity that no detailed description of this expedition has come down to us, just as we have Harishepa's praśasti of Samudragupta. Nevertheless, we cannot get rid of the idea that some meagre, though not detailed, account of Chandragupta's dig-vijaya has been preserved for us in the shape of the Meharauli iron pillar inscription of Chandra (No. 12 below). It is true that there is a great diversity of opinion in regard to the identity of this Chandra. According to some scholars, he is the Gupta king Chandragupta I, and, according to some, Chandragupta II. According to some, again, the inscription does not belong to the Gupta

1 E. J. Rapson's Catalogue Coins Andhra Dyn., Intro., p. cii.
2 James Ferguson, referring to the Persian form of the capital, expresses the opinion that the inscription is of the Chandraguptas of the Imperial Gupta dynasty (History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, Vol. II, p. 208). "My own impression at first, on independent grounds," says J. F. Fleet, "was to allot it to Chandragupta I, the first Mahākṣaṇajñārāja of the family, of whose time we have as yet no inscriptions; and I should not be surprised to find at any time that it is proved to belong to him." (CHII., Vol. III, 1896, p. 140, note 1). He, however, admits that while the characters approximate in many respects very closely to the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta (No. 1 below), it bears the distinguishing feature of very marked mātrās, such as are noticeable in the Belsad pillar inscription of Kumāragupta I (No. 16 below), showing that in point of time they are somewhere midway between the two Gupta monarchs. Again, the fact that the iron pillar is situated in the village of Meharauli, the name of which is a corruption of Mihirapur (Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 362), suggested to him that alternative conjecture that Chandra might be the unnamed younger brother of Mihirakula whose existence is attested by Yuan Chwang. According to Hoernle the characters of the inscription belong to the Gupta variety of the north-eastern alphabet, the only other specimen of which in the west is the Udayagiri inscription of Chandragupta. He, therefore, unhesitatingly ascribes the iron pillar to this Gupta sovereign (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXI, pp. 42-44). V. A. Smith at first agreed with him (JRAŚ, 1897, p. 9). "Not only is there no real ground," says Allan, "for identifying
dynasty at all. Thus, the late Haraprasad Sastri held that he was identical with Chandravarman who is mentioned as 'the lord of Pushkaraṇa' in a rock inscription found at Susūnīa in the Bankura District of West Bengal. But we have to remember that Chandra of the Meharauli pillar inscription is represented as having attained to the supreme sovereignty of the world and enjoyed it for a long time and as having up till then 'perfumed the southern ocean with the breezes of his prowess'. This description cannot possibly apply to Chandragupta I in whose time, as we have seen above, the Gupta dominions included Magadha and extended as far westward as Sāketa (Ayodhya) only. It cannot suit Chandravarman of the Susūnīa rock inscription, as proposed by Sastri. It is true that this scholar tries to make of Chandravarman a supreme ruler of India by identifying his capital Pushkaraṇa with Pōkaraṇa in the Jodhpur District, and showing thereby that, although he was originally a ruler of Mārwār, his conquests had spread so far and wide as to include the western part of Bengal as is indicated by the fact that his inscription is engraved on the Susūnīa rock. But, as we have already pointed out, it is a mistake to identify his capital town Pushkaraṇa with Pōkaraṇa in Mārwār so far away from Susūnīa, when there is a place called Pōkharan about 25 miles from Susūnīa itself, as K. N. Dikshit has informed us. Where is the evidence, again, that this Chandra of the Susūnīa record enjoyed sovereignty for a long time? One sure sign of it is the find of coins. But no coins of this Chandra are found in any part of India although he is supposed to have been an emperor of India and to have reigned long as such. Again, whatever evidence there is points to the conclusion that this Chandravarman of Pushkaraṇa was a mere feudatory, because he, like his father Simhavaran, is simply called a Mahārājā, whereas the title indicative of paramount sovereignty at this time was Mahārājādhirājā. And what is most singular is that H. P. Sastri asseverates that Simhavaran was a chieflain but that his son Chandravarman was a supreme ruler, though both have been designated Mahārājā! It is therefore entirely absurd to identify Chandra of the Meharauli inscription with Chandravarman of the Susūnīa epigraph. The only recourse left is to identify him with Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. We have seen that his father Samudragupta ruled over an empire which on the east was bounded by a line running from the mouths of the Ganges through Tripurā-Cachar-Assam up to the Himalayas through East Punjab and East Rajputana down to the Vindhyanas. And even a little study of the Meharauli pillar inscription is enough to tell us that Chandra, whossoever he was, ruled over an empire whose boundary, though on the cast it was practically the same as that of Samudragupta’s dominions, extended much beyond on the west. These considerations leave no reasonable doubt as to this Chandra being the Gupta monarch Chandragupta II.
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Chandra with Chandragupta II, but it is improbable that the inscription belongs to the dynasty at all” (Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty, Intro., p. xxxviii). This hint was picked up by Haraprasad Sastri, according to whom Chandra pertained to the Varman family and ruled over Pushkaraṇa or Pōkaraṇa in Jodhpur (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, pp. 217 ff.). This view has been considered above. Another theory based on the hint thrown out by Allan is that of A. V. Venkatarama Aiyar who identifies Chandra with Sadichandra mentioned in the Puranic lists among the dynasties that ruled over Vidiśā (The Hindu, Madras, dated the 13th and 24th February 1928). This view is, however, strongly dissented from by S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar (Jour. Ind. Hist., Vol. VI, The Vakatakas and Their Place in History, University Supplement, Introductory, pp. 2 ff.) though it has apparently been adopted by Hemachandra Ray Chandhuri in Pol. Hist. of Ind. (3rd ed.), p. 364, note 2. But Aiyangar opines that the king commemorated in the iron pillar inscription cannot be any other than Chandragupta I (Jour. Ind. Hist., Vol. VI, Studies in Gupta History, University Supplement, pp. 14-16); R. G. Basak also holds the same view (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLVII, pp. 98 ff.).

1 [Ep. Ind., Vol. XIII, p. 133 and plate.—Ed.]
2 This view was first combated by us in IHQ., Vol. I, pp. 254-55.
INTRODUCTION

Let us now study more closely the contents of the Meharauli iron pillar inscription of Chandra. It consists of three stanzas, the first of which describes his exploits. It tells us how far east, west and south he proceeded in his career of conquest. On the east he put down the confederacy of enemies who had gathered and confronted him in the Vāṅga territory. On the west he crossed the seven mouths of the river Sindhu, that is, the Indus, and conquered the Vālhīkas on the battle field. In regard to his conquests on the south we are informed that “the southern ocean is still perfumed by the breezes of his valour”. Let us take the last item first. It merely implies that like his father Samudragupta, Chandragupta played the role of a dharma-vijayar, conquering the various states of Dakshinapatha one after another and collecting tribute, without, however, annexing any one of them to his dominions and that his triumphant march did not end till he actually reached the southern sea. This is clear enough from stanza 1 of the inscription, though we are sorry that no details have been furnished in regard to the actual names of the kings and kingdoms he subjugated. As to the first item of his world conquests mentioned in this record, it seems that kings of the Vāṅga country had formed a conspiracy against him and that he met and vanquished them. It is true that Vāṅga is not mentioned in the Allahabad prāsāti of Harishēṇa. Nevertheless, as Samataṣa is mentioned as a frontier province of his empire held by a tributary prince under him, Vāṅga which was to the west of it, not only was included in his dominions but formed part of Āryāvarta. It seems that it was re-conquered by Chandragupta II. Vāṅga occupies a position between Suhma and Samataṣa and comprises the modern districts of Bakarganj, Khulna and Faridpur of Bangladesh. It is further worthy of note that the poet Kālidāsa, who was a contemporary of Chandragupta, as we shall see later on, also speaks of Vāṅga chieftains as ruling along the various streams of the Ganges, as being possessed of fleets and as being captured and afterwards reinstated by Raghu.\(^1\) What the first part of the stanza therefore tells us is that Chandragupta vanquished the petty rulers of Vāṅga who had confederated against him and laid the Gupta yoke on them. The second part of the stanza says that he crossed the seven mouths of the Sindhu and defeated the Vālhīkas. What does that mean? What it obviously means is that he crossed Western Rajputana and made himself master of Sind and practically the whole of the Panjāb. What it further means is that he inflicted a defeat upon the Vālhīkas who must therefore have been living near the source of any one of the well-known tributaries of the Indus. It is true that the Vālhīkas have been mentioned many a time in the Brihat-saṁhitā along with the peoples of Northern India and usually identified with the people of Bakh,—an inference supported by the derivation of the word from Bākhl or Bahl which is the Pehlevi form of Bakh. But as Allan correctly remarks, “the inscription cannot mean that Chandra’s arms penetrated to Bakh, the route to which would not be across the mouth of the Indus.”\(^2\) Where are we, then, to locate these Vālhīkas? In this connection we have to note a passage in the Rāmāyaṇa, to which our attention was drawn long ago by Chintaharan Chakravarty.\(^3\) There, we are told that messengers were sent by Vasishṭha to Bharata who was then at Girivraj, capital of Kēkaya. They start from Ayodhyā and take a north-western route. They pass through Kuru-Jāṅgala to Pañcchāla and cross the Ikshumati river, which is identified with Kālīnādi (East) which flows through Kumaon, Rohilkhand and Kanauj.\(^4\) The messengers then pass through the Vālhika country to the Sudāman hill and see Vishnupada and the two rivers Vipāśa and Sālmali. This is the most apposite reference to Vālhika, because here it is associated with Vishnupada, which is specified in the third and last stanza

\(^1\) Raghunāma, IV, 35-36.
\(^2\) Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty, Intro., p. xxxvi.
\(^3\) ABORI, Vol. VIII, pp. 173 ff.
\(^4\) Nundobal Dey, Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India, p. 77.
of the Meharauli inscription as the place where the iron pillar was originally set up. It thus, at one sweep, tells us where Vāhika and Vishnupada are to be located, namely, not far from the source of the Vipāśa or Beas in the Himālayas.

Further, we have to note that Vāhikas have been mentioned again in the Rāmāyana in two consecutive chapters. Thus in the Kishkindha-Kānga (Rām. IV. 43. 12) they have been described as living in the north and distinguished from the Kambōjas, Yavanas and Śākas, whereas in IV. 42. 6 they are described as situated in the west and mentioned along with Surāshtras.1 This agrees with the Kāśika on Pāṇini VIII. 4. 9, where we read Svāvīra-pañā Bāhikā, “the Bāhikas are fond of Svāvīra drink”. This shows that according to the Rāmāyana the Vāhikas occupied not only Sindhu and Sauvīra but also the north-west and north-east parts of the Panjab. They probably denote the (Later Great) Kushānas who were the last foreign hordes to migrate into India from Bakh.

The mention of the Vāhikas as being vanquished by Chandra after crossing the seven mouths of the Sindhu is thus quite intelligible. It will thus be seen that while in the time of Samudragupta the Gupta dominions extended westward only so far as to include East Rajputana and East Panjab, in the reign of Chandragupta II they extended further westward so as to comprise Sind and the whole of the Panjab.

The second stanza of the Meharauli pillar inscription is a hard nut to crack. It has been completely misunderstood by J. F. Fleet, and he has drawn the specious conclusion that “the inscription is a posthumous eulogy of the conquests of a powerful king named Chandra as to whose lineage no information is given.”2 And he has been followed by Allan3 and other scholars. It is the first two lines of this stanza that are more important. The first of these is: kkhayasi eva visiśṭa gāṁ na rataśe gāṁ asriyasya tāraśe. What this means is that Chandra has left one gā and is now resorting to another gā. What does gā mean in each case? Fleet translates it thus: “he, the king, as if wearied, has quitted this earth, and has gone to the other world...” Fleet thus implies that Chandra quitted one gā, that is, the earth, and went to another, that is, ‘the other world’. And, as a matter of fact, gā has the three senses of ‘the earth’, ‘the sky’, and ‘the heaven’. Consequently, no exception can be taken to Fleet’s rendering so far as this sentence stands. But the crucial test is furnished by line 2 of the stanza, namely, mṛtyyā karmma-jī-āvanin gatawatih kir[1]yā sthitasya kṣhitau, “moving in (bodily) form to the land (paradise) won by (the merit of his) actions.” Here the most important word is mṛtyyā, which Fleet has rightly translated by ‘bodily form’. But the question arises: how can Chandra, or, for the matter of that, any human being, go to ‘the land (of paradise)’ in (bodily) form? The obvious conclusion is that Chandra was not dead when the eulogy was inscribed on the iron pillar. If mṛtyyā must mean ‘in bodily form’ and as no human being can go to the other world in his corporeal form, karma-jī-āvanin cannot possibly be translated by “to the land (of paradise) won by (the merit of his) actions”, as Fleet has done. The two lines of the stanza have thus to be so translated as to do away with the preconception that Chandra was dead when the pillar was set up. They may therefore be rendered as follows: “who, the king, having quitted this gā (earth), as if being dejected, has resorted to another gā (sky); who, though he has, in body, gone to the land (aveñi) conquered by (his own) action, has remained on the soil of the earth (kṣiti) by fame.” What do these verses mean? As stanza 3 of this eulogy tells us, the column was originally put up at Vishnupada. This Vishnupada, we know, was a

---

1 In the second quotation Vāhikas have been omitted in the Bombay recension. In the other two they have been mentioned in both the places though in the Bangali recension the quotations are found in IV, 43, 5 and IV, 44, 13.


tīrtha or sacred place. There is just a passage in the Vanaparvan of the Mahābhārata which distinguishes between two kinds of tīrthas, those which are situated on the earth (prithiśeṣi) and those, in the mid-region (antarikṣa). The passage to which our attention was first drawn by J. C. Ghosh1 runs thus:

prīthiśeṣi yānī tīrthāṇī antarikṣhacharāṇī cha 1
nadyā hrdayā-ṃtājaśā cha sarva-prasravanāṇī cha 11

(Chap. 83, verse 193).

There can be no doubt that tīrthas on earth have here been differentiated from those in the firmament. Ghosh rightly remarks that "here prithiśeṣi should be taken as 'the plains' and antarikṣa as a high peak of some mountain almost reaching up to the sky." That this distinction between the tīrthas was not an imaginary one may be seen from the line prīthiśeṣi Naimishaśa tīrhāṇi = antarikṣa cha Pushkaram (verse 203), which occurs further in the same chapter of the Vanaparvan. Of these two, Naimisha has been identified with Nimḵār or Nimṣār,2 not far from the Nimsar Railway station. There can thus be no doubt as to Naimisha being a tīrtha on the plains. Some doubt may, however, arise as to Pushkara. Because the tīrtha which is at present known by this name is the celebrated Pushkar Lake, six miles from Ajmer, which, however, is on the plains, and, not on a mountain peak, may thus be looked upon as a tīrtha on prithiśeṣi, and, not in antarikṣa. There is, however, a Pushkara-tīrtha which is apparently to be located in the Himālayas. Thus the Sabhāparvan3 of the Mahābhārata has the following:

pūnāḥ = cha pariśrītya = atha Pushkara-āraṇyavāsino’ḥ
gaṇān = Utsavaśaṅkṭeṣu vajrayat pravashvarabhaḥ 11

"And having turned his back again, the bull among men (Nakula) then conquered the tribes called the Utsavaśaṅkṭeṣas residing in the Pushkara forest." Utsavaśaṅkṭeṣa is mentioned by Kālidāsa in his Rāghuvaṁśa IV, 78, and is believed to be "a Sanskrit word formed by the combination of the names of the Tibetan provinces bordering on India—U’tschang, Bostan and Khotan." And as these Utsavaśaṅkṭeṣas are said to have occupied the Pushkara forests, the latter must have been situated in the Himālayan regions, where India met Tibet. Naturally, therefore, this Pushkara, being on an exceedingly higher altitude than the plains, can easily be described as a tīrtha in the mid-region. And curiously enough, Pushkara, like Vishṇupada, is a synonym of Antarikṣa according to the Amaṇakāla (I. 2.1-2).

To return to our point, how was Vishṇupada exactly situated—Vishṇupada where the pillar was originally erected? Where this Vishṇupada is precisely to be located is a question which we will consider in detail a little further on. But what we have stated above is enough to show that it was somewhere near the origin of the Vipāśa (Beas). That surely indicated a sufficiently high altitude to enable us to class it under antarikṣa-tīrthas. And, as a matter of fact, Durgāchārīya, the commentator, while explaining a passage from Yāska, unequivocally locates Vishṇupada in antarikṣa, as Ghosh has pointed out.5 And further, we have to note that even the Amaṇakālo6 gives Vishṇupada as a synonym of antarikṣa. How could this word have acquired the sense of "the mid-region?" It is true that Kṛṣṇavāmīn, who has written a commentary upon the Amaṇakāla, says: Vishṇuḥ padān kramē = iva Vishṇupadam.7 But this is

2 Nundolal Dey, Geographical Dictionary, etc., p. 135.
3 Chap. 32, verses 8-9.
6 I.2.2.
7 And, in fact, this is supported by what we are told in the Udāgā-parvan (Chap. 110, verses 21-22) namely, that in covering the three worlds Vishnu with one stride created what is called Vishṇupada situated in the northern region and not far from Kailāsa.
not enough, because Vishnu is renowned for his three strides, of which one only was in the antariksha. Why did not the other two places which represented the remaining two strides of Vishnu come to be called Vishnupada, especially the one on the plains (prthivi)? The truth of the matter is that since only one Vishnupada must already have been known as a sacred place, that being situated on a stupendously lofty eminence, it was considered to be midway between earth and heaven, that is, in the firmament, and that consequently Vishnupada came to be used as a term denoting ‘the sky, firmament’ itself before the time of Amara, that is, before the fifth century A.D. If this is the case, it is quite intelligible why Chandra (that is, Chandragupta II) should be described as having quitted one gô, that is, the earth, and as having been settled on another gô, that is, the mid-region, because, as just pointed out, Vishnupada where the column was at first standing was perched on such a high eminence that Vishnupada not only was considered to be existing in antariksha but became itself a term synonymous with antariksha.

The last question that we have now to consider is the exact location of Vishnupada which is mentioned in stanza 3 as the place where the iron pillar was originally planted. We have just seen that there is nothing in stanza 2 which shows that Chandra was dead when the eulogy was engraved on the pillar. On the contrary, the word mûrtiyâ, occurring in it, clearly shows that he was alive at that time, because he could not, by any stretch of imagination, be supposed to have gone to the other world in his bodily form. We have therefore to take it not only that he was living but also that he was then staying at Vishnupada. Here two questions arise: (1) Where precisely was this Vishnupada, and (2) Why was Chandra staying there? In regard to the first point, Fleck raises the query ‘whether it should be identified with the part of the Delhi Ridge on which the column stands.’ But he is undecided, because, says he, on the one hand, that ‘the actual position of the column is in a slight depression, with rising ground on both sides, a position which hardly answers to the description of its being on a giri or ‘hill’. This agrees with the tradition, he argues further, that ‘the column was erected, in the early part of the eighth century A.D., by Anaṅgapāla, the founder of the Tāmara dynasty,’ and raises the surmise that like the Asoka stone columns at Delhi and Allahabad, the iron pillar also was brought from elsewhere to the spot where it is now standing. On the other hand, he says that “the fact that the underground supports of the column include several small pieces of metal ‘like bits of bar iron’ is in favour of its being now in its original position; as they would probably have been overlooked, and left behind, in the process of a transfer.” But “no violence of language,” remarks V. A. Smith, “could possibly justify the application of the term ‘hill’ to the present site of the monument.” And, in his opinion, it is extremely probable that the iron pillar was originally erected at Mathurā, at the Katra mound, where the magnificent temple of Kēśava once stood, and which may very probably prove to be Vishnupada-giri mentioned in the inscription. But the Katra mound also, which, according to Smith, was the original site of the monument, cannot possibly, by any stretch of language be described as a giri. Long ago we noted that the Petersburg Lexicon gave many references to Vishnupada contained in the epics and the Purāṇas. We drew the attention of Chintharan Chakravarty to it, who, thereupon wrote a learned paper entitled “The Original Site of the Meherauli Pillar.” But he was not able to identify the spot accurately. This was, however, done by J. C. Ghosh with practically the same materials. The most important of these is a

---

3 *CASIR.* Vol. VI, p. 28 and Pl. V.
4 *TRAS.*, 1897, pp. 16-17.
5 *ABORI.* Vol. VIII, pp. 172 and ff.
passage, from the Rāmāyaṇa, which gives an account of the travels of the emissaries sent by Vasishtha to bring Bharata back to Ayodhya from Girivraja, the capital of the Kēkayya country. It runs as follows:

Tayur=madhīṇa Vāhlikān Sudāmanān̄cha puratam 1  
Vishpuḥ padam prēkṣhamāyā Vipāsān̄ch=aṇī Śālmālim 1  
Rāmāyaṇa, II. 68. 18-19.

“They went through the Vāhlika1 country to Mount Sudāman, viewing Vīṣṇu-pada and also the Vīpāśa and the Śālmali.”

If we read carefully the second half of this Chapter, namely, Chapter 68, we note that the emissaries of Ayodhya crossed the Ganges at Hastinapura, thereupon with their faces turned towards the west reached the Pañchāla country after passing through Kurujāngala, thence entered the city of Kulinga, from there repaired to the river Ikshumati sacred to the Ikshvāku ancestry, and thereafter to Mount Sudāman passing through the Vāhlika country, from there viewing Vīṣṇu-pada, the Vīpāśa and the Śālmali. From there the emissaries finally reached Girivraja, their place of destination. This Girivraja, the capital town of the Kēkayya country Cunningham identifies with Jalālpur of the Gujarat District, Panjab, now in Pakistan, the ancient name of which was Girjāk. 2 And this identification has been approved by F. E. Pargiter in his translation of the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa. 3 The whole passage is of great significance; first, because Vīṣṇu-pada is here mentioned not alone, but along with Vāhlika—just the two localities which are mentioned also in the Mahārāuli inscription, showing clearly that this is just the Vīṣṇu-pada we are in search of; and, secondly, because the passage provides us with the clue that these places were in the close proximity of the Vīpāśa, which, we know, is the modern Beas, where it is joined by another river, which must therefore be the Śālmali. Thirdly, it is worthy of note that this Ikshumati was much to the south-east of the Beas. It cannot thus be identified with the Oxus near Balkh as one scholar 4 has thought fit to do. Besides, the Oxus was never considered sacred to the Ikshvāku ancestry. The old name of the Oxus, again, was Vaṅkhu. 5 If the Ikshumati of the Rāmāyaṇa has to be located, it had better be identified with the Ikshu mentioned in the Purāṇa 6 as having sprung up from the Himalayas along with the Vīpāśa and others. In this connection, it is desirable to notice another passage, namely, one from the Mahābhārata, which, though referred to in the Petersburg Lexicon was first quoted and brought to the attention of scholars by J. C. Ghosh. The passage runs as follows:

ēṭad=Vīṣṇu-padañā nāma drīṣyātē tirtham=uttamam 1  
ēṭhā rāmyā Vipāśa cha nadi parama-pānani 1  
Kāśmīra maṇḍalañā ch=ātāt sarvā-puṣyam=arindama 1  
(Vanaparvan, Ch. 130, verses 8 and 10)

It will be seen from this description that not only the Vīpāśa but also Kāśmīra was

---

1 It is worthy of note that Vāhlika or Bāhlika is the reading found in the three recensions of the Rāmāyaṇa namely of Bombay, Madras (Kumbhakonam) and Bengal (Calcutta). The Madras and Bengal recensions specify various readings, but nowhere is the reading Vāhlika given for Bāhlika. On the other hand, be it noted that the latter gives the reading Sudāmān̄i instead of Sudāmanān̄i (II. 70. 17), immediately following Bāhlikan. See, in this connection, our articles in IC, Vol. III, pp. 511 and ff. and Jour. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., Vol. X, pp. 86 ff. This is controverted by D. C. Sircar in his paper printed in Festschrift Prof. P. V. Kane, 1941, pp. 469 and ff. But the latter’s view has been substantially refuted in (Miss) Padma Mishra’s article on Vāhlika and Bāhlika published in IC., Vol. VIII, pp. 85 and ff. See also O. Stein’s Round the Mahārāuli Inscription in NIA., Vol. I, pp. 196-96.


3 P. 318, note.

4 J. R. ASB. (Letters), Vol. IX, p. 179, note 6

5 Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 266; Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 188, verse 54.

6 Vīśu-P., Chap. 43, verses 95-96; Mātṣya-P., Chap. 114, verses 21-22.
visible from Vishnupada. Vishnupada was thus on a hill near the Vipāśa from where Kāśmīra was not far distant. It appears that the Vipāśa had her source in the mountains of the Kāśmīra region in the time of the ancient Aryans. On emerging out of Kāśmīra into the country of the Saptasindhavaḷi (Panjab) it has formed a sharp bend in the border of Gurdaspur (Panjab) and Kangra districts. It is just at this bend that it has been joined by another river, which must be the Sālmali. Vishnupada was surely somewhere there.

Before we dismiss this subject, we have to note again that the passage quoted above from the Rāmdāyana associated Vishnupada with the Vālhika country and that both these localities are referred to in the Mēharauli inscription also. We have further to note that stanza 1 of this epigraphic record speaks of Chandra as having conquered the Vālhikas after crossing the seven mouths of the Sindhu or the Indus. Evidently, therefore, Vishnupada was situated in the province subjegated by him. This throws a most welcome light on the line karma-jit-āvanitas gatavatha, etc. in stanza 2 of the inscription. Fleet, of course, renders it by "the land (of paradise) won by (the merit of his) actions." The proper translation should be "gone to the land (aeaut) conquered through (his own) deeds." What it means is that he was then in the country of the Vālhikas which had been subjegated through his prowess. The question that now remains to be discussed is: Why did Chandra, that is, Chandragupta II, go to Vishnupada? I think, the reply is furnished by the line, kūmnasa = eva vīśīṛya gānī naraṇatēr = gām = āśītasa = ātarām. This means that he quitted one gō, that is, the earth, and repaired to another gō, that is, the mid-region where Vishnupada was situated, through dejection as it were. We are further told immediately thereafter that he then remained on the soil of the earth (kṣiti) only by fame. If we read between the lines carefully, the impression produced on our mind is that he was at Vishnupada, not as a temporary pilgrim, but as a permanent resident, that, in other words, he retired from the worldly life and was settled for good at the holy place of Vishnupada. This is not the first instance of an Imperial Gupta ruler abdicating the throne and becoming a Vānaprastha. His grandfather, Chandragupta I, we have seen, had similarly renounced the householder's, and embraced the anchorite's stage of life. When this event most probably came off will be discussed later on.

We have thus seen how wide the Gupta empire had become in the time of Chandragupta II. It was co-extensive practically with the whole of northern India, omitting, of course, the nominal suzerainty that he may have exercised over the states of Southern India. Such a big empire must have had at least two capitals for its effective administration. At any rate, the hereditary capital of the Gupta kingdom, namely, Pātaliputra, was situated a little too far eastward to provide adequate control over the empire. A most welcome light is thrown on this point by the inscription of the Guttas of Guttal. It was Fleet himself who first drew our attention to certain data furnished by these records though he was unable to deduce the proper conclusions. The family is usually called the Gutta anawya, kula or vanīsa. Gutta here is doubtless a Prakrit form of Gupta, because one member of the family is styled Gupta-vanīṭa-Trīṇītra, "a very Trīṇītra (Śiva) in the Gupta race"; another, Gupta-ānawya-bhadānta, "a king belonging to the Gupta lineage"; and a third, Gupta-vanīṭa-vārdhi-vardhana, "increasing (like

---

1 That Vishnupada was somehow connected with the Imperial Gupta dynasty may be seen from the fact that along with the seals of Dharavasāṃti, of the Yuvārāja and his officials picked up by Bloch during his excavations at Bāsar have been found a seal with the inscription: (1) Śrī-Vishnupadavasāṃti-Nā (2) rāja[n]a, "Nārāyaṇa, Lord of the holy Vishnupada" (CASIR, 1909-1910, p. 110, No. 31). Bloch, however, thinks that this Vishnupada is perhaps the temple of Vishnupada at Gayā (ibid., pp. 104 and 111). But there is nothing to show that the famous shrine at Gayā was in existence in the fourth century A.D. Besides, the only Vishnupada known to exist in the early Gupta period is the Vishnupada mentioned in the Mēharauli pillar inscription.

the moon) the ocean of the Gupta race'. This leaves no doubt as to the family name 'Gutta' being identical with 'Gupta'. Now, it is worthy of note that the members of the family are described not only as Vikramādiyavaṁśa-ādhāra, "born in the race of Vikramādiyva" but also as Chandragupta-vaṁśa-ādhāra, "born in the race of Chandragupta". It is also worthy of note that the hereditary titles, which commemorated their place of origin, were Ujjayani- puravar-ādhāra, "supreme lord of Ujjayani, the best of towns" and Pāṭaliputra-ādhāra, "supreme lord of Pāṭala, the best of towns". And to crown all, we are told that they were descended through a Vikramādiyva, who is specified as king of Ujjayani, and whom one record represents plainly as himself a descendant of Chandragupta. Now who could this ancestor of the Guttas or Guptas of Guttal be, who was not only Chandragupta by name, but also a descendant of Chandragupta, and, who, again, not only had the title Vikramādiyva but also was a king of Pāṭaliputra. He can be no other than Chandragupta II, grandson of Chandragupta I, of the Imperial Guptan dynasty. And, as the place of origin of his descendants, namely, the Guttas of the south, is represented once as Pāṭaliputra and once as Ujjayani, the natural conclusion is that this Chandragupta II had two capitals, one Pāṭaliputra and the other, Ujjayani.

It has been assumed above that Chandragupta II bore the title or epithet of Vikramādiyva. This is, however, quite clear from a critical study of his coins, which, again, throw light upon the other titles by which he was known. The most pre-eminent of these was Vikrama, which was to Chandragupta II, what Parākrama was to his father, Samudragupta. There were many combinations formed out of Vikrama as there were out of Parākrama. Like Vyāghra-Parākrama of Samudragupta, we have Sīhha-Vikrama for Chandragupta II. Coins bearing this epithet are known to the numismatist as the Lion-Slayer Type which has been distinguished into at least four classes and each further into a number of varieties. On the obverse the king stands, wearing waist-cloth with sash, turban and jewellery, shooting with bow at a lion and trampling on the animal with one foot. These details, however, vary with the varieties. It is, no doubt, tempting to take this Type of coins as indicating that Chandragupta annexed Kāthiāwār, in the Gir forest of which alone the Indian lions at present exist. But the lion was formerly found throughout the greater part of North-western and Central India. "In the early part of the nineteenth century, lions occurred in Hariyāṇa, Khāndesh, and Rewa and as far east as Palamau, whilst up to 1860 or 1870 many existed in Kāthiāwā and parts of Rajputana." The Lion-Slayer Type cannot thus be taken as a sure indication of Chandragupta's conquest of Kāthiāwā. And we have, therefore, to understand that as among animals the tiger and the lion afford the best standard of comparison, Samudragupta is taken to surpass the former and his son Chandragupta the latter animal in strength and agility. The court poets were so fond of comparing Chandragupta to the lion, that they invented not only Sīhha-Vikrama but Sīhha-Chandra also. This combination of names is not noticeable in the case of other Gupta kings. Thus we have Vyāghra-Parākrama and Sīhha-Mahendrā, but not Vyāghra-Samudra and Sīhha-Kumārā, in the case of Samudragupta and Kumāragupta I, respectively. What is further noteworthy about Chandragupta is that Vikrama was combined with Aditya and developed into the title Vikramādiyva. It is somewhat difficult to know what this name exactly means, that is, whether it means 'the Sun of Valour' as it is generally interpreted or 'Valour who is (also) the Sun'. The latter seems to be the better of the two explana-

5 Allan, loc. cit., p. 43.
ions, because, in the first place, it agrees with the fact that Vikrama alone was par excellence the title of the king, and secondly the very first verse of Inscription No. 11 below compares Chandragupta with Arka which is synonymous with Aditya, both signifying ‘the sun’. And, as a matter of fact, from the time of this king onwards Aditya forms the second half of the composite title assumed by the Gupta sovereigns. We thus have Mahendrāditya for Kumāragupta I, Kramāditya for Skandagupta and so forth. If this interpretation of the title Vikramāditya is not accepted and if it is taken to mean ‘the Sun of Valour’, the question arises as to how we are to interpret Mahendrāditya? Is it possible at all to take the latter expression in the sense of ‘the Sun of Mahendra’? The rendering ‘the Sun of Mahendra’ conveys no meaning at all, and the phrase has to be translated by ‘Mahendra who is (also) the Sun’. This shows that the composite title Vikramāditya has to be interpreted to mean ‘Vikrama who is the Sun’. There is no evidence to show that there was any king prior to Chandragupta II who bore this title. In fact, he seems not only to be the first king who was styled Vikramāditya but also to be the Vikramāditya of tradition reputed for supernatural powers and patronage of arts and sciences. We will consider this point in greater detail later on. A third title derived from Vikrama is Vikramānka, which we find coupled with his name on his silver coins, all found in Kāśīvāra. This no doubt corresponds to Parākramānka of Samudragupta which occurs in line 17 of Inscription No. 1 below. Vikramānka must thus mean “One who has the distinctive appellation or epithet of Vikrama (Valour)”. Sometimes Vikrama is joined to Ajīta, and we thus find Ajīta-Vikrama as another epithet of Chandragupta II. Ajīta-Vikrama has similarly to be taken to signify “the Invincible (one) who is Valour”. It will thus be seen that the epithets that have been conjoined to the name of this Gupta monarch are, all except one, either Vikrama or combinations of Vikrama. The only exception is Sinhā-Chandra which has been noted above. Chandragupta had another appellation which is worthy of note. The copper plate charters of the Vākṣāka kings have been known and published a long time since. The mother of Pravarasena II is, in all of them, mentioned as Prabhāvatigupta, daughter of Dēvagupta. Who this Dēvagupta was, was not known for a long time. It was the discovery of the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta that first unriddled the mystery. And it was first announced by us that these plates left not even the shadow of a doubt as to this Dēvagupta being Chandragupta II. We then also pointed out that another form of the name was Dēvarāja which occurred in a Sānci inscription (No. 9 below), but, which, just because some letters immediately thereafter had broken off in the record, was taken wrongly, of course, by Fleet as the name of a minister of Chandragupta. Whether we take Dēvarāja or Dēvagupta to be his another name, the meaning is the same. Dēva here must signify not ‘a king’ but ‘Indra’, because the former sense is not possible in the form ‘Dēvarāja’, which, in that case has to be taken in the sense of “the king (rāja) of kings (dēvas)” where the word used for ‘king’ in one case is rāja and in the other dēva—a singular procedure.

Of the birudas or laudatory appellations of Chandragupta II, four are known. They are found associated with his name in the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta, who was his daughter and was queen of the Vakṣāka king Rudrasena II. The appellations are: (1) Prithivyām = oprati rathah, (2) Sava-rāj-śechhētā, (3) Chatur-udadhī-sālī-kavādīta-yaśāh, and (4) Anēka-gā-hiranyā-kōtī-sahasra-pradāh. The first three of these, as pointed out above, are exactly the same as the first three of the seven coupled with the name of Samudragupta in his Nālandā plate (No. 3 below) or in the Bilsāla inscription (No. 16 below) of his grandson Kumāragupta I. The fourth, again, is practically identical with the biruda: nāyā-āgal-ānēka-gā-hiranya-kōtī-pradāh which is conjoined to the name of Samudragupta. The second of these, moreover,
as remarked above, was adopted by Kāchagupta as his epithet. Any way, these were not the distinctive apppellations of any one of the Gupta sovereigns, and seem to have been used by them and made so common that they were adopted later, that is, in the beginning of the seventh century, by kings of the Kaṭachchuri family, as we have seen above.

Chandragupta had at least two wives, one Dhruvadēvi and the other Kubēranāgā. The first of these is known to us from four inscriptions, in three of which (Nos. 16, 31 and 41 below) she has been called Dhruvadēvi and in one (No. 13 below) Dhruvasvāmīni. We do not know to which family she belonged. We have seen, however, that she was a bone of contention between Chandragupta whom she had selected and to whom she was allianced and his elder brother Kāchagupta who foreibly espoused her. We know further how Chandragupta afterwards seized and killed Kāchagupta and married Dhruvadēvi who was rightfully his own. She was the favourite queen of Chandragupta, who had from her the two sons, Gōvindagupta and Kumāragupta. One seal of this queen (No. 13) was exhumed by the late Bloch during his excavations at Baśārī in the Muzaffarpur District, Bihar, which has been identified with the ancient Vaiśālī. Its legend means: “The great Queen (Mahādevī), the prosperous Dhruvasvāmīni, wife of the Mahārajadhīrāja, the prosperous Chandragupta (and) mother of the Mahārajā, the prosperous Gōvindagupta.” The names Chandragupta and Dhruvasvāmīni mentioned in the seal are doubtful Chandragupta II and his wife Dhruvadēvi, well-known from Gupta inscriptions. As the names of Chandragupta and his son Gōvindagupta occur in the seal, both must be supposed to be living when the seal of Dhruvasvāmīni was impressed in the clay piece. Chandragupta, as he is called Mahārajadhīrāja, was, of course, the paramount sovereign, and Gōvindagupta, being Mahārajā, was holding some province under him, most probably as Tuarājī in the district of Vaiśālī. This was natural, as Vaiśālī was originally the capital of the Licchhavis through whose active help, as pointed out above, Chandragupta I raised himself to power. It was thus fit and proper that if the seat of the Gupta sovereign was Pāṭāliputra, that of the crown prince should be Vaiśālī. It thus seems that Gōvindagupta was stationed there as Tuarājī. And further it seems that Dhruvasvāmīni was at the time of the seal staying there with her eldest son.

The existence of the second wife of Chandragupta is attested by the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta referred to above. There, she is described as the daughter of Chandragupta II, from his wife, the great queen (Mahādevī), Kubēranāgā, who belonged to the Nāga family. It seems tempting to connect Kubēranāgā with king Kubēra of Dēvarāshtra in South India whom Samudragupta vanquished and thereafter reinstated. But there is nothing to show that this ruler of Dēvarāshtra was a Nāga by extraction. On the other hand, we know that there were no less than three Nāga families ruling over Dhārā, Pāmmavati and Mathurā in North India in the time of Samudragupta. It is true that the Nāga princes of these dynasties are represented to have been destroyed by this Gupta monarch, but there is nothing to show that he extinguished these royal lines and annexed their kingdoms to his own empire. The inference is more probable that Kubēranāgā pertained to one of these Nāga families. Whether Chandragupta had any son from her we do not know, but this much we know for certain that the two had a daughter called Prabhāvatigupta who was the agranahishi or Chief Queen of the Vākāṭaka Mahārajā Rudrasēna (II). She is also described in the Poona plates as “the mother of the Tuarājī, the prosperous Divākarasēna.” And the seal attached thereto records: “this is the enemy-chastising command of the mother of the Tuarājā who is the ornament of the Vākāṭakas and who has obtained royal dignity in course (of succession).” This clearly shows that Divākarasēna was a minor and continued to be Tuarājā, whereas his mother Prabhāvatigupta played the role of Queen-Regent. The year 13, the date of these plates must therefore denote the year of the regency. Whether Divākarasēna ever be-
came a ruler we do not know. At any rate, there is no evidence to that effect, no record of his having yet been found. We have, however, five copper plate inscriptions of his brother, Pravarasena II. One of these records the grants of his mother Prabhavatigupta, but refers itself to his reign. She was then near "the feet of the Lord of Rāmagiri", where, obviously she had retired and from where her grant was issued. As she no longer exercised any ruling authority, the charter is dated in the reign of her son. In that record she is described as "the Mother of the Vākāṭaka Mahānāga Dāmōdarasena and Pravarasena." This means that Divakarasena never became a Mahārāja, that is, died without becoming a king, but that after him the Vākāṭaka throne was occupied first by Dāmōdarasena and afterwards by Pravarasena (II). Their mother, Prabhavatigupta, must have been far advanced in age when she issued her last grant, and, as a matter of fact, she is represented in this inscription as being "more than a hundred years old". There is yet another inscription of the reign of Pravarasena which relates to her. But this time the grant is made by the son himself for the augmentation of merit, in this as well as in the next world, to his Mātrī-bhāṭṭārikā or 'Venerable mother'.

At least three Officers of Chandragupta II are known to us from the inscriptions of the Gupta period. One of these we have already noted. He is the one referred to in the undated Udayagiri cave inscription (No. 11 below). He was the Minister of Peace and War, and was, in fact, a hereditary minister of the royal family. He was named Virasena and surnamed Śāba. He belonged to the Kautsa gōra and was evidently a Brāhmaṇa. He was an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra, and came to Central India in the company of his sovereign during his conquest of the earth. Being a Brāhmaṇa, and, above all, Minister for Peace and War, he was a man of letters. He is thus represented as being conversant with Grammar (Śabda), Polity (Artha), Logic (Nyāya) and Popular Usage and Custom (Lōka). In other words, he was well-versed in the four sciences known as Vyākaraṇa, Artha-sāstra, Nyāya and Dharma-sāstra, as every Minister of Peace and War was expected to be. Above all, he is described as being a poet (kavi). This was also a qualification indispensable to a Śāndhivigrahika. The longest and historically the most important Gupta record is the well-known praśasti of Samudragupta, engraved on the Aśōkan pillar now in the Allahabad fort. It was composed by Harishena who calls it a kāya. Elsewhere we have pointed out that this panegyric was a meritorious production worthy of being styled a kāya. But what was the official position of Harishena at that time? He too was a Śāndhivigrahika. In fact, this office was of such a character that the occupant of it had perfurce to be a master of style. It is rather unfortunate that no piece of composition from the pen of Virasena Śāba has been preserved. The name of another Brāhmaṇa minister of Chandragupta II is revealed by an inscription (No. 21 below) discovered in the Fyzabad District in Uttar Pradesh, belonging to the reign of his son Kumāragupta I, and bearing the date Gupta year 117. He has therein been named Śikharavāmin and mentioned as son of Vīṣṇupālihitabhāṭṭa and grandson of Kumāravyabhāṭṭa who was a teacher of the Chhandoga Veda and was of the Aśvavājīn gōra. Śikharavāmin is there designated as both Mantrin and Kumārānāya. The first of these designations, namely, Mantrin, is of a generic character and seems to be synonymous with Sachīva applied to Virasena Śāba. The name of a third Officer, also of Chandragupta II, appears to have been preserved in an inscription (No. 9 below) dated Gupta year 93 on the railing of the Great Stūpa at Sāñchi, known in ancient times as Kākanādabōta. The purport of this epigraph is to record the benefaction of twentyfive Dīnāras and of a place called Iśvaravāsaka purchased with the money realised by selling off three royal palaces by a donor, called Āmrakārdava, son of Undāna. These

---

2 Ibid., No. 15, pp. 69 ff.
3 For the meanings of these terms see the necessary foot-note to the translation of this record.
gifts were made to the Āryasaṅgha or confraternity of Buddhist monks, that was settled in the Great Monastery of Kākanādabōta, that is, pertaining to the line of teachers connected with Sāṅchi Stūpa No. 1. From each of the donations five monks were to be fed daily and a lamp maintained in the Jewel-House (ratna-grīha), which here obviously denotes a Buddha shrine. The second of these was for the attainment of all virtues by Chandragupta (II) and the first for the enhancement of the donor’s merit. This Āmrakārda was something like an Officer in the service of the Gupta monarch, because he is described as “one whose means of subsistence has been augmented through the favour of the feet” of Chandragupta and as having shown to the world how the dependent of a king should behave himself. That he was an Officer of some military rank is evident from the epithet anēka-samar-ānāpta-vijaya-yaśah-patañkah, which means that “his banner of fame was the victories achieved in many battles.” And, further, as he was in charge of royal palaces some of which he sold off, it seems that Āmrakārda was something like a quarter-master entrusted with the duty of marking out camps and assigning quarters there. It is not quite clear why he sold off some of the royal palaces that were in Vidiśa, on the outskirts of which, no doubt, Kākanādabōta was situated. But as the date of his inscription is Gupta year 93 when Chandragupta was ruling, and as his son Kumāragupta was already a king in Gupta year 96, it seems that Chandragupta abdicated the throne in or about the year 93. And it is quite possible that the palaces which were personally his own were sold off at his own bidding when the Gupta king actually retired from worldly life and became settled at Vishnupada. This is also indicated by the fact that the assignment of Iśvaravāsaka purchased with the proceeds of the sale of the royal palaces was intended for the attainment of virtues by Chandragupta II. This “attainment of virtues” at the close of his reign practically coincided with the Vānaprastha āśrama embraced by Chandragupta soon after the date of this inscription.

As Chandragupta was a paramount sovereign, he must have had a number of tributary princes owing fealty to him. The inscriptions, however, reveal the names of only two of them. One Udayagiri cave epigraph (No. 7 below) is dated Gupta year 82 = 400-01 A.D. and refers itself to his reign. It records the dedication of the excavated shrine apparently to Vīśnu made by a chief of the Sanakānika clan, who describes himself as meditating on the feet of the Mahārājādhirāja Chandragupta. Unfortunately his full name has not been preserved, the last letter of his name, namely, i, being alone legible. He was son of the Mahārājā Vīśnudāsa and grandson of the Mahārājā Chhagalaga, which looks like a Turkish name, as was pointed out by the late A. M. T. Jackson long ago. Probably Vīśnudāsa and Chhagalaga also were feudatory chieftains of Samudragupta whose suzerainty was acknowledged by Sanakānika, as well as by the other tribes, as the Allahabad pillar inscription informs us. Then again we have to take note of an inscription found at Mandasor and dated the 5th of the bright half of Āśvoja (Āśvina) of the Mālava (or Vīkrama) year 461 = 404 A.D. It refers itself to the reign of the Mahārājā Naravarman, son of Sīṅhavarman and grandson of Jayavarman. There can be no doubt that this Naravarman is identical with the prince of that name who is mentioned as father of Vīśavarman in the Gāndhār inscription of Vīkrama year 480. And further we know from another Mandsor inscription (No. 35 below) that Vīśavarman’s son was Bandhuvarman. It will thus be seen that Naravarman belonged to the line of feudatory chieftains that ruled over Daśapura (Mandasor) from about the middle of the fourth to about the middle of the fifth century A.D. Now one of the many epithets of Naravarman mentioned in his record is Sīṅha-vikrānta-gāmin, “a follower of Sīṅha-Vikrānta”. Sīṅha-Vikrānta is obviously the same as Sīṅha-Vikrama which, we know from Gupta coins,

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, pp. 320 ff.
was a title of Chandragupta II. And we have already seen from a Sāñcī inscription (No. 9 below) that this Gupta sovereign was reigning till Gupta year 93 = 411-12 A.D., that is, for at least seven years after this date for Naravarman. The latter was thus a tributary prince of Chandragupta II—a conclusion which is in keeping with the fact that his son and grandson, namely, Viṣavarman and Bandhuvarman, were feudatories of Kumāragupta I.

Students of history need not be told that Vikramāditya has become a favourite hero of the fable literature. Popular stories clustering round his name have been narrated not only in the Sinhasanadvārinīla, Viṭahapatichhaśviniśati, Merutunga’s Prabandhachintāmaṇi and Rājaśekhara’s Chaturviśvātaphṛtadvandha but also in Kshemendra’s Bṛhakathāmakhārai, Somadeva’s Kathāsūrīṣuṇa and Kālidāsa’s Žyāṭhrīdhābharaṇa. It is quite clear from these popular tales and traditions that Vikramāditya, whosoever he was, was not only a yogi and Siddha who could tackle and control evil spirits but also a Śākārī or foe of the Śakas who founded the Vikrama era, and above all, a patron of arts and sciences. Was he one individual who satisfied all these conditions, or was he one hero who drew to himself tales of earlier and later champions? Of all the Vikramādityas known to history, that is, known to epigraphy and numismatics, Chandragupta II was the earliest and perhaps the most famous. Let us see whether or how far he answers to the traditions centering round his name. Was he believed to be a Siddha or yogi who could tame malicious spirits? In this connection reference may be made to the Guttas (Guptas) of Guttl in Dharwar District, Karnata, who claim their descent from Chandragupta-Vikramāditya, a ruler of Ujjainī and Paṭaliputra. We have pointed out that this Chandragupta cannot but be Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. Now, in the records of these Guttas there is one passage which says that at Ujjain (Chandragupta-Vikramāditya) mastered the ashta-mahāśiddhi, “eight great supernatural powers”, and another, that he ruled over the Viṭālas or demons.1 It is thus plain that, in the thirteenth century A.D. when the Guttas of Gutthal flourished, the Vikramāditya who was credited with the development of supernatural powers and the control of Viṭālas was regarded as no other than Chandragupta II. At any rate, that was the tradition handed down in the Gutta family, who traced lineage to this Chandragupta.

But have we got evidence of an earlier period in support of this statement? Now in the Devichandra-grāptam Chandragupta is represented as being intent upon performing some ceremony to propitiate Viṭāla with a view to warding off the calamity threatened by the Śākapati upon the camp of Rāmagupta (Kāchagupta).2 The same event along with the charges of murdering the elder brother and carrying on incestuous intercourse with his wife has been referred to in the Sānqī and Cambay3 plates of the Rāṣṭākuta king Gōvinda IV, to which our attention was first drawn by V. V. Mirashi.4

The question may now further be asked whether any confirmation of this point, partial or of any kind, is forthcoming from the early Gupta inscriptions. Attention may, in this connection, be drawn to the undated Udayagiri cave inscription of Chandragupta (No. 11 below). We have already pointed out that the very first verse of this record describes this king as Antariyātīh ‘Inner or Spiritual Light’. The verse number three it calls him a rishi in the phrase rājādhiraj-arsheh coupled with his name. And the term rishi means not only ‘a saint or sage’, but also ‘an ascetic or anchorite’. Epigraphic evidence, contemporary and later, thus points to the Siddha or yogi Vikramāditya of tradition being no other than Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta line. That the epithet Śakārī, which is applied to Vikramāditya of tradi-
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tion, is also applicable to this Chandragupta can scarcely be doubted, because we have pointed out above that Chandragupta II destroyed the power of the Kshatrapas who were Śakas. But the Śakārī of the tradition was also the founder of the Vikrama era. How could Chandragupta be connected with this era? In this connection it is worthy of note that most dates of the Gupta era can be worked out correctly even by taking them as Vikrama years. The necessary calculations involved in this supposition have already been set forth before us by Dhirenrendranath Mukhopadhyaya in the case of many dates of the Gupta era. How these Gupta dates can work out correctly even though they are treated as Vikrama years may appear somewhat singular and almost incredible at this stage, but this matter has been dealt with fully in a separate chapter. Here it is sufficient to note that this fact adequately explains why the name of a Gupta king, a (Chandragupta-)Vikramāditya above all, should be connected with the inauguration of an era starting from 57 B.C., which for that reason must have been called Vikrama Sahvat. The third important point connected with the traditional Vikramāditya is that he was a patron of arts and sciences. And one tradition recorded in the Jyotirmipidābharaṇa associated with him nine gems of litterateurs and scientists, the most resplendent of whom was Kālidāsa, the prince of poets. Most of the literates huddled together in a verse of this work were tenth-rate people and pertained again to different periods. The nine gems referred to therein could not thus have flourished in one age, or, for the matter of that, during the reign of Chandragupta II. Nevertheless, there is good reason to suppose that Kālidāsa lived and wrote in the fifth century A.D., and was a contemporary not only of Chandragupta II, but of Kumāragupta I, if not also of Skandagupta.

The Rājatarāṅgini informs us that there lived at Ujjayani as the sole sovereign of the world the glorious Vikramāditya who also bore the second name of Harsha and destroyed the Śakas. A poor poet, Mātrigupta, sought the court of this Vikramāditya, and, after long futile endeavours, attracted the attention of the king who sent Mātrigupta to Kashmir and had him installed there on the vacant throne. On the death of his patron and after a just rule of about five years Mātrigupta abdicated in favour of Pravarasena II and retired as a recluse to Banaras, where he died, supported by the end by the donations of his generous rival and successor. This account of Kalhana is an amalgam of truth and fiction, as all traditions in India are bound to be. That this Vikramāditya is Chandragupta II can scarcely be seriously doubted; because Kalhana represents him to be “the sole sovereign of the world”.

It is true that Kalhana further tells us that Pravarasena II “replaced Śilāditya-Pratāpaśila, son of Vikramāditya, who had been dethroned by enemies, in the kingdom of his father”, the capital of which, we have seen above, was Ujjain. This Śilāditya has been identified with a king of that name mentioned by Yuan Chawang as having ruled about 580 A.D. in Mālava, that is, sixty years before the time of the Chinese pilgrim. It is forgotten, however, that this Mālava was situated on the south-eastern side of the Mo-ho (verse 1, Mo-hi=Mahi) river and is distinguished from the country of Ujjayini. Śilāditya mentioned by Kalhana as son of Vikramāditya, ruler of Ujjain, cannot possibly be identified with Śilāditya referred to by Yuan Chawang as a ruler of Mālava whose capital was not Ujjain. On the other hand, we have pointed out above, on the strength of the Meharauli pillar inscription that Chandragupta made himself master of the country through which flowed the Sindicu with her seven mouths, that is, of the country which comprised not only the Panjab but also Kashmir. Whether tradition had in Kashmir
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confused Chandragupta II with Harsha of Kanauj it is difficult to say. But as the latter ruler has not yet been adverted to at all by Kālhaṇa, it looks probable that the second name Harsha had clung to Vikramādiṭiya perhaps through the mistake of the scribe. It seems that originally he was known as Chandra-Vikramādiṭiya. And just as Kāča, the name of his elder brother, was corrupted into Rāma, his own name, that is, Chandra, became Harsha. But who was Māṭrīgupta, the poet of the court of Vikramādiṭiya, who was placed in charge of Kashmir? It is true that the existence of a poet, Māṭrīgupta, is attested by the verses cited from his compositions by Kāśemēndra and other Kashmirian literates. But how is it that he is unknown outside Kashmir? In this connection it is impossible not to take cognisance of an ingenious theory of the late Bhau Daji which identifies Māṭrīgupta with the great poet Kālidāsa. His arguments are principally based on the two names being practically synonymous (Kāli = Māṭrī; dāsa = gupta); on the absence of any mention of Kālidāsa in the Rājatarangini, which, however, speaks of Bhavabhūti, Vākpati and others; and on the ascription to Kālidāsa of the composition of Sōtuhanda at the bidding of a king Pravarasena. Now even if we do not accept that Māṭrīgupta is exactly synonymous with Kālidāsa, it may certainly be another name for Kālidāsa. Another well-known dramatist was Bhavabhūti who, we are told in the pratiṣṭhāna of all his dramas, had the other appellation of Śrīkantha. It is quite possible that Māṭrīgupta was similarly another appellation of Kālidāsa. Again, it is a point worthy of note that one work of Kālidāsa has been styled Vikramādiṭiya and another Kumārasambhava. This gives rise to the presumption that the first components of these names, namely, Vikrama and Kumāra are respectively Chandragupta II and his son Kumāragupta I, whose contemporary he was. The presumption becomes strong when we consider impartially some of the contents of his renowned Raghuvaṇiṣa. This poem speaks of the Hūnas, not simply as situated at a long distance from India, but as settled on the Sindhu and quite on the confines of this country.

Skandagupta, son of Kumāragupta I, was the first Gupta sovereign to meet and repel them in a well-pitched battle. The Raghuvaṇiṣa may thus rightly be taken as being composed in the time of this Gupta monarch. Many allusions to the kings of this royal line have been traced, some of which are more imaginary than real. Some most likely allusions have not been even thought of. One such relates to the Raghus, at the very commencement of the work, who are “a race emanating from the sun” (sūrya-prabhavā vaṁśaḥ). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Guptas were a solar race and that the Raghuvaṇiṣa in the course of the description of many of its princes may contain some covert references to the Gupta princes and this sovereignty enjoyed by them. Thus when at the very outset of the poem we are told that it intends giving an account of the Raghus who pertained to the solar race, the presumption is raised that the Guptas also claimed to be descended from the sun. Now, if we study the coins of this dynasty, we find that most of the Gupta kings had epithets ending in ādiṭya which means ‘the sun’. Thus Chandragupta is called Vikramādiṭiya; Kumāragupta I, Mahēṅdraḍīṭya; Skandagupta, both Kramādīṭiya and Vikramādīṭya; Narasimhagupta, Bāḷāḍīṭya; Kumāragupta II, Kramādīṭya; Chandragupta III, Devāḍaḍīṭya; and so on. What does the term ādiṭya in these epithets signify? To begin from the beginning, Vikramādiṭiya is generally taken in the sense of ‘the sun of valour’. But how will this translation suit, e.g., Mahēṅdraḍīṭya or Bāḷāḍīṭya? The first of these is an epithet of Kumāragupta I. But what is meant by saying that he was Mahēṅdraḍīṭya if Mahēṅdraḍīṭya is taken in the sense of ‘the sun of the great Indra’? In fact, this rendering is not only

1 JBBRAS, Vol. VI, 1861, pp. 218 ff.
2 This view was first insisted upon by K. B. Pahad in JBBRAS, Vol. XIX, pp. 35 ff. and also in Introduction to his Kālidāsa’s Mighadita, pp. vii ff.
meaningless but confusing. We have therefore to translate it by “Mahendra who is (also) the Sun”. Similarly, Vikramaditya is to be understood in the sense of “Valour who is (also) the Sun.” These are, of course, composite epithets of which the second component is invariably Aditya and the first is a second appellation which is peculiar to the Gupta king. Whether he is Vikrama or Mahendra, he is uniformly Aditya. Similarly, Narasimha is styled Bālāditya or ‘the rising Sun’; and Chandragupta III, Dwādaśāditya, or “the twelve Suns (combined)”, but without any second appellation being conjoined to it. It will thus be seen that every one of these Gupta kings was at least an Aditya, whatever were the other appellations he assumed. If this fact is once admitted, the conclusion is irresistible that they claimed to belong to the solar race. When, therefore, Kālidāsa aspires to describe the life and doings of the Rāghu princes, he may have covertly adverted to the exploits of the three Gupta sovereigns whose contemporary he was, as he is suspected to have done. To take one instance, we may turn to the scene of suyayinvara, or bridgroom selection by the Vidyarthia princess, Indumati, which has been set forth in Canto VI of the Rāghuvaṃśa. Sunandā, the maid, takes her from one prince to another who had gathered in the assembly hall. But who is the very first prince to whom Indumati is introduced? He is the ruler of Magadha which is thus accorded the place of honour. This would not have been possible if Kālidāsa had flourished in the sixth century, as by that time Magadha had lost all its importance. About its king, again, it is said that although there were kings by thousands, the earth was said to be under good rule through him alone.¹ And we are further informed about him that Indra was being continuously invited to the sacrificial performances of this king at Pushpapura, which never ended.² As Sanskrit poets are noted for double entendre in many of their verses, this continuance of sacrificial rites most probably refers to Samudragupta who celebrated the Aśvamēdhia, and the Indra invited to attend them is most likely his own son Chandragupta II, whose another name, we have seen, was Dēvarāja, a synonym of Indra. This inference seems to receive some confirmation from the fact that the king mentioned immediately after that of Magadha is the ruler of Aṅga,³ about whom the remark is made that in him dwelt together the goddess of learning and the goddess of wealth although they had naturally discrepant abodes.⁴ This description can suit Chandragupta best. We have pointed out above that in inscriptions he is described as pratigrihitā or ‘selected for succession’ by his father. This means that he was Tuvarāja for some time. And the province that had been ear-marked for Yuvarājaship in the Gupta period was Tirabhukti whose headquarters then was Vaiśāli, as is clear from the seals found at Basār which is the modern representative of that place. And this was but natural, because Vaiśāli was the capital of the Lichchhavis with whose help Chandragupta I, as has been shown before, rose to political power. While the Gupta sovereign sat on the throne of Pāñjaliputra, the heir-apparent, to begin with, ruled at Vaiśāli then included in Tirabhukti which practically coincided with the Aṅga country. It is quite possible that while the sacrificial rites of Samudragupta were being performed in Pushpapura, Chandragupta, the Tuvarāja, was invited to his father’s capital to witness them. This is not unlike what took place in the time of Pushyamitra, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty, who, when he celebrated the Aśvamēdhia sacrifice, invited there his son Agnimitra who was then stationed as Viceroy at Vidiśa, as Kālidāsa tells us in the Mālavākāśamīttra. Some such references to the contemporaneous Gupta monarchs are traceable in the Rāghuvaṃśa, which, though none of them by itself is of a convincing nature,

² Rāghuvaṃśa, vi. 23.
³ Ibid., vi. 27.
⁴ Ibid., vi. 29.
produce cumulative evidence of some cogency.\(^1\) The question is very often asked: what was the birth-place of Kālidāsa? Was it Mālava or was it Kashmir? The first of these views was propounded by the late Mahāmāhya Pādhyāya Haraprasad Sastri;\(^2\) and the second by Pandit Lachmi Dhar Kalla.\(^3\) It is very difficult to decide as to who is correct. But the trend of the evidence points to the inference that Kālidāsa was a native of Mālava, that for a long time he resided in Kashmir and that explains the intimate acquaintance he displays in his writings, with that country. This strengthens Bhai Daji’s suggestion that Mātrigupta who, according to the Rājatarangini was sent by Vikramāditya to rule over Kashmir, was but another name of Kālidāsa.

The only argument that can be urged against this inference is that Kshēmendra, a native of Kashmir, distinguishes between Mātrigupta and Kālidāsa in his Ausōtīyavichārācharchā. But there were probably two or three different Mātriguptas, one a poet referred to by Kshēmendra, another a writer on Alampāra mentioned by Vasudeva in the Karṇāvahamāyā and a third who wrote a commentary on Bharata’s Nāyacakāra.\(^4\) That does not preclude the possibility of either Kālidāsa being confounded with Mātrigupta in the legend connected with Vikramāditya in Kashmir and narrated by Kalhaṇa, or again of Kālidāsa having borne the appellation of Mātrigupta just as Bhavabhūti bore that of Śrīkaṇṭha. What we have further to note in this connection is that the Rājatarangini mentions also a third personage who was a contemporary of Kālidāsa and Chandragupta-Vikramāditya, namely, Pravarasena II.

As Chandragupta was the imperial ruler, we can understand how Mātrigupta (=Kālidāsa) could be appointed as the governor of one province in Kashmir and his grandson Pravarasena of another as he was then a mere prince of the Vākāṭaka territory, his elder brother Divākaraṇa being then the Tuvārāja with their mother Prabhāvatigupta as queen-regent. The connection of Kālidāsa with Vikramāditya and Pravarasena did not cease here, and Kālidāsa seems in the later period to have been dispatched as Tantiṭapāla or chargé d’affaires to the Court of Pravarasena when he became king. It was in regard to his political connection that a poem came into existence with the romantic figure of Kālidāsa at the centre, entitled Kuntalāvarakāya, wrongly shortened into Kuntāvarakāya. Kuntala itself denotes the southwestern part of the Hyderabad territory which, however, came into the possession of the later Vākāṭakas so that the tradition centering round Kālidāsa was woven into the poetic composition long after his return from the Vākāṭaka court. The real author most probably flourished in the reign of some later Vākāṭaka ruler, who included into his composition a few stray verses which Kālidāsa might have uttered at both the courts—at the court of the suzerain power as state poet and state official and at the court of the vassal where he went as ambassador. Anyhow this author must have lived earlier than Rājaśekhara (10th century A.D.) as the latter quotes one verse from this poem.

It was during the period that Pravarasena was on the Vākāṭaka throne and Kālidāsa was an ambassador sent to his court by the suzerain, Chandra-Vikramāditya, that the Vākāṭaka ruler must have composed his celebrated poem Sūtabandha, also called Dalaṃkāvadha or Dāvatadhadha under the inspiration, probably with the help of Kālidāsa. Even Kalhaṇa mentions vaguely a tradition about this work of Pravarasena when he says that the latter constructed the ‘Great Bridge’ (Bṛhat-sītu) built on the Vitastā. This Bṛhat-sītu cannot be a physical construction, as understood by him and also by the translator, but must be taken to be the
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\(^1\) The scholar who first made Kālidāsa a contemporary of the Guptas is R. G. Bhandarkar (JBBRAS, Vol. XX, pp. 399-490). He was followed by M. M. Chakravarti in JRAS, 1903, pp. 183 ff. and 1904, pp. 158 ff.; and by B. C. Majumdar, ibid., 1909, pp. 731 ff.


\(^3\) The Birth-place of Kālidāsa (Delhi University Publications, No. I).

\(^4\) Aufrecht’s Catalogus Catalogorum, Pt. I, p. 448.
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well-known poem of Pravarasena, called Sītābandha. That this Pravarasena ruled over Kashmir is clear also by his coins found in that region which by their type and Gupta characters belong to a period not far removed from the time of Chandra-Vikramāditya. But Kalhana speaks also of another Pravarasena who was his grandfather. The latter is, however, described as the protector of the earth. This Pravarasena is doubtless the founder of the Vakātaka dynasty; and, as he has alone been described as samrāṭ in the records of that family, it is no wonder if his rule spread over Kashmir also. But he was not the grandfather of Pravarasena II, perhaps the grandfather of his grandfather. But as we have remarked above, the first three books of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī are in many legendary accounts with the occasional mention of historic names and incidents, which we have carefully to pick up and distinguish from the others.

Kumāragupta

Who succeeded Chandragupta II to the throne of Pātaliputra is somewhat difficult to determine. As early as 1904 a clay seal was exhumed by the late T. Bloch during his excavations at Basār, the ancient Vaiśāli (No. 13 below). It pertains to the Mahādeva Dhruvasvāminī, who is there described as wife of Mahārājadhīnājī Chandragupta and mother of Mahārāja Gōvinda-gupta. As it is a seal of the Gupta period and this Chandragupta is a Mahārājadhīnājī, he must be Chandragupta II, especially as we know from the Gupta records, that his queen was Dhruvadēvi. It is true that Dhruvadēvi is not exactly the same thing as Dhruvasvāminī. Nevertheless, that is no good ground for entertaining any doubt on the question. We have got an analogous instance in the case of the Uchchakalpa family, where the wife of Jayanātha, a prince of this feudatory family, is, in one inscription, called Muruṇḍadēvi, and, in two, Muruṇḍasvāminī. It seems that the terms dēvi and svāminī were used synonymously. There can thus remain no doubt as to the Basār seal being one of Dhruvadēvi, the chief queen of Chandragupta II. She had therefore a son named Gōvinda-gupta when the seal was issued. But why is he called Mahārāja? Along with this seal of Dhruvadēvi many others were found by Bloch during the Basār excavations which leave no doubt as to Vaiśāli having been not only the headquarters of Tirabhukti but also a seat of the Tūvarājī, at any rate, in the earlier part of the Gupta period. It will not, therefore, be unreasonable to conclude that Gōvindagupta was Tūvarāja stationed at Vaiśāli. Vaiśāli was the old capital of the Lichchhavis, and we have seen how deeply indebted Chandragupta I, the founder of the Gupta dynasty, was to this clan for his rise to political supremacy. It is therefore in the fitness of things that Vaiśāli should be the seat of the Tūvarāj government. That Gōvindagupta held some such position is shown by the fact that with his name is coupled the title Mahārāja. We may thus take it as certain that Gōvindagupta was a son of Chandragupta II and Dhruvadēvi, that he was selected as Tūvarāja and posted at Vaiśāli, and that he was expected in due course to succeed his father to the Gupta sovereignty. But whether he actually ascended the Gupta throne we do not know. On the other hand, we know of another son of Chandragupta II and Dhruvadēvi, namely, Kumāragupta I, for whom we have found many epigraphic records. We have to suppose either that Gōvindagupta died in the lifetime of his father who was therefore succeeded to the throne by Kumāragupta or that Gōvindagupta was another name of Kumāragupta. In this connection it is worth noting another inscription which speaks of Gōvindagupta in verse 4. The verse following it says: "When his lotus-like feet were touched by the heads
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5 Ibid., Vol. I, Bk. iii, verse 97.
7 A.R. ASL, 1903-04, p. 107, Nos. 4, 6, 11, 12, 20, 21, 22, 25 and 29.
of kings whose power was extinct, even the lord of the gods, overwhelmed with fear, ascended the swing of deliberation.” What the verse obviously means is that when Gōvindagupta finished conquering all enemies on earth, Indra feared that Gōvindagupta would next attack him. As Indra has thus been represented as being suspicious of Gōvindagupta’s power, it follows that the latter was a supreme ruler. But as no coins of Gōvindagupta have been found, the conclusion is irresistible that Gōvindagupta and Kumāragupta were names of the same king. This agrees with the fact, as we shall see later on, that Kumāragupta, like Samudragupta, celebrated the Horse-Sacrifice, as is clearly evidenced by their Aiwanâdhaka Type of coins, when he raised himself to the position of Supreme Ruler by carrying out world-wide conquests. This also explains why not a single coin of Gōvindagupta has been found. If any further proof is required, it is supplied by a type of coins which has on the reverse the epithet Śrī-Kramādiya and on the obverse Ku beneath the left arm of the king and Gō between his feet. If Ku has rightly been taken to stand for Kumāragupta—an inference supported by the Archer Type of that sovereign, it is not at all unreasonable to take Gō between his feet as standing for Gōvindagupta.

We may thus take it that Chandragupta II was succeeded to the Gupta throne by Kumāragupta, another name of whom was Gōvindagupta. The latest date that we have for the father is Gupta year 95 = 411-12 A.D. furnished by a Sâñchî inscription, and the earliest for the son and successor is Gupta year 96 = 414-15 A.D. The latter could not have become a sovereign much earlier than 414 A.D. Again, the latest date for Kumāragupta I, known from inscriptions is Gupta year 129 = 447-48 A.D. supplied by the Mankuwar stone image. But as early as 1894, V. A. Smith drew our attention to a coin in the possession of Vost which gave the latest date for this king, namely Gupta year 136 = 454-55 A.D.1 On the other hand, the earliest date for his son Skandagupta is Gupta year 136 given by the celebrated Junâgâdh rock inscription. It is, therefore, reasonable to hold that Kumâragupta ruled from ‘Gupta year 96 to Gupta year 136’, or, in other words, that he had enjoyed a reign of at least forty years.

Many copper-plate inscriptions, not of the nature of ordinary royal grants, but representing a peculiar type of land sale deed between the State and the lay purchaser have been discovered in North Bengal. Three of these are dated in the reign of Kumâragupta I. Of these, one was found at Dhanâidaha (No. 19 below) in the Rajshahi District (now in Bangladesh) and the other two at Dâmâdarpur (Nos. 22 and 24 below) in the Dinajpur District, West Bengal. The Dhanâidaha plate is in such a fragmentary condition that it has to be restored in the light of the Dâmâdarpur plates. The three couple with the name of the king the paramount titles Paramâdiya, Paramabhaṭṭâraka and Mahârâjâdhirâja. The first component of this royal formulary is noteworthy, namely, Paramâdiya, which clearly indicates that in the Gupta period the king was identified with the supreme divinity.2 The Dhanâidaha plate is dated Gupta year 113. And although the name of Kumâragupta has not been preserved, the date clearly shows that his name has disappeared in the lost portion of the plate. It seems that some Âyuktâka Officer, whose name ended in -vishyam approached certain Brâhmaṇas and the Asha-kul-âdikaraṇa of the village for the purchase of some land at the rate prevalent in the District (vishyam) of Khâdâ (tâ?)pâra. His application was complied with, and he in turn made a grant of it to a Chhândoga or Sâmâvedin Brâhmaṇa called Varâhasvâmin. Of the Dâmâdarpur plates of Kumâragupta, one is dated 124, and the other, 128. In both the years, the province (bhâkta) of Puṇḍravardhana was being administered by Chirâttadatta who was

appointed Uparika or Governor thereof by the Emperor himself. The Governor, in his turn, appointed Kumārnāṭya Vētravārmā to administer the court of the town along with four other officials, namely, the Nagara-śreṣṭhīn Dhṛitipāla, the Sārthavāha Bandhumitra, the Praitha-Kukka Dhṛitimitra and the Praitha-Kīyasiṣṭha Śambapāla. It is to this town kachēri that a Brāhmaṇa called Karpatikā applied for one kulyavāpa, that is, a strip of land where one kula of seed could be sown, land, again, which could be held in perpetuity according to the nīvī law, i.e., in lieu of the sum given for it, namely, three dināras. The land was bought for the purpose of the performance of his Agnihūtra rites. It was waste land, unploughed and not yielding (any produce). The record keepers (Pustapālas) Rūsidatta, Jayanandī and Vibhudatta went into the case and fixed upon some land north-west of Dölga, which was thus sold to the Brāhmaṇa. The second plate, which is dated Gupta year 128, mentions exactly the same officials from the Uparika down to the Pustapālas.

Unfortunately, the name of the Brāhmaṇa who made an application for the land is not decipherable. What seems preserved here is that he wanted and secured for the performance of his pāṇcha-mahāyajñas, two drōgas of land in the western quarter in a waterless region (āvārāvatā), devoid of all cattle, but the land was furnished with drinking-places (pañaka) and water-drawing wheels (araṅgaṭṭa).

Another important plate1 of this date, namely, of Gupta year 128, is the one found at Baiğrām in the Bogra District, West Bengal. It is doubtless of the time of Kūmaragupta though the name of the emperor is not mentioned. Nor is the name of the Uparika or Provincial Governor specified. The charter commences with the orders, issued by the Kumārnāṭya Kulaṇīrdhī of Pañchanagarī and the Adhibhāna or Court of the District (visaya) called thereafter, to the village officials, of Trīvṛtē and Śrīgohāli connected with Vāyigrām (Baiğrām). Here Kulaṇīrdhī is spoken of as meditating on the feet of the Bhaṭṭārakā, that is, the sovereign, who, in this case, must be Kūmaragupta I. And it seems that Pañchanagarī was the name not only of the District but also of its headquarters. Bhōyīla of Trīvṛtē and Bhāskara of Śrīgohāli, we are told, applied to this court for three kulyavāpas and two drōgaṇavāpas to help them to make an endowment to defray the expenses of flowers, perfumery, frankincense and so forth for daily worship in, and of occasional repairs to, the temple of Gōvindasāmin, which was founded by their father Śivanandī. The land was granted on the receipt of six dināras and eight rūpakas. This is the value of three kalyavāpas and two drōgas. The price of one kulyavāpa is expressly stated as two dināras; and one kulyavāpa, we know, was equivalent to eight drōgas. It thus seems that in the Gupta period, one dināra was equivalent to sixteen rūpakas, just as one guinea was to sixteen rupees up till some time ago, when normal circumstances prevailed in India. Rūpaka has several meanings. One meaning is simply 'a coin', that is, any coin. In that sense occur such terms as swaṇār-ṛūpaka and svāṇa-ṛūpaka, both in the Rājarāgiṣṭha and in the Kālsthariśagara.2 It is also used in the sense of 'a silver coin', corresponding to the Hindi Rupee and the English 'Rupee'. An inscription originally found at Bijāpūr in the Gōvārī Division of the erstwhile Jodhpur State and dated 997 A.D., speaks of three different types of coins, rūpaka, viṣṭōpaka and karsha while recording benefactions to a Jain temple.3 Of what metal the viṣṭōpaka was made is doubtful. But there can be no doubt as to rūpaka and karsha being made of silver and copper respectively. It thus appears that in the Gupta period two types of coins were prevalent in Bengal, the gold dināra and the silver rūpaka.

It is true that the three copper-plate inscriptions just adverted to are deeds of sale and register the purchase, by private individuals, of fallow and uncultivated land, belonging to the
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1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, pp. 81 ff.
State. Nevertheless, it is worthy of note that they are connected with Brahmanism; because, the land in each case was bought for settling down Brâhmanas in the extreme north of Bengal and enabling them to perform either the Agnihótra or pâneha-mahâyajña rites.¹ There are many other Brahmanic records of the time of Kumáragupta which throw light on the developments of his reign. The earliest of these (No. 16 below) is engraved on a pillar found at Bilsad in Etah District in Uttar Pradesh and is dated "in the ninety-sixth year of the increasingly victorious (Gupta) rule (ahkhiradhamāna-vijaya-rājya-sahevatāra) pertaining to the prosperous Kumáragupta (I), the Mahârajâdhirâja." It records that one Dhrusârman constructed a prātîli or gateway, established a sattra or alms-house and erected the column in question, in connection with a temple of the god Svâmi-Mahâśâna. Then there are two partly broken stone inscriptions (Nos. 17 and 26 below) found at Gaḍhâwâ in the Allahabad District which also refer themselves to the reign of Kumáragupta I. Both of them were originally dated, but the year in one of them is not preserved, whereas that in the other is Gupta year 98. This last records the gift of twelve dinâras for the maintenance of a sattra or alms-house, apparently, to a Brâhmana belonging to the community of Sadâsattras. The other inscription, the year of which has been effaced, seems to record two gifts, one of ten dinâras for the maintenance of a sattra and apparently to a Brâhmana of the same community. There are two more Gaḍhâwâ inscriptions² which also speak of endowments made to other sattras. And as this place was thus studded with many such alms-houses, it naturally came to be known as Sadâsattras or Perpetual Alms-house, and the Brâhmanas thereof as Sadâsattasāmânya, that is, as pertaining to the Community of Sadâsattras.'

There are two more Brahmanic inscriptions of the time of Kumáragupta of which we have to take cognisance. They were found in the western part of Mâlwâ. They are of particular interest inasmuch as they belong to a family of his feudatory chiefstains that ruled over that part of Central India. The first of these³ was found at Gaṅgdhâr in the erstwhile Jehalawar State, Rajputana, and is of the time of a prince called Viśvavarmman, who was either a son or younger brother of Naravarman whose inscriptions dated Vikrama 461 and 474 we have noted in our account of Chandragupta II's reign, and, who, it is all but certain, was a feudatory of that Gupta monarch. The date of the Gaṅgdhâr record is not happily worded, but, it seems, it is dated in the Krita year 488 (expired). As the year has been called Krita, it has to be taken as a Vikrama year. It is thus equivalent to 431-32 A.D. expired and must be taken to belong to the reign of Kumáragupta, though his name has not been specified. The inscription then records the fact that a personage called Mayûrâksha, who apparently pertained to the bonia caste and was an able minister of Kumáragupta I, executed many charitable works at Gargaraṭapura, doubtless Gaṅgdhâr also called Gaṅgrâd. He had two sons, Viśhubhaṭa and Hari-bhaṭa, who were engaged in business and who, at the instance of their father, constructed a temple of Vishnu, whereas Mayûrâksha himself built an edifice of the Divine Mothers, full of female ghouls (dâkini), and also a large drinking step-well. The next inscription (No. 35 below) which we have to notice was originally found at Mandasôr, though it is now deposited in the State Museum, Gwalior. Fortunately for us, it refers itself to the reign of Kumáragupta I, and also speaks of his feudatory Bandhuvarman, as protecting Daśapura. Bandhuvarman is described as a son of Viśvavarmman, no doubt, the son or younger brother of Naravarman as we learn from the Gaṅgdhâr record. Bandhuvarman doubtless pertained to the family of feudatories ruling in Daśapura. The record bears two dates, one the year 493 and the other the year 529. The first of these years is the date of the consecration of a temple of the Sun constructed by

¹ ARORI, Vol. XII, p. 113.
² No. 8 below and CIL, Vol. III, 1888, No. 64, pp. 264 ff.
a guild of silk-weavers who originally belonged to the Lāṭa country but who afterwards migrated to Daśapura and settled down there. While Kumāragupta was ruling over the earth and Bandhuvarman was a prince of Daśapura, the guild, we are told, built and consecrated the Sun temple which was standing in the western ward of Daśapura, "when four centuries, increased by ninety-three, had elapsed, according to the reckoning of the Mālavas", showing that the date was a Vikrama year and was thus equivalent to 436-37 A.D. The inscription then informs us that when a considerable time had elapsed, and also other kings had passed, "one part of the temple was shattered", apparently through lightning, and the same Guild renovated it in the year 529. The inscription closes by telling us that there was one Vatsabhaṭṭi, who not only looked after the work of building and rebuilding the temple but also composed the draft of the record.

The next record that we have to notice chronologically is that dated Gupta year 116 (No. 20 below) and found at Tumain in the Guna District of the erstwhile Gwalior State, nearly forty miles west of ERAJ, the ancient Airikīna, situated in the Sagar District of Madhya Pradesh. Unfortunately, the proper right half of the inscription is gone. Nevertheless, what has been preserved of it is of great importance. It refers first to Chandragupta II in line 1, and then speaks in line 2 of his son, Kumāragupta who is there compared to Mahēndra. In line 3 mention is made of Ghaṭōtakachagupta who is represented as having inherited the inherent powers of his ancestors. And the immediately next line specifies the date 116 and refers it to the reign, not of Ghaṭōtakachagupta mentioned in the preceding line, but of Kumāragupta. The conclusion is almost irresistible that Ghaṭōtakachagupta was a son of Kumāragupta, who was then in charge of the Airikīna District. That there was one Ghaṭōtakachagupta, not far removed from the time of Chandragupta I, is clear from his seal (No. 27 below) found at Basārh, the ancient Vaśāli. We will consider this matter at greater length shortly. But here we will finish our short notice of the Tumain inscription by saying that the object of it is to record the construction of a temple, apparently of Pānākin (Śiva), at Tumbavana (Tumain) by certain brothers of a family which was settled there but which originally hailed from Vaṭādaka, famous as a settlement of Sādhus or merchants.

Another piece of historical information for the same reign is furnished by an inscription (No. 21 below) dated Gupta year 117 and engraved on a tiṅga from Bharādhi Dih near Kārāmdānā, 12 miles from Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh. It registers a benefaction by Prithivīshēṇa, son of Chandragupta’s Mantri-Kumārāmāya Śikharavāmin, who was the son of Vishṇupālita-Bhāṭṭa, son of Kumāravāyabhāṭṭa, of the Chhandogas and of the Āśva-Vājin gōtra. Prithivīshēṇa has been described, like his father, as Mantri-Kumārāmāya, not, however, of Chandragupta II, but of Kumāragupta I. But at the time when the benefaction was made, he was Mahābalādhikṛiti. The benefaction was made for the worship of Mahādēva, known as Prithivīśvara, apparently, the tiṅga of our inscription founded by and named after Prithivīṣeṇa. The portion of the inscription, which recorded the object thereof, is not well preserved, but what remains shows that the donces were some Brahmāṇas from Ayōḍhyā, connected with Mahādēva Śailēsvara, who appears to be the principal deity of the religious settlement. The Brahmāṇas belonged to different gōtras and charanas and were proficient in their penances, Vedic recitation, mantras, sūtras, bhashyas and so forth. The benefaction was made to enable them to perform some duties in connection with the dēvāṅgī at Bhārači, which apparently is the same as Bharādhi Dih, the place where the tiṅga was found. And it seems that the money grant contributed by Prithivīṣeṇa by way of endowment was deposited in the treasury houses of the principal divinity Śailēsvara.

So far in regard to the Brahmanic inscriptions of the time of Kumāragupta. But there are at least five inscriptions of his time which are of a non-Brahmanic character. Of these, two are
Jaina and three Buddhist. Of the former, one is dated Gupta year 107 (No. 18 below). It is
engraved on the base of an image of a large sitting Jina, originally unearthed in the Karīkālī
Tīḷā at Mathurā and now deposited in the Provincial Museum at Lucknow. The inscription
was first deciphered by Bühler who read the date as 113 (?). But the date is clearly 107 and
mentions the twentieth day of the intercalary month Śrāvaṇa. It is thus equivalent to the
English year 426-27 when Śrāvaṇa was an additional month. It further records that the Jina
image was set up by Śāmādhya, daughter of Bhaṭṭībhava and wife of Guhāmitrapālīta, who
was a Prātrārīka (=Prātārika), apparently a lapidary. The second of the Jaina inscriptions3 is
dated Gupta year 106. And, although it does not refer itself to the reign of any king, there can
be no doubt that it must belong to the time of Kumāragupta I. It is engraved in Cave No. 10
of Udayagiri near Bhīlsa. The object thereof is to record the installation of an image of the
Jina Pārśva, that is, the Tirthaṅkara Pārśvanātha, at the mouth of the cave, by a Jaina monk,
whose religious name is not given, but who was a pupil of the teacher Gōśarman, himself
descended from the teacher Bhadra. The secular name of the donor was Śaṅkara, and we are
told that he was a son of Saṅghila-Ripugha through Paṃmavaṭi. We are further told that he
hailed from some country in the north which was as exquisite as that of the Northern Kuras.

Of the three Buddhist inscriptions of the time of Kumāragupta, one is engraved on the
front of the pedestal of a seated image of the Buddha originally found in Mankuwar in the
Allahabad District, but now deposited in the State Museum, Lucknow. It is dated Gupta
year 129 and refers itself to the reign of this sovereign (No. 25 below). It records the installa-
tion of the Buddha image by a Bhikṣu named Buddhāmitra whom the late K. B. Pathak identi-
fied with a Bhikṣu of the same name, who was the teacher of Vasubandhu, whose patrons,
according to Paramārtha, were Skandagupta-Vikramāditya and Narasimhabhagupta-Bālanditya.
In this record Kumāragupta has been styled simply Mahārāja, not Mahārājādhirāja, as has
been done in other inscriptions. Fleet indulges in the surmise that this possibly points to the
king’s reduction to the feudal rank, about the close of his life, caused by the rebellion of the
Pushyamitras and the inroads of the Hūnas adverted to in the Bhītarī epigraph of Skanda-
gupta (No. 31 below). But this is most unlikely as these political disturbances took place, not
in his, but in his successor’s reign, as we will see later on. Nor are the titles always a safe cri-
terion to the rank of a ruler. During the Kushāṇa period the titles attached to the name of a
sovereign are Mahārāja and Rājāśishṭa. As the latter signifies ‘King over kings’, the former must
be taken to mean ‘the great king’. It is in this sense that the title Mahārāja appears to have
been coupled with the name of Kumāragupta. The other two Buddhist inscriptions do not
refer themselves to the reign of this Gupta monarch. Nevertheless, from the dates, they have
to be assigned to his time. One of these,2 dated Gupta year 131, refers to three different granus
by a Buddhist Upāṭikā, named Harisvāmini, wife of Upāṣaka Sanasiddha, made to the Arya-
Śaṅgha at the Great Buddhist Convent of Kākanadāṇa near the great Śūpa at Sānci, for
the purpose of feeding one Bhikṣu daily and for maintaining lamps in the Rāma-grīha and in
front of the seats of the Four Buddhas. The third Buddhist inscription3 is from Mathurā and is
incised on the pedestal of an image which was itself presented by one Dēvātā, who describes
herself as Viṭhāravāminī or ‘Lady Superintendent of Viṭhāṇa’. It is dated Gupta year 135 (=453-
54 A.D.), and probably belongs to the end of Kumāragupta’s reign as one coin of his gives 136
as a date for him.

The coins of Kumāragupta throw light also on the titles or epithets he bore. The most
pre-eminent of this was Mahāndra which was to him what Vikrama was to Chandragupta II,

2 Ibid., No. 62, pp. 260 ff.
3 Ibid., No. 63, pp. 262 ff.
and Parākrama to Samudragupta. Many combinations were formed out of Mahendrā as they were out of Vikrama and Parākrama. Thus, like Vyāghra-Parākrama of Samudragupta or Śīnha-Vikrama of Chandragupta, we have Śīnha-Mahendrā for Kumāragupta on the Lion-slayer Type. But what is noteworthy is that this Śīnha-Mahendrā is sometimes found reversed into Mahendrā-Śīnha, showing clearly again that it is a karmanḍhāraṇya compound, signifying that Kumāragupta is here described as “Mahendrā who is also Lion”. Further, what is strange is that he adopts the upamāna not only of Chandragupta II, but also of Samudragupta. Thus, he is styled not only Śīnha-Vikrama but also Vyāghrāvala-Parākrama on some coins. This does not mean that he was a more powerful king or a more daring sportsman than any one of these predecessors. It may be that he carried on his hunting exploits sometimes in the Gir forest of Kāṭhiāwar and sometimes in the Sunderban jungles of Bengal. The case is, however, different in regard to the Aśvamēdha Type struck by him. This is almost an exact imitation of the Aśvamēdha Type issued by Samudragupta. On the obverse there is a horse wearing breast-band and saddle and facing a yūpa or sacrificial pole, on an altar, carrying pennons, which float over the horse. On the reverse there is queen, nimbate, facing the sacrificial spear bound with fillets and holding chowrie on her shoulder. This celebration of Aśvamēdha, as in the case of Samudragupta, must be taken as an indication of the rank of Śārva-khauna, attained by Kumāragupta. And we have already seen that in an inscription\(^1\) Indra is represented as being suspicious of Gōvindagupta, another name of whom was Kumāragupta, and that the latter must therefore be taken to have become a supreme ruler. In this connection, we have to note another type of his coins called the Peacock Type, on the obverse of which the king stands, nimbate, feeding a peacock from a bunch of fruit with a legend ending with Mahendrā-Kumāra and on the reverse Kāṭṭikēya, riding on the peacock and holding a spear over his shoulder and with the name Mahendrā-Kumāra affixed to it. Anybody who studies this type carefully will be convinced that here the king is actually identified with Kumāra or Kāṭṭikēya. Both on the obverse and the reverse it is not any mortal king that is figuring, but rather the god Kāṭṭikēya feeding the peacock on one side and riding his vehicle on the other. It seems that the original name of the king was Gōvinda but that, being invincible in his fights with the enemies, he was taken to be identical with the god Kumāra and was thenceforth known by that epithet just as the son and successor of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III was known only by the epithet Amōghavarsa.\(^2\) That the king was known for his world-conquests and that his was a glorious reign is indicated also by the great variety in his silver coins which “forms a striking contrast to the scarcity of his father’s silver coinage.” “Not only was the coinage of silver in the west considerably extended . . ., but he also introduced a silver coinage for the first time to the central provinces of the Gupta dominions” (the Ganges Valley), as John Allan has correctly remarked.\(^3\) They bear a superficial resemblance to the Kshatrapa prototype, and display great originality of treatment, not the least important feature of which is the discarding of the representation of Gāruḍa, the family symbol in favour of a peacock standing facing with wings and tail outspread, an allusion, no doubt, to Kumāra (=Kāṭṭikēya) with whom the king is completely identified. This accords with the fact that the Vaishnava legend, in which the epithet Paramabhāganāta prominently occurs in his silver coinage in the west, is discarded in favour of the boast of victory recorded in verse on the gold Archer and Horseman Types in which the epithet Kumāragupta is prominently mentioned.

Kumāragupta had at least two sons. One was Ghatotkachagupta who was apparently in charge of Tumbavana, Tumain, in Gupta year 116 (=434-35 A.D.) in the lifetime of his

---

\(^1\) *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 12 ff.


\(^3\) *Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty*, Intro., p. 349, line 10.
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father (No. 20 below). Another was Skandagupta known to us from many inscriptions and coins. Perhaps a third was Purugupta, known from the Bhitari and Nālandā seals (Nos. 46 and 45 below). We, however, know the name of only one queen of his, namely, Ananta triumph, mother of Purugupta. Whether Skandagupta is identical with Purugupta is a point which we will discuss when we treat of the former. Among the officers of his reign we have to take note, in the first place, of Prithivishena, son of Śikharasvamin who was Māntri-Kumārāṃa to Chandragupta II. Prithivishena like his father was at first Māntri-Kumārāṃa but afterwards became Mahā-balādīśvara and was so in Gupta year 117 when inscription No. 21 below was engraved. The Dāmūdarupur plates (Nos. 22 and 24 below) also speak of two or more of his officers. One was Chirātadatta who was the Uparika or Governor of the Pundravardhana Province (bhūkta) and the other was the Kumārāṃa Vetravarman who was put by the former in charge of the City Court of Kōṭivarsha.

Ghaṭotkachagupta and Skandagupta-Purugupta

Many scholars are of opinion that Kumāragupta began his reign peacefully and gloriously but that it ended in disaster. There is, however, no evidence in support of this conclusion, which is based on a wrong interpretation of certain passages in Skandagupta’s inscriptions. This point we will discuss shortly, but, in the meanwhile, let us see who actually succeeded Kumāragupta. The Tumain inscription of Kumāragupta (No. 20 below) speaks not only of this Gupta sovereign but also of one Ghaṭotkachagupta who apparently was his son and governor of Airikīna (Eran) and gives Gupta year 116 as a date for both. In this connection we have also to take note of the fact that a clay seal of Ghaṭotkachagupta (No. 27 below) was found at Basāḍh along with that of Govindagupta (No. 13 below). We have already seen that Govindagupta was the name of Kumāragupta before he became irresistible and invulnerable in his battles and was, for that reason, identified with god Kumāra and came thenceforth to be styled Kumāragupta after that divinity. We have also seen that Vaisali, the old capital of the Lichchhavis, was the seat of the Yuvārāja or Crown-Prince in the early Gupta period. That was the reason why the seal of Govindagupta (=Kumāragupta) was discovered at Basāḍh (=Vaisali). We can proceed one step further and say that as a seal of Ghaṭotkachagupta also was found at Basāḍh, Ghaṭotkachagupta seems similarly to have been raised to the dignity of the Yuvārāja soon after Gupta year 116 when he was Governor of Airikīna and was, for that reason, posted at Vaisali, the traditional seat of the Gupta Crown-Prince. The question that now arises is whether he ever became a king. Unfortunately, no inscription referring itself to his reign has yet come to light. Nevertheless, a coin of Ghaṭotkachagupta from the St. Petersberg collection is well-known. It is true that on the ground of the style and weight Allan places it about the end of the fifth century A.D. Unfortunately, however, although he makes this remark in the Introduction of his classical work, the actual Catalogue of Coins does not specify the weight of the coin in question. And so far as we can see, the style does not differ essentially from that of Skandagupta’s coins, as may be seen from a comparison of Plate XXIV, 3 with Plate XIX. Besides, as the last date of Kumāragupta is Gupta year 136 = 454-55 A.D., which is not far removed from about the end of the fifth century A.D., we cannot say that on numismatic grounds a difference of even fifteen years is discernible between coins of two almost contiguous members of the same royal family. That would be like an epigraphist detecting with a palaeographic microscope a similar tiny letter of time between two inscriptions. We may thus safely take it that Ghaṭotkachagupta of the Tumain inscription, of the Basāḍh

2 Ibid., p. 149.
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seal and of the coin from the St. Petersburg collection was one and the same person—the prince who was Governor at first of Airikipa, Yuvarāja thereafter stationed at Vaiśāli and the successor to the Gupta throne after the demise of his father Kumāragupta.

But the extreme paucity of Ghaṭotkachagupta’s coins shows that his was a very brief reign. And this is supported by the fact that the latest date for Kumāragupta is Gupta year 136 supplied by a coin and that the same is the earliest date for Skandagupta furnished by the Junaṅgadhi inscription. What could be the cause of this brief reign of Ghaṭotkachagupta? Our most important documents for the history of this period are the Bhitari (No. 31 below) and Junaṅgadhi (No. 32 below) epigraphs of Skandagupta. From certain statements in these records, scholars have argued that Kumāragupta’s last years were much troubled. As a matter of fact, they should have argued on this evidence that the fortunes of the family had sunk to a low level, not in the reign of his father, but, rather, of his immediate successor. Let us examine this evidence more searchingly. There are three distinct allusions to this historical fact in the Bhitari inscription. From the first half of stanza 4 we learn that while he was “intent upon steadying the tottering Fortune of the House, several nights were spent (by him) on the bed, namely, the earth.” The second half of this stanza is taken by scholars as containing a reference to the enemies who had reduced him to those straits, namely, the Pushyamitrās. That was no doubt supported by the reading of Fleet, namely, Pushyamitrās = cha jītvā. Bhagwanlal, however, reads Pushyamitrās = cha jītvā. Some time ago, the reading = Taddh = amitrās = cha was suggested on grounds of plausibility by H. R. Divekar. The damaged condition of the stone does not enable us to arrive at any definite reading. Nevertheless, the ink-impressions supplied to us establish Divekar’s reading as far more probable than that of Fleet or Bhagwanlal Indrajit. In fact, they show that this reading is as good as certain. It is true that the existence of the Pushyamitrās is attested by both a Mathurā Jaina inscription and the Purāṇas. Nevertheless, it is highly strange that such an insignificant clan as the Pushyamitrās should all at once rise to such eminence as to dominate Gupta supremacy for a while, only to sink into perennial oblivion thereafter. We may therefore take it that what stanza 4 of the Bhitari inscription records is only that when the Fortune of his dynasty was for a time at its lowest ebb, Skandagupta had to spend some nights sleeping on the bare earth. The second reference to this historical fact supplies better information contained in stanza 6 which tells us that when he re-established the Fortune of the Dynasty which had turned adrift when his father had repaired to Heaven, he saw his mother who was in tears just as Kṛṣṇa approached Dēvakī when he had slain his foe. If the comparison of Skandagupta and his mother to Kṛṣṇa and Dēvaki has any meaning at all, the foe that had arisen against the Gupta power and made it totter to its foundations was some relative of his through his mother, presumably her brother. In this connection we have to take note of another document of his reign, namely, the Junaṅgadhi inscription. The second half of stanza 2 of this record says that “he forged an order with an effigy, namely, Garaḍa, which rendered devoid of poison, the Serpent (bhujaga) Rulers, who had uplifted their hoods in pride and arrogance.” As bhujaga is synonymous with Nāga, both meaning ‘a serpent’, and as royal families of the name of Nāga were in existence in the Gupta period, and as, further, Garaḍa was an insignia or signet of the Gupta dynasty, the conclusion is irresistible that there was a rebellion set up by some Nāga rulers which Skandagupta quelled. Further, we know that some Nāgas were related to the Guptas. Thus one queen of Chandragupta II was Kubēra-Nāgā, who, we are explicitly informed, was of the Nāga family. His son Kumāragupta may similarly have been married to a Nāga princess from whom Skandagupta was born. This line of reasoning can alone explain why Skandagupta

1 JBBRAS., Vol. XVI, p. 349, line 10.
is represented on the one hand as impressing his Guruja signet on the Nágas and on the other as repairing to his mother in tears just as Kṛishṇa did to Dēvāki after he had laid low his enemy. It seems that on the demise of Kumāragupta, Ghaṭotkacha occupied the Gupta throne. But hardly had he ascended the throne when the Nágas raised the standard of revolt with such virulence and ruthlessness that the fortunes of the Gupta dynasty sank to the lowest level. Ghaṭotkacha was probably killed and his brother Skandagupta who had stood by him had to flee and sleep some nights on the bare earth. Soon, however, he triumphed over all difficulties and was able to re-establish the Gupta supremacy which had for a time been rudely shaken. There is, however, nothing in any of his inscriptions to show that Kumāragupta’s reign had a tragic end. All that has been mentioned in this connection in the records of Skandagupta is that the Gupta power was tottering when his father had passed away. That does not mean that Kumāragupta’s last years were troubled. It can also very well mean that the fortunes of the family ebbed away shortly after his death when Ghaṭotkachagupta came to the throne, and were not restored till Skandagupta made himself supreme.

The Bhna pillar inscription furnishes us with another item of historical importance connected with the reign of Skandagupta. Stanza 8 thereof describes the terrific conflict into which he came with the Hūnas. Unfortunately the stanza is very much mangled and further details, if any, which it contained have been lost. With this may, however, be compared the information contained in stanza 4 of the Junāgadh rock inscription (No. 28 below), which says: “And, moreover, he alone has conquered, whose fame enemies proclaim (being caused to return) to the Mlechcha countries, with (their) pride broken down to the very root.” This is a clear reference to the Hūnas, because, so far as we know, they alone could be the Mlechchas who invaded the Gupta territory but were forced to return to their Mlechcha home. This inscription contains three dates, namely, Gupta years 136, 137 and 138. It thus seems that the Hūnas were defeated and repulsed at least before Gupta year 138=456-57 A.D. when the inscription was engraved. When there is a rebellion inside a kingdom, that affords a most suitable opportunity for outside powers to encroach upon the neighbouring territory. In many cases the insurgent chiefs themselves seek the help of foreign rulers. It is quite possible that the malcontent Nāga chieftain himself invited the Hūna monarch to come to his succour. The result, to begin with, was certainly disastrous, as Ghaṭotkacha appears to have been killed and Gupta supremacy to have been tottering to its foundations. Skandagupta, however, true to his Gupta heritage, rose to the occasion, put down the Nāga rebellion and drove the Hūnas back to their own territory. But where were the Hūnas settled about this time? While describing the conquests of Rāguha, Kālidāsa, who was a contemporary of Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I, says that his hero marched against the northern region where his horses rested on the banks of the Vaṅkhū (Oxus), where saffron was grown and where he vanquished and killed the Hūna king, the inmates of whose harem had therefore to lacerate their cheeks.1


Thus according to Kshirasvāmin, the country described in the Raghuvansha, IV, 66-68, is Vahlkadeśa or Bactria, watered by the Vaṅkhū or Oxus. It was this province which the Hūnas were occupying in the time of Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I, when the Raghuvansha was composed by Kālidāsa. It was from this region that the Hūnas rushed forth and

"Dudhura=vaṭinaḥ skandhām=lagña-kuṅkumā-kesārān"
made their sally upon the Gupta dominions soon after the demise of Kumāragupta. Skandagupta, however, repelled their attacks and forced them to retire to their original tract of country.

In this connection it seems desirable to say a few words about Purugupta or rather Pūrugupta as he is clearly called on one of the two seals (Nos. 45 and 46 below) of his grandson Kumāragupta III, and, above all, to discuss whether he was separate from or identical with Skandagupta. On both the seals Purugupta is represented as being a son of Kumāragupta I through Anandadēvi. As Chandragupta II had another appellation, namely, Dēvagupta, and Kumāragupta had Gōvindagupta, there is nothing to preclude us from holding that Skandagupta also had another appellation, namely, Purugupta. But for a long time there was difficulty in the acceptance of the identification, because Allan had described one Archer Type of Gupta coins as belonging to a king whose name he read as Purugupta on the obverse and Śrī-Vikrama on the reverse. As R. D. Banerji has correctly said, “in the coinage of the Imperial Gupta dynasty there is not a single instance in which two personal names of the same emperor have been used on his coinage”.

As there was thus one Gupta prince who called himself Skandagupta on some coins and another who called himself Purugupta on others, the two could not possibly be identified till 1935, when Sarasvati Saraswatī for the first time correctly pointed out that the legend read as Pura by Allan, as a matter of fact, was either Busha or Budha, and that as sha after Bu was meaningless, the correct reading must be taken to be Budha especially as the existence and imperial position of Budhagupta was attested by Gupta inscriptions. And this conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that this reading alone would assign some coins to Budhagupta who had hitherto none at all assigned to him by the numismatists although he was an Imperial Gupta ruler and reigned for a pretty long time. As there are thus no coins attributable to Purugupta, nothing prevents our identifying him with Skandagupta for whom coins have been found in numbers, just as Dēvagupta and Gōvindagupta who have no coins ascribed to them can be identified with Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I respectively whose coins are numerous and varied.

Besides, if this identification of Purugupta with Skandagupta is once accepted, it simplifies the chronology of the later Imperial Guptas. Thus the last known date for Skandagupta is Gupta year 146. For Kumāragupta II we have Gupta year 154, for Budhagupta dates ranging from 157 to 175, for Vainyagupta 188, for Bhānagupta 191, and so forth and so on. It is then quite natural to take Kumāragupta who issued the Bhitari and Nālandā seals as the grandson of Skandagupta. If we, however, take Skandagupta and Purugupta as two separate brother kings we are forced to cramp three reigns of three generations within a period of eleven years, that is, between Gupta year 146 and 157. If, on the other hand, we take Skandagupta and Purugupta as two names of one and the same Gupta king, it is not cumbrous to accommodate two reigns, namely, of Narasimhagupta and his son Kumāragupta, within that period.

We possess a number of records of Skandagupta’s reign, two of which are most important from the political point of view. They are the Bhitari pillar and the Junāgadh rock inscriptions. What light they throw on the political history of the beginning of Skandagupta’s reign has already been pointed out. Let us now examine what further information they give us. The purport of the first of these epigraphs is to record the installation of an image of Śarīṅgīn (Vishnu) which would be a monument (kirthi) to his father Kumāragupta. Unfortunately the last line of verse 10 of this record has been effaced. But, if the restoration proposed by us is accepted, the god so installed was named Kumāravāmin after him. Skandagupta also granted a village for the maintenance of the shrine and thus for the augmentation of the spiritual

merit of his father. There can be no doubt that this spot was hallowed with the memory of Kumāragupta. This may be seen also from the fact that numerous bricks inscribed with his name were found in the fields by Cunningham as early as 1861-62. And, in fact, the whole village of Bhitari is situated on the Gāṅgi-nādi, apparently a branch of the Ganges. That seems to be the reason why Skandagupta erected this monument to his father on this holy spot. In fact, Bhitari is studded with so many large mounds that it is not impossible that it was the mausoleum or pratima-grīha of the Gupta family. The next record that we have to consider is the Junāgaḍh rock inscription which speaks of Skandagupta as having appointed, as his governor of Surāśṭra (Kāṭhiawār), one Parṇadatta who, in turn, put his son, Chakrapālita in charge of the town, which from Rudradāman’s inscription, appears to be Girinagara. We are further told that the dam of the lake Sudarśana, which had been formed in the valley round the foot of Gīrân, near where the inscribed rock is situated, gave way on account of excessive rain on the night of the sixth day of Prausṛṭapada (August-September) in Gupta year 136 (expired) = 455-56 a.d. One cannot forget in this connection that the Sudarśana lake was first constructed by Vaśya Pushyagupta, provincial governor (rāṣṭra), under Chandragupta, the founder of the Maurya dynasty and that it was afterwards furnished with conduits by the Yavana ruler, Tushāspa, under Aśoka. During the reign of Rudradāman I and in Śaka 72 = 150 a.d. the dam burst out, but was repaired by Suvīśaka, son of Kulaipa, Palhava minister (amatiya) of that Mahākṣatrapa. In the time of Skandagupta when Parṇadatta was the governor of Surāśṭra and his son Chakrapālita was in charge of Girinagara, the dam was renewed after two months’ work in the month of Āṣāṅha in Gupta year 137 (expired) = 456-57 a.d. The Junāgaḍh rock inscription further records that in Gupta year 138 (expired), Chakrapālita built a temple of Viṣṇu named Chakrabhūtī, apparently after him, perched on Mount Ùryayat and overlooking the town.

The Bihār pillar inscription (No. 41 below) of Skandagupta’s time is highly mutilated, but it proves beyond doubt that his power remained intact over Magadhā. The first part of this epigraph records apparently the erection of the temple of Bhadrāryā attended by Skanda and the Divine Mothers and a sacrificial post—both in Skandagupta-baṣa called after him. This seems to have been an agrahāra or inām village from which different shares were apportioned to different recipients, one of whom was Anantaśena. This grant was made for the spiritual merit of the king’s parents. The second part of the inscription records the grant of a plot of land according to the law of akṣhayā-nivī. Unfortunately, it has not been at all well-preserved; otherwise it would have been interesting to compare its details with those of the Dāmōdarpur, and other land-sale documents. It refers to the village of Ajapuraka, one individual called Guhilasvāmin and the goddess called Bhadrāryyakā.

The fourth record of Skandagupta’s reign that we have to take note of is the copper-plate inscription found at Indōr in the Bulandshahr District, Uttar Pradesh. It is dated Gupta year 146 = 465-66 a.d., when the Viśayopati Šarvanâga was administering the District of Antarvvedi which here cannot denote the big province intervening between the Ganges and the Jumna as Fleet takes it, but rather the small region of Kanauj between the Ganges and the Jumna known as Antarabēda and commonly called the Dō’ab. It records that the Brāhmana Devavishnu, who was a student of Sāmakā (Chandōga) and a Chaturvedin or Chōbe of Padma connected with Chandrapura, made an endowment for the permanent maintenance of a lamp in front of the Sun god, established in the eastern ward of Indrapura (Indōr) by two Kshatriya or Khatri merchants of the same town. The money was invested in a local

2 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, pp. 6 ff.
tauli-kæra, ‘guild of oil-men’ headed by Jivanta, to enable two palas of oil being daily and perpetually supplied to the temple.

It is curious that not a single Buddhist inscription of Skandagupta has been found, but one Jaina is known, that engraved on the stone pillar found at Kãhãum (No. 29 below) in the Gorakhpur District, Uttar Pradesh. It states that in Gupta year 141, in the peaceful reign of this Gupta monarch, five images of the Jaina Tirthanikaras (pathi . . . arhatam = adi-karfin) were installed by Madra, sculptured in a lofty stone pillar in the village of Kakubha (Kãhãum). They are no doubt the five standing nude figures in the niches of this column. Madra, again, is described as affectionate towards Brãhmañas, religious preceptors (gurus) and ascetics (yatis). This shows that, though by religious persuasion he was a Jaina, he was a Hindu socially.

There is also a sixth epigraph1 which we have to note in this connection. It is dated Gupta year 148, and records the setting up of an image of Anantasvâmin (Vishnu) and the endowment of a grant. Unfortunately the ruler’s name has been effaced. But having regard to the phraseology (pravardhamâna-vijaya-râja-sahvatsara) occurring in the inscription and to the fact that the last known date of Skandagupta is Gupta year 148 read on some of his silver coins, the record in all probability pertained to the reign of this Gupta sovereign.

Successors of Skanda(Pûru)-gupta

(Chronological Adjustment)

Who succeeded Skandagupta and how they were related to him is a subject of great controversy which has given rise to many conflicting views. This much, however, is certain, that, if Pûrûgupta is identical with Skandagupta, one of his successors was surely his son, Narasimhagupta, who was in turn succeeded by his son Kumâragupta (III). This is clearly proved by the Nâlandâ clay seals (Nos. 44 and 45 below) and the Bhîtâri copper-silver seal of this last prince (No. 46 below). But several inscriptions and clay seals of other Gupta rulers of this period have been found. Thus, we have Kumâragupta (II) with the date Gupta year 154 supplied by a Sârñâth inscription (No. 34 below), and Budhagupta with dates ranging between 157 and 165 furnished by Sârñâth, Dâmôdarpur and Éran records (Nos. 36, 38 and 39 below). The other Gupta princes are Vainyagupta with the date Gupta year 188 contained in the Gunaighar plate2 and Bhânugupta with the date 191 given by the Éran stone pillar (No. 43 below). Similarly we have clay seals found at Nâlandâ not only of Narasimhagupta and his son Kumâragupta III but also of Budhagupta and Vainyagupta (Nos. 42 and 33 below). How exactly to determine the order of succession among these Gupta princes with and without their dates has become a thorny question. Perhaps, it will be better if we tackle the question beginning with the clay seal of Budhagupta picked up in the excavations at Nâlandâ. The fact that his pedigree has been set forth in exactly the same order from Mahâraja Gupta down to Kumâragupta I as in the case of the Bhîtâri seal of Kumâragupta III known to us for upwards of fifty years shows that Budhagupta pertained to the Imperial Gupta line, a conclusion which is supported by the imperial titles with which his name is coupled in the Dâmôdarpur copper-plate charters. Unfortunately that portion of the inscription on his seal intervening between his name and that of Kumâragupta I is somewhat blurred, though it leaves no doubt as to his having been his grandson. Nevertheless, as we have remarked elsewhere, what little is preserved of the name of his father and also of his mother shows that their names were rather Pûrûgupta and Chandradâvi than anything else. And we shall not be far from right if we presume that like Narasimhagupta he was a son of Pûrûgupta and

2 HIQ., Vol. VI, pp. 53 ff.
Chandradēvi. In this connection may be taken into consideration another clay seal from Nālandā, namely, that of Vainyagupta. Here also, unfortunately, it is of a highly fragmentary character and the only line that can be read in full and with certainty is the last which has Paramabhāgavatā Mahārājādhiraśa-sri-Vainyaguptaḥ. Very little remains of the line preceding it which contained the names of his father and mother. But what is preserved can be restored more reasonably to Pūrugupta and Chandradēvi than to the names of any other Gupta king and queen. It appears that like Budhagupta and Narasiṃhagupta, he has the same parentage. Further, no doubt it seems tempting to identify this Vainyagupta with the Vainyagupta who issued the Guṇaighar copper-plate charter, dated Gupta year 188—507 A.D. But the Vainyagupta of the clay seal is not only a Mahārājādhiraśa but also a Paramabhāgavata, whereas the Vainyagupta of the copper-plate grant is a Mahārāja and Bhagavan-Mahādeva-pādānudhyāta. The latter epithet is again in consonance with the recumbent bull that figures on the seal attached to his charter. The evidence thus runs counter to the identification of the Vainyagupta of the grant with the Vainyagupta of the seal. Thus the date Gupta year 188 of the Guṇaighar charter cannot be taken as a date for the latter Gupta monarch. Where is he then to be placed? We know that the dates of Budhagupta range between Gupta years 157 and 175. Immediately before him must be placed Kumāragupta II for whom we have the date Gupta year 154. The last date of Skandagupta is Gupta year 148 known from his silver coins. Vainyagupta of the seal had thus better be placed between Skandagupta-Pūrugupta and Kumāragupta II, that is, between Gupta years 148 and 154. If Vainyagupta was thus an Imperial Gupta ruler, the question arises whether any coins of his have been found as of every Gupta sovereign. Now, it is well-known that there were certain coins which had long been attributed by Allan to Chandra(gupta) III-Dvādaśāditya. But Ganguly has correctly remarked that what occurs on their obverse is not Chandra but indubitably Vainya. The coins have thus to be ascribed to Vainya(gupta)-Dvādaśāditya, and not at all to Chandra(gupta) III-Dvādaśāditya. Further, we have to note that on the obverse figures the Garuḍa standard, pointing clearly to the conclusion that Vainya who struck these coins was a devotee of Vishnu. This accords with the epithet Parama-Bhāgavata associated with Vainya of the seal.

It will be seen that Skandagupta alias Pūrugupta was succeeded to the Gupta throne by Vainyagupta, Kumāragupta II, Budhagupta and Narasiṃhagupta in consecutive order. Further, we know that Vainyagupta, Budhagupta and Narasiṃhagupta were co-uterine brothers to one another, being born of the same father and mother, namely, (Skandagupta-) Pūrugupta and Chandradēvi. It is difficult to avoid the inference that Kumāragupta II also stood in the same relationship to them. It is, however, difficult to understand why these four brothers came to the Gupta throne in quick succession one after another. The inference is not unreasonable that there was a violent Hūṇa eruption again on the north-west frontier. We have seen that this menace first arose after the demise of Kumāragupta I, that his son Gahtōkacakagupta, in fact, lost his life in the turmoil created by the inroads of this foreign tribe, and that it was really his brother Skandagupta who successfully stemmed the tide of this Hūṇa invasion. The Hūṇas were, for a time, held at bay by the might of Skandagupta. But, as soon as he was numbered among his forefathers, the Hūṇa eruption made its appearance with redoubled vigour. It appears that, like Gahtōkacakagupta before Skandagupta, the three brothers Vainyagupta, Kumāragupta and Budhagupta, after the demise of their father, came to the throne one after another, in quick succession, every one of them being foiled in his attempt to stay the flood of the Hūṇa immigration into India. It seems that Budhagupta successfully and for long resisted their onward course of movement, for he ruled much longer.

1 IHQ., Vol. VI, pp. 33 ff.
2 Ibid., Vol. IX, pp. 784 ff.
than any one of his preceding brothers, reigning as he did for eighteen years from Gupta year 157 to 175. But, though he checked their ingress into this country longer than his brothers, the pressure of the barbarian hordes so long held back in check accumulated such a momentum that they swept off all barriers and overwhelmed the Gupta power for some time in Northern India soon after Gupta year 175, the last date of Budhagupta. This appears to be pretty clear from a critical study of three inscriptions found in Ṛraṇ, Sagar District, Madhya Pradesh. One of these is engraved on a pillar in a temple at Ṛraṇ. It is dated Gupta year 165, in the reign of Budhagupta (No. 39 below), and states that the pillar was a gift to the temple by the two Brāhmaṇa brothers, Māṭrīvishṇu and Dhanyavishṇu, the former of whom was a chief of the province round about Airikīna (Ṛraṇ). As the inscription bears the date Gupta year 165 and the latest of his coins, Gupta year 175, the former seems to belong to the early part of Budhagupta’s reign. A second inscription from Ṛraṇ, which is worthy of note in this connection, is on the lower part of the neck of a huge Boar or Varāha image in a corner shrine of the same temple, which records the date as follows: “the tenth day of Phālguna in the first year of the reign of the Maḥārājāḥ Brāhmaṇa” and states that it was the gift of the younger brother of Dhanyavishṇu whose elder brother Māṭrīvishṇu is described as gone to heaven. Since Māṭrīvishṇu is mentioned as alive in the Budhagupta and dead in the Tūrāmāṇa epigraph, it follows that Tūrāmāṇa wrested the Gupta kingdom from Budhagupta about the end of his reign. It was this Sagar District which formed the eastern fringe of Hūṇa dominions and was the principal theatre of war between the Hūṇas and allied tribes on the one hand and the Guptas and their chiefs on the other. Though the Ṛraṇ pillar inscription is dated in the first regnal year of Tūrāmāṇa, we cannot take it that it was the first year of the Hūṇa rule. For, as we learn from Yuan Chwang, the Hūṇa capital was Śākala in the Panjab. What the Ṛraṇ inscription may be taken to mean is that Tūrāmāṇa was the first Hūṇa king to conquer the eastern part of the Gupta empire and that he did so in the first year of his reign. That Tūrāmāṇa was ruling already in the Panjab is clear from his epigraph found in Kura, Salt Range, Panjab, and deposited in the Lahore Museum. Unfortunately, the date portion of it is lost, but it refers itself to the reign of the Rājādhirāja Maḥārāja Tūrāmāṇa Śahī Jāulva. No less a scholar than F. Kielland refers it to “the fourth or fifth century A.D.” Further, what we have to note about Tūrāmāṇa is that at least two silver coins of his are known which bear the date 52. It seems that the Hūṇa inscriptions specified two kinds of dates—one denoting the year of the Hūṇa rule and the other, the regnal year of the particular king. The year 52 which figures on the coins of Tūrāmāṇa indicates the year of the Hūṇa era. From this it is also evident that some Hūṇa kings ruled over the Panjab and Central India prior to the time of Tūrāmāṇa and that the Hūṇas established their sway in India circa 440 A.D. Ever since that time fights were going on between the Hūṇas and the Guptas kings, whether the Gupta king was Skandagupta, Vainyagupta, Kumāragupta (II) or Budhagupta. It is true that in the time of Budhagupta the Hūṇas were held at bay for a long time, but it was soon after Gupta year 175, whether it was in the reign of Budhagupta or soon after his demise, that the Hūṇas under Tūrāmāṇa penetrated through the eastern part of the Gupta dominions, as far east as Ṛraṇ. How long the Hūṇa power lasted in this region, we do not know. But in this connection we have to take note that the Hūṇa monarch after him was his son Mihira-

1 JRAS., 1889, pp. 134-35; Allan’s Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty, p. 153. It is somewhat doubtful whether the date 175 is certain as read on Budhagupta’s silver coins. The symbol for 70 reads here like pd which is a sign for 60 and not pd for 70, as seems from Tafel IX in Bühler’s Sīhazan Tafeln zur Indischen Palaeographie. In that case, we have to suppose that the Hūṇa incursions began soon after Gupta year 165.


3 D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 1899.
kula, who must have ruled for at least fifteen years, as is clear from a Gwalior inscription.\(^1\) In this connection we have to take note of a third inscription from Éran (No. 43 below), dated Gupta year 191=509-10 A.D. It speaks of Bhānu-gupta and Gōparāja as having fought against and defeated the Maitras, apparently in the region of Afrikīna. As the first of these names ends in gupta, it raises the presumption that Bhānu-gupta was a Gupta sovereign. This receives support from the fact that he has been called rāja mahān and Pārtha-samō. It seems that Bhānu-gupta was a supreme ruler, and Gōparāja, his chieftain, the former having presumably succeeded Budhagupta overthrown by Tōramāna and that this Gupta sovereign seems to be no other than Narasimhagupta-Ālāditiya about whom we have to take note of what Yuan Chwang has said about Mihirakula, king of Śākala.\(^2\) The latter, for some reason, was prejudiced against the Buddhist Church and was therefore bent upon its extermination. At that time Bālāditiya, king of Magadh, being a zealous Buddhist, rebelled against the order of the persecution of the Buddhists. When Mihirakula proceeded to invade the territory of Bālāditiya, the latter accompanied by his men withdrew to an island. Mihirakula came in pursuit, and was taken prisoner. On the petition of Bālāditiya’s mother, the prisoner was set free. His younger brother, having taken possession of Śākala, Mihirakula took refuge in Kashmir of which he made himself master by treachery. This account of the Chinese pilgrim may, on the whole, be taken as worthy of credence. The only flaw noticeable in it is that Yuan Chwang places the event “some centuries previously” to his time. But similar flaws are noticeable also in his account, e.g., of Harshavardhana, king of Kanauj, although he was his own contemporary. This king Bālāditiya of Magadh has rightly been taken to be the Narasimhagupta-Ālāditiya\(^3\) of the coins. He represents Bālāditiya to be a staunch adherent of Buddhism. This is corroborated not only by Paramārtha’s testimony of the interest displayed in Buddhism by Bālāditiya but also by inscriptions. Narasimhagupta-Ālāditiya was succeeded by Kumāragupta III, known from two seals of his (Nos. 45 and 46 below)—one, the Nālandā clay seal, and the other, the Bhūtari copper-silver seal. Neither of the seals furnishes him with a date. They do, however, inform us that his mother was Mitrādēvi. Who succeeded Kumāragupta III is not definitely known. But the fifth Dāmodārpur plate, with a date later than 200, shows that the Gupta power continued in the province up till that time (No. 47 below). Unfortunately, only the suffix -gupta has survived, and many scholars have made attempts to restore the full name. But, as pointed out above, in Inscription No. 47 below, it is, in all likelihood ( Vishnu)-gupta, as coins have been found of one Vishnu-(gupta)-Chandāditiya who is supposed to be the last Gupta king who issued gold coinage of the type of the earlier dynasty.\(^4\) There is again, some doubt in regard to the exact reading of the date. Basak who edited the plate reads it as 214, whereas Rao Bahadur Dikshit takes it to be 224. The correct reading, however, seems to be 211. This suits excellently in every way, because there is an inscription engraved in duplicate on two ‘pillars of victory’, found at Mandaśār, which speaks of a king named Yāṣōdharmāna, who enjoyed territories which were never enjoyed by the Gupta lords and where even the sway of the paramount Hīņa sovereigns did not penetrate, who was the overlord of “the chieftains as far as the river Lauhitya (Brahmaputra), Mount Mahāendra, the Snow Mountain (Himālaya) whose peaks are clasped by the Gaṅgā, and as far as the Western Ocean,” and, above all, to whom homage was done by Mihirakula

---

4 Since the above was written, a clay seal of Vishnu-gupta has been found at Nālandā and published by Krishna Deva (Inscription No. 48 below).
touching his feet with the forehead—Mihirakula who had bowed his head to none but the God Śthāṇu (Siva) and, on account of whom, even the Himālaya bore the pride of the appellation: Durga ‘Inaccessible’. It is worthy of note that it was Mihirakula who had made the Himālaya proud of the appellation of Durga, ‘Inaccessible’. This shows that the Hūṇa monarch had then established himself as the ruler of Kashmir. The defeat of Mihirakula by Yaśōdharmar must have happened fairly long after his defeat by (Narasimhiha-)Bālāditya of Magadhha. But what was the date of Yaśōdharmar? We have already referred to his inscriptions on the victory pillars found at Mandasor. There is another inscription1 of his from the same place which commemorates the construction of a well by a Naigama named Daksha, brother of a provincial governor of Vishnuyardhanha in Vikrama 589=532-33 A.D. Its interest for us there is centered on the fact that it mentions two names, one Yaśōdharmar, and the other Vishnuyardhanha, who is spoken of as pertaining to the Aulikara family. The latter is also described as having acquired the titles rājadhirāja and paramēvīvara by subjugating kings of the east and the north. Hoernle2 takes Yaśōdharmar and Vishnuyardhanha as denoting one and the same person. Fleet,3 however, takes them as two separate names, and R. G. Bhandarkar agrees with him.4 The former seems to be the more natural view to take, because we are not informed how Vishnuyardhanha was related to Yaśōdharmar. This is rather unusual. In ordinary circumstances the former should have been mentioned either as a brother or a son of the latter. And further, immediately after the mention of Yaśōdharmar, Vishnuyardhanha is described as narādhipatiḥ sa ecā. This makes it all but certain, nay, certain, that they are one and the same person. It seems that Yaśōdharmar-Vishnuyardhanha was a king of the Aulikara family of Daśapura and that the date 589=532-33 A.D. refers to a single individual ruler. This date therefore is equivalent to Gupta year 214 and is just three years later than 211, the date of (Vishṇu)gupta who is supposed to be the Gupta king that issued the fifth Dāmōdarapur plate and was, in all likelihood, the last of the Early Gupta dynasty. Tōramāṇa was probably in possession of North India as far as Eran from circa 495 to circa 503 A.D. The first of these dates, namely 495 A.D., falls after Gupta year 175=493-94 A.D., the last known date for Budhagupta. And the second date, namely 503 A.D., is prior to Gupta year 191=509-10 A.D., the date of Bhānugupta (—Narasimhiha-Bālāditya) when there was an attempt on the part of the chieftains of the Gupta house to re-establish its power. The period from 503 to 510 certainly fell in the reign of Mihirakula, and it is not unreasonable that about 510 A.D. the Gupta sovereign (Narasimhiha-)Bālāditya, who was in hiding for some time, made his appearance and asserted himself with the help of his vassals and expelled Mihirakula from the Magadhha kingdom, as appears from the account of Yuan Chwang summarised above. But though about 510 A.D. Mihirakula was ousted from the Magadhha dominions, his power remained unshaken in Central India till about 518 A.D., the fifteenth year of his reign, when Yaśōdharmar dealt a death blow to the Hūṇa supremacy in India.

The above conclusions receive support from the records of the Parivrājaka family. With the years ranging between 163 and 209 and specified in their documents is coupled the significant expression Gupta-nriṣa-rāja-bhūtā, ‘during the enjoyment of the sovereignty of the Gupta kings.’ “This expression is of importance,” says Fleet, “in showing clearly that the Gupta dynasty and sway were still continuing.”5 Now we have to note that for Mahārāja Hastin we have two dates, 163 and 191 and for his son Śaṁkshōbha 199 and 209. It is thus

---

4 JBRA., Vol. XX, p. 392.
clear that the Gupta power over Eastern India continued at least till Gupta year 209, that is, two years prior to Gupta year 211, the date of Vishṇugupta furnished by the last Dāmōdarpur plate. What seems to have happened after the defeat of Mihirakula by Bhānugupta (Narasimhagupta-Bālāditya) in Gupta year 191 may be reasonably guessed as follows. As Yuan Chwang has told us, Mihirakula had to beat a hasty retreat to Kashmir, as the Hūṇa capital Śākala had been seized upon by his brother. But Mihirakula was a sturdy warrior. Soon after he made his position in Kashmir secure, he came down south and must have wrested Śākala from his brother who was a usurper. Thereafter he must have come down still further south with a view to conquer not only Central but also Eastern India. But, as ill-luck would have it, a terrible foe to him arose in the shape of Yaśōdharman-Vishṇuvardhana, who did exactly what Mihirakula had intended doing. The former inflicted a hollow defeat upon the latter and forced him to return to Kashmir as before and instead spread his own might not only in Central and Eastern India but also North India, conquering territories, some of which were never under the sway of even the Hūṇas or the Guptas. The Aulikara supremacy, however, came to an end soon, and what happened thereafter to North India we do not know. Most probably the foreign hordes who followed in the wake of the Hūṇas occupied the different parts of India and established their might there. Such were the Maitrakas, the Pratihāras, the Chāhāmānas and so forth. But it is not at all improbable that he was one of those rulers who issued coins of Gupta types. How long Gupta power even with this shorn lustre lasted after Vishṇugupta cannot definitely be ascertained.

The following is the chronological statement that may be tentatively put up as descriptive of this troubled period.

Gupta year 165 = 483-84 A.D., the last date of Budhagupta furnished by his inscription. 485-500 A.D., the reign of Tōramāṇa. 500-515 A.D., the reign of Mihirakula.

Gupta year 191 = 509-10 A.D., the date of Bhānugupta and Hastin, when Mihirakula was driven away from the Magadha kingdom by Narasimhagupta-Bālāditya with the help of his vassals. 515 A.D., the approximate date when Yaśōdharman overthrew Mihirakula and expelled him from North and Central India.

516 A.D., the approximate date when Yaśōdharman temporarily eclipsed the glory of the Gupta power.

Gupta year 191-98 = 509-16 A.D., the reign of Narasimhagupta-Bālāditya. 515-25 A.D., the reign of Yaśōdharman.

Gupta year 199-208 = 517-25 A.D., the reign of Kumāragupta III. 526-34 A.D., of which 533-34 A.D. = Vikrama 590 is his actual date, the reign of Vishṇuvardhana, alias of Yaśōdharman.

Gupta year 224 = 542 A.D., the date of [Vishṇu?]-gupta.
THE GUPTA SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION

The Mauryan hierarchy of officials, if the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭalya is to be our guide on this point, had been almost completely changed and replaced by a new type of bureaucracy in the Gupta period with a correspondingly new set of official terms and designations. Some glimpses into an Adhyaksha-prachāra of this age are afforded by the seals picked up during the excavations at Basādh, the ancient Vaiśālī. The most important of the offices, official designations, etc., mentioned in the legends of these seals may be brought to a focus here. Of these, we may consider the following first:

(1) Śri-Paramabhaṭṭārapādīya-Kumārāṃṭi-ādhikarana
(2) Śri-Ṭvārajaḥṭārapādīya-Kumārāṃṭi-ādhikarana
(3) Ṭvārajaḥṭāpādīya-Kumārāṃṭi-ādhikarana
(4) Tīrā-Kumārāṃṭi-ādhikarana
(5) Vaiśālī-vāmā-kuṇḍe Kumārāṃṭi-ādhikarana
(6) Kumārāṃṭi-ādhikarana

It will be seen that these six seal legends are connected with the officer designated Kumārāṃṭi, who, it seems, may be attached to the king, crown-prince or Revenue Division or any region. Kumārāṃṭi thus seems to have been a big officer,—an inference confirmed by the fact that he had an adhikarana or office of his own, wheresoever he was posted. But what is meant by Kumārāṃṭi? The late K.P. Jayaswal has, in this connection, drawn our attention to a passage occurring in Act II of Bhāsa'ś Prahīna-Taugandharāyaṇa. When Śālaṅkāyana, minister to king Pradyotā Mahāśeṇa, having captured Udayana, ruler of Kauśambī, brings him to the gate of Ujjayini and the news is announced to Mahāśeṇa, the latter instructs the Kāṭchukīya or Chamberlain: Gachchha, Bharatarākaṅkāṅ brāhī: “Kumāra-vidhi-vāṁṣhāya sātikārīya Vatsarājam—agrahaṇa krītva pravāhyātām—amāya iti”, “Go and tell Bharatarākaṅkāṅ to receive the minister (amāya) with the honours due to a prince and bring him in with the Vatsa king.”

It is thus quite clear from the above passage that Kumārāṃṭi is not an ordinary amāya but an amāya who is entitled in court etiquette to the honour and dignity of Kumāra or prince of the royal blood. This designation distinguishes him from an ordinary amāya or minister on the one hand and from a Kumāra or Prince on the other. That there were officers called simply Amāya is known from many seals found at Bhāta. But Kumārāṃṭi was an amāya par excellence and could therefore be attached to the king or the crown-prince and consequently designated as Paramabhaṭṭārapādīya-Kumārāṃṭi and Ĺvārajanapādīya-Kumārāṃṭi or Ĺvārājanābhāṭṭārapādīya-Kumārāṃṭi. Or he may be attached to some nondescript but important office designated e.g., as Vaiśālī-vāmā-kuṇḍe Kumārāṃṭi-ādhikarana on a seal picked up by the late D.B. Spooner during his excavations at Basādh in 1913-14. Spooner reads Vaiśāli-vāma-kuṇḍe, but the reading is clearly Vaiśālī-vāmā-kuṇḍe. The legend has therefore to be translated as “the Office of Kumārāṃṭi at the beautiful water spring of Vaiśālī.” What could this water spring be? Vaiśālī, we know, was the capital of the Licchhavi Gaṇa or tribal oligarchy, every member of which was called a king. “As kings they were entitled to coronation. We

2 Ibid., Nos. 6 and 11.
3 Ibid., No. 4.
4 Ibid., p. 109, No. 22.
5 Ibid., 1913-14, p. 134, No. 200.
6 Ibid., 1903-04, p. 107, No. 3.
10 A.R. ASI, 1911-12, pp. 33-54.
hear of there having been a special *pushkarnī* or tank in Vesāli, the water of which was used to sprinkle their heads while being crowned. The tank was considered very sacred, and was, therefore, covered with an iron net so that not even a bird could get through, and a strong guard was set to prevent any one taking water from it. 1 The importance of this *kunḍa* or *pushkarnī* can scarcely be exaggerated. And as the Guptas were indebted for their sovereignty to the Lichchhavis, every attempt must have been made by them to keep the water of this tank pure and unpolluted by man, beast or bird. For holding charge of this spring, no other officer could be fitter than *Kumārānāyaṇa*, who, in court etiquette, was equal to the prince in rank and dignity.

We have at least three instances of a *Kumārānāyaṇa* being attached to the king. The first is that of Harishēṇa who composed the *prāsaṅkta* contained in the celebrated Allahābad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. The other two are furnished by the Kālamārāṇḍā stone inscription (No. 21 below) of Kumāragupta, which speaks of two persons, father and son, Śikharavīmaṇa and Prīthivīśeṇa, who were *Kumārānāyaṇas* to the two kings, father and son, Gupta sovereigns, Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I, respectively. But it is worthy of note that whereas Harīshēṇa has been designated *Ṣándhyavijñāhaka-Kumārānāyaṇa*, the other two have been styled *Mantri-Kumārānāyaṇa*. The first designation is indicative of the executive function, and the second of the consultative character, with which the *Kumārānāyaṇa* could be entrusted. This inference is confirmed by the fact that Prīthivīśeṇa who was a contemporary of Kumāragupta was at first, we are told, *Mantri-Kumārānāyaṇa* and afterwards *Mahābalāśikṛita*. This shows that the office of *Kumārānāyaṇa* was neither a hereditary appointment nor a permanently personal distinction. The question arises: what kind of an office was held by *Kumārānāyaṇa* as *Kumārānāyaṇa*? That question we have now to consider briefly. We have seen that an officer of the grade of *Kumārānāyaṇa* could be attached to a **yuvāraja**, and, above all, to the king himself as *Mantri* or *Ṣándhyavijñāhaka*. He could also be in charge of a division, as is clear from the seal legend reading *Tira-Kumārānāyaṇa-ādhikaranaśaya*, “Of the Office of *Kumārānāyaṇa* in charge of the Tira (—Division—*Bhūkta*).” He could not have been the governor of the province, because at Basāḍh itself has been found a seal bearing the legend *Tirahbhukti-Uparik-ādhikaranaśaya*. **Uparika**, as will be shown later on, means ‘the governor of a province.’ *Kumārānāyaṇa* of Tirahbukti or Tira province cannot therefore denote its governor. What duty then could he have performed? In this connection we have to note that he could be in charge of the *Adhishṭhan-ādhikarana*, as is evident from two of the Dāmōdaśpur plates (Nos. 22 and 24 below) which both speak of *Kumārānāyaṇa* Vēṭravarman as presiding over the Town Administrative Board (adhisēṭhān-ādhikarana) of Kōṭivarsha and as being nominated to discharge that function by the *Uparika* or Divisional Commissioner of Punḍravardhana. There he was in charge of the Land Records and Settlement Office of the District Town. Probably he had to discharge this function when he was not in charge of any special duty and had to work simply as *Kumārānāyaṇa*. There is, again, a plate of Lōkanātha found at Tipperah, Bengal, which records his grant to a temple of Ananta-Nārāyaṇa. It is worthy of note in this connection that instructions in regard to this grant were communicated to the different officials of the district (vishaya) by *Kumārānāyaṇa* and his *ādhikarana* as is clear from line 1 of the record and also from the seal attached to it. This seems to be the case also about the Baigrām copper-plate inscription 4 where too the *Kumārānāyaṇa* and *ādhikarana* convey similar orders in respect of the grant to the officers of the district concerned. There is mention in this inscription also of the...
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1 D.R. Bhandarkar's *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, p. 150.
pustapālas or record-keepers but no reference at all to the Adhishṭhān-ādhikaraṇa. It seems that Kumārāmāya's adhikaraṇa was conveyance and settlement office par excellence, though this duty was discharged by other officers also in the muṭassil, according to the tradition and convention of the period and the place. Nevertheless, the honour and dignity attaching to the position of Kumārāmāya as Kumārāmāya was never forgotten in the Gupta period at least, as is clear from the Amauna plate1 issued in Gupta year 232 by Nandana who styles himself Kumārāmāya Mahaña. Nandana who issued the charter was not only a Mahārāja or feudatory chieftain but also a Kumārāmāya, a dignitary of some rank in the court of his overlord. But when he made the grant, he must have been in his own territory, retaining and mentioning with pride the titular position he had attained. The same was the case during the earlier part of the Maitraka rule over Valabhi. Thus the Māliyā copper-plate inscription of the Mahārāja Dharasēna II sets forth the list of the state officials as follows: Ayuktaka-Vinayukta-Draṅgika-Mahattara-Chāṭa-Bhata-Dhuravādikaraṇika-Daṇḍapāśika-Rājasthānīya-Kumārāmāya-ādi.2 Here the officials have been mentioned in the ascending order from which it is clear that Kumārāmāya occupies the highest rank in this list and is therefore higher in rank than Rājasthānīya who corresponds to the Uparika or Divisional Commissioner of the early Gupta age, as we shall see later on. The designation continued to be used in an amplified form till the Pāla period, but its significance changed. The designation now is Mahākumārāmāya, and occurs e.g., in the Bhagalpur plate3 of Nārāyaṇapāla and the Manahali plate4 of Madanapāla, but the sense conveyed by it is something like that suggested by Bhagwanlal Indraji, namely an amāta minister or cōncellour, attached to Kumāra or prince.5 This is clear from the fact that Mahākumārāmāya has in these Pāla plates been contradistinguished from Rājasthānīya, which is not noticeable in charters of pre-Pāla period.

The next designation we have now to take cognisance of is Uparika. We have already referred to the legend on the seal discovered at Basādh by Bloch, namely, Tirabhukty-Uparikāśhikaran. Before this seal came to light, the term Uparika had been known from inscriptions of the Gupta and post-Gupta period. The article entitled Office of Uparika by B. Ch. Chhabra may, in this connection, be studied with profit.6 Though the word Uparika was thus known from inscriptions, its purport could not be made explicit. All that could be made out was that he was a great official as he was mentioned in charters in juxtaposition with such officials as Rājasthānīya, and Kumārāmāya.7 In later times, the prefix bṛhat was added to it to exaggerate the importance of the post just as mahā was added in the case of Kumārāmāya.8 But what the exact position of Uparika was remained undetermined, until the Dāmōdarpur copper-plate inscriptions came to light. Just as the Basādh seal referred to above speaks of Tirabhukty-Uparika, these inscriptions speak of Puṇḍravarāhobhaktō-Uparika. Now, it is worthy of note that, according to the Dāmōdarpur plates, during the reign of Kumāragupta I, in the years 124 and 129 Chirāṭadatta was the Uparika of Puṇḍravarāhanga, and that, although he was appointed to that post by the Gupta sovereign, it was he himself who nominated Kumārāmāya Vēṭravarman as the head of the Adhishṭhān-ādhikaraṇa of Kōṭīvarsha. Similarly, in Gupta year

4 Ganeṣṭhānātā, p. 153, line 34.
5 D. R. Bhandarkar, Volume, pp. 321 ff.
7 N. G. Majumdar, Insers. of Bengal, Vol. III, p. 21, line 31; p. 63, line 26; p. 73, line 33; p. 87, line 29; p. 96, line 27; p. 102, line 27; and pl. 111, line 35, where Bṛhāt-Uparika comes immediately after Antaranga. One wonders whether the two terms together formed one designation. In the Nuvīna grant of Dharmarājadēva, Antaranga seems to be separated from Uparika.—Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, p. 41, line 37.
163 Mahārāja Brahmadatta was appointed by Budhagupta as the Uparika of Puṇḍravardhana. According to another Dāmōdarapu plate whose year is not preserved, the same emperor appointed Mahārāja Jayadatta as the Uparika of the same province, who, in his turn, nominated Ayukakā Bhanḍaka as the head of the same Adhishṭhān-ādikaraṇa, namely, of Kōṭivarsha. The last Dāmōrarapu plate bears the date 214, but, unfortunately, the name of the king is gone. Gone also is the name of the Uparika appointed by him for the same province, though this much is certain that he had the title of Mahārāja. The name, however, of the Head of Kōṭivarsha Adhishṭhān-ādikaraṇa, appointed by him, is preserved, namely Svayambhūdeva who was Vishayapatī also. It will be seen from the above account that Puṇḍravardhana in the Gupta period was a province and Kōṭivarsha a district comprised in it. The Uparika of the province was invariably appointed by the sovereign, whether he was Kumaṇragupta, Budhagupta or any other sovereign, but in every case the Uparika nominated the Head of the Adhishṭhān-ādikaraṇa of the District. The conclusion is irresistible that the designation Uparika denotes the Viceroy of a province. The same conclusion is further supported by the description given of this officer in the last of these plates. He is there described as running on the administration with hasty-nina-jana-bhoga, “with the enjoyment (of the rule) consisting of elephants, horses and soldiers.” This exactly describes the status of the Subah or Viceroy such as he flourished in Mediaeval India down to seventy-five years ago. He had at his command not only soldiers but also horses and elephants.

In this connection may further be considered the administration of the districts upon which the Gupta inscriptions throw some light. The biggest territorial division, we have just seen, was bhukti, the administrator of which is styled Uparika. This Uparika, again, we have seen, was not so much the Divisional Commissioner of the modern day as the Subah of the old regime. Another characteristic of the Uparika was that he was invariably appointed by the Gupta sovereign direct. This is quite clear from the Dāmōdarapu plates, where the Puṇḍravardhana bhukti and the Kōṭivarsha vishaya contained in it are mentioned. Another noteworthy thing about the Uparika was that he was not always an individual of ordinary social status. Of the five Dāmōdarapu records, three (Nos. 38, 40 and 47 below) couple the title of Mahārāja with the name of the Uparika. This reminds us of Mahārāja Mānsingh of Amer being nominated the governor of Bengal by the Moghul emperor Akbar. Even long before the Gupta supremacy and during the reign of Aśoka, we know, the Yavana ruler Tushāspa was the provincial governor of Surāśṭra. The next smaller territorial division is vishaya. This is clear from the fact that Kōṭivarsha is mentioned as a vishaya comprised in the Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti. Both R. D. Banerji5 and R. G. Basak6 have remarked on the strength of the Dāmōdarapu inscriptions that the Vishayapatī, or officer in charge of the district, was appointed by the Uparika. This is, however, controverted by the Indōr plate (No. 30 below) of Skandagupta which makes mention of a Vishayapatī called Śarvanāga ruling over Antarvēdi, that is, Antarabheda, the region of Kanauj between the Ganges and Jumna, and speaks of him as tat-pāda-parigṛhiṇa “being favoured by that venerable (king),” that is, Skandagupta. This is precisely the expression used in the Dāmōdarapu records with reference to the Uparika, who, for that reason, is taken rightly by all scholars as being directly nominated by the Gupta sovereign. And the Indōr plate may now be taken to indicate that even the Vishayapatī was appointed by the same sovereign. The power of appointment which the Uparika possessed was with reference, not to the Vishayapatī, but to the President of the District Town Board to which
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5 The Age of the Imperial Guptas (Manindra Chandra Nandy Lectures, 1924), pp. 77-78.
6 The History of North-Eastern India, p. 190.
office he could appoint anybody—a Kumārāṇāya, Āyuktaka or Vishayapati. Here the wording is not tat-pāda-parigṛhita but tan-niyuktaka.

What the district subdivision in the Gupta period was it is very difficult to determine. The Nandapur plate,\(^1\) speaks of the village Khaṭāpuraṇa as being included in the Nanda viṭhi. Viṭhi originally signifies a ‘road’, ‘a row’ or ‘a market’, but here it denotes a “district subdivision.” And in this particular case it seems that the subdivision was called Nanda viṭhi after Nandapur, the place where the plate was found. We have further to note another expression which occurs in the Pahāḍpur grant.\(^2\) Here land is granted from various villages which are said to be contained in the Dakshināmā vilāti and the Nāgiraṭṭa maṇḍala. The question arises: which of these terms, viṭhi and maṇḍala, denotes a more extensive territory? This may be compared to the phraseology occurring in the Nālandā plate\(^3\) of Dēvapāla and the Nāhāṭi plate\(^4\) of Ballālasēna. In the first we have Śrī-Nagara-bhuktau... Gayā-vishay-āntahpāti-Kumudā-sūtra-viṭhi, etc. In the second, we have Śrī-Vardhamāna-bhukty-āntahpātiny=Uttara-Rādhā-maṇḍalē Svaṭpadakshina-viṭhyām. A comparison of the two passages will convince anybody that the terms viṣaya and maṇḍala have been used synonymously and in the sense of a ‘district’, and viṭhi in the sense of a ‘subdivision’.

The Gupta empire, vast as it was, must have been divided into a number of bhūtis and viṣayas. Of these, the Puṇḍravaradhana bhūkti and Kōṭivarsha viṣaya have become well-known from the Dāmōdāpur plates. Then we have seen that one Śrīvaṇaṅga was the Vishayapati of Antarvēdi or District surrounding Kānaḍu. Unfortunately the name of the bhūkti has not been specified. Then the Ėrāṇ pillar inscription of Budhagupta, dated Gupta year 165 (No. 39 below) describes one Suraśmichandra as governing the territory intervening between the Kālinḍi and the Narmadā as Lēkapāla, that is, Vicerey. With his name has been coupled the title Mahārāja, and what is further noteworthy about this inscription is that it mentions another Mahārāja called Mātrivishṇu, who, although he belonged to a holy Brāhmaṇa family, “was married by Sovereignity, as if by a maiden choosing herself (her own husband)” (ṣvānayānvaray=ṣvā nājīlakshmy=ādhiγeta). This means that Mātrivishṇu was the first of his family who raised himself to power. As he has been also styled Mahārāja, he appears to have been a local chieftain. But in no way does it appear that he was Vishayapati of Airikina (Ērāṇ). In fact, Airikina viṣaya has been mentioned in another Ėrāṇ inscription\(^5\) which is of a somewhat later time and which refers itself to the first regnal year of Tōramāṇa. When this epigraph was engraved, Mātrivishṇu had passed away; and the object of it was to record the erection, by his younger brother Dhanayavishṇu, of a shrine over the image of the Boar on whose chest it was incised. In both the records Dhanayavishṇu has been mentioned and is described not only as tad-anuśīdhiyā, “obedient to him,” but also as tat-praśāda-parigṛhita, “encircled by his favours.” Lastly, we have to take note of Parnadatta in whose time the dam of the Sudarśana Lake was rebuilt, as the Junāgaḍh inscription of Skandagupta (No. 28 below) informs us. It was this Gupta monarch, who, we are told, appointed him the protector (gūpṭa) of the whole Surāśtra, by which we have to understand that he was the governor of Kāṭhīwāḍ. And, further, we have to note that Parnadatta put his son Chakrapālita, in charge of the protection of the city where the inscription is found. In other words, to borrow the language of the Dāmōdāpur plates, he was appointed the Head of the Town Administrative Board of Girinagāra by the Uparīka of Surāshṭra, who was doubtless his father.

\(^1\) Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, pp. 52 ff.
\(^2\) Ibid., Vol. XX, pp. 61 ff.
\(^3\) Ibid., Vol. XVII, pp. 318 ff.
Let us now take up for consideration three more administrative terms of the Gupta period. We have to take these three together; because, unless we compare them with one another, it will not be possible to arrive at the correct meaning of each and dispel the confusion which has grown up by the multiplicity of interpretations or misinterpretations proposed by different scholars. The terms in question are supplied by the following seals: (1) Mahādānāyaka-Agniguptasya, (2) Daṇḍāpāi-ādhikaraṇasya, and (3) Yuvarāja-bhāṣṭāraka-pūrṇiyā-balādhi-
karanaṣya. Now, what does Daṇḍānāyaka or Mahādānānāyaka mean? Bloch takes it in the sense of 'judge', and R. D. Banerji in the sense of 'the principal judge', though, further on, he renders it by 'general.' But Agnigupta was not the only Mahādānānāyaka of the Gupta age. This term we find mentioned thrice in the Allahābād pillar inscription (No. 1 below). Thus, the officer who got the prastitī executed was Mahādānānāyaka Tilakabhāṭṭa. Nay, the officer who composed it, we know, was the celebrated Harishēṇa, who is designated not only Sāndhivigrāhika and Kumārāmāya but also Mahādānānāyaka. Further, we have to note that even his father, Dhruvabhūti, is called simply Mahādānānāyaka, without any further title or designation coupled with his name. If any further instance is required, it is furnished by some South Indian records which describe one Brāhmaṇa as Mahāprādūma, Śivānupati and Daṇḍa-
nāyaka, and speak of his father Kāvaṇa also as Daṇḍānāyaka. This shows that, like 'Duke,' 'Earl' and 'Viscount,' Mahādānānāyaka was a hereditary title of nobility. Nay, there is one inscription—a Kannada inscription found at Kargudari and dated Śaka 1030, which in lines 40-41 speaks of one Malliyakka as Daṇḍānāyakītī, 'the female Daṇḍānāyaka.' This reminds us of the titles Mahārāthi-Mahārathinī, Mahābhiṣẹ-Mahābhiṣṇi and Mahāśeṣṇāpata-Mahāśeṣṇāpatinī of the West India cave inscriptions, and Mahāśeṣṇāpata-Mahāśeṣṇāpatinī of the Nāgarjunikona inscriptions. But Malliyakka of the Kargudari inscription was Daṇḍānāyakītī, not because her husband, but rather her father, Iṣvaramaṇya, was Daṇḍānāhaka or Daṇḍānāhaka which seem, at least here, to be synonymous with Daṇḍānāyaka, from whom she apparently inherited it. But how, it may be asked, could Malliyakka be entitled to be called Daṇḍānāyakītī? This is not unlike the English titles Duchess, Countess and so forth, where a woman may be a Duchess, etc., in her own right also. This, too, points to the conclusion that Daṇḍānāyaka was a title of nobility.

When J. F. Fleet translated the passage containing this term which occurs about the close of the Allahābād pillar inscription, he remarked that "Mahādānānāyaka, lit. 'great leader of the forces,' is a technical military title." As dāṇḍa means 'fine' and 'rod' (of chastisement) as well as 'army' or 'forces,' the titles in which it occurs are capable of being explained as either judicial or military. This term has thus been rendered 'judge' by Bloch, 'Chief Officer of Police' by Sir John Marshall, a high, probably judicial, official' by Vogel and ‘a police officer' by ourselves. Thus Abhidhāna-
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1 A.R. ASI, 1903-04, p. 109, No. 17. There are many seals of the Gupta period, belonging also to simple Daṇḍānāyakas (A.R. ASI, 1911-12, p. 55).
3 Ibid., No. 12.
4 Age of the Imperial Gupta, pp. 77 and 96.
7 Ibid., Vol. XLVIII, p. 80 and note 4.
8 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, pp. 6-7.
10 A.R. ASI, 1911-12, p. 54.
11 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 32.
12 A.R. ASI, 1914-15, p. 82.
chiniānā (II.9.34) has chaturaṅga-bal-ādhyakṣah sēnānī=Daṇḍanāyakah. This was no doubt the primary sense. But in what sense are we to understand this term in the Gupta epoch? The most plausible reply to this question is to take Daṇḍanāyaka as equivalent to something like a ‘Mansabdar’ in the Mughal period. According to Irvine, the Mansabdar was in the service of the State and was bound to render service, military or otherwise, when he was called upon to do so. According to Abul Fazal, there were sixty-six grades of Mansabbars, but there were not more than thirty-three in actual existence, the lowest were 20 rising to 5000, though about the close of Akbar’s reign there were created Mansabs of 7000, and even 10,000. Mansab was not granted to a merely military officer. Each Mansab was expected to maintain a certain number of horses, elephants, beasts of burden and carts, according to his rank and dignity.1

This suits here excellently, because, from the inscriptions, there appear to have been at least four grades of this rank and dignity, namely, Daṇḍanāyaka, Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, Mahāprachandaṇḍa Daṇḍanāyaka and Sarva-Daṇḍanāyaka.2 This receives further confirmation from the Rājatarangini, Book VII, verses 975-87, where not only Daṇḍanāyakas but also their forces (sainya) have been referred to in connection with the capture of Rājapuri by Kandarpa upon the demonstrations of king Harsha. Vexed by the reproaches of the king, when Kandarpa, we are told, entered Rājapuri, only one from among the forces (sainyas) of the Daṇḍanāyakas followed him, namely, the general (sēnānī) named Kularāja. This general fell in the skirmish, and the enemy thought that Kandarpa was killed. But at midday Kandarpa penetrated into the royal palace of Rājapuri while three hundred of his foot routed thirty thousand of the enemy’s soldiers. In the evening as he was entering the palace again and preparing himself for another fight, he heard that that Daṇḍanāyaka had arrived whose soldiers (sainikas) had hidden themselves from fright; so forth and so on. From the above account it is clear that several Daṇḍanāyakas with their forces (sainyas) had accompanied Kandarpa to Rājapuri, that only one general (sēnānī) from among them followed him to the palace and that later even the Daṇḍanāyaka whose soldiers had held back through fear also joined him. What inference is here more natural than that the Daṇḍanāyakas were something like Mansabbars who joined the royal army with their forces and that each of these forces was commanded by a Sēnānī or General who was not and could not always be the Daṇḍanāyaka himself? The Rājatarangini has been translated by two scholars. One of these is Sir Aurel Stein who has rendered the term by ‘the prefect of police’ and the other is R. S. Pandit who has translated it by ‘the commissioner of police.’ How different Police Prefects or Commissioners could take to the battle-field their different police detachments of which they were not always the commanders, and joined the regular army for the battle as no doubt the Daṇḍanāyakas did in the present case, is something which it is difficult to understand. This is not intelligible except on the supposition that Daṇḍanāyakas were something like Mansabbars who were to help the State with military service or otherwise as occasion called for it. That they were to serve the State even in times of peace in the Gupta period is clear from the fact that Harishēṇa of the Allahabād pillar inscription is described not only as Mahādaṇḍanāyaka but also as Kumārāmāyī and, above all, Sūndhīegrāhika. If another instance is required, it is supplied by the legend of a Bhūti seal which runs thus: Mahāvapati-Mahādaṇḍanāyaka-Vishnurakshitaśādha-ānugṛhiṣita-Kumārāmāyī-duḥkharapasyā.9 Here we have a Mahādaṇḍanāyaka called Vishnurakshita who is mentioned as Mahāvapati, ‘supreme commander of the cavalry.’ That Vishnurakshita was a big officer is further indicated by the fact that it was within his power to appoint such a high dignitary as Kumārāmāyī.
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1 Isvari Prasad’s Short History of the Muslim Rule in India, pp. 468-69.
3 A.R. ASI, 1911-12, pp. 52-33.
THE GUPTA SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION

The grade of the Danadanayaka survived long after the Gupta rule but was ultimately merged into the Mansabdari of the Moghul period. But how far earlier than the Gupta period was it in existence? That is the question we have now to consider. So far as our knowledge goes, we find it first mentioned in the Kusāna records. Thus, one Mathurā inscription speaks of a Mahādanadanayaka of the time of Huvishka. Similarly, the Mānikiāla inscription of the time of Kanishka and dated in the year 18 of his reign makes mention of another Danadanayaka called Lala who calls himself a scion of the Gusha (Kusāna) race. It is worthy of note that this rank of the Danadanayaka was unknown prior to the time of the Kusānas. At any rate, so far as I know, it is not mentioned in Kautilya’s Arthasastra. Nor is the term met with in the epigraphs of the pre-Kusāna period. We shall perhaps be not far from right if we say that this rank became known to India with the introduction of the feudal system of the Kusāna administration, and later was replaced by the Persian term Mansabdari in the time of Akbar.

It will be seen that it does not at all seem likely that Danadanayaka denoted ‘a general’. There were other terms which are distinctively of a military character. One of these is Mahāavpati occurring in a legend just referred to. A somewhat more extensive term is Bhajāsvpati, which is mentioned on a seal thus: Bhajāsvpati-Yakshavatsaya,4 “(scal) of Yakshavatsa, Commander of Infantry and Cavalry.” A still more extensive term is Sināpati, which, although it does not occur in the inscriptions of the Gupta sovereigns, is found in the copper-plate charters of the Vakāṭaka king Pravarasena II, who was a grandson of Chandragupta II. Two of these charters were drawn up when Chittravarma and Bāppadēva were the Sināpati respectively. In later times also Sināpati was distinct from Danadanayaka. Thus, in the Amgāchhi plate of the Pāla king Vighrahamāla, Mahāśenāpati is mentioned separately from Mahādanadanayaka.7 Similarly, in the Barackpur grant of the Śena ruler Vijayasena also Mahāśenāpati is distinguished from Danadanayaka. In the pre-Gupta period also Mahāśenāpati is mentioned separately from Mahādanadanayaka. Thus one Nāgarjunikonta inscription speaks of one Mahāśenāpati Mahātalavara Mahādanadanayaka Khāṇḍavisākhahāṃaka (=Skandavisākha).9 Here Mahāśenāpati does not seem to be a title of nobility, because his wife Aḍavi-Chāntisiri has been styled only Mahātalavari, and not Mahāśenāpatini as other ladies of the House of king Chāntamūla have been. A fourth term connected with the military department is Balādhikrita and Mahābalādhikrita. The former occurs on a Basāḍh seal bearing the legend: Tuvarāja-bhaṭṭāraka-pādiye-Balādhikaraṇasa.10 It is found also in the Shāhpur stone image inscription11 of the later and feudatory Gupta chieftain Ādityasena. Mahābalādhikrita is found in line 20 of the Majhgawri plates12 of the Mahārāja Hastin as the designation of the Dūtaka called Nāgasinha. Nay, exactly the same designation, namely, Mahābalādhikrita is coupled with the name ofPrithvishêna, a staff officer of Kumāragupta I, mentioned in the Karamḍānḍa epigraph (No. 21 below). We shall not be far from right if we say that Balādhikrita, Mahābalādhikrita and Sināpati were to one another what a quartermaster-general, a brigadier-general and commander-in-chief are in the British military service. A fifth term relating to the Military

1 IHQ., Vol. XII, pp. 225 and ff.
2 TRAS., 1924, p. 402, line 5.
4 A.R. ASI., 1903-04, p. 109, No. 18.
8 Ibid., p. 283, lines 26 and 28.
9 Ibid., Vol. XX, p. 18, line 4.
12 Ibid., p. 108.
department is Rayabhāgādāgādhitkaraṇaya which also is met with on a Basāḷh seal\(^1\) and which must signify "Office of Military Store House." The sixth and the last term that we have to note is Sāndhitvigrāhika or Mahāsāndhitvigrāhika or Mahāsāndhitvigrāhādhitkaraṇākṣa\(^2\) as he is also styled in some records. Here the word mahā seems to be an honorific prefix, as the first two we find used, e.g., in the charters of the Uchchakalpa family. Thus, in the Khoh plate dated 177, Gallu, the officer who drew up the charter, is called Sāndhitvigrāhika,\(^3\) whereas in the Khoh plate of 193, his brother, Manīratha, is styled Mahāsāndhitvigrāhika.\(^4\) Possibly, in later times there was a distinction made between Sāndhitvigrāhika and Mahāsāndhitvigrāhika. In the earlier Gupta period, however, Sāndhitvigrāhika seems to be the only designation known. Thus, Harishṣēṇa, who drew up the Allahābād pillar praṣasti of Samudragupta, was not an ordinary officer. He was not only a Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, but also a Kumaṇīrāmīṭa. That is a clear indication of the high social and political status he was then enjoying. Nevertheless, the actual designation which he had held at that time was that of Sāndhitvigrāhika, without the prefix mahā. Of course, Sāndhitvigrāhika denoted 'a Minister for Peace and War', but whether he was a Minister of External Affairs as we understand him at present, it is difficult to say. As this officer must thus have been connected with correspondence with the foreign states, and was, at any rate, a commissioner properly authorised for such transactions as treaties of peace or of alliance, truces and so forth, he and the members of his office must therefore have been experts in the art of composition and mode of drafting. Thus, an Udayagiri inscription (No. 11 below) speaks of Viraśēṇa Śāva of the Kautsa gōtra as being the Sāndhitvigrāhika of Chandragupta II and describes him as a kavi or poet. Nay, Harishṣēṇa himself who drew up the praṣasti of Samudragupta engraved upon the Allahābād pillar describes it as a kāvya; and elsewhere we have pointed out what a great master of style and composition he was, by discussing the literary merits of that panegyric.\(^5\) It is therefore no wonder if a Sāndhitvigrāhika or any one of his assistants or subordinates\(^6\) is generally\(^7\) found entrusted with the task of preparing the draft of a land grant.

Another officer connected with daṇḍa is Daṇḍapāśika mentioned in the legend Daṇḍapāśikādhitarāṇaya on a Basāḷh seal noted above. In this connection we have to take note of the fact that Daṇḍapāśika is distinguished from Chauvāḍharaṇika not only in the later Pāla and Sēṇa charters but also in the earlier Valabhi\(^8\) and Chamba\(^9\) plates. Further, they are both distinguished from Daṇḍika or Daṇḍaśakti in the Pāla plates. Thus the Khālimpur record of Dharma-pāla has Daṇḍaśakti-Daṇḍapāśika-Chauvāḍharaṇika,\(^10\) whereas the Mungir inscription of Dēvapāla has Chauvāḍharaṇika-Daṇḍika-Daṇḍapāśika.\(^11\) It seems that Daṇḍika is the same as Daṇḍaśakti. Daṇḍika is not an imaginary term, it occurs also in the Deva-Barnaṇk inscription\(^12\) of Jivitagupta II. In thus settling the meaning of Daṇḍapāśika, we have to consider side by side

---

\(^2\) Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 299, line 34.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 128, lines 30-31.
\(^5\) See, pp. 149-63 below.
\(^6\) Thus we find a Kaṭak grant of Mahā-Bhavagupta I drafted by Mahīḍa, a Kāyastha, who belonged to the office of Rāja Malladatta, the Mahāsāndhitvigrāhini (Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 359, lines 46-48).
\(^7\) See e.g., a grant of Daṇḍimalhādēvī which was drawn up by the poet Jambala, son of the great poet Jayātman who is mentioned separately from the Mahākṣapaṭalika and the Mahāsāndhitvigrāhini and Mahāprathikā (Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 139, lines 39-40).
\(^8\) Ind. Ant., Vol. VI, p. 297, line 3; Vol. VII, p. 72, Plate II, line 2.
\(^10\) Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 250, line 45.
\(^12\) CIH., Vol. III, 1888, p. 216, line 9.
with it the sense of the other two terms, namely Dāndika or Dāndāśakti and Chaurōdharanīka. From a careful consideration of these three terms it appears to me that Dāndika or Dāndāśakti corresponds to the Kōtwā or the City Police Magistrate, Dāndapāśika to the Darōgā or District Superintendent of Police, and Chaurōdharanīka, to the Head of the Detective Bureau, whose duty is to apprehend a thief, either by setting a thief to catch a thief or a Pagi or Tracker to trace the cause of the miscreant by means of his foot-prints.

The next designation we have to take note of is contained in a Basādh seal legend thus: Mahāpratihāra-Taranara-Vinayāṣārasya. Vinayāṣāra is, of course, the name of the individual. Taranara is of rare occurrence in the Gupta records. But slightly earlier than this period we find that it had become a title of nobility, as is clear from the Nāgarjunikonda inscriptions. Here we meet with not only Mahātalaṇvara but also the feminine form of Mahātalaṇvari. We may thus take it that Vinayāṣāra was then occupying the social dignity of Taranara. Vogel who had edited the inscriptions enquires whether it can have “any connection with Tamil talaṇṇay (= a general), Tamil talaṇṇiyāri (= a watchman), or Ca ¬ narese talaṇvara, talaṇvāra (= a watchman, a beadle”). Hirananda Sastri further draws our attention to the fact that in early Jain literature the Mahātalaṇvāras are mentioned along with eighteen Gaṇadharas and that in the Panjab there is a subdivision of Khatris which goes by the name of Talwād. There are other names like Mahēndru, Sāhi, Sāhmi, etc., which are evidently derived from Mahēndra: ‘chief’, Sāhi: ‘banker’ and Sāhmi: ‘general’ respectively. There can thus be no doubt that in the social hierarchy of the day Vinayāṣāra held the dignity of Taranara. But what was his office designation? That is indicated obviously by Mahāpratihāra, which is rendered generally by ‘the Great Chamberlain.’ R. D. Banerji, however, takes it in the sense of the “Chief Prefect of Police” — which is inexplicable. Now Mahāpratihāra we find associated with Mahā-dandaṇṇayaka, or with Mahādandaṇṇayaka-Mahākārtikāti-Mahāraja-Mahāsānanta in the specification of the rank and designation of one and the same officer or ruler such e.g., as Dhruvasena I of Valabhi. On the other hand, he is mentioned in the list of officials mentioned in the partially preserved Dēo-Baranārk inscription along with Kumārānātyā, Rājasthāniya, Chaurōdharanīka, Dāndika, Dāndapāśika, etc. What could be the exact signification of Mahāpratihāra? It is curious that in Sanskrit literature whereas dawārika denotes ‘a male door-keeper’ pratihiṇi is employed invariably to denote ‘a female door-keeper,’ especially with reference to a harem. Even in a Nasik cave inscription which seems to be a copy of a charter issued by Gautamiputra Satakarni and his queen-mother, a Pratihiṇa (ra) kṣeti called Lōṭi is mentioned as having composed the dath of the same. In this connection we have to take note of the following passage from the Rājatarangini, relating to Lalitadiya-Muktāptīda, who is represented to have founded five new things, namely, ‘the Mahāpratihārapīda,’ ‘the Great Minister of Peace and War’ (Mahāsāndhivigrahah), ‘the Royal Stables’ (Mahāśvasalā), ‘the High Treasurer’ (Mahābhādgāra) and the Mahāsādhanabhāga.” Of these five, three are obviously officers. Of the other two, one is the Royal Stables, and the other is Mahāpratihārapīdha which literally means ‘the Porter’s chair.’ Vogel rightly informs us that “Dhyān Singh, the powerful minister of
Mahārājā Ranjít Singh held the post of deoḍhīvalā or ‘chief door-keeper’ and further draws our attention to the remark of F. Drew that “in a native court, a palace of personal government, the door-keeper, possessing as he does the power of giving or restraining access to the chief, has considerable influence.” Even in Rajputana up till recently Dēvaḍhidār was an important officer of a chief’s palace.

There are one or two more designations of the Gupta epoch that we have yet to take cognisance of. One of these is Vinayasthitisthāpaka who seems to have had his own adhikarana or office, as is clear from the seal legend Tirabhuktau Vinayasthitii-sthāpaka-adhikaranapasya. Bloch leaves it untranslated, but remarks that Vinayasthitii-sthāpaka “may denote a class of officials entrusted with the superintendence of the moral conduct of the people.” The term or designation may safely be rendered by “the official who maintains moral (vinaya) and social (sthiti) discipline.” This may be compared to Raghuwansa 1, 24-25, where both vinaya and sthiti occur. In later times a somewhat different phraseology was employed to denote the same office or officer, namely, Mahādharmaṇḍyaksha, Dharmādhikaranika, and so on. The same function was apparently discharged by Paṇḍitīrav, a member of Śivāji’s Cabinet Council. His duties as pointed out by K. T. Telang, were “to receive learned persons on behalf of the State and countersign all documents that may issue from the Sovereign relating to Achaśa, Vyavahāra and Prāyāśchitta, that is to say, rules of conduct, civil and criminal law, and penances—the three departments of the Dharma-sāstra.”

Another Officer that we have now to consider is Ayuktaka who is mentioned in a Dāmādarpur plate (No. 40 below). He is Bhandaka who, over and above his duties as an Ayuktaka, was the Head of the District Town Administration of Koṭivarsha. We have further to note that Ayuktas are mentioned in line 26 of the Allahabād pillar inscription of Samudragupta as being “always engaged upon restoring wealth to the many kings conquered by the might of his arms.” In the earlier period the term Yuktas is used. Thus Rock Edict III of Aśoka specifies Yuktas along with the officials, Prādēśikas and Rājukas. In Kauṭalīya’s Arthaśāstra not only Yuktas but also their assistants Upayuktas have been mentioned. The duties of both appear to be of the same kind. They seem to be district treasury officers who managed the king’s property, received and kept account of revenue and had power to spend where expenditure was likely to augment revenue. These designations persisted in later times also. Thus, in the Cambay plates of the Rāṣṭrakūta Gōvinda IV of Māṇyakhēṭa, Yuktaka and Upayuktaka are specified along with Rāṣṭrakoṭa, Grāmakṣaṇa and Mahattara.

Our account of the Administrative System of North India in the Gupta period cannot be complete until we show what light epigraphic records throw upon the Pañchāyat system in Bengal. Pañchāyat is generally taken to signify ‘the village community.’ It had better be understood in the sense of ‘local self-government,’ whether it is connected with a village or district. The old Pañchāyat is at present found in its best preserved form in the Madras Presidency. In many parts of Mahārāṣṭra and Gujarāt also it continues to be in some force, in spite of the innovations introduced by the British Government. But there was hardly any trace of it in

---

3 It is not impossible to take this word as Vinayasthitisthāpaka and understand sthiti-sthāpaka in the special sense of ‘having elastic properties, having the power of restoring to a previous state.’ In that case this officer has to be supposed as being entrusted with the duty of the restoration of moral discipline only. This is, however, too contracted a sense to be attached to the word.
5 *Deccan College Lectures* (First Series), p. 81.
Bengal even at the time of the establishment of the British power except perhaps in the Muhammadan community of Dacca until some time ago. A careful study of the Dāmōdarpur and kindred copper-plate inscriptions leads us, however, to the conclusion that two types of the Pañchāyat were prevalent in Bengal in the Gupta period from circa 300 to 500 A.D.—one connected with the administration of the district town, and the other with that of the village. The Dāmōdarpur plates are five in number, and are all connected with the vishaya or district of Kōtivarsha falling under the bhukti or province of Pundravardhana. Pundravardhana has now been identified with Mahāsthān in the Bōgra District and Kōtivarsha with Bāngarh in the Dinajpur District, West Bengal. Now, it is worthy of note that these records register the orders of the Adhikaraṇa of the Kōtivarsha adhishthāna to certain village officials in regard to the conveyance of certain lands. Let us now consider what these terms signify. First, what is adhikaraṇa? It is generally taken in the sense of ‘a Court of Law’ or ‘administration of justice.’ But this seems to be the narrow sense of the term. As pointed out above, in 1903-04, when T. Bloch excavated Bāsādh, the ancient Vaiśālī, he lighted upon many seals of the early Gupta period, pertaining to such offices as Kumārāṇāṭy-ādikaraṇa, Bal-ādikaraṇa, Śri-raṇabhāṇḍāgar-ādikaraṇa, Daṇḍapāṭ-ādikaraṇa, and so forth. This shows that the term adhikaraṇa was used in the sense of the modern Kachhāri or Kēchhāri, ‘a town-house,’ ‘an office for transacting public business,’ whether it was of a judicial, ecclesiastical or military nature or pertaining to customs and excise. Let us now see what court administration is referred to in the Dāmōdarpur plates. It is true that most of these plates have lost their original seals. Fortunately, one has been preserved which clearly calls it Kōṭivarsha-ādīshthān-ādikaraṇa, that is, ‘Office of the District Town of Kōṭivarsha.’ This shows that adhishthāna here denotes the principal town of a district, in this particular case, the district town of Kōṭivarsha. Let us proceed one step further. In all these plates, except one, even the personnel of the Town Board has been specified. To take the earliest two of them which refer themselves to the reign of Kumāragupta and are dated Gupta years 124 and 128, i.e., 442-43 and 446-47 A.D., we find that this Board was composed of Vētravarmā as President and Dhṛtipāla, Bandhumitra, Dhritimitra and Śambapāla as constituent members. Five members thus constituted this Board; in other words, it was a veritable Pañchāyat. The President of this Board, as we have just seen, was Vētravarmā, who is designated Kumārāṇāṭya. He was appointed President, we are told, by Chirāṭadatta who was the Uparika or Governor of the Pundravardhana bhukti or Province. He was thus a nominee of the State. But what about the other members of the Board? The first of these, Dhṛtipāla, was the Nagara-śrēṣṭhin; the second, Bandhumitra, Sārthavāha; the third, Dhritimitra, Prathama-kulika; and the fourth, Śambapāla, Prathama-kāyastha. Of these the Nagara-śrēṣṭhin has survived in the modern Nāgarṣheṭ of Gujarāt. “In all the chief centres of trade,” says the Bombay Gazetteer,² “some of the leading Vānia capitalists, under the name of Mahājana and great men, form a merchant guild. The guild fixes the rates of exchange and discount, and levies fees on certain transactions, spending the proceeds on humane and religious objects. The head of their community, the Nāgarṣheṭ or city-merchant, was formerly a man of much power and importance, though of late years, with the decay of his functions, his influence has been much reduced.” This clearly shows that up till some time ago, the Nagara-śrēṣṭhin was the head of all the artisan guilds of the district town. And this suits here exceedingly well. As regards Sārthavāha, it is scarcely necessary to point out that the term denotes the leaders of caravans. Those who have read the classical work of the late Rhys Davids named Buddhist India need not be told that even in the sixth century B.C., “there were merchants who conveyed their goods either up and down the great rivers, or along the coasts in boats; or right across country in

2 Vol. IX, pt. i, pp. 95-96; Hopkin’s India Old and New pp. 178-79.
carts travelling in caravans. These caravans, long lines of small two-wheeled carts, each drawn by two bullocks, were a distinctive feature of the times. There were taxes and octroi duties at each different country entered; and a heavy item in the cost was the hire of volunteer police who let themselves out in bands to protect caravans against robbers on the way. India seems to have hardly changed in this respect up till a century ago, the only difference being that the original sārthakaś was later on known as Vanjāras or Lōbānas. These last were the great travelling traders and carriers of Central India, the Deccan and Rajputana; and under the Afghān and Mughal empires were the commissariat of the imperial forces. It will thus be seen that the Nāgarasāḥīthin represented the special industries of the district and the internal mercantile dealings, and sārthakaś the external commercial intercourse between province and province and country and country.

We have now to consider the full significance of the phrase Prathama-kulika. Kātyāyana, the author of a Smṛiti, says in one place: kulānāṁ tu samākas—tu Ganaḥ sa parikāritah, “Gana is an aggregation of clans.” It seems that originally when a gana or a tribe conquered some territory, the different kulas constituting it divided the land among themselves. Every kula had its autonomy, such, e.g., as the Śāky a kula to which the Buddha belonged; and the several kulas confederated themselves into the tribal oligarchy or gana such, e.g., as the Līchchhavi gana. Kulas were thus petty Zemindaries, and their heads were styled Kulkas. There can be no doubt that up till later times the Kulikas played some part in fiscal administration in different provinces. It is a well-known fact that when the grant of land or village is made by a king, the copper-plate charter generally specifies a list of officials and also of people who are likely to be connected with the administration of the grant or in any way affected by it. Now, if we take any one of these plates published by J. Ph. Vogel in Antiquities of Chamba State, we find that after the specification of the state officials mention is made of Khaṣa-kulkas. The same is the case with the copper-plate grants of the Pāla kings of Bengal. They, too, specify first the state officials and make mention thereafter not only of the Khaṣa, but also of the Gauḍa, Mālava, and Hūna, Kulkas. That the Kulikas cut a more important figure in the Gupta period may be seen from the fact that several seals of Kulikas have been found in the excavations of Basādh, such as those of Kulika-Nāgedatta, Kulika-Hari, Kulika-Omabhāṣṭa. What is further noteworthy is that there has been picked up at least one seal from Basādh where with the individual name Hari is coupled not simply Kulika but rather Prathama-kulika, showing that this Hari was the first and foremost of the Kulikas of Vaiśālī. Kulas or clans seem to have been further divided into Kutumbas or families. The heads of these Kutumbas are similarly called Kutumbins; and they have been actually referred to as such in the cave inscriptions of Mahārāṣṭra. Thus in one of these inscriptions a Hālākiya or agriculturist named Usabhaṇaka has been actually styled Kutumbin, whereas his son is described merely as a Gṛihapati, that is, a member of the Middle Class as it was then called. In fact, the Kutumbins were the peasant proprietors and the Kulikas the Zamindars. In later times, though the term Kulika was forgotten, the term Kutumbin is traceable in the
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1 Buddhist India, p. 98.
3 Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 151.
4 Ibid., pp. 149 and ff.
5 p. 166, line 3.
6 Gauḍa-lekhamālā, p. 61, line 36.
8 Ibid., 1913-14, p. 139, No. 277-A.
9 Ind. Ant., Vol. XLVIII, p. 80.
Marathi Kulmhi and the Gujarati Kam and is now used to denote exclusively the cultivators. Though the term Kulika is now forgotten, the term kula is still preserved in the Bengali word kula-karma which means 'cultivation.' The upshot of this discussion is that Prathama-kulika represented, in the Adhikṣaṇa-ādhikaraṇa or the District Town Board, the Kulika class who were District Zamindars.

There now remains the fourth term to be explained, namely, Prathama-kāyastha. We have, therefore, to trace the history of the Kāyastha caste in Bengal. The first question that arises is: when did the Kāyastha caste spring into existence in this province? In this connection we have to note that there is a work called Nyāyakandali by Śrīdhara, which is a commentary on Praśastapāda’s Vaiśeṣikasūtra.1 There he tells us that he composed the work at a place called Bhūrisiphti in Dakshina-Rājdhā in Śaka 913–91 A.D. at the request of Pāṇḍudāsa, who was the head-mark of a Kāyastha kula or clan. The Kāyastha caste had thus been formed in Bengal by the tenth century. But what was the primary occupation of the Kāyasthas before they developed into a caste? A copper-plate was found at Tippera which is dated Gupta year 188–506 A.D. and speaks of Naradatta as the officer who drew up the grant. There he has designated Sandhiyāgrahādhikaraṇa-Kāyastha,2 that is, ‘a Kāyastha pertaining to the Department of Peace and War.’ It is difficult to say what the word Kāyastha here denotes, but there is here no indication at all that the Kāyasthas formed a caste about the end of the fifth century A.D. What was then the exact duty of a Kāyastha between the fifth and the tenth centuries before the Kāyastha caste arose? The Rāmaganj plate of Īśvaraghoshā, which belongs to the late Pāla period, mentions in the list of officials Mahākāyastha along with Mahākaraṇādhyaṇaka and Mahākṣaṭapāṭaṇika.3 This shows that up till the twelfth century A.D. the function of a Kāyastha in Bengal was different from that of a Karagika or ‘the writer’ or Akṣaṭapāṭaṇika or ‘the accountant’. But that does not determine the exact duty of the Kāyastha in Bengal.

If, however, we turn to the earlier Pāla period and especially to the Kāhilmpur charter of Dharmapāla, the list of officials specified therein clusters together Jyōṣṭhī-Kāyastha, Mahāmāhattara, Mahattara and Dāsiagrāmika as Vishaya-śvyavahāris4 or District Officers. It appears that in the Pāla period the lowest unit for the governance of a district was a group of ten villages in charge of an officer who was for that reason styled Dāsiagrāmika, that above him was a Mahattara, and above the latter a Mahāmāhattara and that above every one of them was placed a Jyōṣṭhī-Kāyastha. Now the term Jyōṣṭhī-Kāyastha or the Chief Kāyastha implies that the other officials, namely the Mahāmāhattaras, Mahattaras and Dāsiagrāmikas under him were known simply as Kāyastha. They thus seem to be district officers all connected principally with the collection of revenue and designated Kāyastha in ancient Bengal as they were in Kashmir in the time of Kalhana.5 Prathama-Kāyastha, like Jyōṣṭhī-Kāyastha, obviously denotes the highest grade among the Kāyasthas whose subordinate ranks were represented by the Mahāmāhattara, Mahattara, and Dāsiagrāmika. To revert to the main point, the Prathama-Kāyastha represents the class of officers who were in supreme charge of the collection of revenue.

It will be seen from the above discussion that a district town in Bengal was administered in the Gupta period by a Board of Five. Three members of this Board were Nagarā-śvēṣṭhīn, Sārthavāha and Prathama-Kulika and represented respectively the Industrial, Commercial and Zemindari interests of the District. They seem to have been elected by their constituencies. What exactly the position of the Mahākāyastha was it is difficult to say. Apparently he was

1 R. P. Chanda’s The Indo-Aryan Races, p. 198.
4 Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 250, lines 47.
5 Rājaśvaragīti, Bk. VII, verse 1226.
nominated by the Provincial Government, the senior most of the Revenue Collectors being selected for this purpose. There can, however, be no doubt as to the Head of this Board being appointed by the Provincial Governor. This has been actually stated to be so in the Dāmodarpur plates. And what has to be noted in this connection is that it was not the Vishayapatī who was always appointed President of this District Board of Five, as might naturally be expected. Of the five Dāmodarpur plates, only four specify details about this Board. Of these four, only one speaks of Vishayapatī as being President of the District Board, namely, the plate dated Gupta year 224 and mentioning Svayambhūdeva as his name. Of the remaining three, Kumārāṃītīya has been specified twice and Ayukrakasa once as the President of the District Pañcāḥyāt.

What exactly were the duties this District Pañcāḥyāt carried out cannot definitively be determined. One duty certainly was the conveyance of land as is clear from the Dāmodarpur and other kindred copper-plate inscriptions. Another duty must have been the settlement of town disputes as is clear from Act IX of the Mrīchehhakātiķa where the Śrēśthīṁ and Kāyastha figure in the Adhikarana along with its head. Here the latter is called merely Adhikaranaṇika, and the three Adhikarana-bhōjaka and the Hall where they worked Adhikarana-maṇḍapa. In addition to these, they must have been entrusted with duties connected with public works, town charities and so forth. This receives confirmation from a Nasik cave inscription which relates the benefactions of Ushavadāta (Rishabhadatta) to the Buddhist mendicants staying in the residential cave excavated by him for them. Rishabhadatta, we know, was a son-in-law and general of the Mahākṣhatrapa Nahapāna (c. 125 A.D.). After citing the details of his charities, the inscription says: srāvita nigama-sahāya nīhadha cha phalakavaṇē charitra-tīti, 1 "All this has been proclaimed to the Town Board and registered in a sheaf of record papers according to the established practice." Phalakevāra, 'sheaf of record papers', reminds us of the Pustapālas of the Dāmodarpur plates who were the Keepers of Records, and who, being aware of the title to all lands, registered the conveyance of land. Many other duties of the District Board of Ancient India or Bengal must have been similar to those of the Village Pañcāḥyāt, but of these we have no definite knowledge.

The following passage from a BhīmAḷ inscription may be compared profitably with a similar one from a Dāmodarpur record. The first runs as follows: Śrī-Śrīmāḷe Mahārājayārāja-Śrī-Udayasīṁhadeva-kalāyā-a-vijaya-rājē ten-niyukta-Mahān Gajasītha-prabhṛti-panchakula-pratīpta-tau, "In prosperous Śrīmāla, during the blessed and victorious regium of the Mahārājayārāja Śrī-Udayasīṁhadeva and during the administration of the Pañcāḥyāta (consisting of) Mahāanta Gajasimha and others appointed by him and of others." This may be compared to Pundravardhana-bhaktā—Uparika-Chirāṭadatta—ānunāha-māndak Kōṭivarsa-vishayē cha ten-niyuktā-kā-Kumārāṃītya-Vētravarmmeya—adhishṭhān-adhikaranaṇa cha Nagara-śrēśthī— Sārthavāha— Prathama-kulika— Prathama-kāyastha— purōgē samyavaharati, "While the Kōṭivarsa District is running on with (the rule of) Chirāṭadatta, Uparika of the Pundravardhana Province, and while Kumārāṃītya Vētravarm, appointed by him, is administrating the Board of the Town, (and) presiding over the Nagara-śrēśthī . . ., the Sārthavāha . . ., the Prathama-kulika . . ., (and) the Prathama-Kāyastha . . ." It will be seen that the Adhishṭhān-adhikarana of Kōṭivarsa is a Pañcāḥyāta consisting as it is of five members. And, further, we have to note that just as in the former the President of the Town Board was nominated by the Governor of the Province, so in the latter he was by the petty Chief of the petty State whose capital it was. The only difference between the two is that whereas in the former the members of the Board of Five have been specified and named, in the latter the President alone has been so named. Anyhow both the Boards can be described as Pañcāḥakula, a term which has survived in the modern Pañchori
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1 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 82, line 4.
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which certain families of Rājputānā still bear as a reminiscence of their ancestors having originally been members of this Board.

The villages also of Ancient Bengal were governed by a sort of Pañcāśāyat system about which some details have been furnished by the Dāmāderpur and other kindred records. In this connection may be cited the following passage from inscription No. 38 below: Pañcāśāyat—sa-Viśāsa Mahattar-ādy-Ashtakul-ādhikaraṇa graṃtika-kuṭumbinaḥ = ēka Chandagranakara-brahmanāthān-adhyaksha-kshudara-prakṛiti-kuṭumbinaḥ kuṭalam = uktvā... From Pañcāśāyataka, the Ashtakula Board headed by the Mahattara, in conjunction with Viśāsa, and the husbandmen who are village headmen, after inquiring about (their) health, inform the husbandmen of the village Chaḍāka who are the inferior ryots and are presided over by the Brahmaṇas, as follows.

Now, this passage speaks of two classes, the first consisting of those who issued the order and the second of those to whom it was issued. Let us, in the first place, consider those who pertained to the first order. The most important word or phrase here is the Mahattar-ādy-Ashtakul-ādhikaraṇa. Of these the term adhikaraṇa signifies 'the Administrative Board.' Ashtakula after the analogy of Pañcāśakula should denote a Board with eight constituent members. Who these were is not known. One member, at any rate, was the Mahattara. As stated above, Mahattara and Mahābhārata formed the lower order of officials connected with the collection of revenue. That suits here excellently. That the Mahattaras were in fact connected with and were the heads of Kuṭumbins or husbandmen may be inferred from Mahattar-ādi-kuṭumbins in line 3 of the Pahāḍpur copper plate inscription1 and saṁyavahārī-ādi-kuṭumbins in lines 1-2 of the Nandapur copper plate inscription2 showing clearly that the Mahattaras were saṁyavahārins or officials placed over the Kuṭumbins. The Ashtakul-ādhikaraṇa was thus presided over by the Mahattara, who, being a government official, must have been nominated by the State as no doubt the Head of the Pañcāśakula was. Further, we have to note that with this Board was associated an official whose designation was Viśāsa, as we can also see from line 1 of the Nandapur copper plate inscription referred to above. Who was this Viśāsa? In this connection it is worthy of note that Bīswā is a surname which is very common in Bengal. It is found not only among the Kāyasthas but also among the Bārendra Brahmaṇas of Bengal. And what is further noteworthy is that the surname Bīswā is met with not only among the Hindus but also among the Mussalmans of this province. Evidently it was originally the designation of a post which, later on, being held for several generations, became the surname of the family, like Bhandāri, Munsī, Majumdar, and Chakladar. But what was the meaning of the designation Viśāsa, at the outset? As in the phrase quoted above, Mahattara denotes the Head of the village community called Ashtakula, Viśāsa signifies in all probability the Accountant invariably associated with that community. This agrees with the fact that the term Viśāsa means 'trust' and may thus secondarily denote "an officer holding the post of trust." If this sense of Viśāsa, namely, 'Accountant' is accepted, it explains why Arjunamiśra, the Bengali scholar who composed a commentary on the Mahābhārata, says, as has been pointed out by J. C. Ghosh, that he composed the Mokshadharmarnāthaśāstra in accordance with the order of Gaṇḍēśvaro-Mahāmantri-srinādi-Viśāsa-rāya, that is, "the illustrious Viśāsa-rāya who was the chief councillor of the king of Gauḍa." Similarly the Bengali dramatist, Rāmachandra Guha, says that his father had attained to the distinction (padavī) of Viśāsa-khaṇa, being the chief councillor (mahānāyika) and poet-laureate (kavi-paṇḍita) of the king of Gauḍa. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Viśāsa-rāya and Viśāsa-khaṇa were something like the modern 'Lord Chancellor of the Exchequer.' We cannot explain these designations satisfactorily, unless Viśāsa is

---

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, pp. 61 ff.
2 Ibid., Vol. XXIII, pp. 52 ff.
3 Ibid., Vol. XXIV, p. 128.
taken to denote 'an accountant'. Here we may proceed one step further and notice the fact that Visvāsa is not included in but rather associated with such an Adhikaraṇa, showing that he was a state official who was connected with more than one Ashṭakula. The case is not unlike the Kulikarni of Maharāṣṭra who keeps an account sometimes of more than one village. Even the Marāṇī word kul or kāl signifies 'a ryot paying revenue to Government.'

It will be seen that the Head of the Ashṭakul-ādhikaraṇa was Mahattara, and with them is associated Visvāsa, who was most likely the Accountant of a village or a group of villages. This is not all, because with them further are associated grāmika-ktumbinaḥ. We have already seen that the Ktumbinaḥ were the peasant-proprietors just as the Kulikas were the Zemindars. There were various grades amongst Ktumbinaḥ. One grade is certainly represented by the Grāmika, who, as pointed out elsewhere, were village headmen, or rather the heads of village guilds. It is these village headmen who, along with the Visvāsa, constituted the Ashṭakul-ādhikaraṇa presided over by the Mahattara, in the discharge of the village business. That there were various grades among the Ktumbinaḥ or husbandmen can scarcely be doubted. This is clear from the passage quoted above from a Dāmōdrpur copper plate inscription (No. 38 below), which contains the following words: brahmaṇ-ādhyakṣa-kshudra-prakṛti-ktumbinaḥ. They denote ordinary husbandmen who form the inferior ryots and are presided over by the Brahmaṇas. What this means is that those husbandmen who were not Mahattaras, Visvāsas or Grānikās were stamped as kshudra-prakṛti, or inferior ryots. But they were Brahmaṇ-ādhyakṣa, that is, presided over by the Brahmaṇas. With this may be compared Brahmaṇ-āttarān = Mahattara-ādi-ktumbinaḥ in line 3 of the Pahāḍpur copper plate inscription¹ and Brahmaṇ-āttarān = sainyavahāry-ādi-ktumbinaḥ in lines 1-2 of the Nandapur copper plate inscription.² Evidently, the Brahmaṇas are here distinguished from the Ktumbinaḥ presided over by the village officials. The implication is that these Brahmaṇas were not husbandmen, but, being Brahmaṇas, were at the head of the village folk. In later times, however, some Brahmaṇas in Bengal had taken to tillage and were therefore distinguished from those who were clinging to the old mode of life proper for a Brahmaṇa. Thus in many inscriptions of the Sena period we meet with the expression Kṣhētra karāṇī = cha Brahmaṇ,³ "and the Brahmaṇa cultivators headed by the Brahmaṇas," the Brahmaṇa cultivators being naturally supposed to be inferior in status to the Brahmaṇas who did not turn agriculturists but adhered to the performance of the original duties of a Brahmaṇa.

There are two or three more characteristics of this old Pañcāyat system of Bengal that are worthy of note now. The passage from the Pahāḍpur plate bearing on this point has been cited above. Another, that from the Nandapur plate, referred to above, may be quoted here for comparison. It runs thus: Ambilagrāma-āgrahārāt = sa-Visvāsa = adhikaraṇam Jaṅgōyikā-grāmē Brahmaṇ-āttarān = sainyavahāry-ādi-ktumbinaḥ, etc. In the first place, the Adhikaraṇa here must denote the Ashṭakul-ādhikaraṇa as mention is made of Visvāsa along with it. Secondly, this Ashṭakul-ādhikaraṇa must have been a peripatetic body. In the Dāmōdrpur plate it issues orders to husbandmen and their head in Chaṅḍagrārama, while it is itself stationed at Palāśa-vrindaka. Similarly, in the Nandapur plate it passes these instructions from an agrahāra called Ambila-grāma to villagers in Jaṅgōyikā. Surely an agrahāra village could not have been the headquarters of this Adhikaraṇa. It must have been in camp at that place in the course of its tour. It seems that a number of villages must have been under its jurisdiction which it visited in the course of its tour. Thirdly, and what is most important, is that the Ashṭakul-

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, pp. 61 ff.
² Ivid., Vol. XXIII, pp. 52 ff.
³ N. G. Majumdar's Inscriptions of Bengal, Vol. III, pp. 54 ff.; pp. 55 ff.; pp. 73-74, lines 36-37; p. 87, line 33. Majumdar's translation of the expression is wrong; so is that of J. C. Ghosh (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, p. 129).
ādikaraṇa was a body which was independent of the Adhishṭhāna-ādikaraṇa, because each had a conveyance and record department of its own. How the two exactly worked where they co-existed is somewhat difficult to understand. Because the Adhishṭhāna-ādikaraṇa conveyed lands which were outside the strictly territorial limits of the Adhishṭhāna, whereas the Ashtakula-ādikaraṇa does not seem ever to have included any adhishṭhāna in its jurisdiction. Nevertheless, both forms of Pañchakula were prevalent side by side in Ancient Bengal,—the Pañchakula and the Ashtakula, each with a conveyance and record department of its own.

We have now to find out something further about Ashtakula. We know that like the Pañchakula, it was connected with the sale and purchase of land. Did it share any other characteristics of the Pañchakula? Unfortunately our information on this subject is of a very meagre character. Nevertheless, there is evidence to show that it had power to settle disputes. And curiously enough this evidence is forthcoming from Buddhist sources. We have elsewhere pointed out how Buddhist commentaries afford us interesting glimpses into the manner in which land was administered in the Lichchhavī or Vajji kingdom. When a culprit was found, we are told, he was, in the first instance, sent to an officer called Viniśchaya-Mahānīttra. If he was found guilty, he was transferred to the Body of Vyavahārikas, then to the Sūtradhārās, thence to the Board of Ashtakulikas, thereafter to the Śīnāpati, Upādāya and finally to Rājān (king), who consulted the Pawaṇi-pothakā or “Book of Precedents”, and inflicted a suitable punishment.¹ The Ashtakulikas mentioned here must be the Ashtakula-ādikaraṇa of the Dāmodāpur and Dhanadāla plates, and were certainly endowed with power to try criminal cases under the Vajjian constitution.

Nothing further is definitively known about the Ashtakula-ādikaraṇa. We may, however, indulge in a little speculation about its composition. We have already seen that the Adhishṭhāna-ādikaraṇa was a Pañchakula, the four constituent members of which represented the four different interests of the Adhishṭhāna, such as Industry, Commerce, Zemindary and Revenue. Ashtakula must similarly have been connected with the eight-fold interest of a village or village group, with the Mahattara as the head. It may have been a cosmopolitan body, a recognised permanent council of village representatives of the classes which had traditional rights and claims such as was the case in Mahārāṣṭra. They are called Balutedārs, or public servants of a village entitled to Balute, or share of corn and garden produce for subsistence. They were generally twelve in number over and above the regular Government Officers such as Pājil (village headman), Kukkarī (village accountant) and so forth. There were different Balutedārs for different districts. They represented the important castes or artisan guilds of the village community, not the least important being the untouchable Mahārs and Māṅgs. If we compare this characteristic of the Village-Council of Mahārāṣṭra with what we have culled about the composition of the Ashtakula-ādikaraṇa from a critical study of inscriptions, it seems that Pājil and Kukkarī of the former correspond with the Mahattara and Viśvesa of the latter and the Balutedārs of the former with the Grānikas of the latter. The Grānikas were headmen, not of the village as a whole but of its constituencies, the village guilds of artisanship. As in Mahārāṣṭra so in ancient Bengal, this village council must have supervised the local affairs and seen that religious and social customs and traditions were properly adhered to.

Let us now proceed one step further. We have already noted that the names Pañchakula and Ashtakula have the ending word kula in common. What does it mean? This term in the

¹ Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 154-55. The Vajjian administration has been described by Buddhaghōsa in his comment upon porātaṃ Vajjiḥdhammaṃ ti occurring in Dīghakārī (P.T.S. edn., Vol. II, p. 74, line 10) in his Suttavivādaṭṭhāni, ed. H. Dharmakāti Siri Devamittu Mahāthera, Vol. I, p. 356, Colombo, 1918, Sinhalese edn.). For this information, we are indebted to C. D. Chatterji.
sense of ‘an individual’ is found in several Pāli texts. This sense is not at all unsuitable. But it is worthy of note that Sanskrit lexicons attach the meaning of “the head of a guild or corporation” also to the word kula. This is perhaps the best and most correct explanation of Pañchakula or Ashṭakula. These bodies thus comprise the chiefs of five or eight corporations or classes of a town or village. The Ashṭakula thus consists of headmen of the village guilds of artisanship who later on degenerated into the principal castes of the village community.

SOCIAL HISTORY

We have pointed out above that Gupta as a family name was known long before 318-19 A.D. when the Imperial Gupta dynasty began to rise to power. Among the instances quoted from inscriptions was one found at Bhārhat in the Śungra regime which records the erection of a tōraṇa or gateway by Dhanabhūti, son of Āngāradyut and grandson of Viśvādeva. Viśvādeva is here styled a rājan ‘king.’ It is thus evident that Dhanabhūti who erected the tōraṇa belonged to a ruling family. What we have further to notice is that the names of the three princes are coupled with metronymics and that whereas Viśvādeva and Dhanabhūti have been styled Gārgiputra and Vātsiputra respectively, Āngāradyut is called Gōtiputra (=Gaupitiputra). What this means is that the mothers of the two former belonged to Brahmāna gōtras but the mother of the latter pertained to the Kshatriya clan, Gupta. That Gupta was a clan of nobility even after the Śungra period may be seen from a Kārle cave inscription of the second century A.D. which speaks of a Mahārathī, Agni-mitraṇaka, as being Gōtiputra (=Gaupitiputra). That Mahārathī denoted the rank of a feudatory chieftain is too well-known to require substantiation. It is thus strange that up till the second century A.D. the Guptas did not adopt any Brahmāna gōtra. Things, however, appear to have changed soon, because when the Guptas became an Imperial power, they did adopt a Brahmāna gōtra. This is clear from the copperplate charters of Prabhāvatiguptā, daughter of Chandragupta II. There she styles herself Dhārana-sagōtra, “belonging to the Dhāraṇa gōtra.” She was married to Rudrasēna of the family of the Vākāṭakas, whose gōtra, as we know from their grants, was Viṣṇuvriddha. According to Kātyāyana-Laugākshi and Āśvalāyana, Viṣṇuvriddha pertained to the Bharadvāja gōtra. But instead of Dhāraṇa we find Dhāripi mentioned by Laugākshi-Kātyāyana and as belonging to the Agasti gōtra. Dhārini must be a mislection for Dhāraṇa, which reading is clearly established by the grants of Prabhāvatiguptā, and, as a matter of fact, the gōtra lists enumerated in the Śrautasūtras are full of such misreadings. We may thus take it that as the Guptas and the Vākāṭakas are thus called Dhāraṇa and Viṣṇuvriddha, they were considered as having belonged to the Agasti and Bharadvāja gōtras respectively.

Though the Guptas and the Vākāṭakas had adopted the Brahmāna gōtras, the female members of the ruling families seem to have retained their Kshatriya clan names. It is true that the two charters issued by Prabhāvatiguptā call her Dhārana-sagōtra. Nevertheless, she has not ceased calling herself Guptā, as the ending affix of her name clearly shows. That this Guptā is not a component of her proper name is clear from the name of her mother, Kubēra-Nāga, which is also mentioned in both her grants. Here, too, the ending Nāga must be taken as the feminine form of the clan name Nāga just as Guptā is of Gupta. And, as if to leave no

1 See Mahābodhiśākṣa, ed. Strong, p. 154; Kambodian Mahābhūṣa, chapter 19, verses 1-3; Mahābhūṣa, ed. Geiger, pp. 148 and 155; especially Mahābhūṣa Translation by Geiger, p. 128, note 1. Our attention to these texts was kindly drawn by C. D. Chatterji.


3 Lüders’ List, No. 1088.

4 Gōtra-prasara-nilandha-kedambam (Bombay edn.), pp. 44 and 45.

5 Ibid., p. 87.
doubt on this point, her Riddhapur copper-plate inscription\(^1\) not only mentions her mother as Kuberā-Nāgā but also describes her as Nāga-kulitipannā, 'sprung from the Nāga clan.' It is quite evident from the evidence just set forth that though the ruling families of the Gupta period assumed Brāhmaṇa gōtras, the female members thereof stuck to the clan names of their fathers.

The facts mentioned above give rise to two or three questions which we have now to consider. The first is: how far and where the custom of adopting Brāhmaṇa gōtras was prevalent among the ruling families? The most noteworthy of these is the Sātavāhana family, whose inscriptions have been found in the Nasik, Karle and Kanheri caves. The earliest of them was Gautamiputra; his son, Vasishṭhiputra; and one successor of theirs, Mādhaviputra. These metronymics are doubtless formed out of Brāhmaṇa gōtras. But why should they be found in a ruling family at all? In explanation thereof, it is argued by some that the Sātavāhanas were of the Brāhmaṇa caste.\(^2\) This conclusion, they say, is supported by two passages in Nasik cave inscription No. 2.\(^3\) The first, which is in line 5, is Khatija-daṭapā-māṇa-madanaśa, "of (Gautamiputra), who humbled the pride and arrogance of the Kshatriyas." From this it is inferred that Gautamiputra was not a Kshatriya. For, if he were a Kshatriya, what is the good of his saying that he put down the pride and conceit of the Kshatriyas? What was he then by caste? In reply thereto, they rely on the second passage of the inscription, in line 7, namely ekabhamapanaśa, which has been translated by Senart as "the unique Brāhmaṇa."\(^4\) But bhamana can stand as much for brahmasya as for Brāhmaṇa. In fact, the first equation was suggested by R. G. Bhandarkar long ago, who rendered it by "the only supporter of Brāhmaṇas."\(^5\) The other translation makes Gautamiputra Śatakaṇṭi "the unique Brāhmaṇa," implying that in his time there was no Brāhmaṇa in the whole of India who could equal him in the sacred knowledge and duties of the Brāhmaṇa class in spite of the fact that he had already impaired the status of the first order by carrying on fights like a Kshatriya with hostile princes and lowering his family to that of the second or Kshatriya order. In these circumstances it is inconceivable how he could be styled "the unique Brāhmaṇa." It is more reasonable to take eka-Bhamapanaśa as equivalent to eka-Brāhmaṇapanaśa, "of (Gautamiputra) the unique friend of the Brāhmaṇas." The expression is not unlike aiyanta-(deha)-Brāhmaṇa-bhakta which we find applied to the muddarīja Hastin in the copper-plate inscriptions\(^6\) of the Nṛpati-Parivṝjjaka family. What then becomes, it may be asked, of Khatija-daṭapā-māṇa-madana which is used with reference to Gautamiputra? Khatija of this expression has obviously to be equated with Kshatriya or Kshatttri, the name of a tribe mentioned both by foreign writers and in Sanskrit literature. Thus Arrian who wrote an account of Alexander's invasion of India says that when this Macedonian emperor was in camp on the confuence of the Chenab and the Indus, he received deputes and presents from Xathroi (=Khatrois), an independent tribe of Indians.\(^7\) The same tribe has been referred to as Khatriaioi by Ptolemy.\(^8\) Both seem identical with Kshatriya. That there was a tribe of the name of Kshatriya is clear from Kauṭiyā's Arthaśāstra which mentions it along with Kambhojas and Surāśṭras as a corporate tribe (śrēṇi) subsisting both

\(^1\) CIH, Vol. V, No. 8, pp. 33 ff.
\(^3\) Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 60.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 61; Senart practically follows Bühler, who renders it by "of him who alone (was worthy of the name of) a Brāhmaṇa" (ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 110).
\(^6\) CIH, Vol. III, 1868, Nos. 21, 22 and 23.
\(^7\) McGregor’s Ancient India: Its Invasion by Alexander the Great, p. 156.
\(^8\) Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, p. 360.
yātē. This shows that the Kshatriya borrowed from his Purāhita, not his gotra, but his pravara. Those who are conversant with this subject know full well that the Śrautasūtras always make a distinction between gotra and pravara. Thus the Māthara gotra from which the metronymic Māthariputra is derived has the three pravaras: Kāsyapa, Āvatsāra and Naidhruva. But these pravaras are not the monopoly of Māthara only but are possessed in common by no less than eighty other gotras, such as Kāsyapa, Chhāgari, Aimātyaṇa and so forth.\(^1\) There is no such thing as one set of pravaras for one gotra. Even supposing that a Kshatriya affiliates himself to the gotra of his Purāhita for religious purposes as Bühler says, why should that gotra be binding upon the Kshatriya for secular purposes, why, in other words, should the Kshatriya avoid marrying a girl, not of his own Kshatriya clan, but of the Purāhita's gotra which cannot but be an extraneous something foisted upon his family? This point is quite clear to whoever studies the Nāgarjunikonḍa inscriptions. The kings mentioned in these records are Chāṃtāmūla, his son Vīrapurushadatta and the latter's son Ehuvala-Chāṃtāmūla. The first and the third of these princes are Vāsishṭhiputra and the second Māthariputra, but they are all known by the Kshatriya clan name, Iksvāku. Again, these Iksvākus enter into matrimonial alliances with the Pūgiyas (Pūktis), Kulahakas, Hiranyakas and Dhanikas. These are not found as the names of Brāhmaṇa gotras in any one of the Śrautasūtras and must therefore be presumed to be Kshatriya clans. Nevertheless, it is worthy of note that one Pūgiya, Skandaśri, who had married a sister of Chāṃtāmūla, styles himself Vāsishṭhiputra. What could be the meaning of this? What could be the meaning of these Kshatriya rulers and noblemen having mothers who belonged to Brāhmaṇa gotra and were thus Vāsishṭhi and Māthari. The only conclusion possible in these circumstances is that in the ancient period ranging from circa 150 B.C. to circa 350 A.D. there were intercaste marriages, even of the pratiloma type. The history of these Iksvākus clearly shows that the Brāhmaṇas were ready to give their daughters in marriage to Kshatriyas if they but belonged to the ruling family. If any futher proof is required, it is furnished by the Nasik cave inscription referred to above. It records the gift of the cave by the mother of the Śatāvahana overlord, Gautamiputra Śatakarni. Therein, be it noted, she calls herself Gotami Balasiri (=Gautami Balasiri).\(^2\) It is quite evident from this that the mother of Gautamiputra retains her gotra name, namely, Gautami, though this Śatāvahana king is nowhere mentioned by any Brāhmaṇa gotra appellation. Such is exactly the case with the rulers and noblemen adverted to in the Nāgarjunikonḍa inscriptions. They are all mentioned by their Kshatriya clan names, such as Iksvāku, Pūgiya and so forth but never by any Brāhmaṇa gotra. Such was not, however, the case with the Brāhmaṇas of this period. Thus the Silahāra cave inscriptions speak of their being excavated by an anātya of king Śvāmidatta who is called Mūladēva and styled Vātasa and Maudgaliputra.\(^3\) The first is a patronymic and shows that his father was a Brāhmaṇa of the Vātasa gotra. The second is a metronymic and shows that his mother's father was a Brāhmaṇa of the Mudgala gotra. Another instance, if it is at all necessary, is that furnished by a Maṇavallī pillar record\(^4\) which speaks of the grantee Nāgadatta as not only of the Kaṇḍinya gotra but also as Kauśikiputra. This clearly shows that Nāgadatta was born not only of a Brāhmaṇa mother but also of a Brāhmaṇa father.

The second question that now arises is: what was the use of these metronymics at all? There can be but one reply. When and where polygamy is in existence, it becomes necessary to distinguish the sons of one wife from those of another. The custom is still in vogue in Rājputāna. If a Rājput marries more than one princess, they are distinguished one from the other,
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\(^1\) Baudh. Śr. Sūt. (Bibli. Ind.), Vol. III, pp. 449-49.


\(^3\) Ibid., Vol. XXII, pp. 30 and ff.

\(^4\) Lüders' List, No. 1196.
according as she is a Ḥāḍī-ji, Rāṇāvat-ji and so forth. Such must have been the case in ancient India also. Kings certainly married more than one princess who were therefore known by the clan names of their fathers. But it is worthy of note that this polygamy was prevalent in ancient India not only among the Kshatriyas but also among the Brāhmaṇas, as the instances adduced above clearly show. There can thus be no doubt that up till circa 400 A.D., the Brāhmaṇa mothers, whether they were married in the Brāhmaṇa or Kshatriya community, retained their original gōtras, that is, the gōtras of their fathers. What then becomes of the present day social custom that a girl as soon as she is married, is merged into the gōtra or family of her husband? This is the third question that we have to consider. What we have exactly to consider here is whether it is prevalent even now in all parts of India and also up till what period it was not adopted in ancient India. As regards the first part of the question, we have already pointed out that even to this day the queens of the native princes of Rājputānā, or, for the matter of that, of all Rājput princes, are known by the feminine form of the clan names of their fathers. In respect of the second part of the question we find this practice preserved among the Kshatriyas from early times up till the Gupta period. Thus Ajātashātu of Rājagriha and Udayana of Kauśāmbi who were both contemporaries of the Buddha and belonged to the earlier epoch have been styled Vaidēhīputra in early Pāli literature. Evidently their mothers belonged to Vidēha, which was one of the eight confederate clans constituting the Vajji tribe. An instance of the later period is supplied by the Imperial Gupta dynasty, who, in spite of their being brahmanised, allowed their queens to retain the names of the clan from which they descended. Thus, whereas the daughter of Chandragupta II styles herself Prabhāvatiguptā, her mother is called Kubēra-Nāgā. Each of the queens has retained the clan name of her father even after her marriage, nay even after she is the mother of several children. This is all the more significant as the Guptas were becoming more and more steeped in Brahmanism. Their brahmanisation even in the sphere of kingship is traceable in the fact that the Guptas adopted the Brāhmaṇa gōtra, Dhāraṇa, to keep themselves on the same social footing as the Vākāṭakas who were of the Brāhmaṇa caste and of the Vaiśnūvṛiddha gōtra. We have already mentioned and repudiated the view of Bühler that the ruling classes adopted the gōtras of their Purōhitas as prescribed by the Śrāvastīvinī and that metronymics were formed out of them to distinguish between the princes born of their various Kshatriya mothers. We have shown in the first place that what the Āśvaghoṣa’s Saundarāṇandā (I. 22) informs us that when certain Ikshvākus princes went to the hermitage of Gōṭama Kapila, they became his pupils. And although they were originally Kautsas, they now became Gautamases in consequence of the gōtra of their Guru. The verse following is of great importance as it explains this change of gōtras. It runs thus:

Eka-pitrō = yathā bhrātrōḥ
priṭhag-guru-parigrāhāḥ 1
Rāma ēo = ābhava= Gārgyō
Vāsūbhadrō = pi Gō(au) tamāḥ II (23)

"Just as of the two brothers from one father, Rāma (Balarāma) became Gārgya and Vāsūbhadra (Vāsudēva), Gautama, through their accepting different Gurus."

It is thus clear that from the second century A.D. onwards the ruling princes somehow began to affiliate themselves to the gōtras of their Purōhitas with the result that their descendants generally continued the same gōtra though they by no means discarded their original clan names. This is quite clear from the charters issued by the daughter of Chandragupta. As mentioned above more than once, though she is styled Dhāraṇa-sagōṭrā, she calls herself (Prabhāvatī-)Guptā. Which Gupta prince adopted apparently the Dhāraṇa gōtra of his Purōhita, it is now difficult to say. Similarly, it is equally difficult to determine which Vākṣāṭaka prince originally had or assumed the Brāhmaṇa gōtra of Vīṣṇuvriddha. Certainly it was there in the time of Rudrasēṇa II, husband of Prabhāvatī-Guptā. And it is not impossible that it was the gōtra of Vindhyāsakti who, according to an Ajanṭā cave inscription, was the founder of the Vākṣāṭaka dynasty and was himself a dvija, which, from the second century A.D. onwards, always denoted a Brāhmaṇa. This agrees with the fact that his son Pravarasēṇa I is described in the Vākṣāṭaka plates as having celebrated many sacrifices among which is mentioned not only Vājapēya but also Brīhaspatiśava. “Brīhaspatiśava is the name of a sacrifice by which, according to the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, the priest who desired to become a Purōhita obtained that office. According to the Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra, it was the sacrifice to be performed by a priest after the Vājapēya, while the king performed the Rājaśūya.”¹ It is true that “in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, the Brīhaspatiśava is identified with the Vājapēya; but such identity is clearly not primitive.” And, as a matter of fact, in the Vākṣāṭaka records Pravarasēṇa is represented as having performed not only Vājapēya but also Brīhaspatiśava. The two were of course considered as separate sacrifices when he actually celebrated them. It is thus evident that Pravarasēṇa must have been looked upon as a Brāhmaṇa when he performed them. Whether his descendants continued to be of Brāhmaṇa caste right up to the end or only up to the time of Rudrasēṇa II we do not know. But this much may be taken as certain that the family was of Brāhmaṇa origin and pertained to the Vīṣṇuvriddha gōtra. And further, it seems that when the marriage alliance took place, doubtless of anulōma character, between the Vākṣāṭakas and the Guptas, the latter, to raise themselves to a higher social dignity, assumed a Brāhmaṇa gōtra, Dhāraṇa, probably of their Purōhita. Thus originated the practice of Kṣatriya rulers adopting the Brāhmaṇa gōtra of their gurus which continued right down to the fourteenth century, as is clear from epigraphic records. Thus a Chāndpur inscription² dated Vikrama year 1207 speaks of one Udayapāla who belonged to the Mahā-Pratihāra family and the Vatsa-gōtra. The Mahaḍā plates of Sōmēsvaradēvavārman,³ Lord of Vaūdhā (Baudh) describe him as pertaining not only to the solar race and the Kalikāla linage but also to the Kāśyapa gōtra. Similarly, a sati stone inscription⁴ found at Pushkar records the death of a Tāhkur of the Guhila linage and the Gautama gōtra. Many more instances might be adduced, but they are unnecessary. What we have to note here is that the Guptas who had been known as Kṣatriyias of a high status were by the time of Chandragupta II so much Brahmanised that they had to adopt a Brāhmaṇa gōtra, before probably they entered into a matrimonial alliance with a Brāhmaṇa family, namely, the Vākṣāṭakas whose gōtra was Vīṣṇuvriddha which pertained to the Bhāradvaja stock. As the custom was and is to avoid marriage in the same gōtra, the Guptas had to adopt Dhāraṇa gōtra which belonged to the Agastī stock. Now arises the fourth question, namely, how pratilōma marriages took place between the Iksvākus and Śātavāhanas on the one hand and certain Brāhmaṇa families on the other, as detailed above? There is one passage in a Nāgārjunikonda inscription which is worth consider-

² D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 277.
³ Ibid., No. 1758; Epi. Ind., Vol. XXVIII, pp. 283 ff.
⁴ D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 407.
ing here. The benefactions made in connection with this site were in furtherance of Buddhism. It is therefore no wonder if the important inscriptions there begin with the praise of the Buddha, the founder of that religion. But Buddha was as much an Ikshvāku as any one of the ruling princes of that region. And one of these inscriptions speaks of the Buddha as follows: Ikṣaku-ṛāja-pañva-ṛisi-sata-paḥahaka-rasnm-sainbhava,1 “Of (Buddha), born of a race which was the source of hundreds of Ikshvāku kings who were gōra-originator sages (pravara-tīshita).” It thus appears that the Ikshvākus of Southern Kōsala had preserved some pravaras of their own which they naturally avoided when they married Brāhmaṇa girls. What these pravaras were we have now no means of knowing. Anyhow this much is certain that originally the Kshatriyas had pravaras of their own and had preserved them for a long time. Thus one can quite understand the exact significance of it when the Āpastamba Śrautasūtra says:2 Aha yēśhān (=Kshatriyānām) mantrakṛtō na syuḥ sa-purēhita-pravaraś—tē pravirītān. It is quite clear that some Kshatriyas retained their ārsha gōtra for a very long time. And even as late as the beginning of the twelfth century A.D. we find the mention of a Kshatriya with ārsha gōtra and pravaras. Thus we have six copper-plate charters of the Gāhaḷavāla king Jayachandradēvā of Kanauj,3 with dates ranging between Vikrama years 1233 and 1236 and recording grants to one and the same grantee, namely, the Rūta Rājyaḍharavarman, son of the Mahāmāhattaka, the Ṭhakura Vidyādharā, and son’s son of the Mahāmāhattaka, the Ṭhakura Jagaddhara, a Kshatriya. Now, what does Kshatriya mean here? Does it mean “a member of the second or military order” or “an individual of the Khatrī caste”? This matter is easily settled in favour of the former supposition, first because while the father and grandfather of the donee have been styled Ṭhakura, “a Rajput chief,” he himself is called merely Rūt, that is, Rājput. Probably he did not succeed or did not care to succeed to the ancestral position, and was content to lead a different life. Quite in keeping with the rank of Ṭhakura occupied by his father and grandfather is the title Mahāmāhatiaka which is coupled with their names. Secondly, if any doubt still remains on the point, it is set at rest by the place where the word Kshatriya occurs. The passage runs as follows: Vatsa-gōtrāya Bhāṛggava-Chyavan-Āpanāvān-Aurova-Jamadagny-ṛiti-paṁchi-pravara-ya. . . . . . -paṭrāya . . . . -putrāya rūta-ṛiti-Rājyaḍharavarmanā kṣaṭriyāya.4 This may be compared with the passage in another grant of Jayachandra concerning a Brāhmaṇa grantee. It is as follows: Śārkaraṇkha-gōtrāya Bhāṛggava-Chyavan-Āpanāvān-Aurova-Jamadagny-ṛiti paṁchi-pravara-ya. . . . . . -paṭrāya . . . . -putrāya Mahāpaṁḍita-ṛiti-Hṛṣīkṣita- sarmaṇe brāhmaṇāya.5 It will be noted that Kshatriya in the first passage occupies exactly the same place as Brāhmaṇa in the second. It occurs immediately after the mention of the donee’s name. In the second passage, quite in consonance with the fact of the donee being a Brāhmaṇa are Mahāpaṁḍita and sarmaṇ prefixed and suffixed to his name. Similarly, in the first passage quite in consonance with the grantee being a Kshatriya are rūta and varma prefixed and suffixed to his name. Further, it is worthy of note that each of the donees has five pravaras and that they are exactly the same in the case of both, though one of them is a Brāhmaṇa and the other a Kshatriya. Thus, both have one and the same ārsha gōtra, though the sept of the Brāhmaṇa is Śārkaraṇkha and that of the Kshatriya grantee, is Vatsa. It will thus be seen that up till the twelfth century A.D. some Kshatriyas had preserved their ārsha gōtras and pravaras and were considered to be as holy as the Brāhmaṇas; otherwise there would have been no meaning in Jayachandra issuing grants for the augmentation of the spiritual merit not

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 22, line 1.
2 Pravara-khaṇḍa, III. 15.
3 Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII, pp. 135-143.
5 Ibid., p. 131, lines 27-28.
only of himself but also of his parents. And what is further noteworthy is that this Kshatriya
douce Rājyadharavarman, seems to have been a particularly holy man as the Gāhaḍavāla
king issued no less than six charters to him,—a thing unprecedented in the field of epigraphy.

We have now to consider the fifth question that arises out of the mention of the gōtras and
clans specified in the two copper plate charters of the daughter of Chandragupta II. Let us,
in the first place, recapitulate what we have discussed so far. We have seen that she calls
herself Prabhāvatiguptā and that her mother is described as Kubēra-Nāgā. As the latter is
further described as having sprung from the Nāga family, there can be no doubt that the
post-fix Nāgā is the feminine form of Nāga, the name of the clan to which she belonged. For the
same reason we have to take Gūtā of Prabhāvatiguptā as the name of the clan to which
she pertained. But she was married into the Vākāṭaka family which was decidedly a Brāhmaṇa
family and bore the Brāhmaṇa gōtra Vishnuvriddha. The Gūtās never had any Brāhmaṇa
gōtra before or after they rose to power. We have found so many inscriptions of them, but no
Brāhmaṇa gōtra is found coupled with the name of any one of them. But there is hardly any
record of the Vākāṭaka kings where their Brāhmaṇa gōtra, Vishnuvriddha, is not specified.
Their clan names were already different, namely Gūtā and Vākāṭaka. That was enough to
enable one clan to marry into the other, just as Kubēra-Nāgā was married to Chandragupta.

But as Prabhāvatiguptā was being wedded to a Vākāṭaka king of the Brāhmaṇa caste, the
Gūtās, it seems, had to adopt a Brāhmaṇa gōtra, namely, Dhāraṇa, which had different
pravaras from those of Vishnuvriddha. This was probably to raise themselves to the dignity of a
Brāhmaṇa family and legalise the marriage even from the Brahmantic point of view, by bringing
about matrimonial alliance not only in two different clans but also in two different Brāhmaṇa
gōtras. In fact, it was on account of mixed marriages, anulōma and pratilōma, that the
Kshatriya families were forced to retain or assume Brāhmaṇa gōtras. Those who had the ārsha
pravaras handed down from generation to generation certainly retained them. The mention of
Rājyadharavarman as a grantee in Jayachchandra’s plates is an instance in point, showing
that some Kshatriya families retained such pravaras till the twelfth century A.D. But those
Kshatriya families which had no ārsha gōtras attached to them had to assume them for matrimonial
purposes to start with and borrowed them apparently from their Purōhitas. To sum up,
mixed marriages, like anulōma and pratilōma, were known right up to the time of Chandragupta II,
that is, up to the commencement of the fifth century A.D., that consequently the metronymies,
coincided out of Brāhmaṇa gōtra or Kshatriya clan names, were prevalent up to the Gupta
period, but that except among the Rājpūts these metronymies have now gone completely out
of vogue, especially in the Brāhmaṇa caste, where a girl is believed to be merged into the
gōtra of her husband soon after her marriage. Thus the fifth question that we have to consider
here is: when did the custom arise of a girl being absorbed into the gōtra of her husband?
It is very doubtful whether this custom is Aryan at all. As a matter of fact, it is not supported
by any one of the earlier Śnrtis, such as Manu, and Tājñavelkya, and Narada and Vishnu. Gauāma
Dharmasūtra (IV. 2) says: a-samāna-pravarai意味着. Tājñavelkya-smṛti lays down (I. 53)
that a man should marry a girl who is a-samān-ārsha-gōtrajā, “born in a gōtra which
has dissimilar Pravaras (ārsha).” If the Aryans were so particular about avoiding marriage
with a girl who has the same gōtra, how can they admit a girl into the gōtra of her husband
after a marriage. In fact, Bodhāyana asserts that sa-gōtrai gatau Chāndrāyam charit, “one
shall perform (the penance of) Chāndrāyana, having intercourse with a girl of the same gōtra.”
It thus seems well nigh impossible according to the Aryan custom that a girl after marriage
could be merged into the gōtra of her husband as he thereby committed an incest and would
have to perform the expiatory penance. Nevertheless, the Aryan custom, foisted upon the
marriage system of India, was gradually losing ground and being replaced by the pre-Aryan
Indian custom of a married girl being taken into the gōtra of her husband. Thus the Laghu-Hārīta-smṛiti says:

vivāh-ādini karmāni smaranāt pitri-gōtratāḥ |
sanvatsarā vyattī tu tad-gōtram niṣyati punah // (V. 62)
tri-parikramaṇād = agnī = hridaya-ālanhanāt tathā |
svāmi-gōtrāṇa kartavyā pīṇḍa-dān-ōdaka-kriyā // (V. 63).

From this it is clear that at the time of the marriage of a girl her father’s gōtra counts, but after the lapse of a year that gōtra is replaced by that of her husband’s and that all the subsequent rites such as offering of pīṇḍa etc., were performed with reference to the latter. The Lākīta-smṛiti is more drastic and has the following:

vivāhē ch = avac nityātī chaturthē = tumi rātrishu |
ekatvam sā gatā bhartuḥ pīṇḍe gōtrā cha sūtakē // (V. 25)
sea-gōtrād = bhraṣṭaṁ nārī udvāhā = saṭāmē padē |
bharti-gōtrāṇa kartavyā dānāṁ pīṇḍ-ōdaka-kriyāḥ // (V. 26).

What the passage means is that, as soon as the marriage septapadi is over, a girl loses her father’s gōtra and on the fourth night therefrom is at one with the pīṇḍa, gōtra and sūtaka of her husband’s family and that consequently all gifts, obsequial rice-balls and libration waters are to be offered in her case in conformity with her husband’s gōtra. This state of things must have come into vogue after the Gupta period. For, of this period, are the two Smṛitis, Nārada and Vīṣṇu, and the latter (24.9) says: na se-gōtrāṁ na samām-arṣya-pravaraṁ bhāryāṁ vindetā, “No one shall marry a woman who is of the same gōtra, or the same gōtra-originating sage-ancestor.”

We now turn to an entirely different question connected with the social life of the Gupta period. While treating of Kāchagupta in a chapter on the Political History above, we had occasion to narrate that it was he who succeeded Samudragupta, that then came off a war where Kāchagupta was forced to agree to surrender to a Śaka ruler his queen Dhruvasvāmi, that Chandragupta II put on the garb of the queen, went to the hostile camp and put the enemy to death, that he thereby incurred the violent jealousy of his elder brother who was now trying to assassinate him and that this concatenation of events ended in Chandragupta II putting Kāchagupta to death, occupying the Gupta throne and marrying his wife. This narrative is based upon a drama called Dēvi-Chandraguptam by Viśākhadatta who was the author of another historical play entitled Mūḍrā-Rākshasa. Grounds have been adduced elsewhere to show how far we may take the drama as furnishing history. Supposing that our point of view is correct, supposing, therefore, that Chandragupta II married the wife of his elder brother whom he killed, the question arises: how was it looked upon from the social and legal point of view? When Chandragupta II married Dhruvasvāmi, she was a widow, moreover a widow who was his own brother’s wife. Such a thing was not tolerated in the mediaeval and the modern periods. But was it allowed in the Gupta period? This is the question which we have now to consider. Every student of Smṛiti literature is conversant with the text:

nashē mṛśe pravrajāte klihē cha patiē patau |
pachaso = āatsu nāriṁāṁ patir = anyō vidhyātē //

It occurs not only in the Parāśara but also in the Nārada-smṛiti (XII. 97). It allows a woman to marry another man in five kinds of adversity, that is, when the husband is untraceable, or dead, has become a religious ascetic, or when he is impotent, or is expelled from caste. Other texts may also be quoted, but they are unnecessary. What we have further to note here is that the Nārada-smṛiti has been referred by Jolly to the fifth or sixth century A.D. It is thus of the early Gupta period, and must, therefore, be considered as reflecting the practices of the age. Though widow marriage was thus allowable in the Gupta period, this action of Chandragupta II in killing his brother and marrying his wife was not approved by the public as it is con-
demned in two of the Rāṣṭrākūṭa records referred to above. It was, however, condemned not because of its being legally inadmissible.

We shall now turn to the other aspects of the social life of the Gupta period, and consider, above all, the nature of the ethnico-social fabric of this epoch. Years ago we had occasion to observe that there was a racial identity or rather affinity between the Kāyasthas of Bengal and the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas of Bombay Gujarāt.\(^1\) We were then engaged upon a study of this Brāhmaṇa community with the help of Valabhi inscriptions and certain Pravarādhyāya texts discovered by the late Vallabhjī Haridatta Acharya of Rājkot, the greatest Nāgar Brāhmaṇa archaeologist and historian of the last generation. The texts cite a verse setting forth Śarmas or clan affixes going with the various gōtras of the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas. The verse runs as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Datta-Gupta} & \text{ Nanda-Ghāshau} \\
\text{Śarma-Dāsau cha Varma cha} & \\
\text{Nāgadattas} = \text{Trāta-Bhātāu} \\
\text{Mitra-Dīsau Bhavas = tathā} &  \\
\end{align*}
\]

The texts in question are three manuscripts of the work Pravarādhyāya connected with the Nāgars. One of these is dated Sanvats 1783 Vaisākha śuda 8 Bṛigu. And they all distinctly and unmistakably state that the gōtras, pravaras, etc., therein specified are those which were in existence before Sanvats 1283. The thirteen Śarmas set forth in the verse quoted above must therefore have been in use among the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas up till 700 years ago. Even now they are affixed to their names when they perform the religious ceremonies. Leaving aside the second statement for the time being, let us see whether the first one receives any corroboration from epigraphic sources. We will therefore confine ourselves here to two Śarmas only, namely, Mitra and Trāta. In the Pravarādhyāya, Mitra has been assigned two gōtras, namely, Śārkarāksha and Gāṅgīyāyana. The following extracts from the copper-plate inscriptions of the Maitraka princes, all found at Alinā, are worthy of consideration:

\(1\) Anarttapura-vinirgata-khetaka-nīsāi-Śārkarākshi-sagōtra-bahūrīcha-sabrahmachāri-brāhmaṇa-Āḍtyamitra-putra-brāhmaṇa-Vishnumitrāya\(^2\)

\(2\) Śrimad-Anandapura-vāstavya-tacch-chāṭuvridya-sāmānya-Śārkarākshi-sagōtra-bahūrīcha-sabrahmachāri-bhaṭṭa-Ākhandalaminitrāya bhaṭṭa-Vishnu-putrāya\(^2\)


The above four plates were all found at Alinā in the Kaira District of Gujarāt State. They were issued by different Maitraka rulers of Valabhi to Brāhmaṇa grantees who were natives of Anandapura or Anarttapura. Both are names of Vaḍnaṅgar to which pertained a branch of the Nāgar Brāhmaṇa community called Vaḍnaṅgara.\(^6\) There can thus be no doubt as to the grantees of these charters having been Nāgar Brāhmaṇas. This is proved further by the fact that they were all of the Śārkarākshi gōtra, a gōtra which, the Nāgars maintain, is to be met with in no other caste than their own.\(^7\) Further still, it deserves to be noticed that the names of the donees and their fathers end in Mitra, so far as the first three inscriptions go. What could be

---

\(^1\) \textit{Ind. Ant.}, Vol. XI, pp. 32 and ff.

\(^2\) \textit{Ibid. Ant.}, Vol. VII, p. 72, Pl. II, lines 4-5.


the significance of this suffix? Is it an integral part of the proper names, and not therefore separable from them? Inscription (4) militates against this supposition. For the grantee therein mentioned is also the grantee of inscription (3), namely, Nārāyaṇa, son of Kēśava. In the latter, the suffix Mitra is attached to the names of both, but is conspicuous by its absence in the former. Obviously, it has to be understood as a Sarman in the sense of clan affix. This may be seen also from the fact that it has been assigned to two gōtras, namely, Śārkarāksha and Gāṇgāyāna in Pravaraḍhyāya. That this statement of the work is correct may be seen from the fact that the Brāhmaṇa grantees, mentioned above as Mitras, actually belonged to the Śārkarākshī gōtra.

The Pravaraḍhyāya, again, mentions Trāta as another Sarman and assigns to it two gōtras, namely, Bhāradvāja and Ātrēya. Let us see whether the existence of this Sarman with any one of the gōtras attached to it is borne out by any epigraphic evidence. The Vāvaḍiyā-Jōgia plates of Dhrusvaśena I speak of the grantees thus:

Ānandapura-vātasya-brāhmaṇa-Skandatrāta-Guhatrākāhyām Bhāradvāja-sagōtrābhivyām Chhandōga-sabrahamachārībhvyām, etc., etc.¹

The name Ānandapura shows that the donees here also were Nāgar, above all, Vaḍnagar, Brāhmaṇas. The names of both end in Trāta which must be the clan name. And as required by this clan, both belong to the Brāradvāja gōtra. This agrees perfectly with the information contained in the Pravaraḍhyāya about this Sarman and its gōtra.

The above evidence clearly shows that the contention of the Pravaraḍhyāya, that the gōtras, Sarmans, etc., specified therein as being in existence until Vikrama year 1283, is thoroughly borne out by the plates of the Mastraka rulers of Valabhi, that is, from circa 500 to circa 770 A.D., so far as the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas are concerned. The question arises: are they still prevalent amongst them? The great Nāgar scholar, Vallabhi Ji Haridatta Acharya, assured us in 1910 that they were in full swing up till that year and that even the Sarmans were not forgotten as, at the time of performing religious ceremonies, it was customary to say Bhagvānlal-Trāta for mere Bhagvānlal, Maniśaṅkara-Gupta for mere Maniśaṅkara and so forth. Here, at any rate, Trāta and Gupta are not mere suffixes, for we have them already in lāl of Bhagvanlal and sarīkara of Maniśaṅkara. The conclusion is not unreasonable that their Sarmans originally represented the families or clans that were incorporated in the Nāgar race.

Let us proceed one step further. Of the thirteen Sarmans of the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas mentioned above, no less than ten are found as family names among the Kāyasthas of Bengal, such as Datta, Gupta, Nandi, Ghōsh, Šarma, Dās, Barmā, Bhūt, Mitra and Deb. How can this concurrence of clan names or surnames in two such different parts of India be explained? When we first studied this question in 1909, we could only suspect that this pointed to some racial identity or affinity between the two communities. The chain of evidence was then far from satisfactory, because no Bengali Kāyastha surnames were at all traceable anywhere in ancient Bengal of the Valabhi period, and, above all, among the Brāhmaṇas of Bengal and Orissa. Epigraphy has since then made such considerable progress that we are now in a position to say something definite on the matter. A careful study of the inscriptions shows that the Kāyastha surnames were in existence in Bengal long before the Muhammadan invasion. One such group of inscriptions was found in the Faridpur District of Bengal, and pertaining to the sixth century A.D. But perhaps the earliest of these are the five celebrated copper-plate charters of the Gupta kings found at Dāmōdarpur in the Dinajpur District of West Bengal. The earliest of these, again, is dated Gupta year 124=442 A.D., and the latest, Gupta year 214=

532 A.D. As has been pointed out in another chapter, these charters throw a flood of light on the system of administration prevalent under the Imperial Guptas. The provinces were ruled by governors appointed by the king; and, furthermore, the district towns themselves were administered by Vishayapatis, Kumārāmāyas or Ayuktakas selected by them, being helped by a council of four consisting of Nagara-śrēśṭhīn, Sārthavāha, Prathama-Kulika and Prathama-Kāyastha. One minor but not insignificant official of the district was the Pustapāla. Now in these Damōdarpur plates, we do find the names of these officials ending in Kāyastha surnames. Thus the provincial governors mentioned are Chirāṭa-Datta, Brahma-Datta and Jaya-Datta. The Vishayapatis are Vētra-Varman and Swayambhū-Devā. Those who formed the councils are Dhṛiti-Pāla, Bandhu-Mitra, Dhṛiti-Mitra, Sāmbara-Pāla, Rībhupāla, Vasu-Mitra, Vara-Datta, Vīpripāla, Sthānu-Datta, Mati-Datta and Skanda-Pāla. The Pustapālas named in these grants are Risi-Datta, Jaya-Nandīn, Vibhū-Datta, Patra-Dāsa, Vīshnu-Datta, Vijaya-Nandīn, Sthānu-Nandīn, Gopa-Datta and Bhāṭa-Nandīn.

It will be seen that most of the above names terminate in Dāsa, Datta, Dēva, Mitra, Nandīn and Varman which correspond to Kāyastha surnames in Bengal. The Sanskrit language is, however, so elastic that it is possible to contend that these name-endings need not be taken as surnames at all, but considered as integral parts of individual names. Thus Sambhāpāla need not necessarily denote a person who is called Sambha and surnamed Pāla, but rather an individual who is named Sambhāpāla in the sense of “protected by the god Sambha.” It is quite possible to explain many of these names in this manner, but this cannot explain them all. For, what plausible explanation can be offered of such names as Chirāṭa-Datta, Bandhu-Mitra, Patra-Dāsa, Nara-Nandīn, Bhāṭa-Nandīn and so forth. What philological ingenuity can interpret Chirāṭa-Datta and Patra-Dāsa, for instance? What we have further to bear in mind is that we have here names, a large number of them, every one of which, curiously enough, ends in a Kāyastha surname. And if we take such names as Vētra-Varman and Patra-Dāsa, they must look like ordinary names to a non-Bengali, and he is sure to look upon -Varman and -Dāsa as the name suffixes of the Kshatriya and Śūdra communities respectively. But even here they can be taken as corresponding to the well-known surnames, Barman and Dās, which are prevalent among the Kāyasthas of Bengal. Now, again, can we better explain the two names Dhṛiti-Mitra and Dhṛiti-Pāla? Philology, of course, can explain the former by dhṛiti (=Dhṛitimitra) and the latter by dhṛiti pālayati (=Dhṛiti-pāla). But Mitra and Pāla are well-known surnames, whereas Dhṛiti is not. And Dhṛiti, on the other hand, is not only the common but also the first component of the name. And common sense tells us that Dhṛiti is the individual name in the case of both and that whereas Mitra is the family name of the first, Pāla is of the second Dhṛiti. The conclusion is almost irresistible that the names of the officers specified above are full names, each consisting of the individual name and the family name, the last being the same as the Kāyastha surname. And as the earliest of these inscriptions is dated 442 A.D., it is incontrovertible that the Kāyastha surnames are traceable as early as the fifth century A.D. It must not, however, be thought that the officers who bore these names were, all or any of them, of the Kāyastha caste, because Kāyastha at this early period was an office designation and not crystallised into a caste. We have already seen that the Damōdarpur plates themselves speak of a Prathama-Kāyastha side by side with Nagara-śrēśṭhīn, Sārthavāha and Prathama-Kulika, who together formed the administrative board of a district town. This shows that like Nagara-śrēśṭhīn and so forth, Prathama-Kāyastha was an office designation. In fact, the earliest mention of Kāyastha is in the Tājnavalkya-smṛti (I. 336), a work assigned to c. 350 A.D. There too it seems to be used in the sense of an officer. And there is nothing in the text to show that it denotes any particular caste. And, in fact, Kāyastha as a caste does not seem to have sprung into existence before the ninth century A.D.
When therefore we speak of Kāyastha surnames being traceable in the names of the officers mentioned in the charters, it does not at all mean that the officers were Kāyastha by caste.

It is thus clear that whereas the Kāyastha surnames are traceable in Gujarāt and Kāṭhīā-wād as early as the time of the Valabhi princes, they are found in Bengal even two centuries earlier, that is, in the time of the Gupta kings. But in Gujarāt and Kāṭhīā-wād these surnames were traceable among the Brāhmaṇas. Were they similarly borne by the Brāhmaṇas of Bengal and Orissa at that early period? Three records are known, bearing upon this point, but we shall take here the earliest. This was the celebrated copper-plate charter discovered at Nidhanpur in Pañčchakhaṇḍa, Sylhet, and published in two instalments¹ by Mr. Padmanatha Bhatt-acharyya Vidyavinoda. The plates are of extreme importance, because they enumerate not only many Brāhmaṇa grantees, but also their gōtras and surnames. In fact, a list of these donees with these details accompanies the article of the Mahāmahāpādāyāya, and we notice that such Kāyastha surnames as Dāsa, Datta, Dēva, Ghōsha, Pāla, Pālita, Sēna, Basu and so forth, were borne by the Brāhmaṇa grantees. There was thus a time when even the Brāhmaṇas in Bengal, had name-endings which are now thought to be the conspicuous feature of the Kāyastha community. Now, the question that we have to consider is: to what period are these donees to be assigned? The Nidhanpur charter was no doubt issued by Bhāskaravarmān of Prāgyōṭisha, who was a contemporary and ally of Harsha of Kanauj. It does not, however, register the original grant, which was made, not by him, but by Bhūtivarman (= Mahābhūtivarman), his great-great-grandfather. Owing to some mishap, we are told, the plates were burnt, and the grant was renewed by Bhāskaravarmān in favour of those to whom it was originally issued. The Brāhmaṇa donees specified in this epigraph belong therefore to the time, not of Bhāskaravarmān but of Bhūtivarman, not to the first half of the seventh century A.D., but to at least the beginning of the sixth.

Now, the first point that we have to discuss here is about the race or extraction of the Brāhmaṇas, settled in the easternmost part of Bengal, with name-endings peculiar to the Bengal Kāyastha community. The same thing was noticeable about the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas of Gujarāt and Kāṭhīā-wād who, about 700 years ago, bore similar Sarmans or clan-names, namely, Datta, Ghōsha, Varman, Nāga and Mītra. Is it possible that these Pañčchakhaṇḍa (Sylhet) Brāhmaṇas also, could be Nāgar Brāhmaṇas? It is well-known that the tutelary deity of the Nāgar caste is Hāṭakēśvara.² In fact, it may be laid down as a general rule that wherever there is Hāṭakēśvara, there must be some sort of settlement of the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas or Nāgar Banias. Now, there is a liṅga of this name actually existing in the Pañčchakhaṇḍa.³ In fact, it has been known ever since the time of Vanamāla, who belonged to the Bhauma dynasty of Haruppeśvara and who flourished about the middle of the ninth century A.D. His Tējpur plates⁴ represent him to have renovated the temple of Hāṭakēśulin (Hāṭakēśvara) and made endowments to it. The temple must thus have been in existence at least one century prior to circa 830-65 A.D. when he ruled. We thus find not only that there was a settlement of Brāhmaṇas at Pañčchakhaṇḍa, who, like the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas of the Valabhi charters, assumed surnames corresponding to those of the Bengal Kāyasthas, but also that they were, like the latter, worshippers of Hāṭakēśvara. Further, the attention of scholars may be drawn to a passage which occurs in the Pāradārika section of Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra. The section is concerned with zenana women and their protection. It tells us how in different provinces palace ladies came in contact with male outsiders. It speaks of how promiscuous intercourse takes place among the Aparāntas, Vaidarbhakas, Gauḍas and so forth. But in regard to Aṅga, Vānga and Kālinga,

it is the Nagara-Brahmanas, we are told, who enter the zenana with the object of offering flowers and even with the knowledge of the king, but end in having illicit union with the inmates thereof. Who could these Nagara-Brahmanas be? Are they the Brahmanas of the town or towns? It means practically nothing. The Brahmanas of Gauda were by no means better in this respect. But they are referred to simply as Brahmanas, and not as Nagara-Brahmanas. When the latter are thus associated with the palaces of Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kaliṅga, whom are we to understand thereby? Obviously they are Brahmanas, hailing from Nagara. It is well known that the Nāgara Brahmanas of Gujarāt and Kāthiāwād point to Nagar or Anandapura as their native place and that this place has been identified with Vaḍnagar in North Gujarāt. Further, it is a well-known practice of a people or tribe to name the places, provinces or rivers of their new settlement after the old one from which they have migrated. We have elsewhere pointed out that those Nāgara Brahmanas, before coming down to Gujarāt, must have originally been at Nagar or Nagarkot, the old name of Kāṅgīrā, which is situated in the Panjāb in the Sawālakh or Sapādalaksha hills. Just as they migrated south to Gujarāt, they must have migrated east to Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kaliṅga, if there were at all any Nāgara Brahmanas there. The question that now arises is whether there were any places or provinces in East India named Nagar or Anandapura. An epigraphist need not be told that whereas the Deo Barāpār inscription, found in the Shahabad District, Bihar, speaks of Nagara-bhukti, the Nālandā plate of Samudragupta (No. 3 below) speaks of the victorious camp of Anandapura. So far as Bengal is concerned, there is one village called Nagar in the Dacca District, and another in Sylhet. There are, again, two rivers of that name in North Bengal—one running from Purnea to Dinajpur and the other from Bogra to Rajshahi. Further and now, if we turn to the Karatōyā-mahāmya which describes the holy sites of Mahāsthāna, or old Puṇḍravaradha, which is in the Bogra District of Bengal (now in Bangladesh) and which stands on the west bank of the river, we find that there is a reference, not once, but twice, to the Sapādalaksha Brahmanas. It is worthy of note that all the places mentioned above are not far removed from the Maldah District, where was discovered the Khālimpur charter of Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty. It says that Narayanaavarman, a feudatory chiefman of his, had installed a god called Nanna-Nārāyaṇa who was, we are told, placed chiefly in the charge of the Lāṭa Brahmanas (dvijas). Four villages were granted by Dharmapāla to them for this god. And the question arises: who could these Lāṭa Brahmanas be? It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they were Nāgara Brahmanas who hailed from Anandapura or Nagar, that is, from Vaḍnagar in Gujarāt, the ancient name of which was Lāṭa. As a reminiscence of their early migration to East India may be mentioned again the fact that the names of Nagar and Anandapura are traceable in inscriptions of the Gupta period. Even to this day not only is Nagar found as the name of a village in Dacca and Sylhet but also Gujarāt in Howrah. Keshābab Chandra Bhattacharyya’s Vaṅgē Dākṣiṇāyā-Vaidika speaks of one such family not only as having migrated from this village called Gujarāt, but also being surnamed Vaidya. Vaidya, as a family name, is found among the Nāgara Brahmanas of Gujarāt and Kāthiāwād but not among the members of any high caste of Bengal except the Dākṣiṇāyā Vaidika. When all these pieces of evidence are brought to a focus, the conclusion is irresistible that the Nāgara Brahmanas were settled in Bengal about this time.

1 Kannāṭa, verse 6,41 (p. 301 of Bombay edn.).
6 P. 46.
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As early as 1900, R. G. Bhandarkar contributed an article to the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, entitled A Peep into the Early History of India, etc., wherein he contended that the most noteworthy feature of the Gupta period was "Vigorous Brahmanic Revival and Renovation." The evidence which he urged in support of his theory was then considered to be of an irrefragable character. This explains why his views are still accepted by a good many scholars. Evidence of another type is, however, gathering momentum which prevents our accepting this theory.

He relies upon a two-fold line of argument in support of his conclusion. The first relates to the performance of the sacrificial rites. In Chandragupta II's inscription at Mathurā and Skandagupta's Bihār and Bhitarī inscriptions, Samudragupta is represented, says R. G. Bhandarkar, as having performed the Aśvamedhā, which is pointedly spoken of as having gone out of use for a long time (chitr-ōtsann-āśvamedhā-āhārttuḥ). "This is the first instance of the Brahmanic revival under this dynasty," This achievement was considered so important that Samudragupta struck gold coins or medals, on the obverse of which is the figure of a horse let loose, and the title Aśvamedhā-Parākrama on the reverse. Similar coins bearing on the reverse the legend Aśvamedhā-Mahendra have been found. Mahendra was a title assumed by Kumāragupta I, as is evident from some of his coins on which his proper name as well as the title occurs. It seems, therefore, that he too performed the horse-sacrifice indicative of supreme sovereignty. The present epigraphic evidence, however, runs counter to this conclusion. Even when R. G. Bhandarkar wrote on this subject, the contents of the Nāṇāghāṭ cave inscription of Sātakarni were well known to scholars. There Sātakarni, or rather his wife, is represented to have performed not only a good many sacrifices, but, above all, celebrated Rājasūya once and Aśvamedha twice. This clearly indicates his or her rank as a supreme ruler. Slightly earlier than this record is that found at Ghosunjī, not far from Chittogarh in Rajasthan. The contents of this inscription also were fairly well known when A Peep into the Early History, etc. was published, though it was critically edited much later in the light of two or more copies found on Hāthi-Bāḍā at Nagari in the Epigraphia Indica. This also credits Gājāyana Pārāśariputra Sarvatāta with the celebration of a similar Aśvamedhā, as is clear from the text rājāḥ bhagavatīma Gājāyana Pārāśariputrā Sarvatātēna Aśvamedhā-yājinā etc. The patronymic Gājāyana indicates that Sarvatāta was a Brāhmaṇa and perhaps a Kāñva ruler. Sarvatāta is not a proper name and may have belonged to any ruler, possibly the last ruler of the Kāñva line. But earlier than Sarvatāta was Pushyamitra, the founder of the Śūṅga dynasty (187 B.C.). An inscription of this ruler was found some time ago at Ayūdhya which has dvar-Aśvamedhā-yājinah Sēnāpatēḥ Pushyamitrasya. This conclusively shows that Pushyamitra, like Sātakarni, performed the horse sacrifice, not once, but twice. We may thus take it that Brahmanism was revived with the advent of the Brāhmaṇa Śūṅgas to power, that is, long, long before the time of the Guptas. What then becomes of the expression chitr-ōtsann-āśvamedhā-āhārttā which has been used in Gupta inscriptions with reference to Samudra-
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2 Vol. XX, pp. 356 ff.
3 Ibid., pp. 392 ff.
4 ASWI, Vol. V, pp. 60 and ff.
5 JASB, Vol. LVl, pt. i, pp. 77 ff., No. 1 and Plate V. a.
6 Vol. XXII, pp. 198 ff.
7 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 57.
gupta? Some scholars regard it as an empty boast. But the expression in our opinion is susceptible of a better interpretation which has been set forth above on pages 37–41.

The second line of evidence adduced by R. G. Bhandarkar relates to "the gods and goddesses adopted into the Brahmanic Pantheon." "The worship of Śiva, Vishnu, the Sun, and Mahāsēna seems to have become popular with all classes from princes and chiefs to ordinary individuals. To this pantheon there was not even an allusion in the epigraphical records of the country for more than five centuries. They suddenly present themselves to our view about the end of the fourth century; and appear uninterruptedly for the whole of the subsequent period of about two centuries covered by the inscriptions." It is very doubtful whether Śiva, Vishnu, the Sun and Mahāsēna can be considered to be Brahmanic deities even in the Gupta period. In modern times there is hardly any important shrine of Vishnu, Śiva or Ambikā which is not in charge of a Brahmana priest who alone has the right to show the god or goddess to the devotees on payment of money, or the making of offerings, or both, which is a source of income to the priest. But there is no inscription of the Gupta period to show that there was any temple or any shrine in the fourth, fifth or sixth century to which any Brahmana priest was attached and which was a means of his living. Nor is there any evidence to show that the deities noted above came down to the Gupta period from the Rigvedic times, with the Brahmanical or original character stamped upon them.

Let us take Śiva first. Śiva, we find, is a god unknown to the Vēdas.¹ His name is a word of not unfrequent occurrence in the hymns, but means simply 'propitious.' Not even in the Atharvaṇa is it the epithet of a particular divinity, or distinguished by its usage from any other adjective. It is only in the Śvetāśvatara Upanishad that Śiva first occurs as another name of Rudra. Whether he was originally a divinity from the mountains of the north it is difficult to say. This much is certain that shortly before the time of Patañjali there had developed a Śiva cult, saturated with the worship of Skanda and Viśākha and possibly also Kumāra and Mahāsēna as appears from the coins of Huvishka² and that Śiva so overshadowed Rudra that the latter himself came to be regarded as a form of the former. As regards Vishnu, every student of the Rig-Veda knows that while the hymns and verses, dedicated to the praises of Indra, Agni, Mitra, Varuna, etc., are extremely numerous, those in which Vishnu is celebrated are much fewer.³ Not only is the power by which Vishnu takes his three strides described as being derived from Indra but also Vishnu is represented as celebrating Indra's praises. We shall not be far from right if we say that Vishnu occupied a subordinate place in the estimation and affections of the Rishis who composed the Riks. It is again doubtful whether and how far Vishnu had maintained his original character as a solar deity in the Gupta period. Why else does a divinity spring into existence called Śūrya or Bhāskara about this time? The form of the image of the Sun worshipped in this epoch has been described by Varāhamihira. The feet and legs of his icon, we are told, should be covered up to the knees and dressed in the fashion prevalent in the north and his waist should be encircled with an avyanga. In fact, the images of this Sun have boots reaching up to the knees and a girdle round the waist. "This last is a Persian feature" according to R. G. Bhandarkar.⁴ He further points out that the priests, in charge of the idols of this deity, were called Magas who also correspond to the Persian Magi. This worship of the Sun was thus a foreign importation to a large extent. How this divinity could be assigned to the Brahmanic pantheon in the Gupta period is far from clear. As regards Mahāsēna, he stands or falls together with Śiva. And as the Brahmanical

¹ Muir's Original Sanskrit Texts, Vol. IV (1873 edn.), p. 399.
³ Muir's Original Sanskrit Texts, Vol. IV (1873 edn.), p. 98.
⁴ Vaishnavism, Saivism, etc., pp. 154-55.
character of the Śiva of the Gupta period has not been proved, Mahāśēna also cannot be taken to be a Brahmanical deity for this period.

How Śiva, Vishnu and Sūrya (Bhāskara) developed new characteristics and became entirely different from their prototypes in the Rigvedic period need not trouble us here. What we have to note here is that the mode of worship followed by the Aryans in the Rigvedic period was no longer observed in the Gupta epoch by the Indians. When the hymns of the Rig-Veda were being composed, they prayed to Indra, Varuṇa, the Ádityas, the Ásvin, Apām-napāt, Mātrāśvan and so forth, who are no longer worshipped in the times of the Guptas. But the case was different in regard to the sacrifice performed by the Rigvedic Aryans. They celebrated many such sacrifices as the Áṣṭavāmśha, the Rājasūya, the Agnyādhyāya, the Anvārambhaṇīya and so forth as any critical student of the Brāhmaṇa literature can tell us. But, soon after the Brāhmaṇa period and owing to the rise and spread of Śramaṇa religions such as Buddhism, Jainism and so forth, these sacrifices had fallen into utter desuetude till they were revived with the rise of the Śūngas to political power. This point we had already expatiated upon. If anybody doubts the correctness of this conclusion, he has only to glance over the contents of the Nānāghat cave inscriptions. A careful study of these records gives us the following information. Sātakarni was the supreme ruler of Dakshināpatha (the Dekkan). His queen was Nāganiṇā. And it is worthy of note that although her husband was living, she appears to have performed on her own behalf no less than seventeen Vedic sacrifices of which the Áṣṭavāmśha was one and that it was celebrated twice. Bühler wrongly supposes that “according to the Sāstras, women are not allowed to offer Śrauta sacrifices, and the Brāhmaṇas who perform such sacrifices for them (stria-yājaka) are severely blamed.” But anybody who impartially studies Jaimini-Sūtra, VI. 1.8 and ff. in the light of the Sābara-bhāṣya will be convinced that men and women are entitled alike to perform Vedic sacrifices. So there was a revival of these sacrifices when the Śūngas came to power. And this revival was in full swing in the Gupta age and continued even till the eighth century A.D.

The point just referred to has already been established beyond all shadow of doubt. What we have to note here is that there was a heterogenous mass of Vedic and non-Vedic, Aryan and non-Aryan, gods and goddesses, numbering thirty-three crores as the popular estimate goes. Two unifying principles were at work. One was belief in the Oneness of the Ultimate Spirit; and the other, the Doctrine of Incarnation. For the first, the people of India were indebted to the Aryans. It is so beautifully enunciated in the Rīk:

Indraḥ Mitraḥ Varuṇam—Agnim—āhur—athō
dīvah sa Suparṇo Garutman
êkam sad=viprā bahudhā vadantā=Agnim
Yamaḥ Mātrāśvanam=āhūḥ // (RV, I. 164. 46):

“They call him Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni, and that celestial noble-winged Garutman. Sages name variously that which is One: they call it Agni, Yama and Mātrāśvan.” This is one of the grandest Rīks in the whole range of the Rigvedic hymns, whose syncretising potency is infinite. And, in fact, all the seemingly incoherent elements of the work-a-day Hinduism have been held together simply on account of the sublime notion: êkam sad=viprā bahudhā vadanti, ‘Sages name variously that which is but One’—a notion which has permeated all masses. It is this notion which has principally fused all the jarring faiths of India into Hinduism which at rock-bottom is faith in one Universal God.

The non-Aryan faiths of India also contributed to this syncretisation under the theory of

2 This point we have already dwelt upon in Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture (Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1938-39), pp. 22 ff.
Incarnation or Re-birth. Buddha had several incarnations or re-births when he was Boddhisattva and before he became the Buddha. The Jātaka literature bears ample testimony to this fact. Gautama is called Boddhisattva up to the time when he attained enlightenment, that is, when he became Buddha, not only in his last earthly existence, but in all the countless existences which he experienced as man, animal or god, before he was re-born for the last time as a Śākya prince. Now, Jātaka means a 'birth'; and there were many popular didactic tales which were deeply rooted in the soul of the Indian people, and the hero or the wise man in the story was in every case identified with the Boddhisattva or Buddha in his previous birth, with the result that the popular tales were sublimated into Jātakas. Another non-Aryan faith is Vaishnavism which grew in the environments of Buddhism and Jainism. It is well-known that the ninth incarnation of Vishnu was Buddha. This was known to the Bengali poet-saint, Jayadeva, who further admits that Buddha condemned the Vedic scriptures relating to sacrifices of animals and broadcast the doctrine of kārunya or compassion. In the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa\(^1\) no less than twenty-two incarnations of Vishnu have been specified, of whom the first was Rishabha, son of Nābhi and Mērudēvi,\(^2\) doubtless the first Tirthamkara of the Jainas. This clearly shows that Vaishnavism, to begin with, was a non-Aryan religion which was akin to Buddhism and Jainism and which had adopted the Doctrine of Incarnation.

It will be seen that two syncretising forces were working side by side. One was belief in the Oneness of the Ultimate Spirit; and the other, the Doctrine of Incarnation. The effect of these unifying principles was marvellous. There was a confused tangled mass of Aryan and non-Aryan, Indian and non-Indian, gods and goddesses, said to be numbering thirty-three crores. They were now, in the Gupta period, placed under three categories. Of the gods, some were considered to be forms or incarnations of Vishnu, and some of Śiva. And all the goddesses were regarded as forms or incarnations of Dēvi, Mātrī or Ambikā. Let us take up Vishnu first. The following are his names that are met with in Gupta inscriptions: Ananta-svāmin,\(^3\) Bhagavat (No. 12 below, line 6), Chakrabhrīt (No. 28 below, line 27), Chakragadādhara,\(^4\) Chakrapāṇi,\(^5\) Chakravāmin,\(^6\) Garuḍa-kētu (No. 39 below, line 2), Gōvinda (No. 28 below, line 25), Gōvindavāmin,\(^7\) Indrānuja (No. 41 below, line 1), Janārdana (No. 39 below, line 9), Madhusūdana,\(^8\) Nārāyana,\(^9\) Purusha (No. 14 below, line 1), Śrīrūgu (No. 31 below, line 17) and Vāsudeva.\(^10\)

The Vishnu of the Gupta period is Vedic Vishnu, Purusha-Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva-Krishna and Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa rolled into one. Let us first turn to inscription No. 14 below which is the most important document in this connection, and consider the first verse of the record. It runs thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sahasra-sirasaō tasmai Purushāy—āmit-ātmanē [j]}\tag{[j]} \\
\text{chatus-samudra-parītya-tyāya-Nidrālaō namah [j]}\tag{[j]}
\end{align*}
\]

"Obeisance to that Thousand-Headed Purusha (Supreme Being) whose soul is boundless and who is Sleepy on the waters of the bed-like four oceans." The very first quarter of this verse reminds us of the Purusha-sthāna of the Rg-Veda (X. 90), which opens with sahasra-sīrṣā Purushaḥ. The second half of the verse reminds us of Manu (I. 10), where we are told: "The waters are
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\(^1\) I-3-5 to 25.
\(^2\) Ibid., V. 3. 20.
\(^3\) Ibid., Vol. III, 1888, No. 66, text line 2.
\(^4\) Ibid., No. 17, text line 26.
\(^5\) Ibid., Vol. V, No. 7, text line 12.
\(^6\) Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, pp. 317 ff.
\(^7\) Ibid., Vol. XXI, pp. 81 ff., text line 4.
\(^8\) Ibid., Vol. III, 1888, No. 17, text line 21.
\(^9\) Ibid., No. 36, text line 7.
\(^10\) Ibid., No. 25, text line 1.
called nārāḥ; the waters are, indeed, the offspring of Nara; as they were his first residence (āyana), he is thereby remembered as Nārāyaṇa". Thus in the verse in question, Nārāyaṇa is identified with Purusha. The composite deity, called Purusha-Nārāyaṇa, however, is known as early as the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa (XII. 3. 4. 11) which says that Nārāyaṇa placed himself in all the worlds, in all the gods, in all the Vedas and in all the Vital Airs, and that they were placed in him. In fact, we find Purusha-Nārāyaṇa here raised to the dignity of the Supreme Soul. It is therefore no wonder if the Purusha-sūkta itself is attributed to Nārāyaṇa, just as some hymns are to Paramātmā, Viṣvakarman and so forth. In both the cases the hymns have been ascribed to the deities whose praises they sing. Further, there can be no doubt that it is on account of his being identified with (Purusha)-Nārāyaṇa that Viṣṇu himself has become known as Nidrālu. That Nidrālu is another name of Viṣṇu is clear from lexicons. And it is worthy of note that it occurs in inscription No. 14 below. Its first verse is thus enough to show that it is a Vaishnava record,—a conclusion which is confirmed by verse 11 which praises Vāsudeva and by line 5 of the second fragment which speaks of a temple consecrated to Kṛṣṇa. It is thus incontrovertible that Viṣṇu of the Gupta period is the Vedic Purusha-Nārāyaṇa and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa welded into one. We will revert to this record again shortly.

The initial verse of inscription No. 14 below may also be compared with that of inscription No. 39 below which is as follows:

Jayati vihūsi—chatur-bhujaś—chatur-aryagava—
vipūla-sedīla-paryyankāḥ [/*]

jagatah sthīt-yutatī-rāj[ṛ-y-śaka]-hētur—

Garuḍa-kētūḥ [/*]

"Victorious is the lord, the four-armed (Viṣṇu), whose couch is the extensive waters of the four oceans; who is the sole cause of the continuance, production, and destruction, etc., of the universe; (and) whose ensign is Garuḍa," This is the first inscription in which Viṣṇu, or, rather Janārdana, as he has been called in line 9, is described as four-armed. Further, here also Viṣṇu has been identified with Nārāyaṇa, "whose couch is the extensive waters of the four oceans." And, lastly, it is worthy of note that Garuḍa is associated with him. This is but natural, because Viṣṇu was originally a form of the sun, and in the Rig-Veda X. 149. 3, mention is made of Savitri's strong-pinioned (suparna) Garutman who obeyed his law for ever. So this association of Garuḍa with Viṣṇu is a development from the Rigvedic period. Inscription No. 39 below is of the time of Budhagupta and is dated Gupta year 165—484 A.D. It records the erection of the dhvaja-stambha of the god Janārdana by Mahārāja Mātrivishnu and his younger brother Dhanayavishnu. Things were different when Tōramāṇa's Eran inscription\(^1\) came to be engraved on the body of the stone image of Varāha. This happened when Mātrivishnu was dead and Dhanayavishnu alone alive. That was again in the first year of the reign of Tōramāṇa, the first ruler of the Hūnas who had temporarily supplanted the Gupta supremacy. The opening verse has: "Triumphant is the god, who had the form of a Boar; who, in the act of lifting up the Earth (out of the ocean), caused the mountains to shake with the striking of (his) hard snout etc. etc." Who this god was is made clear in line 7 where Dhanayavishnu is represented to have erected the stone temple of the god Nārāyaṇa who has the form of a Boar. It is the Vaiśasamānyi-Samhitā (37.5) and the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa (14.1.2.11) which first speak of Eṃūsha or Boar raising up the Earth at the bidding of Prajāpati. But it was only in the Gupta period that the Boar was looked upon as an incarnation of Nārāyaṇa (=Viṣṇu). This explains his identification with Gōvinda also, which name occurs in inscription No. 28 below. In the Śanti-parvan (Chap. 342, verse 68) of the Mahābhārata, Bhagavat

\(^1\) CII., Vol. III, 1888, No. 36.
We have seen how the Asura Bali was dealt with by Vishnu. But there was another
demon called Madhu who is associated with Vishnu and was in fact killed by him. In fact,
he was for that reason called Madhusūdana. The second half of verse 15 of the Gāndhār
inscription referred to above has the following: "when it is the time of the slumber
of (Vishnu) who destroyed Madhu and was a scion of Śūra." Here three points are in-
volved. The first is that Vishnu is called Madhusūdana, the second is that he falls into slumbers
which come to an end on a specific day and the third is that he is a scion of Śūra. Let us take
the third point first. Everybody knows that Śūra was the name of Yādava who was the grand-
father of Kṛiṣṇa.¹ This is additional evidence of the identification of Kṛiṣṇa with Vishnu
during this period. As regards the first point, the Purāṇas represent Madhu to be killed along
with Kāitabha by Vishnu. They were demons sprung from the ears of Vishnu, while he was
asleep, and were slain by him as they were about to devour Brahma.² Of course, the Purāṇas
differ as to how they sprung up and also how they came to be killed. These differences must
exist as new mythology was in the making. This much, however, is certain that Vishnu killed
them both and was for that reason known not only as Madhusūdana but also as Kāitabha-jit.
Of course, the epithet, Madhusūdana, is mentioned in the Gāndhār Inscription and Kāitabha-
jit is not yet found in any Gupta record. But this ab silentio argument is no good, as all the
Purāṇas mention Madhu and Kāitabha together and as being slain by Vishnu. The third and
most important point raised is that Vishnu sleeps and is awakened from his slumbers. This no
doubt refers to the myth that Vishnu sleeps four months of the rainy season, that his slumber
commences on the 11th of the bright half of Aṣāḍha and that it ends on the 11th of the bright
half of Kṛiṣṭika. Those days have been named Śayanī and Prabodhini Ėkādaśī respectively in the
Padma-Purāṇa. This, however, seems to be a new development in the mythology of Vishnu
and has nothing to do with the myth of cosmic sleep foisted on him through Purusha-Nārāyaṇa
being identified with him. So far, so good. Another divinity, who has been merged into
Purānic Vishnu, is Purusha-Nārāyaṇa about whom we have said enough above. The third
deity that has been so merged is Vāsudeva-Kṛiṣṇa. We have already adverted to the Bhātari
pillar inscription (No. 31 below), where Skandagupta is, after destroying his enemy, described
as visiting his mother just as Kṛiṣṇa did Dévakī. The story about Kṛiṣṇa, Dévakī and his
enemy Kaṁsa is too well-known to require any repetition.³ Another passage that we have to
take note of occurs in verses 16-17 of the Mandasor stone inscription of Vishnuvardhana.⁴
They describe one Bhagavaddhēṣa as a prop to his relatives just as Uddhava was to the Andhakas
in the proper course of duty and as one who, like Vidura, 'looked far ahead' even in the
devious path of Polity. Now Uddhava was Kṛiṣṇa's cousin, being son of Dévakahā, brother of
Vāsudeva. He was fond of carrying on discussions on philosophy⁵ and pointing out paths of
duty to his relatives. Vidura was the younger brother of Pāṇḍu and was considered to be
dārgha-darśana 'looking far ahead,' Sahā-Parvan, 50.8, says that Vidura was well conversant
with the Science of Polity on which Brihaspati discarded to Indra; and Udyoga-Parvan, 32-40,
actually sets forth, under the title Vidura-vākyas, his own views on the same subject, namely,
Polity. There is a third incident in the life of Vāsudeva-Kṛiṣṇa which is also incidentally

¹ Padma-P., V. 13. 108-9; Vīṣṇu-P., 96. 143-44; Mahāy-P., 46. 1; Harivamsa-P., verses 1922-23. In this connec-
tion we cannot help praising D. R. Patil's Guptā Inscriptions and the Puranic Tradition and Tables, etc., done under
the supervision of H. D. Sankalia.
² Brahman-Vaivartta-P., I. 4. 20-28; Padma-P., V. 37. 19 and MBh., III. 202; and Mārkandey-P., 81. 50 ff.
³ Vīṣṇu-P., IV. 15; V. 1-2; Padma-P., Bhk. III, ch. 13; Bhāgavata, III. 1. 33; III. 2. 17; X. 3. 24 ff., MBh., I. 63.
⁴ CII., Vol. III, 1888, No. 35.
⁵ Bhāgavata, XI. 6. 40-29.49, which is known as Uddhava-gītā.
⁶ Udyoga-Parvan, 32. 5.
referred to in the opening verse of the Tuśām Tablet inscription,\(^1\) which runs thus: "Verily victory has over and over again been achieved by Vishnu, who is a pre-eminent bee on the water-lily, namely, the face of Jāmbavati (but) a frost to the grace of the water-lilies, namely, the faces of (other) demon damsel.s." Jāmbavati, we know, was daughter of Jāmbavat, 'king of bears.' There was a gem called Syamantaka which was given by the sun to Sattrājīt who passed it on to his brother Pṛṣēṇa as he did not wish it to go to Krishna. One quality of this jewel was to project its wearer, when good, but to ruin him, when bad.\(^2\) Pṛṣēṇa was wicked and was killed by a lion, which was carrying off the gem in its mouth, when it was encountered and slain by Jāmbavat. Kṛṣṇa tracked Jāmbavat till the latter submitted to him, gave up the gem and presented him also with his daughter Jāmbavati. Jāmbavat is described as 'king of bears'—which means that he was the ruler of a tribe whose totem was 'the bear.'

Even in historic times the descendants of Bāli (Vāli) had kapi or monkey on their banner.\(^3\) Both were non-Aryan or Dānava clans with the bear or monkey as their totem. Further, we have to note that in the Anuśāsana-parvan (chap. 14) of the Mahābhārata, Jāmbavat has been called once Kāpindra-patru (verse 41) and at another time, that is, in the very next verse (verse 42) Vidyādhara-kṛṣṇa sūtā. Her extraction was thus not definitely settled. And even on that ground she could very well be looked upon as a Dānava which denoted any non-Aryan clan. The last point we have to note is that the above fact has been put to the credit of Vishnu in the inscription, although it was achieved by Vāsudēva-Kṛṣṇa. This is additional evidence, if any is required at all, in support of the complete identification of the two deities in the Gupta period.

As regards the third deity, namely, Gōpāla-Kṛṣṇa, who was merged into Vishnu, we have already considered the contents of the Mandasor inscription (No. 14 below) of Naravarman which throw light on the principal incident in his life story and have pointed out how he too was lost into the individuality of Vishnu. We shall now discuss whether there was any Vaishnava sect in existence in the Gupta epoch. The sects that loom large in the Vaishnava horizon at present are those of Rāmānuja, Madhva, Nimbārka, Vallabha, Chaitanya and so forth. But they all arose from the 11th century onwards. No scholar, not even Rama-krishna Bhandarkar in his Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems, has shown on inscriptional evidence that there was any Vaishnava sect flourishing before the 11th century, and not at all in the Gupta period. It is, however, worthy of note that there was an epigraph found at Tuśām\(^4\) in the Panjab and belonging to the fourth or fifth century A.D. which speaks apparently of the Sātvata sect. It records the benefactions of Āchārya Sōnātrāta, who was the younger brother of Āchārya and Upādhyāya Yaśastraṭā (II). The latter pertained to the Gōtama gotra and was a son of Āchārya Vasudatta born of Rāvaṇi. Whether Rāvaṇi was an individual name of his mother it is difficult to say. But Rāvaṇi seems to be a metronymic, Rāvaṇa being a branch of the Vasishtha gotra.\(^5\) At any rate, the very fact that Yaśastraṭā (II) is said to belong to the Gōtama gotra is enough to show that this family of Āchāryas was Brāhmaṇa by caste. Vasudatta's father was Yaśastraṭā (I), and this Yaśastraṭā was a devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva), to whom, we are told, the Yaśa practice of the Aśa Sātvatas had come down through many generations. This makes it quite clear that this family of Āchāryas were not only Brāhmaṇa by caste but were adherents of the Sātvata sect with its peculiar type of Yaśa.

---

1 Cf., Vol. III, 1889, No. 67.
2 Dowson's Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology, etc., pp. 131-32.
This receives a most welcome confirmation from the Sātvata-samhitā, the contents of which have been so admirably summed up by R. G. Bhandarkar. Rāmānuja also sums it up succinctly as follows: “That this worship of that which is of a four-fold nature means worship of the highest Brāhmaṇa, called Vāsudēva, is declared in the Sātvata-samhitā: “This is the supreme Śāstra the great Brahmośpanishad, which imparts true discrimination to see Brāhmaṇas worshipping the real Brāhmaṇa, under the name of Vāsudēva.’ That highest Brāhmaṇa, called Vāsudēva, having for its body the complete aggregate of the six qualities, divides itself in so far as it is either the ‘Subtle’ (śīksma), or division (vyūha), or ‘manifestation’ (vibhava), and is attained in its fullness by the devotees, who, according to their qualifications, do worship to it by means of works guided by knowledge. ‘From the worship of the vibhava-aspect one attains to the vyūha, and from the worship of the vyūha one attains to the ‘Subtle’ called Vāsudēva, i.e., the highest Brāhmaṇa’—such is their doctrine. By the vibhava we have to understand the aggregate of beings, such as Rāma, Kṛishṇa, etc., in whom the highest Being becomes manifest; by the vyūha the four-fold arrangement or division of the highest Reality, as Vāsudēva, Sarīkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha; by the ‘Subtle’ the highest Brahmān itself, in so far as it has for its body the mere aggregate of the six qualities—as which it is called ‘Vāsudēva’.” R. G. Bhandarkar’s summary on the Sātvata-samhitā supports the above statement in every way and supplements it in one respect. The most important point is that the Brahmośpanishad, the highest Śāstra, reveals itself to a qualified Brāhmaṇa only, when he worships Vāsudēva as Brahmān. The second important point noticeable in his summary is that “This Śāstra along with Rahasya is fruitful to those who have gone through Yōga with its eight parts and whose soul is devoted to mental sacrifice. The Yōgins, who are Brāhmaṇas guided by the Vēdas and who have given up the mixed worship, are competent for the worship of the single one, dwelling in the heart.” Thus the second important point noteworthy about the Sātvata sect is that there is a special type of Yōga connected with it. Now, both these points are noticeable about the Sātvata sect described in the Tuṣāṃ record. The Āchāryas of this sect are all Brāhmaṇas and belonged to the Gōtama gōtra. Secondly, the first of these Āchāryas named Yaśastraṭa is described not only as a devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva), but also as “one to whom the Yōga practice of the Ārya Sātvatas had come down through many generations.” After this agreement in important points, can there be any doubt that there was a Vaishnav sect called the Sātvatas which was in existence in the Gupta period? Further, we have to note that this Sātvata sect was, in regard to the order of succession, more akin to the Vallabhāchārī where the succession was from father to son than to the Rāmānuja, Madhya or Nimbārka where the succession was from a Śāhīnyāśi teacher to his Śāhīnyāśi pupil. There are two more points relating to the Sātvata sect which deserve notice. The first is that one member of this family has been designated not only as Āchārya but also as Upādhyāya. What could be the distinction between the two? Anybody who has read Manu-smṛiti (II. 145) need not be told that according to this law-giver ten Upādhyāyas are equal to one Āchārya. Evidently, an Āchārya is in grade much superior to an Upādhyāya. And we shall not be far from right if we take Upādhyāya in the sense of “a priest or pontiff” and Āchārya in the sense of “a teacher.” Here was therefore a line of teachers pertaining to the Sātvata sect where the Sātvata Yōga came by heritage but where there was one Upādhyāya or priest. What could his duty be? R. G. Bhandarkar, while winding up his summary of the Sātvata-samhitā, says: “Then follows the statement of the mystic arrangement of letters and formulae and the meditations. This work throughout contains the mystic modes of worship by means of mantras variously arranged. The allusion

1 Vaishnavism, Śaivism, etc., pp. 39-40.
3 Vaishnavism, Śaivism, etc., p. 40.
at the end of chapter 66 of the Bhishmaparvan to Saṅkarashāna’s having sung or expounded Vāsudēva according to the Satvata rites (Vidhi) refers in all probability to such rites as are detailed in the Satvata-Sanhitā.” It is possible that the duty of the Upādhyāya was to manipulate these “mystic arrangements of letters and formulae” for the benefit of the laity. The second point that we have to discuss is why this Satvata sect was flourishing in the vicinity of the Tuṣām rock whereon this inscription is engraved. Not far below this record there are incised the emblem of a chakra or discus and also a shorter inscription which means “Victory has been achieved by Bhagavat in (this) region (touched) by the feet of Bhagavat (Vāsudeva)” which is engraved just above this inscription and in characters of about the same period. It seems to be the spot that was then believed to be hallowed by the feet of Vāsudeva as Vishnu. That is perhaps the reason why a discus also was carved on the rock. And further this discus reminds us of a second one, sculptured along with another Vaishnava record,1 which again is of the same age though it is found in the eastern part of India, namely, in a cave of Susunīṭa in the Bankura District of Bengal. It may be that this cave also was another but smaller centre of the Satvata sect, though there is no proof of an irrefragable character to that effect. Two more emblems of the discus have been found in East India, one at Gaṇj2 and the other at Nāch-ne-ki-talāī3 where also was existing one Vaishnava cave.

Īśa (No. 35 below, verse 43), Hara (No. 35 below, verse 40), Mahādēva,4 Mahēśvara.5

We have already pointed out that neither any Sanhitā nor any Brāhmaṇa speaks of Śiva as a divinity. The word Śiva no doubt occurs, but in the sense of “auspicious, propitious.” It is only in the Śvetāśtrata Upanishad that Śiva is, for the first time, found mentioned as a deity though as a form of Rudra. There were many divinities of this class such as Bhava, Śarvan, Paśupati, Ugra, Rudra, Mahādēva and Īśāna who have been mentioned in this ascending order and as manifestations of Ekā-vrātya, in Book XV of the Atharva-VEDA. But we now find that they have all been eclipsed in glory by Śiva, who had no existence at all in the Sanhitā or Brāhmaṇa period and that they themselves have become so identified with him as to become his other names. Such was the unique transfusion effected in mythology in the Gupta age. Side by side with this transfusion it is natural to expect new developments also in the mythology connected with this god. Thus the very first inscription in our volume speaks in verse 9 of the Ganges being confined in the inner hollow of the matted hair of Paśupati but afterwards liberated from the tangled mass, dashing forth rapidly and flowing in higher and ever higher masses and through many paths. The story connected with the descent of the Gaṅga to the head of Śiva, who, to humble her pride, encircled her for long in the labyrinth of his matted locks but eventually allowed her to come out and flow to the sea and even in the infernal regions for the sake of Bhagiratha is well-known from the Rāmāyana (I. 41) and the Vāyu-Purāṇa (chapter 47, verses 27 and ff.). This story is, however, unknown to the pre-Gupta period. We may now proceed to consider the first three opening verses of the Mandāsoīr inscription of Vishnuvardhana6 dated Vikrama year 589. Here Śiva is mentioned as wielding the Pināka bow, as indulging in laughter and vocal music, as being the Procreator of Worldly Life and with his serpent veiling the radiance of the moon. All these characteristics of Śiva are described in the Purāṇas. If we turn, for example, to the Vāyu-Purāṇa, chapter 24, we find Śiva described as Pināka in verse 132 and indulging in Vāyu-nīśa and atīta-hāsa in verses 142-43 and 145.

---

1 Eṣ. Ind., Vol. XIII, p. 133.
4 Ibid., Vol. III, 1888, Nos. 21, text line 1; 22, text line 1; 23, text line 1; and 24, text line 1.
5 Ibid., Nos. 38, text lines 2, 4, 6, 14, 19; 39, text lines 2, 7, 10, 14, 19, 22, 31, 33, 47, 50, 53, 54, 57, etc.
6 Ibid., No. 35.
thus hardly be a doubt that the Kuśika of our record must be regarded as the first pupil of Lakulin and that the four Āchāryas mentioned in the Mathurā record were, of course, his descendants. In the Cintra prāśasti three Āchāryas are mentioned, the last of whom, Trīpurāntaka, was a contemporary of Sārāgadēva during whose reign it was incised. From verse 19 of this inscription it is quite clear that these teachers belonged to the line (gōtra) of Gārgya or Gārgēya. While the Cintra prāśasti gives an account of the ascetic teachers who sprung up in the line of Gārgya, the second pupil of Lakulin, the Mathurā record throws light upon the line of teachers that was founded by Kuśika, the first disciple of Lakulin. In other words, it appears that while some descendants of Gārgya established themselves at Sōmnāth in Kāthiawād, those of Kuśika did at Mathurā.

It is evident that the teachers mentioned in the Mathurā record pertained to the Lakulin sect. There are two or three points connected with this sect which now require to be cleared up. We are told that Uditāchārya, who was the teacher then living, installed Upamitēśvara and Kapilēśvara named after Upamita and Kapila who were his teacher and teacher’s teacher respectively. What did Upamitēśvara and Kapilēśvara denote? As the ending ēśvara shows, they denote Śiva liṅga established in memory of those teachers. But where were they put up? Certainly in the Teachers’ Shrine (Guru-āyatana), as we are expressly told. This shows that there must have been many other liṅgas established in perpetuation of the memory of other teachers, in fact, of all teachers from Kuśika to Upamita (both inclusive). Now, if these memorials in the Teachers’ Shrine were all liṅgas, how could they be distinguished one from the other? How could we say that one liṅga represented one Teacher; and another, another? The natural surmise would be that every one of the liṅgas so put up contained the portrait of a Teacher. Is it to remain a mere surmise, or does it receive confirmation from any extraneous source? In this connection we have to draw attention to another paper on Lakulin which we contributed elsewhere, namely, to the Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report.1 There, we have shown that wherever Lakulin appears, he figures as a human being, invariably with two hands and with his characteristic signs, namely, a Lakuṣa or staff in his left hand, a citron in his right, and above all, with urdhva-medhra. There are, however, two representations of his, at Kārvān—the place of his incarnation as Śiva—one found in the shrine of Nakulēśvara and the other, in that of Rājarājanēśvara. Both of course are liṅgas, but their characteristic feature is that they have combined, each, with a representation of Lakulin, into one image, pointing of course to his absorption into the divinity of Śiva. It is therefore not at all unreasonable to suppose in the case of Upamitēśvara and Kapilēśvara that they were Śiva liṅgas with portraits of Upamita and Kapila carved into them. In fact, they were merged into the godhead of Śiva. That is the reason why all the departed Āchāryas mentioned in the Mathurā inscription have been styled Bhagavat, but the living teacher, namely, Uditāchārya has been called simply Ārya. The question that now arises is: how were the demised Āchāryas absorbed into the divinity of Śiva? In this connection we have to take note of the following passage from the Purāṇas2 adverted to above.

1906-07, pp. 179 ff.

Here have been named the four disciples of Lakulīna who were the founders of the four lines of Pāśupata teachers. They are described not only as possessed of bodies besmeared with ashes, as ārdha-rātsa, i.e., ārdha-nārāyaṇa, but also as having practiced Māhāśvara-yoga and attained to the Rudra world. It is thus obvious that by practising yōga, the ascetic members of this sect hoped to be at one with Rudra or Śiva. The Tōga was also called Pāśupata-yōga. So it is named not only in the Ėkāṅgī stone inscription1 of Naravāhana but also in the Vāyu-Purāṇa, in chapters 11-15, preceding chapter 23 which describes the incarnations of Śiva. We have therefore to suppose that the ascetic teachers of the Kuśika line must have passed away like Yōgins by driving their prāna-vāyu through the brahma-randhra and plunging themselves into the divinity of Śiva. This explains why all these departed teachers have received the divine title of bhagavat. Nevertheless, their earthly remembrances seem to have been preserved in the shape of portraits carved into the liṅga which served to distinguish them from one another along with the order of successions in which their liṅgas were arranged.

There now remains one important point to be considered—the date of Lakulīna. Uditāchārya, we know, was tenth in descent from Kuśika, pupil of Lakulīna. Uditāchārya thus belonged to the eleventh generation from Lakulīna. Uditāchārya's date, that is, the date of our inscription, is Gupta year 61 = 380-81 A.D. If we now allot 25 years to each generation, we have to assign Lakulīna to 105-130 A.D. This agrees pretty closely with the view expressed as early as 1906 that Lakulīna had to be placed as early as the first century A.D. Our conclusion was then based merely on the mention, in the Vāyu-Purāṇa, of Lukulīna as the last incarnation of Śiva. Evidence of this type will always remain of a somewhat conjectural nature. Epigraphical evidence, on the other hand, is more accurate. We may, therefore, take it now as well-nigh proved that Lakulīna flourished in the first quarter of the second century A.D., about half a century later than the time so long ascribed to him.

Let us now proceed to the consideration of another type of divinities hinted in the Gupta inscriptions. In this connection two inscriptions are of great importance. The first is the Bihar stone pillar inscription (No. 41 below) of Skandagupta. Unfortunately it is highly mutilated. What, however, has been preserved may be pieced together thus. Line 8 speaks of a shrine of Bhadrāya, whose image is apparently mentioned in line 32. The line following refers to Mātrīs or Divine Mothers led by Skanda. And the next line, or line 10, records the erection of a Yōga or sacrificial post and refers again to Bhadrāya and other Mothers. If we piece together these scraps of information, what we gather is that in the Gupta period Bhadrā was the most pre-eminent of the Divine Mothers, that these Mothers were headed by the god Skanda and that somehow a sacrificial post was raised for the worship of either or both. We have more than once remarked in the course of this history that Hindu mythology was in the Gupta period fluctuating and that it did not crystallise till the eighth century A.D. To take one instance, the Mātrīs in the mediaeval period were either seven or eight and were stereotyped into (1) Brāhma, (2) Māhāśvara, (3) Chaṇḍī, (4) Vārāhī, (5) Vaishāṇavī, (6) Kaumārī, (7) Chāmuṇḍā and (8) Chāchikā. This is quite clear from the fact that from the eighth century onwards they arc actually found sculptured as the female forms of or Šaktis of Brahmā, Mahāśvara and so forth. But this does not appear to be the case in the Gupta epoch, because the Bihar pillar inscription refers to Mothers mentioning Bhadrā only. And the question naturally arises: have we any list of Mothers which comprises Bhadrā at all? In this connection attention may be drawn first to the Vīshnu-Purāṇa, V. 1 and 2, which speaks of Vīga-nidrā of the Creator of the Universe (Jagad-dhātṛ) who in this case is Vīshnu himself. Vīga-nidrā has consequently been styled Vaishṇavī Mahāmāyā. She has been commanded by the god to transfer a number

---

of foetuses to the womb of Dēvākī. When Krishnā is born of Dēvākī, she herself shall be born of Yaśodā, and thereafter Vāsudēva shall effect the exchange of infants. For the execution of this duty, Vishnu promises that the people will address her, morning and afternoon, with reverence and praise, call her Āryā, Durgā, Dēvagarbha, Ambikā, Bhadrā, Bhadrakalī, Kshēmā and Kshēmāṁkari, and propitiate her with offerings of wine and flesh. As the names Durgā and Ambikā show, she was really the consort of Śiva. She cannot therefore be, strictly speaking, described as Vaishnavi Mahāmāyā. The same string of names we find repeated in the Agni-Purāṇa, XII. 12-13. Now, if we consider these names carefully, we find that they reduce themselves to three distinct appellations. That Durgā is a name by itself can scarcely be doubted. That Bhadrakalī and Kshēmām[ṅ]kari are amplified or periphrastic forms of Bhadrā and Kshēm(ī) ā can also be scarcely doubted. That Āryā and Ambikā are synonymous terms signifying ‘mother’ can also be scarcely doubted. Āryā and Ambikā, in fact, have survived into the vernacular forms Ayā (=Āi) and Ammā. The real names are thus three: (1) Durgā, (2) Bhadrā and (3) Kshēmā, and they are mothers, that is, —Āryā or Ambikā. This reminds us of a passage from the Vājasaneya-sambhāta, ([III. 58] which says: Eska tie Rudra bhāgo saha svasā Ambikayā taṁ juhasva svāhā . . . Ave Rudram adimahy ave āvam Tryambakam, “This is thy portion, Rudra; graciously accept it together with thy sister Ambikā! Svāhā! . . . . We have satisfied Rudra; we have satisfied the god Tryambaka.” Here Ambikā is described as a sister of Rudra and Rudra is in the same breath called Tryambaka. This clearly shows that originally there were three Ambikās or Mothers associated with Rudra. They were Mothers of the world but only Sisters to Rudra. In later times, as mythology shuffled and re-shuffled itself, Āryā or Ambā became the name of Śiva’s wife, and Mothers multiplied themselves into seven or eight. We have already hinted that just as Bhadrakalī was an amplified form of Bhadrā, so was Kshēmākari of Kshēmā. If any doubt remains on this point, it is removed by verse 2 of the Vasantagṛ̥ha inscription of Varmālāta, dated Vikrama year 682—625 A.D. The second line of this verse runs thus: Kshēmāryā Kshēma-kari vidadhātu śivam nas sabatata. Here Kshēmā and Kshēmākari are mentioned together, and Kshēmā has been called Kshēmāryā like Bhadrāryā of the Bihar pillar inscription. Nay, the stanza preceding it is equally important. There Durgā is praised, and is called Yoganidrā of Ṣhātri (Creator) and Viṣṇuyoni, both of which are names of Brahman. Nevertheless, the same stanza tells us that she was the wife of Śiva. The inference is not unreasonable that Durgā, Bhadrā or Bhadrakalī and Kshēmā or Kshēmākari were originally three different Mothers (Āryās) who later on became forms or names of one and the same goddess, namely, Durgā, and remained always connected with Śiva or Rudra.

Let us now proceed one step further and consider what is meant by the Bihar record saying that the Divine Mothers, of whom Bhadrāryā was certainly one, were led by Skanda. How Skanda was born, how he was protected by the Mātrīs and how he conferred powers upon them has been narrated in the Skandopāyaṇa of the Vanaparvan of the Mahābhārata. But in this account the Mātrīs named are entirely different from those anywhere mentioned, such as Kāki, Halimā, Mālinī, Brīṅhikī, Āryā, Palālā and Vaimitrā. Besides, here Skanda, Mahāśēna, Viṣākhā and Kumāra have all been regarded as names of one god. This could not have happened in the Gupta period. For, as we have elsewhere pointed out, in the Kusāna regime, one type of Huvishka’s coins bears on the reverse the three gods, Skanda, Kumāra and Viṣā-
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1 D. R. Bhandarkar’s Some Aspects of Indian Culture, (Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1938-39), pp. 42-43.
3 Chapter 224, verses 10-16; chapter 225, verses 22-25; chapter 229, verses 14 and 15.
4 Mahābhārata, chapter 227, verse 9.
5 D. R. Bhandarkar’s Carmichael Lectures, 1921, pp. 22-23.
kha, and, another, Skanda, Kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsēna. What is further noteworthy is that these names have each a figure corresponding to it. Skanda, Kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsēna evidently represented four different gods in the Kushāna period. And as Huvishka could not have been separated from the Gupta epoch by more than one century and a half, the four gods could not have been identified with one another or looked upon as names of the same god during the supremacy of the early Gupta kings. Nevertheless, this much is certain—that when the Bihār pillar was erected, Skanda alone, and not any other of the four gods, was associated with the Divine Mothers. As in the Amarakōśa the god has been called Agni-bhūh, 'son of Agni', the story of the Skandopākhyaṇa, that he was the son of Agni and Svāhā may be accepted though it is mixed up with details, connected with the other gods such as Shadānana, later known as Kārttikēya. When Svāhā threw the infant on one of the hills of the Himalayas, the Mothers rallied to the child and reared it up. This seems to be the story connected with the birth of Skanda-Guha as contradistinguished from that of Shadānana. This much of the Skandopākhyaṇa may be accepted as being known to the Gupta period. There, however, remains a third point to be discussed in connection with the Bihār pillar inscription, namely, the erection of a Īśa. Where was the necessity of raising a sacrificial post for the worship of these Mothers, such as Bhadrāryā and others? Let us recall to memory what has been summarised above from the Vishṇu-Purāṇa. We have pointed out there that Vishṇu ordered Yogānīdṛa of the Creator to transfer some extraneous fectuses, in succession, to the womb of Dēvakī and that if she carried out this behest (and we know that she did it), she would have the honour of being addressed twice every day by human beings as Āryā, Durgā, Ambikā, Bhadrā, Kshēmā and so forth, and, above all, being propitiated with the offerings of wine and flesh (sura-māṁsā-āpahāraiḥ—cha bhakṣya-bhūjaśe—sūpājitā). After this explanation one can easily understand that the post (Īśa) was erected to offer an animal sacrifice to the Mothers.

The other Gupta record that refers to the Mātris is the Gaṅghār inscription of Viśvarman, of which verse 23 speaks of Mayurākṣha, the counsellor of the king, having built a formidable edifice of the Divine Mothers (Mātris), interspersed with female ghouls (Dākinī)—the Divine Mothers who stir up oceans with mighty gales through magic incantation. Here two things are worthy of note. The first is that Dākinīs were associated with the Divine Mothers. And the second is that the Mothers were endowed with magic powers. Let us take the first point first, namely, the association of Dākinīs with Mātris. The Vanaṭaparvan (chapter 227) describes the followers of Skanda who are not only terrible but also curious-looking. Verse 8 distinguishes the female followers into two classes: Sīvā and Aśivā, ‘auspicious spirits’ and ‘evil spirits.’ This suits here excellently, because the Mātris are the Śivā, and the Dākinīs the Aśivā, class of his Retinue. The second point is that the Mothers were somehow connected with Tantra or Magic formularies. When we speak of Tantras even now, we think primarily of the ‘Great Śakti’, the ‘Great Mother’ who is one, though known by such countless names as Durgā, Kāli, Chaṇḍi and so forth. The worship of Durgā plays a great part in the Tantras and goes back to the Vedic period. "There is no doubt that this goddess and her cult do unite traits of very different deities, Aryan as well as non-Aryan. It is probable, too, that the system of the Tantras adopted many characteristics from non-Aryan and from non-Brahmanical cults. On the other hand, some essential traits of the Tantras can be found as far back as in the Aitareya-veda, as well as in the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads."1 Originally, the Śakti cult was mostly saturated with wild superstition and confused occultism and disfigured by wild orgies inculcating reprehensible morals. Later on, the lofty spirituality of the Hindus sublimated the lewd and repulsive features of the cult and suffused it with a faultless social code of morality and rigid asceticism.

INTRODUCTION

The above is an account of the popular divinities who were of a multifarious character and whose number was legion. The syncretising potency of the Indian mind was infinite; and so, with the advent of the Gupta regime we find these divinities being reduced to three categories. They were looked upon as forms or incarnations of Vishnu, Siva and Amba. There is nothing, however, to show that Brahmanism was responsible for this stupendous change. It is true that at present most of these gods are in the charge of Brāhmaṇa priests who alone have the right of allowing the votaries to have dārāna of the deities and have turned it into a lucrative source of living. But there is nothing to show that in the Gupta period Brāhmaṇas officiated as priests in the shrines of either Vishnu, Siva or Amba.

There can, however, be no doubt as to the Brāhmaṇa rising to prominence shortly before the Gupta period. Every student of history knows who Ushavadāta (=Rishabhadatta) was. He was a son of Dīnika and son-in-law of the Mahākṣatrapa Nahapāna, who belonged to the Kshaharāta family. Dīnika, Nahapāna, Kshaharāta and Kṣatrapa are all non-Hindu names and titles. This unmistakably points to the alien origin of Ushavadāta. This is exactly in consonance with the fact that in one inscription he is called a Śaka. But his name is Ushavadāta =Rishabhadatta. His wife's name is Saṅghamitrā. These are distinctly Hindu names. This is quite in conformity with what is said of him. Thus, in one inscription, he is called tri-gō-sata-sahasrrade, "the giver of three hundred thousand kine." He is also spoken of as having granted sixteen villages to the gods and Brāhmaṇas. And, to crown the whole, he is described as annavarṣam Brāhmaṇa-satasāhasra-bhajāyati, "the feeder of one hundred thousand Brāhmaṇas every year." Those charities stamp Ushavadāta as a very staunch adherent of the Brahmanical religion.1 This also shows that the Brāhmaṇas had begun to acquire general ascendancy over the popular mind in both social and religious spheres. In other parts of India also were visible the signs of the Brahmanic supremacy. We may first turn our attention to a fragmentary Mathurā inscription which was brought to our notice by Dayaram Sahni and which speaks of a dēvakula or shrine raised to the memory of the grandfather of Huvishka and the excavation of a tank connected therewith.2 It seems that the structure fell into disrepair in the time of this Kushāṇa monarch and was renovated by some Balkanapati whose name is lost. The last line, it is true, is mutilated, but it is all but certain that, for the increase of the life and strength of Huvishka, part of the administration of the benefaction was assigned to Brāhmaṇas who were naitik-āltithis, that is, who performed the Ātithyayajña daily. In other words, what the record means is that there was a feeding house attached to this establishment and that this sacred duty was assigned to Brāhmaṇas. It is well-known that Manu (III. 69-70) enjoins the performance of Five Great Sacrifices (Pañcha-mahāyajña) by the householders and that the last of these is Ātithyayajña 'the hospitable reception of guests.' These five are generally mentioned in inscriptions in the abbreviated forms: bali, charu, Vaisvadeva, agnihotra and ātithi.3 It thus seems from the above record that the Brāhmaṇas were entrusted with the duty of carrying out this last yajña of the householder in connection with the memorial of a departed worthy. Another sign of the growing popularity and influence of the Brāhmaṇa community is furnished by another Mathurā inscription of the same Kushāṇa king. Its purport is to record the endowment of a punya-tālā or a Hall for acquiring merit through feeding and distribution of alms. It was made by a donor of foreign extraction. It was an akshayanītī, 'a permanent endowment', the capital of which could not be touched. Five hundred and fifty Purāṇas were deposi-
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ted each in two śrēṇis or guilds.² Out of the monthly interest realised therewith, one hundred Brāhmaṇas were to be fed daily in the Hall and alms distributed every day at the door among the forlorn—hungry and thirsty. Further, the punya-tālā is described as prāchini and chatudīśi. The latter term means that it was open to the needy and indigent coming from any one of the four quarters, whereas the first denotes that it was an ancient institution. This reminds us of a similar site which came into importance in the early Gupta period. No less than four inscriptions (Nos. 8, 17, 26 below and CII., Vol. III, 1888, No. 64) have been found at Gaḍhwā in the Allahabad District which speak of grants being made for the free boarding of Sadāsattras-amāṇiya, whether they belonged to the Brāhmaṇa or other castes. Sadāsattras-amāṇiya must here denote the people who pertained to the township (samāṇya) of Sadāsattras; and it seems that the place was called Sadāsattras, because it was a site for the perpetual feeding of the Brāhmaṇas and the poor. Both the Punyasālā of Mathurā and the Sadāsattras of Gaḍhwā clearly show that the Brāhmaṇas from the second century A.D. onwards somehow came to acquire and tighten their hold over the popular mind. The question arises: how this phenomenon took place. Did the Brāhmaṇas evince any intrinsic qualities of their own which caught the popular imagination?

Let us briefly recall to mind what we have noticed above about the Pāṣupata and Sātvata sects. In regard to the former, the Purāṇas say that the four disciples of Lākuliśa were not only Brāhmaṇas conversant with the Vedas but also experts in the Māheśvara (= Pāṣupata) yōga. The same was the case with the Sātvata sect connected with the Viśṇu cult. Here also the Āchāryas who flourished in the second and third centuries A.D. were not only Brāhmaṇas by caste but also experts in the Sātvata yōga. It seems that the Brāhmaṇas of this period were acquiring ascendency not so much through sacrificial performances as through new spiritual attainments or psychic performances. The practice of yōga enables a man to gain, in the first instance, freedom from worldly attachments and suppression of worldly desires and, finally, deliverance from the cycle of existence. The Yōgis are frequently, in consequence of the yōga exercises, plunged into what is known as Yōga-nidrā or ecstatic slumber; and some, by virtue of peculiar disposition and constant training, can remain for a lengthened period in a cataleptic condition without any indication of life, thereby acquiring a reputation for sanctity. As the Brāhmaṇas devoted themselves to the practice of yōga and were supposed to be on the brink of the final attainment of the supreme goal, it is no wonder if they were looked upon as objects of sanctity and if thereby they soared high in the estimation of the people.

Though the influence of the Brāhmaṇas was thus in the ascendant, there is nothing to show that they were priests who were in charge of the popular divinities—Viṣṇu, Śiva or Ambā, who alone could permit the people to have an actual sight of gods and turned their prerogative into an actual source of living as is the case at present. It may be contended that the Karamānḍamā inscription (No. 21 below) of Kumāragupta I runs counter to this supposition, because it connects the two temples of Mahādēva-Sāilēśvara and Pṛithivīśvara, with Brāhmaṇas who had come from Ayōdhya and were conversant with Mantras, Sūtras, Brāhmyas and Pravachanas. But they seem apparently to be entrusted with the duty of making the shrine a hallowed site and arranging for the procession of the idols of the gods, in a solemn, sacred manner. They were not local men, but seem to have been imported from Ayōdhya for this express purpose and maintained at the expense of the exchequer of the Sāilēśvara temple which was already in existence. Even here, there is nothing to show that they were priests in actual charge of those divinities, who could allow or refuse votaries to have darśana of them. If any further evidence is needed, it is furnished by the Dāmōdarpur plates, which are five in number.

² Eph. Ind., Vol. XXI, pp. 60-61.
Two of these are applications from the orthodox Brāhmaṇas themselves to the state to sell them strips of land in lieu of money to be paid, to enable them to perform agnīhōtra in the case of one (No. 22 below) and pañchaka-mahāyajña in the case of the other (No. 24 below). The third (No. 38 below) is an application by a layman, anxious to settle down Brāhmaṇas in some part of old North Bengal. The fourth (No. 40 below) and the fifth (No. 47 below) are connected with Kōkāmukha-svāmin and Śvētavārāha-svāmin, two primeval gods existing on the table-land of the Himālayas. The first of these was for the purchase of land by Rīdhupāla, the Nagara-śrīśailiṇi, for erecting shrines over these divinities and two store-houses. The second of these relates to the purchase of land by one Kulaputra from Ayōdhya on behalf of one of these gods only, namely, Śvētavārāha-svāmin, but with a view to make provision for repairs etc. to his temple and, above all, for the establishment of the bali, charu, sattra, etc. and for the supply of the materials for the daily worship of the god. In none of these two records is there any mention of Brāhmaṇa priests though both refer to benefactions made to Kōkāmukha-svāmin and Śvētavārāha-svāmin, the two well-known forms of Vishnu, who have been extolled in the Varāha-Purāṇa. And what is noteworthy is that there is no mention of Brāhmaṇa priests although there is express mention of the establishment of bali, charu, sattra, etc. in connection with this god, a case where reference to the Brāhmaṇa priests would surely have been made if there had been any at all associated with him. These daily rites may have been performed by a holy Brāhmaṇa associated with the god, but he certainly was not a priest privileged to take sole charge of the divinity and admit to his darśana only those votaries whom he chose to take.

We shall now turn to Buddhism and find out in what condition it was in the Gupta period. In such a case we form our estimate of the flourishing condition or otherwise of a religion from the number of inscriptions found at different centres. This is all-right so far as it goes. But argumentum ab silentio is not always a safe one. To take one instance, Vogel makes the following remark in regard to the excavations of Sārnāth: “The Gupta period (c. 300—600 A.D.) marks a revival of purely Indian civilisation... The Convent of the Wheel-of-the-Law enjoyed great prosperity in those days, as is evident from the exuberance of sculptural remains dating back to that period. Indeed, the great majority of the sculptures preserved in the Sārnāth Museum belong to Gupta times.”1 Though there was an exuberance of sculptural remains at the Sārnāth centre of Buddhism, pertaining to the Gupta period, there was a paucity of inscriptions in spite of the excavations undertaken there. The non-find or scarcity of epigraphic records cannot therefore be taken as a distinct sign of decadence. On the contrary, the abundance of sculptures of the Gupta epoch exhumed at Sārnāth is an indication that this centre of Buddhism was in as flourishing a condition as ever before. The truth of the matter is that when a religious centre is once established, it must continue in its undiminished glory for a number of centuries whether or not it receives any accretions in the shape of new sculptures or inscriptions. Such was the case with the Sārnāth centre, where there have been found enough of Gupta sculptures and epigraphic records to show that both were in flourishing condition in the Gupta epoch. The difficulty arises in regard to the Mathurā or the Bharhut centre. But as no excavations have been undertaken at these places, we cannot definitely say that Buddhism was in decadence at these places. This receives confirmation, e.g., from an inscription discovered a few years ago by the late Rai Bahadur Dayaram Sahni which we have adverted to above.2 It refers itself to the reign of Malārāja Dēvaputra Kanśikā and specifies the date 84, and not 14 as taken by Sahni.3 The characters are almost exactly the same as those of the
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3 [Lüders and some other scholars read this date as 14 only. Cf. Mathurā Inscriptions, ed. by Janert, p. 116; Sti. Inv., 1965, p. 518.—Ed.]
Allahābād pillar inscription of Samudragupta. The date must, therefore, be assigned to the Kālaçhuri era and must be taken as equivalent to 332 A.D. This unquestionably makes this Kanishka almost contemporaneous with Samudragupta. There can thus be no reasonable doubt that this inscription belongs to the Gupta epoch and that if excavations are undertaken on the mound where it originally came to light, sculptural remains and epigraphic records would be exhumed in abundance, which pertain to the Gupta period. We have referred to this Mathurā inscription, because it is of great importance to the history of Buddhism of this period. There is just one expression here in the first line which is worthy of our careful consideration, which is as follows: bhagavaṇaḥ Pitāmahasya sammya[k*]ṣaṅgbuddhasya sva-matsya dēvasya. This is a string of 'attributives' of which only one can be taken as the 'attributed.' The ending words sva-matsya dēvasya are rendered by Sahnī as ‘(her) favourite deity,’ ‘her’ referring, of course, to the female donor, Sarighilā, who installed the image of Buddha on whose pedestal the inscription is engraved. This cannot, however, give us the correct rendering. We have to take one of these as the 'attributed' and the rest as its attributives. It is safer to take the ending word, namely, dēvasya, as the 'attributed' here. We may therefore translate the expression thus: “Of God (dēva), the Blessed One, the Pitāmaha, the 'Completely Enlightened One,' (and) Śva-mata.” Here two words have been left untranslated. One of these is Pitāmaha. It is worthy of note that Pitāmaha is an attributive of the Hindu god Brahma. It is further worthy of note that this epithet is nowhere in the Pali literature associated with Buddha. And when it is so associated with Buddha in this record, we have to take it in its primary sense, namely, 'the progenitor of progenitors.' In other words, Buddha is here understood like Hindu Brahma as the Creator of the Universe. If this is the case, the word dēva which occurs at the end of the expression must be taken in the sense of 'God' and not 'a god or deity.' This indicates that a new sect of Buddhism had sprung up about the commencement of the Gupta period which looked upon Buddha as God and Creator of the Universe. But what could be the name of this sect? Let us see whether any light is thrown upon this point by the attributive Śva-mata which is comprised in the phraseology. In this connection we have to take note of the occurrence of this term in another inscription (No. 25 below), namely, the Manuvar stone image inscription of Kumāragupta I. There we meet with the expression sva-matā-śivārddhāsya. Here then we have two records where sva-mata is met with. What can the phrase mean? We cannot help thinking that sva-mata explains not only the origin of Śāṃmatīya, the name of a celebrated sect and school of Buddhism but also its principal doctrine. No scholar has yet been able to adduce a satisfactory etymology of the term Śāṃmatīya. It occurs for the first time in a Sarnāth inscription of the early Gupta period, which is wrongly read as Sa[mni]śrīyanām by Vogel. 2 It is to be transcribed as svamātīyanām and corrected into svaṃmatīyanām, "Of those who proclaim the doctrine of sva-mata." Svā-matīya can be easily Prakritised into Śāṃmatīya. But what can be this doctrine of Sva-mata after which the sect is called Svāmatīya? "The most important tenet of the Śāṃmatīya creed . . . . . . .," says Poussin, "is the Pudgala-cāda, the belief in a Pudgala, a sort of person or soul." 3 This suits here excellently, because one of the senses of sva, according to Monier Williams' Dictionary, is: "the Ego, the human soul," so that sva-mata can be taken to mean "One to whom the human soul is something approved (svaṃ matah yasya sātk)." We can thus make it applicable to Buddha as it has been done in the Mathurā pedestal inscription. "The relation of the Pudgala to the Skandhas is like the relation of the whole (avayava) to its part (avayava)." The Śāṃmatīyas do not maintain that there is a soul existing in se apart from the Skandhas—just as there is no whole apart from its part, no cloth apart from

2. Ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 172.
its threads—but they say that a man is something more than a collection of skandhas; he is a padgala, ‘a monk of such name, of such family, living so many years.’ All these characters, while they belong to the whole, do not belong to the parts or to the constituents; the whole is made of parts, but it is lacking neither in unity nor in continuity.” This tenet is strongly controverted not only by the other Buddhist schools but also by non-Buddhist schools. Nevertheless, the Sāṃsāriyas asseverate that ‘the doctrine of padgala has been taught by Buddha’. Well might inscription No. 25 below, therefore, describe Buddha as sva-mata-ānuvuddha, ‘uncontroverted in his doctrine of sva (= padgala).’ Buddhagamittra who made a gift of the image of Buddha must, therefore, have been an adherent of the Sāṃsāriya sect.

It will thus be seen that the Sāṃsāriyas were so called because they promulgated the doctrine of Sva-mata, that is, padgala-vāda and that they looked upon Buddha not only as Pitāmaha or Creator of the Universe but also as Deva or God. How far the orthodox history of Buddhist sects is reliable, we do not know. It may not be safe to put implicit faith in some part of it or another unless it is corroborated by epigraphic evidence. Thus, we may accept as a historic fact that the Sāṃsāriyas, who were Vāsishputras, were responsible for the padgala-vāda tenet. Padgala-vāda is exactly the same in signification as Sva-mata which alone can again explain the etymology of the name Sāṃsāriya, of which no Buddhist text or no Buddhist scholar has yet been able to give a satisfactory derivation. That they were Vāsishputrikas is also clearly proved by a Sarnāth inscription. But now we learn from the Mathurā inscription referred to above that the Sāṃsāriyas looked upon Śākyamuni not only as the Perfectly Enlightened One, but also as God and Creator of the World. How far, therefore, they differed from the Lōkottara-vādins it is very difficult to determine. What we are told according to traditional history is that whereas the Sāṃsāriyas belonged to the Thēravāda, the Lōkottaras were Mahāsāṃghikas.

Let us now proceed one step further. The Sāṃsāriyas were not the only Buddhist sect that were settled at Sarnāth. For at least two inscriptions of the Sarvāstivādins have been found engraved in the south chapel of the Main Shrine. The beginning of one is practically identical with the beginning of the other. The beginning of both is in Sanskrit and in practically identical terms and has been assigned to the fourth century A.D. The end portion, however, is different. One of these is older by about four centuries and is in Prakrit. Evidently, the first part of the earlier inscription was erased and replaced by a new one. What name was comprised in the older one it is difficult to imagine. Perhaps it contained the name of the Mahāsāṃghikas with whom the Sarvāstivādins were in opposition just a century ago, as is clear from an inscription on the Mathurā Lion Capital. It was in the Kushāna period that the Sarvāstivādins were rising to power and spreading over the whole of North India. In this connection we have to notice another inscription found at Sarnāth. It is the celebrated inscription dated the third year of Kanishka and recording the donation of Bhishu Bala, conversant with Tripiṭaka and co-resident brother (saddhyēvihari) of Bhishu Pushyavuddhi. He was associated in this donation, among others, with (the nun) Buddhakānita, conversant with Tripiṭaka. But what was the nature of his donation? It was the statue of a standing Boddhisattva with his umbrella and its post. Further, it is worthy of note that another inscription of this Bala is known. It is the one engraved on a standing figure discovered years ago by General Cunningham at Sahaṭ-Maheṭ (Śrāvasti). It also records the gift of the statue of Boddhisattva

5 Ibid., p. 181.
with umbrella and post, but further asserts that it was the property of the teachers of the Sarvāstivādin school. It is thus clear that Bala pertained to the Sarvāstivādin sect. Unfortunately the date of the inscription has not been preserved, but there can be no doubt that it must have belonged to the time of either Kanjishka or Huvishka. There is a third inscription which we have to take note of here. It was found near Mathurā. It is dated in the year 33 and refers itself to the reign of Huvishka. It records that a Boddhisattva was set up by the nun Dhanavati, sister’s daughter of the nun Buddhāmītā, conversant with the Tripitaka and a female disciple of the monk Bala who knew the Tripitaka. There can thus be no doubt about the identity of this monk with the monk Bala mentioned in the Sahet-Mahet and Sarnath inscriptions. The only point to notice is that here we have the seated image of Boddhisattva. Further, we have to note that all the three statues must have been carved at Mathurā, because the material used is not the buff-coloured stone of the Chunār quarries of which all other Sarnath sculptures are made, but it is the red sandstone from the quarries near Fatehpur-Sikri. Again, it will be seen that the three images are of Boddhisattva and that, whereas one of them is seated, the other two are standing figures. As Vogel has remarked, if they had not been inscribed, no one would have hesitated to call them images of Buddha. Both the royal dress and ornaments which were hitherto thought to characterise the Boddhisattva are absent, and the figures wear only the plain attire of a Buddhist monk, such as is invariably associated with statues of the Buddha. But the inscriptions are quite explicit in the point in designating each Boddhisattva. What then are we to understand by ‘Boddhisattva’? According to Monier Williams, Boddhisattva is “one who is on the way to the attainment of perfect knowledge, that is, a Buddhist saint when he has only one birth to undergo before obtaining the state of a supreme Buddha and then Nirvana.” This is what you find also in Childers’ Pali Dictionary. In fact, this is how it is generally understood by students of Buddhism. This means that the word is not applicable to Buddha. But the three statues referred to above, no one would hesitate to call as those of Buddha. According to the inscriptions engraved on them, however, they are unquestionably images of Boddhisattva. The conclusion is irresistible that Boddhisattva here means Buddha. And, as a matter of fact, the primary sense of Boddhisattva is “one whose essence is perfect knowledge.” In other words, it seems to be equivalent to Buddha. This suits here excellently. Because the term Buddha also was used by the Sarvāstivādins. We have only to turn to inscription A. II. incised on the Mathurā Lion Capital, which speaks of depositing in a stūpa a relic of Bhagavat Buddha, the Sākya sage. That this stūpa was in the possession of the Sarvāstivādins is clear from lines 15-16 of the same inscription. It thus seems that the terms Buddha and Boddhisattva were used synonymously by the Sarvāstivādins. In the time of Fa-Hien (319-414 A.D.), the Sarvāstivādins were flourishing in Pāṭaliputra also as it was here that he secured a transcript of the Vinaya rules belonging to this school such as are observed by the communities of monks in the land of Ts’in. They were also strong in the Panjab as is clear from the Shōrkot (Śibipura) inscription of the [Gupta] year 83. As regards the Sārmitiyas, though they could not prosper in the pre-Christian era, they gradually attained importance in North India during the Gupta period reaching the climax in the reign of Harshavardhana whose widowed sister Rājāriṇī was a Bhikshuni of this school.

We have also to take note of another Buddhist sect mentioned in a record of the Gupta

---

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 162.
2 Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sarnath (1914), pp. 35-37.
4 Ibid., Vol. IX, p. 141.
5 Fa-Hien’s Record of Buddhist Kingdoms by James Legge, p. 99.
period. It is the Mandsor inscription\(^1\) of Prabhākara dated Vikrama year 524 = 467 A.D. He was a feudatory of the Guptas and stationed at Daśāpura, apparently as Charge d'affaires. His army officer was Dattabhāṭa, who constructed a well together with a stāpa, propā and orchard surrounding it, which, we are expressly told, were all included within the bounds of the vihāra of the Lōkottarās. The latter must be the same as the Lōkottaravāda or Lōkottaravādins of the Buddhist works. The Lōkottarās, like the Chaityavādins, were an offshoot of the Mahāsaṅghikas, paving the way for the evolution of the Mahāyānasim which later spread over the whole of India. There are three more Buddhist inscriptions to account for. They were found in excavations at Sārnāth, engraved on images. One of these belongs to the time of Kumāragupta II and the other two, of Budhagupta. They have been taken as statues of Buddha, but neither the word Budha nor Boddhisattva occurs in any one of them. Only one (No. 34 below) of these speaks of it as an image of Śāsta. And it is very difficult to determine to which sect exactly the inscription belonged. The word śāsta, however, is peculiar more to the Sthaviravāda than to any other Buddhist sect. And perhaps we shall not be wrong if we say that even in the later part of the Gupta period the Sthaviravāda school flourished at Sārnāth, or, rather at the place where the Buddha preached his first sermon.

We have twice pointed out above that the special feature of the religious culture of the Gupta period was the development of the Yōga philosophy and practices. It produced an enduring effect not only on the Śaiva but also the Vaishnava sects. It is, therefore, no wonder if it impressed itself strongly on the Buddhism of the period, especially of the Mahāyāna sect. In this connection we have to note the interest which the Buddhists of this sect took in the Yōga school of philosophy and which is clear from a perusal of the Life of Hieun-Tsiang, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India about the beginning of the seventh century. He had studied manifold systems of Indian philosophy in China, but the principal object of his pilgrimage was to obtain more knowledge of the Yōga-sāstra. On his way to India he met a learned Buddhist priest whom he interrogated: “Have you here the Yōga-sāstra or not?” Mōkshagupta branded it as a heretical work and further remarked that no true disciple of Buddha studied it. This made Hieun-Tsiang angry who now regarded him as dirt. And he rejoined: “In our country too we have long had the Vihārā and Kōsha; but I have been sorry to observe their logic superficial and their language weak: they do not speak of the highest perfection. On this account I have come so far as this, desiring to be instructed in the Yōga-sāstra belonging to the Great Vehicle. And the Yōga, what is it but the revelation of Maitrēya, the Boddhisattva next to become Buddha, and to call such a book heretical, how is it you are not afraid of the bottomless pit?” This, no doubt, refers to a comparatively late period, that is, the beginning of the seventh century. But this clearly shows that the Gupta epoch which preceded it was characterised by the renovation of the Yōga philosophy and practices which were completely in the ascendant before Hieun-Tsiang visited India. It was not Śaivism and Vaishnavism only but also Buddhism, where Yōga became a dominant branch of heretic learning. The Yōga atmosphere of the Gupta period is reflected in the sculpture of India also, to which E.B. Havell was the first to draw our attention. “Physical beauty,” says he, “was to the Greeks a divine characteristic; the perfect human animal received divine honours from them, both before and after death.”\(^2\) The Greek, when he attempted to realise a divine ideal, thus took for his model the athlete or the warrior. In Indian art, however, mere bodily strength and mundane perfection of form are seldom glorified. The Indian artist takes as his

---
\(^1\) Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVII, p. 12-18.
\(^2\) S. Beal’s Life of Hieun-Tsiang, p. 39.
\(^3\) Indian Sculpture and Painting, Second edition, pp. 9 and ff.
ideal the Yogi who, by a system of Yoga exercises, aims at freeing himself from worldly attachments and placing himself in communion with the Universal Self. European archaeologists invariably regard the Graeco-Roman type of Gandhara as the highest achievement of Buddhist art, because it approaches nearer to the Greek ideal. Nothing is more firmly rooted in the mind of the educated European than the idea that the Greeks established aesthetic models for all times and all people. And because Indian sculptors and painters, after coming into contact with debased Graeco-Roman art, deliberately formed their ideals upon a different art-philosophy, they are classed as decadents and degenerates.
LITERARY HISTORY

Introductory

Years ago, the late Max Müller brought out his famous dissertation on the Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature, where he has asseverated two literary-historical propositions. The first of these is that the Indians did not manifest any literary activity during the first two centuries of the Christian era, as this country was then infested with the inroads of many foreign races. His second proposition is that the real period of the bloom of Kāyā or Artificial Poetry is to be placed about the middle of the sixth century A.D. In fact, his theory was that the first five centuries of the Christian era were a dark age for Sanskrit literature. This theory, no doubt, held the field for a pretty long period, but has now been completely demolished by literary and epigraphic evidence of an irrefragable character. When Max Müller propounded this view, the dramas of Bhāṣa (circa 300 A.D.) were not brought to light. Little was also known about the literary achievements of Aśvaghōṣha who was a contemporary of the Kusāṇa sovereign Kāniska (circa 125 A.D.) and was the author not only of the Buddhacarita, Saundarananda and Sūtrālankāra but also of the drama Śāriputra-prakaraṇa. These works of Aśvaghōṣha are genuine kāyas in strict conformity with the rules laid down by the sciences of Sanskrit Rhetoric. And the very fact that a Buddhist monk thought of setting forth the life of Buddha with the help of the poetic art shows how popular artificial poetry was even in the first two centuries of the Christian era. But we may proceed one step further, and consider for a while what may be gleaned on the subject from the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali who has now been universally placed about the middle of the second century B.C. On Pāṇini IV. 3. 87 there is a Vārtika which says that “an affix, in the sense of ‘made in relation to any subject’, when the thing made is ‘a book’, is dropped frequently when the book belongs to the class of Ākyāyikās.” In illustration of this Vārtika, Patañjali cites the instances of Vāsaavadattā and Saumanottarā, noticing also an exception in the case of Bhāmaraṭhi. This means that in the time of Patañjali at least three Ākyāyikās were known, namely, Vāsaavadattā, Saumanottarā and Bhāmaraṭhi respectively. Again, it is worthy of note that the first two of these have been mentioned by Patañjali in connection with Pāṇini IV. 2. 60. The actual gloss is: Ākyāyikā-ākyāyikā-tithās-puruṣāḥ-sūbhyāḥ -cha ṭhag -ṇaktasāyaḥ. “The affix ṭhag comes in the sense of ‘one who studies’ or of ‘one who knows’ after (the names of) stories (ākyāna) and narratives (ākyāyikā), and after (the words) tithās and puruṣā.” It is in this connection that Patañjali refers again to Vāsaavadattā and Saumanottarā as Ākyāyikās but under the forms Vāsaavadattika and Saumanottarika (=one who has studied or is conversant with the Vāsaavadattā or Saumanottarā narrative). In regard to the Ākyānas also he cites the forms Yāvakritika, Priyavagāvika and Tāyātika which mean “one who has studied or is conversant with the Yavakritika, Priyāṅgu and Yāyatika stories.” It is reasonable to hold that the terms Ākyāna and Ākyāyikā used by Patañjali are identical with those employed in treatises of Sanskrit Rhetoric in somewhat later times. It is true that in those times there was a little confusion about the exact signification of Ākyāna, Ākyāyikā and Kāthā. But if the Harshacarita has been styled an Ākyāyikā and the Kādambari a Kāthā, it seems that the first word signifies ‘a (historical) narrative’ and the second ‘a romance’. And, further, if it is true that some Ākyānas were Ākyāyikās and some were Kāthās, as Daṇḍin and Viśvanātha assure us, Ākyāna must be taken to mean ‘a story’ so as to include both ‘a narrative’ and ‘a romance’. It will thus be seen that many Ākyānas and Ākyāyikās were known when Patañjali lived and wrote and that consequently
artificial poetry was then in a highly developed condition. This is quite in keeping with the fact that Patañjali in one place speaks of Vānarachān kāvyam, that is, ‘a Poem composed by Vararuchi’, and reminds us of the Rāgukavanśa and Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa, the Kīrtiśārjuna of Bhāravi, the ŚŚūpālavādha of Māgha and the Naishadhacarita of Śrīharsha—the traditional kāyas of the later period. If further evidence is required in support of this conclusion it is furnished by the fragments of verses culled together by the late Kielhorn from the Mahābhāṣya which “appear to be quotations from poetical works composed from classical Sanskrit”. Many of these exhibit “the ornate metres of the late Kāśyapa style” such as the Mālati, Prabhesvariṇi, Pramitākṣarṇa and Vasantaśīlakā. These, again, “agree, in point of contents as well as the mode of expression, not with epic works but with the court kāyas”; compare, for example, vara-tamu saṁpravodanī kukkuṭā. 2 “Oh fair-limbed one, the cocks are crowing”, which evidently has an erotic flavour about it. The evidence set forth above is enough to convince an impartial mind that Kāśyapa or Artificial Poetry prospered in the age of Patañjali.

Now, one of the chief constituents of Kāśyapa is Alakanāra or Figure of Speech. It is this feature which makes poetry artificial and distinguishes principally an epic composition from a Kāśyapa par excellence. If we take our stand upon the occurrence of a Figure of Speech in a composition, we have to trace Artificial Poetry to the Vedic period itself. Thus, there is a well-known text beginning duḥ sūpaṁ saṇjā saukāya which occurs not only in the ŚŚūtastūrā Upaniśad (IV. 6) and the Mundaka (III. 1. 1) but also in the Rigveda (I. 164. 20). Anybody who has studied the tenth Ullāśa of Maṇmadha’s Kāvyaprakāśa will at once be able to say that the text in question is an instance of Atisayōkti, representing the first variety of it described in the words nigriyā—ādhyaasānam tu prakṛtya parēṇa yat. Another Upanishadic text is opāyī-pāḍō javanō grahyā which is found in the ŚŚūtastūrā III. 19. This is a clear instance of the Figure of Speech called Viśvāmanā. Similarly, in the Rigveda we have a philosophical hymn devoted to Viśnū. It comprises a text commencing with uta tvat paśyan na dadasa Viṣvam (Rigveda X. 71. 4).

There can hardly be any doubt as to this being an apt illustration of the Viśvāmanā alakanāra. Or we may take the well-known stanza opening with chatvāri śṛṅgā trayo asya pādāḥ. It occurs not only in the Mahānārāyana-Upaniśad (X. 1), Taṁśīrīya-Āranyakā (X. 10. 2) and Gopātaka-Brāhmaṇa (I. 2. 16) but also in the Kāthaka-Saṁhitā (XL. 7), Maitreyanā-Saṁhitā (XVII. 91) and, above all, the Rigveda (IV. 58. 3). Two traditional but different interpretations of this stanza have been added, one by Yāsaka in his Nirukta (XIII. 8) and the other by Patañjali about the beginning of his Mahābhāṣya. In both these interpretations the Figure of Speech is evidently Atisayōkti of the first variety, such as that noted above. Or, we may take another philosophical stanza Indraṁ Mitraṁ Varnyaṁ=Agniṁ=āhuv which is to be found not only in the Atharva (IX. 10. 28) but also in the Rigveda (I. 164. 46). This obviously is an illustration of Ullāśa which, though it is not noticed by Maṇmadha, has been taken cognisance of by Viśvanātha in his Sāhityadarśaṇa (X. 37). It may now be remarked that there are so many varieties of Upamā, simple and complicated, noticed in Sanskrit treatises on Rhetoric, and it may, therefore, be asked whether any instance can be cited from the Rigveda of any fully developed Upamā. We can draw upon the same philosophical hymn upon which we drew for an instance of Viśvāṅkī at Figure of Speech. The text in question runs as follows: saktum=iva tiṣṭānaṁ punamā tvatra dhīrā manasaṁ vācham=akṛta (Rigveda, X. 71. 2). Evidently this aptly illustrates what is known as Purāṇa-trauśu vākyagā Upamā, where the upamāna is denoted by saktum, upamāya by vācham, ‘the conveying comparison’ by iva, and ‘the common property’ by punamā. The instances collected here of Alakanāras occurring in Vedic literature are just a few out of many that are

1 Ind. Ant., Vol XIV, pp. 326-27.
2 This may be compared to Chakkavāka-vahana āmontāhi sahaṇaram / uṣṭhāṇa vālaṇī which occurs in the Third Act of the Abhijeṇa-Sākuntalam.
found there. It may, however, be contended that the texts quoted above are from hymns that are of religious or philosophical character. They are not from literature which may be reasonably styled Kāya. But it may be urged against it that if the religious and philosophical hymns contain so many and so varied examples of Alankāra, the secular literature of the period must have been as much saturated with this important element of Artificial Poetry as it was from 150 A. D. onwards.

We should now turn to the evidence supplied by Epigraphy which militates against the views of Max Müller. The idea of utilizing inscriptions in connection with the development of Artificial Poetry occurred first to the late Christian Lassen, who, in 1874, in his Indische Alterthumskunde\(^1\) has referred to the significance of the Girnār inscription and Harishēṇa's praśasti engraved on the Aśoka pillar at Allahābād. But his reference to these epigraphs is very brief and incidental, and his work left much to be desired. What flood of light inscriptions throw upon this subject was first shown systematically and at length by G. Bühler in 1890 in his learned disquisition Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie.\(^2\) Therein he has selected four epigraphic records for a full and exhaustive treatment. The first is Vatsabhāṭi's wholly metrical praśasti about the temple of the Sun at Mandasōr, dated Vikrama year 529 = 472-73 A.D. in the reign of Kumārgupta I. The second is an earlier record, but of the Gupta Age, namely, Harishēṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta, engraved between 375-90 A.D., on the Allahābād pillar, referred to above. The third is a still earlier inscription, namely, the Girnār inscription dated (Śaka) 72 (=150 A.D.) in the reign of Mahākṣhatarpa Rasrādāman; and the fourth is the Nasik cave inscription, dated in the nineteenth regnal year of Śri-Pulumāvi (circa 125 A.D.). With the help of these inscriptions Bühler has come to the incontrovertible conclusion that Artificial Poetry was in full bloom as early as even the second century A.D., that the Indo-Scythian princes, who invaded India about the beginning of the Christian era, not only began to bear Indian names in the second generation but also had distinct leanings towards Indian system of religion, and that they had evinced willingness to appropriate the culture of their subjects, a most vivid example of which is furnished by Poetry being described as a personal occupation with the Mahākṣhatarpa Rudradāman. Those who are interested in the subject will do well to read and digest this classical dissertation of Bühler. We are, however, here concerned with only two of the four inscriptions treated at length by him, namely, those of the Gupta period. But we shall take them in their chronological order and show what light they shed on the literary activity of that age. All the important points noticed by Bühler will also be here duly considered, not shrinking from the criticism of this illustrious Indologist where we have an honest difference of opinion.

Harishēṇa's Panegyric of Samudragupta

The Gupta inscription that we shall now examine is Harishēṇa's praśasti of Samudragupta engraved on the Allahābād pillar. It consists of thirty-two lines and a half, with eight stanzas at the beginning, a long prose passage in the middle, and, one stanza, again, at the end.

"All the three parts together," says Bühler, "form one single, gigantic sentence."\(^3\) This, how-

---

\(^1\) 2nd edn., pt. II, pp. 1159-60 and 1169-70.
\(^2\) This has been translated into English by the late V.S. Ghatke and published in Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, pp. 29 ff., 137 ff., 148 ff., 172 ff., 188 ff., 230 ff., and 243 ff.
\(^3\) Ind. Ant., Vol. XLIII, p. 172. It is not quite clear what Bühler means by 'gigantic sentence.' He may perhaps mean the mahātekhya of the rhetoricians. It is true that the Sāhityadarpana (Bibli. Ind. edn., p. 9, sec. 7-8) e.g., defines mahātekhya by quoting a verse from Bhartrihari's Vāyuśpadīya, viz.,
ever, is not correct; and, as a matter of fact, the three parts comprise two separate sentences. The first of these covers the first eight verses. Every one of these contains the relative vocable yaḥ or yaṣya. So also verse 8 also has yaḥ, but corresponding to it is the demonstrative pronoun aṣya which occurs in the third line of that stanza. This shows that these eight verses together comprise one sentence. The second sentence is represented by the prose passage and the concluding verse. It commences with tasya in line 17 which is further connected with the relative pronoun yaṣya in line 30 at the prose passage, which, together with the concluding stanza forms one clause, the relative clause. Thus, the second sentence covers lines 17 to 31. The postscript of the author (lines 31-33) informs us that he looked upon the whole of this record as kāyaṃ. It runs as follows: "And may this poetic composition (kāya) of Harishēṇa, the slave of the very same venerable Bhāṭṭāraka, whose mind has expanded through the favour of remaining near (him), who is the Sāndhivigrāhika, Kunārāṃya (and) Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, (and who is) a native of Khaḍyāṭapāka,1 and son of the Mahādaṇḍanāyaka Dhruvabhūti, lead to the welfare and happiness of all beings." This smacks a little of self-conceit. It is true that Harishēṇa was Minister for Peace and War and was thus no small officer. It is also true that as Sāndhivigrāhika he was expected to be a poet just as the Sāndhivigrāhika of Chandragupta II, Virāśaṇa Śāba, was. Nevertheless, it is somewhat strange that a poet of this early period claims for his composition the title of kāya, especially as it is of such a small length. Kālidāsa nowhere speaks of any one of his compositions as a kāya. Even Vālmīki, who is the author of the Rāmāyaṇa which has been designated the ādi-kāya, does not call his work a kāya though it is a very extensive production, but is content with saying:

prāpta-rāyasya Rāmasya Vālmikir=bhagavān=ṛishih |
chakāra charītaṃ kṛitsnaṃ viṣṇu-ṭpad=ārthavati ||

It is Māgha who is the first poet to call his composition a mahākāya. But Māgha flourished in the eighth century, and his work is much greater in length than the praśasti composed by Harishēṇa. However, taking this praśasti to be a kāya, let us examine it in detail, noting its good and bad points.

The first two verses of this praśasti are well-nigh effaced. Stanza 3 says; "Whose mind is surcharged with happiness in consequence of his association with the wise, who is accustomed to retain the truth and meaning of sciences,........fixed........upraised........, who, putting down obstructions to the grace of good poetry, through the very canons (ajñā) of (Poetic) Excellence, clustered together (gnita) by the connoisseurs (of rhetoric), enjoys, in the literate world, extensive sovereignty in consequence of fame for much and lucid poetry."

This is not a very happy stanza and lacks prasāda which is considered to be an essential feature of good poetry. According to Vāmana’s Kāvyalakāra-sūtra-vṛtti, prasāda is artha-vaimulyaḥ, ‘Perspicuity of Sense’. The Sarasvatīkanṭhābhārana says: Tat= tu prākatyaṃ=arthaḥ prasādaḥ sō=bhidhyatae. Mallinātha also in one place in his commentary on the Kīrtitājurīya quotes prasidhārtha-padavam yat=sa prasādāh nigadhyate, ‘The use of words with well-established sense

Contd. from page 148

v-ārtha-bōdha-samāpiṇām=āng-āṅgītona-vyapakshaḥ |
vijayānām=ka-teka-vatwan punah sahātya jāgati ||

"Out of the sentences, completed as regards the conveying of their own sense, when joined together, there develops the nature of a single sentence, through the mutual relation of the parts to the whole." But, as instances of this mahāvaśya, the Saktipada-pāna cites the names of the Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and Rāgavasūla. Surely Harishēṇa’s praśasti cannot possibly be classed with them and designated mahāvaśya (gigantic sentence).

1 [See above, p. 12, note 1.—Ed.]
is called prasāda.’ This prasāda which consists in the quick, clear and easy perception of the sense conveyed by words is conspicuous by its absence in this stanza. This is the reason why its last lines have led astray, not only Fleet, but even Bühler. The latter translates them as follows:

‘...puts an end to the war between good poetry and prosperity and thus enjoys in the world of the learned, a far-extending sovereignty whose shining glory endures in many poems.’

And, further, he draws the specious conclusion that Samudragupta is here represented to have put an end to the old antagonism between Śri and Sarasavati and which condemns the poet and the literate to a life of indigence and misery and renders the rich incapable of rendering service to Art and Learning. If these lines are translated as Bühler has done, the second half of the stanza remains utterly unconnected with the first half. Above all, his rendering fails to explain how Samudragupta has established ‘a far-extending sovereignty’ based upon his many poems by removing the opposition that exists between the Goddess of Learning and the Goddess of Wealth in the case of the other poets. The last two lines have, therefore, to be so translated as to show how he has come to enjoy this Kirti-rājya through his own poetry. This can only be done by translating them as we have done, in other words, by saying that he rigorously followed the canons of Poetic Excellence laid down by experts in poetics. To come back to our original point, this stanza, especially the second half of it, lacks prasāda, that is, artha-samajyā, ‘Perspicuity of Sense’. Again, the phrase sat-kāyayā-śri-nīrodhān (line 3) of this stanza contains the Poetic Imperfection Adikā-pada, as the words sat and Śri mean practically the same thing. The omission of any one of them would have augmented the excellence of this verse.

The case, however, is different in regard to the stanza following. It says: ‘(Exclaiming) ‘come, Oh worthy (son)’ and embracing (him) with hair standing on end which indicated (his) feeling, (his) father, perceiving (him) with an eye, overcome with affection (and) heavy with tears (of joy), (but) scanning the truth, said to him ‘do protect the whole earth’, while he was being looked up with sad faces by others of equal birth, (but) while the courtiers were breathing forth (cheerful) sighs.” According to the Kavyaprātipa, Poetry (kavya) is lōkkottara-varṇa-nilānā-kavi-karma, ‘the production of a poet proficient in wonderful delineation.’ This definition of Poetry fits this stanza most excellently. It is therefore not a matter of surprise if Bühler has gone into raptures over it. ‘It is not possible,” says he, “to have a more concise and a more graphic picture of the situation. There is not a word which is unnecessary; and one believes as if he sees the scene with his own eyes, how the old Chandragupta, in the presence of his sons, each of whom hoped to have the highest fortune, and of his court who were afraid lest the choice may fall on an unworthy person, turns round to his favourite son. This verse is one of the best productions the Indians have given us, in the domain of miniature-portraits, which is their forte.” “This very example,” Bühler adds, “would also illustrate Harishĉena’s special care for the choice and arrangement of words”, which constitutes a merit of poetry called udātita which the Sarasvatikaśāhāravana explains as Śāhīya-nīśāka-yogyatam, “compatibility of apt attributives.” This good quality of a poem is well-exhibited by the use of such words as utkṛṣṭātā vṛmābhiḥ, snēhayālālāśīnaḥ, and, above all, udāvikshitaḥ. The preposition ad in udāvikshite indicates beautifully the feelings of nirvēda and vishāda described by the authorities on Sanskrit poetics. Here nirvēda is a samāhāri and not a sthāyi bhāva and is self-disparagement caused by īrṣyā or bitter jealousy manifested in the gesture, vīz., the raising of the neck involved in udāvikṣitaḥ.1 Vishāda is ‘a loss of vigour (or despondency) arising from the absence of ex-

---

1 Sāhīyadarpaṇa (Nīrṇaya Sagar, 1936 edn., p. 146), Parichheda III, kārikā 141.
pedients to achieve the end devoutly wished for. Both these feelings have been superbly depicted by the preposition ad in udvikṣṭhaḥ used by Harishēpa with reference to the rival kinsmen of Samudragupta. Again, the word employed by him to denote rival kinsmen is tuḥya-kulāja, ‘born in the same family.’ This also is a most apt phrase denoting the Artha-guṇa or Merit of Sense called ojas or Vigour. This ojas, according to the Sāhityadarpaṇa, is svābhāviprāyatavāram, ‘consisting in pregnancy of meaning.’ The implication conveyed by this expression is that the only qualification that Samudragupta’s rivals possessed was that they were his equals in birth. Though this stanza is thus a master-piece of a poem, it is not completely free from certain foibles of composition. Thus, in line 1, we have the phrases bhāva-śisunāḥ and utkarṇitaiḥ, which are adjectives of rāmahiiḥ. Here utkarṇitai rāmahiiḥ without bhāva-śisunāḥ would have been better. Because, as the Sāhityadarpaṇa says, harsh-ādhaṭuha-bhaya-āśaśyayā rāmānāḥ rāmahiiḥrāmānā, “Horripillation is a change in regard to the hair of the body, caused by joy, surprise, or fear and so on.” In the present case we know that the hair of Samudragupta’s father, Chandragupta I, stood on end on account of delight. Thus the phrase utkarṇitai rāmahiiḥ by itself gives rise to the yajjanāḥ which should be, on the present suggestion that Chandragupta’s mind was replete with joy. Thus, the other phrase bhāva-śisunāḥ not only is superfluous but mars this implication, causing the Poetic Imperfection called gupnābhūta-nayāgya, ‘Implication of secondary type.’ Similarly in line 3, we have bāṣhpā-gurunāḥ...chakshushāḥ. Here the expression bāṣhpagurunāḥ is cumbrous and detrimental to the development of the Poetic Excellence, Uḍāṭata, which has already been animadverted upon. It should have been either bāṣhpā-ālaśena or bāṣhpā-bhariṭenā. Again, in the last line we meet with the word nīrktshya which, however, goes with chakshushāḥ in the previous line. In between stand the words yah pictīḥbhikti. This has caused the Poetic Imperfection called Garbhītātā which is explained by the Sāhityadarpaṇa as vāky-āntarē vāky-āntar-ānu-praveśō, “intrusion of one sentence into another.”

In this appreciation of Harishēpa’s praśasti Bühler passes over stanzas 5 to 7. Stanza 7, however, merits some consideration. Here too the author has given us another example of the Artha-guṇa known as Ojas which we have discussed above. The expression that arrests our attention in this verse is Pushp-āhwayē kriyata, ‘while amusing himself at the city’ named Pushpa.’ The historical sense conveyed by this stanza has been elsewhere considered at length. Here Samudragupta is represented to have quelled a confederacy that had been formed against him by four princes. Three of them met in an open battle, and killed them. The fourth prince, who was not allowed to join the other three, he managed to capture by means of his danda or forces, while he was himself sporting at his capital Pushpapura ((Pāṭaliputra). Here the phrase Pushp-āhwayē kriyata is ‘pregnant with meaning’ (svābhāviprāya) as every example of Ojas should be. The words Pushp-āhwayē kriyata ‘sporting in Pushpa’ (flower and also Pāṭaliputra) indicate with what ease he captured the fourth member of the confederacy. The expression Pushpāhwaye kriyata thus forms a hēt-opahara viśeshaṇa, ‘an adjectival phrase impregnated with a purpose’ which is the same thing as svābhāviprāyaya, the characteristic of this Ojas.

Stanza 6 also merits some consideration, not so much on account of its Excellence as on account of its one Imperfection. Line 3 of this verse has sphaṭā-bahu-rasa-sneha-phullāra, where either sphaṭa or phulla had better be deleted. Otherwise it is susceptible of what is known as Adhika-pada dāshā.

Stanza 8 has twice received the attention of Bühler. First he turns to it for the expression šaśi-kara-śucayaḥ kiṛtaḥ sa-pratānāḥ, with which he seems to have been exceedingly fascinated.

---

1 Sāhityadarpaṇa, (pp. 160-61), Parichheda III, kārikā 167.
2 Ibid., p. 454.
3 Ibid., (p. 158), Parichheda III, kārikā 137.
4 Ibid., p. 412.
He renders it by “the fame sprouting forth, shining purely like the moon.” This translation, however, is not quite satisfactory. It should have been “(his) spreading fame is as bright as the spreading rays of the moon.” Here *sūchi* is one word. It should be rendered by either ‘shining’ or ‘pure’, and not by both together, that is, by ‘shining purely’ as he has done. Secondly, *sa-pratānaḥ* is taken by him to mean ‘sprouting.’ On the strength of this slender basis, he asseverates that the whole expression “bears evidence to his (Harishēna’s) being aware of the well-known idea of the *kīrttvalli* or the creeper of fame, which covers over the three worlds with its tendrils.” The word *pratāna*, no doubt, signifies ‘a sprout, tendril’. But Bühler forgets that the compound word *sa-pratānaḥ* is intended to be taken with both *kīrttvallī* and *kāsī-kara-sūchayah*. It should therefore be rendered by ‘spreading’ instead of ‘sprouting’. Again, it is true, as just remarked, that *pratāna* has also the sense of ‘sprout’ and that, consequently, *pratāninī* signifies ‘a creeper’. But to conclude merely from the use of *pratāna* that Harishēna is here advertting to the idea of *kīrttvallī* is not quite justifiable. To take another instance, *simantini* is no doubt synonymous with *vadhā* ‘woman’, but not the word *simanta*. So, from the mere use of *simanta* we cannot jump up to the notion of *simantini*. The notion of *kīrttvallī* here is thus a little far-fetched. How, again, can this imagery of ‘creeper’ be made applicable to ‘the rays of the moon’? Bühler does not explain. There is, however, one fault in the body of this poem which Bühler has not noticed. It occurs in line 3 of the verse which reads *kō nu syād-yo—syā nā syād—gūpa iti vidusāh. Here syāt is repeated twice and thus gives rise to the Imperfection called *Kūṭhā-pāda-vākya*. This stanza Bühler alludes to, a second time, to prove that Harishēna’s composition does not at all belong to the beginning of the *Kāūya* period. This stanza, like stanza 3, speaks of the brisk poetical activity of Samudragupta. If even a king could be a poet, it means that Harishēna wrote at a time when *kāūya* was in full bloom, and not when it was just beginning to develop. This point, however, we will consider in detail a little further on.

It will be seen that the initial part of the *prāstī* consists of eight stanzas and covers lines 1 to 16. Thereafter commences the *gāyika* portion of the *kāūya* extending from line 17 to line 30. It is comprised of very long sentences which are, nevertheless, so constructed as to permit, to the reciter and the hearer, pauses between long compounds by the insertion of shorter phrases. The views that Bühler has expressed in regard to this prose passage are so convincing that every one of his words will be endorsed by all. His words are worth quoting even though they will make a long quotation. “In the prose part” says he, “there are inserted between the long compounds, at definite intervals, shorter phrases, in order to enable the reciter to draw his breath and the hearer to catch the sense. In the long compounds, the words are so chosen as to bring about a certain rhythm through the succession of short and long syllables; and care is taken to see that this rhythm changes from time to time. This can be best seen by a representation of the design of the compounds occurring in lines 17-22, by marking the accents as is customary in recitation. The lines in question contain only seven long compounds, the arrangement of whose syllables is as follows:

```
1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1
         1  1

2  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1
         1  1

3  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1
         1

4  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1
         1  1  1

1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1
         1
```
It is obvious that the short compounds marked 6 and 7 are to serve as resting points, and that the rhythm in 1, 2 and 4, is to remind us of the beginnings of the *Danda*kas.* What Bühler says is perfectly true and reminds us of the manipulation of long compounds followed by short phrases for pauses such as we notice in classical samples of grandiloquent prose. This indicates not only the extreme proficiency of Harishēca in prose composition but also the high standard reached by the *gadya* portion of *Kāya* literature in the fourth century A.D. The only remark of Bühler to which exception can be taken is his use of the word *danda*ka which is, however, the name of a metre, and not of any "prose rhythm."

We shall consider some of the remarks which Bühler has made in regard to the individual sentences or rather adjectival phrases occurring in this long prose passage. Thus, in line 23 is to be found a poetic representation of Samudragupta’s fame. It is this; to adopt his translation: "Whose fame arising from the re-establishment of many fallen kingdoms and of many extinguished royal races, is tired by its journey through the three worlds." In the first place, Bühler forgets that the text of the inscription has *nīkhila-bhuvana*, and not *tri-bhuvana*. And this suits better the fact recorded about the king in this sentence, namely, that he restored fallen kingdoms and extinct royal families, which could have existed only in one world, namely, on this earth. And, for a court poet to say merely that the fame of his lord and master was tired by its journey over this earth on account of this work of restoration, without telling us in a poetic manner where or how it rested itself would not be a very dignified procedure for him to follow.

It is true that Bühler quotes a stanza from the Jain monk Hēmachandra’s *prasasti* to his Grammar, eulogising his master, namely, the Chaulyka king Kumārapāla. But the stanza represents Kumārapāla’s fame as having first wandered through the three worlds and then having rested on the pale breasts and white cheeks of Mālava women. As, in Sanskrit poetry, fame is always considered to possess a shining complexion, Kumārapāla’s fame after exhaustion through wandering is beautifully represented as resting itself on the breasts and cheeks of Mālava women which had turned white and pale as their husbands had been slaughtered in a battle by Kumārapāla. But, in the Allahābād pillar *prasasti*, if we are to adopt Bühler’s translation, Samudragupta’s fame is represented simply to have tired itself out with wandering over the earth in the work of re-establishing lost kingdoms and overthrown royal families. No court poet would represent his master’s fame as simply overcome with exhaustion without
showing how it rested itself. The sentence has therefore to be translated differently and somewhat as follows: "(Where) fame exerted itself with journey over the whole world caused by the restoration of many fallen kingdoms and overthrown royal families."

Though it is not possible to agree with Bühhler in the interpretation of the sentence quoted above, he is quite right in remarking that the closing part of most of the long-compound attributives in lines 17-24 "comes now and then as a surprise and deviates very much from the usual track", pointing to the individuality of the style. Thus in line 20, while setting forth his conquests in Dakshināpatha, his description ends with the words sarvā-Dakshināpatha-rāja-grahāṇa-mokṣa-ānugraha-janita-pratāp-omniśra-mahā-bhāyasya. Similarly, his account of Samudragupta's exploits in North India in line 21 closes with anēk-Āryavartā-rāja-prasabh-ōdhharaṇ-ōdṛitta-prabhāva-mahataḥ. Further, in lines 22-23, Harishēna describes the stern control which his master exercised over the tributary chiefains and tribes, in the words sarvā-kara-dān-ajukaraṇa-prarām-āgamanā-pariśāhita-praṇaṅga-sāsanasya. This is followed by a sentence detailing the different measures with which the independent princes on the frontier of the Gupta empire prevented him from invading their dominions. The sentence ends with ādy-upāya-sūti-kṛita-bāhu-vīryya-prasara-dharānti-bandhaṇa. This expression, like prasabh-ōdhharaṇ-ōdṛitta-prabhāva-mahataḥ cited above is unique and peculiar to Harishēna. And just because it is out of the ordinary run, all the previous translators were led astray. Thus, Bühhler renders it as follows: "the mighty bravery of his arm which held the whole earth in bondage, received homage from etc." The most important word in this sentence is dharaṇi-bandha, which here obviously means "an earthen embankment." The prowess of his arm (bāhu-vīryya) is compared to a prasara, "flow of water." This onrush of his prowess continued to be unimpeded like a terrific flood. And the neighbouring independent kings, who dreaded his invasion of their territories, were naturally anxious to construct some barriers, i.e., earthen embankments (dharānti-bandha), which could arrest the further onrush of his prowess. And these barriers were of various kinds and correspond to the various measures which they adopted as Harishēna tells us. There are many other phrases which mark Harishēna's individuality not only in diction and phraseology but also in conception. In fact, the whole prose passage bristles with instances of it. It is impossible here to notice them all. We shall notice two or three only. One such is Dhanadeo-Varun-Endr-Āntaka-sāmasya. Bühhler says that this comparison occurs frequently in the epics and is used in later times by almost every classical poet. I have not, however, met with any passage in the epics, where any ruler is compared to these four Regents of the Quarters, combined either in one phrase or in one verse. The only poet who indulges in this comparison is Kakidāsa who, in Canto IX, verse 24 of the Rāghuvaṁśa, likens Daśaratha to Yama-Kubera-Jalēṣvara-Vajryām. The author of the Naishadhāya-charita, however, expresses the same idea but in the general terms: Dig-śa-vrind-ānāta-vibhāțh. This comparison of a king with the Regents of the Quarters must have originated as early as the time of Chandragupta, the founder of the Maurya dynasty; as it is Kauṭalya who first seems to have used it in his Arthasastra. But in the Gupta period they were not satisfied with this comparison of a king merely with the Regents of the Quarters and went so far as to identify him with Supreme God Himself. The rising up of this bold conception of kingship is traceable even in Harishēna's prāśasti in the phraseology (in line 28) lōka-samaya-kriyānvidhāna-mātra-mānuṣhasya lōka-dhānmō dēvasya. "(who is) a human being in that he performs the rites and conventions of the world, (otherwise) God whose residence is the world." This conception which has here been expressed in many words was afterwards crystallised into the phrase Parama-daivita, "Supreme

1 D. R. Bhandarkar's Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity (Manindra Chandra Nandy Lectures, 1925), pp. 141 and ff.
2 Ibid., pp. 163-64.
Divinity, which we find for the first time to be conjoined with the name of Samudragupta’s grandson Kumāragupta, in his Dāmodarpur copper plate inscriptions (Nos. 22 and 24 below). How the king gradually came to be identified with Supreme God is a subject of discussion which is germane to Hindu Polity and has been treated in extenso in a separate chapter elsewhere. We shall conclude this survey of the individualistic prose style of Harishēṇa by taking note of the sentence with which the prose passage ends. It runs as follows:

*sarva-prithivi-vijaya-janit-śākya-uyāpta-nikīkil-avantitalāṁ Kirttim=itas=tridaśa-pati-bhavana-
gaman-udāpta-lafta-sukha-vicharanam=āchakṣaṇa iva bhūto bāhur=ayam=ucchhrītaḥ stambhaḥ*

“this lofty column is the raised arm of Earth, proclaiming, as it were, that (Samudragupta’s) Fame, having pervaded the entire surface of the world, with (its) uprise caused by the conquest of the whole earth, has acquired an easy and graceful movement in that it has repaired from here (i.e., from this world) to the abode of (Indra), the lord of the gods.” What this concluding part of the prose passage tells us is that Samudragupta’s Fame, which is personified as a female by Sanskrit poets, occupied the whole earth and that when she found it impossible to spread further, she went up to the palace of Indra where she roamed easily and happily. This is the first Sanskrit composition where the ascent of Fame to the higher regions or rather to the abode of Indra is spoken of. We find the following in Kālidāsa’s Rāghuvamśa (VI. 77).

Ārūḍham=adrīn=udadhan vitirṇaḥ bhujagamānaṁ vasatiṁ prarishṭam /
ārdhavan gataṁ yaśa na c=ānumandhi yaśaḥ parichekhītām=īyātay=ādām ||

“His fame, which has ascended to the mountains, has crossed the seas, entered the abode of serpents, and has gone high up, being ever-pervading, is not capable of being defined by measurement.”

Here the motive attributed to the Fame of Rāghu is the same as that of the Fame of Samudragupta, namely, the sense of over-congestion caused by rigid confinement to earth and the consequent rising up to higher regions and the sense of joy produced by free and easy movement there. But in the case of Rāghu the conception is further developed, because his fame is represented not only to have spread over the whole of the earth from the lowest level of the seas to the highest altitude of the mountains but also to the nether regions inhabited by the serpents and to heaven which I suppose is to be understood by the term ārūḍha used in the verse. In fact, Rāghu’s fame is to be taken as having extended over the three worlds. Hariśeṇa, on the other hand, represents Samudragupta’s Fame to have, in the first instance, occupied the whole of the earth and, then, being cramped for want of space, to have ascended, not to Tridaśa-pati-bhavana or heaven, but rather to Tridaśa-pati-bhavana or Palace of Indra. This is perhaps a somewhat different conception. What is intended by the court poet here is that the Fame of his master was, after his world-conquests, spread all over the earth, but, not being satisfied with this narrow compass, had to ascend to the Palace of Indra where she was the subject of talk in the whole of Indra-sabha. Kālidāsa’s conception, it will thus be seen, is more complex because he has represented Rāghu’s Fame to have spread over not two but three worlds. It is more mechanical, because the original notion of Kṛtta spreading over the worlds is in no wise maintained by Kālidāsa. According to him Rāghu’s Fame has travelled mechanically as if she were a mere female globe-trotter. Hariśeṇa, on the other hand, has displayed his particularity of expression by preserving the original idea, that Samudragupta’s exploits were a subject of verse not only on earth but also in Indra’s durbhar, though like other poets he has personified his master’s Fame and made her travel all over the earth, before
rising up to heaven where Indra stays. This idea of the ascent of fame to the other world has persisted in Sanskrit poetry even in modern times, and the motive for this ascent is as varied as the mode of expression bombastic. Perhaps the best example of this kind is furnished by the verse of Amśiṭadatta, describing the glory of the Kashmir Sultan Shāhābuddin (1352-70 A.D.) which has been quoted by Bühler himself. It runs thus:

Kirtis tē jāta-jādy iva chatur-ambhūti-majjanāt |
ātāpāya dharā-nātha gata mārđa-mandalam \|

“Thy Fame, Oh lord of the earth, which was, as it were benumbed with cold through its bathing in the four oceans, went up to the sphere of the Sun, in order to warm itself.”

The prose passage is immediately followed by a stanza which is not only the ninth and the last verse of Harishēṇa’s panegyric, but forms also its conclusion. It may be translated as follows: “Whose fame (yaśas),² upraised in ever higher and higher masses, and travelling by many paths, (namely) through liberality, prowess of arm, self-restraint and out-pouring of scientific utterances, purifies the three worlds, like the yellowish white water of the Ganges, dashing forth quickly when liberated from confinement in the inner hollow of the matted hair of Paśupati (which rises up in ever higher and higher masses and flows through many paths).”

Bühler is right in remarking that the phrase anēka-mārga and upārya-upari-sanichay-śekchhrita refer both to Fame and the Ganges. Samudragupta’s Fame was anēka-mārga, that is, followed different paths, because it sprung up from different causes, such as liberality, prowess of arm, self-restraint and so forth, which formed layers one upon another till the Fame towered itself into a high eminence (upārya-upari-sanichay-śekchhrita). Bühler is, however, wrong in his application of these phrases to the Ganges. “As applied to the Gaṅgā,” says he, “the adjective alludes to the Indian belief that this river is first visible in the heavens as the milk-path, then dashing through the mid-region, it falls upon the Kailāsa, and, lastly, it rushes downwards to the plains. Thus, to the looker-on, standing on the plains and looking upwards, the water of the Gaṅgā would appear to be towering in ever-rising layers.” It is, however, worthy of note that Harishēṇa has compared the Fame of Samudragupta, not to the Ganges as a whole, as Bühler apparently thinks, but rather to that part of the Ganges which dashes forth from the matted hair of Śiva, that is, to this river at its very source. There the Ganges flows not in one uniform mass, but in manifold channels (anēka-mārga); and as her waters in these channels rush down in stupendous masses and in steep perpendiculars through the crevices and clefts of the Himālayas, they are dashed up to the skies in ever-accumulating layers which tower to a phenomenal height.

“Apart from the use of long compounds in the prose parts”, says Bühler, “there is nothing very artificial in Harishēṇa’s language.” By ‘artificial’ Bühler obviously means the frequent employment of Amaṃkāras. What he, in other words, means is that Harishēṇa does not much indulge in Figures of Speech. Nothing, however, is more erroneous. “Of the Śabdālārikās,” Bühler proceeds, “he (Harishēṇa) uses only the simplest kind of alliteration, the Varnāmuprāsa, and even this occurs principally in the prose-parts and that, too, not many times.” In the

---

² It is worthy of note that the word here used for ‘fame’ is yaśas, whereas that used in the prose passage immediately preceding this verse is kārī. The Amskāraśā and other lexicons make the two words synonymous with each other, so that no difficulty can arise so far as this prose part is concerned, on account of the employment of these words, one immediately after the other. In later times, however, a distinction is made between the two. Thus Rāmānuja Tārakavāgīṣa, in his comment upon the Śāhīpadarpana, VII (page 437), quotes the following passage in favour of it: khaḍ-gī-śi-prabhāṣā kārī = śdy-gī-śi-prabhāṣām yasaḥ.
first place, there is no such term as \textit{Varnāṇyṛṣṭa} known to the science of poetics. The technical word used to denote ‘alliteration’ is simply \textit{Anuprāṣa}, which is described by Dāṇḍin as \textit{varṇa-vaśītir} = \textit{Anuprāṣaḥ padēṣu cha padēṣu cha}. As \textit{Anuprāṣa} is here defined as \textit{varṇa-vaśītī}, it is possible that Bühler has jumbled the two together and invented the phrase \textit{Varnāṇyṛṣṭa}. Bühler, again, is wrong in saying that \textit{Anuprāṣa} does not occur many times even in the prose passage. As a matter of fact, it is found copiously not only in the prose but also in the verse portion of the \textit{praśasti}. \textit{Anuprāṣa} is of five kinds: (1) \textit{Chhēk-Anuprāṣa}, (2) \textit{Vrīty-Anuprāṣa}, (3) \textit{Śrūty-Anuprāṣa}, (4) \textit{Anty-Anuprāṣa} and (5) \textit{Lāṭ-Anuprāṣa}. Instances of almost all these varieties are found in this \textit{praśasti}. To take only two, \textit{ādhyāt-śāhśinna} in verse 5 is an example of the first variety, namely of \textit{Chhēk-Anuprāṣa}, and \textit{parākram-aika-bandhōḥ Parākramāṅkasya} in line 17, of the last variety, \textit{Lāṭ-Anuprāṣa}. “Of the \textit{Arthālāṅkāras},” Bühler further remarks, “he uses \textit{Rūpaka} very often, and \textit{Upamā} and \textit{Śloka} more rarely.” Nothing is farther from the fact. As Bühler admits that Harīścvara is fond of using \textit{Rūpaka}, no instances need be cited here. We must, however, take note of one instance he has adduced in this connection, namely, \textit{sādhu-asād-udaya-pralaya-hētu-\textit{purushasya} (line 25), “of Purusha (Supreme Being), being the cause of the prosperity of the good and the destruction of the bad.” “The poetic figure used here,” says Bühler “is a \textit{Śloka}-mūlai \textit{Rūpaka}n, i.e., a metaphor which is brought about by the double meaning of the words used.” Nothing is more untrue, because, in the first place, there is no \textit{Śloka} here at all, and, secondly, anybody who is well acquainted with the Science of Poetics will have no hesitation in saying that the passage just quoted is an example of \textit{Tathāsambhay-\textit{alāṅkāra}}. Again, Bühler is not correct in asserting that Harīścvara seldom indulges in \textit{Upamā}. As a matter of fact, the author of the \textit{praśasti} not only uses \textit{Upamā} frequently but displays many varieties of it. Thus \textit{ānanda-saḍriśāni} in stanza 5 is \textit{upamāṇa-luptā Upamā}, \textit{Dhanada-\textit{Varun-\textit{Eṣvar}}-\textit{Āntaka-samasya} in line 26 is \textit{dharm-\textit{luptā Upamā}, whereas \textit{prīthiyān}= \textit{apratīthasya} in line 24 is \textit{dharm-\textit{pānāṇa-luptā Upamā}. The \textit{praśasti}, again, is, by no means, conspicuous by the absence of other poetic figures, whatever Bühler may say to the contrary. Thus \textit{āchakāśana īva bhūvō bāhuḥ} in line 30, which has already been cited in \textit{extenso}, represents \textit{Uṭṛprēkāś}, another variety of which, namely, \textit{pratīyāmaṇā Uṭṛprēkāś} is noticeable not only in \textit{samīḍhāsyā vīghrahavatō lōk-ānugrahaśya} in line 26 but also in \textit{sāṃchay-śeṣekhitam} etc., in stanza 9. Again, stanza 4, which begins with \textit{Āryy}= \textit{aikī}= \textit{īty}= \textit{upāṇīyaḥ}, which has rightly elicited so much encomium from the pen of Bühler and which we have discussed in full above, is itself an undoubted instance of \textit{Kāvyalīṅga}. While this stanza represents one variety of this Figure, namely, \textit{pad-ārthā-gata}, the other variety, \textit{vaśy-ārthā-gata Kāvyalīṅga} is represented by the verse preceding it, namely, stanza 3. Another poetic figure that we may note is \textit{Samuchchaya}, which is found in stanza 8, beginning with \textit{dharm-\textit{prāchitra-bandhōḥ}. This is just a brief survey of the \textit{Alāṅkāraś} which are noticeable in the panegyric.

We have thus discussed the \textit{praśasti}, bit by bit, from the poetic point of view, pointing out the good and the bad points of its composition. Considered as a whole, the panegyric cannot but be regarded as a \textit{Kāvyya}. The author’s claim to this title for his production is thus well founded. Various definitions have been given of \textit{Kāvyya} by writers on Sanskrit Poetics. But, perhaps, the best of these is that cited by the \textit{Kāvyaśrī}) which defines \textit{Kāvyya} as “the work of a poet who surpasses in delineation.” This is, perhaps, an epitome of Bhāmaha’s definition of \textit{Kāvyya}, namely,

\begin{quote}
prajñā nava-nava-śaṃśhā-śālī pratībhā matā
lōd-anuprāṣanāḥ jivēd varṇanā-ṇipūṇah kaviḥ
iṣya karma smṛtītāṃ kāvyanāḥ
\end{quote}

“Imagination (prajñā) possessed of ever-new flashes is considered to be Genius (pratībhā)."
Being inspired thereby (i.e. by Genius), a poet should live as an expert in delineation. His work is regarded as Kāvya.” We have already seen what admirable skill Harishēna has displayed in the art of delineation whether in the verse or prose portion of the praśasti. We have also pointed out that stanza 4 which describes the court scene where Chandragupta I abdicated the throne and installed his son Samudragupta is a masterpiece of miniature portrait. Similarly, his description of Samudragupta’s numerous and varied exploits is also a masterpiece of delineation, which it is difficult to surpass in diction, phraseology and style. What stamps Harishēna as a kāri of no mean order is not simply the choice of words, or the manner of combining them into phrases, clauses and sentences but rather the development within the compass of this small composition, of an individualistic style of his own in accordance with the adage, “style showeth the man.” At any rate, he cannot be surpassed in the art of delineation so far as the prose part of his composition is concerned.

We shall now turn to other points connected with the Allahābād praśasti of Samudragupta. “Thus, this little composition of Harishēna,” says Bühler, “belongs to that class of mixed compositions which, in poetics, are called by the name of chāmpā, while the oldest works preserved for us, such as the Vāsavadattā, Kādambari, Harshacharita and Daśakumāracharita are called by the name of ākhvyākī or kathā ‘a narration, a romance.’ In a footnote he adds “See, for instance, Kādambari, pp. 5-6, 53-56 (ed. Peterson); Harshacharita, pp. 162-79, 227-28, 267-71 (Kashmir edition) and especially Vāsavadattā, pp. 121-291 (ed. Hall), where, in the midst of prose, four verses have been interwoven.” If we read between the lines, what Bühler means is: (1) that Harishēna’s praśasti of Samudragupta is Chāmpā in composition, (2) that the Kādambari, Harshacharita and Vāsavadattā, though classed under Ākhvyākī or Kāthā, are also Chāmpā and (3) that, in fact, any work in prose, if interwoven with verses, is a Chāmpā. It is the last of these propositions that lies at the root of the whole of his erroneous view. If any composition, partly in prose and partly in verse, is a Chāmpā, then such works as the Pañchatantra and the Hitopadeśa, nay, all dramas have to be placed under this category. But no scholar, conversant with Sanskrit Poetics, can subscribe to this astounding assertion, because Ākhvyākī, Kāthā and Chāmpā are terms technical to this Science and must be taken in the senses assigned to them in its treatises. Thus, the Sāhityadarpana places Kāthā in the category of gadya-kāvya and defines it as follows:

(Text)

Kathāyāḥ sarasaini vastu gadyair—eva vinirmitam /
kvachid=atra bhave fārīya kvachid=Vaktr-Āpavaktrakā //
ādau padyair=namaskāraḥ khalāder=vyitta-kārtanam /

(Commentary)

Yathā Kādambariyādīh

(Translation)

(Text)

4 In the Kathā (Tale), the plot (vastu) is set forth in prose. Sometimes the Āryā, and some-
4 This is a mistake for pp. 123-24.
9 Pp. 336-57 (Parichheda VI, Kārikā 332-33).
times, the Vaktra and Aparakrakha metres may be employed. It should begin with obeisance (to some divinity) in stanzas, as also a description of the behaviour of the wicked and others."

(Commentary)

"For example the Kādambarī (of Bāṇabhaṭṭa) and so forth."

Ākhyāyikā has been defined as follows:

(Commentary)

Tathā Harshacharit-ādiḥ etc. etc.

(Translation)

"The Ākhyāyikā (Narrative) resembles the Kathā. But the genealogy of the (author) poet, and sometimes an account of other poets also are given there . . . ."

(Commentary)

For example the Harshacharita (of Bāṇabhaṭṭa) and so forth." . . . "Ākhyāna and others, being included under the Kathā and Ākhyāyikā, have not been separately mentioned. . . . The Pañcchatantra and others are examples of these.''

It will thus be seen that Kathā and Ākhyāyikā are both gadya-kāvyas, in spite of their being interspersed with verses. The Kādambari is a Kathā or Tale; the Harshacharita is an Ākhyāyikā or Narrative. Both these prose works are interwoven with verses, as pointed out by Bühler himself. And yet, they have been classed under gadya-kāvyas by the author of the Sāhityadarpaṇa. The feature that is common to both is vastu or Plot which, however, is nowhere set forth in verse in these works of Bāṇabhaṭṭa. This is rendered more clear in the case of the Pañcchatantra, which is called an Ākhyāna. Ākhyāna, again, we are informed, is included in either a Kathā or Ākhyāyikā. And, as the plot of the Pañcchatantra is more of the type of a Tale than a Narrative, the Pañcchatantra as an Ākhyāna falls under Kathā. But the Pañcchatantra abounds in verses, and yet it is placed under gadya-kāvyas, for the obvious reason that its plot is nowhere given in verse. So far in regard to Kathā, Ākhyāyikā, and Ākhyāna. After mentioning the varieties of gadya-kāvyas, the author of the Sāhityadarpaṇa proceeds to speak of the gadya-padya-mayāni (Kāvyāni). And the first variety thereof that he specifies is the Champū which he defines as follows:

(Text)

Gadya-padya-mayāni Kāvyāni Champūr=ity=abhidhiyate ||
Yathā Dēśarājacharitam.

(Translation)

"A Poem composed in prose and verse is designated Champū."

(Commentary)

"For example, the Dēśarājacharita."

Surely, the Dēśarājacharita, which is the instance given of Champū here, must mean "the Adventures of Dēśarāja," whoever he was. It must, therefore, have had a plot of its own like the Daśakumāracharita. The only difference between the two is that, whereas in the latter work the plot is set forth in prose, in the case of the former it must have been done nearly half in prose and nearly half in verse.

To say, therefore, that Harishēṇa's Kāyya is a Champū simply because it is partly in prose and partly in verse is to say that the Kādambari and the Harshacharita are also Champūs in spite of the fact that they have been classed by the Sāhityadarpaṇa under gadya-kāyya. The critical test here, in all these cases, is vāstu or plot. This answers the question in the negative. Harishēṇa's kāyya may be partly in prose and partly in verse. But, as it has no vāstu or plot, it cannot be styled Kathā, Ākhyāyikā or Champū. But we ought not to stop here. For the very next variety which has been mentioned of the gadya-padya-maya-kāyya in the Sāhityadarpaṇa is Biruda which is thus defined:

(Gadya-padya-maya rāja-stutir=Birudam=uchyatē)

(Translation)

"The panegyric of a king, in prose and verse, is styled Biruda."

This definition suits Harishēṇa's eulogium of Samudragupta so excellently that no doubt can arise as to this Kāyya having to be designated Biruda.

We shall now discuss the Ritī or the Style of Composition to which this prasaṣṭi pertains. Bühler has no doubt that Harishēṇa follows the style of the southerners, or the Vaidarbhi Riti as it has been called. "The language of the verses is," says he, "on the whole, simple, and especially the compounds of extraordinary length, which are found used by Vatsabhaṭṭi, are carefully avoided."1" "With the prose part of the panegyric, however," Bühler further remarks, "things are quite otherwise. Here, simple words are only the exception, while very long compounds are the general rule, the longest compound (lines 19-20) containing more

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 175.
than 120 syllables." If the Allâhâbad pillar praśasti answers to Vaidarbhi Riti, the chief characteristic of which is small compounds, at any rate, absence of long compounds, how is it that the prose portion of the praśasti contains big compounds, one of which again is so big as to comprise 120 syllables? He explains the difficulty as follows: "There cannot be any doubt that this contrast is intentional. Because all the manuals of poetics are unanimous on the point that the essence of elevated prose to be used in romances and stories consists in the length of compounds; while the different schools are not unanimous regarding the admissibility of long compounds in verses." In support of this statement Bühler quotes the authority of Dañdin’s Kavyadarśa, I. 80-81. But we have just seen that the present praśasti is neither a Kathâ (Tale), nor an Akhyâyikâ (Narrative) and that consequently there is no good reason why length of compounds should constitute the essence of its prose. Secondly, it is not quite correct to say that long compounds do not occur in the verses of this panegyric. Thus stanza 7 begins with Uduél-ñiita-bâhu-vîyava-rabhavât, and stanza 9 with pradâna-bhuja-vikramâ-praśama-
śâstra-vâky-ôdayair. Are these not long enough compounds to bear comparison with those in Vatsabhât’s praśasti? But mere length of compounds does not constitute the essence of Vaidarbhi or Gaudî-Riti. There are other characteristics also of these styles, which Bühler has apparently forgotten. The Sâhityadarpaña (IX. 2-3) thus describes the Vaidarbhi Style:

(Text)

Mûdhurya-yañjakair-varñair rachanâ lañit-âtmikâ II 2 II
avîttir=alpa-vrîttir=vâ Vaidarbhi Ritir=uacyjatê

(Translation)

“A dulcet composition with letters manifesting Sweetness with few or no compounds, is designated the Vaidarbhi Style.”

One characteristic of the Style then is absence or paucity of compounds. But the other characteristic that is here specified is the presence of letters manifesting Sweetness or Mûdhurya. And what are those letters? In reply to it, the Sâhityadarpaña (VIII, 3-4) has the following:

(Text)

Mûrddhi vârg-ântyâ-varpêna yuñiâsh=ita-êha-da-dhân=vinâ I
ra-nau laghû cha tañ-yyaktou varvâh kârâvatâm gatâh II
avîttir=alpa-vrîttir=vâ madhurâ rachanâ tathâ I

(Translation)

“All letters, excepting t, th, ð, ð, which are preceded by the last of every series, and by r and n with short vowels, cause the manifestation of Sweetness, as also a negation or scarcity of compounds.”

The very next Style defined in the Sâhityadarpaña is Gaudî. It is of the following nature:

(Text)

Ôjâb-prahâšakair-varñair=bandha ádambaraḥ punâh II 3 II
samâsa-bohulâ Gauḍî (IX, 3-4)
INTRODUCTION

(Commentary)

Tathā chaṁchad-bhuja ity-ādi

(Translation)

(Text)

“The Gauḍī, again, is of bombastic construction with letters manifesting Ūjas and abounding in compounds.”

(Commentary)

“For example chaṁchad-bhuja etc.”

The question now arises: What are the characteristics of this Ūjas, which here is obviously a Śabda-guna and has to be distinguished from Ūjas as Artha-guna which we have considered above. The former is thus described in the Sāhityadarpana (VIII, 4-5):

(Text)

Ūjas—chittasya vistāra-rūpaṁ diptatvam=ucchyatō | 4 |
Vira-Bibhatsa-Raudrēshu kramēṇ=ādhikyam=asya tu |

(Commentary)

Asya Ūjasaḥ atr=āpi Vir-ūdi śabdā upalakshayāni | tēna Vir-ābhās-ādāv=apya=asy=āvasthitih |

(Text)

Vargasyūrya=ādyya-īrīyaabhyaṁ yuktou varnau tad-antimau | 5 |
upary-ādhaḥ deveyor=vā sa-rēṣṭhaḥ la-tha-da-dhaiḥ saha |
śakrās=cha shakrās=cha tasya vyakhatam gatāḥ | 6 |
tathā samāsō bahulō ghatan=auddhatya-sālīni |

(Commentary)

Tathā chaṁchad-bhuja ity-ādi |

(Translation)

(Text)

“The blazing-up of mind assuming dilation is termed Vigour (Ūjas). Of this, there is an ascendancy successively greater, in the Heroic, the Disgustful and the Furious.”

(Commentary)

“‘Of this’ means ‘of Vigour’. Here also the terms Heroic, etc., are used in a comprehensive sense so that it may be comprised in the Semblance of the Heroic and so forth.”
prescribe that a Mahäkavya should comprise descriptions of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons and so on. These characteristics, Vatsabhaṭṭi’s pūraṇa nicely exhibits, as pointed out by Bühler. This Vatsabhaṭṭi has not forgotten to describe the early home of the Guild, namely, the Lāṭa country in verse 4; but the town of Daśapura where they had permanently settled receives much greater attention and he devotes no less than nine verses, as we have seen above, in giving us a description of its lakes and buildings and showing us that it had thus become the ornament of the earth. Further, the inscription contains two dates, and thus gives Vatsabhaṭṭi an occasion to show off his poetic skill in describing the Seasons, Winter and Spring, during which the dates fall.

That Artificial Poetry was in full bloom in the time of Vatsabhaṭṭi may be seen even from the extraneous characteristics of his poem. All the verses of his composition are in ornate metres of the Kāyasa style. Setting aside Anuṣṭubh (verses 34-37 and 44), we have Āryā in verses 4, 13, 21, 33, 38, 39, 41 and 42, Drutavilambita in verse 15, Hariṇā in verse 16, Indravajrā in verse 17, Mālā in verses 19 and 43, Mandakrānta in verse 29, Jātāvākrikā in verses 1-2, Upajāti in verses 10, 12 and 28, Upendravajrā in verses 7-9 and 24, Vānastha in verse 23, and Vasantatilaka in verses 3, 5, 6, 11, 14, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30-32 and 40. Of these metres Vasantatilaka has been used the greatest number of times, as many as fourteen. This multiplicity of metres is not noticeable in Mahākavyas and Kāyas, where generally two metres only are used, the principal one and the second one which last again is found only in the ending verse or verses of a canto. The manifold metres used by Vatsabhaṭṭi in his poem therefore are to be attributed to his eagerness to show that he was a master of Prosody and an expert in versification. Another extraneous characteristic of Artificial Poetry is the clustering of verses in twos, threes, fours and so forth. The Śaṅkhyādāpyāna has it:1

\[
dvābhyaḥ Yugmam—iti prōktān
tribhīḥ śūkair—Viśēshakam ||314||
Kalāpakaṁ chaturbhūṁ syāt
tad-ārdhvaṁ Kulakāṁ matam |
\]

"(A piece of Poetry, complete) in two (stanzas) is termed Yugma; in three (stanzas), Viśēshaka; in four, Kalāpaka; and in five, Kulaka." We find this clustering of verses also in Vatsabhaṭṭi’s composition. Thus, verses 4-5 and 21-22 make Yugmas; verses 23-25 and 26-28 Viśēshakas; and verses 6-10, 31-35 and 36-40, Kulakas. One peculiarity, however, of Vatsabhaṭṭi, that deserves to be mentioned in this connection is that in the clustering of these verses they are of the same metre in the case of the compositions of the other poets, but curiously enough diversity of metres is perceptible in his own composition.

Let us now consider the internal characteristic of this composition which brand it as Artificial Poetry. The first and foremost of these is the Style which obviously conforms to the Gautī Rīti, or the diction of the Eastern School as Bühler has rightly perceived. The chief peculiarity of the Gautī, we have seen above, is the use of long compounds. Vatsabhaṭṭi employs compounds covering not only a pāda or more, pretty frequently, but also sometimes the whole of a half-verse as in stanzas 4, 6, 14, 32 and 41, and once even the whole of a verse as in verse 33. There is another characteristic of the Eastern School to which Bühler refers on the authority of Daṇḍin’s Kāvyādarśa (I. 47-50), according to which a verse composed in the Vaidyarbhī Rīti maintains samaṭa or uniformity in all its pādas but that of the Gautī style may have different pādas composed in different types of letters corresponding to the different senti-

1 Parīchhēdha VI, verses 314 and 315.
ments. In illustration of this statement of Danḍin, Bühler quotes the following stanza (verse 26) from Vatsabhaṭṭi's praśasti:

\[
Tasya=ūtrajñō sthairya-nay-ōpepanānō
bandhu-priyō bandhur=iva prajānām ||
bandhu=artī-hartā mṛipa-Bandhuvaramā
dvīd-arśita-paksha-kshapan-aśka-dakshā||
\]

"The first three pādas," says Bühler, "describe Bandhuvaraman’s wisdom and goodness, the last his terribleness in war with enemies. Corresponding to this, the words in the first three quarters of the verse consist of syllables which are soft or light to be pronounced, in consideration of the necessity of the alliteration of the name of Bandhuvaraman. The fourth pāda, on the other hand, where the Raoudra rasa prevails, contains only hard sounding syllables and agrees quite well with Danḍin’s typical illustration, Kāvyādarśa, I. 72: nyakṣeṇa kṣapitaḥ. pakṣaḥ kṣatryaḥ-khaṇḍaḥ=khaṇḍaḥ." 

The next important internal characteristic of Artificial Poetry is the use of Alanaṁkāras, which are of two kinds: Sabā-alanākāra and Arth-alanākāra. As regards the former we will leave aside the wrong use of the phrases Varnānyuṣṭa and Padānuṣṭa by Bühler, which are unknown to treatises on rhetoric. We have already animadverted upon it. One variety of Alliteration, namely, Chhēk-ānuṣṭa, is noticeable in almost every stanza of this poem. An instance of another variety, namely, Lāj-ānuṣṭa is furnished by verse 26 cited above, where the word bandhu is repeated thrice. Further instances of the same variety are supplied by siddhaścha siddhya-arthibhiḥ in verse 1, kiṃnara-naraḥ in verse 2, prathit-ōruvanśa vanī-ānuṣṭa in verse 18, =anātha-nāthaḥ in verse 25 and =āty-udāram=udāraṇā in verse 37. Of the Arth-alanākāras, says Bühler, Vatsabhaṭṭi uses only the most familiar ones, namely Upanā, Utprēkṣā and Rūpaka. Nothing, however, is more untrue. Thus, stanza 5 contains an illustration of Kāvyaliṅga, stanza 6 of Samāsōkti, stanza 7 of Seabhāvōkti, stanza 19 of Kāvyaliṅga and Samuchchaya, stanza 27 of Viśēshōkti, Utprēkṣā and Vibhāvanā, stanza 42 of Mālopanā, and so on and so forth. It will thus be seen that a plethora of Arth-alanākāras is noticeable in the panegyric of the Sun temple by Vatsabhaṭṭi and not simply the most familiar, Upanā, Utprēkṣā and Rūpaka, as Bühler gives us to understand.

If we now consider the contents of Vatsabhaṭṭi’s composition, we find that it contains many images and turns of expression characteristic of the Kāvyā style. One has only to turn to verses 7-9 where the lakes and gardens of Daśapura are described or to verses 10-13 which give an account of its buildings. In fact, one may turn to any section of this pūtrā of Vatsabhaṭṭi—to a description of the Guild (verses 14-22), of the Winter Season when the Sun Temple was consecrated (verses 30-35) or of the Spring when it was renovated (verses 36-42),—and be convinced that Vatsabhaṭṭi wrote at a time when the science of Indian Poetics had evolved itself to an eminent degree. We may proceed one step further; Vatsabhaṭṭi was a third-rate poet. The presumption therefore is that he must have borrowed many ideas and much phraseology from the contemporary and earlier poets of great renown. Can we make good this presumption? This will also prove that Vatsabhaṭṭi lived at a time when Artificial Poetry was in full swing. Let us, however, see, in the first place, what Bühler has to say on this point. In regard to the very first two of the three stanzas which form the Maṅgala or benediction and with which the panegyric begins, he remarks: "Amongst the court-poets there is one Mayūra, in whose Sūryaśatakā, a prayer addressed to the Sun, we have almost every one of the ideas contained in the verses above, repeated and with much the same form of expression." Bühler, no doubt, tries to expatriate on the point but does not seem to have made it out in a satisfactory
manner. There are, no doubt, some thoughts similar to both, but there is nothing in his argument to show clearly that Vatsabhaṭṭi was indebted to Mayūra, or Mayūra to Vatsabhaṭṭi. It is true that according to stanza 81 of the Mayūra-śataka, prayers are offered to the Sun in the morning, as Bühler has pointed out, by the Siddhas, gods, Chāranaś, Gandharvas, Nāgaris, Viśuddhānaś, Śādyas, Mun-indras (chiefs of sages), and Mākhins (seekers of emancipation), and that according to verse 1 of the praśasti the same prayers are offered to the same god by such classes of beings as gods, Siddhas, Yāgis (desirous of emancipation), and Munis (sages). In the former the number of the divine and semi-divine beings that adore the Sun is much larger than those mentioned in the latter. Besides, the way in which the former adore the god is different from that done by the latter. There is thus a vague similarity of thought, but there is nothing to show convincingly that Vatsabhaṭṭi influenced Mayūra or Mayūra, Vatsabhaṭṭi. Similarly Bühler draws our attention to verse 13 which may be translated as follows: "which (town), being enclosed by two charming rivers of tremulous waves, shines like the body of the God of Love, clasped in private by (his wife) Priti and Rati, possessed of (prominent) breasts."

The idea of a river, looked upon as a female, is a natural one and is frequently met with in Sanskrit poetics. Bühler cites two illustrations in support of it. The first is from Subandhu’s Vāsavadattā, which says of the Vindhyas mountain: Rāyāī priyamayā = eva praśārita-vichī-hastayā = opaṇḍhān, "Encircled by the Rāyā (Narmadā) as by a beloved with extending arms, namely, (extending) waves." The second citation is from the Brihatanātha (XI, 6), namely, rahasi madana-saktayā, Rāyāī kāntyā = eva = opaṇḍhān, "Encircled by the Rāyā as by a love-sick beloved in private."

The latter of these quotations, of course, affords a more exact parallel to verse 13 of our inscription, because both contain the word rahasi and also because the former, containing, as it does, the phrase praśārita-vichī-hastayā, represents a further development of the original thought. Subandhu is, of course, later than Varāhamihira. But whether Vatsabhaṭṭi preceded Varāhamihira or Varāhamihira, Vatsabhaṭṭi, or whether they were contemporaries of each other, it is very difficult to say. Bühler, however, is right in remarking that "even though it may not be certain that Vatsabhaṭṭi lived before Varāhamihira, one would be tempted to conjecture a close connection between his verse and that of the Brihatanātha." The real fact seems to be," he proceeds further, "that all the three poets imitated some well-known model."

Although this point cannot be properly decided, the thing is quite different in regard to verses 10 and 11, which may be rendered as follows:

(verse 10) "Where the buildings, with moving flags, full of women, intensely white, and extremely lofty, bear resemblance to the peaks of white clouds variegated with forked lightning";

(verse 11) "And (where) other (buildings) resemble the lofty summits of Kāllāsa, with long terraces and rail mouldings, resounding with the notes of music, with works in painting set up, and adorned with waving plantain trees";

We shall do well to compare these verses with the stanza occurring in the Māgadhīta

---

1 The stanza in question is as follows:

Siddhā iśvara-mātirn śrīt-vādhi viśuddhaśi = chānāśi = chāpugāra

gītāī gandrāra-mukhayā = māra = cāpatikāhī = yiṣūdhiśri = yaśūmā |
sārhi śādhyā = muindraśi = muṭātama-maṇi-mākṣikāḥ tapahārśi

prāthā prāsabhāyaṇa-stūrī = anau = raviyā = cūr-cūrāya-śatāyā vah //

where Kālidāsa describes Alakā, the capital of Kubēra, and to which our attention was first drawn by Bühler. It runs as follows:

\[ 
\begin{align*}
\text{Vidyutvam} & \text{ lalita-vanitāḥ ānārachāpam sa-chitrāḥ} \\
\text{saṅgītāyā prahata-murajāḥ snigdha-gambhira-ghōṣam} & \\
\text{antus-tōyaḥ maṇi-maya-bhūwan = tuṣīgam = abhramlik-āgrāḥ} & \\
pṛśārās = teṣāṁ tulayitum = alaṁ yatra tais = vair = vīśeṣāḥ &
\end{align*} \\
\]

“Where the palaces can stand comparison with thee in various particulars: these, with beautiful women, with thee possessed of lightning; these with paintings, with thee accompanied by the rainbow; these with tabors struck for music, with thee possessed of charming and deep-sounding thunders; these with crystalline floors, with thee filled with water; (and) these, as sky-scrapers, with thee occupying a high altitude.”

Now, in verse 10 of the Mandasūr inscription, Vatsabhaṭṭi is evidently at great pains to bring out the best possible resemblance between the clouds and the buildings of Daśapura. And it is perfectly reasonable to say that he was indebted to Kālidāsa in this respect. The words tādīl-lata, abalā, atyartha-suklāni, and adhik-ōnanāti of this verse correspond, roughly, and, as would be expected of a third-rate poet, with vidyutvam, lalita-vanī, maṇi-maya-bhūwan, and abhramlik-āgrāḥ respectively of the stanza from the Mēghadūta. Only sa-chitrāḥ, saṅgītāyā prahata-murajāḥ, etc., of the latter remain unaccounted for; and, to our agreeable surprise, we find similar expressions used in the very next verse, namely, gāṇḍharva-sūdra-mukharāṇī and nivishṭa-chitra-karmāṇī. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Vatsabhaṭṭi is here imitating Kālidāsa as the ensemble of thought and imagery is complete. Of course, Vatsabhaṭṭi says something more which is not traceable in the stanza from the Mēghadūta. Whether he does it with a view to excel the prototype as Bühler thinks, or to imitate, along with it, another parallel from some other poet as we suspect, it is very difficult to say. If any further proof is required in support of the conclusion that Vatsabhaṭṭi was acquainted with the works of Kālidāsa, it is furnished by verse 31 of the Mandasūr inscription. It is as follows:

\[ 
\begin{align*}
\text{Rāmā-sanātha-bhavaṇ-ōdara-bhāskar-ānāṣu-} \\
\text{vahun-pratāpa-subhago jala-tīna-mine} & \\
\text{Chaṁdri-ānāṣu-harunya-tala-chandana-tālāvīnta-} \\
\text{hār-ōpaḥhōga-rahitē hīna-dagdha-padmi} &
\end{align*} \\
\]

“(In the season) which is pleasant in consequence of the interiors of the houses being crowded with young women (and) in consequence of the rays of the sun, (and) the warmth of fire, during which the fish lie deep in water and which is destitute of the enjoyments (caused by) the rays of the moon, flat roofs of houses, sandal paste, palmleaf fans, and garlands; and when the water-lilies are bitten by the frost.”

The above stanza is an undeniable imitation of Kālidāsa’s R̄itusāṅkha, chap. V, verses 2-3, as was first pointed out by the late F. Kielhorn. These verses run thus:

\[ 
\begin{align*}
\text{Niruddha-vāṭāyana-mandir-ōdaraṁ} & \\
\text{hutāshanō bhānumatō gābhastayaḥ} & \\
\text{gurūni vāsāṁsy = abalāḥ sa-yavancāḥ} & \\
\text{prayāntā kālē = tra janasya sāvyataṁ} & 2 \\
\text{Na chandanaṁ chandra-marichi-śītalāṁ} & \\
\text{na harunya-prishthāṁ śarad-īndu-sundaram} & \\
\text{na vāyavah śānta-tushāro-śītalā} & \\
\text{janasya chittāṁ ramayanta saṁpratam} & 3 \\
\end{align*} \\
\]
2. “The house interior with windows shut, fire, the rays of the sun, heavy garments (and) women possessed of youth become enjoyable to the people in this season.

3. Not sandal cool with the rays of the moon, not the terrace of a mansion beautiful in consequence of the autumnal moon, not winds chilly with thick frost, now gladden the mind of the people.”

Here doubtless 

butāsanō bhānumatō gabhastayaḥ and na chandanaṁ chandra-marichi-śītalāṁ and na harmya-prishṭham of these verses correspond to bhāskar-āṁśu-vahni-pratāpa and chandra-āṁśu-harmya-tala-chandana ... upabhōga-rahitē of the inscription. And, perhaps, if we turn to the Ritusahāra, Canto I, verse 8, chandana ... evajana ... hārayashī of the same easily answers to chandana-tālavinta-hār-ôpabhōga-rahitē of the Mandasōr praśasti. This common group of ideas indicates that Vatsabhaṭṭi is conversant not only with the Mēghadūta but also with the Ritusahāra of Kālidāsa.

But there is another stanza, namely, verse 32, which is also devoted to the description of the Winter Season. No similarity of thought or expression has been pointed out between it and the Ritusahāra, or, for the matter of that, any other poem. Again, there are two stanzas in Vatsabhaṭṭi’s composition, namely, verses 40-41 which are descriptive of the Spring. No idea or form of expression comprised in them has been traced in the composition of any poet so as to establish the indebtedness of the one to the other. The same remark holds good in the case of other verses also. There are thus, verses which describe the lakes of Daśapura, the Guild of silk-weavers and its distinguished members, the ruler of Daśapura and his suzerain, and the temple of the Sun, built and rebuilt. They are replete with a rush of images and turns of expression. It is true that in most cases they have not at all been characterised by any felicitous grace such as might be expected of a master poet. Nevertheless, the impression is created on the mind that he must have borrowed many of them from the works extant in his time. The conclusion is thus almost irresistible that there was a considerable number of Kāyas which were known when Vatsabhaṭṭi lived and wrote, upon which he drew as he did upon the Mēghadūta and the Ritusahāra, but which have now been lost to us.¹

Let us now try and appraise the poetic merit of Vatsabhaṭṭi’s composition. Bühler seems to be quite right in saying that “Vatsabhaṭṭi was not at all a man to whom we can give the credit of originality; nor can we name him as a poetic genius capable of giving new ideas. He shows the several weaknesses which characterise the poets of the second or third class, who compile their verses laboriously, after the model of the classical great poets.” That Bühler’s decision is on the whole correct may be seen from the rather free use of expletives and particles, the pretty frequent recurrence of the fault of tautology, the employment of words in their usual senses, the absence or omission of any connection between the qualifying and qualified parts of a sentence and many other faults too numerous to mention. We will take some of the stanzas one after another and try to point out a few of these faults. Thus, stanza 2 has yasya in line 1, which is apparently a possessive pronoun without a noun indicating possession. When we read the stanza and come to this yasya, the question arises yasya kiṁ? No reply is furnished. Line 1 of stanza 3 has pratīcibhāti of which the prefix pratī is meaningless. So also is su of su-

¹ In regard to Vatsabhāṭṭi, B. C. Mazumdar makes the following remarks in JRAS, 1904, p. 397:

“The text of the Mandasōr stone inscription in 472 A.D. was composed by a poet named Vatsabhāṭṭi ... There is a striking resemblance between stanzas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 in the inscription and the description of Sārat in the 2nd canto of Bhaṭṭī. That the name of the poet is Vatsa-bhaṭṭī, that the date 472 is the date when Dharaṣana I was reigning as a Valabhi-Rāja, that the Mandasōr text was composed in praise of Kumāra Gopāla, whose Sēnāpati and feudatory this Dharaṣana was, are acknowledged facts. If we accept Vatsabhāṭṭi to be the author of Bhāṭṭīkāyga, many things which we cannot otherwise explain can be explained. It explains the name of the kāyga; it explains why some forms of rhetoric, popular during the days of Bhāravi and Daṇḍin are not found in this kāyga; and it explains also why the story of Rāma, as it is given in the poem, does not include the later portion.”
**INTRODUCTION**

 Kiran—which occurs in line 4 of the same verse. In the stanza following is found the author’s favourite word naga which is used in the rare sense of “a tree” and which is met with also in verses 9 and 32. Similarly, the words prakāśam and samāṭya occurring in stanza 5 are both taken by Bühler as devoid of real meaning. Though they may not be exactly meaningless, they are, at any rate, redundant and clumsy. Stanza 6, again, has, in the last line, tiṣṭa-bhūtam in which bhūtam is superfluous and retards from the proper development of the alaṅkāra. Similarly, the anta in -tiṣṭa-anta-, line 2, verse 7, is redundant. Tuly-ōṣamānāni, in line 4 of verse 10, involves the fault of tautology. If tulya is retained, upamāna is unnecessary; and if upamāna is adopted, tulya becomes superfluous. In verse 12, the word prāśada is found in line 1 and grihaṇi in line 4. Propriety would expect their position to be reversed. Samāṭya in line 1 of verse 15 seems, according to Bühler, to have been used as an expletive. The verse, again, has such qualifying expressions as pravijñābhīta-saukṛtidhā, pratimāṇitāḥ and pramuditāḥ, but there is no viśeṣa-pada or qualified word. If we now turn to stanza 18, we find, in the first place, that pranayinām=upakāra-dakṣhāḥ and dṛṣṭha-saukṛtidāḥ=dha mean practically the same thing and are, thus, tautologous expressions; and secondly that line 4 thereof has viṣrambha-pūrvaṃ which is a kriyā-viśeṣaṇa without any kriyā-pada as its viśeṣaṇa. If we proceed to the next stanza, we notice not only that the abhi of abhieṣhāti in line 4 is meaningless, but that viṣata-viṣheya-saṅgaṇī and mukta-rāgaḥ are tautologous phrases. Similarly, tatas=ta in line 4 of verse 22 are mere expletives. Stanzas 20 and 25 are unpoetic. To say that a woman is not an object of beauty with her youth and complexion but stands in need of the help of ornamentation and, above all, silk attirement, as Vatsabhāṭṭi has done in verse 20, is sheer bad taste. Similarly, a first-rate poet would write bhūtya abhaya-pradāḥ, and not bhūtya bandhu as Vatsabhāṭṭi has done in stanza 25. Many other faults of this nature can be pointed out in his composition, but those that have been adduced are enough to show that Vatsabhāṭṭi is a third-rate poet. It is, therefore, no wonder if he has fallen into two solecisms, as remarked by Bühler. Thus, verse 15 has nyācasanta which is Imperfect Third Person Plural of ni+vas, in the sense of “(they) lived.” But vas in this sense is always First Conjugation Parasmaipada, never Ātmanēpada even with any preposition. Bühler thinks that Vatsabhāṭṭi has used the Ātmanēpadi form to suit the metre. It is, however, more probable that grammar was not his strong point. This inference is strengthened by the second instance of solecism adduced by Bühler. Thus, verse 38 has (nabkaḥ) spriṣann=iva, which goes with grihaḥ in the preceding one. It is true that Fleet proposes to correct it into spriṣat=iva. But apart from the fact that this causes a caesura “the whole construction” rightly remarks Bühler “would not only be changed but broken up into pieces, because then the locatives in the verses 39-40 would be altogether hanging in the air.” The main question, however, is whether we at all can have such a form as spriṣan. The root here is spriṇ, which belongs to the sixth conjugation, and the present participle Nominative Singular of this root even in the masculine gender must be spriṣad, and never spriṣan. And as Vatsabhāṭṭi has employed such an utterly ungrammatical form as spriṣan, it confirms the conclusion that he was not well conversant with the Science of Grammar. Bühler, no doubt, supposes that “he might have been conscious of the fault but that he might have conserved himself with the beautiful principle: māshan=api māshan kuryād=vṛittibhaṅgan viveśarjaye, according to which the correctness of the metrical form precedes every other consideration. It is, however, difficult to agree with Bühler in this view. None of the two instances of solecism is of such a nature as to indicate that Vatsabhāṭṭi was conscious of them. Again, to drop one mātra of māsha and alter it into masha to suit the exigencies of metre is one thing, but to employ an ungrammatical form covering many mātras is entirely different. Similarly, to use an ungrammatical form like nyāvasanta is not an unpardonable blunder, because writers sometimes confound between Parasmaipada and Ātmanēpada and sometimes take a root as belonging to both. But to use such
a form as sṛṣita is to murder Grammar completely. Similarly, Bühler quotes the second half of verse 30, namely, yad=ḥati paśchima-parasya nivishṭa-kānta-chuḍāmaṇi-pratisamāṇ nayan-dhīrīraman, and observes that here “we come across something worse, a fault in construction.” “The genitive paśchima-parasya,” he further proceeds, “goes with chuḍāmaṇi, and there is no substantive which is connected with nivishṭa. The grammatically correct form should have been paśchima-purē, but that would not have suited the metre.” It is very difficult, however, to follow this line of reasoning and perceive wherein exactly lies the fault of construction adverted to by Bühler. The construction requires a genitive, and not a locative, so that the line may be translated: “which shines like the tucked-in lovely crest-jewel of the western ward (of the town).” Further, if paśchima-purē had really been the grammatically correct form, Vatsabhaṭṭi who is so fond of expletives could have easily composed the line thus: Yad=ḥati paśchima-purē hi nivishṭa-kānta, etc. There are, again, a few inconsistencies of composition which have crept into the panegyric and which have been thus exposed by Bühler. “To the category of poetical absurdities not specially alleged,” says he, “belong verses 7-8, where, at first sarānasi, ‘the lakes’ in general is used, then again kecchit sarānasi ‘the lakes in some places’ is used. Further, in verses 10-12, the poet first speaks of grihāni ‘the houses’, then again anyāni ‘other houses’, and, lastly again of grihāni ‘the houses’ in general.”

But even a third-rate composition is not without its excellences. Vatsabhaṭṭi’s production is no exception to this rule. The inscription opens with three stanzas which form the maṅgala and which, on the whole, are excellent poetry. It is true that it contains ideas which are met with in the writings of the Saurus, the Purāṇas and the still older works, as Bühler remarks. It may also be true that there are some similar ideas common to it and the Sūryasataka of Mayūra. But this similarity of thought is not tantamount to plagiarism or even imitation of any poet, so far as we can impartially judge. In the third stanza of the maṅgala, the reddish morning sun is compared to the cheeks of a woman flushed with drink. Bühler quotes a passage from Bāna’s Harshacharita where the poet compares the sun-set to the cheek of a Mālava woman. “Bāna’s comparison,” says he, “is somewhat more nicely brought out than that of Vatsabhaṭṭi, owing to the use of the term ‘Mālava woman’ in place of the general expression aṅganā-jana” of stanza 3 of the Mandaśore praśasti. Bühler, however, does not enter into further details and tell us how exactly the mention of ‘Mālava woman’ enhances the excellence of the comparison. What seems probable is that Mālava women were of fair complexion even in the time of Bāna and were also in the habit of drinking which suffused their cheeks with a red tint as soft as the rising or the setting sun. But Bühler forgets that Vatsabhaṭṭi was a resident of Daśapura which was then the centre of the Mālava people. The generality of men and women there pertained to the Mālava tribe. It was, therefore, natural for him to use the general term aṅganā-jana. Anyway, the first three stanzas of the praśasti read quite nicely and also charmingly. We may now turn to verse 12 which is to be rendered as follows: “Where the buildings, decorated with rows of terraces, resembling lines of gods’ palaces ... (appear) to have risen up surely by tearing open the earth.” Bühler admits that the statement here that the buildings have risen by tearing open the earth is ‘quite striking,’ but thinks that Vatsabhaṭṭi has confounded between two comparisons current in the literature of his time. “If this expression means anything,” thus argues Bühler, “it suggests a comparison of the houses with something to be found in the deep or the nether world, with something like the thousand, white-shining heads of Śesha. Such an image is, however, defective, when there is already a comparison of the houses with the vimānas, the moving gods’ palaces, soaring up high in the sky ... The comparison of houses with the vimānas of gods is not rarely found in epic works, but is still more frequently met with in the Kāvyas. On the other hand, that of buildings with things in the nether world comes only
now and then in artificial poetry." In support of his last statement he quotes two verses, one of which is Kālidāsa's Raghuvāna, Canto XII, verse 70 and the other is Māgha's Siṣṭānapaṇḍita, Canto III, verse 33. Now, it is true that Vatsabhaṭṭi has represented some houses of Daśapura as 'having risen up by tearing open the earth.' But how this statement suggests a comparison with things in the nether world, such as Śesha or Submarine Fire, as Bühler understands it, is far from clear. We can very well suppose that there was much of uneven, undulating ground such as is found on ancient sites, e.g., in modern Broach, the old name of which is Bharukacchha. When there is a stretch of country presenting a succession of elevations and depressions and also when there are skyscrapers on such elevations, the latter not only appear to have come out by tearing open the bowels of the earth but also seem to be vimānas or gods' palaces each temporarily perched upon an eminence but ready to sail again in the aerial regions. Far from there being a confusion of comparisons and a consequent defect in imagery, the idea comprised in verse 13 is as much striking as it is novel, unless we suppose that Vatsabhaṭṭi has borrowed it from a master-poet of his or earlier time.

We may now turn to verse 26 which has already been cited above and animadverted upon. The first three quarters of the same express one sentiment, and, the last, another, which is distinctly raundra. The first sentiment is developed by one type of words and the second by another, which consists of harsh-sounding syllables. On the whole, it is a meritorious performance and constitutes an excellence in his composition.

It is possible to cite a few more examples of excellence in Vatsabhaṭṭi's poem. But they, like the ones already pointed out, are not of a high order. We may, thus, conclude that Vatsabhaṭṭi was, on the whole, an excellent and versatile versifier but was not a first-rate poet with new, original ideas. The Mandasōr inscription is rather the exercise of a Pandit who had studied the Kāyaśaśa and Rhetoric of his time than the production of a poet of inborn talent. Vatsabhaṭṭi was not a poet even in the court of Bandhuvarman, the local ruler of Daśapura. If he had deserved and received royal patronage at Daśapura, Ujjayini or Pātaliputra, his performance would have been of a much higher order and would have been comparable to the prāsasti of Samudragupta by Harishēṇa. As it is, Vatsabhaṭṭi was a mere Pandit of Daśapura with a modicum of poetic sense. And it is no wonder if he freely drew upon the Kāya literature extant in his time resulting in a third-rate performance. He is not even a plagiarist who could take and imbibe original ideas of a first-rate poet and couch them in his own language so as to elude detection at the hands of readers not steeped in poetic literature. Nevertheless, the composition of Vatsabhaṭṭi is of great importance historically and in a two-fold manner. First, it enables us to fix the date of Kālidāsa. As he has evidently borrowed one group of ideas occurring in a verse from the Māgadhita and expressed the same, though discursively, in two consecutive verses of his and further, as he has borrowed similarly another group of ideas contained in two verses of the Ritusainhara and presented them, though crudely, in one verse of his composition, the conclusion is irresistible that Kālidāsa flourished before 472 A.D., the date of the Mandasōr inscription. Secondly, there are some verses of Vatsabhaṭṭi which contain striking ideas and give the impression that here also he must have borrowed from some poets who were his contemporaries or lived prior to him. This gives rise to the inference that in his time were current a considerably large number of poetic compositions which he had studied and with which he tried to compete. It is over-evident that when Vatsabhaṭṭi lived and composed his pūrvā, artificial poetry was in full bloom with a history reaching to a remote antiquity.

The Literary History set forth above takes notice of only two inscriptions of the Gupta period. It may perhaps be thought strange that it is not based upon the works of any poets
who flourished in this period. As a matter of fact, however, no poets or poet is definitely known to have flourished in the reign of any one of the Gupta kings. What we have surmised so far is that poets like Aśvaghōsa, Bhāsa and Kālidāsa most probably lived from the first to the fifth century A.D. But we cannot assert with certainty that any one of them flourished in the reign of any one of the princes who ruled during this age. Nevertheless, the scholar who has critically studied Vatsabhaṭṭi’s praṣasti of the Sun Temple of Daśapura cannot help thinking that as he was a third-rate poet, it is no wonder if, for some imagery and turns of expression, he was indebted to the Ritusaṃhāra and the Migaddatā of Kālidāsa, showing clearly that this poet was well-known and was freely drawn upon for the embellishment of his poetic composition. This point has already been dwelt upon in the political history of the Gupta epoch when we treated of the reign of Chandragupta. We discussed also about three characters, Vikramāditya, Mātrigupta and Pravarasena, who loom so large in the first three books of the Rājatarangini. Although these books abound more with legendary anecdotes than with real incidents, yet, some of them possess historical interest and faithfully reproduce the popular tradition. The question that arises here is: how Vikramāditya, Mātrigupta and Pravarasena have been mentioned together. It is true that this Vikramāditya has been called Harsha-Vikramāditya by Kalhana. There can, however, be little doubt that he was Chandra-Vikramāditya, that is, Chandragupta II, of the Gupta dynasty, because he was the Vikramāditya living at Ujjainī as the sole sovereign of the world and exterminating the Śakas, such as he has been described by Kalhana. This description suits Chandragupta II only. We have already dilated upon this point when we gave an account of his reign. This also explains how chronologically, Pravarasena comes close to the supreme ruler, Vikramāditya of Ujjainī. For, we have already pointed out that there was a Pravarasena who was a son of Prabhāvatigupta, daughter of Chandragupta II. In the introductory verses to the Harshacharita Bāṇa speaks not only of Pravarasena but also of Kālidāsa. “The fame of Pravarasena,” says he, “has gone to the other shore of the ocean of his ‘Bridge,’ like the army of monkeys,” obviously referring to his Prakrit poem, the Śṛutibandha. Just as there was a crust over the name of Vikramāditya, sovereign of Ujjainī, who, instead of being called Chandra-Vikramāditya, was called Harsha-Vikramāditya by Kalhana, there was a crust over the popular tradition about the work of Pravarasena who is mentioned by the Kashmir poet as having constructed the ‘Great Bridge’ (Bṛhat-sēṭu) built on the Vitastā.² There can be no doubt that this Bṛhat-sēṭu here is not a physical construction but the Śṛutibandha, the celebrated composition of the king. So, one who carefully studies the first three books of the Rājatarangini cannot but be convinced that, although most of the legendary accounts mentioned by Kalhana have historical interest, there can be no doubt that more or less thin crusts have grown over the popular traditions of the early centuries of the Christian era. Perhaps, the thickest has overgrown the name of Mātrigupta, who, we have pointed out above, can be no other than Kālidāsa himself. The only question that arises in this connection is how Mātrigupta and Pravarasena came to be connected with Kashmir. But we have to bear in mind that in the Gupta epoch poetry was held in high esteem and poets were assigned high positions. Perhaps the highest office of that period was that of Sāndhivigrahika which was held by Harishēṇa in the time of Samudragupta and by Śāba Kautsa in that of Chandragupta II. That Harishēṇa was a poet of a high order has been pointed out above by means of a critical examination of the praṣasti on Samudragupta engraved on the Allahāhabād pillar. He has himself called it a Kāvyā. That he occupied not only the high administrative post of Sāndhivigrahika, but also a high social position, is clear from the fact that he, like his father, has been styled a Mahā-Daṇḍanīyaka. This and other points connected with Harishēṇa have been set forth above.

² Rājatarangini, Bk. III, verse 354.
As regards Śāba Kausa, inscription No. 11 below tells us that he was not only the Śāndhivigrahika of Chandragupta II but also a kavi. One characteristic of the Gupta period was that poets were immensely admired and appointed to big administrative posts. Poets are masters of diction. This gives enchantment to their composition whether it is in verse or in prose, whether it is a panegyric or a diplomatic document. It is, therefore, no wonder if the poets were selected as Śāndhivigrahikas. Kings themselves aspired to become poets. It has been pointed out above that Samudragupta himself has been styled Kavirāja in the Allahabad pralasti. Unfortunately, not a single verse or poem has yet been traced in anthologies which is attributed to this king by this name. His son, we have seen, was Chandragupta, known also as Vikramāditya. It is worthy of note in this connection that many verses have been attributed to Vikramāditya, singly and sometimes, jointly, in anthologies, such as Saduktikarpāmṛita, Sṛṅga-dharapaddhati, Subhāśīhitavali, and so forth. Who was this Vikramāditya? It seems tempting to identify him with Chandragupta II. But it is worthy of note that this was also an epithet borne by Samudragupta.1 Further, we have to note that in 1941 the Kāthā-prastāvanā of a work called Krishnācharitam was published by the well-known scholar Rājāvaidya Jivaram Kalidas Shastri of Gōndal in Kāthiawār, which from its colophon appears to have been composed by Mahā-rājādhirāja Samudragupta, designated not only Parama-bhāgavata but also Vikramānaka. Whether this work or, rather, its introductory part which is published is genuine or not is a question that need not trouble us here. But it is curious that one verse ascribed to Vikramāditya in the Subhāśīhitavali is rajasa nāthaṁ paramaṁ hi bhūṣhajam, which is placed under Śrī-Bhagavat-svarūpā-varanā-paddhatīḥ (No. 3494). Krishṇa is known to be bhagavat. And it is not impossible to infer that this work of Krishnācharitam is a production of the Gupta monarch, Samudragupta, who has been styled not only as Parama-bhāgavata but also a Vikrama. Whether, however, this work is a genuine one as a whole, or even in greater part cannot be determined unless more of the actual work has been found.

It is not the Gupta kings alone who were poets. They had matrimonial alliances with the Vākātakas of the former Berar and Central Provinces. Chandragupta II had a daughter named Prabhāvatiguptā who was married to the Vākāta ruler, Rudrasēna (II), and had three sons, namely, Divākaraśena, Dāmocdarāsena and Pravarsēna. Divākaraśena has been called Tuvarāja, and it seems that he died without coming to the throne when his mother was queen-regent. The Saduktikarpāmṛita2 of Śrīdharaśāsya cites a Sanskrit verse which is attributed to Tuvarāja Divākara who presumably is this eldest son of Prabhāvatiguptā. As regards Pravarsēna, we have pointed out that he was the author of Rāvaṇavahō, also called Sētubandha, a well-known Prākrit poem. Rāmādasa, who wrote a commentary on this work, records a tradition that it was really composed by Kālidāsa at the bidding of his master Vikramāditya and ascribed to his grandson Pravarsēna of the Vākātaka dynasty. If we weigh these traditions properly, it seems that Chandra-Vikramāditya, Pravarsēna II and Kālidāsa alias Mātrigupta were contemporaries of one another.

This contemporaneity of three personages receives confirmation from a most unexpected quarter. Bhū Jadēva, in his Śrīngāraprākṣā (Prakaraṇa VIII) says that Kālidāsa was sent as ambassador to the court of a Kuntala king, that on his return to the headquarters he was interrogated as to how the Kuntala prince was doing and that he gave the reply in the verse:3

\[
asakala-tristhiiṁ kṣaśālīṁ—īśu kānṭyā\[newline
mukulīta-nayanatīrṭād—vyakta-karuṇa-śīpalaṁ\]
\]

---

2. IV, 31, 4.
that he was so helped at the bidding of Vikramāditya. It, therefore, seems that Vikramāditya, Pravarasena and Kalidasa were contemporaries of one another. If this position is once accepted, Vikramāditya can be no other than Chandragupta II and Pravarasena the Vakataka Pravarasena II, son of Prabhavatigupta, daughter of Chandragupta II. But how could this Pravarasena be, on the one hand, Bhōjadēva as mentioned by Rāmadāsa, and, on the other, Kuntal-śvara as styled by Kṛishaṇa? Now, Bhōjadēva need not be taken to be identical with Bhōjadēva, who belonged to the Paramāra family ruling over Mālava, and was a patron of literature and artists. Bhōjadēva can also mean ‘a king of the Bhojas’ or ‘a ruler of the Bhoja country’. And it is scarcely necessary to add that the ‘Bhoja country’ denotes Vidarbha, that is, the former Berar and the Marāṭhi-speaking Districts of the Central Provinces. That the Vakatakas were primarily rulers of this tract of land can scarcely be doubted, because almost all their copper-plate grants have been found in that region. That at a later period they were also the rulers of Kuntala can also be scarcely doubted, for there is a fragmentary inscription of the Vakatakas in a cave at Ajanṭa which speaks of Kuntala as being conquered once by Pṛthvīśeṇa, a prince of this dynasty, and, at a later time, by Harishēṇa, their minister. This Kuntala is probably co-extensive with the Kannada-speaking division of South India. As in the course of time the Vakatakas lost their ancestral dominion, namely, the Vidarbha and adjoining country, they probably came to be known as the rulers of Kuntala; and this seems to be the reason why Kṛishna, who wrote the Bharatacharita, describes the author of the Siuvamāna as Kuntal-śeṇa, lord of Kuntala.

Whether there was any other Vakataka prince who was a poet, at any rate, and composed verses, is not certain. Mahāmahopādhya V. V. Mirashi, however, rightly says that Sarvasena of the Vatsagulma line has been known to be the author of a kārya called Harivijaya, as mentioned by Ānandavardhana in Dhvanyālāka. It seems that the work was composed in Mahārāṣṭrī, but with the plot somewhat altered.

THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE GUPTA ERA

As we shall see later on in detail, Al Bérūni, the Arab Sanskritist and historian and a protege of Mahmūd of Ghazna, furnishes us with much valuable information about five Indian eras, namely, the Vikrama, the Śaka, the Gupta or Valabhi and the two Harsha eras. And what is worthy of note here is that whereas he speaks of the tārikh of Srī-Harish, the tārikh of Balva and the tārikh of Bikramādīt, he speaks of the Shag-kāl and the Gubit-kāl. In other words, it seems that in his time the first three eras were known as Harsha-sānīvat, Valabhi-sānīvat and Vikramāditya-sānīvat, and the second two as Śaka-kāla and Gupta-kāla. Of these, the epoch of Valabhi-sānīvat, he says, was identical with that of Gupta-kāla. What we have to notice is that the Gupta and the Śaka eras were known up till his time as Gupta-kāla and Śaka-kāla. It is thus all but certain that in the first half of the eleventh century A.D. when Al Bérūni flourished, the Gupta era was believed to be originated by the Gupta kings just as the Śaka era was by the Śaka princes.

An earlier reference to the Gupta era is comprised in the Mōrī grant of Jānička, edited

---

1 D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India (Appendix II), Genealogical Lists of the Various Dynasties, No. 48.
2 Ibid., No. 1712 (p. 241).
3 [For the view of Mm. V. V. Mirashi that the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānaphura and not the Vakatakas were the rulers of Kuntala, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVII, pp. 15-17. However, the possibility of the Kadambas of Banavasi being the rulers of Kuntala referred to here cannot be ruled out.—Ed.]
4 [CII., Vol. V, p. liv.—Ed.]
by R. G. Bhandarkar. This record furnishes a clear intimation that the era was then known as the Gupta era, in the verse containing the date. It occupies lines 16-17 and runs as follows: 

\[ \text{panchāśṭriyā yate ādbhū samātām śata-pañchakā}{;} \quad \text{Gaupē doodāo ādhī nripaḥ sūparāgē rakṣa-mañḍalē} \]

"five centuries of years, together with eighty-five, of the Gupta era, having elapsed, the king gave this, when the disc of the sun was eclipsed." There is no difficulty in disposing finally of the whole bearing of this inscription, notwithstanding the fears of J. F. Fleet to the contrary. It is true that the first plate had been lost, before the grant was obtained for examination at all; as the result of which the genealogy of Jāṅkika is not known. But that does not matter at all. It is also true that the second plate contains no name of a place. That does not, however, compel us to find it in the verse just quoted, as, no doubt, Fleet proposes to do. It is quite possible that the name of the place, or, rather, of the plot of land, granted was mentioned in the first plate. Nay, this seems very probable from the use of the word \textit{pratiṣṭhitam} with which line 4 begins. \textit{Pratiṣṭhitam}, of course, means `granted,' so that it follows that what was granted must have been mentioned in the preceding lines. But, so far as the second plate is concerned, three lines precede it, and they contain no details of the nature of the grant. It is, thus, all but certain that these must have been set forth in the first plate. Secondly, the word actually used is \textit{pratiṣṭhitam}, which is in the neuter. It cannot stand in apposition with any such word as \textit{grāmaḥ} but, rather, with \textit{nivartaṇaḥ}, indicating that what was granted was not so much a village as a measured strip of land. Fleet further argues that the real word “is not \textit{gaupē} at all, but \textit{gōptē}; the \textit{au} being arrived at only by applying again, as a component of the vowel, a perfectly distinct and separate sign, which is in reality nothing but the single mark of punctuation after \textit{panchakā}, at the end of the half-verse, and which had already been properly interpreted as such. It is only by the deliberate correction of \textit{au} into \textit{au}, that the name of the Guptas can be introduced into this passage....” In reply to this criticism, R. G. Bhandarkar says: “I had occasion to look into my old papers, when unexpectedly I found two impressions of the Mārvī plate taken by Burgess, by beating a slip of thin and soft paper a little moistened into the letters by means of a small brush. In these impressions I do find an indentation on the left side of \textit{v}, which is the twelfth letter in the fourth line from the bottom, and a small faintly indented curve connecting it with the upper left hand side flourish of the letter showing that the second stroke necessary for the syllable \textit{vī} did exist in the plate. As the original plate is not forthcoming, I have asked Peterson to take charge of these impressions as Secretary of the Bombay Asiatic Society, and deposit them in the Society’s Museum, where they will be available for inspection.” This places beyond even the shadow of a doubt that the correct reading is \textit{Gaupē}. “But even then” says Fleet, “the adjective occupies a very inconveniently detached position as regards the noun, \textit{pañchakā}, which it qualifies.” R. G. Bhandarkar has cited many instances from Sanskrit literature where an adjective is placed at the commencement of the second half of a \textit{stākam} while the substantive which it qualifies is at the end of the first half. Fleet’s further animadversion on the subject does not, therefore, merit serious consideration. “We might, with just as much reason,” he further remarks, “correct \textit{gōptē} into \textit{gōptē}, ‘to the protector, i.e., the local governor’; and this would be even more sustainable; for the word stands immediately before \textit{dadau, ‘he gave’}, in connection with which we have every reason to look for a dative, or some other case.” As just pointed out, the reading is unquestionably \textit{Gaupē}. There is, therefore, no good reason first to assume it as \textit{gōptē} and then amend it into \textit{gōptē}. Secondly, \textit{Gaupē}, by no means, occupies an irregularly detached position, such as is not infrequently met with in Sanskrit literature. Thirdly, when Fleet asserts that the Mārvī plate conveys a grant to the governor of the province, he, apparently, betrays ignorance of the contents of the record; for, it unmistakably speaks of two Brāhmaṇa brothers of the Śāndilya ġōtra and of the Maitrāyaṇiya śākhā as the grantees. Nay, Fleet proceeds one step further in this fallacious line of
can possibly be entertained as to the Guptas having started an era of their own. And the natural conclusion is that the era must have originated with Chandragupta I, the first Mahārājādhirāja and, therefore, the first independent ruler of the dynasty. Nevertheless, it is curious, very curious, that Fleet foists the origin of the Gupta era on the Lichchhavis of Nepal. We are, therefore, compelled to consider the arguments he has urged in support of this view. On pages 33 and 130 of his Introduction, he no doubt rightly says that the era is not the result of chronological or astronomical calculations, but owes its origin to some historical event, which occurred actually in 320 A.D. or closely to that time. He also rightly remarks that the era cannot have been established by any members of the Valabhi family, who were mere Senāpatis and Mahārājas, that is, feudatories, till about Gupta year 320. Nor can it have been, he rightly remarks, the accession of the first known Gupta prince, Śri-Gupta or his son Ghaṭotkachagupta, who were simple Mahārājas or feudatories, probably of the Indo-Scythic kings. The era might have been established, he rightly surmises, by Chandragupta I, who, at some time or the other during his reign became an independent king. But there are difficulties, says he, in the way of making the era date from the commencement of his reign i.e., from 320-21 A.D.

One difficulty is the period to be assigned to the normal Hindu generation and the other is the period to be assigned to the normal Hindu reign. Let us take the first difficulty into consideration. The great-grandson of Chandragupta I is Kumārāgupta I for whom the last certain date is Gupta year 129. Let us suppose that the latter was dead immediately thereafter. Let us also suppose that Chandragupta I was at least twenty years old when his reign commenced. We have thus to add 20 to 129. This gives 149 years to four generations, that is, thirty-seven years and a quarter to a generation, that is, nearly twelve years in excess of the accepted average maximum rate for a Hindu generation. But, on the question of generations Fleet will not base any particularly special objection, because an abnormal average rate of thirty-seven years and a half for each generation is unfortunately for him furnished by the Western Chālukya genealogy. We have, for example, Śaka-Saṅvat 930, as he himself admits, for the commencement of the reign of Vikramādiṭya V, and Śaka-Saṅvat 1060 for the end of the reign, and it may be safely assumed, the death, of Sūmēśvara III in the third generation after him. Let us also suppose that Vikramādiṭya was twenty years old when he began his reign. We have thus one hundred and fifty years for the four generations. This comes to an average of thirty-seven years and a half for each generation, as mentioned above. This is, no doubt, abnormal.

But the abnormal, Fleet forgets, is sometimes not impossible. But this will not suit the theory with which he is obsessed, namely, that the era used by the Guptas is that of the Lichchhavis of Nepal. He is, therefore, forced to take his stand upon the average duration of eighteen or nineteen years for a Hindu reign. For we have then to suppose that no less than a period of 129 years intervened between the commencement of the reign of Chandragupta I and the end of that of Kumārāgupta I, giving an average of thirty-two years. This cannot suit Fleet's theory of the origin of the Gupta era. He is, therefore, compelled to remark: "An average of thirty-two years for four successive reigns of Hindu fathers and sons, seems, from every point of view, an impossibility. And this prevents our making the Gupta era run from the commencement of the reign of Chandragupta I. And we must look for its origin to some extraneous source."

We shall soon consider how far this extraneous source referred to by Fleet is reliable. But here we shall first see whether an abnormal duration of reign is not possible like the abnormal average rate of generation. Fleet wrote his Introduction to the Gupta Inscriptions in 1888. But in 1891 he published his Tables of the Eastern Chālukyas in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, pp. 12 ff., to which our attention was first drawn by G. Bühler. In these Tables we find the following reigns:
INTRODUCTION

No. 8, Vishnuvardhana III, 37 years
No. 9, Vijayaditya I, son of No. 8, 18 years
No. 10, Vishnuvardhana IV, son of 9, 36 years
No. 11, Vijayaditya II, son of 10, 44 years or 48 years.

The total of the four reigns, says Bühler, is thus 135 or 139 years, the average thus comes to 33-3/4 or 34-3/4. In the presence of these indisputable facts, it is ludicrous to lay too much stress on the abnormal average rate, whether of a Hindu reign or a Hindu generation. “In my opinion,” rightly adds Bühler, “some of the social customs of the Indian royal families favoured the occurrence of a succession of long reigns. Every king had scores of queens and contracted, as his fancy dictated, from time to time, new matrimonial alliances. Each new favourite tried to have a son by all possible means, and to deprive the sons of the elder wives of the succession. Thus, there was always a good chance that a king, who lived to the age of 60 or 70, might be succeeded by a son of twenty or even younger. Of course, early excesses, revolutions and wars carried off many a ruler in the prime of life, and acted as a corrective.”

Let us now consider the extraneous source to which Fleet turns to explain the origin of the Gupta era. From the inscriptions of Nepal, an account of which he gives in Appendix IV, and the dates of which range from 635 to 854 A.D., it is clear, he remarks, that there were two separate houses ruling contemporaneously, one called the Thākuri family in the Vamśavali and uniformly using the Harsha era, and the other the Lichchhavi family, distinctly so named in the inscriptions and uniformly using an era with the Gupta epoch. The Lichchhavi clan or tribe was of great antiquity and power. There is also evidence of relationship between the Early Guptas and the Lichchhavis. Chandragupta I married the Lichchhavi princess Kumārādevī, for which reason their son Samudragupta has been called Lichchhavi-dauḥitra. It is further indicated by some gold coins which, on the reverse, bear their figures and names and, on the reverse, the name of the Lichchhavis. Further, the Allahābād pillar inscription shows that the kingdom of Samudragupta extended up to the confines of Nepal. The Gupta kings must, therefore, have known the nature and epoch of whatever era was being used by their Lichchhavi connections in Nepal. Fleet, therefore, concludes that “in all probability the so-called Gupta era is a Lichchhavi era, dating either from a time when the republican or tribal constitution of the Lichchhavis 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.” Now, Fleet’s theory of a Lichchhavi era, rightly remarks Bühler, suffers from a fatal weakness, which would at once have become apparent, if he had inserted in his discussion the actual dates of the Nepal Lichchhavi inscriptions, which, in his opinion, show an era with the same epoch as that of the Guptas, instead of relegating them to Appendix IV. The earliest five of them are:

Bendale No. 1, Samvat 316, i.e., 635 A.D.
Bhagwanlal No. 1, Samvat 386, i.e., 705 A.D.
Bhagwanlal No. 2, Samvat 413, i.e., 732-33 A.D.
Bhagwanlal No. 3, Samvat 435, i.e., 754 A.D.
Bhagwanlal No. 4, Samvat 535, i.e., 854 A.D.

Out of these, the only date that admits of verification is Bhagwanlal No. 1, which, in full, runs as follows:

Samvat 300 80 6 śukla-pakṣe [ṛ]hini-nakṣaṭra-yuktē chandramasi mṛtē prāṣastē—blājītī.
This gives as its English equivalent 23th April, 705 A.D., if it is taken as Gupta year. And, in fact, Kielhorn has taken all the five dates as years of the Gupta era. But, says Bühler: "The Nakshatra and Muhūrta, mentioned in [Bhagwanlal] No. 1, no doubt, come out correctly for Gupta-Samvat 386. But, as Dr. Schram informs me, they come out correctly also for northern Vikrama-Samvat 386 current and for southern Vikrama-Samvat 386 expired, i.e. either April 27, 328, or May 5, 330 A.D. and for Śaka-Samvat 386 expired, i.e. April 23, 464 A.D." It is thus clear that this and the other four dates are possibly, but not necessarily, years of the Gupta era. Again, in the opinion of Bühler, all the circumstances of the case speak against the assumption that Mānadeva ruled as late as 705 to 732 A.D. and that he had to share the small valley of Nepal with a rival king. Even admitting for the sake of argument that Fleet's and Kielhorn's interpretation of the five dates quoted above is correct, it would, at best, show that the era, identical with that of the Guptas, was used in Nepal from the seventh to the ninth century A.D. For the earliest Lichchhavi date found in Nepal is 316–633 A.D., whereas the earliest Gupta date found in India in the time of Fleet was Gupta year 82, furnished by the Udayagiri cave inscription of Chandragupta II, though, now, it is Gupta year 61 contained in the Mathurā stone pilaster inscription of the same Gupta king. In fact, there is no evidence to prove that this era was used in Nepal at all before the seventh century A.D. The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that it could not have been established by the Lichchhavis who were ruling in Nepal and borrowed or accepted by the Guptas who were an imperial power in India and to whom Nepal was a frontier and tributary province as is clear from Harishenā's prāśasti. The natural inference is that the Lichchhavi kings of Nepal adopted the Gupta era on becoming vassals of the Guptas, just as the Nepal kings of the Thakura race adopted the Harsha era of 606 A.D., after Harsha, as Bāṇa says, "had taken tribute from the country in the Snowy Mountains, that is difficult of access."

THE EXACT EPOCH OF THE GUPTA ERA

In 1881 appeared in the Indian Antiquary a translation of the article of H. Oldenberg, entitled On the Dates of Ancient Indian Inscriptions and Coins.1 Three years later R. G. Bhandarkar published in his Early History of the Dekkan, a note on the Gupta Era, which was republished also in his second edition of the work.2 In these articles, both have endeavoured to show that there was no reason whatever to doubt the accuracy of the initial date of the Gupta Era given by Al Bīrūnī and that such of the Gupta dates as contained enough data for astronomical calculations confirmed the statement of the Arab writer. But this remark of theirs was utterly unheeded though it deserved careful consideration, because the statement of Al Bīrūnī, unfortunately, was a mixture of both truth and fiction—truth so far as the initial years of the eras were concerned, and fiction so far as the tradition about their origin was mentioned,—with the result that there was confusion worse confounded.

Let us, in the first place, see what Al Bīrūnī says about these eras. According to E. C. Sachau's translation, it runs as follows: "For this reason people have given up using them, and have adopted instead the eras of—(1) Śrī Harsha; (2) Vikramādiyus; (3) Śaka; (4) Valabha; and (5) Gupta . . . The era of Valabha is called so from Valabha, the ruler of the town of Valabhi, nearly 30 yojanas south of Amihīvāra. The epoch of this era falls 241 years later than the epoch of the Śaka era. People use it in this way. They first put down the year of the Śaka-

---

Yazdajird corresponds to "the year 1088 of the era of Vikramāditya" and "to the year 953 of the Śaka-kāla." The interval between the two epochs is 155 years, which has been correctly indicated by the Arab historian and continues exactly to the present day. Why not then believe the other equation given by him? Because the same year 400 of Yazdajird corresponds not only "to the year 1088 of the Vikramāditya" but also "to the year 712 of the Valabha era, which is identical with the Gupta-kāla." Now, the Vērāval inscription of the time of Chaulukya (Vaghēla) Arjunadēva of Apahilapātaka has the following: "Bōdhaka-Rasāl-Mahānāmadasaṁvat 662 tathā śrī-nripa Vikrama-saṁhit 1320 tathā śrīmad-Valabhi-saṁh 945 etc. etc."1 Kiβhelhorn has calculated this date and has found that it is equivalent to Sunday, 25th May, 1264 A.D. It will thus be seen that here, Vikrama-saṁvat 1320 is a southern expired year.2 If we now deduct from it the figure 135, we obtain 1186 as the corresponding Śaka year. Similarly, if we deduct from it 241, we obtain, according to Al Bērūnī, 945 as the corresponding year of the Valabha era. And, as a matter of fact, the Vērāval inscription specifies 945 as the Valabhi-saṁvat corresponding to the years of the other eras mentioned therein. Thus, in the case of the epochs of the three eras, namely, Vikrama, Śaka and Valabhi, we find that the statements of the Arab historian prove correct. It is, thus, evident that any account connected with the origin of an era which is generally a hotbed of conflicting traditions cannot, by any means, be taken to discredit the statement of the Arab scholar regarding the initial year of that era, which was a matter of astronomical calculation and of long-standing practice among the people.

Now we have to consider the statement of Al Bērūnī that the Balaba (Valabhi) era is identical with the Gupta-kāla. It is well-known that Kāthāvāḍ forming part of the Gupta empire. This is demonstrated by the fact that silver coins of Chandragupta II, Kumāragupta I, and Skandagupta, with the Gupta dates, have been found in this province. An inscription of Skandagupta has also been discovered in Junāgadh (No. 28 below) which, in two places, speaks of their era, once actually in the words Gupṭaññān kāla-ghanāthālī (line 27). Their feudatories in that region were the Maitrakas, with dates ranging from 183 to 4473 and taken as belonging to the Gupta era. It is true that from 326, that is, from the time of Dharasēnā IV onwards, the titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājaḍhārāja Paramāśvara are coupled with their names. But all the previous rulers of Valabhi are called simply Mahārāja. Their inscriptions mention as the founder of this dynasty the Sīnapati Bhaṭṭakka (=Bhaṭṭaka). He is followed successively by four of his sons. The first of them is Dharasēna I, who is also called Sīnapati. But his younger brother is the Mahārāja Drōṇasīmha and his younger brother is the Mahāsāmanita Mahārāja Dhruvasēna I, with 206 as the earliest date for him.4 Whether there was any meaning in the additional title Mahāsāmanita attached to his name it is somewhat difficult to say. Most probably there was none, because in some of his plates he is styled simply Mahārāja. So, we may take it that it was his elder brother Mahārāja Drōṇasīmha, who was first raised to the dignity of the feudatory. And, as a matter of fact, we have a plate dated 183 issued from Valabhi by the Mahārāja Drōṇasīmha who is described as Paramabhaṭṭāraka-pād-ānudhvāta.5 It is true that in this record he is not mentioned as a son of Bhaṭṭaka, nor as a Maitraka. Nevertheless, the name Drōṇasīmha and the mention of Valabhi and of the title Mahārāja are enough to convince us that he is the first Valabhi ruler who was raised to the rank of a feudatory by some Paramabhaṭṭāraka who must be a Gupta overlord, especially as

---

1 Bhandarkar's List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 565.
3 Bhandarkar's List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 1289 and ff.
4 Ibid., No. 1293.
5 Ibid., No. 1289; Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, p. 18, line 1.
the Gupta sovereignty lasted till Gupta year 224. It is, therefore, no wonder if the Maitrakas dated their inscriptions according to the Gupta era and continued it till 447, the last date so far known of that dynasty. The first date where Valabhi-Samvat is mentioned is furnished by the Ûnâ plate of the time of the Imperial Pratihāra Mahêndrāyudha.1 It records a grant of his feudatory Balavarman of the Châlukya lineage and is dated Śrî-Valabhi-samvat 574. It is worthy of note that though the era is here called Valabhi-samvat, it was not forgotten in Kâthiâwâd that it was Gupta era also. Just eleven years thereafter was issued the Môrib plate of Jâinka, specifying 585 as the Gaупta year, that is, the year of the Gupta era.2 The Valabhi era continued to be used, as we have seen above, till Valabhi-samvat 945—1264 A.D., more than two centuries after Al Bêrûni lived and wrote. And the last Gupta year, as we have just seen, is 585—904-05 A.D., nearly a century before the Arab historian came to India. It is, therefore, no wonder if the Balaba (Valabhi) era was remembered as identical with the Gupta-kâla, up till his time.

Wherever we possess means of controlling Al Bêrûni’s statement about the epoch of the era, it proves to be correct. Let us now turn to the astronomical calculations, and put the Gupta dates to the test, where they admit of such a verification. Let us, in the first place, take up the Êran inscription (No. 39 below) of Budhagupta which, in lines 2-3, gives the following date: Šatâ pañcha-shaśīya-adhâkâ vahshrīnâm bhūpatah cha Budhaguptâ Āśhâdha-mâsa-sukla-duvâsya-yam Suraguru—divasâ, “when a century of years, increased by sixty-five (had elapsed) and while Budhagupta (is) the lord of the earth; on the twelfth lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month of Āśhâdha; on the day of Suraguru; . . .” Here, Fleet wrongly translates the initial part of it by “in a century of years, increased by sixty-five.” I say ‘wrongly’, because that means “in the hundred and sixty-fifth year”; but the actual word used is śata and not śata-tama. It is Oldenberg who has first rightly calculated the date to be Thursday, June 21, 484 A.D. R. G. Bhandarkar and Fleet have arrived at the same result by independent calculation. We thus see that to Gupta 165 of the Êran inscription, we have to add 241 as was the practice up till Al Bêrûni’s time and we get 406 Śaka, to which, if we further add 78, we obtain 484 A.D. This proves the correctness of his statement. Let us now consider the dates contained in the grants of Hastin and Samkshöbha who belonged to the Nripati-Parivrâjaka family. The first of these is: Šhāpatacâśas-ȫ the-uttara bhāl-bhakta Mahâ-Vaisâkha-samvat-sarâ Kârttika-mâsa-sukla-pakhsha-śrīmâyaite,3 “when a century of years increased by fifty-six (had elapsed), the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta kings continuing, in the Mahâ-Vaisâkha samvat-sarâ; on the third lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month of Kârttika.” Now, if we add to the year 156, 241+78 (=319), we obtain 475 A.D. as its English equivalent. In fact, the date has been calculated by P. C. Sengupta who makes the following remarks: “Jupiter was heliacally visible about October 20, 475 A.D.” The actual date of the inscription was October 18, 475 A.D.

Here on the day of the heliacal visibility, the sun was in the nakshatra Viṣâkhâ but Jupiter was 3°40' behind the first point of the nakshatra-division, the vernal equinox of the year being taken as the first point of the Hindu sphere. According to the rule of naming Jupiter’s years as given in the modern Šûrya-siddhânta, xiv, 16-17, it was sun’s nakshatra, on new-moon prior to October 18, 475 A.D., the date of the inscription, which took place on October 15-16 of the year, that gave the name of the year. The sun was in the nakshatra viṣâkhâ and the year begun was consequently the Mahâvaîsâkha year of Jupiter.” The third date we have now to consider is:
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tri-shashīy-uttarāḥ bhaṣa-śatāḥ gupta-nṛṣa-raṣṭha-bhaktāu Mahā-ĀśvayuJa-sāṅwatsarā Chaitra-māsa-śukla-pakṣa-deityāyāṁ "when a century of years, increased by sixty-three (had elapsed), the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta kings continuing; in the Mahā-Āśvayuja sāṅwatsara; on the second lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month of Chaitra.” The calculation of this date has very much exercised both Fleet and Dikshit. But Sengupta calculates reasonably as follows: “The year 163 of the Gupta era or 482 A.D. was similar to the year 1941 A.D. and the date to March 30, 1941. In 1,459 sidereal years (1,941−482=1,459) there are 532,909 days, which are applied backward to the 30th March, 1941 A.D., and we arrive at the tentative date of the inscription as March 8, 482 A.D. On this date as G.M.N., we had—

Mean Jupiter = 29°58' 8.24

Sun = 347°12' 47.11

Here, Jupiter’s heliacal setting is yet to come in about 30 days. Hence on April 7, 482 A.D.—

Mean Jupiter = 32°27' 46.22

Sun = 16°46' 57.02 at G.M.N.

Thus the heliacal setting of Jupiter took place in two days more according to Brahmagupta’s rule on the 9th April, 482 A.D. and the new-moon happened on the 5th April, 482 A.D. when the sun was on the nakṣatra Bharani. Hence the year to come got its name Āśvayuja. But the tentative date of the inscription was obtained as March 8, 482 A.D., which was 28 days before the new-moon, on about the 5th April, 482 A.D. This needs elucidation.

Here by coming down by 30 days we arrive at the lunar month of Vaiśākhā as it is reckoned now. But in the year 482 A.D., i.e., 17 years before the year 499 A.D. when the Hindu scientific siddhāntas came into being, the calendar formation rule was different. In our guage year 1941 A.D. the moon of the last quarter got conjoined with Chitra or a Virginis on the 20th January before sunrise. Hence, as pointed out before, in this guage year 1941 A.D. also, the lunar Agrahāyaṇa of the early Gupta period ended on the 27th January, 1941. Thus the lunar month that is now called Pausha in 1941 A.D. was called Agrahāyaṇa in 482 A.D. Hence the lunar Chaitra of 482 A.D. is now the lunar Vaiśākhā of 1941.

The date of the inscription is thus correctly obtained as the 7th April, 482 A.D.; the Jovian year begun was Mahā-Āśvayuja year.”

In the time of J.F. Fleet two more copper-plate charters of the Nripati-Parivrājakas were known. The dates of both were calculated by S. B. Dikshit as of others. The first of these9 gives us, for calculation, the Mahā-Chaitra Sāṅwatsara, as current on the third tithī or lunar day of the dark fortnight of the month Māgha in Gupta-Saṁvat 191. “By both the systems of unequal spaces, with the running difference of two hundred and forty-two years between current Gupta and current Śaka years, the Mahā-Chaitra sāṅvatsara was current on the given date. And the result gives Śaka-Saṁvat 433 current (A.D. 510-11) as the equivalent of the given current Gupta year”.4 Here, as has been pointed out above, several times, the Gupta-Saṁvat 191 is an expired one. This charter also shows that the Gupta era began from 318-19 A.D. The second charter which we have now to take note of, and which was found at Khōh, gives for calculation, the Mahā-Āśvayuja sāṅwatsara, as current on the thirteenth tithī or lunar day of the bright fortnight of Chaitra in Gupta-Saṁvat 209 current. “By both the systems of unequal spaces, with the running difference of two hundred and forty-two years between current Gupta and current Śaka years,” says S. B. Dikshit, “the Mahā-Āśvayuja
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9 Ibid., Intro., p. 114.
Sārvatāra was current on the given date. And the result gives Şaka-Saṁvata 451 current (A.D. 528-29), as the equivalent of the given current Gupta year.

As a matter of fact, the Mahā-Āśvayuja saṁvata was current on the given date, Chaitra śukla 13, in the following year, Śaka-Saṁvata 452; as well as in Śaka-Saṁvata 451..." Here also, as has been shown above several times, the Gupta Saṁvata 209 has to be taken as an expired year. Its equivalent therefore is Śaka-Saṁvata 451 expired (529-30 A.D.). After the Volume of Fleet’s Gupta Inscriptions was published, two more copper-plate inscriptions of this family came to light. One of these was the Betul grant of the Mahārāja Sarakshôhha, which gives, for calculation, Mahā-Mārgaśīrsha-saṁvatsara on the tenth titli or lunar day of the month Kārttika in Gupta-saṁvatsara 199. Unfortunately, the lunar fortnight, to which this titli belonged, has not been specified. But F. Kielhorn has conclusively pointed out that it is “the 10th titli of the dark half probably of the pûrṇimānta Kārttika of our Tables, but that possibly it may be the 10th titli of the dark half of the pûrṇimānta Āśvina of the Tables. On the first alternative the date would correspond to Monday, the 15th October, 518 A.D., when the 10th titli of the dark half of the pûrṇimānta Kārttika ended 8 h. 26 m. after mean sunrise; on the second alternative, to Saturday, the 15th September 518 A.D., when the 10th titli of the dark half of the pûrṇimānta Āśvina (i.e. possibly, the first pûrṇimānta Kārttika) ended 13 h. 30 m. after mean sunrise. It will be shown now that, in either case, the Jupiter’s year in which the date fell was a Mahā-Mārgaśīrsha year, as required by the wording of the original date.”

“The late Mr. S. B. Dikshit”, continues Kielhorn, “has fully explained that a Mahā-Mārgaśīrsha year occurs when Jupiter at his heliacal rising (i.e. his first appearance in the morning after his conjunction with the sun) is in either of the nakshatras Mrigāsiras and Ārdra, i.e., when at his heliacal rising his true geocentric place (or true longitude), according to the equal space system, is between 53° 20’ and 80°, according to the Brahma-siddhānta between 52° 42’ 20” and 72° 28’ 12.5”, and according to Garga between 53° 20’ and 73° 20’. Now, in the time immediately preceding the 15th September (and the 15th October) A.D. 518, Jupiter was in conjunction with the sun at mean sunrise of the 11th May A.D. 518, when his own true longitude was 51° 3’, and that of the sun 51° 2’ 52”. And his heliacal rising after the conjunction took place before sunrise of either the 25th May, when his true longitude was 54° 21’ (while that of the sun was 64° 23’ 35”), or the 26th May, when his true longitude was 54° 35’ (while that of the sun was 65° 20’ 31”). Whichever of the two days may be absolutely correct, it is clear that before sunrise of the 25th or the 26th May A.D. 518, Jupiter—since his true longitude in either case was more than 53° 20’—by all three systems of the nakshatras rose heliacally in the nakshatra Mrigāsiras, and that, therefore, the year which then commenced was a Mahā-Mārgaśīrsha year. That year of course included both the 15th September and the 15th October A.D. 518; for Jupiter’s next conjunction with the sun only took place some time before sunrise of the 17th June A.D. 519, and his next heliacal rising about the 1st July A.D. 519, when a Mahā-Pauṣha year commenced. I may add that, according to Mr. Dikshit’s calculations, a Mahā-Māgha year commenced on the 3rd August A.D. 520, and a Mahā-Phalguna year on the 4th September A.D. 521.

The result is that the month Kārttika of the Gupta year 199 which is quoted in the date must have fallen in A.D. 518, and that the date probably corresponds to Monday, the 15th October A.D. 518, but may possibly correspond to Saturday, the 15th September A.D. 518.”

---
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The Krīta Era

Another era, which is frequently met with in the inscriptions treated of here, is known as Krīta. In fact, the name of this era was not recognised even long after Fleet published the first edition of this volume, although it contained two inscriptions dated according to it. While discussing the sense of the passage containing the date Krīta year 480, he makes the following remarks: “It leaves krītēṣhu, ‘made, done, performed,’ as a superfluous and rather unmeaning word, unless we somewhat strain its meaning by giving it the sense of ‘fully completed (years)’.

-In the sense of ‘(years) accomplished, i.e. expired’, krītēṣhu occurs in line 1 of the Byāna inscription of Vishnuvardhana, of the year 428, No. 59 below, Plate xxxvi C. But though this use of it is unusual, it is justifiable there, as it is not accompanied by yātēṣhu, ‘having gone by’, or any similar word. My first inclination about the present passage was that krītēṣhu was used in the sense of ‘made, effected, established by’; and the three akṣaras preceding it contained the name of the founder of the era. But Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, with whom I discussed the passage, was of opinion that krīta could not be used in such a sense; and I am not able to quote anything opposed to his opinion.”

This clearly shows that Fleet was not sure of the meaning ‘made, effected, established by’ which he had assigned to that word. But it was not even dreamed by any epigraphist or historian that krīta was the name of Sāṅvat-era, till 1913 when we discovered an inscription at Mandaśor dated 461.1 Up till that time scholars subscribed to the view of F. Kielhorn that the Sāṅvat was “spoken of as either the Mālava or the Vikrama era.” We are not here concerned with the inscriptions which connect it with Vikrama and its variants in one way or another. Our volume includes those which connect it with the Mālavas. But, let us, in the first place, see what Kielhorn actually says about the matter. “From about the 5th to the 9th century this era was by poets believed to be especially used by the princes and people of Mālava, while another era or other eras were known to be current in other parts of India. At the same time, considering that our earliest dates are actually from south-eastern Rājputāna and the parts of Mālava adjoining it, the employment of the word Mālava in connection with the era may be taken to point out fairly accurately the locality in which the era was first employed. What special circumstances may have given rise to its establishment, I am unable to determine at present.”

The above statement, however, contains one slip, because he says that this era used by the princes and people of Mālava was current from about the 5th to the 9th century A.D. As a matter of fact, the last date cited by him in support of his conclusion is from the Mēnālgadhā inscription and is Vikrama year 1226, describing it as Mālavēṣagata-vaksara—“years elapsed of the Mālava (lord or lords)” according to Kielhorn’s translation. This shows that the Mālava era was known by this name up till the 12th century A.D., and not the 9th as supposed by him.

The question that we have now to discuss is: how this era was associated with Mālava. Now, the Gyrāṣpur inscription has Mālavā-kāḷaḥ = chharavām shatririn(trin) sat-samvītikāḥ = aṭītēṣhu / navasā sātēṣhu, that is, speaks of “936 years having elapsed according to the Mālava Era.” But what does Mālavā-kāḷa or Mālava era mean? Let the inscriptions themselves speak about this matter. We will refer again to the Mēnālgadhā inscription which has Mālavēṣa-

2 Ibid., p. 73, note 1.
5 D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 346.
6 Ibid., No. 37.
gata-vatsara-sataih dvadasaiv—cha shataviśa-pūrekaikām,1 that is, "with 1226 years elapsed from the Mālava lord (or lords)"). This corresponds to a Gwalior inscription dated ekādaśa=aitiṣṭhu sarvatsara-satātshu cha ekāṇaprakāśati cha gaiśhv=adī(bī)ṣhu Vikramāt // Pañchāśe ch=Āvoinē māsē kṛishṇa-pakṣaḥ...aihkatā=pi 1150 // Āśina-bahula-pañcchamānaṁ.2 "When eleven hundred years had elapsed, and when (also) forty-nine years had gone by, since Vikrama, ... again in figures, in 1150 etc. etc." This shows that the years were counted since the passing away of Vikrama. Similarly, Mālavēśa-gata-vatsara-sataih of the Mēnālgaḍhā record must be interpreted to mean "with 1226 years gone by since the Mālava lord." On the other hand, the Kanaśāwa inscription has the following: sarvatsara-satāt=yaite sa-panchāna-āvati-āvatiḥ satāḥbhīr= mālavēśānāṁ, "when seven hundred and ninety-five years of the Mālava lords had gone by."3 This indicates that the years belonged to the era started and used by the Mālava lords and not commencing with the demise of the Mālava lord as the Mēnālgaḍhā inscription clearly implies. The tradition referred to in the Kanaśāwa record is supported by the Mandaśor stone inscription4 of Prabhākara, which, in verse 13 has: "When, in course (of time), there had elapsed a number of years, viz five centuries increased by eighty multiplied by three (i.e., 524), indicative of the fame of Mālava lineage, ..." This clearly shows that the year 524 pertained to the era originated by some Mālava dynasty. This was also the case with the Vikrama era. We have pointed out that according to one tradition this era was founded to commemorate the passing away of Vikrama. But there was also another tradition according to which the era was founded by Vikrama or Vikramāditya himself. Thus, we have the copper-plate grants of the Chaulukya kings, Bhīmadēva and Tribhuvanapālādeva, containing various dates described as Śrīmad- Vikramādityyāvātaka-sarvatsara.5 As these two traditions are in conflict with each other and are found current both in connection with Mālava-kāla and Vikrama-kāla, the conclusion is irresistible that the real origin of the Samvat era has to be sought for elsewhere. Nay, there is a third tradition in regard to the Mālava era which gives a clue to its genuine origin. Two of the inscriptions bearing on this point were included in the first edition of this volume and have already been noticed by Kielhorn. They both come from Mandaśor.6 Of these, the earlier one contains two dates, the first of which is expressed in the words: Mālavēśānāṁ gana-sthitāḥ yātē śata-chaitaseḥ āvati-āvatiḥ adhīkāḥ=badānām ... Though the credit of discovering the inscriptions certainly goes to Fleet, the late P. Peterson was the first to publish this date and demonstrate that it was a year of the Samvat era. The latter translates it as follows: "when four hundred and ninety-three years from the establishment (in the country?) of the tribes of Mālavas had passed away." Fleet's rendering of the verse is as follows: "when, by (the reckoning from) the tribal constitution of the Mālavas, four centuries of years, increased by ninety-three had elapsed ..."7 Soon thereafter, another inscription from Mandaśor was discovered by Fleet and published, giving the date in the words:

Pañcāstam suṭēśu saradāṁ yātēḥ =ekāṇa-navati-sahiteśu | Mālavā-gana-sthitim-uṣāt ... The last phrase Fleet translated as "from (the establishment of) the supremacy of the tribal constitution of the Mālavas"8, adding in a footnote: "but it is very difficult to find a really satisfactory meaning" for the word uṣāt in the passage. Fleet, no doubt, recognised the difficulty, but was
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not able to surmount it. F. Kiernhorn tries to explain it away in his article entitled "Kānaswā Stone Inscription of Śīvagāna" and published in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, pp. 56-57. "Now I think," says he, "that, in explaining these (what I may be permitted to call) doubtful phrases, we must start from the very word vaṣāt. Vaṣāt at the end of a compound ordinarily means 'in consequence of, according to, by means of, by'; in fact, it frequently takes simply the place of the termination of an instrumental case, and in the present instance its employment (due no doubt to the exigencies of the metre) shows, at any rate, that the word gana-sthitā in the first passage must be taken to be the instrumental, and cannot be translated as an ablative case, in the manner proposed by Professor Peterson. At the same time, I do not believe that it would be permissible to supply, as was done by Mr. Fleet, the words "the reckoning from" simply to bring out the meaning of the instrumental. And the difficulty caused by the instrumental case rather tends to convince me that the word gana-sthitā must have another meaning than the one assigned to it. At the end of a palm-leaf manuscript of the Aupapāṭika-śrīti, which is mentioned in our Report on Sanskrit Mss., p. 50, we read: grāṇthāgraṃ 3135 akshara-gananaśa sthāpaṇam = iti, i.e., "the grāṇthāgra has by counting the aksharas been settled to be 3135." Here we have, in construction with each other, the word ganana which is etymologically related to gana (one of the synonyms of which is samkhya), and sthāpaṇa derived from the same root sthā from which we also have sthitā. Gana-sthitā sthāpayitum means "to settle or fix by counting, to reckon up," and, in the absence of anything better, we would claim for gana-sthitā a similar meaning and would accordingly translate the phrases Mālavānām gana-sthitā and Mālavā-gana-sthitā-vaṣāt simply with "by, or according to, the reckoning of the Mālavas," a rendering, which, like the original passages, would leave it doubtful whether the Mālavas spoken of should be understood to be the people of Mālava or the rulers of that country."

Kiernhorn's argument is all right so far as it goes, but he has not proved that gana has the sense of ganana, calculation, computation. It is no use saying that etymologically gana is related to ganana and is synonymous with samkhya. Thus, one sense of gana is "a troop of demigods considered as Śiva's attendants." How does this sense of gana follow from its being etymologically related to ganana? Similarly, gana is no doubt synonymous with samkhya which signifies 'enumeration, reckoning, calculation.' But samkhya also means 'a number'; and so does gana. Consequently it was by no means certain that gana and ganana were exactly synonymous. When, therefore, we wrote the paper on Vikrama Era,1 we were not far from right when we said that "the word gana has never the sense of ganana, and when placed in juxtaposition with Mālava, must signify 'a tribe' and 'a tribe' only." In fact, we held this view till K. M. Shembavanekar drew the attention of scholars to the fact that gana bears also the sense of ganana according to the Śabdāravakāśa which has gana = tu ganaśyaanā syād = Ganēṣē Pramathē chaityē.2 It is true that the Śabdāravakāśa has not yet been published. Nevertheless, Shembavanekar has rightly pointed out that the above citation is found in the commentary of Mallināthā on stanza 35 of the Mādhudīta. No doubt can thus be now entertained as to the correctness of Kiernhorn's interpretation of the phrases: Mālavānām gana-sthitā and Mālavā-gana-sthitā-vaṣāt 'according to the reckoning of the Mālavas.' But, he admits that this rendering leaves it "doubtful whether the Mālavas spoken of should be understood to be the people of Mālava or the rulers of that country." The proper rendering, however, would be "of the Mālava people or the Mālava country."

It may, in this connection, be asked whether Mālavānām gana-sthitā or Mālavā-gana-sthitā of the Mandasor inscriptions is the same thing as the Mālava-kāla, e.g. of the Gyārāspur inscription dated 936. Prima facie, this does not seem reasonable, because kāla must denote 'an era' and gana-sthitā, 'settled mode of calculation.' The years of an era are calculated in a variety
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of ways. Thus, to take the Vikrama era itself into consideration in this connection, we find that there are some years which pertain to the Kārttikā, and some to the Chaitra system of calculation and that both kinds of years were used over the same tract of country. Again, "in early times the pūrṇimānta scheme of the lunar months was more commonly followed in connection with the Vikrama era than the amānta scheme, that afterwards the amānta scheme has been gaining considerably on the pūrṇimānta scheme, and that a change in favour of a more general employment of the pūrṇimānta scheme has again taken place in quite modern times." If this is the state of things in regard to the Vikrama era, the expression Mālava-gaṇa-sthiti cannot but point to the conclusion that the Mālava people or rather the Mālava country had its own peculiar system of reckoning the date. What was then the name of the Saṁvat year at that early period? This question we have now to tackle. In 1913 a third inscription was found at Mandasōr. The date of this record is set forth in the verse:

Śrīr-Mālava-gaṇ-āmnātē praśasti Kṛita-saṁjñītē |
Eka-shashtya-adhikē prāptē samā-sāta-chausūţayē ||

In this verse there are two expressions which are worthy of consideration. The first is Mālava-gaṇ-āmnātē, which doubtless corresponds to Mālavanām gaṇa-sthiti and Mālava-gaṇa-sthiti-usātē of the other two Mandasōr inscriptions. The natural sense of āmnātē, as given e.g. in the Amarkosā, is sampradāya (=traditional usage). The phrase must therefore mean "traditionally handed down in the Mālava country." The other two similar phrases are exactly in consonance with this. The word gaṇa is common to the three expressions and must be taken to signify 'computation, calculation', as has been already pointed out. The word sthiti of the other Mandasōr inscriptions is equivalent to āmnātē of the Mandasōr inscription, because the St. Petersburg Dictionary gives 'a settled rule or usage' as one of the senses of sthiti, and even quotes Sanskrit texts in support of this meaning. No reasonable doubt can thus be entertained as to Mālava-gaṇa-sthiti being practically identical with Mālava-gaṇ-āmnātē. So, the question arises: what was the name of this era? The reply is furnished by the second expression in the verse cited above, namely, Kṛita-saṁjñītē, which qualifies the phrase expressing the date. As the word saṁjñītē shows, the year 461, the date of the inscription, is itself intended to be called Kṛita. But, as indicated by Śrīr-Mālava-gaṇ-āmnātē, the date is clearly a year of the Vikrama era. Obviously, therefore, Kṛita appears to be the name of the years of this era. There were at least two instances from epigraphy of the use of Kṛita in this sense before the discovery of the third Mandaśār epigraph, but its real significance was not understood, as we have remarked at the outset. They are the Bijayagadā stone pillar inscription of Vishnuvardhana, and the Gaṅghūr stone inscription of Vīṣvavardhana referred to above. In the first, the date is specified as follows: Kṛitēshu chaturśa varsha-śaṭēshw=ashjaviniśhēshw 400 20 8, etc. The second sets forth the date in the verse: Yatēshu chaturśa Kṛitēshu śaṭēshu saunyē=shūtīti-soṭhara-paḍēshw= ika vatsa[rēshu]. As pointed out above, J. F. Fleet, who has edited both these records, translates the word Kṛitēshu by "fully complete", but admits that it involves a straining. Besides, with this meaning, the word is made redundant by yatēshu, which is used along with it in the second inscription. But now that we know that Kṛita was the name of Vikrama Saṁvat, the occurrence of the term in the Bijayagadā and Gaṅghūr records becomes perfectly clear and intelligible.

Many inscriptions have been found since the discovery of the third Mandaśār record, where the name of the era specified is Kṛita. One of these was brought to light at Nagari,
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seven miles north of Chittörgadh in the former Udaipur State, Rājasthān. We will consider this record in detail later on. For the present, we shall only note that it is dated Kṛita 481. Others were discovered at Bādvā in the former Kōtāh State, Rājasthān. They are engraved on three separate Yāpa pillars and bear one and the same date, namely, Kṛitēhī 200 90 5 Phālgunā-śuklaśa pāṇeḥ dī. This has been translated as follows by Altekar: “On the fifth day of the bright half of Phālguna (of the year) 295 by Kṛita (years).” The meaning of the phraseology “(the year) 295 by Kṛita (years)” is not at all clear to us and, we are afraid, it may not be clear to anybody. It had better be rendered as follows: “On the fifth day of the bright half of Phālguna when 295 Kṛita years (had passed away).” On this day the Yāpa pillars were set up by the three brothers Balavarddhana, Sōmadēva and Bālasīnha. They were the three sons, no doubt, of Bala, but are themselves styled Maukhari and Mahāśēnāpatis as correctly pointed out by N. P. Chakravarti. The Maukhari thus pertaining to a class of nobility or feudal lords called Sēnāpatis such as those mentioned in the Nāgārjunikona inscriptions of the southern Ikśvāku rulers and flourishing in the south-eastern part of Rājputānā. To say, therefore, that “Sēnāpatis, the title by which Pushyamitra, the founder of the Śunga dynasty, was known even to posterity, is a humber title than the one given to Bala in our records”; and that “Bala, therefore, may well have been more than a general” is an assumption, pure and simple, without any foundation in fact, and it is not clear how the statement was allowed to stand as it is, by the Editor, though he corrected the translation which altered the sense completely. Two more inscriptions have been found at Barnālā in the former Jaipur State, where Kṛita has been mentioned as the name of an era. They were discovered by the late Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni, but were edited by Altekar in the Epigraphia Indica, Volume XXVI, pp. 118 and ff. They are also Yāpa pillar inscriptions. The earlier is dated Kṛitēhī 200 80 4 Chaitra-sūkla-pārshva-panchadāsi and is translated thus by him: “The full-moon day of (the month of) Chaitra of the year 284 by the Kṛita (reckoning).” The latter is dated Kṛitēhī 300 30 5 Jyēṣṭha-suddhāśa panchadāsi and is translated by Altekar thus: “The fifteenth day of the bright fortnight of (the month of) Jyēṣṭha of the year 335 by the Kṛita (reckoning).” “The year 284 or 335 of the Kṛita (reckoning)” conveys no sense especially in consequence of the use of the term Kṛitēhī, which is in the plural and in the instrumental. Here also was expected some constructive criticism from the Editor of the Epigraphia Indica. But this has somehow escaped his attention, important though it is. It is best to translate the expression by “when 284 or 335 Kṛita years (had passed by).” But the earliest of these epigraphs was the one found at Nāndśā in the former Udaipur State and is dated Kṛita 282.

All the early inscriptions ranging between 282 and 480, referred to above, record years which are called simply Kṛita and do not make the slightest mention of Mālava or Mālavas. These two points are of great importance. The first is that these years are in no way connected with Mālava, whatever that may mean. The second point is that the years are by themselves called Kṛita and are nowhere spoken of as belonging to any era. It is true that we have such expressions as Kṛitayōr = dyaōr = vvarsha-satayōr = dyaśayōp 200 80 2, Kṛitēshu chaturshu varsha-satēshu = ashtāśvaśēshā 400 20 8, Yatēshu chaturshu Kṛitēshu satēshu samvaśē = ashtāśvaśē = sōtara-padeśē = iha vatsaraśē, and so on and so forth. In such expressions, the suspicion is

1 D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, etc., No. 5.
3 Ibid., p. 52.
4 Ibid., p. 52, note 8.
5 Ibid., Vol. XXVI, pp. 6 and 32.
6 Ibid., Vol. XXXIII, p. 47.
7 Ibid., Vol. XXVI, pp. 120 and 123.
likely to arise that as Krita is here in apposition to varsha or vatsara, the former may, after all, be an adjective of the latter. And, as a matter of fact, there was a time when we took the word Krita as an adjective of varsha or vatsara and propounded the theory that krita here meant ‘made’ or ‘artificial’ and referred to an era invented by the people or astronomers for the purpose of calculating dates. There was, however, no evidence in support of it, and there was nothing in this suggestion which could inherently command acceptance. But this theory which we once propounded is now controverted by the Yupa pillar inscriptions found at Badvā and Barpālā. There, the word Kṛitiḥ occurs alone and by itself without being preceded or followed by varsha or vatsara. This shows without even the least shadow of a doubt that Kṛitiḥ stands for Kṛitaiḥ and means Kṛitaiḥ (gataiḥ) “when the Kṛita years (had elapsed).” In other words, Kṛita by itself denotes the Kṛita year, and the Mandasor inscription of Naravarman (No. 14 below) was correct in calling the years 461 (passed) of its date as Kṛita, which was, in fact, the designation (sanyāsa) of these years. Things were, however, changing soon after Kṛita 480, the date of the Gangadhar inscription. With the Kṛita year, the name Mālava came to be associated in one form or another. At first, both the names were in juxtaposition with each other. Thus, in the Mandasor inscription of 461, we find Mālava-gan-āmnāta and Kṛita-sanyāsīta associated with this year. This point we have already dilated upon and need not, therefore, engage our attention here. The Nagari inscription which was first brought to light in December 1915 sets forth the date as follows: Kṛitēs̄a chaturṣu varsha-satēśā-ikāśity-uttarēśā-aṣyāṁ Mālava-pūrvāyāṁ [400] 80 1 Kārtika-sukla-paṁchamayāṁ. The first portion of the date speaks of four hundred and eighty-one Kṛita years having passed. There can, thus, be no doubt that this 481 is a year of the Vikrama era. The second portion of the date may be rendered as follows: “when the detailed specification (of the date) according to the Mālavas was this, namely, 481, on the 5th day of the bright half of Kārtika.” We have elsewhere pointed out that the word pūrvā has a specific sense of ‘detailed description or specification’ and is used in connection with the setting forth of dates. The Bijayagad inscription of Vishnuvardhana, e.g., has Kṛitēs̄a chaturṣu varsha-satēśā-aṣtāvijaśaśaḥ 400 8 Paḷguna-bahula-paṁchamayāṁ-etasāyāṁ-pūrvāyāṁ, “when four centuries of Kṛita years increased by twenty eight, i.e. 428 (had passed), on the 15th of the dark half of Paḷguna, when this was the specification (of the date).” If we compare etasāyāṁ-pūrvāyāṁ of this epigraph with the corresponding Mālava-pūrvāyāṁ of the Nagari record we cannot help thinking that the Mālavas had a different mode of reckoning, possessed of one or two peculiarities of its own. As pointed out above, on the authority of Kielhorn, while some years of the Vikrama era pertain to the Kārttiṅḍi, some others pertain to the Chaitrādi, mode of reckoning; and in the earlier times, the pūrṇīṁata scheme of lunar months was more commonly followed than the amānta. And, strange to say, the phrase Mālava-pūrvā or Mālavāñāṁ gana-sthitā we find mentioned only in connection with the months of Āsvina, Kārttiṅḍa and Pausha to the beginning of Vasant season, that is, the month of Chaitra, when somehow a new year has to commence or an old one to end. No reasonable doubt can, therefore, be entertained as to the Mālavas having a specific mode of their own for the computation of the years. What characteristics it exactly combined it is difficult to determine on the scanty evidence at our disposal at present. This much may be taken as certain, that not only the 11th but also the years were affected thereby. We can, therefore, safely reiterate that Mālavāñāṁ gana-sthitā or Mālava-gana-sthitī-vāśāt must
āditya, which was the epithet, apparently of Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. And the era was now generally known as Śrīmad-Vikrama-nṛṣa-kāla, Śri-nṛṣa-Vikramasahvat, Vikrama-sahvat and so forth. But what is meant by these expressions? Exactly what was denoted by Mālav-ča? Thus, the copper-plates of the Chaulukya king Bhūmādēva II give one explanation, as follows: śrīmad-Vikrama-ditytī-pādāśita-sahvatara-, “the year (of the era) originated by the illustrious Vikramāditya.” But that was not the only tradition prevalent about the association of Vikrama with the era. Because we meet with such expressions as Śri-Vikramatō gatēshu, gatēshu-abdēshu Vikramāt, Vikramāraka-gatē kālē, and so forth. If any doubt arises about the correct interpretation of these expressions, it is set at rest by what Amitagati says in setting forth the date of his work the Subhāṣitaratnasamānāda as follows: samārūddhē pūta-tridaśa-castāniḥ Vikrama-nṛṣa, “after king Vikrama had ascended to the pure dwelling of the immortals.” There can, therefore, be no doubt as to this era having been established to commemorate the passing away of the eponymous founder of the era. But what were these traditions in their incipient stage? In the case of the Mālavēsa traditions, we have seen that their inchoate form was indicated by the wording Mālava-vanēsa which is found in the epigraphic record of Prabhākara. Mālava-vanēsa developed, on the one hand, into Mālavēsa-gutē-vatsaraśataiḥ, and, on the other, into vatsaraśataiḥ-yātāḥ ... Mālavēsa-anām. What was the inchoate form in the case of Śrīmad-Vikramāditya-pātāśita-sahvatara and gatēśa = abdēshu Vikramāt? The incipient form of these traditions seems to be preserved in the wording of the Dhōlpur inscription as follows: vasu nav = uṣhayau varshō gatasya kālasya Vikram-ākhyasya, “when the time called Vikrama had gone by, namely, the years 898.” This, Kielhorn explains as follows: “autumn (śarad) in India was pre-eminently the Vikrama-kāla” or war-time. And it is only one step further that Vikrama-kāla should be connected with the year (śarad) itself, as that term has also the sense of ‘the year.’ Afterwards, when the origin and the true meaning of the terms Vikrama-kāla and Vikrama-year had been forgotten, the people interpreted these terms after the manner of their own age, and, Vikrama being a well-known name of famous kings, they naturally connected the era with a king of that name who would be supposed, either, like their own kings, to have counted the years from his accession or to have otherwise given occasion for the establishment of the era. Had it been founded by a king Vikramāditya in 58 B.C., it is strange that no allusion should ever have been made to this for more than a thousand years afterwards. Again, had it been invented in memory of some great king, the name of that king would surely have been prominently mentioned many a time before Vikrama year 1050, the date of Amitagati’s Subhāṣitaratnasamānāda. Besides, nothing has yet been brought to prove the existence of a king Vikramāditya in the century preceding the birth of Christ. An attempt was no doubt, sometime ago, made to revive this theory, and proof was adduced to show that there was a king of the name of Vikramāditya in the first century before Christ. It was first broached by C. V. Vaidya in an article published in the Indian Review, December 1909. The same view has been put forth by Haraprasad Shastri in his paper on the Mandasōr inscription of Naravarman, forgetting, however, to mention the name of Vaidya. It has, therefore, become necessary to reconsider this question and find out how far their evidence is trustworthy. They both rely on a verse from Hāla’s Gāthā-saptasālī (verse 64) which runs thus:

Sānūśhāna-suha-rasa-tōsiṇa dentēṇa tuha karē lakkaṁ 
chalaṇēṇa Vikkamāścika-chariam = āpyuṣikkhaṁ tissā ||

2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, pp. 407 and ff.
3 Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 320.
Evidently this verse makes mention of Vikramāditya and refers to his munificent nature. And as Hāla, the author of the Gāthāsaptasatī, is ordinarily spoken of as a Śatavāhana, and as this name occurs in the Purāṇas, and is placed there before that of Gautamiputra Satakarnī who, we know, lived about 125 A.D., it is argued that the work was composed about the beginning of the first century after Christ. And when such a work alludes to Vikramāditya, it is concluded that there was really a king of this name living in the first century B.C., as reported by the tradition. Hence, both Vaidya and Haraprasad Shastri hold that the tradition gives a correct account of the origin of the Vikrama era and that it was, therefore, initiated by a king called Vikramāditya.

Now, even supposing for the moment, that there was such a king as Vikramāditya living in circa 57 B.C., it does not necessarily follow that the era was founded by him. It is true that even in inscriptions the era is associated with the name of Vikramāditya. But these are records of a later period, and, in fact, it is in Amitagati’s Subhāśitaratnasamāndōha composed in Vikrama Śaṃvat 1050 that we hear for the first time of a prince Vikrama in connection with it; and from the actual wording of the date by this Jain author it seems that the era was believed in his time not to have been founded by Vikramāditya but rather started to commemorate his death. All earlier inscriptions going back to the first quarter of the third century A.D. give an entirely different name for the era. What that name is has been stated above, namely Kṛita, and it is sufficient here to say that they give not even the least inkling of its being associated with Vikramāditya. If this is what epigraphy tells us, it is rash to assume that the era was known to be connected with this king even long prior to Vikrama year 1050. And if, as we know from epigraphy, this era had an altogether different name and had absolutely no connection with Vikramāditya it is not reasonable at all to infer that it was established by him.

But, is it a fact that the Gāthāsaptasatī was such an early work as has been assumed? In the first place, that its author, Hāla, was a Śatavāhana is a mere tradition and must be set aside like all other traditions about the ancient litterateurs of India. Introductory verse 13 of Bāṇa’s Harshacharita, no doubt, speaks of a Śatavāhana having composed a Kōśa of songs, but there are no grounds to suppose that this Kōśa is Hāla’s Saptasatī, as has been well pointed out by Weber. The internal evidence afforded by the work points, on the other hand, to a much later date for its composition. Only two points may be here noticed. The first is the reference to Kṛishṇa and Rādhikā contained in verse 1. 89, and the second to a week-day, Tuesday in 3. 61. The earliest mention of Rādhikā that we have been able to trace is in the Pāñcaratra which was compiled in the fifth century after Christ. Similarly, the practice of citing the week-day in dates or for other general purposes came into vogue in the 9th century though the earliest instance of its use is found in the Īrā inscription (No. 39 below) of Budhagupta dated 484 A.D. And we shall not be far wrong if we assign Hāla of the Gāthāsaptasatī to the commencement of the 6th century. If we take this to be his period, there is nothing strange in our finding a verse, in his anthology, descriptive of the liberality of Vikramāditya. Because, whether we take this Vikramāditya to be Chandragupta II of the Gupta dynasty with R. G. Bhandarkar or with his grandson Skandagupta with K. B. Pathak, he cannot be pushed later than 475 A.D. And it is quite possible that after the death of this Vikramāditya, his generosity stuck to the memory of the people and became the subject of
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encomium with subsequent poets. Thus, we find a reference to Vikramāditya's liberality not only in the work of Hāla but also in one of the introductory verses (verse 10) of the Vāsavadatta by Subandhu, who has to be placed about the close of the 6th century A.D. at the latest.

Let us now turn to the second question, namely, the determination of the meaning of the term Kṛita. It has been pointed out above that the earliest inscriptions of the Vikrama era record years which are called simply Kṛita and that Kṛita is always in apposition with varsha or vatsara. We had thrown out two suggestions, according to one of which Kṛita meant 'made' or 'artificial' and referred to an era invented by the people or astronomers for the purpose of computing dates. There was, however, nothing in this suggestion which could inherently command acceptance. The second suggestion we will consider here again, because it has somehow escaped the notice of scholars. Before we do so, let us see what theory has been propounded by Altekar when he wrote his articles on the Bādava and Barhālā inscriptions.

He suggests that the era was known as Kṛita because it was founded by some individual of that name. It is true that Kṛita as a personal name was not familiar to later Indian history and literature, but the case was different in earlier times. "Kṛita was the name of one of the Viśvedevas; Viśvedēva had given it to one of his sons from Rōhiṇī; a pupil of Hiranyābha was known by that name; and fathers of Uparichara and Haryavana were christened by it. What inherent improbability is there in postulating that the so-called Vikrama era may have been originally started by a king named Kṛita?" In the same breath he says that "According to the Viśvarūpa, Kṛita has also the sense of fruit or reward. This meaning seems to be connected with one of the Vedic meanings of the word,—'booty'. At the time of the founding of the era, a king named Kṛita may probably have scored a memorable victory and won great booty (kṛita). To commemorate the victory an era was started called Kṛita named after its founder and his great achievement." What these last two sentences exactly mean it is somewhat difficult to understand. Altekar probably means that there was a king, who, because he scored a victory and won great booty (kṛita), was, therefore, called Kṛita and that the era was called Kṛita after this founder to commemorate the victory which gave him not only Kṛita or booty but also the consequent name Kṛita. Nevertheless, he admits that his theory is only a tentative one and that "so far we have no evidence whatsoever of a king named Kṛita having flourished by the middle of the 1st century B.C." "It is also true" he continues, "that an era named after king Kṛita should be known by a taddhita expression like Kāṭra-varsha or saṁvatsara, on the analogy of the expression Gaṇḍā-ābādā varsha-tāta-trayā varittamāṇe occurring in the Ganjam plates of the time of Śaṅkarāja." Altekar adduces a two-fold reason. "The authors of early inscriptions," says he at first, "were not particularly strong in Sanskrit (as is, for instance, evidenced by the present inscriptions) and the expression Kṛita (saṁvatsara) for Kāṭra (saṁvatsara) is quite possible in their compositions." By "the present inscriptions" he, of course, means the Three Maukhari Inscriptions on Tāpas. But what is the language of these records? On page 46 he says: "The language of the record may be described as incorrect Sanskrit." He has apparently forgotten that this represents the Gāthā dialect or the mixed Sanskrit in which the Buddhists worked and the inscriptions of the Kushāṇa period were composed. We shall, however, consider the earliest Kṛita date, namely, of the Nandasā record which reads as follows: Kṛitayōr=advayōr=varsha-satayōr=daśatayōh 200 80 2 Chaittra-pūrṇamasya asyān=āravīṣāṃ, "the full-moon day of Chaitra after two centuries of Kṛita years (and) eighty-two (had passed away)—this, being the specification (of the date)." Does not the language of this date represent chaste Sanskrit? And yet we find here, not Kāṭra-varsha, but Kṛitayōr ... =varsha-satayōr. Here Kṛita stands exactly in apposition with the group of years, showing
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clearly that these are not the years, started by a king called Kṛita, but assuredly as years named Kṛita. Or, we may take the Bijayagad pillar inscription which is the next earliest Sanskrit inscription and is dated, as follows: Kṛtētāḥ chaṭārsuḥ varsha-satāśu = aṣṭāvāniśāśu 400 20 8 Phaliguna-bahulasya paṅchadasiyām = śestyāṃ pūrvayām. The language of this date also is Sanskrit, pure and simple. And here also Kṛita stands in apposition to the group of years, namely 428, unmistakably proving that they are not the years of any era originated by Kṛita but most certainly the years themselves styled Kṛita. As these two are the earliest Sanskrit records where the years have been named Kṛita and not Kārta, it is not clear what Altekar means by saying that as the authors of the early inscriptions were not particularly strong in Sanskrit, the expression Kṛita for Kārta is quite possible in their compositions. Further, as a matter of fact, the term Kārta is nowhere yet found employed in Indian epigraphy in place of Kṛita. And, further still, in the Mandaśōr inscription of Naravarman, as he himself admits,1 "it is expressly stated that Kṛita was its proper name, though it was traditionally handed down among the Mālavas." It is true that this statement is confusing though he is right in saying that the name was Kṛita. But he creates confusion by assigning the name Kṛita to an era. In the record in question it is the years (461) that have been styled Kṛita. And this confusion has become worse confounded by his remark that the era was traditionally handed down among the Mālavas. As a matter of fact, the Mālavas were connected, not with the founding of the era, but with the computation of the years which are now known as those of Vikrama. This point we have already expatiated upon and it need not now detain us here.

Let us, therefore, turn again to the important question of the determination of the meaning of Kṛita. We shall now consider or rather reconsider the second suggestion which was put forward by us,2 which, strange to say, was not known to Altekar when he wrote his learned articles on the Bādvā and Bārṇāla Yūpa inscriptions, although the articles containing our view was published as early as 1932 in the Indian Antiquary. He refers to it only casually on page 90 in his popular article in the Vikramādika Number published by the Nāgāri Prachāriṇi Patrikā in Sāhit 2000 Vikrama. What we contended in that article may be set forth here again, as our theory has not yet been well controverted and not at all upset.

Enough attention has not been drawn to the importance of the 'Brahmin Empire' established by the Śūngas sometime before the Christian era. K. P. Jayaswal was the first to bring this subject to our notice in two papers on the Brahmin Empire. In the second of these, he has quoted a passage from the Harivāna attached to the Mahābhārata where Pushyamitra and his revival of Brahmanism have been clearly hinted at. Soon after reading this paper we happened to light upon Chapters 190-91 of the Vanaprastha of the Mahābhārata which describe the Kaliyuga and its atrocities. We are told that during the Kāli Age the Śūdras will be the preachers and Brāhmaṇas the hearers, that the earth will be adorned, not by shrines of gods, but by Buddhist stūpas (edūka) and that India itself would be overrun by the Māchchhita hordes. This has been described as the character of the Kaliyuga, but Kaliyuga will gradually, we are told, develop into a sandhi period before the Kṛitayuga is ushered in. In regard to the Kṛitayuga, we are informed that a Brāhmaṇa named Viṣṇuṣuvas will be born as Kalki in the town of Sambhala in a Brāhmaṇa family and that he will be not only a supreme ruler (chakravartin) but also a righteous conqueror (dharma-vijaya). He will exterminate the Dasyus, perform a great Horse Sacrifice, give back the earth to the Brāhmaṇas, establish the worship of trīśūlas, śaktis and deer-skins, and will usher in the Kṛita Age (Chapter 191, verses 1-9).

This description suits Pushyamitra excellently, as he was a Brāhmaṇa, a supreme ruler, a righteous conqueror, and celebrated a horse sacrifice and re-established the Brahmanic religion. Nay, the account of the Kaliyuga preceding the advent of Kalki lays stress on the predominance of Buddhists and the Śūdras becoming the preachers exactly as is done by the Harivamśa, according to which this state of things was ended by Śeṇānī devīja, who, as shown by Jayaswal, cannot but be Pushyamitra. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in the case of the Mahābhārata also, Pushyamitra is intended by the description of Kalki. The only difficulty that may be raised is that Kalki is spoken of as a personage to come. But Jayaswal has already told us that the Purāṇas “clearly say that he did flourish.”¹ Thus, the Matsyapurāṇa says that the Buddha was born as the ninth (avatāra) and that Kalki, Vishṇuyaśas, the leader of the Parāśaras will be the tenth incarnation at the close of the Kaliyuga. Then follows a description of his conquest, but, at the end, we are told that “Time having passed, that king (or god, dēva) disappeared.” This is exactly the conclusion which is forced upon the mind of the scholar who reads the Kalki-Purāṇa.² This clearly shows that according to some authorities the Kalki incarnation of Vishṇu has come and gone. This means that the Kali Age also has passed away, giving rise to the Kṛta, which is, therefore, now going on. If this line of reasoning has any weight, Pushyamitra becomes the inaugurator of the Kṛta Epoch which began with 57 B.C.

It is true that Pushyamitra has been assigned to circa 80 B.C. on the strength of the dynastic lists and regnal periods specified by the Purāṇas. The testimony of the Purāṇas may perhaps be utilised when there is nothing of an irrefragable character to contradict it.³ Unfortunately, the recent discovery of a Śuṅga inscription in Ayōḍhyā runs counter to the above date of Pushyamitra. It refers to the reign of Dhanadēva, son of Phalguṇḍevas and Kausiki, who was Lord of Kōśala. But the most important point about it is that Dhanadēva says that he was sixth in descent from “Śeṇāpati Pushyamitra, who twice performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice.” Now, N. G. Majumdar rightly says in regard to this epigraph that the alphabet is “almost the same as in the records of the Northern Kṣatrapas (first century A.D.).”⁴ Daya Ram Sahni, who edited this inscription last, also remarks that it “on palaeographical grounds must be assigned to about the first century A.D.”⁵ In fact, if any scholar frees his mind from any bias created by the date already assigned to Pushyamitra on the strength of the Purāṇas and considers impartially the palaeography of the Ayōḍhyā inscription, he cannot but come to the same conclusion, viz., that the record belongs to the first century A.D.⁶ We have seen that Dhanadēva was sixth in descent from Pushyamitra, and if we assign 25 years to a generation, an interval of 150 years must have separated the two. Further, supposing Dhanadēva lived about 75 A.D., Pushyamitra has to be placed circa 75 B.C. It is possible that he first seized power about this time, but he must have been engaged in inter- neceine warfare for a pretty long period before he could put down the Mle chestha rulers and establish himself as an indiscputable paramount sovereign. That he was engaged in warfare for a long period is shown by the fact that he celebrated the horse sacrifice, not once, but twice. The first horse sacrifice must have been celebrated after he first established his power. But it

² Bengali edn., p. 5, 89, 102, etc.
³ D. R. Bhandarkar’s Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 58 and note 1.
⁵ Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 57.
⁶ The most knotty phrase in this Ayōḍhyā inscription is Pushyamitraya skashṭhaṇa qualifying Dhanadēva. This expression is interpreted by some scholars as denoting Dhanadēva as “the sixth son of Pushyamitra” (JBORS, Vol. XIII, pp. 247-49). But this places Pushyamitra not about the middle of the first century B.C., but about the middle of the first century A.D., which is highly improbable.
seems that it was soon after called in question by a number of enemies who had arisen. These were, however, put down, and he re-established his supremacy, which was signalised by the second performance of the horse-sacrifice. Although he thus first came to power in 75 B.C., it was not till 57 B.C. that he became an undisputed supreme ruler and a righteous conqueror (dharma-vijeyer). So the Krityayuga must have been ushered in by him when his power was established for the second time and placed on a firm footing.

Now only one difficulty remains in regard to the theory that the so called Vikrama Saṁvat years are years of the Kṛita era. It may reasonably be asked how Kṛita in such a case stands in apposition to varsha. We would rather have Kṛita-varṣaraḥ or Kṛitāḥ varṣaraḥ. It seems that we have a parallel for such terminology in the Śaka era. It is well-known that the years of this era have once been called Śaka-nṛpati-rājya-ābhishēka-sauvatsara, but that they are generally Śaka-saṁvat. It is true that there are some inscriptions, where Śaka seems to stand apparently in apposition with Suvatsara as Kṛita does. Thus, a grant of Harihara II of the Vijayanagara dynasty has the following: Śrī-Śakē trāyodaś-adhika-trīśat-ottara-sahasrē-gate. If we proceed to an earlier period, the Pañchāṣṭ padda of the Dēvagiri-Yadava Rāma (= Rāma-chandra) have: Sa(Śa)kē cha ēkādaśasa triṇāyati-adhikāh = atītēṣu 1193 etc. Similar is the case if we go up to a still earlier period. Thus the Kokaṭāuru padda of the Kalachuri Mahākālaśāṅkha Soma (= Śomēśvara) give the date: Svanāvitya-adhika-sahasratamē Ṣakē etc. If any inscription from Northern India is required in support of our proposition, it is supplied by that of Śomavakha king Karṇaraṇa of Kākairā, bearing the date Chaturḍāś-ottarē s = evam = ēkādaśe śatē Ṣakē. In all these cases Śakē has been used in the sense of “the years of the Śaka era, i.e., (Śaka-sauvatsarasah)” which means that the original sense of Śaka-nṛpa-kāla is completely forgotten. If we want an instance about the Vikrama era in a similar deteriorated sense, it is supplied by the Delhi (Śivālīk) pillar inscription of the Gahamāna Visaladeva Vigrarahāja, one date of which is Sauvatt śrī Vikramādityā 1220 etc. etc. This naturally puzzled even the scholar who edited them, namely, F. Kiellhorn, who in a note below says: “One would have expected here Vaikramāditya”. Kṛita had, however, been ever since 282 (226 A.D.) the name of the year and not of any epoch. And it continued to be so till Vikrama year 461 in a Mandaśōr inscription as shown above where the years have been explicitly called Kṛita (Kṛite-sahjitāḥ). There is, therefore, no reasonable ground against the supposition that Vikrama years were, from the beginning, known as the name of years and not of any epoch.

This theory about the origin of the Vikrama era has, no doubt, been propounded with all the air of plausibility and speciousness. But it cannot commend itself to the sober judgement of any savant. It is true that an era was started by Kalki who is believed to have ushered in the Kṛita Age. The question, however, arises: when did it commence? In this connection we may notice a couplet which occurs not only in the Vāyu, Vishnu and other Purāṇas but also in the Mahābhārata, Vanaprastha, Chapter 190, verse 91, and which runs as follows:

Yadā chandraś = ca sūryaś = ca tathā Tishya-Brihaspati/\neka-rāṣṭra sameṣṭhyanti tadā Kṛite-yugaṁ bhavet //

“And then when the Sun, the Moon, and Brihaspati will, with the constellation Pushya, be together in the same sign (rāśi), the Kṛita Age will begin again.”

We have above referred to this chapter from Vanaprastha while expatiating on the rise of

---

2 JBBRAS., Vol. IV, pp. 115 and f.
3 F. Kiellhorn’s List Insers. South India, No. 369.
4 Ibid., No. 283.
5 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 185 f.
6 Ind. Anti., Vol. XIX, p. 218, note 22.
Kalki, and the ushering in of the Kṛita Age. Now, P. C. Sengupta who has made the necessary calculations has come to the conclusion that this Kṛita began with 63 B. C., and not with 57 B. C. It is possible to argue that Pushyamitra re-established his power in 63 B. C. but started an era of his own in 57 B. C. which began the Kṛita years. But another calculation of the same data is possible. Thus, according to Harit Krishna Deb, “A.D. 424 (November 20) 425 (November 16) conforms to their requirements.” This agrees with the Jaina tradition to which R. Shamasāstra has drawn our attention. Further, he remarks as follows: “From these facts I am led to believe in the existence of a historical personage Kalki, king of Pāṭaliputra, who, born in 402, started an era after his own name in 428 and who, championing the cause of the Brāhmaṇas against the Huns, the Jainas, and the Buddhists for about 40 years, died in A.D. 472.” It is thus clear that according to the Jaina tradition, that is, according to some Indian tradition at any rate, the Kalki era was originated in 428 A.D., and not in 57 B.C., as surmised by us. To associate the name of Kalki with the foundation of the Vikrama era and to assert that it originated the Kṛita Age in 57 B.C. has not even the background of any Indian tradition. Besides, there is a veritable disorder and jumble of traditions about the origin of the Vikrama Era. This has been pointed out by us in detail before. What is, however, important to remember in this connection is that all the early inscriptions of the Vikrama era, ranging between 282 and 480, record years which are called simply Kṛita and do not make the slightest reference to ‘Mālava’ or Vikrama.’ It is true that Śaka once or twice and Śrī-Vikramaditya only once are used to denote a year of the Śaka or Vikrama era. But this we find done long long after the era had been in vogue, and not at all about the commencement of it. Hence, if we are again allowed to weigh between the two theories propounded by some scholars, we cannot help saying now that the interpretation of the word Kṛita proposed at first is more reasonable than the second one, namely, that it was really Kṛita, ‘made’, that is, invented by the astronomers for the purpose of reckoning years and that it somehow caught the imagination of the people who, therefore, began to use it and actually styled it Kṛita, ‘invented’. When we broached the theory, we were unaware of what Al Bérūnī had said about the eras that were prevalent in India. The Arab historian says that in his time the eras adopted by the Hindus were four in number, namely, those of (1) Śrī Harsha, (2) Vikramaditya, (3) Śaka and (4) Valabha, also known as Gupta, because the epoch of both these eras is “241 years later than the Śaka-kāla.” Besides these, there were four more eras of the astronomers, because the authors of them considered them “as the most suitable to be used as cardinal points in astronomical and other calculations, whence calculation may conveniently extend forward or backward.” It is worthy of note here that the eras of the astronomers were considered suitable not only for astronomical but also for other calculations. This raises the presumption that in some provinces the eras of the astronomers were used by the people also. This fits the Vikrama era excellently because in the earliest period when this era is found to be in vogue, it bears no name of its own, but, on the contrary, its years are called Kṛita, ‘made’, invented by the astronomers of a province for the use of their astronomical calculations and adopted by the people for their calculations. This province seems to have been South-eastern Rājputāna and Mālāvā, and that appears to be the reason why these Kṛita years were regarded as Mālava-gan-āmāta, “traditionally handed down according to the reckoning of the Mālavas.” This is quite clear from another inscription which speaks of four hundred and eighty-one Kṛita years as having passed and as Mālava-pūrṇāyam—this being the detailed specification (of the date) according to the Mālavas.”

---

3 Sachau, Alberuni’s India, Vol. II, pp. 5 and 7.
4 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
To sum up, the evidence points to the almost irresistible conclusion that the Vikrama Saṁvat was originally an era started by an astronomer or astronomers of Mālwa which was afterwards accepted by the people. Another instance of an era invented by the astronomers and foisted upon the people is what is called the Śrī-Harsha era by Al Bīrūnī. It is exactly four hundred years prior to the era of Vikramādiṭṭya. Surely no king of the name of Harsha is known to have lived about 457 B.C. "His era" says he, "is used in Mathurā and the country of Kanōj. Between Śrī Harsha and Vikramādiṭṭya there is an interval of 400 years, as I have been told by some of the inhabitants of that region. However, in the Kashmirian calendar I have read that Śrī Harsha was 664 years later than Vikramādiṭṭya." The Arab historian ends this description by saying: "In face of this discrepancy I am in perfect uncertainty, which to the present moment has not yet been cleared up by any trustworthy information." The uncertainty, however, disappears the moment this Harsha is taken to be Harsha who was a contemporary of the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang, and was living 664 years after Vikrama (=607 A.D.) and onwards and whose era was invented in his honour by the astronomers of his court by antedating, by the round number of 400 years, the Vikrama Saṁvat, the earliest popular era of that time. Al Bīrūnī no doubt says that Śrī Harsha era was used in Mathurā and Kanauj. But not a single date has so far been verified as a year of this era, whether beginning from 457 B.C. or from 607 A.D., as has been so well pointed out by D.N. Mookerjee.²

¹ Sachau, *Alberuni's India*, p. 5.
² *NLA*, 1940, pp. 244 and ff.
THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

No. 1 : PLATE I

ALLAHĀBĀD STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF SAMUDRAGUPTA

This inscription appears to have been first brought to the notice of the public in 1834, when, in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. III, pp. 118 ff., were published a translation by Captain A. Troyer, Secretary of the Sanskrit College, and a transcript by Madhav Rao Pandit, Head Librarian of the same College, accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate vi), which was reduced by James Prinsep from a copy commenced by a brother of Lieutenant T. S. Burt, of the Engineers, finished by a Munshi, and revised by Lieutenant Burt himself. In the same volume, pp. 257 ff., the Revd. W. H. Mill, Principal of Bishop's College, who was then Vice-President of the Asiatic Society, working from the same lithograph, published a revised version of the text and translation, followed, at pp. 339 ff., by a supplementary paper containing the first genealogical tree of the dynasty. His version, however, though it was an improvement on that of Captain Troyer, still fell very far short of exhibiting the original completely or accurately: (1) in his misreading lines 11 and 21, in such a way as to introduce into the translation and genealogical tree, without any foundation whatever in the original, the independent princess Sainhāriki, with a daughter, name unknown, who was the wife of Samudragupta, (2) other mothers-in-law of the same king, and (3) a royal issue expected at the date of the inscription, and (4) in his treatment of line 30, where, instead of अङ्कशंपा इव भवो भादर = गयम = उच्छिन्दितः स्तम्भिः, “this lofty column (is) the raised arm of the earth, proclaiming as it were, (the fame of Samudragupta),” he read रेमा-चर्मानाह रावि-भवो भादर = गयम = उच्छिन्दितः स्तम्भिः, and translated “of this child of the Sun, though clothed in hairy flesh, this lofty pillar is the arm,” which led him to refer Samudragupta and his dynasty to the Solar race, a mistake that sometimes seems to have been not even yet completely eradicated. In 1837, in the same Journal, Vol. VI, pp. 969 ff., James Prinsep gave a fresh and much improved lithograph of the inscription and its alphabet (ibid., Plate iv), reduced from impressions on cloth and paper made by Captain Edward Smith, of the Engineers; and, with it, his own version of the text and translation. His rendering of the inscription still failed to represent the original with any real approach to accuracy and completeness. But it was a very great improvement on the two versions that had preceded it; especially in avoiding the leading mistake of Mill, pointed out above. In fact, it remained the best version for a long time, except that in 1872, in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. IX, pp. cxcvi ff., Bhau Daji notified, from a copy on cloth made by Bhagwanlal Indraj, some corrections in the historical part, in the names of the kings and countries conquered by Samudragupta. The whole of the inscription, thereafter, was systematically and almost accurately deciphered by J. F. Fleet from the original column and published in CII., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 1 ff. And to this English scholar goes the credit of first making the standard text of this epigraphic record ready for being handled for historical purposes by all scholars and antiquarians eager to understand and interpret Ancient India. Fleet’s transcript had been so well done that hardly any corrections in the reading were made by Bühler, when, two years later, he published a revised version of the same inscription in Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie, pp. 39 ff. and 88 ff. 2

1 [In dealing with this and the other inscriptions edited by the late J. F. Fleet in his CII., Vol. III, 1888, the late D. R. Bhandarkar has largely followed the introductory remarks of the former scholar.—Ed.]

The round monolith sandstone column, thirtyfive feet in height, on which this inscription is incised, cannot be later than the third century B.C., as is clear from the famous edicts of Aśoka on it. It now stands in a conspicuous position inside the Fort at Allahābād. It is doubtful, however, whether the column was originally erected at this place. As has been suggested by General Cunningham, it was first set up at the ancient Kauśāmbi, now represented by the village of Kūsam on the left bank of the Yamunā, about twenty-eight miles west by south from Allahābād; and, was still at that place when the present inscription was engraved. He further suggests that it was afterwards moved from there to Allahābād by one of the early Musalman kings of Delhi, perhaps Fīrūz Shāh, just as the two Aśoka columns now at Delhi are known to have been brought there by him from their original positions at Mērāth and in the Śiwalik hills. The point in favour of the former supposition is that the column contains a short Aśoka edict addressed to the Mahāmātrās of Kauśāmbi. The latter supposition seems unlikely, because, Delhi was the capital of Fīrūz Shāh, not Allahābād, which, on the other hand, was founded, or refounded, two centuries after it was taken by Akbar. It is more likely that this ruler removed the pillar from Kūsam to Allahābād,—an inference supported by the records of his favourite Birbal and of his son Jahāngir inscribed on it.

The writing, which covers a space of about 5' 8" broad by 5' 4" high, commences on the north of the column, towards the north-east, and in the longest part, line 30, runs all round the column, except for a space of about 1' 9". The bottom line is about 6' 0" above the point where the column starts from its present pedestal. There is a large crack in the column, from above the first word of the first line, and extending down to the beginning of the fourteenth. And the upper part of the inscription has suffered very much, partly from some of the mediaeval inscriptions, which are so abundant on the column, being engraved on and between the original lines here, and partly from the peeling off of the surface of the stone in several places. But nothing of historical nature appears to have been lost; except, perhaps, after the mention of Nāgasēna in line 13, and in connection with the mention of Pushapapura in line 14. A few letters, again, have been damaged or destroyed by the peeling off of the stone near the beginning of line 23, and in the centre of lines 23, 24, 31, and 32; but, except in line 32, the letters can be supplied without any doubt. The really important part of the inscription, the historical and genealogical passages commencing with line 19 and ending in line 30, is fortunately in a state of excellent preservation, and is decipherable without the slightest doubt from beginning to end. The size of the letters, by which is meant, here and throughout, the height of such letters as ch, d, p, m, b, v, etc., which are formed entirely within the limits of, so to speak, the lines of writing, without any projections above or below, varies from \( \frac{3}{16} \) to \( \frac{3}{8} \).

---

1 It is generally assumed that the pillars on which Aśoka's edicts are engraved were set up by him. It is, however, doubtful whether they were all so chiselled and put up in his time. Thus Pillar Edict VII ends with the following: "This Dhanma-itiṣṭa should be inscribed where stone pillars and stone tablets are found, so that it may endure." (D.R. Bhandarkar, Aśoka, 1932, p. 536. See also CIL, Vol. I, 1925, p. 137). Similarly about the close of the Rupnath Minor Rock Edict, Aśoka says: "Here and far off where there is any stone column, have it engraved on the stone column." (D. R. Bhandarkar, Aśoka, 1932, p. 370. See also CIL, Vol. I, 1925, p. 169). This seems to show that the pillars were already in existence and were well-known before his edicts were ordered to be inscribed on them.


4 CIL, Vol. I, 1925, pp. 159-60. Plate facing p. 159; see also in continuation of the end of line 10 of the present inscription in the plate which contains part of Aśoka's edict where the second word Kūsam [m] bījam is quite clear.

5 Ibid., Introduction, p. x.

6 [In this Volume, the measurements are given in feet and inches.—Ed.]
The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet. By 'Gupta alphabet' is meant, of course, the alphabet that was prevalent in Northern India from the beginning of the fourth to the middle of the sixth century A.D. The test letters of this variety are m, l, s, sh and h, and are met with in records from Allahabad eastwards including East Bengal, such as Nos. 8, 17, 22, 24, 26 and so forth. Thus, the curved bottom and the left hook are flattened into one elongated base of m of this eastern variety. Similarly, the left limb of l undergoes a change, and is turned sharply down. The letter s has a loop at the end of its left vertical line, instead of the usual curve or hook. The left limb of sh consists of a loop attached to the slanting central bar. About the letter h, Bühler says "The base stroke of ha is suppressed, and its hook is attached to the vertical and turned sharply to the left." These test letters of the eastern variety are of an entirely different nature from those found in Central India in such inscriptions as Nos. 2, 8, 11 and so on. As regards those found in the western part of the U.P., we notice a variable admixture of both, in such records as Nos. 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17 and so forth. It is, however, a mistake to suppose that this eastern variety originated in Eastern India. As was pointed out by us elsewhere, an inscription has been discovered at Mathurā dated in the 14th year of Kanishka's reign, which contains the typically eastern Gupta forms of the three letters m, s and h. It is possible to maintain that Kanishka of this record is Kanishka of the later Great Kusāna, or the Kusānaputra dynasty, who, most probably, originated the Kalachuri era. In that case, the date of the inscription becomes equivalent to 263 A.D. This brings the record sufficiently close to the time of the rise of the Gupta power. Again, we know of an inscription found at Gadhā (Jasdan) in Kathiawar of the time of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudrasena. It is dated 127 (or 126), and, as it is to be referred to the Śaka era, we obtain 205 A.D. (or 204 A.D.) as its equivalent in the Christian era. If we carefully examine the facsimile of this record published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XVI, (plate facing page 237), we find that the letters m and h are incised sometimes in the Eastern Indian, and sometimes in the Central Indian, variety of the Gupta alphabet. It is thus clear that these eastern forms of the letters were in existence as early as 205 A.D., the date of the Jasdan inscription, that is, certainly more than a century prior to the rise of the Gupta power. It would be the height of absurdity to call them Gupta characters at all, and, above all, to style them as the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet, when the Jasdan record is not only of the pre-Gupta period but is far removed to the south-west of Pāṭaliputra. Nevertheless, it cannot possibly be gainsaid that when the Gupta sovereignty was established, the five characters referred to above, namely, m, l, s, sh and h, became somehow the test letters of the alphabet prevalent in Eastern India and differentiated it from that of Central India, whereas in the western part of U.P. was perceptible a varying interchange of both the varieties so far as these five characters are concerned. We can therefore safely assert that the characters of this inscription represent the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet.

There are other palaeographic characteristics which are peculiar to this inscription. Thus, there are two letters, which, after the cave inscriptions period, lay for a long time in disuse.

---

1 Indian Palaeography, 1959, p. 65.
2 Ep. Ind., Vo. XXI, pp. 2 ff.
3 Ibid., Vol. XIX, pp. 96 ff. This may also be compared to the inscription figuring in Mahabodhi, Plate XXV where m, l, s and h are found to be typical of the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet. In the A. R. ASIF, 1922-23, p. 169, the date 64 of the record has been referred to the Gupta era. But we have said elsewhere (A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, p. 170, note 4), that although the characters resemble those of the Gupta period, the dating and language are in the Kusāna style and that it would be safer, therefore, to assign the date to the Kala-churi era.

4 [These eastern forms of m and h are found in the Mathurā inscription of Kanishka's 4th regnal year corresponding to 81-82 A.D. Cf. Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIV, pp. 9 ff. and plate.—Ed.]
in the southern alphabets, and were not revived for a considerable time after the present period; namely, the ḍ, as distinct from ḍ, exhibited in kṛṣṇā, line 14, Dāvāka, line 22, and vṛṣṭī, line 27; and the lingual dh, exhibited in virūḍha, line 18. On the other hand, in the ḍ which occurs in vyākṣa, line 8, Kaurālaka, line 19, Sāṁhala, line 23, and loṭā, lines 27 and 30, they include a letter which properly belongs exclusively to the southern alphabets and languages; and its occurrence here seems to furnish an unconscious piece of evidence to the effect that the conquests attributed to Samudragupta in the south of India were actual facts. In śabhā, line 18, Vishnugopa, line 19, and gā-tata, line 25, the vowel ō is formed in a rather peculiar way, which, so far as the right-hand stroke is concerned, is followed also in the vowel ə as attached to the same consonants, e.g., in jāsana, lines 23 and 24, and Gāṇgā, line 31. In respect of r in combination with a following y, we have to notice that, as in the case of other consonants, the ū is doubled and the r is written above the line, e.g., in virya, line 13; whereas, in a somewhat later development of this alphabet in Central India, it became the custom, as in the case of ə in conjunction with the other letters, to write the r on the line, with a single ə attached below it, e.g., in maryādaya, lines 6-7, and kuryā, line 12, of the Majhgawami plates of the Mahārāja Hastin. The characters also include, in the numbering of the verses, forms of the numerical symbols for 3, 4, and 8 only in the preserved portion of the inscription. It must have contained forms of the numerals 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 9, as well, which are lost to us.

The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in verse as far as the end of line 16, and the rest is in prose, except that in lines 30 and 31 there is one more verse thrown in. In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are (1) the doubling of k, in conjunction with a following r, e.g., in parakkrama, line 17, kṣṛṣ, lines 27 and 28, and vikrama, line 30; (2) the doubling of the consonant following r, as in taṭṭvāy PATHO-bhattachary, line 5, kṛṣṭi, line 6, utkarnita, line 7, and so forth; (3) the doubling of dh (by d as required by the rules) in conjunction with a following y and v, in addhyāya, line 16, and sāḍḍha-asāḍḍha, line 25; and (4) the use of the southern ḍ, in the instances pointed out above.

The inscription is non-sectarian, being devoted entirely to a recital of the glory, conquests, and descent of the Imperial Gupta king Samudragupta. It is not dated. Its great value lies in the abundant information which, in the conquests attributed to Samudragupta, it gives us as to the divisions of India, its tribes, and its kings, about the middle of the fourth century A.D. This, however, has received a detailed treatment in the historical chapters which form part of the Introduction to this volume. Fleet thinks that this record describes Samudragupta as deceased and that it must, therefore, belong to the time of his son and successor Chandro-gupta II and must have been engraved soon after the accession of the latter. He has gone even to the length of calling it “Allahabad Posthumous Stone Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta.” This view, however, is based on an erroneous interpretation of a passage in lines 29-30 as was pointed out soon after (1890) by no less a scholar than Bühler in his Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie, p. 32 ff. It has again been discussed and controverted in the Introduction to this volume. This record is of extreme importance for the history of Kāśya literature also, to which our attention was first drawn by Bühler. This subject also has received consideration at some length in the Introduction.

In connection with Samudragupta, there is mentioned in verse 7 (line 14), a city named Pushpa, which is spoken of in such a way as to indicate that it was his capital. Pushapura, Pushapauri and Kusumapura, all meaning ‘the town or city of flowers’, were names of Pāṭaliputra which is now represented by the modern Pāṭnā in Bihar, on the Ganges, but which

1 CII., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 107-08, Plate XIV.
2 See also A. A. Macdonell, A History of Sanskrit Literature, 1925, p. 320; A. B. Keith, A History of Sanskrit Literature, 1928, pp. 76-78, 300 and 332.
originally stood at the confluence of this river with the Śon, spread lengthwise along the bank of the latter, as is known to us from Megasthenes and Patañjali. This junction is now near the Cantonment of Dinapore, about twelve miles above Patna. But it is well-known that these rivers have changed their courses considerably during the many centuries that Patañliputra has fallen into ruins. It is also well-known that formerly the Śon joined the Ganges immediately below the modern town of Patna. The tradition of this junction is preserved among the villagers to the south-west of Patna, where they still point to an old channel called the mará or dead Śon. The antiquity of the name Kusumanipura, is vouched for by Hiuen Tsiang, who speaks of the city under both names, K’u-su-mo-pu-lo, or Keu-su-mo-pu-lo, which he also explains by the Chinese Hua-kung or Hua-kung, ‘flower-pancel’ and Hsiao-hu-kong-sh’ing, ‘city or royal precinct of the scented flowers; and Po-cl’ a-li-tsu-ch’ing, ‘the city of Patañliputra.’ He tells us that Kusumanipura was the more ancient name of the two. And, though this point cannot be proved, there is no reason to controvert that the synonym Pushpapura or Pushpapuri was in use in early days. As a matter of fact, both these forms are found in Danūḍin’s Daśakumāra-charita which “probably dates from the sixth century A.D.” The name Pushpapura occurs also in Viśākhadatta’s Mudrārakshasa which has been ascribed by some scholars to 800 A.D. and by some to 400 A.D. Kalidāsa also mentions Pushpapura as the capital of Magadha in the Raghuvamśa, and this poet, as we have seen above, was most probably a protegé of Samudragupta’s son, Chandragupta, also known as Vikramāditya. Pushpapura was thus certainly known as a synonym of Patañliputra even early in the Gupta period. Verse 7 of our inscription may, therefore, be taken as furnishing good grounds for locating Samudragupta’s capital at Patañliputra. Nevertheless, Fleet has drawn our attention to the following points which run contrary to this view: “(1) Until the time of Skandagupta, no inscriptions of this dynasty have been found anywhere in the neighbourhood of Patañliputra. (2) Though Patañliputra is mentioned, under its own proper name, in two of the inscriptions of Chandragupta II, yet neither of these passages connects the city with him, as his capital. And (3) Hiuen Tsiang mentions another ancient Kusumanipura,—for which the synonym Pushpapura would be equally acceptable,—far distant, and quite distinct, from Patañliputra. He tells us that the old capital of Kanyakubja, or Kanauj, was originally called Kusumanipura. And, though he is not absolutely specific on the point, yet the way in which he describes how the town came to be invested with the name of Kanyakubja seems to indicate that he understood Kusumanipura to be the ancient name of the very site, which, in his time, was called Kanyakubja. A capital here or anywhere in this neighbourhood, would be far more in accordance with the localities at which all the earlier inscriptions of the dynasty exist; and still more so with a selection of a column either at Allahabad or at Kausambi, to contain the record of the conquests of Samudragupta, by whom the power of the family was brought to maturity and was placed on an extensive footing.” Let us now consider, briefly, of course, the arguments urged by Fleet against the identification of Samudragupta’s Pushpa with Patañliputra. He says that Kusumanipura was another name also of Kanyakubja and that its synonym, Pushpa, which is mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription, had better be taken to denote this place rather than Patañliputra. And, in support of his first state-

---


5 Canto VI, verse 24.

ment he quotes the authority of Huen Tsiang. But the Chinese traveller does not say that Kusumapura was another name of Kanyakubja in his time but rather in some pre-historic period. Many instances of old towns bearing many names in pre-historic times are known, especially from the Pāli Buddhist jātakas. Thus Bārāṇaśi, we are told, was called Surundhana in the Udaya Birth, Sudassana in the Chullasatosaṇa, Brahmanavaddhana in the Sonandana, Pushabhuti in the Khandahala, and Ramma Citi in the Yuvaṇjaya Birth. This does not mean at all that Bārāṇaśi was known by all these names in historic times. We may, therefore, take it that Kanyakubja was never known as Kusumapura in any historic period and that Kusumapura or its synonym Pushapura was another name of Pāṭaliputra alone, so far as we know. The mention of Pushapā in the Allahābād pillar inscription thus points to the natural inference that Pāṭaliputra was the capital of Imperial Guptaś. Up till 1888 when Fleet brought out his volume on Gupta Inscriptions, it was no doubt true that all the records of this dynasty, not excluding those of the time of Skandagupta, were found far to the west of Pāṭaliputra, giving rise to the presumption that their capital was somewhere in the neighbourhood of Allahābād or Kauśāmbī where the inscription-pillar originally stood. But, since then many copper-plate inscriptions of the time of Kumāragupta I and Bodhagupta have been found which have been discovered equally far to the east of Pāṭaliputra in such distant districts of Bengal as Rajshahi and Dinajpur. So, the argument based on the find-spots of the Gupta epigraphs and urged against Pāṭaliputra being the capital of the Gupta empire has no grounds to stand upon. And, as a matter of fact, there are two inscriptions of Chandragupta II where Pāṭaliputra is mentioned, as pointed out by Fleet himself. One of these is the Gaḍhāva inscription of Gupta Year 88 (No. 8 below). It is true that this is a highly fragmentary record, and, consequently, although line 12 contains the name Pāṭaliputra, nothing has been preserved there which could have thrown light on this point. Such is not, however, the case with the other record, namely, the Udayagiri cave inscription (No. 11 below), which introduces to us Virāsena Śāha, Minister for Peace and War. He had come thither, we are told, along with his lord and master, Chandragupta II, in the course of the latter’s dig-vijaya; and while they were temporarily encamped there, he caused a cave to be made and dedicated to the god Śambhu. This is no doubt the Udayagiri cave where the record has been engraved. And it is while specifying details about this Virāsena that the inscription tells us that he was ‘an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra.’ ‘The natural inference is’, says Bühler correctly, ‘that the town was the capital of the empire.’

We have also to take note of two geographical divisions mentioned in this inscription, namely, Āryāvarta and Dakṣināpatha, which correspond roughly to Northern and Southern India. The name Pratyanta also occurs, but it is doubtful whether the Pratyanta States were then excluded from Āryāvarta. It is possible that geographically they were considered integral parts of this division though politically they were on the frontier of Samudragupta's empire. As regards Āryāvarta, Manu distinguishes it from Madhyadēśa. The latter denotes the land bounded by the Himalayas in the north, the Vindhyas in the south, Prayāga or Allahābād in the east, and Vinaśana, or the place where the Sarasvati disappears, in the west. And Āryāvarta is defined as the land between the Himalaya and the Vindhyas on the one hand, and between the eastern sea and the western sea, on the other. Āryāvarta is generally understood to mean “the abode of the noble or excellent ones,” and with this agrees one dictionary.

---


2 D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 50-51.


4 Manusmriti, Chapter II, Verses 21-22.
It has already been hinted that Patañjali borrowed his definition of Āryāvarta from one of the Dharmasūtras. As a matter of fact, the same definition occurs both in the Baudhāyana¹ and in the Vasishṭha² Dharmasūtras. And, as Patañjali sometimes quotes phrasology met with in the Baudhāyana,³ the inference is not unreasonable that he was indebted to this Dharmasūtra for his definition of Āryāvarta. We may, therefore, take it that from the time of Baudhāyana up till that of Patañjali, Āryāvarta was bounded on the west by Ādārśa, apparently a country situated between the Rāvi and the Beās, and on the east by Kālakā-vana or Kālakā-vana which corresponds to the modern Jhādkhand. Let us now see how far Āryāvarta had spread in the time of Samudragupta. The Allahābād pillar inscription, no doubt, speaks of Āryāvarta in connection with certain princes whom Samudragupta violently uprooted. But that does not mean that this province did not extend beyond the kingdom of the easternmost or westernmost prince specified in the list of these Āryāvarta rulers. Other kingdoms or countries mentioned there must be passed in review in this connection. Thus, among the tribes that acknowledged the political domination of Samudragupta are the Madrakas whose country with its capital Śākala (=Sialkot), as we have seen above,⁴ lay between the Rāvi and the Chenāb. It thus seems that in the time of Samudragupta, Āryāvarta had extended more westward, that is, gone beyond the Ādārśa country which was situated between the Rāvi and the Beās. Similarly, the political supremacy of this Gupta monarch had spread over such frontier provinces as Samatāta, Daśāka and Kāmarūpa of which the first was doubtless bordered by the sea on the east.⁵ It will thus be seen that Āryāvarta in the fourth century A.D. was much wider in extent than even in the time of Patañjali and corresponded rather to the Āryāvarta of the Manusmṛiti, according to which it was bounded on the east and the west by the seas.

The second territorial division that engages our attention is Dakṣināpatha. Originally it was with reference to the Middle Country (Madhyadēśa) that the terms Dakṣināpatha and Uttarāpatha seem to have been coined. What this Madhyadēśa was according to Manu, we have already seen, when we spoke of his definition of Āryāvarta. Madhyadēśa is not unknown to Buddhist literature also. It is there called Majhimaṇḍa. The only difference between the two was that the easternmost point, at any rate, of this Middle Country in Manu's time was Prayāga, whereas it had extended nearly 400 miles eastward when the Buddha lived and preached.⁶ It was in regard to this Madhyadēśa that the two territorial divisions, Dakṣināpatha and Uttarāpatha,⁷ came into vogue. The term Dakṣināpatha has been frequently used in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas.⁸ But that does not enable us to fix even approximately the time when this name first came into use, as these works have been recast more than once. In such a case we are helped more by the Pāli Buddhist, than by the Sanskrit Brahmanic, literature.⁹ One of the oldest Pāli works, the Suttanipāta, speaks of a Brāhmaṇa gṛha called Bāvarin as having left the Kōṣala country of his patron king, Pasenadi (Prasēnajit), and retired to a place on the Gōdāvari in the Assaka (Āśmaka) pro-

² B.S.S., No. XXIII, I, 8, p. 1.
³ Notice e.g., the phrases kumbhidhaṇī alātūpā of Baudhāyana (1, i, 5, p. 2) in his definition of the sīkṣas which occur also in Mahābhārata, Vol. III, VI, iii, 109, p. 174. See also JBBRAS., Vol. XVI, p. 335.
⁵ Ibid., p. 22.
⁶ D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 44.
⁷ Uttarāpatha and Dakṣināpatha denote literally 'Path or Road Northward and Southward.' But they are intended apparently to mean 'the Northern Region and the Southern Region.'
⁹ The author of the Periplus also speaks of Dakshinabadēs=Dakṣināpatha (Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII, p. 143), which shows that the name was popular in the first century A.D.
vince in Dakhināpatha (Dakshināpatha). The story tells us that Bāvarin sent his sixteen pupils to wait upon the Buddha; and the route has been described by which they traversed from their settlement in Asmaka. They first went to Paṭiṭṭhāna (Pratishṭhāna) of the Mūlaka country, then to Māhishmati, and so on. It will thus be seen that the Asmaka country and Bāvarin’s settlement on the Gōdāvari were to the south of Pratishṭhāna, or Paṭiṭṭhan in Aurangabad District, Maharashtra State, the principal town of the Mūlaka province. Dakshināpatha thus, in the Buddha’s time, stretched so far south as to contain not only Mūlaka but also Asmaka.

The same appears to be the case with the term Uttarāpatha. One Buddhist jātaka speaks of certain horse-dealers as having come from Uttarāpatha to Bārāṇasi or Vārāṇasi. Uttarāpatha cannot here signify Northern India, because Vārāṇasi itself is in Northern India. Evidently it denotes a country at least outside and to the north of the Kāśi kingdom whose capital was Vārāṇasi. As the horses of the dealers just referred to are called saṁdhava, it clearly indicates that they came from the banks of the Sindhu or the Indus. We have seen that according to Manu, the Sarasvati formed the western boundary of Madhyadēśa. It was thus with reference to the Middle country that the name Uttarāpatha also was devised. Up to the seventh century A.D., we find the term Uttarāpatha used in this sense. Thus, when Prabhākaravardhana, king of Sthānīvīvara, sent his son Rājyavardhana to invade the Hūna territory in the Himālayas, Bāṇa (c. 625 A.D.), author of the Harshacharita, represents him to have gone to Uttarāpatha. As the Hūna territory has thus been placed in Uttarāpatha, it is clear that Prabhākaravardhana’s kingdom was excluded from it. And as Sthānīvīvara, capital of Prabhākaravardhana, is Thanesar and is on this side of the Sarasvati, his kingdom is naturally presumed to be included in Madhyadēśa, with reference to which alone the Hūna territory seems to have been described as being in Uttarāpatha. Similarly, the poet Rājaśekhara (830-920 A.D.), in his Kātyānīmānas, places Uttarāpatha on the other side of Prithūdaka, which, we know, is Pehoa in the Karnal District, Haryana, that is, on the western border of the Middle Country. It is therefore clear that the terms Dakshināpatha and Uttarāpatha came into vogue only in regard to Madhyadēśa. It must, however, be borne in mind that although Uttarāpatha in Northern India denoted the country north of Madhyadēśa, in Southern India about the time of Bāṇa the term denoted Northern India. Thus Harshavardhana, Bāṇa’s patron, has been described in South Indian inscriptions as Sovereign of Uttarāpatha which must here signify North India.

There are many other localities and countries mentioned in the Allahābād pillar inscription, especially in connection with Dakshināpatha. These have been already dealt with above in the Introduction.

TEXT 7

[Metres: Verses 2, 3, 5 and 8 Sragdharā; verses 4 and 7 Śārdūlavikṛti; verse 6 Mandākrāntā and verse 9 Pṛithvī.]

1 [Yaḥ] kulyaiḥ svai. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
2 ya (?)syai(?) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

---

1 Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 4-5, 19 and 22.
2 Ibid., p. 46.
7 From estampages supplied by the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Northern Circle.
8 The first four lines of this inscription contain the first two of its stanzas. The letters that remain of the first do not suffice to determine what its metre was. But what remains of the second shows that it is in the Sragdhāra metre. [Most probably the metre of the first stanza is also Sragdhāra.—Ed.].
3 Pu(?i)rv. .......................... tra......
4 sphā(?i)u-dva(?i) .......................... kshaḥ sphuṭ-ōddhva[m*]sita......
........................................................................ pravatata. [7]
7 [Ā*]rya = [ai]²h = ity = upaguhyā³ bhāva-piśunā — utkarnitī rūmabhiḥ sabhyeṣh — ucechāhvasītenyū tulyakulajñ[ī] [1*] [1*] [1*]
8 sn[ē]ha-vyālulitēna bāṣhpa-gurunā tattv-ēkhiṇā chakshusā yāh pitr — abhihitō [n]i[r] [ks]h [n]i k[i] [ṃ] pāḥy = ēva[m*] = [u]rv[v] [l]m = i[t]i [1*] [4]
10 viryā-ōttaptāḥ = cha kēchch = chhaṇāṃ = upagatā yasya vṛttē praṇāmē = py = [ar][t][i][?] — — — — — — — — — — — — — — [1*] [5]
11 Sāmārāmekhā sva-bhujā-vijitā nityaṃ = ucechā-śakrāṛī bhvā-Śvō mānapā va — — — — — — — — — — — — — — [1*]
13 Udveλ-ōdita-bāhu-viryā-rabhasād = ēkēna yēna kṣanād = unmulyō — Ācchu[ta]-Nāgasēna-G — — — — — — — — — — — — — — [1*]
15 Dha[ṛmm]a-prāchira-bandhaḥ śaśī-kara-suchayaḥ kṛttayaḥ sa-pratāṇā vaidushyaṃ tattvā-bhēdi praṣāma — — — — — — [uku = y = k = mu (?)] t — — — — ārtthamaḥ fp] [1*]
19 Kausalaka-Mahēndra-Māḥ[a]kāntāraka — Vyāghraraṣa-Kauḷalaka⁴-Maṇṭa-

1 Read —kṣaya-śri-vīrīdhān.
2 Restore it to sikrishṭah. [Dr. V. Raghavan would restore it to viśāṭ (JOR, Vol. XVI, p. 160) while Dr. Sircar restores as viśāṭ (Sel. Isr., 1965, p. 263). —Ed.].
3 Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra, however, reads dhy — ch — ity — upagukṣa (IC, Vol. XIV, p. 143).
4 [Better read pāṭi triṃ — urviṃ — iti. See the article on Chandragupta's Abidation, Ibid., pp. 141 ff. —Ed.]
5 This is Bühler's reading which is preferable to Fleet's māṭ[ṇ] [?] sy[ṇ]d = cama[!]n[ṇ]ma[!] [?] — — — — [1*]
6 Restore it perhaps to Gāpāṇā = ṭīma samṛty — agatā. [Sircar would restore as Gāpāṭyā-āḍān = nṛpān saṅgarē (Sel. Isr., 1965, p. 264, note 1). —Ed.]
7 [Fleet reads māṭ. —Ed.].
8 Fleet corrects Kauralaka into Kairalaka, for which, he thinks, the word in the text is obviously a mistake. He, on doubt, says that 'it is easy to see how the engraver, or perhaps the writer from whose draft he engraved, formed kauralaka, by mistake for kairalaka, through a stroke on the right of the k in kai and of the ra.' One slip of stroke is intelligible, but not two, which are presupposed in the engraving of Kauralaka, wrongly for Kairalaka. It is true that Fleet also maintains that 'though kaurala occurs in the sense of a light bay horse with black legs,' it is not known as the name of a country or a city. But it has been pointed out (see above, Introduction, p. 15) that the Kaurāḍa can easily be identified with Kunāla of the Aihole inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, pp. 1 ff) and both with the modern Kollār (Collair) lake.
rāja-Paishātupuraka-Mahēndragiri-Kauṭṭāra-Svāmīdatta1-Airandapallaka-Damana-Kānchēyaka-Viṣṇugōpā-Avamukta-
20 Nilarāja-Vaingēyaka-Hastivarmma-Pālakkak-Ógrasēna-Daivarāṣṭraka-
Kubēra-Kausthupaluraka-Dhanājyaja-prabhṛiti-sarvva-Dakshinā-
patha-rāja-grahana-mōkshi-ñanugraha-janita-pratāp-ñoomiśa-māhābhāgyasya
21 Rudradēva-Matila-Nāgadatta-Chandravarmma-Ganapatināga-Nāgasēn-
Āchuyatanandi2-Balavarm-ādy-anēk-Āryāvartta-rāja-prasabhb-ōḍha-
raṇ-ōdvrita-prabhava-mahataba-parichārakikīrt-sarvva-ātavika-rājasya
22 Samataṭa-Ḍavāka-Kāmārūpa-Nēpāla-Kartṭipur-ādi-pratyaṇa-ñiqipatibhir-
Mmālav-Ārjunāyana-Yaudheya-Mādrak-Ābhīra-Prarjuna-Śanakā-
nika-Kāka-Kharaparik-ādibhiṣya-cha sarvva-karadān-ajñakaraṇa-panām-
agamana-
23 parīśhitā-prachandita-śansaysa anēkā-bhrajita-śāja-ōtsanna-rāja-vaṃśa-prati-
śīhāpan-ōdbhūtā-ñikihila-bh[āva]na-vi[cha] [ra]na-[sr]a[nta-yaśasah Daiva-
purtra-Sbhi-Sbhānushbhi-Śaka-Mūruḍāhī Saināhak-ādibhiṣya-cha sarvva-dvipa-
vāsibhir-aṭmanivēdana-kanyōpayaṇadāna-garutmadāna-svavyā-
vīṣāya3-bhukti-śa[sana]-[y]a[ncan]-āyupāya-svēk-vīrāya-prasara-
dharana-bandhasya prithivyām4-apratirathasya
25 sucharita-sat-ālāṅkṛit-ānēka-guṇa-gaṅ-ōṣkīti-bhīṣya-cha raṇa-ṭala-ṣaṃprāśaṅ-
naraṇapati-kirtṭēḥ sādhv-asādh-ūdaya-pralaya-hētu-purushasya-āchityasya

1 This is not an easy passage to deal with. Bhau Daji renders it by "Śvāmīdatta of Piṣṭapura, Mahēndragiri and Kuṭṭāra" (JBBRAS, Vol. IX, p. cxvii), where Kauṭṭāra is a mis-reading for Kauṭṭāra. But "this is not admissible" as Fleet correctly remarks, "because it would require mahēndragirika in the text, instead of mahēndragiri," as it actually exists. And, as a matter of fact, the passage has been translated by Bhagvanlal Indrājī thus: "Śvāmīdatta of Piṣṭapura Mahēndra-Giri and Auṭṭra" (BG., Vol. I, Part 1, p. 63). Even then this procedure is open to the objection that we should have had Mahēndragirika instead of Mahēndragirika. "If mahēndragiri is to be taken as one word and as denoting the mountains", it is possible, says Fleet, to render the passage by "Śvāmīdatta of Piṣṭapura and of Kauṭṭāra on Mahēndragiri." "And it might be supported by the fact that we have a Koṭṭūra on almost the same range of hills as to which the Mahēndragiri belongs; viz., the 'Kailasā-Koṭṭa and Kailāsa-Koṭṭur and seems to be a place of importance. But the objection to this interpretation is that none of the other kings' names, mentioned in this inscription, is coupled with more than one locality. "This leads us", remarks Fleet correctly, "to connect Śvāmīdatta with Koṭṭūra only, and to find the name of another king in connection with Piṣṭapura. The first inclination then might be, to divide the text thus, Piṣṭapuraka-Mahēndragiri-Kauṭṭā-
ra-Svāmīdattaka; and to translate, 'Mahēndragiri of Piṣṭapura and Svāmīdatta of Koṭṭūra.' It is a great pity that Fleet did not stick to his first inclination, and divided the words following Maṇṭārāja into Piṣṭapuraka-Mahē-
ndra and giri-Kauṭṭāra-Svāmīdatta and translated them as 'Mahēndra of Piṣṭapura, Svāmīdatta of Koṭṭūra on the hill'. The reason he specifies in support of this view is that 'though giri or gir is a very common termination of proper names in the present day, it is used only as a religious title, and affixed only to the names of Gōsāvīs; and even among them it would seem to be confined to one particular division of the Daśānāṁ-Gōsāyīs [see H. H. Wilson's Works (Rost's edition), Vol. I, p. 202; Molesworth, Marathi Dictionary, s. v. gir; and Monier Williams, Sanskrit Dictionary, s. v., giri]. I think, therefore, that, in the absence of any other analogous instance, it would in all probability be incorrect to accept it as a suitable termination for a king's name." Fleet's view, however, sets the rules of grammar completely at naught. The vṛddhi in Kauṭṭāra clearly shows that the word giri preceding it is to be connected with Mahēndra. If giri had really formed part of the name of the country whose ruler Śvāmīdatta was, we should have had Gārikā Kauṭṭāra instead of Girikauṭṭāra. Besides, it is not necessary to take giri here as a suffix similar to that of giri or gir of Gōsāvīs, as he has done. It is best to understand the whole of Mahēndragiri as the proper name of the ruler of Piṣṭapura. Instances are not unknown of names of sacred moun-
tains being adopted as individual names whether in ancient or modern times (see above, Introduction, p. 15).
2 Fleet and others take Achhya and Nandi as names of two different Āryāvarta rulers. But here, Nandi had better be taken as a surname of Achhya (see above, Introduction, pp. 10 and 20) like Nāga of Gaṇapati.
3 Read śivasya-
4 Read prithivyām —
bhakty-avanati-mātra-grāhya-mṛdu-hṛidayasya-ānukampāvatō-nēka-gō-
śata-sahasra-pradāyinaḥ
26 k[r]paṇa-dīn-ānāth-ātura-jan-ōḍdharana-sattva-1 diksh-ābhuyapagana2-manasaḥ
samiddhasya vighrahavatō lōk-ānugrahamasya Dhanada-Varun-Ēndr-Āntaka-
samsayā svā-bhuja-bala-vijit-ānēka-narapati-vibhava-pratyarpanā-nitya
-vyāprit-āyuktā-purushasya
27 niśita-vidagdha-mati-gāndharva-lajitair = vṛć[i]taka-tridaśapagituro-Tumburu-
Nāradādēr=vividvaj-jan-ōpa[j]y-ānēka-kāvyā-klriyābhī pratishthīta-kavi-
rāja-sabdasya suchira-stōtavyā-ānēk-ādbhut-ōdāra-charitasya
28 I[ō]ka-samaya-krāyā-ānuvidhāna-mātra-mānushasya lōkā-dharmnō devasya mahā-
rāja-srī-Gupta3-prapautrasya mahārāja-srī-Ghaṭōtkacha-pautrasya mahā-
rājādhirāja-srī-Chandragupta-purtasya

1 [Fleet reads māhātra in place of sattva. —Ed.]
2 Read -ābhuyapagata-.
3 It is possible to argue, as V.A. Smith once did (JASB, Vol. LIII, Part i, p. 119, and note), though he gave
up the view subsequently (EHI, 4th edition, 236, note 1), that the name here intended is Sṛgupta, and not Gupta.
Gupta, it may be contended, is a mere past participle meaning ‘protected’ and cannot stand as a proper name by
itself. Sṛgupta, on the other hand, signifies ‘protected by Śri (godness of prosperity),’ and can make a suitable
individual name. And, as a matter of fact, the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing, who was in India in the second half of
the seventh century, mentions ‘a great king’ (mahārāja), Sṛgupta, who lived about 500 years prior to him (JFRS,
N.S., Vol. XIII, p. 571; Ind. Ant., Vol. X, p. 110). In regard to the first of these arguments it has been pointed out
(see above, Introduction p. 2) that Gupta can stand very well as a proper name. Secondly, if the name of the
grand-father of Chandragupta I had been Sṛgupta and not Gupta, we should have had in this line, not
Sṛgupta, but sṛ-Śrīgupta; in other words, the honorific śrī would certainly have been prefixed to the individual
name Śrīgupta. Thus, as out of Gupta, we have the several instances as mahāśrayan śrī-Śrīmaityam=uttamaṇaḥ in
line 2 of the Deo-Baranark inscription of Jīvāgupta II (CII, Vol. III, 1888, Plate XXIX B); śrī-Śrīpathyayān puri,
in verse, in line 5 of the Bayāna inscription of V.S. 1100 (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, p. 10), and śrī-Śrīpathyayān, in prose,
in the Bayāna inscription of V. S. 1593 (Ibid., Vol. XV, p. 239). Similarly, we should have had in this record
mahārāja-śrī-Śrīgupta-prapautrasya, which wording, however, does not occur even once in any Gupta inscription.
The third argument which relates to the mention of an actual king called Śrīgupta by I-tsing has also been set
forth at length and disposed of (see above, Introduction p. 3), where it has been pointed out that this Śrīgupta
was at least one century prior in time to the grandfather of Chandragupta I and cannot, thus, be identified with
the latter. The question that now arises is whether the name Gupta here is a full name or an abbreviation of some
fuller original name. In this connection Fleet cites the authority of Bühler to show from Sanskrit literature that
shortening of names was in popular use in ancient India and was allowed even by the grammarian, Kātyāyana.
Thus, the latter’s cārtika 4 on Pāṇini VII, 3, 46 shows that in his time Dēvaka and Yajūkā were well-known
short forms of Dēvadatta and Yajñadatta. Similarly, Bühler correctly addsuces the instances of the popular shortening
of such common nouns as niyamabhi into nabhi, and, of such proper nouns as Satyabhāma into Satyā or
Bhāma. Likewise, Fleet on his own initiative cites many instances of such abbreviated names from inscriptions.
When he gives Vikrama and Mahēndra as short forms of Vikrāmaditya and Mahēndraditya—the titles of the
Gupta and other sovereigns—such a procedure is intelligible enough and cannot possibly be objected to. When,
however, he advert to the use of mere Samudra, Chandra and Kumāra for Samudragupta, Chandragupta II
and Kumāragupta I on the gold coins of these Gupta monarchs, his view may rightly be called in question,
because in these cases Gupta is a family name and not part of the proper name, as Fleet apparently supposes.
Thus, in Samudragupta, Chandragupta and Kumāragupta are full names of these sovereigns of which the first part,
namely, Samudra, Chandra or Kumāra, is a proper name, and the second part, namely, Gupta, is their family
name. Thus, when the father of Chandragupta I is named Ghaṭōtkacha, we can very well understand that in this
case his proper name alone has been mentioned without the clan name Gupta being affixed to it. But what about
Gupta? Is it the proper name or the family name? If we accept the former supposition, his full name becomes
Gupta-gupta which sounds very fanciful. On the other hand, it seems more natural to suppose that Gha-
ṭōtkacha’s father is here denoted by his family name alone. Instances of this nature are not unknown. Thus, above
the relieve figure of a prince in the celebrated Nāgārāja cave the following name is labelled: “the Kumāra Sātā-
vahana” (Löcher’s List, No. 1118). Now Sātvahana is known to be the name of a royal family ruling over the
Deccan. Nevertheless, a prince of this dynasty has been here mentioned, not by his individual, but family, name.
It is quite possible that the father of Ghaṭōtkacha has been similarly referred to in the Gupta records by his family
name only, apparently because he was a person of no importance. This point has already been dealt with (see
29 Lichchhavi-dauhitrasya mahādevyām Kumāradēvyām=upthannasya1 mahā-
rājñādhirāja-śri-Samudraguptasya sarvva-prithivi-vijaya-janit-ōdaya-vaśāpat-
nikhil-avantilām kirttim=itas=tridaśapati-
30 bhavana-gaman-āvāpta-lalitā-sukha-vicharanām=āchakshāna iva bhuvā bāhur=
ayam=uchchhritāḥ stambhāḥ [*] yasya 2 Pradāna-bhuja-vikrama-
praśama-śāstravāky-ōdayair=uparyuparī- sañcayah—ōchchhritam=anēka-
mārggaṁ yāṣaḥ [*]
31 punāti bhuvana-trayaṁ Paśupatē=jaṭ-āntar-guhā-nirūdhha-parimōkṣa-sīghram
=iva pāṇḍu Gāṅgāṁ [payah] [1 9] ētach=cha kāvyam=ēśām=ēva bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-nāṁ dasāya samipa-parisarpan-ānu-grahām-ōn-milita-match
32 Klādyatāpikaksya3 mahādaṇḍanāyaka-Dhruvabhbūti-putrasya sāndhivigrha-hika-
kumāramātya-ma[hādaṇḍanāyaka]ka-Hārīshēnasya sarvva-bhūta-hitasukhāy
=āstum [1 9]
33 Anūṣhīhitān cha paramabhaṭṭāraka-pāḍ-ānudhyātēna mahādaṇḍanāyaka-
 Tilabhaṭṭakēnā [1 9]

TRANSLATION

(Verse 3) Whose mind is surcharged with happiness in consequence of his association
with the wise, who is thus accustomed to retain4 the truth and purpose of (any) science . . .
fixed . . . upraised . . . who, removing impediments to the grace of good poetry through
the very injunction (ājñā) of (poetic) excellence (gupta) clustered together (gupta) by the
experts, enjoys, in the literate world, in an attractive fashion, sovereignty, in consequence
of fame for copious lucid poetry.5

(Verse 4) (Exclaiming) ‘Come, oh worthy (one)’, and embracing (him) with hair standing

---
1 Read =upthannasya.
2 [Dr. Sircar would restore the reading as Klādyatāpikā. S. I. A., 1965, p. 268, note 1.—Ed.].
3 Attention may be invited to Pāṇini II, 2, 15 ṣiṣyakābhīyath karuṇi. And, as bhūya here is part of the compound,
it has to be taken as ṣrīpratyaśa-ānta, denoting tāṭchāhīya.
4 The translation of this stanza by Fleet is anything but clear. Bühler renders it as follows: “The order of the possessor
(i.e., of Samudragupta) of the true meaning of the Śāstras whose heart is highly happy at the association
with the good,—multiplied as its power is, by the virtues of the wise—puts an end to the war between good poetry
and prosperity and thus enjoys, in the world of the learned, a far-extending sovereignty whose shining glory
endures in many poems.” (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLI, p. 177). The first half of Bühler’s translation also is vague, at any
rate, not sufficiently intelligible. In the second half he notices too an allusion to the well-known allegory
about the discord between the Muse of Poetry and the Goddess of Wealth; but it leaves the third and fourth
lines of this stanza utterly unconnected. He has failed to explain how Samudragupta has established kāṁsiṁma
on account of his own poetry, by removing the discord between Śrī and Sarasvatī in the case of other poets. [Dr.
V. Raghavan, who has discussed in detail this stanza as well as stanza 8 of this inscription, translates it as follows:
“Of him whose mind found its proper delight in giving itself up to the lady of Intellect and who was the master of
the soldiers called] the truths of śāstras, the celebrated and prolix Poesy (of that king), having excellent literary
productions as its treasury, having removed literary flaws by (following) the rules of the literary excellences
enumerated by the learned (critics), (having destroyed all opposition by the command of the six guṇas of statecraft
advocated by the wise counsellors), enjoys the kingdom of fame in the ‘wide’ world of scholars.” JOR., Vol. XVI,
p. 161. The verb bhūnakti in the original obviously stands for ‘enjoys’ as it has been translated by all. In that case,
the correct form should have been bhūnakti and not bhūnakti, according to Pāṇini I, 3, 66—bhūjāḥ=nawant.—Ed.].
on end and indicating (his) feeling, (his) father, perceiving (him) with the eye, overcome with affection, (and) laden with tears (of joy), (but) discerning the true state (of things) said to him 'so protect (thou) the whole earth', while he was being looked up with sad faces by others of equal birth, (but) while the courtiers were breathing cheerfully.¹

(Verse 5) Beholding whose many super-human actions, some felt the thrill of marvel and burst into horripilation, some relishing with feeling......, some afflicted with his prowess sought (whose) protection after performing obeisance;......

(Verse 6) (Whose enemies), whose offence was always great, being conquered by his arm in battles......day by day......pride......(develop) repentance with their minds filled with delight and expanding with much and evident pleasure and affection.

(Verse 7) By whom, with the imputctuousity of the prowess (of his) arm, which grew to overflowing, having singly and in a moment uprooted Achyuta and Nágáséna and [Gaṇapati]² come together in a battle (against him) thereafter, causing, indeed, the scion of the Kóta family to be captured by (his) forces, (while) amusing himself at (the city) named Pushpa, while the sun......the banks......

(Verse 8) (Being) the enclosing structure of Dharma (Sacred Law), (his) multifarious sprouting fame is as bright as the rays of the moon; (his) erudition pierces down to Truth......quiescence......, the course of (his) wise utterances is worthy of study; (his) again is poetry which outdistances the greatness of the genius of (other) poets. What excellence is there which does not belong to him? So has he alone become a fit subject of contemplation with the learned.³

(Lines 17-18) Of him (who) was skilful in engaging in hundreds of battles of various kinds, whose only ally was valour (parákrama) through the might of his own arm, and who

¹ For Bühler’s translation of this verse, see Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 176. “This verse,” says Fleet, “seems to indicate that Chandragupta I specially selected Samudragupta, from among several brothers, to conquer the land and to succeed him on the throne.” This means apparently that Samudragupta was selected by his father to ascend the Gupta throne in course of time after his death. This seems to be supported by what he says further, namely that “a clear indication of some such custom of selection is afforded by the epithet taś-parigrahitā, “accepted (as his favourite son and chosen successor) by him (Samudragupta),” which is always applied to Chandragupta II, in the genealogical passages; e.g., in lines 9-10 of his Mathurā inscription,” (No. 10 below, Plate X.). It is, however, very doubtful whether Fleet’s view is correct. The words nikhilam pāhāḥ = śvam = uvēṣm = ātvḥ “So do (thou) protect the whole earth,” are, in my opinion, a clear indication that Chandragupta I retired from the arduous life of a king and became a sāhāprastha by putting Samudragupta in charge of the urvi or earth which he had conquered and held (see above, Introduction, p. 8). Compare the last verse of the third canto of the Rāghuvamāśa. [In this connection, attention is invited to the article on Chandragupta’s Abdication in IC, Vol. XIV, pp. 141 ff. and the translation given there, on p. 146, which runs as follows: “with hair erect, indicating affection, when father embraced him, saying: ‘come, come!’ those present in the court felt exhilarated, while the rival claimants looked at him with sullen faces. Then his eyes laden with tears and sparkling with emotion, father cast a piercing glance at him and thus spake to him: ‘protect thou the whole earth!’”—Ed.].

² This is a translation of the restored part of line 13. Originally the name must have been Gaṇapa in this stanza. The name, however, is identical with Gaṇapati who, we know, was a Nāga prince of much power and influence. For the identification of this ruler and others mentioned along with him, and, above all, for the formation of the Nāga confederacy against Samudragupta, see above, Introduction, pp. 6-11.

³ Bühler translates the stanza as follows: “He alone is worthy of the thoughts of the learned! Because what excellence is there, which would not be his? He has made firm the barrier of law, his is the sprouting fame that shines purely like the rays of the moon, his the wisdom which pierces down to the truth, his the self-control........., his the poetic works which multiply the spiritual treasures of poets.” (Ind. Ant., Vol.XLII, p. 178).[Dr. V. RagHAVAN translates the stanza as follows: “Wide spread fame, pure as the rays of moon and having the fence of Dharma, piercing scholarship that comprehends the truth (of things and śāstras); study of the belles—lettres; and poesy which throws into shade the genius of (other) poets;—what excellence is there which is not in this king; he who is the one person who is (thus) contemplated upon by the learned.” JôR, Vol. XVI, p. 162.—Ed.].
(has thus) the epithet Parākrama, whose body was most charming, being covered over with the plenteous beauty of the marks of hundreds of promiscuous scars, caused by battle-axes, arrows, spikes (ṣaktu, spikes (ṣakti), barbed darts (prāsa), swords, iron clubs (tōmarā), javelins for throwing (bhindipāla), barbed arrows (nārācha), span-long arrows (vatālīka) and many other weapons.

(Lines 19-20) Whose magnanimity blended with valour was caused by (his) first capturing, all the kings of Dakshināpatha such as Mahēndra of Kōsāla, Vyāghrārāja of Mahākantāra, Maṇṭarāja of Kurāja, Mahēndragiri of Pīṣṭapura, Svāmīdatta of Kōṭṭūra, Damana of Ėraṇḍapalla, Vishnuśopa of Kāṅchi, Niṭarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Vēṇgi, Ugrāsēna of Pālakka, Kubēra of Dēvarāṣṭra, and Dhanaṇjaya of Kūsthalapura.

(Line 21) (Who) is great through the extraordinary valour, namely, the forcible extermination of many kings of Āryāvarta such as Rudradēva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Chandravarman, Gaṇapatiṇāga, Nāgāsena, Āchyuta-Nandin and Balavarman, who has made all the kings of the forest regions to become his servants.

(Lines 22-23) (Whose) formidable rule was propitiated with the payment of all tributes, execution of orders and visits (to his court) for obeisance by such frontier rulers as those of Samatāṇa Dāvāka, Kāmarūpa, Nēpāla, and Kārṭipura, and, by the Mālavas, Ārjunāyanas, Yauḍhēyas, Mādrakas, Ābhīras, Prārjuna, Sanakānikas, Kākas, Kharaparikas and other (tribes).

(Line 23) (Whose) fame has tired itself with a journey over the whole world caused by the restoration of many fallen kingdoms and overthrown royal families.

(Lines 23-24) The unimpeded flow (prasara) of the prowess of (whose) arm (was arrested) by an earth embankment (dharaṇi-bandha) put up by means of service through such measures

---

1 The word anka in Parākram-āka is synonymous with lāṅkhaṇa (epithet) as in Śrīkaṇṭha-pada lāṅkhaṇa occurring in the description of Bhavabhūti about the beginning of all his dramas. One commentator, Ghanasītara, explains the term either as vyakshēna (nickname), anka (epithet) or bhiruda (laudatory appellation), and, in support of his position, quotes lāṅkhaham vyakshēnā-āka-bhirudēkhu iti Rudra-Kēṭavau. This suits here excellently so that we can safely take this passage to mean that Parākrama was an epithet of Samudragupta. In fact, we find this appellation given to him on some of his coins (Allan, Catalogue of Indian Coins—Gupta Dynasties, 1914, pp. 1-5; Smith, Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Vol. I, p. 102).

2 In regard to vatīṣṭika Fleet says: "The word is not explained in the dictionaries. It must be a derivative from viṣāsti, a long span, measured by the extended thumb and little finger." Nevertheless, the St. Petersburg Dictionary explains the word by "a span-long (arrow)" and cites some references to it from the Mahābhārata (BORT, critical edition), Drōna-Parvan, Chapter 98, verse 50, p. 540 and has the following: "those, indeed, are the arrows of the span measure and used in close fight."

3 The expression -grihiṇa-māksa-muṅgraha- of the text may apply be compared to the phrase grihiṇa-prati-mukteṣaṇa used by Kāliśa in the Rāgaharsha (IV, 43) to show that Raghu was a righteous conqueror (dharam-ujyaj). See above, Introduction, p. 33.

4 Notice that the name of every country in Dakshiṇāpatha is marked with nyādhī in the first vowel and ends with the suffix ka. To take one instance, Kauśalaka is formed as follows: Kauśalānāṁ rājā Kauśalō (Pāṇini, IV, 1, 168); and then anukamataḥ Kauśalāḥ Kauśalekāḥ (Pāṇini, V, 3, 76) which accords with māksa-muṅgrahā of the text excellently; otherwise Pāṇini V, 3, 74 may be made applicable. For the identification of the names of kings and countries included in Dakshiṇāpatha see above, Introduction pp. 12-20.

5 For the identification of some of these Āryāvarta rulers, see above, Introduction, pp. 20-21.

6 Some of the frontier countries and tribes mentioned here will be found identified above, see Introduction, p. 22.

7 This passage has been translated by Fleet as follows: "whose binding together of the (whole) world, by means of the amplitude of the vigour of (his) arm, was effected by the acts of respectful service, such as......." Bühlner renders it by "the mighty bravery of his arm which held the whole earth in bondage, received homage from the inhabitants of all countries, in various ways, such as.......

(Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 178). Both the scholars have misunderstood the meaning of the phrase dharaṇi-bandha. The prowess of Samudragupta's arm was as unimpeded (contd. on p. 218)
as self-surrender, offering (their own) daughters in marriage and a request for the administration of their own districts and provinces through the Garuda badge,\(^1\) by the Dēvaputra-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhi and the Śaka lords\(^2\) and by (rulers) occupying all Island countries, such as Sirinvala and others.

(Lines 24-26) He was without an antagonist on earth;\(^3\) he, by the overflowing of the multitude of (his) many good qualities adorned by hundreds of good actions, has wiped off the fame of other kings with the soles of (his) feet; (he is) Purusha (Supreme Being), being the cause of the prosperity of the good and the destruction of the bad\(^4\) (he is) incomprehensible;\(^5\) (he is) one whose tender heart can be captured only by devotion and humility; (he is) possessed of compassion; (he is) the giver of many hundred-thousands of cows; (his) mind has received ceremonial initiation for the uplift of the miserable, the poor, the forlorn and the suffering; (he is) resplendent and embodied kindness to mankind; (he is) equal to (the gods) Kubera, Varuṇa, Indra and Yama; (his) Āyukta officers are always engaged upon restoring wealth (titles, territories, etc.) to the many kings conquered by the might of his arms.

(Lines 27-28) (He) has put to shame Brihaspati\(^6\) by (his) sharp and polished intellect, as also Tumburu, Nārada and others by the graces of his musical performances;\(^7\) (his) title of ‘King of Poets’\(^8\) has been established through (his) many compositions in poetry which were a means of subsistence to the learned people;\(^9\) (his) many wonderful and noble deeds are fit to be praised for a very long time; (he is) a human being, only as far as he performs the rites and conventions of the world, (otherwise he is) God whose residence is (this) world.

(Lines 28-30) This lofty\(^10\) column, (is) the raised arm of the earth, proclaiming as it were,

---

\(^{1}\) Fleet’s rendering of this passage is: “offering themselves as sacrifices, bringing presents of maidens, (giving) Garuda-tokens, (surrendering) the enjoyment of their own territories, soliciting (his) commands, etc., (rendered) by………. “ Bühler’s translation is: “causing themselves to be presented to him, offering daughters and other presents, and requesting him for a decree with the Garuda seal for the possession of their country” (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 178). For a full explanation of the different parts of this passage, see above Introduction, pp. 26-30.

\(^{2}\) The words garutmadāsī, sāsana, vishaya and bhukti in the original seem to be technical terms, the first two standing for ‘Garuda Seal’ and ‘copper charter’ respectively and the latter two for territorial units ‘district’ and ‘division’ respectively. See the article on Seals of Ancient India in The Indian Archivists, Vol. XIV, p. 41. —Ed.]

\(^{3}\) Who these foreign contemporary monarchs were has been discussed above, see Introduction, pp. 26-30.

\(^{4}\) [Or, say Apratiratha, God Vishnu Himself, on earth. JNSI., Vol. IX, pp. 137 ff.; Nāgari Prachāra Pātikā (N.S.), Year 54, (Satvath 2006), pp. 1 ff.—Ed.]

\(^{5}\) [Another significant allusion to Samudragupta being God Vishnu on earth: purśaṇva śaṅkākhyā vinsītyac ha dāshkhyā (Bhāgavatīgīta, Chapter IV, verse 8). For an elaborate discussion see Nāgari Prachāra Pātikā, op. cit.—Ed.]

\(^{6}\) [Allusion is again to Samudragupta being an incarnation of Achintya, God Vishnu. Ibid.—Ed.]

\(^{7}\) See above, Introduction, pp. 43-5.

\(^{8}\) Ibid.

\(^{9}\) Ibid.

\(^{10}\) [This rendering has been objected to by Prof. Jagan Nath Agrawal who would translate as—which were ‘fit to serve as the sources of inspiration for the learned.’ See the Bhārata Vīdyā, Vol. IX (The Munshi Diamond Jubilee Commemoration Volume), Part I, p. 277. This accords well. We may thus take the word upajītya of the original as standing for ‘model’. —Ed.]

\(^{11}\) It is possible to propose an alternative translation which will be something like this—“This column has been erected as an arm of the earth” etc. But this presupposes that the pillar had fallen and was set up again in the time of Samudragupta. Here is what Prinsejop thinks: “That it was overthrown, some time after its first erection…… by order of the great Asoka in the third century before Christ, is proved by the longitudinal or random insertion of several names………. in a character intermediate between” those of the Aśoka and the Gupta inscriptions.

(contd. on p. 219)
that the fame having pervaded the entire surface of the world with (its) rise caused by the conquest of the whole earth, has acquired an easy and graceful movement\(^1\) in that it has re-
paired from here (i.e. from this world) to the abode of (Indra)\(^2\) the lord of the gods—(the fame) of that prosperous\(^8\) Samudragupta the Maharājādhirāja,\(^4\) son of the prosperous Chandragupta (I), the Maharājādhirāja, born of the Mahādevi\(^5\) Kumāradēvi, (and)

Of one of these names, he remarks—"Now it would have been exceedingly inconvenient if not impossible to have cut the name, \ldots \ldots , up and down at right angles to the other writing, while the pillar was erect, to say nothing of the place being cut off reach, unless a scaffold were erected on purpose, which would hardly be the case since the object of an ambitious visitor would be defeated by placing his name out of sight and in an unreadable position" (\textit{JASB.}, Vol. VI, p. 967 f.). "But this particular name," says Fleet, "with several of the others referred to by him, is in characters that are certainly of considerably later date than the Gupta inscription; and none of the names are in characters that are any earlier than the inscription." Nevertheless, there are some letters which look earlier than those of the Gupta period. See e.g., the three characters which are engraved between lines 6 and 7 just at the beginning of these lines which are clear even in Plate I of Fleet's volume and which are symbols for integers. The first is clearly 20 and the second 7. The third is somewhat indistinct. And they apparently belong to the Kshatrāra or Kusāna period. Nevertheless, I agree with Fleet in adopting a translation that does not bind us to either view."

\(^1\) Bühler takes \textit{vichara} in the sense of 'path' and observes that "the synonyms \textit{charaṇa}, \textit{gamana} and \textit{yāna} are given in this sense in the Petersberg lexicon" (\textit{Ind. Ant.}, Vol. XLII, p. 174). But it is very doubtful whether any one of these words with the preposition \textit{ei} can signify 'a path.' Secondly, if the primary sense of \textit{vicharaṇa}, 'free movement, ramble' can fit here, it is unnecessary to go in for the secondary one.

\(^2\) It is clear from this translation that what has gone to the abode of Indra is, not Samudragupta, as Fleet gratuitously assumes, but his Fame. This Fame, having already pervaded this world, had perforce to ascend to heaven to attain further scope. This is a poetic fancy often indulged in by Sanskrit poets. See, \textit{Introduction}, p. 12.

Fleet translates this passage thus: "This lofty column (\textit{būma}) as it were an arm of the earth, proclaiming the fame, —which, having pervaded the entire surface of the earth with (its) development that was caused by (his) conquest of the whole world, (has departed) hence (and now) experiences the sweet happiness attained by (his) having gone to the abode of (Indra) the lord of the gods, etc. The points where he has gone wrong are: (1) the addition of (\textit{has departed}), and (\textit{and now}), (2) the rendering of \textit{vicharaṇa} by 'experiences,' and, above all, the insertion of (\textit{his}), that is, of Samudragupta, before 'having gone.' Bühler's translation is as follows: "This high pillar is, as it were, the arm of the earth raised up, which announces that the fame of Samudragupta, the illustrious lord of great kings, greatly augmented through the conquest of the whole earth, filled the whole surface of the earth, and found a happy path in that it wandered from this world to the palace of the lord of gods." (\textit{Ind. Ant.}, Vol. XLIII, p. 173). This rendering is a great improvement upon that of Fleet. Bühler is quite right in suggesting that the word \textit{uchchhrito} goes not only with the pillar but also with the arm of the Earth. He is, however, wrong in taking \textit{vicharanya} in the sense of 'path.' It is true that \textit{charaṇa} like its synonyms \textit{gamana} and \textit{yāna} has this sense as we find it in the Petersberg lexicon, but none of these words with the preposition \textit{ei} is given in that sense in any lexicon or is known to possess it.

\(^3\) \textit{Śrī}, 'auspiciousness, glory, prosperity,' and \textit{irimāt}, 'possessed of auspiciousness, glory, prosperity,' are frequently used as honorific prefixes to the names of deities, sacred works, holy men, eminent persons or well-known places, and have to be rendered accordingly. They can thus be safely rendered 'holy' in the case of gods, 'saintly,' of priests, teachers, etc., 'famous' of towns, and so forth. It is doubtful whether Fleet is correct in translating the word by 'glorious' in the case of paramount sovereigns and their wives, and 'illustrious,' of feudatories. It is best to designate them all by either 'glorious' or 'prosperous' without any invidious distinction such as never was intended in the case of rulers by the mere use of this honorific prefix. There is no such rule as that of using \textit{Śrī} before a consonant and \textit{irimāt} before a vowel, as Fleet thinks, for we meet with expressions not only like \textit{Śrī-Adīpaseṇavāra} as in Mandal Hill Rock Inscription (\textit{GIF}, Vol. III, 1868, No. 45, p. 212, line 1), but also like \textit{Śrīmāt-Svagayaśeśadhāva} \ldots \ldots \textit{Irīmāt-Vaḷlabhanurāravikāva} (\textit{Int. Ant.}, Vol. XII, p. 251, line 38.) as Fleet himself has pointed out. Nor can it be suggested that only \textit{Śrī}, not \textit{Irīmāt}, is used in the case of paramount sovereigns. Such a suggestion has been ably controverted by Fleet with a number of instances to the contrary.

\(^4\) Fleet takes it as equivalent to \textit{Mahārājādhirāja} and renders it by 'supreme king of Mahārājas.' It had better be understood to mean \textit{Mahā-rājādhirāja}, "the great over-king of kings." For the political significance denoted by this title, see above, \textit{Introduction}, p. 2.

\(^5\) Mahādevī seems to have been here used as the title of a wife of a paramount sovereign. It is curious that while derivatives of \textit{rājan} such as \textit{Mahārāja} and \textit{Mahārājādhirāja} have been coined as titles of supreme rulers, neither \textit{rājī} nor its derivatives, but \textit{Mahādevī} is employed to denote their queen-consorts. The term \textit{rājī} was certainly in existence during this period, but signified 'the wife of a ruler (rājan)' and was not used as a title. Hence we find (contd. on p. 220)
daughter's son of the Lichchhavi, son's son of the prosperous Ghaṭotkacha, the Mahārāja and the son of the son's son of the prosperous Gupta, the Mahārāja. Whose

(Verse 9) fame, ever ascending higher and higher masses, and travelling by many paths, (namely) by liberality, prowess of arm, sobriety and utterance of scriptural texts, purifies the three worlds, like the white water of the (holy river) Gaṅgā, dashing forth rapidly when liberated from the confinement in the inner hollow of the matted hair of Paśupati, (which rises up in ever higher and higher masses and flows through many paths).³

(Lines 31-32) And may this poet, composition (kavya) of Harisheṇa, the servant of the very same venerable Bhavaṇaka, whose mind has been enlightened through the favour of dwelling near him, who is the Śandhivigrhaṅka, Kumārāṇāya (and) Mahādānaṇāyaka, (and who is) a native of Khāḍyaṭāpāka, and son of the Mahādānaṇāyaka Dhruvabhūti, lead to the welfare and happiness of all beings!

(Lines 33) and (it) was executed by the Mahādānaṇāyaka Tilabhāṭṭaka who meditates on the feet of the Paramabhāṭṭaka.

No 2 : PLATE II

ĪRĀṆ STONE INSCRIPTION OF SAMUDRAGUPTA

This inscription was first brought to notice by Alexander Cunningham in 1880, in the Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. X, p. 89, from which it seems that he discovered it in 1874-75 or 1876-77, when, as Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India, he

both the terms rājī and Mahādānaṇāyaka used in conjunction with the name of the wife of a paramount sovereign, compare, e.g. Paramabhāṭṭakāra-rājī-Mahādānaṇāyaka-Koṅgadevi of the Mandar Hill rock inscription of Āṣītivasēna (CII., Vol. III, 1888, p. 212). In the later part of the Gupta period, however, Mahādānaṇāyaka was applied even to the wives of Mahārāja, e.g., throughout the Kārītalā grant of Jayanātha (Ibid., p. 118).

³ Note the spelling of the tribal name here; it is Li-uchiha-vi. Elsewhere, e.g., in line 3 of the Bhitari pillar inscription of Skandagupta (No. 31 below), it is Li-uchiha-vi, where the vowel in the second syllable is i instead of a.

² From the Gupta period onwards Mahārāja was applied only to feudatories, not to paramount sovereigns. See above, Introduction, p. 2.

³ Bühler translates this stanza as follows: “And the glory of this (ruler), which rises up in layers one above the other, through his generosity, his bravery of the arm, his self-control, and his perfection in the science of letters and which follows more than one path, purifies the three worlds, like the white waters of the Gaṅgā, which rises up in ever higher floods, follows more than one path, and dashes forth rapidly, freed as it is from the imprisonment in the inner hollow of the braid of hair of Paśupati.” (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 173).

⁴ Fleet renders it by “the slave of these same feet of the Bhāṭṭāraka” and Bühler by “the slave of the feet of this same lord” (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 172). Both these scholars seem to have forgotten that the plural of pāda is often added to proper names or titles in token of respect. In such cases pāda cannot be translated by “the feet (of).” If the latter sense had been intended, we should have had, not bhāṭṭāraka-pādaṇāṁ but bhāṭṭāraka-pādayāḥ. In the very next line, Tilabhāṭṭaka, who was entrusted with the engraving of the record, speaks of the king as Paramabhāṭṭakāra which is practically equivalent to Bhāṭṭāraka-pādaḥ of Harisheṇa. But who is intended by Bhāṭṭāraka-pādaḥ? Fleet thinks that he was not Samudragupta but his son and successor Chandragupta II. But the word ēva in ēvaṁ ēvaṁ which immediately precedes Bhāṭṭāraka-pādaṇāṁ clearly shows that it must denote the king who has been the subject of the panegyric up till the inditing of the colophon by Harisheṇa. This king, of course, is Samudragupta, as Bühler also understood him to be. Fleet has correctly pointed out that whereas mere Bhāṭṭāraka has been applied to feudatory Mahārājas, Paramabhāṭṭakāra is coupled with Mahārājadhirāja in the Gupta epoch.

¹ [See above, page 215 note 3, according to which the meaning would be of the superintendents of the royal kitchen.]—Ed.

⁶ [Can this name Tilabhāṭṭaka be an error for Tilaḥbāṭṭa?—Ed.]
undertook tours in Bundelkhand and Madhya Pradesh. It was, however, edited critically for the first time by J. F. Fleet in *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 18 ff. The text of it was thereafter annotated first by K. P. Jayaswal in the *History of India* 150 A.D. to 350 A.D., pp. 140 ff. and afterwards by Dasaratha Sharma in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XIV, pp. 27 ff., and then by Prof. Jagannath, in the same journal.¹

Éran, the ancient Airikina, is a village on the left bank of Bina, eleven miles to the west by north from Khurā, the chief town of the Khurā Tahsil of the Sagar District in Madhya Pradesh. The inscription is on a red-sandstone squared block, that was found a short distance to the west of the well-known ruined temple of Varāha, the Boar incarnation of Vishnu, in which there is the inscription of Toramāna.² The original stone is now in the Indian Museum at Calcutta.

The writing, which covers the entire front of the stone, about 9-½” broad by 3-½” high, is in a state of fairly good preservation; but it does not give a very clear lithograph, in consequence of the whole surface of the stone being full of holes more or less large. It is only a fragment; six entire lines, as shown by the numbering of the verses, have been broken away and lost at the top of the stone, and an indefinite number at the bottom; and also an entire pāda of each successive verse has been broken away and lost at the commencement of lines 25 ff. In addition to this, from one to three letters have been destroyed at the commencement of each extant line, as far as line 24, by whetting tools on the edge of the stone. As far as line 24, each line contains one pāda of a verse; but the lines that follow contained originally two pādas each; this shows that the inscription was of an irregular shape, with probably some sculptures on the proper right side of the stone above the first halves of lines 24 ff. The average size of the letters is about 6”. As is indicated especially by the form of m, the characters belong to the southern class of alphabets. They include, in the numbering of the verses, forms of the numerical symbols for 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The language is Sanskrit. And the inscription is written in verse throughout, and the stanzas numbered by figures. In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are (1) the use of the guttural nasal, instead of the anusvāra, before h, in parihṛshāna(pa), line 26; and (2) the doubling of k and ḷh, in conjunction with a following r, in vikrama, line 13 and parākkrama, lines 17 and 21; and in adhikrama, line 12.

The inscription is one of the Imperial Gupta king Samudragupta, whose name is recorded in line 10. Whether any of his ancestors were mentioned in the lines preceding it, we do not know, as lines 1-6 have been completely destroyed. Lines 25 onwards record the object of the inscription and refer to something that was erected at Airikina, i.e., Éran. And lines 11-24 contain the description of the prowess, etc., of a king who can be no other than Samudragupta as the name of no other prince is found in any one of these intervening lines. We have, therefore, to take it that it was this Gupta monarch that was responsible for the erection of something referred to in the inscription. Judging from its shape and appearance, the stone was originally an integral part of some temple. And Cunningham has suggested that “if it was attached to any of the existing ruins, the most probable would be the old temple of the colossal Vishnu, with its massive capitals and mouldings, which were discarded at a later date for pillars of a more highly ornamented style.”³ And the lacunae of lines 26-27 can be easily filled so as to give this result, as may be seen from notes on page 222 (of the Text).⁴ The date of the inscription, if any was recorded, is broken away and lost.

⁴ See also note 1 on page 224 (of the Translation), below.
TEXT

(Metre: Vasantatilakā throughout)

(Lines 1 to 6, containing the whole of the first verse and the first half of the second, are entirely broken away and lost.)

7 [---]² suvarṇa-dānē
8 [---] rita³ nṛpatayah⁴ Pṛthu-Rāghav-ādyāḥ [ii*] 2
9 [---]³ babhūva Dhanad-Āntaka-tushti-kāpa-tulyaḥ⁶
10 [---] ma-nayēna⁷ Samudraguptaḥ [i*]
11 [---] pṛththiva-gaṇas-saṅkalaḥ pṛthivyām
12 [---]⁸ [sva]-rājya-vibhava-[ddh]rutam-āsthito-bhūt [ii*] 3
13 [---] [va]¹⁰ [bha]kti-naya-vikkramā-tōṣhītēna
14 [yō] rājā-sabda-vibhavair-abhishēchan-ādyaiḥ [i*]
15 [---] nītāḥ¹¹ parama-tushti-puraskṛtēna
16 [---] vō¹² nṛpatir=aprātivārya-virīyaḥ [ii*] 4
17 [---] sya¹³ paurusha-parākkrama-datta-śulκā
18 [Hasty-a]sva-ratna-dhana-dhānya-samṛiddhi-yuktā [i*]
19 [---] Jñ¹⁴=grīhēṣhu muditā bahu-putra-pautra-
20 [sa?]ākrāmiṇī kula-vadhūḥ vratini¹⁵ nivīṣṭā [ii*] 5
21 [Yasya=ō]rijitaṁ samara-karmma-parākkram-śeddham
22 [---]¹⁶ [ya]śaḥ su-vipulam=paribambhamīti [i*]
23 [---] yasya ripavaś=cha ran-ōrijitaṁ
24 [sval]pn-āntarēśhv=api vichintya paritrara[n]ti [ii*] 6
25 [---]¹⁸ [-]pta[?]h¹⁹ sva-bhōga-nagar-Airikīṇa-pradēśē
26 [---]¹⁹ [sa]nsth]āpitas=sva-yāsasah paribhrūhan-[i*]
27 [---] vō nṛpatir=āha yadā [---] [i*]

---

¹ From the original stone.
² The lacuna may possibly be filled up with yēn=ārūdh-kalpa-viṣapēna.
³ Restore it to sarvārṣṭa.
⁴ The letter ta in this word was first omitted by the engraver who later inserted it faintly and in a smaller size below the line at its proper place.
⁵ Restore it to rōjā.
⁶ With the exception of lines 9 and 10, the other lines of this inscription, as far as line 24, contain exactly a pāda of each verse. Lines 25 ff. contained exactly two pādas of each verse.
⁷ This may be restored to [sād-āgama]. Dr. Sircar restores as parākrama (Solv. Ins., 1965, p. 269).
⁸ Restore it to ājñābya. Dr. Sircar restores as yārī prāya (ibid.).
⁹ Restore it to yēna. Dr. Sircar restores as parvante (ibid.).
¹⁰ Restore it to pētī=ācāra. Dr. Sircar restores as iśṭēna (ibid.).
¹¹ Restore it to saṁmānīlaḥ.
¹² This may be restored to [ Bhā-vōn]aṇḍa. Dr. Sircar restores as sō=yarī dhruvō (ibid.).
¹³ Restore it to śrīv=āsya. Dr. Sircar restores as Daśāsya (ibid.).
¹⁴ Restore it to nīyēnā=
¹⁵ Read kula-vadhūḥ=vratini.
¹⁶ This may be restored to šukram or śuklam. Dr. Sircar restores as Prithivyāṁ (ibid.).
¹⁷ Restore it to [karma]jī. Dr. Sircar restores as kūrūṇā (ibid.).
¹⁸ This may perhaps be restored to bhaktīṁ nīkaśayāṁ=ācīyantōṣad-pāda-jiṣṭe.
¹⁹ Restore it to prājāḥ.
²⁰ This may perhaps be restored to dvar-ālayas=cha kṛitin=ātra jānārdanaṇaṇa.
²¹ Read paribhrūhan-.
ÉRĀṆ STONE INSCRIPTION OF SAMUDRAGUPTA

G. S. Gai

From photograph
TRANSLATION

(Lines 1 to 6, containing the whole of the first verse and the first half of the second, are entirely broken away and lost.)

(Verse 2) ............... in the giving of gold ............ (by whom) Prithu, Rāghava and other kings (were outdistanced.)

(Verse 3) ............... there was (a king), Samudragupta, who was equal to (the gods) Dhanada and Antaka in joy and wrath\(^1\) (respectively), through (his excellent knowledge and) policy; (and) (by whom) the whole tribe of kings upon the earth was (through mere mandate) set up firm with their own sovereignty and wealth.

(Verse 4) (Who) became a king of irresistible prowess,\(^2\) (Indra on earth), being (honoured) with the title and glories of a king, consecration by besprinkling, etc., surely by (his father), urged by supreme joy, being satisfied with (his) devotion, policy and valour.

(Verse 5) (The Goddess of Wealth), whose purchase price was provided by his manliness and prowess, who was possessed of an abundance of (elephants), horses, gems, money and grains, who passed over to (his) many sons and grandsons, settled down in (his) family, being (always) contented, as a wife of good birth, observing the vow (of chastity);\(^3\)

(Verse 6) Whose deeds in battle (are) mighty, being fired with prowess; (whose brilliant and) very extensive fame is always circling round about; and whose enemies are terrified, when they think, even in dreams, of (his) vigorous (deeds) in battle-fields;

(Verse 7) (Having arrived, with a view to show his devotion to the fect of Achyuta) at a

---

\(^{1}\) Compare the customary expression Dhanada-Vaṃśya-Endra-Āntaka-samā- occurring in line 26 of No. 1 above, lines 2-3 of No. 10 and line 2 of No. 16 below.

\(^{2}\) This agrees with the suggestion of John Allen that in the couplet of the Asvamedha type “the last word is apratīṭāryaṁya, a known epithet of Samudragupta.” (Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty, Intro., p. xxi; p. 21).

\(^{3}\) This verse is taken by Eelert to refer to Samudragupta’s wife, Dattadevi. But the expression parasu-paravānu-mārtika cannot possibly apply to her. Obviously, the whole stanza refers to Śrī (Goddess of Wealth) which word must have stood originally at the beginning of the verse and of line 17, but has now been obliterated.

\(^{4}\) Bhūga signifies ‘enjoyment, use.’ This enjoyment may be of a village or of a country. In the former case it becomes ‘possession, usufruct,’ and in the latter, ‘rule, sway.’ Both the senses are met with in epigraphy. In fact, a village is represented as being enjoyed in an eightfold manner, sāmaka-bhūga. Thus the Naṇḍapura grant of Anna-Vemā speaks of that village being granted by that king “together with ............ the eight enjoyments” (Ep., Ind., Vol. III, p. 292). Similarly, the Koṅkaliṇu grants of Allaya-Dodda refer to the koṅkaliṇu-bhūga-śāstraka grant of the Gumtiṇi village (ibid., Vol. V, p. 59, lines 46-47). What these eight bhūgas are reputed to be has been explained by Mr. G. V. Ramamurti who edited these grants in ibid., p. 57, note 4. Even the derivative word bhūgika in the sense of ‘one who enjoys the bhūga’ is found in inscriptions. Thus a Kṛṣṇadeva inscription has at the end the following: kīkāteśa ch-ātra Sānśīva-āṅkhyena A[-]dvaya-bhūgikena (ibid., Vol. II, p. 20, lines 9-10). As Sānśīva-āṅkhyena is the office designation of Āditya, Bhūgika must be taken to be his personal title indicative of his zemindary. Similarly, the Koṅśrā inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūta Anṇāghavarsa I was drafted by Vāidika-bājayata-samā-samā-dharmā-nakṣatra-sthāna-bhūgika-Vaikāraṇa etc., (ibid., Vol. VI, p. 33, line 57) “by Vatsarakūta born in the race of Vālaha Kāyastha, who held the office of Dharma, i.e., of the Judge, and was a Bhūgika, i.e., a Zemindar.” But the word bhūga occurs in epigraphic records also in the other sense, namely, “a tract or country enjoyed by way of rule or sway.” The derivative bhūgika and the compound word bhūgopati are also met with in this sense. Thus the Sātāra grant of the Eastern Chāhāyka Vīṇauvardhana has Śriśrī-bhūgō-Āṇḍopala-agrahaṛṣya (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 309, line 18). Again, the Vāḍiṇī plates of the early Kālaçhuri Bādhakrēṣṭa have Vāṇanagara-bhīga-hetu-śāstraka-pratītya-sāvantini-kālīgha-grāmane etc. (Ep., Ind., Vol. XII, p. 34, line 19). Exactly in the preceding line in the same inscription occurs rāja-sāvantini-bhīga-śīlayopati etc. And the question arises in what sense we are to take this word bhīgika. As it comes immediately after rāja and sāvantini, it seems to signify ‘a zemindar.’ On the other hand, as it immediately precedes śīlayopati, it appears to denote some official set to govern a bhīga, a territorial division apparently more extensive than viśaya. But it is noteworthy of note that in line 23 of the same Vāḍiṇī grant we have āgāmi-śīlayopati-bhīgapati-kāhā. It will thus be seen that in one and the same record we meet with both (cond. on p. 224)
place named \textit{Airikina}, the town of his own district,\(^4\) (the virtuous one) has set up (here a temple of Janardana) for augmenting his own glory.\(^1\)

(Verse 8) \textit{when the king said...}

\textit{(The rest of the inscription is entirely broken away and lost.)}

No: 3 : PLATE III

\textbf{NALANDA COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF SAMUDRAGUPTA: THE YEAR 5}

This plate was unearthed at Nalanda in 1927-28 in Monastery Site No. 1, near the copperplate of Devapala. In 1935 it was transferred to the Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, where it is at present deposited. A preliminary note on it was published by Hirananda Sastrī.\(^2\) He was good enough to send me a photo and an estampage of the same to enable me to edit it in the \textit{Epigraphia Indica}. But on examining the same carefully I found that I could not agree with my friend that this was a fabrication. Nor could I agree with J. F. Fleet that the sister Gayā Plate (No. 4 below) of the same king, namely, Samudragupta, was a spurious one. I, therefore, made the following remark: "Like No. 1540, Sastrī thinks this also to be fabricated. But one ungrammatical clue, which is common to both, is not enough to stamp either as spurious. On the other hand, the alphabet of this plate is really of the time of Samudragupta, though that of No. 1540 is of the 6th century".\(^3\) As this inscription was to be finally published in that journal, I was collecting further information on the point. This was a laborious task involving some amount of thinking and some expenditure of time, when I was agreeably surprised to find that the record had been published by A. Ghosh.\(^4\) Mr. Ghosh frankly admits that in deciphering the text he had received much valuable help from N. P. Chakravarti, then Government Epigraphist for India. He also tells us, and quite correctly as I knew beforehand, that some portions were more legible before that plate was chemically treated. Mr. Ghosh was soon followed by Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sircar with a note printed

\textit{bhāgika} and \textit{bhāgpati}. It therefore seems natural to take the \textit{first} to mean 'a zamindar' and the second, 'the head of a bhāga.' Precisely the same is the case with the Sarasanji plates of the early Kalachuri Buddharāja where also the terms \textit{bhāgika}, \textit{bhāga} and \textit{bhāgpati} are found in lines 18, 19 and 24 respectively in exactly the same sense (ibid., Vol. VI, p. 296). Of these, line 19 has Bhārakhelkha-viṣhay-antaragata-Gūraja-bhāga Bhukandārā-putryaśaṇa-Kumārī-vaṇjā esa grāmaḥ. This clearly shows that in Gujarāṭ and in the time of the early Kalachuris bhāga as a territorial unit was smaller in area than viṣaya. This agrees with the fact that in the Khalimpur plates of the Pāla king Dharmpalā bhāgpati is placed between viṣhayapati and shashṭhōdākika (ibid., Vol. IV, p. 249, line 44), and that in the Pāṇḍukēvar plate of Lalitaśura, bhāgpati ranks after viṣhayapati (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXV, p. 179, line 12). It will thus be seen that \textit{bhāgika} by itself means 'a zamindar' and is not identical with \textit{bhāgpati}. Nevertheless, bhāgika is distinguished from Bhāgika-pāla or Bhāgika-pālaka who apparently is an officer and is the same as bhāgpati (Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 21, line 9 and p. 23, line 4, Vol. V, p. 41, No. II, line 27). Now, in the inscription which we are dealing with, bhāga appears to have been employed to denote some territorial division. But whether it is a viṣaya or a sub-division of viṣaya it is difficult to decide. It is, however, worthy of note that, in line 7 of Erān Stone Boar Inscription of Toreśnāṇa (CII, Vol. III, 1888 No. 36, pp. 158 ff.), Airikina is mentioned as the name of a viṣaya. It is quite possible that the bhāga of the inscription under review has been used synonymously with the viṣaya figuring in the inscription of Toreśnāṇa.

\(^1\) "The lacunae in this verse," says Fleet, "render it impossible to say whether here, and below, \textit{sa}, 'his own' refers to Samudragupta, or to some feudatory of his, who may have been mentioned here." But the lacunae can very well be filled up as shown in the footnotes to lines 25 and 26 of the text so as also to throw light on the object of the inscription and bring it in conformity with Cunningham's suggestion that the inscribed stone was originally attached to some temple which enshrined the colossal Vishnu found in the ruins of Erān (p. 221 above).


\(^3\) \textit{A list of the Inscriptions of Northern India}, p. 290, note 1.

\(^4\) \textit{Ep. Ind.}, Vol. XXV, pp. 50 ff.
in *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 135 ff., where, however, he gives neither the text nor the translation of the inscription, but proclaims the spuriousness of the plate.¹

The Plate, which is inscribed on one side only, measures about 10\(\frac{1}{2}\) by 9\(\frac{1}{2}\). The inscription had already suffered considerably in lines 4-6, and particularly in line 7 in the effacement of letters when it was examined, but after chemical treatment these lines, and especially line 7, developed actual perforations. The record has thus been in a much damaged condition. Nevertheless, the text can be restored to a large extent by a reference to the Gayā plate of the same monarch as far as the place where the details of the donee and the place-names begin. No seal was found along with the plate, but it is not unlikely that it was attached to that portion of the proper right side which is now broken, that is, near the commencement of lines 7-8, as in the case of the Gayā plate. The weight of the plate, as it is, is 45 tolas. The average size of letter is 4\(\frac{1}{4}\). The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet such as is represented by the Allahābād Pillar inscription, the test letters being m, s, h and so forth. They include in line 10, forms of the numerical symbols for 5 and 2. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout. In respect of orthography, we have to notice (1) the doubling of r throughout, in conjunction with a following r, e.g. in *pratapastrya*, line 3, *daushtṛasya*, line 4; *pitṛr̥=*, line 6, =*träväśyā*syā, line 8, and so on; (2) the doubling of consonants following r e.g. in *sarva*, line 1, *mēdhāhār̥t̥r̥=*, line 3, and so forth; (3) the occasional use of b for v, *Viditaṁ=b̥*, line 6, *sahab̥=*, line 10; (4) the use of v for b, in *mañhaś̥hikri̊ta*, line 11; and (5) the use of *upadhīnya* in such cases as *utpaṇna=b̥parama*, line 4 and ch =*aṭṭāh=prabhṛti*, lines 8-9.

The inscription is one of Mahānājīja Samudragupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty; and the charter recorded in it is issued from his camp situated at Ānandapura. It is dated, in numerical symbols, in the year 5 on the second (solar) day of the month Māgha. It is a non-sectarian inscription; the object of it being to record the grant of two villages to a Brāhmaṇa Jayabhaṭṭīṣvāmin by name, styled *Tāvādiya* in subsequent lines. The grant was written at the orders of Gopavāmin, the *Akhāṣṭālaśhikṛiṇa*, Mahāpilīpati and Mahābalādhi-kṛiṇa. At the end occurs the name of the prince (kumāra) Chadragupta, apparently as Dūta, as stated by us long ago in the *List of Inscriptions of Northern India*.

There is another plate of Samudragupta, namely, that found at Gayā,² which agrees with the present one as far as the genealogical portion is concerned. Whatever remarks Fleet passes in regard to the former applies to the latter also. Thus in regard to the Gayā Plate Fleet says: "The inscription itself, however, is undoubtedly spurious. This is shown conclusively, if by nothing else, by the fact that from *uṣṭhha=ṭt̥uḥ*, line 1, to *daushtṛasya*, line 5, the epithets of Samudragupta are uniformly in the genitive case; the drafter of the inscription was copying from a grant of Chadragupta II or some other descendant of Samudragupta; he only then recognised that this construction would not suit a supposed inscription of Samudragupta himself, which was required in accordance with the seal that was to be attached; and he promptly thus adopted the nominative construction, *utpaṇṇah...Samudraguptah*, without taking the trouble to correct the preceding passages."³ Fleet’s criticism was not quite unjustifiable, because the palaeography and the general appearance of the Gayā Plate pointed to the beginning of the eighth century A.D. as being its reasonable age. Such is not, however, the case with the present grant, which according to its palaeography "shows Gupta forms throughout".⁴

¹ Dr. Sircar cites the indiscriminate use of v and b as one of the reasons for its spuriousness. *Contrast*, see Dr. G.S. Gai’s article in *JGTL*, Vol. VI, p. 308—Ed.]*

² See inscription No. 4, below.


as Mr. Ghosh has correctly remarked. Nevertheless, like Fleet he takes a firm stand on the fact that like the Gayā Plate "it has the same ungrammatical construction of the genealogical portion (.....uchhēttuḥ ..... apratīrthasya ..... pratīrthasya ..... pratīrthasya ..... dvakhītasya ..... ut-pannaḥ Samudraguptaḥ)." If the plate be regarded as genuine, it is puzzling why the secretary of Samudragupta should have committed such a silly error in giving the genealogy of its master. I find it difficult to explain away this error as accidental and am, on the whole, inclined to think that the genuineness of the present plate is not above suspicion."¹ Not long ago this matter attracted the attention of a 'tyro' like (Miss) Sakuntala Rao Sastri,—especially the silly error of Samudragupta's secretary which puzzled Mr. Ghosh. "These puzzles, however," she rightly says, "are furnished by not a few copper-plate grants which have been taken as genuine. Thus to take a fresh instance, the Bāsim Plates of Vākāṭaka Vindhyāsakti have .. Chaturaśvamēdhayājinas = samāraja [h*] Vṛṣṇivṛiddha-sagōrasya ... sri-Pravarasēna-patrasya ... sri-Vindhyāsaktēr."² This inscription has been edited by both Dr. D. C. Sircar³ and Prof. Mirashi⁴ who have freely corrected sri-Pravarasēna-patrasya into sri-Pravarasēnasapatrasya and sri-Samudrasēna-patrasya into sri-Samudrasēnasapatrasya. How was then this ungrammatical construction in the genealogical description of Vindhyāsaktēr tolerated in the secretariat of this ruler? Did it not, as a matter of fact, mislead Mr. Y. K. Deshpande and Dr. D. B. Mahajan who originally edited the record?⁵ Do they not describe Vindhyāsaktēr as "a samārat who performed four Aśvamedhas" and the other sacrifices and his grandfather "merely as Śrī Pravarasēna without any kingly epithet"? Can error further go? Nevertheless, this silly error was caused in the composition of the genealogy of Vindhyāsakti for which the secretariat of the master was solely responsible. And what is the most silly error is that the gōra of the master's family given in the Bāsim Plates is Vṛṣṇivṛiddha, and not Vīṣṇuśrīvṛiddha which is invariably given in the other Vākāṭaka grants and which is the correct form of the gōra given in the standard works on Gōtras and Prawaras. Is any sane scholar therefore to consider the Bāsim grant as a spurious record like the Nālandā and Gayā Plates?

A similar slip is that pointed out by Fleet in the description of genealogy but opposite in character is supplied by the Vakkalēri Plates of the Chālukya Kīrtivarman II in lines 3-11, which run as follows: Śrī-Kīrtivarman-prathivāvallabhahamahārājas = tasya = utmajas = samarasaśaktaka-sakalāttarapathēvara-śrī-Harsavarddhana-parāray-ōpāta-pramēṣvarasabdas = tasya Satyārāya-śrī-prathivāvallabhah-mahārājāḥ śrī-Śrīprāyaparājya-śrī-Harsavarddhana-pramēṣvarasabdas = prīya-tanayāsya.⁶ As has been shown by F. Kielhorn, the above draft should be corrected into Kīrtivarmana .... mahārājā-ūtmanasya .... Harsavarddhana-śrī-parāray-ōpāta-pramēṣvarasabdasya Satyārāya- ... . etc. There are thus two slips here in the genealogical portion set forth. But the first of these slips occurs in two other Chālukyan Plates, both found at Nērūr.⁷ The truth of the matter is that when there are many long compounds in the genealogical portions of a grant, there is every likelihood of a jumble being created by some of these compounds ending in the genitive case and some in the nominative case when all should have been in one and the same case. And it is but natural that the same jumble should appear in both the grants as the draft was composed in one and the same office, namely, that of the Akṣapataṅkādikā Gopasvāmin. There is thus no definite evidence to show that the Nālandā grant is a spurious record.

¹ Ep. Ind., p. 51.
⁵ PIHC., Third Session (1939), pp. 449 ff.
Nālandā Copper-plate Inscription of Samudragupta: The Year 5

G. S. Gai

From photograph
TEXT


7 .................[s-ōparika]r-ō[ddēśen = āgrāharatvēn = ātīśīṣi]ra[t17] [1*] tad = yushmābhīr = a[s]ya-

8 cha tr[a[i]vidyasa śrōttavyam = āja[18] cha kartavyā [sargvē cha samu]chitā grā-[ma]-pratyāyē[na] hira[n]y-ādaya dēyā[1*] [1*] na ch = aitāh = pra-


10 [sy]ād = ṛtī = — — — — 31 Sambat[21] 5 Maṅga-di 2 nibadh[a[m] [1*]


12 [Dūtah] Kumāra-śri-Chandragupta[23] [1*]

---

1 From an impression and photograph supplied by Hiranand Sastri.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 Read [ṛ]jīSchhīṭtā.
4 Read [ṛ]thābh.
5 Read [ṛ]sābh.
6 Read -Āntaka-samāḥ. Mr. Ghosh reads —Antaka-, but there is no ka here.
7 Read -parasūr-
8 Read -pradāī-
9 Read -āhārtā Ma.
10 Read -prapauttrō.
11 Read -pauttrō.
12 Read -pautrō.
13 Read -dauhittrō.
14 Mr. Ghosh reads krīmā which does not seem to be warranted by any estampages. Krīmā, however, is practically the same thing as Krīmā.
15 Read vidita[m] = bē.
16 Read = ēra.
17 Read *ghōu.
18 Read śrūtavyam = ājīrā.
19 Read āgrākār.
20 There are four short horizontal strokes here.
21 Read savatā.
22 [The reading seems to be amu.—Ed.]
23 Read *śēm[-]ēṃā.
TRANSLATION

(Line 1) Oh! Hail! From the great camp of victory, containing 1 ships, elephants and horses and situated at Ānandapura.

(Lines 1-5) The prosperous Samudragupta, the Mahārājādhirāja, and ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vaṣudēva), who is the exterminator of all kings; who has no equal adversary on earth; whose fame is tasted by the waters of the four Oceans; who is equal to (the gods) Dhanada, Varuna, Indra, and Antaka; who is the very axe of Kṛitānta (Death); who is the giver of many crores of lawfully acquired cows and gold; who is the performer of the Astamūḍha sacrifice, that had long decayed; who is the son of the son's son of the prosperous Gupta, the Mahārāja; the son's son of the prosperous Gaṅgādēva, the Mahārāja; and the son of the prosperous Chandragupta, the Mahārājādhirāja, the daughter's son of the Lichhāvī (and) born of the Mahārāja Kumārādēva—addresses to (the officers) attached to the Treasury of the two villages; (1) Bhadrāparakāraka pertaining to the Vāvīrīkṣhya district (and) (2) Purūnānga pertaining to the Krivāla district, and says as follows:

(Lines 6-7) "Be it known to you! For the sake of augmenting the spiritual merit of (my) parents and of myself, these two villages have been granted by me as agrahāra, with the assignment of the upariśarka... to Jayabhaṭṭa-svāmin...

(Lines 7-10) You should therefore listen to this Traśivīda (conversant with the three Vēdas) and be obedient to his commands; and all dues in accordance with the customary charge of the village should be paid, such as (the find of) gold and so forth. And, from this time forth, the tax-paying cultivators, artisans, etc., of other villages should not be allowed to enter by this Traśivīda; (for) otherwise there would be a forfeiture of the Agrahāra.

(Lines 10-12) Registered in the year 9 of the year 2 of Māgha. Drawn up by the order of Gūpavāmin, Mahāpillīpati, Mahābalādhikriyā, the Akṣapaṭalādhikriyā of Anyagrāma. The Dūtaka, the prince Śri-Chandragupta.

No. 4: PLATE IV

GAYĀ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF SAMUDRAGUPTA: THE YEAR 9

This inscription is from a copper-plate that was obtained years ago by General Cunningham at Gayā3 the chief town of the Gaya District in the Bihar State and was apparently first brought to notice by him in 1883, in his Book of Indian Eras, page 53, where it is entered as being dated in the year 40. J. F. Fleet obtained the original plate, for examination, from General Cunningham, and published it in the CIL, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 254 ff.

1 In the Śātavāhana period we meet with the expression ṣeṇḍāya ṣeṇḍāyantīya ṣeṇḍāyaḥkhaḍhācārā (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 71, line 1), the first two terms of which stand apparently for mahā-nāy-aṣṭi-aṣṭi of this grant, which describes the components of ṣeṇḍāyaḥ-ṣeṇḍāya. The grants of Harshavardhana contain practically the same phraseology, such e.g. as mahānāy-ṣeṇḍāya-ṣeṇḍāya aṣṭi-ṣeṇḍāyaḥkhaḍhācārā (ibid., Vol. IV, p. 210, line 1). The word vāsaka however does not occur. In the Pratīkhāvya charters the phraseology runs as follows: Śri-Mahādeva-samācārici-śrīkṣetraṁ-bhyo-ṣeṇḍāya-ṣeṇḍāya-ṣeṇḍāyaḥkhaḍhācārā (ibid., Vol. XIX, p. 17, line 1). Here the word samācārici is no doubt met with, but the phraseology has become too big and bombastic. There is greater resemblance in the initial part between the grants of Samudragupta and Harshavardhana. Even the epithets of Samudragupta were not forgotten in the 7th or 8th century A.D. and were actually assumed by the Kalachuri king Śākaraṅgaja (ibid., Vol. VI, p. 298, line 9). It is, therefore, no wonder that the initial part of the grants of the former king is found in those of the latter.

2 The word nibaddha is traceable as early as in the Śātavāhana grants engraved in the Nasik caves (ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 73, line 12).

3 The 'Gaya' of maps, etc. Indian Atlas, sheet No. 104, Lat. 24° 48' N.; Long. 85° 3' E.
The plate, which is inscribed on one side only, measures about 8" by 7\(\frac{1}{8}\)". It is quite smooth, the edges having been neither fashioned thicker, nor raised into rims. About half-way down the proper left side, the plate has laminated rather seriously; and there is also a small crack just below this place, and another in the top of the plate, in the word vi\(\text{ṣ}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{k}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{t}\); but, except at these places, the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation almost throughout. The plate is fairly thick and substantial, and the letters, which are shallow, do not show through on the reverse side of it at all. The engraving is fairly good; but, as usual, the interiors of the letters show marks of the working of the engraver's tools throughout. Onto the proper right side of the plate, there is fused a seal, oval in shape, about 2\(\frac{3}{8}\)" by \(\frac{3}{16}\)". It has, in relief on a countersunk surface, at the top, Garuḍa, represented as a bird, standing to the front, with outstretched wings; and, below this, a legend in five lines, which, being also in relief, is so worn out, that nothing of it can be read except a few disconnected letters here and there, and Sam[u]\(\text{d}[u]\)\(\text{r}[u]\)\(\text{p}[\text{tah}\), very faintly, at the end of line 5. It must have contained a succinct recital of the genealogy, after the fashion of the As\(\text{ṛ}\)\(\text{g}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{ṭ}\)\(\text{ā}\)\(\text{ḍ}\) seal of Śravavarman\(\text{I}\) and the S\(\text{ō}\)\(\text{n}\)\(\text{p}\)\(\text{at}\) seal of Harshavardhana.\(\text{I}\) The weight of the plate, with the seal, is 2 lbs. 10 oz. The average size of the letters is \(\frac{3}{16}\)". The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets. They include, in line 14, forms of the numerical symbols for 9 and 10. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout. In line 3-4, we have, instead of the usual expression utsan\(\text{n}\)a, the word uchchhanna, which, as used here, is, according to Sir Monier Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, a Prakrit corruption of the Sanskrit utsan\(\text{n}\)a. In respect of orthography, we have to notice (1) the doubling of t throughout, in conjunction with a following r, e.g. in pro\(\text{p}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{d}\)\(\text{r}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{y}\)a, line 4; \(\text{p}t\text{ṭ}t\text{ṭrōr}, line 8; and \(\text{s}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{g}\)\(\text{ō}\)\(\text{ṭ}rō\)\(\text{y}\)a, line 9; (2) the doubling of dh, in conjunction with a following y, in Ayōḍh\(\text{y}ā, line 1; (3) the occasional use of b for v, in bō, line 8, and sam\(\text{b}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{t}\), line 14; and (4) the use of \(\text{u}\) for b in vrāh\(\text{m}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{n}\)a, lines 7 and 10; vaḥ\(\text{r}\)\(\text{i}\)\(\text{c}\)\(\text{h}\)\(\text{ā}\)ya, line 9; and sa\(\text{v}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{r}\)\(\text{h}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{m}\)\(\text{a}\)c\(\text{h}\)\(\text{ā}\)rī, lines 9-10.

The inscription purports to be of the Imperial Gupta king Samudragupta, and to record a charter issued from his camp at the city of Ayōḍh\(\text{y}ā.\)\(\text{I}\) It purports to be dated, in numerical symbols,\(\text{I}\) in the year nine (A.D. 328-29), on the tenth solar day, without any specification of the fortnight, of the month of Vaiśākha (April-May). It is a non-sectarian inscription; the object of it simply being to record the grant to a brāhmaṇa, ostensibly by Samudragupta, of the village of Rēvati\(\text{kā}\) in the Gayā vishaya.

The legend on the seal of this grant is in characters which present a very different appearance to those of the body of the inscription; as also does the copper of the seal, as compared with the substance of the plate; and the seal is in all probability a genuine one of Samudragupta, detached from some other plate. The inscription itself, however, is spurious, according to Fleet. His remarks on the subject have been quoted in the previous inscription. "It is difficult" says he "to suggest any definite time for the fabrication of this grant; on the one side, some of the characters are antique, e.g. the forms of k, p, m, and r, and particularly h; on the other side, others are comparatively modern, especially the sh in vaḷaṭka\(\text{u}s\)\(\text{h}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{b}\)\(\text{h}\)\(\text{y}ā,\)
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line 7-8. But it has the general appearance of having been made somewhere about the beginning of the eighth century A.D. Points which may hereafter serve to fix its date more definitely are (1) the use of the Prakrit corruption uchchhanna, in line 3-4; and (2) the opening expression mahā-nau-hasty-āśva, etc., in line 1; the only other instances of similar expressions being in line 1 of the Deo-Barapārā inscription of Jivitagupta II,1 and in line 1 of the Dīghāva-Dubaulī grant of the Mahārāja Mahēndrapāla,2 of A.D. 761-62; and of the Bengal Asiatic Society's grant of the Mahārāja Vināyakapāla,3 of A.D. 794-95.4

TEXT 5

1 Śva Svaismahā-nau-hasty-āśva-jayaskandhāvārāj(d) = Ā(A)yōddhyā-vāsakāt = sarva-raj-ōchchhēttu[h*] pīr-
2 thiyām = apratirathasāya chatur-udadhi-salil-āsvādita-yaśa[śō*] Dhanada-Varun-Endr-Ā.
5 mahārājādhirāja-sri-Chandragupta-putrāsa[ś] Lichchhivi-dauhitrasya[ś] mahādēvyā[ś] Ku-
6 māra-rādhyām = upanna[ś] paramabhāṣa-vatō mahārājādhirāja-sri-Samudra-
7 guptah Ga yā = vaishayika-Rēvatikā-grāmē vṛā (brā) hmona-puroga-grāmā-vala-
8 tkaushabhiyām = āha | Eva ch = ārtha[ś] viditambō (m = vō) bhavatvē cśā (sha) grāmō mayā mātāpittrē = ā-
9 tmanas = cha puny-ābhiyuddhiyē Bhāravāyā-sagōtrēya Va (ba) hvīchāya sav[ś]a (brā) lamach-
10 ritē vṛā (brā) hmaṇa-Gōpādēvasvāmī[ś] sōparika-ōddēśēn = āgrahāratvēn = āti-
11 srīshāt[ś] tad = yushmābhīr = asyā śrōtavyām = ājīnā cha kartaṭavyā sarvve cha14 sa15muchitā grāmā-pra-
12 tyāyē mēya-hirany-ādayō dēyē [ś] na chē (ch = ai) tat-prabhṛty = ētad-āgrahāri-
kēṇa (n = ā) nyad-grā-

1 CIL, Vol. III, 1888, No. 46.
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 112; See also D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 40.
5 From the original plate.
6 There is a mark over the letter śa, which may be only a rust-mark, but which renders it a little doubtful whether yasi-dhamado was engraved, or yasi-dhanado with an omission of śa. The other inscriptions, however, show that the correct reading is yasi-dhanado, etc.
7 The other inscriptions all read utsumma. Monier Williams, in his Sanskrit-English Dictionary, suggests that uchchhanna, which, in the sense of 'uncovered', is a regular derivative from ud+chhad, and it is in the sense of 'destroyed, fallen into disuse', a Prakrit corruption of utsumma, from ud+saḍ.
8 In order to render the inscription capable of translation, read propūtraḥ. And, at the same time, correct all the preceding genitives into nominatives.
9 Read pūtraḥ.
10 Read pūtraḥ.
11 Read daśhitroṣaḥ.
12 This mō was first engraved closer to the margin of the plate, and then, being indistinct there, was repeated.
13 The reading is Gomadevatēmītā-. Ed.].
14 Ša was engraved here, and then corrected into cha.
15 Cha was engraved here, and then corrected into sa.
VIDIŚĀ STONE IMAGE INSCRIPTIONS OF RĀMAGUPTA

13 ma-di-kara-du-kutumbi-kāruṇā-dayah pravēsāyitavya ma(a)nyathā
   nityatā(m = a)gra-
14 hār-ākṣhēpa(h)* syād=iti (h)* Sama(mva) t1 9 Vaiśākha di 10 [h]*
15 Anya-grām-ākṣhapatālādhiṃsita-Dyūta-Gopavāmy-ādēśa-lihitah2 [h]*

TRANSLATION

(Line 1) Ōm ! Hail ! From the great camp of victory, containing ships, elephants and
   horses and situated at Ayūdhya.

(Lines 1-7) The prosperous Samudragupta, the Mahārājādhīraṇa . . . addresses to the
   pre-eminent (officers) attached to the Treasury of the village and the Brāhmaṇas in the village of
   Rēvatikā belonging to the Gayā district.

(Lines 8-11) "And be (this) matter known to you! For the sake of augmenting the spirit-
   ual merit of (my) parents and of myself, this village has been granted by me, as an agrahāra,
   to a religious fellow-student, the Brāhmaṇa Gopavāmin,3 of the Brāravāya gōtra (and) the
   Bahvṛicha (ākēha).

(Lines 11-14) You should therefore listen to him; and (his) commands should be obeyed.
   And all dues in accordance with the customary law of the village should be paid, such as can be
   measured, gold, and so forth. And, from this time forth, the tax-paying cultivators, artisans
   etc., of other villages should not be allowed to enter by this Agrahārika; (for) otherwise there
   will be a lapse of the agrahāra.4

(Lines 14-15). The year 9; the day 10 of Vaiśākha. Drawn up by the order of the
   Dūṭaka Gopavāmin, the Akṣhapatālādhiṃsita of Anyagṛāma.

No. 5 A, B and C : PLATE V

VIDIŚĀ STONE IMAGE INSCRIPTIONS OF RĀMAGUPTA

These three inscriptions, called here A, B and C, are engraved on the pedestals of three
Jaina images which were discovered at the Durjana pura village in the Vidiśā District of
Madhya Pradesh in 1968. They are now kept in the Museum at Vidiśā. The three images
containing the inscriptions were found while clearing a field in the above village with a bull-

dozer which has caused damage to them and to the inscriptions on the pedestals. While the
inscription on A is well-preserved and complete, that on B has suffered damage in the last two
lines and the inscription on C is completely effaced, though some words and letters can be
traced with difficulty in the first two lines with the help of A and B. Two of these inscriptions
were first published by Dr. G.S. Gai in the JORI, Vol. XVIII (1969), pp. 218 ff. and plates
while all the three inscriptions were edited by him in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 46 ff. and
plates.

The inscriptions are in Gupta characters of about the 4th century A.D. The alphabet

closely resembles that of the Sānchi inscription of Chandragupta II dated in the Gupta year
93 and to some extent that of the Éran inscription of Samudragupta. The individual letters
like u, h, g, n, b, bh, m, y, r, l, s and h appearing in the inscriptions on A and B are very
similar to these letters in the Sānchi inscription. The letters like y, r, l and s also resemble those
in the Éran inscription of Samudragupta. And the letters m, r, l and h are of the so-called

1 As regards the interpretation of the first symbol, see page 229 above, note 3.
2 Supply uḷlekha = yam, or any similar words.
3 [See p. 230 note 13 above.—Ed.]
5 Ibid., pp. 18 ff. and plate.
southern or western variety of the Gupta alphabet as in the case of the Śāṅchi inscription. The medial i in these records has, however, more flourish than in the Śāṅchi inscription where it is just a circle on the top of the letter. Such a feature appears in earlier records like the Nāndsā Yūpa inscriptions of the 3rd century a.d. Thus, from the palaeographical point of view, these records can be assigned to about the 4th century a.d. and this dating is supported by the stylistic features of the Jaina images bearing the inscriptions. The prabhavali of the images is not so much developed and stylised as in the case of the Buddha images at Śāṅchi attributed to the 5th century a.d. The fact that only chaktra is represented in the centre of the pedestals of the images and not the characteristic lāṅkhas of the respective Tirthanākaras also indicates the early stage in the development of Jaina iconography.

In respect of orthography, it may be noted that the consonant following r is doubled in Sarpasena (A) and that the class-nasal is used in the words Chandraprabha (A), Pushpadanta (B) and Chandrakshama (A and B). The language of the three records is Sanskrit.

The two inscriptions on A and B contain 4 lines each and give identical text in the first two lines except the name of the image. The inscription on C also appears to be in 4 lines with a similar draft. While the record on A states that the image of Chandraprabha was caused to be made by Mahārajādhirāja Rāmagupta, that on B refers to the making of the image of Pushpadanta by the same ruler. The name of the image in C appears to read Padmaprabha. The record on A further informs us that this act of Rāmagupta (viz. the making of the image of Chandraprabha) was done on the advice or at the instance (upadesa) of Chelā-kshamaṇa, son of Gōlayani and disciple of Āchārya Sarpasena-kshamaṇa and the grand-disciple (i.e., disciple's disciple) of the Jaina teacher who is described as pāṇipātrika-Chandrakshaṃ-āchārya-kshamaṇa-śramaṇa. This description is also found in the record on B which gives the name as Chandrakshama-āchārya instead of Chandrakshaṃ-āchārya. The epithet pāṇipātrika indicates that the Jaina monk was eating with his hands as bowl. In the record on B the name of the person at whose instance the image was made as well as that of his immediate teacher and also the names of parents, if any, are lost in the damaged portion at the end of that record. This portion in the inscription on C is completely effaced and nothing can be made out.

The importance of these records lies in the fact that they refer to Mahārajādhirāja Rāmagupta. From the assumption of the title of Mahārajādhirāja, Rāmagupta must have been an imperial ruler and since the records have been assigned to the 4th century a.d., he must be regarded as an imperial king of the Gupta dynasty holding sway over the Vidiśā region. If this identity is accepted, then these inscriptions will be of unique importance since they furnish the first epigraphical mention of Rāmagupta of the imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadhā.

The controversy regarding the existence and historicity of Rāmagupta is well known to all the scholars of Indian history and particularly of Gupta history. This controversy has been going on for about half a century, ever since the discovery in 1923 of the portions of the Sanskrit drama called Devichandraguptam by Viśākhadatta and it gained fresh momentum after the discovery of some copper coins ascribed to Rāmagupta in 1951 and afterwards.3

From the evidence of the drama Devichandraguptam and other literary sources and epigraphic references of later period, scholars have tried to reconstruct the story of Rāmagupta.
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somewhat as follows: He was the son of Samudragupta and elder brother of Chandragupta II and succeeded his father to the throne. He was besieged by a Śaka ruler and was placed in such a difficult position that to effect his escape and for the safety of his subjects, he had to agree to surrender his queen Dhruvadēvi. But his brother Chandragupta could not tolerate this ignominious arrangement and offered to go to the enemy’s camp in the guise of the queen with a view to killing the enemy. He succeeded in this plan and was raised in the estimation of his people as well as in that of the queen while the reputation of Rāmagupta suffered which resulted in the enmity between the brothers. Ultimately Chandragupta II murdered Rāmagupta, succeeded to the Gupta throne and married queen Dhruvadēvi.

This ingenious reconstruction of the story of Rāmagupta was considered by some scholars as incredible and unbelievable. They doubted the existence and historicity of Rāmagupta himself in the absence of any epigraphical records mentioning his name and also of coins prior to their discovery in 1951. Even after the discovery of the copper coins of Rāmagupta, some scholars did not accept his identification with the imperial Gupta king in the absence of any imperial title but took him to be a local ruler in the Vidiśā region.¹

In the midst of these conflicting views, it was considered wise to suspend one’s judgement. In fact Majumdar and Alleker said “we must suspend our judgement upon the historical character of Rāmagupta, his fight with the Śakas, and the strange event which deprived him of his throne, life and the natural affection and fidelity of his wife.”²

Under these circumstances, the discovery of three stone inscriptions in the Vidiśā region, two of them clearly mentioning the name of Mahārājādhirāja Rāmagupta, is undoubtedly of great significance. As indicated above, the third record also seems to mention this ruler. And, as stated above, they establish the existence and historicity of Rāmagupta as an imperial ruler of the Gupta dynasty.

**TEXT³**

**Inscription on Image A**

1 Bhagavatō=rhataḥ Chandraprabhasya pratim=ēyaṁ kāritā ma-
2 hārājādhirāja-sri-Rāmaguptēna upadēsāt=pānipā-
3 trika-Chandaraksham=āchāryya-kshamaṇa-śramaṇa-praśisyā-āchā-
4 ryya-Sarpasāṇa-kshamaṇa-śishyasya Gōlakyaṇtyā-satpū(tpu)trasya Chēlla-kshamaṇasya-ēti ||

**Inscription on Image B**

1 Bhagavatō=rhataḥ Pushpadantasya pratim=ēyaṁ kāritā ma.⁵
2 hārājādhirāja-sri-Rāmaguptēna upadēsāt=pānipātrika-
3 Chandrakshama[nāchā]rryya⁷-[kshamaṇa]-śramaṇa-praśisy[shya]⁸... .
4 .................................................. tī⁹

² *The Vākṣṭha-Gupta Age*, 1946, p. 164.
³ From impressions.
⁴ The two letters ksha and mā are slightly blurred.
⁵ The formation of this letter m is rather peculiar inasmuch as the head is curved into a downward stroke.
⁶ This letter is slightly damaged.
⁷ Inscription on image A reads Chandraksham-āchārya.
⁸ Only a portion of the letter sh is preserved.
⁹ This line is completely effaced.
Inscription on Image C

1 Bhagava[tō]=r̥ha[taḥ]² [Padma]³prabhasya pratim=eyam
[kā]riitā mahā[rājā]dhirā[ja]-
2 śri-[Rāmaguptē]na⁴ u[padēṣat=pā]⁵ni-[pāтри]

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-4) This image of Lord Chandraprabha,⁸ the Arhat, has been caused to be made by the illustrious Maharajadhiraja Rāmagupta under instruction from the mendicant Chēlla, who is the good son of Goloṣayānti, the disciple of the teacher Sarpaśena, the mendicant (and) the disciple's disciple of the teacher Chandrakshama, the mendicant and monk, who took a vow to use his palms as a bowl.⁹

No. 6 : PLATE VI

MATHURĀ PILASTER INSCRIPTION OF CHANDRAGUPTA II : THE YEAR 61

This inscription, which I published for the first time, in 1933, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXI, pp. 1 ff., is engraved on a tiny pillar originally attached to a well situated in the Chandul Mandul Bagichi near Raṅgēśvara Mahādeva temple at Mathurā. It was discovered there by one Bholanath, a dealer in antiquities, in July 1928 and removed to his place. Later, it was taken possession of by the local Police authorities and was lying in their custody in the mālgudām (godown), Mathurā. Thereafter, it was secured by the Director General of Archaeology in India and transferred to the Curzon Museum at Mathurā where it is kept now, bearing the number 1931. In January 1931 Hirananda Sastri, the then Government Epigraphist for India, visited the Museum and took some impressions of the inscription. He was so good as to send me two excellent estampages, one plain, in one whole piece, and the other inked, in two parts. It is on these estampages that my transcript of this epigraph was based, when I first edited it. The transcript remains practically unaltered in this second account of the record.

The inscription is really engraved on the shaft of a tiny pillar, which is octagonal. The inscribed portion covers only five of its faces, which are well dressed, the remaining three being left rough. The top and the base of the pillar have each four sides, only one of which is well-dressed. While the well-dressed side of the top is sculptured with a trident, that of the base has a standing figure, apparently, of Lakulīśa. This shows that our sculpture is not

---

1 This record is badly damaged and effaced.
2 Traces of visarga marks can be seen on the impression.
3 Traces of these letters can be seen on the impression.
4 Faint traces of the letters ma and pi can be seen on the impression so that the word can be restored as Rāmaguptē.
5 The letters in the brackets have been restored with the help of the other records.
6 The remaining letters in this line are completely effaced.
7 The letters in this line and the following are completely effaced.
8 The name of the image appears as Pushpadanta in B and as Padmaprabha in C.
9 I.e. to eat and drink only from his hands.
exactly a pillar, but rather a pilaster, the rough undressed faces of which were covered, and concealed from view, by some parts of an edifice, possibly the 'Teachers' Shrine, referred to in the record. The pilaster was already an integral part of this shrine, when the inscription was engraved. This may be seen from the fact that the lines of the record run irregularly and that the second half of the Aryā verse with which it should have ended could not be engraved as no space was available for it on the shaft. This is possible only when the pilaster is in situ and the engraver had to suit himself somehow to the exigencies of the case.

The writing occupies five of the faces with which the pillar is adorned, and is spread over a surface, about 2' 3" broad by 1' 6½" high. The record, on the whole, is not badly preserved. It may seem that some portion at the end is gone, as the last line contains only the first half of a verse in the Aryā metre. But, as will be seen subsequently, the second half of this Aryā verse could not be engraved, as there was no space available for it between the top and the base of the pillar. The case, however, is different in regard to the third of the five sides of the pillar, on which the record is engraved. Almost the whole of this part of the inscription is abraded and completely destroyed. This, indeed, is a grievous loss, because part of the most important matter contained in this interesting record is thus irrevocably lost to the historian, as we shall see in the sequel. The language is Sanskrit. And the inscription is in prose throughout, except for an Aryā verse at the close, only half of which could be engraved. In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are: (1) the doubling, throughout, of o (lines 5 and 10), of y (lines 8, 12, 14, 15) and of t (lines 3), except in the word kirtī, in conjunction with a preceding r, and (2) the use of the jihādāliya in line 12.

The characters belong to the early Gupta period when they were practically identical with those of the Kushāṇa records. This is particularly significant inasmuch as our inscription is found at Mathurā, from where a number of Kushāṇa epigraphs have already come to light. In fact, it would have been well-nigh impossible to say that ours was a Gupta and not a Kushāṇa record, had it not contained the name of a Gupta king. Detailed remarks on this subject will be found in the article published in Epigraphia Indica mentioned above, while dealing with paleography. There are, however, some minor paleographic peculiarities in our inscription which call for notice here. The end m in siddham, with which the inscription begins, looks, however, like the eastern variety of the Gupta m, though in all other cases it is represented by the other—earlier—form of the letter. That it is the ending m is indicated by its tiny shape. The h in mahārāja in line 1 is represented by a character which looks like n. Possibly its right limb remained unincised inadvertently. Though n is engraved in all other cases with the base-line bending slightly lower down on either side, the n in guṇavāyanē in line 10 has a distinct loop on the left as in the later form of that character. This, however, is not unknown to the Kushāṇa records. The way in which components of the conjunct mbō are joined in samboddhanā (line 12) is worth noting. The rare n in viśṇikam (line 13) and the Kushāṇa forms of a and ā in lines 5 and 8 are also worthy of note. Similarly, the character for the numeral 60 in line 4 does not resemble any of the Gupta period shown by Bühler in cols. IX-X of his Tafel IX, but comes very close to that in column V of the Kshatrāpa period ranging between the 2nd and the 3rd century A.D.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Imperial Gupta king Chandragupta, son of Samudragupta. The titles coupled with each name are worth noting. They are bhāttāraka, mahārāja and rājādhirāja. The first of these, namely, bhāttāraka is associated pretty frequently with the names of the Gupta sovereigns. But the other title which they almost invariably assume is mahārājadhirāja instead of what we have in the present record, viz., mahārāja rājādhirāja, an exact replica of mahārāja rājādhirāja which the Kushāṇa kings bore. It is quite natural in Mathurā, which formed one of the most important districts of the Kushāṇa kingdom and
where numerous Kushāna epigraphs have been unearthed. How far this formulary was peculiar to Mathurā we do not know; for, in the second Mathurā inscription of this king, neither his name nor his titles have been preserved.

The date of the inscription is 61, which, of course, has to be referred to the Gupta era. It is rather unfortunate that the important words in lines 3-5 which contain the details of the date have been effaced. The first part of it tells us to what regnal year of Chandragupta this date corresponds. It is a serious loss that this part has not been preserved. The second part tells us to what kāla or era the year 61 belonged. It is all but certain that Gupta-kāla was engraved. But nothing would have been better if the word Gupta had been preserved beyond all doubt. Then again, the name of the month also has been destroyed. Fortunately for us, the word prathamā has been preserved immediately after the specification of the month. This shows that in the year 61 there was an intercalary month. On the evidence of Jaina works the late K. B. Pathak has proved that expired or current Gupta years can be converted into corresponding (expired or current) Śaka years by adding 241. Thus, if we add 241 to 61 of Gupta year of our inscription, we obtain 302 Śaka = 380 A.D. We do not yet know whether this Gupta year is current or expired. We leave it undecided for the time being. Now, if we refer to page 42 of Table X of the Indian Chronology by Swamikkannu Pillai, we find that there was an additional month only in A.D. 380, and none in 378 or in 381-82, and that in A.D. 380 Ashādha was the intercalary month. The lacuna before prathamā can thus be easily filled up with Ashādha-māsi. We thus find that the month of our date must be Ashādha. We also find that the date of our record was a current Gupta year. Because the intercalary month came only in A.D. 380, the Gupta year 61 must therefore be also a current year. The earliest date we had for Chandragupta II before the discovery of this record was Gupta year 82, supplied by an Udayagiri cave inscription of his feudatory chieftain of the Sanakāṇika family (No. 7 below). But the date furnished by our epigraph is 61, which is thus twenty-one years earlier. It also sheds some light on the length of his reign. The latest known date for this Gupta sovereign is 93 (No. 9 below). Therefore, Chandragupta II must have had a reign of at least 32 years.

After the specification of the date, the inscription introduces us to a teacher who was a Māheśvara or devotee of Śiva and was called Uditāchārya. His pedigree is given. But unfortunately the name of his teacher is not clearly preserved. It is, however, pretty certain that it was Upamita. The latter, again, was a pupil of Kapila, and Kapila, a pupil of Parāśara. We have thus a list of Māheśvara teachers extending over four generations. In fact, Uditāchārya has been mentioned as chaturthī or fourth in succession from Parāśara. This is intelligible and quite all right, as it is in an unbroken order. But Uditāchārya has been also specifically mentioned as daśama or tenth in descent from Kuśika. As no names of the intervening teachers have been given and Uditāchārya is specified as tenth in succession from Kuśika, the only possible inference is that Kuśika, though he did not originate any new doctrine or sect, must have been at least the founder of a line of teachers. We have already dealt with this point elsewhere, but what we have to note here is that while the living teacher Uditāchārya is called merely an Ārya, all the others, namely, Upamita, Kapila, Parāśara and Kuśika, have received the supreme designation of Bhagavat, which is generally associated with personages who are supposed to have attained to the rank of divinity.

The object of the inscription is to record that Uditāchārya, who was the Māheśvara teacher living, established two images, called Kapīlēśvara and Upamiteśvara in the Guru-āyatana. The

1 [For other views about the restoration of this lost portion, see Jel. Ins., 1965, p. 277 and Journal of Ancient Indian History, Vol. III, 1970, pp. 115-17—Ed.].
2 [For Ant. Vol. XLVI, p. 293.]
3 See above, Introduction, pp. 133-35.
second part of these two names, i.e., isvara, shows that it was the liṅgas that were installed. The first part of these, i.e., Upamita and Kapila, are the names of the teacher and the teacher’s teacher of Uditāchārya. It therefore seems that the latter established two liṅgas, one in the name of Upamita and the other in the name of Kapila. We have numerous instances of persons setting up idols of Vishnu or Siva either in their own name or in their father’s or mother’s name.1 It is therefore no wonder that Uditāchārya put up two liṅgas in the name of his teacher and teacher’s teacher. What is, however, noteworthy here is that he installed the liṅgas in a place called Guru-āyatana which can only mean “the Teachers’ Shrine.” As none of the gurus of the line to which Uditāchārya pertained was then alive, the Guru-āyatana can only denote the place where the memorials of the gurus were established. And we know from this inscription what sort of memorials were set up by Uditāchārya in the names of his gurus. They were liṅgas called individually after them. The inference is reasonable that Guru-āyatana was a place where liṅgas were installed in the names of all the teachers who preceded Uditāchārya.

But what was this Guru-āyatana like exactly? As has been pointed out above, we have epigraphic evidence to show that in the Kushāna times dēvakulas or shrines were raised to the memory of the departed kings.2 The custom seems to have persisted in India up till the Rajput period. Thus at Manṣor, six miles north of Jodhpur, we have a number of structures, commemorative of the various kings of the Rāṭhod family of this place, which look like temples and which are known locally as dēlānī (-dēvakulas).3 The term Guru-āyatana, however, occurring in our inscription does not indicate the different memorial structures existing side by side and separately in one huge enclosure as is customary in Rajasthan. It denotes rather one huge edifice comprising different memorials to the different teachers. It is thus more like the pratimā-griha, described by Bhāsa in his drama Pratimānātaka, which is “a royal gallery of portrait statues” pertaining to the different princes of the Ikshvāku family.4 Guru-āyatana may thus be taken as a shrine comprising the liṅgas set up in the name and to the memory of gurus of that lineage to which Uditāchārya belonged. It may be contended that the resemblance here is not complete unless we could show that these liṅgas were identical with or contained the portraits of the departed gurus. It has to be admitted that there is some force in this contention. For, in line 10, immediately after Guru-āyatana, we have the two letters guru which were originally followed by at least five letters that have unfortunately been effaced. It is worthy of note that guru is again engraved immediately after Guru-āyatana and it may be asked whether the letters destroyed cannot be restored so as to answer to this presumption. We do not think we shall be very wide off the mark if we restored the lacuna to guru-pratimā-yutan. The liṅgas, established, not only were named after the gurus Upamita and Kapila but must also have borne their portraits.

Further, it is worthy of note, that the inscription specifically mentions Uditāchārya as daśama or tenth in descent from Kuśika and fourth from Parāṣara. While the teachers intervening between Parāṣara and Uditāchārya are mentioned and are only two, those between Kuśika and Parāṣara are not mentioned at all though they were no less than five. In fact, there was no


2 Introduction, p. 138; JRAI, 1924, p. 403, lines 1-3; A.R. ASL, 1911-12, p. 124, line 3.


need of mentioning Kuśika at all unless he was the most important personage of the line to which Uditāchārya belonged. We are therefore compelled to infer that Kuśika, though he may not have propounded any new religious system, must have at least originated a line of teachers to which pertained Parāśara, Kapila, Upamita and Udita. Who could this Kuśika be? Years ago I had occasion to point out who Lakuli was. I then drew attention to a passage which is common to both the Vāyu-Purāṇa and the Liṅga-Purāṇa. On the strength of this passage I showed (1) that Lakuli was the last incarnation of Mahēśvara, (2) that this incarnation took place at Kāyārōhana or Kāyāvatāra which was identical with Kāravāṇ, in the Ḍabhoī taluk, Baroda District, Gujarāt State, and (3) that he had four ascetic pupils, namely, Kuśika, Garga, Mitra and Kaurushya. The same information is contained in a stone slab inscription, which originally belonged to a temple at Śōmanātha in Kāṭhiāwāḍ, but is now preserved in the Quinta of Don João de Castro at Cintra in Portugal. The inscription is thus known as the Cintra prāsasti of the reign of the Chaulukya ruler Śrāṇagadeva, and was last critically edited by G. Bühler in Ep. Ind., Vol. I, pp. 271 ff. This inscription corroborates practically all that has been said by the Purāṇas about Lakuli. The order and names of his pupils are, however, slightly different in this epigraphic record, being Kuśika, Gārgya, Kaurusha and Maitrēya. But this much is certain that in both Kuśika remains unaltered in name and also stands first in order. The Cintra prāsasti, however, tells us one thing more, namely, that these four disciples of Lakuli were the founders of four lines amongst the Pāṣupatas. There can thus hardly be a doubt that the Kuśika of our record must be regarded as the first pupil of Lakuli and that the four Āchāryas mentioned here were, of course, his descendants. In the Cintra prāsasti three Āchāryas are mentioned, namely, Kārtikarāsī, Vālmikirāsī and Tripurāṅtaka, the last of whom was a contemporary of Śrāṇagadeva during whose reign it was incised. Verse 19 of this inscription distinctly tells us that these teachers belonged to the line (gōtra) of Gārgya. While the Cintra prāsasti thus gives an account of the ascetic teachers who sprang in the line of Gārgya, the second pupil of Lakuli, our present record throws light upon the line of teachers that was founded by Kuśika, the first disciple of Lakuli. It appears that while some descendants of Gārgya established themselves at Śōmanātha in Kāṭhiāwāḍ, those of Kuśika were settled at Mathurā.

If the teachers mentioned in our inscription belonged to the Lakulīśa sect, it clears up two or three points of our inscription which would otherwise have remained obscure. The first is how the āṅgas, if they were installed as memorials to Upamita and Kapila, could also contain their portraits. The second point is why all the dead teachers of this line, namely, Kuśika, Parāśara, Upamita and Kapila, have been styled bhagavat. The third is why the living teacher Uditāchārya has been called ārya. Let us now take up the first point: how could the āṅgas, put up in memory of Upamita and Kapila, also comprise their portraits? I have alluded above to the paper on Lakulīśa which I wrote for the JB BRAS., Vol. XXII, pp. 151 ff. in 1906. Not long after, I contributed another on the same subject to the A.R. ASI., 1906-07, pp. 179 ff. This latter contained copious illustrations of the figures of Lakuli whether on the door jambs and friezes of shrines, on the outside walls of temples, or in separate sculptures. I have shown that wherever Lakuli appears, he figures as a human being, invariably with two hands, but with his characteristic signs, namely, a laktuṭa or staff in his left hand and a citron in his right.

2 It does not seem likely that the whole line of teachers descended from Kuśika were settled at Mathurā. We have already noticed that Uditāchārya, the teacher living at the time of this record, has been mentioned as chaturtha or fourth from Parāśara and dālana or tenth from Kuśika and whereas all the teachers from Parāśara onwards are specified, those intervening between him and Kuśika have not been mentioned at all though they were not less than five. It thus seems that the Pāṣupata Āchāryas at Mathurā were a branch of the Kuśika line established by Parāśara.
There are, however, two representations of his which are singular, and they are both found at Kārvān, the place where this last incarnation of Śiva came off and also passed away. Here we have two liṅgas with the portraits of Lakulī sculptured in front. One of these is in the temple of Naklēśvar and the other, in that of Rājarājēśvar, both at Kārvān. If they were mere liṅgas, how could they be distinguished one from the other? How could we say that one liṅga denoted one ākārya, another liṅga another ākārya and so on? It will thus be seen that the Śiva liṅga has been combined with the representation of Lakulī into one image. It may be asked: What could be the meaning of this? Now, the Purāṇas and the inscriptions are unanimous in saying that Lakulī was the originator of certain austerities and religious practices called the Pāṣupata or Māheśvara yōga, which his pupils disseminated. And it is well-known that when a yōgi passes away, he does not die like an ordinary mortal with his last breath going out of his earthly nostrils, but rather by a yōga feat which enables him to pass it through the brahma-randhra, that is, by breaking through his human skull. It is only in this manner that he is absorbed into Brahman, if he is a Vedantist, or into Śiva, if he is a Pāṣupata or Māheśvara. But as Lakulī was a worshipper of Śiva, we have to suppose that the two sculptures from Kārvān represent obviously the absorption of Lakulī into the divinity of Śiva. It is therefore not at all unreasonable to suppose that even in the case of Upamiteśvara and Kapilēśvara, we had not mere Śiva liṅgas set up here but rather liṅgas with portraits of Upamita and Kapila carved into them, as is the case with Lakulī in the two images of Kārvān. Upamita and Kapila, being descendants of Kuśika, must have been experts in the Pāṣupata yōga. We have therefore to presume that they too must have passed away like the yōgins by driving away their prāna-vāyu through the brahma-randhra. They must have thereby merged themselves into the godhead of Śiva. This alone can explain why all these departed ascetics of the Lakulī sect have received the divine title of bhagavat. The teacher, Uditāchārya, who was still living and who was not yet absorbed into Śiva, was not to, and, in fact, cannot, be honoured with this supreme title. He has, therefore, been merely styled ārya. Here it may be asked whether even this title has at all any significance of its own. In this connection my attention had been drawn by my late lamented friend Jogendra Chandra Ghosh, to a verse in the Cintra prasasti.1 It is with reference to 'Tripurāntaka, the ascetic-teacher of the Gārgya lineage, who has been referred to above. He was a contemporary of the Chaulukya king Sāraṅgadēva, during whose time the inscription was engraved. The verse runs thus:

Iha sākṣhāt-Umākāntah śrīmān Gaṇḍa-Brihaspatiḥ 1
Āryam-enaḥ vinirvāya shashīthān chakrē mahattaram [II] 34

"Here the illustrious Gaṇḍa Brihaspati, visibly the husband of Umā, having made him an Ārya, appointed him sixth Mahattara."

What the verse says is that Gaṇḍa Brihaspati, who was apparently the State Officer in charge of the religious monuments, made Tripurāntaka an Ārya and then appointed him sixth Mahattara. Bührer who edited the inscription was himself not sure whether Ārya and Mahattara referred to officers, or were mere titles. The second alternative is considered by him as more probable. Personally, however, I think that Mahattara denotes an officer, and corresponds possibly to the modern Mahant, the head of a religious order. As regards Ārya, it is worthy of note that Ḫemacandra’s Abhidhānachintāmāni gives it as a synonym of prabhu, "a master, an owner."2 This fits excellently not only in the Cintra prasasti, but also in our record. For in the first case we know that Tripurāntaka built five temples of which he legitimately could be an Ārya or owner. In the second case we have seen that Uditāchārya raised two

---

2 Martya-kēda, paryāya 1 (verse 23).
memorial structures to his gurus in the ‘Teachers’ Shrine’, of which he must, doubtless, have been an ācārya or owner.

TEXT

1 Siddham [ḥ] ṇārtaraka-mahārāja-[rajaśīr-]ārāja-śi-rāmudugra-ta-sa-
2 tputrasya ṇārtaraka-ma-[hārāja]-[rajaśīr-]ārāja-śi-Chandrāgra-ta-
3 sya vi-ṣayaśi-ṣa-saṁvatsa-[ṛc]. . . . . . . kāś. = ānuvarttamanā-saṁ-
4 vatsāraṇī eka-shashthī 60 1 . . . . . . . [praṭham]e śuśka-divasē paṁ-
5 chamyāṇ [i] aṣaṇī pūrva[yath] [bha]ga-[vat-Ku]ṭākād = daśāmēna bhagava-
6 t-Parāśarāch = chatur[th]e[na] [bhagavat-Ka]ṭīla] - Vimala-śi-
7 shya-śiśyēṇa bhagavat[-Upamita]-vimala-śiṣhēṇa
8 ārty-[Odi] [tā]chāryē[ṇa] [sva] [pu]-[ny-ā] [p]yāya-nya-nimittam
9 guṇādhīna cha kirt-ā[rtham-U]pamitēṣva]ra-Kapilēṣvarau
10 Guvv-āyatana guru . . . . . . . pratiṣṭhāpito 5 n = ai-
11 tat = khyāt-artham = abhili[kh]ya-te[tha] mahēśvaranārīram vi-
12 jñānātmah = kriyātē sambōdhanaṁ cha yath-kā[le]n = āchāryāyi-
13 nām parigrahām = iti matvā viśāṅka[rin] pujā-pura-
14 skāra[rin] parigraha-pāripālya[k]māryād = iti vijñāpitr = iti [*]
15 Yās = cha kirty-abhidrāmaṁ kuryād = iti vijñāpitr = iti [*]

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-5) In the year 61 according to the era (of the Gupta kings), in the victorious reign of the Bhaṭṭāraka Mahārāja Rājādhīrāja, the prosperous Chandragupta, the good son of the Bhaṭṭāraka Mahārāja Rājādhīrāja, the prosperous Samudragupta—on the fifth of the bright half of the first (Āśāḍha).

1 Read viṣaya-tājya-
2 This may be restored to Gupta-nīpō-tājya-kāl-.[ See above, p. 236 and note 1.—Ed.]
3 The lacuna may be filled up with Āśāḍha-nāśē-
4 This may perhaps be restored to guru-pratīma-yuva-
5 The ā in ā is quite clear at the back of the uninked estampage. Correct the word, however, into pratīṣṭhā-
pitau.
6 Read māhīcaraṇam.
7 Read uchchhyādyta or some such word after sa.
8 Read bhagavaṇ = Dāṇḍaḥ sa.
9 The word śiddham occurs frequently at the beginning of ancient inscriptions, Prakrit or Sanskrit. It is translated by Stevenson by ‘To the Perfect one.’ Later, on the analogy of an inscription (CASIR, Vol. V, Pl. xlii H) which commences with Śīrṣa śīrṣaśrīvat, Bühler takes śiddham as the neuter nominative of the passive perfect participle and as an equivalent of śiddhaḥ and translates it by ‘success’ (Ind. Ant., Vol. X, p. 273). Thereafter, on the analogy of jīvitaḥ bhagavatāḥ of the Gadāla inscription of Kumāragupta I (No. 26, below) and the grant of the Pallava Vyasaśrīnāga Vidyaprayaśvaram (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, p. 51), Fleet takes śiddham as the remnant of some such phrase as śiddhaḥ bhagavatāḥ, “perfection or success has been attained by the Divine One” (CII., Vol. III, 1888, p. 25, note 4). But he forgets that, as we do not meet with jīvitaḥ as the abbreviated form of jīvitaḥ bhagavatāḥ, we do not find śiddhaḥ bhagavatāḥ as the fuller form of śiddham. And further what jīvitaḥ bhagavatāḥ means is explained in an amplified form by the verse with which the Toṣām inscription (CII., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 269-70) begins, to which Fleet himself has drawn our attention. On the other hand, the commencement of Pataṇjali’s Mahābhadāṣṭya there occurs the following passage which is worthy of note in this connection:

madālakā niḥṛtyā mahāvīraśāstra maṅgala-śrāvāna śiddha-saṃdham = ādīśoḥ pravṛttikā maṅgala-dīni hi śāstraṁ prathamāḥ viśva-purāhākṣaṁ cha bhavantī = ṣvayaṁ = praṇayaḥ-purāhākṣaṁ chaḥ = adīśyātārāḥ = cha śiddha-śrīḥ yathā syār = iti. “An auspicious teacher, desirous of success, employs the word śiddha at the very outset for the purpose of auspiciousness to the great volume of (his) scientific treatise, because scientific treatises commencing with auspicious utterances” (contd. on p. 241)
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stand on two feet like a heroic man or like a man of longevity, and because the readers (also) may attain to (their) object." As Patañjali passes this remark in connection with the first vārttika: siddhi śabad-ārtha-sambandhā and as the word siddha of this vārttika is in the locative, it seems that according to Patañjali this word ending in any termination may be used provided it is placed at the beginning of a work. Such was the magic value of the word siddha. In the ancient period, however, the word that was generally employed was siddhān or siddhāna and it was so employed by all Hindus—Buddhists, Jains and Brahmanists—sometimes along with auspicious signs like the svastikā and others (e.g., in the inscriptions of Junnar caves, ASW, Vol. IV, Pl. XLVIII and ff.). It is true that the word is thus connected with siddhi in the sense of 'supernatural powers'. It is, however, better to leave it untranslated. At any rate, if it is necessary to translate it, 'luck' is the best rendering of it. In later times siddhāna was being gradually replaced by siddhāh and even by such a personal word as siddhi-dātā as, e.g., in Bengal. The word siddhāna has not, however, completely fallen into disuse and is still generally employed at least in Mahārāṣṭra.

1 The word pāvāt occurs in many inscriptions and appears to have been used in a sense afterwards lost to it. The expression ayānā pāvātyān or tāstāyā pāvātyān is met with first in the Kusāna, and, afterwards in the Gupta, inscriptions. In the first group of records where it occurs also in various Prakrit forms, the phrase has been translated by Bühler thus: 'on this (date specified) as above' (Ep. Ind., Vol. I, pp. 381 ff. and Vol. II, pp. 202 ff.). And he has been followed by Lüders (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXIII, pp. 36 ff.) and Vogel (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 176). In the case of the Gupta records, Fleet has in every case added the foot note: 'supply titha.' This no doubt seems to receive support from the specification of the date found in some plates of the later Chaulukya kings of Anahalapataka, namely, ayānā nāsā-paśka-vānā-paśa-vā-śātā-śātā pāvātyān tīthā with slight variants (see D. R. Bhandarkar's A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 451, 455, 478; cf. also No. 241). But here the word tīthā actually occurs in the text. And, as a matter of fact, what that tithā is has been specified in every one of these Chaulukya records. And it seems not a little suspicious that in all cases where the phrases ayānā or tāstāyā pāvātyān is used, whether in the Kusāna or Gupta records, there is not a single instance where the word tīthā is employed as in the specification of the date in the Chaulukya grants just referred to. Next, what we have to note is that no tīthā has at all been specified in any one of the Kusāna epigraphs, and that, on the contrary, there is evidence that the days mentioned there are solar (compare e.g., Nos. 16, 20, 29, 32 and so forth of Lüders' List of Brahmi Inscriptions, etc., where the number standing after di or divāna exceeding fifteen which is the maximum number of a paśka). What then becomes of the word pāvāt occurring in the Kusāna records? The word tīthā cannot possibly be understood after it, because none of them makes mention of any tīthā. It is true that in the Gupta inscriptions tīthās are mentioned in the specification of dates, but it does not follow that in the expression ayānā pāvātyān when it occurs in any one of them, we have to understand tīthā as Fleet has invariably done. If this view is accepted, how is it possible to interpret the expression ayānā-diāna-pāvātyān which is found in lac 7 of No. 16 below. We cannot possibly understand tīthā after it as Fleet has done in the foot note attached to it. First because no tīthā has been actually specified in this record. And secondly because the word diāna here must mean the day intervening between sunrise and sunset, and may sometimes comprise more than one tīthā. We have therefore to seek for some other meaning for pāvāt. Let us find out in what other inscriptions the word occurs. Thus, it is found in verse 12 on p. 192 of Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, and, above all, in verse 44 of the celebrated Maudgār inscription of Kumāragupta I and Bandhuvarman (No. 36 below), where, however, Fleet remarks: 'supply prāśastīh.' This is a curious proposal, because at one time the word tīthā and at another the word prāśastīh is understood by Fleet after pāvāt. The question arises: why not take pāvāt as a substantive as seems natural instead of taking it as an adjective? Because it is rather strange that in all these cases which are many, we find that we have to supply either tīthā or prāśastīh after it. That pāvāt is in such cases used as a substantive may be seen from the following which occurs in CII., Vol., III (1888), No. 36, pp. 138 ff. evam niṣakam-nāsakām śāhāyām pāvātyān sam-lekhana-rātucchā pāvātyān. In this sentence the term pāvāt has been used, not once, but twice. We are, therefore, compelled to take both these pāvāt, at least the first of them, as a substantive. And further it seems that the word was used probably in the sense of 'detailed description or specification'. The phrase may therefore be translated as follows: 'when, in this manner, with the regnal year, month and day, this was the detailed order (of the date), the detailed order being invested with its own characteristics'. That pāvāt had some such meaning appears also from the Nagari inscription (Bhandarkar, List of Northern Inscriptions etc., No. 5), where we meet with ayānā Mālavā-pāvātyān, "when this was the detailed order (of the date) according to the Mālavās". In all other records, therefore, where ayānā or śāhāyān pāvātyān occurs, we had better, for the same reason, translate it "when this was the detailed order (of the date)". [For further discussion on pāvāt, see B. Ch. Chhabra, Serva Prater, pp. 108 ff.; and D. C. Sircar, Ep. Ind., Vol. XXX, p. 123.—Ed.].
Kapila, for the commemoration of the preceptors and for the augmentation of the religious merit of himself.

(Lines 10-16) (It is) not written for (my own) fame, but for beseeching the worshippers of Mahēśvara. And it is an address to (those who are) the Āchāryas for the time being. Thinking them to be (their own) property, they should preserve, worship, and honour (them) as (their own) property. This is the request. Whosoever will do harm to these memorials or (destroy) the writing above or below, shall be possessed of the five great sins and the five minor sins.

(Line 17) And may divine Daṇḍa be always victorious, whose staff is terrific and who is the foremost leader.

No. 7 : PLATE VII

UDAYAGIRI CAVE INSRIPTION OF CHANDRAGUPTA II: THE YEAR 82

This inscription appears to have been first brought to notice in 1854 by General Cunningham, in his Bhilsa Topes, pp. 150 ff., where he published his reading of the text, and a translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate xxi, No. 200). In 1858, in his edition of Prinsep’s Essays, Vol. I, pp. 246 ff. note 4, E. Thomas published his own reading of the text, accompanied by a translation by Professor H. H. Wilson. And, finally, in 1880, in his CASIR, Vol. X, p. 50, General Cunningham published his revised reading of the text, and a revised translation of it, accompanied by a fresh lithograph (ibid., Plate xix). It was thereafter edited critically by J. F. Fleet, in CII., Vol. III, 1883, pp. 21 ff. accompanied by Plate II B.

Udayagiri is a well-known hill, with a small village of the same name on the eastern side of it, about two miles to the north-west of Bhēlā, the chief town of the Vīḍīśa District, Madhya Pradesh. On the eastern side of the hill, a little to the south of the village, and almost on the level of the ground, there is a cave-temple, which from its containing this inscription, General

---

1 Kṛiti in lines 9 and 15 should be distinguished from khyāti in line 11. K. T. Telang (Ind. Ant., Vol. IX, p. 35, note 13) first brought to notice, on the authority of Bhagwanlal Indraji, that in certain connection kirtana has the meaning of ‘a temple’; e.g. in line 18 of the Khārāpātan grant of Anantadeva, dated Saka-Saṅvat 1016 (ibid., p. 34), which he was then editing. Nevertheless, Fleet lost sight of this meaning when he translated verses in lines 14-17 of the Baroda grant of the Gujrat Rāshtrakūta Karka II, dated Śaka 724 (ibid., Vol. XII, p. 163). Soon thereafter R. G. Bhandarkar drew attention to the annotation of Telang and pointed out the error into which Fleet had fallen (ibid., Vol. XII, pp. 228 ff.). He was also able to quote three passages from the Agni-Purāṇa, (in the Bibliotheca Indica, Vol. I, P. 111), Bāna’s Kādambari, and Śōmeśvara’s Kṛitiśākamudī in which the word evidently has the same meaning. And to these instances Fleet was afterwards himself able to add the ‘Dudali’ inscriptions of Dēvalabhidhi (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, p. 289), and the Udayagiri inscription, dated Vikrama-Saṅvat 1093 (ibid., Vol. XIII, p. 183). On the analogy of these authorities, there is every reason for allotting the same meaning, when required, to kṛiti, which is a derivative from the same root. But the words kṛiti and kirtana are hardly to be actually translated by ‘temple’, or by any other specific term; they denote generally ‘any monument, or work, calculated to render famous the name of the constructor of it’. This is in accordance with the etymology of the words, from the root kṛi, ‘to mention, commemorate, praise’. And the particular word referred to may be a temple, as in the instances quoted above; a memorial, as in the present case; or a tank, as in Nos. 44, 45 of CII., Vol. III (1886), p. 212, note 6.

Another passage in which kṛiti has the same meaning, though we have no information now as to the specific nature of the work referred to, is in lines 4 ff. of an inscription on the right-hand side pier in the porch of the temple of Vaidyanātha at ‘Deoghari’ in the ‘Santal’ Parganās in the Bengal Presidency, edited by Rajendra Lal Mitra in the Jadasi, Vol. I, part i. [See the article on Kṛiti—Its Commutation by B. Ch Chhabra in Siddha Bhārati, Vol. I, pp. 33 ff. and Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVIII, p. 184.—Ed.].

2 Spelt as Udyagiri in Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. XXIV, p. 108, and described as “situated in 23° 32’ N. and 77° 46’ E., between the Betwa and the Besh rivers.” See also Atlas, ibid., Vol. XXVI, New (Revised 1931) edition, pl. 27.

3 The ‘Bhūla or Bheha’ of maps, etc., spelt Bhilā in the Imperial Gazetteer of India. Vol. VIII, p. 105.
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Cunningham has named “the Chandragupta Cave.” The inscription is on the upper part of a smoothed and countersunk panel, about 2’ 4½” broad by 1’ 6” high, over two figures, one of the four-armed god Vishnu, attended by his two wives; and one of a twelve-armed goddess, who, according to Fleet, is some form of Lakshmi. Cunningham, however, seems to be right in taking her to be Mahishasuramardini, as she is represented as holding the buffalo-demon by the heels and treading upon his head, which are sculptured on the face of the rock, outside the cave and a few feet to the north of the entrance to it. On the south is another figure of standing Vishnu. The writing which covers a space of about 2’ 3½” broad by 4½” high, is in a state of fairly good preservation. The surface of the rock has peeled off in some places; but no letters are entirely destroyed, except the g of Chandragupta in line 1, and in line 2, the first two aksharas of the name of the Mahārāja whose gift is recorded. The average size of the letters is about 9”. The characters belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet, and combine with a ‘box-headed’ variety, peculiar to Central India; but, in this inscription, there are no instances in which enough remains of the square centre of the tops of the letters to show distinctly in the lithograph. The ending m is indicated by the usual character of the letter but engraved diminutively, once in siddham and another time in ṭkādaśyām, both in line 1. Line 1 also includes forms of the numerical symbols for 2 and 80. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose. In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice, is the doubling of dh in conjunction with a following y, in aumuddhyāta, line 1.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. It is dated partly in numerical symbols and partly in words, in the year2 eighty-two (400-01 A.D.), and on the eleventh lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month of Āśāḍṣa. The cave appears to be a Vaishnava one, as on both sides of the entrance there is a figure of standing Vishnu. And the object of the inscription is to record the excavation of the same as a temple to that god, and not the mere gift of the two sculptures above which it is engraved, as Fleet has understood it,—by a Mahārāja of the Sanakānika tribe or family, who was a feudatory of Chandragupta II, but whose name, in line 2, is now illegible. His grandfather was the Mahārāja Chhagalaga, which name, according to A.M.T. Jackson, ‘has a Turki look’.4

TEXT

1 Siddham

Sanvatsārā 80 2 Āśāḍṣa-māsa suklaśkailkādaśyām

paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhi-srī-Chandraṛṛupta-pād-ānuddhyātaśya

1 CASR., Vol. X., pp. 49 ff., and Pls. xvi and xvii.
2 The wording here is sanvatsārā 80 2 which has to be understood as sanvatsarāṇaṇaḥ. The current year is therefore to be understood. If eighty-two had been expurred, we would have had sanvatsarāṇaḥ instead of sanvatsārā.
3 The vowel in the fourth syllable of this name is short i here, but it is long in the same word in the Allahābād pillar inscription (No. 1 above), p. 213, line 22.
5 From inked castampages.
6 The viśāna is indicated by two vertical strokes below which is placed the m of siddham. The miniature size of this m shows it to be mute.
7 Read mahārajaśakalī.<br>
8 Each one of these lines ends with a horizontal stroke, looking like the numerical symbol for 1. Fleet, however, takes it to be a viśīma, which is a mistake, as the viśīma in this record is represented by a vertical stroke as may be seen from the preceding immediately after siddham. The horizontal stroke may have been inserted here to indicate the ending of a line.
dhala (?) the son's son of the Mahārāja Chhagalaga; and the son of the Mahārāja Vishṇudāsa, who meditates on the feet of the Paramābhāṣṭāraka Mahārājadhirāja, the glorious Chandragupta (II).

TRANSLATION

Luck! In the year 80 2, on the eleventh lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month Āśādhāra, (is made) this, the religious benefaction[3] of the Sanakāṇika,[4] the Mahārāja . . . dhala (?), the son's son of the Mahārāja Chhagalaga; (and) the son of the Mahārāja Vishṇudāsa, who meditates on the feet of the Paramābhāṣṭāraka Mahārājadhirāja, the glorious Chandragupta (II).

No. 8: PLATE VIII

GAḌHWĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF CHANDRAGUPTA II: THE YEAR 88

This inscription, and the following two inscriptions of Kumāragupta, Nos. 17 and 26, are on a stone that was discovered in 1871-72 by Rājā Śīva Prasād, and were first brought to notice by General Cunningham in his CĀSIR, Vol. III, p. 55 and Vol. X, p. 9. It was afterwards re-edited by J. F. Fleet in CĪL, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 36 ff., Plate IV B.

Gaḍhwā, which means literally 'a fort,' is the name of several villages in the Arail and Bārā Parganās in the Karchhanā Taliṣāl or Sub-Division of the Allahābād District, Uttar Pradesh. The particular Gaḍhwā, where these inscriptions were found, is in the Bārā Parganā, eight miles to the west by south from Bārā, and one and a half miles south of the village of Bhatgadh. It is entered in the map simply as a "Fort." The stone containing the inscriptions was found built into the wall of one of the rooms of a modern dwelling-house inside the enclosure of the fort; and is a rectangular sandstone fragment, measuring about 9-½" broad by 4½" thick and 2½" high. It is now in the Indian Museum at Calcutta.

The stone is inscribed on three faces,—on the front, as it stands in the Museum, and on the two sides. It is entire towards the bottom; but the top of it, containing two or three lines of writing, has been broken away and lost. In addition to this, the sides now contain only about half of each line of the inscriptions engraved on them; and this, with the unfinished roughness of the present back of the stone, shows that about half of it has been pared away, in adapting it to some other purpose than that for which it was originally intended.

On the front of the stone, towards the top, traces are visible of eleven lines of writing, each of about thirteen letters, in characters of the same period with those of the inscriptions that are now published. But no part of this inscription, which seems to have been quite distinct from those on the sides, can be read; and the traces of it that remain are not worth being photographed.

---

1 The letter preceding lasya, which is partially preserved, is taken by Fleet as dhā. But this dhā is quite unlike dhā in Āśādhā in line 1. The original name seems to have consisted of four letters.
2 Fleet takes this symbol as double ḍvṣa. But this is clearly one horizontal stroke between the two dots of the visarga of dharmah.
3 Monier Williams in his Sanskrit-English Dictionary renders dīya-dharma by 'the duty of giving, charity'; Dowson, by 'votive offering' (e.g., JRAS, Vol. V, p. 164); Buhler and Bhagwanal Indrāja, by 'meritorious gift (or benefaction)' (e.g., ASWL, Vol. IV, p. 83); and Senart by 'a pious gift' (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 76, Nos. 7-8). The word literally means 'a religious gift (dharma), which is fit to be given'. It had better be translated with R. G. Bhandarkar by 'a benefaction' (Collected Works of R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol. I, p. 223).
4 See p. 243 above, note 3.
Gāḍhwā Stone Inscription of Chandragupta II: The Year 33
The inscription of Chandragupta II now published, is on the upper part of the present proper left side of the stone, and the writing covers a space of about 4" broad by 14-3/8" high. It was originally brought to notice, in 1873, by General Cunningham, who published his reading of the text of lines 10 to 17 in the CASIR., Vol. III, p. 55, with a lithograph of the whole (ibid., Pl. xx, No. 1). The first two entire lines, and the last half of each of the remaining lines, have been broken away and lost. The remnant of the inscription, however, is fairly well preserved and easy to read. The average size of the letters is 5-1/4". The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets, and are practically of the same type as those of the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, No. 1, pp. 203 ff. above, Plate I. We use the word 'practically' because m, l and h are, in all cases, of the eastern variety. But s in two instances is of the western type, s in divasa-, line 3 and in -ska(ñdh)am, line 17, all other cases of this character presenting the eastern. Further, the characters include in lines 7, 11, and 16, forms of the numerical symbols for 8, 10, and 80. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout. In respect of orthography, the only point requiring notice is the doubling of y and v after the anusvāra, in samyukta, lines 8 and 9, and -saṁvatsarē, line 11.

In the first part of the inscription, lines 1 to 9, the date and the name of the king are entirely broken away and lost. So also the name in the second part. But, in the latter part, lines 10 to 17, we have the date, in numerical symbols, of the year eighty-eight (406-07 A.D.). And this, coupled with the epithet Paramabhāgavata in line 10, followed by the beginning of the title Mahārājādhirāja, shows that the inscription, in this part, certainly belongs to the time of the Imperial Gupta king Chandragupta II. And the first part is so plainly engraved by the same hand,—and is, moreover, not separated by any dividing line,—that it must certainly be allotted to the same reign, and supposed to be of practically the same contents. Both the parts seem to record the gift of ten dināras as a contribution to the perpetual maintenance of a sātra, or charitable almshouse, apparently by a woman who was the wife of Mātridāsa, Chief of House-holders and an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra. The contribution was made over to a Brāhmaṇa whose name is lost but who bore the surname of Sadāsattrā-sāmānyā, the first part of which is apparently the old name of the place where the inscription was originally engraved and was so called because it was a place of perpetual almshouse.

TEXT

First Part

1 [Paramabhāgavata-mahārājādhirāja-sṛ-Chandragupta-rājya].
2 [saṁvatsarē] . . . . . . . . . . . . asyaṁ]
3 divasa-pūrvaṁ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
4 ka-Mātridāsa-p[u][t]ra . . . . . . [puny-ā]-
5 pyāyan-āṛttham rachi[ta] . . . . . . . . . . . . [sa]-
6 dāsa[t]ra-sāmāny[a]-brāhma[ṇa] . . . . . . . . .
7 dināraṁ = ddaśībbhip 10 . . . . . . . . . . . . [ni]
8 Yaś = ch = ainaṁ dharmma-skanda(ndha)m [vyuchchhindyāt = sa paṁcha-mahā patakāh sarṁ]-
9 yyukta(h) syād = iti [iti]

Second Part

10 Paramabhāgavata-mahā[rājādhirāja-sṛ-Chandragupta-rā]-
11 jya-saṁvatsarē 80 8 . . . . . . . . . . . . .
12 pūrvaṁ Pāṭaḥ(ṭa)liput[t]rē . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . [gri]-
THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS

13 hasthasya bhāryā y. ........................
14 =ātma-puny-ōpachay-[ārthamā] ........................
15 sadā-sattra-sāmānya-b[rāhmaṇa] ........................
16 dinārāḥ daśa 10 ............................... [ II ] [Yaś=ch=ainarā]
17 dharmma-skanda(ṇḍha)m vyuchchhindya[t=s] pañcha-mahāpātakaṁ samyuktaḥ
syād=iti [ II ]

TRANSLATION
First Part

(Lines 1-3) In the year of the (dyamic) rule \(^1\) of the prosperous Chandragupta the Mahārājādhirāja, an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudeva), when this was the specification of the date,

(Lines 3-7) ... Mātridāsa, the Chief (of the Householders) \(^2\) .. for the purpose of

---

\(^1\) Flect proposes to correct rājya-saṅvatsaraḥ into rājya saṅvatsaraḥ, because the original, if it is accepted as it stands, would have to be translated “in the year eighty-eighth of the reign of Chandragupta.” But the numerals, both here and elsewhere, says he, show that the expression cannot possibly refer to regnal years. “This method of expression,” he adds, “was a very common one in early times; and is due, of course, to the fact that the early years of most eras were regnal years, and that, after the death of the founder of each era, the expression was continued mechanically in the case of his successors.” But this emendation of reading is altogether unnecessary, and consequently the explanation in support of it, unconvincing. The word rājya in rājya-saṅvatsaraḥ may be compared to that in Gupta-nirpa-rajya-bhaktas occurring in the grants to the kings belonging to the Nripatiparājājaka family, and the whole expression had better be translated by “in the year of (the dynastic) rule of Chandragupta, etc.” This may be compared to Gupt-saṅvatasamāne nīpata-sattanābānān rājya-kulasāvahāvantam occurring in verse 1 of Udayagiri Cave Inscription, the year 106 (CII, Vol. III, 1888, No. 61). What this means is that the year 88 is of the Gupta sovereignty and pertains to Chandragupta II inasmuch as it fell in his reign. The phrase rājya-saṅvatsaraḥ does not occur for the first time in this inscription, or, for the matter of that, in any other Gupta record. It is met with also in the Kusaṇa period; e.g., in Mahārājasaśa Curṇikamya rājya-saṅvatsara vennam (No. 22 of Lüders’ List), in Dhakṣa rājya-saṅvatsara 20 (No. 33 of ibid.), and in Mahārājasaśa dvīputrasya Huvikhamya rājya-sanī (No. 51 of ibid.). A fuller form of the same expression is abhīvītadāmāvānāḥ rājya-saṅvatsaraḥ which occurs in line 6 of the Bīsād Pillar inscription of Kumāragupta, No. 16 below, line 3 of the Indo Plate of Sankagupta, No. 30 below, and line 1 of the Gaḍhwā inscription of the year 148 (CII, Vol. III, 1888, No. 66). Sometimes the word rājya is dropped, and simply saṅvatsaraḥ or its equivalent vasatḥ is used, e.g., rājya Kṣatrāparas ātani-Rudrāparas [sa]ṣṭhā ṭrī) yuttatā-jalāre 100 3 in lines 2-3 of the Gopā inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, p. 233) or rājya Mahākṣatrāparas ... Rudrāparas vasantā dvīputatāmānti 70 2 in line 4 of the celebrated Junāgadhi rock inscription (ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 42). This last record was edited by F. Kielhorn who has rendered it by “in the seventy-second—72nd—year of the king, the Mahākṣatrāparas Rudrāpamā” but in the introductory part of his paper on the same remark as follows: “the meaning clearly is that it took place during the reign of Rudrādamān in the given day in the 72nd year of the era used by Rudrādamān (and the Western Kṣatrāparas generally)” (ibid., p. 41). It had better be translated by “in the seventy-second—72nd—year (of the dynastic rule) of the king, the Mahākṣatrāparas, Rudrāpamā”.

\(^2\) If pra following Mātridāsa in the first part of the Text is restored to praathamā, [gṛ]haṃsaya of the second part may be taken to be the second component of the name. The whole word may thus be restored to praathamagṛhaṃsaya, which seems to be equivalent to praathamakulika of the Dāmōdarpur plates edited below (Nos. 22, 24, 41 and 47). Gṛhaṃsya appears to be identical with Gṛhapatī, a term frequently met with in cave inscriptions. We thus hear of Gaḥapati-Nagama (Lüder’s List, Nos. 1001, 1127 and 1153), Gaḥapati-Śeḷī (ibid., Nos. 1056, 1073 and 1075), and Gaḥapati-Satthavaha (ibid., No. 1062). As one of these Gaḥapatis is a Naigama, one a Śṛṣṭhīna and one a Sātvaha, this is apt to create the impression that Gaḥapati represents the mercantile class only. But we have also an instance of a Gaḥapati (Gṛhaṃsya) called Naṇḍa (Naṇḍa) who is mentioned as a son of Usabhaṇa (Rishabha), who is, however, described not only as Kuṭubika (=Kutumbyaka=Gṛhaṃsya) but also as Hālakya (ibid., No. 1121). As Hālakya is the same as Hālīka, ‘a ploughman, an agriculturist,’ it is quite clear that Naṇḍa, though a Gaḥapati, belonged to the cultivators’ class. Besides, it is worthy of note that Kutumbyaka is identical with Gṛhaṃsya as both the words signify ‘a householder.’ It thus seems that in ancient times the higher middle class was composed of agriculturists and mercantile people. In later times, the term Gṛhaṃsya was forgotten and kutumbya was alone in use. And the latter denoted exclusively the cultivating caste, and is, no doubt, traceable in the Marāṭhī word Kuṇbī or Kuṭjīhē and the Gujarati Koṇbī.
augmenting (her own spiritual merit) . . . organised . . . a Brāhmaṇā of the township of Sadāsattrā . . . by ten dināras (or in figures) 10.

(Lines 8-9) And whosoever (breaks up) this bit of charity² shall become infected (with the Five Great Sins).

Second Part

(Lines 10-12) In the year 808, of the (dynastic) rule of the prosperous Chandragupta the Mahānā, an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva) . . . (on this lunar day characterised by the week day).

(Lines 12-16) . . . Pātaliputra . . . the wife of (the chief of) the Householders . . . (for the purpose) of augmenting (her) own spiritual merit . . . a Brāhmaṇā of the township of Sadāsattrā . . . ten dināras, (or in figures) 10.

(Lines 16-17) (And whosoever) breaks up (this bit of charity) shall become infected with the Five Great Sins.

No. 9: PLATE IX

SĀNCHĪ STONE INSCRIPTION ON CHANDRAGUPTA II: THE YEAR 93

This inscription was first brought to notice in 1834, in the JBAS, Vol. III, pp. 438 ff., where was published a lithograph of it (ibid., Plate xxviii), reduced by James Prinsep

¹ The word sāmānya in the sense of 'community' is of common occurrence in inscriptions. We have thus Śrī-Valabhi-vinnirōgata-tach-Chāturvīda-sāmānya-Vātsalāvasa-sagātra, in lines 14-45 of the Baroda plates of the Gujarāt Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Karaka Suvarṇavara (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, p. 150), Śrī-Varnavi-vinnirōgata-tach-Chāturvīda-sāmānya-Kunjina-sagātra, in the Baroda plates of the Gujarāt Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Kirīnārāja Akaḷavara (ibid., Vol. XIII, p. 69), Girinagara-vinnirōgata-Suddhācāra-vinnirōgata-tach-Chāturvīda-sāmānya-Sudāsvari-sagātra, in line 19 of the Nausāri plates of the Gurjara Jayabhaṭa (III) (ibid., Vol. XIII, p. 78), and so forth. Chāturvīda and Chāturvēda of these records have been taken to stand for Trivēda and Chaturvēda of the modern day. It thus seems that sāmānya was here used in the sense of 'surname or family name.' On the other hand, we have to note of somewhat dissimilar instances of the employment of this word. Thus, we have e.g., Bhāradaṇī-gotra-sāmānya-charya, Kājēpa-gotra-sāmānya-charaya, etc., specified in lines 25-26 of some Brāhmaṇā grantees named in the Mudiyānār plates of the Bāṇa Mallādeva-Nandīvarman (ibid., Vol. XV, p. 175). It is not at all impossible that here the Gotra served as a family name as is still the case in U.P. and Panjab. Another instance that we have to note in this connection is Kaliṅgāvara-sāmānya-Cāggeśa-sagātra, occurring in line 10 of the Parā-Kimedi plates of the Gaṅga Indravarman Rājasidhā (Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, p. 134). Here also it is quite possible to argue that Kaliṅgāvara has been used as a surname of the Brāhmaṇ grantee, a practice which is still common in Madras and Mysore. In fact, this phrasing may be compared to Uṇhaṇarākṛta-kulamānudāypī which occurs in the Haidarabad plates of Chalukya Pulakēśa II and to which we drew attention in Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, p. 72. Here Uṇhaṇarākṛta is unquestionably the name of a village, which is taken as a family name of the grantees; in other words, kulamānudāypī here seems to be synonymous with sāmānya. Nothing, therefore, precludes us from supposing that the word sāmānya signifies primarily 'a community' or 'ownership' and is secondarily used to denote 'surname' or 'family name.' The same must be the sense in which the word has been employed in our inscription. Sadāsattrā must, therefore, be taken to be the name of the place where this inscription and those bearing numbers 17 and 26 were engraved. And, as they all speak of endowments being made to one and the same sattā, whether for feeding Brāhmaṇas or people of other castes, it is not unreasonable to surmise that this locality, which abounded in such charitable houses was for that reason called Sādāsattrā. If any instances of such significant names are required, they are furnished by Pushkara so called because it contains (three) lakes (pushkara) as well as by Anūpa and Jáñgala so named because they were originally or are even now watery or marshy (anupa) and arid and unfertile (jāngala) countries.

² It is somewhat difficult to understand what dharmaskanda signifies. Skanda means 'a troop, multitude, quantity, aggregate'; 'a part, division (especially a division of an army or a form of military array)'; 'a chapter, section (of a book, system, etc.)'. In these circumstances Dharmaskandha must mean either 'a mass or aggregate of charity' or 'a bit, part or section of charity'. The latter sense seems preferable.
from a copy by R. H. Hodgson. This lithograph was not accompanied by any details of the contents of the inscription; and it is a very imperfect one; especially in showing no traces whatever of the first six or seven letters of each line, all the way down. And in 1837, in the same Journal, Vol. VI, pp. 451 ff., Prinsep published his reading of the text, and a translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph, reduced from copies on cloth and paper made by Captain Edward Smith, of the Engineers (ibid., Plate xxv). It was edited critically for the first time by J. F. Fleet, in CII., Vol. III, 1883, pp. 29 ff., Plate III B.

Sāñchi, or Sāchī, is a village about twelve miles to the north-east of Diwāngañj, the chief town of the Diwāngañj Tashil or Sub-Division of Bhopal in Madhya Pradesh. It is sometimes called Sāñchi-Kānākhēgā, through its name being coupled with that of another small village immediately to the north of it.

The writing, which covers a space of about 2' 6-1/4" broad by 1' 9" high, is on the outer side of the top rail in the second row, outside and on the south side of the eastern gateway of the Great Stūpa. The inscription is very well preserved, except that two or three letters are destroyed and quite illegible near the commencement of each line as far as line 8. The average size of the letters is 3/8". The characters belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet and approximate most closely to, in the present volume, those of the Mandasōr inscription of Kumāragupta and Bandhuvarman, No. 36 below, Plate xxxvi, and, elsewhere, those of the Aihoi inscription1 of the Western Chalukya king Pulakēśin II of Śaka-saraṇvat 556 (634-35 A.D.). They include, in line 11, forms of the numerical symbols for 3, 4 and 90. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout. In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice is the use of the dental s, instead of the visarga or the upadimāṇyā, in conjunction with p, in yaśas-patāka, line 4.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. Its date, in numerical symbols, is the year ninety three (411-12 A.D.), on the fourth day, without any specification of the lunar fortnight, of the month Bhādrapada (August-September). It is a Buddhist inscription; and the object of it is to record the grant, by Amrakārdava or Ámrakārdava, son of Undāna, of a village called Īśvaravāsaka, and a sum of money, to the Ārya-Saṅgha, at the Great Buddhist Convent of Kākanādabōta, for the purpose of feeding mendicants and maintaining lamps. Amrakārdava was presumably an officer of Chandragupta II. He describes himself to be an anyujin or dependent of this king, to have achieved victories in many battles, and, above all, as selling off three rājakulas or palaces which have been named. It seems that Amrakārdava was something like a quarter-master entrusted with the duty of the making out of camp and assignment of quarters. It further seems that Chandragupta's establishment, apparently at Vidiśā, broke up before Bhādrapada of the Gupta year 93 when he retired from the world and that consequently Amrakārdava had to sell off the palaces which had been occupied by the king and his party. With the money so realised which was apparently the king's own half, the village of Īśvaravāsaka was purchased for feeding monks and burning lamps for the acquisition of virtues by Chandragupta Dēvārāja.

The Kākanādabōta Convent, says Fleet, is the Great Sāñchi Stūpa itself. But a vihāra, which is a place of residence for monks, is always distinguished in Buddhist literature from a thūpa or stūpa, which is an object of worship. The remains of many monasteries were exhumed by John Marshall during his excavations at Sāñchi. But none of them is earlier than the seventh century A.D. In some places, however, he lighted upon traces of older monasteries on which the later ones were erected. Anyhow the Mahāvihāra referred to in this record has not

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, pp. 1 ff.
yet been identified. What Kākanāda-bōta exactly means or denotes we do not know. Nevertheless a shrewd guess may be hazarded. It is worthy of note that Kākanāva and other Prākrit forms of Kākanāda occur in five inscriptions connected with Sāñchi and Andhēr Stūpas. Two of these, associated with Sāñchi Stūpa No. I, utter an imprecation against any one who takes away or causes to be taken away an arch (tūra), railing (vēdikā) or stonework (sēlākama) from ‘this Kākanāva’ and causes it to be transferred to another āchārya-kula (Lüders’ List Nos. 340 and 350). Bühler, on the suggestion of Jacobi, translates the term āchārya-kula, by ‘temple of the teacher’; and Lüders follows him. But the word, on the analogy of ārakula and rējikula had better be rendered by ‘the seat or establishment of a teacher.’ It thus seems that some site near Sāñchi Stūpa No. I formed the establishment of one Teacher, which, again, was known as Kākanāva (=Kākanāda). This sense which we have attached to the word does not run counter to the text of a third inscription found at Sāñchi Stūpa No. I which, according to Bühler, runs: Kā[kanā]jē bhagavañē paṃāna-laṭhī (Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 99, No. 21). His translation, however, is faulty, and we have to accept that of Fleet and Lüders, namely, ‘The measuring-staff of Bhagavat at Kākanāva’ (loc. cit., No. 200). There are two more records which mention Kākanāda. One of these is engraved on the steatite box of Andhēr Stūpa No. II. Fleet correctly reads it Sāpurisasa Gōtiptasa Kākanā-Pabhāsanasa Kōñīna-gōlasa (CII., Vol. III, 1888, p. 31) and Lüders correctly renders it by “(Relics of the saint (sāpurisa) Gotiputa (Gauptiputra) of the Kōñīna (Kauṇānya) gōtra (gōta) who illumined (? pabhāsana) Kākanāva” (loc. cit., No. 681). The only doubtful word here is pabhāsana, which means ‘illuminator.’ And, prima facie, this appears to be the correct sense, because Kākanāda, being the site of an Āchārya-kula, was already a holy place. And if there was a teacher here who was an illuminator of Kākanāda, he must naturally have been looked upon as sāpurisa (=satpurusha) or saint whose relics were worthy of being enshrined in a stūpa close by, namely, at Andhēr. But the fifth or the last record which we have now to notice seems to cast some doubt on this point. It is engraved on the inner circle of the steatite box in Sāñchi Stūpa No. II. According to Cunningham it reads: Kākanava-pabhāsasahāna dānam (Bhilsa Tapes, p. 288, No. 2); and Lüders translates it by “Gift of The Pabhāsasahās of Kākanava” (No. 659). It is well-known that Cunningham’s readings of inscriptions in this volume are very often faulty and the Plates, being mere eye-copies, cannot be considered as very reliable. In these circumstances it is permissible to compare these two records, one with the other, and suspect that what he reads as pabhāsasahāna is a mistake for pabhāsanakāna and further infer that Pabhāsana or Pabhāsanaka may, after all, be the name of the line to which the Āchāryas of Kākanāda pertained. Anyhow, this much is certain that Kākanāda is the name of the site occupied by the Āchārya-kula connected with Sāñchi Stūpa No. I.

What then does Kākanāda-bōta mean? It is worthy of note that the whole expression Kākanāda-bōta-śri-mahāvijñātṛ occurs in the Sāñchi stone inscription1 of the year 131, which also is engraved on a railing of and is connected with Sāñchi Stūpa No. I. In this connection Fleet says: “It is not quite certain what meaning is to be allotted to bōta in this name; but it is probably another form of bōta, ‘the foundation of a house.’ This does not help us at all in understanding the term Kākanāda-bōta. It is true that in a footnote Fleet remarks further that bōta occurs again as part of a proper name in Raṅkabōta, in line 8 of the Khoh Copper-plate inscription2 of Mahārāja Jayanātha and vēta as territorial name, in line 6 of the Khoh Copper-plate inscription3 of Mahārāja Sarvanātha. We have also Bōta, as a proper name, in a

---

2 Ibid., No. 27, p. 122.
3 Ibid., No. 29, p. 131.
Valabhi plate (CII, Vol. III, 1888, p. 166, line 25). This also does not help us because we know that Kākanāda of Kākanādobota denoted a particular place; in fact, it denoted the site of the Āchārya-kula to which pertained Sāñchī Stūpa No. I. Kākanādobota must therefore have signified the bōja of this site, or of Kākanāda as it was then called. Now, the term bōja has been preserved, so far as we know, in Marāṭhi and Hindi, and means ‘a finger; a finger’s breadth.’ If this sense is really intended here, Kākanādobota seems to have been so called, because it looked like a finger of the Kākanāda locality.

TEXT

1 [Siddham]1 Kā[kanā]dabota-sri-mahāvīhārē śila-samādhī-prajñā-guṇa-bhāvīt-
ēndri[y]āya parama-puṣya-
2 kṣē[2]... tāya chatur-ddig-abhāyāgatāya śramāṇa-puṅgav-āvasathāyā=āryyasāṅghāya
mahārajaḍhi-
3 rā[ja-srī]-Chandragupta-pāda-prasād-āpyāyita-jivita-sādhanaḥ anujīvi-satpuru-
sha-sadbhāva-
4 vṛi ... 4 jagnī prakhyāpyan anēka-samar-āvāpta-vijaya-yaśas-patakaḥ Sukuli-
dēśa-Na-
5 stī ... vāstavyaḥ Undāna-putr-Āmrakārddavā Māja-Śarabhaṅga-Āmrarāta-
rājakula-muḷya-κri-
6 ta[m ... r.ī] Isvaravāsakāma pañccha-maṇḍalyā pañcīpataya dadāti pañccha-
vinśati=cha7 dinā-
7 rān ... 11.8 [11.8] yad-aruddhena mahārajaḍhiraṇa-srī-Chandraguptasya
Dēvarāja iti pri-
8 ya-nā[ma] ... [y=ṛ]tasya9 sarvga-guṇa-sampattayē yāvach=chandrādityau
tāvat=pañccha bhikṣhavō bhurja-
9 tām ra[tna*-][grihē] cha dipakō jvalatu [1*] mama ch-āpar-ārdhāṁ=pañch=
aiva bhikṣhavō bhurjanatāḥ ratna-grihē cha
10 dipaka i[t] [1*] [Ta]=stä-pravṛttarhy uucchhindyāt=sa gō-brahma-hatyayā
sahyukto bhavet=pañcchabhis=ch=āna-
11 ntaryyair=iti [1*] Sarī10 90 3 Bhādrapada-di11 4

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-7) Luck! To the venerable (Buddhist) confraternity, in the prosperous Great Convent of Kākanādobota, in which the organs of sense (of its members) have been perfected

1 In the original, this word, which is very much damaged and hardly recognisable, stands above the first two letters of line 1.
2 These two letters have been supplied from line 2 of the Sāñchī inscription of the year 131, CII., Vol. III, 1888, No. 62, Plate xxxviiii, where they are quite distinct.
3 Fleet wrongly reads this letter as kṛ. It is clearly kṣē; and the whole can be safely restored to parama-puṣya-

kṣētra-matāya which also makes good sense, as may be seen from the translation.
4 This may be restored to tṛittakaṃ.
5 This may be restored to dvyadharmanāṃ.
6 Fleet corrects it into pañccha-maṇḍalyā[ṛḥ*], which is wrong.
7 Read -vinśati cha.
8 The lacuna may be filled up with aksāya-nilabdabah.
9 We might supply the lacuna with priya-nāmadhārayaḥ bhavaty=ītasya.
10 See p. 246 above, note 1.
11 That is, diśa or divasī. As di has been joined to Bhādrapada, the word properly denotes the solar day, from sunrise to sunrise, with which a week-day name would be coupled; not the lunar ṛṭikā, which may coincident with, more or less may differ from, the solar day and week day.
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by such qualities as piety, meditation and wisdom; which is considered to be the highest field of merit; which has gathered together from the four quarters of the world; (and) which is the abode of most eminent Sramaṇas, having prostrated himself in a circle of five (limbs), Āmrakārdava, son of Undāna whose means of subsistence has been augmented through the favour of the feet of the Meharājādhiraṅga, the prosperous Chandragupta (II), who is proclaiming to the world the faithful spirit of a dependent who is an excellent man, whose banner of fame was the victories achieved in many battles, (and) who is an inhabitant of (the town of) Nashī ... in the Sukulī country—gives Iśvaravāsaka ... purchased with the price of the palaces Maja, Śarabhaṅga and Āmrarāṭa; and twenty-five dināras (as a permanent endowment); (Lines 7-9) with the (first) half of which, let five (Buddhist) mendicants be fed, and let a lamp burn in the jewelled house, as long as the moon and the sun (endure), for the attainment

5 The Pāli form of puṇya-kuṭīrā is puṇtha-kuṭīrāṇṇa which is thus explained by Childers in A Dictionary of the Pāli Language: “field of merit, epiphany of the Saṅgha or Buddhist clergy, because men acquire merit by showing kindness or charity to them.”

6 According to Fleet, “pāṭha-maṇḍalī is evidently the same as the Paṭhāṭit, Paṭhāṭyā, or Paṭhāṭ, of modern times, the village-jury of five (or more) persons, convened to settle a dispute by arbitration, etc.” The words that are, however, found regularly used in inscriptions are (1) paṭhāṭī or Paṭhāṭikā in Nepal inscriptions, No. 4, line 11; No. 7, lines 13 and 15; No. 10, line 16; No. 13, line 20 (Ind. Ant., Vol. IX, pp. 168, 170, 173 and 177); and (2) paṭhāṭikālī in Gujarati and Rajasthan inscriptions (D.R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 565, 587 and 631); from which is derived the word paṭhāṭī prevalent still in Rajasthan and signifying ‘a member of the Panch’, and of which the abbreviated form paṭha is found prefixed to the names of some people, though Kielhorn feels inclined to take it as ‘equivalent to paṭhāṭakalpli (paṭhāṭī) which occurs as an epithet of two persons (father and son) in Prof. Weber’s Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., Vol. II, p. 96” (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 106-107). The term paṭhāṭamāṇḍalī means ‘a group or aggregate of five,’ which does not run counter to the sense Fleet has attached to the word. This does not, however, seem to be the sense intended here, because, in the first place, the word actually engraved is paṭaṭa-maṇḍalī which Fleet wrongly corrects into paṭha-maṇḍalīn[ms]; secondly, idiom requires that we should have paṭha-maṇḍalīn pravṛtiṇa instead of paṭha-maṇḍalīn pravṛtiṇa as Fleet has it, if Āmrakārdava really prostrated himself before the Panch; and, thirdly, the verb dadāti in line 6 goes with Āryanāgāya in line 2 which is in the dative and there is no necessity of supposing any intermediate body like the Panch, the word standing for which is paṭha-maṇḍalīn[ms], which, again, is not in the dative but locative. What then could be the meaning of paṭha-maṇḍalī here? In this connection our attention was drawn many years ago by Rev. Mr. Siddhartha to the word paṭha-paiṭhisāna which is explained in Childers’ Dictionary as follows: “Setting down or fixing of five things ... Paṭhāṭakaiṭhisānā vandati, to salute with the five roots, viz., to prostrate oneself before a superior so completely that the forehead, elbows, waist, knees, and feet rest on the ground ... Paṭha-maṇḍalī pravṛtiṇa of our text corresponds to this Pāli phrase and may be taken to mean ‘having prostrated himself in a group of five (so that his five limbs touched the ground).”

Dēśa denotes primarily ‘a country’ and secondarily ‘a kingdom;’ so also, rāṣṭra and vishaya. The last two terms again denote a division or sub-division of a kingdom for administrative purposes according to the different times and the different parts of India where they were used. Here, however, dēśa stands for ‘a country’ as the term vāstuṣya following it shows.

6 Muḷpa means ‘price, worth, a sum of money given as payment.’ It cannot be equivalent to akṣhayo-nūtī, as Fleet takes it; because akṣhayo-nūtī means ‘a permanent endowment,’ if muḷa at all has that sense. Again, Fleet translates Maja-Śarabhaṅga-Āmrarāṭa-rājikāla by “Maja, Śarabhaṅga and Āmrarāṭa of the royal household” which yields no good sense at all. Rājikāla must here be taken in the sense of ‘a palace.’ Maja, Śarabhaṅga and Āmrarāṭa thus seem to be the names of the palaces which were occupied by Chandragupta II while he was encamped at Vidiśā during his expedition of conquest.

7 Akṣhayo-nūtīth may be supplied on the analogy of line 3 of the Sāṃchi inscription of the year 131 referred to on p. 249, note 1 above.

8 This must refer to the income realised from Iśvaravāsaka after paying off the state revenue. This income must be equal to the interest on twentyfive dināras, as the object served by both was exactly identical.

9 “This is the literal meaning of rātasa-grīha,” says Fleet. “It seems to denote the Śūpā itself, as the abode of the three rātas or ‘jewels or precious things,’ viz., (1) Buddha; (2) Dharma, the Law or Truth; and (3) Śunyata, the community or congregation.” Fleet, however, forgets that the Buddha was one of the three rātas and that consequently rātasa-grīha can reasonably denote the shrine of the Buddha. In fact, the term rātasa was employed to denote not only the Buddha but also Bōdhisattvas. See, e.g., the passage where the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka explains (Contd. on p. 252)
of all virtues by the Mahārājādhīrāja, the prosperous Chandragupta (II) whose favourite name is Devarāja;¹

(Lines 9-10) with the other half, which is mine,² let the same number of mendicants be fed, and let (a lamp) burn in the jewel-house.

(Lines 10-11) Whosoever breaks up that same arrangement, shall become infected with the killing of a cow or of a Brāhmaṇa³ and with the five sins that cause immediate retribution.⁴

(Line 11) (In the year 903, on the day 4 of Bhādrapada.

No. 10: PLATE X

MATHURĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF CHANDRAGUPTA II

This inscription was discovered in 1853 by General Cunningham, and was first brought to notice by him in his first Archaeological Report, which, originally printed in 1863 as a supplement to the J.B.A., Vol. XXXII, pp. iii to cxxix, was in 1871 reprinted, with the addition of Plates, as Casir., Vol. III, p. 37, and Plate xvi, No. 24, wherein he published a reduced lithograph of it, showing the completion of the lines as arranged by him. It was thereafter edited critically by J. F. Fleet, in Gh., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 25 ff. accompanied by Plate III A.

The inscription is on a red-sandstone fragment, about 10½” broad by 11-¾” high, cracked across the lower proper right corner, which was found, with its face downwards, forming part of the pavement immediately outside the Katra gateway at Mathura, the chief town of the Mathura District in Uttar Pradesh. The original stone was for a long time in the Provincial Museum at Lahore, but has now been transferred to the Curzon Museum, Mathura.

The writing, which covers the entire front of the stone, about 10½” broad by 11-¾” high, is in a state of very fair preservation. It is only a fragment, the first line has been almost entirely destroyed, and an indefinite number of lines have been almost entirely broken away and lost at the bottom of the stone; and, in addition to this, from one to nine aksharas have been broken away and lost at the commencement of the lines, except in lines 8 and 9. The size of the letters varies from ⅓” to ⅕”. The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets. They are of radically the same stock with those of the Mathura pillar inscription of Chandragupta II, No. 6 above, but with some minor differences in details. The only character of the eastern Gupta

the phrase Mathura-prajñavādita (SBE., Vol. XXI, p. 66. Ratnagriha is met with once again in a Mathura Buddhist inscription, where we have ratnagriha-sarva-buddha-tattva, ‘Jewel-house for the worship of all Buddhas’ (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXI, p. 246, note; Lüders’ List, No. 125), showing that here we had a shrine comprising images of all Buddhas. We have a similar expression in ratnakara-bhadra-dhamma in a Kāraṇa Jaina inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 131, line 7), meaning ‘the blessed abode of the three Jewels’ who in this particular case are Arā, Muni and Muni-Suvrata mentioned in line 20 (ibid., p. 132).

¹ Princp rendered this passage so as to make Dēvarāja to be another name of Chandragupta II. But says Fleet: “This may be correct. But we have no other authority for giving him this second name.” He, therefore, filled up the lacunae in such a way as to give the translation: “for the perfection of all the virtues of him who, having the familiar name of Dēvarāja, is minister of the Mahārājādhīrāja, the glorious Chandragupta.” Prinsep’s surmise, however, turns out to be correct. For, since Fleet wrote, two grants of the Vākāṭaka queen Prabhavati-Guptā have been found (Gh., Vol. V, pp. 5 ff. and pp. 35 ff.) which show that her father who is elsewhere called Dēvarāja is here called Chandragupta (II), son of Samudragupta. This was pointed out by us long ago in Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, pp. 186-61.

² Obviously Amrakārda is here speaking of himself.

³ It is worthy of note that the slaughter of a cow is here considered to be as heinous as that of a Brāhmaṇa.

⁴ Pañcika ānusārya is the same as the Pañcika Pañcikāsūriya-kammañ, which is thus explained by Childers: “Five sins that bring with them immediate retribution. . . They are the six Abhīṣānas minus the last or last but one.” And Abhīṣāna is further explained as follows: “Crime, deadly sin. . . They are six: Matricide, patricide, killing an Arhat, shedding the blood of a Buddha, causing divisions among the priesthood, following other teachers.”
MATHURĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF CHANDRAGUPTA II

G. S. Gai

From photograph
alphabet which is noticeable here is m, which is practically identical with that of the Allahābād pillar inscription of Samudragupta except that there is a slightly marked curve in the left downward stroke of this letter. The other text characters, namely, l, s and k are of the western Gupta variety. The language is Sanskrit; and the extant portion of the inscription is in prose throughout. The orthography does not present anything calling for remark.

The inscription is one of the Imperial Gupta king Chandragupta II. His name does not occur in the portion that is extant. But the instrumental case putrēna in line 9, immediately after the mention, in the genitive case, of Samudragupta, shows that the genealogy was continued down to, and ended with, his son and chosen successor (parigarhiśa), whose name came in line 11 or 12, and who is known from the subsequent records to have been Chandragupta II (e.g., line 19 of No. 33 below). The date of the inscription, if any was recorded, and the subject of it, were in the portion that has been broken away and lost.

TEXT

1. . . . [Sarvva-raj-ōcchhētuḥ prithivivaluum = apratiratha]-
2. [sya chatur-udadhi-sal]-āsvādita-ya[śasō Dha]-
3. [nada-Varu-En-dr-Āntaka-samasya Kṛiṇānta-[paraśōh]-
4. [nyā-āgat-ānēka-gē]-hīranya-kōti-prada[yā chīr-o]-
5. [tsann-āsvamēdāh-āharttum=mmahārāja-śri-Gupta-prapau[t]r[asya]-
6. [mahārāja-śri-Ghaṭotkaṭa]-cha-paurasraya mahārājādhirā[ajā]-
7. [śri-Chandragupta-pu]trāsva Lichchhavi-dauhitrāsva mahā[dē]-
8. [vyan Kumāra]-d[ē]vyām = utpānvasya mahārājādhirā-
9. [ja-śri-Samudraguptasya] putrēna tat-pa[rir]-
11. [na] paramabhāgavatēna mahārājādhirāja-śri]-
12. [Chandraguptēna] . . . . . . . . .

( The rest of the inscription is entirely broken away and lost.)

TRANSLATION

(Lines 11-12) [By the prosperous Chandragupta, the Mahārājādhirāja, an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsūdevā),]

1 From the original stone. The passages that have been broken away are supplied from lines, 24, 26, 28 and 29 of the Allahābād pillar inscription of Samudragupta (No. 1 above), and from lines 1 to 4 of the Bhitari pillar inscription of Skandagupta (No. 31 below).

2 These two lines have been added to show how the original record must have continued.

3 Bhāgavata literally means 'a devotee of Bhagavat,' and consequently Paraśa-Bhāgavata 'an ardent devotee of Bhagavat.' The term is employed as an epithet of any god or object of worship; thus, it is applied to Śambhu (Śiva) in line 5 of No. 11, below; to Śvāmi-Mahāśēna (Kārttikeya), in line 7 of No. 16, below; to Viṣṇu, in line 6 of No. 40, below; to Varuṇavāsin (the sun), in line 13 of Deo-Baranark inscription (CII, Vol. III, 1888, No. 46); to Daññakārṇa, lord of serpents, in line 3 of No. 16, Ep. Ind., Vol. 1, p. 590; to the Buddha, in line 6 of Sāntī Stone inscription (CII, Vol. III, 1868, No. 62) and to Jinvendra, in line 1 of the Aihole inscription of Pulakśīn II (Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 4). But it seems to denote Viṣṇu or rather Vāsūdevā when used by itself, as in bhagavat-pādeva', lines 8-9 of the Khōr plates of the Mahārāja Jayaśāha of the year 177 (No. 27, CII, Vol. III, 1888). Similarly, bhāgavata denotes 'a devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsūdevā)' when there is nothing in the context to give it any other application; thus, in the celebrated Benagari pillar inscription, the Greek ambassador (Tīna-dēta), Heliodēra (Heliodoros), calls himself Bhāgavata in connection with the erection of the pillar by him as a Garuda-dhāraṇī in front of the shrine of Vāsūdevā, god of gods (A.R. ASI, 1908-09, p. 128). Similarly, the term bhāgavata occurs in line 7 of the Khōr plates just referred to. The term could, however, be affixed to the name of any other god to denote devotees of that god. Thus, the Mahābhāṣya, Verse 2.76, speaks of Śiva-bhāgavata in the sense of 'devotees of Śiva, the bhagavat.' As regards Paraśa-Bhāgavata, it is a technical sectarian title, analogous to Paraśa-Mahākara (e.g., No. 38 of CII, Vol. III, 1888), Paraśa-Brahmasya (e.g., line 39 of the grant of (Contd. on p. 254)
Amma II, Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, p. 16; also in Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 237, line 83). Other similar epithets, but not formed in quite the same way, are Parama-Aditya-bhakta (e.g., in line 10 of No. 38 of CH, Vol. III, 1888); and Parama-Bhagavati-bhakta (e.g., Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, p. 18, lines 5 and 5-6); also Atyanta-Mahesvara and Atyanta-Śrīmi-Mahēśvararāja-bhakta, e.g., Chamnak Copper-plate inscription of Pravaraśena II, lines 9 and 4 (CH, Vol. III, 1888, No. 55); and Atyanta-Bhadra-bhakta, in No. 40 below, line 6, and Erū Trimurtic inscription of Tōraṇāja, line 1 (CH, Vol. III, 1886, No. 36). In the mediaeval period the epithet Parama-Vaiśnavāja also met with (e.g., Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, p. 17, line 1). Whether it is exactly identical with Parama-Bhagavata is, however, not quite clear. The same is the case with Parama-Pītāpana which also occurs in epigraphic records (e.g., line 3 of the Verawal inscription of Arjunadeva, Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, p. 242), like Parama-Mahēśvara. These two epithets may, however, stand for two different sects of Śaivas. Similarly, in the Neupura plate of Subhākara of the Kara family, while the king is called Parama-Sugata, his own father Śivakara is styled Parama-Tāṭhāgata (Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, p. 3, lines 3-5 f.). This also may indicate two different sects of Buddhism. In later times, again, a person may be an adherent of two alien sects; thus, in a Pītāpūram inscription, Mallapadēva describes himself as both Parama-Bhagavata and Parama-Brahmānanda (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 237, lines 62-83); similarly, Vaidyadeva of Prāggyatīsika calls himself both Parama-Mahēśvara and Parama-Vaiśnavāja (Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 339, line 47). 1

1 The word parigūḍha must here mean ‘selected’ or ‘accepted’, as Fleet first pointed out (CH, Vol. III, 1888, p. 12, note 1). And further we must assume that what is meant here is that Chandragupta was selected by his father as heir-apparent, no doubt, from amongst his many brothers, some of whom were senior to him in age. Surely in the Gupta period the practice of adopting the name of the yuvārāja was prevalent. Thus, at Bāysīth, many seals have been recovered of the time of Chandragupta II, which relate to the offices connected with the administration of the yuvārāja (ASI, A.R., 1903-04, pp. 107 ff., Nos. 4, 6, 11 and 12). Generally, the choice fell upon the eldest son, but he was not recognised as yuvārāja unless he was formally anointed. The yuvārāja had the status of a Mahārāja as in the case of Gāvindagupta, son of Chandragupta II and Dhrusavāminī (ibid., p. 107, No. 1; Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, p. 5). It seems that Chandragupta II was not the eldest son of Samudragupta and is, therefore, spoken of as being selected (as heir-apparent) by the latter. The necessity of stating it was all the greater in his case, as his elder brother, Kāchagupta (or Rāmagupta), stood for some time in the way of his ascending the Gupta throne after the demise of their father.

2 The epithet, sarva-raja-śeśēṇëti, occurs on the reverse of some gold coins, hitherto always classed in the Imperial Gupta series (Allan, Cat. of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties, Intro., p. xx and pp. 15-17; Smith, Cat. of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Vol. I, pp. 96 and 100), which have on the obverse the name of Kāchā, as Fleet rightly points out, "in the place in which the king's name usually stands on coins," with the marginal legend Kāchā gām = aṣṭīya dhīna harmdhīna = aṭṭamāra = jayatai, "Kāchā, having conquered the earth, wins heaven by (his) most excellent deeds." Further, Fleet correctly remarks, "There is nothing distinctive in this epithet, sufficient to show that it belonged only to the Early Gupta Dynasty (and, in that dynasty, to Samudragupta). Numismatists, however, are now absolutely certain that these coins belong to the Imperial Gupta series, but while some of them assign them to his predecessor and brother called Kāchā. We have also pointed out (Introduction, pp. 50-51) that Kāchā must be the original and correct form of Rāma (-gupta), the elder brother of Chandragupta II, who usurped the Gupta throne but who was ultimately ousted by the latter. It is true that kāchā ordinarily signifies 'glass, crystal; the string of the scale of a balance; alkaline salt, black salt; wax; etc.' as Fleet tells us, but he also says that Kāchā was used as an individual name and has actually been mentioned as the name of two rulers, Kāchā I and Kāchā II, in one of the inscriptions in the Ajanṭā caves (ASWL, Vol. IV, p. 129, lines 4 and 6; CH, Vol. III, 1888, p. 27, note 4).

3 Kṛiṣṇa-pārśaṇa is one of the epithets applied to Samudragupta on some of his gold coins (Allan, Cat. of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty, Intro., pp. lxxii, ff. and cx; and pp. 12 ff.; Smith, Cat. of the Coins of the Ind. Museum, Calcutta, Vol. I, pp. 96 and 104).

4 Fleet renders this phrase by "who was the restorer of the aṣvamedha-sacrifice, that had been long in abeyance." This translation, though it is not an impossible one, cannot be the correct one for the reasons specified above (Introduction, pp. 37-38). With it we have to compare the legend Aṣvamedha-pārśaṇai on some of the gold coins of Samudragupta. Its interpretation has also been discussed above (Introduction, p. 37).
UDAYAGIRI CAVE INSCRIPTION OF CHANDRAGUPTA II

(Lines 5-8) who was the son of the son's son of the prosperous Gupta, the Mahārāja; the son's son of [the prosperous] Ghatotkachă, [the Mahārāja]; and the son of [the prosperous Chandragupta I], the Mahārājādhirāja, the daughter's son of the Lichchhāvi; and born of the Mahādēvi Kumāradēvi.

No. 11: PLATE XI

UDAYAGIRI CAVE INSCRIPTION OF CHANDRAGUPTA II

This inscription appears to have been discovered by General Cunningham, and was first brought to notice by him in 1880, in his *Archaeological Survey of India Report*, Vol. X, pp. 51 ff., where he published his own version of the text, and a translation of it by Raja Siva Prasad, accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate xix). This rendering of the inscription was followed for a long time, except that in 1882, in the *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XI, p. 312, E. Hultsch pointed out some errors in the last line as published. The inscription was thereafter critically edited for the first time by J. F. Fleet in *CII.*, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 34 ff. and Pl. IV A, and his treatment has remained the standard version though his text and translation have been slightly revised by G. Bühler in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, Vol. V, pp. 226 ff.

The inscription is on the back wall, a little to the left as one enters, inside a cave at Udayagiri, in the Vidiśā District of Madhya Pradesh which is known as the “Tawā Cave”, from the resemblance of the large flat stone, on the top of the rock in which it is excavated, to a gigantic tawā, or ‘griddle for baking cakes.’

The writing which covers a space of about 3’ 7” by 1’ 2”, has suffered a good deal from the peeling off of the surface of the rock on which it is engraved; but the general purport of it remains complete, and nothing of historical nature appears to have been lost. The size of the letters varies from 3” to 1 1/2”. The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Guptā alphabet, and are of radically the same type as those of the Allāhābād pillar inscription of Samudragupta, No. 1, pp. 203 ff., above, Plate I. They include in the numbering of the verses, forms of the numerical symbols for 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The language is Sanskrit; and, except for the opening word *siddham*, the inscription is in verse throughout, and the verses are numbered. In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice is the use of the *jhatāmũlīya* and *ūpādānāmya* in “jñah = kavā = Pitām”, in line 4.

The inscription refers itself to the time of Chandragupta II, of the Imperial Guptā dynasty, whose name is recorded in line 1. As no date is given, there might be some doubt as to whether the Chandragupta mentioned here is the first or the second of the name. But the fact that the inscription records that the Chandragupta mentioned in it came in person to Udayagiri, coupled with the existence at Udayagiri of the inscription of the year 82, No. 7, pp. 242 ff., above, which is proved by its date to be one of Chandragupta II, shows that the king mentioned here is Chandragupta II, not his grandfather, Chandragupta I. It is a Śāiva inscription; and the object of it is to record the excavation of the cave as a temple of the god Śambhu (Siva), by the order of a certain Virasēna, surnamed Śāba and pertaining to the Kutsa gōtra, who was one of the ministers of Chandragupta II.

TEXT

[Metre: Śāka (Anushṭubha) throughout]

1 Siddham² [i*] [Ya]d=a[ti]rjyōtir=arkk−ābham=ur]vyy[vām]−−−−−−−−[i*]
−−−−−−−−−−−−−−4vyāpi Chandragu[pt−ākhyam=adbhutam [i*] 1

¹ From inked estampages.
² In the original this word stands in the margin, opposite the commencement of line 3.
³ This has probably to be restored to [=anlabham nyishu*].
⁴ The gap may perhaps be filled up with [sū. = sudhi hrdaya*].
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2 Vikram-āvakraya-kritā dāsya-nyagbhūta-[pā]ṛtthiv[a] [i*] m=anu săhrakā dharmma — — — — — — — — — — [ii*] 2

3 Tasya rājadhirāj-arshēr=achin[t*]yō — — [rmma]n[ba]h[i*] anvaya-prāpta- sāchivyō vyā — — — [in*]dh[i*]v[i*]grah[i*] [ii*] 3

4 Kautsaśa=Śāha iti khyāto Virasēnāh kul-ākhya[yā] [i*] sabd-ārtha-nyāya-lōka[nah]=kavih=Pātaliputra[ka]h [i*] 4

5 Kṛṣṇa-prithvi-jayārṭhēna rājā=āiv=ēha saḥ=āgataḥ [i*] bhaktīyā bhagavataś =Śambhōṛ=gguhām=ētām=akāra[yā] [i] [ii*] 5

TRANSLATION

(Line 1) Luck!

(Verse 1) That inner light, which shines like the sun, (which is difficult to find among men) on earth, which pervades (the heart of the learned) and which is wonderful, has the appellation of Chandragupta (II).?

(Verse 2) (The earth), which is bought by the purchase-money of (his) prowess, (and) in which the princes have become humbled with slavery, is attached with reference (to him), (being protected with) righteousness (and good policy).

(Verse 3 and 4) He, who has attained to the position of minister, through hereditary descent, of that saint-like over-king of kings7 of inconceivable (but magnanimous) action, and has been entrusted with the Office of Peace and War, is Virasēna, of the Kusa gōma,

---

1 Fleet reads this as māna, but it seems more like m=auv. May be restored to [prīthvi ya*]m=auśānavaktā.
2 May perhaps be filled up with [sauya=pāsita].
3 Bühler restores it to ṝ[ī][n][e][d][ā][d][a]-[k][a][r][m][m][a][ṇ][a][h]. Better to restore it to ṝ[ī][n][a][d][a]-[k][a][r][m][m][a][ṇ][a][h].
4 Fleet restores it to sākṣṣīra-sāndhi-grahah, which makes no sense and which, as Bühler says, “introduces a metrical mistake.” He, therefore, proposes Jacobs’s restoration: sākṣṣīra sāndhi-grahah. The part of the rock after the last letter ka is well preserved, and if there had been a visarga, it surely would have been preserved. Besides, what is required here is a word denoting an office and used in the locative. Again, the second letter of ṝī is completely gone, and what is preserved of the intermediate one is more like pṛi than like ṝri. Perhaps this line is to be restored to ṝṛṣṭiḥṣaḥ=ṣāndhi-grahah.
5 As Fleet says, “there seems to be intended a play on the words ‘sun’ and ‘moon’, the latter of which (chanda) forms part of the king’s name.” By “inner light” we have to understand, I suppose, “the light of knowledge.”
6 The word used for “prowess” is vikrama, and the word arka has already been used in the preceding verse. They together make Vikramārka which is equivalent to Vikramaditya, a title which is frequently coupled with the name of Chandragupta II on his coins. It is not impossible that the two components of his title have been explained each in one verse.
7 It is worthy of note that Chandragupta is here called rīḍī. It shows that he was not a mere ruler, but that there was something of the speculative or spiritual in him. This agrees with the fact that he has been called antar- jyōti in the very first verse. As regards rājadhirāja, it was a title of paramount sovereignty, occurring, as was pointed out by Fleet, in its Prākrit form i.e., rājadhirāja, on some coins of Mauze, Ghondphares, etc. (Gardner and Poole, Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India, pp. 68 ff. and pp. 103, 109-110). The same, however, has been read as Rajadhirāja by Whitehead in his Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum, Lahore, pp. 98 ff. and pp.146 ff.). Rajadhirāja is obviously identical with Rājaśīrāja occurring in the sense of paramount sovereign but coupled also with Mahārāja in some inscriptions of the earlier Great Kushānas (Lüders, A List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, Nos. 56, 60, 62, 72, etc.). By the early Gupta period, these joint titles seem to have been supplanted by the single Mahārājarājadhirāja, except in No. 6 above, where, as pointed out before, the name of Chandragupta is coupled with the two titles: Mahārāja and Rajadhirāja, exactly like Mahārāja Rājaśīrāja of the Kushāka kings. But this is obviously due to the fact that the record was put up at Mathura where the influence of the Kushāka chancellory still persisted. From the Gupta period onwards Rājadhirāja occurs only in metrical passages, where it was inconvenient or impossible to introduce the prefix mahā; thus, in addition to the present passage, in line 5 of the Mandaśīr inscription of Yāsīndhman and Viśnunārādhana (CIL, Vol. III, 1888, No. 35) and in the derivative rājaśīrāja, in line 24 of the Junāgadh rock inscription of Skandagupta, No. 28 below, in line 2 of which we also have, again for metrical reasons, another variety of the title, namely Rājaśīrāja.
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known by the family-name of Śaba, conversant with Grammar, Polity, Logic and Popular Usage and Custom, a poet, an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra.1

(Verse 5) He has come hither with that same king who is desirous of conquering the whole earth and has through devotion caused to be made this cave to the divine Śambhu.

No. 12: PLATE XII

MEHARAULI IRON PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF CHANDRA

This inscription was first brought to notice in 1834, in the JASB., Vol. III, p. 494, where James Princep published a lithograph of it (ibid., Plate xxx), reduced from a facsimile made in 1831 by Lieutenant William Elliot, 27th Regiment N. I. This lithograph was not accompanied by any details of the contents of the inscription; and it does not represent a single letter of the original correctly, and is quite unintelligible from beginning to end. In 1838, in the same journal, Vol. III, pp. 629 ff., James Princep published a much improved lithograph (ibid., Plate xxxiii) reduced from an ink-impression made in the same year by Captain T. S. Burt, of the Engineers; and, with it, his own reading of the text and a translation of it. And finally, in 1875, in the JBBRAś., Vol. X, pp. 63 ff., Bhaub Daji published a revised version of the text and translation, including the correct reading of the king's name as Chandra, with a lithograph which appears to have been reduced from a copy on cloth made by Bhagwan Lal Indrani. But it was critically edited for the first time by J. F. Fleet in CII., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 139 ff., along with Plate XXI A.

Meharauli, or Memharauli—an evident corruption of Mihirapuri,—is a village nine miles almost due south of Delhi, the chief town of the Delhi District. The inscription is on the west side of a tapering iron column, sixteen inches in diameter at the base and twelve at the top, and twenty-three feet eight inches high, standing near the well-known Kub Minār in the ancient fort of Rāy Pithorā within the limits of this village.

The writing, which covers a space of about 2' 9½" broad by 10½" high, is in a state of excellent preservation throughout, owing, of course, to the nature of the substance on which it is engraved. The bottom line of the inscription is about 7' 2½" above the stone platform round the lower part of the column. The engraving is good; but, in the process of it, the metal closed up over some of the strokes, which gives a few of the letters a rather imperfect appearance in the lithograph; this is especially noticeable in the s of the opening word yajñā, and in the ṛ of

1 Fleet's translation of verse 4 is hopelessly bad. That given by Bühler is much better. Sandhivadha, I take in the sense of Sanskrit-sandhivādharā occurring in some post-Gupta inscriptions (e.g., in Nos. 1209, 1312 and 1313 of D. R. Bhandarkar's A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India). Loka has, according to Bühler, the same meaning as Vārta, which is explained by Kautilya thus:

Krīṣṭā-paśūtāḥ vanijyā cha vārta 1

dhānya-pāda-hiranyā-kūpya-śaśāḥ-pradaṇāḥ=

auḥkārāki (Arthaśāstra, I. 4. 1-2),

"Agriculture, cattle-breeding and trade constitute vārta. It is serviceable inasmuch as it brings in grains, cattle, gold, forest produce and free labour." It is safer, however, to take loka in the sense of lākā-ādāra, 'Popular Usage and Custom', in other words, 'Law', with which it was absolutely necessary for a minister to be conversant. As regards śabdārtha it is best to split it up into śabda, 'Grammar,' and Artha, 'Polity' as Bühler has done, though Kiellord has taken it in the sense of "the science of words and their meanings, i.e., grammar" in line 13 of the Junāgadh rock inscription of Rudradāman (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 48 and note 2), because it seems more reasonable to take every one of the words forming the compound śabdārtha-ṛṇāya-ādāra as denoting one particular science as it can bear that meaning. And here śabda by itself can denote śabda-lākāra, 'Science of Grammar'; and similarly Artha by itself Artha-lākāra, 'Science of Polity'. Besides, the study of Artha-lākāra was, by no means, slack or neglected in the Gupta period. On the contrary, it was very much alive. It was indispensable for a king or minister to make himself thoroughly acquainted with it.
urusă in the same line. The size of the letters varies from \( \frac{5}{16} \) to \( \frac{1}{4} \). The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet; and, allowing for the stiffness resulting from engraving in so hard a substance as the iron of this column, they approximate in many respects very closely to those of the Allahâbâd pillar inscription of Samudragupta, No. 1 above, Plate I. But, as a distinguishing feature, we have to notice the very marked matrás, or horizontal top-strokes of the letters, which we also observe in the Bilsâd stone pillar inscription of Kumâragupta I, No. 16 below, pages 267 ff. and Plate XVI. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in verse throughout. In respect of orthography, we have to notice (1) the use of the dental nasal, instead of the anusvâra, before ś, in prânsu, line 6; (2) the doubling of ṅ, in ṅatrul, line 1; and (3) the very unusual omission of the second ṅ, which is formative and not due to the preceding ṅ, in mûrtṣā for mûrtṭā, and kirṭṣā for kirṭṭā, line 3.

The inscription is an eulogy of the conquests of a powerful king named Chandra, as to whose lineage no information is given. Nevertheless, as pointed out above, it must belong to Chandragupta II when he abdicated the throne and settled down as Vanaprasthâ at Vishṇupada. It is not dated. It is a Vaishnava inscription; and the object of it is to record the erection of the pillar, which is called a dẖaṇa, or ‘standard,’ of the god Vishṇu, on a hill called—Vishṇupada. We are expressly told that this pillar was erected by Chandra whose mind was fixed upon Vishṇu with devotion. This also shows that Chandra was alive at that time. And this further agrees with the fact that in Gupta inscriptions he has been styled Bhâgavata.

"As regards this hill named Vishṇupada, and the question whether it should be identified with that part of the Delhi Ridge on which the column stands" says J. F. Fleet, "the actual position of the column is in a slight depression, with rising ground on both sides; a position which hardly answers to the description of its being on a giri or 'hill'. And this, coupled with the tradition that the column was erected, in the early part of the eighth century A.D., by Anâgâpaḷa, the founder of the Tâmarâ dynasty, lays it quite open to argument whether this is the real original position of the column, or whether, like the Asoka columns at Delhi, and possibly the Asoka (and Gupta) column at Allahâbâd, it was brought to where it now stands from some other place. But the fact that the underground supports of the column include several small pieces of metal "like bits of bar-iron," remarks Fleet further, "is in favour of its being now in its original position; as they would probably have been overlooked, and left behind, in the process of a transfer." But as a matter of fact such was precisely the case with the Delhi stone column of Asoka which was removed from Topra (Ambala District, Panjab) along with the foundation stone. It is possible that this iron pillar also was removed from

2 Prinsep allotted this inscription to the third or fourth century A.D.; and Bhu Daji, to a period later than the time of the Guptas, Ferguson (Indian Architecture, p. 503), drawing special attention to the Persian form of the capital, expressed a conviction that the inscription is of one of the Chandraguptas of the Early Gupta dynasty, and consequently belongs to A.D. 363 or 400. Fleet's own impression at first, on independent grounds, was to allot it to Chandragupta I.
3 Compare dẖaṇa-stambha, 'flag-staff,' as applied to the Īrau column in line 9 of No. 39 below. There is another iron column, at Dhûr, the ancient Dhûra, now the chief town of the Dhûr District in Madhya Pradesh. But there is no ancient inscription on it (A.R. ASL, 1902-03, pp. 205 and ff.).
5 Ibis., Vol. IV, p. 28, and Plate v.
7 D. R. Bhandarkar's Asoka (2nd ed.), pp. 215-17.
Vishnupada along with foundation materials by the same Sultan Firoz Shah, to beautify his capital town.

TEXT

[Metre: Śārdūlaśikṛṣṭita throughout]

1 Yasya-ōdvarṭtayataḥ pratipam-ūrasā śatrūn-samēty-āgatān-vaṅgēśhv-āhava-varttinō-bhillikhāt āhadaṃ kirttir-bhujē [1*]
2 tīrtvā sapta mukhānī yēna samārē Sindhōr-jiitā Vāhlikā| yasya-ādy-āpy-adhi-vāsyatē jaliandhir-vīrīyy-ānīlaīr-dādakshinaī [1*]
3 Khinnasya-ēva visījya gāṁ narapatēr-ggām-āśritasya ēṭarānī mūrt[1*]yā
karmaṃ-jit-āvānīṃ gatavataḥ kirt[t1*]yā sthitasya kshita[1*]
4 śāntasya-ēva mahāvanē hutaḥbhujō yasya pratāpō māhānī-n-ādy-āpy-utṣipjāi
praṇāśita-ripōr-yyatnasya śēshaḥ kṣhitim [1*]
5 Prāptēna sva-bhuḥ-ārijitōna-cha suchirān-āch-aikāḍhirāyaṃ kshita[1*]
Chandrabhīvēna samagra-chandra-saḍrīśīm vaktra-śriyāṃ bibhratā [1*]
girau bhagavatō Vishnōr-dhvaṭaḥ sthāpītāṃ [1*]

TRANSLATION

(Verse 1) On whose arm fame was inscribed by the sword, when, in battle in the Vaṅga territory, he dashed back with his breast the enemies who, uniting together, came upon (him); by whom crossing the seven mouths of the Sindhu the Vāhlikas were conquered in battle; by the breezes of whose valour the southern ocean is still perfumed;

(Verse 2) Who, the king, quitting this gō (earth), as if dejected, has resorted to another gō (intermediate region);4 who, though he has, in body,7 gone to the land (avani) conquered for (religious) rites, has remained on earth (kṣiti) by name; (and) whose great pratāpa (valour), (though it is now) the conclusion of the exertion of (him) who had destroyed his enemies, does not as yet leave the earth like the pratāpa (heat) of the conflagration in a great forest (though it has now) subsided;

(Verse 3) by that king, who acquired sole supreme sovereignty on earth by his own arm and for very long (and) who having the name Chandra and bearing beauty of face like that of the full-moon, with devotion having fixed (his) mind upon Vishṇu, this lofty flag-staff of the divine Vishṇu was set up on the hill, Vishnupada.8

1 From inked stammapas.
2 Prīsep also read vāhlikā; but Bhu Daji, varying in the first syllable, read bālīkā. In the first akṣhara the v is imperfect on the right side, through the closing up of the metal. In the second akṣhara, the h is turned in the opposite direction to that in which it is turned in āhuva, line 1 and mahāvaṇi and mahān, line 4. But, that the akṣhara in hī, not thī is certain; because l can only be formed to the left; whereas, at this period, h was formed sometimes to the left and sometimes to the right; and, in the present inscription, it is turned to the right, as here, again in hutaḥbhujō, line 4, dhvēna, line 5.
3 This is obviously a mistake for bhācēna.
4 Read Vishnuu.
5 For the identification of these Vāhlikas with the Kushānas, see Intro., p. 57 above; also (Miss) Padma Misra’s article on Vāhika and Bālīkha (I.C., Vol. VIII, pp. 85 and ff.).
6 For the differentiation between gō (earth) and go (mid-region), see Intro., pp. 57-9 above. Quite in consonance with this, the tirthas on earth (prithivī) have been distinguished from those in mid-region or firmament (antaraksha) in the MBa, Vana-Parvan, Chap. 83, vv. 93-94. And Vishnupada, being situated on a high eminence, must have been regarded as belonging to the second category.
7 The word mūrtiṣṭu clearly shows that Chandra was living in this world when the pillar was set up, that is, at Vishnupada and as śānaprastha.
8 For the identification of Vishnupada, see Intro., pp. 59-61 above.
BASĀR CLAY SEAL INSCRIPTION OF DHRUVASVĀMINĪ

This seal was discovered by the late T. Bloch, when, as Superintendent, Archeological Survey, Eastern Circle, he was excavating the ruins of Basār or Basārh in the Muzaffarpur District, Bihar, in the months of December, January and February of 1903-04. Two more specimens also came to light during the excavations, but they were broken and very indistinct. He published the reading of the text, and translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph in A.R. ASI, 1903-04, p. 107, No. 1 and Plate XI, I. The significance of its contents was afterwards considered by us in 1912 in Ind. Ant., Vol. XLI, p. 3. The seal is now deposited in the Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

The seal is oval in shape, marked by a single border-line preserved in the right half, and measuring 2 ¾ by 1 ¾. The upper part is occupied by a seated lion facing right, with a horizontal line below, now faintly preserved; and the lower, by the inscription which consists of four lines. The characters, on the whole, belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet, because, though s is of the eastern type characterised by a loop on the left, m, and h are unquestionably of the western variety. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout. Orthography calls for no remarks.

The seal is one of Mahādevī Dhruvasvāminī, wife of Mahārajādhirāja Chandragupta and mother of Mahārajā Gōvinda-gupta. That this Chandragupta is Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty can scarcely be doubted, because his chief queen was Dhruvadēvi as we know from other Gupta records. The only point of doubt that may be raised is that whereas the latter speak of her as Dhruvadēvi, the present seal gives her the name of Dhruvasvāminī. But the term dēvi here is synonymous with svāminī. And if any proof is required in support of it, it is furnished by the grants of the Uchchakalpa family, one of which1 gives the name of Jāyanātha’s wife as Muruṇḍadēvi and two as Muruṇḍasvāminī.2 For the same reason Dhruvadēvi must be taken as exactly identical with Dhruvasvāminī. Secondly, it is worthy of note that Dhruvasvāminī has been described not only as wife of Mahārajādhirāja Chandragupta but also as mother of Mahārajā Gōvinda-gupta. This means that both the father and the son were living when the seal of Dhruvasvāminī was being used and that while the former was the sovereign, the latter was serving as the governor of a province under him. As Basārh has been correctly identified with Vaisālī,3 the capital town of the Lichchhavī principality, which is practically co-extensive with the northern part of Bihar, and as it was on account of the Lichchhavis that Chandragupta I became master of Pāraliputra and rose to political eminence, it seems natural to infer that Vaisālī was the seat of the Yuvarāja government. And it receives confirmation from the fact that many seals were picked up by Bloch during his excavations at Basārh which belonged to officials connected with the Yuvarāja.4 This leaves no doubt as to Vaisālī having been the seat of the Yuvarāja, at any rate, during the earlier period of the Gupta supremacy. And from other seals found on this site it appears that Vaisālī was the head-quarters (adhisthāna) of not only Vaisālī-rāṣṭhṛya or Vaisālī District but also of Tīra-bhūkṣi or Tīra Province.5 It therefore appears that when her seal was impressed upon the clay pieces, Dhruvasvāminī

1 CII., Vol. III, 1838, No. 28.
2 Ibid., Nos. 29 and 31.
3 Cunningham’s Ancient Geography of India, ed. by S. N. Majumdar, p. 717.
4 A.R. ASI, 1903-04, pp. 107-08, Nos. 4, 6, 11 and 12.
was living at Vaiśāli with her son, who was then Yuvarāja and the ruler of the Tīra-bhukti. Further, we have to note that Gōvinda-gupta was not the only son of Chandragupta (II) and Dhruvavāmini. They had a second son named Kumāragupta (I), several inscriptions of whom have been found. Whether Gōvinda-gupta succeeded his father and, if so, how long he reigned are questions which naturally arise here. But these have been discussed elsewhere, in the Introduction, pp. 72 ff. above.

**TEXT**

1. Mahārāja[ jā* ]dh[i*]r[āja-sīr*]-[Chandra][gupta*]-
2. [pa*]ni-mah[ā*]r[āja*]-sīr-G[ō*]v[i*]nda-[gupta*]-
3. mātā mahādevī-sīr-[Dhruv]-
4. vasvāmini [*]

**TRANSLATION**

The prosperous Dhruvavāmini, the Great Queen (Mahādevī), wife of the prosperous Chandragupta, the Mahāraja-dhiraja, (and) mother of the prosperous Gōvinda-gupta, the Mahāraja.

No. 14: PLATE XIV

**MANDASŌR INSCRIPTION OF NARAVARMAN: THE KṚTA YEAR 461**

This inscription is in two fragments. The larger was found early in 1912 in the property of Lala Jayashankar, a pleader of Mandasōr, while some of his men were cultivating one of his fields near the Fort gate and not far from the village of Toḍi. It was immediately taken possession of and put for safe custody in the house of the Subah of Mandasōr. In October 1912 the late Mahāmahāpādhyāya Haraprasad Sastri saw the stone and with the permission of the Subah had it removed to the house of the Lala where he was staying and where he deciphered the inscription. The stone was lying in the Lala’s house when in February 1913 I visited Mandasōr and inspected the record. A careful examination of the fragment left no doubt in my mind that the original stone was purposely and neatly cut out after line 9 for being used in some building. In 1922-23 M. B. Garde, then Superintendent of Archaeology, picked up the other fragment in Mandasōr, but he does not say from where exactly. It is first account of the larger fragment setting forth its historical and chronological importance was published by me in the Progress Report of Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, for 1912-13, p. 58 and in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XLIII, pp. 161 ff. I intended editing the record along with the text and translation in the Ep. Ind., but as the late Haraprasad Sastri was himself anxious to publish it there, I forwarded him the inx-impressions which I had taken with my own hand. And this he did in Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, pp. 315 ff. and Plate. As regards the second smaller fragment of the inscription, Garde published a small notice of the same in the A.R. ASI., 1922-23, p. 187. Neither of these fragments seems to have been handled, even in part, by any other scholar except R. G. Bhandarkar, who, in 1913, gave out his own interpretation of verse 2 in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, pp. 199-200.

Mandasōr or Mandasaur, more properly, Dasōr, is the chief town of the Mandasōr District of the former Gwalior State, now in Madhya Pradesh. It is situated on the bank of the Siwana river, a tributary of the Śiprā, and on the Ajmer-Khandwa branch of the Western

---

1. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XLI, p. 3.
Railway. How Dasōr came to be called Mandaśōr has been explained variously. Perhaps the best explanation is that given to me in 1897 when I first visited Mandaśōr. Then a learned Brahmaṇa told me that originally there was also another village close by called Man and that Mandaśōr thus consisted of the two place names—Man and Dasōr. Many instances are known of such composite names; e.g., Sānci-Kānākheda. The original stone fragments are now lying at the State Museum, Gwalior.

The larger fragment bears nine lines of writing, each containing one anushubh and a half or forty-eight syllables. Thus there are thirteen verses and a half on this fragment. Chisel marks are noticeable on all sides. The writing covers a space about 1' 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) - 7\(\frac{1}{2}\) by 7\(\frac{1}{2}\) high. The size of the letters varies from 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) to 3\(\frac{1}{4}\). The characters belong to the Mālāvā variety of the Western class of Gupta alphabet. This is indicated by the test letters m, s, sh and h, and also by the right limb of which is a long vertical stroke bent towards the left. These differentiate the western from the eastern alphabet of the Gupta period. Other palaeographic peculiarities that are worth noticing are: (1) the occurrence of the long initial i in idrīk- in line 4, which may be compared with the short initial i found in the Allahabad and Kāhārū inscriptions (Nos. 1, above and 20 below) and the long i in the Sānci inscription (No. 9, above); (2) the occurrence of the initial e in ika- in line 2; (3) the ringlet at the bottom of th instead of a crossbar in the middle, as in manoratā, line 4; (4) the bipartite y in ṭapachay- in line 4, which, however, is tripartite in all other cases; (5) the letter s, the left limb of which is as much a convex curve as the right; (6) a concave curve in the beginning of the left limb of p, ph and sh, as e.g., in paryanka-, line 1, phaladaṁ, line 7, and purusha-, line 1; (7) the medial a placed lower down about the middle in the case of a and m, as in Āśvāja- in line 3, and sasya-māḷiṇi in line 3; (8) medial i expressed sometimes by a loop and sometimes by a curve on the left; (9) medial u expressed in three different ways, by a hook attached to the bottom turned towards the left as e.g., in samudra-, line 1 and pushpār-, line 3, or by a curve on the right rising up vertically to the height of the letter as e.g., in sākṣaya, line 3 and duhita-, line 9, or, in two cases of r by a curve attached to the bottom rising up on the left and intersecting the letter about the middle, as in chāru- line 7 and kāruṣikā, line 9, but not in purushā-, line 1. The language is Sanskrit; and, except for the opening word siddham, the inscription is in verse. There is one mistake due to the mason’s carelessness, viz., sva-kulasya = atha instead of sva-kulasya = atha in line 8; two due to the scribe’s ignorance, e.g., pravṛtik-kālē instead of pravṛtik-kālē in line 2 and vidduda-dīpa- instead of vidyud-dīpa- in line 4; and one, a solecism, for which apparently the composer is responsible, viz., the use of śīr, twice instead of śīr as the first part of a compound word, as in śīr-Mālava-, line 1 and śīr-mmahārāja-, line 5.

In respect of orthography, we have to notice (1) the doubling of consonants in conjunction with a preceding r, e.g., in paryanka-, line 1, sanvaardhika-, line 4, and so forth; (2) the doubling of r in conjunction with a following r in Śakrasya, line 2 and vikrāmē, line 4, but not in vikrānta-, line 5; (3) the use of anusvāra instead of seṇḍhi, in = alankṛti and paniehamyāṁ in line 3, and sanabhāra-, line 6, but not in sarṣi = gataḥ, line 7; and (4) the use of guttural nasal instead of anusvāra before h, in śīrharvarmanār = = Śīrha-vikrānta, line 5.

The inscription is of the time of a prince named Naravarman, who was a son of Śīharvarman and son’s son of Jayavarman. It is dated, in words, when four hundred and sixty-one years had expired (verse 2), on the fifth day of the bright fortnight of Āśvina (verse 5). The era has not been specified, but the years just referred to have been named Kṛita[1]

[1] In these and in similar other instances the retention of eśārago in śīr is justified according to the grammatical rule a-sṛṣṭaevā = na su-līpaḥ (Siddhānta Kusumadit with Bālamantrakā, 1910 Ecd., p. 201). Cf. also the expression śīr-mahārājā-Asvaghosa in the Crystal Intaglio Inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVI, pp. 273 ff) where also it has been regarded by the editor as a mistake for śīr mahārāj, etc.—Ed.]
MANDASÖR INSCRIPTION OF NARAVARMA: KRITA YEAR 461

and are mentioned as being handed down traditionally in accordance with the reckoning of the Mālavas. But, as shown elsewhere, these years have to be referred to what is now known as the Vikrama era, commencing with 57 n.c.; and the result for the present inscription is 404-05 a.d. The object of the record is not very clear so far as the larger fragment goes, but something is mentioned as having been given by one Satya, who was apparently of the bania caste and was a grandson of Jaya and a son of Varnaarvīdha through Jayamitra. From the smaller fragment, however, it appears that there was a shrine of Kṛṣṇa adjoining an orchard and that it was this orchard which was apparently given by Satya. It is thus a Vaiṣṇava record, a conclusion which agrees with verse 1 where obeisance is paid to Purusha and verse 11 which praises the god Vāsudēva. It further seems from the smaller fragment that the upkeep of the orchard was entrusted to a Brahmaṇa whose name is gone but who belonged to the Gārgya gōtra. It is true that this stone belonged to the present Mandasōr; but that it belonged also to the old and original Daśapura is clear from line 2 thereof where it is spoken of as a town (pura) named (Daśa) which is times five (i.e., ten).

As was first pointed out by us,1 Jayavarman, Sīnhavarman and Naravarman mentioned in this inscription belonged to a family of feudatory chieftains ruling over Daśapura and were succeeded by Vīśavarman and Bandhuvarman known from Gangadhāra2 and Mandasōr3 inscriptions respectively. Among the various epithets of Naravarman specified in this record occurs in line 5 the epithet Sīnha-vikrānta-gāmin, which shows that he was a feudatory of Chandra-gupta II. For, we know from Gupta coins that Sīnha-vikrama was an epithet of Chandra-gupta II.4 Further, we know from inscriptions Nos. 6 and 9 above that this Gupta sovereign reigned from Gupta year 61 to 93, i.e., from a.d. 380 to 412; whereas the date for Naravarman is Vikrama year 461, i.e., 404 a.d. Naravarman was thus doubtless a contemporary of Chandra-gupta II. Nothing therefore precludes us from supposing that the expression Sīnha-vikrānta-gāmin indicates that Naravarman was a tributary prince of Chandra-gupta II. And this is in keeping with the fact that his successors, Vīśavarman and Bandhuvarman were contemporaries and feudatories of Kumāragupta I.

The date of the inscription, we have seen, is the 5th of the bright half of Āśvina. This date fell, we are told in line 2, when the festival of Indra approved by Kṛṣṇa was going on. Although the festival coincided with what is known as Pūjā in Bengal, it is strange that Haraprasad Sastri has slurred over the passage and has not explained what this festival of Indra approved by Kṛṣṇa was. The Harivarṣa (chapters 72-76, especially verses 4005-08 and verses 4019-20), however, throws some light on the subject.5 It was the custom of the people of Brindāvana to offer worship to Indra on the 14th day of the dark half of Kārtaika, but Kṛṣṇa induced them to transfer their worship to the cows and Mount Góvardhana which were the source of their sustenance. This made Indra angry who poured down such a deluge as to cause destruction amongst them and their kine. This led to a struggle for supremacy between Indra and Kṛṣṇa which ended in the victory of the latter by Kṛṣṇa pulling out Góvardhana and holding it as an umbrella over the cowherds and the kine. Thereupon Indra came to terms with Kṛṣṇa. According to these Indra agreed that although there were four months of the rainy season, the first two (i.e., Śrāvaṇa and Bhādra) should be considered

3 No. 56 below.
as his, and the last two (i.e., Āśvina and Kārtika) which constitute the Śarad season would henceforth be assigned to Kṛiṣṇa. As soon as the first half ended, that is, doubtless, on the first of the bright half of Āśvina, we are informed, the people shall erect flag-crowned poles with the effigies of Mahēndra and Upēndra and do worship in pursuance of the customary rites of the two gods. The Puṣṭā festival is celebrated all over India, but with different motives in different parts of the country. And the explanation set forth by the Hariyamāṇa represents one such motive. The whole question has been discussed in greater detail in the Introduction, page 127.

TEXT

[Metre: Amuṣṭabh throughout]

First Fragment

1 [Ś]*jiddham [*] Sahasra-śirasē tasmai Purushāy-āmit-ātmane [*] chatus-samudraparyyaṅka-tōya-nidrālavē namaḥ [*] Śrīr = māMā(Mā) lava-gap-āmānate praśastē Kṛita-saṁjhīte [*]


5 Kshit-īśe Śīnḥavarmaṇaṇa = Śīnha-vikrānta-gāmini [*] satpurē śrīr = mā(ma)ā hārāja-Naravarmaṇaṇi pārththive [*]


9 Mahā(karu)niṁkaḥ Satyaḥ dharmam-arjita-mahādhanah [*] = satputro Varṇa navriddhēc = tu satputro = tha Jayasya vai [*] [13] Duhitūr = Balasūryāḥ [*] = satputro Jayamitrīrayā [*]
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G. S. Gai

From photograph
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Second Fragment

1 Gārggāyana-sagotrō vai jñāti[tah]\* [\*]
2 Purē mahati vikhyātē Pañcha-dvīg[una-saṁjñakē]\* [\*]
3 Nānā-vriksha-latā-gulma-saṁprāyukta]\* [\*]
4 Dhanyō bhavatu maṅgalyah pu[tra]-[pautra-samanvitaḥ]\* [\*]
5 Krushṇē\* =āddhyushīlas-tāvā[\*]

TRANSLATION

First Fragment

(Line 1) Luck!
(Verse 1) Obeisance to that Thousand-headed Purusha\* (Supreme Being) whose soul is boundless and who is sleepy on the waters of the bed-like four oceans.
(Verse 2) When there had been completed\* the auspicious quaternion of hundred years increased by sixty-one, known as Kṛita and traditionally handed down according to the reckoning of the Mālavas;
(Verse 3) When there had been completed the auspicious rainy season which caused contentment to the mind of men; and when there is going on the festival of Indra approved by Kṛiṣṇa,\* then
(Verse 4) The corn-wreathed earth, with replenished rice and fodder, is adorned with kāśa flowers, and shines more intensely with luminaries.
(Verse 5) On the fifth day of the bright half of Āśvina—when such an excellent season, well-ordered and enjoyable, is dominating the world;
(Verses 6 and 7) When the prosperous Mahārāja king Naravarman, whose desires were cherished through repeated accumulation of merit in previous births, is the ruler of the earth—(Naravarman) who is the grandson of king Jayavarman, (and) he is the virtuous son of Simhavarman, (and) who is the follower of Śrīma-vikrīnta, (and) is as valorous as Dēvendra;
(Verses 8 to 11) As exemplification of the good qualities of his (Naravarman’s) administration, (Satya) whose accumulated wealth is the acquisition of religious merit in (his) previous births; whose undertakings, as soon as they were accomplished, were multiplied with the plenitude of his fame and spiritual merit,—regarding this world of living beings to be as unsteady as the water of the mirage, or a dream, or lightning, or the flame of a lamp,

\* Read Kṛiṣṇē=
\* This refers to Purusho-tāku (Ṛgveda, X, 90) where Purusha is described as sahastra-bīrha. Purusha again is identified with Nārāyaṇa who is thus described by Manu (I. 10): “The waters are called nārāh; the waters are, indeed, the offspring of Nara; as they were his first residence (ayūna), he is thereby remembered as Nārāyana”. This explains why Purusha is described as sleeping on the waters of the four oceans. Compare also Rāghuvarsha, Canto XIII, verse 6.
\* The word prāpta occurs twice in this record, once in this and once in the next verse; and Haraprasad Sastri translates it once by “on the arrival” and once by “on the approach” which both give “arrived, reached” as the sense of the word intended here. This sense, however, cannot suit the context, especially in the case of verse 3. For, if we stick to this meaning and say that the object of the inscription, whatever it was, was executed “on the approach of the auspicious rainy season” as Haraprasad Sastri evidently understands it, this is in contradiction to the date of the record, viz., the 5th of the bright half of Āśvina. Because the Varsha or rainy season begins with the month of Śrīvaṇa, which, however, is immediately followed by Bhādrapada and not Āsvina. The term prāpta must therefore be taken in another sense. Now one of the senses of this word is ‘completed, accomplished’. This suits here excellently, because prārṣiṇ-kaḥ prāpta in verse 3 can thus mean “when the rainy season had been completed” and further is perfectly congruous with the date of the inscription, because the rainy season terminates with Bhādra and as the 5th of the bright half of Āśvina can follow immediately thereafter.
\* See pp. 263-64 for an explanation of this passage.
took refuge with the grantor of refuge, namely (that Tree) which yields the noble fruit of heaven, whose charming young shoots are the heavenly damsels, whose many branches are the celestial cars, (and) which trickles out honey (in the shape of) rain water; namely, Vāsudēva whose abode is the world, who is inscrutable, unborn (and) all-pervading;

(Verses 12 to 14) Satya who does honours to friends, servants and the distressed; who, again, is the moon of his family; whose wealth and life have been consigned to the gods and the Brāhmaṇas; who is intensely compassionate; who has acquired (his) profuse wealth by lawful means; who is the virtuous son of Varmāvarṣidhī but indeed the virtuous son’s son of Jaya, (and) the virtuous son through Jayamitrā, daughter of Balaśūrā.

Second Fragment

(Line 1) Pertaining to the Gaṛggāyaṇa gobira, and by caste....
(Line 2) In the extensive and well-known town named (Datā which is) two times five,...
(Line 3) Abounding in varied clumps of trees and creepers.
(Line 4) May he become blessed and lucky, (being surrounded by sons and son’s sons),
(Line 5) Permeated by Krishna....

No. 15: PLATE XV

BIHĀR KŌTĀ INSRIPTION OF NARAVARMAN: THE (KRITA) YEAR 474

This inscription was originally found at Bihār Kōtā in the former Rājgadh State, Central India, now Madhya Pradesh, and was secured by a tourist and collector from whom it was acquired by purchase by the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, where it is now deposited.¹

The inscription contains six lines of writing, covering a space about 1' 2" broad by 6-4" high. The characters, generally speaking, belong to the Mālwa variety of the Western class of Gupta alphabet, as in No. 14, with individual differences as in the case of r, ṛ, s and so forth. M has a calligraphic form and two forms of tripartite ṛ are also noticeable, one with and the other without the left loop. The other palaeographic peculiarities are (1) the occurrence of the initial ॐ in Olikarasya in line 1 and (2) the end ॐ in -dvitiyāt, line 3.

The language is Sanskrit, and the whole of the inscription is in prose. There is one solecism, namely, the use of śrīr-, once, instead of śrī-, in śrīr-mahārāja-, line 1. This solecism occurs also in No. 14.² In respect of orthography we have to notice (1) the doubling of consonants with a preceding r, e.g., in -Naravarmmaṇaḥ, line 1, and sarvaa-, line 3; and (2) the doubling of t in conjunction with a following r in -satputrēṇa, line 4.

This is another inscription of the time of Naravarman; and, as it is a prose inscription, we find the title Mahārāja coupled with his name, indicative of his feudatory rank. What is, however, of greater importance in this connection is that he has been called Olikara which reminds us of Aulikara used with reference to Vishnuvardhana in a Mandasār inscription,³ dated Kṛta 589. It seems that Olikara or Aulikara was a surname of the feudatory family ruling over Western Mālwa with its capital at Daśapura as has been explained in our account of No. 14 above. Another important item of information supplied by this record is the date 474 which has to be taken as a Kṛta year and which, so far as we are able to fill up the lacuna, was

¹ This inscription has been published in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVI, pp. 130 ff.
² [See p. 262, note 1 above.—Ed.]
³ CII., Vol. 111, 1888, No. 35.
BIHĀR KŌTRĀ INSCRIPTION OF NARA VARMAN: THE (KRĪTA) YEAR 474

G. S. Gai

From photograph
the twentieth year of Naravarman’s reign. It thus appears that his rule began in Vikrama year 454 = 397-98 A.D. We may thus safely take it that he was a contemporary and feudatory of the Gupta monarch, Chandragupta II as has been presumed in our treatment of the preceding record. It is a Buddhist inscription and the object of it is to record the excavation of a well by Viraśēna, son of Bhaṭṭī Mahāttara, for the Buddhist mendicants from the four quarters, on the second day of the bright half of Śrāvana in the (Kṛita) year 474.

TEXT

1 [Si]ddhayē [*] Śrīrmmahiśāja- Naravarmanmakhaḥ Olikarasya [vīri]-
2 [śē] ṛāy-a-saṁvatsarē chaturshu varsha-satēśhu chatu[h*]-
3 [sa]ptatiṣhū Śrāvaṇa-sukla-duitiyāyām Bhaṭṭī-maha[ta]-
4 ra-satputrīṇa Viraśēṇa-āyam udamānāḥ khāni-
5 tāḥ = chāturddiśāṁ bhikshu-samgham uddhiṣṭya sarvva-satvānāṁ
t6 [vṛt]iṣhna-kshayāyā-āstu [i*]

TRANSLATION

(Line 1) For luck !

(Lines 1-3) On the second of the bright half of Śrāvana, when four centuries of years

(and) seventyfour (haṭa elapsed), in the twentieth year of the reign of the illustrious Nara-

varman the Māhārāja and Olikara,

(Lines 3-5) This well was excavated by Viraśēna, the virtuous son of Bhaṭṭī Mahāttara,

for the sake of the confraternity of the (Buddhist) mendicants.

(Lines 5 and 6) May it be for the slaking of the Thirst of all creatures.

No. 16 : PLATE XVI

BILSAढ STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I : THE YEAR 96

This inscription was discovered in 1877-78 by General Cunningham, and was first brought to notice by him in 1880, in his reading of the text, and translation of it, published in

1 [See editorial remarks under note 5 below.—Ed.].
2 From impressions supplied by R. G. Gyani, Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay.
3 These letters seem to have been engraved later and slantly between lines 1 and 2 about the beginning.
4 Read Śrī-Mahiśa- [See p. 262, note 1 above.—Ed.
5 This is a tentative restoration from the first letter it which is fairly clear in one estampage [The more plausible reading is viṣṇa.—Ed.].
6 Here only four dots are visible, which seems to be the remnants of ita.
7 Read -sattaṁṇāṁ.
8 See p. 240, note 9 above.
9 The expression chaturshu varsha-sattathṣa chatuspatisṭhaḥ clearly shows that some such word as gattṣu or aṭṭaṣṭhu

has to be understood after it.
10 Olikara here must evidently be the same as Aulkara occurring in Aulkara-lāṭākhana āṭhama-vatikā used with

reference to Vasiṣṭhvadhana in line 5 of the Mandaśūr inscription of the Mālava year 589 (Gl., Vol. III, 1883,

No. 33). Aulkara in this place stands for the name of the family as explained in the translation of the inscription.

Olikara or Aulkara thus denoted the feudatory family of Daśapura to which princes from Jayavarman to Visiṣṭhv-

adhana belonged.
11 The word triṣaḥ seems to have been used here in a double sense; (1) the physical thirst which any creature

may slake with water from this well and (2) the metaphorical "thirst"—the insatiable desire that drives the beings

(Contd. on p. 268)
the CASIR., Vol. XI, pp. 19 ff., accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate viii). It was afterwards re-edited by J. F. Fleet in CHI., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 42 ff., accompanied by Plate V.

Bilsad\(^1\) or Bilsan\(^2\) is a village,—consisting of three parts, called respectively Bilsad-Puvayām, or Eastern Bilsad: Bilsad-Pachhāyām, or Western Bilsad; and Bilsad-Paṭṭi, or Bilsad Suburb,—about four miles towards the north-east of Aliganj,\(^3\) the chief town of the Aliganj Tahsil or Sub-division of the Eta\(^4\) District, Uttar Pradesh. At the south-west corner of Bilsad-Puvayām, or the eastern division of the town, there are four broken red-sand-stone monolith columns,—two of them, towards the west, round; and two of them, towards the east, square. Each pair of columns stands almost due north and south; and the two western columns are both inscribed. The inscription now published is on the eastern side of the northern column of the west pair.

On the eastern side of the southern column of the west pair, there is also an inscription, which, as shown by the remains of it, was a duplicate copy of that on the northern column; but it was arranged somewhat differently, being, as counted by General Cunningham, in sixteen somewhat shorter lines, instead of thirteen. From General Cunningham’s ink-impression, hardly any appreciable portion of this second inscription remains, except the second and third lines and lines 12 to 16; and these are not in sufficiently good order to be lithographed, though they are of use in supplying more clearly a few letters which are doubtful in the two verses at the end of the inscription on the northern column. In this second inscription, line 2 begins with svādita-puṣasā of line 1 of the one now published;—line 3, with the gat-āṅkka of line 2;—line 12, with the paṁshadā of line 9;—line 13, with the kaubhārachhandā of line 10;—line 14, with the [satt]tra of line 11;—line 15, with the ... subhā of line 12; and line 16, with the yena=āphūn of line 15.

With this pair of duplicate inscriptions, we may compare the duplicate inscriptions\(^5\) of Yaśōdharman on the two columns at Mandasor. But Yaśōdharman’s pillars, remarks J. F. Fleet, were jayustambhas or ‘columns of victory’, not connected with any building; whereas the two inscribed Bilsad pillars seem to have had a direct connection with a temple, now ruined, the remains of which must be hidden under the rubbish that has accumulated over the site, rīz, the temple of the god Svāmi-Mahāśeṇa or Kārttikeya, referred to in the inscription.

The writing of the inscription now published covers a space of about 2’1-\(^\frac{1}{2}\)” broad by 1’10-\(^\frac{1}{2}\)” high. The first four lines are almost entirely destroyed, and a good deal of damage has been done to the rest; but nothing of historical nature seems to have been lost. The average size of the letters is about \(\frac{3}{8}\). The characters, on the whole, belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet, the only test letters that belong to the eastern type being m and l. Again, they present a very pointed difference from the characters of the same class in the preceding inscriptions, in respect of the very marked mātrās or prolonged horizontal top-strokes of the letters. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose as far as the end of line 9, and the rest in verse. In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice is the doubling of t, in conjunction with a following r, e.g., in puttrasa, line 4.

\(^1\) The ‘Bealsur and Bilsar’ of maps, etc., Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 63., Lat. 27° 33’ N., Long. 79° 16’ E. The name is written and pronounced optional with or without a nasal in the second syllable; compare Apsan, in the case of the inscription of Adiyansa (CHI., Vol. III, 1888, No. 42).

\(^2\) The ‘Bealsurpowa, Bealsurpucha, and Bealsurputee’ of maps.

\(^3\) The ‘Aliqanji and Uilleaganje’ of maps, etc.

\(^4\) The ‘Eeta, Etah, and Eytuk’ of maps, etc.

\(^5\) CHI., Vol. III, 1888, Nos. 33 and 34.
BILASD STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF KUMARAGUPTA I: THE YEAR 96
The inscription refers itself to the reign of Kumāragupta (I) of the Imperial Guptan dynasty. It is dated, in words, in the year ninety-six (415-16 A.D.); but without any specification of the month and date. Its object is to record the accomplishment, by a certain Dhruvaśarman, at a temple of the god Svāmi-Mahāśeṇa, of certain works, viz., (1) the construction of a pratīti,1 or ‘gateway’; (2) the establishment, apparently, of a sattva or charitable hall or almshouse; and (3) the erection of the column with the inscription on it, to record the above acts.

The name of the donor has been twice given in this inscription as Dhruvaśarman. But in line 11 Šarma is separated from Dhruva. It seems that Dhruva was his personal name and Šarma his family name. Šarma is still a family name in Bengal and was even a clan name as early as the Mahābhārata.2

TEXT

[Metres: Verse 1 Śragdhara; verse 2 Śārādvikriḍita.]

1. . . . . . . [sarva-ra-gī-ṛchchhēttvuh prithivyāṃ-apratirathasya chatur-udadh (*ji-[sa*-]
[līl-āsva*-di]-ya-yaṣasō
2. [Dhanada-Varun-Endr-Āntaka-samasya Kṛṣṇa-para-soḥ nyāy-aṁgat-āncaka-gō-hī]
ra[ra*-ja]-kōti-[prakāsa]-chir-ōsam-āsva-mēdh-āhṛtthu
3. [mahārāja-śri-Gupta-prapautstrasā mahārāja-śri-Ghaṭotkachak-paustrasya ma*-]
h[a]-[a]-jāhārāja-śri-Chandragupta-puṭtrasā
4. Lichoṣhavi-dauhi[ṭtṛtrasā mahādēvyāṃ Kumāradēvyāṃ-utpānasya mahāra*-]
jāhāra-śri-Samurdagupta-puṭtrasā
5. mahādēvyāṃ Dattad[ēv]ya[āṃ]-utpānasya [svayam-apratirathasya parama*-]
[bhāgavata]-[ṣya mahārājadhirāja-śri-Chandragupta-puṭtrasā
6. mahādēvyāṃ Dhrudavadevyāṃ-utpānasya mahārājadhirāja-śri-Kumāraguptasya-
abhivardhamāṇa-vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsarē śaṅ-ṇavatē
7. [A*-]sya[ṃ]-djīvasa-pūrṇvāyaṃ bhagavatasaṃ-trālōkaya-tējas-sambhāra-sam[bhṛ]-
ādṛbhuta-mūrttēr-Brahmāṇya-dēvasya
8. . . . . . . . . . . [n]-jāvai[n]-Śvāmi-Mahāsēnasā-ayatāē-smin-Kārttyay-ācchāra-
śaddharmma-vartm-ānuyāyinā
9. . . . . . . . . . . [pa*-jshādā mānitesa Dhruvaśarmmaṇā karma mahat-kī-[śrāmā*-]
i[ī]*
10. [Kṛtvā] — [ā]-bhirmā[m]-muni[vasati] — [svargga]-sōpāna-[ṛ]-[pām [-*-] kauśbē-
chchanda-bimbēm sphaṭika-maṇi-dal-ābhāsa-gaurāṃ pratōlim
11. prāsād[-gr]-ābhṛ[ti]-pa[r]-gu[ny-a]ra-bhavana[ṇ]-dharman[a]-[sa]-tṛṣṭ[ma]-[ya]-[th]a[va]-[i]-
pu[n]jēśhv-ēv-ābhīrma[m]-vrajati śubha-matis-[tā]-Śarmma Dhruvō-
stu [i-ī]*
12. — ā - 1 - sya — - śubh-āṃśita-vara-prakhya-tā-labdhā bhuvī [i*-] — ā - ē bhaktīr-
ahina-sat[ṛ]-ya-samata kas-tām na sampūjayaēt

1 For fully understanding this term, see J. Ph. Vogel’s informing article on The Sanskrit pratīti and its New-Indian Derivatives in JRAS, 1906, pp. 539 ff. From the Sanskrit texts quoted in this article, it seems to denote a strongly built gateway connected with a road. The Sanskrit pratīti has now been preserved in the Hindi derivative pīl which we find used in connection with many city gates, especially in Rajasthan. It is not unlikely that in this particular case pratīti denotes the gateway in the enclosure of the temple of Mahāśeṇa connecting the principal streets of the town with the road leading to the shrine inside. That this word has this meaning in the present inscription may be seen from the fact that the pratīti of Dhruvaśarman has been compared to a svarga-sphāna, “a flight of steps (leading) to heaven.”
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. LXI, p. 63.
3 Read kītum = idam.
13 yēn=āpūrvva-vibhūti-saṅchaya-chayaṁ - ai - i — — — - h [1] tēn=āyāṁ Dhruva

TRANSLATION

(Line 6) When the detailed order of the date was this, that is, in the ninety-sixth year
of the increasingly victorious (Gupta) rule, pertaining to the prosperous Kumāragupta (I)
the Mahārājādhīrāja,

(Line 5) Who is the son, born of the Mahādevī Dhruvadēvi, of the prosperous Chandragupta (II), the Mahārājādhīrāja, who was himself without an equal adversary, (and) an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vasūdēva), (and)

(Line 4) (Chandragupta II), who was the son born of the Mahādevī Dattadēvi, of the prosperous Samudragupta, the Mahārājādhīrāja,

(Lines 1-2) (Who was the exterminator of all kings; who had no equal adversary on earth); whose fame was tasted by the waters (of the four oceans); who was equal to (the gods) Dhanada, Varuṇa, Indra and Antaka; who was the very axe of Kṛitānta (God of death); who was the giver of (many) crores of (lawfully acquired cows and) gold; who was the performer of the aśvamedha sacrifice, that had long decayed, (and),

(Lines 3-4) (Who was the son of the son's son of the prosperous Gupta, the Mahārāja; the son's son of the prosperous Ghaṭōkacha, and Mahārāja), (and) the son of the prosperous Chandragupta I, the Mahārājādhīrāja, the daughter's son of the Lichchhavi; (and) born of the Mahādevī Kumāradēvi.

(Lines 7-9) At this temple of Lord Mahāśeṇa, the divine (one), whose wonderous body is produced out of the mass of the lustre of the three worlds; who is the god Brahmaṇya; (and) who resides at .......... this magnificent work has been accomplished by Dhrūvaśarman who follows the path of the practice and true religion of the Kṛita Age, (and) who has been honoured by the assembly ..........

(Lines 10-11) Having constructed a gateway, charming (to the eye), (containing) abodes of sages, having the appearance of a staircase leading to heaven, resembling kaubārochchhanda (in style), white—shining, because it bears the radiance of crystal gems and petals;—(and having constructed), in a very proper manner, a (religious) alms-house (?), a structure eminent in qualities, and as beautiful as the best of mansions;—he, of righteous intention, moves about charmingly among the pious. May Dhrūva continue in bliss !

(Lines 12-13) That same Dhrūvaśarman, who ...... by means of the abundance of the unprecedented accumulation of wealth, ........... has caused the erection of this firm and excellent pillar.²

No. 17: PLATE XVII

GĀDHWA STONE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I: THE YEAR 98

This is another of the inscriptions on the stone discovered by Rājā Śiva Prasād, in 1871-72, at Gādhwa in the Allahābād District, Uttar Pradesh. It was not noticed when the stone was

1 Though portions of the first half of the verse are legible, it is left untranslated because of the uncertainty of the construction owing to the missing words.
2 The wording in the original is faulty; sthira-varaḥ qualifies the stambha which is wrongly compounded with uchhīrva 'erection' or 'loftiness'.
GADHWÄ STONE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I: THE YEAR 98

G. S. Gai

From photograph
first discovered; but was afterwards found, on clearing away the lime under which it was hidden, by General Cunningham, who then, in 1890, published his reading of the text in the *CASIR.*, Vol. X, p. 9, with a lithograph (ibid., Plate V, No. 1). It was afterwards edited by J. F. Fleet in *CII.*, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 40 ff. and Pl. IV D.

This inscription is on the upper part of the proper right side of the stone. Almost the whole of the first line, and the first half of each of the remaining lines, have been entirely broken away and lost. The remnant of the writing, however, covering a space of about 4" broad by 9" high, is fairly well preserved and easy to read. The size of the letters varies from \( \frac{3}{8} \) to \( \frac{1}{2} \). The characters belong, on the whole, to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet where \( s \) alone is of the western, and are of precisely the same type as those of the two inscriptions, Nos. 8 above and 26 below, being probably engraved by the same hand. They include, in the date, forms of the numerical symbols for 8 and 90. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout. The orthography presents nothing calling for remark.

The name of the king is broken away and lost in the first half of line 2. But the inscription is dated, in numerical symbols, in the year *ninety-eight* (416-17 A.D.); and this shews that the record must belong to the time of the *Imperial Gupta* king Kumāragupta. So little remains of it that the form of religion or the sect to which it belonged, cannot be determined; nor can the object of it; except that it records a gift of twelve dināras, apparently as a contribution to some Brāhmaṇa from Sadāsattra.

### TEXT

1 [Jitaṁ bhagavatāḥ Paramabhaṅgaḥ*][vata-mahā][rājādhi*]-
2 [rājā-sri-Kumāragupta-rājya-satṉvatsa*]rē 90 8 ...
3 [asyāṁ divasa*]-pūrvvāyaṁ padūa\(^1\) ...
4 ................. nē(?) n = ātma-puṇy-ōpa[chay-ārtham*]
5 ................. rē kāliyan Śadāsa[1*] [tra- ...
6 ................. kasya talakaniṅāc(?) ...
7 ................. bhyaṁ dinārāh dvādaśa ...
8 ................. sy = ămkur-ōdbha(?) sta-chchha
9 ................. [saṁ*]jyukta[h*] syād = iti i\(^2\)

### TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-3) [Victory has been achieved by Bhagavat (Vāsudēva)!\(^3\) [In the year] 90 (and) 8 [of the (dynastic) rule\(^4\) of the prosperous Kumāragupta, the Mahārājādhirāja, an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva)\(^5\); ...; when this was the specification of the date\(^6\).

(Lines 3-8) [For the purpose] of augmenting (his) own spiritual merit ....... (to endure) for the time ....... Sadāsattra\(^2\) ....... twelve dināras .......

(Lines 8-9) [And whosoever breaks up this bit of charity shall become infected with (the Five Great Sins)].

---

\(^1\) May be read also as *pata* with Fleet.
\(^2\) Expressed by a horizontal stroke.
\(^3\) The meaning of this phraseology is explained by verse 1 of the Tuśām inscription (*CII.*, Vol. III, 1888, No. 67, p. 270) showing that bhagavatā stands for *Vishnu*.
\(^4\) See note 1 to Translation of No. 8 above, p. 246.
\(^5\) See note 3 to Translation of No. 10 above, p. 253.
\(^6\) See note 1 to Translation of No. 6 above, p. 241.
\(^7\) See note 1 to Translation of No. 8 above, p. 247.
MATHURĀ IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I:
THE YEAR 107

This inscription was first brought to notice by G. Bühler in 1894 in the *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, pp. 210-11, No. xxxix, where he published his reading and translation of the text, accompanied by a lithograph (*ibid.*, Plate facing p. 209) based upon estampages supplied by A. Führer.

The inscription is incised on the base of a large sitting Jina, measuring 3' 8" by 2' 7".\(^1\) unearthed by Führer during his excavations from November 1890 to March 1891 in the Kaṅkālī Tīlā at Mathurā, the chief town of the Mathura District, Uttar Pradesh. The image is now in the Provincial Museum at Lucknow.

The *writing* covers a space of about 2' 5½' broad by 1' 2½' high. It is well preserved with the exception that two or three letters are destroyed in the first line in two places. The average *size* of the letters is 7/8". The *characters*, on the whole, belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet. Those representing ה, ג and ל are decidedly and uniformly of the western type, מ alone being of the eastern variety. If we compare this record with No. 6, which also was found at Mathurā, we find that some of the characteristics of the Kushāṇa period which the latter displays are to be seen also in this record. Thus, the letters י and י of this inscription still preserve flat and angular bases, מ alone developing a curve. The tops of ה and כ, which in No. 6 manifest this characteristic have, however, lost it in our record.

The only other point in regard to the palaeography of this epigraph that is worthy of note, is that the characters include in line 1, forms of the numeral symbols for 7, 20 and 100. The *language* is mixed Dialect or Gāthā Dialect\(^2\) as it was known to the Indians, and agrees completely with that of the Jaina inscriptions exhumed along with this by Führer in Mathurā and published by Bühler in the *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 381 ff., and 395 ff.; Vol. II, pp. 199 ff.

In respect of *orthography* we have to note (1) that כ is doubled in conjunction with a following ר, e.g., in *Guhāmitra*, line 2 and (2) that וב and ת are doubled with a preceding ר, e.g., in *pāre*[hā]rikasa, line 1 and *prāf*[hā]rikasa, line 2.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Kumāragupta, i.e., Kumāragupta I of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. Its *date*, in numerical symbols, is *one hundred and seven*, on the *twentieth* day of the intercalary month Śrāvaṇa. It, thus, corresponds to 426-27 A.D., when alone Śrāvaṇa was an additional month. It further shows that the Gupta year 107 of this record was an expired one. It is a Jaina inscription; and the *object* of it is to record the putting up of the image of a Jina by Śāmādhīya, who was the daughter of Bhaṭṭibhava and wife of Guhāmitra Pālīta who was a Prāthārika, apparently a lapidary. We are further told that the benefaction was made in accordance with the behest of Datilācārya who pertained to the Vidyādhari-śākhā of the Kōṭṭiya-gaṇa. Both the Gaṇa and the Śākha, have been mentioned in the Stavarāvali of the *Kalpasūtra.*\(^3\)

---


\(^2\) It "represents the spoken language, if not the vernacular, of the śāhā people from the first century B.C. to the third century A.D., when, owing to the increasing supremacy of Brahmanism, Sanskrit was being largely studied even by non-Brahmanical sects but Pāli as a literary vehicle was not yet extinct." (D. R. Bhandarkar’s *Asoka*, 2nd edition, p. 212, note 1).

\(^3\) *SBE.*, Vol. XXII, p. 292.
MATHURĀ IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRGUPTA I: THE YEAR 107
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Dhanāidaha Copper-Plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I: 273
Year 113

Text


Bhaṭṭibhavasya dhītu Guhamitrā-Pāli[ṭa]-prāt[thā]rikasya4 [kuṭumb*]jñiyē pratimā pratisīṭhāpi[tā] [r]

Translation

Luck! (The year) 107; the intercalary month of Śrāvaṇa; the day 20, (in) the victorious reign of the Paramabhaṭṭaraka Mahārajādhirāja, the prosperous Kumāragupta—when this was the specification (of date), the image was set up by Śāmādhīya (=Śyāmādhīya), daughter of Bhaṭṭibhava (and) wife of the lapidary Guhamitra Pāli, who had been commanded by Datilāchārya (=Datilāchārya) of the Kōṭṭiya-gaṇa and the Vidya[ḍ]hari-sākhā.

No. 19: Plate XIX

Dhanāidaha Copper-Plate Inscription of Kumāragupta I (r)

The year 113

This inscription, engraved on a thin copper-plate which looks very much worn out and fragile, was discovered about 1906 A.D., in a village called Dhanāidaha in the Natore Subdivision of the Rajshahi District in the Rajshahi Division of Bangladesh. Babu Akshaya Kumara Maitreyya, Director of the Varendra Research Society of Rajshahi, obtained it from Khan Bahadur Muhammad Ershed Ali Khan Choudhuri, and it is now deposited in the Museum of the Society along with the five copper-plate inscriptions of the Gupta period discovered in April 1915 at Dāmōḍarpur in the District of West Dinajpur. It was edited in 1909 by R. D. Banerji, then of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, in the JASB., Vol. V, No. 11, pp. 459-61. Banerji’s decipherment of this fragmentary inscription was not correct as proved by the Dāmōḍarpur records discovered subsequently. While editing two of these inscriptions belonging to the same monarch’s reign, Rabha Govinda Basak revised the reading of this inscription and he re-edited it in the Bengali monthly, the Sāhiṭya of Calcutta, in the Pausha issue, 1323 B.S. Thereafter, he edited the inscription in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XVII, pp. 345 and ff.

The inscription is a fragmentary one, consisting of 17 lines of writing incised in the early

---

1. Read -Mahārajādhirāja-.
2. It is somewhat curious how after viṣayārāja- Bühler reads sam [100 10] 3. Even the plate accompanying his text has clearly su which again is followed by the numerical symbol for 7. Then between this symbol and ka the stone is much damaged, showing, however, that two letters have been lost. After ka the only syllables that are quite whole and entire are māsa. But this māsa was preceded immediately by na which, though it is somewhat injured, is as good as certain. Between ka and na there is a lacuna of two or three letters only. And we cannot be wide off the mark if the lacunae are filled up, as shown in the text. Bühler’s restoration kārīṭuka-Hāmanila-nāsaya dināsē is not only very wide off the mark but also yields no good sense.
3. This name is doubtless Guhamitra, and not Grahamittra as Bühler reads.
4. Bühler reads prāt[thā]rikya but admits in the foot-note that ‘possibly pratiḥārikaya is to be read’. It looks more like prāt[thā]rikaya.
5. If prāt[thā]rikya is the correct reading, it stands for the Sanskrit prastārika, ‘a dealer in prastara’. But prastara signifies both an ordinary and a precious stone. Perhaps the second sense is here intended. In that case, prastārika denotes ‘a lapidary’.
Gupta characters of the 5th century A.D. It is written on one side only of the plate, which is now very much corroded. In length, the full plate seems to have been almost twice the fragment now preserved, which measures 5 1/4" by 5 1/4". Almost the whole of the proper right half of the plate is broken and lost, together with the upper right and lower left corners. From an examination of the portions of the writing preserved in lines 14-16, which form part of the well-known imprecatory verses, it can be ascertained that about a dozen and a half letters are cut off from the proper right side of each of the lines. This loss of almost half of the inscribed portion and the extremely blurred state of the letters preserved are the greatest obstacles in explaining the document. But the five Dāmodarpur grants and the four Faridpur grants have helped us much in deciding that the present plate also, like them, is not an ordinary royal land-grant, but is a sale-deed embodying the record of a purchase of land for the purpose of donation. Banerji states that the fragments of the proper upper right corner, broken in the exhibition grounds of the Calcutta Industrial Exhibition of 1906-07, contained the two letters ma and ra, which, he thinks, were evidently the second and third syllables of the name of the emperor Kumāragupta. The inscription is dated in 113, which must be referred to the Gupta era, and this evidently proves that it belonged to the time of the Gupta monarch Kumāragupta I. The language of the inscription is Sanskrit, and it is in prose throughout excepting in lines 14-16, which contain three damaged imprecatory verses in the Anuvāṣṭhayā metre. Banerji's statement that "the bad state of preservation makes it very difficult to make any remarks on the orthography" cannot be upheld: for, the following points in respect of orthography were easily observed by Basak:

1. as in the Dāmodarpur copper-plates, the sign of the medial ā is attached by a hook-like sign towards the bottom of the lower right of some of the letters, especially of kh, g and v, e.g., khāṣaka line 5, khāṭā line 7; grām-āśta- line 6; and guṇāṇa-line 13;
2. the sign of caucaha is not used, as in visayē = nuvritta- line 7;
3. the letters g, f, t, m, y and v (and not sh, e.g., vārsha- line 15) are doubled with a preceding r, e.g., vārgga- line 4, svārgga line 15; ukūrṣam line 17; kūṛti line 4; saṃma line 3 and line 5, dhārmma line 8; māryyādā- line 7; and pūrvā line 2 and line 16, sarvā line 9;
4. m has sometimes been joined with the following pa and va, e.g., in svadattām-para-dattām = vā line 14; and
5. k has been doubled with a following r, e.g., in kκrāmaṇa (na) line 8.

The forms of the initial vowels ā, i and u are seen in the following words respectively, aukāla line 11, iha line 7, and ukūrṣam line 17. The form of the letter mē in kκrāmaṇa (na) line 8, sarvām = ekam line 11, is to be noticed. For a similar incision of mē, especially the ē mark in it, we may compare the words kāyam = ēshām line 31 of the Allahābād pillar inscription of Samudragupta, No. 1, above, and gahām = ēṭām line 5 (above, No. 11), and the word dōṣha-grāmō line 1 (wrongly read as dāś-āgrēṇa by Harā Prasad Sastrī) of the Susunī rock inscription.1

In his paper "The Five Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscriptions of the Gupta period",2 Basak made a remark at the outset that those sale-deeds, which the present inscription resembles, "may be regarded as having roughly six different parts in the form in which they are drawn up." The same remark, he says, holds good with regard to this inscription also. The first part ends with the word viṣṇupāti- line 7, the second with dā[ṭum] line 8, the third with tād = avadṛṭum = iti yatas line 10, the fourth with ekam dattāṁ line 11, the fifth with Varāha-svāminō dattāṁ line 12, and the sixth with the rest of the grant. We agree with him.

---

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XIII, p. 133.
2 Ibid., Vol. XV, pp. 113 ff.
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The contents of the inscription may be stated as follows: In the Gupta year 113 (=432-33 A.D.), belonging evidently to the reign of Kumāragupta I, some one, (very likely a royal officer, an āyukta), whose name seems to have ended in -vishnu (line 7), approached the village house-holders, the mahattaras and the ashṭa-kul-ādhikaraṇas and, perhaps, also the local government of the district and expressed to them his desire to purchase one kulyavāpa of cultivated land by paying the price at the usual rate prevalent in the vishaya of Khādā(ṭa?)pāra. It seems that the applicant wanted to buy the land by destroying the nīva-dharma (the non-transferability of it), i.e., with the right of alienation. His prayer was granted and the purchased land was severed for him by proper measurement. He, in turn, seems to have made a donation of the same to a Sāmavēcin Brāhmaṇa (Chhandogya, line 12) of the name of Varāha-svāmin. It seems very probable, though the mutilated condition of the plate does not permit us to be very confident on the point, that the Dhanāidaha plate contained a reference to the Pundravardhana bhukti being under a governor appointed by the Gupta ruler (compare the Dāmōdarpur plates of the Gupta years 124 and 128, belonging to the same monarch’s reign) and that the vishaya of Khādā(ṭa?)pāra was, like Kōjīvarsha, one of the many districts of the same bhukti. In the Khālimpur copper-plate of Dharmapāla, king of Gauda, though of the 9th century A.D., we have the names of two other vishayas, viz., Mahāntāprakāśa (line 31) and Sthālikkata (line 41), as being situated in the bhukti of Pundravardhana.

**TEXT**

1. ....... mvatsara²-sat[e] trayōdaś-ōttake-
2. [rē?r].... [asya n=d[i] vasa-pūrvvāyām parama-daiyata-parama-
3. ....... ā(? katu[m]bī]. brāhmaṇa-Śivasārma-Nāgaśārma-maha-
4. ....va-kirtti-Kṣēmaddatta-Gośīṭhaka-Varggapāla-Piṅgala-Sūkṣuka-Kaḷa-
5. ......pa(?)-vishnu-[Dēva]ārjuna-Vishnu-bhadra-Khāsaka-Rāmaka-Gopāla-
6. ......sa(? su(? Śri-bhadra-Somapāla-Rāmr-ādyāh(?) grām-āśīta-kulādhyake-
7. ...... vishnunā(?) vijñāpita iha Khādā(ṭa?)pāra-vishayē =nuvṛtta-marryādā
8. ...... nīva-dharma-kṣhayēna labhya[tē] [ṭa]d-ahatha mam-ādy-ānēn-āiva
9. kramēna[nā] dā[ttum]-
10. samēty=ā(?) bihihitai(ḥ?) sarvam=ēva jūn(?) kara⁵-prativēśī(?)-ktumbbhibhir=
11. avasthāpya ka-
12. ...... ri. kana . yad=itō...[ṭa]d=avadhītam=īti yatas=tath=ēti pratipādy-
13. ...... vaka-nalā[byāḥ]m⁶=apaviṇcchaya kṣetra-kulyavāpam=ēkaṁ dattāṁ tataḥ
aṅkata-
14. ...... bhrā(?)[ṛ]-kaṭaka-vāṣṭavya-Chhandogya-brāhmaṇa-Varāhasvāminō
dattāṁ tad=dha[va?]-
15. bhūmīya dā[nd-ākṣhē]pē cha gun-āgnuman-anuchoitya śarīra-ka(kā) nchanakasya chi-

---

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 249.
2 Read sateutara-.
3 D.C. Sircar restores the first few letters of this line as Sarā 100+10+3. Sel. Ins., 1965, p. 283.—Ed.]
4 D.C. Sircar reads nīva-dharma-kṣhayēna. Ibid.—Ed.]
5 D.C. Sircar restores as kṣetram. Ibid.—Ed.]
6 Read ashāpaka-naivaka-natdhyāna=—
THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS

14  .......ā [u]ktāna=cha bhagavatā Dvaiapāyanēna Svadattām=paradattām=vā
15  ......[bhīh] saha pachyate [i*] Shashṭiṇi varsha-sahasrāni(ni) svarggē mōdati
     [bhā]mida[ḥ] [i*]
16  ......[Pṛ]rrva-dattān dvijātibhyō yatriṇād=rakṣa Yudhisṭhirā [i*] mahīm
     [mahi][matān=chhreṣṭha]*
17  ......ya[ṇ]u (?) Sṛibhadṛēṇa(ṇa)1 utkṛṣṭam Sthā(Sta)mbhēśvaradāsē-
     [na]......

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-7) When one hundred years exceeded by thirteen [had passed]......(and)
when, in this detailed order of the date, Paramadāvata, Paramabhēṣṭaraka, etc., Kumārgupta
(is the lord of the earth), the husbandmen (consisting of)......the Brāhmaṇas Śivaśarman and
Nāgaśarman and the village Board of the Ashtakula (consisting of the Mahattaras Dē?) vakirtti,
Kshēmadatta, Gōṣṭhaka, Varagapāla, Pīṅgala, Śuṅkakā, Kāla......,...... vishiṇu, Dēvaśarman,
Vishnubhadra, Khāsaka, Rāmaka, Gōpāla,......su(?) Śribhadra, Sōmapāla, Rāma and
others were informed by......vishiṇu as follows:

(Lines 7-10) in the district of Khāḍā(ṭa)pāra (according to) the rule of sale prevalent
here......to be had on the termination of the Endowment Contract (niśi-dharma). Deign ye,
therefore, to grant me according to this same custom by the neighbouring husbandmen who
are obedient and are addressed in a body, having established it all.

(Lines 10-13) Whereas it was so determined and accepted saying ‘so be it’, one kule-
vaṇa of land, being severed by 8 x 9 reeds, was given by the Āyuktaka officer to the Chhandōga
(Sāmavēdin) Brāhmaṇa Varāhaśvāmin, resident of......bhrāṭī-kaṭaka. So......considering
the merit and demerit in the grant and confiscation of land and (the impermanence) of body
and gold (it should be respected by the administration in time to come).

(Line 14) And it has been said by the divine Dvaiapāyana:

(Verse 1) He (who takes away land) given by himself or by others, (having become a
worm in excreta) rots with his forefathers.

(Verse 2) The giver of land rejoices in heaven for sixty-thousand years. (He who resumes
it and he who assents to it may dwell in hell for as many years).

(Verse 3) Carefully preserve the land that has already been given to the twice-born
(Brāhmaṇas), Yudhisṭhirā, the best of land-owners. (Preservation is more meritorious than
grant of land.)

(Line 17) ... (written) by Śribhadra. Engraved by Stambhēśvaradāsa.

No. 20 : PLATE XX

TUMAIN INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRGUPTA I: THE YEAR 116

This inscription was discovered as early as 1919 in the course of his tour for the prepara-
tion of the List of Antiquities by M.B. Garde, the then Superintendent, Archaeological Depart-
ment of the erstwhile Gwalior State, who first published a summary of it in the Ind. Ant.,

---

1 [D.C. Sircar suggests the restoration as ākkhatā paṭik=gaṇa anātya-Bhadṛa. Sel. Ins., 1965, p. 289, note 3.—Ed.].
Tumain is a village in the Guna District of Madhya Pradesh, about forty miles to the west of Erán, the Airikina of ancient India, in the Khurái Thahlil of the Sagar District. The original stone is now in the State Museum at Gwalior.

Nearly one half of the inscription, the proper right portion, is destroyed. It is also not clear how much of the lower part is missing. The writing on what is preserved of the stone covers a space 7" high by 24" broad, and is in an excellent state of preservation, except in the last line where the letters are injured here and there. The size of the letters varies from \( \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \) to \( \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon} \). The characters belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet, as is clear from the formation of such test letters as \( m \), \( s \) and \( h \). There is some doubt only about \( t \), which, in the word loka- in line 1, looks more like the eastern than the western prototype. Three more palaeographic peculiarities, which are noteworthy, are: (1) the ending \( m \) which is denoted by a miniature form of this character surmounted by a horizontal bar, the whole occupying half the height of a normal letter; (2) the \( \text{virama} \) which is indicated sometimes by a horizontal stroke as after loka-trey-ante in line 1 and after yukté in line 4, but sometimes by vertical uprights as e.g., at the end of lines 3 and 5; and (3) the jìhādāntiša which is denoted by the character for \( m \) as in tatah-kanivān in line 5. The language is Sanskrit; and, so far as the preserved text goes, it is in verse. As regards orthography, it is sufficient to note that (1) the letters \( j, l, y \) and \( v \) following \( r \) are doubled; (2) that the \( \text{visarga} \) followed by \( s \) has been once changed to that letter, in =ōditas=sa, line 3; (3) that the anusvara and gh following it have been twice changed to \( nh \), once in siddha-sahha, line 1 and another time in Sanhadevaḥ, line 5; and (4) that the jìhādāntiša has been used once in tatah-kanivān, line 5.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Kumāragupta I of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. In the existing portion of line 1 is preserved the second half of a stanza, which, according to Garde, “apparently refers to Samudragupta.” This, however, seems unlikely, because what remains of this line speaks of the lotus-like feet of some one described in the stanza as being adored by the bands of the Siddhas. This eulogy which is worthy of a divinity can hardly apply to Samudragupta. It is safer to take the line, as containing praise of some god, possibly Śiva, who seems to have been referred to in the last verse, as we shall see presently. The next stanza in line 1 describes Chandragupta II as being in charge of the earth up to the bounds of the ocean. Line 2 informs us that Chandragupta had a son called Kumāragupta who was almost equal to Mahēndra and who protected the earth as if she were his chaste and lawful wife. The first verse in line 3 compares Ghatośkachha to the moon and the second represents him as having inherited the inherent prowess of his ancestors and attained to fame. Line 4 specifies the date of the inscription thus: “When a century of years of sovereigns (born of Gupta) (had elapsed), accompanied by sixteen years” and refers it to the reign of Kumāragupta who is described as “shining on earth like the sun in the autumn”. Lines 5-6 specify the object of the record. In the first place, we are told that there was a family of brothers hailing from Vajōdaka which was noted as a settlement of sadhus or merchants. From there, they seem to have migrated and settled in Tumbavana where they constructed a temple, apparently, of Pīnākin or Śiva.

It is worthy of note that in the record Kumāragupta has been mentioned twice, first in line 2, and afterwards in line 4 where, in fact, the date of the inscription has been specified and is referred to his reign. In between these two lines mentioning Kumāragupta, that is, in line 3, occurs the name of Ghatośkachagupta. It is a pity that the first half of this line has not been
preserved. But the fact that the second component of his name is Gupta and that his name is contained in line 3 whereas lines 2 and 4 speak of Kumāragupta as a living sovereign is enough to show that Ghaṭotkachagupta was not only a Gupta prince but most probably a son of Kumāragupta. And further, as Ghaṭotkacha's name occurs in an inscription found in Tumain, it seems that in the Gupta year 116, the date of the record, he was the governor of Airikīṇa, which was one of the important provinces of the Gupta empire. Further remarks about him will be found in the account of Inscription No. 27.

TEXT1

1 . . . 5rir=yyasya lōka=tray-āntē [1]3 charaṇa-kamalam4 matyaṁ vandyētē5 siddha- 

saññhaî[6] (11) 7Rājā śrī-Chandraguptas= tad-anu jayati yō mēdinīṁ sāgar-āntāṁ 

2 . . . 8Śrī-Chandraguptasya Mahēṇdra-kalpaḥ Kumāraguptas= tanayas= sama-

[ggrā][m [1*] raraksha sādhvīm= iva dharmma-patnīṁ vīryy-āgra-hastair= 

upaguhya bhūmīm [1*] 

3 . . . 9[gā][ga-gaurah [1*] kṣhīty-ambarē guṇa-samūha-[may]ūkha-jālō nāmṁ=ōditas= 

sa tu Ghaṭotkachagupta-chandraḥ[11*] 10Sa pūrvvajānāṁ sthira-satva 11-kṛttīr= 

bhuj-ārijitāṁ kṛttiṁ= abhiprapadya 11 

4 . . . 11nāṁ vasudhēśvarāṇāṁ samā-śatē shōdaśa-varsha-yuktē 13 Kumāraguptē 

nirpaṭau pri(pr)i thīvyāṁ virāja(ja)mānē śarad=īva sūryē[14] Vātōdakē sādhun- 

jan-ādhivā(s)ē 

5 . . . 15taś=Śrīdeva ity=ūrjījita-nāmadhēyah [11*] 16tad-agrājō= bhūd=Dharīdeva- 

sañājhas=tato=nūjō yas= tu sa Dhanyadēvah [1*] tatō= varō yas= cha sa 

Bhadradēvas=tataḥ= kanyāṁ= api Sañhadēva[h]17 

6 . . . 18nasakta-chittāh [1*] samāna-[yṛtti]-ākriti-bhē[da-bhī]*[nn]*[āh k[shatr]-ālayās= 

T[u]*]ṁbavanē babhuvāḥ 19 akārayaṁs= tē girī-śrī(śrī)ṛga-tungam śaśi-

prabham dēva20 . . . .

1 [Since this inscription is fragmentary, the verses occurring in it cannot be serially numbered. Hence, the metres, wherever possible, have been shown in the notes below.—Ed.].

2 Metre: Mālinī.
3 Expressed by a horizontal stroke.
4 The anusvāra over la is superfluous.
5 Read vandyētē.
6 Read -sāṅghuḥ.
7 Metre: Śrīkhaṭi.
8 Metre: Upāṭi.
9 Metre: Vaśantairakā.
10 Metre: Upāṅgavajrā.
11 Read -satīs-. 
12 Metre: Upāṅgavajrā. 
13 Expressed by a horizontal stroke.
14 Metre: Upāṅgavajrā. 
15 Metre: Indrāvajrā. 
16 Metre: Upāṅgavajrā. 
17 Read Saṅghadēva. 
18 Metre: Upāṭi. 
19 Metre: Upāṅgavajrā. 
20 This may be restored to dēva-Pindeṇkīṁ griham.
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TRANSLATION

(Line 1) ... whose lotus-like feet, which are the source of knowledge, are adored by bands of Siddhas up to the extremities of the three worlds.

Thereafter, pre-eminent is the illustrious Chandragupta, the king, who... the earth up to the ocean bounds ...

(Line 2) ... The son of the illustrious Chandragupta is Kumārgupta who is well-nigh the great Indra and who protected the whole earth, holding her with arms, namely, valour, as if she were his chaste lawful wife.

(Line 3) .... brilliant; in the sky, namely, the earth, arose that moon, namely Ghaṭotkachagupta by name with his cluster of rays, namely, his store of good qualities.

He of steady fame for the inherent prowess of (his) ancestors, having attained to fame acquired through (his) arms ...

(Line 4) ... when a century of years of sovereigns (born of Gupta) (had elapsed), accompanied by sixteen years (and) when Kumārgupta was the king shining on earth like the sun in the autumn;

In Vaṭōdaka, a settlement of merchants (sādhu),

(Line 5) ... of the dignified name of Śrīdēva; he had an elder brother called Haridēva; his younger was Dhanyadēva; younger than he was Bhadradēva; still younger than he was Saṅghadēva.

(Line 6) ... (who) of unattached minds, of identical virtuous conduct (but) varying with difference of (human) figure, became the abodes of Kṣatriya valour in Tumbavana; (and) who constructed (a shrine of) the god (Pinākin), as lofty as the peak of a hill and bearing the lustre of the moon.

---

1 Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary explains nāyatā as "the means of acquiring knowledge (=jñānaya kāraṇam), Kū. on Pān. IV, 4, 97".

2 This may be compared with the epithets Śrī-Mahēndrah, Śrī-Aliceśvīra-Mahēndrah, Ajīta-Mahēndrah, etc., which Kumāragupta bears on his coins (Allan, Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty, pp. 61-81).

3 Sānā-sītī nāyāma-vasāha-yuktē may be compared to sarvatastara-lata ekamastay-uttaratē with which No. 43 below, e.g., begins. Fleet translates the latter by "in a century of years, increased by ninety-one". But this is a mistake, for, in that case, we should have expected "in the hundredth year increased by ninety-one", or, in other words, we should have had sarvatastara-lataisantē, instead of sarvatastara-lata. We have, therefore, to take some such word as gati or dīrgha, understood after sarvatastara of the one and sarvatastara of the other. That this is the correct explanation may be seen from the fact that it agrees with Saka 241 given by Alberuāl as equivalent to the initial year of the Gupta era. We, thus, have Gupta-sānivat 192 (current) plus 241 = Šāka-sānivat 433 (current) = 510-11 A.D. Fleet wrongly calculated it as "Gupta-Sānivat 191 + 242 = Šāka-Sānivat 433 current"; in which year the given date corresponds to Monday, the 3rd January, A.D. 511" (CII, Vol. III, 1888, Introd. p. 114).

4 It is not impossible to take sādhu-jan-dhādhavesê to mean "the abode of the virtuous people", in connection with Vaṭōdaka. But this is highly unlikely, because in the next line we are told that Śrīdēva and his brothers embraced the Kshatriya profession in Tumbavana. It is, therefore, more reasonable to take sādhu in such a sense that it will denote a profession. This is possible if we take it to mean "a merchant, money-lender, usurer" which is one of the senses Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary gives for this word. This is no doubt supported by Sanskrit lexicum as the Vaijñānti of Yādavaprabhākā which makes it synonymous with vardhini, 'usurer' (ed. by Gustav Oppert, p. 238, line 192). The Sanskrit term sādhu is no doubt preserved in the vernacular sāṭhē which is found not only in Hindi but also in Marāṭhi and Gujārāti and is "applied to a merchant or trader generally". It is also preserved in the Bengali word sāṭhē, which is sometimes spelt sava. The word sādhu is met with frequently also in inscriptions. Thus, one Khaṇjārāḥ inscription records the putting up of a Jaina image by one Sāṭhē Sālhe, son of Pāhlīlī, who was a son of Śrīśīthīnī Dēdē, of the Grahapati family, (Ep. Ind., Vol. 1, p. 153). What is worthy of note here is that the term sādhu has been distinguished from śrīśīthīnī. The word also occurs in South Indian inscriptions. From these, it is evident that in that part of India the sādhu played an important part in a public transaction whether issuing from the king or the people (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 181, 239, note, and 315, line 28; Vol. XIII, p. 255, No. 135 where a Brāhmaṇa named Tēḷaṅgārya and belonging to Harita gōtra is mentioned as a sādhu).
KARAMḌĀMDĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I: THE YEAR 117

The existence of this inscription was first brought to notice by Kunwar Kamta Prasad in 1908, when he was Deputy Collector, Faizabad, the chief town of the Faizabad District, Uttar Pradesh. A summary of its contents was published by J.P. Vogel in the *PRAS.*, *W.G.*, for the year ending 31st March, 1908, p. 39. The inscription was first edited by R. D. Banerji in the *Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. I, p. 458 and afterwards by Sten Konow in the *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. X, pp. 70-72, accompanied by a plate.

The inscription is incised on a *liṅga* of greyish sand-stone which was excavated from a mound called Bharadāḥi Pih near the village of Karamḍāmdā,1 about twelve miles from Faizabad on the road to Shahganj, in the District of Faizabad. The *liṅga* itself consists of an upper circular portion, 1' 1" high and 10-½" in diameter, rising from an octagonal base 1' 9" high. The inscription is incised on five faces of the octagonal base of the *liṅga*, which is now deposited in the State Museum, Lucknow.

The writing covers a space 1' 5-½" high and 1' 7-½" broad, and consists at present of eleven lines. Some letters of the first two lines in the top right hand corner have been effaced but they can be restored from other Gupta records. Across the base, at a distance of 11" from the bottom, runs an indentation below line 4, which has partially obliterated some of the top mātrās of letters in line 5. The lowermost portion, again, has been broken off. In other respects the inscription is in an excellent state of preservation. The average size of the letters is 1½". The characters belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet except perhaps that for *m*. This last is curiously shaped, being neither of the eastern nor of the western variety and closely resembles ḍ, *e.g.*, in *Āyodhyaka*— in line 10. Other palaeographic peculiarities are also worthy of note, though they are of a minor nature. The short *u* is denoted in different ways; compare the *u* of *ku* and *gu* in *Kumāragupta- occurring in lines 3 and 7, and also the *u* of *nu* in *-nudhyātasya*, line 2. The form of the initial *i* in *iyam*, line 8, and the initial *ā* in *Āyodhyaka-*, line 10, are further worthy of note. The former agrees with that in the Khāûn pillar inscription of Skandagupta. And the latter looks like the *m* of this inscription, as just remarked. Attention may also be invited to the subscript *y* which is sometimes so engraved as to look almost like its initial form; compare, *e.g.*, the subscript *y* in *-nudhyātasya* in line 2 with that of *Kumārāmātya* in line 6. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose so far as it is preserved. In respect of orthography we may note (1) the doubling of a consonant before *r* in *-gūtra*, lines 5 and 10, but not in *putra*, line 5, or *putraḥ*, line 6; (2) and after *r* in *-pūrva-yām* and *-ācārya-*, line 4, in *yathā-karttavya-dhārma-karmanā*, line 9; (3) the change of *anuvāra* to *n* before *d* in *-yān=divasa= pūrva-yān*, line 4; (4) the use of *cuhh* in the beginning of a word in *Cehhān-dugaya=*, line 4; and the change of *visarga* to *ś* in conjunction with a following *ś*, in *Kumārāmātyaś= Śikhara-*, line 6.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of *Kumāragupta I* of the Imperial Guptan dynasty. It is dated, in words, "in the century of years of the victorious rule (of the Guptas) increased by seventeen (435-36 A.D.) on the tenth day of Kaṛttika." The object of it is to record a gift made by Prithivishēṇa, son of Chandragupta II's Mantri-Kumārāmātya Śikharavāmin, who was the son of Vishṇupālītabhaṭṭa, who, in turn, was the son of Kurmāranyabhaṭṭa. This last is described as Preceptor and Chanter of the Sāmavēda and pertaining to the Aśvavājīn gōtra. Aśvavājīn is most probably identical with Vājivājīn mentioned as a division of the Kaṇva gōtra in the *Baudhāyana-dvaitasūtra.*

---

1 PRAS. N. C., 1907-08, p. 39.
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It seems that Śikharasvāmin was Mantri-Kumārāṇāya of Chandragupta II throughout his official career, and that his son, Prithivishēṇa was at first during the reign of Kumāragupta I but afterwards became Mahābalaḥikṣita. The gift was made for the worship of Mahādēva known as Prithivisvara, presumably the liṅga on which the inscription is engraved. As the name of the god is Prithivisvara, and, of the donor, Prithivishēṇa, it appears that the liṅga was so called after the donor who established it. The practice of naming gods or their temples in this manner is too common to require much elucidation. Further details of the grant have been lost; and even line 12, which is the last line preserved, has only the upper half of it preserved and cannot, thus, be restored with absolute certainty. Sten Konow's restoration may, however, be safely accepted. The benefaction made by Prithivishēṇa in favour of Prithivisvara was laid at the feet of Mahādēva Śailēśvara. What it most probably means is that the principal shrine on this site was that of Śailēśvara which consequently had a treasury house of its own and that the money grant contributed by Prithivishēṇa was deposited there for being utilised on behalf of the god Prithivisvara founded by him. How exactly this grant was to be expended is not known, but immediately thereafter we find mention made of some persons, apparently Brāhmaṇas, who hailed from Ayōdiyā, pertained to various gōtras and charanas, and were proficient in penances, sacred recitation, in the mantras, sūtras, bhāshyas and pravachanas. About seven letters were engraved thereafter, but these cannot be restored with any degree of plausibility. Only four letters, deva-d[r]*ān[ṛ]*ān, are clear enough at the end of this line. This word, according to Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, means an idol procession (orig. ablation); and the St. Petersburg Lexicon refers to the Trikāṇḍa-sēsha 2, 7, 8 and the Hariva 129. It seems that the Brāhmaṇas adverted to above were put in charge of this duty in connection with the god Prithivisvara and that, consequently, Prithivishēṇa made his grant for this purpose.

TEXT

1 Namō Mahādēva 2 Ma[hā]rājā[dhi]-rāja-[sṛ-]Cha[ndragupta]-pād-ā-
2 nudhyātasya chatudhudaḥ [sali]-āsvādita-ya[sa]sō Mahārājā*
3 dhīrījā-sṛ-Kumāraguptaśa vijaya-rājya-saṅvatsara 5 śa[tē] saptadas-ōttarē

1 Thus Allâ, son of Vâsîlabhaṭṭa, was in charge of the Gēpâdır (Gwalior) fort in the time of the Imperial Prâhâra king, Bhâjaḍâva I, built a temple of Vîshnu called Vâsîlabhaṭṭâsvâmin (Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 159, line 6) after his father. Nârâyânavarma, a feudatory chief of the Pâla monarch, Dharmapâla, founded a temple of Vishnu under the name of Nanna-Nârâyaṇa (ibid., Vol. IV, p. 250, line 50; also p. 247), where the first component, Nanna, is obviously an abbreviation of the founder's name. Corresponding to Nanna-Nârâyaṇa is Kamâla-Nârâyaṇa (Bum. Gaz., Vol. I, Part II, p. 569) under which name the Kâdamba queen Kâmalâdevi constructed a temple of Vishnu at Dēgâṇave. Similarly, Mathâmâdeva, a feudatory prince of the Imperial Prâhâra king, Kâshâpâlaḍâva, founded a temple of Mahâdeva called Lâchchulâkâśvâra (Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 266, lines 8-9) after his mother Lâchhulâkâ. We read also of a monastery shrine of Śiva named Nâkâlêśvara (ibid., Vol. I, p. 262, line 32 and p. 270, note 4) after Nâkâlâ, wife of the Kâlachuri ruler Kâyâvarsha. Similarly we hear of a shrine of Śurya under the name of Indrâdityâdeva built by a Châhârâna chief Indrârâja (ibid., Vol. XIV, p. 185, line 18; p. 186, line 23; p. 187, lines 31-32).

2 It is, however, doubtful whether this is the sense of the word dhvârâ here intended. The same word occurs in line 6 of a Talēśvara copper-plate (Ep. Ind., Vol. XIIII, p. 115), where the same meaning is adopted (p. 117). As the plate, however, came from the hilly district of Almora, it is better to take the word in the sense of the Valley of (the shrine of) the God. This agrees with Paschimârâṇi which is mentioned in line 24 and is evidently distinguished from Dēvârâṇi. This may further be compared to bhâgâ-râṇi mentioned as the site of a shrine in a Rajputana inscription summarised in Prac. W.C., 1909-10, p. 37. Perhaps, this is not the sense of the word râṇi used in this record, as the inscribed liṅga stone was found in the plains, and, not in the mountainous region of Uttar Pradesh.

3 Expressed by a curve.

4 Read chatâra-udâdhi.

5 The reading is clearly saṅvatsara and not saṅvatsar[e] as given by Konow.
4 Kārttikamāsā-daśama-divasē-ṣyān-divasa-pūrvvāyāṁ [Ch]chhand[o]g[y]-
ācha[ryy-Aśva]-vāji-
5 sa-gōntra-Kuramaranya-haṭṭasya putrō Vishnupālita-bhaṭṭas-tasya putr[o]
Mah[3]-r[3]-
6 jadhijā[s]-sīri-Chandraguptasya mantri-Kumārāmātyas-Śikharasvāmy-abhūt
-tasya putraḥ
7 Prithivishēṇa Mahārājādhirāja-sīri-Kumāraguptasya mantri-Kumārāmātyō-na-
8 ntaraṁ cha mahābālādhikritaḥ bhagavatō Mahādevasya Prithivīśvara ity-evaṁ
samākhıyātasya
9 sy-aiva bhagavatō yathā-karttavya-dhārmika-karmmaṇā pāda-sūrśuṣaṇāya
bhagavacḥ-Chhai-
10 lēśvaravāmi-Mahādeva-pāda-mūlē Āyōdhya-నā-gotra-charaNā-tapah-
11 s[v]*ādh[ya]-[ya]-[mantra-sū]-[tra]-bhāṣ[ya]-[p][ra]-[vachana]-[pārāga] [r*]
[ā][vartita-sarīsad]-[dēvad][r]ōṇ[ya]ṁ

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-4) Obediance to Mahādeva. In the victorious reign of the Mahārājādhirāja, the
prosperous Kumāragupta, whose fame was tasted by the waters of the four oceans (and)
who meditated on the feet of the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Chandragupta, when a
century of years increased by seventeen (had elapsed), on the tenth day of the month
of Kārttika;

(Lines 4-11) when this was the specification of the date, Prithivīśheṇa, who was (at first)
Mantri-Kumārāmātya (and) afterwards the Mahābālādhikrita of the prosperous Kumāragupta
the Mahārājādhirāja, and who was son of Śikharasvāmini, Mantri-Kumārāmātya of the prosperous
Chandragupta (II), the Mahārājādhirāja, and son of Vishnupālītabhāṭṭa who, (in turn) was
son of Kuramaranyabhāṭṭa, a teacher of the Chhandoga and of the Aśvavāja gotra (placed) at
the feet of Śailēsvaravāmin Mahādeva, for the worship of the feet of this same Lord Mahādeva,
known as Prithivīśvara, with proper religious rites to (Brāhmaṇas) from Ayōdhya, of different
gōtras and charasās (and) conversant with penances, recitation of sacred texts, the mantras, the
śūtras, the bhāṣyas and pravachanas... at the procession of the image....

No. 22 : PLATE XXII

DĀMŌDARPUR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I: THE
YEAR 124

This inscription, along with four others (Nos. 24, 39, 41 and 47, below), was discovered in
the village of Dāmōdarpur, about 8 miles west of the Police Station Phulbāri in West Dinajpur
District, West Bengal. All the five plates came to light in April 1915 while some coolies, employed
by one Chhamir-ud-din Mondal, were, during the construction of a road, clearing away a
heap of earth between two tanks, locally called Haripukur and Khōlākutipukur. In course of

1 Read Chhāndaṣya-
2 The last letter of this name is doubtful. Konow reads Kurān[ā]raṣya.
3 Read -jāṭhīnōja-
4 This word is mantri- and not mantri as read by Konow.
5 Read śīrō.
6 Read samākhıyāṣṭy-ā. There is, however, a horizontal stroke after sya and almost attached to it which is
perhaps placed there wrongly instead of being placed vertically as a top nātrā.
7 The restoration of this broken line by Konow up to this point is really marvellous and has been accepted
with slight changes, but the letters occurring between it and dēvadṛṣṭyāṇā cannot be restored with any confidence.
time, they came under the notice of J. A. Ezechiel Esqr., I.C.S., who was then the District Magistrate of Dinajpur who made them over to the Varendra Research Society, who, in their turn, placed them in the hands of Radhagovinda Basak for decipherment. They were all published by him in Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, pp. 113 ff. The text and the translation of the inscription in question may be found there on pp. 130 ff., and Plate i a and i b.

The plate is one in number but is inscribed on both sides, the first containing eight and the second five lines of writing. It measures 6-3/4” by 4-1/4”. It is a thin plate; nevertheless, the edges of it were not fashioned thicker for the protection of the writing. The letters have been engraved deeply, and the inscription is, on the whole, in a good state of preservation, though, in some places, its surface is corroded through rust. Originally a seal was attached, as is indicated by the projection on one side which is now but partly preserved. The weight of the plate, according to Basak is 11-1/2 tolas. The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet, the test letters m, s, h and l being practically identical with those of the Allahābād pillar inscription. In regard to other palaeographical points connected with this inscription, attention may be drawn to the occurrence of (1) the initial vowel a in ar(a)hatha, line 7 and aprad-a, line 7; (2) u in uttara, line 11; (3) e in evam, line 9; (4) of the sign for b in three cases, namely, Śambāpāla, line 6 and brāhmaṇa, line 6 correctly, but para-dattām=bā, line 12, incorrectly; (5) the peculiar form ṭ in bhāṣṭāraka, line 1; (6) the noteworthy manner in which the subscript ō is indicated, namely, by a hook attached to the lower right, of such letters as th, e.g., in dhīṣṭhān-ādhi-, line 4, g, e.g., in yōgāya, line 7, dh in, e.g., dhāraṇa, lines 10-11; (7) the form for the conjunct hma in brāhmaṇa-, line 6, which has, however, to be distinguished from an almost similar sign for yma in saṅgrīya, line 10; and (8) the peculiar form of ending m in kulaśāpan=ēkam and dattam, both in line 11. The characters also include, in line 1, forms of the numerical symbols 4, 7, 20 and 100. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout, with the exception of the single impercatory verse in lines 12-13. The only linguistic peculiarity that calls for notice is the use of the affix ka in some words, such as in anuvahāmānaka, line 3, and niyuktaka, line 4. In respect of orthography we have to note (1) the doubling of k, th, and dh (the last two by t and d as required by the rules), p and m in conjunction with a preceding r, as in -chandr-ārka, line 8, -sūrthāraka, line 5, Pundravardhana- line 2, -karpoṭikēna, line 6, -Vitāvarman-, line 4, and -dharumēṇa, line 9, and (2) the use of o for b and b for o, as in Vamūhmitra, line 5, and para-dattām=bā, line 12.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Paramadāipati Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Kumāragupta that is, Kumāragupta I of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. Its date, in numerical symbols, is the year one hundred and twenty-four (442-43 A.D.), on the seventh day of Phalguṇa (February-March). Under Kumāragupta was Chirātadatta as Head (Uparika) of the Pundravardhana province (bhuktī); and in the Kōjīvarsha district (vīshaya), under the latter the court (adhitarka) of the Town (adhitīkhaṇa) was being administered by Kumārāmāya Vitavarmman appointed by Chirātadatta, along with the Nagarā-śrīśūkha Dīritēlē, the Sūrthāraka Bandhmitra, the Prañām-Kulika Dhīritimitra and the Prañām-Kāyastha1 Śambāpāla. And the object of the inscription is to record the purchase of one kulaśāpā2 by a Brāhmaṇa, Karpoṭikēna by name.

1 For the explanation of these four terms, see Introduction, pp. 101-03.
2 Kulaśāpā consists of the two words kula and śāpā. Vēpa was known as early as the time of Pāṇini who has referred to it in rasa vēpaḥ (V. 1.45) upon which Bhāṣṭrīji Bhyakṣa’s gloss is as follows: utpati uṣmāni=iti tēpōk khetram i prathasaya vēpad prastikam i drāṃgikam i kharikam i “Vēpa is that wherein is sown (a quantity of seed), that is, a field. Prāṃgika, drāṃgik or kharik is a field sown with (a quantity of grain measuring) a prāṇika, dhiṣḍha or kharī” Similarly kulaśāpā must signify ‘a field where is sown seed measuring one kula,’ kula being equal to (Contd. on p. 204)
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for the purpose of his agnihotra rites. The Brâhmaṇa first made an application to the government of the Kōṭiivarsha town. The land was, therefore, selected by the local record-keepers, three in number, and given to him after his payment of three dināras as its price.

From the inscription it appears that as early as the Gupta period Puṇḍravaradha was the name of a bhakti or province and that Kōṭiivarsha was one vishaya or district comprised in it. Puṇḍravaradha has been known ever since the time of the Maurya rulers, as is clear from the Mahāsthān inscription.¹ Though there is no epigraphic evidence of an early epoch in favour of the antiquity of Kōṭiivarsha, scriptural and Paurânic evidence is, by no means, wanting. Thus, the Jainī Kalpasūtra² mentions three sākṣhas of the Gōḍāsa-gana or Division of Jainī monks, one named after Puṇḍravaradha, another after Kōṭiivarsha and a third after Tâmrâlīpī, all situated in Bengal. The first of these was identified by Cunningham more than half a century ago with Mahāsthān in the Bogra District, West Bengal. In his account of Bhāsu Bihār, four miles to the west of Mahāsthān, he remarks that the Buddhist remains at this place corresponded both in description and position with those noted by Yuan Chwâng at the Po-shêp-té's monastery, which was situated just 20 lî or 4 miles to the west of the capital of the country of Pun-na-fa-tan-na³ which transcribes itself into Puṇḍravaradha but is obviously intended for Puṇḍravaradha. "This city," says Cunningham, "the pilgrim places at 600 lî, or 100 miles to the east of the Ganges, near Râjmahal. Now this description corresponds exactly with the relative positions of Râjmahal and Mahāsthān, the latter being just 100 miles to the east of the former."⁴ The suggestion of Cunningham was, before long, confirmed by the Karatīyamāhātya which was first published about half a century ago.⁵ This work mentions many holy spots which are all found at present in Mahāsthān; and, further, though it calls itself Karatīyamāhātya, it purports to describe the sacred sites of Puṇḍra or Puṇḍravaradha-kshêtra. It is thus evident from it that the present Mahāsthān is identical with the old Puṇḍravaradha. There are good reasons to suppose that the Mahāthyā could not have been composed later than 1100 A.D. We may thus, take it that the identity of Mahāsthān with Puṇḍravaradha was known before the twelfth century A.D. But this identity is now placed beyond all doubt by the Mahāsthān inscription. It is, no doubt, a fragment of an inscription, but speaks of a Kōshīṭhāgāra or royal granary in existence at Puṇḍranaagara. And as this fragmentary inscription was picked up from the ruins of Mahāsthān, it is obvious that they represent the vestiges of the old Puṇḍravaradha. Kōṭiivarsha also was an equally ancient place. It has been mentioned above that one sāhā of the Jainī Gōḍāsa-gana was
cight dhōpas according to lexicons. That there was the practice in ancient India of dividing land into fields according to the measures of seed that could be sown into them may be seen, e.g., from a Talōśvar grant of Vishnuvarman, which speaks of Vajrashala-kshêtra as kulvāpa, Mālava-kshêtra as khārīrāpa and so forth (Ep. Ind., Vol. XIII, p. 119, lines 13-14). Further, Nalini Kanta Bhatosalī seems to be right in saying "the term Kukadd, equivalent to Bigha, the most current land-measure in Bengal, appears to be a corruption of the term kulvāpa. The name survives in the form of Kulvāpa, the name of the standard land-measure in the Sylhet District" (Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, p. 79, note 2). Lastly, it is worthy of note that the term sāpā and kulvāpa occur also in Kauṭāyana's Arthasāstra, II. 24.5. That sāpā means there 'a field' cannot possibly be doubted. But it is doubtful whether kulvāpa of that text is equivalent to kulvāpa, though according to Apte's Dictionary, kulva means 'a measure of grain equal to 8 dhōpas.'

² SBE., Vol. XXII, pp. 84-86.
⁴ ASI., Vol. XV, p. 110.
⁵ This Mahāthyā was edited for the second time and for the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, now Bangladesh, by Prabhus Chandra Sen, who rightly points out that one verse from it is cited by Sarvânanda (1159 A.D.) in his Tâtaparni on the Amaratâsha and two in the Śripatiscandrikâ by Dēvanâbhâṭṭa who is himself quoted by Hâmâendi (12th century) (Bomh. Gaz., Vol. I, Part II, pp. 248-49). This shows that the Karatīyamāhātya is a composition which cannot be later than 1100 A.D.
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G. S. Gai

From photographs
named after Kōṭivarsha. Kōṭivarsha is also mentioned by the Vāyu-Purāṇa¹ as the place where the twenty-fifth incarnation of Śiva took place. The Abhidhānachintāmaṇi² of Hema-
chandra and the Trikāṇḍalaśāya³ of Purushottamadēva give Dēvikōṭa, Ushāvana, Bānapura
and Sōpitapura as other names of Kōṭivarsha. There is a place in the West Dinajpur District
of West Bengal called Bāngarh or Bāṅ-nagar⁴ which is full of ancient remains and which is
said to be the capital of the celebrated Asura ruler, Bāna, father of Ushā. And, further, this
Bāngarh is still locally known as Dēvikōṭa. This indicates that Kōṭivarsha, the headquarters
of a district falling under Pundravardhana bhukti, is to be identified with this Bāngarh or
Dēvikōṭa. Kōṭivarsha as a district (vishaya) persisted as late as the Pāla period, and, Pundra-
vardhana, as a bhukti, even later, that is, in the Sēna period.

TEXT

[Metre: Verse 1 Anushīṛṣṇa.]

First Side

1 Samva 100 20 4 Phālguna⁵ di 7 Paramadaivaartic-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārāj[a]-
2 dhīrāja-sri-Kumāraguptē pṛitiḥtpatau tat-pāda-parigrahitē⁶ Pundravardha-

na*]-
3 bhuktād⁷—Uparika-Chirādatān[e⁸—ānuvalavānaka⁹ Kōṭivarsha-vishayē cha ta-
4 n-niyuktaka-Kumārāmāya-Vētravarmmanay¹⁰—adhishṭhān-ādhī¹¹ karaṇaṃ=cha
Nagarasṛṣṭhī-
5 Dhrīṭipāla-Sārtthavāha-Vandhu¹²mitra-Prathamakulika-Dhrītimitra-Prathamak-

ya*]-
6 stha-Sambāpāla-purūgē saṃvyavaharatī yataḥ brāhmaṇa-Karppaṭikēga¹³
7 vijñāpita[ṃ] araha(rḥa)ma mam=āgniḥōtr-ōpayōgaya aprad-āprahata-khi-
8 la-kṣeṭra[ṇ] traidinārikya-kulyavāpēṇa¹⁴ saśvatā[d=ā]-chandr-ārka-tāraka-
bhōjyē

Second Side

9 yā¹⁵ nivi-dharmmēṇa dātum=iti śvaṁ diyatāṁ =ity=utpannē trini¹⁶ dinā[rāṇya= u*]-
10 pasāṅgrhiyā yataḥ Pustapāla-Riśidatta-Jayanandī-Vibhūdattānām=avadhā-
11 raṇayā Dōṅgāyā uttarapaścīnaddēśē¹⁷ kulyavāpam=ēkam¹⁸ dattam¹⁸ [h*]

¹ Chap. XXIII, v. 209.
² Chap. IV, verse 977.
³ II. 197.
⁴ Cāṣṭe, Vol. XV, p. 95.
⁵ Read Phālguna.
⁶ Read -pritiṁ.
⁷ Read -bhukiṇo—Uparika-.
⁸ Read -Chirādatan[e—.
⁹ Read —ānuvalavānako.
¹⁰ Read -Vētravarmmanay—.
¹¹ Read —adhishṭhān-ādhi—
¹² Read -Vandhu-.
¹³ Read -Karpṭaṭikēna.
¹⁴ Read -vāpēna.
¹⁵ Read -bhāgayatayā.
¹⁶ Read -trini.
¹⁷ Read -prasāṁśīcīnādēśē.
¹⁸ The ending m is here expressed by a symbol.
12 Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ baṁ yoharēta vasudharāṁ [ι*] bhūmi-[dāna]-sārva (ba)ddhā[h*] slokā bhava[niti]
13 sa viṣhūyāṁ krīmī-[ι*] bhūtvā piṭīrhiṁ saha pachyate [ι* ι*] [ι*]ti [ι*]

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-6) The year is 100 (and) 20 (and) 4, (the month) Phālguna, the day 7, while Paramadāvatā Paramabhātārka Mahārājādhīrōja, the prosperous Kumāragupta is the lord of the earth; and while the Kōṭivarsha district is running on with (the rule of) Chirātdatta, an Uparika of the Pundravardhana province, selected by His (Majesty's) feet; and while Kumārāṁśya Vētravarman, appointed by him (Chirātdatta), is administering the Board of the town presiding over the Nagarā-irśhīlīn Dhrītipāla, the Sārthavāha Bandhumitra, the Prathama-Kulīka Dhrītimitra (and) the Prathama-Kīyasthī Śambāpāla.

(Lines 6-9) Whereas the Brāhmaṇa Karpaṭika has applied: "Deign to make over a strip of wasteland, unploughed (and) not yielding (anything), for being used for my Agnihotra rites, at the rate of three dīnārās a kulyavāga, to be enjoyed (by me) for ever, as long as the moon, the sun and the stars (endure), in accordance with the niśṭhārṇa;"}

1 Read -dattārī vā.
2 Read -dharāṁ.
3 This should have preceded the imprecatory verse.
4 Read krīmī-
5 Read piṭīrhiṁ.
6 The phrase in this record is -Chirātadattaṁ-ānuvahata-Kōṭivarsha-viśhyāṁ. In No. 24, below, it is -Chirātadattasa bhōgīṁ-ānuvahata-Kōṭivarsha-viśhyāṁ. In No. 41, below, it is -Jagadattasa bhōgīṁ-ānuvahata-Kōṭivarsha-viśhyāṁ; and in No. 47, below, -nājapuṭa-dīccha-bhātārakasa hasty-aiśa-jana-bhōgīṁ-ānuvahata-Kōṭivarsha-viśhyāṁ. In every one of the last three cases which are perfectly analogous with the first one, ānuvahata is preceded by bhōgīṇa. The phrase in our record should, therefore, be corrected into Chirātadattasa bhōgīṁ-ānuvahata-Kōṭivarsha-viśhyāṁ. Ānuvahataṁ, of course, means 'flowing on, running on.' Bhōga has several senses, one of which is 'rule, governance, authority,' a sense which is supported by the phraseology hasty-aiśa-jana-bhōgīna occurring in No. 47, below. Perhaps, a better rendering of bhōga would be 'enjoyment (of power).'
7 Adhikaranaṁ... saivyevaḥaraṭi is taken by Basāk to mean ‘administering the government etc.’ (Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, p. 131). This view is disentangled from R. C. Majumdar. ‘It appears to me, however,’ says he, ‘that the question, here, is not general administration, but merely the administration of justice. This follows from the ordinary meanings of the terms adhikarana and ayadhara, etc., ‘court of law’ and ‘administration of justice,’ and I do not see any reason why these words should be stretched to cover the idea of general administration’ (Corporate Life in Ancient India, 2nd ed., pp. 64-65). In 1903-04, when T. B. Chadwick excavated a site at Bāsāth, the ancient Vaiśāli, he lighted upon many seals of the early Gupta period, bearing such legends as: Kumārāṁśya-ādikarana, yuvrāja-bhātāraka-pādiya-bal-ādikarana, Śri-rājābhūja-yuvrāja-ādikarana, Dāndapāl-ādikarana, and so forth (A.R. ASI, 1903-04, pp. 107 ff). This shows that the term adhikarana was used in the sense of ‘Kachhāri’ in the early Gupta epoch, that is, ‘any court or board of administration, judicial, customary, ecclesiastical or military.’
8 These four offices did not constitute a Board of Advisers to help Vētravarman, but rather all the five formed the Administrative Board for the governance of the Kōṭivarsha town. The Board must have been something like a Panchākula or Panchāyat for the town so frequently referred to in the mediaeval inscriptions of North India; compare e.g., jan-niyukta-mahāṁ Gajāśya-prabhīṣit-pāchakula-prāṣāttapa (Ep. Ind., Vol. XI, p. 57, lines 5-6). It is worthy of note that Vētravarman is here designated Kumārāṁśya, and not Vishyapati. It is only in No. 47 below that we find a Vishyapati mentioned as the Head of the Administrative Board of the District Town. For the explanation of the terms Kumārāṁśya, Nagarā-irśhīlīn and so forth, see Introduction, pp. 101 ff.
9 Sanskrit lexicon make kāla synonymous with oppahata. Here, however, a distinction is sought to be made. Aprahata is 'fallow land,' but kāla apparently denotes 'land never tilled.'
10 In II.9.30, Amara makes nīśi, parippāna and mālādhamma as synonymous terms; and in III.3.212, he assigns to the word the two senses of stī-koṭa-vastra-bandha and parippāna. A commentary called Mākaka, however, distinguishes between parippāna and mālādhamma. The first is nājapuṭa-dīccha-bándhā, 'giving of a prince etc., as a hostage,' and the second, vauṭāva mālādhamma, 'the capital or principal invested with traders.' Haima also gives these three different senses to that term by saying nīśi stī-koṭa-vastra-bandhān mālā-dhārape parippāṇa (see in the Nāmadāṅgīnālīsana published by the Nāmāya-sagāra Press, the commentary on III.3.312). The word nīśi occurs also in other records (Contd. on page 287)
(Lines 9-11) It being resolved that it might be granted, one kulyavāpa (of land) was given (him) on acceptance of three dināras in the region north-west of Dāngā according to the determination of the record-keepers, Rishidatta, Jayanandin and Vibudatta.

(Line 12) The stanzas connected with grants of land are:

(Verse 1) "He, who takes away land given by himself or by others, having become a worm in excreta, rots with his forefathers."

NO. 23 : PLATE XXIII

MATHURĀ IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I : THE YEAR 125

The inscription is engraved on the pedestal of a broken sandstone image which was discovered, some years ago, while digging for the foundation of a room in the Collector's office at Mathurā, the headquarters of the district of the same name in Uttar Pradesh. It is now deposited in the Archaeological Museum at Mathura (accession No. 64.12). The proper right portion of the pedestal of the image, which appears to be that of a standing Buddha, is broken away resulting in the loss of some letters at the beginning of the first two lines and of all the letters in the third line. The inscription was noticed in A.R. Ep., 1965-66, as No. B 677 and was edited by V. N. Srivastava in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVII, pp. 153-54 and plate.

The characters belong to the western variety of the Gupta alphabet. The language is Sanskrit. In respect of orthography, it may be noted that the consonant following r is re-duplicated; e.g. in sarva, line 2.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Kumāragupta I of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. It is dated in the year 125, and the ninth day of the month Āsvayuja. When referred to the Gupta era, this date would fall in 444-45 A.D. The inscription is benedictory in nature and its object is to record the gift of the image by a native of Mathurā whose name is damaged, the extant portion reading māradāsa-bhāṭṭa. So his name seems to have been Kumāradāsa-bhāṭṭa.¹ The inscription is important as it is the only dated epigraph from Mathurā, known so far, referring to the reign of Kumāragupta. It is also the only known Gupta record referring to Mathurā.

The only geographical name which occurs is Mathurā and is evidently modern Mathurā from where the record is found.

THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS

TEXT 1

1  . . . śr[1]-Kumāraguptasya v[j]ya-x-[ā]jya-sa[m][v]a[t]\textsuperscript{2} 100 20 5\textsuperscript{5} [Ā]śvayuja-
māśē di 9 as[y][ā]mī vāsas-pū[rv]v[y][ā]y[ā]mī Mathura[s]ya
2  . māradāśa[4]bha[t]-vijñāyamānasya \textsuperscript{4} yad= a[tra] puṇyaṁ tad=bhavatu mātā-
pitṛōḥ sarvva-sa[t]\textsuperscript{4} tvānāṁ ch=ānuttara-
3 .......................... 5 ll

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-3) In the year 125 of the victorious reign of the illustrious Kumāragupta, on the 9th day of the month of Āśvayuja, when this was the detailed order of the date, (this is the) gift of [Ku]māradāśabhaṭṭa, a native of Mathurā.

Whatever religious merit (there is) in this (act), let it be (for the acquisition of) supreme (knowledge) by (his) parents and by all sentient beings.

No. 24: PLATE XXIV

DĀMŌDARPUR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRA GUPTA I: THE YEAR 128

This inscription was discovered in the village of Dāmōdarpur, about eight miles west of the Police Station Phulbari in West Dinajpur District, West Bengal, in the same circumstances as No. 22 above. It also is now deposited in the Museum of the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, now Bangladesh. And it was edited by Radhagovinda Basak in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, pp. 132 ff. and Plate ii a and ii b. The date, however, had been wrongly read by him and was corrected by K. N. Dikshit in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XVII, p. 193.

The plate is one in number but is inscribed on both sides, the first containing eight and the second five lines of writing as in No. 22 above. It measures 6\textsuperscript{7/8} x 3\textsuperscript{5/8}. The edges thereof have not been raised into rims for the protection of the writing. The plate is thicker than that described in No. 22 above, but the letters are less deeply incised. The plate has been generally damaged through corrosion and considerably in a portion of the proper left side, especially a few letters in lines 5-10. Though the work of decipherment has thus become a very difficult task, the wellnigh obliterated letters can be restored with some confidence with the help of the plate transcribed in No. 22 above and other sister plates. The weight of the plate, according to Basak, is 15\textsuperscript{1/4} tolas. The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet precisely as remarked about the previous plate (No. 22 above). The other palaeographical points that deserve notice are also the same as in the other plate, namely, (1) the occurrence of the initial vowel a as in advāsīthāna, line 4, arthaḥ, line 6, and api, line 11; (2) the initial े as in etd-, line 7, and etasmād=, line 8, and (3) the peculiar sign for the subscript ā by a hook attached to the lower right of the letter dh, as in dhrāṇugā, line 8, and =uvasudhā, line 12. The characters also include, in line 1, forms of the numerical symbols 3, 8, 10, 20 and 100. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout.

1 From impressions.
2 Read sarvasvatāt.
3 This figure is slightly damaged.
4 The reading may be restored as Kumāradāsa.
5 All the letters in this line are lost.
MATHURĀ IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I: YEAR 125

G. S. Gai

From photograph
DAMODARPUR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF KUMARAGUPTA: 289
YEAR 128

excepting the two benedictory and imprecatory verses in lines 11-13. The only linguistic peculiarity that calls for notice is the use of the affix ka, as in the previous plate, in the words anuvahamāntaka, and niyukta in line 3. In respect of orthography we have to note (1) the doubling of t, dh (by d as required by the rules), m, y and v in conjunction with a preceding r as in the previous plate, pravartanay = ṛ-, line 6, Puṇḍravardhana-, line 2, varmmanī, line 4, dharmma-, line 10, maryādayā, line 7, pīrma-, line 11, and vañhki = vañhūḍhā, line 12, but not of th as in -Sārthavāha-, line 4, (2) the use of n instead of anusvāra in conjunction with a following v as in samvyavaharati, line 5, samvyavahāriḥṛṣṇi line 10 and -samvaddha, line 11, and (3) the use of v for b as in -Vedhamitra-, line 4.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Paramadatta Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhīrāja Kumāragupta, that is Kumāragupta I of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. Its date, in numerical symbols, is the year one hundred and twenty-eight (446-47 A.D.), on the thirteenth day of Vaiśākha (April-May). The Officers in charge of the Puṇḍravardhana bhukti and of the Kacheri of the town (adhiṣṭhṭāna) of Kōṭivarsha were precisely the same as those specified in No. 22 above. The object of the inscription is to record the purchase of a piece of land measuring five drōṇas made by a Brāhmaṇa whose name is undecipherable owing to the badly corroded condition of the plate, for the purpose of conducting the five daily sacrifices (pāṇīca-mahāyaṇa), after undergoing the same official procedure as that detailed in the last plate. The land granted was situated in the western quarter in a waterless region (airavata) devoid of cattle (agu) but had comprised water-drawing wheels (araghattās) and drinking-places (pānakas).

As for the five drōṇas of land two dināras were paid and as the rate for one kulyāyapa was three dināras, it is obvious that the kulya in this part of the province was equivalent to 7-½ drōṇas and not 8 as appears from other records.

TEXT

[Metre : Verses 1-2 Anushtubh]

First Side

1 Sa[m*] 100 20 8 Vaiśākha-di 10 3 Para[madaiva]ṭa-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-

Mahārājādhirāja-[Śrī]-[Kumāraguptē]

2 Pṛthivipatau [tāt-pāda]-parigriḥitasya Puṇḍra[vardhana]-bhuktav = Upa[rika-

Chī]rātadatta[sva]

3 bhogena = ā[nuvala][mānaka]1 Kōṭiva[rsha]-vishayē tan-niyuktaka-Ku[mā]

rāmāyta-Vē[tra]-

4 varmmanī adhiṣṭhṭān-ā[diūka][ra]yaḥ = cha Nagara-[Śrī]ṣṭhi-Dhrītīpāla-Sārtha-

vā[ha-Vandhumitra]2 Pra[tha]

5 makulika-Dhrītimitra-Prathamakāya-stha-[Śārīva]pāla3 - purō[gē] samvyava[harat]i...

6 vijnāpati[ar] ā[rha]tha mama pa[ṃcha]-mahāyajña-pravarttanay = ānuvritt-āprad-

ākshaya-ni4...

7 maryādāya dātum = iti [*] ētad = vijnāpyam = upalabhya pustap[la]-Riśidatta-

Jayana[ndi-Vi] .....5

1 Read -mānāḥ.
2 Read -Bandhumitra-.
3 Read -Śāmbopaḥa-.
4 This may perhaps be restored to -nīt-dharma-.
5 This may be restored to Vibhadattāṇāṃ = ca-.
THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS


Second Side

10 araghā[ta]-pānakaiḥ=cha3 sahit=āti4 dattāḥ [*] tad=uttara-kālaṁ samvyaya-
hārihiḥ [dharmmam=avekṣhy=āṇu[ma]-
11 ntvayāḥ [*] api cha bhūmi-dāna-samvaddhām=imau6 slōkau bhavatāḥ [*] Pārva-
dattāṁ dvijāti[bhyā]
12 yatnād=rakṣa Yudhisṭhirā [*] mahīṁ mahīvatāṁ śrēṣṭha dānāḥ=chhrēyō=nupalanāṁ [*] Vahubhir7=vvasudā dattā dī[ya]te cha
13 punaḥ punah [*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalam=ī(lam[ll.2*]
i)ti [*]

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-5) The year (is) 100 (and) 20 (and) 8, (the month) Vaisākha, the day 7, while Paramuṣadīvatvā Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājāḥdirōṣṭa the prosperous Kumārāṇa is lord of the earth; (and) while the Kōṭīvārṣha District is running on with the rule of Chirāṭadatta, Uparikā in the Prānḍravardhana province, selected by His Majesty's feet; and while Kumārāṇa Vēṭvarman, appointed by him (Chirāṭadatta), is administering the Board of the Town, presiding over the Ṋagara-śrēṣṭhiṃ Dhrāṭipāla, the Sārthavāda Bandhumitra, the Prathama-kulika Dhrūtumitra, (and) the Prathama Kāyastha Śambapāla.

(Lines 5-7) Whereas . . . has applied: "Deign to give (a plot of land) according to the customary (anuvṛtta) rules (mārādā) of perpetual (niśa Law) in respect of (land) not yielding anything (aprada) for instituting my five great sacrifices (paśc-acmahāyājna),"

(Lines 7-11) "After receiving this application, is being resolved that it might be granted

---

1 Perhaps the letter preceding -rājya is gu, and not gā as read by Basak.
2 Read -paścima-.
3 These seem to be the words intended, which are not controverted by anything that remains visible of them on the plate. Basak, however, reads paścisa-dro[ṛṣṇa]kaḥ ha[[sar]-pānakaiḥ—cha which words make no sense.
4 Read -aḥiṭi ēi.
5 Read -samvaddhām=imau.
6 Read mahīmatāḥ.
7 Read Bhavahīr =.
8 Basak translates the passage as follows: "Deign to make a gift (of land) according to the established rule—
9 (for disposing of lands) by destroying the condition of apradādkṣaya (niśa) (non-transferability), for the conducting of my five daily sacrifices—". In support of this translation he says the following in a note: "In the light of the expression apradā-dharmaḥ in plate No. 5 (No. 47 below, in the place of niśa dharmaḥ) the phrase apradā-
10 dkṣaya may here be explained as in the case of 'niśa dharma-kṣaya', thus, land could not, unless so conditioned, be alienated or transferred without state permission, after being once sold for the purpose of a gift to a Brāhmaṇa or a god. We might equally well read the phrase as apradādkṣaya."
11 These have been explained in Manu, III, 68-71, "A householder has five slaughter-houses (at it were, niz.,) the hearth (chālī), the grinding-stone (pēkṣani), the broom (upaskara), the pestle and mortar (kangā), the water-vessel (ada-kumha), by using which he is bound (with the letters of sin). For the purpose of expiating them all in succession, the great sages have prescribed the five great sacrifices for the daily (performance) of the house-
12 holders. Teaching is sacrifice to Brahman (Brahma-yajña); offering of waters and food (tarpaya) is sacrifice to the Manes (piṭri-yajña); burnt oblation (hōma) is (Sacrifice) to Gods (Daiva); Bali offering is (Sacrifice) to Bhūtas; (and) hospitable reception of guests (sthi-pūjana) is Sacrifice to men (niṣ-yajña)."
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accor rding to the determination of the record-keepers Rishidatta, Jayanandin and Vibhudatta, five dönas of land were given together with drinking-places and water-drawing wheels, on acceptance of two dinaras, at the established rate of three dinaras of each kulyavapa, in the western quarter, in the waterless region destitute of cows. These dönas (of land) should be respected by the future administrators, considering (them) to be a religious gift."

(Line 11) And there are these two stanzas connected with grants of land.

(Verse 1) Carefully preserve the land that has already been given to the twice-born (Brāhmaṇas) Yudhishthira, the best of land-owners. Preservation is more meritorious than grant (of land).

(Verse 2) Land has been granted, and will again and again be granted by many. (But) the fruit (of such grant) belongs to whosoever possesses the earth at any time.

No. 25 : PLATE XXV

MANKUWAR STONE IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF KUMARAGUPTA I:
THE YEAR 129

This inscription was discovered in 1870 by Bhagwanlal Indraj, and appears to have been first brought to notice by General Cunningham in 1880, in the CASIR, Vol. X, p. 7, where he published his own reading of the text, accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate IV, No. 2). And, in 1885, Bhagwanlal Indraj published his own reading of the text, and a translation of it, in JBRRAS, Vol. XVI, p. 354. It was afterwards edited by J. F. Fleet in CII, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 45 ff. and Plate VI A.

Mankuwar² is a small village near the right bank of the Jamunā, about nine miles in a south-westerly direction from Arail or Arayal, the chief town of the Arail Pargana in the Karchhanā Tahsil or Sub-Division of the Allahābad District in Uttar Pradesh. The inscription is on the front of the pedestal of a seated image of the Buddha, which, when it came to the notice of General Cunningham, was in a garden at Mankuwar, belonging to the Gosāl of Dēoriya³ or Dēwariyā. But it is said to have been originally discovered in a brick mound between the five rocky hillocks called Pañch-Pahārī, a short distance to the north-east of Mankuwar. The image represents the Buddha, seated; wearing a plain cap, fitting close to the head, with long lappets on each side; and naked to the waist, and clad below in a waist-cloth reaching to the ankles. The first line of the inscription is at the top of the pedestal, immediately below the image. Then comes a compartment of sculptures, containing in the centre, a Buddhist wheel; on each side of the wheel, a man seated in meditation, and facing full-front; and, at each corner, a lion. Then follows the second line of the inscription at the bottom of the pedestal. The image has now been deposited in the State Museum, Lucknow.

The writing, each line covering a space of about 1½ 7' broad, by ¾' high in the first line, and 1' in the second, is in a state of excellent preservation. The size of the letters varies from ¼' to 1½'. The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet, and approximate very closely to those of the Allahābad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, No. 1, above.

¹ Airāvat-āgu-rājī vāśikama-dīśi has been translated by Basak as "in the west of Airāvatia(?)."
² The 'Mankūrā and Mankowar' of maps, etc.; Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 88, Lat. 23°.19' N.; Long. 81°.52' E.
³ The 'Deoriya and Deorya' of maps, etc.; about a mile to the north-west of Mankuwar, Bhagwanlal Indraj writes the name 'Devaliā.'
Plate I. The peculiar form of ending \( m \) in \textit{prahāt-ārtham}, line 2, is noteworthy. They include, in line 2, forms of the numerical symbols for 8, 9, 10, 20 and 100. The \textit{language} is Mixed Dialect; and the inscription is in prose. The \textit{orthography} presents nothing calling for remark.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the \textbf{Imperial Gupta} king \textbf{Kumāragupta I.} For some reason or other, it gives him the subordinate feudatory title of \textit{Mahārāja}, instead of the paramount title of \textit{Mahārājādhīraja}. But we know of no feudatory chieftain of the name of Kumāragupta; and the date fits exactly into the period of Kumāragupta I, of the Imperial Gupta dynasty; and there can be no doubt that he is the person referred to. The use of the subordinate title is most probably due to carelessness or ignorance on the part of the drafter of the inscription. "Or possibly it may indicate," says Fleet, "an actual historical fact, the reduction of Kumāragupta towards the end of his life, to feudal rank by the Pushyamintras and the Hūnas, whose attacks on the Gupta power are so pointedly alluded to in the Bhitāri inscription of Skandagupta" (No. 31 below).\(^1\) But this seems very unlikely, because the political disturbances alluded to in this inscription appear to have taken place, not in, but after, the reign of Kumāragupta I. The \textit{date} of the inscription, in numerical symbols, is the \textbf{year one hundred and twenty nine}\(^2\) (448-49 A.D.), and the \textbf{eighteenth day}, without any specification of the fortnight, of the month \textit{Jyēśṭha} (May-June). It is a Buddhist inscription; and the \textit{object} of it is to record the installation of the image on the pedestal of which it is engraved. The image, we are told, was installed by the monk Buddhāmitra; and as the Buddha is here described as \textit{sva-mat-āvivuddha}, 'uncontroverted in respect of his own tenets,' it shows, says K. B. Pathak, "that this Bhikshu Buddhāmitra of the Maukuwār inscription was identical with the Buddhāmitra who was the teacher of Vasantabhandhu," whose "patrons mentioned by Paramārtha were Skandagupta-Vikramāditya and Narasimhagupta-Bālaḍāditya."\(^3\)

But in this connection we have to take note also of the attributives used with reference to the Buddha in the Mathurā pedestal inscription,\(^4\) namely, \textit{bhagacatō pitāmahasya Sāmyyo[\textsuperscript{\textasteriskcentered}]samuddhāsya sva-matasya dēkasya}. Every one of the words occurring in this phraseology is an attributive of Sāmyaksaṃbuddha. It will not, therefore, be a correct procedure to take \textit{sva-matasya} as an adjective of \textit{dēkasya}, and translate it by "(her) favourite deity," as has been done by the late Dayaram Sahni who edited the inscription. In fact, \textit{sва-mata} of the above phraseology seems identical with \textit{sва-mata} of the expression \textit{sва-mat-āvivuddhasya} found in our record. What can \textit{sва-mata} mean? It seems that from this phrase has somehow originated the name, Sāṃmitiṣya, of a well-known sect and school of Buddhism. Nobody has yet been able to give any satisfactory derivation of Sāṃmitiṣya. It is met with for the first time in a Sarnath epigraph. It is transcribed as \textit{Sa}[\textit{n]mi]ṭiṣyānām} by Vogel. The impression, however, shows that the first two letters are \textit{sa-emyā}. It seems \textit{vā} has been wrongly tacked on to \textit{n(a)}. This is indicated by a thin indentation joining \textit{vā} to the preceding \textit{sa}. So we perhaps have to read here \textit{svāmyatiṣyānām}, which appears to be intended for \textit{svāmatiṣyānām}. And \textit{Śvāmatiṣya} can easily run into Sāṃmitiṣya. The question that now arises is: What did the original \textit{Śvāmatiṣya} mean? That it is derived or is derivable from \textit{svāmata} can scarcely be doubted. But why should the Buddhist school be called \textit{Śvāmata} or \textit{Śvāmatiṣya} ? This has been explained above, Introduction, pp. 141-42.

\(^1\) We may compare the legend on the copper coins of Chandragupta II, \textit{Mahātīra-Chandrāguptah} (Allan, \textit{Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty}, p. 52).
\(^2\) [D. C. Sircar reads this date as 100 09 i.e. 109 (\textit{JAIH.}, Vol. III, p. 135). But we do not agree with him.—\textit{Ed}].
\(^3\) \textit{Ind. Ant.}, Vol. XLII, p. 244.
TEXT

1 Öm² Namō Budhāna² [•*] Bhagavatō samyak-sambuddhasya sva-mat-āviroddhasya iyam pratitā pratishthāpita bhikshu-Buddhamitrēpa

2 Samvata 100 20 9 mahārāja-śrī-Kumāraguptasya rājyē Jyēṣṭha-māsa di 10 8 sarvva-duḥkkhaṇa-prāhān-ārththamā [•*]

TRANSLATION

Öm ! Obeisance to the Buddhas! This image of the Divine One, who completely attained to perfect enlightenment, (and) who was uncontroverted in respect of his tenets, has been installed by the Bhikshu Buddhamitra, (in) the year 100 (and) 20 (and) 9; in the reign of the Mahārāja, the glorious Kumāragupta; (in) the month Jyēṣṭha; (on) the day 10 (and) 8, for the purpose of averting all sufferings.

No. 26: PLATE XXVI

GADHWĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I

This is the last of the inscriptions on the stone discovered by Rājā Śīva Prasād, in 1871-72, at Gadhwā, in the Allahābād District, Uttar Pradesh. It was first brought to notice, in 1873, by General Cunningham, who published his reading of the text in the CASIR., Vol. III, p. 55, accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate XX, No. 1). It was afterwards edited by J. F. Fleet in CII., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 39 ff. and Pl. IV C.

This inscription is on the lower part of the proper left side of the stone, immediately below the inscription of Chandragupta II, No. 8 above, from which it is separated only by a line across the stone.

The last half of each line has been entirely broken away and lost. The remnant of the writing, however, covering a space of about 4′ broad by 10′ high, is fairly well preserved and easy to read. The average size of the letters is about ½′. The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets, and are of practically the same type as those of No. 8 above.

1 From the ink-impression.
2 As was usual throughout the whole of the period covered by this volume, this word is represented by a symbol, not by actual letters. Öm is not of very frequent occurrence at the commencement of Buddhist inscriptions. But another instance is afforded by line 1 of the Shergadh (Kōṭāh) inscription of the Sāmanta Dēvadatta dated Vikrama 847 (D. R. Bhandarkar’s A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 21).
3 The form Budhāna after namō and bhagavatō immediately preceding samyak-sambuddhasya are relics of the Monumental Prakrit which survived in what is called Mixed Dialect, so commonly used in the Buddhist and Jain inscriptions of the Kushāna period. The use again of genitive after namō is common enough in Monumental Prakrit; e.g., in the Ĥāthigumpha cave inscription of Khurān, which commences with Namō Arjunañēnaḥ namō sava-siddhānam (Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 79), in the Mahārāja record beginning with Namō Arhatat Mahārājāya (Jb., Vol. II, p. 209, No. 8), in the Amārāvati stūpa inscription, opening with Siddham Namō bhagavatō sava-satvanena Budhaya (ASSI., Vol. III; Notes on the Amarāvati Stūpa, p. 12, No. 12 B) and others too numerous to mention.
4 Read dhukha.
5 Read prāhān-ārththam.
6 Öm is an auspicious exclamation, used at the beginning of books, etc. It is made up of the three letters u, u and m; and in later times it was looked upon as a mystic name for the Hindu triad, and as representing the union of the three gods, Viṣṇu (a), Śiva (u), and Brahma (m). The efficacy of the exclamation is detailed in the Mānavadharmaśāstra, ii. verses 74-83 (Bühler’s Translation, SBE., Vol. XXV, pp. 43-44).
7 With this plural, compare the mention of four Buddhas in the Sānchī inscription of the year 131 (CII., Vol. III, 1888, No. 62, Plate XXXVIII b) and also Bhagavatō samyak-sambuddhānām Buddhānām, “of the divine Buddhas, who attained to complete enlightenment” in line 22 of the Wāla grant of Dhrusvēna 1. (Ind. Ant., Vol. IV, p. 105).
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Fleet goes so far as to say that Nos. 8 and 17 above and 26 are probably engraved by the same hand. S also presents the western variety in this record. This and Nos. 8 and 17 above can, therefore, be of the same hand. Further, the characters include, in lines 3 and 6, forms of the numerical symbol for 10. The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; and its composition is in prose throughout. The orthography presents nothing calling for remark.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Imperial Gupta king Kumāragupta. The date, however, except in respect of the day, is broken away and lost. So little remains of the inscription that the form of religion or sect to which it belongs cannot be determined; nor can the object of it; except that it seems to record two gifts, one of ten dīnāras, and the other of an uncertain number, as contributions, apparently to some Brāhmaṇas from Sadāsattrā.

TEXT

1 Jitāṁ bhagavatā 1 Pa[ra][mabhāgavata-mahārājādhirāja*]-
2 śri-Kumā[r]agupta[ssya]2 rā][jyasamvatsarē*].
3 divasē 10 [as][yāṁ divasa-pūrvvāyāṁ*].
4 rā Pā[ṭaliputra]ra3..
5 ....... Sadāsattrā[ta*]ra-sā[mā][nya*].
6 [da*[ttā][di(nā)rāḥ 10 ta(?).]
7 ti satrē cha dīnārās-tray. [...*][Yas=ch=aināṁ dharma-skandhaṁ vyuchchhi*]-
8 ndyāt=sa pañca-mahāpā[ta]kaih samyuktah syād=iti [...]
9 Göyindā-lakshmā4..

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-3) Victory has been achieved by Bhagavat (Vāsudēva).5 [In the year] of the (Gupta) Rule6....... pertaining to the prosperous Kumāragupta, [the Mahārājādhirāja], an ardent [devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva)]7 on the day 10; when this (was the specification of the date).8

(Lines 3-7) .....Pāṭaliputra. ...... the township of Sadāsatra9. .....ten dīnārās were given in the almshouse (called) ......three dīnārās ......

(Lines 7-8) [And whosoever breaks up this bit of charity shall become infected] with the Five Great Sins.

(Line 9) Sign-manual of Göyindā.

No. 27 : PLATE XXVII

BASĀRH CLAY SEAL INSCRIPTION OF GHAṬOTKACHAGUPTA

This seal also was, like that described in No. 13 above, discovered by the late T. Bloch, when, as Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Eastern Circle, he carried on ex-

---

1 Expressed by a horizontal stroke.
2 Read -Kumāraguptasya.
3 Curiously, this line has not been read at all by Fleet.
4 This line seems to have been written in a different hand, though the letters are of the same period. Possibly it may be the sign-manual of the donor.
5 See p. 233, note 3 above.
6 See p. 246, note 1 above.
7 See p. 253, note 3 above.
8 See p. 241, note 1 above.
9 See p. 247, note 1 above.
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G. S. Gai
From photograph
cavations at Basar or Basar in the Muzaffarpur District, Bihar, in the cold season of 1903-04. Only one specimen came to light. He published the reading and translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph, in A. R. ASI, 1903-04, p. 107, No. 2, and Plate XI, 14. The seal is now deposited in the Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

The seal is oval in shape, marked by a single border-line preserved all along except at the extreme proper right and measuring 1-3/4" by 3/4". It is difficult to say to what variety of the Gupta alphabet the characters belong, because though here, as on the seal described in No. 13 above, is of the eastern type characterised by a loop on the left, the other test letters, m and h, would have been found to be of the western variety as on the latter, had any such letters formed part of the legend of the present seal. The average size of the letters is about 3/16". The language is Sanskrit; and the legend is in prose. Orthography calls for no remarks.

The seal is one of Ghatotkachagupta. According to Bloch, he is "perhaps identical with the Mahārāja Ghatotkacha, the father of Chandragupta I". This view was adopted by V. A. Smith not only in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1905, p. 153 and the Early History of India (2nd ed.), p. 266, note 2, but also in the Early History of India (3rd ed. 1914), p. 280, note 1. Allan, however, holds a different opinion. "It is remarkable in the first place," says he, "that, if Ghatotkaca were known as Ghatotkacagupta, he should not be given this name in any known inscription." This, however, is not a very convincing argument. Nevertheless, he is strong in advancing the further argument that he has done in support of his position. "We must further consider," he continues, "the date of the seals found at Vaiśāli along with that of Ghatotkacagupta. The most important of these, and the one which gives the key to the date of the whole collection, is a seal of the 'Mahādeva Dhruvasvāmini, queen of the Mahārājādhirāja Candragupta [II], and mother of the Mahārāja Govinda-gupta.' Dhruvasvāmini is clearly the Dhruvadēvi of the inscriptions, and the date of the seal may be placed towards the end of the reign of Chandragupta II, the latter being still alive, and Govinda-gupta governor of Vaiśāli for his father. Many of the seals are clearly those of contemporary officials of Govinda-gupta's court. D. R. Bhandarker is apparently right in suggesting that the place where the seals were found was the office of the person entrusted with the duty of making seals. It is most unlikely that he would have in his possession a seal of a king who had lived nearly a century before, particularly as no seals were found which might be assured to be intermediate in date. There is really no reason, then, to identify Ghatotkaca with Ghatotkacagupta of the seal." This line of reasoning is worthy of acceptance except in one minor respect, because Allan contends that the seal of Ghatotkacagupta has to be placed about the end of the reign of Chandragupta II. We have now seen that the Tumain inscription of Kumāragupta I (No. 20, above) gives Gupta year 116 as a date for both this Gupta sovereign and one Ghatotkacagupta who apparently was his son and governor of Airikina. This date is not far removed from Gupta year 96 which is the last date we have for Chandragupta II. Everything, thus, tends to support the view that the Ghatotkacagupta of our seal is identical with the Ghatotkacagupta of the Tumain inscription. It is, however, somewhat doubtful whether he is the same as the Ghatotkacagupta for whom there is a coin in the St. Petersburg collection. Allan, however, is emphatic on this point. In his opinion, "the style and weight of the coin place it about the end of the fifth century," and hence, "the coin in question cannot be attributed to the Ghatotkacagupta" of the seal. The above statements Allan has made in his book in that part of the Introduction which deals with

---

1 Catalogus of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties, etc., pp. xvi and xvii.
2 Ibid., p. lv.
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‘History and Chronology,’ but in the actual ‘Catalogue of Coins’ where he gives description of the coins he does not specify the weight of Ghaṭōtkacha’s coin. And as regards the style it does not seem to differ essentially in any way from that of Skandagupta’s coins as a comparison of Plate XXIV-3 with Plate XIX shows. In these circumstances, there is nothing to preclude us from supposing that the Ghaṭōtkachagupta of the seal and the inscription is identical with the Ghaṭōtkachagupta of this coin. In other words, the inscription, the seal and the coin refer to a Ghaṭōtkachagupta who was situated chronologically between Kumāragupta I and Skandagupta. It further seems that when the inscription was engraved and the seal was issued, Ghaṭōtkachagupta was a mere governor, but that he was a king when the coin was struck.

TEXT

Ś[r]-Ghaṭat[ka]chaguptasya [*]

TRANSLATION

(The seal) of the prosperous Ghaṭōtkachagupta.

No. 28: PLATE XXVIII

JUNAGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF SKANDAGUPTA: THE YEARS 136, 137 AND 138

The discovery of this inscription appears to have been first announced in 1838, by James Prinsep, in the JASB., Vol. VII, pp. 347 ff. In 1844, in the JBBRAS., Vol. I, p. 148, there was published a lithograph of it, reduced from a copy, made by General Sir George LeGrand Jacob, N. L. Westergaard, and a young Brahmin assistant, which had been submitted to the Society two years previously. In 1852, in the same Journal, Vol. VII, pp. 121 ff., Bhau Daji published his reading of the text, and a translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph reduced from a cloth tracing made in 1861 by Bhagwanlal Indrajit. And in 1876, Bhau Daji’s text and translation, the latter revised by Professor Eggeling, were reprinted in the ASWL., Vol. II, pp. 134 ff., accompanied by a slightly reduced reproduction of the original lithograph from Bhagwanlal Indrajit’s copy (ibid., Plate XV). It was thereafter edited critically by J. F. Fleet in the CIZ., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 56 ff., accompanied by Plate VIII.

JUNAGADH is the chief town of the Junagadh District in the Kathiawad Peninsula in Gujarat. The city itself, or its ancient representative, is spoken of in this inscription; but its ancient name is not given. The name occurs, however, in line 1 of Rudradāman’s inscription, as Girinagara, or ‘the city of, or on, the hill.’ This name subsequently passed over to the mountain itself, Girmăr, which in the inscriptions is called Urjayat; and this fact rather tends to indicate that the ancient city stood, not where the modern town stands, but closer up to the mountain, and perhaps on the rising ground at the foot of it. The inscription is on the north-west face of a large granite boulder, containing also fourteen Aśoka edicts and a long inscription of the Mahākshaitapa Rudradāman, now under a shed specially built to

1 Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties, etc., p. 149.
2 Correct it into -Ghaṭōtkacha-.
3 The 'Joongur, Junagad, Junagarh, and Junagurh,' of maps, etc. Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 13. Lat. 21° 31' N.; Long. 70° 36' E.
4 The 'Kathiawar and Kattywar' of maps, etc.
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JUNAGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF SKANDAGUPTA: YEARS 136-38

protect it, about a mile to the east of the town, and at the commencement of the gorge that leads to the valley which lies round the mountain Gîrnâr.

The writing, which covers a space of about 10' 0" broad by 7' 3" high, is in a state of fairly good preservation; and it is only in lines 22 ff., where the rock has actually peeled off, that there are some extensive lacunae in the inscription. It is, however, not very easy to read; owing partly to the irregular, and occasionally rather shallow, nature of the engraving; partly to the roughness of the rock, and the way in which the natural marks of it mix themselves up a good deal with the letters; and partly to the fact that at several places the engraver, in consequence of unusual irregularities of the surface, passed over considerable portions of the rock and left them blank. The size of the letters varies from about \( \frac{9}{16} \) to \( \frac{13}{16} \). The characters belong to the southern class of alphabets; but the type is a later development of that which was used in the inscription of the Makhâśhatrapa Rudradâman on the same rock; it may be called the Saurâśtra or Kâthiâwâd alphabet of the fifth century A.D. One of its most marked characteristics is the way in which the subscript \( y \) is represented by the full form of the letter, not, as in other alphabets, by a curtailing of it; e.g. in buddhyā, line 5; vyaśami, line 6; ānyā-, line 8. The language is Sanskrit; and, except for the opening word siddham, and a few words in line 23, the entire inscription is in verse. In respect of orthography we have to notice (1) the use of the guttural nasal, instead of the anusvāra, before ś, in -santra-, line 24; (2) the doubling of dh in conjunction with a following y, in buddhyā, line 5; and (3) the indirection about the doubling of consonants in conjunction with a preceding r; e.g. the consonant is doubled in -ārthām, line 1, -ārāṃś-, line 2, and -ārāṃś-, line 3; but not in -vīryā, line 2, -paryānta-, line 3, sarvāṇ - , line 5, -ārwā-, line 7, and -ārjan - rthāya, line 8.

The inscription divides itself into two parts: the first is concerned with the embellishment of the Sudarśana lake and the second with the construction of two temples. Both the works were undertaken and completed by Chakrapâlita during the reign of Skandagupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. As regards the first part of the record, it begins with an invocation of the god Vishnu, which is followed by five verses in praise of the reigning king. Verse 2 informs us that he “founded an order with an effigy, namely, Garuda, which rendered, devoid of poison, the Serpent (bhujaga) rulers, who uplifted their hoofs in pride and arrogance.” As royal families of the name of Nâga which term is synonymous with bhujaga were in existence during the Gupta period and as Garuda was an insignia of the Gupta House, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in Skandagupta’s time there was a Nâga rising which he effectively put down. Similarly, verse 4 says that the fame of this Gupta sovereign was proclaimed by his enemies who were forced by him to return to the Mâchchhâ country. Obviously these enemies must have been Mâchchhas themselves who invaded the Gupta territory but were repulsed and compelled to return to the Mâchchhâ country from which they had come. In all likelihood these Mâchchha enemies were the Hûnas whose terrific onset against Skandagupta has been so vividly described in the Bhitarî pillar inscription (No. 31 below). Verses 11-13 narrate how Skandagupta appointed a certain Parnadatta to govern the Saurâśtra country, that is, Kâthiâwâd, which was included in his kingdom. Parnadatta’s son was Chakrapâlita (verse 16), who was appointed by the father to govern the city at which the inscription is (verse 20). The inscription then proceeds to its real object namely, to record that the embankment of the lake Sudarśana (formed in the valley round the foot of Gîrnâr, near where the inscription is) burst in consequence of excessive rain, at night, on the sixth day of the month Praushtapada (August-September) in Gupta year 136 (expired) = 455-56 A.D., or “when a century of years,” as the inscription puts it, “increased by thirty and also six more (had elapsed), making the calculation according to the Gupta era” (verse 27). When the dam gave way, all the rivers that originated from the mountain Raivataka and also the
river Palāśinī, being free from all barrier and overflowing their banks, met the sea; and it appeared as if Mount Ûrjayat stretched out its hand in the shape of this river (i.e. the Palāśinī), touching its friend, the sea. The breach made was 100 cubits in depth, sixty-eight in length and 7 parshas in height (verse 36). The breach was filled up and the embankment renewed under the orders of Chakrapālita after two months' work in the month of Ashādha in Gupta year 137 (expired) = 456-57 A.D. (verse 35). Here ends the first part of the inscription. This is indicated clearly by the words which occur in line 23, namely, iti Sudarśana-tatāka-sanśkāra-granitha-rachanā samāpita.

The second part, lines 24 to the end, seems to have mentioned Skandagupta and Parnasatta in verses 40-41 though their names have not been preserved owing to the peeling off of the rock. And then, in keeping with the Vaishnava invocation with which the inscription opens, it goes on to record in verse 45 that in the one hundred and thirty-eighth year (expired), "(according to the calculation) of the Gupta era," Chakrapālita caused to be built a temple of the god Vishnu under the name of Chakrābhirāj, 'the bearer of discus,' on Mount Ûrjayat, and shining over the head of the town (verses 45-46). The last verse also refers to the erection apparently of another temple, similarly overlooking the town.

As regards the localities mentioned in this inscription, Surāśītra is modern Kaṭhiawād, the southern part of which is still known as Sóraṭh. It is an old name, being first mentioned by Kauṭalya who speaks of the Surāśītras along with the Kambujas and Kshatriyas as a tribal corporation (saṅgha) subsisting upon both agriculture and arms. It thus seems that Kaṭhiawād was known as Surāśītra in the ancient period because the Surāśītra tribe had been settled in that province. Surāśītra has also been referred to in the Śikṣā associated with the name of Pānini. It is the Surāśtrēṇa of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (c. 90 A.D.) and the Sylæstrēṇa of Ptolemy (c. 150 A.D.). The author of the Periplus says that its capital was Minagar, which Bhagwanlal Indrajī identified with Junāgadh which was once called Manipura. Later on, however, he took Minagara to be a mistake for Girinagara, the old form of Girnār. The other places of interest mentioned in the inscription are the two mountains Raivatakā and Ûrjayat, the river Palāśinī and the town which was connected with the lake Sudarśana. The actual name of this town has not been given, but it was Girinagara as appears from line 1 of Rudradāman's inscription. That it was rightly called Girinagara is clear from verse 46 where we are told that it was situated about the foot of Mount Ûrjayat. Mērutunga's Prabandha-chintāmaṇi, while describing the animosity between the Dīgharama and Vēṭḍharama sects of Jainism at Raivatakā, speaks of Ujjayanta (=Ûrjayat) as another name of it and of Girinagara as being settled upon it. But according to the Kaṭhiawād volume of the B.G., "The ancient name of the Girnār hill is Ujjayanta or Girnar, but not Revatāchal as is sometimes supposed. Revatāchal is the name of the hill immediately over the Revata Kund. At the foot of this hill is the celebrated Asoka stone with the inscriptions of Asoka, Rudra Dāma, and Skanda Gupta; ... The Jains sometimes incorrectly apply the name Revatāchal to the Girnār." This agrees with what we gather from the inscription which distinguishes between Raivatakā and Ûrjayat and places the town (Girinagara) at the foot of Ûrjayat. This also explains why Ujjayanta came in later times to be known as the Girnār hill. This further explains why the inscription of Rudradāman mentions Girinagara as being distant (dāra) from the Sudarśana lake. That Girinagara was a town of importance may be seen from the fact that it is mentioned as the place from which hailed the Brāhmaṇa grantee of the Nauśārī charter issued by the Gūrjara king Jayabhāṣṭa III in the Kalachuri saṅvat 456. As regards the river Palāśini, it is worthy of note that it is mentioned along with the Suvarṇasikātā in Rudradāman's inscription as both rising from Mount Ûrjayat. The late F. Kielhorn who

1 CII., Vol. IV, pp. 82 ff.
edited the record last identifies the Suvarṇarēkha with the Sōnrekha on the authority of Bhagwanlal Indrajit, but in regard to the Palāsini makes the remark that its name does not survive. But the Kāṭhāwāḍ volume of the B.G. tells us that “a little further on,” that is, between the boulder bearing inscriptions and the Girnār hill, “is the Palāsini bridge built by Sundarji Shavjī, the first native agent to the British Government in the Political Department in Kāṭhāwāḍ.” This shows that the river Palāsini is still in existence. Rudradāman’s inscription mentions another river, namely, the Suvarṇasikatā, side by side with the Palāsini. It has been rightly identified with the Sōnrekha. As regards the embankment referred to in the record, attention may be drawn to the fact that remains of it were discovered in 1890 by Khan Bahadur Ardeeser Jamshetjee, Special Divan of Junāgadh.

**TEXT**

**First Part**

1 Ōṁ [s]iddham [1\*] Śriyam = abhimata-bhāgyāṁ naika-kāl-āpanitāṁ tridaṣṭa[p]ati-
Lakṣmyāḥ

2 sa āyati vijiṁ-āṛtāṁ = viśvērāt = atyaṇa-jaśihūḥ [1\*]\*] Taḍ = anu ayati śaśvata 3 śrī-
[pari]khipta-vakshāḥ sva-bhuja-janita-viryo rājarājā [dhīrā]jaḥ [1\*] [na]rapati-

udadhi-ja [?][?][?][?] [āntāṁ] śrīḥ pāryanta-dēśām [1\*]

4 a[va]nim = avanat = āṛira = yaḥ cha (s = cha) kār = āṭma-saṁsthāṁ pitari suras-
akhitvam [prāpta]jaty = āṭma-sāktyā [1\*]\*] Api cha jītaṁ = [evidence] ta tēna prā-
thayanṛt niyāṁ yasya ripaḥ = pi [1\*] ā-mūla-bhagaya-darpā niva[rśa]ta]

**Mlecchha-dēśāḥ** [1\*]\*]

5 Kramēna buddhyā[ā] nipuṇaṁ pradhārya dhyātmā cha kṛṣṇāṁ = guṇa-[dōshā-
hēṭhūṁ] [1\*] vyap[e]tya sarvāṃ = manuṣyendra-prutāṁ = Lakṣmīḥ [svayaṁ] yaṁ
varayāṁ chakāra [1\*]\*] [Ta]smin = nṛpē [tā] satiṁ n = aiva kaśchid = dha[rmā]ṁ = d =
apētō manuḥ prajāśu

[kṛi]tv[ā] | sarvēsāh dēśēśu vidhiyā gōṛtrin' samchintaya[m]āsā bahru-
prakāram [1\*]\*] Syāt = kō = nūṟūpo

7 matimān = viniṭō mēchā-smṛtīthāy [ā]m = anap[e]t[a-bhā] vah [1\*] saty-ārjav-[au*]-
dārya-nay-ōpāma[mnō] [mādhurya]-dākshinyā-[ya]-śō-nītā = cha [1\*]\*] Bhaktō =
nurak[tō] nī-ũ-[i] [e] ṣha-yuktaḥ sarv-pathābhīṣ = cha viśuddha-buddhiḥ=
āṇīṇya-bhāv-ōpāt-āntārātmāḥ sarvvasya lōkasya hitē pravṛttāḥ [1\*]\*]

---

1 Expressed by a symbol and omitted by Fleet.
2 Ending *m* indicated by the average character.
3 Ending *i* indicated by a tiny form of the character and placed at a lower level.
4 Indicated by two horizontals.
5 Read bhṛśa-.
6 Read gōṛṭra.
7 Read = viniṭō.
8 Read -ātmā.
8 Nyāy-ārjanī = rthasya cha kah samartṛthā syād = arjītasya = āpy = atha rakṣaṇe cha |
gopāyitasya = āpi [cha] vṛddhi-hētau vṛddhasya pātra-pratipādanāya [ii 10*]
Sarvveṣhū bhītyēṣhva = āpi saṁhatēṣhva yō mē praśīṣhān = nikhilēṇ = Surāśhtrā |
āṁ jātēma = ēkak khalu Parnadattē bhārasya tasya = ādvahanē samartṛthā |
[ii 11*]
9 Ėvaṁ viñēṣhītya nṛjā-ādhipēṇa naikān = āh-bhāra-ganāṇ = sva-matīyā |
y ah samīn-
niyuktō = rthanāyā kathāhchit samyaka-Sūrāśhtrē-āvānī-pālānāya [ii 12*] Niyuṣya
dēva Varunam praṭīchāyān svasthā yathā n = onmanasō babhūva[h] [i] pūrva- |
ētarāṣyaṁ dīi Parnadattē niyuṣya rāja dhīrtimāṃś = tathā = ābhbūt [13*]
10 Tasya = ātmajō hy = ātmaja-bhāva-yuktō dvīdh = ēva ch = ātm = ātmvaṇē nītaḥ |
sarva-ātmman = ātm = ēva cha rakṣaṇēyō nīty-ātmavān = ātmaja-kāntā-rūpāḥ |
[i 14*] Rūp-ānurūpaṁ = lalitār = vichitraṁ nītya-pramōd-āṅvīta-sarva-bhāvaḥ |
prabuddha-padmākara-padmāvaktō niṛjānī sāraṇyāl śaraṇ-āgatānām [i] 15*
11 Abhavad = bhūvi Chakrāpālītō = sāv = iti nāmā praṭihātāh priyō janasya |
sagunān = anupakṣītār = udātt[aij]ḥ pitarān yās = cha viśēṣyānāmkahāra [i] 16*]
Kehāmā prabhuṭvarāi vinayō nāyaś = cha sauryān vinā sauryā mah[ai] naïkhānā |
cha vā[ai] khya[ai] in daṁ dānam = adinātā cha dākhānyam = āniṇyam = as[ai] |
yatā cha [i] 17* Sauṁdaryam = āryētāra-nigrahaḥ = cha a vīmāyō dhauryam = |
udīnātā cha |
12 Īty = ēvak = eti = tīṣayēna yasminn = a-vipra-vāsēna guṇā vasantī [i] 18* Na |
vidyatē = sau sakalē = pi lōkē yatr = ēpamā tasya guṇaṅ kriyēta | sa eva kāraṁṣeṇyā |
guṇ-āṇvītānāṁ babhuva nī[ai]ṇām = upamānabhūtāḥ [i] 19* Īty = ēvak |
eti = adhiṅkānō = atō = nyān = guṇān = par[ai]kṣhya svayaṁ = ēva pitū | yah samīn-
niyuktō nagarasya rakṣasyā viśīṣyā pūrvaṁ = prachākāra samyak [i] 20*
arpāṇi n = Odēvyāyāmasa cha karhchid = ēvak = asmin = parē ch = āiva sāsāsa |
dushtāḥ [i] 21* Viśrābdham = alpēna sāśasā yō = smīn kālēnā lōkēshu sa-nāga-
rēshu yō lālayāmasa cha paura-vargān = = = 2 putrān = surākṣhya dōshān |
[i] 22* Samraṁjayaṁ cha prakṛtvu = babhūva pūrva-smīt-ābhāsana-māna-
dānāiḥ |
14 niryantrau-ānyōnya-griha-pravēṣai[h] = sanvartirdhita-pṛitti-grih-āpachārīḥ [i] 23* |
Brahmānya bhāvēna parēṇa yuktō saktō sūchir = dāna-parō yathāvāt |
prāpyān = sa kālē vishyaṁ = sishēvē dharm-ārthayōṣ = ch = ē[ai]pō = vīrōḍha-
nēna [i] 24* Yō = − − − − − − − − − − − Parnadattē = sa nyāvāyān = atra |
kim = asti chaṛāṁ | muktā-kalāp-āmbuja-padma-āṭāch = chandrāt = kim = uṣhṇē |
havītā kadāchīt [i] 25*]
15 Athā kramēn = āmbuda-kālā āgat[ai] n[ai]dāgha-kālam pravidārya tōyādaiḥ |
vavarsha tōyam bahu saṁtataṁ chaṛāṁ Sudarśanasāṁ yēna bhībēdā |
[ ch = ātvarū[ai] 26* Samvatsarāqāṁ = adhiṅkā šate tu trimśadbhīr = an-
yār = āpi saḍbhīr = ēva | rātrau dīnē Prauṣṭhāpadasya shasṭhēe Gupta- |
prakāḷē gaṇanāṁ vidhyāya [i] 27*]
16 Imās = cha yā Raivatakād = vinirgata[h] = Palāśin = īyān sīkatā-vilāsīṇī | samudra-
kāntāḥ cha-ra-bandhaḥ-āśicāḥ punaṅ parin śāstra-yathā-āśicām yayūḥ [i] 28* |
Avēkṣhya varṣa-āgama-jaṁ mah-ōdhīramaṁ mah-ōdadbēr = Īrajuṭī |
priyēpsunā | anēka-tūr-ānta-ja-puśpha-śōbhītō

1 Read duṣṭān.
2 Restore to svām = ēva. [Or pit = ēva. —Ed.]
JUNAGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF SKANDAGUPTA: YEARS 136-38

17 nadimayō hasta iva prasāritaḥ [I 29*] Vishādyam[manāḥ] khalu sarvatō ja[nā]ḥ kathahṃ kathahṃ kāryamṃ iti pravādinaḥ mithō hi pūrva-apara-rātram = utthita vihīntayāṃ ch = āpi bahūvur = uṣukāḥ [I 30*] Ap = iha lōkē sakalē Sudarśanaṃ pumāṃ (n) hi durdurānaṃ gataṃ kṣiṇāt

18 bhavēṃ = nu s-ambhōndhi-tulya-darśanaṃ Su-darśanaṃ = = = = [I 31*]

19 trī[mā]dhiṣhā[ra[ra]] = anyair api saptabhiṣ = cha = pra

20 Graishmasya māsasya tu pūrva-pa[kshē] = = = [pra]thamē = hni samyak māsa-dvayen = ādaravān = sa bhūtvā dhanasya kṛtvā vya[yam = a-prameyam = [I 35*] Aṣṭamaṃ hasta-śataṃ samagraṃ vistṛrataḥ shashṭiจำนวน = āpi ch = āśiṣṭu

21 utsc[hdha]tāḥ = nyat purusorhāṇi sa (? pta (? = = = = = [hast]a-śata-dvayaṣa [I 36*] Babandha yati = mahatā nṛdēvēn = [abhīharchya]? samjag-ghati-ōpalēṇa a-jāti-duṣṭaḥ = prathitaṃ tākalāḥ Sudarśanaṃ śāśvata-kalpa-kalāṃ [I 37*]

22 Api cha sudrīdha-sētu-praṇō | vīmala-salīla = bhuvi ta[ = = = = = = = = = = = ] da[-ā]yakaḥ sāsi cha [I 38*]

23 Nagaram = api cha bhūya = vriddhimār = pauru-juṣṭhaṃ dvija-bahu-śata-gita-brahma-nirāṣṭha-pāpañ = samāṇi = api cha samāṇi = iti-durbhiṣha[- = = = = = = = = = = = = = ] [I 39*] [Iti Suda]rānaṇṇātaka-saṁskāra-granṭha, rathanā [sa]māptā

Second Part

24 Driptā-āri-darpa-pranudāḥ pritub-śriyāḥ svā-vānsa-kētoḥ sakal-āvani-patēḥ | rājādhirājyā-ādhihuta-puṇya-[karmanāḥ] [I 40*]

25 dvishataṃ damāya [I 41*] Tasya = ātmajēn = ātmā-guṇ-ānvitēchā Gōvinda-pādārīpta-jīvītēna [I 42*]

26 mahatā mahatā cha kailēn = ātmā-prabhāva-nata-paurajēna tēnā [I 43*] Chakran bibharti ripu [I 44*]

27 Kārītāṃ = a-vakra-mattina Chakrabhrītah Chakrapāliṭēna grihāṃ | varsha-sāte-

28 kurvā = prabhūtavam = iva bhāti purasya mūrdhīni [I 46*] Anyach = cha mūrdhāni su [I 47*]

29 ruddha-vihaṇga-ṃargaṃ vihārajatē [I 48*]

The metre is faulty in the first aksara of the first and third pāades which should be short, not long.
TRANSLATION

Luck!

(Verse 1) Victorious is that Vishnū, who, for the sake of the happiness of (Indra) the lord of the gods, snatched away the royal dignity of Bali,¹ which was admitted to be worthy of enjoyment and which had more than once been wrested (from them)² who is the permanent abode of (the goddess) Lakṣmī, whose resting-place is the waterlily; who overcomes affliction and is the consummate victor.

(Verses 2-3) And next, victorious for ever, is Skandagupta, whose chest is clasped by the goddess of wealth; who has developed valour through his own arms and has become over-king of kings; who forged an order with an effigy, namely, Garuḍa,³ which rendered, devoid of poison, the Serpent (bhujagā) Rulers who uplifted their hoofs in pride and arrogance; who is the abode of kindly qualities, is of profuse glory; (and) who, when his father attained to the companionship of the gods,⁴ humbled down his enemies and made subject to himself the (whole) earth, bounded by the waters of the four oceans and with thriving border countries;

(Verse 4) And, moreover, he alone has conquered, whose fame enemies proclaim (being caused to return) to the Mleccha countries, with (their) pride broken down to the very root;

(Verse 5) Whom the goddess of fortune has of her own accord selected as her husband, having discarded all sons of kings, after considering them in succession, with judgement and skill, and pondering over all the springs of virtue and vice.

(Verse 6) While that king is ruling, verily no man whatsoever from among his subjects has deviated from duty; is distressed, indigent, addicted to vice, miserly; or in one, who is severely chastised with a cudgel.

(Verses 7-11) Having thus conquered the whole earth, having destroyed the egregious pride of enemies, (and) having appointed protectors in all provinces, he cogitated in many ways:— “who is there that is suitable; endowed with intellect; is modest; possessed of a nature not devoid of wisdom and recollection; endowed with truthfulness, straightforwardness, magnanimity, and diplomacy; and possessed of sweetness, kindness and fame; devoted; attached; endowed with many characteristics;⁵ and possessed of (good) intentions, tested by all allurements;⁶ possessed of an inner soul which has attained to the state of being free from

---

¹ The legend, as Fleet rightly points out, is that the demon Bali, or Mahābali, by his austerities acquired the dominion over the three worlds and oppressed the gods very much. Vishnū then incarnated himself as a dwarf and prayed to Bali to give him as much earth as he could cover in three steps. Bali, noted for his liberality, forthwith acceded to this seemingly simple request. But the dwarf assumed a mighty form, and began to measure the three steps. The first step covered the earth, the second the heavens; and the third he planted on the head of Bali and sent him and his legions to the Pātala or lower regions whose dominion was assigned to him.

² Fleet translates: “who had been kept away from him for a long time.” This phrase, however, undoubtedly refers to the frequent defeats inflicted upon Indra and the gods by Hiranyakasipu and other demons. It had therefore better be rendered by “which had more than once been wrested (from them, i.e., the gods).”

³ As Garuḍa was an insignia of the Gupta sovereigns and as Nāgās were a ruling family, it seems that there is in this verse an allusion to Skandagupta having somewhere overthrown the Nāgā power.

⁴ i.e., “had died.”

⁵ Nai-śīlesa-rūṣṭaḥ may also be taken to mean “possessed of choice men.”

⁶ Upadhiḥ is a term technical to the Hindu Science of Polity. Thus, Kautilya in his Arthasastra (I. 6.1) has santri-paritih-cēkāh śāmīyām = adhikāraṇaṁ tāhākāraṇaṁ sthāpitaṁ = ānātyāṁ = upadhiḥ śādhyāt. “In association with the councillors and the high-priest, the king shall test with allurements (the character) of the ministers appointed in ordinary government departments.” Following Kautilya, Kāmandaka says: Upadhiḥ-lādhitaṁ samaggaḥ = lādhitaṁ phalōdgaṇaṁ | tē = yā svarō vā karīkhan s-ānurāgāh kṛiti-dākṣyāṁ || Upanīya dhīyati yasmin = upadhiḥ tē tataḥ smṛtiḥ | upāya ṣādhiḥ jīvyā yo = ānātyāḥ karīkhyāt || (Nīśāsya, Canto IV, verses 25-26). Kautilya specifies four kinds of upadhiḥ or allurement, namely, dharmo- śādhiḥ ‘religious allurement,’ artho- śādhiḥ ‘lucre allurement,’ kām- śādhiḥ ‘love allurement’ and bhūy- śādhiḥ ‘allurement under danger.’ Kautilya also informs us to what upadhiḥ or upadhiḥś officers of one class or another may be subjected.
(all) debt (to his master); striving for the welfare of the whole world; who, again, is capable in the lawful acquisition of wealth, in the preservation of it when acquired, and further in causing the augmentation of it when preserved, and in the dispensation of it on worthy objects when augmented; whom among all my servants put together, shall govern the whole of the Surāśṭra country? Ah! I know it; (there is) just one man, Parṇadatta, competent to bear this burden.”

(Verse 12) By the lord of kings, having so decided with his own deliberation for a number of days and nights, who (Parṇadatta) was appointed somehow with pressing, to protect in a proper manner the land of the Surāśṭras.

(Verse 13) Just as the gods, having deputed Varuṇa to the west became contented and unperplexed, so the king, having deputed Parṇadatta to the region opposite to the east (i.e., the west), became happy.

(Verses 14-16) His son, possessed of a filial disposition; his own soul divided into two; guided by self-control; worthy of being protected by the all-pervading soul as if it were (his own) self; always self-possessed; with (his) form as lovely as that of cupid; with (his) whole disposition permeated by continuous joy in consequence of varied pastimes consonant with his (graceful) form; with his face resembling a lotus (coming) from a tank of full-blown lotuses; the protector of men who come for refuge—and has become renowned under the name of Chakrapālita on earth; who is dear unto the people; who has excelled (his) father by his own pristine noble qualities.

(Verses 17-18) In whom dwell all these qualities pre-eminently and inseparably, namely, forbearance, masterfulness, modesty, prudent behaviour, great respect for (all) heroism, except heroism represented on the stage, eloquence (?), self-restraint, liberality, high-spiritedness, civility, freedom from debt (to the master), freedom from listlessness, beauty, control of (people) other than Āryas, freedom from arrogance, fortitude, and generosity.

(Verse 19) There exists in this whole world no one where a comparison with his virtues may be made; verily he has become, in all entirety, a standard of comparison to men endowed with virtuous qualities.

(Verse 20) Who, being appointed by (his) father, after testing in person these qualities mentioned above and many others than these, has afforded the protection of (this) city excellently, surpassing his predecessors.

(Verse 21) Relying upon the prowess of his own two excellent arms (?), not on the conceit of another man, he has harassed no one in this city, and punished the wicked only.

---

1 This sentiment of a servant towards his master may be traced even in an edict of Asoka. Thus, while expostulating with his Mahāmātratas in charge of Kalliga, the Mauryan monarch says e.g. in Second Separate Rock Edict at Dhauli: hovam cha kaliturthā tuhpe svaugam āśādirvīṣa sva manu cha āmanīṣaḥ āraha, “If it is performed well, you will gain heaven and also discharge your debt to me” (D. R. Bhandarkar’s Akoja, 2nd ed., p. 362).

2 The author of this prāsasti is here also obviously indebted to Kauṭilya who, in his Arthasastra (1.4. 5-6) says: tasa (dona)āya na tinā=Daṇḍanātha, labhāna-lābhārtha, labhā-pairakshānti, raksita-seivardhanti, yuddhasya śiśteṣu pradhāpānti cha, “The wielding of it (i.e., of Danda) is Daṇḍanāti which concerns itself with (1) the acquisition of what has not been acquired, (2) preservation of what has been so acquired, (3) augmentation of what has been so preserved and (4) distribution amongst the deserving of what has been so augmented.” For the exposition of this passage, see D. R. Bhandarkar’s Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, pp. 16 ff.

3 Ātmaja-kāvita-rāpas Fleet translates by “endowed with a naturally beautiful form.” But ātmaja has also the sense of ‘cupid’ which suits here better.

4 What we have in the text is śaurya vina śaurya-mahārechanum which Fleet renders by “heroism without (too) great an (e)stimination of prowess.” He, however, forgets that lexicons give for this word also the sense of “representation of war and supernatural events on the stage; cf. ārabhaṭṭi,” “the heroic branch of dramatic art (=ārabhaṭṭi).” This suits here excellently as it draws a sharp contrast between the two śauryas: one real and the other unreal, because represented on the stage.
(Verse 22) Within this brief time, he ruled with confidence over the people, including the inhabitants of the city; and who has fondled all classes of citizens, (surely his own) sons, [or, as if they were his own sons—Ed.], after carefully enquiring into (their) faults.

(Verse 23) And (who) has gratified the subjects by conversations preceded by smiles, marks of honour and presents, and by unrestrained visiting one another’s houses such as promotes friendly home receptions.

(Verse 24) Full of the highest feeling of reverence to the Brâhmaṇa, capable, pure, (and) in a suitable manner devoted to charity, he has enjoyed pleasures of sense attainable in time, without any conflict between religious merit and worldly prosperity.

(Verse 25) Is it strange if he, (born of Parâdatta), is possessed of proper behaviour? Will any scorching arise from the moon which is cooling like a string of pearls or like a water-lily?

(Verse 26) When, in course of time, there came the season of clouds, tearing asunder with (its) clouds the season of heat, much water rained down unceasingly for a long time— in consequence of which (the lake) Sudarśana burst from the four roads.

(Verse 27-28) And now when a century of years, increased by thirty-six (had elapsed), making the calculation according to the Gupta era, at night, on the sixth day of (the month) Praushtapada,—these (rivers) sprung from (the mountain) Raivataka, and this Palâśini that moves gracefully in sand, (all of them) the wives of the ocean, having dwelt for long in bondage,¹ went again to their husband (the ocean), in due accordance with the scriptures.

(Verse 29) Noticing the great bewilderment caused by the advent of rains, (the mountain) Urjayat, wishing to do a good turn to the great ocean,² stretched forth, as it were, a hand, consisting of the river (Palâśini), decorated with the numerous powers that grew on the edges of (its) banks.

(Verse 30-31) Feeling, indeed, dejected on all sides, discussing how they should act, keeping awake the whole night by turns, the people reflected (thus), feeling restless “just in a moment, (the lake) Sudarśana, has become disagreeable to the sight of men;³ can it ever become pleasing of aspect, having the appearance of the ocean?... ?”

(Verse 32) He, having become..., displaying exceeding devotion to (his) father, (and) placing, (prominently) before him, religion, (his) sacred ties to the king, and the well-being of the town;

(Verse 33) When a century of years, increased by thirtyseven (had elapsed), comprehending the sacred writings, ..., whose great might is well known; though (he is) viśva,⁴

(Verse 34) Then having sacrificed to the gods with oblations of clarified butter and with obeisances; and having gratified the twice-born with (presents of) riches; and having honoured

¹ Here there is a pun upon the Sanskrit word bandhana which means both ‘bondage’ in the case of wives and ‘barrage’ in the case of the rivers.

² The expression moh-ñadār = Urjayati priy-apuna is thus translated by Fleet: “desirous of appropriating the wives of the mighty ocean” which is ridiculous. Priyapu here stands, not for priyā īpu, but for priyā īṣu and is to be taken in the sense of “wishing or desirous of doing a good turn (priyā)”, obviously to his friend, the mighty ocean, by stretching forth its hand in the shape of the Palâśini, which, being overflown and being one sheet of water from Urjayat to the sea appeared like a hand extended by the mountain itself to touch and quiet its friend, the ocean, which was tempest-torn on account of the monsoon.

³ In the phrase pumān(n) hi, the word hi seems to have been used in the sense of iva. Or, it may be, as seems more probable, that pumān is a mistake for puṣpānim.

⁴ Anabhāṇīdhī itself means an ocean, s-anabhāṇīdhī is therefore far-fetched. But the word seems to have been used here by the panegyrist as he was a weak poet.

⁵ There is a pun upon the word viśva; at one time, it means ‘all-pervading’ and at another ‘a citizen (nāgara).’
the citizens with such honours as they deserved and (his) respectable servants and friends with presents;

(Verse 35-37) In the first fortnight of the month (called Āshādha) and belonging to the hot season, on the first day, he, having put forth careful efforts and made an immeasurable expenditure of wealth, in two months, laboriously built up a hundred cubits in all in depth, and sixty-eight in breadth, and seven (?) men's height in elevation (of the breach into the embankment) of two hundred cubits, having done honour to the kings, built with great labour, with stone well laid, (so that) the lake, not evil by nature, became renowned as Sudarṣāna² (of good appearance) for all eternity.

(Verse 38) Agitated by the lower part of the body of the ruddy-geese, the herons and the swans which have displayed their beauty on the edges of the firmly built embankment . . . pure waters . . . (so long as) the sun and the moon.

(Verse 39) And may the city become affluent; teeming with citizens; bereft of sin through prayers sung by many hundreds of Brāhmaṇas, (and free) for a hundred years from distress such as those caused by calamities (like) famine . . . .

(Line 23) Thus ends the literary composition of the restoration of the Sudarṣāna Lake.

(Verse 40) . . . . (Skandagupta), who destroyed the haughtiness of the haughty enemies; who is of great royal dignity; who is the foremost of his family; who is the lord of the whole earth; whose pious deeds are more wondrous than overlordship of kings.

(Verse 41) By his son, who is endowed with his own good qualities; whose life has been dedicated at the feet of (the god) Gōvinda . . . .

(Verse 43-45) And by that Chakrapālita, who is of a straightforward mind, who causes townsfolk to bow down by his own prowess, having acquired there at the lotus-like feet of Vishnu . . . has been caused to be built a temple of (the god) Chakrabhārti, who carries the discus . . . with a great expenditure of wealth and after a long time, when one hundred and thirty-eight years (had elapsed) (according to the calculation) of the Gupta era.

(Verse 46) . . . . uprisen, as it were, from the mountain Urjayat, shines over the head of the town, manifesting, as it were, (its) lordship.

(Verse 47) And another . . . . over the head . . . . shines, obstructing the path of the birds . . . . .

No. 29 : PLATE XXIX

KAHĀUM STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF SKANDAGUPTA : THE YEAR 141

This inscription appears to have been discovered by Francis Buchanan (Hamilton), whose Survey of the Provinces, subject to the Presidency of Bengal, was commenced in 1807 and was continued during seven years, and whose manuscript results were transmitted in 1816 to the Court of Directors of the East India Company. From his reports Montgomery

¹ As in verse 31, there is a play here on the name of the lake. It had become duśārasiṇa when there was a breach in the dam, but has become Sudarṣāna again, in accordance with its name, when the embankment was repaired. This play on the name Sudarṣāna is noticeable also in an earlier epigraph, namely, that of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudrādīman, where, in line 8, we have duśārasiṇa (nom.=āsū), and in line 16 (su)duśāraṇaṁ kāśikā (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, pp. 43-44).

² Rathakaraṇa-samāhāra . . . āśū-dūṣita is taken by Fleet to mean “agitated by the defiances of the ruddy-geese.” Obviously, he understands ‘defiances’ by the term sanātho. But this is a mistake. Because rathāṅga is synonymous with rathakaraṇa; and if rathāṅga also means ‘the ruddy goose,’ there is no reason why rathakaraṇa-samāhāra should not also bear the same sense. Similarly, āśū is taken by Fleet in the sense of āsīta, ‘settling down.’ But āśū means the ‘lower part of the body behind, posteriors.’ Monier Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary. This suits here excellently.
Martin compiled, and in 1838 published, the book entitled Eastern India, in which, for the first time, the inscription is noticed in Vol. II, pp. 366 ff., with a reduced lithograph (ibid., Plate V, No. 2). In the same year, in the J.B.A.S., Vol. VII, pp. 37 ff., James Prinsep published his reading of the text, and a translation of it,\(^1\) accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate i) reduced from a copy made by D. Liston. In 1860, in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. VI, p. 350, Fitz Edward Hall published his reading of the first verse of the inscription, and a translation, which was subsequently revised and reprinted in the J.B.A.S., Vol. XXX, p. 3, note. In 1871, in the CASIR., Vol. I, p. 93 f., and Plate xxx, General Cunningham published another lithograph, reduced from his own ink impression. In 1881, in the Ind. Ant., Vol. X, pp. 125 ff., Bhagawanlal Indrajal published his revised reading of the text, and a translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph reduced from an impression made by him when he visited Kāhāum in 1873. And finally, the whole of the inscription was carefully edited by J.F. Fleet in CII., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 65 ff., and Plate IX A.

Kāhāum or Kāhāwām,\(^2\) the ancient Kākubha or Kākubhagramā of this inscription, is a village about five miles to the west by south of Salampur-Majhaull,\(^3\) the chief town of the Salampur-Majhaull Pargāṇā in the Dèɔrīyā or Dēwariyā\(^4\) Tahsil or Sub-Division of the Gorakhpur District in Uttar Pradesh. The grey-sandstone column on which the inscription is engraved stands a short distance on the north of the village.\(^5\)

Of the sculptures on the column, the most important are five standing naked figures, one in a niche on the western face of the square base; and one in a niche on each side of the square block immediately below the circular stone with an iron spike in it, which, the original pinnacle having been lost, now forms the top of the column. As appears to have been first fully recognised by Bhagawanlal Indrajal.\(^6\) These are distinctly Jain images. He suggested that they represent the five favourite Tirthāṅkaras, Ādīnātha, Śāntinātha, Nēmīnātha, Pārśva, and Mahāvīra. And they are, in all probability, the five images of Ādikaraṇī, or Jain Tirthāṅkara, referred to in the inscription itself.

The writing, which covers a space of about 2' 2-½" broad by 1' 8" high, is on the three northern faces of the octagonal portion of the column; and the bottom line appears to be about 7' 6" above the level of the ground. It is evidently in a state of excellent preservation throughout. The size of the letters varies from ½" to ¾". The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet, and are of the same type with those of the Allahābād pillar inscription of Samudragupta (No. 1 above). The language is Sanskrit; and, except for the opening word siddhāṃ the inscription is in verse throughout. In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are: (1) the use of the dental nasal, instead of the anusvāra, before ज in vanaṣa, line 2, and trisṭhat, line 4; and (2) the usual doubling of k and t, in conjunction with a following r, e.g., in chakrē, line 9 (but not in Śakrō, line 3), and putrō, line 6.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Imperial Gupta king Skandagupta. It is dated in words, in the year one hundred and forty-one (459-60 A.D.); and in the month Jyēṣṭha (May-June); but without any specification of the day of the month or fortnight. As is shown by the images in the niches of the column, as well as by the tenor of the record.

---


\(^2\) The ‘Kahum, Kahong, Kanghe, and Kuhun’ of maps, etc. Indian Atlas, sheet No. 103, Lat. 26° 16’ N.; Long. 83° 53’ E.


\(^4\) The ‘Deorva’ of maps.

\(^5\) For a full description, with drawings, of all the columns and other remains at Kāhāum, see CASIR., Vol. I, pp. 91 ff. and Plate xxix, and ibid., Vol. XVI, pp. 129 ff. and Plate xxix.
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From photograph
itself, this is distinctly a Jaina inscription. And the object of it is to record that a certain Madra set up five stone images of Ādikārtṛis or Tirikāṅkharas, i.e., apparently the five images in the niches of the column,—and the column itself, at the village of Kakubha or Kakubhagrāma, i.e., Kāhānum.

TEXT

[Metre: Sragdhārī throughout]

2 Guptānām vanśajasya praviṣṛtā-yaśasas=taśya sarvav-ōttam-arddhēḥ [1°]
3 rājyē Śakra-ōpamasya kṣhitapa-saṭa-patēḥ Skandaguptasya sāntē
data śrīnāda-saṅkarṣaṇa-saṅkramaṇē Jyēṣṭha-māśi prapannē [1°]
5 Khyātē=smin=grāma-ṛatīc Kakubha iti janaīs=sādhu-saṁsarga-pūtē [1°]
6 puttrō yaś=Sōmilaśya prachura-guṇa-nidhēṣ=Bhaṭṭisōma mahātma[m] ā [1°]
7 tat-sūnā Rudrasōma[h] prīthula-mati-yaśa Vyāghra ity=anya-saṁjñō [1°]
8 Madras=tasya=ātmajī=bhūtī=dvija-gurū-yaṭhī prāyaścaḥ prītīmān=yaḥ [1°]
9 Punya-skandham ca chakrē jagad=idad=akhilaṁ saṁsaraṁ=vikśyaj bhitō
10 śṛyēḥ-rtharā bhūta-bhūtay pathi niyamavatām=Arhatām=Ādikārtṛān [1°]
11 paṃcō=endraṁ śthāpayitē dharanīdharamayān=sannikhītāς=tatō=yaṃ
12 śālā-stambhaṁ su-chārur=giri-vara-śikhar-āgr-ōpamaḥ kṛttikaritā [1° 3°]

TRANSLATION

Luck!

(Verse 1) In the peaceful reign of Skandagupta, whose hall of audience is fanned by the breezes caused by the throwing down (at his feet) of the heads of hundreds of kings; who is born in the lineage of the Guptas; whose fame is spread (far and wide); who is of supreme greatness; (and) who resembles (the god) Śakra, being the lord of a hundred kings;—in the 141st year, the month, Jyēṣṭha having arrived;

(Verse 2) In this jewel of a village named by the people as Kakubha, (and) purified by the intercourse of holy men,—(there was) the great-souled Bhaṭṭisōma, who (was) the son of Sōmila, the receptacle of many good qualities; his son (was) Rudrasōma, of great intellect and fame, who had the other appellation of Vyāghra. His son was Madra, who (was) exceedingly affectionate towards Brāhmaṇas, religious preceptors and ascetics.

1 From the ink-impressions supplied by the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Northern Circle, Agra.
2 In the original, this word is in the margin; the si opposite the commencement of line 2, and the adhāra opposite, and partly above, the commencement of line 3.
3 The mark in the original after this vīrarga would seem to be an accidental slip of the engraver's tool rather than intended for a mark of punctuation, which is not required here and which is unlike that occurring at the end of lines 4, 5, or 8. The marks of punctuation, at the end of lines 5 and 7 are, however, unnecessary.
4 Read paṃcā-endrīn.
5 sāntē: It is unnecessary to explain in detail the interpretation of this word. The difficulty is, as Fleet correctly remarks, not the correct rendering of it, which is perfectly obvious, but to comprehend how it ever came to be read sāntē, and to be interpreted by "of the repose, i.e. death," i.e. "after the decease (of Skandagupta):" or, being read sāntē correctly, to comprehend how it ever came to be interpreted as meaning "(the empire of Skandaga-upta) being quiescent," or "(the empire of Skandagupta) being extinct (for the hundred and forty-first year)."
The correct interpretation appears to have been first pointed out by Bhuṭ Daji; "in the year one hundred and forty-one, in the peaceful reign of Skandagupta." (JBBRAS, Vol. VIII, p. 246.)
6 For some similar instances of second names, see page 234 above, note 3.
(Verse 3) Observing and being alarmed that this whole world is evanescent, he acquired a mass of religious merit; and for (his own) bliss and for the welfare of (all) existing beings, having established, of stone, the five lords who were originators (ādikārthīśa) in the path of the Arhats who practise restraint of mind, (he) thereupon planted (in the ground) this exceedingly beautiful and fame-contributing pillar of stone which resembles the tip of the summit of the chief of mountains.

NO. 30 : PLATE XXX

INDÓR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF SKANDA GUPTA: THE YEAR 146

This inscription was discovered in 1874 by A.C.L. Carllyle, First Assistant to the Director General of the Archaeological Survey of India; and was first brought to notice, in the same year, in the *J.B.A.S.*, Vol. XLIII, Part I, pp. 363 ff., where a lithograph of it was published, prepared by General Cunningham (ibid., Plate xix), accompanied by a version of the text, and a translation of it, by Rajendralala Mitra. It was critically edited by J.F. Fleet in the *C.I.I.*, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 68 ff. and Plate IX B. One correction was pointed out by F. Kiellhorn in the *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 219.

The inscription is on a copper-plate which was found in a small stream at Indór, the ancient Indrāpurā and Indrāpurī of the inscription, a large and lofty mound about five miles to the north-west of Dibḥāī, the chief town of the Dib Hawthā in the Anupshahar Tahsil or Sub-Division of the Bulandshehar District in Uttar Pradesh. Until recent years, Indór was a small inhabited village; but it is now only a khāqā, or deserted mound and is not shown in maps. Fleet obtained the original plate, for examination, from the possession of General Cunningham.

The plate is a single one, inscribed on one side only, measuring about 8-1/8" by 5-1/2" at the end and 5-7/8" in the middle. The edges of it are here and there slightly thicker than the surface of the plate, with small depressions inside them at the same places; but there does not seem to have been any intention of purposely fashioning the edges thicker all round, so as to serve as a rim to protect the writing. The surface of the plate is in some places a good deal corroded by rust; the inscription, however, with care, is legible with certainty throughout. The plate is fairly thick; but the letters, being rather deeply engraved, show through distinctly on a great part of the back of it. The engraving is clean and well executed; the majority of the letters, however, show, as usual, marks of the working of the engraver's tool. There is no hole.

3 *Indrán*. Bhagwanlal Indraji, in his published version, first pointed out the kind of meaning to be given to this word here (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, p. 126).

2 *Ādikārthīśa*: lit. 'originators.' Bhagwanlal Indraji first pointed out the correct meaning of this word, as referring here to five of the *Tirathariśkarās* or sanctified teachers of the Jains (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, p. 126 and note 16). See also *SBE.*, Vol. XXII, pp. 224-25.

3 The 'Dabhai, Dabhai, Dibhai, and Dubhaee,' of maps, etc. Indian Atlas Sheet, No. 67, Lat. 23° 12' N.; Long. 79° 51' E. The position of Indór, with reference to Dibbhāī, is shown in the sketch map given in *CASIR.*, Vol. XII, Plate 1.

4 The 'Anoopshahar and Anupshahar' of maps, etc.

5 Burnett allotted the earliest instances of arranging for the preservation of the writing on copper-plates, by beating up the margins round the plates and then flattening the edges, to the ninth or tenth century A.D. (*South Indian Palaeography*, p. 92). "But there are plenty of earlier instances," says Fleet, "in the south, as well as in the north of India. These raised rims were obtained, at first, by thickening the plates at the edges, in the process of fashioning them. Afterwards, it became customary to beat the plates out quite smooth, and then to turn them up at the edges and fuse them together at the corners; and some of the Eastern Chalukya plates, made in this way, have raised rims a good quarter of an inch high." It is, however, worthy of note that the edges of the Dāmōdarpur Plates, noticed above (Nos. 22 and 24), have not been raised into rims for the protection of the writing.
in the plate for a ring with a seal on it; nor are there any indications of a seal having been soldered on to it, as, from the instance of the spurious Gaya plate of Samudragupta, No. 4 above, Plate IV; illustrated also, by the Śirgahol seal of Sarvaavarman, CIT., Vol. III., 1888, No. 47, Plate XXX A, and the Sönpat seal of Harshavardhana, ibid., No. 52, Plate XXXII B, and, elsewhere, by the Dighwā-Dubauli plate of the Mahārāja Mahēndrapāla and the Bengal Asiatic Society's plate of the Mahārāja Vināyakapāla,—seems to have been the early custom in the north of India. The weight of the plate is 1 lb. 2 oz. The average size of the letters is between \( \frac{3}{8} \) and \( \frac{5}{12} \). The characters, on the whole, belong to the western variety of the Gupta, i.e., northern class of alphabets, the test letter \( m \) alone being of the eastern type. The initial \( i \) has an entirely different form from that of the other northern type; contrast it in Indrapura and \( i̯ō \), line 8, with \( i̯va \) in Plate I, page 215 above, line 30, and \( i̯t \) in plate IX, p. 250, line 7. In line 10, we have a form of the numerical symbol for 2. The language is Sanskrit; and all the formal part of the inscription, from Paramabhitāraka, line 3, to samakālyyanam, line 10, is in prose. From a linguistic point of view, we have to notice the affix \( kα \), in =Endrāparaka, line 5, Indrāparaka, line 6, and especially pratishṭāpita, line 7. Other instances of it are given by No. 26, CIT., Vol. III., 1888, Plate XVI line 10, utpādyānāka; No. 27, ibid., Plate XVII, line 9, Pratishṭāpita, and line 12, utpādyānāka; No. 28, ibid., Plate XVIII, lines 13 and 14, anumādita, line 14, uparikhyita, and lines 14 and 15 pratishṭāpita, and lines 18 and 19 utpādyānāka; No. 29, ibid., Plate XIX A, line 11, upariliṅkita, and line 15, utpādyānāka; No. 31, ibid., Plate XX, line 9, utpānaka, lines 9 and 16, utpādyānāka, and line 11, kāritaka; No. 41, ibid., Plate XXVII, lines 11 and 12, atisyājaka. In respect of orthography, we have to notice: (1) the use of the guttural nasal, instead of the anusvāra, before \( i \) and \( h \), in chatvāritṣad, lines 3-4., and śinaka, line 6; (2) the doubling of \( k \), and usually of \( i \), in conjunction with a following \( r \), e.g., in abakramana, lines 8-9., and pattraḥ, line 5, (but not in putrō in the same line); and (3) the doubling of \( v \) after the anusvāra, in satvatsara, line 3.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Imperial Gupta king Skandagupta, whose officer, the Vishaya-pati Śrīvanāga, was administering Antarvēdi, which, according to Fleet, denotes the country lying between the Gaṅga and the Yamuna. But this does not seem likely, because this whole province would rightly be a bhūkti, 'province', and would be too big to be a vishaya, 'district,' of which Śrīvanāga could be Vishaya-pati. It probably denotes some doab touching the Gaṅga which was not far removed from Indrapura and of which it could be the headquarters. It is dated in words, in the year one hundred and forty-six (464-65 A.D.); and in the month Phālguna (February-March), but without any specification.

---

2. ibid., pp. 133 ff.
3. As regards these two words, Monier-Williams, in his *Sanskrit-English Dictionary,* gives puraka as another form of pura, 'a city'; but refers only to 'Ārghāśṭapurasaka' as an authority for the word. This city, however, as Fleet points out, only owes its existence to one of the early misreadings of *Mukterāja-Paśṭapurasaka* in line 19 of the Allahbāḍ inscription, No. 1 above.
4. Vishaya-pati is a technical official title, meaning 'the lord, or ruler, of a vishaya.'
5. According to the *Abhidhāna-chintamani:* Gaṅga-Yamunāyiḥ = nadi-yam = Antarvedī Samasthali = (Bhāmbādha, 27). This shows that the tract of the land intervening between the Gaṅga and the Yamuna was called Antarvedī or Antarvedi and also known as Samasthali. See also the *Trinity of the Nagas,* 2.1.7. The inhabitants of this land were for that reason called Antarvedi (Rāmānuy, IV. 41. 14). Antarvedi as the name of this country has been referred to also in the *Aneṣvarādhava* (Kṛṣṇamīd, ed.), p. 311. It will thus be seen that Antarvedi here denotes a country or ida which is more extensive than a bhūkti and is certainly far more extensive than a vishaya. But there is also a smaller division of this Antarvedi which is popularly styled Antarabeda and which denotes the region of Kanauj lying between the Gaṅga and the Yamuna, commonly called the Doṭh (Bate's *Dictionary of the Hindi Language,* sub voce). This probably represents the Antarvedi vishaya of the Indor plate.
of the day of the month or fortnight. It is an inscription of solar worship; and the object of it is to record a perpetual endowment, by a Brāhmaṇa named Dēvavīṣṭu, for the purpose of maintaining a lamp in a temple of the Sun at Indrapura or Indrāpura i.e., the modern Indor. This mention of the place, under its ancient name, connects the record satisfactorily with the locality in which the plate was found. The temple was built by the two merchants of Indrapura, Achalavarman and Bhīrakunāthaśiriṇa, Kshatriya or Khatri1 by caste and the amount of the endowment was invested at Indrapura in a guild of oil-men of which Jivanta was the head (prasara). The guild was to make a uniform and perpetual supply of oil for lamp, wherever it was stationed, whether at Indrapura or at some other town whither it might emigrate.

TEXT

[Metres: verse 1 Śārdūlavikṛṣṭa and verse 2 Indravajrā]

1 Siddham [|| *] Yaśa vīprā vidhivat—prabuddha-manansā dhyān-aika-tānā³-stuvah⁴ 
   yasya=antarī tiḍa-śurā na vividur=nn=ōrdhvaṁ na tiryā-
2 g-gatih⁵ [|| *] yaśa loḵo bahu-rōga-vega-vivaśaḥ sannāṭrīya chetiō-labhaḥ pāyād=vaḥ 
   sa jagat-pithānā⁶ puṭahbhid-śrīmā-2-
3 karō bhāsakaraḥ || [||] Paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājāḥ-dhirāja—śri-Skandaguptasya= 
   abhiyuddhaṁmaṇa-vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsara—śatē⁷ shach⁸-chatvā-
4 [ri*] insād-uttaratamē Phālguna-māsē tat-[p*]darpaprijīhītasya vishayapatī-
   Śarvanāgasya=Antarvṛṣṭiyāṁ bhog-abhiyuddhīhī varīta-
5 mānchē ch=Endrāpuraka⁹-padmāḥ—chāṭurvīśva-saṁvāya-brāhmaṇa—Dēvavīṣṭu— 
   Dēvavīṣṭu Haritrāta-paquṭraḥ Ṣudīka-prapauṭraḥ satat-āgniḥō-

1 It is worthy of note that there was a tribe called Kshatriya or Kshatri which is mentioned both by foreign writers and in Sanskrit literature. Thus Arrian, who has left us an account of Alexander’s invasion of India, informs us that when this Macedonian emperor was encamped at the confluence of the Chēnāb and the Indus, he received deputies and presents from Xathroi (Khalūrī), an independent tribe of Indians (McCrlndle’s Ancient India, its invasion by Alexander the Great, p. 150). As has been pointed out by K. P. Jayaswal (Hindu Polity, pt. I, p. 60), the same tribe appears to have been mentioned by Kauṭiyā (XI. line 4) along with the Kāmbēśaras and Surāṣṭras as the Sāṅghas subsisting both upon agriculture and arms. They have apparently been referred to as Kshatriyas by Ptolemy (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, p. 350). Similarly, they seem to have been referred to in the phrase Khaṭja- 
   doppamōne-madunasa occurring in the Nasik cave prāsasti of Gautamiputra Sātakrī (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 60, line 5). Again, they appear to be the Kshatriya described in the Manusmṛti (X. 12, 13, 16, 19, 26 and 49) and the Kshatriyas of later inscriptions, such, e.g., as the Lāḍū inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, pp. 23 ff.) of Sādharāga who and his ancestors are spoken of as Kshatriyas of the Kāśyapa gōṭra or the six grants of the Gaṅgāvāla king Jayaḥchandradeva of Kannu (Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII, pp. 136-42) which speak of one and the same granter, viz., Rājakanyandas, a Kshatriya and of the Vatsa gōtra. They doubtless represent the modern Kshatri caste which pursues businesses and is spread over the Panjab, U.P., Rājputānā, Central India, Gujarāt and even some parts of Mahārāṣṭrā (R. E. Enthoven’s Tribes and Castes of Bombay, Vol. II, pp. 205 and ff.).

2 From the original plate.

3 Read -śtāna-

4 “The form stū”, says Fleet, “is rather unusual; the customary form being stut. But Bühler has given me the analogous instance of ṣṭutu—stū, which is mentioned by Kātyāyana in his comments on Pāṇini, iii. 2, 76. The meaning of ṣṭutu is not given in the Mahābhāṣya; but Monier Williams explains it by ‘panegyrist.’” The note is all right except the reference to Pāṇini which should be iii. 2, 178.

5 Read -gaṭm.

6 Read -śiḍdāna.

7 See p. 246 above, note 1. But, after the cleaning of the plate, Gen. Cunningham (CASIR, Vol. XII, p. 40) could see a faint trace of the vowel ē of rājē. According to him, it should thus read rājē samvasaraśātē.

8 Read ṣaṭ.

INDOR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF SKANDAGUPTA: THE YEAR 146

From photograph
TRANSLATION

(Line 1) Luck!

(Verse 1) May that Sun, the store of rays that cleave as under the sheath of the world (viz., darkness) protect you, whom Brāhmaṇas, with minds enlightened, praise, according to the rite in (their) uniform course of meditation; whose end, either vertically or transversely, neither the gods nor the demons could ascertain; (and) by having recourse to whom, mankind, when they are helpless through the intense virulence of disease, acquire consciousness (again)!

(Lines 3-5). When a century of years augmented by forty-six (has elapsed), pertaining to the increasingly victorious reign of the Paramabhaṭṭaraka Mahārājaṇḍikaraṇa, the prosperous Skandagupta, and when the month of Phāḷguna is current, for the augmentation of the enjoyment (of power), in Antarvēdi, of the Vīshayōpati Śarvanāga, who has been favoured by that venerable (king),

(Lines 5-8). The Brāhmaṇa Dēvavishṇu, who belongs to community of Chaturvedins of Padmā relating to Indrāpura, who is the son of Dēva, (and) the son’s son of Haritṛata, (and) the son of the son’s son of Duḍika; who always maintains the sacred fire and is a student of the Sāmavēda, who belongs to the Rāṇāyanaka school;

1. Read Rāṇāyanīya.
2. Fleet corrects it into -Bhrūkunṭha, but Bhrūkunṭha and Bhrūkunṭha are interchangeable.
3. Read -adhīṣṭhāta.
4. Read pravachhāti. That the marks after ti are the visarga and not marks of punctuation, is shown by the form of the visarga throughout this inscription, and contrasted with it, the marks of punctuation after bhūskaraḥ, line 3, and at the end of the inscription.
5. The visarga is unnecessary in sandhi.
6. Read -dattam [i*] Anayā.
7. Read prattham-. Fleet correctly says that tulyaṇa seems to be a mistake for taulyaṇa.
8. Read yā--tikramed--.
9. Read duḥ gachchhēn--.
10. Read cha [i*] 2* iti ||
11. See page 246 above, note 1.
12. I.e., Skandagupta. For the term pāda, see note 4 on page 20 above.
14. I.e., Skandagupta. Fleet translates it by “who always recites the hymns of the Agniḥātra—sacrifice”. See the next note.
15. According to Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Rāṇāyanīya-sūtra is equivalent to Gōhila-grihyasūtra. It is well-known that the latter is a Grihya-sūtra of the Śāmavēda; and this agrees with the fact that Dēva-vishṇu, the donor, is called a Chhandaṇīga, 'a student of the Śāmavēda.' The preceptor, Gōhila, is credited with the composition of also a Śrauta-sūtra and a Naigya-sūtra, both pertaining to the same Vēda.
gōtra, for the increase of his own fame, gives an endowment, (of which the interest is) to be applied to (the maintenance of) a lamp for (the temple of) the divine Sun, established by Achalavarmā and Bhrukunḍhasīnha, Kshatriya merchants of the town of Indrāpura, just touching mādāyāna in the east of that town.

(Lines 8-10) Whatever has been given through the Brāhmaṇa’s endowment to (the temple of) the Sun is perpetual from the guild of oil-men, residing at Indrapura, of which Jivanta is the head and wherever it (i.e., the guild) may settle down after moving away from this town and entering (some other place). There should then be given by this guild, for the same time as the moon and the sun (endure), two palas of oil by weight (or in figures) by weight 2, uninterrupted in fulfilment (and) continuing without any diminution from the original value.

(Lines 11-12) Whosoever transgresses this grant that has been drawn up, that man, (becoming as guilty as) the slayer of a cow,(or) the slayer of a spiritual preceptor, (or) the slayer of a Brāhmaṇa, shall go to the infernal region, being overpowered with those (well-known) five sins, together with the minor sins.

NO. 31 : PLATE XXXI

BHITARĪ STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF SKANDAGUPTA

The column containing this inscription appears to have been discovered in 1834 by Tregear; but the inscription itself was not observed till a short time afterwards, when General Cunningham discovered it, on clearing away the earth from the lower part of the shaft. The discovery was announced in 1836, by James Prinsep, in the JASB., Vol. V, p. 661. And the inscription was first brought to notice in 1837, in the same journal, Vol. VI, pp. 1 ff., where W. H. Miller published his reading of the text, and a translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph (marked ibid., Vol. V, Plate xxxii), reduced by Prinsep from a copy made by General Cunningham. In 1871, in CASIR., Vol. I, p. 98 and Plate xxx, General Cunningham published another lithograph of the inscription. In 1875, in JBBRAS., Vol. X, pp. 59 ff., Bhau Daji published a revised reading of the text, and a translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph, from a hand-copy made by Bhagwankal Indrajī. In 1885, in the JBBRAS., Vol. XVI, pp. 349

1 Varṣhagana is perhaps identical with Vairātaspushpa (v. 1. pushpa or pushta) included by the Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra in the Yāsaka division of the Bṛgiga-gōtra.
2 Here, i.e., in line 6, the vowel of the second syllable of this name is long, but below, i.e., in line 7 and 8, it is short.
3 The meaning of mādāyāna is not apparent.
4 A well-known instance of a guild emigrating from one place to another and settling down there is furnished by that of the silk-weavers mentioned in the Māndāśr inscription of Kumāragupta I and Buddhavarman (No. 35 below).
5 Pala, a particular weight, = 4 swarṇas or 64 māśa (beans). See also D. R. Bhandarkar’s Carnelian Lectures, 1921, p. 86.
6 The ‘puṣṭa’ mayāyīkā, or ‘five great sins.’ The men who are guilty of these sins are described in the Mānava-Dhāmaśāstra, IX, 235, which is thus translated by Bühler: “The slayer of a Brāhmaṇa, (a twice-born man) who drinks (the spiritual liquor called) Sūrā, he who steals (the gold of a Brāhmaṇa) and he who violates a Guru’s bed, must each and all be considered as men who committed mortal sins (mayāyīkas),” SBE., Vol. XXV, p. 333. See also Mānava-Dhāmaśāstra, XI, 55-59 and Bühler’s Translation, ibid., pp. 441-42. Upāpātika seems to be the same as Upapātika, ‘the longer form being used in this verse for the sake of the metre’ as Fleet rightly remarks. As regards apapātaka or minor offences, such as ‘slaying king, sacrificing for those who are unworthy to sacrifice’ etc., etc., see the Mānava-Dhāmaśāstra, XI, 60-67 and Bühler’s Translation, ibid., pp. 442-44.
8 This paper was not published till 1873; but it was read before the Society four years earlier, on the 13th April, 1871.
ff., Bhagwanlal Indraji has given his own reading of the text, and a translation of it, with another lithograph reduced from his hand-copy. Three years thereafter it was edited by J.F. Fleet in the *GII.*, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 52 and ff. and Plate VII. Though his treatment of the inscription is an improvement upon that of the Pandit, the transcript of neither can be considered final or even satisfactory. This seems to be due to the fact that the stone is highly weathered and is also injured in some places. The extreme historical importance of the epigraph, however, deserves more attention being bestowed upon it. Accordingly I have checked not only the transcripts of the Pandit and Fleet in the light of the ink impressions, but also the results thereof by examining the original column.

**Bhitari** is a village about five miles to the northeast of Sayyidpur,² the chief town of the Sayyidpur Tahsil or Sub-Division of the Ghazipur³ District in Uttar Pradesh. The redsandstone column on which the inscription is, stands just outside the village, on the south side. The inscription is on the eastern face of the square base of the column; and the bottom line is only a few inches above the level of the ground.

The writing, which covers a space of about 2' 4-1/4" high by 2' 2-1/4" broad, has suffered very much from the effects of the weather; also the stone has peeled off in a few places; and there is a crack running vertically down the inscription, near the left side. With care, however, the greater portion of the inscription is legible, on the original stone, with certainty; and nothing of a historical nature seems to be lost. The size of the letters varies from 1/4" to 7/16". The characters belong to the western variety of the northern class of alphabets. On the whole, the letters are somewhat squarely cut. The letters ś and m, in some cases, resemble those of the Mathurā inscription of Chandragupta II (No. 10 above). The left downward stroke of m is curved. ṣ has no loop, but has instead a slanting straight stroke at the bottom of the left limb. Sometimes, however, ṣ is so squarely cut that it becomes difficult to distinguish it from ḍ. Letters like g and ṣ are highly akin, and the one can be easily mistaken for the other. There are two doubtful cases where the m looks like its southern type; see mahārāja⁴ (line 3) and sneyam (line 4). Medial i is generally indicated by a curve placed on the left limb of the letter. In cases of letters which have two parts, this ikāra is indicated on the top of the left limb. An exception to it may be seen in pituk (line 17). At times the curve comes down so much as to enclose the whole letter like the ḍ of the southern type and hence more space is left out between it and the preceding letter than is usual; see e.g., -dāuhitra (line 3). Sometimes this curve is very much suppressed and looks like the ā as in sthāpiṭo (line 11). Medial ā is indicated by a horizontal stroke to the right, but in exceptional cases by an up-ward slanting stroke attached to the top of the letter as in sthāpiṭo (line 11). In the case of j, the ā is attached to the middle limb, excepting in nyūyā (line 2) where it is attached to the right limb. āu is generally indicated by three strokes as in -dāuhitra (line 3), but the au in prapautra (line 2) is peculiar and looks like ai. U is indicated by a suppressed hook to the left. In the case of letters like m and ś, only the right vertical line is prolonged downwards. Ś, however, has a hook to denote śu as in subhram (line 12). The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose as far as the middle of line 6, and the rest in verse. In respect of orthography, we have to notice (1) the use of the guttural nasal, instead of the anusvāra, before ś in vraśa, lines 7, 13 and 14; (2) the doubling of k, in conjunction with a following r, in =vikkramēṇa and kkramēṇa, line 9; (3) the doubling of l, under the same circumstances, in -pautrasya, line 3 (but not in -prapautrasya, line 2; putras=, line 4; and other places); and (4) in -ānuddhyātō, line 5.

---

¹ The 'Bhitari, Bhitrī, and Bhitari' of maps, etc. Indian Atlas, Sheet, No. 103, Lat. 25° 35' N.; Long. 83° 17'.
² The 'Saidpur and Sydpoor' of maps, etc.
³ The 'Ghazeepor' of maps.
The inscription is one of the Imperial Gupta king Skandagupta. It is not dated. It belongs to the Vaishnava form of religion; and the object of it is to record the installation of an image of the god Vishnu under the name of perhaps Kumāravāmī called after his father and the allotment, to the idol, of the village, not mentioned by name, in which the column stands, for the augmentation of the spiritual merit of his father Kumāragupta I.

In stanza 4 of this inscription both Bhagwanlal Indrajit and Fleet read the name Pushyamitra; and whereas the former takes it in the singular, the latter does it in the plural. On the strength of Bhagwanlal Indrajit’s reading, the late P. Peterson took this Pushyamitra to be the king whose contemporary and protege was Patañjali, the author of the Mahābhāṣya. R. G. Bhandarkar strongly dissented from the view, and no scholar has since then been found who agrees with Peterson. As regards the reading of Fleet which takes Pushyamitra in the plural, it has been accepted to this day. Who, however, the Pushyamitrās were for some time undecided, until the late A.M.T. Jackson pointed out that a Jain inscription from Mathura mentioned the Pushyamitrās as a kula of the Vārāṇa Gaṇa. Later, F. E. Pargiter drew our attention to the Pushyamitra family mentioned in the Purāṇa as having ruled in the third century A.D. But it is rather curious that such a clan as the Pushyamitrās, which was unknown to epigraphy or numismatics before, should all of a sudden rise to such an importance as to dominate the Gupta supremacy for a while, only to sink into oblivion thereafter. This reasonable scepticism has now been apparently set at rest by the fact that, after all, the correct reading most probably is not samudita-bala-kōśān = Pushyamitrānī = cha jītvā, but rather samudita-bala-kōśān = yudhy = amitrānī = cha jītvā. Though stanza 4 cannot thus be utilised for the purposes of history, there are two others whose importance has not been a bit diminished. Thus, stanza 6 informs us that when his father died, the fortune of the Gupta House was in a tottering condition but that as soon as he re-established it, he repaired to his mother who was in tears just as Krishṇa did to Dēvaki when he had slain his enemy. If the comparison of Skandagupta and his mother to Krishṇa and Dēvaki has any meaning, it seems that some menace to the Gupta power had arisen from the side of Skandagupta’s mother and that the prince who actually threatened it was perhaps her brother. To what family he probably belonged is a question which has been considered above in the Introduction, pp. 80 ff. The second item of historical importance which is furnished by this inscription is contained in stanza 8, which describes his fierce conflict with the Hūṇas. Unfortunately this stanza has not been properly preserved; and so we do not know whether any further information on this point had been supplied to us about his battle with the Hūṇas, especially the place where it took place.

TEXT

[Metres: Verse 1 Pushpitāgrā; verses 2–6 Mālinī; verses 7–8 Śārdūlavikrīḍita; and verses 9–12 Amushūṭākh.]


1 See p. 317 note 3 below.
3 Ibid., pp. 199 and ff.
5 The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 50–51 and 73.
6 From the original column and the ink impressions supplied.
7 There are some faint marks above the sariva, which seem to be remnants of this word; but it is not quite certain.
BHITARĪ STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF SKANDAGUPTA

G. S. Gai

From photograph
3 mahārāja-śri-Ghaṭotkacha-pauttrasya mahārājādhirāja-śri-Chandragupta-putra-
   sya Lichchhivī-dauhitrasya mahā[de]vyāṁ Kum[ā]radēvyā[ā].

4 m=utpannasya mahārājādhirāja-śri-Samudraguptasya putras=at-parigrihitō
   mahādevyān=Dattadēvyām=utpanna[ī] svayam=apratirathaḥ

5 paraṃ-bhāgavatō mahārājādhirāja-śri-Chandraguptas=taṃsya putra[ś]=ta-
   [t]-pādānuddhyātō mahādevyān[Dhruva]dēvyām=ut[p]a[ṃ]nah parama-

6 [bhā]gavatō mahārājādhir[ā]ja-śri-Kumārguptas=tasya[ṛ] Prathitta-prithumati-
   [sva]bhāva-sakteḥ prithu-yasaḥ prithiḥvīpateḥ prithu-śriḥ [₁]*

   [₁₁ Ṛ] [Ja]gati bhuj[ṛ]-baḷ-aḍy[o]₁ Gutha-vaṇsai[ka]-vīraḥ prathita-vipula-

8 nāma nāmaṇāḥ Skandaguptaḥ [ṛ]sucharita-charitānāṃ yena vṛttena v[ṛ]ṭṭhān
   na viḥatam=ataḥ chi=atmā tāna-[dhiḍaṭi]-vinītaḥ [₁₁ Ṛ] Vinaya-

9 bala-suntīr[ā]=vivikramaḥ kramena pratidinam=abhiyogad-IPA[ñ]ra na lā-
   [bdh]ya[ Ṛ] svabhimaṇa-vijigśhā-pararyatāṃ parēśhāṃ prati-

10 hita iva le[bhē sa]vṛddhāṇ-ōpadesăḥ [₁₁ 3*] Vichalita-kula-lakṣmī-śambhanāy=
   oṣṭyaṇa kṣhitaśaṭyāniyē yēna nītāś=trīyāmāḥ [₁₁] samu-

11 dita-ba[la]-kōśan=uddhayā=amitrēmā=cha [j]jītvā kṣhitipā-charanā-pithē sthāpīto
   vāma-pāḍah [₁₁ Ṛ] Prasambha-anupama-rddhir=dhvasta-śastra-pratāpa[ṛ]*=vīna-

12 [supitrā]-kṣāṇi-saura[yaiṛ]=nirūḍham [₁]* charitam=amala-kīrttēr=ggiyate
   yasya subhrahīṇaḥ dīśi diśi pariṣṭu[ṣṭ]air=ā-ku[mā]raṃ manushyaiḥ [₁₁ 5*] Pitari
   dīvam=up[e]ṭe

   jītam=iti pariṣṭhān[ā]=mātānām sāstra-nīṭrāṁ mata-rūpaṁ iva [Kṛ]ṣṇo
   Dēvakim=abhyu[pē]

   pratiṣṭhāpāya yō bāhuḥbyām=avanāḥ vijītya hi janēṣhv=āṛṭēṣhu kīṭvā dayām [₁]*
   n=ōṣṭi[ktō] [na cha]* vismitaḥ pratidīnaḥ

   [prā]payatī=āryatāṁ [₁₁ 7*] Hānapā=yyasām samagatasya samarç dōbhyaṁ
dharā kampitā bhūm-āvṛttā-karasya

16 śatrasu śrā [--- --- --- --- --- --- ---] vira-(?) chi(?) taṁ prakhyāpitō [d]ī
   [pt]jī[ma]n=na dyō[ṛ] [---] nabhītai laṣhyata iva śṛṭēṣhu Śāṅga-dvānīḥ [₁₁ 8*]

17 S[v]-a-piṭhuḥ kirtī [--- --- --- --- --- ---] [₁]* [--- --- --- ---] [₁₁ 9*] [Prakṛyā]
   pratiṃ kācīḥ=pratimānaḥ tasya Śāṅgaṇīḥ [₁]*

18 s[u]-pratītaṁ=chakār=emāṁ [--- --- --- --- ---] [₁₁ 10*] Iha ch=aṁ nam
   pratiṣṭhāpya su-pratiṣṭhīta-sāsanāḥ [₁]* grāmām=čnaṁ sa viddiḥ[ś] pituḥ
   pu[n]jya-ābhivṛddhayā [₁₁ 2*]

---

¹ Read -ādiyaḥ.
² "The second syllable of this name," says Fleet, "like the rest of the inscriptions, is damaged. But, as regards the lower component,—comparing it with the subscript y of this inscription, e.g. in pradyasa, line 2, and dassibraya, line 3; and contrasting it with the subscript p, e.g. in tat-parigrihitē, line 4, and -at-pāḍē line 5, it is plainly y." But the upper component of this second syllable is most certainly ḍh; the ink impressions leave not even the shadow of a doubt on this point. And as the subscript y is hardly distinguishable from the subscript p especially when it is in a weather-worn condition, we are compelled to read =uddhaty =amitaṭhi =cha instead of =Partayamāntī =čcha. This was in fact, the reading suggested, on grounds of plausibility, by H. R. Divkear in ABOHRI, Vol. I, pp. 100-01.
⁴ Fleet restores it to yadāḥ-āchāraḥ-ātēkāram. But if āchāraḥ is used, ā is superfluous. It has, perhaps, to be restored to Kumārasaṃ-a-ātēkāram.
19 Atō bhagavatō mūrttir—iyāṁ yaś—ch—ātra [saṁskriṭah] [* udbhayam niśrddidēś = āsau pituḥ puṇyāya puṇya-dhīr= iti²

TRANSLATION

(Line 1) Luck!
(Lines 4-5) The prosperous Chandragupa (II) the Mahārājādhirāja, who was himself without an equal adversary (and) an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudeva), who, born of the Mahādevī Dattādevī was the son of, and selected (as successor)³ by the prosperous Samudragupta, the Mahārājādhirāja,

(Lines 1-2) who was the exterminator of all kings; who had no equal adversary on earth; whose fame was tasted by the waters of the four oceans; who was equal to (the gods) Dhanada, Varuna, Indra and Antaka; who was the very axe of Kṛṭānta (God of Death) who was the giver of many crores of lawfully acquired cows and gold; who was the performer of the aśvamēṣha-sacrifice that had long decayed,⁴ (and)

(Lines 2-4) who was the son of the son's son of the prosperous Gupta, the Mahārāja; the son's son of the prosperous Ghaṭākāśaka, the Mahārāja, (and) the son of the prosperous Chandragupta I, the Mahārājādhirāja, the daughter's son of the Lichchhāvi; (and) of the Mahādevī Kumārādēvi;

(Lines 5-6). His (Chandragupta II's) son, who mediates on his feet, is born of the Mahādevī Dhrūvadēvi (and) is an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudeva), (is) the prosperous Kumāragupta (I), the Mahārājādhirāja; of him,

(Verse 1) the power of whose colossal intellect and own calibre was renowned, whose fame was colossal (and) who was the lord of the earth (is) this son (the present king) who is clinging to the lotus-like feet, (still) remembered, of (his) father, whose fame is renowned, and who is (now) the lord of the earth;

(Verse 2) who, possessing strength of arm most abundantly in the world, is the one hero of the Gupta lineage; whose splendour is as profuse as renowned; who is Skandagupta by name; by whom, in (his) conduct, the conduct of those whose rule of life is virtuous deeds is not violated; and who is again a soul well-disciplined in (musical) śāṇa and dhīḍā.⁶

(Verse 3) By whom, with daily assiduous application, having attained his wish gradually through self-restraint, force, good policy (and) valour was obtained a lesson in organisation (of expedition) as is laid down (on a board) for other (kings) intent upon conquest so highly welcome (to them);

(Verse 4) By whom, as he was intent upon steadying the tottering. Sovereignty of the House, several nights were spent on a bed, namely, the earth; and, having in a battle vanquished enemies who had developed forces and treasure, (his) left foot was placed on the royal foot-stool;⁷

1 Read saṁskriṭah.
2 Read puṇya-dhī [II 12*] iti.
3 That is, by Samudragupta; see page 254 above, note 1.
5 Another form of this name is Lichchhāvi, with the vowel a in the second syllable. As regards the present variant, see page 223 above, note 29.
6 These are terms apparently technical to the Indian science of music. And if I have rightly understood this line, it means that Skandagupta was well conversant with music—a conclusion which need not surprise us as we know that his great grandfather, Samudragupta, was an accomplished musician.
7 It has been pointed out above that the correct reading seems here to be puṇtyam—amitratiḥ—cha, and not Pushtyaaprtiḥ—cha as taken by Fleet. And even though his reading is supposed to be the correct one, the phrase khaḷiṣpa-charṣa-piṭhē is rendered devoid of all meaning. He, no doubt, translates the line by "he placed his left foot (Contd. on p. 317)
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(Verse 5) The bright mode of life of whom, possessed of spotless fame, which has sprung out of peerless restraint of senses ....... forgiveness and heroism, which have perforce eclipsed the splendour of (his) weapon, is sung in every direction by contented men down to the boys;

(Verse 6) Who, with enemies conquered by the strength of (his) arm, established again the Sovereignty of the House that had turned adrift when (his) father had repaired to heaven; (and) delighted because he had won, he approached (his) mother whose eyes were full of tears, just as Kṛishṇa did Dēvakī when he had slain (his) foe.

(Verse 7) Who, with his own forces, has established (again) (his) lineage that had tottered ....... , who, having conquered the earth with (his) two arms and shown mercy to the people in distress, has become neither puffed up nor amazed though (his) radiance is increasing day by day; (and) whom the narration of (his) mode of life, whether with songs or with panegyrics, is raising to the dignity of an Ārya;

(Verse 8) Of whom, when he had come in contact with the Hūṇas, with (his) two arms, in battle, the earth quaked; of whom that causes terrible whirlpools among enemies ....... proclaimed ....... is noticed in (their) ears as if it were the twanging of the bows.

(Verse 9) The monument of his father ....... 

(Verse 10) Firmly convinced that some image should be made, he made this (image) of Śārīgīn (Vishṇu) (called Kumārasvāmin).

(Verse 11) And having here installed this (god), he, whose rule is well-established, has assigned this village (to the god) for the augmentation of the spiritual merit of (his) father.

(Verse 12) Thus this image of the Divine One and [the column] which was consecrated here—both these the pious minded one has indicated for the spiritual merit of (his) father.

NO. 32 : PLATE XXXII

SUPIĀ PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF SKANDAGUPTA:
THE YEAR 141

The stone pillar bearing the inscription under study was discovered in the village of Sūpiā in the former Rewa State, now in Madhya Pradesh in 1943-44. It was first published by B. Ch. Chhabra in the Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference, Varanasi, Vol. III, 1948, pp. 587-89. It was briefly noticed by D. C. Sircar in JAS., Letters, Vol. XV, 1949, p. 6 and edited by him in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIII, pp. 306-08, along with plate. Another inscription, on a foot-stool which was the king (of that tribe himself)." But Divekar rightly says: "Had the writer meant to express what Dr. Fleet would make him do, he would have written the last line as "idān-ekśīta-padvaj-pijáha stūpatā vāma-pādekā" (ABOR., Vol. I, p. 103). But if we accept the other reading, namely, yudhy = anitrāni = cha, kṣīpā-
vāma-prajāha acquires a natural sense, and what the line means is that he occupied the throne and rested his left foot on the foot-stool which is an integral part of a king's throne; in other words, it means that he made himself king.

1 This reference to Kṛṣṇa and Dēvaṅkī clearly shows that Skandagupta's enemy was a close relative of his mother, possibly her brother. This stanza may be compared with stanza 2 of the Junāgaḍh rock inscription (No. 26 above).

2 For this sense of the word kṛṣṭa, see p. 242 note 1 above.

3 This is in accordance with our restoration of the line. If this is accepted, Kumārasvāmin becomes the name of the god Vishṇu installed by Skandagupta in honour of his father Kumāragupta I. This may be compared to Vālaḥaṇṭhasvāmin, an image of Vishṇu founded by Allā in honour of his father Vālaḥaṇṭha (Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 159, line 6).

4 This, of course, refers to the place where the column is set up and where the purificatory ceremony took place.

5 [D. R. Bhandarkar's manuscript does not contain his article on this inscription though he was aware of its discovery and possessed an impression of it.—Ed.]
which is much damaged, recording the performance of a Sati rite, has been engraved at a much later date on the back side of this pillar.

The inscription is written in seventeen lines covering an area about 8 inches in breadth and about 22½ inches in height. The **characters** are the same as in the contemporary inscriptions of central part of India such as the earlier records of the kings of the Parivrajaka and Uchchakalpa dynasties. The **language** of the inscription is Sanskrit and the composition is in prose throughout. In respect of **orthography**, it may be noted that the consonant following $r$ is reduplicated, e.g. dharmma, line 6, and Vargga, line 15; sometimes the consonant preceding $r$ is also reduplicated, e.g. vikraméya, line 5 and -göttra- line 14. Vanśa is written for vañśa, line 1 and chatvārīṃśa for chatvārīṃśa, line 9.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of **Skandagupta** of the **Imperial Gupta dynasty**. He is called here as **Mahārāja**, rather inaccurately. The **date** of the record is given in lines 8-9 as **year 141** of the reign of Skandagupta. The details are given in lines 16-17 as the second **ādi** of the bright half of the month of Jyēṣṭha. The year has to be referred to the Gupta era and its equivalent would be 460-61 A.D. The **object** is to record the erection of the **bala-yāṣṭi**, which was a göttra-sāiltikā, by Varga-grāmīka. This Varga is stated to be the brother of Śrīdatta and Chhandaka, son of Hari-srēṣṭhīn and grandson of Kaivartti-srēṣhthin. Śrīdatta is described as kuṭumbika i.e. husbandman residing at **Avaḍara** while Varga is described as grāmīka i.e. village headman, apparently of Avaḍara. Thus his family members were srēṣhthin (banker), kuṭumbika and grāmīka.

The **stone** pillar bearing the inscription and erected by Varga is called **bala-yāṣṭi** in the epigraph. Yāṣṭi here means a memorial pillar which is also called göttra-sāiltikā i.e. ‘family (pillar of) stone’ because Varga erected this pillar in memory of all the members of his family mentioned therein.

Only one geographical name occurs in the record viz. **Avaḍara** which cannot be identified. It may be a locality in the neighbourhood of Supā.

**TEXT**

1 [Śrī]-Ghata[ō]tkachā|h | *] tad-vanśa prava . . .
5 [ṛtu]-tu[lyō] [mahā]-bala-vikrama[mē]na Rā[rma]-
6 [tu]lyō dha[rrma]-pa[ra]tayā Yudhishthirā sa[t-yē]-
7 nācharavi[n]aya mahāraja-śrī-Ska[n]da-
8 guptasya$^5$ rājya-[samva]sa[rā]$^2$-sāte ēka-
9 chatvāri[nśoṭṭa]rakē$^{10}$ [t$^*$] [asyārā] divasa-pū-
10 rvvāyām(yām) Avaḍara-vāstäya-kuṭumb[i[kah$^*$]
11 Kaivartti-srēṣṭhi-nāptṛi(pta) Hari-srēṣṭhi-pu[tra[h$^*$] Śrīda-

---

$^2$ From an impression.
$^3$ Read tad-vanśa.
$^4$ The two lost eksaras may be restored as ritamā or rādhamā.
$^5$ The damaged letter looks more like nēm.
$^6$ Read Yudhishtīhārā-tuṭyaḥ.
$^7$ Read *na-āchāra-viṃśyaḥ or better saṭṛ-āchāra-viṃśyaḥ.
$^8$ Read guptāḥ | tasya.
$^9$ Read saṃvatsara.
$^{10}$ Read *rūnīsād-uttarakē.
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TRANSLATION

(Line 1) The illustrious Ghaṭōkacha. In his family ...

(Lines 2-4) Prosperous Samudragupta the mahārāja; his son, the prosperous Vikrama-
ditya (i.e. Chandragupta II), the mahārāja; his son, the prosperous Mahendrāditya (i.e. Kumāragupta I), the mahārāja; his son,

(Lines 4-9) The prosperous Skandagupta, the mahārāja (who) resembled a Chakravartin in strength and valour, Rāma in righteous conduct and Yuddhishṭhīra in truthfulness, conduct and humility. In his regnal year one hundred exceeded by fortyone, when in this detailed order of the date,

(Lines 9-12) Śrīdatta, son of Hari-śrēṣṭhin and grandson of Kaivartti-śrēṣṭhin, (was) the husbandman residing at Avāḍara, his brother (was) Varga, his brother (was) Chhanda;

(Lines 13-15) (This) bala-yaśhti (i.e. memorial pillar) (called) goṭra-śaṅkikā (i.e. family-
stone) was erected by Varga-grāmika for the increase of his own merit, glory and fame,

(Lines 16-17) On the second day of the bright half of the month of Jyeṣṭha.

NO. 33 : PLATE XXXIII

NĀLANDĀ CLAY SEAL OF VAINYAGUPTA

This seal bearing an inscription of Vainyagupta was picked up like those of Buddhagupta, Narasimhagupta and Kumāragupta III (Nos. 42, 44 and 45 below) in the course of the excavation to Monastery site No. 1 at Nālandā, in the Patna District, Bihar, in 1927-28. It remained unnoticed except for a brief reference to its discovery by Hiranyā Sastrī in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, p. 77, postscript. Later on he published it in his Memoir on Nalanda and its Epigraphic Material, p. 67. This seal, like the others, was originally a clay impression which was eventually burnt into terracotta in the circumstances mentioned below on page 355.

Unfortunately the seal is a mere fragment. The whole of it is broken off except the middle portion of its lower surface which is preserved in the shape of a triangle. The extant fragment measures 2-½” at the base and is 2-¾” in height. The seal was oval in shape as seems from the curvature of the rim preserved. Its upper part which presumably contained some device and an indefinite number of lines is entirely broken off. The seal in its present fragmentary state contains five lines of prose writing. Of the first line nothing except a ligature remains. The second, third and fourth lines have each lost some letters both at the beginning and at the end. Only the last one seems to be completely preserved. From the analogy of the other Gupta seals from Nālandā to which it bears strong affinity, it is not unlikely that this also originally contained eight lines of writing. The characters which are executed in relief are well formed

---

1 [D. C. Sircar thinks that two letters are lost after Chhanda and restores them as `I = ch = ch. But actually there are three letters which appear to read as Saṇṭāṇ, probably referring to a place-name.—Ed.]

2 MASI., No. 66.
and are exactly akin to those of the Nālandā seals of Kumāragupta III, noticed below. The language is Sanskrit. In respect of orthography the only point worth noticing is the doubling of d(h) in conjunction with a following y in -pādānuddhyātā, line 4, but not in the same expression occurring in line 3.

The legend on the seal is purely genealogical and follows the stereotyped formula found on every other Gupta seal. It refers itself to the reign of Vainyagupta who, in common with the other Gupta sovereigns, whose seals are known, is called Paramabhaṅga Busta Mahārājadhirāja (line 5). Owing to the highly fragmentary character of the legend, no name other than that of the issuer, is preserved in full. Thus, in line 4, which is expected to contain the names of Vainyagupta’s father and mother, all that remains of the former is a hook below, evidently representing the medial u, followed by gupta. This can, however, plausibly be restored as [Pur*]
uguța as it is the only one among the known names of Gupta emperors which satisfies the requirements of the case and takes the particular form of this medial u used here; cf., e.g., the identical medial u-sign in ru of Puru-gupta on the seals of Narasimhagupta and Kumāragupta III. The other name in the same line, namely, that of the mother is well-nigh obliterated. Thus, after śr[ī] may be seen the vestiges of two letters with only their lower parts intact. The first looks like cha while the second is a ligature, to all appearances dra, the subscript being quite legible. This may easily be restored to [Chandra][devī*] who is evidently represented here as the queen of Puru-gupta and the mother of Vainyagupta. These restorations receive confirmation from the seals of Narasimhagupta and Kumāragupta III which also mention Chandrabihī as the queen of Puru-gupta. Thus, Vainyagupta shares this parentage certainly with Narasimhagupta and also probably with Budhagupta. He may be one of the several brothers, ruling successively over the empire.

The only other known record of Vainyagupta is the Gunaighar copper plate grant dated the Gupta year 188, corresponding to 507 A.D. But this Vainyagupta bears the title, not of Mahārājadhirāja but simply Mahārāja. What is further noteworthy about him is that in this record he has been described as Bhagavan-Mahādeva-pād-ānudhyātā. And quite in keeping with this is the fact that the seal attached to his charter bears the figure of a recumbent bull. Vainyagupta of the seal, on the other hand, is styled not only Mahārājadhirāja but also Paramabhaṅga Busta. Unfortunately this seal is fragmentary, but if it had been preserved whole and entire like the other Gupta seals, the upper part of it would have been found containing a representation of Garuda, which was, in fact, the badge of the imperial Gupta dynasty. The evidence thus militates against the identification of Vainyagupta of the seal with Vainyagupta of the plate. This conclusion is confirmed by another piece of evidence. The date of the Gunaighar plate is Gupta year 188, whereas the last date of Skandagupta-Puru-gupta is Gupta year 148. They are thus separated by an interval of 40 years which is too long an interval that should separate the ruling father from a ruling son. But if the conclusion is accepted that the two Vainyaguptas are two separate princes, Vainyagupta of the seal can easily be placed after Skandagupta-Puru-gupta and presumably between him and Kumāragupta II, that is, between Gupta year 148 and 154.

It will be seen that Vainyagupta of the seal was a Mahārājadhirāja. It is, therefore, natural that coins of this king should have been identified. Coins, exactly similar to the archer type of Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I, had so long been attributed by Allan to Chandra-(gupta) III—Dvādaśāṣṭitva in his Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasty, p. 144 and Plate XXIII, Nos. 6-8. But D. C. Ganguly has correctly pointed out that what has been read as Chandra on the obverse is indisputably Vainya.1 Secondly, the obverse bears the Garuḍa standard

1 IHQ., Vol. IX, pp. 784 ff.
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on the left which also clearly shows that he was a devotee of Vishnu—a fact which accords with the epithet Paramabhagavata which is coupled with his name on the seal.

TEXT

1 [syā]  
2 [Chand*][ra]guptas = tasya putra[s] = ta ....
3 s = tasya putras = tat-pādānuddhyātah śrī-[Ma] ....
4 [Pur*]guptas = tasya putras = tat-pādānuddhyātāḥ Mahādevyā[a]ḥ śrī[Chand]ra ....
5 paramabhāgavatō Mahārājādhirāja-śrī-Vainya-guptaḥ [1*]

NO. 34 : PLATE XXXIV

SĀRNĀTH STONE INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA II: THE YEAR 154

This inscription was discovered during the excavations carried out by H. Hargreaves in the cold season of 1914-15 at Sārnāth near Banaras in the Uttar Pradesh and was transcribed and translated by Y. R. Gupte in the A.R. ASI, 1914-15, p. 124, No. XV, and Plate LXIX, n. It is engraved on the pedestal of a Buddha image (Plate LXIII, b of the same Report) which was recovered east of the main shrine.

The writing is in three lines and covers a space of about 1 7" broad, by 2 3" high. The inscription, on the whole, well-preserved, though the ending portion of line 3 is undecipherable. The average size of the letters is 1 4". The characters belong to the northern class of the Gupta alphabet such as was prevalent in Uttar Pradesh. The letters, in other words, resemble those of Central India, except m, which is of the eastern variety. The m, again, has, like that of the Kārmāṇiśa record, two recessed corners. Further palaeographic peculiarities are: (1) the form of the letter bha, (2) the left limb of sa and ga which ends in a slight curve and (3) the ending m which is indicated by a serif covering the whole top. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in verse throughout. In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice is the doubling of a consonant in conjunction with a preceding r.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Imperial Gupta king Kumāragupta II. It is dated, in words, when a century of years increased by fifty-four of the Guptas (had passed away) on the second day of the month of Jyēṣṭha. The date is thus equivalent to 473-74 A.D. It is a Buddhist inscription; and the object of it is to record the setting up of an image of the Teacher (Buddha) by the monk Abhayamitra, on the pedestal of which it is engraved.

TEXT

[Metres : verses 1-3, Āryā]

1 Varsha-śatē Guptānāṁ sa-chatuḥ-paṁchāsad-uttarē bhūmiṁ [ [rakshathi
Kumāraguptē māśē Jyēṣṭhē [dvjī][t][y][ā]*]yām || [1*]
2 Bhaktē = [ā*]varjīta-manaśā yatinā pūjārtham = Abhayamitrēṇa ||
pratī[m] = āpratirmasya guṇā[a] = [r =]yām [kā] ritā Śāstūṣ || [2*]
3 Mātā-pitrī-guru-pūrṭiḥ puṇyēn = ānēṇa satvākāyāyōḥ ||
labhatām = abhimatam = upaśa-mahāvahā . . . prayām || [3*]

1 [Daya Ram Sāhni suggests pūrvaī in the A.R. ASI, for 1914-15, p. 124, note 1, which is a better reading Ed.].
TRANSLATION

(Verse 1) When a century of years, increased by fifty-four, of the Gupta (had passed away), on the second day of the month of Jyēṣṭha, when Kumāragupta was protecting the earth;

(Verse 2) This unique image of the Teacher (Buddha), unparalleled through (his) merits, was caused to be made for worship by the monk Abhayamitra whose mind was subdued with devotion;

(Verse 3) Through this spiritual merit, may this body of sentient beings, supplemented by (my) parents and preceptors, obtain the desired extinction (of wordly existence) . . . .

NO. 35 : PLATE XXXV

MANDASÖR INSCRIPTION OF KUMĀRAGUPTA (I) AND BANDHUVARMAN: THE (KRITA) YEARS 493 AND 529

This inscription was first brought to the notice of scholars in 1885 by Peter Peterson in the *JBBRAS.*, Vol. XVI, pp. 380-81, where he has given us a brief summary of its contents and discussed the significance of the date. It was, thereafter and for the first time, edited in full by J.F. Fleet in the *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XV, pp. 194 ff. The credit, however, of discovering it goes to the latter scholar as the copyists he sent to Mandasör for taking impressions of the fragmentary pillar inscription¹ of Yasōdharman, discovered not only the duplicate copy of this pillar inscription² but also of the record that is under consideration. The inscription was afterwards re-edited by Fleet in an amplified form in *CII.*, Vol. III, 1888, pp. 79 ff., and Plate XI. There were, however, many mistakes in Fleet's reading and rendering of the text. Most of these were corrected by R. G. Bhandarkar in the *JBBRAS.*, Vol. XVII, Pt. II, pp. 94 ff. and some by Durgaprasad in Nos. 51-52 of the *Prāchīna-līkha-māla* published in the *Kāsyamālā* Series. The whole text and most of the translation were afterwards revised by G. Bühler in *Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Kunstdenkmale*, pp. 91-96 and pp. 8 ff.

Mandasör or more properly Daśōr, is, as already stated, the chief town of the Mandasör District of Madhya Pradesh. The inscription is engraved on a sand-stone slab which was originally built into a wall of the flight of steps leading to a shrine of Mahādeva on the river and consequently to the Mahādeva ghūṭ called after that god. About the end of April 1905 I visited Mandasör and inspected the inscription which I then found was in an utterly neglected condition.³ As no particular sanctity attached to it, I recommended the removal of the stone to some place of safety. The stone, however, was not removed from the place till M.B. Garde was appointed Superintendent of Archaeology of the Gwalior State. It is now in the Museum at Gwalior.

The inscription opens with three verses of maṅgala addressed to the Sun, the first and the third of which invoke the blessings of the divinity and the second and middle one of which offers obeisance to him. Verses 4-5 speak of the migration of a Guild of Silk-weavers from Lāṭa or Gujarāṭ to Daśāpura or Mandasör. Verses 6-13 give a word picture of Daśāpura, its position in the world, its lakes and its edifices. Then follows a graphic description of the Guild and the different hobbies pursued by its different members (verses 14-20). Verse 21 describes the pre-eminence of the silk cloth manufactured by them, and the next, the desire of the Guild to make some religious benefaction, having regard to the transitory nature of

³ *PRAS. W. C.*, for 1904-05, p. 63, para 84.
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the world. Verse 23 mentions Kumāragupta (I) as the suzerain, and, verses 24-29, Bandhuvarman, son of Viśavarman, as the ruler of Daśapura, during whose reigns the religious benefaction was carried out, namely, the building of a temple of the Sun, which, according to verse 30, looked like the crest-jewel of the western ward (paśchima-pura) of Daśapura. This is followed by a poetic description of the Winter Season (verses 31-33) during which the temple was constructed. The actual date of the construction is, however, given in verses 34-35 as follows: “when four centuries, increased by ninety-three had elapsed, according to the reckoning of the Mālavas ... on the blessed thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Sahasya ...” Thereafter we are told that when a considerable time had elapsed and some kings had passed away, “one part of the temple was shattered” (verse 36) apparently by lightning and the same Guild rebuilt it (verse 37), “when five centuries of years, increased by twenty-nine years, had elapsed, and on the second lunar day of the bright fortnight of Tapasya” (verse 39), when the Spring had commenced, a description of which season is comprised in verses 40-41. This is followed by a wish that the temple may endure for ever (verse 43). And verse 44 which is the concluding verse tells us that Vatsabhaṭṭi not only composed the pāravā or the above ‘descriptive statement’ with care but was also in charge of the building and re-building of the temple first because he was ordered by the Guild to see the work through and secondly because he was a devotee of the Sun.

It will be seen from the above summary of the contents of the inscription that there are two dates specified here. One of these is 493 and the other 529. They are, of course, Kṛiti years, which are identical with those of the Vikrama era. They are consequently equivalent to 437-38 A.D. and 473-74 A.D. respectively. The first is that of the original construction of the temple which thing occurred, we are told, when Kumāragupta (I) was the supreme ruler and Bandhuvarman the local ruler of Daśapura. This seems to be the natural sense of the stanzas referring to these princes. The other interpretations proposed by scholars have been considered below on p. 329, note 2. The second date is that of the re-building of the temple when part of it had been damaged, apparently, through lightning. But we have not been informed as to who the rulers were at that time. We are simply told that some other kings had passed away by that time. Of course, Kumāragupta I was then dead. His son, Gaṭṭōkachagupta, who apparently was his immediate successor, had also passed away. And so Skanda-gupta also. This last was doubtless succeeded by Kumāragupta II. Whether he was actually living in Vikrama Year 529 is doubtful. Similar changes must have taken place in the succession also of the ruling family of Daśapura. Vatsabhaṭṭi is thus fully justified in saying that, from Vikrama year 493 to 529, kings other than Kumāragupta I and Bandhuvarman had passed away. He does not, however, mention who were actually ruling in 529, probably because it was a troublesome period of the Gupta sovereignty.

As regards the localities mentioned in this inscription, Lāṭa represents the greater portion of modern Gujārat. According to Bühler¹ and Bhagwanlal Indrajī,² it corresponds to the country between the Mahi and the Koṅkaṇ or the Tāpī. But Hultsch³ maintained that it was that portion of Gujārat which intervened between the Tāpī and the Shērī. The latter view is supported by the Cambay Plates of Govinda IV.⁴ The second locality mentioned in this record is Daśapura which is obviously identical with Mandasōr. As stated elsewhere, the best explanation of the formation of the name Mandasōr is that it is a composite name con-
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sisting of Man and Dāsōr which were originally lying side by side and of which Man has been completely wiped out of existence. The second of these, namely, Dāsōr, is a regular modern derivative of the ancient Daśāpura. And, in fact, in some bilingual samads or warrants of more than two centuries ago, whereas the Persian draft gives Mandasōr as the name of the place, the vernacular version preserves the old name Dāsōr, as J.F. Fleet has assured us. Again, Daśāpura has been mentioned not only by Varāhamihira in the Brīhaspatīhitā (chapter XIV, verse 11-16), but also by Kālidāsa in the Meghadūta (I. 47). As to inscriptions, it is found as early as in those of the Nāsik caves. It is mentioned in one of the records of Ushavadatta (=Rishabhadatta), son-in-law of the Mahākṣatrapa Nahapāna, along with the three big cities, Śrōppāra, Gōvardhana and Bharukachchha, where he executed works of public utility. Possibly it was the capital of Nahapāna also and was known as Minmagar. ¹ Quite in keeping with this is the fact that there is a Brāhmaṇa caste called Dāsōrā after Daśāpura. Two more interesting details are supplied by our inscription about this ancient town. One is that it was encircled by two rivers. At present, however, one river only is known in the close neighbourhood of Mandasōr, namely, the Siwanā. Probably, the other river has either dried up or has been filled up with the ancient remains of the town. The other details about it mentioned in the inscription is the piece of information that the temple of the Sun built by the Guild was situated in the western pura or Ward of the town. The word here used is pura, which gives rise to the inference that Daśāpura was so called because it consisted of daśa puras or ten wards. Fleet is, therefore, quite right in remarking that just as now the township includes from twelve to fifteen outlying hamlets or divisions, such as Kilehipur, Jan-kūpur and so forth, so in ancient times, at any rate, when it was originally constituted, Daśāpura included exactly ten (daśa) such hamlets (pura).²

TEXT

[Metres : verses 1 and 2 Śārdūlavitikārita ; verses 3, 5, 6, 11, 14, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30-32 and 40 Vasantatilakā ; verses 4, 13, 21, 33, 38, 39, 41 and 42 Āryā ; verses 7-9 and 24 Uṇḍrāvajrā ; verses 10 and 12 Uṇḍrajitī of Indravagrā and Uṇḍravajrā ; verse 15 Drutavilāmita ; verse 16 Harinī ; verses 17 and 26 Indravajrā ; verses 19 and 43 Mālīni ; verse 23 Vaiśāstha ; verse 28 Uṇḍrajitī ; verse 29 Māndākrāntā ; verses 34-37 and 44 Anuṣṭubh]

₁ [Sid[*]dham [1*[?] Yō dh[rity-a[r*]]tham=upāsyatē sura-ganais=siddhaiss= [cha] siddhy-arthaḥbhir=ddhyān-aik-āgra-parair=vidyāya-vishayair=mmōkṣh-ārththibhir= yyōgibhih t bhaktāyā tīvra-tapōdhanaśi-ca muniśihih=sāpā-prāsāda-kshamair=heṭtur= yyō jagatah=kshay-ābhhyudadayyōḥ=pāyāt=sa vō bhāskaraḥ [[I*] Tatva [=jāna-vido= pi yasa na vidur=brahmarsha-

² yō=bhūdyatāḥ=kṛtsnānī yaś=cha gabhastibhiḥ pravi-srītaḥ=push[n]īti lōkā-

lothayam [1*] gandddharv-āmara-siddha-kinnara-narais=samstūyatē=bhuyutithō bhak-
tēbhyās=cha dadātī yō=bhilashitaṁ tas[m]ai savitrē namaḥ [[2*] Yaḥ=pratyaham prativibhāyā=uḍāyāchālendra-vistūrāntu-ṛgva-sīkhara-skalīt-āṇśu-jālāḥ [[1*] kṣhī-

prüjān[a*]].

³ jana-kapōla-tal-ābhītāmraḥ=pāyāt=sa vas=sa u-k[,]rāṇ-ābharaṇō vivasvān [[3*]

Kusuma-bharā[,]nata-taravara-dēvakula-sabbi-viḥāra-raṃ尼亚═Lāṭa-vishyāyān═

gag-[a]*vrita-sailāḥ=jagati prathita-śīpāḥ [[1*] Tē dēśa-pārththiva-gun-āpahritāḥ

prakāśam=adīv-ādi-jāny=a-viralāny=a-sukhā-

---

¹ Ind. Ant., Vol. XLVII, p. 78. [Daśāpura is mentioned, along with Madhyamā, in a sixth century A.D. inscription at Chitorgarh. Cf. Ep. Ind., Vol., XXXIV, pp. 53 ff.—Ed.]


³ Read Tattoa-
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9 sauñhiräñä = [1*] nritarpibhis = suta-vat = pratimä = [2*] nitàñ pramuditä nyaväshanta sukham parë = [15*] Srävana-[sub]bhage gândharvves = nyë = drídhari parishûhitänä sucharita-çã-åsangha = keçcid = vichitra-kathâvidä = [1*] vinśa-nibhîras = samyag-dharmma-prasânga-parâyanã = priyam = aparushâñ patthyäñ ch = anyéy kshamä bahu bhâshi-tum(tum) = [16*]
10 Kechit = sva-karmaññë = adhikäs = tath-ànyair = vâjñâyate = yôtisham = ätmavadbhih = [ëva] adyäpi ch = anyéy samaora-pragalbhih = kurvanta = arinäm = ahitañ prasahya = [17*] Prâjñâñ manöjña-vadhushä = prathit-ôru-vamä = vamö-anurûpa-charit-âbhärañä = tath = anyë = satya-vratâñ prajöyinäm = upakâra-dakshâ visrambha-
11 [pûrva*] ñm = aparë drídha-sauñhiräñä = cha = [18*] Vijita-vîsya-sângair = dharmma-silais = tath = anyair = m[ri*] dibhir = adhika-sat[f*] vair = lôkâyatr-âparai = cha = [1*] svä-kuëa-tilaka-bhûtaïr = muktâ-râgaïr = ùdârâñ = adhikâm = abhavihâti śreññir = çvâñ prakâraññh = [19*] Tûrnnya-kânty-uptachitô = pi suvarññahära-tâmûla-pushpa-vdhihinä sama-

---

1 Fleet reads -taru-mañña-. R. G. Bhandarkar and Pandit Durgaprasad correct it into -taru-khauda. But the original has -taru-shaṇḍa-, as is clear from the impressions and as was first pointed out by Bühler.
2 Fleet and Bühler both read puras-. But it is clearly puran-.
3 Read Kulläṣa.-
4 Read mukhârâññi.-
5 Read Präśâda.-
6 Fleet reads Śravanga-subhaganä dhâmarcâdyañi but the original has Śravanga-subhaga gândharvve'-nyë, as is clear from the impressions and as was first pointed out by R. G. Bhandarkar.
7 Read -vâñana-. Fleet reads -vadhushä which is not warranted by the impressions, and is, besides, ungrammatical, as was first pointed out by R. G. Bhandarkar. The latter proposes -vâñanaḥ or vakhah. Pandit Durgaprasad reads -vâñanaḥ. The impressions however have -vadhushä which is obviously a mistake for -vâñanaḥ.
8 Fleet reads lôkâ-yâra-ûparaiñ = cha. Bühler adopts this reading but Pandit Durgaprasad corrects it into lâka-yâtra-paraiñ = cha. The impressions, however, give this reading.
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---

3 Fleet reads priyam and corrects the following = agrya into = airyam. But as was first pointed out by Bühler the correct reading is sriyam with which = agryam accords excellently.

9 This is the reading actually warranted by the impressions. Of course, this has to be corrected into visalim = tehshir. It is strange how this emendation is taken to be the actual reading of the text not only by Fleet but also by Bühler.

5 Fleet reads abh, but Bühler correctly reads abh.5

4 Both Fleet and Bühler read = samudr-âm-bu but the impressions are in favour of = samudr-ambu.

8 Fleet read = sandhâ, but R. G. Bhandarkar first pointed out that the correct reading was = sattva.

6 Read = nayita.

7 Read = visht.

9 Fleet reads =ravanâ dara- which is emended into = bhavanâ dara- by R. G. Bhandarkar. Kiellhorn reads = bhavan-ôdara- which is accepted by Bühler. Though this reading is highly probable, it is possible to read = gunan-ôdara- also.

9 Read = oppabhoga.

10 Fleet reads = kal-abhirame. Pandit Durgaprasad however reads = kal-abhirame, and Bühler supports it on the ground of the plate published in Fleet's Volume. It is true that the plate clearly points to this reading. But the impressions before me are in favour of = kal-abhirame. The impressions of Fleet must have similarly been in favour of the same reading, and some slip seems to have arisen in the preparation or printing of the plate.

11 Read = nagas. Fleet and Bühler both read = nagas- but the impressions clearly have = nagas.
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19 stana-jaghana-ghan-ālinga-nirbharsita-tuhina-hima-pātē || [33*] Mālavānāṁ gaṇa-
shityā yāt[e*] śata-chatusḥṭayē tri-navaty-adhikē bdānām = ritau¹ sēvyā-
ghana-stane⁰ || [34*] Sahasya-māsa-suklasya praśastē = hni trayōdaśe mangal-
āchāra-vidhina praśādo = yanī nīveśitaḥ || [35*] Bahunā samatīṭena

20 kālēna = ānyaîśa = cha pāṛthivaiḥ vyaśyryat = aika-dōsō = sya bhavanasya tatō =
dhunā || [36*] Sva-yaśov[r]iddhayē sarvam = aty = udāram = udāraya = savāṅkāritam =
īdaṁ bhūyāḥ sṛṇyā bhānamatō griharī (ham) || [37*] Atyunmatam = avadātaṁ
nabha₄ spīśam = iva manoharaṁ śikharaiḥ [*] śāśi-bhānvōr = abhyudayēśvē =
amalā-mayūkh-āyatana-

bhūtaṁ (tam) || [38*] Vatsara-śatēśhu paṁchasu viśamty-’adhikēśhu navasu
ch-ābdēśhu || yātēśhv = abhiramya-Tapasya-māsa-sukla-dvitiyāyāṁ || [39*] Spash-
ṭair = aśokataru-kētaka-simduvāra-lōl-ātīmutkakalatā-madayantikānāṁ (nām) =
pushpōdgaṁair = abhinavair = adhigamya nūmam = aikyāṁ vijñānibhitā-śarē Hara-pūta⁸-
dēhē || [40*]

22 Madhu-pāna-mudita-madhukara-kul-āpagaṇa⁵-aika-prithu-śākhē [*] kālē nav-
kusum-ōdgaṁ-danuṭra-kāṁta-prachura-rōddhrē || [41*] Śaśīm = ēva nabhō vimalāṁ
kaus[*] ubha-maṣṭīn = ēva Śāṅgīnī vakshāḥ bhavana-varēṇa tath-ēdaṁ puram =
akhilam = alaṇkāritam = udāraṁ (ram) || [42*] Amalina-śaśī-

lēkhā-danuṭaraṁ pūngalānāṁ parivahati samāhārī yāvad = Iśo jāṭānāṁ (nām) =
vikaṭ-

kamala-mālām = aṁsa-saktāṁ cha Śāṅgī bhavanam = idam = udāraṁ śāśvaṁ =
tāvad = astu || [43*] Śreny-āḍēśēna bhaktyā cha kāritaṁ bhavanam rāvēḥ purvīva

ch = ēvaṁ prayaṭnēṇa rachita Vatsabhaṇīṇā || [44*]

24 Svasti kartṛ-śēkhaka-vāchaka-śrōṭribhyaḥ || Siddhir = astu ||-

TRANSLATION

(Line 1) Luck !

(Verse 1) May that (Sun) Light-giver (bhāskara), whom the cause of the destruction and prosperity of the universe, protect you, who is worshipped by hosts of gods for fortitude (of mind); by the Siddhas, being desirous of supernatural powers; by the Yōgins, who, being desirous of liberation, are occupied with the one end, namely, meditation, and have sensual attractions under subjection; and, with devotion, by sages, rich in rigorous austerities and who are powerful enough to curse or to bless.

(Verse 2) Obeisance to (the Sun) Generator (saucītri), whom the Brāhmaṇa sages and others, exerting themselves, cannot fully comprehend though they are conversant with the knowledge of Truth; and who nourishes all the three worlds with (his) spreading rays; who, when he has risen, is praised by Gandharvas, gods, Siddhas, Kinnaras and Naras;¹ and who grants the devotees (their) desires.

¹ Read = ritau.
² Fleet reads -scanē, and Pandit Durgaprasad conjectures staved. But the impressions have clearly -staved, as was pointed out by Bühler.
³ Read -riddhayē.
⁴ Read nabhaḥ.
⁵ Read vinīṭaṁ.
⁶ Fleet corrects it into dūta-, which is altogether unnecessary.
⁷ Read -nagam.
⁸ Bühler takes nara in the sense of 'men' (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 140). But Fleet seems right in taking the word to mean 'mythical beings.' In fact, according to Monier Williams' Dictionary it signifies, inter alia, "a class of myth beings allied to the Gandharvas and Kinnaras."
(Verse 3) May that (Sun) Illuminator (Vivasvan), whose ornament is exquisite beams, protect you, who, with (his) mass of rays dropping down from the wide and lofty summit of the Rising Mountain, every day looks intensely red like the cheeks of intoxicated women!

(Verse 4-5) From the province of Lāṭa, which is lovely in consequence of choice trees, bowed down with the weight of flowers, temples, assembly-halls, and Vihaṇa, (and) the mountains of which are covered with flora, there came to the (town of) Daśapura those (people) of well-known craft, first with their mind full of regard (for it), and afterwards (bodily) in a band, together with children and kinsfolk, disregarding the unceasing discomforts of journey and so forth, being manifestly carried away by the good qualities of the ruler of the country.

(Verse 6) In course (of time) this (town) has become an excellent forehead beauty-mark of the Earth, which is adorned with thousands of mountains the rocks of which are besprinkled with the drops of rut trickling down from the sides of the temples of intoxicated elephants, and the ear-ornaments of which are the trees bending down with flowers;

(Verse 7) (The town), where the lakes shine with waters, on the bank, being variegated with many flowers fallen from trees growing on the margins, are adorned with full-blown lotuses; (and) are full of ducks;

(Verse 8) Where in some places the lakes shine with swans, become tawny with the pollen falling from the lotuses set in motion by the tremulous waves, and, in some, with water-lilies bent down with the weight of their filaments;

(Verse 9) Where the woods are adorned, with lordly trees, bowed down with the burden of their flowers;—with the humming of the swarms of bees become bold through intoxication,—and with the women-folk of the town strolling unceasingly;

(Verse 10) Where the buildings, with moving flags, full of women, intensely white, (and) extremely lofty, bear resemblance to the peaks of white clouds variegated with forked lightning;

(Verse 11) And (where) other (buildings) resemble the lofty summits of Kailāsa, with long terraces and rail mouldings, resounding with the notes of music, with works in painting set up and adorned with waving plantain trees;

(Verse 12) Where the buildings, being decorated with rows of terraces, resembling lines of gods' palaces (and) as pure as the rays of the full-moon, (appear) to have risen up as if by tearing open the earth;

(Verse 13) Which (town) being enclosed by two charming rivers of tremulous waves, shines like the body of the God of Love, clasped in private by (his wives) Prati and Rati, possessed of (prominent) breasts;

(Verse 14) Which, with the Brāhmaṇas who are endowed with truthfulness, forgiveness, self-control, quiescence, religious vows, purity, fortitude, study of Veda, proper conduct, modesty and understanding, and who are stores of knowledge and penance (and yet) free from conceit, shines like the sky with glowing planets;

(Verse 15) Then having come in contact with constant meetings, and with cordiality augmenting day by day, (and) being honourably treated like sons by the kings, they lived in the town in joy and happiness;

1 Fleet renders viśākha apparently by 'arbours' and Bühler by 'stone-seats' (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII. p. 142). But viśākha, being here associated with talabhī, should denote some member of a building. In this connection attention may be drawn to the occurrence of the word in Kārī inscriptions (Nos. 3 and 15) where it is rendered by "[rail pattern] moulding" by Bühler (ASW., Vol. IV, p. 90 and note 3) and by "rail mouldings" by Senart (Ep. Ind., Vol. VII, pp. 51-52). There can thus be no doubt that viśākha once denoted some kind of moulding forming part and feature of an edifice.

2 It would have been better if prāsāda and griha of this verse had interchanged places. As it is, prāsāda has to be taken in a sense different from that of griha (= building). One such sense is "a lofty seat or platform for spectators, terrace" and is supported by Śāṅkhāyana-Śrutiśāstra, XVI. 18.13 and Manusmṛti, II. 204. This sense suits here excellently.
(Verse 16) Some are intensely attached to music (so) pleasing to the ear; others, being proud of (the authorship of) a hundred excellent biographies, are conversant with wonderful tales; (others), filled with humility, are absorbed in excellent religious discourses; and others are able to say much that is pleasing, free from harshness, (and yet) salutary;

(Verse 17) Some excel in their own religious rites; likewise by others, who were self-possessed, the science of (Vedic) astronomy was mastered; and others, valorous in battle, even to-day forcibly cause harm to the enemies;

(Verse 18) Likewise, others are intelligent, possessed of attractive figures, with renowned and long-extending lineages and adorned with deeds befitting (their) lineage; others, with the vow of truthfulness, are expert in (conferring) obligations on favourites, and are firm in friendship accompanied by a sense of trust;

(Verse 19) Likewise, with others who have overcome attachment to worldly objects, who are disposed towards piety, who are gentle, who are of abundant inherent stuff, who are engaged on worldly affairs, who are the forehead-mark of their own clan, who have cast away passion, who are magnanimous-with such-like (members) the guild shines gloriously;

(Verse 20) Womankind, though saturated with youth and complexion (and) decorated with golden necklaces, betel leaves and flower-dressing, does not attain to transcendent beauty until she has put on a pair of silken garments;

(Verse 21) By whom this whole surface of the earth has been adorned with silk cloth, agreeable to the touch, variegated with different colours and arrangement (of parts), (and) pleasing to the eye;

(Verse 22) The mind of those has (turned) towards (spiritual) welfare, they having then reflected that the world, the human body and the accumulations of wealth are as very unsteady as the charming flower-sprout ear-ornaments of the Vidyādhara women, set in motion by the breezes;

(Verse 23) While Kumāragupta was ruling over the Earth, whose waist-girdle is pendulous with the waters of the four oceans, whose plump breasts are Sumēru and Kailāsa (and) whose smiles are the beautiful and full-blown flowers on the outskirts of the woods;

1 Apte's Sanskrit-English Dictionary gives the following as one of sense of āroha, etc., “Pride about the authorship of a thing (kastrii-ākhămāṇa).” This meaning suits here excellently. What the second line of this stanza apparently means is that, being the authors of the lives of historical personages, some of the members of the Guild are well-acquainted with heart-thrilling incidents and anecdotes connected with them.

2 The construction of the passage from verse 23 to verse 29 has very much exercised some scholars who have dealt with this inscription. There ought to be really no difficulty in properly understanding it. The skeleton of the passage is as follows: Kumāragupta pritiśāhā prāśātī (verse 23) Bandhuvarami........... Daśapara= idam pīlāyati, .... paṭjaḍaśṭatī .... śrvakaḥtirodīḥ= khananam .... kāritam dīpta-reimāḥ (verse 29) Mālavānām gaṇa-sāhiyā yātī sata-chaśvāhāyō tri-nacay-adāhā= bānām .... (verse 34); Sahasya-mūtra-saṅkhyāyō. . . . aham trayādyā manjīgal-āchāra-vidhāna prāśātī= yam niteśāḥ (verse 32) | Bhamud saṃmattāhā kūlīn= anvāsī= cha pāṭhikāhā naśtītyāḥ nīka-dīrō= syā khananāṣa (verse 36) | Sarvām. . . samhākārim= idam bhūyaḥ śṛvāyā bhūmaṇāmā gīhāṃ (verse 37); vatsara-sātāhā panchāha vibhāṣā-adāhāhā navasū cha= ēkāhāḥ rājāḥ . . Tapasya-mūtra-saṅkhyā-śivādyāṇā (verse 39) ‘‘While Kumāragupta was ruling over the Earth, (verse 23), ... while Bandhuvaram was protecting this (town of) Daśapara ... a temple of the bright-rayed (Sun) was caused to be made by the weavers of silk-cloth formed into a Guild (verse 29). When four centuries, increased by ninety-three had elapsed, according to the reckoning of the Mālavas (verse 34), on the thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Sahasya, this edifice was consecrated with ceremonies according to the precepts of auspiciousness (verse 35). When a considerable time and (also) other kings had passed away, one part of this (temple) was shattered (verse 36). This ... whole edifice of the Sun was renovated again by the Guild (verse 37), when five centuries of years increased by twenty and nine years had elapsed, on the second lunar day of the bright fortnight of Tapsaya month (verse 39)”.

It may be contended that this construction is open to the grave objection that the prāśātī does not give the names of the rulers, suzerain and feudatory, at the time when it was composed and engraved, but gives rather the name of Kumāragupta, the overlord, and, of Bandhuvaram, his chieftain, who ruled thirty-six years before. But there is nothing strange about

(Contd. on p. 330)
(Verse 24) There was king Viśvarman, the protector (of men), who was equal to Śukra and Brihaspati in understanding, who was the ornament of the kings on earth (and) whose deeds were like those of Pārtha in battles;

(Verse 25) Who was compassionate to the poor; who gave consolation to the helpless and the distressed classes; who was excessively full of tenderness; who was a protector of the forlorn; who was the wish-giving tree to the supplicants; and who granted freedom from fear to the frightened; and who was the friend of (his) subjects;

(Verse 26) His son (was) king Bandhuvartman possessed of firmness and statesmanship; beloved by (his) friends; a friend, as it were, to (his) people; who removed the afflictions of (his) friends; the only one skilful in destroying the haughty partisans of (his) enemies;

(Verse 27) He is handsome, young, fit for battles, and possessed of modesty; a king though he is, he is not accessible to such intoxicants as self-conceit and others; he shines like the incarnation of Erotic Sentiment, even when without decoration; in point of beauty he is as it were a second Goddess of Love;

(Verse 28) Even to-day, when the long-eyed beautiful women of (his) enemies, afflicted by the fierce calamity of widowhood, remember him, a tremor springs up through fright causing torture to (their) compact breasts.

(Verse 29) While that same Bandhuvarman, a bull among kings, the magnanimous (and) the high-shouldered one, was protecting this (town of) Daśapura which was abundantly prosperous, a lofty and peerless temple of the bright-rayed (Sun) was caused to be made by the weavers of silk-cloth formed into a guild, with stores of wealth acquired through (their) craft;

(Verse 30) (The temple) which has broad and lofty spires, which (thus) resembles a mountain, is pale-red like the mass of the rays of the moon just risen, and, being charming to the eye, shines like the tucked-in lovely crest-jewel of the western ward (of the town);

(Verse 31) (In the season) which is pleasant in consequence of the interiors of the houses being crowded with young women (and) in consequence of the rays of the sun, (and) the warmth of fire, during which the fish lie deep in water and which is destitute of the enjoyments (caused by) the rays of the moon, flat roofs of houses, sandal paste, palm-leaf fans, and garlands; and when the water-lilies are bitten by the frost;

(Verse 32) In the season which is charming on account of the swarms of bees exhilarating with the juice of the full-blown flowers of the rōdhra (and) the priyangu trees and the jasmine creeper, when the solitary branches of myriads² of the lāvāli creepers dance with the winds violently cold with particles of frost;

it, because Vatsabhātī was not only the composer of the panegyric but also the Overseer who was in charge of the building and re-building of the temple. And in the present case the re-building was of a fragment only. Consequently, the more important thing was the original construction and consecration of the edifice. Secondly, it was apparently a delicate matter to mention the name of the ruler during whose reign the temple was restored. Possibly Bandhuvarman was alive, as appears from stanzas 27-28. But during the thirty-six years intervening between 493 and 529 the two dates of this record, there was apparently a good deal of change in the succession to the Gupta throne. This change again was of a more or less violent character. That seems to be the reason why the ruling Gupta king is not mentioned and why the vague phraseology anyasi—cha pārthīwaḥ has been employed by Vatsabhātī. Nevertheless, as this inscription does not mention any ruler in the year 529 this has been taken to be an uncommon procedure by some scholars who have therefore proposed a different construction of the whole passage (See e.g. Panna Lall's article on The Dates of Shandragupta and his Successors in the Hindustan Review, for January, 1918, pp. 15 and ff.; D. B. Dikshitar's article in JBBRS., Vol. II (N.S.), p. 176, and his Selections from Sanskrit Inscriptions, Vol. I, pt. II, p. 64). Thus it is suggested that whereas the date 529 in verse 39 is connected with Kumāragupta (II) in verse 25, the date 493 in verse 34 with Bandhuvarman in verse 29. But the late R. D. Banerji (ABORI., Vol. I, p. 79) and Dassaharatha Sharma (JC., Vol. III, p. 380) are quite right in saying that whereas Kumāragupta was the suzerain and Bandhuvarman the ruler of Daśapura in 493 when the temple was built, the inscription with equal unambiguity is silent about the rulers in 529 when it was repaired.

(Verse 33) When the falling of frost and snow is derived by the fast claspings of the massive, lovely and plump thighs, breasts and hips of the beloved women by young men, fallen into the power of sexual love;

(Verse 34) When four centuries, increased by ninety-three, had elapsed, according to the reckoning of the Mālavas, in the season when the massive breasts (of women) are worthy of enjoyment, on the blessed thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Sahasya, this edifice was consecrated with the performance of auspicious ceremonies;

(Verse 35) When considerable time had passed away and, one part of this (temple) was shattered; hence now, for the augmentation of their own fame was again renovated most munificently by the magnanimous guild, this whole edifice of the Sun.

(Verse 36) Which is very lofty, burnished, as it were touching the sky with (its) attractive spires, (and) has become the receptacle of spotless rays of the moon and the sun at (their) rise;

(Verse 37) When five centuries of years increased by twenty and nine years had elapsed, on the second lunar day of the bright fortnight of the charming month of Tapasya;

1 Fleet has rendered the verse as follows: "And, in the course of a long time, under other kings, part of this temple, fell into disrepair." It will thus be seen that anyaischa pārthivaiś that the verse has been translated as "under other kings." This, however, is inadmissible. The word cha and the instrumental case in anyaischa pārthivaiś show that and instrumental case new from the first quarter of the verse has to be understood after the latter also. But this has been considered defective by Dasharatha Sharma, as "it connects samaditāna, an adjective in the singular number with pārthivaiś, a noun in the plural, while the general rule is that a noun and its defining word should be of the same number" (IC, Vol. III, p. 380). He, however, does not cite any grammatical rule which compels one to this procedure. As it is, there are instances, from classical poetry, of a contrary nature. Thus Bhavabhūti's Utara-rādamasmita has Yāsah kulāduh svatat cha guravayavat cha. If Sharma's rule had been obligatory, we should have had gurav vayavat cha. Similarly, in Kālidāsa's Rājagīrīya, XVII, 71 we have na chaśabhatatatvato kṣayat. Here also kṣayat, an adjective in the singular number, goes not only with sā but also with tā which is in the dual. Nothing therefore precludes us from taking samaditāna with pārthivaiś, although the first is in the singular and the second in the plural. It is better, however, to take anyaischa pārthivaiś as instrumental absolute and translate it by "and with other kings", or "when (others were) other rulers". Sharma further remarks: "But the significance of the instrumental case in pārthivaiś, and the passive voice in vyāsūyata, a form formed from the Paramālaṃadi root 3ri of the 9th conjugation, can be brought fully, only if we translate the verse as follows: "After much time had passed, a part of this building was destroyed by other kings." If this translation is accepted, cha following anyaischa becomes meaningless. Besides, it is natural to connect samaditāna with pārthivaiś, as just pointed out. In this way alone cha attains its full significance. "Nor can it be argued" proceeds Sharma further "that vyāsūyata is the bhuva-śācnya form of the root vi-śr, for in that case the expression should have been ikṣaśāna vyāsūyata instead of ikṣaśāna-parvyāsūyata found in the verse." It is not quite clear why this argument has been urged. Because even Apte's Sanskrit-English Dictionary gives for vi-śr (past) the primary sense of "to be split in pieces, be shattered," and illustrates it with a quotation from Bhartrihari's Śatāca, namely, viśārya maniṁ-cha ed. This suits here excellently. Part of the temple not only fell into disrepair but was shattered within thirty-six years of its construction, may be, through lightning, as from the inscription it appears that it was a building of considerable height. Many a monument of the ancient period must have suffered similarly. To take one instance, it is well-known that in the celebrated Allahābād pillar there is a large crack in the column, from about the first word of the first line, and extending down to the beginning of the fourteenth of Samudrāgupta's prasasti inscribed upon it and further that the bell-shaped capital and the surmounting animal figure have not been traced and seem to have disappeared even before the time of the Moghul emperor Jehangir. We may, therefore, take it until the contrary is proved that the Sun Temple of Daśapura also suffered this fate. The surmise that Hāṇa vandalism was responsible for it (IC, Vol. III, p. 381) is not well-founded, because if these barbarians had at all wanted to destroy the sacred lān, they would have done so completely, and not destroyed it in part. Besides, it is very doubtful whether iconoclasm was at all known to India before the advent of the Muhammadan power. The pro-Muhammadan foreigners became Hindusised as fast as they came in touch with the Indian culture and civilisation. And, further, as a matter of fact, the Hāṇas penetrated into the interior of India after Budhagupta whose last date is Gupta year 175 = 493 a.d., whereas the date of the Mandasor inscription is Vikrama Year 529-472 a.d.

2 A novel interpretation has been proposed for this line by K. Rama Pisharoti. He translates it by "after five (Contd. on p. 332)"
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(Verse 40) In the season when (Kāmadēva), whose body is purified by Hara, displays (his) arrows, having verily attained to (his) identity, with the distinct and fresh bursting-forth of the flowers of the Aśoka tree, the Ketaka, the Śrīnduvāra, the pendulous Atimuktaka creeper and the Madayantikāa;

(Verse 41) In the season, when the solitary large branches of the Nagana are full of the music of the swarms of bees delighted with the drinking of honey, when the lovely and exuberant Rādhra (trees) are overstrewn with flowers newly bursting forth;

(Verse 42) As (is) the pure sky with the moon, the breast of Śārīrīgan, indeed, with the Kaustubha jewel, so is this whole extensive town decorated with (this) best structure;

(Verse 43) As long as Ṭaśa (Śiva) bears a mass of tawny matted hair covered with the spotless digit of the moon, (and) as long as Śārīrīgan (Viśnū) a garland of full-bloom lotus flowers clinging to (his) shoulders, so long may this stupendous structure remain eternal.

(Verse 44) By Vatsabhaṭṭi1 was caused to be made this edifice of the Sun through the order of the guild and in consequence of (his) devotion (to the god), and was composed with care this detailed description;2

(Line 24) Hail to the composer, engraver, reader and listener! May there be luck!

NO. 36 A AND B: PLATE XXXVI

SĀRṆĀTH STONE INSCRIPTIONS OF BUDHAGUPTA; THE YEAR 157

These two inscriptions, A and B, which bear the same draft came to light along with No. 26 when excavations were carried on by H. Hargreaves in the cold season of 1914-15 at hundred and twenty-nine years had elapsed,' "not as others have taken, in the Mālava era, but, as I hold, after the construction of the temple. In other words, I have assigned the renovation of the temple to 493 + 529 or 1023 M.E., i.e., in 966 A.D. (K., Vol. IV, p. 111; S. Krisnasaivani Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, pp. 69-73). He argues that the temple was of such a noble and stately structure that it could not have fallen into disrepair within the comparatively short space of thirty-six years. Two agents of destruction were at work here: (1) the passage of time primarily and (2) the indifference of kings secondarily — kings who belonged to a family different from the one which built the temple originally. This line of reasoning, we fear, will not commend itself to any epigraphist. Because, according to Pisharoti, 966 A.D. is the date of the inscription; and no epigraphist will ever subscribe to the conclusion that palaeographically it belongs to the tenth century. Secondly, there can be no doubt that the temple was renovated by the same śrīgī that constructed it. This is clear from verses 29, 37, 44. And it is incredible that any śrīgī could have lasted for 529 years, that is, from Mālava year 493 to 1023 (=966 A.D.), if Pisharoti's view is upheld. Thirdly, why should we assume such a long period as that of 529 years to have elapsed before the renovation took place? There is nothing to show that the temple had fallen into disrepair as has been assumed by many scholars. It is quite possible that the word svaśrūyata in verse 36 means 'was shattered' as has been pointed out by us above. And there is nothing at all improbable in a high building being struck and partially damaged by lightning within thirty-six years of its construction.

1 Neither Fleet nor Bühlner has properly understood this verse. What it really means is that Vatsabhaṭṭi not only composed the pātra but was also in charge of the operations of the building and re-building of the temple. This work he undertook and executed on account of the orders of the Guild and also on account of his devotion to the deity, that is, on account of his being a worshipper of the Sun. This is the natural sense of the verse. And it is a wonder how it did not occur to other scholars who slavishly followed Fleet and Bühlner. The scholar who first understood the general sense of the verse correctly was K. Rama Pisharoti (S. Krisnasaivani Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, p. 70). He is, however, not correct in taking Vatsabhaṭṭi to be a sthapati or architect. He was rather a Kārāpaka such as is mentioned in many inscriptions of Northern India in connection with temples. Thus an epigraphic record of Varmalāṭa dated Vikrama year 682 and found in Vasanatagaḍ in the Srīhari District, Rājasthān, speaks of the erection of a temple of Kalēshvarāy by the Gāhāy of Vājākrāstānā who selected one Saryadaśa as the Kārāpaka for seeing the work through (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 192, verse 9). Kārāpaka does not mean 'one who causes a temple to be constructed,' but rather 'a person appointed to look after the construction of a temple' as has been so conclusively shown by Kiellhorn (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 62, note 53). Vatsabhaṭṭi thus appears to have been a Kārāpaka entrusted by the Guild with the execution of the building and re-building of the Sun temple.

2 For the correct sense of the word pātra, see page 241, note 1 above.
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G. S. Gai

From photograph
Sārnāth near Banaras in Uttar Pradesh and were transcribed and translated by Y. R. Gupte in the *A.R. ASI*, for 1914-15, pp. 124 ff., Nos. XVI and XVII and Plate LXIX, o and p. Both are engraved on the pedestals of Buddha images. The proper left half of the second inscribed stone (B), it seems, had been destroyed but was replaced by a piece of halo of a somewhat earlier period but engraved with the missing part of the inscription. The writings on both these parts belong practically to the same Gupta period but seems to be the works of two different hands.

The writing on each is in three lines. But what space each originally covered it is difficult now to determine, as the inscriptions are in a fragmentary condition. The average size of letters is \( \frac{3}{4} \)". The characters belong to the northern class of the Gupta alphabet and are practically identical with those of No. 26. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscriptions are in verse throughout. In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice is the doubling of \( t \) in conjunction with a following \( r \).

The inscriptions refer to the reign of the Imperial Gupta king Budhagupta. They are dated, in words, when a century of years increased by fifty-seven of the Guptas had passed away, on the seventh day of the month of Vaiśākha, when the asterism Mūla was visible. These are Buddhist inscriptions; and their object is to record the installation of the images of the Buddha, on the aforesaid date, by Abhayamitra, the same donor as in No. 26.

**TEXT**

(A)

[Metres: Verses 1 to 4 *Anuśūbhā*]


3 chitra-vīnyāsa-chitrāṁ (tām) [3*] Yad=asti pun[ya]ṁ p[ra]timāṁ kārayitvā mam=āstu1 tat [1 *] [mātāpittrōr=gurūnāṁ cha lōkasya cha śām-āpta[yē] [1*] [4*]

(B)

1 [Guptāṃnāṁ samati][krāntē*] [sapta-paṁchāśa]d-uttarē [1*] śatē samānāṁ prīthiviṁ Budhagu[ptē*] praśāsatē [1*] Vaiśākha-māsa-saptamyāṁ Mūlec=śma-


3 [chitra-vīnyāsa-chitrāṁ(tām)*] [1*] [Yad=asti punyaṁ pratimāṁ kārayitvā mam=āstu tat*] [1*] mātāpittrōr=g[ū]rū[ṇ]āṁ cha lōkā[s]ya cha [śa]m-āpta[yē] [1*] [4*]

---

1 As corrected by Prof. Jagan Nath (*JUPHS.*, Vol. XIII, p. 100; *PIHC.*, 1940, p. 60, No. 7.) He, however, omits tat after sam=āṣṭa.
THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS

TRANSLATION

(A and B)

(Verse 1) When a century of years, increased by fifty-seven of the Guptas had passed away, when Budhagupta was ruling the earth;

(Verse 2) On the seventh of the month of Vaiśākha, when (the asterism) Mūla was visible in the sky, the image was caused to be made by me, Abhayamitra, a Buddhist monk.

(Verses 3 and 4) Having caused to be made this wonderful image of (Buddha) accompanied by Devaputra, decorated with hands upraised, exquisite umbrella and lotus throne, (and) painted with a layer of painting, whatever spiritual merit accrues, may it be for the attainment of the extinction (of worldly existence) by (my) parents and preceptors and of mankind!

No. 37: PLATE XXXVII

VĀRĀṆASI STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF BUDHAGUPTA; THE YEAR 159

The pillar containing the inscription was discovered sometime in 1940-41 at Rājghat in Vārāṇasi, Uttar Pradesh and is now preserved in the Bhārat Kalā-bhavan at Vārāṇasi. It was first noticed by Adris Bancerji in JGJRI, Vol. III (1945), pp. 1 ff. and plate and subsequently published by D. C. Sircar in JRAI., (Letters), Vol. XV (1949), pp. 5-7 and plate.

The pillar is approximately 4 feet and 4½ inches in height. It is rectangular at base up to 2 feet 4½ inches which contains four niches in which there are four avalīras of Viṣṇu. The characters belong to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet except in the case of the letter ḷ which is of the western type. The numerical symbols for 8, 9, 20, 50 and 100 occur in the record. The language is Sanskrit which is not free from mistakes of grammar. In respect of orthography, it may be noted that the consonant following r is reduplicated.

The inscription belongs to the reign of Mahārājādhirāja Budhagupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. It is dated in the Gupta year 159, the 28th day of the month of Mārgaśirsha. This date could correspond to 478 A.D. The object of the inscription is to record the erection of a stone pillar by a lady named Dāmasvāmini, daughter of Māravisha (?), a resident of Pārvārika, while her mother's name seems to be Sābhāṭi. The purpose for which the pillar was erected has not been mentioned in the record but it has been suggested that the use of the word stambha indicates that it was votive in nature and that it has been set up in a religious establishment with a view to acquiring merit.1

There is only one geographical name in the inscription viz. Pārvārika which cannot be identified.

TEXT

1 Ša[mva]9 100 50 9 Mārgga di4 [20] 8 Mahārājādhirāja-
2 Budha[gu]tpa5-rājyē Pārvvarika-vāstavya-Māra
3 [visha ?]-duhitā(trā) Sābhāṭi (?)-duhi[trā*] cha Dāmasvā-
4 mi[nyā] śilā-stambha sthā[p]itah [ii *]

2 From impressions.
3 Read satnātsarē.
4 I.e. Mārgaśirsha-divasē.
5 Read Budhagupta.
VĀRĀṆASI STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF BUDHAGUPTA: THE YEAR 159
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TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-4) On the twenty-eighth day of Mārgaśīrṣha in the year 159, during the reign of Māharājādhirāja Budhagupta, the stone pillar is set up by Dāmasvāmī (who is) the daughter of Māravisha (?), an inhabitant of Pārvarika and is also the daughter of Sābhāti (?).

No. 38 : PLATE XXXVIII

DÄMÖDARPUR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF BUDHAGUPTA: THE YEAR 163

This inscription also was discovered in the village of Dämödarpur, about eight miles west of the Police Station Phulbāri in Dinajpur District, West Bengal, in the same circumstances as Nos. 22 and 24, above. It is now deposited, along with them, in the Museum of the Varṇāstra Research Society, Rajshahi, Bangladesh. And it was edited by Radhagovinda Basak in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, pp. 134 ff., and Plate iii a and b.

The plate is one in number, but is inscribed on both sides, the first containing eight and the second five lines of writing as in Nos. 22 and 24, above. It measures 7¾" by 3½". The edges thereof have not been raised into rims for the protection of the writing. The plate is slightly thicker than those described in Nos. 22 and 24. The letters are well executed and well preserved except in some places where they have been eaten up by verdigris. It is not known whether there was any seal attached to it. The weight of the plate is 13 tolas. The characters belong, generally speaking, to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet as remarked about the plate described in No. 22. The other palaeographical points that deserve notice are: (1) the occurrence of the initial vowel  ámb in ákṣhpā, line 13; (2) the peculiar form of the medial á after ṹ, dh, and b, indicated by a hook attached to the bottom on the proper left of these letters, as in -brāhmaṇ-āryān=, line 4, -avadhāritam, line 6, -bāhy-āprada-, line 5, and so forth; and (3) the joining of t or n to the following p and s as in tut-pāda-, line 1, vṛindakāt=sā-, line 2 and -āryān=pratīvāśayītum, line 4. The characters also include, in line 1, forms of the numerical symbols for 3 and 10. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout except the three benedictory and imprecatory verses in lines 11-13. In respect of orthography we have to note (1) that the visarga followed by s has been changed to that letter, as in māttī-pitrāsa=sva-puṣya-, line 4 and so on; (2) that the letters g, t, dh, m, y, v and sh are doubled in conjunction with a following r, as in svarga, line 13, karttum=, line 6, samyagahāribhir=ddharmam=, line 11, -brāhmaṇ-āryān=, line 4, -śrvaṇa, line 9, maharshabhir=, line 11, and so forth; (3) that the final m of a word, instead of being changed to an anusvāra, is joined to the following p as in svadattām=para-, line 11; and (4) that the letter b is distinguished from v and is denoted by its own sign, e.g., brāhmaṇ-ādhyaksha-, line 3, brāhmaṇ-āryān=, line 4, and so on.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Paramadaiwata Paramabhaṭṭāraka Māharājādhirāja Budhagupta, that is, Budhagupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. Its date, in numerical symbols, seems to be the year one hundred and sixtythree (481-82 A.D.) on the thirteenth day of Āśādhā (June-July). Under Budhagupta was Māharājā Brahmabatta as Head (Upapika) of the Pundaravahana province (bhukti). The plate then refers to the Ashtakula Board of Palāśavṛindaka, headed by the Mahattara Officer and associated with the Viśvaśa (Accountant) Officer and husbandmen (Kutumbins) and speaks of a communication issued by them to the husbandmen of the Chaṇḍa village, in regard to an application made by Nābhaka, a native of that village, for the purchase of some waste land for settling down certain Brāhmaṇas. And we are told that, with the approval of the record-keeper Patradāsa,
he was given one kulyavāpā of waste land on the receipt of two dināras, with the direction that its exact location should be fixed up somewhere alongside of Satya and Vāyi-grāma by the (Local) Board of Chanḍa headed by the Mahattara after duly measuring it in accordance with the customary Nālas.

Of the localities specified in the record Vāyi-grāma is doubtless the same as Vāyi-grāma or Baigram where a plate⁴ of the Gupta period was found. Baigram is of course situated in the Bogra District, now in Bangladesh. The other locality, Satya, is untraceable.

**TEXT**

[Metres: Verses 1 to 3 Amuḫubh]

**First Side**

1. [Sam 100*] [60] 3 Ashāqhā di 10 3 Paramadaivata-Paramabhaṭṭā[ra]ka-mahā-
3. [rā]ṇa[r]i² grāmikakuṭumvīnā²=cha Chanḍagrāmaka⁴-brāhmaṇ-āyaksha⁵-
   kṣudra-prakṛiti-kūṭumvīnāḥ⁶ kuśalam=uktv=anudarśayanti [yathā*]
4. [v]i[jh]āpyanatī² nō grāmika-Nābhakō=ham=icchhē⁷ mātā-pitrō=s-āpya-
   yānāyāna kādīcid⁸=brāhmaṇ-āryyān=pratīvāsāya[ṃ]-
5. tad=arhatā grām-ānukrama-vikraya-marīyādāvya mattō hiraṇyam=upasaṃ-
   grihya samudaya-bāhy-āyapa-khila-[kṣhētrasya]¹⁰
6. [pra*]sādāṃ kartum=[i*]ti [i*] yataḥ pustapāla-Patradāśān=āvadhāritam-
   yuktam=anēna vijñāpitam=asty=aṣyāṃ vikraya-
7. marīyādā-prasaṅgas=tad=diyatām=asya Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārāja-pā[da-
   nāṃ]¹¹ punyā-pāchayāy=āti [i*] punar=ays=aiva
8. [Patradā]sasy=āvadhārānay=āvadhṛitya Nābhaka-hastād=diṇāra-dvayam¹²=upa-
   saṅgrihita Sthānavāla²⁰. Kapilāśrībhadrābhyyām=āy[i*]kritya cha samudaya-

**Second Side**

9. [bāhyā-āyapa-khī*]la-kṣhētrasya kulyavāpam=ekam=asya Vāyi-grāmaka-ottara-
   pārsvasy=aiva cha Satya-marīyādāya daṅkhīpa-pācchīma-pūrvvēṇa
10. Maha[tta]jāry-ādy-adhikaraṇa-kūṭumvībhihi⁴⁴ pratyavekṣhī=āṣṭaka-nava(ka- (navaka)-

---

¹ Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, pp. 78 ff.
² Basak reads Mahattar-ādy-āṣṭākula-ādhikaraṇa-grāmika-kūṭumvīnaḥ=cha which makes hardly any sense. Besides, it makes cha superfluous. We had therefore better read Mahattar-ādy-āṣṭākula-ādhikaraṇa grāmika-kūṭumvīnaḥ=cha.
³ Ṛcand -kūṭumvīnaḥ=.
⁴ Basak reads -grāmakē.
⁵ Basak reads -brāhmaṇādy-anṇa-.
⁶ Ṛcand -kūṭumvīnaḥ.
⁷ Ṛcand vijñāpayati.
⁸ Ṛcand =ičchhēyāni.
⁹ Ṛcand kaṭichid=.
¹⁰ Basak reads -kṣhētrasya.
¹¹ Basak reads -pūrṇa-.
¹² The word -dvayam= was at first inadvertently omitted, but was afterwards engraved immediately below -diṇāra-.
¹³ Basak reads Sthānagāla-.
¹⁴ Ṛcand -kūṭumvībhihi.
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nalabhyaṃ = apavičchhhyā cha [kṛṣhimtā n = ो च च हिंदिया] cha Nābha[क्या] 11 [dēyam ētād-um]ttara-kālam samvyavahāribhir = ddharmām = avēkṣhāya prati-
pālaniyam = uktanā = cha maharshih[ṛṣhi] bhih [ἰ*] Sva-dattām = para-dattām
vā yō harēta vasundharāṃ[ṛēṃ] [ἰ*]

12 [sa visiiṭhā]*yām kṛmēr = bhūtvā pitribhis = saha pachayatē [ἰ*] Bahubhir =
vvasudhā dattā rājabhīṣ = Sagarādibhīṣ [ἰ*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis = tasya
tasya

13 [tadd*] phalaṃ(lam)[] [ἰ*] Shashṭisā varshāḥ(rsha)-sahasrāṇi svarggē mōdāti
bhūmidaḥ [ἰ*] ākṣheptā ch = ənumantā cha tānya-ēva narāke vasēd = iti4

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-2) [The year is 100] (and) 60 (and) 3, (the month of) Āśāḥda, the day 10
(and) 3, while Paramadavina Paramaḥāṭjaraka Mahārajaḍhūraja, the prosperous
Budhapugata, is the lord of the earth; (and) while the Mahāraja Brahmadattā, the Upārika of the
Pundravardhana Province, selected by His (Majesty’s) feet, is carrying on the administration;
(Lines 2-3) Hail! From Palāśāvaṇīkada, the Ṭaśṭakula Board9 headed by the Mahattara,9
in conjunction with Vīśvāsa,7 and, the husbandmen8 who are village headmen,9 after enquiring

1 Basak reads taśṭakulā(ḥ)āya which makes no sense. Our reading is in accord with -karshha-dvīrhdh-sthānā in
line 18 of the Baigrama copper-plate inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, p. 82).
2 Read = ो च हिंदिया.
3 Read pratipātanym = utakāra =
4 Read nātē = in 3*].
5 Aśṭakula, like Paṭṭakula, was one of the local self-government in ancient India. In the first, eight, and, in
the second, five, representatives of village families were taken to form a Board to decide a dispute that might arise.
That Aśṭakula was a proper institution may be seen from the fact that the Affakathūr or Commentary of
Buddhaghoṣa on the Mahāparinibbāṇavatattvānta speaks of Affahakulaха while giving an account of the judicial
procedure prevalent in the Vajjiran kingdom (D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures 1918, p. 153; B. G. Law, Some Kha-
triya Tribes of Ancient India, p. 103). For the exact sense of adhikaraṇa affixed to Aśṭakula in this expression, see note
7, p. 286 above.
6 This word occurs in the Faridpur grants also, where Parjker renders it by “men of position in the villages,
the leading men” (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXIX, p. 213). A common title for the headman of a village in East Bengal
now, says he further in the foot-note, is Māṭabhar or Māṭabār, which he derives from the Arabic miṭba₂r, “trust-
worthy”, reputable.12 A. S. Atkare says that Mahattara by itself signifies ‘village elders’, and consequently the
expression Mahattar-ādhikārīka, ‘Officers appointed from among the village elders’ (A History of Village Communities in
Western India, p. 21). According to Bhagvanlal Indrajit “Mahāṭāra the Marāṭhī for an old man is the same word.
In the Valabhi plates mahāṭāra seems to be generally used to mean the accredited headman of a village, recog-
nised as headman both by the people of the village and by the Government” (BG., Vol. I, Pr. I, p. 81). He had
better be taken as the accredited Head of a village community appointed by the state from among its lowest revenue
officials.

7 The term Vīśvāsa occurs not only in this but also in another inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, p. 54, text
line 1). In both the places it is rendered by ‘with confidence,’ which, however, yields no sense. It seems to have
survived in the modern Bengali surname Biseswars, which is found not only among Hindus but also Muhammadans.
Originally it most probably denoted “the village accountant”. Titles like Vīśvāsa-rāṇya and Vīśvāsa-khāna meaning
‘Lord Chancellor of the Exchequer’ were known to medieval Bengal (Ibid., Vol. XXIV, p. 129).
8 In Ancient India it seems that the middle classes were divided principally into kṣātriyas or cultivators and
grīhaptis or mercantile people. Each of these was further distinguished into a number of smaller groups. Thus we
hear of Gahapati-Nēgama (Liders’ List, No. 1001, 1127 and 1153), Gahapati-Sēti (Ibid., Nos. 1056, 1073 and
1075) and Gahapati-Sathavārā (Ibid., No. 1062). It will thus be seen that Grahapatis were divided into Śrēṣṭhāns,
Śrāvathāns and Nāgamas. As regards Kūṭumbara, in one inscription a Hālakiya or ploughman is spoken of as
Kuṭumbika (Kuṭumbika) whereas his son was a Gahapati (Grahapati) (Ibid., No. 1121). What the other groups of
the Kūṭumbinae were we do not know. In modern times the term Grahapati has been entirely forgotten, but Kūṭum-
binas is still traceable in the Mārāṭhi Kūṭambikā and the Gujarati Kanch, both denoting the cultivating classes.
9 Grāmīka-kūṭumbarāḥ is divided by Basak into two words and rendered by “the village-heads (grāmikuṇa) and the
householders.” He rightly explains grāmika by saying that “this word is used by Manu in verses 116 and 116 of
(Contd. on p. 338)
about (their) health, inform the husbandmen of the village Chandaka who are inferior Ryots and are presided over by the Brahmanas, as follows:

(Lines 3-6) The village headman Nabhaka, has petitioned to us: 'for the augmentation of (my) parents' and my own spiritual merit, I am desirous of settling down certain venerable Brahmanas. Deign ye, therefore, to do me the favour of (granting) waste land, excluded from revenue and not yielding (anything), according to the rule of sale customary in the village, after accepting gold from me.'

(Lines 6-11) 'Whereas it has been determined by the record-keeper Patradasa that 'this is a case (falling) under the rule of sale and that (land) may be granted to him for the augmentation of the good fortune of the venerable Paramabhattaraka Maharanja, in the receipt of two dinaras from the hands of Nabhaka and on (the same) being credited (to the treasury) by Sthanaivala and Kapila-Sribhadra, one kujavaapa of waste land, (excluded) from revenue (and) not yielding (anything), has been assigned to him, as determined by the determination of that same Patradasa, (somewhere) on the south, west and east of the boundary of Satya on the north side of the Vayi village. And this should be allotted to Nabhaka after being inspected by the husbandmen under the (Asthakula) Board headed by Mahattara, after severing it with eight (-cubit) by nine (-cubit) nalas4 and without detriment to (their) culti-

Chapter VII with reference to the head of the village, who had the right to enjoy several privileges, e.g., to use for himself the king's dues received from the villagers' (Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, p. 137 and note 3). It is, however, forgotten that grtimika occurs not only in line 3 but also in line 4 and that in both cases it should be taken in the same sense. But, whereas, in line 3 the word is taken by Basak to signify 'the village-head,' in line 4 it is taken by him in the sense of 'of this village.' Besides, as has just been pointed out, mahattara apparently denotes the Head of the village community. Grtimika had thus better be taken in the sense of 'a village headman,' so as to suit both the places where it occurs.

Nala ordinarily means 'a reed,' but here it denotes the measuring reed. The expression asthaka-nawaka-nalabhyan occurs also in line 18 of Bajgram Copper-Plate Inscription (Ep. Ind. Vol. XXI, pp. 81 ff.). The same expression is found in the Faridpur plates (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXIX, pp. 200 ff.), but here nala has been used in the singular. In regard to the measurement of land in East Bengal, F. E. Pargiter makes the following pertinent remarks: 'The commonest land-measure in the eastern districts of Bengal has been the kazi, though it is now being superseded by the standard Government bigha. It is not a square, but an oblong. Its dimensions vary in different localities, its measurements being 24 x 20 reeds or 24 x 16, or 12 x 10. (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXIX, p. 215)'. It seems that this land-measure in the Guptan period was 9 x 6, that is to say, one side of it was a Nala nine cubits in length and the other a Nala eight cubits in breadth. The Nala measure varied in different localities and at different periods in Bengal. But it was always measured in terms of hasta. Thus the Tarapaddhali plate of Lakshamapanca has tattaya-diza-cyacahare-nalena (Inscr. of Bengal, Vol. III p. 102, line 36) and the Govindapur plate of the same king has tad-dizya-sanyasahara-shapetetabhit-hasta-perimata-nalena (ibid., p. 96, lines 36-57). This shows that different districts had Nalas of different measure in the Sena period and that in the Vardhamana bhakti the Nala measured 56 hastas or cubits. There was also an attempt in the Sena period to have a standard Nala. Thus, we find the expression Vishakhasikara-nala in the Sena records (ibid., p. 74, line 45; p. 87, lines 35-37), where Visakhbashakara is doubtless the bhruta of Vijayasena. It is true that in the Sena epoch the land was measured by the linear Nala but prior to the time of the Falias it was by the oblong Nala, as we have seen above. But this oblong Nala was 9 hastas long and 8 hastas broad. That after asthaka and nawaka the expression asthaka-nawaka-nalabhyan, hasta is understood, may be seen from the fact that it is immediately succeeded by Darvikkarna-nalena in the Bajgram plate mentioned above, which obviously means 'in accordance with the hand of Darvikkarna.' A similar expression occurs in two of the Faridpur grants referred to above, namely, Savachandra-hari-asthaka-nawaka-nalena, where it has been rendered by Pargiter by 'according to the standard measure of eight reeds in breadth and nine reeds in length by the hand of . . . Savachandra' (Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXIX, pp. 202 and 203). That somebody, a king or an officer fixed up the standard hasta can scarcely be doubted. The phrase Vishakhbashakara-nala has already been referred to. We may also draw attention to Chandradasa-karpaya nala-pramohana and Srikarana-Sivadasa-muneko-nala-pramohana (JASB., 1896, Pt. I, p. 255, line 2; p. 256, line 12). The hasta was, no doubt, sometimes that of the king, as the phrase Vishakhbashakara-nala indicates. Sometimes it denoted that of a holy man, because Savachandra whose hasta has been adverted to in the Faridpur grants has been described as dhammatattva, 'righteous.' Whether it similarly denoted the hasta of the officer Karapa or Srikarana mentioned in the aforesaid Orissa plates is doubtful. What is here intended is that they fixed how many hastas a Nala should comprise and of what length a hasta should

(Contd. on p. 339)
vation. (And) the future administrators should guard it looking (upon it) as a religious gift.”

(Verse 1) He, who takes away land given by himself or by others, having become a worm in excreta, rots with his forefathers.

(Verse 2) Land has been granted by many kings, Sagara and others. The fruit (of such grant) belongs to whosoever possesses the earth (at any time).

(Verse 3) The giver of land rejoices in heaven for sixty thousand years. He who resumes it and he who assests to (it) may dwell in hell for exactly those (years).

No. 39 : PLATE XXXIX

ÉRÂN STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF BUDHAGUPTA: THE YEAR 165

This inscription was discovered in 1838 by Captain T.S. Burt, of the Engineers, and was first brought to notice in the same year, in the J.B.A.S., Vol. VII, pp. 633 ff., when James Prinsep published his reading of the text, and a translation of it, accompanied by a lithograph (ibid., Plate xxx), reduced from an ink-impression made by Captain Burt. In 1861, in the same Journal, Volume XXX, pp. 17 ff., Fitz Edward Hall published his revised reading of the text, from the original pillar, and a translation of it. And finally, in 1880, in the C.A.S.I.R., Vol. X, p. 82, General Cunningham, in reprinting Hall’s translation, pointed out that the akṣaras in line 3,—in which Prinsep had found a reference to the Surāśṭras; and which Hall read as saṁsūrabhā, and translated by “chosen land of the gods,”—were in reality a repetition of the date in numerical symbols, as had, in fact, been suggested, though without particularisation, by Hall himself, in the J.B.A.S., Vol. XXX, p. 127, note. It was for the first time critically edited by J.F. Fleet in the C.I.L., Vol. III, 1888, pp. 88 and ff., and Plate XII A.

This is another inscription from Érān in the Khurā Sub-Division of the Sagar District in Madhya Pradesh. It is on the west face towards the bottom of the lower and square part of a large monolith red-sandstone column, which stands near the well-known group of temples about half a mile to the west of the village, and which seems from its position to be specially connected with a small double temple that General Cunningham has named the “Lakṣmī Temple,” separated by the intervening “Vīṣṇu Temple” from the “Varāha Temple” or temple of the Boar, at which there is the well-known inscription of Tōrāmāṇa.

The writing, which covers a space of about 2’ 6½” broad by 1’ 7½” high, has suffered a good deal in places from the weather; but on the original column the whole inscription can be read with certainty, except a few letters at the proper left side that have been quite worn away by sharpening tools on the edge of the stone. The bottom line of the inscription is about 3’ 3” above the plinth from which the column rises. The size of the letters varies from ¼” to ⅛”. The characters on the whole belong to the southern variety of the Gupta alphabet; because though m is of the eastern type, ɔ, h and so forth are unquestionably of the Malwa

---

2 See page 221 above.
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variety. The letter r̥, as the first part of a compound consonant, is formed sometimes within the top line of the writing, e.g., in ānnava-, line 8 and sometimes above it, e.g., in -parasyaṅkaḥ, in the same line. The characters include, in line 3, forms of the numerical symbols for 5, 60, and 100. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in verse as far as line 4, and the rest in prose. In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice is the constant doubling of t̥, in conjunction with a following r̥, e.g., in Mahāratnija-, line 5; pautṛṇa, line 6; and -pitrō, line 8.

The inscription opens with a verse in praise of Vishnu whose ensign is Garuḍa (verse 1). Then we are told that when one hundred and sixty-five years had elapsed (marked also in numerical symbols) and when Budhagupta was the lord of the earth and on Thursday, the twelfth lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month of Āśādha (verse 2), and when Suraśmichandra was a protector of the people (lokapāla), protecting the province intervening between the Kālindī (Yamunā) and the Narmadā (Verse 3), the column on which this inscription is engraved and which is called a dheja-stambha or 'flag-staff' of Bhagavān Janārdana (Vishnu) was caused to be erected by the Mahāratnija Mātrivishṇu and his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu (lines 7-8). He was the son of Harivishṇu, grandson of Varṇavishṇu and, above all, great grandson of Indravishṇu, the Brāhmaṇa sage, who was the head of the Maitrāyaṇiya school of the Yajurveda and performed sacrifices (krūtra).

TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1 to 3 Āryā.]

1 Jayati vibhūṣa = chatur-bhujaś = chatur-arṇava-vipula-salila-paryyaṅkaḥ [*]
   jagatah sthity=utpatthiṇya[y-aika*]-
   hētūr=Garuḍa-kēṭuḥ [† 1*] Śatē pañcha-shashtyadadhikē varṣhāṇāṁ 
   bhūpatau cha Budhagupte Āśādha-māsa-śukla]-
   dvādaśyāṁ Suragurōṛ-ddivasē [† 2*] Saṁ 100 60 5 [† 5*] Kālindī-
   Narmmadayōṛ=mmadhyanā pālayati lōkapāla-gunaīr[†*] =jjagati* mahār[āja]-
   śrīyam = anubhavati Suraśmichandrē cha [† 3*] Asyāṁ saṁvatsara-māsa-
   divasa-purvāyaṁ swa-karmm-ābhāratasya kratu-yājja[naḥ]
   adhitā-svādhyāyaśa vipr-arśeṁ = Maitrāyaṇiya-vrishabhasy = Endravishṇōḥ pra-
   pautṛṇa pitur = guṇ-ānukārinō Varunav[ī]ś[ṇiḥ]
   pautṛṇa pitaram = anu-jātasya swa-varṇśa-ṛiddhi-hētōṛ =-Harivishṇōḥ puttrēn 
   = śatyanta-bhagavad-bhaktēma Vidhātūr = iechchhaya svayaṁvaray = ēva r[a]-
   lakṣmy = adhitātēna chatur-samudra-paryaṁta-prathita-yāsāśa akṣiṇa-mañ̄a-
   dhanēn = āṅkē-sāttru-samarajjīṁṇa mahārājā Mātrivishṇu[ā]

1 The word lōkapāla does not in this inscription denote 'the regent of a quarter' but rather 'a ruler or protector of the people,' compare the Rājastaraṅgiṇī, 1, 344.
2 Compare dheja, 'standard,' as applied to the Maharauli column, in line 6 of No. 12 above.
3 From inked impressions.
4 In the last legible syllable, part of the subscript y does not strike the consonant above it or does not meet the sense properly met by supplying yādi for the effaced syllables. Hall, therefore, suggests yād[y-ādi*], which Fleet adopts. But yād[y-aika*] seems better. [The consonant above the subscript y appears to be n rather than r. Compare the angular shape of n throughout this inscription, and, for contrast, the syllable yād in Dhanyavishṇu in line 8. The intended reading, therefore, seems to be yād[y-ādi] rather than yād[y-ādi] or yād[y-aika].—Ed.]
5 This akṣara is somewhat damaged; but it is very distinctly doṇ. Princep's reading of trayaḍyaṁ is proved to be wrong by the metre, if by nothing else.
6 Read jagati.
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8 tasya =aiv =ānujēna tat-adunvidhāyin[ā] tat-prasāda-parigri[hi]tēna Dhanyavish-
numā cha | mātri(tā)-pitrōḥ puny-āpāyān-ārtham=ēsha bhagavataḥ (i)
9 punyajan-ārddanasya Janārddanasya dvaja-stambhō = bhuyechchhiritah [ii*]
Svasty=astu gō-brāhmaṇa-p[u]rōgābhyaḥ sarvva-prajābhya iti (iii)

TRANSLATION

(Verse 1) Victorious is the lord, the four-armed (Vishnu)—whose couch is the extensive
waters of the four-oceans; who is the sole cause of the continuance, production, and destruction,
etc., of the universe; (and) whose ensign is Garuḍa!

(Line 2) When a century of years, increased by sixty-five (had elapsed); and
while Budhagupta (is) the lord of the earth; on the twelfth lunar day of the bright fort-
night of the month Āṣāḍha; on the day of Suraguru;¹

(Line 3) (Or in figures) the year 100 (and) 60 (and) 5.

(Verse 3) And while Suraśmichandra is protecting, with the qualities of a Protector
of the people,² (the province) between the Kālindī and the Narmadā, (and) is enjoying in
the world the glory of (being) a Mahārāja;

(Line 4) When this was the detailed order (of the date) regarding the year, month and
day;³

(Lines 6-7) By the Mahārāja Mātrivishṇu who is excessively devoted to Bhagavān
(Vishnu), who, by the will of Destiny, was married by Sovereignty, as if by a maiden choosing
herself (her own husband); whose fame extends up to the borders of the four oceans; whose
wealth is unimpaired high-mindedness; (and) who has been victorious in battle against many
enemies;

(Lines 4-6) Who is the son of the son’s son of Indravishṇu, who was devoted to his religious
rites; who performed sacrifices; who studied his Veda; who was a Brāhmaṇa sage; (and)
who was the head of the Maitrāyaṇīya school of Yajurveda;—who is the son’s son of Varun-
viṣṇu, who imitated the virtuous qualities of (his) father;—(and) who is the son of Harivishṇu,
who took after⁴ (his) father, (and) was the cause of the advancement of his race;

(Lines 8-9) (By him) and by his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu, who is obedient to him,
(and) has been encircled by his favours,—this flag-staff of the divine (god) Janārada, the
destroyer of the demons,⁵ has been erected, for the purpose of increasing the religious merit of
their parents.

(Line 9) May it be well to all the people, headed by the cows and the Brāhmaṇas!

¹ I.e., “On Thursday,”—Suraguru, ‘the preceptor of the gods,’ is another name of Brīhaspati, from which
latter name the day takes its customary appellation of Brīhaspativāra.
² See note 1 on p. 299 above.
³ See note 1 on p. 241 above.
⁴ Pīrāra = ana-jātaya. Hall explained this expression in the JBS., Vol. III, p. 139, note, by a passage quoted
in the St. Petersburg Dictionary from the Panchatantra: viz.,

Jātāḥ putrā = nājatiḥ = cha | atijātā = kath = aic a c a |
apejātaḥ = cha lōkā = smīn = manātayā śāstra-vēdākhiḥ
Mātrī-putra-jātā = vā = amujātaḥ putrā samāraḥ |
atijātā = dharma = tasmā = apesti = dharmād-dharmāh

“By those who know the scriptures, (sons) are to be understood among men as being a jāta son, or an amujāta, or
an apejāta, or an apejātā. A jātā (i.e. one whose virtues are equal to (those of his) mother; an amujāta (i.e. equal to
(his) father (in virtues); an apejāta surpasses that (father) (and) an apejātā (ii) altogether inferior (to him).”
⁵ Puṣṭavajna. i.e., ‘a good pious, or virtuous man,’ also denotes ‘a class of supernatural beings, a fiend, a goblin,
a demon.’
Dāmōdarpur Copper-Plate Inscription of Budhagupta

This plate also was found in the village of Dāmōdarpur in the same circumstances, as Nos. 22, 24 and 38, and is deposited along with them in the Museum of the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, now in Bangladesh. It was edited by Radhagovinda Basak in the Eph. Ind., Vol. XV, pp. 138 ff., and Plate iv a and b.

The plate is one in number, and is inscribed on both sides, the first containing twelve and second six lines of writing. It measures 7 3/8" X 4 3/4". The edges of it have not been raised into rims for the protection of the writing. The plate as it is, is uniformly even except along the edge of its proper right side. The upper corner here has been cut away, the actual specification of the year of the date being destroyed therewith. As regards the second side of the plate it is so corroded that the writing on it has become almost illegible, though lines 15-18 can be read with pretty certainty by comparison with the corresponding matter on Nos. 38 and 47. The seal is practically of the same oval shape as that of the plate described in No. 47 below and was attached to the middle of the proper right side. It measures 1 3/4" X 1 3/4". It seems it once bore a legend upon it as in No. 47. But it is now completely effaced. The weight of the plate together with its seal is 27 3/4 tolas. The characters belong, generally speaking, to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet as remarked about the plate described in No. 22 above. The other palaeographic peculiarities are (1) the occurrence of the initial a in adhvishthān-, line 3, anēna, line 5, and so on; (2) the initial ī in ekādaśa, line 11; (3) the peculiar form of the medial ā, after th and dh as in yathākṛaya-, line 9 and -avadhārane = ā, line 10, and in grā as in Dōṇgā-gramē, line 6, as remarked above in connection with No. 38; (4) the method of forming r in conjunction with a following r, e.g., in -maraśā in lines 9 and 12; (5) the coupling of ending t and n with the immediately following consonants, e.g., tat-pāda-, line 2, -ētata-kōṣṭhikā-, line 8, asmrito-phal-, line 6, -ahan = lat-kśētra, line 7, and kuleśāpān = yathākṛaya-, line 9. The characters also include, in line 1, numerical symbols for 10 and 5 (?). The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout, with the exception of the three imprecatory verses in lines 15-18. The only linguistic peculiarity that calls for notice is the use of the affix ka in some words, such as ānuvahamāṅakā, lines 2-3; niyuktaka and Āyuktaka-, line 3, adviṣṭhākās =, line 7 and daitekās = line 11. In respect of orthography, we have to note (1) the doubling of, th and dh (by t and d as required by the rules), ē and ś (wrongly) in conjunction with a preceding r as in -Sārthavāka-, line 4, and -tad-artha =, line 11 [sān]yavahāribhir = ēdētā-, line 15, Puṇḍravardhanā-, line 2, pārvavā-, line 6 and [Kō]ti[varshka]-, line 3; (2) the doubling of t in conjunction with a following r, such e.g., as in -kṣētra-, lines 7, 11 and 12, -Vasumitra-, line 4; (3) the use of the dental nasal instead of anusvāra in combination with a following s, as e.g., in -phal-āśantā, line 6; (4) the change of visarga to s in conjunction with that letter following it as e.g., in [pi]r[i][khi = saha], line 16; and (5) change of anusvāra to m with a following s, as e.g., in sa[m]yavahāriti, line 4.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Paramadevītā Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Budhagupta, that is, Budhagupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. The date was in numerical symbols but unfortunately the ‘year’ part of the date has disappeared with the upper corner of the proper right side of the plate which is destroyed. The exact specification of the day also is not well preserved. The month mentioned has, however, been preserved, and it is Phālguna. Under Budhagupta was Mahārājā Jayadatta as Head (Upartha) of the Puṇḍravardhana province (bkukiti); and in the Kōṭivara district (vishaya), under him, the Court (adhikarana) of the Town (adkhishṭhāna) was being carried on by the Āyuktaka Bhaṇḍaka,
appointed by Jayadatta, along with the Nagaratrēśṭhin Ribhupāla, the Sārthavāha Vasumitra, the Prakrama-Kulika Varadatta, and the Prakrama-Kāyastha Viprapāla. We are further informed that of these latter, Ribhupāla, who is now called not Nagaratrēśṭhin, but simply Ārāha, applied to the Court of the Town for permission to purchase six kulaśikās of building site (vāstu) on payment of the price at the usual rate of three dināras a kulaśikā. The object of this purchase of land was to erect on it two shrines and two store-rooms of the primeval gods Kōkāmukha-svāmin and Śvētavāraha-svāmin to whom four and seven kulaśikās respectively had already been donated by the donor on the table-land of the Himālayas in the village of Dōngā. And further we are told that the application was granted with the approval of the record keepers Vishnu-Datta, Vijaya-Nandin, and Sthānu-Nandin, after corroborating the statement of the owner’s former gift of eleven kulaśikās mentioned in the application.

Kōkāmukha-svāmin and Śvētavāraha-svāmin are doubtless forms of Vishnu. But where they were exactly situated it is difficult to say. R. G. Basak¹ suspects that the first of these was connected with Kōkāmukha-ūrtha mentioned in the Hariśvanśa, Mahābhārata² and Varaha-Purāṇa.³ J. C. Ghosh is more positive on this point and locates it in that region where flow the rivers Kauśikī, Kōkā and the Trisābhas specified in Chapter 140 of the Varaha-Purāṇa and answering “to the modern Kośi, Kaṃkāi and Tista in Northern Bengal.”⁴ Anybody who reads this chapter carefully will be convinced that the Kōkā emerges from the Himālayas. This agrees with the fact that the two gods mentioned in this plate were on the tableland of the Himālayas. The Varaha-Purāṇa, Chapter 140, verse 68, speaks of a sacred place called Dāmiśrāṅkura just where the Kōkā emerges. This seems to be the location of Kōkāmukha-svāmin. In fact, the actual name Kōkāmukha occurs twice in the same Purāṇa, Chapter 122, verses 19 and 22 and Chapter 140, verse 4. The same Purāṇa, Chapter 140, verse 24 mentions Vishnusaram as a place where Varaha pulled out the Earth with one stroke of the tusk. This appears to be the location of Śvētavāraha-svāmin. This perhaps explains why the Earth has been described in this inscription as liṅga-kshetreg, “the Subtle Earth.” From the names of the rivers Kauśikī, Kōkā and Trisābha, that is, the Sun Kośī, Kaṃkāi and Tista, it is clear that the shrines of these gods were situated somewhere in Darjeeling and Sikkim. It thus appears that the Kōtivāraṇa viṣaya and Pundravardhana bhūti extended as far northward as the Darjeeling and Sikkim region. Now, in Sikkim, there is what is called Dongkya Pass and Mount.⁵ And it seems tempting to suppose that the Dōngā of this record has survived in Dongkya. As these gods existed somewhere near the snowly Darjeeling and Sikkim Districts, it is no wonder if one image of the Boar Incarnation was called Śvētavāraha-svāmin. It looks that the images of these gods and the Earth were natural formations of the rock. This agrees with the fact that the gods have been called ādya or primeval in line 7 and the Earth described as liṅga-kshetreg in line 8.

TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1 to 3 Anushṭubh]

First Side

1 . . . . . Phālguna di 10 [5] Paramadaivata-Paramabhaṭṭaraka-Mahārājādhirāja-śrī-
[Vudha] [guṛ]pt[ē]ṣṭ[ē]ṣṭ [prithivi]-

2 III, 84, 159; XIII, 23, 50.
3 Chapters 113, 122 and 140.
4 JASB., (N. S.), Vol. XXVI, p. 242; Varaha-Purāṇa, Chapter 140, verses 53, 72, etc.
6 Read Budhagupta.
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2 [patau tat-pā]*da-parigrihitasya Purandaradhana-bhuktāv=Uparika-Mahārāja-
Jayadattasya bhogēn=an[vahamā]-
3 nakē [Kōṭi]varshasha(rsha)-vishayē cha tan-niyuktaka Āyuktaka-Bhanḍakē [*]
dhishṭhān-ādhikarana[m*]- Nagārāśēśṭhī-Ribhu-
4 pāla-Sārthavāha-Vasumitra-Prathamakulika-Varadatta-Prathamakāyastha-Viprap-
pāla-purūgē cha sa[mvy[a]harahā[*
5 Anēna śrēṣṭhī-Ribhupālēna vijnāpitaṃ [*] Himavach-chhikharē Kōkāmukha-
svāmīnāḥ chatvārāḥ kulyavāpāḥ [Sve]tava-
6 rāhā-svāmīnī=pi satpa kulyavāpāḥ asmāt-phal-āsāsīnā puny-ā(ny-ā)bhivṛddhiyē
Dōngā-grāmē pūrvvānī mayā
7 apradā asīṣiṣṭhātakās=tad=aḥan=tat-kṣhetra-sāmīpya-bhūmau tayōr=ādyam-Kō-
kāmukha-svāmi-Svētavrāhā-
8 svāminōr=nā[ma]-liṅga-[kṣhöńj] dévakula-dvayam=[etat=kōṣṭhīkā-dvayaṇ]=cha
tārayitum=ichchhāmy=aratha vāṣṭunō
9 sa[j]-kulya[vā]pān=yaṭhākraya-marryādayā dātum=iti [*] yathāḥ Pustapāla-
Vishṇudatta-Vijaya[nandī]-Sthān(n)[u]-
10 nandinām=avadhārṇāya=āvadhitam=asty=anēna Himavach-chhikharē tayōḥ
Kōkāmukha-svāmi-Svētavrāh[ha]svāmi[sa]h
11 apra[dā]h kṣhēttra-kulyavāpā ēkādāsa dattakās=tad-artṭhan=ch=ēḥa dévakula-
kōṣṭhīkā-karanē yuktam=[c]ta[d=viṃā]-
12 [pirami] [kra]mēna tat-kṣhē[tra]-sāmīpya-bhūmā vāstu dātum=īty=ana-vṛttā-
tri-dinārika-kū[layā]pa-vīkṛaya-[mar[vā]da-

Second Side

13 [ya*] rā kulana ....... rā ga ra(?) ........
14 ...... pu[śkhar]i=pū[rvvēṇa] Ribhu[pā]la-pū[rvva-dattaka-kṣhētra*] [dakshi-
ṇēna] [pāṇi*]
15 [kulyavāpā*] dattāḥ [*] [ta]d=uttara-kālaṁ [saṁ]vyavahāribhir=ddēva-bha[kty-
ā]numantaya[*] Uktāṁ Vyāsēna [*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattā-
16 [m=vā yō harēta] vasundharām [*] sa visēṭhā[ya]ṁ krimūr=[bbhūtvā] [pi]trī-
[bbhis=sāja] pachyate [*] Pūrvvā-dattāṁ ḍvātītibhyō
17 [yatnād=raṣṭha Yu]dhisēṭhīra [*] maḥīnā[maṁ]maḥīmā ṣrēṣṭha dā[nāḥ =
chhēyō=nu]pālānām [i 2*] [Bha]ukahīr=vasu[dbhā dajtē]
18 [ṛajabhibis=cha punaḥ punah] [*] [ya]sya [ya]sya yadā bhūmī[ś=tasya tasya-
] ta[dā] pha[la]m=iti 2

TRANSLATION

(Lines 1-4) [The year ...], (the month of) Phālguna, (and) the day 10 (and) 5 ?, while Paramadāvata Paramabhaṭṭaraka Mahārāja-dhārāja, the prosperous Budhagupta is the lord of the earth; while the Kotivarsha district was running on with the enjoyment (of the rule) of Mahārāja Jayadatta, (who is) Uparika over the Purandaradhan province, being selected by His (Majesty’s) feet; and while Āyuktaka Bhanḍakē, appointed by him (Jayadatta), was administering the Court of the District Town as the chief of the Nagara-Śrēṣṭhī Ribhupāla, the Sārthavāha Vasumitra, the Prathamakulika Varadatta and the Prathamakāyastha Viprapāla;

1 Basak reads tan-niyuktakē hāṣyanikē-Śa(ī)vyākē.
2 Read phalas [i 3*] īt i [i*]
3 Compare Āyukta-parasha in line 25 of Inscription No. 1 above. See also D. R. Bhandarkar’s Aloka (2nd ed.), pp. 57-58.
Dāmōdarpur Copper-Plate Inscription of Budhagupta
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(Lines 5-9) Whereas this Śrēṣṭhin Ribhupāla has applied, "In the village of Ṭoṅgā were formerly given by me, hoping for eternal benefit, four kulyavāpas (of land) not yielding (any revenue) to Kōkāmukha-svāmin, and seven kulyavāpas to Śvētavārāha-svāmin, on the tableland of the Himālayas, for the augmentation of spiritual merit. Now, on land in the neighbourhood of that cultivatable field I desire to erect two shrines, with the subtile Earth-bowing (in front), and their two store-rooms, for these primeval (gods), Kōkāmukha-svāmin and Śvētavārāha-svāmin. Design to make over six kulyavāpas of building site in accordance with the prevalent custom (of sale)."

(Lines 9-15) Whereas it has been determined through the ascertainment of the recordkeepers Viṣṇu-Datta, Vijaya-Nandīn and Sthānu-Nandīn that it is a fact that by him were given eleven kulyavāpas of cultivatable field, not yielding (any revenue), to the same Kōkāmukha-svāmin and Śvētavārāha-svāmin on the tableland of the Himālayas and whereas for the erection here of the shrines and store-houses in connection with them (the gods) he has properly applied for building-site being given him on land in the neighbourhood of the cultivatable field, according to the prevailing custom of sale, namely, three dināras for one kulyavāpa ..., on the east of the lotus-pool ....... to the south (of the cultivatable field previously given by) Ribhupāla, were granted (six kulyavāpas).

(Line 15) So these (kulyavāpas) should be respected by administrators in time to come.

It has been said by Vyāsa:2

(Verse 1) He, who takes away land given by himself or by others, having become a worm in excreta, rots with his forefathers.

(Verse 2) Carefully preserve the land that has already been given to the twice-born (Brāhmaṇas), Yudhisṭhīra, the best of land-owners. Preservation is more meritorious than grant (of land).

(Verse 3) And land has been granted, again and again, by many kings. (But) the fruit of that (land) belongs to whosoever possesses the land at that time.

No. 41: PLATE XLI

BIHAR STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF BUDHAGUPTA

This inscription appears to have been discovered by Ravenshaw, and to have been first brought to notice by him in 1839, in the J.B.A.S., Vol. VIII, pp. 347 ff. From his remarks it appears that the column was originally found in front of the northern gate of the old fort of Bihār, but had been subsequently removed and set up "in a reversed position, with its base in the air, and its summit in the ground," a little to the west of the same gate, where it was afterwards found, fallen, by General Cunningham. In 1866, in the J.B.A.S., Vol. XXXV, pp.

1 For the interpretation of this passage, see the introduction of this inscription, p. 343 above. In regard to the word namat 'bowing' applied to kīvhīni, compare the phrase kṣīr-aṅgala-puṇa, applied to dhārani in the Vaiṣṇava-Purāṇa, chapter 39, verse 26.

2 Vyāsa, whose name, as well as his epithet of "arranger of the Vēdas," is usually inserted in this passage, e.g., in line 13 of the Mahāgāvānam grant of the Mahārāja Hastin of the year 191 (C.I., Vol. III, 1898, No. 23, p. 108 and Plate). In the grants of Jayanātha (Ibid., No. 26, p. 119 and No. 27, p. 122), these verses are said to be from the Mahābhārata. And in line 19 of the Khōr grant of the Mahārāja Śravānāthā of the year 214 (Ibid., No. 31, p. 137 and Plate) it is also added that they are in the Sūta-gaṇi-Sanhitā of the Mahābhārata. These verses are nearly always attributed, in the inscriptions, to Vyāsa. But, in lines 27-28 of the Kānṭil grant of the third year of Vīkrama-dīya I (J.B.B.R.A.S., Vol. XVI, p. 237), the verse commencing Bhuhbir = vasudhā bhukti, the second in the present inscription, with one other not in this inscription, is allotted to Manu; a point which may be of some interest in connection with Bihler's discovery (see Ind., Ant., Vol. XIV, p. 324) that about one-tenth of Manu's verses occur in the Mahābhārata.

**Bihar**¹ is the chief town of the Bihar Sub-Division of the Patna District in the Bihar State. The broken red sandstone column on which the inscription is, was eventually removed by A.M. Broadley, Magistrate of Bihar, and was set up on a brick pedestal opposite the Bihar Court House,² where it still stands. Broadley perpetuated the inverted position of the column, upside down; and also disfigured it with an English inscription, printed in full by General Cunningham, a few letters of which appear in the lithograph now published. Also, the column, as placed by Broadley, stands now in the middle of a house, the roof of which is supported by it; and the last eight lines of the inscription, shewn in Rajendralal Mitra's and General Cunningham's lithographs are now completely hidden, and rendered quite inaccessible, by a wooden structure placed on the top, i.e., the proper bottom of the pillar, in order to connect it with the roof.

The writing originally extended, in the First Part, lines 1 to 13, over four of the faces of the column, as is shewn by the metres of the extant portion; and in the Second Part, lines 14 ff., over three faces, as is shewn by the number of letters lost in each line. The extant portion, now lithographed, covers a space of about 1' 4" broad by 3' 5" high, and is in a state of fairly good preservation. The size of the letters varies from $\frac{3}{8}$" to $\frac{5}{8}$". The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets, and approximate closely to those of the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, No. 1, pp. 203 ff., above, Plate I. They include, in lines 11 and 13, forms of the numerical symbols for 3, 8, 30. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in verse as far as line 10, and the rest in prose. In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are (1) the use of the dental nasal instead of the *anuvāra*, before ś, in *ausa*-, lines 11 and 13; (2) the doubling of k and t, in conjunction with a following r, e.g., in *chatkra*, line 10 (but not in *vikramaditya*, line 3), and *pauitrasya*, line 17; and (3) the doubling of dh, in conjunction with a following y, in *anudhyāta*, line 22.

The first part of the inscription mentions the Imperial Gupta king Kumāragupta, and seems to have recorded the name of his wife, which is, however, lost in the part that has peeled off. But this part of the inscription seems to belong to the time of his successor Skandagupta, from the mention of apparently a village name *Skandaguptabata*, in line 11. This part of the inscription records the erection of a circle of shrines of Bhadrāryā and other deities and in front thereof a column, which in line 10 is called a *yāga* or a 'sacrificial post,' apparently by some minister whose sister had become Kumāragupta's wife. This minister seems to be Anantāśīna mentioned in line 13. His sister and consequently the mother of Skandagupta seems to have been Anantāśīna mentioned in Nos. 44-46 below as mother of Puru (=Skanda)gupta. And the inscription further recorded certain shares in the village of Skandaguptabata (?), and in another agrahāra, the name of which is lost. From the mention of Skanda and the divine Mothers, in

---

¹ The 'Bihar and Behar' of maps, etc., Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 103 Lat. 25° 11' N.; Long. 83° 33' E. The proper form of the name, which is by no means an uncommon one for villages in Northern and Central India, is, of course, Bihar, with the vowel i in the first syllable, from the Sanskrit भिर, 'a Buddhist (and Jain) temple or convent' and this is the form that is used by the people of the Patna District. The Sanskrit name, Vihāra, occurs in lines 9-10 of the 'Pessarava' inscription, now stored in the collection at Bihar, where the place is called 'Vihāra, the city of the glorious Yasovarman' (*JIBAS.*, Vol. XVII, p. 492 ff.).

line 9, this part of the inscription seems to have belonged to the Śākta or Tāntrika form of worship, with Bhadrāryā as the predominant goddess.

The second part, which also contained a date, now lost, is a record of apparently a son of Skandagupta, possibly Budhagupta as he had a longer reign than any one of his brothers, during the troublous times that followed the reign of Skandagupta. Enough of it, however, remains to show that it contained a grant to the same temple of Bhadrāryakā by Bhaṭṭa Guhilavāmin at the request apparently of his grandfather.

TEXT

First Part

1 [-]ḥṛṇi-ṭhendra Indrānju-tulya-vīryyō gunair=atulyaḥ [- - - - - - - ] [v]
2 [-] [ta]ś-y śīpī sūnur=bhuvi svāmi-nēyāḥ khyātaḥ sva-krittyā [- - - - - - - ] [u]
3 [-] [sva]sás-aiva yasy=atula-vikramena Kumāragupt[ī]ṭena [ - - - - ] [u]
4 [- - ] [p]śṭri(tri)ṁś=cha dēvāṁś=cha hi havya-kavyaiḥ sadā nṛṣaṁsy-ādi [ - - - - - - - ] [v]
5 [- - - ] [a]ṭhikaraṃ=devāṇika-mandalaṃ kshitāv=anaupamya- [- - - - - - ]
6 ......... ba(? ?)ṭč( ? ) kila stambha-var-ōchhhr(ōchhrr)ya-prabhāśe tu manda....
7 ......... bhīr=vriksḥānam kusuma-bhar-ānat-āgra-śūm(? )ga(? )-vāyāmaka-stayak ....
8 [- ] Bhadrāryayāḥ bhāṭi gṛhaṁ nav-ābhra-nirmāṁkā nirman[kta [- - - - - - - ] [u]
9 [- - ] Skanda-pradhānair=bhuvi māṭri bhiṣ=cha lōkān=sa su(? )shya(? ) [- - - - - - - - - ] [v]
10 [- - - - - ] yūp-ōchhhrayam=eva chakke=[u*] Bhadrāryy-ādi.............
11 .........[Ska(?)]ndaguṭtabatuṭe anśāni 90 5 tā(? )mrakaṭāku(? )ḥ kala.............
12 ......... pithu sva-māṭur=yyady=asti hi dushkritam bhajatu tanče.............
13 ......... k-āgrahāre anśāni 3 Anantasēnēn=ōpa.............

---

1 Compare the undoubted instance of this, in the same period, in the Gaṅghāra inscription of Viśavarman (C.I.I., Vol. III, 1888, No. 17, pp. 72 ff.). The mātāraḥ or mātrīgaṇa, 'the divine Mothers,' are personified energies (śakti) of the principal deities. They are closely connected with the worship of the god Śiva. Originally they were seven in number,—Brāhmaṇi or Brāhmaṇe, Vaiṣṇava, Māhāvaisravī, Kaumārī, Vāraṇī, Aindrī or Indrī or Māhēṇḍri, and Chāmūnī, as representing the Pleiades, the seven mothers or nurses of Kārttikeya, the son of Śiva. Afterwards the number was increased to eight, nine, sixteen, and various other figures. The chief object of the Śākta or Tāntrika worship now is Parvati, Durgā or Māhēśvari, the wife and female energy of Śiva; especially under the name of Jagadambā, 'the mother of the universe.' Not long after this period, Svāmī-Mahāśēna, or Kārttikeya, and the divine Mothers, 'the seven mothers of mankind,' appear as special objects of worship, and tutelary deities, of the Early Kadambas (e.g., Ind. Ant., Vol. VI, p. 27); and of the Early Chalukyas (e.g., Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, p. 162; Vol. VI, pp. 74; and Vol. XIII, p. 137 ff.).

2 "As far as line 25, from the ink-impression; partly from Gen. Cunningham's lithograph, and partly from the lithograph published with Dr. Rajendralala Mitra's reading."—J. F. Fleet.

3 The first two entire pādas, and parts of the third pāda of most of the verses, have peeled off and are lost all the way down.

4 Metre: Upendraśajrā.

5 Metre: Indrasisajrā.

6 The metre is faulty here; since the vi of bhūti, which should remain short, is lengthened by the following sa.

7 Metre: Upendraśajrā; and in the next verse.

8 Metre: Varnāśanā.

9 Metre: apparently Gitī; and in the next verse.

10 Metre: Indrasisajrā; and in the following two verses.
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Second Part

14. ...... [Sarvva-rāj-ōchchhē]ttuh1 pri[pri]thivyām=aprairathasya
15 [chatur-udadhī-salil-āsvādita-yaśasō Dhanada-Varuṇ-Ē]ndr-Āntaka-samasya Kritānta-
17 [mahārāja-śri-Gupta-prapaustrasya mahārāja-śri-Ghaṭō]tkachapaustrasya mahā-
rājā-
18 [dhirāj-śri-Chandragupta-puṭstrasya Lichchhavi-dauhitrasya ma]hādevyāṃ Ku-
māra-devyāṃ=uppanasya
19 [mahārāja-dhirāj-śri-Samudraguptasya puṭtra]s=tat-parigrihitō mahādevyāṃ
20 Dattadēvyām=uppanah svayam=a-pratirathah paramahāgavatō mahārājā-
21 [dhirāja-śri-Chandraguptas=tasya puṭtras=tat-pād-ānuddhyā]tō mahādevyāṃ
Dhruvadēvyāṃ=
22 [uppanmah paramahāgavato mahārāja-dhirāj-śri-Kumāraguptas=tasya] pu-
tras=tat-pād-ānuddhyātah
23 mahādevyāṃ=Anantadēvyāṃ=uppanah paramahāgavatō mahārāja-dhirāja-
śri-Ska[ndaguptah [i]*
24 [tasya puṭtras=tat-pād-ānuddhyātō mahādevyāṃ Chandradēvyāṃ=uppanah] par-
amahāgavatō
25 [mahārāja-dhirāj-śri-Buddhaguptah [?]].....[vai]shayik-Ājapura[ka]-sa[?]mai[?]-
26 ...........................................gra...ka...[ak]shaya-nivī grāma-kśettraṁ
27 ...........................................kri...uparika-kumārāmātya-
28 ...........................................ngikula[?]h[?] vanī[ja*]ka-pādit-ārika-
29 ...........................................[a]graḥarika-śaulkika-gaulmik-āsanyāṁ śra[?]*-
30 ...........................................vaś[i]k-ādim=asmat-prāśad-ōpajivinaḥ
31 [samāṇhapayāmi] .................Varmmanā viṇāpiṭō=smi mama pitāmahēna
32 ...........................................namē bhaṭṭa-Guhilasvāminē Bhadrē[r]yyakā
33 ...........................................m.g.p[r]ati...ā.āgrōkaya...nākaya-
(The rest of the inscription had been broken away and lost, before it was dis-
covered.)

TRANSLATION

First Part

(Line 1) ..............the very moon among men; equal in prowess to (the god Vishnū) the younger brother of Indra; unequaled in respect of virtuous qualities; ..............

(Line 2) ..............moreover, his son guided by Svāmin (Kārttikēya) on the earth; renowned; ..............by his own fame.

(Line 3) ..............whose sister, indeed, [as espoused] by Kumāragupta, of unequaled prowess.

(Line 4) ..............both the deceased ancestors and the gods, with the oblations proper for each of them;2 ..............always ..............things such as wickedness, etc.

---

1 The passages that are lost in lines 14 to 22, are supplied from No. 1, lines 24, 26, 28 and 29, pages 213-14 above, and from the Bhutar pillar inscription of Skandagupta, No. 31 above, lines 1 to 6. The sectarian epithet of Skandagupta, in line 23, is supplied from line 24, and from his silver coins (See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, pp. 66 ff).

2 Lit. “with the hāsya (the oblation to the gods) and kāsya (the oblation to deceased ancestors).”
caused to be made a group of temples, not [rivalled by] anything else that could be compared with it in the world.

assuredly in [Skandaguptabāṣṭa] which is beautiful with the erection of (this) best of columns.

of the trees ........ the groups of fig-trees (?) and castor oil (?) plants, the tops of which are bent down by the weight of (their) flowers.

in consequence of Bhadrāryā, the edifice shines freed from (dirt) like a fresh cloud or serpentine slough.

headed by (the god) Skanda, and by the divine Mothers, on the earth, mankind ........

[he made, indeed, the erection of (this) sacrificial post ........
(for) Bhadrāryā and others ........ in [the village(?)] called Skandaguptabāṣṭa 30 (?), (and) 5 shares ............

if there be any misdeed on the part of (his) father (or) his mother, let his share ........

in the agrahāra of ........... 3 shares ....... by Anantasēna

Second Part

The son of Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Samudragupta,—who was the exterminator [of all kings]; who had no equal adversary on earth; [whose fame was tasted by the waters of the four oceans]; who was equal to (the gods) [Dhanada and Varuṇa] and Indra and Antaka; [who was the very axe] of Kṛitānta (god of Death); [who was the giver of many crores of lawfully acquired cows and gold]; who was the performer of the āvamādha sacrifice, that had long decayed; [who was the son of the son’s son of Mahārājā, the prosperous Gupta]; who was the son’s son of [the Mahārājā, the prosperous] Ghaṭotkacha (and) who was [the son] of the Mahārājādhirāja, [the prosperous Chandragupta (I), (and) the daughter’s son of the Lichchhavī, begotten on the Mahādēvi Kumāradēvi.

(Lines 19-21) [(was) an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva), the Mahārājādhirāja, [the prosperous Chandragupta (II)], who was selected (as successor) by him;1 [who was born of] the Mahādēvi [Dattadēvi], (and) [who was himself without an equal adversary].

(Lines 21-22) [His son], who meditated on [his feet], (and) [who was born of the Mahādēvi Dhruvadēvi], (was) [the ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva)], [the Mahārājādhirāja, the glorious Kumāragupta].

(Lines 22-23) [His] son, who meditated on his feet, (and) [who was born of the Mahādēvi Anantadēvi (is) an ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva), the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous] Skandagupta.

(Lines 24-31) [His son, who meditated on his feet (and) who was born of the Mahādēvi Chandradēvi (is) the] ardent devotee of Bhagavat (Vāsudēva) [the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Budhagupta], [I issue a command] ............ of the town of Ajapura in the .... in the vishaya ........ a perpetual endowment ........ a village-field ........ the Uparika,² the Kumāramāya ......... acquired by the merchant ........ in the

---
1. I.e., by Samudragupta; see page 254 above, note 1.
2. Uparika is a technical official title, the exact purport of which is not known, and a suitable rendering of which cannot be offered. But see B.Ch. Chhabra’s article, Office of Uparika, in D. R. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, pp. 231-33.
seat (of office) (?) of the Agrahārīka,¹ the Śāulīka,² and the Gaulmika³ ............. and others who subsist on our favour.

(Lines 31-33) "I have been requested by ....varman, by my father’s father, .... .... by the Bhāṭṭa Guhilasvāmin, .......... belonging to Bhadrārya ..........”

No. 42: PLATE XLII

NĀLANDĀ CLAY SEAL OF BUDHAGUPTA

This seal bearing an inscription of Budhagupta was exhumed like those of Vainyagupta, Narasimha-gupta and Kumārāgupta III from Monastery site No. 1 at Nālandā, Patna District, Bihar. It has remained unnotied, except for a brief reference to its find by Hirananda Sastri in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, p. 77, post script, and is published here for the first time.⁴ This seal also was originally a clay impression which was burnt eventually into a terracotta in the circumstances mentioned on page 355 below.

The seal is fragmentary, its proper right half being broken off. The extreme measurements of the extant fragment are, as nearly as possible, 4-½” high by 1-¼” wide. It has an obvious affinity with the other Gupta seals from Nālandā, being oval in shape, pointed at the top and the bottom, and its edge being marked by a border line which is distinct at the bottom. Like them, again, its upper field is occupied by a figure of Garuḍa executed in comparatively higher relief. The proper left half of Garuḍa together with his face which is slightly defaced, is all that is preserved now. It, however, differs from the other Nālandā seals in regard to the representation of the wing of Garuḍa which is appreciably longer here. To the proper left of Garuḍa is seen a small disc which may represent the sun. If so, the arrangement of the emblems of the sun and crescent respectively to the right and left of the figure is inverted on this seal. In all other details the figure is similar to the device occurring on the above-mentioned seals. The Garuḍa is, as usual, represented as standing on a base composed of two parallel lines, below which runs a prose inscription in eight lines. Unfortunately the proper right half of the inscribed portion has been destroyed, resulting in the disappearance of a little more than half the writing in the beginning of each line. Again, whatever remains of the inscription is, on the whole, in a bad state of preservation. The five upper lines are executed in a relatively bolder relief than the lower ones, the irregularity being perhaps due to an uneven pressure in the act of stamping. Lines 1-3 are more or less well-preserved. Lines 4 and 5 are somewhat defaced and blurred; nevertheless they are not illegible. Lines 6-7 are too worn out and obliterated to be properly deciphered. The last line can be read with certainty. The characters, on the whole, resemble those of the Nālandā seals of Kumārāgupta III but differ from them in certain respects. The most notable difference is the occurrence here of m, characteristic of the southern variety. The letter h exhibits two forms; the first occurs only once in Maharāja line 1, and, though slightly broader, approximates to the same sign on the Nālandā seals of Kumārāgupta III, while the second, as in dhaunitraya, line 2 and -grihīta, line 3, looks like a precursor to the later acute-angled type seen in such records as the Bōdhgaya inscription of Mahānāman and the Lākhāmaṇḍala prasasti. The only other sign worth noticing is the medial u in -gupta, line 8, which consists of a curve at the bottom turning to the right and ending in

---

¹ Agrahārīka is an official title, denoting probably ‘an officer in special charge of an agrahāra’.
² Śāulīka is a technical official title, which might be rendered by some such term as ‘Superintendent of tolls or customs (vatka)’.
³ Gaulmika is a technical official title, which might be rendered by ‘Superintendent of woods and forests (gulma)’.
⁴ [It was subsequently published by Hirananda Sastri in his Nalanda and its Epigraphic Material, MASI., No. 66, p. 64 and plate VIII, a.—Ed.]
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a vertical line of the height of the full letter. The size of the letters varies from $\frac{1}{8}$ to $\frac{1}{6}$. The last three lines contain letters smaller than in the upper ones, evidently due to the anxiety of the engraver to accommodate the whole of the legend in the limited space. The language is Sanskrit. In respect of orthography we have to notice the doubling of $i$ in conjunction with a following $r$, as in -prapautrasya, line 1, and putras$, =$, line 4, but not in daukitrasya, line 2; and the change of visarga into $s$ in conjunction with the same letter following it in $=utpannas= swayam$, line 3.

The inscription on the seal is genealogical in character, and refers itself to the reign of Budhagupta. The fact that his pedigree is traced here in an unbroken line of succession from Mahârâja Gupta onwards through Ghaṭotkacha, Chandragupta I, Samudragupta, Chandragupta II, Kumâragupta I and so forth, shows that he belonged to the Imperial Gupta line and not to any supposed branch. As far as line 5 which mentions Kumâragupta I, the legend is a mere repetition of the formula occurring on the later seals of Narasimhagupta and Kumâragupta III. It is the lines following which, however, constitute the more important portion of the legend. But of these, only the last, furnishing the name of Budhagupta, is distinct, while lines 6 and 7, which presumably contained the names of Budhagupta’s father and mother respectively, are unfortunately very much defaced or rather blurred. Nevertheless, a careful examination reveals in line 6, faint traces of four letters pu ru gu tpa (?) placed in consecutive order which thus appear to be intended for Purugupta. If this is accepted, Purugupta who is the son and successor of Kumâragupta I becomes the father and predecessor of Budhagupta. Again, line 7 appears to have partially preserved his mother’s name which reads Cha-dèvyâ= and has therefore to be restored to Cha[ndra *]-dèvyâ=. It looks that ndra has been omitted here through inadvertence. The admissibility of this presumption is attested by the haphazard slovenly fashion in which the whole legend has been executed, the engraving of tpa instead of tta in Purugupta (line 6) being another instance of the kind. Thus, it seems that Budhagupta, like Vainyagupta and Narasimhagupta was a son of Purugupta by Chandradëvi. The earliest date we have for him is Gupta year 157. But before him flourished Kumâragupta II for whom we have the date 154. Kumâragupta II was thus, apparently, another son of Skandagupta-Purugupta, whom Buddagupta succeeded to the Gupt throne between Gupta years 154 and 157.

TEXT

1 śrī-Gupta-prapaut[t]rasya Mahâraj[aj-s]ī. Ghaṭō1...
2 .............. v[i -]*d[au*]h[i -]*trasyâ Mahâdèvyân Kumâ[r]a[dèvyam=utpa*]-
3 .............. grih[I]to Mahâ[r]a[ī]vyâ[m] Datta[e]vyâ[m=utpannas=swayam]
4 .............. [śrī]-Chandraguptas= tasya putras= tat-pâdânu-
5 .............. [śrī] Kumâraguptas= tasya putras= tat-pâdânu-
6 .............. [hârjâdhirâja-śrī-Pur[n*]gutpas3=ta]-
7 .............. [Cha[ndra *]-dèvyâ[m=utpannah *]
8 .............. [śrī]-Budhagupt[ta]-

1 There is space after Ghaṭō for two letters but all that can be seen on the photograph is a horizontal wavy line.
2 Though the portion of the seal containing the actual names of Chandragupta I and Samudragupta has broken off, it can, without difficulty, be restored at the beginning of lines 2 and 3 as the text follows a prescribed form.
3 Read Puruguptas =.
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No. 43 : PLATE XLIII

EARliest STONE PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF BHĀNUGUPTA: THE YEAR 191

This inscription was discovered in 1874-75 or 1876-77 by General Cunningham, and was first brought to notice by him in 1880, in the CASIR., Volume X, p. 89. It was first published by J. F. Fleet in the CII., Volume III, 1888, pp. 91 and ff. and Plate XII B.

It is another inscription from Ėran,¹ in the Khurāī Sub-Division of the Sagar District in the Madhya Pradesh. It is on a small pillar, afterwards converted into a liṅga or phallic emblem of Śiva, which stands under some tall trees near the left bank of the Bīnā, about half a mile to the south-east of Ėran, and halfway between it and the neighbouring village of Pehlejpur.² The original lower part of the pillar is now broken away and lost; the remnant of it is about 3' 11" high and 1' 6" in diameter. The bottom part is octagonal; and the inscription is at the top of this octagonal part, on three of the eight faces, each of which is about 7" broad; the bottom line is about six inches above the level of the ground. Above this, the pillar is sixteen-sided. Above this, it is again octagonal; and the faces here have sculptures of men and women, who are probably intended for the Goparāja of the inscription, and his wife and friends; the compartment immediately above the centre of the inscription, represents a man and a woman, sitting, who must be Goparāja and his wife. Above this, the pillar is again sixteen-sided. Above this, it is once more octagonal; and on two of the faces here, there are the remains of a quite illegible inscription of four lines, in characters of the same type with those of the inscription now published. Above this, the pillar curves over in sixteen flutes or ribs, into a round top. The pillar was converted into a liṅga, by fitting an ablation-trough to it; this was attached over the part where the inscription lay; and it was only by the breaking of it, that the greater part of the inscription was disclosed to view.

The writing which covers a space of about 1' 9" broad by 11" high, has suffered a good deal from the weather, and from the sharpening of tools on the edges of the stone; but, on the original pillar, it is fairly legible almost throughout; and the only historical items that have been lost are, in line 2, the name of Goparāja’s grandfather, and of the family to which he belonged. The size of the letters varies from ½" to ¾". The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets, and, though not quite so well formed, are of almost precisely the same type as those of the Ėran pillar inscription of Budhagupta, No. 39 above, Plate XXXIX. The letter r, as the first part of a compound consonant, is formed within the top line of the writing in pārtha, line 5, and bhārya, line 7; but above it in sārddham, line 5. The characters include, in line 2, forms of the numerical symbols for 1, 7, 90 and 100. The language is Sanskrit; and, the inscription is in prose as far as the end of the date, in line 2, and the rest in verse. In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are (1) the use of the guttural nasal, instead of the anusvāra, before i, in vaishā, lines 2 and 4; and (2) the doubling of k and t, in conjunction with a following r; e.g., in -vīkṛta and putrō =, line 3.

The inscription does not refer itself to the reign of any particular king but mentions one Bhānutagupta who, though he may not have been a sovereign, was at least a contemporary scion of the Gupta family. It is dated, in both words and numerical symbols, in the year one hundred and ninety-one (501-11 A.D.), on the seventh lunar day of the dark fortnight of the month of Śrāvāna (July-August). It is a non-sectarian inscription; the object of it being only to record that, in the company of Bhānutagupta, who was a great ruler, his chieftain

¹ See pp. 221 above.
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or noble named Goparaja came to Eran and fought a battle with the Maitras;¹ that Goparaja was killed; and that his wife accompanied him, by cremating herself on his funeral pyre, apparently near the place where the pillar was set up. This is the earliest instance of Suttee coming into vogue.²

**TEXT**³

[Metres: verses 1 and 2 Anushubh; verses 3 and 4 Indrawajra]

1 Ōṁ Sarīvatsara-satē ēka-navaty-uttarē Śravaṇa-bahuła-paṅka-sapsa[k]a-
my[āṁ]

2 samvat 100 90 1 Śravaṇa ba di 7 Sulakṣaṇa-vaṁśad = uṭpannō [→ →]

3 rāj-eti-विश्रुता[1] tasya putrō = ti-vikkrāntō nāmnā rāj = ātha Mādhavah [1*]

4 Goparaja[h]


6 sva-vaṁśa-

7 tilō = [bhavad(?)] [1] 2[*]


9 Mfai[t]trān = uḍāṣy = āchakit-ānuyataḥ [3[*] Kṛtvā [cha[*]] y[u]ddham sumahat

10 prak[a]sam svarggaṁ gatō divya-var-E(?)[ndra-kalpaḥ 1*]

11 bhakt = ānurakta cha priyā cha kāntā bh[a]ṛ[r]y = ā[va]lag[n] = ānuṣṭ a = āg[n]i-
r[a]śim [4[*]]

**TRANSLATION**

(Lines 1-2) Ōṁ! When a century of years, increased by ninety-one, (had elapsed) on the seventh lunar day of the dark fortnight of (the month) Śravaṇa, (or in figures) the year 100 (and) 90 (and) 1 (the month) Śravaṇa the dark fortnight⁴; the (lunar) day 7;—

(Verse 1) (there was) a ruler, renowned as...rāja sprung from the Śulakṣaṇa⁵ lineage; and his son (was) valorous by the name (of) Mādhava.

---

¹ It is true that the name of Maitra is not quite clear and beyond all doubt. Nevertheless, it is as good as certain. For the immigration of the Maitrakas, see JPASB., Vol. V, pp. 183 and ff., and Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, pp. 31 ff.

² ABORI., Vol. XIV, p. 233, which contains a scholarly article on the subject by Saktantala Rao. There are several inscribed Suttee monuments about Eran though they are of much later date, as noted by Cunningham (CASIR., Vol. X, p. 90). But much earlier memorial stones of this type and going up to the 9th century have been found at Ṣāri (PRAS., W. C., 1906–07, p. 37).

³ From the ink impression.

⁴ The metre is faulty here, as the cha, which should remain short, is lengthened by the following double consonant. [This is covered by the rule praḥarṇa at i.e. a short vowel preceding pra or kṛṇa can remain short if required in a metre as in Dārīḍrāḥ = ṛuṣiḥ = hi-παριγκαταḥ praḥrápyatē tājāḥ, etc. Here i of ā is short, as required by the metre, even though it followed by hṛṣi.—Ed.]

⁵ Ba of the text in line 2 obviously is an abbreviation of baḥalapoksha of line 1 just as saṁvat of line 2 is of sarvat-sara of line 1. Di similarly is an abbreviation of dina or duṣasa and may stand for the lunar or solar day. In this particular case it must stand for ‘lunar day’ as it is preceded by bā (-baḥula). Corresponding to ba is śa which represents śakla or śuddha. When in an inscription di occurs without śa or ba preceding it, it is doubtful whether it denotes the solar or the lunar day unless it is followed by a numerical figure exceeding 15; in that case it must stand for the solar day. It is therefore not clear what Fleet means by saying that the inscription “is dated, in both words and numerical symbols, on the seventh lunar day of the dark fortnight, and solar day of the month of Śravaṇa (July-August).”

⁶ Sulakṣaṇa seems to be the name of the line to which Goparaja belonged. May it be identical with Śulikas who are mentioned along with the Andhiras and Gaudas as having been vanquished by the Maukhari ruler Iśānavarman (D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, etc., No. 10 and note 3).
(Verse 2) His son was the illustrious Gōparāja, renowned for manliness; the daughter’s son of the Śarabha king, who became the ornament of (his) family.

(Verse 3) There is the glorious Bhānugupta, a distinguished hero on earth, a mighty ruler, brave being equal to Pārthha. And along with him Gōparāja, following (him) without fear, having overtaken the Maitras and having fought a very big and famous battle, went to heaven, becoming equal to Indra, the best of the gods; and (his) devoted, attached, beloved, and beauteous wife, clinging (to him), entered into the mass of fire (funeral pyre).

No. 44 : PLATE XLIV

NĀLANDĀ CLAY SEALS OF NARASIMHAGUPTA

Two seals, each bearing an identical inscription of Narasimhagupta, were excavated, like those of Budhagupta, Vainyagupta and Kumāragupta III from Monastery site No. 1 at Nālandā, Patna District, Bihar. A brief reference to their discovery was made by Hirandanda Sastri in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, p. 77, postscript. These seals also were originally clay impressions which were eventually burnt into terracotta in the circumstances mentioned below on page 355. The one marked A is comparatively better preserved than that marked B. Both, however, are fragmentary, the proper right half in each case being broken off. Seal B has further lost the upper portion of its proper left surface amounting to one third of the original length. Seal A also has sustained additional damage at the top as well as at the bottom of its proper left side. The extreme measurements of the extant faragments are 3\(\frac{1}{2}\)” long by 2\(\frac{1}{2}\)” broad in the case of A and 3\(\frac{1}{2}\)” long by 2” broad in the case of B. That there is a strong family likeness between these and the other Gupta seals from Nālandā is shown by their oval shape; the decoration of the border line : the figure of the Gurūḍa facing, with outstretched wings, and standing on a base composed of two parallel lines; and the prose inscription in eight lines below, done in relief. The legend is fuller and better preserved in A than in B, the letters in the former being much neater and better executed. The latter, however, which is evidently an impression of an independent, rather crude, original, seems to have been executed by a shaking unsteady hand as is clear from its awfully blurred letters, sloping from right to left. The characters are closely akin to those of the seals of Kumāragupta III discussed below. The only peculiarity is the novel way in which the medial \(u\) is indicated in gu, as e.g. in Paramgupta, line 6, where it resembles the medial \(r\) of pribhīcyām in line 1 of the seals of Kumāragupta III. The language is Sanskrit. In respect of orthography we have to notice the doubling of i in conjunction with the following r as in prapavitra-, line 1, -daufitra-, line 2, and -putira-, lines 2 and 5; the change of ending anusvāra to \(n\) and \(n\) in conjunction respectively with a following \(k\) and \(d\) as in Mahādevyān=Kumāra
deyām=, line 2 and Mahādevyān=Dattadevyām=, line 3; the use of the upadhmānya in [a]= Paramabhadgavaı̄, line 4; and the grammatically incorrect change of anusvāra into \(n\) with a \(h\) following as in Narasinhaguptah, line 8.

The seals refer themselves to the reign of Narasimhagupta who is called a Paramabhāgavaı̄ Mahārajādhirāja. The legend is genealogical and is identical with that of the seals of Kumāragupta III as far as the mention of Narasimhagupta.

---

1 It is not improbable that this king, called Śarabha, was the founder of Sarabhapura from which were issued four plates—one by Mahājayarāja and three by Mahāsudēvarāja (D. R. Bhandarkar, A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 1878-1881).

2 They were subsequently published by Hirandanda Sastri in his Nālandā and its Epigraphic Material, MASI., No. 66, page 65 and plate VIII, b, c.—Ed.
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NĀLANDĀ CLAY SEALS OF KUMĀRAGUPTA III

TEXT

Seal A

2. ....ja-śrī-Chan[dra]gupta-puttrasya [Lī]chchhavī-dauhitras[ya Mahādēvāyān = Ku[mā*]radēvyām = utpanna-
4. ....[h] = Paramabhāgavat[ō] Mahārāj[a]dhīrāja-śrī-Chan[dra]guptas = tasya putras = tat-p[a*]d[a*]nu-
5. ....Dhr[uva]dēv[y]ām = [u][p]a mnō Mahā[r[a]j[a]dh[i]rāja-śrī-Kumār-
6. ....[dēv[y]ām = Anantadēv[y]ām = [u][p]a mnō Mahā[r[a]j[a]dh[i]rāja-śrī-
7. ....Mahā[r[a]dēv[y]ām śrī-Chan[dra]d[e]v[y]ām = utpanna[ḥ*] = Paramabhā-
8. ....[r[a]ja-śr[i*]-Narasiṃhagupta[ḥ*]

Seal B

1. ....[ja]-śr[i]-Gupta-prap[a]trasya Mahā[r[a]ja-śrī-Ghaṭōkachapaum-
2. ....vi-d[a]u[ntrasya Mahādēvāyān = Ku[mār]adēvyām = utpanna-
3. ....s = tat-pa]r[ghā[ō] Mahādēvyān = Dattadēvyām = utpannō-
4. ....[dhi]r[a]-śrī-Chandraguptas = tasya putras = tat-pādu-
5. ....[r[a]jadhīrāja-śrī-Kumāragupta[ta]s = [ta]sya puttras = tat-pa-
6. ....Mahārājadhīrāja-śrī-Pur[u]guptas = tasya pu-
7. ....śrī-Chandradēvyām = utpannah = Paramabhā-
8. ....śrī-Narasiṃhagupta[ḥ]

No. 45 : PLATE XLV

NĀLANDĀ CLAY SEALs OF KUMĀRAGUPTA III

These seals, which were originally clay impressions, each bearing an identical inscription of Kumāragupta III, were picked up from the excavations of Monastery Site No. 1 at Nālandā in the Patna District, Bihar. Out of the several specimens excavated, only two are complete, of which, the one marked A on the accompanying plate, is quite well preserved, while the other, marked B, though larger in size and exhibiting bolder and superior execution of letters and device, is unfortunately broken into two. This break about the middle has damaged a letter or two in each line of its legend while the mutilation of a portion of its lower surface in the proper right corner has caused further loss of two or four letters in the three lower lines. The damaged or lost letters, however, can be easily restored from the identical text of seal A. The inscription was first noticed by Hirananda Sastri in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, p. 77, postscript; and subsequently a note was published by N.P. Chakravarti (A.R.ASI., 1934-35, p. 63) who made an improvement in regard to the name of a queen. There is clear evidence of the Monastery Site being set on fire more than once. It seems that all the clay impressions here were thus baked; and this explains why these seals along with others found upon the site and described above look like terracottas. That these seals, like their companions, were originally clay impressions is clear from the section of seal B, which shows an aperture running right through
from the top to the bottom and containing unmistakable traces of pieces of string or cloth which originally passed through it and which were fastened to the document to which the seal was attached (Plate XLV, B). This would have been meaningless if the seals had been terracottas from the beginning.

From the impressions, the original seals seem to have been oval in shape, pointed at the top and bottom. Their external measurements are, as nearly as possible, 3½” broad by 4½” high in the case of A, and 3½” broad by 4½” high in the case of B. The edge in each case is clearly marked by a border line which, on the whole, is well-preserved. The upper section of the face of the seals, being slightly less than one half of the surface, is occupied by a figure of Garuḍa, executed in tolerably high relief. He is represented as standing on a base composed of two parallel lines, facing front, with outspread wings. His face is that of a man, broad and full, with thick lips, scaly fur and upright Vaishnava mark on the forehead, and his hair is arranged exactly like the wig of an English Judge. A hooded snake is coiled round his neck, its head projecting above his left shoulder. A circle and a crescent, doubtless intended for the sun and the moon, are indicated in the field to the proper right and left of the figure respectively. A space, about an inch high, is left blank at the bottom of the seals. The interval between this space and the parallel lines on which Garuḍa stands is occupied by eight well-preserved lines of prose writing, done in relief.

The characters are well-formed, and exhibit an admixture of the two varieties of the Gupta alphabet. Ma and la are of the eastern variety; while sa and ha are of the southern. Medial i is indicated by a loop or curve turning to left. Medial i is of two varieties, represented in /slick/, one to be seen e.g., in line 8 and the other in line 1. In the case of mu, pu and nu the medial u is indicated by elongation down below, of the right vertical, while in tu, ku, dhru, gu and ru it is expressed by a hook at the bottom turning to the left. Medial ri is formed by a hook at the lower end, turning towards the right. Ta is tripartite without a loop. The language is Sanskrit.

In respect of orthography we have to note (1) the doubling of r in conjunction with a preceding r, as in sarvā-, line 1; (2) the doubling of t in conjunction with a following r, as in putra, lines 2 and 7; pautra, line 1; pratpautra, line 1; dautitra, line 2; and Mitra, line 7; (3) the use of the upadhvānyā in =eśekhitāh = prithivayām =, line 1; =apraitraḥaḥ = parama, line 3, and =utpannāḥ = paraṇa, line 8; (5) the doubling of ḏ(h) in conjunction with a following j as in =pādānuddhyāt =, lines 4-7; (5) the change of visarga into s in conjunction with the same letter following it, as in =utpānas = suvām, line 3; and (6) the change of an ending anusvāra to n with a following da as in = Mahādēvān = Dattadēvān = in line 3.

These seals refer themselves to the reign of Kumāragupta III and resemble the copper-silver Bhitari seal of the same ruler, noticed in No. 46 below, in the representation of the Garuḍa as well as in the legend. The inscription on the seals is purely genealogical, as are those on the Aśīrgaḍh and Nālandā seals of Sarvavarman, the Sōnapat and Nālandā seals of Harshavardhana and so forth. And with the omission of certain epithets of Samudragupta, they follow a set formula giving the genealogy, which came to be standardised by the time of Skandagupta such as may be noticed in the Bhitari pillar inscription of the emperor. The chief interest of these seals, however, centres in the names of the three Gupta monarchs mentioned after Kumāragupta I. Thus we have Purugupta mentioned as his son and successor who was followed by Narasimhagupta and the latter, in his turn, was succeeded by Kumāragupta III, whose seals these are. Being better preserved, they help us to correct a few errors in the readings of certain names in the Bhitari seal.

In line 5, the name of the wife of Kumāragupta I is certainly Anantadēvī, as has been unanimously read by scholars.
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Hitherto the name of the son of Kumāragupta I begotten on Anantarāvī was read as Purugupta. But it is now quite clear that it is Purugupta (line 6) as our seals unmistakably show the second syllable of the name to be not ṛa but ṛu, the medial ṛu being indicated by a hook attached to the bottom of its proper left. The misreading of the name on the Bhitari seal was evidently due to the indifferent preservation and defaced surface of the inscription, though a careful examination of its plate published by Smith shows faint traces of the medial ṛu below r.

The name of the wife of Purugupta and the mother of Narasimhagupta has been variously read by scholars. Hoernle (JASB., Vol. LVIII, Part I, pp. 210 pp.) and Fleet (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, pp. 224 ff.) who edited the Bhitari seal inscription by turn, took the reading to be Vatsadēvi, while Hirananda Sastri who examined the present seals held (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, p. 77, postscript) that the name of Purugupta’s wife (not mother as inadvertently stated by Sastri) was Vainyadēvi. N. P. Chakravarti, however, was the first to read the name correctly, namely, Chandradēvi (ARASI, 1934-35, p. 63). This is confirmed by an examination of the seals under notice which show complete agreement of form between the first half of this name, viṣṇu, Chandra (line 6) and the identical half of Chandraguptas’ name (lines 2 and 4).

There is a controversy also regarding the name of the wife of Narasimhagupta and mother of Kumāragupta III. Hoernle read it as Śrīmatīdēvi while Fleet maintained that it must be taken as Mahālakshmīdēvi, failing which, it might be a lernatively Mahādēvi or Mahādēvidēvi. These, however, have now to be consigned to the limbo of oblivion in view of the reading Mittradēvi (line 7) furnished by the present seals, as has already been pointed out by Hirananda Sastri and N. P. Chakravarti.

TEXT

Seal A

2 ṛājādhirāja-śri-Chandragupta-putttrasya Līchchhāvī-āuḥruhitrasya Mahādēvyāṁ Kumāradēvyāṁ =utpannasya Mahārājādhirājā-
3 [śri-Sa]mudraguptasya puttras=tat-parigṛhitō Mahādēvyān=Dattadēvyām = utpannasya Mahādēvyāṁ=
5 jādhirāja-śri-Kumāraguptas =ta[s]yā puttras=tat-pādānuddhyātō Mahādēvyāṁ =Anantadēvyāṁ = utpannō Mahā-
7 rājādhirāja-śri-Narasimhagupta[ta]s =ta[s]yā puttras=tat-pādānuddhyātō Mahādēvyāṁ śri-M[ī]trādē-

Seal B

1 Sarvva-rāj-ōchchhēttuh=prithivyām=apratirathasya Mahārāja-śri-Gupta-prapau[ttrasya Mahā)r[a]j-śri-Gha[t]ōtkacha-pau[ttrasya Mahā-
2 ṛājādhirāja-śri-Chandragupta-putttrasya [Lī]chchhāvī-āuḥruhitrasya Mahādēvyāṁ Kumāradēvyāṁ = utpannasya Mahā[r]ā[n]jādhirājā-

1 Hoernle says that Cunningham also read this name as Puru from a coin (JASB., Vol. LXIII, Pt. I, p. 212).
THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS

3 śri-Samudraguptasya puttras = ta[t-pa]ri[gri]hitō Mahādēvyān = Dattadēvyām = ut[panna]s = svayaṁ ch = āpratirathah = Paramabhāga-

4 vatō Mahārājādhirāja-śri-Chandragupta = tasya puttras = tat-pāḍānuddhyātō Mahādē[č]vyān = Dhruvadēvyām = utpanno Mahārā-

5 jādhirāja-śri-Kumā[r]agnāputras = tasya puttras = tat-pāḍānuddhyātō Mahā-

dēvyām = Anantadēvyām = utpanno Mahā-

6 rāj[a*]dhirāja-śri-Purug[uptas = tasya puttras = tat-p[a]dānuddhyāt[ō*] Mahā-

dēvyān śri-Chandradēvyām = utpanno Mahā-

7 rājādhirāja-śri-Narasinhtaguptas = tasya puttras = tat-pāḍānuddhyātō Mahā-

dēvyām śri-Mitrađē-

8 vyā[m = utpannah = Parama]bhāgavatō Mahārājādhirāja-śri-Kumāraguptah

TRANSLATION

Lines 1-3) Of the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Samudragupta, who was the exterminator of all kings; who had no antagonist (of equal power) in the world; who was the son of the son’s son of the Mahārāja, the prosperous Gupta, who was the son’s son of the Mahārāja, the prosperous Ghaṭotkacha, (and) who was the son of the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Chandragupta (I), (and) the daughter’s son of the Lichchhavis, begotten on the Mahādevi Kumāradēvi.

Line 3) The son (was) the Paramabhāgavata, the Māhārājādhirāja, the prosperous Chandragupta (II), who was accepted by him (Samudragupta); who was begotten on the Mahādevi Dattadēvi; and who was himself without an antagonist (of equal power).

Line 4) His son, who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi Dhruvadēvi, (was) the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Kumāragupta (I).

Line 5) His son, who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi Anantadēvi, (was) the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Purugupta.

Line 6) His son, who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi, the prosperous Chandradēvi (was) the Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Narasinhtagupta.

Line 7) His son, who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi, the prosperous Mittradēvi (is) the Paramabhāgavata, the Māhārājādhirāja, the prosperous Kumāragupta (III).

No. 46: PLATE XLVI

BHITARĪ COPPER-SILVER SEAL OF KUMĀRAGUPTA III

This seal was discovered some time before 1866, when the foundations for a new building were being dug at Bhitarī, in the Sanyidpur Tahsil of the Gazipur District, Uttar Pradesh. It was presented by a Muhammadan gentleman of the place to C. J. Nicholls, B.C.S., Judge of Kanpur, and is now in the Government Museum, Lucknow. Its discovery was first announced in the Pioneer newspaper of the 15th May 1889. V. A. Smith made some remarks on it in the issue of the same newspaper of the 28th May following and published a detailed account of the seal in the JAS, Vol. LVIII, Part I, pp. 84 ff. In continuation of his account, A. F. Rudolf Hoernle edited the inscription on the seal with a photo-colotype. Subsequently it was critically re-edited by J. F. Fleet in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, pp. 224 ff., without, however, any plate accompanying it.

The seal is oval in shape, pointed at the top and bottom. Its extreme measurements are, as nearly as possible, 4½” broad by 5⅝” high. The face of the seal is protected by a raised rim, of which the average breadth is about ⅛” and the average height a little less
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than \( \frac{3}{8} \). On the back of it there are two projecting knobs, each about \( \frac{3}{8} \) in diameter, evidently intended for the purpose of attaching it to some such object as a copper charter, which is now lost. The metal is of whitish grey colour, which suggested at first that it was base silver; but it was found, by analysis, to consist of copper, silver and gold, in the proportion of 62.970, 36.225, and 0.405, with a trace of iron; so that it is practically a copper rather than a silver seal. The weight of the seal is 59\( \frac{3}{8} \) tolas. The upper section of the face of the seal, slightly less than half, is occupied by an effigy of Garuda, executed in fairly high relief on the countersunk surface. He is represented standing on a base, composed of two parallel lines, facing front, with outspread wings. His face is that of a man, broad and full, with thick lips. On his forehead is faintly visible the upright Vaishnava tilaka which is the earliest plastic representation of this mark. Curiously enough, his hair is arranged exactly like the wig of an English Judge. A hooded snake is coiled round his neck, its head projecting above his left shoulder. A circle and a crescent, doubtless intended for the sun and the moon, are faintly represented in the field to the proper right and left respectively of the figure. A space about an inch high is left blank at the extreme bottom of the seal. The interval between this space and the parallel lines on which Garuda stands is occupied by writing consisting of eight lines of prose and done in relief. A good deal of it is fairly legible. But lines 2 and 3 are rather badly damaged about the centre; and in some other places the writing is too worn out to be properly read. In the light, however, of the better preserved Nālandā seals of the same ruler, (No. 45 above) there is now absolutely no difficulty in restoring the lost or damaged letters on the present seal. Even a superficial observation will show that this seal is just a metallic replica of the clay specimens from Nālandā, though slightly larger in size than the largest of them. The text and device are identical in all details. Even the lines open and close alike. A careful examination of the original as well as the published plate shows that line 5 closed with maha as on the Nālandā seals, and not with mahārā as was supposed by Hoernle and Fleet, there being no trace of ṛ at the end of the line. Vestiges of this letter are fairly visible at the beginning of the next line where it may confidently be restored from the clear reading in the corresponding line of the Nālandā seals. All other doubtful readings on this seal can likewise be checked and definitively settled by reference to the latter. The characters are well-formed, and are of precisely the same type as those of the Nālandā clay seals of the same ruler (No. 45). The average size of the letters is somewhat less than \( \frac{1}{2} \). The language is Sanskrit. In respect of orthography no points call for notice beyond those detailed in our account of No. 45.

The inscription on the seal is genealogical and refers itself to the time of Kumāragupta III. For the misreadings of some Gupta names on this seal and their corrections, attention is invited to the discussion on p. 357 above.

**TEXT**

1. [Sārvajñaviya]ضا- rañau = ochchhelthi = prithivyaṁ = apratirathasya Mahārāja-śri-Gupta- prapat[tr]asya Mahārāja-śri-迦摩鉤迦- pauttrasya Mahāhā-


3. [śri] Samudraguptasya putras = tat-pariṣ[tr]h[t]i to Mahāhādevya[n = Da]t[t]a-

4. [vatō Mahāhā]


6. [Dhr]yadeva[vy]aṁ = utpanno Mahā-
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No. 47 : PLATE XLVII

DĀMŪDARPUR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF VISHNUGUPTA: THE YEAR 224

This plate was also found in the village of Dāmūdarpur, in the same circumstances as Nos. 22, 24, 38 and 40 and is deposited along with them in the Museum of the Varṇāstha Research Society, Rajshahi, now in Bangladesh. It was edited by Radhagovinda Basak in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, pp. 142 ff. and plate a and b. But the date, namely, 224, was first correctly read by Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, ibid., Vol XVII, p. 193.

The plate is one in number, and is inscribed on both sides, the first containing twelve full lines and a thirteenth with only three syllables and the second containing nine lines of writing. It measures 6½" by 2". The edges of the plate have not been raised into rims for the protection of the writing. Though the letters are well executed and well preserved some of them towards the close of lines 1-4 and in line 12 have been eaten up by verdigris and made quite illegible. There is a regular patch of corrosion right across the first side, which is prominent on the second side also and has rendered it very thin in this portion. The seal is practically of the same oval shape as that of the plate in No. 40 above and was attached to the middle of the proper right side. It measures 2" by 1½" and is divided into two parts with two parallel horizontal straight lines in relief. The upper side is marked with a trident also in relief, and below occurs in relief the legend "Kājivarka-adhishthāna-adhā[ka]raṇya". The weight of the plate together with the seal is 22-1/10 tolas. The characters belong, generally speaking, to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet as remarked about the plate described in No. 22 above. The other palaeographical points that deserve notice are: (1) the occurrence of initial a in adhishthāna=, line 4, Amritadīva, line 6, apradā-, lines 10 and 18, and so on; (2) the initial a in ārya-, line 4, Āyō[dy]ka-, line 6, akṣhēṇā, line 22; (3) the initial i in it, lines 14 and 17; (4) the initial e in itamād= and itam-, line 14, and ekāḥ in line 16 and (twice) in line 17; (5) the peculiar form of the medial ā after y and dh indicated by a hook attached to the bottom on the proper left of these letters as in -ksēṭraṇāṁ, lines 6 and 7, āvadhāraṇā-, line 24, and -vvasudhā, line 20; (6) the method of forming r in conjunction with a following y, e.g., in ārya-, line 4; (7) the coupling of ending i and n with the immediately following consonants, e.g., tat-pāda-, line 2, -Amritadīva=paṁchāda:, line 14, sāvva-kāla-, line 18 and -stokān=datūn=, line 10; and (8) the peculiar conjunct hya in -vāḥ(h)ya-hya, line 6 and upasāngirīya, lines 7 and 14. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose throughout, with the exception of three impercative verses in lines 20 to 22. The only linguistic peculiarity that calls for notice is the use of the affix ka in some words, such as -ānuvahama[na]kā, line 3, -niyuktaḥ, line 4, and -kulaṇātraka-, line 6. In respect of orthography, we have to note (1) the doubling of k, g, ṭ, ṭ(ḥ), d(ḥ), b(ḥ), m, and n in conjunction with a preceding r as in -madhuparka-, line 9, vṛṣṭag, line 21, -pravartana-, line 9, sārthavāḥ-, line 5, Punjabāravahā-, line 2, kṛmī=-bhūtā, line 20, -dharmāṇa, lines 10 and 18, dharm[ṛ]ma[], line 11, dharma, line 12, pārvan (twice), line 17, vahubhir=-vvasudhā, line 20; also wrongly in the case of sh in Kājivarkaḥsha-, line 3 and varsha, line 21; (2) the doubling of t in conjunction with a following r, e.g., "putra-, line 3, -kulaṇātraka-, line 6, -[kṣa]tṛa", line 6, (but not in the same word in line 10 or in atr=-āryaḥ, line 8 or in -satre-
9); (3) the change of visarga to s in conjunction with that letter following it, as, e.g., vāṣṭu-
hīs = sāha, line 15; (4) the omission of the sign of avagraha as, e.g., in vīkramyā = nava-
titaṁ, line 7; (5) the omission of sandhi, e.g., in samyocahāribhīsa dēva, line 19; and (6) the joining of ending m with the following va, e.g., in para-dattām = vā, line 20.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of a Paramadaivata Paramabhaṭṭaraka Mahārājā-
dhirāja whose name has disappeared with the upper corner of the proper left side of the plate which is destroyed. According to Basak, "only two letters seem to be cut off from the portion of this plate and lost," and he surmises that they might be Bhānu.1 On the other hand, the late Rao Bahadur H. Krishna Sastri thought that the reading was probably Ku-mā-ra.2 But if two letters only have been lost here as Basak rightly contends, they may perhaps be restored as (Vishnu) Gupta who, in that case, may be identified with Vishnu(Gupta)-Chandrāditya, one of the last Gupta kings of this period. Its date in numerical symbols, seems to be the year two hundred and twenty-four (=542-43 A.D.) on the fifth day of Bhādrapada (August-September). Under [Vishnu?] Gupta, was a Mahārājā as Head (Uparika) of the Pundravarṣadhaṇa Province (bhūkta). His name also has not been preserved. But the titles Dēva, Bhaṭṭaraka and, above all, Rājaputra, which are coupled with his name show that he was some prince of the imperial family. Further, in the Kōṭivarṣa District, the Court (adbhi-
karaṇa) of the Town (adbhisūla) was being carried on by the Vishayapati Svayambhūdeva, appointed by the Uparika, along with the Nāga-śrīśākhu Ribhpāla, the Sāttavāka Sthānu-
datta, the Prathamakulika Matidatta and the Prathamakāyashta Skandapāla. We are then 
told that Amritadēva, a kulaputra from Ayōdhya, applied to the Town Court of the Kōṭivarṣa District for the purchase of some khīla or waste land, on condition of apanā-dharma, "Law of 
Irreovable (Endowment)—practically, the same as Akṣayanīvīv-dharma—and, by the issue 
of a copper-plate charter, by paying the price at the usual rate of three dināras for each 
kulavāpa of such land. The object of this purchase of land was to make provision for repairs, 
etc., to the temple of the god, Śvētavarāhasvāmin, for the establishment of the bāli, charu, 
śatra, etc., and for the supply of the materials for daily worship of the god. In accordance 
with the ascertainment of the record-keepers, land, measuring five kulavāpas, situated in four 
different localities specified in the inscriptions was sold to Amritadēva.

It is worthy of note that Amritadēva, who bought the land, is described as Ayōdhya-
kulaputra. That means that he was a kulin originally come from Ayōdhya. It is tempting 
to remark that just as in later times Kanauj was the cradle of the kulin Brāhmaṇas and 
Kāyasthas of Bengal, in the Gupta period this position of honour was occupied by Ayōdhya 
as may be seen from the fact that in line 10 of Inscription No. 21 above Brāhmaṇas of 
various gōtras are referred to as having come from Ayōdhya and settled in connection with the 
temple of Śailēśvara.

TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1 to 3 Anushṭubh]

Seal—Kōṭivarṣa-śādhishṭhān-śāh[karanasya*]

First Side

1 Sa[mva] 200 20 4 Bhādra di 5 Paramadaivata-Paramabhaṭṭaraka-Ma[hā]-
rājādhirāja-śrī [.. 9]--

---

3 Basak seems to be right in supposing that two letters only have apparently been lost with the cut-off portion of the plate. As pointed out above, they can be restored as Vishnu for the reasons assigned there.
THE GUPTA INSCRIPTIONS

2 guptē prithivipatau tat-pāda-parigrihitē Puṇḍravarddhana-bhuktāv = Upari[ka-
Mahārāja]syā... 
3 rājaputra-Dēva-bhaṭṭārakasya hasya-aśva-jana-bhōgēn = ānuvahamā[na]kē Kō-
[tiva]rśhsha¹-visha[yē] cha ta-
4 n-niyuktakē [I*]ha-vishayapati-Svayambhūdēvē adhishṭhānā-ādhirakaraṇa[m*] ārya-
[na]gara[śrēṣṭhī-Rihu]pāla-
5 Sārīrthaśā-ha-Sthānudatta-prathamakulika-Matidatta-prathamakāyastha-Śandapāla-
purōgē [saṁ]jya[vaha]rati 
6 Ayō[diya]ka-kulaputtraka-Amrītadēvēna vijñāpitam = iha-vishayē samudaya-bāhy-
āprahata-khila-[kṣē]ṭrā-
7 nām tri-dīnārika-kulyāvāpa-vikrayō = nuvṛittāh [I*] tad = arathā maṭṭo dinārān =
upasaṁgrihya man-mātūḥ [pu]ṇyā-
8 bhīvṛddhāyē atr = āraṇyē Bhagavataḥ Svētavaraśa-svāminō dēvakule khaṇḍa-
phutā²-prati[sam]ksā[ra-ka]-
9 raṇāya bali-charu-satra³-pravarttana-gavya-dhūpa-pusīpa-prāpana-madhūparkka-
dip-ādy-upa[yō]gā[ya] cha 
10 apradā-dharmmēna tāmrapattikṛtya kṣērā-stōkan = dātum = iti [I*] yataḥ pra-
thama-pustapāla-Nara[na]ndi-
11 Gopaṭatta-Bhaṭaṇandimām = avadhāraṇāya yuktatayā dha[rmm-ādhū]kāra-[bu]
dhūya vijñāpira[m*] [nō] kāry[o] 
12 vishayapatinā kāśchid = virōdhaḥ kēva[laṁ] śri-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-pādānu[m*] dharmma-[pha][la-sha*]-
13 ḍ-bhā[g-ā*]vāp[tj[i[h*] 

Second Side

14 ity = anēn = avadhāraṇa-kramēna ētasmād = Amritadēvāt = pañcādasa-āpradā
 = upasaṁgrihya ētan-mātū[hi*] 
15 anugrahēna Svachehhandapāṭaka = [rddha]ṭi-prāvēṣya-Lavaṅgaskāyān = cha vās-
tubhis = saha kulyāvāpa-dvayaṅ 
16 Śatuvānāśramakē = pi vāstunā saha kulyāvāpa ēkaḥ Pārmatikāyāṁ Pañcavakyā-
vapakasya = ōtta[ṛ]tā 
17 Jamuṭa[na-dyaḥ] pūrvvēna kulyāvāpa ēkaḥ Pūranaṇvindikaharaṇu Pātaka-pūrvvēna
 kulyāvāpa ēkaḥ ity = ēvaṁ khila-kṣētra-
18 syā vāstunā saha pañcā kulyāvāpāḥ apradā-dharmmēna Bhaga[va*]tē Svētavara-
ha-svāminē śāśvat-kāla-bhōgyā dattāh [I*] 
19 tad = uttara-klām saṁvavyahāribhiḥ dēvabhaktāyē = ānumantavyāḥ [I*] api cha
 bhūni-[dā]-saṁvadhāḥ⁶ slōkā bhavanti [I*] 
20 Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ = vā yō harēta vasundhāraṁ[rām] [I*] sa vishṭhāyaṁ
 krimira⁷ = bbhuṭvā pitribhīs = saha pachyatē [I I I*] vahuḥbhūr = vvasudhā dattā
DAMODARPUR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF VISHNUGUPTA:
THE YEAR 224

G. S. Gai
From photographs
21 rājabhis=Sagar=ādibhiḥ [*] yasya yasya yādā bhūmīs=tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ
[1²] Shashṭhiṅhiि varisisha(rsha)-sahasrāni svargge mōḍati bhūmidā[ḥ*] [1]
22 ākshēptā ch=ānumantā cha tāṇy=ēva narakē vasēditii²

TRANSLATION

Seal—Of the town court of Kōṭivarsha.

(Lines 1 to 5) The year 200 (and) 20 (and) 4, (the month of) Bhādra, the day 5, while Paramaṇāgānata Paramabhaṭṭaraka Māhārājādhirāja, the prosperous [Vishnu?]u̇gaṇta is the lord of the earth; and while the Kōṭivarsha District is running on with the enjoyment (of the rule) consisting of elephants, horses and soldiers of Mahārāja.--------. His Honour, the Prince, the Bhaṭṭaraka, and Upārika over the Pundravarṇdhana province, being selected by His (Majesty’s) feet; and while the vishayaṇapati Svaṇambhūṭēva, appointed by him, is administering the Court of the Town as the chief of the Nagarā-trīśṭhiṅhi Ārya Ribhipāla, the Sārīthavāha Sthāṇuddata, the Prathamakukka Matidatta and the Prathamakayastha Skandapāla;

(Lines 6 to 10) Whereas the Kulaṭputraka² Amṛtadēva, an inhabitant of Ayodhya, has petitioned: “In the district here is customary the sale, at the rate of one kulaṭvāpē for three dināras, of unfurrowed waste land free from revenue. So ye deign, to assign a bit of land, for the augmentation of the spiritual merit of my mother, after accepting dināras from me (and) turning it into a copper-plate charter in accordance with the Law of Irrevocable (Endowment),¹ for the execution of repairs to cracks and fissures, for the establishment of balī, charu and sātra, for the supply of cow’s milk, frankincense and flowers and for the use of madhuparka, light and so forth, in the temple of the god Śvētavarāha-svāmin here in the forest”;

(Lines 10 to 13) Whereas it has been determined through the ascertainment of the chief record-keeper Naranandin, and Gopādatta and Bhaṭṭanandin that the application has been made properly (and) in the spirit of the administration of Law (dharma), that no objection whatever can be taken by the Vishayaṇapati (and) that.--------. there will be purely an acquisition of one-sixth (of the produce) to the prosperous and great Venerable Bhaṭṭaraka, as a lawful accrual;

(Lines 14 to 18) In consequence of this line of ascertainment (and) having received fifteen dināras from that Amṛtadēva, (and) out of kindliness to his mother, five kulaṭvāpas of land including high land¹ were granted, to be enjoyed for all time to come, in accordance with the Law of Irrevocable (Endowment) to the god Śvētavarāha-svāmin, namely two kulaṭvāpas including high land in Svāchhhaṇḍapāṭṭa and Lavaṇgaskā accessible through Ardhaṇī, one kulaṭvāpa including high land in Sāṭuvaṇāśramaka, one kulaṭvāpa including high land in Paraptakā to the north of Panchakulāvāpaka and the east of the Jambūnadi, and one kulaṭvāpa to the east of Pāṭaka in Pūrṇavindikāhari.

¹ Read shashṭhiṅhiि.
² Read ṣaṭęi [³] ॥ ॥ ॥ [⁴]
¹ The word kulaṭputra occurs not only in Sanskrit, but also in Pali literature; e.g., iva sarveśu-phalaṁ kulaṭputra-mahādṛvaṇaḥ in the Mīchchhakathā, Act IV, verse 10 and Yassa kassaci Mahādāna kulaṭpatana paṇcika dharmā suvisesāna in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya, Part III, p. 76. It is generally rendered by “a son of a noble family, respectable youth.” But it corresponds to the Bengali kulin in such phrases as kulin-Brahmana and kulin-Kṣatriya and had better be translated by 'son of a good stock or recognised clan.'
² Aprodhi-dharmaṇa dānāntaritithi of this record may be compared to akṣaya-nīyopas tānrapattāiñna dānatim in line 17 of Baigrama copper-plate inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, pp. 81 ff.) and line 7 of Banaḍpur copper-plate inscription (Ibid., Vol. XXIII, pp. 52 ff.).
³ The word viśu is used in practically the same sense as in lines 9 and 16 of Baigrama copper-plate inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, pp. 81 ff.).
⁴ As surmised by Basak, this seems to be a plot of land so named because it contained five kulaṭvāpas.
(Line 19) So these (kālyavāṇas) should be respected by administrators in time to come, out of devotion to the god. There are also verses relating to the grant of land:—

(Verse 1) He, who takes away land given by himself or by others, having become a worm in excreta, rots with his forefathers.

(Verse 2) Land has been granted by many kings such as Sagara and others. The fruit (of such grant) belongs to whosoever possesses the earth at any time.

(Verse 3) The giver of land rejoices in heaven for sixty thousand years. He who resumes it and he who asents to (it) may dwell in hell for exactly those (years).

No. 48 : PLATE XLVIII

NĀLandā CLAY SEAL OF VISHNuGUPTA

The seal bearing an inscription of Vishnu Gupta was also exhumed like those of Vainyagupta and others in 1927-28 from Monastery Site No. 1 at Nālandā, Patna District, Bihar. It has remained unnoticed even in Hirananda Sastri’s Nalanda and its Epigraphical Material (MĀSI, No. 66). It is published for the first time by Krishna Deva in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVI, pp. 235 and ff. This seal also was originally a clay impression which was burnt eventually into a terracotta mentioned on page 355 above.

The seal is fragmentary, its upper right half being broken off. The extreme measurements of the extant fragment are, as nearly as possible, 3" by 2\(\frac{4}{5}\)" by 2\(\frac{4}{5}\)", comprising the last four lines of writing. There is no doubt that like the other Gupta seals from Nālandā this seal also was oval in shape, pointed at the top and bottom, and that its edge was marked by a border line which is distinct at the bottom. Like them, again, its upper field must have been occupied by a figure of Gauḍa, flanked by the sun and the crescent, the lower containing eight lines of writing. Of these, the proper right halves of the first four have been completely lost, and of the fifth, not only the right half but also part of the left. Nevertheless, on the analogy of the other seals the full legend of this seal also can be restored with reasonable certainty. The characters exhibit a mixture of southern and eastern varieties. The notable examples of the former are sa and ha, and of the latter ma. The height of the letters varies from \(\frac{1}{8}\)" to \(\frac{1}{4}\)". The language is Sanskrit. In respect of orthography we have to notice (1) the doubling of dh in conjunction with a following y as in -pādānudhyātō, (lines 2 and 3); (2) the doubling of r in conjunction with a following r as in puṭras=, (lines 2 and 3); and the use of the upādhuṇyā sign as in... mnah=Paramā" (line 4).

The inscription on the seal is genealogical in character, and refers itself to the reign of Vishnu Gupta. What is preserved of the seal says that he was the son of the Mahārājādhirāja Kumāragupta, grandson of the Mahārājādhirāja Purugupta. This shows that as in other seals this also sets forth in an unbroken line of succession the Gupta princes from Mahārāja Gupta to Kumāragupta, father of Purugupta. This seal carries the genealogy of the Imperial Gupta dynasty one generation further than was hitherto known. It is, however, unfortunate that the name of Vishnu Gupta’s mother has been lost in the broken portion of the last line.

TEXT

1... hārājādhi[r[ā]ja-śr[ī]-[P*]u...  
2... h[ā*]r[ā*]hṛāja-śrī-Narasiṃha[guptas]=-tasya puttras=tat-pādanudd- 
   dh[yā*t]f[ō]  
3... r ajādhirāja-śrī-Kumaraguptas=tasya puttras=tat-pādanuddhyātō Ma[hā]-  
4... mnah= Paramabhāgavatō Mahārājādhirāja-śrī-Viṣṇug[u][ptaḥ ni*]
NALANDĀ CLAY SEAL OF VISHṆUGUPTA

G. S. Gai

From photograph
INDEX

By S. Subramania Iyer, M.A., Ph.D.

[The figures refer to pages, and * after a figure to foot-notes. The following other abbreviations also have been used: au.=author; br.=Brahmapuri; ca.=capital; ch.=chief; ci.=city; cn.=country; com.=composer; de.=deity; dl.=district or division; dt.=district; dy.=dynasty; E.=Eastern; engr.=engravers; ep.=epigraphs; fs.=famous; fr.=familial; gen.=general; gr.=grant; gr.=granite; hist.=historical; ins.=inscription, inscriptions; k.=king; l.=locality; l.m.=linear measure, land measure; m.=male; m.m.=minister; mnt.=mountain; myth.=mythological; n.=name; N.=Northern; of.=office, officers; p.=people; pl.=plate, plates; pr.=prince, princess; reg.=region; rel.=religion, religions; ri.=river; S.=Southern; s.=same as; saur.=saurashtra; s.c.=sculpture; t.=title; t.d.=tertiarional division; t.r.=town; v.=village; w.=Western; w.r.=work; wt.=weight]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Bāna, a., of the demons,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>10, 199, 171, 173, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>181, 182, 211, 242 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Bānapura r., Kātyāvarsha, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Banaras, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>5, 68, 321, 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Bandhuvantra, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Bandhuvarman, k., of Dānapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>66-67, 75-76, 166, 172, 253, 323, 326, 329 n, 330, 330 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Banerji R.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>1, 1 n, 5, 59, 82, 93, 95, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>274, 260, 320, 330 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Bāgar or Bāg-nagar, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bāgar j., Bāvīkota, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Bangladesh, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>56, 73, 121, 273, 283, 335-36, 342, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Barī, caste,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bankar, b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>20, 55, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bankar, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>55 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bāpūlu, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bappudāda, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bārī, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bārāgu, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>200, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bārcī, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bārendhra-bāhūmana, community,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bankar k., Chandragupta III, Guptas k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>46-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bārnā, s., of a f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bārun, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Bānāl, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>192, 196-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Bānālā, s. pillar ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Bānālā, s. pillar ins., dated Kṛṣṇa year 294,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>15, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Barnett, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>193, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Baroda grant of Gujarāt Rāṣṭrākūṭa, t., Karkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>247 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Baroda grant of Gujarāt Rāṣṭrākūṭa, t., Karka I,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>242 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Baron A. Von Suel Holsterin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>1 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 n, 338 n</td>
<td>East Bengal, av.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 179</td>
<td>Eastern Chalukya, ē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 n</td>
<td>Eastern Chalukyan pl.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eastern Ghat, mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East Godavari, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eastern Deccan confederacy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 90, 297</td>
<td>Eggeling,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ekhuvula Chākhānula, Tīhātka k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>ēka-Brahmanas' unique friend of the Brihadanast, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Ekāṅgī stone ins. of Naravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ekāṅgī sā. Śiva, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Elamakachi, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elamakachi Kaliṣadāsa, ē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Elliot William,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ellora, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Ėmukha, 'boar',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Epigraphs of the Gupta period,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indica, Journal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Era—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gupta years of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>41, 181, 181, 236, 240, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>65, 181, 236, 243, 249 n, 244, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>245, 246 n, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>65-67, 73, 231, 248, 250, 252, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>73, 75, 267, 268-70, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>75, 278-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>77, 272-73, 273 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>292 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 (wrong for 129)</td>
<td>73, 273-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 (wrong for 107)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>76, 78-79, 276-77, 278-79, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>65, 76, 79, 283-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>73, 92, 101, 168, 275, 262-83, 265-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>267-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>73-74, 101, 275, 288-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>73, 77, 92, 179, 291-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>77, 249, 293 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>73, 77, 79-81, 83, 296-97, 301, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>81, 83, 296, 298, 300-01, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>81, 83, 296, 298, 303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kṛita, years of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>191, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>190-92, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>190, 192, 197, 261-62, 264-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>187, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>191-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lichchāvī, years of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mālava, years of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>66, 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>193, 327, 329 n, 330 n, 331, 332 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>323, 327, 329 n, 330 n, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>195, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>187, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>332 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256</td>
<td>188, 193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Śaka, years of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>246 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (wrong for 84)</td>
<td>140, 140 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>246 n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Flaizbad, dt. .......................... 56, 118, 229 n, 289
Faridpura copper pl., granua ........... 274, 337 n, 399 n, 395 n
Fatepura Säri, ts. ..................... 143, 154 n
Ferguson, James ........................ 204
Firs J. F. ................................ 309, 339
Fitz Edward Hall ........................ 309, 339
Fleet, 75 ............................... 2-3, 6, 1, 2, 19, 21, 31, 31 n, 37-38, 51 n
French, p.to ........................... 28
Frontier countries ........................ 22
Führer ................................. 272
Fuk-sze i.e. Shiam, ca. ................. 28
Fyzabad, et ........................... 65
Francis Buchanan (Hamilton) .......... 305
G

Vaishali, years of, ........................ 183
208, 206 ............................... 183
209, 206 ............................... 183
574 ................................. 184
712 ............................... 183
945 .................................. 183

Vikram, years of, ........................ 767
454 ................................. 75, 159, 263
461 ................................. 75, 267
474 ................................. 66
460 ................................. 75
486 ................................. 75, 159
493 ................................. 144
524 ................................. 75-76, 148, 331 n
529 ................................. 69, 132
568 ................................. 69
590 ................................. 69
662 ................................. 136, 164, 332 n
795 ................................. 188
847 ................................. 239 n
898 ................................. 194
943 ................................. 193
1050 ................................. 192
1058 ................................. 188
1149 ................................. 188
1159 ................................. 113
1207 ................................. 199
1220 ................................. 187
1226 ................................. 114
1233 ................................. 117-18
1783 ................................. 181, 183

Vikram, years of, Southern .............. 396
945 .................................. 183
1320 .................................. 183

Erän, st. .............................. 11, 16, 86, 221, 224 n, 339
Erän ins. of Bodhagupta dated 484 A.D. 94, 95, 94, 104, 105, 339
Erän ins. of Samudragupta ............... 32, 94, 129, 220, 231
Erän ins. of Toramana .................. 221, 224 n, 234 n, 339
Erän posthumous pillar ins. of Göpāçāla dated Gupta 279 n
year 191 .................................. 97
Erāndapāli s.a. Erānpāla, et .......................... 16
Erāndapāla, ca. .......................... 12, 16-19, 213, 217
Erāndapāla, in .......................... 16, 19
Eth, dt. ............................... 258
European, p.to .......................... 145
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## INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 132-33, 327, 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 45, 49 n, 46 n, 55, 55 n, 57, 194-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251, 265, 266 n, 265 n, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 127, 197-98, 263-64, 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176, 181-82, 200-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 146, 158-59, 171, 175, 175, 195, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87, 143, 181, 211, 226, 223 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 88-89, 109, 178, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 16, 17-23, 121 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 153, 239, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96, 31, 144, 207-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 60, 87-88, 137, 140, 150, 200-09, 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48, 48 n, 49, 55, 57, 58, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343, 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 103, 181, 241 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 124, 293 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99, 224, 227 n, 234, 319, 350, 354 n, 355, 357, 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 n, conjunct letter, distinguished from an almost similar sign for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 n, conjunct letter, distinguished from an almost similar sign for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 45, 45 n, 46 n, 54 n, 356, 357 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200, 202, 297, 314-15, 317, 331 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143, 246 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14, 19, 23 n, 37, 60, 110-14, 191, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 142-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, 333-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237, 237 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, 94, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237, 234, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52, 232-34 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83, 109, 112, 214 n, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 9-10, 25-26, 62, 75, 86, 89, 203-06, 266, 346 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 4-5, 89, 121, 132, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India N., d.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India N.E., d.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India W., d.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India S., d.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian chronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indor, ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indor, br.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indor copper pl. ins. of Skandagupta dated Gupta year 146, 83, 93, 246 n, 308, 309 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Sceythian pr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Sceythian kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indradyumna, vishnu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrajit, spiket of gold Vishnu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrapura, ret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrapura, br.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrapurana, d.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrawash, Chakamana k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrawishu, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indumati, Vairabha princess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus, ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins. at Sâcheh of Chandragupta I., dated Gupta year 93, 26, 65, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins. of Kumâragupta dated Gupta year 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins. at Mandor of Naravarman dated Krita year 161, 66, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignia—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garuda,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varaha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron pillar ins. of Chandragupta of Mohrauli,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irtho, 'bitter jealousy',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvara, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvara, same ending in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvaramayya, Ṛ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvararāṣṭra, Abhira k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvaravarman, Maunkhari k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvaravaksha, 1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, Tang, Chinese ev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J, flat and angular base,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson A.M.T.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagadāparāś, goddaś.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagadāśāram, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagnad-durjā, 'creator of the universe',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagnāṇītyāgarav,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaggayayapēṣa, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jangān, Mahāgān k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaimini-sūtra, aṣṭ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina author,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina books,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina cosmography,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina literature,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina monks,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina preceptor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina te.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina dr̥̄ṇākasāra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina tradition,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina vek.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainism, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainika, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainpur, former state,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainpur, E., l.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jallāpur, m.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalabana, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambatavā, m., monkey warrior,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambavata, wife of Śrī-Krishna,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambūnādi, ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Princep,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janmū, ni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janardana, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janakādāna, br.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāngala, 'arid and infertile land',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāregyikī, ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jankāpur, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasdan ins. of Malikābhavasena Prithviraj dated Saka 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaxo, former state,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātaka literature,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātaka or Jāt; t. a. Madeka r. a. Miścchha, tribe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunpur stone ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaya, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaabhāṣa, d.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaabhāṣāvānī, d.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaadhahendra copper plate grant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaadhahendra, Gobelnadde k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaadhata, Ṛ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaadhata, provincial governor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaadhav, Ṛ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaēḍāya, I. k., of Nepal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaēṭāri, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayanāndā, Ṛ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayanātha, Udayāhāsaka k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaśpīda,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayānātha, W. Chalukya k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayawal, K.P.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāṭān, ēṭā,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāṭān, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīloti, ēḍā Ṛ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīloti, community,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīloya-ṣār, 'tract where Jīloyas have settled',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīloya-jēgām, 'chief of Jīloya tribe',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīloyavār, 'area comprising part of Bavapalpur state and Multan d.',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jullucūr, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumna, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāgadh, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāgadh, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāgadh, d., of Ruradāman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāgadh ins. of Skandagupta, 78, 80-83, 94, 127-28, 183, 256 n, 296, 298, 317 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāgadh ins. of Skandagupta, 73, 80-83, 94, 127-28, 183, 256 n, 296, 298, 317 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāgadh ins. of Skandagupta, 73, 80-83, 94, 127-28, 183, 256 n, 296, 298, 317 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jvīśṭhā Kāśyapa, tin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jvīśṭhādārā, aṣṭ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K**

| K | 28 |
| Kaḥal, r. | 50-52 |
| Kačā, Gupta fr. | 254 n |
| Kačā I, d. | 254 n |
| Kačā II, d. | 51, 51 n |
| Kačā s.a. Kāčā | 51, 52 n |
| Kačā s.a. Samudragupta, Gupta fr. | 51, 52 n |
INDEX

Kushāla epigrapha (or records), 27, 97, 233-36, 241 n
Kushāla kingdom, 30
Kushāla period, 77, 137, 196, 246 n
Kushāla-putra, dy., 27, 205 n
Kushāla-putra, ins. n., of Kusihāla I, 1 n
Kushāla rule, 28
Kushāla style, 205 n
Kushāla times, 237
Kushāla type with Ardolīkī, type of Kushāla coin, 29
Kusīka, erotic peplum, 133-35, 236-38, 240-41
Kushtalapura, ce., 13, 17, 19, 213, 217
Kushtalapura, ln., 15
Kusnapura s.a. Kāntrapura, ce., 260-64
K‘u-ta-ko-chu-lo s.a. Kusnapura, ci., 207
Kuttalūr s.a. Kushtalapura, ln., 17
Kuttalūr
Kuttalūritka, 102
Kuttalūritka, husbandman, 318
Kuṭṭampi, 'culivator', 102, 105-46, 246 n, 335, 337 n
Kuṭṭamini s.a. Kuṭṭamī s.a. Kanpi, 109
Kyotacottaka, 213 n
L
l, eastern type, 258
l, forming only to the left, 259 n
l, left limb undergoing a change and turning sharply down, 205
l, right limb of which is a long vertical stroke bent towards the left, 262
l, western type, 258
Laccdive, island, 26 n
Lachchūkā, t.s., 231 n
Lachchūśeivāra, te., 231 n
Lachchūśeivara, god, 237 n
Lachchūka, fe., 237 n
Lādā ins., of Sādārāra, 110, 318 n
Laghu Hātāin-amriti, mē, 128
Lakaharaśa, Sīla k., 116
Lakṣṭun, goddess, 127-28, 299, 302
Lakṣṭun temple, 330
Lakshadive s.a. Laccadive, island, 26 n
Lakuli, incarnation of Sīla, 238
Lakuli, sect., 238
Lakuli, figure of, 230-32
Lakulin, incarnation of Sīla, 138-33
Lakulīsa, de., 139
Lakulīsa, sect., 238
Lakulīsa, figure of, 234
Lakṣṭu, staff, 134
Lala, ef., 97
Lala Jayasimhan, 261
Lalādihāya Muktārāja, k., of Kashmir, 90
Lāttāka
Parakhrama, 217 n
Garuḍa, 80
Śrīkaṇṭha-pāda, 217 n
Language,
Apabhramśa, 44
Arabic, 46, 337 n
Bengali, 103, 279 n, 337 n, 363 n
Chinese, 267
Gujarati, 101, 103, 246 n, 279 n, 337 n
Hindi, 230, 269 n, 279 n
Kannada, 99, 176
Mahārāṣṭrī, 176
Marāṭhī, 103, 106, 176, 246 n, 250, 279 n, 337 n
Mixed dialect, 196, 272, 293 n
Orisi, 14
Pali, 15, 208, 210, 251 n, 252 n, 272 n
Pāli, 56
Persian, 47, 324
Prakrit, 15, 41, 44, 142, 174, 240 n, 241 n, 256 n, 295 n
Sanskrit, 1 n, 41, 44, 70, 119, 142, 147, 174, 196-97, 206, 210,
221, 225, 229, 232, 236, 239 n, 243, 245, 258, 255, 258,
260, 262, 266, 268, 269 n, 271, 272 n, 274, 279 n, 280, 283,
286 n, 287-33, 294-95, 297, 304 n, 306, 309, 315, 316, 320-21,
Sanskrit and Prakrit, 3
Tamil, 99
Lātī pha., of Gāhādvāla k., Gāvindachandra, 20
Lātā, 76, 121, 164-65, 322-24, 928
Lātā-Anupāsana, type of alliteration, 157, 166
Lātā-Brāhmāna community, 121
Lātā, 'measuring staff', 249
Laugākhi Kātyāyana, sa., 108
Lauhotiya s.a. Brahmāpura, ri., 87
Lauhotiya, 'creepers', 326, 330
Lavangasāla, l., 362-63
Law B.C., 23 n
Legend on coins, 279 n
Ajita-Mahānā, 279 n
Adevīzhau-parīkrama, 254 n
Śri Adevīzhau-Mahānā, 279 n
Śri-Mahānā, 279 n
Śri Vikrama, 82
Samudragupta, 229
Śrīvijaya, 46-47
Lichchhavī, ṣk., 2, 4, 6, 6 n, 7, 64, 70, 72, 79, 90, 180, 215, 220,
227-28, 230, 253, 255, 268-70, 315-16, 316 n, 346-49, 353,
357, 359
Lichchhāvī date, 181
Lichchhāvī era, 180
Lichchhāvī kingdom, 67, 107
Lichchhāvī principality, 260
Lichchhāvī of Nepal, ṣk., 179
Līchchha-ṣā, 123
Līchchhi-ṣā ti. s.a. Līchchhavi, ṣk., 220 n
Līchchhi-ṣā ti. ti. s.a. Līchchhavi, ṣk., 116
Līchchhāvi, ṣk., 133, 238
Līgā-Kahō, epīṣēt, 343
Lion Slayer type, coin of Chandragupta II,
I.ēkapāla, god, 340, 340 n
Iēkapāla, 'viceroy', 94 n
Iēka, 'popular usage and custom', 65, 257 n
Lōkottara-vāhika, 144
Lōkottara-vāca or school of philosophy,
Lōkottara-vādin, 142, 144
Lōtā, 99
Lūders, 5, 140 n, 241 n
Lyrant type of coin, coin of Samudragupta,
34, 41, 43
M
m, form of, 205, 253, 266, 272, 313, 321
m, eastern variety of the Gupta period, 325, 268, 272, 309
m, ending, form of, 281, 292, 321
m, ending, joining of with the following n, 361
m, sometimes joining with the following n and s, 274
m, eastern variety, 260, 295
m, engraved diminutively, 243, 243 n
m, s, k, eastern form of, 205 n
Macedonia, ṣk., 109, 310 n
Madayantikā, tr., 138, 327, 332
Māhāhartraprīta, matrāryan, 109
Māhāhartraprīta Vipra-prasudhabhika, Skāhākū k.,
Māhāharvāra, n. of a courtesan, 13, 110
Māhāharvāra, sa., 40
Māhāharvāra Māhāharvāna I, Vishākunḍi k.,
Māhāhara, N., of a poetical quality, 161-63
Māhā�ūdana, epithet of god Vishnu, 125, 129
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Mandasar ins. of Prabhakara dated Vikrama 524, 144, 188, 193-94
Mandasar ins. of Yasodharman dated Vikrama 589, 87-88, 129, 193, 250 n, 286
Mandasar duplicate (fragmentary) ins. of Yasodharman, 268, 322
Manḍer, ci, 237
manḍala, 'blessediction', 164, 166, 171
Māṅg, community, 107
Maṅgaṅa ins. of the time of Kaniska dated year 18, 97
Maṇḍūpura, co, 35
Maṇḍūsanahar-Gupta s.a. Maṇḍūsanahar, m, 219
Maṇḍūsāri s.a. Maṇḍūsāri, Māṅkār, 291 n
Māṅkrāwār, dojo, 77, 291
Māṅkāwār image ins. of Kannayagupta I dated Gupta year 129, 73, 141, 292
Maṇḍōrā, aff, 99
Maṇḍabdar, 99
Maṇḍabdar, 97
Maṇḍabdar, ck, 99
Maṇḍāra, ka, 12, 15, 17, 212-13, 213 n, 217, 309 n
Maṇḍāra, sat, 35, 125, 138, 208-11, 293 n, 337 n, 345 n
Maṇḍāravī, sat, 115, 269-10, 310 n, 328 n
Maṇḍāravīs, w, 334-35
Maṇḍēci, sge, 205
Maṇḍēvīka-purāṇa, sat, 66
Maṇḍēvīka-purāṇa, 66
Maṇḍūsārī s.a. Maṇḍūsāri, tribe, 29
Maṇḍūsāri, John, 95, 248
Maṇḍūsāri s.a. Maṇḍūsāri, tribe, 26
Maṇḍīr, co, 21, 55
Maṇḍīr, 'rules', 286-90
Māṅkāwā, t, 1 n
Māṅkāwār s.a. Māṅkāwār, Maṅkāwā, 'trustworthy or repeatable', 397 n
Māṇḍānapura, th, 281 a
Māṇḍānapura, māṇya, 281 n
Māṇḍāravī, th, 1-2, 21, 23, 25, 27-28, 59, 64, 77, 134, 139-40, 143, 201, 234-36, 238, 252, 256 n, 272, 287-83
Māṇḍāravī, dh, 232, 272, 287
Māṇḍāravī fragmentary ins. of Champadurgapura II, 42, 122, 216 n, 236, 292, 313
Māṇḍāravī ins. dated Gupta year 61, 41, 52, 133-34, 161, 234, 222
Māṇḍāravī ins. of Huvishka (date lost), 97
Māṇḍāravī ins. of Huvishka dated year 23, 138
Māṇḍāravī ins. of Kaniska dated year 4, 23, 141-42, 205 n, 292
Māṇḍāravī ins. of Kaniska dated year 8, 27
Māṇḍāravī ins. of Kaniska dated year 14, 205
Māṇḍāravī image ins. of Kannayagupta dated Gupta year 107, 272, 287-83
Māṇḍāravī Jaina ins., 29, 272, 293a, 314
Māṇḍāravī image ins. dated Gupta year 230, 287 n
Māṇḍāravī lion capital ins. of Kaniska, 142-53
Māṇḍāravī, eff., 119, 361-63
Māṇḍāravī, k, 20, 213, 217
Māṇḍāravī, s, 20
Maṇṭi-bhūtanāṭika, 'divine mothers', 135-37
Maṅḍśāli, 245-46, 247 n
Maṅḍśāli, post, 60-61, 71
Maṅḍśāli s.a. Kālīśāla, 69, 71, 173
Maṅḍśāli, 'divine mothers', 133-37
Maṅḍśāli, bhūtanāṭika, br, donar, 46
Maṅḍśāli, s, 94, 126, 341
Maṇṭyapūrāṇa, sat, 28, 128, 133, 198
Mauṣ, cvasi, 10 n, 47, 191
Mauṣhāri, dh, 196
Mauṣhāri ins., 196
Mauṣhāri, s, 35, 47, 83, 90, 154, 284, 303 n
Mauṣ, dh, 146, 148
Mauṣ, s, 166-67, 171
Mauṣa s.a. Maurya, pe, 10
Mauṣārakha mā, 75, 197
Mauṣārakha, s, 167
Mauṣārakha, s, 1, 5, 27
Mēgaḥdāta, s, 164, 167-68, 172-73, 189, 324
Mēgaḥthanes, s, 207
Mēghīvānna s.a. Mēghīvānna, dh, of Ceylon, 31
Mēghīvāna, dh, 30-31
Mēhruhl, b, 54 n
Mēhruhl s.a. Mēhruhl s.a. Mēhruhlpuri, 237
Mēhruhlpuri ins. dated Māvila year 1226, 187-88, 199
Mēhu-loum s.a. Mēhu-loum, tribe, 28
Mēhu-loum, b, 293
Mēhu-loum, s, 293
Mēhu-loum, dh, 97, 298
Mēhu-loum, 's', 298
Mēhu-loum, dh, 335-34, 361
Apuṣṭaka, 159
Aṣṭa, 158, 165, 235, 299, 321, 340
Aṣṭa, 153
Aṣṭa, 165, 324
Aṣṭa, 347 n
Aṣṭa, 165, 324
Aṣṭa, 353, 324, 347 n
Aṣṭa, 147
Aṣṭa, 165, 278 n, 299, 314, 347 n
Aṣṭa, 147
Aṣṭa, 211
Aṣṭa, 299, 314
Aṣṭa, 324, 314, 324
Aṣṭa, 219, 229, 314, 324
Aṣṭa, 219, 229, 278 n
Aṣṭa, 165, 278 n, 299, 324
Aṣṭa, 165, 278 n, 324, 347 n
Aṣṭa, 397 n
Aṣṭa, 159
Aṣṭa, 165, 324
Aṣṭa, 147
Aṣṭa, 147
Aṣṭa, 324, 314, 324
Aṣṭa, 298
Aṣṭa, 117
Aṣṭa, 118
Aṣṭa, 123-24, 147
Aṣṭa, 119-20
Aṣṭa, 87
Aṣṭa, 242 n
Aṣṭa, 81, 297, 299, 302
Aṣṭa, 297
Aṣṭa, 25
Aṣṭa, 49 n
Aṣṭa, 28
Aṣṭa, 93, 331 n
Aṣṭa, 57
Aṣṭa, 68
Aṣṭa, 68
Aṣṭa, 105
Aṣṭa, 144
Aṣṭa, 167, 167 n
Aṣṭa, 229, 230 n, 244, 348
Aṣṭa, 305-06
Aṣṭa, 88, 129, 184, 243-44, 244 n, 268, 305, 335-37, 340-41
Aṣṭa, 189
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Aśōna (or Āśōya or Āśraya), 66, 127, 186, 188, 192, 262-65, 265 n, 267-88
Bhāradavā (or Bāhādra), 248, 250, 259 n, 252, 263, 265 n, 361
Chaitra, 183-86, 191-92, 196
Jyeṣṭha, 190-91, 292-93, 306-07, 309, 319, 321
Kārtikā, 129, 184, 196, 192, 254, 273 a, 280, 282
Māgha, 185, 225, 227-28
Mārgaśīrṣa, 334-35
Pauṣa (or Āgraṇāya or Sahasa), 185, 192, 323, 327, 329 n, 331
Phāloggana (or Taptāna, 86, 191-92, 197, 203, 205, 233 n, 285, 310-11, 323, 327, 329 n, 351, 340, 343-44
Pṛathama Āśāgha, 240
Prauṣṭhānapada, 83, 297, 300, 304
Rāḍa, 183
Rāvaṇa, 77, 263, 265 n, 267, 272-73
Vaiśākha, 117, 185, 229, 231, 288-90, 339-42

Moon, 199, 327, 332
Mōbī, 178
Mōbī grant of Jānaḍa dated Guptā year 385, 176-77, 184
Mount, L, 434
Mrichakhatakā, 36, 104
Mrīgāṇāthī, m, 214 a
Mrīgāṇāthānā, l, 214 a
Mrīgāṇāthānā, m, 214 a
Mudūyāṇur pūla of Bṛha Mallādeśa Nandavarman, 247 n
Mudrā Rākṣasa, U, 46-47, 116, 207
Mughal, 43
Mughal period, 96
Muhammadan, community, 101, 110, 182, 391 n
Muhammadan, rel., 18
Muhammadan version, 47
Mujūal-at-Tawarīkh, 46, 49
Mukhopadhyaya Dhīcendranath, 68
Mukta-Kīś, epīth of Pārāda trīkhe, 30 n
Mukta, 728 n
Mālādeśa, m, 111
Mālakā, 13, 211
Maulān, dt., 24
Mānāyā, 'price worth a sum of money given as payment', 225 n, mānā 'sage', 167, 167 n
Mānāyā, 'chief or sage', 167, 167 n
Muni-suvrata, Jaina Tirukkāvai, 252 n
Munsā, sūr, m, 105
Muruvā, ṛīra, 20, 29, 213
Murūḷadēvali, s., Murūḷadavāsimī, Ucchikṣalāta p, 72, 260
Murūḷadavāsimī s., Murūḷadēvali, ṛ., 72
Mūsānali, k, of Delhi, 24
Mūsānali Parvan, n, of a chapter in Muhābātarī, 25
Mūsātan, community, 188
Mūsātan, goddess of learning, 150
Mūsātan, community, 24
Mūsafarpan, ṛ., 64, 260, 295
Mynensīgh, ṛ., 22
Mynore, ṛīra, 247 n

Nāhī, ending, coupling of, with the immediately following consonant, 342, 360
Nāhī, conjoined in all other cases with the base line bending slightly lower down on either side, 235
Nāhī, with a distinct loop on the left, 235
Nābhāsaka, m, 335-36, 338
Nābhāsaka, short form of mtāsī, 214 n
Nābbhi, m, 123
Nāṭā, k, of the name ending with, 132
Nāṭā, ṛīra, 191
Nāṭā, k, 213 n
Nāṭā, k, 118
Nāṭā, sūr, m, 213 n
Nāṭā, ṛīra, 119
Nāṭā, pr, 20
Nāṭā, n, 19
Nāṭā, ā, 20
Nāṭī, 14
Nāṭī, grant of Anna Vema, 223 n
Nāṭī, kind of celestial being, 187, 190 n
Nāṭī, 20, 120, 213 n
Nāṭī, 20, 120, 213 n
Nāṭī, 327, 332
Nāṭī, 124
Nāṭī, of Ahīchhata, ṛ., 10
Nāṭī, ṛīra, 121
Nāṭī, 120
Nāṭī, 117-16, 120-21
Nāṭī, 121
Nāṭī, Bhāratmaṇḍa, 94, 121
Nāṭī, k, 9, 9 n
Nāṭī, 9, 9 n
Nāṭī, 9
Nāṭī, head of all the artisan crafts of the dt., in, 101-03
Nāṭī, āṣa, 23
Nāṭī, āṣa, 121-22, 190
Nāṭī, ins., dated Krita year 461, 182, 191-92, 241 n
Nāṭī, āṣa, 13, 110
Nāṭī, āṣa, 95, 97, 111, 113, 141, 141
Nāṭī, āṣa, 121
Nāṭī, āṣa, 275-76
Nāṭī, āṣa, 8-10, 8, 11, 8, 20, 21, 264
Nāṭī, āṣa, 212-13, 216-17
Nāṭī, āṣa, 97
Nāṭī, āṣa, 94
Nāṭī, āṣa, 104, 138, 324
Nāṭī, āṣa, 86, 337 n
Nāṭī, āṣa, 311 n
Nāṭī, āṣa, 94
Nāṭī, āṣa, 58
Nāṭī, āṣa, 58
Nāṭī, āṣa, 117, 154
Nāṭī, āṣa, 138
Nāṭī, āṣa, 58
Nāṭī, āṣa, 134, 239
Nāṭī, āṣa, 336-36, 338 n
Nāṭī, āṣa, 85, 224, 318, 330, 333, 339, 364
Nāṭī, āṣa, 94
Nāṭī, āṣa, 42, 63, 121, 224, 226
Nāṭī, āṣa, 84, 330
Nāṭī, āṣa, 356
Nāṭī, āṣa, 87, 320, 335, 359
Nāṭī, āṣa, 84
Nāṭī, āṣa, 84
Nāṭī, āṣa, 85, 319
Nāṭī, āṣa, 364
Nāṭī, āṣa, 204 n
Nāṭī, āṣa, 246 n
Nāṭī, āṣa, 40, 122, 124
Nāṭī, āṣa, 117
Nāṭī, āṣa, 92
Nāṭī, āṣa, 94
Nāṭī, āṣa, 105, 300
Nāṭī, āṣa, 94
Nāṭī, āṣa, 119
Nāṭī, āṣa, 10
Nāṭī, āṣa, 29
Nāṭī, āṣa, 191
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Norwegian, national, 109, 178, 184, 185, 246 n
Nirgati Parivalaika, f., 29
Numerical symbols for—

3, 248, 268, 335, 346
4, 26, 248, 283, 361
5, 223, 340, 346, 361
7, 219 n, 283
8, 245, 271, 288, 292, 334
9, 229 n, 292, 334
10, 28, 229 n, 248, 268, 292, 334
20, 219 n, 283, 288, 292, 334, 361
30, 346
50, 334
60, 340
70, 368
90, 28, 248, 245
90, 248, 271
100, 283, 288, 292, 334, 340
200, 361

N.W.P. state, 48
Nyāya, n. o a science, 65
Nyāyakandaiki, o., 103

O

O, medial form of, 206, 272

Orthography—

amusāra and gh following s changed to dh, 277
amusāra, change of ending to s and n in conjunction respectively with a following k and d, 350
amusāra, ending, change of to n with a following d, 356
amusāra, incorrect change of, into a with a k following, 359
amusāra, use of, instead of sāndhi, 262
agusāra, not used, 274
agusāra, omission of, 361
b, use of, for r, 283
b (h), doubling of, in conjunction with a preceding r, 360
consonant, doubling of, with a preceding r, 266
d, doubling of, in conjunction with a preceding r, 342
dental nasal, use of, instead of anusāra in combination with following j, 342
dental nasal, use of, instead of anusāra before s, 258, 306, 346
dh, doubling of, followed by d, 289
dh, doubling of, in conjunction with a preceding r, 360
dh, doubling of, in conjunction with the following j, 297, 320, 346, 356, 364
dh, doubling of, in conjunction with a following y and r, 296
dh, doubling of, in conjunction with a preceding r, 283, 342
g, doubling of, with a preceding r, 274, 360
g, doubling of, with a following r, 333
guttural nasal, use of, instead of anusāra before k, 221
guttural nasal, use of, instead of anusāra before s, 297, 313
guttural nasal, use of, instead of anusāra before l and h, 309
j, doubling of, following r, 277
jñāna, denoted by the character for m, 277
jñāna, use of, 253, 277
k, doubling of, in conjunction with a following r, 283, 221, 262, 274, 306, 309, 313, 346, 350
k, doubling of, in conjunction with a preceding r, 283
kh, doubling of, in conjunction with a following r, 221
l, southern form, use of, 206
m, doubling of, in conjunction with a preceding r, 274, 283, 299
m, doubling of, with a following r, 333, 350
n, ending denoted by a miniature form of this character surmounted by a horizontal bar, the whole occupying half the height of the letter, 277
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Index Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32, 72, 113, 226</td>
<td>Pravarasena I.a, Pravarasena I, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65, 68, 71-72, 97, 147, 176</td>
<td>Pravarasena II, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, 71-72</td>
<td>Pravarasena II, k., of Kaukim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65, 71-72, 173-76</td>
<td>Pravarasena I.a, Pravarasena II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7, 208, 210</td>
<td>Prayaga, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prayaga a, Allahabad, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Prayoteca, 'explains riti'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Prince of Wales Museum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51, 208, 218, 242, 244, 247, 249, 252, 253, 257, 258, 259</td>
<td>Princep, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Prahvishthaka, au.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-82</td>
<td>Prahvishthaka, dower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76, 79</td>
<td>Prahvishthaka, dorn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91, 93</td>
<td>Prahvishthaka, opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>Prahvishthaka I, Vaidikata k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 176</td>
<td>Prahvishthaka I.a, Prahvishthaka II, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-82</td>
<td>Prahvishvara, god.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Prahvishvara I.a, Mahadeva, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Prahvishvara, tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Prahvishvallabhaka, tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326, 330</td>
<td>Priyadara, tres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Pritha, son. k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Prithudaka a, Nehru, ni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138, 325, 328</td>
<td>Prithi, teas of god of love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 109, 296, 310</td>
<td>Prithula, doctrine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-64</td>
<td>Prithugalla, dorn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Prithugya, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Prithi festival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Pukhya r, Pilguy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pulakesin I.a, Pulakesin II, W, Chatuyaka k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pulakesin II, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Pulma, dorn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Pundaravardhini I.a, Pundaravardhini, tu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Pundaraka, as. Pundaravardhini, tu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Pundarana gar, Pundaravardhini, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Pundraravardhini, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Pundraravardhini-Sakha, n., of a Jaina-tirthika,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Puram-ela-tan-tru, t.a, Pundraravardhini, tu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Purugapsa, &quot;a good, pious, or virtuous man, a class of supernatural beings, a friend, a goblin, a demon&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>&quot;pustakidâ&quot;‘s half for acquiring merit through feeding and distribution of alms&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189-39</td>
<td>Purugapta, wrong reading for Parugapta, Gupta k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Purakshita, ‘leader’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purisata, Kshatriya k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227-28</td>
<td>Puranangita, ni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302-65</td>
<td>Puravindikarihari, l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Purca, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Puru t.a, Purugapta, Gupta k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51, 82</td>
<td>Purugapta, r, Pundragupta, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Purugapta, Pundragupta, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Purugapta, Pundragupta, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Purusha, ‘supreme being’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Purusha I.a, Nairayana, god.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125, 127, 129</td>
<td>Purusha-Nairayana, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Purushanukta, n., of a bhran,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Purushottama-déva, au.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-65, 172, 192, 241, 323, 327, 332</td>
<td>&quot;púruṣotáma, detailed statement&quot;,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pukhari, lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Pukhari sat, stone, st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 247</td>
<td>Pukhara, l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pukhara, forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pukhara, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Pukhari, tank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151, 206-8, 212</td>
<td>Puppha, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Puppha I.a, Pataliputra, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Puppha I.a, Pushpurura, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pushpurura, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 70, 204</td>
<td>Pushpurura I.a, Pataliputra, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Pushpurura I.a, Pushpurvari, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Pushpurvari, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Pusya, constellation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Pusyaagupta, governor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Pusyamitra, Śvega k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Pusyamitra, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200, 218</td>
<td>Pusyamitra, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Pusyuvadhi, ‘attainment of a son’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>Pusyuvadhi, ‘attainment of a son’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q**

Quinta do Dou João de Castro, 256.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Index Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>340, 342, 360</td>
<td>R, forms of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>r, reduplication of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>R. lakkih, wife of Śrīkīrtana,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Rāghava, Ṛkṣaśīrṣa, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Rāghava, V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274, 283, 335, 342, 360</td>
<td>47, 49, 51, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153, 217</td>
<td>Rāghava, y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 58, 69-70, 61, 100, 147, 195, 196, 154, 172, 216, 216, 217, 331</td>
<td>Rāhure, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Raipur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Raivatika, mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297-98, 300, 304</td>
<td>rajajīrāja, r, rajajīrāja, u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>rajajīrāja, r, rajajīrāja, u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Rajajīrāja, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>rajāśāsana, ‘palace’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248, 250, 251</td>
<td>rajā-lāsāhika, ‘royal scribe’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>rajā-mahārāja, u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223, 278</td>
<td>Rajā, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Rajāpura, me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Rajāpurama, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134, 239</td>
<td>Rajārājēśvara, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Rajārān, ‘a sage of the Kshatriya caste’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rajāsūryā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44, 44, 48, 67, 71, 175, 211</td>
<td>Rajā Śiva Prasad, 270, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Rajajāsthana, me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123, 129, 237, 251, 253, 269</td>
<td>Rajajāsthana, i.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Rajajāsthānīya, n., of an office,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 26, 68-69, 71, 74, 96, 173, 340</td>
<td>Rajātarangini, u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 77, 235, 236</td>
<td>Rajendralal Mitra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368, 346, 346</td>
<td>Rajagac, state (former).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Rajaghat, l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Rajmahal, l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Rajpat, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 111</td>
<td>Rajpat, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Rajpatrana, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-12, 164, 191</td>
<td>Rajpatrana E. de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 55, 57</td>
<td>Rajpatrana N. E. de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rajpatrana S. E. de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187, 191, 200</td>
<td>Rajpatrana W. de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rajpatrana ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Rajpat period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223, 238, 273</td>
<td>Rajshahi, de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121, 288, 335, 342, 360</td>
<td>Rajshahi, ni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-15</td>
<td>Rajyādharaśārmman, dones,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>INDEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 n</td>
<td>Sripurva pillar ins., of Skandagupta dated Gupta year 141, 917 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 n</td>
<td>Sur, gran father of Śrītirshana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 n</td>
<td>Surunādhana, son of Bārāṇaḥa, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 n</td>
<td>Sūrya, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 n</td>
<td>Sūrya, śātaka, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 n</td>
<td>Sūrya-sīthāna, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 n</td>
<td>Sūrya-sīthāna, kind of alliteration, the, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 n</td>
<td>Standard type of coin of Kāśa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 n</td>
<td>Sūtra, a, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 n</td>
<td>Sūtrasava N.V.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264 n</td>
<td>Sun koroa, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 n</td>
<td>Sunnā, 13, 21, 55, 132, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 n</td>
<td>Sūtrel, ri., 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 n</td>
<td>Sūtanipatā, do.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 n</td>
<td>Śrījānaśāla,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, m, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363-63</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, son of Kāśa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361-63</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132, 141</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362-63</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122, 201-21, 284 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119, 361</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112, 213, 219 n, 217</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361-63</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132, 141</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122, 201-21, 284 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119, 361</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112, 213, 219 n, 217</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361-63</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132, 141</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122, 201-21, 284 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119, 361</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112, 213, 219 n, 217</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361-63</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132, 141</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122, 201-21, 284 n</td>
<td>Śrīvāsana, daughter of Sūrya,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This table contains a unique sample of the text from the document, organized in a structured format for easier readability.
