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PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

A new edition of the Political History of Ancient India from the Accession of Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty is placed before the public. The work has been out of print for some time, and need has long been felt for a fresh edition. Therefore it goes forth once more having been revised and re-written in the light of the new information that is coming in so rapidly and in such vast bulk. No pains have been spared to bring the book up to date, and make it more attractive to students. Material emendations have been made in almost every chapter. Some of the extracts in Sanskrit have been provided with English renderings. New paragraphs, sections, appendices and genealogical tables have been added where necessary, the more important additions will be found on pages 5n, 14, 48, 50, 72f, 88n, 118, 178n, 190nf, 195n, 205n, 207, 234f, 254f, 266n, 267, 300, 302, 314n, 315n, 321f, 337, 345n, 250n, 361n, 380f and 386f.

Attention may be called here to the fact not noticed in the text that in the Harivamśa there is a passage (I. 14, 17) which characterises the Pahlavas as Śmastrudhārināḥ. Judged by this test, kings of the family of Rañjubula and Nāhapāna, who are not unfrequently taken to be Parthians, could not have belonged to that nationality as their portraits found on coins (JRAS, 1913, bet. pp. 630-631) show no traces of beards. They were, therefore, almost certainly Śakas. Regarding the controversy about Pātika, pp. 284-85, it may be noted that the Rājataraṅgini furnishes an instance of a son being replaced by his father as king (cf. the case of Pārtha), and of a king abdicating in favour of his son and again resuming control over the kingdom (cf. the case of Kālasa who continued to be a co-ruler after the resumption of control by his father).
A word may here be added about Dr. Thomas' citation of the rule of Pāṇini II. 2. 15. This is a Samāsa rule and hardly refers to the cases to which Thomas applies it.

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

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

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

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

THE UNIVERSITY, CALCUTTA: 

H. C. R. C.

April 12, 1927.
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

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

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

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

The writer of these pages offers his tribute of respect to the Hon’ble Sir Asutosh Mookerjee for providing opportunities for study which render it possible for a young learner to carry on investigation in the subject of his choice. To Professor D. R. Bhandarkar the author is grateful for the interest taken in the progress of the work. His acknowledgments are also due to Messrs. Girindramohan Sarkar and Rameschandra Raychaudhuri for their assistance in preparing the Indexes. Lastly, this preface cannot be closed without a word of thanks to Mr. A. C. Ghatak, the Superintendent, for his help in piloting the work through the Press.

*July 16, 1923.*

H. C. R.
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Political History of Ancient India

PART I

From the Accession of Parikshit to the Coronation of Bimbisara

FOREWORD

No Thucydides or Tacitus has left for posterity a genuine history of Ancient India. But the patient investigations of numerous scholars and archaeologists have opened up rich stores of material for the reconstruction of the ancient history of our country.

The first notable attempt to "sort and arrange the accumulated and ever-growing stores of knowledge" was made by Dr. Vincent Smith. But the excellent historian, failing to find sober history in bardic tales, ignored the period immediately succeeding "the famous war waged on the banks of the Jumna, between the sons of Kuru and the sons of Pāṇḍu," and took as his starting point the middle of the seventh century B.C. My aim has been to sketch in outline the dynastic history of Ancient India including the neglected period. I have taken as my starting point the accession of Parikshit which, according to Epic and Purānic tradition, took place shortly after the Bharata War.

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

Sources

No inscription or coin has unfortunately been discovered which can be referred, with any amount of certainty, to the post-Parikshita-pre-Bimbisārian period. The South Indian plates purporting to belong to the reign of Janamejaya (Ep. Ind., VII App., pp. 162-163) have been proved to be spurious. Our chief reliance must, therefore, be placed upon literary evidence. Unfortunately this evidence is purely Indian, and is not supplemented by those foreign notices which have "done more than any archaeological discovery to render possible the remarkable resuscitation" of the history of the post-Bimbisārian period.

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

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

(a) The last book of the Atharva Veda.
(b) The Aitareya, Satapatha, Taittiriya and other ancient Brāhmaṇas.
(c) The Brihadāranyaka, Chhāndogya and other classical Upanishads.

That these works belong to the post-Parikshita period is proved by repeated references to Parikshit, to his son Janamejaya, and to Janaka of Videha at whose court the
fate of the Pārikshitas was made the subject of a philosophical discussion. That these works are pre-Buddhistic and, therefore, pre-Bimbisārian has been proved by competent critics like Dr. Rājendralal Mitra (Translation of the Chhāndogya Upanishad, pp. 23-24), Professor Macdonell (History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 189, 202-203, 226) and others.

II. The second class comprises Brāhmaṇical works to which no definite date can be assigned, but large portions of which, in the opinion of competent critics, belong to the post-Bimbisārian period. To this class belong the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. The present Rāmāyaṇa not only mentions Buddha Tatbāgata (II. 109. 34), but distinctly refers to the struggles of the Hindus with mixed hordes of Yāvanas and Śakas, यवनमिश्रितान् (I. 54. 21). In the Kishkindhya Kāṇḍa (IV. 43. 11-12), Sugriva places the country of the Yāvanas and the cities of the Śakas between the country of the Kūrūs and the Madras, and the Himaḷayas. This shows that the Græco-Scythians at that time occupied parts of the Pañjab. The Lāṅka Kāṇḍa (69-32) apparently refers to the Purāṇic episode of the uplifting of Mount Govardhana (Parījāhīya girindor-bhyāin vapur Vishnūr vidambayān).

As regards the present Mahābhārata, Hopkins says (Great Epic of India, pp. 391-393), "Buddhist supremacy already decadent is implied by passages which allude contemptuously to the eḍukas or Buddhistic monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. Thus in III. 190. 65 'They will revere eḍukas, they will neglect the gods'; ib. 67 'the earth shall be piled with eḍukas, not adorned with godhouses.' With such expressions may be compared the thoroughly Buddhistic epithet,

* For other Purāṇic allusions see Calcutta Review, March, 1922, pp. 500-502.
Cāturmahārājika in XII. 339. 40 and Buddhistic philosophy as expounded in the same book."

"The Greeks are described as a western people and their overthrow is alluded to ............ The Romans, Romakas, are mentioned but once, in a formal list of all possible peoples II. 51. 17, and stand thus in marked contrast to the Greeks and Persians, Pahlavas, who are mentioned very often............ The distinct prophecy that 'Scythians, Greeks and Bactrians will rule unrighteously in the evil age to come' which occurs in III. 188. 35 is too clear a statement to be ignored or explained away."

The Ādīparva (I. 67. 13-14) refers to King Aśoka who is represented as an incarnation of a Mahāśura, and is described as "mahāvīryoparājitah." We have also a reference (Mbh. 1. 139. 21-23) to a Greek overlord (Yavānādhipah) of Sauvīra and his compatriot Dattāmitra (Demetrios ?). The Śānti Parva mentions Yāska, the author of the Nirukta (342. 73), Vārshagānya (318. 59) the Śāmkhya philosopher who probably flourished in the fifth century after Christ (J.R.A.S., 1905, pp. 47-51), and Kāmanda (123. 11), the authority on Dharma and Artha, who is probably to be identified with the famous disciple of Kauṭilya.

The Purāṇas which contain lists of kings of the Kali Age cannot be placed earlier than the third or fourth century A.D., because they refer to the Andhra kings and even to the post-Andhras.

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

III. The third class of literature comprises Brāhmaṇical works of the Post-Bimbisārian period to which a date in a definite epoch may be assigned, e.g., the Arthasastra attributed to Kautilya who flourished in the Maurya epoch,¹ the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (second century B.C.), etc. The value of these important works can hardly be overestimated. They form sheet anchors in the troubled sea of Indian chronology. Their evidence with regard to the pre-Bimbisārian age is certainly inferior to that of the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads, but the very fact that such information as they contain comes from persons of known date, makes it more valuable than the Epic and Purānic tradition, the antiquity and authenticity of which can always be called in question.

IV. To the fourth class belong the Buddhist Suttas, Vinaya texts and the Jātakas. Most of these works are assignable to pre-Sunga times. They furnish a good deal of useful information regarding the period which immediately preceded the accession of Bimbisāra. They have also the merit of preserving Buddhist versions of ancient stories, and vouchsafe light when the light from Brāhmaṇical sources begins to fail.

¹ According to some scholars the Arthasastra literature is later than the Dharmaśastras, and dates only from about the third century A.D. But the prevalence of the study of Arthavidyā in a much earlier epoch is proved by the Jungrāth Rock Inscription of Rudradēman I, and the existence of treatises on Arthasastra is rendered probable by the mention of technical terms like “Prāṇaya,” “Vishāj,” etc. It is interesting to note that the Kautilya which purports to be a compendium of pre-existing Arthasastra, does not quote the views of previous Āchāryas in the Chapter on “Prāṇaya” (Bk. V, ch. 2). It is, therefore, not unlikely that Rudradēman I, who claims to have studied the Arthavidyā, learnt the use of the term from the Kautilya itself and not from a pre-Kautilya treatise.
V. To the fifth class belong works of the Jaina canon which were reduced to writing in A.D. 454 (S. B. E., Vol. XXII, p. xxxvii, XLV, p. xl). They give valuable information regarding many kings who lived during the pre-Bimbisārian Age. But their late date makes their evidence not wholly reliable.

THE AGE OF THE PĀRIKHITAS

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

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

Parikshit appears in a famous land of the Twentieth Book of the Atharva Veda Samhitā (A.V., XX. 127. 7-10) as a king of the Kuruṣ (Kauravya) whose rāṣṭra flowed with milk and honey. We quote the entire passage below.

"Rājño viśvajānīnasya yo devomartyāṁ ati
Vaiśvānarasya sushitamā sunotā Parikshitaḥ
Parichchhinnaḥ kshemamakarot tama āsanamācharan
Kulāyan kṛiṇvan Kauravyaḥ pātriṇadati jāyaya
Katarat ta śharāṇi dadhi manthāṁ pari śrutam
Jāyāḥ patiṁ vi prichchhari rāṣṭre rājñāḥ Parikshitaḥ
Abhivaśvaḥ pra jihite yavaḥ pakkhaḥ patho bilam
Janah sa bhadrāmedhati rāṣṭre rājñāḥ Parikshitaḥ."

"Listen ye to the high praise of the king who rules over all peoples, the god who is above mortals, of Vaiśvānara
Parikshit! Parikshit has produced for us a secure dwelling when he, the most excellent one, went to his seat. (Thus) the husband in Kuru land, when he founds his household, converses with his wife.

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

"Like light the ripe barley runs over beyond the mouth (of the vessels). The people thrive merrily in the kingdom of king Parikshit."—(Bloomfield, Atharva Veda, pp. 197-198.)

Roth and Bloomfield regard Parikshit in the Atharva Veda as a divine being. But Zimmer and Oldenberg recognize Parikshit as a human king, a view supported by the fact that in the Aitareya and Satapatha Brāhmaṇas the famous king Janamejaya bears the patronymic Pāriksita. Cf. the following passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 21).

"Etena ha vā Aindrenā mahābhishekena Turah Kāva-
sheyo Janamejayan Parikshitam abhishishecha."

Referring to king Parikshit, Macdonell and Keith observe (Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 494): "The Epic makes him grand-father of Pratiṣravas and great-grand-father of Pratipa." Now, the Epic has really two Parikshits, one a son of Avikshit or Anaśva, and an ancestor of Pratiṣravas and Pratipa, the other a descendant of Pratipa and a son of Abhimanyu (Mahābhārata, Adiparva, 94. 52 and 95. 41). We shall call the former Parikshit I, and the latter Parikshit II. Was Parikshit I of the Epic identical with the Vedic Parikshit? The Vedic Parikshit had four sons, namely, Janamejaya, Ugrasena, Bhūmasena and Śrutasena (Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 520). The Epic Parikshit I, on the other hand, had only one son (Bhūmasena) according to Chapter 95, verse 42 of the Adi-
parva of the Mahābhārata, and seven sons (Janamejaya,
Kakshasena, Ugrasena, Chitrasena, Indrasena, Susheena and Bhimasena) according to Chapter 94, verses 54-55, and among these the name of Šrutasena does not occur. Even Janamejaya is omitted in Chapter 95 and in the Java text (JRAS, 1913, p. 6). There is no king of that name immediately after Parikshit I, also in the Kuru Pāṇḍu genealogy given in the Chellur or Cocanada grant of Virachoda (Hultsch, S.I.I. Vol. I, p. 57). The Epic poet, and the writer of the Chola inscription which is much older than many extant manuscripts of the Mbh., therefore, were not quite sure whether this Parikshit (I) was the father of Janamejaya and Šrutasena. On the other hand, according to the unanimous testimony of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas Parikshit II had undoubtedly a son named Janamejaya who succeeded him on the throne. Thus, the Mahābhārata, referring to Parikshit II, the son of Abhiranyu, says (I. 95. 85):—

“Parikshit khalu Mādravatīn nāmopayome tva-mātaram. Taśyāṁ bhavān Janamejayaḥ.”

The Matsya Purāṇa says (Mat. 50. 57):—

“Abhiranyoḥ Parikshittu putrāḥ parapuraṇājayaḥ
Janamejayaḥ Parikshitāḥ putrāḥ paramadhārmikāḥ.”

This Janamejaya had three brothers, namely, Šrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhimasena:—“Janamejayaḥ Pārikshitāḥ saha bhṛatribhīḥ Kurukshetre dirgha satram upāste taśyā bhṛātara strayaḥ Šrutasena Ugrasena Bhimasena iti” (Mbh. I. 3. 1).

Particulars regarding the son and successor of the Vedic Parikshit agree well with what we know of the son and successor of the Epic and Purānic Parikshit II. Janamejaya, the son of the Vedic Parikshit, is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as a performer of the Aśvamedha. The priest who performed the sacrifice for him
was Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka. On the other hand, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which also mentions his Aśvamedha names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (IX. 22. 25-28), too, distinctly mentions Tura Kāvasheya as the priest of Janamejaya, the grandson of Abhimanyu, and the son of Parikshit II.

Kāvasheyaṁ purodhāya Turaṁ turaga medhayāḥ
Samantāḥ prīthivāṁ sarvāṁ jītvā yakṛhyāt chādhvāraiḥ.

The statements of the Śatapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas are apparently conflicting, and can only be reconciled if we surmise that Janamejaya performed two horse sacrifices. Is there any evidence that he actually did so? Curiously enough the Purāṇas give the evidence which is needed. The Matsya Purāṇa speaking of Janamejaya, the grandson of Abhimanyu and the son of Parikshit II, says:

Dvīr aśvamedham āhṛitya mahāvājasaneyakaḥ
Pravartayītvā tum sarvām śishim Vājasaneyakaṁ
Vivāde Brāhmaṇaiḥ sārdḏham abhiśaptō vanamṁ yāyaṁ.

(Mat. 50. 63-64.)

The quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas, alluded to in the last line, is also mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 27).

Parikshit II has thus a better claim than Parikshit I to be regarded as identical with the Vedic Parikshit. It is, however, possible that Parikshit I and Parikshit II were really one and the same individual, but the Epic and Purānic poets had some doubts as to whether he was to be regarded as an ancestor or a descendant of the Pāṇḍavas. The fact that not only the name Parikshit, but the names of most of the sons (in the Vishṇu Purāṇa, the names of all the sons) are common to both, points
to the same conclusion. We shall show later on that a Kuru prince named Abhipratārin Kakshasena (i.e., the son of Kakshasena) was one of the immediate successors of the Vedic Janamejaya. Kakshasena thus appears to have been a very near relation of Janamejaya. Now a prince of that name actually appears as a brother of Janamejaya and a son of Parikshit I, in chapter 94 of the Mahābhārata. This fact seems to identify the Vedic Parikshit with Parikshit I of the Epic. But we have already seen that other facts are in favour of an identification with Parikshit II. Parikshit I and Parikshit II, therefore, appear to have been really one and the same individual. That there was a good deal of confusion regarding the parentage of Parikshit, and the exact position of the king and his sons in the Kuru genealogy is apparent from the dynastic lists given by the Great Epic and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. The latter work says (IV. 20. 1) “Parikshito Janamejaya Śrutasenas-Ograsena-Bhīmasenasḥ chatvāraḥ putrāḥ.” It then gives the names of Kuru princes down to the Paṇḍus and Parikshit II, and adds (IV. 21. 1) “Ataḥparam bhavishyāṁ abhimipālāṁ kirtayishye. Yo ‘yam śaṃpratam avanipatiḥ tasyāpi Janamejaya-Śrutasena-Ograsena-Bhīmasenasah putrās chatvāro bhavisrayanti.” The confusion may have been due to the fact that according to one tradition Parikshit, the father of Janamejaya, was the ancestor of the Paṇḍus, while according to another and a more reliable tradition he was their descendant, and the Epic and the Purānic writers sought to reconcile the traditions by postulating the existence of two Parikshits and two Janamejayas. The important fact to remember is that Parikshit, with whose accession our history begins, should be identified with his Vedic namesake.¹ This

¹ The necessity felt for offering an explanation of the name of Abhimanyu’s son, and the explanation itself probably suggest that the tradition of an earlier Kuru king with the name of Parikshit had not yet come into existence (cf. Nīh. X. 16.3).
conclusion follows from facts to which reference has already been made. We have seen that all the known facts about Parikshit II, the king who ruled after the Bhārata war, and his sons tally with what we know about the Vedic Parikshit and his sons. There cannot be any doubt as to his historical reality.

Parikshit is said to have married a Madra princess (Mādravati) and to have ruled for 24 years, dying at the age of sixty (Mbh. I. 49. 17-20 with commentary). But stories about him in the epic and the Purānas are obviously legendary. The only facts that can be accepted as historical are that he was a king of the Kuru, that the people lived prosperously under his rule, that he had many sons, and that the eldest prince Janamejaya succeeded him.

It will not be quite out of place here to say a few words about the kingdom of Kuru over which Parikshit ruled. The kingdom extended from the Sarasvati to the Ganges, and was divided into three parts, Kurujāngala, the Kuru and Kurukshetra (Mbh. I. 109. 1). Kurujāngala, as its name implies, was the wild region of the Kuru realm extending as far as the Kāmyaka forest. But in certain passages it is used in a wider sense to designate the entire kingdom. The Kuru proper were probably located in the district round Hāstina-pura (identified with a place near Mirat). The boundaries of Kurukshetra are given in a passage of the Taītirīya Aranyaka (Vedic Index, I, pp. 169-70) as being Khāṇḍava on the south, the Tūrghna on the north, and the Parināḥ on the west. The Mahābhārata (III. 83. 204-208) gives the following description of Kurukshetra: “South of the Sarasvati and north of the Dṛishadvati, he who lives in Kurukshetra really lives in heaven....The region that lies between Taruntuka, and Arantuka, the lakes of Rāma and Macchakruka—this is
Kurukshtera which is also called Sámantapañchaka and the northern sacrificial altar (uttaravedi) of the grandsire (i.e., Brahmā). Roughly speaking, the Kuru kingdom corresponded to the modern Thanesar, Delhi and the upper Doab. Within the kingdom flowed the rivers Hīranvati, Kauśikī, Aruṇā, Āpayā and the Pastyā as well as the Sarasvati and the Drishadvatī. Here, too, was situated Śaryanāvant, which the authors of the Vedic Index consider to have been a lake, like that known to the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa by the name of Anyataḥ-plakṣā.

The capital of the kingdom was Āsandīvant (Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 72). This city was probably identical with Hāstina-pura, the capital which was abandoned by Nichakshu, the famous descendant of Parikshit, when he removed to Kauśāmbī.

Gāngayāpahīte tasmin nagare Nāgasāhavye
Tyaktvā Nichakshu nagaram Kauśāmbyāṁ sa nivatsyati.
(Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 5.)

According to epic tradition the kings of Kurukshtera belonged to the Pūru-Bharata family. The Paaurava connection of the Kūrus is suggested by the Rigvedic hymn (X. 38) which refers to "Kuru-śravana" as a descendant of Trasadasyu a famous king of the Pūrus. The connection of the Bharatas with the Kūrus is also attested by Vedic evidence. Oldenberg says (Buddha, pp. 409-410):—"We find in the Rik-Sambhitā trace of a peculiar position occupied by the Bharatas, a special connection of theirs with important points of sacred significance, which are recognized throughout the whole circle of ancient Vedic culture. Agni is Bhārata, i.e., propitious or belonging to the Bharata or Bharatas; among the protecting deities who are invoked in the Āpri-odes, we find Bhārati, the personified divine
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protective power of the Bharatas. We find the Sarasvati constantly named in connection with her; must not the sacred river Sarasvati be the river of the holy people, the Bharatas? In one ode of the Manḍala, which specially extols the Bharatas (III. 23), the two Bhāratas, Devaçrava and Devavāta, are spoken of, who have generated Agni by friction: on the Drishadvatī, on the Āpsyā, on the Sarasvatī may Agni beam. We find thus Bharata princes sacrificing in the land on the Drishadvatī and on the Sarasvatī. Now the land on the Drishadvatī and on the Sarasvatī is that which is later on so highly celebrated as Kurukshetra. Thus the testimonies of the Samhitā and the Brāhmaṇa combine to establish the close connection of the ideas Bharata, Kuru, Sarasvatī.

"Out of the struggles in which the migratory period of the Vedic stocks was passed, the Bharatas issued, as we believe we are entitled to suppose the course of events to have been, as the possessors of the regions round the Sarasvatī and Drishadvatī. The weapons of the Bharata princes and the poetical fame of their Rishis may have co-operated to acquire for the cult of the Bharatas the character of universally acknowledged rule, and for the Bharatas a kind of sacral hegemony: hence Agni as friend of the Bharatas, the goddess Bhārati, the sacredness of the Sarasvatī and Drishadvatī.

"Then came the period, when the countless small stocks of the Samhitā age were fused together to form the greater peoples of the Brāhmaṇa period. The Bharatas found their place, probably together with their old enemies, the Pūrūs, within the great complex of peoples now in process of formation, the Kūrus; their sacred land now became Kurukshetra."

Among those kings who are mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Ādi parva, Chapters 91 and 95) as ancestors
and predecessors of Parikshit, the names of the following occur in the Vedic literature:—

Puruṣ-ravas Aila (Rig-Veda, X. 95; Śat-Br., XI. 5. 1. 1), Āyu (Rig-Veda I. 53. 10, II. 14. 7, etc.), Yayāti Nahushya (R. V., I. 31. 17; X. 63. 1), Puruṣ (R. V., VII. 8. 4; 18.13), Bharata Dauḥśantī Saudyumai (Śat. Br., XIII. 5. 4.11-12), Ajamiḍha (R. V., IV. 44. 6), Riksha (R. V., VIII. 68-15), Kuru (frequently mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa literature, cf. Kuru-śravana, Rig-Veda, X. 33), Uchchaiḥśravas (Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa III. 29. 1-3), Pratipa Prātisatvana or Pratisatvana (Atharva Veda, XX. 120. 2), Bahlika Prātipīya (Śat. Br., XII. 9. 3. 3), Śamtanu (R. V., X. 93), and Dhṛtarāśtra Vaichitravirya (Kathaka Śamhitā, X. 6).

The occurrence of these names in the Vedic texts probably prove their historicity, but it is difficult to say how far the epic account of their relationship with Parikshit is reliable. But some of the kings, e.g., Śamtanu were undoubtedly of the same race (Kauravya) as Parikshit.

Puruṣ-ravas Aila, the first king in the above list, is said to have been the son of a ruler who migrated from Bahlī or Bactria to India (Rām. VII. 103. 21-22). Tradition recorded in the Papančasūdant represents the Kuru—the most important branch of the Ailas according to the epics and the Purāṇas—as colonists from the trans-Himalayan region known as Uttara Kuru.1 Bharata, the fifth king in the above list, firmly established his power in the “Middle country,” i.e., the Doab between the Ganges and the Jumna, after defeating the Satvats, and the epic tradition that he was the progenitor of the Kuru royal family is, as we have seen, in agreement with Rig-Vedic evidence which connects the Bharatas with the

1 Law, Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 16.
same territory which afterwards became famous as Kurukshetra. The history of the Kuru royal line becomes more definite from the time of Sańtanu who was fifth in the ascending line from Parikshit. Regarding the events of Parikshit’s reign we have little reliable information. We only know that the drought that threatened the Kuru realm in the time of Sańtanu had passed away and the people threw merrily in the kingdom of Parikshit.

The date of Parikshit is a matter regarding which the Vedic texts give no direct information. There is, however, a remarkable verse, found with slight variants in all the historical Purāṇas, which places his birth 1050 (or 1015 according to the e Vāyu, Vishṇu, and Bhāgavata Purāṇas) years before Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king of Magadha.

Mahāpadma-abhishekāttu
Yaśajjanam Parikshitaḥ
Evaṁ varsha sahasraṁhū
duṣyaṁ pāñcāsaduttaram.
(Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 58.)

If, accepting the Ceylonese chronology (Geiger, Mahāvamsa, p. 27), we place the first Nanda twenty-two years before the accession of Chandragupta Maurya, i.e., in 322+22=344 B.C., Parikshit’s birth must be dated about 1394 B.C. (1350 B.C. according to the e Vāyu and Vishṇu Purāṇas). If, on the other hand, we give credence to the testimony of the Vāyu Purāṇa (99. 328-329, “Asṭāvim-śatı varshāṇī prathivivā pālayishyati,” etc.) and take 40 years (Mahāpadma, 28+his sons’ 12) to be the reign-period of Nanda and his sons, then Parikshit’s birth must be dated about 322+10+1,050=1412 B.C. (1377 B.C. according to the e Vāyu and Vishṇu Purāṇas). He is said to have come to the throne 36 years later in 1376 or 1341 B.C. (cf. Mahābhārata Maushalaparva, “Shaṭṭrimśe
tvatha sampṛāpte varṣhe," etc., and Mahāprasthānīkapar-
va, "abhishichya svarājye cha rājānaṁcha Parikshitam)."
It is clear that epic and Purānic tradition places the
accession of Parikshit about the middle of the 14th
century B.C. Vedic evidence, however, points to a much
later date. We shall show in the next chapter that
Parikshit's son and successor Janamejaya was separated
by five or six generations of teachers from the time of
Janaka and his contemporary Uddālaka Āruṇi. At the
end of the Kaushitaki or Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka (Adhyāya
15) we find a vaṁśa or list of the teachers by whom
the knowledge contained in that Āranyaka is supposed to
have been handed down. The opening words of this list
run thus:—

"Om! Now follows the vaṁśa. Adoration to the
Brahman. Adoration to the teachers! We have learnt
this text from Guṇākhyā Śāṅkhāyana, Guṇākhyā
Śāṅkhāyana from Kahola Kaushitaki, Kahola Kaushitaki
from Uddālaka Āruṇi."

(S. B. E., Vol. XXIX, p. 4.)

From the passage quoted above it is clear that
Śāṅkhāyana was separated by two generations from the
time of Uddālaka who was separated by five or six
generations from the time of Janamejaya. Śāṅkhāyana,
therefore, flourished seven or eight generations after
Janamejaya, and eight or nine generations after Parikshit.
If this Śāṅkhāyana (Guṇākhyā Śāṅkhāyana) be identical
with the author of the Śāṅkhāyana Grīhya Sūtra he
must have been a contemporary of Āśvalāyana because
they mention each other in their respective works. The
Praśna Upanishad tells us that Āśvalāyana was a
Kausalya, i.e., an inhabitant of Kosala, and a contemporary
of Kabandhi Kātyāyana. These facts enable us to identify
him with Assalāyana of Sāvatthi mentioned in the
Majjhima Nikāya (II. 147 et seq.) as a famous Vedic
scholar,\(^1\) and a contemporary of Gotama Buddha and, hence, cf. Kakuda\(^2\) or Pakudha Kachchhāyana. Consequently Āśvalāyana must have lived in the sixth century B.C. If the identification of Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana with the Gṛihya Sūtrakārā be correct, then he, too, must have lived in the sixth century B.C.\(^3\) Professor Rhys Davids in his Buddhist Suttas assigns 150 years to the five Theras from Upāli to Mahinda. We may, therefore, assign 240 or 270 years to the eight or nine generations from Parikshīt to Śāṅkhāyana, and place Parikshīt in the ninth century B.C. It is, doubtless, possible that Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana was not identical with the Gṛihya Sūtrakārā (cf. S. B. E. XXIX, pp. 4-5). But the reference to Paushkarasādī and Lauhitiya, who figure among the contemporaries of Buddha, in his Aranyaka, probably shows that Guṇākhya could not have flourished earlier than the sixth century B.C.

Parikshīt was succeeded on the Kuru throne by his eldest son Janamejaya. The Mahābhārata refers to a great snake sacrifice performed by this king. In this connection it is mentioned that the king conquered Taxila. Although a passage of the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa connects a Janamejaya with the snake-sacrifice (Vedic Index, I, p. 274), the epic account of the Kuru king’s Sarpa-satra cannot be accepted as sober history. But the conquest of Taxila may well be an historical fact, because King Janamejaya is represented as a great conqueror in the Brāhmaṇas. Thus the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa says (VIII. 21) “Janamejayaḥ Parikshītaḥ samantam sarvataḥ

---

1. “Tīrgaḥ Vedaṃ pācagā saṁghanḍaḥ ketubhānāt,”
2. As to the equation kabaṇḍh = kakuda comp. Atharva v. (IX. 4. 3) where the root kabaṇḍha can be a kabaṇḍha of “goodly treasure.”
3. In this connection it is interesting to note that among the teachers cited in the Aranyaka of Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana there are two whose names seem to occur in the Buddhist suttas as those of Buddha’s contemporaries, e.g., Paushkarasādī of Ambaṭṭhasutta, and Lauhitiya (Lauhitiya) of Lohiccha suttas.
prithivin jayan pariyāṇāvena cha medhyeneje tadesha’bhi yajña gātha'giyate :

Āsandivatī dhānyādam rukminām harita srajam
Aśvam babandha sāraṅgam devebhyo Janamejaya iti”

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

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

(Keith, Rig Veda Brāhmaṇas, 336 ;
Eggeling, Śat. Br., V, p. 396.)

In another passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 11) it is stated that Janamejaya aspired to be a “Sarvabhūmi,” i.e., a paramount sovereign.

“Evaṁvidam hi vai mā mevaṁvida yajayanti tasmād aham jayāmyabhītvaram senāṁ jayāmyabhītvaryā senayā namā divyā na mānushya ishava rīchohhantye shyāmi sarvā māyāḥ sarva bhūmir bhavishyāmīti.”

(Janamejaya Pārikshita used to say) “Those who know thus sacrifice for me who know thus; therefore I conquer the assailing host, I conquer with an assailing host. Me neither the arrows of heaven nor of men reach. I shall live all my life, I shall become lord of all the earth.”

The possession of Taxila in the extreme north-west implies control over Madra or the Central Pañjāb, the homeland of Janamejaya’s mother Mādravatī. In this connection it may be noted that a prince of the Paurava race ruled in the Rechna Doab down to the time of Alexander, while Ptolemy, the geographer, expressly mentions the Pāṇḍus as the rulers of Śākala (Siālkot).

It was presumably after his victorious campaigns that Janamejaya was consecrated with the Punarabhisheka and
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the Aindramahâbhîsheka, performed two horse-sacrifices and had a dispute with Vaiśampâyana and the Brâhmaṇas. The Matsya version, which is considered by Pargiter to be the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for some time, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest; but the Vāyu version says he perished and the Brâhmaṇas made his son king. The Purânic narrative is strikingly confirmed by the evidence of the Brâhmaṇas. The Satapatha Brâhmaṇa refers to one of the horse-sacrifices, and says that the priest who performed the sacrifice for him was Indrota Daivâpi Šaunaka. The Aitareya Brâhmaṇa mentions the other sacrifice and names Tura Kâvasheya as his priest. It also contains a tale stating that at one sacrifice of his he did not employ the Kaśyapas, but the Bhûtaviras. Thereupon a family of the Kaśyapas called Asita-mṛiga forcibly took away the conduct of the offering from the Bhûtaviras. We have here probably the germ of the Purânic stories about Janamejaya’s dispute with the Brâhmaṇas. An allusion to this quarrel occurs also in Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra (cf. “Kopaj Janamejayo Brâhmaṇesbu vikrântaḥ”).

The Gopatha Brâhmaṇa narrates an anecdote of Janamejaya and two ganders, pointing out the importance of Brahmacharya, and the time which should be devoted to it. The story is absurd, but it shows that Janamejaya was already looked upon as an ancient hero in the time of the Gopatha Brâhmaṇa. The Râmâyana also refers to Janamejaya as a great king of the past (II. 64.42).

Janamejaya’s capital according to a gāthâ quoted in the Satapatha and Aitareya Brâhmaṇas was Āsandivant, probably identical with the famous city of Hûstinapurâ mentioned not only in the Mahâbhârata, but also in the Râmâyana, II. 68.13, and the Ashûdhyâyâ of Pâṇini, VI. 2. 101. The gāthâ has been quoted above in connection
with the king's conquests. Its meaning is given below:

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

(Eggeling, Śat. Br., V, p. 396.)

The palace of Janamejaya is referred to in the following passage of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa:

“Even as they constantly sprinkle the equal prize-winning steeds so (they pour out) the cups full of fiery liquor in the palace of Janamejaya.”

(Ibid, p. 35.)

If the Mahābhārata is to be believed Janamejaya sometimes held his court at Taxila, and it was at Taxila that Vaiśampāyana is said to have related to him the story of the great struggle between the Kuru and the Pāṇḍu (Mbh. XVIII. 5. 34). No direct independent proof of this war is forthcoming, but a dim allusion to the battle of Kurukshetra 1 is probably contained in the following gāthā of the Chhāndogya Upanishad (VI. 17.9), referred to by Hopkins (The Great Epic of India, p. 385):

Yato yata āvartate tad tad gachchhati mānavaḥ
Kurun aśvābhīrakshati.

It may be asserted that the Pāṇḍus are a body of strangers unknown to the Vedic texts, and that therefore the story of their feuds with the Kurus must be post-Vedic. But such a conclusion would be wrong because, firstly, an argumentum ex silento is seldom conclusive,

1 The battle of Kurukshetra is very often described as a fight between the Kurus and the Śrīkṣajaya (Mbh. VI. 45, 2; 60, 29; 72, 15; 73, 41; VII. 20, 41; 49, 49; VIII. 47, 29; 57, 12; 63, 1; 69, 1). The unfriendly feeling between these two peoples is distinctly alluded to in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Vedic Index, II, p. 38).
and, secondly, the Pāṇḍus are not a body of strangers but are scions of the Kurus. Hopkins indeed says that they were an unknown folk connected with the wild tribes located north of the Ganges (the Religions of India, p. 388). But Patañjali (IV. 1.4.) calls Bhima, Nakula and Sahadeva Kurus (Ind. Ant., I, p. 350). Hindu tradition is unanimous in representing the Pāṇḍavas as an offshoot of the Kuru race just as the Kurus themselves were an offshoot of the Bharatas. The very name of the Great Epic betrays the Bhārata (Kuru) connection of the principal heroes and combatants. The testimony of Buddhist literature points to the same conclusion. In the Dasa-Brāhmaṇa Jātaka (Jātaka No. 495) a king “of the stock of Yuddhiṭṭhila” reigning “in the kingdom of Kuru and the city called Indapatta” is distinctly called “Koravya,” i.e., Kauravya—“belonging to the Kuru race.” The polyandrous marriage of the Pāṇḍavas does not necessarily indicate that they are of non-Kuru origin. The system of Niyoga prevalent among the Kurus of the Madhyadeśa was not far removed from fraternal polyandry¹ (Mbh. I. 103. 9-10; 105. 37-38), while the Law (Dharma) of marriage honoured by the Northern Kurus was admittedly lax (Mbh. I. 122, 7).

Already in the time of Āśvalāyana’s Grihya Śūtra (III. 4) Vaiśampāyana was known as Mahābhāratachārya. He is also mentioned in the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka (I. 7. 5) and the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini (IV. 3. 104). Whether Vaiśampāyana was a contemporary of Janamejaya or not, cannot be ascertained at the present moment. But I have found nothing in the Vedic literature itself which goes against the epic tradition.

The early Vedic texts no doubt make no reference to the Mahābhārata, but they mention “Itihāsas” (A. V.

¹ See also my “Political History,” pp. 93-96, Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta University), Vol. IX.
XV. 6. 11-12). It is well known that the story recited by Vaiśampāyana to Janamejaya was at first called an Itihāsa and was named "Jaya" or victory, i.e., victory of the Pāṇḍus, the ancestors of the king.

"Muchyate sarva pāpebhyo Rāhuṇa Chandramā yathā Jayo nāmetiḥāso'yam śrotavyo vijigīṣhuṇa."

(Mbh. Ādi. 62. 20.)

Janamejaya's brothers, Bhimaśena, Ugrasena and Sūtrasena appear in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 3) and the Śāňkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XVI. 9. 7) as performers of the horse-sacrifice. At the time of the Brāhāraṇyaka Upanishad their life and end excited popular curiosity and were discussed with avidity in philosophical circles. It is clear that the sun of the Pārīṣkhitas had set before the time of the Upanishad, and it is also clear that they had been guilty of some heinous crime which they had atoned for by their horse-sacrifice. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa quotes a gāthā which says:

"The righteous Pārīṣkhitas, performing horse sacrifices, by their righteous work did away with sinful work one after another."

The Purāṇas state that Janamejaya was succeeded by Śatānīka. Śatānīka's son and successor was Aśvamedhadatta. From Aśvamedhadatta was born Adhisimakṛishṇa famed in the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas. Adhisimakṛishṇa's son was Nichakshu. During king Nichakshu's reign the city of Hāștinapura is said to have been carried away by the Ganges, and the king is said to have transferred his capital to Kauśāmbi (Par-giter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 5).

The Vedic texts do not refer in clear terms to any of these successors of Janamejaya. The Rigveda no doubt

---

mentions a (Bhārata) king named Āsvamedha (V. 27. 4-6), but there is nothing to show that he is identical with Āsvamedhadatta. A Śatānīka Śatrājita is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as a great king who defeated Dhṛitarāśtra, the prince of Kāsi, and took away his sacrificial horse. He, too, was probably a Bharata, but the patronymic Śatrājita probably indicates that he was different from Śatānīka the son of Janamejaya. The Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa, Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa and the Chhāndogya Upanishad mention a Kuru king named Abhipratārin Kākhaseni who was a contemporary of Girikshit Auckchamanyava, Saunaka Kāpeya, and Dṛiti Aindrota. As Dṛiti Aindrota was the son and pupil of Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka the priest of Janamejaya, Abhipratārin, son of Kakhasena, appears to have been one of the immediate successors of Janamejaya. We have already seen that Kakhasena appears in the Mahābhārata (I. 94. 54) as the name of a brother of Janamejaya. Abhipratārin was thus Janamejaya’s nephew. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XV. 16. 10-13) refer to a prince named Vṛiddhadyumna Abhipratāriṇa, apparently the son of Abhipratārin. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa mentions his son Rathagraitis and priest Suchivriksha Gaupālāyana. The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra informs us that Vṛiddhadyumna erred in a sacrifice, when a Brāhmaṇa threatened that the result would be the expulsion of the Kurs from Kurukshetra, an event which actually came to pass.

The Chhāndogya Upanishad refers to the devastation of the crops in the Kuru country by Matachi (hailstones or locusts) and the enforced departure of Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa a contemporary of Janaka of Videha (Bṛhad Upanishad, III. 4).

1 Vashīśta Brāhmaṇa; Vedāc Index, Vol. I, pp. 27, 373.
2 Trivedi’s translation, pp. 322-323.
The evidence of the Vedic texts and that of the Purāṇas can be reconciled if we assume that, after the death of Janamejaya, the Kuru kingdom was split up into two parts. One part, which had its capital at Hastinapura, was ruled by the direct descendants of Janamejaya himself. The other part was ruled by the descendants of his brother Kakshasena. The junior branch probably resided at Indraprastha or Indapatta which probably continued to be the seat of a race of kings belonging to the Yuddhitihila gotra (Yudhishthira gotra), long after the destruction of Hastinapura, and the removal of the main line of Kuru kings to Kausambi.

All our authorities agree that during the rule of Janamejaya's successors great calamities befell the Kurus. Large sections of the people, including one of the reigning princes, were forced to leave the country, and to migrate to the eastern part of India. The transference of the royal seat of the Kuru or Bharata dynasty to Kausambi is proved by the evidence of Bhāsa. Udayana, king of Kausambi, is described in the Svarṇavāsavadatta (ed. Ganapati Śāstri, p. 140) as a scion of the Bharata family:

BHARATANĀM KULE JĀTO VINĪTO JUŚAṆVĀṆCHCHUḤIḤ
TANṆŚHASI BALAḌDHAṬṬUM RĀJADHARMASYA DESIKĀḤ

**Genealogy of the Pārīkṣhita Family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parīkṣhita</th>
<th>Janamejaya</th>
<th>Kakshasena</th>
<th>Ugrasena</th>
<th>Śrutasena</th>
<th>Bhīmasena</th>
<th>Śatrūnaka</th>
<th>Abhipratkrin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aśvamedhādatta</td>
<td>Vṛddhadyumna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aḍhindramakṣāśya</td>
<td>Rathagvīśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichakshu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kings of Kauśāmbi</td>
<td>Kings of Indapatta (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Age of the Great Janaka

We have seen that a series of calamities sadly crippled the Kurus; and the king of Hastinapura had to leave the country. During the age which followed the Kurus played a minor part in politics.

The most notable figure of the succeeding age was Janaka the famous king of Videha. The waning power of the Kurus and the waxing strength of the Vaidehas are shown by the fact that while Kuru princes are styled rājā in certain Brāhmaṇas (Ait. VIII. 14), Janaka of Videha is called Samrāj. In the Sat. Br. (V. 1. 1. 13) the Samrāj is asserted to be of higher dignity than a rājan.

That the great Janaka was later than the Pārīkshitās admits of no doubt. We shall show later on that he was a contemporary probably of Nichakshu, and certainly of Ushasti Chākrāyana during whose time disaster befell the Kurus. In Janaka’s time we find the majesty and power, as well as the decline and fall, of the Pārīkshitās still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of general curiosity in the royal court of Mithila. In the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad Bhuju Lāhyāyani tests Yājñavalkya, the ornament of the court of Janaka, with a question, the solution of which the former had previously obtained from Sudhanvā Āṅgirasa, a Gandharva, who held in his possession the daughter of Kāpya Patačchala of the Madra country:—

"Kva Pārīkshitā abhavan?" (Bṛihad. Upanishad, III. 3. 1) "Whither have the Pārīkshitās gone?" Yājñavalkya answers: "Thither where all Aśvamedha sacrificers go."

From this it is clear that the Pārīkshitās (sons of Parīkshiti) must at that time have passed away. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of
the people, and a subject of controversy in societies of philosophers.

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

Sadasya śchābhavad Vyāsāḥ putra śishya sahāyavān
Uddālakaḥ Pramatakaḥ Śvetaketuścha Pīngalāḥ

(Mbh., Adi., 53. 7).

The Vishṇupurāṇa says that Śatānika, the son and successor of Janamejaya, learned the Vedas from Yajña-valkya (Vishṇu, P. IV. 21. 2). The unreliability of the epic and Purānic tradition in this respect is proved by the evidence of the Vedic texts. We learn from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 1) that Indrota Daivāpa or Daivapi Śaunaka was a contemporary of Janamejaya. His pupil was Dṛiti Aindrota or Aindroti according to the Jaimintya Upanishad and Vama Brāhmaṇas. Dṛiti’s pupil was Pulushe Prāchīṇayogya (Vedic Index, II, p. 9). The latter taught Paulushi Satyayajña. We learn from the Chhāndogya Upanishad (V. 11. 1-2) that Paulushi Satyayajña was a contemporary of Buḍila Āsvatarāśvi and of Uddālaka Āruṇi, two prominent figures of Janaka’s Court (vide Brihadāranyaka Upanishad, V. 14. 8. “Janako Vaideho Buḍilam Āsvatarāśvim uvācha”; and III. 7. 1). Satyayajña was, therefore, certainly a contemporary of Janaka of Videha. He was an elder contemporary because his pupil Somāśushma Śātyayajñī Prāchīṇayogya is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XI. 6. 2. 1-3) as having met Janaka. As Satyayajñī certainly flourished long after Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka, his contemporary
Janaka must be considerably later than Janamejaya the contemporary of Indrota.

We should also note that, in the lists of teachers given at the end of the tenth book of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, and the sixth chapter of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad, Tura Kāvashaya, the priest of Janamejaya, appears as a very ancient sage who was tenth in the ascending line from Śaṅjīviputra, whereas Yajñavalkya and Uddālaka Ārūṇi, the contemporaries of Janaka, were only fourth and fifth in the ascending line from the same teacher. We quote the lists below:—

Janamejaya Tura Kāvashaya
Yajñavachas Rajastambhayana
Kuśri
Śāṇḍilya
Vātsyya
Vāmakakshayana Uddālaka Ārūṇi
Mahīththi Yajñavalkya
Kautsa Āsuri
Māṇḍāvya Āsurāyaṇa
Māṇḍūkāyani Prāśniputra Asurivāsin
Śaṅjīviputra Śaṅjīviputra

It is clear from what has been stated above that Janaka was separated by five or six generations from Janamejaya’s time. Prof. Rhys Davids in his Buddhist Suttas (Introduction, p. xlvii) adduces good grounds for assigning a period of about 150 years to the five Therās from Upāli to Mahinda. If the five Therās are assigned a period of 150 years, the five or six teachers from Indrota to Somaśushma, and from Tura to Vāmakakshayana the contemporary of Uddālaka Ārūṇi and Janaka, must be assigned 150 or 180 years. It is, therefore, reasonable to think that Janaka flourished about 150 or 180 years after
Janamejaya, and two centuries after Parikshit. If, following the Purāṇas, we place Parikshit in the fourteenth century B.C., we must place Janaka in the twelfth century. If, on the other hand, accepting the synchronism of Gaṇakhyā Sāṅkhāyana with Āśvalāyana and Gotama Buddha, we place Parikshit in the ninth century B.C., then we must place Janaka in the seventh century B.C.

The kingdom of Videha, over which Janaka ruled, corresponds roughly to the modern Tirhut in Bihār. It was separated from Kosala by the river Sadānīrā, usually identified with the modern Gandāk which, rising in Nepal, flows into the Ganges opposite Patna (Vedic Index, II. 299). Oldenberg, however, points out (Buddha, p. 398 n.) that the Mahābhārata distinguishes the Gandāki from the Sadānīrā, “Gaṇḍakīnācha Mahāśoṇam Sadānīrūṭh tathaivaṭha.” Pargiter, therefore, identifies the Sadānīrā with the Rāpti. We learn from the Suruchi Jātaka (489) that the measure of the whole kingdom of Videha was three hundred leagues. It consisted of 16,000 villages (J. 406).

Mithila, the capital of Videha, is not referred to in the Vedic texts, but is constantly mentioned in the Jātakas and the epics. It has been identified with the small town of Janakpur just within the Nepal border. It is stated in the Suruchi and Gandhāra (406) Jātakas that the city covered seven leagues. At its four gates were four market towns (J. 546). We have the following description of Mithilā in the Mahājanaka Jātaka (Cowell’s Jataka, Vol. VI, p. 30):

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

According to the Rāmāyaṇa (I.71.3) the royal family
of Mithila was founded by a king named Nimi. His son
was Mithi, and Mithi’s son was Janaka I. The epic then
continues the genealogy to Janaka II (father of Sītā) and
his brother Kuśadhvaja, king of Śākaśya. The Vāyu
(88.7-8; 89.3-4) and the Vishnu (IV.5.1) Purāṇas re-
present Nimi or Nemi as a son of Ikshvāku, and give
him the epithet Videha (Śaśāpena Vasishṭhasya Videhaḥ
samapadyata—Vāyu P.). His son was Mithi whom both
the Purāṇas identify with Janaka I. The genealogy is
then continued to Śraddhvaṭa who is called the father of
Sītā, and is, therefore, identical with Janaka II of the
Rāmāyaṇa. Then starting from Śraddhvaṭa the Purāṇas
carry on the dynasty to its close. The last king is named
Kṛiti, and the family is called Janakavamśa.

Dhrītestu Vahulāśvo bhud Vahulāśva sutāḥ Kṛitiḥ
Tasmin santishṭhave vamśo Janakāṇām mahātmanām
(Vāyu Purāṇa, 89.23.)

The Vedic texts know a king of Videha named Namī
Sāpya (Vedic Index, I.436). But he is nowhere repre-
sented as the founder of the dynasty of Mithila. On the
contrary, a story of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa seems to
indicate that the Videha kingdom was founded by Videga-
Mathava who came from the banks of the Sarasvati. We are told that Agni Vaisvāna went burning along this earth from the Sarasvati towards the east, followed by Mathava and his priest, Gotama Rāhugāṇa, till he came to the river Sādānirā which flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain, and which he did not burn over. No Brāhmaṇas went across the stream in former times, thinking "it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaisvāna." At that time the land to the eastward was very uncultivated, and marshy, but after Mathava's arrival many Brāhmaṇas were there, and it was highly cultivated, for the Brāhmaṇas had caused Agni to taste it through sacrifices. Mathava the Videgha then said to Agni, "where am I to abide?" "To the east of this river be thy abode," he replied. Even now, the writer of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa adds, this forms the boundary between the Kosalas and the Videhas. The name of Mithi Vaideha, the second king in the epic and the Purānic lists, is reminiscent of Mathava Videgha.

If Mathava Videgha was the founder of the royal line of Mithila, Nami Śāpya must be a later king of Videha. The Majhima Nikāya (II.74-83) and the Nimi Jātaka mention Makhādeva as the progenitor of the kings of Mithila, and Nimi is said to have been born to "round off" the royal house of Mithila, "the family of hermits." The combined evidence of Vedic and Buddhist texts thus shows that the name Nimi was borne not by the first, but probably by some later king or kings.

As the entire dynasty of Maithila kings was called Janaka vaṁśa (Vaiśṇo Janakānāṁ mahātmanāṁ), and
there were several kings bearing the name of Janaka, it is very difficult to identify any of these with the great Janaka of the Vedic texts. But there is one fact which seems to favour his identification with Śraddhvaḍa of the Purānic list, i.e., the father of Sītā. The father of Sītā is, in the Rāmāyaṇa, a younger contemporary of Aśvapati king of the Kekayas (maternal grand-father of Bharata, Rāmāyaṇa, II. 9. 22). Janaka of the Vedic texts is also a contemporary of Aśvapati, prince of the Kekayas, as Uḍḍālaka Aruni and Būḍhila Aśvataraśvi frequented the courts of both these princes.¹ But as the name Aśvapati is also given to Bharata’s maternal uncle (Rāmāyaṇa, VIII. 113. 4) it seems that it was possibly not a personal name but a family designation like ‘Janaka.’ In that case it is impossible to say how far the identification of the Vedic Janaka with the father of Sītā is correct.

It is equally difficult to identify our Janaka with any of the kings of that name mentioned in the Buddhist Jātakas. Prof. Rhys Davids (Bud. Ind., p. 26) seems to identify him with Mahā-Janaka of the Jātaka No. 559. The utterance of Mahā-Janaka II of that Jātaka;

¹ Mithilā’s palaces may burn
But naught of mine is burned thereby ²

indeed reminds us of the great philosopher-king.

In the Mahābhārata (XII. 17. 18-19; 219. 50), too, we find the same saying attributed to Janaka of Mithilā.

“Mithilāyāṁ pradiptāyāṁ na me davyati kīchana”
“Api cha bhavati Maithilena gītāṁ
Nagaramupāhitam agnirahvīkṣya
Na khalu mamahidahyate’tra kīchit
Svayam idamāha kila sma bhūmipālah.”

² Ved. Ind., II. 69; Chh. Up., V. 11. 1-6; Brīh. Up. III. 7
In the Jaina Uttarādhyayana, however, the saying is attributed to Nami (S. B. E. XLV. 37). This fact coupled with the mention of Nemi in juxtaposition with Arishta in the Vishnu Purāṇa (IV. 5. 13) probably points to the identification of Nami or Nemi with Mahā-Janaka II who is represented in the Jātaka as the son of Ariṭṭha. If Mahā-Janaka II was identical with Nami, he cannot be identified with Janaka who is clearly distinguished from Nami in the Vedic texts. One may be tempted to identify the Vedic Janaka with Mahā-Janaka I of the Jātaka. But proof is lacking.

In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and in the Brīhadāranyaka Upanishad Janaka is called “Samrāt.” This shows that he was a greater personage than a “Rājan.” Although there is no clear evidence in the Vedic literature of the use of the word “Samrāj” as Emperor in the sense of king of kings, still the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa distinctly says that the Samrāj was a higher authority than a “Rājan”; “by offering the Rājasīya he becomes king, and by the Vājapeya he becomes Samrāj; and the office of king is the lower, and that of Samrāj the higher” (Śat. Br., V. 1. 1. 13; XII. 8. 3. 4.; XIV. 1. 3. 8). In the Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra X. 3. 14 Janaka is mentioned as a great sacrificer.

But Janaka’s fame rests not so much on his achievements as a king and a sacrificer, as on his patronage of culture and philosophy. The court of this monarch was thronged with Brāhmaṇas from Kosala and the Kuru-Paṇḍhara countries (e.g., Āśvala, Jāratkārava Ārtabhaga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Ushasta Chākrāyaṇa, Kahoja Kaushitakeya, Gārgī Vāchaknavi, Uddālaka Aruni and Vidagdha Śākalya). The tournaments of argument which were here held form a prominent feature in the third book of the Brīhadāranyaka Upanishad. The hero of these was Yājñavalkya Vaiṣāsaneya, who was a pupil of Uddālaka Āruni. (Br. Up. VI.
5. 3). Referring to Janaka’s relations with the Kuru-Pańchāla Brāhmaṇas Oldenberg says (Buddha, p. 398). “The king of the east, who has a leaning to the culture of the west, collects the celebrities of the west at his court—much as the intellects of Athens gathered at the court of Macedonian princes.”

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

1. Gandhāra
2. Kekaya
3. Madra
4. Uśinara
5. Matsya
6. Kuru
7. Pańchāla
8. Kāsi
9. Kosala

Gandhāra formed a part of Uttarāpatha:—

Uttarāpathajanmānaḥ kīrtayishyāmi tān api
Yauna Kāmboja Gandhāraḥ Kirātā Barbaraiḥ saha.
(Mbh. XII. 207. 43.)

It included the Rawalpindi district of the Pańjāb and the Peshāwar district of the N. W. Frontier Province. Thus it lay on both sides of the Indus.¹ We learn from the epic and Purāṇic literature that this Janapada contained two great cities, viz., Takshaśila and Pushkaraṇvati.

¹ Rāmāyaṇa VII. 113. 11; 114. 11: Simhavanhayataḥ pārśva.
Gandhāra vishaye siddhe, tayoh puryau mahātmānoh
Takshasya diksu vikhyātā ramyā Takshaśilā purī
Pushkaraśyāpi virasya vikhyātā Puskaraśvati.
(Vāyu Purāṇa 88, 189-190; cf. Rāmaśyaṇa VII. 114. 11.)

If the Telapatta and Susima Jātakas (Nos. 96, 162) are to be believed Takshaśilā lay 2,000 leagues away from Benares. The remains of the great city “are situated immediately to the east and north-east of Sarai-kala, a junction on the railway, twenty miles north-west of Rāwalpindī. The valley in which they lie is watered by the Haro river. Within this valley and within three and a half miles of each other are the remains of three distinct cities. The southernmost (and oldest) of these occupies an elevated plateau, known locally as Bhir-mound.”

Pushkaraśvati or Pushkaraśvati (Prakrit Pukkalāoti, whence the Peucelaotis of Arrian) is represented by the modern Prang and Chārsadda, 17 miles N. E. of Peshāwar, on the Swāt river.

Gandhāra is a later form of the name of the people called Gandhāri in the Rig Veda and the Atharva Veda. In the Rig Veda (I. 126. 7) the good wool of the sheep of the Gandhāris is referred to. In the Atharva Veda (V. 22. 14) the Gandhāris are mentioned with the Mūja-vants, apparently as a despised people. In later times the ‘angle of vision’ of the men of the Madhyadesa changed, and Gandhāra became the resort of scholars of all classes who flocked to its capital for instruction in the three Vedas and the eighteen branches of knowledge.

In a significant passage of the Chhāndogyya Upanishad (VI. 14) Uddalaka Āruṇi, the contemporary of Janaka, mentions Gandhāra to illustrate the desirability of

---

2 Schott, The Peripites of the Erythrean Sea, pp. 183-184; Pococke, Gandhāra, p. 11.
having a duly qualified teacher from whom a pupil "learns (his way) and thus remains liberated (from all world ties) till he attains (the Truth, Moksha)." A man who attains Moksha is compared to a blind-folded person who reaches at last the country of Gandhāra. We quote the entire passage below:

"Yathā somya purushaṁ Gandhārebbyo' bhinaddhā-
ksham śulya taṁ tato'tijane visṛijet, sa yathā tatra prān 
vā uḍāṁ vādhaṁ vā pratyān vā pradhmayita—abhinad-
dhākṣha aṇito' bhinaddhāksho visṛisṭaḥ. Tasya yathā 
binahanam pramuchya prabruyād etāṁ diśāṁ Gandhārā 
etāṁ diśāṁ vṛajeti. Sa grāmā mā prichohhan 
pandito medhāvī Gandhārān evopasampadyeta, evaṁ eveh-
āchāryavān purusho veda."

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

The full import of the illustration becomes apparent 
when we remember that the Uddālaka Jātaka (No. 487) 
represents Uddālaka as having journeyed to Takshaśilā 
(Takṣaśila) and learnt there of a world-renowned teacher. 
The Setaketu Jātaka (No. 377) says that Setaketu, son of 
Uddālaka, went to Takshaśilā and learned all the arts. 
The Śātapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions the fact that Uddālaka 
Aruṇī used to drive about (dhāvayāṁ chakāra) amongst

1 Dr. E. L. Mitra’s translation of the Chhândogya Upanishad, p. 114.
the people of the northern country (Śat. Br. XI. 4. 1. 1, et seq.). It is stated in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa (VII. 6) that Brāhmaṇas used to go to the north for purposes of study. The Jātaka stories are full of references to the fame of Takṣasila as a university town. Pāṇini, himself a native of Gandhāra, refers to the city in sūtra IV. 3. 93. An early celebrity of Takṣasila was Kauṭilya.

The Kekayas were settled in the Pañjab between Gandhāra and the Beas. From the Rāmāyaṇa (II. 68. 19-22; VII. 113-114) we learn that the Kekaya territory lay beyond the Vipāśa and abutted on the Gandharva or Gandhāra Vishaya. The Vedic texts do not mention the name of its capital city, but the Rāmāyaṇa informs us that the metropolis was Rājagriha or Girivraja (identified by Cunningham with Girjak or Jalalpur on the Jhelam).

"Ubhau Bharata Śatrughnau Kekayeshu parantapau Pure Rājagrihe ramye mātāmaha nivesane"
(Ītām., II. 67. 7.)

"Girivrajam puravaram sighram āsedur añjasā"
(Rām., II. 68. 22.)

There was another Rājagriha-Girivraja in Magadha, while Hiuen Tsang mentions a third Rājagriha in Po-ho or Balkh (Beal—Si-yu-ki, Vol. I, p. 44). In order to distinguish between the Kekaya city and the Magadha capital, the latter city was called "Girivraja of the Magadhas" (S. B. E., XIII, p. 150).

The Purāṇas (Matsya, 48. 10-20, Vāyu 99. 12-23) tell us that the Usinaras, Kekayas and the Madrakas were septs of the family of Anu, son of Yayāti. The Anu tribe is frequently mentioned in the Rig Veda (I. 108. 8; VII. 18. 14; VIII. 10. 5). It appears from a hymn of the eighth Maṇḍala (74) that they dwelt in the central Pañjab (not far from the Parushni), the same
territory which we found afterwards in the possession of the Madrakas and the Kekayas.

The king of Kekaya in the time of Janaka was Aśvapati, a name borne also by the maternal grandfather and the maternal uncle of Bharata (Rām. II. 9. 22; VII. 113. 4). The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (X. 6. 1. 2) and the Chhandogya Upanishad (V. 11. 4 et seq.) say that king Aśvapati instructed a number of Brāhmaṇas, e.g., Aruṇa Aupavesi Gautama, Satyayajña Paulushi, Mahāśāla Jābāla, Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi, Indra-dyumna Bhālavaya, Jana Śārkarākshya, Prāchīnāśāla Aupamanyava, and Uddālaka Āruni.

The Jaina writers tell us that one-half of the kingdom of Kekaya was Aryan, and refer to the Kekaya city called "Seyaviyā" (Ind. Ant., 1891, p. 375). A branch of the Kekayas seems to have migrated to Southern India in later times and established its authority in the Mysore country (A.H.D. 88, 101).

The Madra people were divided into two sections, viz., the northern Madras and the southern Madras or Madras proper. The northern Madras, known as Uttara-Madras, are referred to in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as living beyond the Himavat Range in the neighbourhood of the Uttara-Kurus, probably, as Zimmer and Macdonell conjecture, in the land of Kāśmir.

The southern Madras were settled in the central Pañjīb between the Kekayas and the river Irāvati (cf. Mbh. VIII. 44. 17). Their territory roughly corresponds to Siālkot and its adjacent districts which were known as the Madra-ṛṣeṇa as late as the time of Guru Govind.† The Madra capital was Śākala or Śāgalanagara (modern Siālkot). This city is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (II. 32. 14, "Tataḥ Śākalamabhītya Madrāṇāṁ putabhedanam") and

† Malcolm, Sketch of the Sikhs, p. 55.
several Jātakas (e.g., Kalinabodhi Jātaka, No. 479; and Kusa Jātaka No. 531). The Madras proper are represented in those works as living under a monarchical constitution. The name of the ruler of the Janapada in the time of Janaka is not known. It was politically not of much importance. But it was the home of many famous teachers of the Brāhmaṇa period such as Madragāra Saunāgāyani and Kāpya Patañchala, one of the teachers of the celebrated Uddālaka Āruṇi (Bṛhad. Up. III. 7. 1). The early epic knows the Madra royal house (cf. Aśvapati and his daughter Śāvitri) as a virtuous family. But in later times Madra earned notoriety as the seat of outlandish peoples with wicked customs.

The country of the Usinara was situated in the Madhyadesa. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14) says “asyāṁ dhruvayāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratishthāyāṁ dīśāṁ” lie the realms of the Kuru Pañchālas together with Vaśas and Usinara. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad also the Usinara are associated with the Matsyas, the Kuru Pañchālas and the Vašas. They probably lived in the northermost part of the Madhyadesa for in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa the Usinara and Vasas are mentioned just before the Udichyas or northerners (Gop. Br., I. 9): Kuru Pañchāleshu Aṅga Magadheshu Kāsi Kausalyeshu Śālva Matsyeshu sa Vaśa Usinaresh-Udichyeshu.

In the Kathāsaritāgara Usinaragiri is placed near Kanakhal the “sanctifying place of pilgrimage, at the point where the Ganges issues from the hills.” It is, doubtless, identical with Usiragiri of the Divyāvadāna (p. 22) and Usiradhvaja of the Vinaya Texts (Part II,

1 See p. 25, ante; Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 126.
2 For detailed accounts of the Madras see now H. C. Ray in JASB. 1922, 257; and Low, Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India, p. 214.
Pāṇini refers to the Uśīnara country in the sūtras II. 4. 20 and IV. 2. 118. In sūtra II. 4. 20 Uśīnara is mentioned in juxtaposition with Kantha (Kathaioi ?). Its capital was Bhojanagara (Mbh. V. 118. 2).

The Rig Veda (X. 59. 10) mentions a queen named Uśīnarāṇī. The Mahābhārata, the Anukramanī and several Jātakas mention a king named Uśīnara and his son Śibi. We do not know the name of Janaka's Uśīnara contemporary. The Kaushitaki Upanishad tells us that Gārgya Balāki, a contemporary of Ajātaśatru of Kāsi, and of Janaka, lived for some time in the Uśīnara country.

Matsya, says Prof. Bhandarkar (Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 53), originally included parts of Alwar, Jaipur and Bharatpur, and was the kingdom of the king Virāṭa of the Mahābhārata, in whose court the five Pāṇḍava brothers resided incognito during the last year of their banishment. But Alwar seems to have been the territory of a neighbouring people—the Śālvās. The Matsya capital has been identified with Bairat in the Jaipur State. Pargiter thinks that the capital was Upaplavya. But according to Nilakantha Upaplavya (Mbh. IV. 72. 14) was "Virāṭanagara samipastha nagnāntaram."

The Matsyas first appear in a passage of the Rig Veda (VII. 18. 6), where they are ranged with the other enemies of the great Rig Vedic conqueror Sudās. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 3) mentions a Matsya king named Dhvasan Dvaitavana who celebrated the horse sacrifice near the Sarasvati. The Brāhmaṇa quotes the following gāthā:

"Fourteen steeds did king Dvaitavana, victorious in battle, bind for Indra Vṛitrahan, whence the lake Dvaitavana (took its name)."

1 See Hultzsch, Ind. Ant., 1905, p. 179
2 Mbh., XII. 29. 89 ; Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 908 ; Mahā-Kāśyapa Jātaka, No. 409 ; Nīmī Jātaka, No. 541 ; Mahā Nārada Kāsaṇa Jātaka, No. 544, etc.
The *Mahābhārata* mentions the lake *Dvaitavana* as well as a forest called *Dvaitavana* which spread over the banks of the river *Sarasvatī* (*Mbh*. III. 24-25).

In the Gopatha Brahmaṇa (I. 2. 9) the Matsyas appear in connexion with the Śālvas, in the Kaushitaki Upanishad (IV. 1) in connexion with the Kuru Paṇḍhalas, and in the Mahābhārata in connexion with the Trigarttas (*Mbh*. bk. IV) of the Jālandar Doāb, and the Chedis (V. 74. 16). In the Manu-Samhitā the Matsyas together with the Kurukshetra, the Paṇḍhalas, and the Śurasaṇakas comprise the land of the Brahmaṇa Rishis (Brahmarśihideśa).

The name of Janaka’s contemporary ruler is not known. That the country of the Matsyas was an important place in the time of Ajāṭhasatru of Kāsi, and of Janaka, is known from the Kaushitaki Upanishad.

The *Kuru* country fully maintained its reputation as the centre of Brahmaṇical culture in the age of Janaka. Kuru Brahmaṇas (*e.g.*, Ushasti Chākṛayāṇa) played a prominent part in the philosophical discussions of Janaka’s court. But it was precisely at this time that a great calamity befell the Kurus, and led to an exodus of large sections of the Kuru people including Ushasti himself. The Chhāndogya-Upanishad (I. 10. 1) says “Maṭachihateshu Kurushu āṭikyā saha jāyayā Ushastir ha Chākṛayāṇa iḥhya-grāme pradrāṇaka uvāsa.” One commentator took Maṭachi to mean rakta-varṇāh kṣudra-pakshi viśēṣāh. Professor Bhandarkar says that the explanation of this commentator is confirmed by the fact that Maṭachi is a Sanskritised form of the well-known Canarese word “midiche” which is explained by Kittel’s Dictionary as “a grasshopper, a locust.”

If the Purānic list of Janamejaya’s successors be accepted as historical then it would appear that Nichakshu was probably the Kuru king in the time of Janaka,
1. Janamejaya  ...  1. Indrota  Daivāpa Śaunaka
2. Satānika  ...  2. Dṛiti Aindrota (son and pupil)
3. Āśvamedhadatta  ...  3. Pulusha Prāchīnaya-gya (pupil)
4. Adhisimakṛishṇa  ...  4. Paulushi Satyayajña (pupil)
5. Nichakshu  ...  5. Śomasūshma Satyayajñī (pupil); Janaka’s contemporary.

Curiously enough it is Nichakshu who is represented in the Purāṇas as the remover of the seat of government from Hāstimāṇḍala to Kauśāmbī. We have some indication that the city of Kauśāmbī really existed about this time (cf. Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 123). The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa makes Prati Kauśāmbiya a contemporary of Uddālaka Āruni who figured in the court of Janaka. It is thus clear that Kauśāmbiya was a contemporary of Janaka. Now, Harīsvāmin in his commentary on the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa understood Kauśāmbiya to mean a ‘native of the town of Kauśāmbī.’ It is, therefore, permissible to think that Kauśāmbi existed in the time of Janaka, and hence of Nichakshu. There is thus no difficulty in the way of accepting the Purānic statement. According to the Purāṇas the change of capital was due to the inroad of the river Ganges. Another, and a more potent, cause was perhaps the devastation of the Kuru country by Maṭāchī. From this time the Kurus appear to have lost their political importance. They sank to the level of a second-rate power. But the Bharata dynasty, as distinguished from the Kuru people, exercised wide sway down to the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII, 5. 4. 11).
Panchāla roughly corresponds to Bareilly, Budaun, Furruckhabad and the adjoining districts of the United Provinces. There is no trace in the Vedic literature of the epic and Jātaka division of the Pañchālas into northern (Uttara) and southern (Dakṣiṇa). But the Vedic texts knew a division into eastern and western, because the Śāṁhitopanishad Brahmaṇa makes mention of the Prāchya Pañchālas (Ved. Ind., I. 469). The most ancient capital of Pañchāla was Kāmpīlya which has been identified with Kampi on the old Ganges between Budaun and Furruckhabad. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 7) mentions another Pañchāla town Parivakrā or Parichakrā identified by Weber with Ekachakrā of the Mahābhārata (Ved. Ind., I. 494).

The Pañchālas, as their name indicates, probably consisted of five tribes—the Kṛvis, Turvaśas, Kesins, Śrīnjayas and Somakas. The Kṛvis appear in a Rg-Vedic hymn which also mentions the Sindhu (Indus) and the Asīṅi (Chenāb). But their actual habitation is nowhere clearly indicated. They are identified with the Pañchālas in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Oldenberg observes (Buddha, p. 404): “We are to look to find in the people of the Pañchālas, of the stock of the Rik Śamhitā, the Turvaśas also as well as the Kṛvis.” He supports the conjecture by quoting a passage of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 16) which says “when Śatrūsāha (king of the Pañchālas) makes the Aṣvamedha offering the Taurvaśas arise, six thousand and six and thirty clad in mail.”

The fusion of the Turvaśas with the Pañchālas does not seem to be improbable in view of the Purānic statement that, after Marutta, the line of Turvaśu was merged into the Paurava line (A.I.H.T., p. 108), of which the Pañchālas are represented as an off-shoot.

1 Cf. also Patañjali (Kielhorn’s ed., Vol. I, p. 13).
The Pañchālas also included the Kesins (Ved. Ind., I. 187) and probably the Śṛiṅjayas (Pargiter, Mārkaṇḍeya Pūrāṇa, p. 353; Mbh. I. 138. 37; V. 48. 41). In Mbh., VIII. 11. 31 Uttamaṇjas is called a Pañcāla, while in VIII. 75. 9 he is called a Śṛiṅjaya. As to the Somakas their connection with the Pañchālas is known throughout the Great Epic (cf. Mbh. I. 185. 31; 193, 1. Dhrisṭādvyumnaḥ Somakānāṁ Pravaroḥ).

In the Mahābhārata the royal family of the Pañchālas is represented as an offshoot of the Bharata dynasty (Ādi. 94. 33). The Purāṇas say the same thing (Matsya 50. 1-16; Vāyu, 99. 194-210) and name Divodāsa, Sudāsa and Drupada among the kings of the Pañchāla branch. Divodāsa and Sudāsa are famous kings in the Rig Veda where they are closely connected with the Bharatas (Ved. Ind. I, p. 353; II, pp. 95, 454). But they are not mentioned as Pañchāla kings. In the Mahābhārata Drupada is also called Yajasena and one of his sons was named Śīkhandin (Mbh. Ādi. 166. 24; Bhīṣma, 190, et seq.). A Śīkhandin Yajasena is mentioned in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa (VII. 4) but it is not clear whether we are to regard him as a prince, or as a priest of Kēsin Dālbhya, king of the Pañchālas.

The external history of the Pañchālas is mainly that of wars and alliances with the Kūras. The Mahābhārata preserves traditions of conflict between the Kūras and the Pañchālas. We learn from chapter 166 of the Ādiṇaparva that Uttara Pañchāla was wrested from the Pañchālas by the Kūras and given away to their preceptor. Curiously enough the Somanassa Jātaka (No. 505) places Uttara Pañchālanagāra in Kururatīṭha.

The relations between the two peoples (Kūrus and Pañchālas) were sometimes friendly and they were connected by matrimonial alliances. Kēsin Dālbhya or Dārbhya, a king of the Pañchālas, was sister’s son to
Uchchhaiṣhravas, king of the Kurus (Ved. Ind., I. 84. 187. 468). Uchchhaiṣhravas occurs as the name of a Kuru prince in the dynastic list of the Mahābhārata (I. 94. 53). In the epic a Pañcāla princess is married to the Pāṇḍavas who are represented as scions of the Kuru royal family.

Among the most famous kings of the Pañcālas mentioned in the Vedic literature are Kraivya, Keśin Dālbhya, Śona Sātrāśāha, Pravāhana Jaivali and Durmukha. Durmukha is also mentioned in the Kumbhakāra Jātaka (No. 408). His kingdom is called Uttara Panchālaraṭṭha and his capital Kampillanagara. He is represented as a contemporary of Nimi, king of Videha. If this Nimi be the penultimate king of Janaka’s family mentioned in the Nimi Jātaka (No. 541) Durmukha must be later than Janaka.

Pravāhana Jaivali, on the other hand, was Janaka’s contemporary. This prince appears in the Upanishads as engaged in philosophical discussions with Aruni, Śvetaketu, Śilaka Śālavatya, and Chaikitāyana Dālbhya (Bṛhad. Up., VI. 2; Chh. Up., I. 8. 1; V. 3. 1). The first two teachers are known to have been contemporaries of Janaka.

The kingdom of Kāśi was 300 leagues in extent (a stock phrase, Jātaka No. 391). It had its capital at Bārāṇaśi also called Surundhana, Sudassana. Brahmapaddhana, Pupphavati, Ramma city, and Molini (Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 50-51). The walls of Bārāṇaśi were twelve leagues round by themselves (Taṇḍulanāli Jātaka).

The Kāśīs, i.e., the people of Kāśi, first appear in the Paippalāda recension of the Atharva Veda (Ved. Ind., II. 116 n.). They were closely connected with the people of Kosala and of Videha. Jala Jātukarnya is mentioned in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XVI. 29. 5) as having obtained the position of Purohita of the three peoples of Kāśi, Videha and Kosala in the life-time of Śvetaketu, a contemporary of Janaka. Curiously enough a king named
Janaka is mentioned in the Sattubhasta Jataka (No. 402) as reigning in Benares. This Janaka cannot be the Janaka of the Upanishads, for we learn from those works that, in the time of the famous Janaka, Ajātaśatru was on the throne of Kāśi.

Very little is known regarding the ancestors of Ajātaśatru. His name does not occur in the Purānic lists of Kāśi sovereigns (Vāyu 92. 21-74; Viṣṇu IV. 8. 2-9), nor does the name of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, king of Kāśi, who was defeated by Śatāntika Śatrājīta with the result that the Kāsīs down to the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa gave up the kindling of the sacred fire. The Purāṇas represent the Kāśi family as a branch of the house of Purūravas, the great ancestor of the Bharatas. Of the kings mentioned in the Purāṇas the names of two only (Divodāsa and Pratardana) can be traced in the Vedic literature. But the Vedic texts do not connect them with Kāśi.

In the Mahāgovinda Suttanta Dhataratthā, king of Kāśi, who must be identified with Dhṛitarāṣṭra, king of Kāśi mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, is represented as a Bharata prince (Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, p. 270).

The Bharata dynasty of Kāśi seems to have been supplanted by a new line of kings who had the family name Brahmadatta, and were probably of Videhan origin. That Brahmadatta was the name of a family, and not of any particular king, has been proved by Prof. Bhandarkar and Mr. Hāritkrishṇa Dev (Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 56). The Matsya Purāṇa refers to a dynasty consisting of one hundred Brahmadattas:

Śatam vai Brahmadattānām
Vīraṇām Kuravaḥ śatam

(Matsya, p. 278, 71.)
The "hundred Brahmadattas" are also mentioned in the Mahābhārata, II. 8. 23.

In the Dummedha Jātaka (Vol. I, p. 126) the name Brahmadatta is applied both to the reigning king and to his son. (Cf. also the Susima Jātaka, the Kumma Sapinda Jātaka, the Aṭṭhāna Jātaka, the Lomasa Kassapa Jātaka, etc.) In the Gangamāla J. (421) it is distinctly stated that Brahmadatta was a family designation. King Udaya of Benares was addressed by a Paehcheka Buddha as "Brahmadatta."

That the Brahmadattas were of Videhan origin appears probable from several Jātakas. For instance, the Mātiposaka Jātaka (No. 455), which refers to king Brahmadatta of Kāsi, has the following line:

mutto'mhi Kāsirājena Vedeheṇa yassassinā ti.

In the Sambula Jātaka (No. 519) prince Sotthisena, son of Brahmadatta, king of Kāsi, is called Vedehaputta:

Yo putto Kāsirājassa Sotthiseno ti tam vidū
tassāham Sambulā bhariyā, evam jānāhi dānava,
Vedehaputto bhaddan te vane basati āturo.

Ajātaśatru, the Kāśya contemporary of Janaka, seems to have belonged to the Brahmadatta family. The Upanishadic evidence shows that he was a contemporary of Uddālaka. The Uddālaka Jātaka tells us that the reigning king of Benares in the time of Uddālaka was Brahmadatta.

Ajātaśatru appears in the Upanishads as engaged in philosophical discussions with Gārgya Balāki. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad he is represented as being jealous of Janaka's fame as a patron of learning.

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (V. 5. 5. 14) mentions a person named Bhadrasena Ajātaśatrava who is said to
have been bewitched by Uddālaka Āruṇi. Macdonnell and Keith call him a king of Kāśi. He was apparently the son and successor of Ajātaśatru (S.B.E., XLI, p. 141).

The kingdom of Kosala corresponds roughly to the modern Oudh. It was separated from Videha by the river Sadānirā, which was for a long time the easternmost limit of the Aryan world. Beyond it was an extensive marshy region, not frequented by Brāhmaṇas which, after Mathava Videgha’s occupation, developed into the flourishing kingdom of Videha.

The Vedic texts do not mention any city in Kosala. But if the Rāmāyaṇa is to be believed the capital of Kosala in the time of the Janakas was Ayodhyā which stood on the banks of the Sarayū and covered twelve yojanas (Rām. I. 55–7). The river Sarayū is mentioned in the Rigveda which also refers to an Aryan settlement on its banks (IV. 30. 18). One of the Ārya settlers bears the name of Chitraratha which occurs also in the Rāmāyaṇa (II. 32. 17) as the appellation of a contemporary of Daśaratha. A king named Daśaratha is eulogised in a Rig Vedic hymn (I. 126. 4) but there is nothing to identify him with the Ikśvāku king Daśaratha who is represented in the Rāmāyaṇa as the Kosalan contemporary of Siradhvaja Janaka. Daśaratha’s son according to the Rāmāyaṇa was Rāma. The Rig Veda (X. 93. 14) mentions a powerful person named Rāma but does not connect him with Kosala. The Daśaratha Jātaka makes Daśaratha and Rāma kings of Bārāṇasi, and disavows Sītā’s connection with Janaka.

Kosala was probably the fatherland of Janaka’s Hotṛ priest Āśvala who was very probably an ancestor of Āśvalāyana Kausalya mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad as a disciple of Pippalāda and a contemporary of Śukeśa Bhāradvaja and of Hīranyanābha, a Kosalan prince.

The details of Kosalan history will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.
## Synchronistic Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaśṭa</th>
<th>Vāśāṃitra (Rig. V.)</th>
<th>Vasāśīha (Rig. V.)</th>
<th>Nārada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śubhānu (Rig V. and Mbb.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśhita (Kāśhaka Satheśa).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛṣa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṛga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhininya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parikshita (Atharva Veda)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janaśeṣaya</td>
<td>Kākshesana</td>
<td>Indrota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaśtaika</td>
<td>Abhīprasārin</td>
<td>Dṛtī Aṇḍrota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aśvamedhavatā</td>
<td>Vṛkṣaḥchārya</td>
<td>Pulisha (pupil)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhitaṃkṛtya</td>
<td>Rāthagrīva</td>
<td>Pulish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaṁuka (puru)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- "Śubhānu (Rig V. and Mbb.)"
- "Vāśāṃitra (Rig. V.)"
- "Vasāśīha (Rig. V.)"
- "Nārada"
- "Viśvakṣema (pupil)"
- "Vṛṣṇi Parāśārya"
- "Śāmavācchaka (Srāmaṇa)"
- "Vyāsa"
- "Aṣṭānā (Rig. V.)"
- "Viśvaksena (pupil)"
- "Vṛṣṇi Parāśārya"
- "Śāmavācchaka (Srāmaṇa)"
- "Vyāsa"
- "Aṣṭānā (Rig. V.)"
- "Vyāsa"
- "Aṣṭānā (Rig. V.)"
The Purāṇas give the following lists of the successors of Śrīdēvāja Janaka:

\[\text{Vāyu (89. 18-28)}\]

Śrīdēvajāttu jātastu
Bhānumān nāma Maitilāḥ
Tasya Bhānumataḥ putraḥ
Pradyumnaśeṣha pratāpavān
Munistāsya suta śchāpi
Tasmād Īrjavahah śṛṃritāḥ
Īrjavahāḥ suta Dvājaḥ
Śākuni stasya chātmajāḥ

\[\text{Viṣṇu (IV. 5. 12-13)}\]

Śrīdēvajasyā ṣpatyaṁ Bhānumān Bhānumataḥ Sāta-
dyumnāḥ, tasya Śuchih tasmād Īrjavahanāma putro
jajne—tasyāpi Satvarā-
dēvahāḥ, tataḥ Kūniḥ, Kū-
ner Añjanaḥ
tatputraḥ Ritujit, tato’ rishi-
ta-Nemīḥ, tasmāt Śrutāyuḥ,
tataḥ Śūryāśvah, tasmād
Śaṅjayaḥ, tataḥ Kṣemāriḥ,
tasmād Anenaḥ, tasmān
Mīnarathaḥ, tasya Satya-
rathaḥ, tasya Sātyara-
thiḥ, Sātyarather Upaguh,
tasmāt Upaguptaḥ, tasmāt
Śaśvataḥ, tasmāt Sudhanvā
(Suvareśhāḥ) tasyāpi Subhā-
saḥ, tataḥ Śuṣrutah tasmāj-
Jayaḥ, Jayaputo Vijayaḥ,
tasya Rītaḥ Rītāt Sunaḥ

Śvāgataḥ Śākuneḥputraḥ
Suvareśhā stat sutaḥ śṛṃrītaḥ
Śrutāyastasya dāyadh
Suśrūta stasya chātmajāḥ
Suśrūtasya Jayaḥ putro
Jāyasya Vijayaḥ sutaḥ
Vijayasya Rītaḥ putra
Rītasya Sunaḥ śṛṃrītaḥ

Sunayād Viśhahavastu
Viśhahavyātmajo Dhrītiḥ
Dhrītestu Bahulāśvo’bbūḍ
Bahulāśva sutaḥ Kṛitiḥ
tasmād Kṣemāśvah, tasmāt
Dhrītiḥ, Dhrīter Bahulāś-
vah, tasya putraḥ, Kṛitiḥ,
Kṛitau santishṭhate 'yaṁ
Tasmin santishṭhate varśō
Janakāṇām mahātmanām Janaka vaṃśaḥ.

It will be seen that the two Purāṇic lists do not wholly agree with each other. The Vāyu Purāṇa omits many names including those of Arishtā Nemi and his immediate successors. The Vishnu Purāṇa, or the scribe who wrote the dynastic list contained in it, may have confounded the names Arishtā and Nemi and made one out of two kings. Arishtā is very probably identical with Aritṭha Janaka of the Mahā-Janaka Jātaka. Nemi is very probably the same as Nami of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra to whom is ascribed the same saying ("when Mithila is on fire, nothing is burned that belongs to me") which is attributed to Mahā-Janaka II, son of Aritṭha, in the Mahā-Janaka Jātaka.

With the exception of Arishtā (and?) Nemi none of the kings in the Purāṇic lists can be satisfactorily identified with the Videhan monarchs mentioned in the Vedic, Buddhist and Jaina literature. It is, therefore, difficult to say how far the Purāṇic lists are reliable. Moreover, as the identification of Stradhvaja with the Vedic Janaka is by no means certain, it is not easy to determine which of the kings mentioned in the Purāṇic lists actually came after the contemporary of Āruṇi and Yajñavalkya. The evidence of the Jātakas, however, suggests that a king named Nimi, at any rate, ruled after the great Janaka, as he is called the penultimate sovereign of the dynasty. Pargiter (AIHT, p. 149) places all the kings of the Purāṇic lists from Bhānumant to Bahulāśva before the Bhārata war, and apparently identifies Kṛiti with Kṛitakṛshaṇa of the Mahābhārata (II. 4. 27), a contemporary of Yudhisṭhirā. But as there were "Janakas" even after Yudhisṭhirā (AIHT, p. 330) and as "two Purāṇas conclude with the remark that with Kṛiti ends the race of the Janakas" (ibid, p. 96), the identification of Kṛiti with Kṛitakṛshaṇa does not seem to be plausible. It is
more reasonable to identify Kṛiti of the Purāṇas with Karāla Janaka who, as we shall see below, brought the line of Vaideha kings to an end. The only objection to this view is that Karāla is represented as the son of Nimi, whereas Kṛiti was the son of Bahulāśva who came long after Arishṭa-Nemi. But the title Nimi may have been borne by several kings besides Arishṭa (or his son?) and Bahulāśva may have been one of them.

The Vedic texts mention besides Māthava and Janaka two other Vaideha kings, namely, Para Āhlāra and Nāmi Sāpya. Macdonell and Keith identify Para Āhlāra with Para Āṭārā, king of Kosala, about whom we shall speak in a subsequent chapter. Nāmi Sāpya is mentioned in the Pañchavimśa or Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa (XXV. 10. 17-18) as a famous sacrificer. His identification with king Nāmi of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra, Nēmi of the Vishnu Purāṇa, and Nimi of the Makhādeva Sūtra of the Majjhima Nikāya, the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Nimi Jātaka is more or less problematical. In the last mentioned work it is stated that Nimi was the penultimate sovereign of the Maithila family. According to the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (S. B. E., XLV. 87) he was a contemporary of Durmukha (Dvimukha) king of Pañcāla, Naggaji (Naggati) of Gandhāra, and of Karandu (Karakandu) of Kalinga. This synchronism accords with Vedic evidence. Durmukha the Pañcāla king had a priest named Bṛhaduktha (Vedic Index, I. 870) who was the son of Vāmadeva (ibid, II. 71). Vāmadeva was a contemporary of Somaka the son of Sahadeva (Rig Veda, IV. 15. 7. 10). Somaka had close spiritual relationship with Bhīma king of Vidarbha and Nagnajit king of Gandhāra (Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII. 34). From this it seems very probable that Durmukha was a contemporary of Nagnajit. This is exactly what we find in the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra.
The Nimi Jātaka says that Nimi was “born to round off” the royal family “like the hoop of a chariot wheel.” Addressing his predecessor the sooth-sayers said, “great king, this prince is born to round off your family. This your family of hermits will go no further.”

Nimi’s son Kaśāra Janaka⁴ is said to have actually brought his line to an end. This king is apparently identical with Karāla Janaka of the Mahābhārata (XII. 302. 7). In the Arthasastra of Kauṭilya it is stated that “Bhoja, known also by the name Dāṇḍakya, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa maiden, perished along with his kingdom and relations; so also Karāla, the Vaideha.”⁵ Karāla, the Vaideha, who perished along with his kingdom and relations, must be identified with Kaśāra (Karāla) who according to the Nimi Jātaka brought the line of Vaideha kings to an end. The downfall of the Vaidehas reminds us of the fate of the Tarquins who were expelled from Rome for a similar crime. As in Rome, so in Videha, the overthrow of the monarchy was followed by the rise of a republic—the Vajjian Confederacy.

There is reason to believe that the Kaśi people had a share in the overthrow of the Vaideha monarchy. Already in the time of the great Janaka, Ajātaśatru king of Kaśi could hardly conceal his jealousy of the Videhan king’s fame. The passage “Yathā Kaśyo vā Vaideha vo-graputra ujjyam dhanu radhijyam kṛitvā dvāv vāna vantau sapatnātivyādhinau haste kṛtvo-potishthēd” (Bṛhad. Upanishad, III. 8. 2.) probably refers to frequent struggles between the kings of Kaśi and Videha. The Mahābhārata (XII. 99. 1–2) refers to the old story

---

⁴ Mahāśeṣa Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, II. 82; Nimi Jātaka.
⁵ The evidence of the Arthasastra is confirmed by that of the Buddhacharita of Áśvaghoṣa (IV. 80). “And so Karāla Janaka, when he carried off the Brāhmaṇa’s daughter, incurred loss of caste thereby, but he would not give up this love.”
(itihāsām purātanam) of a great battle between Pratar-
dana (king of Kāśi according to the Rāmāyana, VII. 48.
15) and Janaka king of Mithilā. It is stated in the
Pāli commentary Paramatthajotikā (Vol. I, pp. 158-
165) that the Lichchhavīs, who succeeded Janaka’s
dynasty as the strongest political power in Videha, and
formed the most important element of the Vajjian Con-
federacy, were the offsprings of a queen of Kāśi. This
probably indicates that a junior branch of the royal
family of Kāśi established itself in Videha.

The Deccan in the Age of the Later Vaidehas.

The expression “Dakshināpadā” occurs in the Rig
Veda (X. 61. 8) and refers to the place where the exile
goes on being expelled. In the opinion of several scholars
this simply means “the South” beyond the limits of the
recognised Aryan world. Dakshinātya is found in Pāṇini,
(IV. 2. 98). Dakshināpatha is mentioned by Baudhā-
yana coupled with Surāśṭhra (Bau. Sūtra I. 1. 29). It is
however extremely difficult to say what Pāṇini or Baud-
hāyana exactly meant by Dakshinātya or Dakshināpatha.

Whatever may have been the correct meaning of those
terms it is certain that already in the age of the later
Vaidehas the Aryans had crossed the Vindhyas and even
established several states in the Deccan. One of these
states was Vidarbha or Berar. Vidarbha was certainly a
famous kingdom in the time of Nimi mentioned in the
Jātakas. We have already seen that the Kumbhakāra
Jātaka and the Uttarādhayayana make him a contemporary
of Naggaji, Naggati or Nagnajit king of Gandhāra. We
learn from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34) that Nagnajit
was a contemporary of Bhīma king of Vidarbha.

“Etamu haiva prochatuḥ Parvata Nārada Somakāya
Śahadevyāya Sahadevyāya Sārṇjayāya Babhreva Daivar-
vṛidhāya Bhīmāya Vaidarbhāya Nagnajite Gāndhārāya.”
Vidarbhā therefore existed as an independent kingdom in the time of Nimi. The kingdom is mentioned in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (II. 440; Ved. Ind. II. 297). It was famous for its Māchas (perhaps a species of dog) which killed tigers (JAOS, 19, 100 Vidarbheṣu mācalas Sārameyā apiha Čardulān mārayanti). The Praśna Upanishad mentions a sage of Vidarbha named Bhārgava as a contemporary of Āśvalāyana. Another sage called Vidarbhi Kaundinya is mentioned in the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad. The name Kaundinya is apparently derived from the city of Kaundina, the capital of Vidarbha (Mbh. II. 73. 1-2; Harivāmśa, Vishnuaparva, 59.60), represented by the modern Kaundinya-pura on the banks of the Wardhā in the Chāndur taluk of Amraoti (Gaz. Amraoti, Vol. A, p. 406).

From the Purānic account of the Yadu family it appears that Vidarbha, the eponymous hero of the Vidarbhas, was of Yadu lineage (Matsya Purāṇa, 44. 36: Vāyu Purāṇa, 95. 35-36).

If the evidence of the Kumbhakāra Jātaka has any value, then Nimi king of Videha (mentioned in the work), Nagnajit king of Gaudhāra and Bhīma king of Vidarbha must be considered to be contemporaries of Kaundu of Kalinga. It follows from this that the kingdom of Kalinga was in existence in the time of Nimi and his contemporaries of the Brāhmaṇa period. The evidence of the Jātaka is confirmed by that of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta (Dialogues of the Buddha, II. 270) makes Sattabhu king of Kalinga a contemporary of Renu king of Mithilā and of Dhataraṭha or Dhītarāṣṭra king of Kasi (mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XIII. 5. 4. 22). There can thus be no doubt that Kalinga existed as an independent kingdom in the time of which the Brāhmaṇas speak. It is mentioned both by Pāṇini (IV. 1. 170) and Baudhāyana.
DECCAN IN THE AGE OF THE LATER VAIDEHAS

(I. i. 30-31). The latter regards it as an impure country but evidently not unfrequented by Aryans. It comprised the whole coast from the river Vaitarani (Mbh. III. 114. 4) in Orissa to the borders of the Andhra territory. We learn from the Jātakas that the capital of Kalinga was Dantapurānagara¹ (Dantakura, Mbh. V. 48. 76). The Mahābhārata mentions another capital called Rājapura (XII. 4. 3). The Mahāvastu (Senart’s edition, p. 432) refers to another city named Simhapura. The Jaina writers mention a fourth city called Kamchānapura (Ind. Ant., 1891, p. 375).

The Mahāgovinda Suttanta refers to another southern realm, namely, Assaka (on the Godhāvari, Sutta Nipata 977) which existed in the time of Renu and Dhataraṭṭha (Dhritarāśtra). It was ruled by king Brahmadatta who had his capital at Potana.

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa refers (VIII. 14) to princes of the south who are called Bhojas and whose subjects are called the Satvats, “dakṣināsyaṁ dīśi ye ke cha Satvatāḥ rājāno Bhanjayyaivate bhishichyante Bhoyeteyanān-abhishiktān-āchakshata.” In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 21) the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats, and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an Aśvamedha are referred to. These Satvats must have been living near Bharata’s realm, i. e., near the Ganges and the Yamuna (cf. Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 11). But in the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa they probably moved further to the south. Their kings were called Bhojas. This account of the Satvats and the Bhojas, deduced from the Brāhmaṇical statements, accords strik-

¹ Cf. Ep. Ind. XIV, p. 361, Dantaparaśakha. The name of the city probably survives in that of the fort of Dantavakra near Chacocole in the Gaźgam District. Many other Kalinga capitals stood in the same district, e. g., Kaligana (Mahākālaṇgam on the Vahāndharī, Ep. Ind., IV. 197), Simhapura (Singapuram near Chacocole, Dubreuil, A. H. D., p. 94), etc.
ingly with Puránic evidence. It is stated in the Purámas that the Sátvatas and the Bhojas were offshoots of the Yadu family which dwelt at Mathurá on the banks of the Yamuna (Matsya, 43. 43; 44. 46-48; Váyu, 94. 52; 95. 18; 96. 1-2; Vishnu, IV. 13. 1-6). We are further told by the same authorities that they were the kindreds of the southern realm of Vidarbha (Mat. 44. 36; Váyu 95. 35-36). We have evidence of a closer connection between the Bhojas and Vidarbha. A place called Bhojakata is included within Vidarbha both by the Harivamśa (Vishnu Parva, 60. 32) and the Mahabhárata (V. 157. 15-16). The Chammak grant of the Vákātaka king Pravarasena II makes it clear that the Bhojakata territory was equivalent to the Illichpur district in Berar or Vidarbha (J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 329). Dr. Smith says, "The name Bhojakata ‘castle of the Bhojas’ implies that the province was named after a castle formerly held by the Bhojas, an ancient ruling race mentioned in the edicts of Aśoka." Kalídása in his Raghuvamśa (V. 39-40) calls the king of Vidarbha a Bhoja (cf. also Mbh. V. 48. 74; 157. 17). But Vidarbha was not the only Bhoja state. The Aitareya Bráhmaṇa refers to several Bhoja kings of the south. A line of Bhojas must have ruled in Dandaka. A passage in the Arthaśāstra (Ed. 1919, p. 11.) runs thus:—

"Dándakyo náma Bhojaḥ kámāt Bráhmaṇa-kanyām abhimanyamānas sabandhu rāṣṭro vinanāśa"—a Bhoja known as Dándakya, or king of Dándaka, making a lascivious attempt on a Bráhmaṇa girl, perished along with his relations and kingdom. We learn from the Sarabhaṅga Jataka (No. 522) that the kingdom of Dándaki had its capital at Kumbhavati. According to the Rámáyaṇa (VII. 92. 18) the name of the capital was Madhumanta, while the Mahāvastu (Senart’s Edition, p. 363) places it at Govardhana (Nāsik).
It is clear, from what has been stated above, that there were, in the age of the later Vaidehas, and the Brāhmaṇas, many kingdoms in the south, both Aryan and Non-Aryan, namely, the Bhoja kingdoms, one of which was Vidarbha, and another, probably, Daṇḍaka, as well as Assaka and Kaliṅga. With the exception of these organised states the whole of Trans-Vindhyán India was occupied by non-Aryan (dasyu) tribes such as the Andhras, Śabarás, Pulindas and probably also the Mātibás (Ait. Br. VII. 18). In the opinion of Dr. Smith the Andhras were a Dravidian people, now represented by the large population speaking the Telugu language, who occupied the deltas of the Godāvari and the Kríṣhṇá. Mr. P. T. Sṛṇivāsa Iyengar argues that the Andhras were originally a Vindhyán tribe, and that the extension of Andhra power was from the west to the east down the Godāvari and Kríṣhṇá valleys (Ind. Ant., 1913, pp. 276-8). Prof. Bhandarkar points out that the Sṛṇivāsanī Jātaka places Andhapura, i.e., the pura or capital of the Andhras, on the river Telavāba which he identifies with the modern Tel or Telingiri (Ind. Ant., 1918, p. 71). But if “Seri” or Sṛṇājya refers to the Gaṅga Kingdom of Mysore, Telavāba may have been another name of the Tungabhadrā-Krīṣhṇá, and Andhapura identical with Bevāda. The Mayidavolu plates of the early Pallava king Siva-skanda-varman prove that the Andhra country (Andhrāpatha) embraced the Krīṣhṇá District and had its centre at Dhaṇñaakaḍa or Bevāda (Ep. Ind. VI. 88).

The Śabarás and the Pulindas are described in teh Mātśya and the Vāyu Purāṇas as Dakṣiṇāpathavāsināḥ, together with the Vaidarbhās and the Daṇḍakas:

Teshām pare janapadā Dakṣiṇāpathavāsināḥ

* * *
Kārnāshācha saha-ishikhā Ātabyāḥ Śabarāstathā
Pulindā Vindhya Pushikhā Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
(Matsya, 114. 46-48.)

Ābhitrāḥ saha cha-ishikhā Ātabyāḥ Śabarāscha ye
Pulindā Vindhya Mulikhā Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
(Vāyu, 45. 126.)

The Mahābhārata also places the Andhras, Pulindas and Śabarās in the Deccau:

Dakshināpathajanyānānaḥ serve naravar-Āndhrakāh
Gubhāḥ Pulindāḥ Śabarāś Chuchukā Madrakaiḥ saha.
(Mbh. XII. 207. 42.)

The precise position and extent of the country of the Śabarās cannot be shown. They are usually identified with the Sauris of Pliny and the Sabarac of Ptolemy, and are probably represented by the Sāvaralu, or Sauras of the Vizagapatam Hills, and the Savaris of the Gwalior territory (Ind. Ant., 1879, p. 282, Cunn. AGI, new ed., pp. 583, 586).

The capital of the Pulindas (Pulindanagara) probably lay to the south-east of Daśārpa (Mbh. II, 5-10), i.e., the Vidiṣa or Bhilā region (Meghadūta, 24-25).

The location of the territory of the Mutibas, another Dasyu tribe mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa along with the Andhras, Pulindas, and Śabarās, is not so certain. Megasthenes refers to a tribe called “Modubae,” and places them beyond the “Modo-galiugae,” who inhabited a very large island in the Ganges. The Modubae are associated with the Ubereae, perhaps, identical with the Savares of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. In the Sānkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XV. 26. 6) the Mutibas are called Mūchipa or Mūvīpa. It is not altogether improbable that the Mūchipas are the people who appear in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (57. 46) under the designation of Mushika. A
ANCIENT DAKSHINAPATHA.
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comparison of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa with the Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra betrays a good deal of confusion with regard to the second and third consonants of the name. It was, therefore, perfectly natural for later generations to introduce further variations. The Mushikas were probably settled on the banks of the river Musi on which Hyderabad now stands.¹

**THE SIXTEEN MAHĀJANAPADAS.**

The Vedic texts do not throw much light on the political history of the period which elapsed from the fall of the Videhan monarchy to the rise of Kosala under Mahākosalā, the father-in-law of Bimbisāra. But we know from the Buddhist Anguttara Nikāya that during this period there were sixteen states of considerable extent and power known as the Solasa Mahājanapada. These states were:

1. Kāsi
2. Kosala
3. Aṅga
4. Magadha
5. Vajji
6. Malla
7. Chetiya (Chedi)
8. Vadhana (Vatsa)
9. Kuva
10. Paśchāla
11. Mahebha (Maṣya)
12. Sūrāsenā
13. Assaka
14. Avanti
15. Gandhāra

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

¹ Purgiter, Māckṣaṇḍaya Purṣaṇa.
The Jaina Bhagavati Sūtra gives a slightly different list of the sixteen Mahājana-padas:

1. Āṅga
2. Bāṅga
3. Magaha (Magadha)
4. Māliya
5. Mālava
6. Achehha
7. Vacehha (Vatsa)
8. Kechehha (Kachchha?)
9. Pāṭha (Pāṭhya?)
10. Lādhha (Lādhha)
11. Bajji (Vajji)
12. Moli
13. Kāsi
14. Kosala
15. Avaha
16. Sambhattara (Sambhuttara?)

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

Of the sixteen Mahājana-padas Kāsi was probably at first the most powerful. We have already seen that Kāsi probably played a prominent part in the subversion of the Videhan monarchy. Several Jātakas bear witness to the superiority of its capital Benares over the other cities, and the imperial ambition of its rulers. The Guttila Jātaka (No. 243) says that the city of Benares is the chief city in all India. It extended over twelve leagues¹ whereas Mithilā and Indapatta were each only seven leagues in extent.² Several Kāsi monarchs are described as

¹ "Dvādasayojanikam sahala Bāravasa nagaṇam"—Sambhava Jātaka, No. 515 Sarabha-mīga J. 483; Bhūritattra J. 549.
² Suruchi J. 489; Vidhura-pāṇḍita J. 545.
aspirants for the dignity of “sabbarājūnam aggarājā,” and lord of sakala-Jambudīpa (Bhaddasāla Jātaka, 465; Dhonasākha Jātaka, 353). The Mahāvagga also mentions the fact that Kāsi was a great realm in former times:

“Bhūtapubbaṃ bhikkhave Barāṇasiyaṃ Brahmadatto nāma Kāsirājā ahosi addho mahaddhano Mahābhogo mahabhalo mahāvāhano mahāvijito paripunṇakosa kotṭhāgāro.”

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

Already in the Brahmaṇa period a king of Kāsi named Dhṛtarāṣṭra attempted to offer a horse sacrifice, but was defeated by Śatānika Sātrājīta with the result that the Kāsis down to the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, gave up the kindling of the sacred fire (Sat. Br., XII, 5. 4. 19). Some of the other Kāsi monarchs were more fortunate. Thus in the Brahmachatta Jātaka (No. 336) a king of Benares is said to have gone against the king of Kosala with a large army. He entered the city of Sāvatthi and took the king prisoner. The Kosambi Jātaka (No. 428), the Kunala Jātaka (No. 536) and the Mahāvagga (S.B.E., Vol. XII, pp. 294-299) refer to the annexation of the kingdom of Kosala by the Brahmadattas of Kāsi. The Assaka Jātaka (No. 207) refers to the city of Potali, the capital of Assaka in Southern India, as a city of the kingdom of Kāsi. Evidently the reigning prince of Potali was a vassal of the sovereign of Kāsi. In the Sona-Nanda Jātaka (No. 532) Manoja, king of Benares, is said to have subdued the kings of Kosala, Aṅga, and Magadha. In the Mahābhārata (XIII. 30) Pratardana, king of Kāsi, is said to have crushed the power of the

1 Mahāvagga X. 2. 3; Vinaya Pitaka I. 342.
Vitahavyas or Haihayas. In the absence of corroborative evidence it is difficult to say how far the account of the achievements of individual kings, mentioned in the Jātakas and the epic, is authentic. But the combined testimony of many Jātakas and the Mahāvagga clearly proves that Kāsi was at one time a great, almost imperial, power, stronger than many of its neighbours including Kosala.

Prof. Bhandarkar has pointed out that several Kāsi monarchs, who figure in the Jātakas, are also mentioned in the Purāṇas, e.g., Vissasena of Jātaka No. 268, Udaya of Jātaka No. 458, and Bhallāṭiya of Jātaka No. 504 are mentioned in the Purāṇas as Vishvakṣena, Udakasena, and Bhallāṭa (Matsya 49. 57 et seq.; Vāyu 99. 180 et seq.; Viṣṇu IV. 19. 13).

We know from the Bhojajāniya Jātaka (No. 23) that "all the kings round coveted the kingdom of Benares." We are told that on one occasion seven kings encompassed Benares (Jātaka 181). Benares in this respect resembled ancient Babylon and medieval Rome, being the coveted prize of its more warlike but less civilized neighbours.

The kingdom of Kosala was bounded on the west by Paṇḍhāla, on the south by the Sarpikā or Syandikā (Sai) river (Rām. II. 49. 11-12; 50. 1), on the east by the Sadāntrā which separated it from Videha, and on the north by the Nepāl hills. Roughly speaking, it corresponds to the modern Oudh. It included the territory of the Śākyas of Kapilavastu. In the Sutta Nipāta (S.B.E., X, Part II, 68-69) Buddha says, "just beside Himavanta there lives a people endowed with the power of wealth, the inhabitants of Kosala. They are Ādichchas 1 by family Śākiyas by birth; from that family I have wandered.

1 Belonging to the Āditya (Solar) race (cf. Lüders Ins. 929 i). For an early reference to the Lunar family (Chandra-Sūtra) see the Nānaghat inscription (ASWJ, V. P. 60).
out, not longing for sensual pleasures." This passage leaves no room for doubt that the Śakiyas or Śākyas were included among the inhabitants of Kosala. If any doubt is still entertained it is set at rest by Pasenadi's words recorded in the Majjhima Nikāya (II. 124):

"Bhagavā pi khattiyo, aham pi khattiio, Bhagavā pi Kosalako, aham pi Kosalako, Bhagavā pi āsittiko, aham pi āsittiko."

Kosala proper contained three great cities, namely, Ayodhya, Śāketa and Sāvatthi, besides a number of minor towns like Setavyā (Pāyāsi Suttanta) and Ukkaṭṭha (Ammatttha Sutta). Ayodhya (Oudh) was a town on the river Sarasvati. Śāketa is often supposed to be the same as Ayodhya, but Prof. Rhys Davids points out that both cities are mentioned as existing in the Buddha's time. They were possibly adjoining like London and Westminster. Sāvatthi is the great ruined city on the south bank of the Rāpti called Saheth-Maheth which is situated on the borders of the Gonda and Bahraich districts of the United Provinces.

In the story of the spread of Aryan culture told in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the Kosalas appear as falling later than the Kuru Pañchālas, but earlier than the Videhas, under the influence of Brāhmanical civilisation.

In the Rāmāyaṇa and in the Purāṇas the royal family of Kosala is represented as being descended from a king named Ikshvāku. Branches of this family are represented as ruling at Viśāla or Vaisali (Rāmāyaṇa I. 47. 11-12), at Mithila (Vāyu. P. 89. 3) and at Kusinārā (The Kusa Jataka No. 531). A prince named Ikshvāku is mentioned in a passage of the Rig Veda (X. 60. 4). In the Atharva Veda (XIV. 39. 9) either Ikshvāku, or one of his descendants, is referred to as an ancient hero. The Purāṇas give lists of kings of the Aikshvāka dynasty from Ikshvāku himself to Prasenajit, the contemporary
of Bimbisāra. Many of these kings are mentioned in the Vedic literature. For example:—

Maudhātri Yuvanāśva (Vāyu, 88. 67) is mentioned in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa (I. 2. 10 et seq.).

Purukutsa (Vāyu, 88. 72) is mentioned in the Rig Veda (I. 63. 7; 112. 7. 14; 174. 2. VI. 20. 10).

In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 5) he is called an Aikshvāka.

Trasadasyu (Vāyu, 88. 74) is mentioned in the Rig Veda (IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3, etc.).

Tryaruna (Vāyu, 88. 77) is mentioned in the Rig Veda (V. 27). In the Pāñchavimśa Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 3. 12) he is called an Aikshvāka.

Triśāṇku (Vāyu, 88. 109) is mentioned in the Taittirīya Upanishad (I. 10. 1).

Hariśchandra (Vāyu, 88. 117) is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 13. 16) and is styled Aikshvāka.

Rohita, the son of Hariśchandra (Vāyu, 88. 119) is also mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 14).

Bhagiratha (Vāyu, 88. 167) is mentioned in the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa (IV. 2. 12) and is called Aikshvāka. Under the name of Bhaje-ratha he is probably referred to in the Rig Veda (X. 60. 2) itself.

Ambarisha (Vāyu, 88. 171) is mentioned in the Rig Veda (I. 100. 17).

Rituparṇa (Vāyu, 88. 173) is mentioned in a Brāhmaṇa-like passage of the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XX. 12).

Daśaratha (Vāyu, 88. 183) is possibly mentioned in the Rig Veda (I. 126. 4).

Rāma (Vāyu, 88. 184) may be the person of the same name mentioned in the Rig Veda (X. 93. 14). But Daśaratha and Rāma in the Vedic passages
are not connected with either the Ikshvāku family or with Kosala.

Hiraṇyanaḥbha Kausalya (Vāyu, 88. 207), is mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad, VI. 1, and the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Śūtra, XVI. 9. 13. He is probably connected with Para Ātmāra Hairaṇyanaḥbha, the Kosala king mentioned in a gāthā occurring in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XIII. 5. 4. 4. According to the Praśna Upanishad, Hiraṇyanaḥbha was a contemporary of Sukeśa Bhāradvāja (VI. 1), who was himself a contemporary of Kausalya Āśvalāyana (Praśna, I. 1). If it be true, as seems probable, that Āśvalāyana of Kosala is identical with Assalāyana of Sāvatthi mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya (II. 147 et seq.) as a contemporary of Gotama Buddha, he must be placed in the sixth century B.C. Consequently Hiraṇyanaḥbha, too, must have lived in that century. The patronymic "Hairaṇyanaḥbha" of Para Ātmāra probably indicates that he was a son of Hiraṇyanaḥbha.

Some of the later princes of the Purānic list (e.g., Sākya, Suddhoḍana, Siddhārtha, Rāhula and Prasenajit) are mentioned in Buddhist texts. The relations of Hiraṇyanaḥbha with Prasenajit, who also flourished in the sixth century B.C., will be discussed in a later chapter.

It is clear from the facts mentioned above that the Purānic lists contain names of real kings and princes. But they have many glaring defects.

(1) Branches of the Ikshvāku family ruling over different territories have been mixed together, e.g., Trasadasya, king of the Pūrūs (Rig Veda, IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3), Rituparāṇa, king of Śaphala (Baud. Śrauta Śūtra, XX. 12), Suddhoḍana of Kapilavastu and Prasenajit, king of Śravasti, have been mentioned in such a way as to leave
the impression that they formed a continuous line of princes who ruled in regular succession. 

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

(3) Certain names have been omitted, e.g., Para Āṭāra and Mahākosala.

(4) The name of Siddhārtha (Buddha), who never ruled, has been included.

It is not easy to find out all the kings of the Purānic list who actually ruled over Kosala. The names of some of the earlier kings of the list, e.g., Purukūtsa, Trasadasyu, Harischandra, Rohita, Kituparna, and a few others, are omitted from the dynastic list of the kings of Ayodhyā given in the Ramāyana (I. 70). We know from the Vedic literature that most, if not all, of these princes ruled over territories lying outside Kosala. The only kings or Rājas mentioned in the Purānic list who are known from Vedic and early Buddhist texts to have reigned in Kosala, or over some part of it, are Hiranya-nābha, Prasenajit and Śuddhodana.

The Vedic texts mention another king named Para Āṭāra. The Buddhist works mention a few other kings of Kosala, but their names do not occur in the epic and Purānic lists. Some of these kings had their capital at Ayodhyā, others at Sāketa, and the rest at Śrāvastī. Of the princes of Ayodhyā the Ghata Jātaka (No. 454) mentions Kālasena. A Kosalarāja reigning in Sāketa is mentioned in the Nandiyamiga Jātaka (No. 385). Vanaka, Mahākosala and many others had their capital at Sāvatthi or Śrāvastī. Ayodhyā seems to have been the

1 E.g., The Kosalarāja of J. 75, Chatta (336), Subhamita (512), and Prasenajit.
earliest capital, and Sāketa the next. The last capital was Śrāvasti. Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town in Buddha’s time (Buddhist India, p. 34), but Sāketa and Śrāvasti were included among the six great cities of India (Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, S.B.E., XI, p. 99).

The chronology of ancient Kosala is in a state of utmost confusion. If the Purāṇas are to be believed, a prince named Divākara occupied the throne of Ayodhyā in the time of Adhistmakṛishṇa, great-great-grandson of Parikshit. It is not known when the older capitals were abandoned in favour of Śrāvasti. But it must have been some considerable time before the accession of Prasenajit, the contemporary of Bimbisāra, and of Udayana, the descendant of Adhistmakrīṣṇa.

We learn from the Mahāvagga (S.B.E., XVII, p. 294) that during the period of the earlier Brahmadattas of Kāsi, Kosala was a small realm: Dīghiti nāma Kosalavrājā ahosi daliddo appadhano appabhago appabalo appavāhano appavijito aparipuṇṇakosakotthāgāro.

In the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., however, Kosala was a mighty kingdom which contended first with Kāsi, and afterwards with Magadha for the mastery of the Madhyadeśa. The history of its struggles with Kāsi is reserved for treatment in a later chapter. The rivalry with Magadha ended in the absorption of the kingdom into the Magadhan Empire.

Anga was the country to the east of Magadha. It was separated from the latter kingdom by the river Champā, modern Chāndan. The Anga dominions, however, at one time included Magadha and probably extended to the shores of the sea. The Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka (No. 545) describes Rājagrha as a city of Anga. The Sānti Parva of the Mahābhārata (29. 35) refers to an Anga king who sacrificed on Mount Vishnupada (at Gaṅga). The Sabhāparva (44.9) mentions Anga and Vaṅga as forming one
Vishaya or kingdom. The Kathā-sarit-sāgara says (25.35; 26.115; 82.3-16) that Vīnaṇkapura, a city of the Aṅgas, was situated on the shore of the sea.

Champa, the famous capital of Aṅga, stood on the river of the same name (Jātaka 506) and the Ganges. Cunningham points out that there still exist near Bhāgalpur two villages, Champapara and Champapura, which most probably represent the actual site of the ancient capital. It is stated in the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and the Hari-vamśa that the ancient name of Champā was Mālinī:

Champasya tu purī Champā
Ya Mālinyabhavat purā.

In the Jātaka stories the city is also called Kala-Champā. The Maha-Janaka Jātaka (No. 539) informs us that Champā was sixty leagues from Mithilā. The same Jātaka refers to its gate, watch-tower, and walls. Down to the time of Gotama Buddha's death it was considered as one of the six great cities of India, the other five being Rājagrha, Sravasti, Sāketa, Kauśāmbi, and Benares. Champā increased in wealth and traders sailed from it to Suvrāṇabhūmi for trading purposes. Emigrants from Champā to Cochin China are supposed to have named their settlement after this famous Indian city.

The earliest appearance of Aṅga is in the Atharva Veda (V. 22. 14) in connection with the Gandhāris, Mūjavants, and Magadhas. The Rāmāyana tells an absurd story about the origin of this Janapada. It is related in that epic that Madana having incurred the displeasure of Mahādeva fled from the hermitage of the latter to escape

---

1 Watters, Yuan Chwang, II. 181; Daśakumāra Charita, II. 2.
2 Matrak, 48. 97; Vāyan, 99. 105-60; Hariv. 52. 49; Mbh. XII. 5. 6-7.
3 Mahāparinibbāna Sutta.
his consuming anger, and the region where "he cast off his body (Aṅga)" has since been known by the name of Aṅga (JASB, 1914, p. 317). The Mahābhārata attributes the foundation of the kingdom to a prince named Aṅga. There may be some truth in this tradition. Aṅga Vairochana is included in the list of anointed kings in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 22). The Mahāgovinda Suttanta mentions king Dhatarattha of Aṅga.¹ The Buddhist texts mention a queen named Gaggarā who gave her name to a famous lake in Champa. The Purāṇas (Matsya, 48. 91-108; Vāyu, 99. 100-112) give lists of the early kings of Aṅga. One of these kings, Dadhivāhana, is known to Jain tradition. The Purāṇas and the Harivamsa (32. 48) represent him as the son and immediate successor of Aṅga. Jain tradition places him in the beginning of the sixth century B.C. His daughter Chandanā or Chandrabālā was the first female who embraced Jainism shortly after Mahāvira had attained the Kevaliship (JASB, 1914, pp. 320-321). Śatānīka, king of Kauśāmbī attacked Champa, the capital of Dadhivāhana, and in the confusion which ensued, Chandanā fell into the hands of a robber, but all along she maintained the vows of the order. Magadha was then a small kingdom. A great struggle for supremacy was going on between Aṅga and Magadha.² The Vidhura Pāṇḍita Jātaka (Cowell, VI. 133) describes Rājagṛha as a city of Aṅga, while the Mahābhārata refers to a sacrifice which an Aṅga king performed at Mt. Vishṇupada (at Gayā). These facts probably indicate that at one time the Aṅga king annexed Magadha. Brahmadatta, king of Aṅga, is actually known to have defeated Bhātṛiya, king of Magadha. Aṅga had, at this time, an ally in the king of the Vatsas. Sri Harsha speaks of a king of

¹ Dialogues of the Buddha, II. 270.
² Champāeyya Jātaka.
Aṅga named Dīhavarman being restored to his kingdom by Udayana, king of Kausāmbi (Priyadarśikā, Act IV).

The destruction of the kingdom of Aṅga was effected by Bhāṭṭiya's son Bimbisāra Śrenika of Magadha who killed Brahmadatta, took his capital Champā, and resided there as viceroy till his father's death when he returned to Rājagṛha.¹

Magadha corresponds roughly to the present Patna and Gayā districts of Bihār. Its earliest capital was Girivraja, or old Rājagṛha, near Rājgir among the hills near Gayā. The Mahāvagga (S.B.E., XIII, 150) calls it Giribhaja of the Magadhas to distinguish it from other cities of the same name (cf. Girivraja in Kekaya). The Mahābhārata refers to it as Girivraja, Bihadrathapura (II, 24, 44), and Māgadhapura (Goratham girimāsādyā dadṛṣṭur Māgadhampuranam II, 20, 80), and says that it was an impregnable city, purāṇa duṇḍharṣhau samantatāh, being protected by five hills, Vaihāra "Vipulaḥ śailo," Varāha, Vrishabha, Rishigiri and Chaityaka. From the Rāmāyana we learn that the city had another name Vasumatī (I, 32, 5). The life of Hiuen Tsang (p. 113) mentions still another name, Kusāgarapura. Indian Buddhist writers give a seventh name, Bimbasārapuri (Law, Buddhaghosha, 87n).

In a passage of the Rig Veda (III, 53, 14) mention is made of a territory called Kikaṭa ruled by a chieftain named Pramaganda. Yāska (Nirukta VI, 32) declares that Kikaṭa was the name of a non-Aryan country. In later works Kikaṭa is given as a synonym of Magadha (cf. Abhi-
dhāna chintāmanī, "Kikaṭa Magadhāhavyaḥ"; Bhāgavata Purāṇa I, 3, 24: Buddhonāmnā'ñjanasutaḥ Kikāteshu bhavishyati; Śrīdhara "Kikaṭaḥ Gayāpradesaḥ").

The name Magadha first appears in the Atharva Veda (V, 22, 14) where fever is wished away to the Gandbāris,

Mujavants, Anagas, and Magadhas. The men of Magadha are usually spoken of in the early Vedic literature in terms of contempt. In the Vrātya (XV) book of the Atharva Samhitā, the Vrātya, *i.e.*, the Indian living outside the pale of Brāhmaṇism, is brought into very special relation to the Pumśchali and the Māgadha, faith is called his harlot, the Mitra his Māgadha. In the Śrauta Śūtras the equipment characteristic of the Vrātya is said to be given, when the latter is admitted into the Aryan Brāhmaṇical community, to the so-called Brāhmaṇas living in Magadha (Brahmabandhu Māgadhadesīya, Vedic Index II. 116). The Brāhmaṇas of Magadha are here spoken of in a sneering tone as Brahma-bandhu. In the Śāṅkhāyaṇa Āraṇyaka, however, the views of a “Magadhavāsi” Brāhmaṇa are quoted with respect. The Vedic dislike of the Magadhas in early times was due, according to Oldenberg (Buddha, 400n) to the fact that the Magadhas were not wholly Brāhmaṇised. Pargiter (J.R.A.S., 1908, pp. 851-853) suggests that in Magadha the Aryans met and mingled with a body of invaders from the east by sea.

With the exception of Pramaganda no king of Magadha appears to be mentioned in the Vedic literature.

The earliest dynasty of Magadha according to the Mahābhārata (I. 63. 30) and the Purāṇas is that founded by Bṛhadratha, the son of Vasu Chaidyoparichara, and the father of Jarāsandha. The Rāmāyaṇa (I. 32. 7) makes Vasu himself the founder of Girivraja or Vasumati. A Bṛhadratha is mentioned twice in the Rig Veda (I. 36. 18; X. 49. 6) but there is nothing to show that he is identical with the father of Jarāsandha. The Purāṇas give lists of the Bṛhadratha kings from Jarāsandha’s son Sahadeva to Rupuṇjaya, and apparently makes Senājit, seventh in descent from Sahadeva, the contemporary of Adhisimā-krīṣṇa of the Pārīkṣita family.

---

1 Weber, Hist Ind. Lit., p. 112.
and Divākara of the Ikshvāku line. But in the absence of independent external corroboration it is not safe to accept the Purānic chronology and order of succession of these princes as authentic (cf. pp. 65-66 ante). The Bāhradhrathas are said to have passed away when Pulika placed his son Pradyota on the throne of Avanti. As Pradyota was a contemporary of Gotama Buddha it is reasonable to conclude that the Bāhradhratha dynasty came to an end in the sixth century B.C. The Jaina writers mention two early kings of Rājagṛha named Samudravijaya and his son Gaya (S.B.E., XLV, 86). Gaya is said to have reached perfection which has been taught by the Jainas. But very little reliance can be placed on the uncorroborated assertions of late Jaina authors.

The second Maṇḍhān dynasty, according to the Puraṇas, was the Śaśāṇa line founded by a king named Śaśānā. Bimbisāra, the contemporary of Buddha, is said to have belonged to this dynasty. Aśvaghosha, however, in his Buddha-charita, distinctly (XI.2) refers to Śrenya, i.e., Bimbisāra as a scion, not of the Śaśānā family, but of the Haryāṇika-kula, and the Mahāvamśa makes Susunāga the founder of a dynasty which succeeded that of Bimbisāra. The Puraṇas themselves relate that Śaśānā will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and will be king:

Asa-trīṃśa-chchhatam bhāvyah
Prādyotaḥ pañcha te sutāh
Hatva teshām yasaḥ kṛitisnām
Śaśānāḥ bhaviśhyati.

(Vāyu Purāṇa, 99. 314.)

If this statement be true, then Śaśānā must be later than the first Pradyota, namely Chanda Pradyota Mahāsenā, who was, according to the early Pāli texts, a contemporary of Bimbisāra. It follows that Śaśānā must
be later than Bimbisāra. But we have seen that the Purāṇas make Śiśunāga an ancestor of Bimbisāra. Thus the Purāṇas, in their present form, are self-contradictory. The inclusion of Vāraṇasi and Vaiśāli within Śiśunāga’s dominions (Dynasties of the Kali Age, 21; S.B.E., XI, p. xvi), proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru who were the first to establish Magadhan authority in those regions. The Mālālāṅkāravatthu tells us that Rājaṅrha lost her rank of royal city from the time of Śiśunāga. This also indicates that Śiśunāga came after the palmy days of Rājaṅrha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. Prof. Bhandarkar in his Carmichael Lectures, 1918, accepts the Ceylonese version and rejects the Purāṇic account of Bimbisāra’s lineage. He makes Bimbisāra the founder of his dynasty, and says that he was a general who carved out a kingdom for himself at the expense of the Vajjis. The Mahāvaṁsa, however, states (Geiger’s translation, p. 12) that Bimbisāra was anointed king by his own father when he was only 15 years old. Turnour and N. L. Dey mention Bhatiyo or Bhaṭṭiya as the name of the father (Turnour, Mahāvaṁsa I. 10; J.A.S.B., 1914, 321). The Tibetans on the other hand, call him Mahāpadma (Essay on Guṇāḍhya, p. 173). We have already mentioned his defeat at the hands of Brahmadatta, king of Anga. The defeat was avenged by Bimbisāra who launched Magadha into that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kaliṅga.

The Vajjis, according to Prof. Rhys Davids and Cunningham, included eight confederate clans (aṭṭha-kula), of whom the Videhans, the Lichchhavis, the Jñātrikas and the Vajjis proper were the most important. The identity of the remaining clans remains uncertain. It may, however, be noted here that in a passage of the Sūtrakritāṅga the Ugras, Bhogas, Aikshvākas and
Kauravas are associated with the Jñātris and Lichchhavis as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly (SBE, XLV, 339).

The Videhans had their capital at Mithilā which is identified by some scholars with the small town of Janakpur just within the Nepāl border. But a section of them may have settled in Vaiśālī. To this section probably belonged the princess Trisalā, also called Videhadattā, mother of Mahāvīrā.

The Lichchhavis had their capital at Vesālī (Vaiśālī) which has been identified with Besārāh (to the east of the Gaṇḍak) in the Muzaffarpur district of Bihar. Vesālī is probably identical with the city called Viśālā in the Rāmāyana (Ādi., 45. 10):

Visālāṁ Nagarāṁ rāmyāṁ divyāṁ svārgopāmāṁ tadā.

We learn from the introductory portion of the Ekapaṇḍa Jūtaka (No. 149) that a triple wall encompassed the city, each wall a league distant from the next, and there were three gates with watch-towers.

The Jñātrakas were the clan of Siddhārtha and his son Mahāvīra the Jīna. They had their seats at Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma and Kollāga, suburbs of Vesālī. Nevertheless they were known as "Vesālie," i. e., inhabitants of Vesālī.¹

The Vajjis or Vrijis are mentioned by Panini (IV. 2. 131). Kautilya² distinguishes the Vrijikas or Vajjis from the Lichchhivikas. Yuan Chwang (Watters, II. 81) also distinguishes the Fu-li-chih (Vrijī) country from Fo-li-chih (Vaiśālī). It seems that Vrijika or Vajji was not only the name of the confederacy, but also of one of the constituent clans. But the Vajjis, like the Lichchhavis, are often associated with the city of Vesālī which was not only the capital of the Lichchhavi

¹ Hoernle, Uvângañāsī, II, p. 4n.
clan, but also the metropolis of the entire confederacy.¹ A Buddhist tradition quoted by Rockhill (Life of Buddha, p. 62) mentions the city of Vesālī as consisting of three districts. These districts were probably at one time the seats of three different clans. The remaining clans of the confederacy resided in suburbs like Kunḍagrāma, Kollāga, Vāṇiyagāma, etc.²

We have seen that during the Brāhmaṇa period Mithilā had a monarchical constitution. The Rāmāyana (I. 47. 11-17) and the Purāṇas (Vāyu, 86. 16-22; Vishnu IV. 1. 18) state that Viṣāla, too, was at first ruled by kings. The founder of the Vaiśālikā dynasty is said to have been Viṣāla, a son of Ikshvāku according to the Rāmāyana; a descendant of Nabhaga, the brother of Ikshvāku, according to the Purāṇas. Viṣāla is said to have given his name to the city. After Viṣāla came Hemachandra, Suchandra, Dhumrāśva, Śrīnijaya, Sahadeva Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kakutstha and Sunati. We do not know how much of the Rāmāyanaic and Purānic account of the Vaiśālikā nṛpas can be accepted as sober history. A king named Sahadeva Sārṇijaya is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (II. 4. 4. 3. 4) as having once been called Suplan Sārṇijaya, and as having changed his name because of his success in performing the Dākshāyana Sacrifice. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34. 9) he is mentioned with Somaka Sāhadeva. None of these kings, however, are connected with Vaiśālī in the Vedic literature.

The Vajjian confederation must have been organised after the fall of the royal houses of Videha.

¹ Cf. Majhima Nikāya, II. 101; the Book of the Kindred Sayings, Sanyutta Nikāya, by Mrs. Rhys Davids, pp. 257, 260.
² For the Ugras and Bhogas see Eišh. op. III. 8. 2; 885, XLV, 71; the association of a body of “Kauravas” with the Vajjian group of clans is interesting. Kura Brāhmaṇas, e.g. Usatati Chākṛtyaṇa, had been to settle in North Bihār long before the rise of Buddhism. For the Aikshvākas of North Bihār see Pārīkṣa, AIRT, 86-97.
political evolution in India thus resembles closely the political evolution in the ancient cities of Greece where also the monarchies of the Heroic Age were succeeded by aristocratic republics. The probable causes of the transformation in Greece are thus given by Bury: "in some cases gross misrule may have led to the violent deposition of a king; in other cases, if the succession to the sceptre devolved upon an infant or a paltry man, the nobles may have taken it upon themselves to abolish the monarchy. In some cases, the rights of the king might be strictly limited, in consequence of his seeking to usurp undue authority; and the imposition of limitations might go on until the office of the king, although maintained in name, became in fact a mere magistracy in a state wherein the real power had passed elsewhere. Of the survival of monarchy in a limited form we have an example at Sparta: of its survival as a mere magistracy, in the Archon Basileus at Athens."

The cause of the transition from monarchy to republic in Mithila has already been stated. Regarding the change at Viśalā we know nothing.

Several eminent scholars have sought to prove that the Lichchhavis, the most famous clan of the Vajjian confederacy, were of foreign origin. According to Dr. Smith the Lichchhavis were Tibetans in their origin. He infers this from their judicial system and the disposal of their dead.¹ Dr. S. C. Vidyābhushana held that the Lichchhavis were originally Persians and came from the Persian city of Nisib.² The unsoundness of these theories has been demonstrated by several writers (Modern Review, 1919, p. 50; Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, 26 ff). Indian tradition is unanimous in representing the Lichchhavis as Kṣatriyas. Thus we read in the Mahāparinibbāna

¹ Ind. Ant., 1909, p. 283.
² Ind. Ant., 1908, p. 78
Suttanta: "and the Lichchhavis of Vesāli heard the news that the Exalted One had died at Kusināra. And the Lichchhavis of Vesāli sent a messenger to the Mallas, saying: 'the Exalted One was a Kshatriya and so are we. We are worthy to receive a portion of the relics of the Exalted One.'" In the Jaina Kaalpa Sūtra Triśāla, sister to Chetaka, who is regarded by several scholars as a Lichchhavi chief of Vesāli, is styled Kshatriyāṇī (S. B. E., XXII, pp. xii, 227).

Manu concurs in the view that the Lichchhavis are Rājanyas or Kshatriyas (X. 22):

Jhallo Mallaścha rājanyād vṛātyān Nichchhivireva cha Naṭaścha Karanāśchaiva Khaśo Drāvida eva cha.

It may be argued that the Lichchhavis, though originally non-Aryans or foreigners, ranked as Kshatriyas when they were admitted into the fold of Brāhmaṇism like the Drāvidians referred to in Manu's śloka and the Gurjara-Pratihāras of mediæval times. But, unlike the Pratihāras and Drāvidas, the Lichchhavis never appear to be very friendly towards Brāhmaṇism. On the contrary, they were always to be found among the foremost champions of non-Brāhmaṇic creeds like Jainism and Buddhism. As a matter of fact Manu brands them as the children of the Vṛātya Rājanyas. The great mediæval Rajput families (though sometimes descended from foreign immigrants) were never spoken of in these terms. On the contrary, they were supplied with pedigrees going back to Rāma, Laksmanā, Yadu, Arjuna and others. A body of foreigners, who were unfriendly towards the Brāhmaṇas, could hardly have been accepted as Kshatriyas. The obvious conclusion seems to be that the Lichchhavis were indigenous Kshatriyas who were degraded to the position of Vṛātyas.
when they became champions of non-Brahmanical creeds. The Pali commentary Paramatthajotikā (Vol. I, pp. 158-165) contains a legend regarding the Lichohdhavis which traces their origin to a queen of Benares.

The date of the foundation of the Lichchhavī power is not known. But it is certain that the authority of the clan was firmly established in the time of Mahāvira and Gotama, i.e., in the sixth century B.C. A vivid description of the Lichchhavis is given by Buddha himself in the following words (SBE., XI, p. 32): “Let those of the brethren who have never seen the Tāvatimsa gods, gaze upon this company of the Lichchhavis, behold this company of the Lichchhavis, compare this company of the Lichchhavis—even as a company of Tāvatimsa gods.”

Buddhist tradition has preserved the names of eminent Lichchhavis like prince Abhaya, Oṭṭhaddha, Mahāli, general Silha, Dummukha and Sunakkhatta.¹ In the introductory portions of the Êkapança (149) and Chulla Kālinga (301) Jātakas it is stated that the Lichchhavis of the ruling family numbered 7,707. There was a like number of viceroys, generals, and treasurers. The Jaina Kalpasūtra §128) refers to the “nine Lichchhavis” as having formed a confederacy with nine Mallakis and eighteen Gaṇarājas of Kāsi-Kosala. We learn from the Nirayavali Sūtra that an important leader of this confederacy was Chetaka² whose sister Trisalā or Videhadattā was the mother of Mahāvira, and whose daughter Chellanā or Vedehi was, according to Jaina writers, the mother of Kūṅika-Ajātaśatru.

¹ Aṅguttara Nikāya, III. 74 ; Mahāli Sutta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, p. 196; Mahāvagga, SBE., XVII, p. 108; Majjhima N., 1. 234; 63; II. 282; The Book of the Kindred Sayings, 295. For a detailed account of the Lichchhavis, see now Law, Some Ekaṭiya Tribes of Ancient India.

² In the opinion of several scholars Chetaka was a Lichchhāri. But the secondary names of his sister (Videhadattā) and daughter (Vedehi) probably indicate that he was a Vīśējan domiciled at Vesāli.
The great rival of Vaiśālī was Magadha. Tradition says that even in the time of the great Bimbisāra the Vaiśālians were audacious enough to invade their neighbours across the Ganges (Si-yu-ki, Bk IX). But in the reign of Ajātaśatru the tables were turned, and the great confederacy of Vaiśālī was utterly destroyed.

The preliminaries to the conquest of Vaiśālī are described in the Mahāvagga and the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (SBE., XVII, p. 101; XI, pp. 1-5).

The Malla territory (Mallaraṭṭha or Mallarāṣṭra, Bh., VI. 9. 34) was divided into two parts which had for their capitals the cities of Kusāvatī or Kusinārā and Fāvā. The exact site of Kusinārā is not yet known. In the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, it is stated that the Sala Grove of the Mallas, the Upavatana of Kusinārā lay near the river Hiranyavatī. Smith identifies the Hiranyavati with the Gaṇḍak and says that Kuśinagara (Kusinārā) was situated in Nepal, beyond the first range of hills, at the junction of the Little, or Eastern Rāpṭi with the Gaṇḍak (EHL., p. 159 n). He, however, adds that the discovery in the large stupa behind the Nirvāṇa temple near Kasiā of an inscribed copper plate bearing the words "[parini] r vāna-chaitye tāmrapatā iti," has revived and supported the old theory, propounded by Wilson and accepted by Cunningham, that the remains near Kasiā (on the Chota Gaṇḍak), in the east of the Gorakhpur District, represent Kuśinagara.

Pāvā has been identified by Cunningham (AGI. 498) with the village named Padaraona, 12 miles to the NNE. of Kasiā and separated from it by the Bādhi Nala (ancient Kukutthā). Carileyle, however, proposes to identify Pāvā with Fāzilpur, 10 miles SE. of Kasiā and separated from it by the Kuku (Kukutthā; AGI. 714).

1 Kus Jānaka No. 631; Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 161-162.
The Mallas together with the Lichchhavis are classed by Manu as Vrātya Kshatriyas. They too, like the Lichchhavis, were ardent champions of Buddhism.

Like Videha, Malla had a monarchical constitution at first. The Kusa Jātaka mentions a Malla king named Ṭakāka (Ikśvāku). The name Ṭakāka probably indicates that like the Śākyas (cf. Dialogues, Part I, pp. 114-115) the Malla kings also belonged to the Ikśvāku family. And this is confirmed by the fact that in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta they are sometimes called Vāsetṭhas, i.e., “belonging to the Vasiṣṭha gotra” (Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 162, 179, 181). The Mahāsudassana Sutta mentions another king named Mahāsudassana (SBE, XI, p. 248). These kings, Ṭakāka and Mahāsudassana, may or may not have been historical individuals. The important thing to remember is that Mallarāṭṭha was at first ruled by kings. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence of the Mahābhārata (II. 30. 3) which refers to a king of the Mallas. During the monarchical period the metropolis was a great city and was styled Kusāvatī.

Before Bimbisāra’s time the monarchy had been replaced by a republic (cf. SBE, XI, p. 102; Kaṇṭhila’s Arthasastra, 1919, p. 378); and the metropolis had sunk to the level of a “little wattel and daub town,” a “branch township” surrounded by jungles. It was then styled Kusināra.

The Mallas had several other important cities namely Bhoga-nagara,1 Auupiya and Uravelakappa.1

The relations of the Mallas with the Lichchhavis were sometimes hostile and sometimes friendly. The introductory story of the Bhaddassāla Jātaka (No. 465) contains an account of a conflict between Bandhula the Mallian (Commander-in-chief of the king of Kośala) and 500 kings of the Lichchhavis. The Jaina Kalpasūtra, however, refers to nine Mallakis as having formed a league

1 Of the Bhoga, p. 57 ante; Saṅka Nipāta, 194, Uṇāṣagadāṣṭa, II. Appendix, p. 67; Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 149.
with nine Lichchhavis, and the eighteen Gaṅarājas of Kāsi-Kośala.¹

The league was evidently aimed against Kūnika-Ajātasatru who, like Philip of Macedon, was trying to absorb the territories of his republican neighbours. The Malla territory was finally annexed to Magadha. It certainly formed a part of the Maurya Empire in the third century B.C. Chedi was one of the countries encircling the Kurus (parītaḥ Kurūṁ, Mbh. IV. i. 11), and lay near the Jumna (I. 63. 2-58). In ancient times it corresponded roughly to the modern Bundelkhand and the adjoining region. In the mediæval period, however, the southern frontiers of Chedi extended to the banks of the Narmadā (Mekalasutā):

“Nādināṁ Mekala-sutā nṛpānam Raṇavīgrahaḥ
Kavināmaḥa Suśrūṇandā Chedi-mandala maṇḍanam” ²

We learn from the Chetiya Jātaka (No. 422) that the metropolis was Sothivati-nagara. The Mahābhārata calls the capital Suktimati (III. 20.50) or Sukti-sāhvaya (XIV. 83.2). As pointed out by Mr. Nundolal Dey, Sothivati is the same as Suktimati.³ The Great Epic mentions also a river called Suktimati which flowed by the capital of Rāja Uparichara of Chedi-vishaya (I. 63, 35). Pargiter identifies the stream with the Ken, and places the city of Suktimati in the neighbourhood of Banda.⁴ Other towns of note were Sahajāṭi (Anguttara III, 355) and Tripuri, the mediæval capital of the Janapada.

The Chedi people are mentioned as early as the

¹ Navā Mallai navā Lechchhaini Kāsi Kośalaya aṭṭhārcavā vi gauśraya-vayo. Jacob translates the passage thus:
The eighteenth confederate kings of Kāsi and Kosala, the nine Mallakis and nine Lichchhavis.
² Konow, Karpuramaśjīrī, p. 182.
Rig Veda. Their king Kaśu Chaidya is praised in a Dānastutī occurring at the end of one hymn (VIII. 5. 37-39). Rapson proposes to identify him with 'Vasu' of the Epics.

The Chetiya Jātaka gives the following legendary genealogy of Chaidya kings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahāsammata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vararoja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalyāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varakalyāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uposatha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māndhātā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varamāndhātā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upachara or Apachara

The last king, Upachara, had five sons who are said to have founded the cities of Hatthipura, Assapura, Sīhapura, Uttarapañcchāla and Daddarapura. This monarch is probably identical with Uparichara Vasu, the Paurāva king of Chedi mentioned in the Mahābhārata (I. 63. 1-2), whose five sons also founded five lines of kings (I. 63. 30). But epic tradition associates the scions of Vasu’s family with the cities of Kauśāmbī, Mahodaya and Girivraja (Rāmāyaṇa I. 32. 6-9; Mahābhārata I. 63. 30-33).

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

We learn from the Vedabha Jātaka (No. 48) that the road from Kāsi to Chedi was unsafe being infested with roving bands of marauders.

**Vamsa** or **Vatsa** is the country of which Kauśāmbi, modern Kosam near Allahabad, was the capital. Oldenberg (Buddha, 393 n) is inclined to identify the Vamsas with the Vaśas of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. But the conjecture lacks proof. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions a teacher named Proti Kauśāmbayya (Sat. Br., XII. 2. 2. 13) whom Harisvāmin, the commentator, considers to be a native of the town of Kauśāmbi. Epic tradition attributes the foundation of this famous city to a Chedi prince (Ram. I. 32. 3-6; Mbh., I. 63. 31). The origin of the Vatsa people, however, is traced to a king of Kāsi (Harivamsa, 29, 73, Mbh. XII., 49. 80). It is stated in the Purāṇas that when the city of Hāstimapura was carried away by the Ganges, Nichakshu, the great-great-grandson of Janamejaya, abandoned it, and removed his residence to Kauśāmbi. We have already seen that the Purānic tradition about the Bhārata or Kuru origin of the later kings of Kauśāmbi is confirmed by Bhāsa. Udayana king of Kauśāmbi, is described in the Svaṇavasavadaṭṭa (Ed. Ganapati Sāstṛi, p. 140) as a scion of the Bhārata kula.

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

Brahmakshatraśya yo yonir vamsō devarshī satkritaḥ
Kśemaṃkam prāpya rājānāṃ samkhāṃ prāpsyati vai
kalau.
The earliest king of Kausambi about whom we know anything is Śatānāka II of the Purānic list. His father’s name was Vasudāna according to the Purāṇas, and Sahasrānāka according to Bāṣa. Satānāka himself was also styled Parantapa (Buddhist India, p. 3). He married a princess of Videha as his son is called Vaiḍehiputra. He is said to have attacked Champa, the capital of Aṅga, during the reign of Dadhivāhana (JASB, 1914, p. 321). His son and successor was the famous Udayana the contemporary of Bimbisāra.

The Bhagga (Bharga) state of Sumśumāragiri was a dependency of Vatsa. The Mahābhārata (II. 30. 10-11) and the Harivamsa (29. 73) testify to the close association of these two realms.

The Kuru state was according to Jātaka No. 537 (Mahā-Sutasoma) three hundred leagues in extent. The Jātakas say that the reigning dynasty belonged to the Yuddhisṭhila gota, i.e., the family of Yudhishṭhira. The capital was Indapatta or Indapattana, i.e., Indraprastha or Indrapat near the modern Delhi. It extended over seven leagues (Jātakas Nos. 537, 545). We hear of a number of nīgamas or smaller towns besides the capital such as Thullakotthita, Kammāssadamma, and Vārapāvata.

The Jātakas mention the following Kuru kings and princes: Dhanañjaya Korabya, Koravya, and Sutasoma. We cannot, however, vouch for the historical existence of these personages in the absence of further evidence.

The Jaina Uttarādhyayana Śūtra mentions a king Ishukāra ruling at the town called Ishukāra in the Kuru.

---

1 Jātaka No. 383; Carmichael Lee., p. 93.
2 Dharmakārika Jātaka, No. 413; Dasa Brahmaṇa Jātaka, No. 495.
3 Karṇādhama Jātaka No. 279; Dharmakārika Jātaka No. 413; Sambhava Jātaka, No. 516; Viśnusārasaṅga Jātaka, No. 545.
4 Dasa Brahmaṇa Jātaka, No. 495; Mahāsutasoma Jātaka, No. 537.
5 Mahāsutasomam Jātaka, cf. the Mahābhārata I. 96. 75 where Sutasoma appears as the name of a son of Bhima.
country (SBE. XLV. 62). It seems probable that after the removal of the main royal family to Kauśāmibi, the Kuru realm was parcelled out into small states of which Indapatta and Ishūkāra were apparently the most important. Later on the little principalities gave place to a Saṅgha or republic (Arthaśāstra, 1919, 378).

Pāṇchāla roughly corresponds to Rohilkhand and a part of the central Doāb. The Mahābhārata, the Jātakas and the Divyāvadāna (p. 435) refer to the division of this state into northern and southern. The Bhāgirathī (Ganges) formed the dividing line (Mbh. I. 138. 70). According to the Great Epic, Northern Pāṇchāla had its capital at Ahichchhātra or Chhatravati (the modern Rāmnagar near Aonlā in the Bareilly District), while Southern Pāṇchāla had its capital at Kāmpiliya, and stretched from the Ganges to the Chambal (Mbh. 138. 73-74). A great struggle raged in ancient times between the Kurus and the Pāṇchālas for the possession of Uttara Pāṇchāla. Sometimes Uttara Pāṇchāla was included in Kururaṭṭha (Somanassa Jātaka, No. 505; Mahābhārata I. 138) and had its capital at Hāṣṭinapura (Divyāvadāna, p. 435), at other times it formed a part of Kampillaraṭṭha. Sometimes kings of Kampillaraṭṭha held court at Uttara Pāṇchālanagara, at other times kings of Uttara Pāṇchalaraṭṭha held court at Kampilla (Kumbhakāra Jātaka, No. 408).

The history of Pāṇchāla from the death of Pravāhana Jaivala or Jaivali to the time of Bimbisāra of Magadha is obscure. The only king who may perhaps be referred to this period is Durmukha (Dummukha), the contemporary of Nimi (Jātaka No. 408), who is probably to be identified with the penultimate sovereign of Mithila.

1 Brahmadatta Jātaka, No. 323, Jayaddha Jātaka, No. 613, and Gangāsthiṇḍu Jātaka, No. 530.
(Jātaka No. 541). In the Kumbhakāra Jātaka it is stated that Dummukha’s kingdom was styled Uttarā Pañchāla-rajṭha; his capital was not Abhichhhatra but Kampillanagara. He is represented as a contemporary of Karaṇḍu, king of Kalinga, Naggaji (Nagnajit), king of Gandhāra and Nimi, king of Videha. We learn from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 23) that Durmukha, the Pañchāla king, made extensive conquests. His priest was Bhṛhaduktha:


A great Pañchāla king named Chulani Brahmadatta is mentioned in the Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka (546), the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (SBE. XLV. 57-61), the Svapnavāsavadatta (Aot V) and the Rāmāyaṇa (I. 32). In the last mentioned work he is said to have married the daughters (Kanyāḥ) of Kusūrābha who were made hump-backs (Kubja) by the wind-god. In the Jātaka Kevatta, the minister of Brahmadatta, is said to have formed a plan for making Chulani chief king of all India, and the king himself is represented as having laid siege to Mithilā. In the Uttarādhyayana Brahmadatta is styled a Universal monarch. The story of Brahmadatta is, however, essentially legendary, and little reliance can be placed on it. The Rāmāyaṇic legend regarding the king is only important as showing the connection of the early Pañchālas with the foundation of the famous city of Kanyākubja or Kanaṇj.

The Uttarādhyayana Sūtra mentions a king of Kampilya named Sañjaya who gave up his kingly power and adopted the faith of the Jinas (SBE. XLV. 80-82). We do not know what happened after Sañjaya gave up his throne. But there is reason to believe that the Pañchālas, like the Videhas, Mallas and Kurus, established a

Matsya had its capital at Virātanagara or Bairāṭ in the modern Jaipur State.¹

The early history of the Matsya kingdom has already been related. Its vicissitudes during the centuries which immediately preceded the reign of Bimbisāra of Magadha are not known. It is not included by Kauṭilya among those states which had a Saṅgha form of Government. The probability is that the monarchical constitution endured till the loss of its independence. It was probably at one time annexed to the neighbouring kingdom of Chedi. The Mahābhārata (V. 74. 16) refers to a king named Sahaja who reigned over both the Chedis and the Matsyas. It was finally absorbed into the Magadhan Empire. Some of the most famous edicts of Aśoka have been found at Bairāṭ.

The Mahābhārata (II. 31. 4) mentions a people called the Apara Matsyas who probably occupied the hill tract on the north bank of the Chambal (J.A.S.B., 1895, 251). The Rāmāyana (II. 71. 5) has a reference to the Vira Matsyas. From the Dibbida plates (Ep. Ind. V. 108) we learn that a family of Matsyas settled in the Vizagapatam region in medieval times. We are told that Jayatsena, the lord of Utkala, gave to Satyamārāṇḍa of the Matsya family in marriage his daughter Prabhāvatī, and appointed him to rule over the Oddavādi country. After twenty-three generations came Arjuna who ruled in 1269 A.D.

The Surasena country had its capital at Mathurā which, like Kauśambī, stood on the Yamunā. Neither Śarasena nor Mathurā finds any mention in the Vedic literature. But the Greek writers refer to the Surasenoi and their cities Methora and Cleisobora.

¹ Carmichael Lee., 1919, p. 58.
In the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas the ruling family of Mathurā is styled the Yadu or Yādava family. The Yādavas were divided into various septs, namely, the Vītihotras, Sātvatas, etc. (Matsya, 43-44; Vāyu, 94-96). The Sātvatas were subdivided into several branches, e.g., the Daivāvṛīdhas, Anūhakas, Mahābhujas and Vṛishnis (Vishṇu, IV. 13. 1; Vāyu, 96. 1-2).

Yadu and his tribe are repeatedly mentioned in the Rig Veda. He is closely associated with Turvaśa and in one place (1. 108. 8) with Druhyu, Anu and Pāru. This association is also implied by the epic and Purānic legends which state that Yadu and Turvaśu were the sons of the same parents, and Druhyu, Anu and Pāru were their step-brothers.

We learn from the Rig Veda (I. 36. 18; VI. 45. 1) that Yadu and Turvaśa came from a distant land, and the former is brought into very special relation to the Parsus or Persians (VIII. 6. 46). The Sātvatas or Satvats also appear to be mentioned in the Vedic texts. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 21) the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats or Satvants and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an Aśvamedha are referred to. The geographical position of Bharata’s kingdom is clearly shown by the fact that he made offerings or the Yamunā and the Ganges (Ait. Br. VIII, 23; Mbh. VII. 66. 8). The Satvats must have been occupying some adjoining region. The epic and Purānic tradition which places them in the Mathurā district is thus amply confirmed. At a later time, however, a branch of the Satvats may have migrated southward, for in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14. 3), the Satvats

1 Epigraphic evidence points to a close connection between Western Asia and India from about the middle of the second millennium B.C. Rig Vedic Gods like Śūrya (Suryas), Maru (Marutazha), Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, the Nāsitāyas, and even Daksha (daksha, star, O.A.H. I. 583) figure in the records of the Kassites and the Mitanni.
are described as a southern people ruled by Bhoja kings. In the Purāṇas also we find that a branch of the Satvats was styled Bhoja (Vishnū IV. 13. 1-6):

"Bhajina-Bhajamāna-divyāndhaka-Devāvṛidha-Mahā-bhoja-Vrishṇi-samjōṣah Sātvatasya putrā babhūvuh...... Mahā Bhojaśvati dharmātmā tasyānvaye Bhojamārtikā vata babhūvuh."

It is further stated that several southern states, Māhismati, Vidarbha, etc., were founded by princes of Yadu lineage (Mat., p. 43. 10-29; 44. 36; Vāyu, 34. 26; 95. 35). Not only the Bhojas, but the Devāvṛidha branch of the Sātvatas is also mentioned in the Vedic literature. Bahru Daivāvṛidha (Vāyu, 96. 15, Vishnū, IV. 13. 3-5) is mentioned in the Aitareya Brahmana (VII. 34) as a contemporary of Bhima, king of Vidarbha and Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra. The Andhakas and Vrishṇis are referred to in the Asāṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (IV. 1. 114; VI. 2. 34). In Kauṭilya’s Arthasastra (p. 12) the Vrishṇis are described as a Saṅgha, i.e., a republican corporation. The Mahābhārata, too, refers to the Vrishṇis, Andhakas and other associate tribes as a Saṅgha (XII. 81. 25), and Vāsudeva as a Saṅgha-mukhya. The name of the Vrishṇi corporation has been preserved by a unique coin. It is stated in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas that Kamsa, like Peisistratus and others of Greek history, tried to make himself tyrant at Mathurā by overpowering the Yādavas, and that Krishna, a scion of the Vrishṇi family, killed him. The slaying of Kamsa by Krishna is referred to by Pātañjali and the Gātaka Jātaka (No. 451). The latter work confirms the Hindu tradition about the association of Krishna-Vāsudeva’s family with Mathurā (‘Uttara Madhura’).}

1 Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, p. 110.
2 The question of the historical existence of Krishna Vāsudeva has been discussed in my Early History of the Vaisākha Sect., pp. 26-35, and my Political History of Ancient India, 1st ed., 1923, p. 312.
The final overthrow of the Vrishnis is ascribed to their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas. It is interesting to note in this connection, that the Vrishnis and the Andhakas are branded as Vrātyas in the Drona Parva of the Mahābhārata (1.11.15). It is a remarkable fact that the Vrishni-Andhakas and other Vrātya clans (e.g. the Lichchhavis and Mallas) are found in historical times on the southern and eastern fringe of the “Dhruva Madhyama dīś” occupied by the Kuru-Pańchālas. It is not improbable that they represent an earlier swarm of Aryans who were pushed southwards and eastwards by the Pūru-Bharatas, the progenitors of the Kuru-Pańchālas. It may be remembered in this connection that the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa actually refers to the defeat by Bharata of the Satratis—the progenitors of the Vrishni-Andhakas. And the Great Epic refers to the exodus of the Yādavas from Mathurā owing to pressure from the Paurava line of Magadha, and probably also from the Kurus (cf. baḥu-Kurucharī Mathurā, Pt. IV. 1.1., GEI., p. 395 n).

The Buddhist texts refer to Avantiputta king of the Šūrasenas in the time of Mahā Kachchāna (M. 2. 83) who was the first among the chief disciples of Śākyamuni through whose agency Buddhism gained ground in the Mathurā region. A king of Šūrasena named Kuvinḍa is mentioned in the Kāvyā-Mimāṁsā. The Šūrasenas continued to be a notable people up to the time of Megasthenes. But at that time they must have formed an integral part of the Maurya Empire.

Assaka was situated on the banks of the Godhāvarī (Sutta Nipāta, 977). The name of the territory represents the Sanskrit Aśmaka, identified by the commentator

---

Bhaṭṭasvāmin with Mahārāṣṭra. The Aśmakaś are mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. 1. 178). As the grammarian refers to Dākshinātya (IV. 2. 98) and Kaliṅga (IV. 1. 178) his Aśmaka may be Assaka in the Deccan. It may, however, also denote the Aśmakaś in North-West India referred to by the Greek writers as the Assakenoi.

The capital of Assaka was Potana or Potali,¹ the Paudanya of the Mahābhārata (1.77. 47). Prof. Bhandarkar points out (Carm. Lec., pp. 53-54) that in early Pali literature Assaka has, on the one hand, been distinguished from Mulaka which lay to its north, and on the other from Kaliṅga. He suggests that in later times Assaka seems to have included Mulaka, and also perhaps Kaliṅga. In the Sona-Nanda Jātaka we find Assaka associated with Avanti; this association can only be explained if we surmise that Assaka included at that time Mulaka and thus its territory abutted on Avanti.

In the Vāyu Purāṇa (88. 177-178) Aśmaka and Mulaka appear as scions of the Ikṣuvākū family, and the Mahābhārata speaks of "Aśmakonāma Rājarṣīḥ Paudanyam Yonyavesayat." This probably indicates that the Aśmakaś and Mulakaš kingdoms were believed to have been founded by Ikṣuvākū chiefs, just as Vidarbha and Daṇḍaka were founded by princes of the Yadu (Bhoja) family. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta mentions Brahmadatta king of the Assakas who was a contemporary of Sattabhu king of Kaliṅga, Vessabhu king of Avanti, Bharata king of Sovira, Reṇu king of Videha, Dhataraṭṭha king of Aṅga and Dhataraṭṭha king of Kāsi.²

We learn from the Assaka Jātaka (No. 207) that at one time the city of Potali was included in the kingdom of Kāsi, and its prince, Assaka, was presumably a vassal of the Kāsi monarch. The Chulla Kaliṅga Jātaka

¹ Chulla-Kaliṅga Jātaka, No. 301 ; D. 2. 235.
² Dialogues of the Budhā, Part II, p. 270.
mentions a king of Assaka named Aruṇa and his minister Nandisena, and refers to a victory which they won over the king of Kalinga.

Avanti roughly corresponds to modern Mālwa, Nimār and the adjoining parts of the Central Provinces. Prof. Bhandarkar points out that this Janapada was divided into two parts: the northern part had its capital at Ujjain and the southern part called Avanti Dakshinapatha had its capital at Māhissati or Māhiṃmati, usually identified with the modern Māndhātā on the Narmada.1

Buddhist and Jain writers mention two other cities of Avanti named Kuraraghara and Sudarśanapura.3

The Mahāgovinda Suttanta mentions Māhissati as the capital of the Avantis, and refers to their king Vessabhu. The Mahabhārata, however, distinguishes between the kingdoms of Avanti and Māhīṃmati, but locates Vinda and Anuvinda of Avanti near the Narmadā (Narmadāmabhitah, II. 31. 10).

The Purāṇas attribute the foundation of Māhīṃmati, Avanti, and Vidarbha to scions of the Yadu family. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa also associates the Satvats and the Bhojas, septs of the Yadu family according to the Purāṇas, with the southern realms (Matsya, 43-44; Vāyu, 95-96: Ait. Br. VIII. 14).

The Purāṇas style the first dynasty of Māhīṃmati as Haihaya (Matsya, 43. 8-29; Vāyu, 94. 5-26). This family is referred to by such an ancient authority as Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, p. 11). The Haihayas are said to have overthrown the Nāgas who must have been the aboriginal inhabitants of the Narmadā region (cf. Nāgpur). The Matsya Purāṇa mentions five branches of the

---

1 There is one difficulty in the way of accepting this identification. Māndhātā lay to the south of the Parijatīra Māta. (W. Vindhyas), whereas Māhīṃmati lay between the Vindhyas and the Nīlakaṇṭha—to the north of the Vindhyas and to the south of the Nīlakaṇṭha, acc. to the commentator Nīlakaṇṭha (Harivānśa, II. 38. 7-10).

2 Law, Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 136; Kathākōṭu, 18.
Hālbhayas namely Viśhotras, Bhojas, Avantis, Kuṇḍikeras or Tūndikeras and the Tālajāṅghas (43. 48-49). When the Viśhotras and Avantis passed away, a minister named Pulika (Punika) is said to have killed his master and anointed his own son rādyota by force in the very sight of the Kshatriyas. In the fourth century B.C., Avanti formed an integral part of the Magadhan Empire.

The kingdom of Gandhāra according to Jātaka No. 406 included Kāśmir as well as the Takshaśilā region. The evidence of the Jātaka appears to be confirmed by that of Hekataios of Miletos (B.C. 549-486) who refers to Kaspapyros (Kaśyapapura, i.e. Kāśmir—cf. Rājatarangini I. 27) as a Gandavic city. Takshaśilā, the capital city, lay 2,000 leagues from Benares.¹

The Purāṇas represent the Gandhāra kings as the descendants of Druhyu (Matsya 48. 6; Vāyu 99. 9). This king and his people are mentioned several times in the Rig Veda. In the Vedic Index (I. 385) it is stated that "from the tribal grouping it is probable that the Druhyus were a north-western people." Thus the Purāṇic tradition about the connection of the Gandhāras with Druhyu accords with Vedic evidence.

Takshaśilā is mentioned in the Mahābhārata in connection with the story of king Janamejaya by whom it had been conquered. In the time of Nimi king of Videha, Durmukha king of Pañcha, and Bhima king of Vidarbha, the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Naggaji or Nagnajit (Kumbhakāra Jātaka; Ait. Br. VII. 3¹; Sat. Br. VIII. 1. 4. 10).² We learn from the Kumbhakāra Jātaka that his capital was Takshaśilā. The Jaina Uttarādhyayana Sūtra mentions "Dvimukha" of Pañcha-  

¹ Telapata Jātaka, No. 96; Sudama Jātaka, No. 168.
² A Nagnajit also appears in the Mahābhārata as the Gandharan contemporary of Kṛṣṇa (V. 48. 76). But the same epic mentions Śakuni as the King of Gandhāra in the time of Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas.
la, Nami of Videha, "Naggati" of Gandhāra, and "Karakaṇḍu" of Kalinga, and says that "these bulls of kings have adopted the faith of the Jainas." (SBE. XLV. 87). As Pārśva (777 B.C.) was the first historical Jina, Naggati or Nagnajit is probably to be placed between 777 B.C. and 543 B.C. (the date of Pukkusāti the Gandhārian contemporary of Bimbisāra). We do not, however, say that implicit reliance can be placed on a statement of the Uttarādhyayana.-

Nagnajit was succeeded by his son Svarjit (Sat. Br., VIII. 1. 4. 10). In the middle of the sixth century B.C., the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Pukkusāti who is said to have sent an embassy and a letter to King Bimbisāra of Magadha, and waged war on Pradyota of Avanti who was defeated (Essay on Guṇādhiya, p. 176). He is also said to have been threatened in his own kingdom by the Pāṇḍavas (who occupied a part of the Pañjab as late as the time of Ptolemy). In the latter half of the sixth century Gandhāra was conquered by the king of Persia. In the Behistun inscription of Darius, cir. 516 B.C., the Gandhārians (Gudara) appear among the subject peoples of the Achaemenid Empire.¹

Kamboja is constantly associated with Gandhāra in literature and inscriptions.² Like Gandhāra it is included in the Uttarāpatha (cf. Mbh. XII. 207. 43). It should, therefore, be clearly distinguished from "Kamvuja" in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula (i.e. Cambodia), and must be located in some part of North-west India not far from Gandhāra. We learn from a passage of the Mahābhārata that a place called Rājapura was the home of the Kambojas (Mbh., VII. 4. 5, "Karna Rājapuraṁ gatvā

¹ See "Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenidae Inscriptions" by Herbert Cushing Tolman, Vanderkilt Oriental Series, Vol. VI.
² Mbh. XII. 207. 43; Aṅguttāra N. I. 213; 4. 282, 256, 290; Rock Edict V of Aśoka.
Kāmbojā nirjita stvayā"). The association of the Kāmbojas with the Gāndhāras enables us to identify this Rājpura with the Rājpura of Hiuen Tsang¹ which lay to the south or south-east of Punc. The western boundaries of Kāmboja must have reached Kafristan, and there are still in that district tribes like the 'Caumojee,' 'Camoze,' and 'Camoje' whose names remind us of the Kāmbojas.²

Kāmboja may have been a home of Brāhmānic learning in the later Vedic period. The Vāṁśa Brāhmaṇa actually mentions a teacher named Kāmboja Aupamanyava. But already in the time of Yāska the Kāmbojas had come to be regarded as a people distinct from the Aryans of the interior of India, speaking a different dialect. We have further changes in later ages. And in the Bhāvidatta Jātaka (No. 543) the Kāmbojas are credited with savage (Non-Aryan) customs:

ete hi dhāmma anariyarūpā
kāmbōjākahanām vītathā bahunnaṁ ti.
(Jātaka, VI, 208.)

These are your savage customs which I hate,
Such as Kāmboja hordes might emulate.
(Cowell's Jātaka, VI, 110.)

This description of the Kāmbojas agrees wonderfully with Hiuen Tsang’s account of Rājpura and the adjoining countries. "From Lampa to Rājpura the inhabitants are coarse and plain in personal appearance, of rude violent dispositions...they do not belong to India proper but are inferior peoples of frontier (i.e., barbarian) stocks."

We have seen that the metropolis of the Kambojas in the Epic period was probably Rājapura. Dvāraka mentioned by Rhys Davids as the capital in the early Buddhist period, was not really a city of Kamboja though it happens to be mentioned in a story which also refers to Kamboja. A real city of the Kambojas was apparently Nandinagar mentioned in Lüders' Inscriptions 176 and 472.

The Vedic texts do not mention any king of Kamboja. But, as already pointed out, they refer to a teacher named Kamboja upamanyava who was probably connected with this territory. In the Mahābhārata the Kambojas are represented as living under a monarchical constitution (cf. I. 67. 32; II. 4. 22; V. 165. 1-3, etc.). The Epic makes mention of the Kamboja Kings Chandravarman and Sudakshiṇa. In later times the monachy gave place to a Saṅgha form of government. Kauṭilya (p. 378) mentions the Kambojas as an illustration of a "Vārtāsastropajīvin" Saṅgha.

**THE EPIC ACCOUNT OF THE MAHĀJANAPADAS.**

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

The Pañcālas, Kurus, Mātysyas, Śūrasenas and the Chedīs receive unstinted praise:

Kuravaḥ saha Pañcālāḥ Śalvā Mātysyāḥ sa Naimишāḥ Chedayaścha mahābhāga dharmaṁ jānanti śāsvataṁ Brāhmaṁ Pañcālāḥ Kauraveyāṣtu dharmaṁ Satyaṁ Mātysyāḥ Śūrasenāścha yajñām

"The Kauravas with the Pañcālas, the Śalvas, the Mātysyas, the Naimishas and the Chedīs who are all highly blessed, know what the eternal religion is.

---

THE MAHÁJANAPADAS OF ANCIENT INDIA.

Specially prepared for Dr. H. C. Ray Chandhuri's Political History of Ancient India.
The Pañchálas observe the Vedas, the Kauravas observe Dharma, the Matsyas observe the truth, and the Śūrasenas perform sacrifices.”

The Magadhas are called comprehenders of signs; while the Kosalas are represented as comprehending from what they see:

Iṣṇitajñāścha Magadhāḥ prekshitajñāścha Kośalāḥ.¹

The Aṅgas and the Gandhāras come in for a good deal of condemnation:

Āturāṇām parityāga sadāra-suta-vikrayaḥ
Aṅgeshu vartate Karṇa yeshām adhipatir bhavān.

“*The abandonment of the afflicted and the sale of wives and children are, O Karṇa, prevalent among the Aṅgas whose king thou art.*”²

Madrakeshu cha saṃspṛśtaṁ sauchāṁ Gāndhārakeshuḥ
Rāja-yājaka-yaśyechā nashtarāṁ dattam havir bhavet.

“*Amongst the Madrakas all acts of friendship are lost as purity among the Gāndhārakas, and the libations poured in a sacrifice in which the king is himself the sacrificer and priest.*”³

The verses quoted above give a fair idea of the attitude of a poet of the western part of the Madhyadesa towards most of the Mahājanapadas of Northern India.

THE FALL OF KĀŚI AND THE ASCENDANCY OF KOŚALA.

The flourishing period of many of the sixteen Mahājanapadas ended in or about the sixth century B.C. The

¹ Mahābhārata, VIII. 45. 14-16; 25. 34.
² Ibid, 45. 40; 40. 20.
history of the succeeding period is the story of the absorption of the states into a number of powerful kingdoms, and ultimately into one empire, namely, the empire of Magadha.

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

In the Mahāvagga (SBE, XVII. 294-99) and the Kosambi Jātaka (No. 428) it is stated that Brahmadatta, king of Kāsi, robbed Dighati, king of Kosala, of his kingdom, and put him to death. In the Kunaḷa Jātaka (No. 536) it is stated that Brahmadatta, king of Kāsi, owing to his having an army, seized on the kingdom of Kosala, slew its king, and carried off his chief queen to Benares, and there made her his consort. The Brahāchatta Jātaka (No. 336) and the Sona-Nanda Jātaka (No. 532) also refer to the victories of Kāsi kings over Kosala.

Success however did not remain long with the Kāsis (cf. Jātaka No. 100). In the Mahāsīlava Jātaka (No. 81) king Mahāsīlava of Kāsi is said to have been deprived of his realm by the king of Kosala. In the Ghatā Jātaka (No. 355) and the Ekarāja Jātaka (No. 303); Vanksa and Dabbaṇa, kings of Kosala, are said to have won for their kingdom a decided preponderance over Kāsi. The final conquest of the latter kingdom was probably the work of Kān̄sa, as the epithet "Bārānasīggho," i.e., conqueror of Benares, is a standing addition to his name. The interval of time between Kān̄sa's conquest of Kāsi and

---

1 The Seyya Jātaka, No. 282, and the Terakaṇṭa Jātaka, No. 521; Buddhist India, p. 25.
the rise of Buddhism could not have been very long because the memory of Kāsi as an independent kingdom was still fresh in the minds of the people in Buddha’s time, and even later when the Aṅguttara Nikāya was composed.

In the time of Mahākosalā (sixth century B.C.) Kāsi formed an integral part of the Kosalan monarchy. When Mahākosalā married his daughter, the lady Kosalādevī, to king Bimbisāra of Magadha, he gave a village of Kāsi producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money.¹

In the time of Mahākosalā’s son and successor Pasenadi or Prasenajit, Kāsi still formed a part of the Kosalan empire. In the Lohichcha Sutta² Buddha asks a person named Lohichcha the following questions: "Now what think you Lohichcha? Is not king Pasenadi of Kosala in possession of Kāsi and Kosala?" Lohichcha replies, "Yes, that is so Gotama." We learn from the Mahāvagga (SBE, XVII, 195) that the Viceroy of Kāsi was a brother of Pasenadi.

The Śāmyukta Nikāya³ mentions Pasenadi as the head of a group of five Rājās. One of these was probably his brother who was the Viceroy of Kāsi. Among the remaining Rājās we should perhaps include Prince Pāyāsi of Setavyā mentioned in the Pāyāsi Suttanta, and Hiranyanābha Kausalya who, as we have seen, was a contemporary of Sukeśa Bharadvāja and Āśvalāyana, and consequently of Buddha and Pasenadi, if our identification of Āśvalāyana Kausalya with Assalāyana of Sāvatthi mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya be correct.

Another Rājā of the group was probably the Śākya chief of Kapilavastu. From the introductory portion

¹ Harita Māta Jātaka, No. 239; Vajjhati Sākarn Jātaka, No. 283.
³ The Book of the Kindred Sayings, translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 105.
of the Bhaddasāla Jātaka (No. 465) we learn that the Śākya territory was subordinate to the Kosalan monarch. The inclusion of the Śākya territory, the birthplace of Buddha, within the Kosalan empire is also proved by the Sutta Nipāta¹ and the Majjhima Nikāya² which describe Buddha and his people as Kosalans.

It was probably during the reign of Mahākosala, that Bimbisāra ascended the throne of Magadha. The Mahāvaṁsa³ tells us that “The virtuous Bimbisāra was fifteen years old when he was anointed king by his own father.” With the coronation of Bimbisāra ends the period with which this chapter deals.

Kingship.

We have given the outlines of the political history of India from the accession of Parikshit to the coronation of Bimbisāra. We have seen that during the major part of this period the prevailing form of Government was monarchical. No political history of this age is complete unless we know something about the rank, power and status of the monarchs in the different parts of India, their caste, the methods of their selection and consecration, the chief members of their households, and their civil and military services, and the checks on their authority.

The different kinds of rulership prevalent in different parts of India are thus described in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,⁴

Etasyāṁ Prāchyaṁ dīśi ye ke cha Prāchyāṁ rājānaḥ
Sāmrājyāyai va te‘bhishiohyante Samrāl-ityenān-
abhishiktān-āchakshata etameva Devānāṁ vihiti-
manu.

¹ SBE, X, Part II, pp. 03-09.
³ Goilge’s Translation, p. 12.
⁴ VIII. 14.
KINGSHIP

Etasyāṃ Dakshiṇasyāṃ diśi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ Rāja-no Bhaujuṭāyaiva te’bhishichyante Bhojetyenān-abhishiktān-āchakshhata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimānu.

Etasyāṃ Pratichyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Nichyānāṁ Rājāno ye’nāchyānāṁ Svārājyāyaiva te’bhishichyante Svarāl-ittyenān-abhishiktān-āchakshhata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimānu.


Several scholars assert that Vairājya means a kingless state. But in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa ¹ a king consecrated with Indra’s great unction is called Virat and worthy of Vairājya. When a king consecrated with the Punara-bhisheka ascends his Āsandī or throne, he prays for attaining Vairājya as well as other kinds of royal dignity. Sāyaṇā takes the word Vairājyaṁ to mean “iṭarebhhyo bhupatibhhyo vaśīshtyam.” It is also stated in the Śukraniti ² that the Virat was a superior kind of monarch. In the Mahābhārata (XII. 43. 11) Kṛishṇa is called Saṃrāt, Virat, Svarat and Surarāja.³ Dr. Keith translates the

¹ VIII. 17.
³ Cf. XII, 68, 54.
passage “Etasyāṁ Udichyāṁ,” etc., thus: “In this northern quarter, the lands of the Uttara Kurus and the Uttara Madras, beyond the Himavant, their (kings) are anointed for sovereignty; ‘O sovereign’ they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods.”

It is not easy to decide whether all the terms Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svārājya, Vairājya and Rājya referred to essentially different forms of royal authority in the Brāhmaṇic period. But two terms at least, namely, Sāmrājya and Rājya are clearly distinguished by the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa¹ and also the Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.²

Rājā vai Rājasūyeneshtvā bhavati, Samrāṣ Vājapeyena varanāhi Rājyam param Sāmrājyam kāmayeta vai Rāja Samrāṣ bhavitum avaranāhi rajyam param Sāmrājyath.³

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

If the Purāṇas are to be believed Bhoja was originally a proper name. But afterwards it came to denote a class of Southern kings. The word Cæsar furnishes an exact parallel. Originally it was the name of a Roman dictator. But afterwards it was a title assumed by Roman Emperors.

In some Vedic texts⁴ Svārājya means uncontrolled dominion, and is opposed to Rājya.⁵

¹ V. I. I. 13. ² XV. I. I. 2. ³ Śat. Br. V. I. I. 13. ⁴ Kāṭhyaka Sūkhīta, XIV. 5; Malīrṇyānī Sūkhīta, I. II. 13, etc. ⁵ Vedic Index, II. 221.
The king was usually, though not always, a Kshatriya. The Brāhmaṇas were considered to be unsuited for kingship. Thus we read in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, "to the king (Rājan) doubtless belongs the Rājasūya; for by offering the Rājasūya he becomes king, and unsuited for kingship is the Brāhmaṇa." 1

We have, however, references to Śūdra and Āyogava kings in the Vedic texts. King Janaśruti Pastrāyaṇa is called a Śūdra in the Chhāndogya Upanishad. 2 King Marutta Avikshita is styled "Āyogava" in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. 3 Āyogava denotes a member of a mixed caste, a descendant of a Śūdra by a Vaiśya wife. 4 The Jātakas refer to kings of several castes including Brāhmaṇas (cf. Jātakas 73, 432).

Kingship was sometimes hereditary, as is indeed shown by several cases where the descent can be traced (cf. the Pārīkṣhitas and the kings of Janaka's line; cf. also the expression Daśapurushaṁrājya—a kingdom of ten generations occurring in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XII. 9. 3. 8), yet in others the monarchy was elective. The selection was made sometimes by the people and sometimes by the ministers. The choice was sometimes limited to the members of the royal family only, as is shown by the legend in Yāsaka 5 of the Kuru brothers Devāpi and Śaṅtanu. In the Śāmvara Jātaka (No. 462) the courtiers of a king asked the latter "when you are dead, my lord, to whom shall we give the white umbrella?" "Friends," said the king, "all my sons have a right to the white umbrella. But you may give it to him that pleases your mind."

---

1 ŚBE, XLI; Eggeling, Śat. Br., Part II, p. 4.
2 IV. 2. 1-5.
3 XIII. 5. 4. 6.
4 Manusarhitā, X. 12.
5 Nirukta, II. 10. Vedā, Inā II. 211.
Sometimes the popular choice fell on persons who did not belong to the royal family. It is stated in the Pādañjali Jātaka, No. 247, that when a certain king of Benares died, his son Pādañjali by name, an idle lazy loafer, was set aside, and the minister in charge of things spiritual and temporal was raised to the throne. The Sachchaṃkīra Jātaka, No. 73, tells a story how the nobles, Brāhmaṇas and all classes slew their king and anointed a private citizen. Sometimes an outsider was chosen. The Darimukha Jātaka (No. 378), the Dasanākā Jātaka (401) and the Sonaka Jātaka (No. 529) tell us how on failure of heir at Benares a prince of Magadha was elected king.

The king during the Brāhmaṇa period was usually allowed to have four queens, viz., the Mahishti, the Parivrktī, the Vāvata, and the Pālāgali. The Mahishti was the chief wife, being the first one married according to the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Parivrktī was the neglected wife, probably one that had no son. The Vāvata is the favourite, while the Pālāgali was the daughter of the last of the court officials. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 18), however, refers to the "hundred" wives of king Hariśchandra. In the Jātaka period several kings kept a bigger harem. We are told in the Kusa Jātaka, No. 581, that king Okkako had sixteen thousand wives among whom Silavati was the chief (aggamahesi). The king of Benares according to the Dasaratha Jātaka, No. 461, had an equal number of wives. In the Suruchi Jātaka, No. 489, a king of Mithila says, "Ours is a great kingdom, the city of Mithila covers seven leagues, the measure of the whole kingdom is 300 leagues. Such a king should have sixteen thousand women at the least." Sixteen thousand appears to have been a stock phrase. The number is

1 VI. 3. 3. 1; Ved. Ind., I. 478.
2 Weber and Pischel in Vedic Index, I. 478.
evidently exaggerated. But it indicates that the kings of the Jātaka period were extreme polygamists who frequently exceeded the Brāhmaṇic number of four or even a hundred queens.

The king was consecrated after his succession or election with an elaborate ritual which is described in several Brāhmaṇas, and for which the Mantras are given in the Samhitās. Those who aided in the consecration of the king were called Rājakartṛ, or Rājakṛt, i.e., "kingmaker." In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa the persons meant and specified are the Sūta (minstrel and chronicler or charioteer), and the Grāmaṇi, village chief. Prof. Rādhākumud Mookerji observes,1 "It is apparent from the lists of persons aiding in the royal coronation that both official and non-official or popular elements were represented in the function." The principal ceremonies or sacrifices of royal inauguration were the Vājapeya, the Rājasūya, the Punarabhiseka and the Aindra Mahābhisheka.

The Vājapeya bestowed on the performer a superior kind of kingship called "Sāmrājya," while the Rājasūya merely conferred the ordinary royal dignity.2 The Punarabhiseka made the king elect eligible for all sorts of royal dignity, e.g., Rājya, Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svārājya, Vairājya, Pārameshṭhya, Māhārājya, Ādhipatyā, Svāvaśya and Ātishthatva.3 The object of the Aindra Mahābhisheka is thus described:

"Sa ya ichchhedavaṁvit Kshatriyamayam sarvā jītirjāyetāyaṁ sarvāṁlokaṁ vinītāyaṁ sarveshāṁ Rājānaḥ Śraishṭhyam Atishṭhām Paramatam gachchheta Sāmrājyam, Bhaujyam, Svārājyam, Vairājyam, Pārameshṭhyam, Rājyaṁ, Māhārājyaṁ Ādhipatyam ayaṁ samanta-"
paryāyaṁ syāt śārvabhaumaṁ śārvāyuḥaṁ a’ntaḥ parārdhāḥ Prithivyai Samudraparyayāyaṁ Ekarāḥ iti tametena Aindrenā Mahābhishkekena kṣatriyaṁ śāpayitvāṁ bhiṣiṣṭaṁ.

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

The Vajapeya rites include a race of 17 chariots, in which the sacrificer is allowed to carry off the palm, and from which, according to Eggeling, the ceremony perhaps derives its name. Professor Hillebrandt would claim for this feature of the sacrifice the character of a relic of an old national festival, a kind of Indian Olympic games. After the chariot race the next interesting item is the mounting of a chariot wheel, which is placed on the top of a long pole, by the sacrificer and his wife, from which homage is made to the mother earth. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa says, "Truly he who gains a seat in the air gains a seat above others." The royal sacrificer having descended from the pole, is offered a throne-seat with a goatskin spread thereon and addressed by the Adhvaryu in the following words: "Thou art the ruler, the ruling lord—thou art firm and steadfast—(here I seat thee) for the tilling, for peaceful dwelling, for wealth, for prosperity, i.e., for the welfare of the people, the common weal."
The Rajasuya consisted of a long succession of sacrificial performances which began on the 1st of Pālguna, and spread over a period of upwards of two years. The rite is described at great length in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇga. Besides much mere priestly elaboration, the ritual contains traces of popular ceremonial. The popular features are chiefly these:

(1) The Ratnīmāṁ havīnshī or offerings to the chief queen and court officials;
(2) The Dig Vyāsthaṇa or the king's mounting on the quarters as an indication of his universal rule;
(3) a mimic cow raid against a relative; or a show fight with a Rājanya;
(4) A game of dice in which the king is made to be the victim;
(5) Stepping on a tiger skin, thus gaining the strength and the pre-eminence of the tiger.
(6) The Abhishechanīya or besprinkling and
(7) Narration of the Ākhyāna of Śuṇahṣeṇa.

The recipients of the "Ratnīmāṁ havīnshī" were the Ratnins i.e. the chief members of the royal household and of the king's civil and military service: viz.—

1. The Senāni (Commander-in-chief).
2. The Purohita (Royal Chaplain).
3. The Mahishī (Chief Queen).
4. The Sūta (Charioteer).
5. The Grāmaṇi (Village Headman).

1 Keith, Black Yajas pp. cxii-cxili.
2 SBE XLII, p. xxvi.
3 V. 2. 3 (cf seq.).
4 Ved. Ind., II. 219.
5 Sat. Br. V. 4. 3. 1 cf seq.
6 Cf. Tulsidīya Saṅhitā, 1. 8. 16 with commentary; SBE XLII, 100, n 1.
7 The importance of this office is shown by the cases of Sumantra and Sādjaya, who is called a Mahārasaṃ (Mbh. XY. 16. 4).
6. The Kshattri (Chamberlain)—forerunner of the Antarvahsika of later times.¹

7. The Samgrahitri (Treasurer)—forerunner of the Sannidhatri.

8. The Bhagadugha (Collector-General)—forerunner of the Samahartri.

9. The Akshavapa (Keeper of the Dice).²

10. The Go-vikartana (King’s Companion in the chase).

11. The Palagala (Courier)—forerunner of the Duta (Sasanahara, etc.).

The most essential part of the Rajasuya was the Abhisheka or besprinkling. It began with offerings to Savita Satyaprasava, Agni Grihapati, Soma Vanaspati, Brhaspati Vak, Indra Jyeshta, Rudra Pasupati, Mitra Satya and Varuna Dharmapati. The consecration water (Abhishechaniya Apah) was made up of seventeen kinds including the water of the Sarasvati, sea-water, and water from a whirlpool, a pond, a well and dew. The sprinkling was performed by a Brahmana, a kinsman or brother of the king elect, a friendly Rajanya and a Vaisya.

The two most important kinds of Abhisheka were the Punarabhisheka and the Aindra Mahabhisheka.

The Punarabhisheka or Renewed Anointment is described in the Aitareya Brahmana, VIII. 5-11. It was intended for Kshatriya conquering monarchs. The first interesting part of the ceremony was the king’s ascent to the throne or Asandi which was made of Udumbara wood with the exception of the interwoven part (Vivayana) which consisted of Munja grass. Then came the besprinkling. Among other things the priest said

¹ Vidura was the Kshatri (Mbh. I. 200. 17, II. 68. 1, etc.) at the Kuru Court.
² Cf. the position of Kaaka (Yudhishthira) at the Matsya Court.
“Rājāṁ tvam Adhirājo bhaveha; Mahāntam tvā mahānāṁ
Samrājaṁ chārṣaṁṇāṁ.”¹ The king was next required to
get down from the throne and make obeisance to the
Brāhmaṇas: “Brāhmaṇa eva tat Kshatram vaśām eti tad
yatra vai Brāhmaṇaḥ Kshatram vaśām eti tad rāṣṭraṁ
samriddhaṁ tadviravadā hāsmin viro jāyate.”² Here
there is ample provision for the prevention of royal
absolutism.

Janamejaya, the son of Parikshiti, was evidently
consecrated with the Punarabhīsheka.³

The Aindra Mahābhisheka or Indra's great unction
consisted of five important ceremonies, vis.:

1. Oath taken by the king to the priest: “From the
night of my birth to that of my death, for the space
between these two, my sacrifice and my gifts; my place,
my good deeds, my life and mine offspring mayest thou
take, if I play thee false” (Keith).
2. Ārohaṇa (Ascending the throne).
3. Utkrosana (Proclamation).
4. Abhimantraṇa (repetition of special formulas or
Mantras).
5. Anointing.

The following kings are said to have been consecrated
with the Aindra Mahābhisheka: Janamejaya, Šāryāta,
Śatānaka, Āmbāśṭhyā, Yudhāṁśraushtī, Viśvakarmā,
Sudās, Maṛutta, Āṅga and Bharata.⁴ The first-mentioned
king, and probably the third, fourth, fifth and ninth also,
belonged to the post-Parikshiti period.⁵

Powerful kings and princes performed another

¹ Ait. Br. VIII. 7.
² Ait. Br. VIII. 8.
³ Ait. Br. VIII. 11.
⁴ Ait. Br. VIII. 21-23.
⁵ Śaṅkīka defeated Dhrītarāṣṭra of Kšāṇi who, according to the Mahāgurīnda
Suttanta, was a contemporary of Sattabhā of Kalīṅga and Brahmānta of Assaka.
As the Deccan kingdoms are not referred to in pre-Parikshiti works, it is probable
important sacrifice called the Asvamedha. The Apastamba Śrāuta Sūtra (XX. i. 1) says that a Sarvabhauma Rāja may perform the Aśvamedha. The Aśva or steed, for a year roamed under guardianship of a hundred princes, a hundred nobles, a hundred sons of heralds and charioteers and a hundred sons of attendants. If the year were successfully passed the steed was sacrificed. The features of the rite included the panegyric of the king by a Kshatriya and a Brāhmaṇa lute-player, and a cyclic Ākhyāna. Among the kings and princes who performed the Aśvamedha were Janamejaya, his brothers Bhimasena, Ugrasena, and Śrutasena, and Para śāra, king of Kosala.

Kingship during the Pārīkshita-Janaka period was not merely a “Patriarchal Presidency.” The monarch was not merely a “chief noble,” “the first among equals,” “President of a Council of Peers.” In several Vedic texts he is represented as the master of his people. He claimed the power of giving his kingdom away to anybody he liked, and taxing the people as much as he liked. In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad Janaka says to Yājñavalkya, “So’ham Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi māṁchāpi saha dāsyayeti” (Bṛih. Up., IV. 4. 23). The king is called “Vīśvasya bhūtasya adhipati” and is further described as the devourer of the people—Vīśamattā (Ait. Br. VIII. 17). “Rāja ta ekaṁ mukham tena mukhena Viśo’tsi” (Kaush. Up., II. 6).

The king, however, was not an absolute despot in practice. His power was checked, in the first place, by the Brāhmaṇas. We have seen that the most powerful sovereigns, even those who were consecrated with the

that Śatānaka and his contemporaries flourished after Parīkhātī. Aṃbadhṛtya and Yudhārājanjati were contemporaries of Parvata and Nārada who were very near in time to Nagnajit the contemporary of Nimi, probably the penultimate king of Viśāla. Aṅga was probably the immediate predecessor of Dādāvīśāma who according to Jain evidence, flourished in the 6th century B.C.  

1 Keith, Black Yajur, pp. cxxxii f.
Punarabhisheka, had to descend from the throne and make obeisance to the Brāhmaṇas who formed the higher educated community of those days. We learn from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 97) and Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra that even a powerful king like Janamejaya was humbled by the Brāhmaṇas. The Vṛishnis perished on account of their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas. This shows that not only the kings, but the republican corporations (Saṅgha), too, had to cultivate friendly relations with the Brāhmaṇas.

The second check was supplied by the ministers and village headmen who aided in the consecration of the king and whom the king consulted regularly. In the Vedic texts the Sūta and the Grāmaṇi are styled Rājakartṛi or Rājakrit, i.e., “King-maker.” The very title indicates their importance in the body politic. They, as well as the other ratnins, figure prominently in the sacrifice of royal inauguration.

The claim of the ministers and village headmen to be consulted was certainly recognised by the kings down to the time of Bimbisāra. The Mahāvagga says,5 “King Brahmadatta of Kāśi, O Bhikkhus, having entered Benares, convoked his ministers and counsellors (Amacce Pārisajje sannipāta petvā) and said to them: ‘If you should see, my good sirs, young Dīghāvu, the son of king Dīghiti of Kosala, what would you do to him?’” The Mahā assūroha Jātaka (No. 302) refers to a king who by beat of drum through the city gathered together his councillors. In the Mahāvagga we find the following passage: 6 “Now when Seniya Bimbisāra, the king of Magadhā, was holding an assembly of the eighty thousand Grāmikas he sent message to Sona Kolivisa.” The Chulla-Sutasoma Jātaka also refers to the eighty thousand councillors of a

---

1 Ed. 1919, p. 11.  
2 SBE, XVII. 204.  
3 SBE, XIII. 2. 2. 18.  
4 SBE, XVII, p. 1.
king headed by his general. These were asked to elect a king. The king-making power of the councillors is recognised also in the Pādañjali and Sonaka Jātakas.

Another check was supplied by the general body of the people (Janāḥ) who were distinct from the ministers and Grāmaṇis or Grāmikas, and who used to meet in an assembly styled Samiti or Parishad in the Upanishads. In the Utkroṣana passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 17) the people (Janāḥ) are clearly distinguished from the Rājakartāraḥ among whom, according to the Šatapatha Brāhmaṇa a were included the Sūta and the Grāmaṇi. That the Samiti or Parishad was an assembly of the Janāḥ, i.e., the whole people, is apparent from such expressions as “Pañcabalānaḥ Samitim eya,” “Pañcabalānaḥ Parishadam ajagama.” The Chhandogya Upanishad (V. 3. 1) mentions the Samiti of the Pañchāla people presided over by king Pravāhana Jaivali, “Śvetaketur hāruneyaḥ Pañchālānaṁ Samitim eya, tam ha Pravāhaṇo Jaivalir uvacha.” The Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (VI. 2. 1) uses the term Parishad instead of Samiti “Śvetaketur āruṇeyeḥ Pañchālānaṁ Parishadam ajagama.” The analogy of the Lichchhavi Parishā mentioned in Buddhist works shows that the functions of the Pañchāla Parishad were not necessarily confined to philosophical discussions only. The people took part in the ceremony of royal inauguration (Ait. Br. VIII. 17). The Dummedha Jātaka (No. 50) refers to a joint assembly of ministers, Brāhmaṇas, the gentry, and the other orders of the people.

That the people actually put a curb on royal absolutism is proved by the testimony of the Atharva Veda (VI. 88. 3) where it is stated that concord between king and assembly was essential for the former’s prosperity.

1 Cowell’s Jātaka, V, p. 97.
2 III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18.
We have evidence that the people sometimes expelled and even executed their princes together with unpopular officials. Thus it is stated in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa,¹ “Now Dushtaritu Paurṇāyana had been expelled from the kingdom which had come to him through ten generations, and the Śriṇjāyas also expelled Revottaras Paṭava Čhakra Sthapati.”² The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 10) refers to personages who were expelled from their rāṣṭras and who were anxious to recover them with the help of the Kṣatriya consecrated with the Punarabhishēka. Such persons were the Indian counterparts of the French “emigrants” who sought to reclaim revolutionary France with the help of the troops of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns.³ We learn from the Vessantara Jātaka that the king of Sivi was compelled to banish prince Vessantara in obedience to “the people’s sentence.”

The king was told:

The bidding of the Sivi folk if you refuse to do
The people then will act, methinks, against your son
and you.

The king replied:

Behold the people’s will, and I that will do not gainsay.

The Padakusalamāṇava Jātaka (No. 432) tells a story how the town and the countryfolk of a kingdom assembled, beat the king and priest to death as they were guilty of theft, and anointed a good man king. A similar story is told in the Sachchāṇkira Jātaka (No. 73). We are told in the Khandahāla Jātaka that the people of one kingdom killed the minister, deposed the king, made him an outcast and anointed a prince as king. The

¹ XII. 9. 3. 1 et seq.; Ewigling, V. 269.
² For the designation ‘Sthapati,’ see Camb. Hist. Ind., 151 ; Fleet, CII, 120a.
³ Cf. Lodge, Modern Europe, p. 517.
ex-king was not allowed to enter into the capital city. Prof. Bhandarkar points out that in the Telapatta Jataka a king of Takshaśila says that he has no power over the subjects of his kingdom. This is in striking contrast with the utterance of Janaka quoted above (“Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi,” etc.). Evidently the royal power had declined appreciably, at least in the north-west, since the days of Janaka.

The more important attributes of kingship are referred to in the “Utkrośana” passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 17). The monarch is there described as “Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati,” i.e., sovereign lord of all beings, “Viśamattā,” i.e., devourer of the people, “Amitrāṇāṃ hantā,” i.e., destroyer of enemies, “Brāhmaṇānāṃ gopāḥ,” i.e., protector of the Brāhmaṇas, and “Dharmasya gopāḥ,” i.e., protector of the laws.

In the expressions quoted above we have reference to the king’s sovereignty and imperium, his power of taxation, his military functions, his relations with the hierarchy, and his judicial duties.
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PART II

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

The following pages deal with the political history of India from the time of Bimbisāra to that of the Guptas.

For the period from Bimbisāra to Aśoka I cannot claim much originality. The subject has been treated by Professor Rhys Davids and Dr. Smith, and a flood of new light has been thrown on the history of particular dynasties by Professors Geiger, Bhandarkar, Rapson, Jayaswal, Hultzsch and others. I have made use of the information contained in their works, and have supplemented it with fresh data gathered mainly from epical and Jaina sources. I have also tried to present old materials in a new shape, and my conclusions are not unoften different from those of former writers.

In the chapter on the Later Mauryas I have examined the causes of the dismemberment of the Maurya Empire, and have tried to demonstrate the unsoundness of the current theory that "the fall of the Maurya authority was due in large measure to a reaction promoted by the Brahmans." 1

My treatment of the history of the Early Post-Mauryan and Scythian periods, though not entirely original, is different in many respects from that of previous authors. I have not been able to accept the current views with regard to the history and chronology of several dynasties, notably of the Early Śatavāhanas, the Greeks of Śakala, and the Śaka-Pahlavas of the Uttarapatha.

1 The chapter on the Later Mauryas was published in the *JASB*, 1900.
In my account of the Gupta period I have made use of the mass of fresh materials accumulated since the publication of the works of Fleet, Smith and Allan. The relations of Samudra Gupta with the Vākāṭakas have been discussed, and an attempt has been made to present a connected history of the later Guptas.¹

THE RISE OF MAGADHA

I. The Age of Bimbisāra

Under the vigorous kings of the race of Bimbisāra and Nanda, Magadha played the same part in ancient Indian history which Wessex played in the annals of Pre-Norman England, and Prussia in the history of modern Germany. It was about the middle of the sixth century B.C., that Bimbisāra or Śrenika of the Haryanka-kula (called also Seniya Bimbisāra), son of Bhaṭṭiya, the real founder of the Magadhan imperial power, mounted his ancestral throne. The Mahāvamsa ² tells us that “the virtuous Bimbisāra was fifteen years old when he was anointed king by his own father...two and fifty years he reigned.” We learn from the Sutta Nipāta ³ that the Magadhan capital was at this time at Rājagaha or Rājagriha, “the Giribajja in Magadha.”

The early Buddhist texts throw a flood of light on the political condition of India in the time of Bimbisāra. There were, as Prof. Rhys Davids observes, “besides a still surviving number of small aristocratic republics four kingdoms of considerable extent and power.” In addition to these there were a number of smaller kingdoms, and some non-Aryan principalities. The most important amongst the republics were the Vajjians of Vaiśālī and the Mallas of

¹ The chapter on the Later Guptas was published in the JASB, 1892.
² Gediger’s translation, p. 12.
³ SBE., X. II. 67.
Kusinārā (Kusmāgarā) and Pāvā. An account of both these peoples has already been given. Among the smaller republics Rhys Davids mentions the Śākyas of Kapilavastu, the Koliyas of Rāmagāma, the Bhaggas of Suṣumārā Hill, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Kālamas of Kesaputta, and the Moriyas of Pippalivana.

The Śākyas were settled in the territory bordered on the north by the Himalayas, on the east by the river Rohini, and on the west and south by the Rāpti. They claimed to belong to the solar (Āditya) race and Ikshvāku family, and, as we have already seen, acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of Kosala. The Koliyas were their eastern neighbours. The introductory portion of the Kunāla Jātaka says that the Śākyas and Koliya tribes had the river Rohini, which flows between Kapilavastu and the capital of the Koliyas, confined by a single dam and by means of it cultivated their crops. "Once upon a time in the month Jetthamūla when the crops began to flag and droop, the labourers from amongst the dwellers of both cities assembled together." Then followed a scramble for water. From the mutual recriminations which ensued we learn that the Śākyas had the custom of marrying their own sisters. In the Tīrtha-jāṭrā section of the Vanaparva of the Mahābhārata mention is made of a place called Kapilāvata. It is not altogether improbable that we have here a Brāhmaṇical reference to the capital of the Śākyas.

The Bhaggas (Bhargas) are known to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 28) which refers to the Bhārgāyana

---

1 Twelve miles from Kusinārā (Cunningham, AGI., old ed., p. 434). Between Pāvā and Kusinārā there was a stream called Kukutihā, the Cynoethes of the Classical writers.
2 Piprāvā in the north of the Basī district; or Tilana Kōṭ in the Tarki (Smith, EH1., p. 159). For the institutions of the city see Bud. Ind., p. 19.
3 A tribuary of the Rāpti (Oldenberg, Buddh., p. 96).
4 Rapson, Ancient India, p. 161 ; Oldenberg, Buddh., pp. 95, 96.  
5 III. 84. 31.
prince Kairisi Suvan. In the sixth century B.C., the Bhagga state was a dependency of the Vatsa kingdom; for we learn from the preface to the Dhonasakhajataka, No. 353, that prince Bodhi, the son of Udayana, king of the Vatsas, dwelt in Sunsumaragiri and built a palace called Kokanada. The Mahabharmata and the Harivamsha also testify to the close connection between the Vatsas and the Bhargas (Bhaggas):

"Vatsabhumiacha Kaunteyo vijigye balavan balat Bhargagamadhipaanchaiva Nishaddhipatim tathau."

"Pratardanasya putrau dvau Vatsa Bhargau babhu-vatuh."

Regarding the Bulis and the Kalama, we know very little. The Dhammapada commentary refers to the Buli territory as the kingdom of Allakappa, and says that it was 10 leagues in extent. From the story of its king’s intimate relationship with king Veṭhadipaka it may be presumed that Allakappa lay not far from Veṭhadipa, the native land of the Brähmana Droṣa, which stood on the way from Masar in the Shahabad District to Vaisali (Si-yu-ki, Bk. VII). The Kalama were the clan of the philosopher Ālāra. The name of their capital, Kesaputta, reminds us of the Kesins, a people mentioned in the Satapatha Brähmana and probably also in the Ashtādhhyayi of Pāṇini, and connected with the Pañchālas and Dālbhyas who appear in the Rig Veda, V. 61, as settled on the banks of the Gomati.

---

1 MSH. II. 30, 10-11.  
3 Hariv. 20, 73.  
4 Buddhacharita U.J. 2.  
5 VI. 4, 105.  
6 The Anguttara (I. 188) seems to place Kesaputta in Kesala.
The Moriyas were undoubtedly the same clan which gave Magadha its greatest dynasty. Pippalivana, the Moriya Capital, is apparently identical with the Nyagrodhavana or Banyan Grove, mentioned by Huen Tsang, where stood the famous Embers Tope. Fa Hien tells us that the Tope lay twelve Yojanas to the west of Kusināra.

Among the smaller kingdoms may be mentioned Gandhāra ruled by Pukkusāti, Boruka (in Sauvira or the Lower Indus Valley) governed by Rudrāyana, Śūrasena ruled by Subāhu Avantiputta, and Āṅga under the sway of Brahmadatta.

The most famous amongst the non-Aryan principalities was the realm of the Yakkha Ālavaka. This little state was situated near the Ganges and was probably identical with the Chanchu territory visited by Huen Tsang. Cunningham and Smith identify the country with the Ghāzipur region. It had Ālavī for its capital. This city seems to be identical with the town of Ālabhiyā mentioned in the Uvasagadāsa. Near it there was a large forest. According to Hoernle the name of the kingdom represents the Sanskrit Aṭavī which means a forest. The same scholar points out that in the Abhidhānappadīpikā Ālavī is mentioned in a list of twenty names of cities including Bārāṇasi, Śāvatthi, Vesāli, Mithilā, Ālavī, Kosambhi, Ujjeni, Takkastāla, Champā, Sāgala,

---

1 "Then did the Brāhmaṇa Ośanāka assume a glorious youth, known by the name Candagutta, as king over all Jambudīpa, born of a noble clan, the Moriyan." Geiger, Mahāvaṃsa, p. 27.
2 Rhyia Davida, Buddhāda Suttas, p. 135; Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, pp. 25-24;
3 Cunningham, AG I., old ed., pp. 429, 433.
4 Læger, Fa Hien, p. 79. Cf. JRAS., 1903, 388.
5 Sutta Nipāta, SBE, X, II. 29-30.
6 Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, pp. 61, 340.
7 Sutta Nipāta: the Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 275.
8 II, p. 163; Appendix, pp. 51-52.
9 Cf. the Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 160.
Sumanmāragira, Rājagaha, Kapilavatthu, Sāketa, Indapaṭṭa, Ukkattha, Pataliputtaka, Jettuttara, Samkassa and Kusinārā. The Chullavagga (VI. 17) mentions the Aggālava shrine at Ālavī. In the Uvāsagadāna the king of Ālabhiyā is named Jiyasattu (Jitaśatru). But Jiyasattu seems to have been a common designation of kings like the epithet Devānampiya of a later age. The name is given also to the rulers of Sāvatthi, Kampilla, Mithilā, Champā, Vaṇiyagāma, Bārānasi and Polasapura. Buddhist writers refer to other Yakkha principalities besides Ālavaka.

The most important factors in the political history of the period were, however, neither the republics nor the Yakkha principalities, but the four great kingdoms of Kosala, Vatsa, Avanti and Magadha.

In Kosala king Mahākosala had been succeeded by his son Pasenadi or Prasenajit. The new king preserved unimpaired the extensive heritage received from his father, and ruled Kāsi and Kosala. He also exercised suzerainty over the Sākya territory. We have already seen that the Samyutta Nikāya refers to him as the head of a group of five Rājās, "on one occasion when the Exalted One was at Sāvatthi, five Rājās the Pasenadi being the chief among them, were indulging in various forms of amusements."

In her interesting article "Sage and King in Kosala-Samyutta," Mrs. Rhys Davids admirably sums up the character of Pasenadi, "He is shown combining like so many of his class all the world over, a proneness to affairs of sex with the virtues and affection of a good 'family

---

1 A town in the Kingdom of Kosala (Dialogues of the Buddha, I, 108).
2 Near Chitor (N. L. Dey).
3 Cf. Hoernle, Uvāsagadāna, II, pp. 6, 64, 100, 103, 105, 118, 166.
5 Ruled, according to the Tibetans, by Prasenajit, son of Brahmadatta (Mahākosala), Udāyana, son of Sañjīva, Pradyota son of Anantasemi (Punikas or Punaka), and Bimbisāra son of Mahāpadma (Bhaṭṭiya) respectively (Essay on Gṛpṭīhya, p. 178).
man,” indulgence at the table with an equally natural wish to keep in good physical form, a sense of honour and honesty, shown in his disgust at legal cheating, with a greed for acquiring wealth and war indemnities, and a fussiness over lost property, a magnanimity towards a conquered foe with a callousness over sacrificial slaughter and the punishment of criminals. Characteristic also is both his superstitious nervousness over the sinister significance of dreams due, in reality, to disordered appetites, and also his shrewd, politic care to be on good terms with all religious orders, whether he had testimonials to their genuineness or not. 1

We learn from the Ambattha and Lohichcha Suttas 2 that Pasenadi was a patron of the Brāhmaṇas, and gave them spots on royal domains with power over them as if they were kings. He was also a friend of the Buddha and his followers, and made monasteries for their habitation. 3

He had many queens, e.g., Mallikā, daughter of the chief of garland-makers in Sāvatthi, and Vāsabha Khattiya born to a Śākya named Mahānāma from a slave woman. He had a daughter called Vajirā or Vajiri Kumāri, 4 and a son named Viḍūḍabha whose mother was Vāsabha Khattiya. Prince Viḍūḍabha at first appears to have served as his father’s Senāpati or General. 5 Afterwards he succeeded to the throne and perpetrated a ferocious massacre of the Śākyas.

Hoernle in the Uvāsagadasāśo 6 refers to Mṛigadhara, who is said to have been the first minister of Prasenaṅjita

1 Shandarkar Commemoration Volume, p. 134.
3 Gagga Jāntuka, No. 155.
4 Majjhima, II, p. 110.
5 For the employment of princes as Senāpati see Kauṭiliya (Mysore edition, 1919), p. 34.
6 II, Appendix, p. 55.
or Pasenadi. Prof. Bhandakar refers to another minister called Siri-Vaddha. Another important official was Dīgha Chāṇāyaṇa. He is probably identical with Dīgha Chāṇāyaṇa mentioned by Kaṭhiliya as an author of a treatise on kingly duties, and by Vātśyāyana as an author of the science of Erotics. His uncle Bandhula was a general.

The Buddhist texts throw some light on the foreign and internal affairs of Pasenadi's reign. The Majjhima Nikāya (II, p. 101) tells us that the Kosalan monarch was on friendly terms with Seṇiya Bimbisāra and the Visālikā Lichehavati. But he was much troubled by robbers like Angulimāla. We read in the Mahāvagga that certain Bikkhus travelling on the road from Sāketa to Sāvatthi were killed by robbers. Then the king's soldiers came and caught some of the ruffians. In another passage (p. 261) of the Mahāvagga it is stated that a residence of the Bikkhus in the Kosala country was menaced by savages.

In the Vatsa kingdom king Satānaka Parantapa was succeeded by his son Udayana who is the hero of many Indian legends. The commentary of the Dhammapada gives the story of the way in which Vāsuladattā or Vāsvadattā, the daughter of Pradyota, king of Avanti, became his wife. It also mentions two other queens of the Vatsa king, viz., Māgandiyā, daughter of a Kuru Brāhmaṇa, and Sāmāvatī. The Svapna-Vāsavadatta of Bhūsa mentions another queen named Padmāvatī who is represented as sister to king Darśaka of Magadha. The Priyadarśikā speaks of Udayana's marriage with the daughter of Dṛḍhavarma, king of Aṅga. The Ratnāvālī tells the

---
1 Majjhima N. II, p. 118.
4 For a detailed account of the legends see "Essay on Guṇḍāyana and the Bṛhatkathā" by Prof. Félix Léodée, translated by the Rev. A. M. Tulard.
story of the love of the king of Vatsa and of Sāgarikā, an attendant of his queen Vāsavadattā. Stories about Udayana were widely current in Avanti in the time of Kālidāsa (cf. Meghadūta, "prāpyāvantim Udayana kathā kovida grāmaviddhān"). The Jātakas throw some sidelight on the character of this king. In the preface to the Mātanga Jātaka it is related that in a fit of drunken rage he had Piṇḍola tortured by having a nest of ants tied to him. The Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva, a writer of the eleventh century A.D., contains a long account of Udayana's Dīgavijaya. The Priyadarśikā of Śrīharsha (Act IV) speaks of the king’s victory over the lord of Kaliṅga, and the restoration of his father-in-law Drīdhavarman to the throne of Aṅga. It is difficult to disentangle the kernel of historical truth from the husk of popular fables. It seems that Udayana was a great king who really made some conquests, and contracted matrimonial alliances with the royal houses of Avanti, Aṅga and Magadha.

The throne of Avanti was at this time occupied by Chanda Pradyota Mahāsena who had three sons named Gopālaka, Pālaka and Kumārasena, and a daughter named Vāsavadattā, the chief queen of Udayana. Regarding the character of Pradyota the Mahāvagga says that he was cruel. The Purāṇas tell us that he was “nayavajrīta,” i.e., destitute of good policy. The same authorities observe that “he will indeed have the neighbouring kings subject to him—sa vai pranata sāmantah.” That he was a king feared by his neighbours is apparent from a statement of the Majjhima Nikāya (III. 7) that Ajātaśatru, son of Bimbisāra, fortified Rājagriha because he was afraid of an invasion of his territories by Pradyota.

2 SBE., XVII, p. 187.
Magadha, as we have already seen, was ruled by Bimbisāra himself. He maintained friendly relations with his northern and western neighbours. He received an embassy and a letter from Pukkusāti, the king of Gandhāra. When Pradyota was suffering from jaundice the Magadha king sent the physician Jivaka. He contracted matrimonial alliances with the ruling families of Madra, Kosala and Vaisālī. These marriages were of great importance for the history of Magadha. They paved the way for the expansion of Magadha both westward and northward. Bimbisāra’s Kosalan wife brought a Kāsi village producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money.¹ According to the Thusa Jātaka⁴ and Musika Jātaka⁵ the Kosalan princess was the mother of Ajātaśatru. The preface to the Jātakas says, “At the time of his (Ajātaśatru’s) conception there arose in his mother, the daughter of the king of Kosala, a chronic longing to drink blood from the right knee of king Bimbisāra.” In the Samyukta Nikāya¹ Pasenadi of Kosala calls Ajātaśatru his nephew. On page 38 of the Book of the Kindred Sayings, however, Maddā appears as the name of Ajātaśatru’s mother. The Jaina writers, on the other hand, represent Chellana, daughter of Chetaka of Vaisālī, as the mother of Kunika-Ajātaśatru. The Nikāyas call Ajātaśatru Vedehiputta. This seems to confirm the Jaina tradition because Vaisālī was situated in Videha. Buddhaghosha, however, resolves “Vedehi” into Veda-Iha, Vedena Ihati or intellectual effort.⁶ In this connection we should remember that even Kosalan monarchs had sometimes the epithet

¹ Jātaka Nos. 239, 283, 492.
² No. 388.
³ No. 373.
⁴ The Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 110.
⁵ The Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 109 n.
THE AGE OF BIMBISĀRA

Vaideha. It is difficult to come to a final decision with regard to the parentage of the mother of Ajātaśatru from the data at our disposal.

Disarming the hostility of his powerful western and northern neighbours by his shrewd policy, Bimbisāra could devote his undivided attention to the struggle with Aṅga which he annexed after defeating Brahmadatta. The annexation of Aṅga by Bimbisāra is proved by the evidence of the Mahāvagga and of the Śoṇadāṇḍa Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya in which it is stated that the revenues of the town of Champā have been bestowed by King Bimbisāra on the Brāhmaṇa Śoṇadāṇḍa. We learn from Jaina sources that Aṅga was governed as a separate province under a Magadhan prince with Champā as its capital. Thus by war and policy Bimbisāra added Aṅga and a part of Kāśi to the Magadhan dominions, and launched Magadha in that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Asoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kalinga. We learn from the Mahāvagga that Bimbisāra’s dominions embraced 80,000 townships, the overseers (Gānikas) of which used to meet in a great assembly.

The victories of Bimbisāra’s reign were probably due in large measure to the vigour and efficiency of his administration. We are informed by the Chullavagga of the Vinaya Pitaka (VII. 3.5) that he exercised a rigid control over his High Officers, dismissing those who advised him badly and rewarding those whose advice he approved of. The Highest Officers (Mahāmātrasya) were divided into three classes, viz., (1) Sabbatthaka (the officer in charge of

1 Cf. Vedic Index, Vol. I, pp. 100, 491; Parn Āptāra is called both Vaideha and Kangaliya.

2 JAB, 1914, p. 521.

3 SBE, XVII, p. 1.

4 Hemachandra, the author of the Sthaviravali; cf. also the Bhagavatī Sūtra and the Nirayāvalī Sūtra.
general affairs, (2) Vohārika Mahāmattas (judges) and (3) Senānīyaka Mahāmattas (generals).

The Vinaya texts afford us a glimpse into the activities of these Mahāmattas (Mahāmātras), and the rough and ready justice meted out to criminals. Thus we have reference not only to imprisonment in jails (kārā), but also to punishment by scourging, branding, beheading, tearing out the tongue, breaking ribs, etc. Information regarding activities of a different kind is given by the Chinese pilgrims. Huien Tsang, for instance, refers to Bimbisāra's road and causeway, and says that when Kusāgārapura or Kusāgrayapura¹ (old Rājagriha) was afflicted by fires the king went to the cemetery and built the new city of Rājagriha. Fa Hien, however, gives the credit for the foundation of New Rājagriha to Ajāṭaśatru.

Bimbisāra had many sons, namely, Kūnika-Ajāṭaśatru (Aśokachandra of the Kathākośa), Halla and Vehalla (born from queen Chellana), Abhaya (born from queen Nandā), Silavat, Vimala-Koḍaṇṇa, and Kālaga. Ajāṭaśatru seems to have acted as his father's Viceroy at Champā.² He is said to have killed his father and seized the entire kingdom.

II. Kūnika-Ajāṭaśatru.

The reign of Kūnika-Ajāṭaśatru was the highwater mark of the power of the Bimbisārian (Haryaṅka) dynasty. He not only humbled Kosala and permanently annexed Kāśi, but also absorbed the state of Vaiśāli. The traditional account of his duel with Kosala is given in the Samyutta Nikāya³ and the Haritamāta, Vajjhaiki-Sākara, Kumma Sapiṇḍa, Tachchha Sākara

¹ Probably named after the early Magadhan King Kuśāra (AIHT, 149).
² Bhagavati Sūtra, Nīlakṣvaṭi Sūtra, Parīśatāparvan and the Kathākośa, p. 178.
and the Bhaddasāla Jātakas. It is said that after Ajātaśatru murdered Bimbisāra, his father, the queen Kosala Devi died of love for him. "Even after her death Ajātaśatru still enjoyed the revenues of the Kāśī village which had been given to the lady Kosala for bath money. But Pasenadi, the king of Kosala, determined that no parricide should have a village which was his by right of inheritance and made war upon Ajātaśatru. Sometimes the uncle got the best of it, and sometimes the nephew. On one occasion the Kosalan monarch died away in defeat; on another occasion he took Ajātaśatru prisoner. His daughter Vajirā he gave in marriage to his captive nephew and dismissed her with the Kāśī village for her bath money." It is stated in the Bhaddasāla Jātaka that during Pasenadi’s absence in a country town, Dīgha Chārāyana, the Commander-in-Chief, raised prince Viḍūḍabha to the throne. The ex-king set out for Rājagaha, resolved to take his nephew (Ajātaśatru) with him and capture Viḍūḍabha. But he died from exposure outside the gates of Rājagaha.

The traditional account of Ajātaśatru-Kūnika’s war with Vaiśāli is given by Jaina writers. King Seniya Bimbisāra is said to have given his famous elephant Sēyanaga (Sechanaka) together with a huge necklace of eighteen strings of jewels, to his younger sons Halla and Vehalla born from his wife Chellana, the daughter of King Chetaka of Vaiśāli. His eldest son Kūniya (Ajātaśatru) after usurping his father’s throne, on the instigation of his wife Paumāvat (Padmāvattī) demanded from his younger brothers the return of both gifts. On the latter refusing to give them up and flying with them to their grandfather Chetaka in Vaiśāli, Kūniya having failed peacefully to obtain the extradition of the fugitives, commenced war with Chetaka.\(^1\) According to Buddha-

\(^1\) Uñāṇakadāna, II, Appendix, p. 7; cf. Tawney, Kathākoṇa, pp. 178 ff.
ghosha's commentary the Sumangala vilasini the cause of the war was a breach of trust on the part of the Lichchhavis in connection with a mine of precious gems.

The preliminaries to the struggle between Magadha and Vaisali are described in the Mahavagga and the Mahaparinibbana Suttanta. In the Mahavagga it is related that Sunidha and Vassakara, two ministers of Magadha, were building a fort at Pataligama in order to repel the Vajjins. The Mahaparinibbana Suttanta says "the Blessed One was once dwelling in Rajagaha on the hill called the Vulture's Peak. Now at that time Ajatasatru Vedehiputta, the king of Magadha, was desirous of attacking the Vajjins; and he said to himself, 'I will root out these Vajjins, mighty and powerful though they be, I will destroy these Vajjins, I will bring these Vajjins to utter ruin.'"

"So he spake to the Brhma Vassakara, the prime minister of Magadha, and said 'Come now, Brhma, do you go to the Blessed One, and...tell him that Ajatasatru has resolved 'I will root out these Vajjins' Vassakara hearkened to the words of the king..." (and delivered to the Buddha the message even as the king had commanded).

In the Nirayvali Sutra it is related that when Kunika (Ajatasatru) prepared to attack Cheaka of Vaisali the latter called together the eighteen Garajjas of Kasi and Kosala, together with the Lichchhavis and Mallakis, and asked them whether they would satisfy Kunika's demands, or go to war with him. The good relations subsisting between Kosala and Vaisali are referred to in the Majjhim Nikaya, Vol. II, p. 101. There is thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Jaina statement regarding the alliance between Kasi-Kosala.

on the one hand and Vaiśāli on the other. It seems that all the enemies of Ajātaśatru including the rulers of Kāsi-Kosala and Vaiśāli offered a combined resistance. The Kosalan war and the Vajjian war were probably not isolated events but parts of a common movement directed against the establishment of the hegemony of Magadha. This struggle reminds us of the tussle of the Samnites, Etruscans and Gauls with the rising Roman power.

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

The war synchronised with the death of Gosāla Māṇkhaliputta. Sixteen years later at the time of Mahāvira’s death the anti-Magadhan confederacy was still in existence. We learn from the Kalpa Sūtra that on the death of Mahāvira the confederate kings mentioned in the Nirayāvalī Sūtra instituted a festival to be held in memory of that event. The struggle between the Magadha king and the powers arrayed against him thus seems to have been protracted for more than sixteen years. The Atthakathā gives an account of the Machiavellian tactics adopted by Magadhan statesmen headed by Vassakāra to sow the seeds of dissension among the Vaiśālians and thus bring about their downfall.

The absorption of Vaiśāli and Kāsi as a result of the Kosalan and Vajjian wars probably brought the aspiring ruler of Magadha face to face with the equally ambitious

---

1 Urvāragadālaka, Vol. II, Appendix, p. 60; Kathākośa, p. 179.
sovereign of Avanti. We have already referred to a statement of the Majjhima Nikāya that on one occasion Ajātaśatru was fortifying his capital because he was afraid of an invasion of his dominions by Pradyota. We do not know whether the attack was ever made. Ajātaśatru does not appear to have succeeded in humbling Avanti. The conquest of that kingdom was reserved for his successors.

In the opinion of Mr. Jayaswal the Parkham statue is a contemporary portrait of king Ajātaśatru. But this view has not met with general acceptance.

III. Ajātaśatru's Successors.

Ajātaśatru was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Darśaka. Prof. Geiger considers the insertion of Darśaka after Ajātaśatru to be an error, because the Pāli Canon indubitably asserts that Udāyibhadda was the son of Ajātaśatru and probably also his successor. Jaina tradition recorded in the Kathākoṇa (p. 177) and the Pariśishtaparvan (p. 42) also represents Udaya or Udāyin as the son of Kūnika by his wife Padmāvatī, and his immediate successor.

Though the reality of the existence of Darśaka, as king of Magadha, is established by the discovery of Bhāsa's Svapna-Vāsavadatta, yet in the face of Buddhist and Jaina evidence it cannot be confidently asserted that he was the immediate successor of Ajātaśatru. Prof. Bhandarkar identifies him with Nāga-Dāsaka who is represented by the Ceylonese Chronicles as the last king of Bimbisāra's line. The Ceylonese tradition seems to be confirmed by the following passage in Hiuen Tsang's Si-yü-ki, "To the south-west of the old Saṅghārāma about 100 li is the Saṅghārāma of Ti-lo-shi-kia... It was built by the last descendant of Bimbisāra raja."¹ The name of the

¹ Peal, Si-yu-ki, II, p. 102.
second Sanghabāma was probably derived from that of Darśaka who is here represented as the last descendant of Bimbisāra.

Udāyin: Before his accession to the throne Udāyin or Udāyibhadda, the son of Ajātaśatru, seems to have acted as his father’s Viceroy at Champa. The Parisiṣṭaparvan further informs us that he founded a new capital on the bank of the Ganges which came to be known as Pāṭaliputra. This part of the Jaina tradition is confirmed by the testimony of the Vāyu Purāṇa according to which Udai built the city of Kusumapura in the fourth year of his reign. The choice of Pāṭaliputra was probably due to its position in the centre of the realm which now included North Bihār. Moreover its situation at the confluence of two large rivers (the Ganges and the Son) was important from the commercial as well as strategic point of view. In this connection it is interesting to note that Kauṭilya recommends a site at the confluence of rivers for the capital of a kingdom.

The Parisiṣṭaparvan (pp. 45-46) refers to the king of Avanti as the enemy of Udāyin. This does not seem to be improbable in view of the fact that his father had to fortify his capital in expectation of an attack about to be made by Pradyota, king of Avanti. The fall of Aṅga and Vaiśālī and the discomfiture of Kosala had left Avanti the only important rival of Magadha. This last kingdom had absorbed all the kingdoms and republics of eastern India. On the other hand, if the Kathā-sarit-sāgara is to be believed the kingdom of Kauśāmbi was at this time annexed to the realm of Pālaka of Avanti, the son of Pradyota. The two kingdoms, Magadha and Avanti, were brought face to face with each other. The contest between the two for the mastery of northern India began, as we have seen, in the reign of Ajātaśatru. It must have continued

1 Jacobi, Parisiṣṭaparvan, p. 42.
2 Towney’s Translation, Vol. II, p. 484.
during the reign of Udāyin. The issue was finally decided in the time of Śiśunāga.

In the opinion of Mr. Jayaswal one of the famous “Patna Statues” in the Bhārhatu Gallery of the Indian Museum is a portrait of Udāyin. According to him the statue bears the following words:

Bhage ACHO chhonidhiše.

He identifies ACHO with king Aja mentioned in the Bhāgavata list of Śaśiunāga kings, and with Udāyin of the Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmacāda lists. Mr. Jayaswal’s reading and interpretation of the inscription have not, however, been accepted by several scholars including Dr. Barnett, and Professors Chanda and Majumdar. Dr. Smith, however, while unwilling to dogmatize, was of opinion that the statue was pre-Maurya. In the third edition of his “Asoka” he considers Mr. Jayaswal’s theory as probable.

The characters of the short inscription on the statue are so difficult to read that it is well-nigh impossible to come to a final decision. For the present the problem must be regarded as not yet definitely solved. Cunningham described the statue as that of a Yaksha. According to him the figure bore the words “Yakhe Achusanigika.” Prof. Chanda’s reading is: Bha (?) ga Achachha nivika (the owner of inexhaustible capital, i.e. Vaiśravaṇa).\(^1\) Dr. Majumdar reads: Gate (Yakhe ?) Lechchhai (vi) 40, 4.

Udāyin’s successors according to the Purāṇas were Nandivardhana and Mahānaadin. But the Ceylonese chronicles place after Udāyi the kings named Anuruddha, Muṇḍa and Nāga Dāsaka. Here again the Ceylonese account is partially confirmed by the Aṅguttara Nikāya which refers to Muṇḍa, King of Pāḷaliputra. Prof. Bhandarkar mentions his queen Bhadrādevi and treasurer

\(^1\) Indian Antiquary, March, 1919.
Priyaka. The Aṅguttara Nikāya by mentioning Pāṭaliputra as the capital of Munda indirectly confirms the tradition regarding the transfer of the Magadhan metropolis from Rājayāgraḥa to Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra.

The Ceylonese chronicles state that all the kings from Ajātaśatru to Nāga-Dāsaka were parricides. The people became angry, banished the dynasty and raised an anātya named Susu Nāga (Śīṣunāga) to the throne.

The new king seems to have been acting as the Magadhan Viceroy at Benares. The Purāṇas tell us that “placing his son at Benares he will make Girivraja his own abode.” The employment of anātayas as provincial governors or district officers need not cause surprise. The custom was prevalent as late as the time of Gautamiputra Śatakarni and Rudradāman I.

The Purānic statement that Śīṣunāga destroyed the power of the Pradyotas proves the correctness of the Ceylonese tradition that he came after Bimbisāra who was a contemporary of Pradyota. In view of this we cannot accept the other Purānic statement that Śīṣunāga was the progenitor of Bimbisāra’s family. It may be argued that as Śīṣunāga had his capital at Girivraja he must have flourished before Udāyin who was the first to remove the capital to Pāṭaliputra. But the fact that Kālaśoka, the son and successor of Śīṣunāga, had also to transfer the royal residence from Rājayāgraḥa to Pāṭaliputra indicates that one of his predecessors had reverted to the old capital. Who this predecessor was is made clear by the Purānic statement that Śīṣunāga “will make Girivraja his own abode.” The inclusion of Benares within Śīṣunāga’s dominions also proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru who were the first to establish Magadhan authority in Kāśi.

1 SBE, XI, p. xvi.
From a statement in the Mālālaṅkāravatthu, a Pāli work of modern date, but following very closely the more ancient books, it appears that Siśunāga had a royal residence at Vaiśāli which ultimately became his capital.1 "That monarch (Susunāga), not unmindful of his mother's origin,2 re-established the city of Vaiśāli, and fixed in it the royal residence. From that time Rājagaha lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered." This passage which says that Rājagaha lost her rank of royal city from the time of Siśunāga, proves that Siśunāga came after the palmy days of Rājagaha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru.

The most important achievement of Siśunāga seems to have been the annihilation of the power and prestige of the Pradyota dynasty of Avanti. Pradyota, the first king of the line, had been succeeded by his sons Gopāla and Pālaka after whom came Āryaka. The Purāṇas place after Āryaka or Ajaka a king named Nandivardhana, or Vartivardhana, and add that Siśunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and be king. Mr. Jayaswal identifies Ajaka and Nandivardhana of the Avanti list with Aja-Udāyin and Nandivardhana of the Purāṇic list of Śaśunāga kings. But Prof. Bhandarkar says that Āryaka or Ajaka was the son of Gopāla, the elder brother of Pālaka. 'Nandivardhana' and 'Vartivardhana' are apparently corruptions of Avantivardhana, the name of a son of Pālaka according to the Kathā Sarit Sāgara,3 of Gopāla, according to the Nepalese Brihat Kathā. The important thing to remember is that the Pradyota dynasty was humbled by Siśunāga. Whether the

1 SBE, XI, p. xvi. If the Dhevidūsāvatthu is to be believed Vaiśāli (Vaishali) continued to be a secondary capital till the time of the Nandins.
2 Susunāga, according to the Mahāvamśa (Turnour’s Mahāvamsa, xxxvii), was the son of a Licchhāvī rāja of Vaiśāli. He was conceived by a sepa-rodhī and brought up by an officer of state.
3 Tawney’s translation II, 403.
Śaśunāga occupation of Avanti took place immediately after Pālaka, or two generations later, is immaterial.

Śiśunāga was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by his son Kākavarna, according to the Ceylonese chronicles by his son Kālasoka. Professors Jacob, Geiger and Bhandarkar suggest that Kālaśoka, “the black Aśoka” and Kākavarna, “the crow-coloured” are one and the same person. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence of the Aśokāvadāna which places Kākavarnin after Muṇḍa, and does not mention Kālaśoka. The two most important events of the reign of Kālaśoka are the holding of the Second Buddhist Council at Vaiśāli, and the retransfer of the capital to Pātaliputra. Bāna in his Harshacharita gives a curious legend concerning the death of Kākavarna (Kālaśoka). It is stated there that Kākavarna Śaśunāgi had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The story about the tragic end of this king is, as we shall see later on, confirmed by Greek evidence.

The successors of Kālaśoka were his ten sons who are supposed to have ruled simultaneously. Their names according to the Mahābodhivamsa were Bhadrasena, Korandavarna, Maṅgura, Sarvañjaha, Jālika, Ubhaka, Sañjaya, Koravya, Nandivardhana and Pañchamaka. Prof. Bhandarkar suggests that Nandivardhana of the Mahābodhivamsa is most probably Nandivardhana of the Purānic list. Mr. Jayaswal says that the headless Patna statue in the Bhārhat Gallery of the Indian Museum is a portrait of this king. According to him the inscription on the statue runs as follows:—

Sapa (or Sava) khaṭe Vata Naṃdi.

¹ The Kāvya Mhmāṣa contains an interesting notice of this king and says that he prohibited the use of eunuchs in his harem.
² Geiger, Mahāvaṇha, p. xlii. ³ Edited by Kailāśī Pāṇḍurāṇa Parāh, p. 223.
He regards Vata Nándi as an abbreviation of Vartivardhana (the name of Nandivardhana in the Vayu list) and Nandivardhana. Mr. R. D. Banerji in the June number of the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, 1919, says that there cannot be two opinions about the reading Vata Nándi. Prof. Chanda, however, regards the statue in question as an image of a Yaksha and reads the inscription which it bears as follows:—

Yakha sa (?) rvata nándi.

Dr. Majumdar says that the inscription may be read as follows:—

Yakhe sam Vajinām 70

He places the inscription in the second century A. D., and supports the Yaksha theory propounded by Cunningham and upheld by Prof. Chanda. He does not agree with those scholars who conclude that the statue is a portrait of a Śaiśunāga sovereign simply because there are some letters in the inscription under discussion which may be construed as a name of a Śaiśunāga king. Referring to Mr. Jayaswal's suggestion that the form Vata Nándi is composed of two variant proper names (Vartivardhana and Nandivardhana) he says that Chandragupta II was also known as Devagupta, and Vigrahapāla had a second name Sūrapala; but who has ever heard of compound names like Chandra-Deva or Deva-Chandra, and Sūra-Vigraha or Vigraha-Sūra?

Mahāmāhopādhya Haraprasād Śāstrī takes Vata Nándi to mean Vṛtya Nándi and says that the statue has most of the articles of dress as given by Kātyāyana to the Vṛtya Kshatriya. In the Parāpas the Śisunāga kings are mentioned as Kshattrabandhus, i.e., Vṛtya Kshatriyas. The Mahāmāhopādhya thus inclines to
the view of Mr. Jayaswal that the statue in question is a portrait of a Śaśunāga king.¹

Mr. Ordhendra Coomar Gangoly regards the statue as a Yāksha image, and draws our attention to the catalogue of Yakshas in the Mahāmayuri and the passage “Nandi cha Vardhanas chaiva nagare Nandivardhane.”² Dr. Barnett is also not satisfied that the four syllables which may be read as Vaṭa Naṇḍi mention the name of a Śaśunāga king. Dr. Smith, however, in the third edition of his “Aśoka” admits the possibility of Mr. Jayaswal’s contention. We regard the problem as still unsolved. The data at our disposal are too scanty to warrant the conclusion that the inscription on the Patna statue mentions a Śaśunāga king. The script seems to be late.

Messrs. R. D. Banerji and Jayaswal propose to identify Nandivardhana, the Śaśunāga king, with Nandarāja mentioned in the Hāthigumpha inscription of Kharavela, king of Kalinga. One of the passages containing the name of Nandarāja runs thus:

...Paṁchame cha dāṇi vāse Na (ṁ) da-rāja-tivasasata-o(ghā?) ātam Tanasulīyavāṭa panādīm nagaraṁ pavessa...

“In the fifth year he had an aqueduct that had not been used for 300 (or 103) years since king Nanda conducted into the city.”

Nandivardhana is identified with Nanda on the strength of Kṣhemendra’s reference to the Pūrvanandāḥ who, we are told, should be distinguished from the Navaṇṇaṇḍāḥ or New (Later) Nandas, and identified with Nandivardhana and Mahānandin.³ In the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, however, Pūrvananda (Sing) is distinguished, not from the

¹ JBORS, December, 1919.
² Modern Review, October, 1919.
³ The Oxford History of India, Additions and Corrections; JBORS, 1918, 91.
Navanandāḥ, but from Yogananda (Pseudo-Nanda) the reanimated corpse of king Nanda. The Purāṇas and the Ceylonese authorities know of the existence of only one Nanda line. Those works represent Nandivardhana as a king of the Sāiśunāga line—a dynasty which is sharply distinguished from the Nandas. Moreover, as Prof. Chanda points out, the Purāṇas contain nothing to show that Nandivardhana had anything to do with Kalinga. On the contrary we are distinctly told by those authorities that when the kings of the Sāiśunāga dynasty and their predecessors were reigning in Magadha 32 kings reigned in Kalinga in succession synchronously. It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought “all under his sole sway” and “uprooted all Kshatriyas.” So we should identify Naundarāja of the Hāthigumpha inscription who held possession of Kalinga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons.

We learn from the Purāṇas as well as the Ceylonese Chronicles that the Sāiśunāga dynasty was supplanted by the Nanda line.

IV. The Chronology of the Bimbisāra (Haryanka) Sāiśunāga Group.

There is considerable disagreement between the Purāṇas and the Ceylonese Chronicles regarding the chronology of the kings of the Bimbisārian (or Haryanka) and Sāiśunāga dynasties. Even Dr. Smith is not disposed to accept all the dates given in the Purāṇas. Prof. Bhandarkar observes, “they (the Purāṇas) assign a period of 363 years to ten consecutive reigns, i.e., at least 36 years to each reign which is quite preposterous.”

1 Kashā Sarīt Śāgnum, Durgaprasad and Farnb’s edition, p. 10.
2 Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India, No. 1, p. 11.
3 Carm. Lnc., 1918 p. 68.
According to the Ceylonese Chronicles Bimbisāra ruled for fifty-two years, Ajātaśatru for 32 years, Udaya for 16 years, Anuruddha and Munda for 8 years, Nagadāsaka for 24 years, Śuṣunāga for 18 years, Kālāśoka for 28 years and Kālāśoka's sons for 22 years. Gautama Buddha died when Ajātaśatru was on the throne for 8 years, i.e., $52 + 8 = 60$ years after the accession of Bimbisāra. Fleet and Geiger adduce good grounds for believing that the Parinirvāna really took place in 483 B.C. Adding 60 to 483 B.C. we get the year 543 B.C. as the date of the accession of Bimbisāra. In the time of Bimbisāra Gandhāra was an independent kingdom ruled by a king named Pukkusāti. By B.C. 516 Gandhāra had lost its independence and had become subject to Persia, as we know from the Behistun inscription of Darius. It is thus clear that Pukkusāti and his contemporary Bimbisāra lived before B.C. 516. This accords with the chronology which places his accession in B.C. 543. Curiously enough this is the starting point of one of the traditional Nirvāṇa eras. Prof. Geiger shows that the dates 544 (543 according to some scholars) and 483 were starting points of two distinct eras. He proves that in Ceylon down to the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. the Nirvāṇa era was reckoned from 483 B.C. There can thus be no doubt that the era of 483 B.C. was the real Nirvāṇa era. What then was the origin of the era of 544 or 543 B.C.? It is not altogether improbable that this era was reckoned from the accession of Bimbisāra, and was at first current in Magadha. Later on it travelled to distant lands including Ceylon and was confounded with the Nirvāṇa era of 483 B.C. Then the real Nirvāṇa era fell into disuse, and the era of 544 B.C. came to occupy its place.

1 Carm. Lec., p. 70.
V. The Nandas.

We have seen that the Śāśiṇāga dynasty was supplanted by the line of Nanda. The name of the first Nanda was Mahapadma according to the Purāṇas, and Ugrasena according to the Mahābodhivamsa. The Purāṇas describe him as Śūdra-garbha-odbhava, i.e., born of a Śūdra mother. The Jaina Pārisīśhṭaparvan (p. 46) represents Nanda as the son of a courtesan by a barber. The Jaina tradition is strikingly confirmed by the classical accounts of the father of Alexander’s Magadhan contemporary. Curtius says¹ “His (Agrammes’, i.e., the last Nanda’s) father (i.e., the first Nanda) was in fact a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who, from his being not uncomely in person, had gained the affections of the queen, and was by her influence advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning monarch. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered his sovereign and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal children, usurped the supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death begot the present king.” The murdered sovereign seems to have been Kālaśoka-Kākavarṇa who had a tragic end as we know from the Harshacharita. Kākavarṇa Śāśiṇāgī, says Bāna, had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The young princes referred to by Curtius were evidently the sons of Kālaśoka-Kākavarṇa. The Greek account of the rise of the family of Agrammes fits in well with the Ceylonese account of the end of the Śāśiṇāga line and the rise of the Nandas, but not with the Purānic story which represents the first Nanda as a son of the last Śāśiṇāga by a Śūdra woman, and makes no mention of the young princes. The name Agrammes is

¹ McCrindle, The Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 222.
probably a corruption of the Sanskrit Aurasainya, “son of Ugrasena.” Ugrasena is, as we have seen, the name of the first Nanda according to the Mahābodhi-vāṃsa. His son may aptly be termed Aurasainya which the Greeks corrupted into Agrammes and later on into Xandrames.

The Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas call Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king, the destroyer of all the Kshatriyas (sarva Kshatrāntaka) and sole monarch (ekarāt) of the earth which was under his undisputed sway which terms imply that he overthrew all the dynasties which ruled contemporaneously with the Saśunāgas, viz., the Ikshvākus, Kurus, Pañcālas, Kaśis, Maithilas, Vitihotras, Haihayas, Kalingas, Aśmakas, Sūrasenās, etc. The Purānic account of the unification of a considerable portion of India under Nanda’s sceptre is corroborated by the classical writers who speak of the most powerful peoples who dwelt beyond the Beas in the time of Alexander as being under one sovereign who had his capital at Palibothra (Pātaliputra). The inclusion of Kosala within Nanda’s dominions seems to be implied by a passage of the Kathā-sarit-sāgara which refers to the camp of king Nanda in Ayodhya. Several Mysore inscriptions state that Kuntala, a province which included the southern part of the Bombay Presidency and the north of Mysore, was ruled by the Nandas. But these are of comparatively modern date, the twelfth century, and too much cannot be built upon their statements. More important is the evidence of the Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela which mentions Nandarāja in connection with an aqueduct of Kaliṅga. The passage in the inscription seems to imply that Nandarāja held sway in Kaliṅga. A second passage of Khāravela’s inscription seems to state

1 Tawney’s Translation, p. 21.
2 Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 3.
that king Nanda carried away as trophies the statue (or footprints) of the first Jina and heirlooms of the Kaliuga kings to Magadha. In view of Nanda's possession of Kaliuga, the conquest of regions lying further south does not seem to be altogether improbable. The existence on the Godāvari of a city called "Nau Nand Dehra" (Nander\(^1\)) also suggests that the Nanda dominions embraced a considerable portion of the Deccan.

The Matsya Purāṇa assigns 88 years to the reign of the first Nanda, but 88 (Ashtaśati) is probably a mistake for 28 (Ashtāvimśati), as the Vāyu assigns only 28 years. According to Tāranāth, Nanda reigned 29 years\(^2\). According to the Ceylonese accounts the Nandas ruled only for 22 years.

Mahāpadma-Ugrasena was succeeded by his eight sons who ruled for twelve years according to the Purāṇas. The Ceylonese Chronicles, as we have already seen, give the total length of the reign-period of all the nine Nandas as 22 years. The Purāṇas mention only the name of one son of Mahāpadma, viz., Sukalpa. The Mahābodhivamsa gives the following names: Paṇḍuka, Paṇḍugati, Rūtapāla, Rāṣṭrapāla, Govishāṇa, Daśasiddhaka, Kaivarta and Dhana. The last king is called by the classical writers Agrammes or Xandrames. Agrammes is, as we have seen, probably the Greek corruption of the Sanskrit patronymic Angrasainya.

The first Nanda left to his sons not only a big empire but also a large army and a full exchequer. Curtius tells us that Agrammes king of the Gangarídæ and the Prasii kept in the field for guarding the approaches to his country 30,000 cavalry and 200,000 infantry, besides 2,000 four-horsed chariots, and, what was the most

---

\(^1\) JBOIS, 1917, December, pp. 447, 457-458.
\(^2\) Maxmueller's Sikh Religion, V, p. 226.
\(^3\) Ind. Ant., 1876, p. 362.
formidable force of all, a troop of elephants which, he said, ran up to the number of 3,000. Diodorus and Plutarch give similar accounts. But they raise the number of elephants to 4,000 and 6,000 respectively.

The enormous wealth of the Nandas is referred to by several writers. Prof. S. K. Aiyangar points out that a Tamil poem contains an interesting statement regarding the wealth of the Nandas “which having accumulated first in Pāṭali, hid itself in the floods of the Ganges.” The Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang refers to “the five treasures of king Nanda’s seven precious substances.” A passage of the Kathā-sariś-sāgara says that king Nanda possessed 980 millions of gold pieces.

The Ashtadhyayi of Panini, translated by Mr. S. C. Vasu contains a rule (Sūtra II. 4. 21) as an illustration of which the following passage is cited:

Nandopakramāni mānāni.

This indicates that one of the Nanda kings was credited with the invention of a particular kind of measures.

We learn from Kautilya’s Arthasastra, Kāmandaka’s Nitisāra, the Purāṇas, the Mahāvamsa and the Mudrārakshasa that the Nanda dynasty was overthrown by Kautilya, the famous minister of Chandragupta Maurya. No detailed account of this great dynastic revolution has survived. The accumulation of an enormous amount of wealth by the Nanda kings probably implies a good deal of financial extortion. Moreover, we are told by the

---

1 Beginnings of South Indian History, p. 82.
2 Cf. “The youngest brother was called Dhana Nanda, from his being addicted to hoarding treasure,...He collected riches to the amount of eighty koṭis—in a rock in the bed of the river (Ganges) having caused a great excavation to be made, he buried the treasure there,...Levying taxes among other articles, even on skins, guns, trees, and stones he amassed further treasures which he disposed of similarly.” (Turnour, Mahāvamsa p. xxxix).
3 Tawney’s Translation, Vol. I, p. 21
classical writers that Agrammes (the last Nanda) "was detested and held cheap by his subjects as he rather took after his father than conducted himself as the occupant of a throne."1

The Purānic passage about the revolution stands as follows:

Uddharishyati tān sarvān
Kauṭilyo vai dvir ashtabhīh
Kauṭilyas Chandraguptam tu
Tato rājye'bhisheksyati.

Mr. Jayaswal2 proposes to read Virasrābbhiḥ instead of dvir ashtabhīh. Virasṛas he takes to mean the Āraṭṭas, and adds that Kauṭilya was helped by the Āraṭṭas "the band of robbers" of Justin.3

The Milinda-Pañho4 refers to an episode of the great struggle between the Nandas and the Mauryas: "there was Bhaddasāla, the soldier in the service of the royal family of Nanda, and he waged war against king Chandagutta. Now in that war, Nāgasena, there were eighty Corpse dances. For they say that when one great Head Holocaust has taken place (by which is meant the slaughter of ten thousand elephants, and a lac of horses, and five thousand charioteers, and a hundred kotis of soldiers on foot), then the headless corpses arise and dance in frenzy over the battle-field." The passage contains a good deal of what is untrustworthy. But we have here a reminiscence of the bloody encounter between the contending forces of the Nandas and the Mauryas.5

---

1 McCrindle, The Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 223.
2 Ind. Ant., 1914, p. 124.
3 Cf. Cunningham, Bhilas Topes, pp. 88, 89.
4 Cf. SBE., XXXVI, pp. 147-48.
5 Cf. Ind. Ant., 1914, p. 124n.
THE ADVANCE OF PERSIA TO THE INDUS

THE PERSIAN AND MACEDONIAN INVASIONS.

I. The Advance of Persia to the Indus.

While the kingdoms and republics of the Indian interior were gradually being merged in the Magadha Empire, those of North-West India were passing through vicissitudes of a different kind. In the first half of the sixth century B.C., the Uttarakpatha beyond the Madhyadesa, like the rest of India, was parcelled out into a number of small states the most important of which were Kamboja, Gandhara and Madra. No sovereign arose in this part of India capable of welding together the warring communities, as Ugrasena-Mahapadma had done in the East. The whole region was at once wealthy and disunited, and formed the natural prey of the strong Achæmenian monarchy which grew up in Persia.

Kurush or Cyrus (558-530 B.C.), the founder of the Persian Empire, is said to have led an expedition against India through Gedrosia, but had to abandon the enterprise, escaping with seven men only. But he was more successful in the Kabul valley. We learn from Pliny that he destroyed the famous city of Kapisa. Arrian informs us that "the district west of the river Indus as far as the river Copihen (Kabul) is inhabited by the Astaceniens (Askakas?) and the Assaceniens (Asmakas) Indian tribes. These were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes, and finally they submitted to the Persians, and paid tribute to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses as ruler of their land." Strabo tells us that on one occasion the Persians summoned the Hydraces (the Kshudrakas) from India (i.e., the Pañjab) to attend them as mercenaries.

1 H. and F. Strabo, III., p. 74.
3 Patañjali (iv. 2.2) refers to "Ashhurun nāma dhanva."
In the Behistun (Bahistân) inscription\(^1\) of Darayavaush or Darius I (522-486 B.C.), the third sovereign of the Achæmenian dynasty, the people of Gandhâra (Gadâra) appear among the subject peoples of the Persian Empire. But no mention is there made of the Hidus (people of Sindhu or the Indus Valley) who are included with the Gandhârians in the lists of subject peoples given by the inscriptions on the palace of Darius at Persepolis, and on his tomb at Naksh-i-Rustum.\(^1\) From this Rapson infers that the “Indians” (Hidus) were conquered at some date between 516 B.C., (the probable date of the Behistun inscription) and the end of the reign of Darius in 486 B.C.

The preliminaries to this conquest are described by Herodotus\(^2\) “He (Darius) being desirous to know in what part the Indus, which is the second river that produces crocodiles, discharges itself into the sea, sent in ships both others on whom he could rely to make a true report and also Scylax of Caryanda. They accordingly setting out from the city of Caspatyrus\(^3\) and the country of Paktyike (Pakthas?)\(^4\) sailed down the river towards the east and sunrise to the sea; then sailing on the sea westwards, they arrived in the thirtieth month at that place where the king of Egypt despatched the Phœncians, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented the sea.”

Herodotus tells us that “India” constituted the twentieth and the most populous satrapy of the Persian Empire, and that it paid a tribute proportionately larger than all the rest,—360 talents of gold dust (“equivalent to over a million pounds sterling”). Gandhâra was included in the seventh satrapy. The details regarding

---

\(^1\) Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achæmenidian Inscriptions by H. C. Tolman.
\(^2\) McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, pp. 4-5.
\(^3\) Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 386.
\(^4\) Ibid, p. 82.
“India” left by Herodotus leave no room for doubt that it embraced the Indus Valley and was bounded on the east by the desert of Rājaputāna. “That part of India towards the rising sun is all sand; for of the people with whom we are acquainted, the Indians live the furthest towards the east and the sunrise, of all the inhabitants of Asia, for the Indians’ country towards the east is a desert by reason of the sands.”

Khshayārshā or Xerxes (486-465 B.C.), the son and successor of Darius I., maintained his hold on the Indian provinces. In the great army which he led against Hel- las both Gandhāra and “India” were represented. The Gandhārians are described by Herodotus as bearing bows of reed and short spears, and the “Indians” as being clad in cotton garments and bearing cane bows with arrows tipped with iron. An interesting relic of Persian dominion in India is a Taxila inscription in Aramaic characters of the fourth or fifth century B.C.¹ To the Persians is also attributed the introduction of the Kharoshṭhī alphabet, the “Persepolitan capital,” and words like “dipi” and “nipishta” occurring in the inscriptions of Aśoka. Persian influence has also been traced in the preamble of the Aśokan edicts.

II. The Last of the Achæmenids and Alexander.

Indians figured in the army which Darius III Codomannus (335-330 B.C.) led against Alexander. “The Indians, who were conterminous with the Bactrians, as also the Bactrians themselves and the Sogdisians had come to the aid of Darius, all being under the command of Bessus, the Viceroy of the land of Bactria. They were followed by the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwell in Asia. These were not subject

¹ JRAS., 1915, pp. 340-347
to Bessus but were in alliance with Darius...Barsantes, the Viceroy of Arachotia, led the Arachotians and the men who were called mountaineer Indians. There were a few Elephants, about fifteen in number, belonging to the Indians who live this side of the Indus. With these forces Darius had encamped at Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about 600 stades distant from the city of Arbela."

1 The hold of the Achæmenians on the Indian provinces had, however, grown very feeble about this time, and the whole of north-western India was parcelled out into innumerable kingdoms and republics. A list of the more important among these states is given below:—

1. The Aspian territory (Alishang-Kūnar valley):

It lay in the difficult hill country north of the Kābul river watered by the Choēs (Alishang ?) and the Euaspla (Kūnar ?). The name of the people is derived from the Irānian "Aspix" i.e. the Sanskrit "Āśva" or Aśvaka. The Aspianos were thus the western branch of the Aśvakas or Aśmaka (Assakenians).

2. The country of the Guraeans:

It was watered by the river Guraeus (Gauri or Pañj-kora) and lay between the land of the Aspianos and the country of the Assakenians.

1 Chinnock, Arrian's Anabasis, pp. 142-143.
2 Camb. Hist. 382 n3.
3 Chinnock's Arrian, pp. 280-281.
3. The kingdom of Assakenus (Swat Valley):

It had its capital at Massaga, a "formidable fortress probably situated not very far to the north of the Malakand Pass but not yet precisely identified." The name of the Assakenians represents the Sanskrit Aśvaka or Aśmaka. The Aśmakas are mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. 1. 173). They are placed in the north-west by the authors of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa and the Brihat Saṃhitā. A branch of this people probably settled in the Deccan, and gave their name to the Assaka Mahājanapada mentioned in the Aṅguttara Nikāya. The Assakenian king had a powerful army of 20,000 cavalry, more than 30,000 infantry and 30 elephants. The reigning king at the time of Alexander's invasion is called by the Greeks Assakenos. His mother was Kleophis. Assakenos had a brother¹ who is called Eryx by Curtius and Aphrikes by Diodoros. It is not known in what relation these personages stood to Šarabha, king of the Aśmakas, whose tragic fate is described by Bāna.

4. Nysa:

It was a small hill state with a republican constitution. It was alleged to have been founded by Greek colonists long before the invasion of Alexander.² Arrian says,³ "the Nysaeans are not an Indian race, but descended from the men who came into India with Dionysus." Curiously enough a Yona or Greek state is mentioned along with Kamboja in the Majjhima Nikāya (II. 149) as flourishing in the time of Gautama Buddha and Assalāyana: "Yona Kambojesu dveva vāṇā Ayyo c'eva Dāsoca."

¹ Invasion of Alexander, p. 378.
According to Holdich the lower spurs and valleys of Koh-i-Mor are where the ancient city of Nysa once stood. At the time of Alexander’s invasion the Nysaeans had Akouphis for their President. They had a Governing Body of 300 members.1

5. **Peukelaotis**:

It lay on the road from Kābul to the Indus. Arrian tells us2 that the Kābul falls into the Indus in the land called Peukelaotis, taking with itself the Malantus, Soastus and Guraeus. Peukelaotis represents the Sanskrit Pushkarāvati. It formed the western part of the old kingdom of Gandhāra. The people of the surrounding region are sometimes referred to as the “Āstakenoi” by historians. The capital is represented by the modern Chārsadda, 17 miles N. E. of Peshāwar, on the Swāt river, the Soastus of Arrian, and the Suvāsu of the Vedic texts.

The reigning king at the time of Alexander’s invasion was Āstes3 (Hasti or Ashtaka?). He was defeated and killed by Hephaestion, a general of the Macedonian king.

6. **Taxila or Takshaśila**:

Strabo says4 “between the Indus and the Hydaspes (Jihlam) was Taxila, a large city, and governed by good laws. The neighbouring country is crowded with inhabitants and very fertile.” The kingdom of Taxila formed the eastern part of the old kingdom of Gandhāra.

In B. C. 327 the Taxilian throne was occupied by a prince whom the Greeks called Taxiles. When Alexander of Macedon arrived in the Kābul valley he sent a

---

1 *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 81.
3 Chinnock, *Arrian’s Anabasis of Alexander and Indo*, p. 228.
4 *H. & F.’s Ed. III*, p. 90.
herald to Taxiles to bid him come and meet him. Taxiles accordingly did come to meet him, bringing valuable gifts. When he died his son Mophis or Omphis (Sanskrit Āmbhi) succeeded to the government. Curiously enough Kauṭilya, himself a native of Taxila according to the Mahāvamsa Tikā, refers to a school of political philosophers called Āmbhiyās, and Dr. F. W. Thomas connects them with Taxila.\(^1\)

7. **Abhisāra**

Strabo observes\(^2\) that the kingdom was situated among the mountains above the Taxila country. The position of this state was correctly defined by Stein who pointed out that Darvābhisāra (cf. Mbh. VII. 91, 43) comprised the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Jihlam and the Chinśb. Roughly speaking it corresponded to the Punch and Naoshera districts in Kaśmir, and was probably an offshoot of the old Kingdom of Kamboja. Abisasī, the contemporary of Alexander, was a shrewd politician of the type of Charles Emanuel III of Sardinia. When the Macedonian invader arrived he informed him that he was ready to surrender himself and the land which he ruled. And yet before the battle which was fought between Alexander and the famous Poros, Abisasī intended to join his forces with those of the latter.\(^3\)

8. The kingdom of **Arsakes**

It represents the Sanskrit Uraśa, the modern Hazāra district. It adjoined the realm of Abisasī, and was probably, like the latter, an offshoot of the old kingdom of Kamboja. Uraśa is mentioned in several Kharos̱htī

---

\(^1\) Bārhamspātīya Arthaśāstra, Introduction, p. 15.
\(^2\) H. & F.'s Ed. III., p. 90.
\(^3\) Chirnneck, Arrian, p. 276.
Inscriptions, and, in the time of the Geographer Ptolemy, absorbed the neighbouring realm of Taxila.

9. The kingdom of the Elder Poros:

It lay between the Jihlam and the Chināb and roughly corresponded to the modern districts of Jihlam, Guzrāt and Shāhpur.1 Strabo tells us2 that it was an extensive and fertile district containing nearly 300 cities. Diodoros informs us3 that Poros had an army of more than 50,000 foot, above 3,000 horse, about 1,000 chariots, and 130 elephants. He was in alliance with Embisaros, i.e., the king of Abhisāra.

Poros probably represents the Sanskrit Pūru or Paurava. In the Rig Veda the Pūrus are expressly mentioned as on the Sarasvati. In the time of Alexander, however, we find them on the Hydaspes (Jihlam). The Brihat Samhita, too, (xiv. 27) associates the ‘Pauravas,’ with ‘Māraka’ and ‘Mālava.’ The Mahābhārata also refers to a “Puram Paurava-rakshitam” which lay not far from Kaśmira (Sabha, 27, 15-17). It is suggested in the Vedic Index (Vol. II, pp. 12-13) that either the Hydaspes was the earlier home of the Pūrus, where some remained after the others had wandered east, or the later Pūrus represent a successful onslaught upon the west from the east.

10. The country of the people called Glauganikai (Glauganicians) by Aristobulus, and Glausians by Ptolemy:

This territory was conterminous with the dominion of Poros.5 It contained no less than seven and thirty cities,

---

1 It apparently included the old territory of Kekaya.
2 H. θ F.'s Ed. II, p. 91.
3 Invasion of Alexander, p. 374.
4 With the second part of the name may be compared that of the Samakṣikas of the Gupta period. Mr Jayaswal who restores the name as Glauchukṣikans does not apparently take note of this fact.
5 Chinook, Arrian, p. 376.
the smallest of which contained not fewer than 5,000 inhabitants, while many contained upwards of 10,000.

11. **Gandaris**:

It lay between the Chināb and the Rāvi and (if Strabo has given the correct name of the territory) probably represented the easternmost part of the old Mahājanapada of Gandhāra.¹ It was ruled by the Younger Poros, nephew of the monarch who ruled the territory between the Jihlam and the Chināb.

12. The **Adraistai** (Adrijas? Mbh. VII. 159. 5).²

They dwelt on the eastern side of the Hydraotes or the Rāvi, and their main stronghold was Pimprama.

13. **Kathaioi** or **Cathaecans**:

Strabo says,³ “some writers place Cathaia and the country of Sopeithes, one of the monarchs, in the tract between the rivers (Hydaspes andACESines, i.e., the Jihlam and the Chināb); some on the other side of the Acesines and of the Hyarotis, on the confines of the territory of the other Poros, the nephew of Poros who was taken prisoner by Alexander.” The Kathaioi probably represent the Sanskrit Kantha (Pāṇini, II. 4. 20), Kaṭha (Jolly, SBE., VII, 15) or Krātha (Mbh. VIII. 85. 18). They were the head of the confederacy of independent tribes dwelling in the territory of which the centre was Sāngala. This town was probably situated in the Gurudāspur district, not far from Fathgarh.⁴ Anspach locates it at Jandiāla.

¹ But see Camb. Hist. Ind., I, 370, n. 4; the actual name of the territory in olden times was, however, Madra.
² Yandhēyaṇ Adrijān Rājan Madrakka Mālavān añi.
⁴ JRAS., 1906, p. 687.
The Kathaians enjoyed the highest reputation for courage and skill in the art of war. Onesikritos tells us that in Kathai the handsomest man was chosen as king.¹

14. The kingdom of Sophytes (Saubhūti):

In the opinion of Smith, the position of this kingdom is fixed by the remark of Strabo² that it included a mountain composed of fossil salt sufficient for the whole of India; Sophaistes was, therefore, according to him, the “lord of the fastnesses of the Salt Range stretching from Jhilam to the Indus.” But we have already seen that the classical writers agree in placing Sophaistes’ kingdom east of the Jhilam. Curtius tells us³ that the nation ruled by Sophaistes (Sophaistes), in the opinion of the “barbarians,” excelled in wisdom, and lived under good laws and customs. They did not acknowledge and rear children according to the will of the parents, but as the officers entrusted with the medical inspection of infants might direct, for if they remarked anything deformed or defective in the limbs of a child they ordered it to be killed. In contracting marriages they did not seek an alliance with high birth, but made their choice by the looks, for beauty in the children was highly appreciated. Strabo informs us⁴ that the dogs in the territory of Sophaistes (Sophaistes) were said to possess remarkable courage. We have some coins of Sophaistes bearing on the obverse the head of the king, and on the reverse the figure of a cock. Strabo calls Sophaistes a nomarch which probably indicates that he was not an independent sovereign, but only a viceroy of some other king.

¹ McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literatures, p. 38.
² H. and F.’s Ed. III, p. 36.
³ Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 219.
⁴ H. and F., III, p. 93.
15. The kingdom of **Phegelas** or Phegeus:

It lay between the Hydraotes (Rāvi) and the Hyphasis (Bias). The name of the king, Phegelas, probably represents the Sanskrit Bhagala—the name of a royal race of Kshatriyas mentioned in the Ganapatha.¹

16. The **Siboi**:

They were the inhabitants of the Shorkot region in Jhang. They were probably identical with the Śiva people mentioned in a passage of the Rig Veda (VII. 18. 7) where they share with the Alinas, Pakthas, Bhalānas, and Viśāqins the honour of being defeated by Sudās.² The Jātakas mention a Sivi country and its cities Ariṭṭhapura³ and Jetuttara.⁴ It is probable that Śiva, Śivi and Siboi were one and the same people. A place called Śiva-pura, is mentioned by the Scholiast on Pāṇini as situated in the northern country.⁵ It is, doubtless, identical with Śibipura mentioned in a Shorkot inscription edited by Vogel. In the opinion of that scholar the mound of Shorkot marks the site of this city of the Śibis.⁶

The Siboi dressed themselves with the skins of wild beasts, and had clubs for their weapons. The nation had 40,000 foot soldiers in the time of Alexander.

The **Mahābhārata** (III. 130-131) refers to a rāṣṭra of the Śivis ruled by king Uśinara, which lay not far from the Yamunā. It is not altogether improbable that the Uśinara's country was at one time the home of the

---

¹ Invasion of Alexander, p. 401.
³ Uṃsāndanti Jātaka, No. 527; cf. Pāṇini, VI. 2. 100.
⁴ Vessantara Jātaka, No. 547. See note, p. 120, n. 2.
⁵ Patanjali, IV. 2. 2; Ved. Ind., II, p. 382.
⁶ Ep. Ind., 1921, p. 16.
⁷ Vide pp. 38, 39 note.
Svis. We find them also in Sind, in Madhyamikā in Rājaputāna,1 and, in the Daśa-kumāra-charita, on the banks of the Kāverī.8

17. The Agalassoi:

They lived near the Siboi, and could muster an army of 40,000 foot and 3,000 horse.

18. The Sudrace or Oxydrakai:

They were settled between the Hydraotes (Rāvi) and the Hyphasis (Bias), in the territory probably included within the Montgomery District. Their name represents the Sanskrit Kshudraka.3 They were one of the most numerous and warlike of all the Indian tribes in the Pañjāb. Arrian in one passage refers to the "leading men of their cities and their provincial governors" besides other eminent men. These words afford us a glimpse into the internal condition of this and similar tribes.

19. The Malloi:

They occupied the valley of the lower Hydraotes (Rāvi), on both banks of the river. Their name represents the Sanskrit Malava. According to Weber, Āpiśali (according to Jayaswal, Kātyāyana) speaks of the formation of the compound—"Kshaudraka-Mālava." Smith points out that the Mahābhārata coupled the tribes in question as forming part of the Kaurava host in the Kurukshetra war.4 Curtius tells us5 that the Sudrace

1 Yaldas, Med. Hind. Ind. 1, p. 102; Curran, Leo., 1918, p. 179.
2 The southern Svis are probably to be identified with the Chola ruling family (Kaiser, List of Southern Inscriptions, No. 885).
3 Mbh. II. 63:15; VII. 28:9.
4 RFL., 1914, p. 94 a.; Mbh. VI. 59:135.
5 Invasion of Alexander, p. 234.
and the Malli had an army consisting of 90,000 foot soldiers, 10,000 cavalry and 900 war chariots.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar informs us that Pāṇini refers to the Mālavas as living by the profession of arms.¹ In later times they are found in Rājaputāna, Avanti and the Māhī valley.

20. The Abastanoi:

Diodorus calls them the Sambastai,² Arrian Abastanoi, Curtius Sabarcae, and Orosius Sabagras. They were settled on the lower Akesines. Their name represents the Sanskrit Ambashtha. The Ambashthas are mentioned in several Sanskrit and Pāli works. An Ambashtha king is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 21), whose priest was Nārada. The Mahābhārata (II. 52. 14-15) mentions the Ambashthas along with the Śivis, Kshudrakas, Mālavas and other north-western tribes. The Purāṇas represent them as Anava Kshatriyas and kinsmen of the Śivis.³ In the Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra,⁴ the Ambashtha country is mentioned in conjunction with Sind :

Kāśmira-Hūn-Ambashtha-Sindhavah.

In the Ambatṭha Sutta,⁵ an Ambatṭha is called a Brāhmaṇa. In the Smṛti literature, on the other hand, Ambasṭha denotes a man of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Vaiśya parentage. According to Jātaka IV. 363, the Ambatṭhas were farmers. It seems that the Ambashthas were a tribe who were at first mainly a fighting race, but some of whom took to other occupations, viz., those of

¹ Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 290.
² Invasion of Alexander, p. 292.
⁴ Ed. F. W. Thomas, p. 21.
priests, farmers, and according to the Smrīti writers, physicians (Ambāṣṭhānāṁ chikitsitam, Manu, X. 47).

In the time of Alexander, the Ambāṣṭhas were a powerful tribe having a democratic government. Their army consisted of 60,000 foot, 6,000 cavalry and 500 chariots.¹

In later times the Ambāṣṭhas are found in South-Eastern India near the Mekala range, and also in Bihār and Bengal.²

21-22. The Xathroi and the Ossadioi:

The Xathroi are according to McCrindle³ the Kṣhatri of Sanskrit Literature mentioned in the Laws of Manu as an impure tribe, being of mixed origin. V. de Saint-Martin suggests that in the Ossadioi we have the Vāṣāti of the Mahābhārata,⁴ a tribe associated with the Sibis and Sindhu-Sauvīras.⁵

23-24. The Sodrai (Sogdoi) and the Massanoi:

They occupied Northern Sind. The Sodrai are the Sūdras of Sanskrit literature, a people constantly associated with the Ābhiras who were settled near the Sarasvati.⁶

25. The kingdom of Mousikanos:⁷

¹ Invasion of Alexander, p. 282.
² Cf. Prolæcy, Ind. Ant., XIII. 361; Bṛhaṇa Sandhi śāstra XIV. 47; "Mekhalāmsavīṭa" of Mārkaṇḍeya P. LVIII. 14, is a corruption of Mekal-Āmbāṣṭha. Cf. also the Ambāṣṭha Kṣasthas of Bihār, and the Vaiśyas of Bengal whom Bharata Mallika classes as Ambāṣṭha.
³ Invasion of Alexander, p. 196 n.
⁴ VII. 19.11; 83.37; VIII. 44.49.
⁵ ' "Anbāṣṭhaḥ Sarasvato Śivavīṭha Vāsandvāyaḥ." (Mbh. VI. 106.8.)
   "Vaiśāti Sūdravī Śivavīṭaḥ prasvī 'thākakītathaḥ"
   "Gandhāra Śīlaṃ Sāvīravī Śivavīṭaḥ Vaiśāyaḥ." (Mbh. VI. 61.14).
⁶ Patanjali, I, 2.8; Mbh. VII. 19.6; IX. 57.1.
⁷ Bevan in Camb. Hist. Ind., p. 377, restores "the name as Māshka. Mr. Jayaswal in his Hindu Polity suggests Muchukunda."
It included a large part of modern Sind. Its capital has been identified with Alor in the Sukkur district. The following characteristics of the inhabitants of the kingdom of Mousikanos are noticed by Strabo.

"The following are their peculiarities: to have a kind of Lacedæmonian common meal, where they eat in public. Their food consists of what is taken in the chase. They make no use of gold nor silver, although they have mines of these metals. Instead of slaves, they employed youths in the flower of their age, as the Cretans employ the Aphamiotæ, and the Lacedæmonians the Helots. They study no science with attention but that of medicine; for they consider the excessive pursuit of some arts, as that of war, and the like to be committing evil. There is no process at law but against murder and outrage, for it is not in a person's own power to escape either one or the other; but as contracts are in the power of each individual, he must endure the wrong, if good faith is violated by another; for a man should be cautious whom he trusts, and not disturb the city with constant disputes in courts of justice."

From the account left by Arrian it appears that the "Brachmans," i.e., the Brāhmaṇas exercised considerable influence in the country. They were the instigators of a revolt against the Macedonian invader.

26. The principality of Oxykanos:

Curtius calls the subjects of Oxykanos the Praesti (Proshthas? Mbh. VI. 9.61). Oxykanos himself is called both by Strabo and Diodoros Portikanos. Cunningham places his territory to the west of the Indus in the level country around Larkhāna.
27. The principality of Sambos: 1

Sambos was the ruler of a mountainous country adjoinig the kingdom of Mousikanos, with whom he was at feud. His capital, called Sindimana, has been identified with Schwan, a city on the Indus. 2

28. Patalene:

It was the Indus delta, and took its name from the capital city, Patala, at or near the site of Bahmanabad.

Diodorus tells us 3 that Tanala (Patala) had a political constitution drawn on the same lines as the Spartan; for in this community the command in war was vested in two hereditary kings of different houses, while a Council of Elders ruled the whole state with paramount authority. One of the kings in the time of Alexander was called Moeres. 4

The states described above had little tendency to unity or combination. Curtius tells us 5 that Ambhi, king of Taxila, was at war with Abisares and Poros. Arrian informs us that Poros and Abisares were not only enemies of Taxila but also of the neighbouring autonomous tribes. On one occasion the two kings marched against the Kshudrakas and the Malavas. 6 Arrian further tells us that the relations between Poros and his nephew were far from friendly. Sambos and Mousikanos were also on hostile terms. Owing to these struggles and dissensions amongst the petty states, an invader had no common resistance to fear; and he could be assured that many would welcome him out of hatred for their neighbours.

1 Sambhu, according to Bevan (Camb. Hist. Ind., 377). Samba is a possible alternative.
2 McCrindle, Invasion of Alexander, p. 404.
3 Inv. Alex., p. 296.
4 Inv. Alex., p. 296.
5 Inv. Alex., p. 293.
6 Chisholm, Arrian, p. 279.
The Nandas of Magadha do not appear to have made any attempt to subjugate these states of the Uttarāpatha. The task of reducing them was reserved for a foreign conqueror, *viz.*, Alexander of Macedon. The tale of Alexander’s conquest has been told by many historians including Arrian, Q. Curtius Rufus, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch and Justin. We learn from Curtius that Scythians and Dahae served in the Macedonian army.\(^1\) The expedition led by Alexander was thus a combined Śaka-Yavana expedition. The invader met with no such general confederacy of the native powers like the one formed by the East Indian states against Kūñika-Ajātaśatru. On the contrary he obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Āmbhi of Taxila, Sangæus (Sañjaya?) of Pushkaravati, Kophaos or Cophaeus (of the Kabul region?), Assagetes (Āsvajit?), and Sisikottsos (Śaśigupta) who got as his reward the satrapy of the Assakenians.\(^2\) The only princes or peoples who thought of combining against the invader were Poros and Abisares, and the Mālavas (Malloi), Kshudrakas (Oxydrakai), and the neighbouring autonomous tribes. Even in the latter case personal jealousies prevented any effective results. Alexander met with stubborn resistance from individual chiefs and clans, notably from Astes ( Hasti or Ashtaka?), the Aspasians, the Assakenians, the elder Poros, the Kathaisans, the Malloi, the Oxydrakai, and the Brāhmanas of the kingdom of Mousikanos. Massaga, the stronghold of the Assakenians, was stormed with great difficulty, Poros was defeated on the banks of the Hýdaspes (B.C. 326), the Malloi and the Oxydrakai were also no doubt crushed. But Alexander found that his Indian antagonists were different from the effete troops of Persia. Diodoros

\(^1\) Inv. Alex., p. 208.
\(^2\) Inv. Alex., p. 112.
informs us that at Massaga, where Alexander treacherously massacred the mercenaries, "the women, taking the arms of the fallen, fought side by side with the men." Poros, when he saw most of his forces scattered, his elephants lying dead or straying riderless, did not flee—as Darius Codomannus had twice fled—but remained fighting, seated on an elephant of commanding height, and received nine wounds before he was taken prisoner. The Malli almost succeeded in killing the Macedonian king. But all this was of no avail. A disunited people could not long resist the united forces of the Hellenic world led by the greatest captain of ancient Europe. Alexander succeeded in conquering the old Persian satrapies of Gandhāra and "India," but was unable to try conclusions with Agrammes king of the Gargarides and the Praisii, i.e., the last Nanda king of Magadha and the other Gangetic provinces. Plutarch informs us that the battle with Poros depressed the spirits of the Macedonians and made them very unwilling to advance further into India. Moreover they were afraid of the "Gandaritai and the Praisii" who were reported to be waiting for Alexander with an army of 80,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 8,000 war-chariots and 6,000 fighting elephants. As a matter of fact when Alexander was retreating through Karmania he received a report that his satrap Philippos had been murdered. Shortly afterwards the Macedonian garrison was overpowered. The departure of Eudemos (cir. 317 B.C.) marks the final collapse of the Macedonian attempt to establish an empire in India.

The only permanent effect of Alexander's raid seems to have been the establishment of a number of Yona settlements in the Uttarāpatha. The most important of these settlements were:

1 Inr. Alex., p. 270.
1. The city of Alexandria (modern Charikar or Opian) in the land of the Parapanisadæ, i.e., the Kabul region.
2. Boukephala, on the spot whence the Macedonian king bad started to cross the Hydaspes (Jihlam).
3. Nikaia, where the battle with Poros took place.
4. Alexandria in Sind, in the vicinity of the countries of the Sodrai or Sogdoi, and Massanoi, who occupied the banks of the Indus.¹

Aśoka recognised the existence of Yona settlers on the northern fringe of his empire, and appointed some of them (e.g. the Yavanarāja Tushāspha) to high offices of state. Boukephala Alexandria flourished as late as the time of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.² One of the Alexandrias (Alasaunda) is mentioned in the Mahāvamsa.³

Alexander's invasion produced one indirect result. It helped the cause of Indian unity by destroying the power of the petty states of north-west India, just as the Danish invasion helped the union of England under Wessex by destroying the independence of Northumbria and Mercia. If Ugrasena-Mahāpadma was the precursor of Chandragupta Maurya in the east, Alexander was the forerunner of that emperor in the north-west.

THE MAURYA EMPIRE; THE ERA OF DIGVIJAYA.

I. The Reign of Chandragupta Maurya.

In B. C. 326 the flood of Macedonian invasion had overwhelmed the Indian states of the Pañjāb, and was threatening to burst upon the Madhyadeśa. Ahrangmes was confronted with a crisis not unlike that which Arminius had to face when Varus carried the Roman Eagle to the Teutoburg Forest, or which Charles Martel

¹ I.)., Alex., pp. 299, 354.
² Schaff's Ed., p. 41.
³ Geiger's Ed., p. 194.
had to face when the Saracens carried the Crescent to the field of Tours. The question whether India was, or was not, to be Hellenized awaited decision.

Agrammes was fortunate enough to escape the onslaught of Alexander. But it is doubtful whether he had the ability or perhaps the inclination to play the part of an Arminius or a Charles Martel, had the occasion arisen. But there was at this time another Indian who was made of different stuff. This was Chandragupta, the Sandrocottus of the classical writers. The rise of Chandragupta is thus described by Justin.¹

"India after the death of Alexander had shaken, as it were, the yoke of servitude from its neck and put his governors to death. The author of this liberation was Sandrocottus. This man was of mean origin but was stimulated to aspire to regal power by supernatural encouragement; for having offended Alexander by his boldness of speech and orders being given to kill him, he saved himself by swiftness of foot; and while he was lying asleep, after his fatigue, a lion of great size having come up to him licked off with his tongue the sweat that was running from him, and after gently waking him, left him. Being first prompted by this prodigy to conceive hopes of royal dignity he drew together a band of robbers, and solicited the Indians to support his new sovereignty. Sometime after, as he was going to war with the generals of Alexander, a wild elephant of great bulk presented itself before him of its own accord and, as tamed down to gentleness, took him on his back and became his guide in the war and conspicuous in fields of battle. Sandrocottus having thus acquired a throne was in possession of India when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness."

¹ Watson’s Ed., p. 142.
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The above account, shorn of its marvellous element amounts to this, that Chandragupta, a man of non-monarchical rank, placed himself at the head of the Indians who chafed under the Macedonian yoke, and after Alexander’s departure defeated his generals and “shook the yoke of servitude from the neck” of India. The verdict of the Hydaspes was thus reversed.

The ancestry of Chandragupta is not known for certain. Hindu tradition connects him with the Nanda dynasty of Magadha. Jaina tradition recorded in the Parisishātaparvan (p. 56) represents him as the son of a daughter of the chief of the village of Mayuraposhaka. The Mahāvamsa¹ calls him a scion of the Moriya clan. In the Divyāvadāna² Bindusāra, the son of Chandragupta, claims to be a Kshatriya Mūrdrabhishtikta. In the same work (p. 409) Asoka, the son of Bindusāra, calls himself a Kshatriya. In the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta³ the Moriyas are represented as the ruling clan of Pipphalivana, and as belonging to the Kshatriya caste. As the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta is the most ancient of the works referred to above, and as it belongs to the early Buddhist period its evidence must be accepted as authentic. It is, therefore, practically certain that Chandragupta belonged to a Kshatriya community, viz., the Moriya (Maurya) clan.

In the sixth century B. C. the Moriyas were the ruling clan of the little republic of Pipphalivana. They must have been absorbed into the Magadhan empire along with the other states of Eastern India. During the inglorious reign of Agrammes, when there was general disaffection amongst his subjects, the Moriyas evidently came into prominence, probably under the leadership of

¹ Geiger's Translation, p. 27.
² Cowell and Nell's Eds., p. 370.
³ SBE. XI, pp. 134-35.
Chandragupta. These clansmen were no longer rulers, and were merely Magadhan subjects. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that Justin calls Chandragupta a man of humble origin. Plutarch, as well as Justin, informs us that Chandragupta paid a visit to Alexander. Plutarch says 1 “Androkottus himself, who was then a lad, saw Alexander himself and afterwards used to declare that Alexander might easily have conquered the whole country, as the then king was hated by his subjects on account of his mean and wicked disposition.” From this passage it is not unreasonable to infer that Chandragupta visited Alexander with the intention of inducing the conqueror to put an end to the rule of the tyrant of Magadha. His conduct may be compared to that of Rānā Saṅgrāma Simha who helped Bābar to put an end to the rule of Ibrahim Lodi. 2 Apparently Chandragupta found Alexander as great a tyrant as Agrammes, for we learn from Justin that the Macedonian king did not scruple to give orders to kill the intrepid Indian lad for his boldness of speech. The young Maurya apparently thought of ridding his country of both the tyrants, Macedonian as well as Indian. With the help of Kauṭilya, also called Chāṇakya or Vīshāṇugupta, son of a Brāhmaṇa of Taxila, he overthrew the infamous Nanda. Traditional accounts of the conflict between Chandragupta and the last Nanda are preserved in the Milinda-pañha, the Purāṇas, the Mudrārakshasa, the Mahāvaṃsa Ṭīkā and the Jainī Parisīṣṭaparvan. The Milinda-pañha 3 tells us that the Nanda army was commanded by Bhaddasāla. The Nanda troops were evidently defeated with great slaughter, an exaggerated account of which is preserved in the Milinda-pañha.

1 Life of Alexander, LXII.
2 Regarding the conduct of Saṅgrāma Simha, see Tod’s Rājasthān, Vol. I, p. 240 n. (2).
3 SBE, Vol. XXXVI, p. 147.
“Sometime after” his acquisition of sovereignty, Chandragupta went to war with the prefects or generals of Alexander¹ and crushed their power.

The overthrow of the Nandas, and the liberation of the Panjab were not the only achievements of the great Maurya. Plutarch tells us² that he overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men. Justin also informs us that he was “in possession of India.” In his “Beginnings of South Indian History,” Chapter II, Prof. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar shows that Māmulanār, an ancient Tamil author, makes frequent allusions to the Mauryas in the past having penetrated with a great army as far as the Podiyil hill in the Tinnevelly district. The statements of this author are supported by Paraṇār or Param Korranār and Kallil Āṭṭiraiyanār. The advanced party of the invasion was composed of a warlike people called Kosar (Košalas?). The invaders advanced from the Konkan passing the hills Ellimalai, about sixteen miles north of Cannanore, and entered the Kongu (Coimbatore) district, ultimately going as far as the Podiyil Hill. Unfortunately the name of the Maurya leader is not given. But the expression “Vamba Moriyar” or Maurya upstarts ³ would seem to suggest that the first Maurya, i.e., Chandragupta was meant.⁴

Certain Mysore Inscriptions refer to Chandragupta’s rule in north Mysore. Thus one inscription says that Nāgakhandā in the Shikārpur Tāluaq was protected by the wise Chandragupta, “an abode of the usages of eminent

² Alex. LXXII.
³ Beginnings of South Indian History, p. 89.
⁴ Barnott suggests (Camb. Hist. Ind. 596) that the ‘Vamba Moriyar’ or “Eastard Mauryus” were possibly a branch of the Konkan Māuryas. For other suggestions, see JRAS., 1923, pp. 98-98.
Kshatriyas."¹ This is of the fourteenth century and little reliance can be placed upon it. But when the statements of Plutarch, Justin, Māmularā, and the Mysore inscriptions referred to by Rice, are read together they seem to suggest that the first Maurya did conquer a considerable portion of trans-Vindhyan India.

Whatever we may think of Chandragupta’s connection with Southern India, there can be no doubt that he pushed his conquests as far as Surāshtra in Western India. The Junāgadh Rock Inscription of the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman refers to his Rashtriya or High Commissioner, Pushyāgupta, the Vaiśya, who constructed the famous Sudarśāna Lake.²

The Seleukid War.

We learn from Justin³ that when Chandragupta was in possession of India Seleukos (Seleucus), a general of Alexander, was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleukos was the son of Antiochus, a distinguished general of Philip of Macedon, and his wife Laodice. After the division of the Macedonian Empire among the followers of Alexander he carried on several wars in the east. He first took Babylon, and then, his strength being increased by this success, subdued the Bactrians. He next made an expedition into India. Appianus says⁴ that he crossed the Indus and waged war on Chandragupta, king of the Indians, until he made friends and entered into relations of marriage with him. Justin also

¹ Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 10.
² The subjugation of the whole of Northern India (Udchel) from the Himalayas to the sea is probably suggested by the following passage in the Kaṇṭhāya Arthashastra (IX.1), “Deśāḥ Prthivī; tasyāḥ Himavat Samudrāḥ taram Udchelnaḥ yojana-sāhara parimānum utiyak Chakravarti-Kshatrum.”
³ Watson’s Ed., p. 143.
observes that after making a league with Chandragupta, and settling his affairs in the east, Seleukos proceeded to join in the war against Antigonus. Plutarch supplies us with the information that Chandragupta presented 500 elephants to Seleukos. More important details are given by Strabo who says ¹:

"The Indians occupy (in part) some of the countries situated along the Indus, which formerly belonged to the Persians: Alexander deprived the Ariani of them, and established there settlements of his own. But Seleucus Nicator gave them to Sandrocottus in consequence of a marriage contract, and received in turn 500 elephants." "The Indians occupied a larger portion of Ariana, which they had received from the Macedonians." ²

It will be seen that the classical writers do not give us any detailed record of the actual conflict between Seleukos and Chandragupta. They merely speak of the results. There can be no doubt that the invader could not make much headway, and concluded an alliance which was cemented by a marriage contract. In his Aśoka ³ Dr. Smith rightly observes that the current notion that the Syrian king ‘gave his daughter in marriage’ to Chandragupta is not warranted by the evidence, which testifies merely to a ‘matrimonial alliance.’ The Indian Emperor obtained some of the countries situated along the Indus which formerly belonged to the Persians, together with the larger portion of Ariana, “giving in exchange the comparatively small recompense of 500 elephants.” Dr. Smith adduces good grounds for believing that the territory ceded by the Syrian king included the four satrapies: Aria, Arachosia, Gedrosia and the Paropamisadai, i.e., Herāt, Kandahār, Makrān and Kābul. The inclusion of the Kābul valley within the Maurya Empire is proved by the inscriptions of Aśoka, the grandson of

Chandragupta, which speak of the Yonas and Gándháras as vassals of the Empire.

**Megasthene.**

We learn from the classical writers that after the war the Syrian and Indian emperors lived on friendly terms. Athenaeus tells us that Chandragupta sent presents including certain powerful aphrodisiacs to the Syrian monarch.¹ Seleukos sent an envoy to the Maurya court, whose name was Megasthenes. Arrian tells us ² that Megasthenes originally lived with Sibyrtes the satrap of Arachosia. He was sent from thence to Pátaliputra where he often visited the Maurya Emperor, and wrote a history on Indian affairs. The work of Megasthenes has been lost. The fragments that survive in quotations by later authors like Strabo, Arrian, Diodorus and others, have been collected by Schwanbeck, and translated by McCrindle. As Professor Rhys Davids observes, Megasthenes possessed very little critical judgment, and was, therefore, often misled by wrong information received from others. But he is a truthful witness concerning matters which came under his personal observation. The most important piece of information supplied by him is, as Rhys Davids has pointed out, the description of Pátaliputra which Arrian quotes in Chapter X of his *Indica*:

"The largest city in India, named Palimbothra, is in the land of the Prasians, where is the confluence of the river Erannobaos ³ and the Ganges, which is the greatest of rivers. The Erannobaos would be third of the Indian rivers………………Megasthenes says that on one side where it is longest this city extends 80 stades (9½ miles)

---

¹ *In. Alex.*, p. 408.  
² Chisham's *Ed.*, p. 254.  
³ *Erannobaos* = *Hiranyaváha*, *i.e.*, the Sun. *Cf.* "*Anuścéph Pátaliputra.*"  
(Patañjali II. 1.2)
in length, and that its breadth is fifteen (1 1/4 miles); that the city has been surrounded with a ditch in breadth 6 plethra (606 feet), and in depth 30 cubits; and that its wall has 570 towers and 64 gates."

There were many other cities in the empire besides Pāṭaliputra. Arrian says "it would not be possible to record with accuracy the number of their cities on account of their multiplicity. Those which are situated near the rivers or the sea are built of wood; for if they were built of brick they could not long endure on account of the rain and because the rivers overflowing their banks fill the plains with water. But those which have been founded in commanding places, lofty and raised above the adjacent country, are built of brick and mortar." The most important cities of Chandragupta’s empire, besides the metropolis, were Taxila, Ujjain and Kausāmbī.

Aelian gives the following account of the palace of Chandragupta. "In the Indian royal palace where the greatest of all the kings of the country resides, besides much else which is calculated to excite admiration, and with which neither Susa, nor Ecbatana can vie (for, methinks, only the well-known vanity of the Persians could prompt such a comparison), there are other wonders besides. In the parks tame peacocks are kept, and pheasants which have been domesticated; there are shady groves and pasture grounds planted with trees, and branches of trees which the art of the woodsman has deftly interwoven; while some trees are native to the soil, others are brought from other parts, and with their beauty enhance the charms of the landscape. Parrots are natives of the country, and keep hovering about the king and wheeling round him, and vast though their numbers be, no Indian ever eats a parrot. The Brachmans honour them highly.

1 Cf. Patañjali, IV. 3.2., "Pāṭaliputraḥ prasādāḥ Pāṭaliputraḥ prakāra śi."
above all other birds—because the parrot alone can imitate human speech. Within the palace grounds are artificial ponds in which they keep fish of enormous size but quite tame. No one has permission to fish for these except the king's sons while yet in their boyhood. These youngsters amuse themselves while fishing in the unruffled sheet of water and learning how to sail their boats."

The imperial palace probably stood close to the modern village of Kumrahār. The unearthing of the ruins of the Maurya pillar-hall and palace near Kumrahār, said to have been built on the model of the throne room and palace of Darius at Persepolis, has led Dr. Spooner to propound the theory that the Mauryas were Zoroastrians. Dr. Smith observes that the resemblance of the Maurya buildings with the Persian palace at Persepolis is not yet definitely established. Besides, as Professor Chanda observes, "Ethnologists do not recognize high class architecture as test of race, and in the opinion of experts the buildings of Darius and Xerxes at Persepolis are not Persian in style, but are mainly dependent on Babylonian models and bear traces of the influence of Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor."

We learn from Strabo 4 that the king usually remained within the palace under the protection of female guards (cf. stri gaṇair dhanvibhiḥ of the Arthaśāstra) and appeared in public only on four occasions, viz., in time of war: to sit in his court as a judge; to offer sacrifice; and to go on hunting expeditions.

Chandragupta's Government.

Chandragupta was not only a great soldier and conqueror, he was a great administrator. Megasthenes, the

1 McGrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, pp. 141-62.
Greek ambassador at his court, has left detailed accounts of his system of government. The edicts of his grandson Ashoka and the Arthashastra attributed to his minister Kautilya confirm in many respects the particulars of the organisation of the empire given by the distinguished envoy.

The supreme Government consisted of two main parts:

1. The Rāja, and
2. the "Councillors" and "Assessors" (Mahāmātras, and Amātyas or Sachivas).

The Rāja or sovereign was the head of the state. He had military, judicial, legislative, as well as executive functions. We have already seen that one of the occasions when he left his palace was war. He considered plans of military operations with his Senāpati.

He also sat in his court to administer justice. "He remains there all day thus occupied, not suffering himself to be interrupted even though the time arrives for attending to his person. This attention to his person consists of friction with pieces of wood, and he continues to listen to the cause, while the friction is performed by four attendants who surround him." Kautilya says, "when in the court, he (the king) shall never cause his petitioners to wait at the door, for when a king makes himself inaccessible to his people and entrusts his work to his immediate officers, he may be sure to engender confusion in business, and to cause thereby public disaffection, and himself a prey to his enemies. He shall, therefore, personally attend to the business of gods, of heretics, of Brāhmaṇas learned in the Vedas, of cattle, of sacred places, of minors, the aged, the afflicted, the helpless and of women;—all this in order

---

1 Cf. Strabo, XV. i; and Kautilya, Bk. X. 2 Kautilya, p. 38.
(of enumeration) or according to the urgency or pressure of those works. All urgent calls he shall hear at once."

As to the king’s legislative function we should note that Kauṭilya calls him “dharma-pravartaka,” and includes Rājasāsana among the sources of law. As instances of royal “Śāsānas” or rescripts may be mentioned the Edicts of Aśoka, the famous grandson of Chandragupta.

Among executive functions of the king, our authorities mention the posting of watchmen, attending to the accounts of receipts and expenditure, appointment of ministers, priests and superintendents, correspondence with the Mantriparishad, collection of the secret information gathered by spies, reception of envoys, etc.

Kauṭilya holds that Rajatva (sovereignty) is possible only with assistance. A single wheel can never move. Hence the king shall employ Sachivas and hear their opinion. The Sachivas or Amātyas of Kauṭilya correspond to the “seventh caste” of Megasthenes which assisted the king in deliberating on public affairs. This class was small in number, but in wisdom and justice excelled all the others.

The most important amongst the Sachivas or Amātyas were undoubtedly the Mantrins or High Ministers, probably corresponding to the Mahāmātras of Aśoka’s Rock Edict VI, and the “advisers of the king” referred to by Diodorus (II. 41). They were selected from those Amātyas whose character had been tested under all kinds of allurements. They were given the highest salary,

---

1. Bk. III, Chap. I.
2. Kauṭilya, Bk. I, Ch. XVI; XVIII; Bk. VIII, Ch. I. Cf. Aśoka’s Rock Edict III (regulation about ṣīṣa-pancaśi and ṣīṣa-dhārayastā), VI (appointment of high officials), VI (relations with the Parīchād, and collection of information from the Paśūasāla), and XIII (diplomatic relations with foreign powers).
5. Sarvopadā śadābhān Mantrināḥ kuryāt.—Arthaśāstra, p. 17.
vis., 48,000 pañas per annum. They assisted the king in examining the character of the Amatyas who were employed in ordinary departments. All kinds of administrative measures were preceded by consultation with three or four of them. In works of emergency (ātyāyika kārye) they were summoned along with the Mantriparishad. They exercised a certain amount of control over the Imperial Princes. They accompanied the king to the battle-field, and gave encouragement to the troops. Kautilya was evidently one of these Mantrins. Another minister (or Pradeshtṛi ?) was apparently Maniyatappo, a Jatiilian, who helped the king to “confer the blessings of peace on the country by extirpating marauders who were like unto thorns.” That there were at times more than one Mantrin is proved by the use of the plural Mantrināḥ.

In addition to the Mantrins there was the Mantriparishad or Assembly of Imperial Councillors. The existence of the Parishad as an important element of the Maurya constitution is proved not only by the Arthasastra but by the third and sixth Rock Edicts of Aśoka. The members of the Mantriparishad were not identical with the Mantrins. In several passages of Kautilya’s Arthasastra the Mantrins are sharply distinguished from the Mantriparishad. The latter evidently occupied an inferior position. Their salary was only 12,000 pañas, whereas the salary of a Mantrin was 48,000. They do not appear to have been consulted on ordinary occasions, but were summoned along with the Mantrins when Ātyāyika kārya, i.e., works of emergency had to be transacted. The king was to be guided by the decision of the majority (Bhūyishṭhāḥ). They also attended the

---

1 Ibid, p. 247.  
2 Ibid, pp. 26, 28.  
3 Ibid, p. 333.  
5 Turnour’s Mahāvaishāsa, p. xiii.  
6 Ibid, p. 16.  
7 Ibid, p. 29. Cf. Aśoka’s Rock Edict VI.  
8 Ibid, p. 166.  
king at the time of the reception of envoys (p. 45). From the passage "Mantriparishadāṃ dvādaśamātyān kurvīta," it appears that the Parishad used to be recruited from all kinds of Amātyas (not necessarily from Mantrins). From Kauṭilya’s denunciation of a king with a “Kshudraparishad” (p. 259), his rejection of the views of the Mānasavas, Bārhaspatyas and the Anuṣanasas, his preference for an “Akshudra-parishad,” and his reference to Indra’s Parishad of a thousand Rishis, it may be presumed that he wanted to provide for the needs of a growing empire, and prevailed upon his master to constitute a fairly big assembly.

Besides the Mantrins and the Mantriparishad, there was another class of Amātyas who filled the great administrative and judicial appointments.¹ Kauṭilya says (p. 17) that the “dharma-padhāsuddha” Amātyas should be employed in civil² and criminal³ courts; the “artha-padhāsuddha” Amātyas should be employed as Samāhārī (“Chancellor of the Exchequer and Minister of the Interior”) and Samādbhātri (High Treasurer and Keeper of Stores), the “kāmopadhāsuddha” Amātyas should be appointed to superintend the pleasure grounds, the “bhaya-padhāsuddha” Amātyas should be appointed to immediate service (āsanna kārya), while those who are proved impure should be employed in mines, timber and elephant forests,⁴ and manufactories. Untried Amātyas were to be employed in ordinary departments (sāmānya adhikaraṇa). Persons endowed with the qualifications

¹ Cf. the Konars-Sukhvas of the Junagadh Rock Inscription of Rudrādīnasa.
² Civil (Dharmasthāla) Courts were established “in the cities of Saṅgrahāya (in the midst of a collection of ten villages), Dṛgāgāmbha (in the centre of four hundred villages), Saṁhitā (in the centre of eight hundred villages), and at places where districts met (Janapadāraṇāyikā),” and consisted of three Dharmasthālas and three Amātyas.
³ A Criminal (Kasaṅgaśāthana) Court consisted of 8 Amātyas or 3 Pradakṣhyāsa.
⁴ Cf. Nāgavana of Pillar Edict V
required in an Amāṭya (Amāṭya sampadopeta) were appointed Nisṛṣḥṭārthāḥ or Ministers Plenipotentiary, Lekhakas or Ministers of Correspondence, and Adhyakshas or Superintendents.

The statements of Kaṇṭīlya regarding the employment of Amāṭyas as the chief executive and judicial officers of the realm, are confirmed by the classical writers. Strabo, for example, observes,¹ "the seventh caste consists of counsellors and assessors (Symbouloi and Synedroi) of the king. To these persons belong the offices of state, tribunals of justice, and the whole administration of affairs." Arrian also says, "from them are chosen their rulers, governors of provinces, deputies, treasurers, generals, admirals, controllers of expenditure; and superintendents of agriculture."

The Adhyakshas who formed the pivot of the Maurya administration, are evidently referred to by Strabo as Magistrates in the following passage:

"Of the Magistrates, some have the charge of the market,² others of the city, others of the soldiery." Some have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, and inspect the closed reservoirs, from which water is distributed by canals, so that all may have an equal use of it. These persons have charge also of the hunters, and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either. They collect the taxes, and superintend the occupations connected with land, as wood-cutters, carpenters, workers in brass, and miners. They superintend the public roads, and place a pillar at every ten stadia to indicate the by-ways and distances. Those who have charge of the city (astynomoi) are divided into six bodies.

² "District" according to the Cambridge History of India, I, 417.
³ Cf. the Durya-dakṣya-dasya-makhyas of Kaṇṭīlya, bk. XIII, Cha. III and V.
⁴ i.e., the district officials (Agronomoi).
of five each. Next to the Magistrates of the city is a third body of governors, who have the care of military affairs. This class also consists of six divisions each composed of five persons."

The Magistrates in charge of the city and those in charge of military affairs are evidently the same as the Nagarādhyaśas and Balādhyaśas of the Arthasāstra. Dr. Smith remarks, "the Boards described by Megasthene as in charge of the business of the capital and the army are unknown to the author (Kauṭiliya), who contemplated each such charge as the duty of a single officer. The creation of the Boards may have been an innovation effected by Chandragupta personally." But the historian overlooks the fact that Kauṭiliya distinctly says, "Bahu-mukhyam anityam chādhikaraṇam śāpayet," each department shall be officered by several temporary heads; "Adhyakṣaḥ Śankhyāyaka-Lekhaka-Rūpadāraka-Nivigrāhak-ottarādhyaśa-sakhāḥ karmāṇi kuryuḥ." Evidently Dr. Smith notices only the Adhyakṣas but ignores the existence of the Uttarādhyaśas and others. As in regard to the Arthasāstra Smith notices only the

---

1 Each body was responsible for one of the following departments, viz., (1) the mechanical arts, (2) foreign residenta, (3) registration of births and deaths, (4) sales, exchanges, weights and measures, (5) supervision of manufactured articles and (6) collection of tithes on sales.

2 Each division or Board was responsible for one of the following departments, viz., the navy, transport and commissariat (cf. Vīshāl Kauṭiliya, Bk. X, Ch. IV), the infantry, the cavalry, the chariots and the elephants. In the Śāntiparva the divisions are stated to be six (III. 38) or eight (LIX. 41-42).


5 Arthasāstra, 1919, p. 69. On page 57 we have the following passage—Hastya-nava-ratha-padāstam-śeṣaka-mukhyam-avasthāpaṇey, i.e., elephants, cavalry, chariots, and infantry shall each be placed under many chiefs,
Adhyakshas, so in regard to the classical accounts he takes note only of the Boards, but ignores the chiefs who are expressly mentioned in two passages,\textsuperscript{1} \textit{viz.}—

"One division is associated with the \textit{Chief Naval Superintendent}," "another (division) is associated with the \textit{person who has the charge of the bullock-teams}." The Chief Naval Superintendent and the Person in Charge of the Bullock-teams, doubtless, correspond to the Nāvadhyaksha and Go'adhyaśka of the Arthaśāstra. It is a mistake to think that the Nāvadhyaksha of the early Hindu period was a purely civil official, for he was responsible for the destruction of Himavānas, and the Mahābhārata (XII. lxx. 41-42) clearly refers to the navy as one of the \textit{āṅgas} of the Royal Forces. The civil duties of the Nāvadhyaksha have their counterpart in those of Megasthenes' Admiral relating to the letting out of ships on hire for the transport both of passengers and merchandize" (Strabo XV. 1. 46).

The central popular assemblies like those that existed among the Liechehavis, Mallas, Śākyas and other Saṅghas had no place in the Maurya constitution. The custom of summoning a great assembly of Grāmikas seems also to have fallen into disuse.

\textbf{Provincial Government.}

The Empire was divided into a number of provinces, because "no single administration could support the Atlantean load." The exact number of provinces in Chandragupta's time is unknown. In the time of his grandson Aśoka there were at least five, \textit{viz.}:

1. Uttarāpatha\textsuperscript{2} … capital, Taxila
2. Avanti raṭṭha\textsuperscript{3} … " Ujjayinī

\textsuperscript{1} H. & F. Strabo, III, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{2} Divyāvadāna, p. 407.
\textsuperscript{3} Mahābodhīvamsa, p. 88.
3. Dakshinapatha ... capital, Savarapagiri (?)
4. Kaliuga ... Tosali
5. Prachya (Prasii) ... Pataliputra

Of these only the first two and the last one can be said, with any amount of certainty, to have formed parts of Chandragupta’s Empire. But, it is not altogether improbable that Dakshinapatha, too, was one of Chandragupta’s provinces. The outlying provinces were ruled by princes of the blood royal who were styled Kumāras. We learn from Kautilya’s Arthashastra (p. 247) that the salary of a Kumāra was 12,000 pānas per annum.

The Home Provinces, i.e., Prachya and the Madhyadesha, were directly ruled by the Emperor himself with the assistance of Mahāmātras stationed in important cities like Pataliputra, Kausambi, etc.

Besides the Imperial Provinces Maurya India included a number of territories which enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy. Arrian refers to cities which enjoyed a democratic Government.1 Kautilya (p. 378) refers to a number of Sanghas, e.g., Kamboja, Surāshtra, etc. The Kambojas find prominent mention as a separate unit even in the Thirteenth Rock Edict of Aśoka. That Surāshtra was autonomous in the time of Aśoka seems probable from Rudradāman’s inscription at Junāgadh which refers to its Rajā, the Yavana Tushāspa, the contemporary and vassal of Aśoka. The Yavanarāja was probably a Greek chief of the North-West who was appointed Mukhya of the Surāshtra Sangha by Aśoka, just as Rājā Mānsingh of Amber was appointed Sūradāra of Bengal by Akbar. His title of Rājā probably indicates that he enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy. His relations with Aśoka remind us of the relationship subsisting between the Rājā of the Śākya state and Pasenadi. In the time of the first

1 Chinneck, Arrian, p. 413.
Maurya Surāśṭra had an officer named Pushyagupta, the Vaiśya, who is described as a Rāṣṭriya of Chandra-
gupta. In the Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part I, p. 18,
the word Rāṣṭriya was taken to mean a brother-in-law.
Kielhorn, however, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III,
p. 46, took the term to mean a provincial governor. This
meaning does not seem to be quite satisfactory because
we have already seen that Surāśṭra was very probably an
autonomous vassal state, and not an Imperial Province.
A Rāṣṭriya seems to have been a sort of Imperial High
Commissioner, and the position of Pushyagupta in Surāś-
ṭra was probably like that of Lord Cromer in Egypt.
Neither the Arthaśāstra nor the Edicts of Aśoka mention
any class of officials called Rāṣṭriya. It is, however,
probable, that the Rāṣṭriya was identical with the
Rāṣṭrapāla whose salary was equal to that of a
Kumāra.¹

**Overseers and Spies.**

The classical writers refer to a class of men called
Overseers (Episkopoi) who “overlook what is done through-
out the country and in the cities, and make reports to
the king where the Indians are ruled by a king, or the magis-
trates where the people have a democratic government.”²
Strabo calls this class of men the Ephori or Inspectors.
“They are,” says he, “intrusted with the superintendence
of all that is going on, and it is their duty to report privately
to the king...The best and the most faithful persons are
appointed to the office of Inspector.”³ The Overseers
of Arrian and the Inspectors of Strabo probably corre-
pond either to the Pradeshṭris or the Gūḍha-Purushas of

¹ Arthaśāstra, p. 247. For Rāṣṭriya, see also Mbb. XII. 86. 12; 87. 9.
² Chinamock, Arrian, p. 413.
³ H. & F., Strabo, III, p. 103.
the Arthasastra. Dr. Thomas derives the word Pradeshtri from Pradeśa which means "report" by the rule of Pāṇini, II. 2. 15 (Trījākābhyaśā kartari).

Strabo tells us that the City Inspectors employed as their co-adjutors the city courtesans; and the Inspectors of the Camp, the women who followed it. The employment of women of easy virtue as spies is also alluded to by Kauṭilya. According to him there were two groups of spies, *vis.*:

1. Samsthā₃, consisting of Kāpaṭika, Udāsthita, Gṛhaṃpatika, Vaiḍekha and Taṇḍa, *i.e.*, fraudulent disciples, recluses, householders, merchants and ascetics.

2. Saṃchārāḥ, including Satri, Tikshṭa and Rashada, *i.e.*, class-mates, firebrands, and poisoners, and certain women described as Bhikṣukts, Parivraṅjkās, Muṇḍas and Vṛishalis. It is to the last class, *vis.*, the Vṛishalis that Strabo evidently refers. We have explicit references to courtesan (Pumśhali, veśya, rūpajīva) spies on pp. 221, 249, 316 of the Arthasastra.

**Care of Foreigners.**

It is clear from the accounts of Diodorus (II. 42) and Strabo (XV. 1. 50) that the Maurya government took special care of foreigners. "Among the Indians officers are appointed even for foreigners, whose duty is to see that no foreigner is wronged. Should any one of them lose his health, they send physicians to attend him, and take care of him otherwise, and if he dies they bury him, and deliver over such property as he leaves to his relatives. The judges also decide cases in which foreigners are concerned with the greatest care, and come down sharply on those who take unfair advantage of them."

---

1. JEAS., 1915, p. 97.
2. Cf. Lǎsůra, Im, No. 1900.
VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION

Village Administration.

The administrative and judicial business of villages was carried on by the Grāmikas¹ who were, no doubt, assisted by the Grāmavṛddhhas² or village elders. The omission of the Grāmika from the list of salaried officials given in Bk. V, Ch. III of the Arthaśāstra is significant. It probably indicates that the Grāmika was not a paid servant of the crown, but an elected official of the villagers. The king’s servant in the village was the Grāmabhrītaka.³ Above the Grāmika were the Gopa,⁴ who looked after 5 or 10 villages, and the Sthānīka who controlled one quarter of a janapada or district. The work of these officers was supervised by the Samāhatri with the help of the Pradeshvītras (pp. 142, 217).

The Last Days of Chandragupta.

Jaina tradition avers that Chandragupta was a Jaina and that, when a great famine occurred, he abdicated and repaired to Mysore where he died. Two inscriptions on the north bank of the Kāverī near Seringapatam of about 900 A.D., describe the summit of the Kalabppu Hill, i.e., Chandragiri, as marked by the footprints of Bhadravāhu and Chandragupta Munipati.⁵ Dr. Smith observes,⁶ “The Jain tradition holds the field, and no alternative account exists.” Chandragupta died about 298 or 297 B.C., after a reign of 24 years.

If the Parishishtaparvan of Hemachandra is to be believed Chandragupta had a queen named Durdharā who

³ Pp. 175, 248.
⁴ The Gopas proper do not find mention in early epigraphs, but Lüders, Ins. No. 1266, mentions “Sāṇāgopas.”
⁵ Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, pp. 8-4.
⁶ The Oxford History of India, p. 76.
became the mother of Bindusāra, the son who succeeded him on throne. In the absence of corroborative evidence, however, the name of the queen cannot be accepted as genuine.

II. The Reign of Bindusāra.

Chandragupta Maurya was succeeded in or about the year 298 B.C. by his son Bindusāra Amitrāghāṭā. The name or title Amitrāghāṭa (slayer of foes) is a restoration in Sanskrit 1 of the Amitrachates of Athenaios, and Allitrochades of Strabo, who is stated to have been the son of Sandrocottus. Dr. Fleet prefers the rendering Amitrakhaḍa or devourer of enemies, which is said to occur as an epithet of Indra. 2 From Aśoka’s Rock Edict VIII (Kāśi Text) it appears probable that Bindusāra, as well as other predecessors of Aśoka, used the style Devānāṃpiya.

If Hemachandra and Tāranātha are to be believed, Kauṭilya or Chānaka continued to serve as minister for some time after the accession of Bindusāra. 3 “Chānaka,” says Tāranātha, “one of his (Bindusāra’s) great lords, procured the destruction of the nobles and kings of sixteen towns, and as king he made himself master of all the territory between the eastern and western seas.” The conquest of the territory between the eastern and western seas has been taken by some scholars to refer to the

1 Cf. Lasen, and Cusen. (Bhīṣen Topes, p. 92). The term Amitrāghāṭa occurs in Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya, iii. 2. 2. Dr. Jull Charpentier observes (in Lo Monds Orients, quoted in Calcutta Review, May-June, 1926, p. 300), “that the Greek word Αμιτραχατος as a synonym of Bindusāra, should be rendered Amitrāghāṭa seems clear not only from the Mahābhāṣya but also from the royal title amitrāḥya kauṭā in Alt. Br. VIII. 17.”

2 JRAS., 1903, p. 24.

annexation of the Deccan. But we should not forget that already in the time of Chandragupta the Maurya Empire extended from Surāshtra to Bengal (Gangaridāe), i.e., from the western to the eastern sea. Tāranātha’s statement need mean nothing more than the suppression of a general revolt. No early tradition expressly connects the name of Bindusāra with the conquest of the Deccan. The story of the subjugation of sixteen towns may or may not be true, but we are told in the Divyāvadāna that at least one town of note, viz., Taxila, revolted during the reign of Bindusāra. The king is said to have despatched Aśoka there. While the prince was nearing Taxila with his troops the people came out to meet him, and said “we are not opposed to the prince, nor even to king Bindusāra, but the wicked ministers (Dushāṃātyāh) insult us.” The high-handedness of the Maurya officials in the outlying provinces is alluded to by Aśoka himself in his Kālinga Edict. Addressing his Mahāmātras the Emperor says:

“All men are my children: and, just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same for all men. You, however, do not grasp this truth to its full extent. Some individual, perchance, pays heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well established. Again, it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture, and when the result is his imprisonment without due cause, many other people are

1 Cf. Smith, III, p. 149, JRAS, 1919, 598; Jayaswal, The Empire of Bindusāra, JBOAS, II, 82.
2 See, however, Schramaṇām, JRAS, 1923, p. 96. “My Gurus Guru has written in his commentary on a Śāṅkara work that the Tuj-a-nālā was established by the son of Chandragupta,” perhaps Tuliyan (Tuli-śīnu).
3 Cowell and Neill’s Ed., p. 371.
deeply grieved. In such a case you must desire to do justice...and for this purpose, in accordance with the Law of Piety, I shall send forth in rotation every five years such persons (Mahāmātras) as are of mild and temperate disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life, who knowing this my purpose will comply with my instructions. From Ujjain, however, the Prince for this purpose will send out a similar body of officials, and will not over-pass three years. *In the same way from Taxila.*"

**Foreign Relations.**

In his relations with the Hellenistic powers Bindusāra pursued a pacific policy. We learn from the classical writers (e.g., Strabo) that the king of Syria despatched to his court an ambassador named Deimachos. Pliny¹ tells us that (Ptolemy) Philadelphos sent an envoy named Dionysios. Dr. Smith, however, points out that it is uncertain whether Dionysios presented his credentials to Bindusāra or to his son and successor, Aśoka. The same historian says ² that Patrocles, an officer who served under both Seleukos and his son, sailed in the Indian seas and collected much geographical information which Strabo and Pliny were glad to utilize. Athenaios tells an anecdote of private friendly correspondence between Antiochos, king of Syria, and Bindusāra which indicates that the Indian monarch communicated with his Hellenistic contemporaries on terms of equality and friendliness. We are told that Amitrochates (Bindusāra), the king of the Indians, wrote to Antiochos asking that king to buy and send him sweet wine, dried figs, and a sophist, and Antiochos replied: we shall send you the figs and the wine, but in Greece the laws forbid a sophist to be sold.³

¹ McGrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 108.
³ McGrindle, Irr. Alex., p. 409.
Bindusāra's Family.

Bindusāra had many children besides Aśoka, the son who succeeded him on the throne. We learn from a passage of the Fifth Rock Edict in which the duties of the Dharma-mahāmātrás are described, that Aśoka had many brothers and sisters. The Divyāvadāna mentions two of these brothers, namely, Susima and Vigatāśoka. The Ceylonese Chronicles seem also to refer to these two princes though under different names, calling the former Sumana and the latter Tishya. Susima-Sumana is said to have been the eldest son of Bindusāra and a step-brother of Aśoka, while Vigatāśoka-Tishya is reputed to have been the youngest son of Bindusāra and a uterine brother of Aśoka, born of a Brahmana girl named Subhadrāngī. Hiuen Tsang mentions a brother of Aśoka named Mahendra. Ceylonese tradition, however, represents the latter as a son of Aśoka.

Bindusāra died after a reign of 25 years according to the Purāṇas, and 28 years according to the Ceylonese Chronicles. According to Dr. Smith's chronology his reign terminated about 273 B.C.1 If the Ceylonese account be correct, the date of his death was 270 and not 273 B.C.

III. The Early Years of Aśoka.

Both the Divyāvadāna and the Ceylonese Chronicles agree that there was a fratricidal struggle after the death of Bindusāra. Aśoka is said to have overthrown his eldest stepbrother with the help of Rādhagupta whom he made his Agrāmātya (Chief Minister). Dr. Smith observes, 2 "the fact that his formal consecration or coronation (abhisheka)

1 Aśoka, p. 73.
2 The Oxford History of India, p. 93.
was delayed for some four years until 269 B. C., confirms the tradition that his succession was contested, and it may be true that his rival was an elder brother named Susima. In his Aśoka (third edition) published a few months later, he says, "it is possible that the long delay may have been due to a disputed succession involving much bloodshed, but there is no independent evidence of such a struggle." Mr. Jayaswal gives the following explanation for the delay in Aśoka's coronation: "It seems that in those days for obtaining royal abhisheka the age of 25 was a condition precedent. This seems to explain why Aśoka was not crowned for three or four years after accession."

Dr. Smith characterises the Ceylonese tales which relate that Aśoka slew many of his brothers as silly because Aśoka certainly had brothers and sisters alive in the seventeenth or eighteenth year of his reign, whose households were objects of his anxious care. But we should remember that the Fifth Rock Edict refers only to the female establishments of his brothers (olodhanesu bhātinam) as existing. This does not necessarily imply that the brothers also were alive. We should, however, admit that there is nothing to show, on the contrary, that the brothers were dead. The Fifth Rock Edict, in our opinion, proves nothing regarding the authenticity or untrustworthiness of the Ceylonese tradition.

The first four years of Aśoka's reign is, to quote the words which Dr. Smith uses in another connection, "one of the dark spaces in the spectrum of Indian history; vague speculation, unchecked by the salutary limitations of verified fact, is, at the best, unprofitable."

1 Mahāvṛatās, Geiger's translation, p. 28.
2 JBORS, 1917, p. 438.
3 There were other kinds of abhisheka also, e.g., those of Yuvaraṇa, Kumāra, and Sañgatī.
4 EHI, p. 155.
Like his predecessors Aśoka assumed the title of Devānampiya. He generally described himself as Devānampiya Piyaḍasi. The name Aśoka is found only in literature, and in two ancient inscriptions, viz., the Máski Edict of Aśoka himself, and the Junāgadh inscription of the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman I. The name Dharmāśoka is found in one Medieval epigraph, viz., the Sārnath inscription of Kumāradēvi.

During the first thirteen years of his reign Aśoka seems to have carried on the traditional Maurya policy of expansion within India, and of friendly co-operation with the foreign powers, which was in vogue after the Seleukidian war. Like Chandragupta and Bindusāra he was aggressive at home but pacific abroad. The friendly attitude towards non-Indian powers is proved by the exchange of embassies and the employment of Yavana officials like Tushāṭha. In India, however, he played the part of a conqueror. The Divyāvadāna credits him with the suppression of a revolt of Taxila. In the thirteenth year of his reign (eight years after consecration) he effected the conquest of Kalinga. We do not know the exact limits of this kingdom in the time of Aśoka. But if the Sanskrit epics and Purāṇas are to be believed, it extended to the river Vaitarani in the north, the Amarakaṭaka Hills in the west and Mahendragiri in the south.

An account of the Kalinga war and its effects is given in Rock Edict XIII. We have already seen that Kalinga formed a part of the Magadhan dominions in the time of the Nandas. Why was it necessary for Aśoka to

---

2 The epithet "Piyaḍansi" is sometimes prefixed to Chandragupta also (Bhāndarkar, Aśoka, p. 5; Holtzsch, ChI, Vol. I, p. xxx).
3 Dharmāśoka-narādhipatya samaye śrī Dharmāchakre Jina yādūrāyakaśaḥ kahitaśa pumaraṇyaśaḥ caḥkaraṁ itopyadbhūtāṁ.
4 Māh., III. 114. 4.
5 Kūraṇa Purāṇa II. 39. 9.
6 Rāgāvahāda IV. 38-43; VI. 53-54.
reconquer it? The question admits of only one answer, viz., that Kalinga severed its connection with Magadha after the fall of the Sndas. If the story of a general revolt in the time of Bindusāra be correct then it is not unlikely that Kalinga, like Taxila, threw off the allegiance of Magadha during the reign of Bindusāra. It appears, however, from Pliny who probably based his account on the Indica of Megasthenes, that Kalinga was already an independent kingdom in the time of Chandragupta. In that case there can be no question of a revolt in the time of Bindusāra. Pliny says, 1 "the tribes called Calingae are nearest the sea...the royal city of the Calingae is called Parthalis. Over their king 60,000 foot soldiers, 1,000 horsemen, 700 elephants keep watch and ward in 'procinct of war.'" 2

The Kalinga kings probably increased their army considerably during the period which elapsed from the time of Megasthenes to that of Aśoka, because during the war with Aśoka the casualties exceeded 250,000. It is, however, possible that the huge total included not only combatants but also non-combatants. The existence of a powerful kingdom so near their borders, with a big army 'in procinct of war,' could not be a matter of indifference to the kings of Magadha. Magadha learnt to

---

1 Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 338.
2 If, as is probable, Kalinga included at this time the neighbouring country of Aśmaka, then Parthalis may be the same as "Punti." For an interesting account of Kalinga and its early capitals Dantakaṁ and Tassali, see Sylvain Lévi, "Pré-Aryen et Pré-Dravidian dans l'Inde," J.A., juillet-Septembre 1923; and Indian Antiquary, 1926 (May), pp. 94-98. "The appellation of Kalinga, applied to Indians throughout the Malay world, attests the brilliant rôle of the men of Kalinga in the diffusion of Hindu civilization." Not far from the earliest capital (Pallēr-Pundara-Dantakaṁ) lay the epistatium, "where vessels bound for the Golden Peninsula ceased to hug the shore and sailed for the open sea." Note, in this connection, the name Hsi-ling (Po-ling, Kalinga) applied by the Chinese to Java (Takakur 1-teing, p. xlvii) an island which was known by its Sanskrit name to Ptolemy (150 A.D.) and even to the Rāmāyaṇa (Kishk, 40, 30).
her cost what a powerful Kalinga meant, in the time of Khāravela.

We learn from the Thirteenth Rock Edict that Aśoka made war on the Kalinga country and annexed it to his empire. "One hundred and fifty thousand persons were carried away captive, one hundred thousand were slain, and many times that number died." Violence, slaughter, and separation from their beloved ones befell not only to combatants, but also to the Brāhmanas, ascetics, and householders.

The conquered territory was constituted a viceroyalty under a prince of the royal family stationed at Tosali, apparently situated in the Puri district. The Emperor issued special edicts prescribing the principles on which both the settled inhabitants and the border tribes should be treated. These two edicts are preserved at two sites, now called Dhauli (in Puri) and Jaugada (in Gañjam). They are addressed to the Mahāmātras or High Officers at Tosali and Samaṇa. In these documents the Emperor makes the famous declaration "all men are my children," and charges his officers to see that justice is done to the people.

The conquest of Kalinga was a great landmark in the history of Magadha, and of India. It marks the close of that career of conquest and aggrandisement which was ushered in by Bimbisāra's annexation of Aṅga. It opens a new era—an era of peace, of social progress, of religious propaganda and at the same time of political stagnation

1 Tosali (variant Tolum) was the name of a country as well as a city. Lévi points out that the irectaka refers to the country (Janapada) of "Amīta-Tosala" in the Daśasimhapatna, "where stands a city named Tosala." In Brāhmaical literature Tosala is constantly associated with (South) Kosala and is sometimes distinguished from Kalinga. The form Tosale occurs in the Geography of Ptolemy. Some mediavul inscriptions (Ep. Ind. IX. 266; XV. 3) refer to Daśasimha Tosala and Uttara Tosala.

2 For the identification of Somaṇa, see Ind. Ant., 1928, pp. 66 ff.
and, perhaps, of military inefficiency during which the martial spirit of imperial Magadha was dying out for want of exercise. The era of Digvijaya was over, the era of Dhammavijaya was about to begin.

We should pause here to give an account of the extent of Asoka’s dominions and the manner in which they were administered before the Emperor embarked on a new policy.

Asoka mentions Magadha, Pāṭaliputra, Khalatikapavata (Barabar Hills), Kosambi, Lunminigāma, Kaliṅga (including Tosali, Samāpā and Khepīṅgala or the Jaugada Rock), Āṭavi (the forest tract of Central India), Suvarṇagiri, Isila, Ujjayinī and Takshaśilā expressly as being among those places which were under his rule.

Beyond Takshaśilā the empire stretched as far as the confines of the realm of “Aṁtiyako Yonarāja” and included the wide territory round Shāhbazgarhi and Mānsahra inhabited by the Yonas, Kambojas and the Gandhāras. The exact situation of the Yona territory has not yet been determined. The Mahāvamsa evidently refers to it and its chief city Alasanda which Geiger identifies with the town of Alexandria founded by the Macedonian conqueror near Kābul.1 Kamboja, as we have already seen, corresponds to Rājapura or Rajaur near Punch in Kaśmir. The tribal territory of the Gandhāras at this time probably lay to the west of the Indus, and did not apparently include Takshaśilā which was ruled by a princely Viceroy, and was the capital of the province of Uttarāpatha.2 The capital of Trans-Indian Gandhāra was Pushkarāvatī.3

---

1 Geiger, Mahāvamsa, p. 194.
2 Cf. Kalinna Edict; Divyavānśa, p. 407, Rājaśokasy-ottarâpatha Takshaśilâ nagaraṇa, etc.
3 Cf. Curm. Let., 1918, p. 54.
The inclusion of Kaśmira within Aśoka’s empire is proved by the testimony of Huen Tsang’s Records ¹ and Kalhaṇa’s Rājatarāṅgini ²: Kalhaṇa says: “The faithful Aśoka, reigned over the earth. This king who had freed himself from sins and had embraced the doctrine of Jina, covered Sushkalātra and Vitastātra with numerous Stūpas. At the town of Vitastātra there stood within the precincts of the Dharmārāṇya Vihāra a Chaitya built by him, the height of which could not be reached by the eye. That illustrious king built the town of Srinagarī. This sinless prince after removing the old stuccoed enclosure of the shrine of Vijayeśvara built in its stead a new one of stone. He...erected within the enclosure of Vijayeśa, and near it, two temples which were called Aśokeśvara.” The description of Aśoka as a follower of Jina, i.e., Buddha, and the builder of numerous stūpas leaves no room for doubt that the great Maurya monarch is meant. We are told by Kalhaṇa himself that he is indebted for much of the above account to an earlier chronicler named Chhavillākara.

The inscriptions at Kālsi and those on the Rummindeī and the Nigālī Sāgar pillars prove the inclusion of the Dehra-Dūn District and the Tarāī within the limits of Aśoka’s Empire, while the monuments at Lalitapātan and Rāmpurwā attest his possession of the valley of Nepāl and the district of Champāran. Further evidence of the inclusion of the Himalayan region within Aśoka’s empire is furnished by Rock Edict XIII which refers to the Nāhapaṃtis of Nābbhaka, probably identical with Na-pei-keś of FaHien,⁵ the birthplace of Krakuchchhanda Buddha, about 10 miles south or south-west of Kapilavastu.⁶

² I. 102-108.
³ Legge, 64.
According to Bühler Rock Edict XIII mentions two vassal tribes Viṣa and Vajri. Several scholars do not accept Bühler's reading, and substitute Visayamhi in its place. That is no doubt the reading of the Girnar text, but according to Professors Bhandarkar and Majumdar the Shāhbazgarhi and Mānsahra texts read Vishavajri. Kautūlya in his Arthasastra refers to the Vrijikas as a Saṅgha along with Kamboja and other states. It is not unlikely that Vrijika is identical with Vajri, and that like Kamboja, the Vrijikas were a vassal state within the Maurya Empire. The capital of the state was, of course, Vaiśāli. A tribe called Besatae is mentioned in the Periplus of the Erythrean sea and is located on the borders of the land of Thris, i.e., China. It is not altogether improbable that the Vishas of Aśoka's Edict are identical with the Besatae of the Periplus, and the names of the products Bisi and Mahābisi were derived from them. In the commentary on the Arthasastra it is stated that the twelve villages producing Bisi and Mahābisi are situated on the Himālayas.

We learn from the classical writers that the country of the Gangarides, i.e., Bengal, formed a part of the dominions of the king of the Prasii, i.e., Magadha, as early as the time of Agrammes, i.e., the last Nanda King. A

---

1 The Inscriptions of Aśoka, published by the University of Calcutta, Part I, p. 53.
2 P. 378.
3 Schoffer's Ed., p. 42.
4 Mentioned in the Arthasastra, p. 79.
5 Shasosati's translation, p. 91, n. 10.
6 For early references to Vāṭa, see Lévi "Pré-aryen et Pré-dravidien dans l'Inde." Several scholars find it mentioned in the Aitareya Aranyaka. But this is doubtful. Beddjaman brands it as an impure country and even Pāṇini excludes it from Ṛṣīvarā. The country was, however, aryanised before the Masaunahita which extends the eastern boundary of Aryanvaśa to the sea, and the Jain Prajñāpāna which ranks Aśa and Vāṭa in the first group of Aryan peoples.
7 McGerdrick, Inv. Alex., pp. 221, 231.
passage of Pliny clearly suggests that the “Palibothri” dominated the whole tract along the Ganges. That the Magadhan kings retained their hold on Bengal as late as the time of Aśoka is proved by the testimony of the Divyāvadāna and of Hiuen Tsang who saw Stūpas of that monarch near Tāmralipti and Kānasuvanā (in West Bengal), in Samatata (East Bengal) as well as in Pundravardhana (North Bengal). Kāmarūpa (Assam) seems to have lain outside the empire. The Chinese pilgrim saw no monument of Aśoka in that country.

We have seen that in the south the Maurya power, at one time, had probably penetrated as far as the Podiyil Hill in the Tinnevally district. In the time of Aśoka the Maurya frontier had receded probably to the Pennār river near Nellore as the Tamil Kingdoms are referred to as “Prachānta” or border states and are clearly distinguished from the Imperial dominions (Vijita or Rājavishaya), which stretched only as far south as the Chitaldurg District of Mysore. The major part of the Deccan was ruled by the viceregal princes of Suvarṇagiri and Tosali, the Mahāmatras of Isila and Samāpā and the officers in charge of the Āṭāvī or Forest Country (Edict XIII). But certain strips of territory were occupied by vassal tribes, e.g., the Andhras, Pulindas, Bhojas and Rāṣṭrikas. The word Pitinika mentioned in Rock Edicts V and XIII should, according to Prof. Bhandarkar, not be read as a

1. Ind. Ant., 1877, 399.
3. A clue to the location of this city is probably given by the inscriptions of the later Mauryas of Koṅkana and Khāndesh, apparently the descendants of the southern Vicerey (Op. Ind. III. 186). As these later Maurya inscriptions have been found at Vads in the north of the Thāgā District (Bomb. Gaz., Vol. I, Part II, p. 14) and at Waghil in Khāndesh (ibid 284), it is not unlikely that Suvarṇagiri was situated in that neighbourhood. Curiously enough there is actually in Khāndesh a place called Sengir. According to Hultsch (GII, p. xxxviii) Suvarṇagiri is perhaps identical with Kamakagiri in the Nīsāka’s dominions, south of Maski, and north of the ruins of Vijayānagara. Isila may have been the ancient name of Siddāpara.
separate name but as an adjective qualifying Rāṣṭrika (Edict V) and Bhoja (Edict XIII). The Professor draws our attention to certain passages in the Aṅguttara Nikāya where the term Pottanika occurs in the sense of one who enjoys property given by father. The Andhras and the Pulindas are, as we have already seen, mentioned in a passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. The Bhojas are also mentioned in that work as rulers of the south. Pliny, quoting probably from Megasthenes, says that the Andarara (Andhras) possessed numerous villages, thirty towns defended by walls and towers, and supplied their king with an army of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants. The earliest Andhra capital (Andhapura) was situated on the Telāvāna river which, according to Professor Bhandarkar, is either the modern Tel or Telingiri both flowing near the confines of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. The Pulindas are invariably associated with the Vindhyan region in the Purāṇas.

Pulinda Vindhya Pushika Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saba (Matsya, P. 114, 48).

Pulinda Vindhya Mulika Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saba (Vāyu, 55, 126).

Their capital Pulindanagara lay not far from Bhilsā and may have been identical with Rūpṇāth, the find-spot of one recension of Minor Rock Edict I.

The Bhojas and the Rāṣṭrikas were evidently the

1 III. 70 and 300.
2 Ind. Ant., 1919, p. 80. Other scholars, however, identify the Pottinikas with the Paṇḍharikas or natives of Paṇḍha, and some go so far as to suggest that they are the ancestors of the Śiṅhdeva rulers of Paṇḍha. See Wulstan, Asoka Text and Glossary, II. 113; also JSAS, 1923, 92.
4 In historical times the Andhras are found in possession of the Krishnā and Guntīr districts as we learn from the Mayindava plates and other records. The earliest capital of the Andhra country or “Andhrakāla” known from the inscriptions, is apparently Dhamākada or Basavāda. Kumbiraka of the Šatapatha inscriptions (C. 200 B.C.) is the earliest known ruler.
ancestors of the Mahābhojas and the Mahārathis of the Sātavāhana period. The Bhojas apparently dwelt in Berar and the Koṅkan, and the Rāṣṭrīkas in Mahārāṣṭra.

In the west Asoka's Empire extended to the Arabian Sea and embraced all the Aparāntas (Surāparaka, Nāsik, etc., according to the Mārkaṇḍeya P. 57. 49-52) including no doubt the vassal state or province of Surāṣṭra which was governed by the Yavana-rāja Tushāsptha with Girinagara (Girnar) as his capital. Dr. Smith says that the form of the name shows that the Yavana-rāja must have been a Persian, but according to this interpretation the Yavana Dhamma-deva, the Saka Ushavadāta (Rishabhadatta) and the Kushān Vasudeva must have been all native Hindus of India. If Greeks and other foreigners adopted Hindu names there is no wonder that some of them assumed Iranic appellations. There is, then, no good ground for assuming that Tushāsptha was not a Greek, but a Persian.

Having described the extent of Asoka's empire we now proceed to give a brief account of its administration. Asoka continued the Council government of his predecessors. There are references to the Emperor's dealings with the Parishā or Parishad in Rock Edicts III and VI. Senart took Parishā to mean Sāṅgha and Bühler understood by it the Committee of caste or sect. But Mr. Jayaswal has pointed out that the Parishā of the Edicts is the Mantriparishad of the Arthaśāstra. The inscriptions prove that Asoka retained also the system of Provincial Government existing under his forefathers. Tosali, Suvarṇagiri, Ujjayinī and Takṣashaṅkā were each under a prince of the blood royal (Kumāla or Ayaputa).
The Emperor and the Princes were helped by bodies (Nikāyā) of officials who fell under the following classes:—

1. The Mahāmātras and other Mukhyas.
2. The Rājukas.
3. The Pradeśikas or Prādeśikas.
4. The Yutas (the Yuktas of the Arthaśāstra, pp. 59, 65, 199, Rāmāyaṇa, VI. 127.34; Mbh. II. 55.18, Manu, VIII. 34; cf. the Raja-yuktas of the Śāntiparva 82.9-15).
5. Pulisā.
6. Paṭivedakā.
7. Vachabhūmikā.
8. Lipikaras.
10. Āyuktas.

There was a body of Mahāmātras in each great city and district of the empire. The inscriptions mention the Mahāmātras of Pāṭaliputra, Kauśāmbi, Tosali, Sāmpā, Suvarṇagiri and Isīla. In the Kālīṅga Edicts we have certain Mahāmātras distinguished by the term Nagala Viyohālakā. The Nagala Viyohālakā of the Edicts correspond to the Paura-vyāvahārikas of the Arthaśāstra (p. 20) and no doubt administered justice in cities. In Pillar Edict I mention is made of the Āśṭa Mahāmātras or the Wardens of the Marches, who correspond to the Antapālas of the Arthaśāstra (pp. 20, 247) and the Gopāris of the age of Skanda Gupta. Kauṭilya tells us that the salary of an Antapāla was equal to that of a Kumāra, a

1 Cf. also Arthaśāstra, pp. 16, 20, 58, 64, 218, 237-39.
2 Cf. also Nāgara-dhāraṇya Vyāvahārika, p. 55.
Paurava-vyāvahārika, a member of the Mantriparishad or a Rāṣṭrapāla (p. 247). In Edict XII mention is made of the Ithijhaka Mahāmātras who, doubtless, correspond to the Stry-adhyakshas (the Guards of the Ladies) of the Mahābhārata.

As to the Rājākas, Dr. Smith takes the word to mean a governor next below a Kumāra. Bühler identifies the Rājāka of the Aśokan inscriptions with the Rajjūka or the Rajjugāhaka amacheha of the Jātakas. Pillar Edict IV refers to the Rājūkas as officers "set over many hundred thousands of people," and charged with the duty of promoting the welfare of the Jōnapadas, to whom Aśoka granted independence in the award of honours and penalties. The reference to the award of penalties (Danda) probably indicates that the Rājūkas had judicial duties. In Rock Edict III as well as in Pillar Edict IV they are associated with the Yutas. Strabo refers to a class of Magistrates (Agronomoi) who "have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, have charge also of the hunters and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either." The measuring of the land connects those Magistrates with the Rajjugāhaka Amacheha of the Jātakas while the power of rewarding and punishing people connects them with the Rājūkas of Aśoka. It is probable, therefore, that the Agronomoi referred to by Strabo were identical with the Rājūkas and the Rajjugāhaka Amachehas. The Arthasastra (p. 234) refers to a class of officials called "Chora Rajjukas," but there is no reference to the Rajjukas proper, although on p. 60

---

1 IX. 29. 68, 90; XV. 29, 20; 23. 12.
2 Aśoka 3rd, p. 94.
3 The Social Organization in North-east India by Fick, translated by S. Maltr, pp. 148-151.
5 Cf. Maltr, Fick, pp. 148-149.
“Rajju” is mentioned in conjunction with “Chora Rajju.”

As regards the Pradeśikas or Pradeśikas, Senart, Kern and Bühler understood the term to denote local governors or local chiefs. Smith took it to mean District Officers. Hultzsch compares it with Pradeśikēsvaṇa of Kalhaṇa’s Rājatarangini (IV. 126). The word occurs only in the third Rock Edict where the functionaries in question are included with the Rājūkas and the Yutas in the ordinance of the Anusaṃyāna. Thomas derives the word from pradeśa which means report¹ by the rule of Pāṇini ṭṛisatkālīkhyāṁkārtarī (II. 2.15) and identifies the Pradeśikas or Pradesikas of the Edict with the Pradesātri of the Arthaśāstra. The most important functions of the Pradesātri were Balipragraha (collection of taxes, or suppression of recalcitrant chiefs), Kaṇṭakaśodhana (administration of criminal justice), Choramārgaṇa (tracking of thieves) and Adhyakṣhāṇām adhyakṣa purushānam cha niyamanām (checking superintendents and their men). They acted as intermediaries between the Samāhatri on the one hand and the Gopas, Sthānikas and Adhyakshas on the other.²

As to the Yutas or Yuktas, they are represented by Manu (VIII. 34) as the custodians of Praṇasṭādhigata dravya (lost property which was recovered). In the Arthaśāstra, too, they are mentioned in connection with Samudaya or state funds which they are represented as misappropriating. Hultzsch suggests that they were ‘secretaries’ employed for codifying royal orders in the office of the Mahāmātrās. The Pulisā or Agents are apparently identical with the Purushas or Rāja Purushas of the Arthaśāstra (pp. 59, 75). Hultzsch prefers to equate them with the Gāḍha-purushās and points out

¹ JRAS, 1916, p. 97, Arthaśāstra, p. 111.
² Cf. Arthaśāstra, pp. 142, 200, 217, 222.
that they were graded into high ones, low ones, and those of middle rank. They were placed in charge of many people (Pillar Edict VII) and controlled the Rājākas. The Paśīvedakā or Reporters are doubtless the Chāras referred to in Chap. 16 of the Arthaśāstra (p. 38), while the Vachabhūmikas or “Inspectors of cowpens” were evidently charged with the superintendence of “Vraja,” referred to in Chapter 24 (pp. 59-60). The Lipikaras are the royal scribes one of whom, Paḍa, is mentioned by name in Minor Rock Edict II. Dūtas or envoys are referred to in Rock Edict XIII. If Kauṭilya is to be believed, they were divided into three classes, viz., Nisṛṣhiṛthāḥ or Plenipotentiaries, Parimitārthāḥ or Chargés d’Affaires and Śasanaharas or conveyers of royal writ. The Ayuktas are local officials referred to only in the Kalinga Edicts.
THE MAURYA EMPIRE: THE ERA OF DHAMMAVIJAYA AND DECLINE.

1. Aśoka after the Kaliṅga War.

We have already seen that the Kaliṅga war opened a new epoch in the history of Magadha and of India. During the first thirteen years of his reign Aśoka was a typical Magadhan sovereign—the inheritor of the policy of Bimbisāra, of Mahāpadma and of Chandragupta—conquering peoples, suppressing revolt, annexing territory. After the Kaliṅga war all this is changed. The older political philosophy of Vassakāra and Kauṭilya gave way to a new state-craft inspired by the teaching of the sage of the Śākyas. Before proceeding to give an account of the remarkable change we should say a few words about the religious denominations of India and the condition of society during the reign of the great innovator.

In the days of Aśoka the people of India were divided into many sects of which the following were the most important:

1. The orthodox Deva-worshippers.
2. The Ājīvikas or the followers of Gosūla Māñjahirputta.
3. The Nirgranthas or Jainas, i.e., the followers of Niganṭha Nāṭaputta who is commonly called Māṇavīra or Vardhamāna.
4. The followers of Gautama Buddha Śākyamuni.

In Edict IV we have the following account of the prevailing state of society: "for a long period past, even for many hundred years, have increased the sacrificial slaughter of living creatures, the killing of animate beings, unseemly behaviour to relatives, unseemly behaviour to
Brāhmaṇas and ascetics (Śramaṇas)." The kings used to go out on so-called Vihāra-yātrās in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised. The people performed various ceremonies (maṅgala) on occasions of sickness, weddings of sons, the weddings of daughters, the birth of children, and departure on journeys. The womankind performed many, manifold, trivial and worthless ceremonies.

The Change of Asoka's Religion.

Asoka himself was at first a Deva-worshipper. He had no scruple about the slaughter of men and animals; "formerly, in the kitchen of His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King each day many hundred thousands of living creatures were slaughtered to make curries." The hecatomb of the Kaliṅga war has already been mentioned. The sight of the misery and bloodshed in that sanguinary campaign made a deep impression on him and awakened in his breast feelings of anusocharanam, "remorse, profound sorrow, and regret." About this time he came under the influence of Buddhist teaching. We read in Rock Edict XIII "directly after the Kaliṅgas had been annexed began His Sacred Majesty’s zealous protection of the Law of Piety (dhramapalanaṁ), his love of that Law (dhrama-kamata), and his inculcation of that Law (dhramanuśati)."

1 Cf. Ajātaśatru’s treatment of Bimbisāra, Udayana’s cruelty towards Piśodara, and Nanda’s haughty demeanour towards Chaṇḍakya.

2 Tours of pleasure, cf. Mahābhārata, XV, 1, 18, Kaṇḍaḥ, p. 332.

3 Vihārasyāṭrāṃ punaḥ Kuruṝjagocarṇavāhanam

Saccāṁ kāmāṁ mahāteṣīgh prasiddav Ambikāmultu.

4 R. Edict, VIII.

5 For “Maṅgala” see also Jātakas No. 87, and No. 168 (Hathimadāgala).

6 For Āvśa and Viśa see also Mbh. V. 141. 14.

7 R. Edict, IX.
Although Aśoka became a Buddhist he was not an enemy either of the Devas or the Brāhmaṇas. Up to the last he took pride in calling himself Devānampiya. He found fault with unseemly behaviour towards Brāhmaṇas and inculcated liberality to the same class. He was perfectly tolerant. "The king does reverence to men of all sects." He reprobated Atmapāsanda-pujā when coupled with Para-pāsanda-garaha. That he was sincere in his professions is proved by the Barābar Cave Dedications to the Ājivika monks. His hostility was chiefly directed, not towards the Devas and the Brāhmaṇas, but the killing of men in war and Samājas, the slaughter of animals in sacrifice, and the performance of vulgar, useless and offensive ceremonies.

The Change of Foreign Policy.

The effect of the change of religion was at once felt in foreign policy. The Emperor declared that "of all the people who were slain, done to death, or carried away captive in Kalinga, if the hundredth part or the thousandth part were now to suffer the same fate, it would be matter of regret to His Sacred Majesty. Moreover, should any one do him wrong, that too must be borne with by His Sacred Majesty, so far as it can possibly be borne with." In Kalinga Edict I, the Emperor expressed his desire that the unconquered peoples in the frontiers of his realm (Aṁtā avijitā) "should not be afraid of him, that they should trust him, and should receive from him happiness not sorrow." The chiefest conquest in the Emperor's opinion was the conquest of the Law of Piety (Dhammavijaya). In Edict

1 Sūkya (Rāṣṭrī), Buddha Sūkya (Mañjī), Upāsaka (Sabarum); see Hultzsch, CII, p. xlv. Cf. also Kalhaṇa, Rājatarangini, i. 102.
2 Edict, IV.
3 Edict, XII.
IV he exultingly says "the reverberation of the war drums (Bherighoso) has become the reverberation of the Law (Dhammaghoso)." Not content with what he himself did he called upon his sons and even his grandsons to eschew new conquests—putro papotra me asa navam vijayam ma vijetaviyam. Here we have a complete renunciation of the old policy of Digvijaya and the enunciation of a new policy, viz., that of Dhammavijaya. The full political effects of this change of policy became manifest only after the death of Aśoka. From the time of Bimbisāra to the Kalinga war the history of India was the history of the expansion of Magadha from a tiny state in South Bihār to a gigantic Empire extending from the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil country. After the Kalinga war ensued a period of stagnation at the end of which the process is reversed. The empire gradually dwindled down in extent till it sank to the position from which Bimbisāra and his successors had raised it.

True to his principle Aśoka made no attempt to annex the frontier (Prachāmitsa) kingdoms, viz., Chola, Paṇḍya, Satyaputra, Keralaпутra, Tambapanni (Ceylon) and the realm of Aṃtiyako Yonarāja. On the contrary he maintained friendly relations with them.

The Chola country was drained by the river Kāverī and comprised the districts of Trichinopoly and Tanjore. We learn from a South Indian inscription that Harā asked Gunabhara, "How could I standing in a temple on earth, view the great power of the Cholas or the river Kāverī?" When Pulakesin II strove to conquer the

1 The Aśokan conception of Dhammavijaya was similar to that described in the Chakkavatī Suanaddha Sutta, "conquest not by the sword, not by the sword, but by righteousness" (Dialogues of the Buddha, Part III, p. 59). It was different from the Hindu conception explained and illustrated by the Mahābhārata (XII, 50.38-39), the Kauṭilya (p. 382), and the Raghunāthā (IV, 43).

2 Hultzsch, SIII, Vol. I, p. 84.
Cholas "the Kāveri had her current obstructed by the causeway formed by his elephants." The Chola capital was Uraiyūr (Sanskrit Uragapura) or Old Trichinopoly.¹ The principal port was at Kāviripattinam or Pugār on the northern bank of the Kāveri.²

The Pandya country corresponded to the Madurā, Rāmna and Tinnevally districts and perhaps the southern portion of the Travancore state, and had its capitals at Kolkaï and Madurā (Dakshaṇa Mathurā). The rivers Tamilparṇ and Kritisālā or Vaigai flowed through it. Kātyāyana derives Pāṇḍya from Pāṇḍu. The Pāṇḍus are mentioned as the ruling race of Indraprastha in the Mahābhārata as well as in several Jātakas. Ptolemy (cir. 150 A. D.) speaks of the country of the Pandouoi in the Paṇjāb. There can be no doubt that Pāṇḍu was the name of a real tribe in northern India. Kātyāyana's statement regarding the connection of the Pandyas with the Pāṇḍus receives some support from the fact that the name of the Pāṇḍya capital (Madura) was identical with the famous city of Mathura in the Śurasena country which, according to Epic tradition, was the seat of a family intimately associated by ties of friendship and marriage with the Pāṇḍus of Indraprastha. The connection between the Pāṇḍus, the Śurasenas, and the Pāṇḍyas seems to be alluded to in the confused stories narrated by Megasthenes regarding Herakles and Pandoia.³

¹ Aelian, however, has the following reference to the realm of Soma (Chola?) and its chief city: "There is a city which a man of royal extraction called Soma governed at the time when Eukratidas governed the Bactrians, and the name of that city is Perimoda. It is inhabited by a race of fish-aters who go off with nets and catch oysters." For Uragapura in Choleka Vishaya see Ep. Ind., X. 108.

² For the early history of the Chola Kingdom and other Tamil states see O.H.I. Vol. I, Ch. 24; Smith E.H., Ch. XVI; Kanakarabba Pillai, Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago; Krishnaswami Aiyanar Beginnings of South Indian History and Ancient India.

³ Ind. Ant., 1177, p. 249.
Satiyaputra is identified by Mr. Venkatesvarsarayar\(^1\) with Satya-vrata-kshetra or Kañchipura. But Prof. K. Aiyangar points out that the term Satya-vrata-kshetra is applied to the town Kañchi or a part of it, not to the country dependent upon it. There is besides the point whether vrata could become puta. Mr. Aiyangar prefers Bhandarkar’s identification with Satpute. He takes Satiyaputra to be a collective name of the various matriarchal communities like the Tulus and the Nāyars of Malabar.\(^2\) According to Dr. Smith\(^3\) Satiyaputra is represented by the Satyamangalam Taluk of Coimbatore. Mr. P. J. Thoma, however, prefers to identify it with “Satyabhūmi” of the Keralālpatti, a territory which corresponds roughly to “North Malabar including a portion of Kasergode Taluk, South Canara.”\(^4\)

Keralaputra (Ketalaputra or Chera) is “the country south of Kūpaka (or Satya), extending down to Kanneti in Central Travancore (Karanagapalli Taluk). South of it lay the political division of Mūshika.”\(^5\) It was watered by the river Periyar on the banks of which stood its capital Vañji (near Cochin) and at its mouth the seaport of Muziris (Kranganur).

Ceylon was known in ancient times as Pārasamudra\(^6\) as well as Tāmraparṇī (Greek Taprobane).\(^7\) Tāmraparṇī,

---

\(^1\) JRAS, 1915, pp. 511-52.


\(^3\) Asoke, Third Ed., p. 161.

\(^4\) JRAS, 1923, p. 412.

\(^5\) JRAS, 1923, p. 413.

\(^6\) Grek Palaisamvuda, see Ray Chandhuri, Ind. Ant., 1919, pp. 195-96.

\(^7\) For other names of Ceylon see "Megasthenes and Arrian" published by Chakravartti and Chatterji, 1926, p. 60 n. For a short history of the island see Camb. Hist. Ind., Chap. XXV, and IHQ II. I, p. 1ff. According to tradition recorded in the Dipawams and the Mahāvamsa the first Aryan immigrants were led by Prince Vijaya of Lāla, whom the chronicles represent as the great-grandson of a Princess of Vañga. The identification of Lāla is, however, open to controversy, some placing it in Gujarāt.
i.e., Tamraparni is mentioned in Rock Edicts II and XIII of Asoka. Dr. Smith now says he takes the word to mean not Ceylon but the river Tamraparni in Tinnevally. He refers to the Girnar text “a Tambapāṇhi” which according to him indicates that the river is meant not the island. Now, in Edict II the phrase “a Tambapāṇhi” comes after Ketalaputo and not after Pāda. The expression “Ketalaputo as far as the Tamraparni” is hardly appropriate, because the Tamraparni is a Pāṇḍya river. We, therefore, prefer to take Tamraparni to mean Ceylon. Asoka’s Ceylonese contemporary was Devānāthpiyā Tissa whose accession may be dated about 251 or 247 B.C.

Asoka maintained friendly relations not only with the Tamil powers of the south, but also with his Hellenistic frontager Antiochus Theos, king of Syria and Western Asia (B.C. 261-246): and even with the kings the neighbours of Antiochus, namely Ptolemy Philadelphos, king of Egypt (B.C. 285-247): Magas, king of Cyrene in North Africa (about B.C. 285-258); Antigonus Gonatas, king of Macedonia (B.C. 277-239); and Alexander who ruled over Epirus according to Norris, Westergaard, Lassen, Senart and Dr. Smith. Beloch and Hultzsch, however, suggest that Alikasudara of Edict XIII is Alexander of Corinth, son of Craterus (B.C. 252—cir. 244) and not Alexander of Epirus (272-cir. 255), son of Pyrrhus.

Though Asoka did not covet the territories of his neighbours, there is evidence that he gave them advice on occasions, and established philanthropic institutions in others identifying it with Bādga or Western Bengal. Barnett may be right in his assumption that the tradition of two different streams of immigration was knit together in the story of Viṣaya.

1 Asoka, 3rd Ed., p. 102.
2 JRAS, 1914, pp. 943ff.
their dominions. In other words he regarded them as objects of religious conquest (Dhammavijaya).

“My neighbours, too, should learn this lesson” (M. R. Edict I).

“Among his frontagers the Cholas, Pandyas, the Satyaputra, the Ketalaputra as far as Tamraparni, Antiochos the Greek king, and even the kings the neighbours of that Antiochos everywhere have been made healing arrangements of His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King.”

In Edict XIII Aśoka declares that the “conquest of the Law of Piety,........has been won by His Sacred Majesty........among all his neighbours as far as six hundred leagues, where the king of the Greeks named Antiochos dwells, and to the north of that Antiochos (where dwell) the four kings named severally Ptolemy (Turamāyo), Antigonos (Aṃtekina), Magas (Maga or Maka), and Alexander (Alikasudaro)—(likewise) in the south, the Cholas and Pandyas as far as Tamraparni.......Even where the envoys (dutā) of His Sacred Majesty do not penetrate, those people, too, hearing His Sacred Majesty’s ordinance based upon the Law of Piety and his instruction in that Law, practise and will practise the Law.”

The Ceylonese chronicles do not refer to the envoys sent to the Tamil and Hellenistic kingdoms but name the missionaries sent to Ceylon and Suvannabhūmi (Pegu and Moulmein according to Dr. Smith). The Ceylonese mission was headed by prince Mahendra. No reference to Suvanṇabhūmi occurs in the Edicts hitherto discovered.

The Change in Internal Policy.

The effects of Aśoka’s change of religion after the Kalinga war were felt not only in foreign policy but

---

1 For Buddhism in Western Asia, see Beal, Si-yu-ki, II. 781 and Alberuni, p. 21.
also in internal affairs. The principal objects of his complaint according to Rock Edict IV and the Kalinga Edicts were:

1. The sacrificial slaughter (ārambho) of living creatures.
2. Violence (vihiṁsā) to animate beings.
3. Unseemly behaviour (asampratipati) to kinsmen (jāti).
4. Unseemly behaviour to Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas.
5. Maladministration in the Provinces.

According to Rock Edict I, Aśoka saw much offence not only in the sacrificial slaughter of animals, but also in certain Samājas or Gatherings which, as we learn from Kauṭilya (p. 45), were often witnessed by the Maurya Emperor. The Samāja, says Smith, was of two kinds. The popular festival kind, accompanied by animal fights, heavy drinking and feasting, including much consumption of meat, was necessarily condemned by Aśoka, as being inconsistent with his principles. The other kind, the semi-religious theatrical performance, sometimes given in the temples of Sarasvati, the goddess of learning, was apparently not included among offensive Samājas. Dr. Thomas describes the disapproved Samāja as “a celebration of games or contests taking place in an arena or amphitheatre surrounded by platforms (maṇicha) for spectators (Prakṣhā).” This kind of Samāja is apparently referred to in the following lines of the Virāṭa parva of the Mahābhārata.

Ye cha kechin niyotsyanti Samājeshu niyodhakāḥ
(Virāṭa, 2, 7).

1 For the holding of Samāja in Magadha and in neighbouring countries see Mahāvastu III. 57 and 333.
2 JRAS, 1914, pp. 392 ff.
Tatra Mallāḥ samāpetur digbhya rājan sahasrasaḥ
Samāje Brahmaṇo rājan tathā Paśupater api
Mahākāyab mahāviryah Kālakaṇjāh ivāsurah.

(Ibid, 13, 15-16.)

The harmless Samāja is probably the one referred to in Vatsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra (Pakshasya māsasya va prajñāte' hani Sarasvatyā bhavane niyuktānām nityāṃ Samājaḥ). According to Hultszch the harmless Samāja refers to edifying shows.

Asoka determined to put a stop to the practices, referred to above, which he did not approve. At the same time he sought to improve the moral and material condition of the people to such an extent as to effect the “association of gods with men” (cf. Minor Rock Edict I). He did all this “in order that he might discharge the debt (which he owed) to living beings, (that) he might make them happy in this (world) and (that) they might attain heaven in the other (world).” The means employed to achieve this object may be classed under four heads:

1. Administrative reforms.
2. Dissemination of instructions in the Dhamma (Law of Piety).
3. Benevolent activity; promotion of the welfare of man and beast.

Administrative Reforms.

In the first place, Asoka instituted the Quinquennial and Triennial Anusamāhyāna or Circuit of the Yutas, Rājukas, Pradeśikas, and Mahāmātras. Mr. Jayaswal and

1 Cf. The Harivamśa passage (Bharahyaparva, Ch. 821) “Devātaḥ mānasāvyāsaḥ sahasraḥ bhavatidad.” Hultszch, however, compares (xiv) Deva with Dīvyaśrūpā of Rock Edict IV.
Dr. Smith are of opinion that the whole administrative staff from the Rājūka and the Prādeśika down to the Yuta could not possibly go on circuit at once every five years. They interpret the term as signifying a regular system of transfers from one station to another. But there is nothing in the text to show that all the officers were required to go on circuit at once. The anusāmyāna of the Yutas, Rājūkas and Prādeśikas was mainly intended for propaganda work. The anusāmyāna of the Mahāmātras was specially instituted for the purpose of checking miscarriage of justice, arbitrary imprisonment, and torture in the outlying Provinces (Kaliṅga, Ujjayini and Takshasālā).

Secondly, Aśoka created a number of new posts, e.g., Dharma-mahāmātras and probably Dharmayutas. The Dharma-mahāmātras were given a protective mission among people of all sects including the Brāhmaṇas and the Nirgranthas or Jainas, and among the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandhāras, Rāṣṭhrikas and all the Aparāntas. "Among servants and masters, Brāhmaṇas and the wealthy (Ibhyaś), among the helpless and the aged, they are employed in freeing from worldly cares their subordinates (in the department) of the Law of Piety. They are also employed on the revision of (sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of) release, on the grounds of motive, having children, instigation, or advanced years.... At Pātaliputra and in all provincial towns, in the female establishments of the king's brothers and sisters, as well as of other relatives, they are everywhere employed." The Dharma-mahāmātras were further engaged everywhere in the imperial dominions among the Dharmayutas with regard to "the concerns of the Law, the establishment of the Law, and the business of alms-giving."

Anokh, 3rd edition, p. 166.
The emperor was naturally anxious to keep himself fully informed without delay about all public affairs, specially about the doings of the Mahâmâtras on whom the success of his mission mainly depended. He therefore gave special directions to the Patîvedâkas that when a matter of urgency committed to the Mahâmâtras and discussed in the Parishad occasioned a division of opinion or adjournment (?), he must be informed without delay.

It is apparent from the Kâlînga Edicts and Rock Edict VI that Aśoka kept a watchful eye on the Mahâmâtras especially on those who administered justice in cities. But he was more indulgent towards his Râjûkas who were “eager to serve him.” To the Râjûkas “set over many hundred thousands of people” the emperor granted independence in the award of honours and penalties in order that those officials might perform their duties confidently and fearlessly. He, however, wanted to maintain some uniformity in penalties as well as in procedure. For this reason he issued the following rule:—

“To condemned men lying in prison under sentence of death a respite of three days is granted.”

Lastly, Aśoka issued certain regulations restricting slaughter and mutilation of animals, and up to the twenty-seventh year of his coronation effected twenty-five jail deliveries. This suggests, as has been pointed out by Hultsch, that the emperor used to proclaim an amnesty to criminals at almost every anniversary of his coronation.

Measures adopted to disseminate Instructions in the Law of Piety.

The Law of Piety according to the Second Pillar Edict, consisted in Apāsinâve, bahukayâne, dayâ, dâne, sache, sochaye, “little impiety, many good deeds, compassion, liberality, truthfulness, purity.” In Minor
Rock Edict II the virtues of the Law which must be practised are thus stated: “father and mother must be hearkened to; respect for living creatures must be firmly established; truth must be spoken. The teacher must be reverenced by the pupil, and fitting courtesy must be shown to relations.” In Edict XIII we have the following: “hearkening to superiors, hearkening to father and mother, hearkening to teachers (or elders), and proper treatment of friends, acquaintances, comrades, relatives, slaves and servants, with steadfastness of devotion.” Edict VII lays stress on: “mastery over the senses, purity of mind, gratitude, and steady devotion.”

We learn from Minor Rock Edict I that for more than two-and-a-half years Aśoka was a lay disciple (Upāsaka) without exerting himself strenuously. He then entered the Saṅgha and began to exert himself strenuously. He issued the famous proclamation: “Let small and great exert themselves,” sent missions (Vyutha) to expound and expand his teaching, began to write the imperishable record of his purpose on the rocks and engraved it upon stone pillars wherever there were stone pillars in his dominions. Aśoka at first utilised the existing administrative machinery for religious propaganda. He commanded his Parishad to inculcate the Dharma on the Yutas and ordered the latter as well as the Rājukas, and Pradesikas to inculcate the same while they set out for the anusāmyāna. The dharma which they were to preach was explained thus:

1 For the question of slavery in Maurya India, see Monahan, Early History of Bengal, 154–155.

2 “Apprached,” according to Halsbech, in whose opinion the two-and-a-half of Upāsakas include the period which followed his “visit” (not “entry”) to the Saṅgha. The contrary view is, however, supported by I-tsing who mentions an image of Aśoka dressed in the garb of a Buddhist monk.

3 The interpretation of Vyutha as missionary was pointed out by Searle and accepted by Dr. Smith (Aśoka, third ed., p. 153). Prof. Bhattacharjee takes Vyutha as Vyutha to mean “officials on tour.”
"An excellent thing is the hearkening to father and mother; an excellent thing is liberality to friends, acquaintances, relatives, Brāhmaṇas and ascetics; excellent is abstention from the slaughter of living creatures; excellent is small expense with small accumulation."

When he had been consecrated thirteen years, Aśoka created the new officials called Dharma mahāmātrās who were specially entrusted with the work of dharmadhīthāna and dharmavadhi, i.e., the establishment and increase of Piety.

The Emperor also exhibited spectacles of the dwellings of the gods (Vimānadasanā), spectacles of elephants (Hastidasanā), masses of fire (Agikhamdhāni) and other representations of a divine nature. Prof. Bhandarkar refers to the Pāli Vimānavatthu which describes the splendour of the various celestial abodes (Vimānas) in order to induce listeners and spectators to lead good and unblemished lives and thereby attain to these. Aśoka seems to have made representations of these Vimānas and paraded them in various places. Hasti, according to Prof. Bhandarkar, is Sveto hasti, i.e., Buddha himself who is also described as "Gajatama," i.e., Gajottama. Hultsch suggests that Hasti may refer to the vehicles of the four "Mahārajās," (guardians of quarters). As regards Agikamdha (Agniskandha) Professor Bhandarkar draws our attention to the Jātaka No. 40 which refers to a blazing fire pit created by Māra on the surface of which the Bodhisattva strode and gave a bowl to a hungry Pachteka Buddha and extolled alms-giving. Others

1 Cf. Sigālovīda Suttanta (Dialogues of the Buddha, III, 1738).
3 Cf. also the Tameke-Puṭikāraṇa displayed by the Budhdā at Śrāvastī which consisted in walking the air in various attitudes while emitting alternately flame and waves from the upper and lower parts of his body (Pouchar, the Beginnings of Buddhism, Art. 165).
take Agikaṃdha to refer to "radiant beings of another world."

While his officers were busy preaching the new Gospel, the Emperor himself did not remain idle. In his eleventh regnal year he "started on the path" leading to Sambodhi (ayāya Sambodhiḥ) and commenced the tours of Piety (Dhammayātā) in the place of the old tours of pleasure (Vihārayātā). In the tours of Piety this was the practice—visiting ascetics and Brāhmaṇas, with liberality to them; visiting elders, with largess of gold; visiting the people of the country (Janapada) with instruction in the Law of Piety, and discussion of that Law. The memory of a pious tour in Aśoka’s twenty-first regnal year (B.C. 249 according to Smith) is preserved by the Rummindet and Nigāli Sāgar epigraphs in the Nepalese Tarai. These records prove that Aśoka visited the birth-place of Gautama and paid reverence to the stūpa of Konākamana, one of the former Buddhas.

In 242 B.C., according to Dr. Smith, Aśoka issued the Seven Pillar Edicts which contain a review of the measures taken during his reign for the "promotion of religion, the teaching of moral duty."

Benevolent Activity. Promotion of the Welfare of Man and Beast.

Aśoka abolished the sacrificial slaughter of animals and offensive Samājas and the massacre of living creatures to make curries in the imperial kitchen. Rock Edict VIII refers to the abolition of the vihārayātras or tours of pleasure in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised. Pillar Edict V contains a code of

---

1 Some scholars take Sambodhi to mean supreme knowledge. But Prof. Bhandarkar contends that Sambodhi is equivalent to the Bodhi Tree or the Mahābodhi Temple at Bodh Gaya. According to the Diryavadāna (p. 303) Aśoka visited Bodhi in the company of the Sthavira Upagupta (Hultzsch, CHI, xiii).
regulations restricting slaughter and mutilation of animals. Dr. Smith points out that the prohibitions against animal slaughter in this edict coincide to a considerable extent with those recorded in the Arthaśāstra.

The Emperor established healing arrangements in two kinds, namely, healing arrangements for men and healing arrangements for beasts. Medicinal herbs also, both for men and for beasts, wheresoever lacking, were imported and planted. Roots also and fruits, wheresoever lacking were imported and planted. On the roads wells were dug at intervals of 8 kos, flights of steps built for descending into the water, and banyan trees and mango groves planted for the enjoyment of man and beast.

Pillar Edict VII refers to the employment of superior officers (Mukhyas) in the distribution of alms, both the emperor’s own and those of the queens and princes. One of the Minor Pillar Edicts refers to the donations of the second Queen Karuvāki, mother of Tivara: “Whatever gift has been given here by the second Queen—be it a mango-garden, or pleasure-grove, or alms house, or aught else—is reckoned as proceeding from that queen.”

**Religious Toleration and the Prevention of Schism in the Buddhist Church.**

In Rock Edict XII the Emperor declares that he “does reverence to men of all sects, whether ascetics (Pavajitāni) or householders (Gharastāni) by gifts and various forms of reverence.” That he was sincere in his professions is proved by the Barābar cave dedications in favour of the Ājivika ascetics, who were more akin to the Jainas than to the Buddhists.

The Emperor only cared for the “growth of the essence (Sāra) of the matter in sects.” He says that

---

1 Dharmasamyama, cf. Patnājali I.II.
“he who does reverence to his own sect while disparaging the sects of others wholly from attachment to his own, with intent to enhance the splendour of his own sect, in reality by such conduct inflicts the severest injury on his own sect.” Concord (Samavāyo) is praised by him as meritorious (Samavāyo eva sādhū).

Just as Aśoka tried to secure concord among the various sects, so he wanted to prevent schism within the Buddhist church. Tradition affirms that a Buddhist Council was convened at Pāṭaliputra during his reign for the purpose of suppressing heresy. The Sārnāth Edict and its variants may be regarded as embodying the resolution of this Council.¹

The Success and Failure of Aśoka.

Dr. Smith observes that Aśoka, by his comprehensive and well-planned measures of evangelization, succeeded in transforming Buddhism which was a local Indian sect into one of the great religions of the world. His teaching continued to bear wholesome fruit long after he had passed away. In the second century A. D. Queen Gautami Balaśī takes pride in the fact that her son was “alien to hurting life even towards an offending enemy.” (Kitāparādhe pi satujane apanahisāruchi.) Even in the fifth century A. D. the rest houses and free hospitals of Magadha excited the wonder and admiration of foreigners. The benefactions of Dharmāśoka were a source of inspiration to royal personages as late as the time of Govinda-chandra of the Gahaṁvar dynasty.

The political record of the great Maurya’s early years was no less brilliant. His reign saw the final triumph of those centripetal forces that had been at work since the days of Bimbisāra. The conquest of Kaliṅga

Smith, Aśoka, third Ed., p. 55,
THE LATER MAURYAS

completed the unification of non-Tamil India under the hegemony of Magadha.\(^1\)

But the policy of Dhammavijaya which he formulated after the Kalinga War was not likely to promote the cause for which a long line of able sovereigns from Bimbisāra to Bindusāra had lived and struggled. Dark clouds were looming in the north-western horizon. India needed men of the calibre of Pura and Chandragupta to ensure her protection against the Yavana menace. She got a dreamer. Magadha after the Kalinga War frittered away her conquering energy in attempting a religious revolution, as Egypt did under the guidance of Ikhnaton. The result was politically disastrous as will be shown in the next section. Ashoka's attempt to end war met with the same fate as the similar endeavour of President Wilson.

According to Dr. Smith's chronology Ashoka died in 232 B.C., after a reign of about 40 years. A Tibetan tradition is said to affirm that the great Emperor breathed his last at Taxila.\(^2\)

II. The Later Mauryas and the Decline of their Power.

The Magadha Empire under Ashoka extended from the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil country. But the withdrawal of the strong arm of Piyadasi was perhaps the signal for the disintegration of this mighty monarchy. "His sceptre was the bow of Ulysses which could not be drawn by any weaker hand." The provinces fell off one by one. Foreign barbarians began to pour across the north-western gates of the empire, and a time came when the proud monarchs of

\(^1\) For Ashoka's achievements in the domain of art, see Smith, SFAIC, 13, 57 ff.; Ashoka\(^2\), p. 107 ff.; CHI, 618 ff.; Havel, ARI, 104 ff.

\(^2\) The Oxford History of India, p. 115.
Pātaliputra and Rājagṛìha had to bend their knees before the despised provincials of Andhra and Kalinga.

Unfortunately, no Kautilya or Megasthenes has left any account of the later Mauryas. It is impossible to reconstruct a detailed history of Aśoka’s successors from the scanty data furnished by one or two inscriptions and a few Brāhmanical, Jaina and Buddhist works.

Aśoka had many children. In Pillar Edict VII, he pays attention to the distribution of alms made by all his children, and in particular to those made by the “Princes, sons of the Queens.” It is to this last category that belonged some of the Kumāras who represented the Imperial authority at Takşasila, Ujjayint, Suvarṇagiri and Tosali.

Tivara, the son of queen Kāravakī, the only prince named in the inscriptions, does not appear to have mounted the imperial throne. Three other sons, namely, Kunāla (Suyaśas?), Jalauka and Mahendra are mentioned in literature. It is, however, uncertain whether Mahendra was a son of Aśoka or his brother.

The Vāyu Purāṇa says that after Aśoka’s death his son Kunāla reigned for eight years. Kunāla’s son and successor was Bandhupālīta, and Bandhupālīta’s dayāda or heir was Indrapālīta. After Indrapālīta came Devavarman, Satadhanus and Brihadratha.

The Matsya Purāṇa gives the following list of Aśoka’s successors:—Daśaratha, Samprati, Satadhanvan and Brihadratha.

The Vishnu Purāṇa furnishes the following names:—Suyaśas, Daśaratha, Śaṅgata, Śāliṣūka, Somaśarman, Satadhanvan and Brihadratha.

The Divyāvadāna (p. 433) has the following names:—Sampadī, Vrihaspati, Vyrasena, Pushyadharman and Pushyamitra.

* For Tivara or a Magadhan name see the Book of Kindred Sayings II, p. 128-130.
The Rājatarāṅgini mentions Jālayuka as the successor of Aśoka in Kaśmir, while Tāranātha mentions another successor Virasena who ruled in Gandhāra and was, as Dr. Thomas suggests, probably the predecessor of Subhagāsenā of Polybius.¹

It is not an easy task to reconcile the divergent versions of the different authorities. The reality of the existence of Kunāla is established by the combined testimony of the Purānic and Buddhist works (which represent him as the father of Saṃpadi) as well as the evidence of Jinaprabhasuri and Hemachandra, the well-known Jaina writers. The name Suyaśas found in the Vīṣṇu and the Bhāgavata Purānas was probably a biruḍa or epithet of this prince. Tradition is not unanimous regarding the accession of Kunāla to the imperial throne. He is reputed to have been blind. His position was, therefore, probably like that of Dhṛitarāṣṭra of the Great Epic and though nominally regarded as the sovereign, he was physically unfit to carry on the work of government which was presumably entrusted to his favourite son Saṃpratī, who is described by the Jaina and Buddhist writers as the immediate successor of Aśoka.

Kunāla’s son was Bandhupalita according to the Vāyu Purāṇa, Saṃpadi (Saṃpratī) according to the Divyāvadāna and the Pāṭāliputrikaśa of Jinaprabhasuri, and Vigatāsoka according to Tāranāth.² Either these princes were identical or they were brothers. If the latter view be correct then Bandhupalita must be identified with Dasaratha whose reality is established by the brief dedicatory inscriptions on the walls of cave-dwellings at the Nāgarjuni Hills which he bestowed upon the Ājivikas. Dasaratha, who receives the epithet “devānampiya” in the inscriptions,

¹ Ind Ant. 1875, p. 352; Camb. Hist. Ind., p. 512.
² Ind. Ant. 1875, 352.
was a grandson of Aśoka according to the Matsya and Vīṣṇu Purāṇas, and the predecessor of Samprati (variant Saṅgata) according to the same authorities.

Indrapālita must be identified with Samprati or Śaliśūka according as we identify Bandhupālita with Daśaratha or Samprati. "In the matter of the propagation of the Jaina faith, Jaina records speak as highly of Samprati as Buddhist records do of Aśoka." The PāṭaliputraKalpa of Jinaprabhasuri says, "in Pāṭaliputra flourished the great king Samprati, son of Kunāla, lord or Bhārata with its three continents, the great Arhanta who established Vihāras for Śramaṇas even in non-Aryan countries." Dr. Smith shows good grounds for believing that the dominions of Samprati included Avanti and western India.

In his Aśoka he admits that the hypothesis that Aśoka left two grandsons, of whom one (Daśaratha) succeeded him in his eastern and the other (Samprati) in his western dominions, is little more than a guess. The Jaina writers represent Samprati as ruling over Pāṭaliputra as well as Ujjayini. His name is mentioned in the Purānic list of Aśoka’s Magadhan successors.

The existence of Śaliśūka is proved not only by the testimony of the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa but also by that of the Gārgi Samhitā and the e Vāyu manuscript referred to by Pargiter. He may have been identical with Vṛihāspati, son of Samprati according to the Divyāvadāna.

Devavarman and Somaśarman are variant readings of the same name. The same is the case with Śatadhanaus and Satadhanvan. It is not easy to identify Vṛishasena

---

1 Third Ed., p. 70.
2 Kerr’s Bṛihadādhitā, p. 37.

The Gārgi Samhitā says, "There will be Śaliśūka, a wicked quarrelsome king, Unrighteous, although teaching on righteousness (dharmaṇaśī aśhamikāḥ) he cruelly oppresses his country."
and Pushyadharma; possibly they are merely birudas or secondary names of Devavarman and Śatadhanvan.

The last Imperial Maurya of Magadha, Brihadratha, is mentioned not only in the Purāṇas but also in Bāga’s Harshacharita. He was assassinated by his general Pushyamitra Śuṅga who is wrongly described by the Divyāvadāna as of Maurya descent.

Petty Maurya kings continued to rule in western India as well as Magadha long after the extinction of the Imperial line. King Dhavala of the Maurya dynasty is referred to in the Kāṇaswa inscription of A. D. 738. Prof. Bhandarkar identifies him with Dhavalappadava, the overlord of Dhanika mentioned in the Dabok (Mewar) inscription of A. D. 725. Maurya chiefs of the Koṅkaṇ and Khāndesh are referred to in the Early Chalukya and Yādava epigraphs. A Maurya Prince of Magadha named Pūrṇavarman is mentioned by Huen Tsang.

There can be no doubt that during the rule of the later Mauryas the Magadha Empire experienced a gradual decay. Asoka died about the year 232 B. C. Within a quarter of a century after his death a Greek army crossed the Hindukush which was the Maurya frontier in the days of Chandragupta and his grandson. The Yuga Purāṇa section of the Gārgī Samhitā bears testimony to the decline of the Maurya power in the Madhyadeśa after the reign of Śāliśuka:

Tataḥ Sāketam ākramya Pañcholām Mathurāṃstatha
Yavanaḥ dusṭavikrāntaḥ prāpsyati Kusumadhvajam

1. Bomb. Gaz. I, Part 2, p. 284. Kāṇaswa is in the Kothar state, Rājputān. It is not unlikely that Dhavala was a descendant of some princely Viceroy of Ujjain.

2. Ep. Ind., XII, p. 11.

3. Bomb. Gaz. I, Part 2, pp. 283, 244. Sühler suggests (Ep. Ind. III, p. 128) that these Maurya chieftains of Koṅkaṇ were probably descendants of the princely viceroy of the Deccan. He also draws our attention to the family name ‘More’ which is met with in the Maharashtra country, and is apparently a corruption of ‘Maurya.’
Tataḥ Pushapapure prāpte karddame prathite hite?
Ākulā vishaya sarve bhavishyanti na saṁśayaḥ.¹

Where was now the power that had expelled the prefects of Alexander and hurled back the battalions of Seleukos? According to Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Sāstrī ² a reaction promoted by the Brāhmaṇas had sapped the foundations of the Maurya authority and dismembered the empire.

Among the causes of the alienation of the Brāhmaṇas the foremost place is given to Aśoka’s Edict against animal sacrifices. The Edict, in Paṇḍit Sāstrī’s opinion, was certainly directed against the Brāhmaṇas as a class and was specially offensive because it was promulgated by a Śūdra ruler. As to the first point we should remember that prohibition of animal sacrifices did not necessarily imply hostility towards Brāhmaṇas. Long before Aśoka Brāhmaṇa sages whose teachings have found a place in the Holy Sruti, the most sacred literature of the Brāhmaṇas, declared themselves in no uncertain terms against sacrifices, and in favour of Ahiṃsā. In the Muṇḍaka Upanishad (1. 2. 7) we have the following Sloka:—

Plavā hyete adriḍhā yajñarūpa
Ashtādaśoktam avaram yeshu karma
Etachchhreyo ye’bhinandanti mūḍhā
Jarāṁityum te punarevāpi yanti.

“Frail, in truth are those boats, the sacrifices, the eighteen in which this lower ceremonial has been told. Fools, who praise this as the highest good, are subject again and again to old age and death.” In the Chhāndogya Upanishad (III. 17. 4) Ghora Aṅgirasa lays great stress on Ahiṃsā.

¹ Kerr, Brīhat Sāhhitē, p. 37. ² JASB, 1910, p. 269.
As to the second statement we should remember that tradition is not unanimous in representing the Mauryas as Sudras. The Puranas assert, no doubt, that after Mahapadma there will be kings of Sudra origin. But this statement cannot be taken to mean that all the Post-Mahapadman kings were Sudras, as in that case the Sungs and the Kshvas also will have to be classed as Sudras. The Mudrarakshasa which calls Chandragupta a Sudra, is a late work, and its evidence is contradicted by earlier books. In the Mahaparinibbana sutta the Moriyas (Mauryas) are represented as belonging to the Kshatriya caste. The Mahavamsa refers to the Moriyas as a noble (kshatriya) clan and represents Chandragupta as a scion of this clan. In the Divyavadana (p. 370) Bindusara, son of Chandragupta said to a girl “Tvam Nāpini aham Rāja Kshatriya Mūrdhābhidhisthāḥ katham māyā sārdham samāgamo bhavishyatī?” In the same work (p. 409) Asoka says to one of his queens (Tishyarakshita) “Devi aham Kshatriyah katham paṇḍuṁ parībhakṣhayaṁ?” In a Mysore inscription Chandragupta is described as “an abode of the usages of eminent kshatriyas.” Kautilya’s preference of an “abhijata” king seems also to suggest that his sovereign was born of a noble family.

Having referred to the prohibition of animal sacrifices Paṇḍit Sastrī says: “this was followed by another edict in which Asoka boasted that those who were regarded as gods on earth have been reduced by him into false gods. If it means anything it means that the Brāhmaṇas who were regarded as Bhūdevas or gods on earth had been shown up by him.”

1 Geiger’s Translation, p. 27.
2 Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 10.
3 Cf. Arthasastra, p. 326.
The original passage referred to above runs thus:—
Y (i)-imāya kālaya Jambudipasi amisā deva husa te dāni m (i) s-kaṭā.

Pancit Sāstrī followed the interpretation of Senart. But Prof. Sylvain Lévi has shown that the word amisā cannot stand for Sanskrit amṛishā, for in the Bhābru edict we find Musā and not Misā for Sanskrit mṛishā. The recently discovered Māski version reads misibhūta for misam-kaṭā showing that the original form was mīṣībhūta. It will be grammatically incorrect to form mīṣībhūta from Sanskrit mṛishā. The word mīṣā means mixed. And mīṣībhūta means "made to mix" or made to associate. The meaning of the entire passage is "during that time the men in India who had been unassociated with the gods became associated with them."¹

There is thus no question of "showing up" anybody. The true import of the passage has been pointed out by Prof. Bhandarkar in the Indian Antiquary, 1912, p. 170.

Pancit Sāstrī adds that the appointment by Aśoka of Dharma-mahāmātras, i.e., of superintendents of morals, was a direct invasion of the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. It is hardly correct to represent the Dharma-mahāmātras as mere superintendents of morals when their duties consisted in the establishment of the Law of Piety (which included liberality to Brāhmaṇas), the promotion of the welfare of the Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Gāndhāras, Rāṣṭrīkās, Brāhmaṇas and others, revision of sentences of imprisonment or execution, the supervision of the female establishments of the Emperor’s brothers

¹ Cf. Apanstamba Dharmaśāstra, II. 7. 10. 1. “Formerly men and gods lived together in this world. Then the gods in reward of their sacrifices went to heaven, but men were left behind. Those men who perform sacrifices in the same manner as the gods did, dwell with the gods and Brahma in heaven.” My attention was first drawn to this passage by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar. Cf. also Harivamśa (III. 32.1)

"Devatānā bhavāḥ manasāh kṣadāt sahavāya bhavattātā."
and other relatives, and the administration of almsgiving. These duties were not essentially those of a superintendent of morals, and were not a direct invasion of the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. Moreover there is nothing to show that the Dharma-mahāmatras were wholly recruited from non-Brāhmaṇas.

Our attention is next drawn to the passage where Aśoka insists upon his officers strictly observing the principles of Daṇḍasamātā and Vyāvahārasamātā. Pandit Sāstrī takes the expressions to mean equality of punishment and equality in lawsuits irrespective of caste, colour and creed, and adds that this order was very offensive to the Brāhmaṇas who claimed many privileges including immunity from capital punishment.

The passage containing the expressions Daṇḍa-samātā and Vyāvahāra-samātā should not be divorced from its context and interpreted as if it were an isolated ukase. We quote the passage with the context below:

"To my Rājukas set over many hundred thousands of people I have granted independence in the award of honours and penalties. But as it is desirable that there should be uniformity in judicial procedure (Vyāvahāra-samātā) and uniformity in penalties (Daṇḍa-samātā), from this time forward my rule is this—"To condemned men lying in prison under sentence of death a respite of three days is granted by me."

It is clear from the extract quoted above that the order regarding Vyāvahāra-samātā and Daṇḍa-samātā is to be understood in connection with the general policy of decentralisation which the Emperor introduced. Aśoka granted independence to the Rājukas in the award of penalties, but he did not like that the Daṇḍa and Vyāvahāra prevalent within the jurisdiction of one Rājuka

should be entirely different from those prevailing within the jurisdiction of others.\(^1\) He wanted to maintain some uniformity (samātā) both in Danda (penalties) as well as in Vyāvahāra (procedure). As an instance he refers to the rule about the granting of a respite of three days to condemned men. The Samātā which he enforced involved a curtailment of the autonomy of the Rājukas and did not necessarily infringe on the alleged immunity of the Brāhmaṇas from capital punishment.

But were the Brāhmaṇas really immune from capital punishment in ancient India? The immunity was certainly not known to the Kuru-Pauchāla Brāhmaṇas who thronged to the court of Janaka. In the Brīhadāranyaka Upanishad (III. 9. 26) we have a reference to a Brāhmaṇa disputant who failed to answer a question of Yājñavalkya and lost his head. We learn from the Pauchavimśa Brāhmaṇa\(^2\) that a Purohita might be punished with death for treachery to his master. Kautīlya, p. 229, tells us that a Brāhmaṇa guilty of treason was to be drowned. Readers of the Mahābhārata are familiar with the stories of the punishments inflicted on Maṇḍavya and Likhita.\(^3\) The life of a Brāhmaṇa was not so sacrosanct in ancient as in mediaeval and modern India. We learn from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa that king Hariśchandra of the Ikshvāku family did not scruple to offer a Brāhmaṇa boy as a victim in a sacrifice.

Against the surmises regarding the anti-Brāhmaṇical policy of Asoka we have the positive evidence of some of his inscriptions which proves the Emperor’s solicitude for the well-being of the Brāhmaṇas. Thus in Rock Edict III he inculcates liberality to Brāhmaṇas. In Edict IV he speaks with disapproval of unseemly behaviour towards

\(^1\) I am indebted for this suggestion to Mr. S. N. Majumdar.

\(^2\) Vedic Index, II, p. 84.

\(^3\) Ādi, 107 and śānti, 23, 26.
Brāhmaṇas. In Edict V he refers to the employment of Dharma-mahāmātrās to promote the welfare and happiness of the Brāhmaṇas.

Pāṇḍit Śastri says further that as soon as the strong hand of Aśoka was removed the Brāhmaṇas seemed to have stood against his successors. We have no evidence of any such conflict between the children of Aśoka and the Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand if the Brāhmaṇa historian of Kaśmir is to be believed the relations between Jalauka, one of the sons and successors of Aśoka, and the Brāhmaṇical Hindus were entirely friendly.

In conclusion Pāṇḍit Śastri refers to the assassination of the last Maurya Emperor of Magadha by Pushyamitra Śuṅga and says, “We clearly see the hands of the Brāhmaṇas in the great revolution.” But the Buddhist remains at Bhārhat erected “during the supremacy of the Śuṅgas” do not bear out the theory which represents Pushyamitra and his descendants as the leaders of a militant Brāhmaṇism. Are inferences deduced from uncorroborated writings of late authors like Tāranāth to be preferred to the clear testimony of contemporary monuments? Even admitting that Pushyamitra was a militant Brāhmaṇist we fail to see how the decay and dismemberment of the Maurya Empire can be attributed primarily to him or his Brāhmaṇist followers. The Empire was a shrivelled and attenuated carcase long before the Śuṅga coup d'etat of 185 B. C. We learn from the Rājatarangini that immediately after the death of Aśoka one of his sons, Jalauka, made himself independent in Kaśmir and conquered the plains including Kanauj. If Tāranāth is to be believed another Prince, Virasena apparently wrested Gandhāra from the hands of his feeble successor at Pāṭaliputra. The loss of the northern provinces is confirmed by Greek evidence. We learn from Polybius
that about 206 B.C., there ruled over them a king named Sophagasesus (Subhāgasena, probably a successor of Virasena). We quote the passage referring to the king below:

"He (Antiochos the Great) crossed the Caucasus and descended into India; renewed his friendship with Sophagasesus, the king of the Indians; received more elephants, until he had 150 altogether, and having once more provisioned his troops, set out again personally with his army, leaving Androsthenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him."

It will be seen that Subhāgasena was a king and not a petty chief of the Kabul valley as Dr. Smith would have us believe. He is called "King of the Indians," a title which was applied by the Classical writers to great kings like Chandragupta and Demetrios. There is nothing in the account of Polybius to show that he was vanquished by the Syrian king in war or was regarded by the latter as a subordinate ruler. On the contrary the statement that Antiochos "renewed his friendship with Sophagasesus, king of the Indians" proves that the two monarchs met on equal terms and friendly relations were established between them. The renewal of friendship on the part of the Greek king and the surrender of elephants on the part of his Indian brother only remind us of the relations subsisting between Chandragupta and Seleukos. Further the expression "renewal of friendship" seems to suggest that Subhāgasena had had previous dealings with Antiochos. Consequently he must have come to the throne sometime before 206 B.C. The existence of an independent kingdom in the north-west before 208 B.C. shows that the Maurya Empire must have begun to break up nearly a quarter of a century before the usurpation of Pushyamitra.
We have seen that the theory which ascribes the decline and dismemberment of the Maurya Empire to a Brāhmānical revolution led by Pushyamitra Sunaṇa does not bear scrutiny. Was the Maurya disruption due primarily to the Greek invasions? The earliest Greek invasion after Aśoka, that of Antiochos the Great, took place about 206 B.C., and we have seen that the combined testimony of Kalhaṇa and Polybius leaves no room for doubt that the dissolution of the empire began long before the raid of the Hellenistic monarch.

What then were the primary causes of the disintegration of the mighty empire? There are good grounds for believing that the government of the outlying provinces by the imperial officials was oppressive. Already in the time of Bindusāra ministerial oppression had goaded the people of Taxila to open rebellion. The Divyāvadāna says (p. 371):

"Atha Rājñō Vindusārasya Takshaśilā nama nagaram viruddham. Tatra Rājñā Vindusāren Aśoko visarjitah... yāvat Kumārāścharurāṅgēna balakāyena Takshaśilāṁ gataḥ, śrutvā Takshaśilā nīvāsinaḥ paurāḥ pratyudgamyā cha kathayanti 'na vayam Kumārasya viruddhāḥ nāpi Rājñō Vindusārasya api tu dushtāmātyaṁ asmākām paribhavam kurvanti'."

"Now Taxila a city of Bindusāra's revolted. The king Bindusāra despatched Aśoka there......while the prince was nearing Taxila with the four-fold army, the resident Paurās of Taxila, on hearing of it...came out to meet him and said:—'We are not opposed to the prince nor even to king Bindusāra. But these wicked ministers insult us'."

Taxila again revolted during the reign of Aśoka and the cause was again the tyranny of the ministers. "Rājñō-aśokasya-ottarpate Takshaśilā nagaram viruddham...." Prince Kunāla was deputed to the
government of the city. When the prince went there the people said “na vayam Kumārasyaviruddhā na rājūo ’
śokasy-āpi tu dushṭatmano’ mātyā āgatyāsmākam apamān-
amkurvanti.”

The Divyāvadāna is no doubt a late work, but the reality of ministerial oppression to which it refers is
affirmed by Aśoka himself in the Kāliṅga Edicts. Addressing the High officers (Mahāmātras) in charge of Tosalī he says: “All men are my children; and just as I desire for my children that they may
enjoy every kind of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same
for all men. You, however, do not grasp this truth to its full extent. Some individual, perchance, pays
heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well established.
Again, it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture and when the result is his imprisonment
without due cause, many other people are deeply grieved... Ill performance of duty can never gain my regard....
The restraint or torture of the townsmen may not take place without due cause. And for this purpose, in accordance with the Law of Piety, I shall send forth in rotation every five years such persons as are of mild and temperate
disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life...From Ujjain, however, the Prince for this purpose will send out
a similar body of officials, and will not over-pass three years. In the same way—from Taxila.”

From the concluding words of the Edict it appears that official maladministration was not confined to the
province of Kāliṅga. The state of affairs at Ujjain and Taxila was similar. It is thus clear that the loyalty of the
provincials was being slowly undermined by ministerial

---

oppression long before the Śuṅga revolution of 185 B.C., and the Greek invasion of 206 B.C. Aśoka no doubt did his best to check the evil, but he was ill served by his officers. It is significant that the provincials of the north-west—the very people who complained of the oppression of the dusṭāmātyas as early as the reign of Bindusāra were the first to break away from the Maurya empire.

The Magadhan successors of Aśoka had neither the strength nor perhaps the will to arrest the process of disruption. The martial ardour of imperial Magadha had vanished with the last cries of agony uttered in the battlefields of Kalinga. Aśoka had given up the aggressive militarism of his forefathers and had evolved a policy of Dhammadvijaya which must have seriously impaired the military efficiency of his empire. He had called upon his sons and grandsons to eschew new conquests, avoid the shedding of blood and take pleasure in patience and gentleness. These latter had heard more of Dhammadhosa than of Bherighosa. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the rois faînains who succeeded to the imperial throne of Pātaliputra proved unequal to the task of maintaining the integrity of the mighty fabric reared by the genius of Chandragupta and Chāṇakya.

The disintegration which set in before 206 B.C. was accelerated by the invasions led by the Yavanas referred to in the Gārgī Saṁhitā and the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The final coup de grace was given by l'ushyamitra Śuṅga.

1 On the contrary, if the Gārgī Saṁhitā is to be believed, one of his successors, namely, Śūlāśka actually quickened the pace by his tyranny—Saṁśāra mandata ghoraṁ dharmavāldi adhisthānaka. Some of Aśoka’s descendants (e.g., Jāhauka) set up independent sovereignty, and were thus responsible for the dismemberment of the empire.
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THE ŚUṆGA EMPIRE AND THE BACTRIAN GREEKS.

I. The Reign of Pushyamitra.

Bṛihadratha, the last Maurya Emperor of Magadha, was, according to the Purāṇas and the Harshacharita, assassinated by his general Pushyamitra Śuṅga who usurped the throne, and founded a new dynasty—that of the Śuṅgas.

The origin of the Śuṅga family is wrapped up in obscurity. According to one theory the Śuṅgas were Iranian, worshippers of the Sun (Mithra). Others regard them as Brāhmaṇas. Curiously enough Pāṇini in Sūtra IV. 1. 117 connects the Śuṅgas with the well known Brāhmaṇa family of the Bharadvajas. Sauṅgiputra, "son of a female descendant of Śuṅga," is the name of a teacher in the Bṛihadāranyaka Upanishad. Sauṅgāyani, "descendant of Sauṅga," is the name of a teacher in the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa. Macdonell and Keith point out that the Śuṅgas are known as teachers in the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra. It is not known for certain when and why the Śuṅgas, like the Kadambas of a later date, exchanged the ferule for the sword. There is no reason to think that Aśoka tyrannised over the Brāhmaṇas and that his oppression forced them to engage in non-priestly pursuits. Brāhmaṇa Senāpatis were by no means rare in ancient India (cf. the cases of Droṇa, Kṛipa and Aśvatthāman in the Mahābhārata and of Someśvara, the Brāhmaṇa general of the Pāla kings).

1 In the Mālavīśayatīrtra (Tawney's translation, p. 60) Agamitra claims descent from 'Bimbaka.' Mr. H. A. Shah suggests (Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, Madras, p. 379) that the Bimbikas were connected with the family of Bimbikara.

2 VI. 4. 31.
3 XII. 18. 5, etc.
The dominions of Pushyamitra extended to the river Narmadā, and included the cities of Pātaliputra, Ayodhyā, Vidiśā, Bharhut and, if Tāranātha is to be believed, Jalandhara. It appears from the Divyāvadāna, p. 131, that the Emperor himself continued to reside in Pātaliputra. The Mālavikāgnimitra tells us that Vidiśā was governed by Prince Agnimitra, probably as his father’s viceroy. Another viceroy, also a relation of the emperor, governed Kosala.1 Agnimitra’s queen had a brother of inferior caste, named Vīrasena. He was placed in command of a frontier fortress on the banks of the Narmadā (Ātthi devi vanāvaro bhādā Vīraṇaṇaṁ, so bhaṭṭinā antavālādugge Nammadāṭre thāvido). Lüders’ Inscriptions, Nos. 687-688, seem to suggest that Bharhut (in Baghelkhand) was governed by a Śuṅga feudatory.

Affairs in the Deccan.

It appears from the Mālavikāgnimitram that the foundation of the Śuṅga dynasty synchronised with the establishment of a new kingdom in the Deccan, viz., Vidarbha. Agnimitra’s Amāṭya refers to the kingdom as “achirādhishṭīta” (established not long ago) and compares its king to a tree which is newly planted and therefore not firm (nava-saṃropapat-sīthilera-stara). The king of Vidarbha is represented as a relation of the Maurya minister (Sachiva) and a natural enemy (prakṛtyamitra) of the Śuṅgas. It appears that during the reign of Bribhadratha Maurya there were two parties or factions in the Magadha Empire, one headed by the

1 The existence of this viceroyalty is disclosed by an inscription discovered at the door of a temple at Ayodhyā, which records the erection of a “ketana” by a Kosālādhīpā who was the sixth (brother, son or descendant?) of Senāpadī Pushyamitra, the performer of two horse sacrifices (Nāgarī Prachārī Pratirī, Vaiśākhha, sam 1911, Mod. Rev. 1914, October, p. 431).
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king's Sachiva or minister, the other headed by his Senāpati or general. The minister's partisan Yajñasena was appointed governor of Vidarbha, while the general's son Agnimitra got the Viceroyalty of Vidișā. When the general organised his coup d'état, killed the king, and imprisoned the minister, Yajñasena apparently declared his independence and commenced hostilities against the usurping family. This is why he is called acharādhishthita-rājya and prakṛity-amitra by Agnimitra and his Amātya.

The Mālavikāgnimitram says that when Kumāra Madhavasena, a cousin of Yajñasena and a partisan of Agnimitra, was secretly on his way to Vidișā, he was captured by an Antapala (Warden of the Marches) of Yajñasena and kept in custody. Agnimitra demanded his surrender. The Vidarbha king promised to give him up on condition that his brother-in-law the Maurya minister should be released. This enraged the Śunāga Prince who ordered Virasena to march against Vidarbha. Yajñasena was defeated. Madhavasena was released and the kingdom of Vidarbha was divided between the two cousins, the river Varadā forming the boundary between the two states.

In the opinion of several scholars an enemy more formidable than Yajñasena threatened the Śunāga dominions from Kalinga. In his Oxford History of India Dr. Smith accepts the view that Kharavela, king of Kalinga, defeated Pushyamitra who is called Bahapatimita or Bahasatimita in the Hāthigumpha Inscription. Prof. Dubreuil also seems to endorse the view that Kharavela was an antagonist of Pushyamitra, and that the Hāthigumpha Inscription is dated the 163th year of

1 Additions and Corrections, and p. 68n.
Rāja-Muriyakāla which corresponds to the 13th year of the reign of Khāravela.

Dr. Majumdar, however, points out that of the six letters of the Hāthigumpha Inscription which have been read as Bahasati-mitam, the second letter seems to have a clear U sign attached to it, and the third and fourth letters look like pa and sa. Even if the reading Bahasati-mitam or Bahapati-mitam be accepted as correct, the identification of Bahasati (Bṛhaspati-mitra) with Pushyamitra on the ground that Bṛhaspati is the regent of the nakshatra or Zodiacal asterism Pushya, also named Tishya, in the constellation Cancer or the Crab, cannot be regarded as final in the absence of further evidence. In this connection we should note that the Divyāvadāna (p. 434) represents Pataliputra as the residence of Pushyamitra whereas the Magadhan antagonist of Khāravela is called "Rajagahanapa" and apparently resided in the city of Rājagṛha.

The date "165th year of the Muriyakāla" is deduced from a passage of the Hāthigumpha Inscription which was read as follows:


There is another passage in the same inscription which runs thus:

Pampchame cha dānī vasa Namda-rāja ti-vasa-sata (m ?)—oghāṭitaṁ Tanasuliya-vatā-panāṭām Nagaram pavesa-tī.

If Pāṇaṃtariya-sāthi-vasa-sate be taken to mean 185 years, ti-vasa-sata should be taken to mean 103 years and we shall have to conclude that Khāravela flourished 185

---

1 Ind. Ant., 1919, p. 189.
3 Jayaśwāl, JBORE, 1917, p. 450.
years after a Maurya king and only 103 years after Nandarāja which is impossible as the Nandas preceded the Mauryas. If, on the other hand, ti-vasa-sata be taken to mean 300 years, pānāmtariya-sāthi-vasa-sate should be taken to mean not 163 but 6,500 years. In other words Khāravela will have to be placed 6,500 years after a Maurya which is also impossible. Mr. Jayaswal has himself now given up the reading “pānāmtariya-sāthi-vasa-sate Rāja-Muriya-kāle vucchhine cha chhe-yathī Argasi ti kāmṭāriyam upādiyati” in line 16, and proposes to read “pānātariya sata-sahasehi Muriya kālam vucchhina cha chhojathī agasatikāmṭariyam upādiyati.” He translates the expression beginning with Muriyakāla thus:—“he (the king) completes the Muriya time (era), counted, and being of an interval of 61 with a century.”

With regard to this new reading and translation Professor Chanda observes: “the rendering of vucchhine as ‘counted’ is even more far-fetched than ‘expired.’ The particle cha after vucchhine makes it difficult to read it as vucchhinam qualifying the substantive Muriyakālam. Even if we overlook vucchhine, the passage appears to be a very unusual way of stating a date. Still more unusual is the statement of a date as an independent achievement in a prāṣasti.” It may be added that there is no reliable evidence of the existence of a Rāja-Muriya-kāla in the sense of an era founded by the first Maurya.

Mr. Jayaswal takes ti-vasa-sata to mean 300 years and places Khāravela and Pushyamitra three centuries after Nandarāja whom he identifies with Nandavardhana.

---

1 JBERS, Vol. IV, Part iv.
2 M. A. S. I., No. 1, p. 10.
3 An era of Samsattt, grandson of Aśoka, is however, mentioned in an ancient Jain Ms. (KHI 1 p. 202n). If we refer the year 164 to this era, the date of Khāravela must be brought down to (Cf 224—164=) 60 B.C.
But we have already seen that Nandavardhana or Nandivardhana was a Śaśānāga king, and that the Śaśānāgas do not appear to have had anything to do with Kaliṅga. "It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought ‘all under his sole sway’ and ‘uprooted all Kshatriyas’ or the old reigning families. So we should identify Namdarāja of the Hāthigumpha inscription who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons."1 As Mahāpadma and his sons ruled in the fourth century B.C., Khāravela must be assigned either to the third century B.C. (taking ti-vasa-sata to mean 103) or to the first century B.C. (taking ti-vasa-sata to mean 300). In either case he could not have been a contemporary of Pushyamitra Śunga who ruled from about 185 to 149 B.C.

**The Yavana Invasion.**

The only undoubted historical events of Pushyamitra’s time, besides the coup d’état of 185 B.C. and the Vidarbha war, are the Greek invasion from the North-West referred to by Patañjali and Kālidāsa, and the celebration of the horse sacrifice.

Patañjali was a contemporary of Pushyamitra. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar draws our attention to the passage in the Mahābhāṣya—iha Pushyamitram yājayāmah “here we perform the sacrifices by Pushyamitra”—which is cited as an illustration of the Vārtika teaching the use of the present tense to denote an action which has begun but not finished.2 The instances given by Patañjali of the use of the imperfect to indicate an action well-known to people, but not witnessed by the speaker, and still

---

2 Ind. Ant., 1872, p. 300.
possible to have been seen by him, are, "Arunad Yavanaḥ Sāketam: Arunad Yavano Madhyamikām." This, says Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, shows that a certain Yavana or Greek prince had besieged Sāketa or Ayodhya and another place called Madhyamikā when Patañjali wrote this. Kālidāsa in his Mālavikāgnimitram refers to a conflict between the Śuṅga prince Vasumitra and a Yavana on the southern bank of the Sindhu. Unfortunately the name of the invader is not given either in the Mahābhārata or the Mālavikāgnimitram. There is a considerable divergence of opinion with regard to his identity. But all agree that he was a Bactrian Greek.

The Bactrian Greeks were originally subjects of the Seleukid Empire of Syria (and Western Asia). We learn from Strabo, Trogus and Justin that "about the middle of the third century B.C. when the Seleukid rulers were pre-occupied in the west" Diodotos or Theodotus, "Governor of the thousand cities of Bactria," revolted and assumed the title of king. He was succeeded, according to Justin, by his son Theodotus II who entered into an alliance with Arsakes who about this time tore Parthia from the Seleukid Empire.

The successor of Theodotus II (Diodotes II) was Euthydemos. We learn from Strabo that Euthydemos and his party occasioned the revolt of all the country near the province of Bactriana. We are told by Polybius that Antiochos III of Syria made an attempt to recover the lost provinces but afterwards made peace with Euthydemos. The historian says "Antiochos the Great received the young prince (Demetrios, son of Euthydemos) and judging from his appearance, conversation and the dignity of his manners that he was worthy of royal

---

1 Near Chitor; cf. Mbb, II, 328.
honour he first promised to give him one of his daughters, and secondly, conceded the royal title to his father. And having on the other points caused a written treaty to be drawn up and the terms of the treaty to be confirmed on oath, he marched away, after liberally provisioning his troops, and accepting the elephants belonging to Euthydemos. He crossed the Caucasus and descended into India; renewed his friendship with Sophagasenus, the king of the Indians; received more elephants, until he had 150 altogether, and having once more provisioned his troops, set out again personally with his army, leaving Androstenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him."

Not long after the expedition of Antiochos the Great, the Bactrian Greeks themselves formed the design of extending their kingdom by the conquest of the territories lying to the south of the Hindukush. Strabo says "the Greeks who occasioned its (Bactria's) revolt became so powerful that they became masters of Ariana and India, according to Apollodorus of Artemita. Their chiefs, particularly Menander (if he really crossed the Hypanis\(^1\) to the east and reached Isamus\(^2\)) conquered more nations than Alexander. These conquests were achieved partly by Menander, partly by Demetrios, son of Euthydemos, king of the Bactrians. They got possession not only of Patalene (Indus Delta), but of the kingdoms of Saraostos (Surāśhra or Kāthiāwār), and Sigerdis (probably Ṣagradvipa of the Mahābhārata, II. 31. 66, Cutch ?) which constitute the remainder of the coast. Apollodorus in short says that Bactriana is the

---

\(^1\) i.e., the Hypanis or Vīpāśa (the Bass).

\(^2\) The Teśāmāḥ! In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (V 10. 17) a river of this name is mentioned in conjunction with the Kandīki, Māndīkīni, Yamunā, etc.
ornament of all Ariana. They extended their empire even as far as the Seres and Phryni."

Strabo gives the credit for spreading the Greek dominion furthest to the east into India partly to Menander and partly to Demetrios, son of Euthydemus and son-in-law of Antiochos the Great.

**Menander** has been identified with the king Milinda who is mentioned in the Milindapañho as a contemporary of the Buddhist Thera Nāgasena. This monarch was born at Kalsigrāma in the Island of Alasanda or Alexandria and had his capital at Sāgala or Śākala, modern Siālkot, in the Panjāb, and not at Kābul as Dr. Smith seemed to think. The extent of his conquests is indicated by the great variety and wide diffusion of his coins which have been found over a very wide extent of country, as far west as Kābul, and as far east as Mathurā. The author of the Periplus states that small silver coins, inscribed with Greek characters and bearing the name of Menander were still current in his time (cir. 60-80 A.D.) at the port of Barygaza (Broach). Plutarch tells us that Menander was noted for justice, and enjoyed such popularity with his subjects that upon his death which took place in camp, diverse cities contended for the possession of his ashes. The statement of Plutarch is important as showing that Menander’s dominions included many cities.

**Demetrios** has been identified by some with king Dattamitra mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, the “great Emetreus, the king of Inde” of Chaucer’s *Knightes Tale*

---

2. Trenchner, Milindapañho, p. 83.
3. Ibid., p. 82; CHI, 550.
4. Ibid., pp. 2, 14.
5. EEI, 1914, p. 225.
   L. 139, 23.
and Timita of a Besnagar seal. The wide extent of his conquests is proved by the existence of several cities named after him or his father in Afghanistan as well as India. Thus in the work of Isidore of Charax we have a reference to a city named Demetrias polis in Arachosia. The Mahābhāshya and the Vyākaraṇa of Kramaṭīśvara mention a city in Sauvitra called Dattāmitra. Ptolemy the Geographer mentions the city of Euthymedia (Euthydemia?) which was identical with Śākala; and was, according to the Milindapañho, the capital of the Indo-Greek Empire in the time of Menander.

It is permissible to conjecture that one of the two conquering kings, viz., Menander and Demetrios, was identical with the Yavana invader who penetrated to Śāketa in Oudh, Madhyamikā near Chitor, and the river Sindhu in Central India, in the time of Pushyamitra, Goldstücker, Smith and many other scholars identified the invader with Menander who crossed the Hypanis and penetrated as far as the Isamus (Trisāma?). On the other hand, Prof. Bhandarkar suggested, in his Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population, the identification of the invader with Demetrios. We learn from Polybius that Demetrios was a young man at the time of Antiochus III's invasion cir. 206 B. C. Justin says that Demetrios was "king of the Indians" when Eukratides was king of the Bactrians and Mithridates was king of the Parthians. "Almost at the same time that Mithridates ascended the throne among the Parthians, Eukratides began to reign among the Bactrians; both of them being great men...
Eukratides carried on several wars with great spirit, and though much reduced by his losses in them, yet, when he was besieged by Demetrios, king of the Indians, with a garrison of only 300 soldiers, he repulsed, by continual sallies, a force of 60,000 enemies." Dr. Smith assigns Mithridates to the period from 171 to 136 B.C. Eukratides and Demetrios must also be assigned to that period, that is, the middle of the second century B.C.

We have seen that Demetrios was a young man and a prince in 206 B.C. We now find that he ruled as king of the Indians in the middle of the second century B.C. He was, therefore, the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra Śunga who ruled from 185 to 149 B.C. Menander, on the other hand, must have ruled over the Indo-Greek kingdom much later, as will be apparent from the facts noted below. Justin tells us that Demetrios was deprived of his Indian possessions by Eukratides. Eukratides was killed by his son with whom he had shared his throne. The identity of the parricide is uncertain but no one says that he was Menander.

Justin furnishes the important information that the prince who murdered Eukratides was a colleague of his father. We know that Greek rulers who reigned conjointly sometimes issued joint coins. Thus we have joint coins of Lysias and Antialkidas, of Strato and Agathokleia, of Strato I and Strato II, and of Hermias and

---

2 Ibid, p. 277.
3 According to Cunningham and Smith the parricide was Apollodotos. But Rapseon shows good reasons for believing that Apollodotos did not belong to the family of Eukratidhs, but was, on the other hand, a ruler of Kipha who was ousted by Eukratides (JRA8, 1903, pp. 784-785). Rawlinson points out (Intercourse between India and the Western World, p. 73) that Apollodotos uses the epithet Philopator, and the title would be somewhat incongruous if he were a parricide. It may be argued that the parricide was Apollodotos Soter and not Apollodotos Philopator, but we should remember that the titles Soter and Philopator sometimes occur on the same coin (Whitehead, Catalogue of Coins, p. 48) and therefore it is impossible to justify the separation of Apollodotos Soter and Apollodotos Philopator as two entities.
Calliope. The only Greeks whose names and portraits appear on a coin together with those of Eukratides are Heliokles and his wife Laodike. Gardner suggested that Heliokles and Laodike were the father and mother of Eukratides. But Von Sallet\(^1\) proposed an entirely different interpretation of the coins in question. He thought that they were issued by Eukratides, not in honour of his parents, but on the occasion of the marriage of his son Heliokles with a Laodike whom Von Sallet conjectured to have been daughter of Demetrios by the daughter of Antiochos III. If Von Sallet’s conjecture be accepted then it is permissible to think that Heliokles was the colleague of Eukratides referred to by Justin, and the murderer of his father.

It is clear from what has been stated above that Demetrios was succeeded by Eukratides, who, in his turn, was followed by Heliokles. Menander could not have reigned earlier than Heliokles. It may, however, be argued that after Demetrios the Indo-Greek kingdom split up into two parts, one part which included the Trans-Indus territories was ruled by Eukratides and his son, the other part which included Euthymedia or Sakala was ruled by Menander who thus might have been a younger contemporary of Eukratides (cir. 171 B.C.) and consequently of Pushyamitra Sunga (cir. 155-149 B.C.).

Now, the disruption of the Indo-Greek kingdom after Demetrios may be accepted as an historical fact. The existence of two rival Greek kingdoms in India and their mutual dissensions are proved by literary and numismatic evidence. The Purāṇas say:—

\[
\text{Bhavishyantīla Yavanā dharmataḥ kāmato’rthatataḥ naiva mūrdhābhishiktās te bhavishyanti nāradhipāḥ}
\]

\(^1\) Ind. Ant., 1880, p. 256.
yuga-dosha-durāchāra bhavishyanti nṛpās tu te
strinām bāla-vadhenaiva hātvā chaiva pārasparam

"There will be Yavanas here by reason of religious
feeling or ambition or plunder; they will not be kings
solemnly anointed but will follow evil customs by reason
of the corruptions of the age. Massaering women and
children and killing one another, kings will enjoy the
earth at the end of the Kali age." ¹

The Gārgī Saṃhitā says—

Madhyadeśe na sthāsyanti Yavanā yuddha durmadābh
Teshām anyonya saṁbhāvā (?)bhavishyanti na saṁśayāḥ
Ātma-chakrotthitām ghorām yuddham parama-dāruṇam

"The fiercely fighting Greeks will not stay in the
Madhyadeśa; there will be a cruel, dreadful war in their
own kingdom, caused between themselves." ²

Coins bear testimony to struggles between kings
of the house of Eukratides and kings of the family of
Euthydemos. But the evidence which we have got
clearly indicates that the contemporaries and rivals of
Eukratides and Heliokles were Apollodotos, Agathokleia
and Strato I, and not Menander. Certain square
bronze coins of Eukratides have on the obverse a bust
of the king and the legend Basileus Megalom Eukra-
tidou. On the reverse there is the figure of Zeus and the
legend "Kavisīye nagara-devatā." They are often coins
of Apollodotos restruck.³ From this it is clear that
Apollodotos was a rival of Eukratides and was superseded
in the rule of Kāpiśa by the latter. Rapson further
points out⁴ that Heliokles restruck the coins of

¹ Fargiter.
² Kern, Brihat Saṃhitā, p. 38.
³ Rapson, JRAS, 1905, 766.
⁴ JRAS, 1905, pp. 165 ff.
Agathokleia and Strato I ruling conjointly. Further, the restriking is always by Heliokles, never by Agathokleia and Strato I. From this it is clear that Agathokleia and Strato I ruled over an Indo-Greek principality either before, or in the time of Heliokles, but not after him.

We have seen that according to the evidence of Justin and the Kāpiśa coins Eukratides fought against two rivals, namely, Demetrios and Apollodotos, his son Heliokles also fought against two rivals, namely, Agathokleia and Strato I. As Demetrios and Apollodotos were both antagonists of Eukratides and used the same coin-types, the inevitable inference is that they were very near in time as well as in relationship to one another, in fact that one immediately followed the other. Now Demetrios was beyond doubt the son and successor of Euthydemos, consequently Apollodotos must have been his successor.

As Heliokles was a son of Eukratides, the rival of Apollodotos, he must have been a younger contemporary of Apollodotos. Consequently Heliokles' antagonists Agathokleia and Strato I, whose coins he restruck, were very near in time to Apollodotos. Strato I later on ruled conjointly with his grandson Strato II. There is no room for the long and prosperous reign of Menander in the period which elapsed from Demetrios to Strato II. According to the Buddhist tradition recorded in the Milindapañha, Milinda or Menander flourished "500 years"\(^1\) after the Parinirvāna, parinibbānato pañcha-vassa sate atikkante ete upajjissanti.\(^2\) This tradition probably points to a date in the first century B.C. for Menander. Thus both according to numismatic evidence and literary tradition Menander could not have been

\(^1\) i.e., in the fifth century (cf. Smith EB1, 3rd edition, 323).
\(^2\) Trelokar, the Milinda-pañha, p. 3.
the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra Śunga. It is Demetrios who should, therefore, be identified with the Yavana invader referred to by Patañjali and Kālidāsa, one of whose armies was defeated by Prince Vāsūmitra.

The Āśvamedha Sacrifice.

After the victorious wars with Vidarbha and the Yavanas Pushyamitra celebrated a horse-sacrifice. This sacrifice is regarded by some scholars as marking an early stage in the Brāhmaṇical reaction which was fully developed five centuries later in the time of Samudra Gupta and his successors. Late Buddhist writers are alleged to represent Pushyamitra as a cruel persecutor of the religion of Śākyamuni. But the Buddhist monuments at Bhārhut erected "during the supremacy of the Śungas" do not bear out the theory that the Śungas were the leaders of a militant Brāhmaṇism. Though staunch adherents of orthodox Hinduism the Śungas do not appear to have been so intolerant as some writers represent them to be.

The Mantriparishad in the Śunga Period.

If Kālidāsa is to be believed the Mantriparishad (Assembly of Councillors or Council of Ministers) continued to be an important element of the governmental machinery during the reign of Pushyamitra. The poet gives us the important information that even the viceregal princes were assisted by Parishads. The Mālavikāgnimitram refers in clear terms to the dealings of Prince Agnimitra, the Viceroy of Vidiśā, with his Parishad:

---

1 Bühler (Ep. Ind. III. 137) points out that Mokha's Kumāras were also each assisted by a body of Mahāmaṇḍras. These probably correspond to the Kumārāṃśyas of the Gupta period.
"Deva evam Amātya-parishado vijñāpayāmi"  
"Mantri-parishado'pyetad-eva darsanam  
Dvidhā vibhaktām śriyam-udvahantau  
dhuram rathāsvāviva samgrāhītuḥ  
tau sthāyatas-te nripater nideśe  
paraspar-āvagraha-nirvikārau"  
Rājā: tena hi Mantri-parishadam brūhi senānye Viraśenaḥ  
likhyatām-evam kriyatām iti."  

It seems that the Amātya-parishad or Mantri-parishad  
was duly consulted whenever an important matter of  
foreign policy had to be decided.

II. Agnimitra and his Successors.

Pushyamitra died in or about 140 B.C. after a reign  
of 36 years, and was succeeded by his son Agnimitra.  
The name of a prince named Agnimitra has been found  
on several copper coins discovered in Rohilkhand.  
Cunningham was of opinion that this prince was probably  
not a Śunga, but belonged to a local dynasty of North  
Pañchāla (Rohilkhand). He gave two reasons for this  
conclusion:

1. Agnimitra's is the only coin-name found in the  
Purānic lists. The names of the other Mitra kings do not  
agree with those found in the Purānas.

2. The coins are very rarely found beyond the limits  
of North Pañchāla.

1 "King: I will announce this decision to the Council of Ministers."

"This is also the view of the (Council of) Ministers. These two kings,  
upholding the fortunes of their superior lord divided between them, as the horses  
upholding the yoke of the charioteer, will remain firm in their allegiance to thee, not  
being distracted by mutual attacks."

2 "King: Tell the Council then to send to the General Viraśena written instructions  
to this effect." (Tawney, Māhāvīrāgnaimitra, pp. 89-90.)

Coins of Ancient India, p. 79.
As to the first point Rivett-Carnac and Jayaswal have shown that several coin-names besides that of Agnimitra can be identified with those found in the Purānic lists of Śunga and Kāṇva kings; for example, Jethamitra may be identified with the successor of Agnimitra, Vasu-Jyesṭhā or Su-Jyesṭhā who is called simply Jyesṭhā in the k Vishṇu manuscript. Bhadraghosha may be identified with Ghosha the seventh king of the Purānic list of Śunga kings. Bhumimitra may be identified with the Kāṇva king of that name. Several names indeed cannot be identified, but they may have been names of those Śungas who survived the usurpation of Vasudeva Kāṇva, and the remnant of whose power was destroyed by the Andhra (bhṛitya)ś and Śiśunandi.

As to the second point we should remember that Mitra coins have been found at Kausāmbhi, Ayodhya and Mathurā as well as in Pañchāla. Names of two Mitra kings Brahmanmitra and Indramitra are found engraved on two rail pillars at Budh Gayā as well as on coins discovered at Mathurā and North Pañchāla. In the face of these facts it is difficult to say that the Mitras were a local dynasty of North Pañchāla.

Agnimitra's successor, as we have already seen, was Jyesṭhā of the k Vishṇu manuscript who is very probably identical with Jethamitra of the coins.

The next king Vasumitra was a son of Agnimitra. During the life-time of his grandfather he had led the Śunga army against the Yavanas and defeated them on the Sindhu (in Central India) which probably formed the boundary between the Śunga and Indo-Greek dominions.

1 Ind. Ant. 1880, 341.
2 JBOBS, 1917, p. 479.
3 Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 31, n. 12.
4 Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 49.
5 Coins of Ancient India, p. 74.
Vasumitra's successor is called Bhadraka in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Ādraka and Odruka in the Vishnu, Andhraka in the Vāyu, and Antaka in the Matsya Purāṇa. Mr. Jayaswal identifies him with Uḍāka mentioned in a Pabhosā Inscription which runs thus: "By Āśādhaseṇa, the son of Gopāli Vaihikdarī and maternal uncle of king Bahasatimitra, son of Gopāli, a cave was caused to be made in the tenth year of Uḍāka for the use of the Kassapiya Arhats." We learn from another Pabhosā Inscription that Āśādhaseṇa belonged to the royal family of Adhichhatra, the capital of North Pañcchala. Mr. Jayaswal maintains that Odraka (Uḍāka) was the paramount Sunga sovereign, while the family of Āśādhaseṇa was either gubernatorial or feudatory to the Magadha throne. Marshall, on the other hand, identifies the fifth Sunga with king Kāśiputra Bhagabhadra mentioned in a Garuda Pillar Inscription found in the old city of Vidiśa, now Besnagar. Mr. Jayaswal identifies Bhāga-bhadra with Bhāga Sunga, i.e., Bhāgavata of the Purāṇas. This theory has to be given up in view of the discovery of another Besnagar Garuda Pillar Inscription (of the twelfth year after the installation of Mahārāja Bhāgavata) which proves that there was at Vidiśa a king named Bhāgavata apart from king Kāśiputra Bhagabhadra. In the absence of clear evidence connecting Uḍāka with Vidiśa it cannot be confidently asserted that he belonged to the house of Agnimitra and Bhāgavata. The view of Marshall seems to be more probable.

It appears that the successors of Agnimitra at Vidiśa cultivated friendly relations with the Greek sovereigns of the Pañjāb. The policy of the Bactrian Greeks in this respect resembled that of their Seleukidan predecessors. Seleukos, we know, first tried to conquer the Magadha

1 A Guide to Bārhi, p. 11 n.
Empire, but being frustrated in his attempts thought it prudent to make friends with the Mauryas. The Bactrians, too, after the reverses they sustained at the hands of Pushyamitra’s general, apparently gave up, for a time at least, their hostile attitude towards the Sungas. We learn from the Besnagar Inscription of the reign of Bhāgabhadrā that Heliodora, the son of Diya (Dion), a native of Taxila, came as an Ambassador from Mahārāja Antialikita (Antialkidas) to Rājan Kāśiputra Bhāgabhadrā the Saviour (Trāṭāra), who was prospering in the fourteenth year of his reign. The ambassador, though a Greek, professed the Bhāgavata religion and set up a Garuḍadhvaja in honour of Vasudeva, the god of gods. He was apparently well-versed in the Mahābhārata¹ which he might have heard recited in his native city of Taxila.

Nothing in particular is known regarding the three immediate successors of Bhadraka. The ninth king Bhāgavata had a long reign which extended over 32 years. Prof. Bhandarkar identifies him with the Mahārāja Bhāgavata mentioned in one of the Besnagar Inscriptions mentioned above. Bhāgavata’s successor Devabhuti or Devabhūmi was a young and dissolute prince. The Purāṇas state that he was overthrown after a reign of 10 years by his Amātya Vasudeva. Bāna in his Harsha-charita says that the over-libidinous Śūṅga was bereft of his life by his Amātya Vasudeva with the help of a daughter of Devabhūti’s slave woman (Dāsī), disguised as his queen. Bāna’s statement does not necessarily imply that Devabhūti was identical with the murdered Śūṅga. His statement may be construed to mean that Vasudeva entered into a

¹ The three immortal precepts (dāma, chīga and apramāda), mentioned in the second part of Heliodora’s inscription, occur in the Mahābhārata (XI.7.28 : Damāntyāgo pramādaśca te trayo Brahmāṇa hayaḥ). Cf. also Gītā, XVI.1.2. See J. A. S. B. 1922, pp. 269-271.
conspiracy with the emissaries of Devabhūti to bring about the downfall of the reigning Śuṅga (Bhāgavata), and to raise Devabhūti to the throne. But in view of the unanimous testimony of the Purāṇas this interpretation of the statement of Bāṇa cannot be upheld.

The Śuṅga power was not altogether extinguished after the tragic end of Devabhūti. It probably survived in Central India1 till the rise of the so-called Andhras, Andhrabhṛityas or Sātavāhanas who "swept away the remains of the Śuṅga power" and probably appointed Śiśunandi2 to govern the Vidiśā region. Śiśunandi's younger brother had a grandson (daunhitra) named Śiśuka who became the ruler of Purika. Curiously enough Śiśuka is also the Purānic name of the first king of the Andhra (bhṛitya) dynasty. It is not improbable that the two Śiśukas were identical, and that after overthrowing the Śuṅgas, Śiśuka (Simuka of the Inscriptions) annexed Purika but placed Vidiśā under his maternal relations.

III. Importance of the Śuṅga period of Indian History.

The rule of the Śuṅga emperors marks an important epoch in the history of India in general and of Central India in particular. The renewed incursions of the Yavanas which once threatened to submerge the whole of the Madhyadeśa received a check, and the Greek dynasts of the borderland reverted to the prudent policy of their Seleukidан precursors. There was an outburst of activity in the domains of religion, literature and art, comparable to that of the glorious epoch of the Guptas. In the history of these activities the names of three Central Indian localities stand pre-eminent: Vidiśā,

1 Cf. Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 48.
2 Ibid, 48.
(Besnagar), Gonarda and Bhārhut. As Foucher points out "it was the ivory-workers of Vidiśā who carved, in the immediate vicinity of their town, one of the monumental gates of Sāñchi." Inscriptions at Vidiśā (and Ghasundi) testify to the growing importance and wide prevalence of the Bhāgavata religion. Though no Aśoka arose to champion this faith, the missionary propaganda of its votaries must have been effective even in the realms of Yavana princes, and a Yavana dūta was one of its most notable converts. Gonarda was the birthplace of the celebrated Patañjali, the greatest literary genius of the period. Bhārhut saw the construction of the famous railing which has made the sovereignty of the Śuṅgas (Suganam raja) immortal.
THE FALL OF THE MAGADHAN AND INDO-GREEK POWERS.

1. The Kāṇvas, the Later Śūṅgas and the Later Mitras.

Vasudeva at whose instance the “over-libidinous Śūṅga” was “reft of his life” founded about 73 B.C. a new line of kings known as the Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana dynasty. The Purāṇas give the following account of this family. “He (Vasudeva), the Kāṇvāyana, will be king 9 years. His son Bhūmimitra will reign 14 years. His son Nārāyaṇa will reign 12 years. His son Suṣaṇman will reign 10 years. These are remembered as the Śūṅga-bhṛitya Kāṇvāyana kings. These four Kāṇva Brāhmanas will enjoy the earth. They will be righteous. In succession to them the earth will pass to the Andhras.” Bhūmimitra seems to be identical with the king of that name known from coins.

The chronology of the Kāṇva dynasty is a matter of controversy. In his Early History of the Deccan, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observes “the founder of the Andhra-bhṛityas is said to have uprooted not only the Kāṇvas, but ‘whatever was left of the power of the Śūṅgas.’ And the Kāṇvas are pointedly spoken of as Śūṅga-bhṛityas or servants of the Śūṅgas. It, therefore, appears likely that when the princes of the Śūṅga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped the whole power and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns. Thus then these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śūṅgas include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas.”
Now, the Purānic evidence only proves that certain princes belonging to the Śunga stock continued to rule till the Andhra (bhṛitya) conquest and were the contemporaries of the Kāṇvas. But there is nothing to show that these rois faineants of the Śunga stock were identical with any of the ten Śunga kings mentioned by name in the Purānic lists, who reigned 112 years. On the contrary, the distinct testimony of the Purāṇas that Devabhūti, the tenth and last Śunga of the Purānic lists, was the person slain by Vasudeva the first Kāṇva, probably shows that the rois faineants, who ruled contemporaneously with Vasudeva and his successors, were later than Devabhūti, and were not considered to be important enough to be mentioned by name. Consequently the 112 years that tradition assigns to the ten Śunga kings from Pushyamitra to Devabhūti do not include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to accept Dr. Smith's date B.C. 73-28 for the Kāṇva dynasty.

It is not known in what relationship the Kāṇvas and the Later Śungas stood to the "Mitra" kings who were supplanted by the Satraps of Mathura. Among these Later Mitras, Vishṇumitra and Gomitra deserve mention.

II. The Śatavāhanas and the Chetas.

While the Śungas and Kāṇvas were engaged in their petty feuds, new powers were rising in trans-Vindhyan India. These were the Śatavāhana, Andhra or Andhra-bhṛitya kingdom of Dakshināpatha and the Cheta kingdom of Kalinga.

The founder of the Satavahana or the so-called Andhra (bhṛitya) dynasty was Simuka whose name is misspelt as Śisuka, Sindhuka and Śipraka in the Purāṇas. The Purāṇas state that the Andhra Simuka will assail the

1 E.H.L. 227a; IHQ II.3.441.
Kāṇṭhāyanas and Suśarman, and destroy the remains of the Śūṅgas' power and will obtain this earth. If this statement be true then it cannot be denied that Simuka flourished in the first century B.C. Dr. Smith and many other scholars, however, reject the unanimous testimony of the Purāṇas. They attach more importance to a statement about which there is not the same unanimity, that the Andhras ruled for four centuries and a half. Accordingly they place Simuka in the third century B.C. and say that the dynasty came to an end in the third century A.D.

A discussion of Simuka's date involves the consideration of the following questions:

1. What is the age of the script of the Nāṇāghat record of Nāyanikā, daughter-in-law of Simuka?

2. What is the actual date of Kharavela's Hāthigumpha Inscription which refers to a Sātakarni who was apparently a successor of Simuka?

3. What is the exact number of Andhra (bhṛitya) kings and what is the duration of their rule?

As to the first point we should note that according to Professor Chanda the inscription of Nāyanikā is later than the Besnagar Inscription of Bhagavata the penultimate king of the Early Śūṅga dynasty. Consequently Simuka may be placed in the Kāṇva period, i.e., in the first century B.C.—a date which accords with Purānic evidence.

As to the second point Mr. B. D. Banerji gives good grounds for believing that the expression Ti-vasa-sata occurring in the passage "Pamohame cha dānī vase Namdaraja ti-vasa-sata..........." of the Hāthigumpha


2 Bāhār also observes (ASWL, Vol. V. 65) that the characters of the Nāṇāghat inscription belong to a period anterior by about 100 years to that of the edict of Gautami putra Sātakarni and his son Puṣvāyati.
Inscription means not 103 but 300. This is also the view of Mr. Jayaswal and Professor Chanda. If Ti-vasasata means 200 Khāravela and his contemporary Śātakarnī must have flourished 300 years after Nandarāja, i.e., in or about 23 B.C. This agrees with the Purānic evidence which makes Śātakarnī’s father a contemporary of the last Kāṇva king Susaṃan (38-28 B.C.).

We now come to the third point, viz., the determination of the exact number of Śātavāhana kings, and the duration of their rule.

Regarding each of these matters we have got two different traditions. As to the first the Matsya Purāṇa says:

“Ekona-vimśatir-hyete Andhrā bhokshyanti vai mahīm,” but it gives thirty names.

The Vāyu Purāṇa with the exception of the ‘M’ manuscript says—

“Ityete vai niśpac trimśad Andhrā bhokshyanti ye mahīm,” but most of the Vāyu manuscripts name only seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen kings.

As to the duration of the Andhra rule several Matsya manuscripts say—

“Teshām varsha śaṭāṇi syuṣ chatvāri shashtīr eva cha.” Another Matsya manuscript puts it slightly differently:—

“Dvādaśadhikam eteshām rājaṁ śata-chatushtayam.”

While a Vāyu passage gives altogether a different tradition:

“Andhrā bhokshyanti vasudhām śate dve cha śataṁ cha vai.”

1 JEBOS, 1917, 496-497.

* In his fifth year Khāravela extended an aqueduct that had not been used for ti-vasa-sata since Nandarāja. If “ti-vasa-sata” is taken to mean 103, Khāravela’s accession must be placed 103—5 = 98 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of Yavarāja took place 9 years before that date, i.e., 98—9 = 90 years after Nandarāja. (i.e., not later than 323 B.C.—80=234 B.C.). Khāravela’s father must have been on the throne at that time, and he was preceded by his father. But we
Obviously according to one tradition there were about nineteen kings who probably ruled for 300 years as the Vayu says, while according to another tradition there were thirty kings whose reigns covered a period of more than 400 years. In the opinion of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar the longer list includes the names of princes belonging to all the branches of the Andhrabhṛitya dynasty, and that the longer period represents the total duration of the reigns of all the princes belonging to the several branches. The period of 300 years, and the seventeen, eighteen or nineteen names given in the Vayu Purāṇa, and hinted at in the Matsya, refer to the main branch. That there was at least one line of Sātakarnis distinct from the main branch is admitted by all. Inscriptions in Aparānta, in Kanara and in the north of Mysore testify to the existence of a family of Sātakarnis who ruled over Kuntala (the Kanarese districts) before the Kadambas.¹ The Matsya list includes at least two kings of this line named Skandāsvāti and Kuntala Sātakarni, who are passed over in silence by the Vayu. Skanda-nāga-Sātaka actually appears as the name of a prince of the Kanarese line of Sātakarnis in a Kanheri inscription.² As to Kuntala Sātakarni, the commentary on Vatsyaśāna's Kāmasūtra takes the word "Kuntala" in the name Kuntala Sātakarni Sātavāhana to mean "Kuntala-vishaye jātavāt tat-samākhyāḥ." It is, therefore, fair to conclude that the Matsya Purāṇa which mentions 30 Sātavāhana kings includes not only the main branch but also the Kuntala line.

¹ Learn from Aśoka's inscriptions that Kaliṇga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya Kusāna under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore ti-vaas-mūla should be taken to mean 300 and not 108.
² A Sātavāhana of Kuntala is referred to by the Kṛṣṇa Māmāṅga (p. 50) as having ordered the exclusive use of Prakrit in his harem. He may have been identical with the famous king Ṣala (cf. Kuntala-janavaiṣṭāgama Haṭāma, p. xxiii).
On the other hand, the Vāyu Purāṇa omits some of the Śatakarnīs of Kuntala and mentions only about 19 kings most of whom belonged to the main line whose rule lasted for 300 years. If the main line of Śatavāhana kings consisted only of about nineteen princes, and if the duration of their rule be three centuries, there is no difficulty in accepting the Purānic statement that Simuka flourished in the first century B.C., and that his dynasty ceased to rule in Northern Deccan in the third century A.D. The Kuntala line lasted longer and did not come to an end before the fourth or fifth century A.D., when it was supplanted by the Kadambas. Thus the total duration of the rule of both the branches of Śatakarnīs is really more than 400 years. The kings of the Kuntala line are no doubt placed before the great Gautamiputra and his successors. But we have other instances of the inversion of the order of kings in the Purāṇas.¹

Regarding the original home of the Śatavāhana family there is also a good deal of controversy. Some scholars think that the Śatavāhanas were not Andhras (Telugus) but merely Andhra-bhrityas of Kanarese origin. In the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XIV (1917) Dr. Sukthankar edited an Inscription of Siri-Pulumāvi “king of the Śatavāhanas” which mentions a place called Śatavāhani-hāra. The place occurs also in the Hira-Hadagalli copper-plate inscription of the Pallava king Śiva-skanda-varman in the slightly altered form of Sātāhāni-raṭṭha. Dr. Sukthankar suggests that the territorial division Śatavāhi-Sātāhāni must have comprised a good portion of the modern Bellary district, and that it was the original home of the Śatavāhana family. Other indications point to the territory immediately south of the

¹ See pp. 68, 72 n. In the latest date of Hala see Bland, Comm., Vol. 189.
Madhyadeśa as the original home of the Śatavāhana-Śatakarnis. The Vinaya Texts' mention a town called "Setakannika" which lay on the southern frontier of the Majju-ma-desa. It is significant that the earliest records of the Śatakarnis are found in the Northern Deccan and Central India. The name Andhra probably came to be applied to the kings in later times when they lost their northern and western possessions and became a purely Andhra power governing the territory at the mouth of the river Krishna.  

There is reason to believe that the "Andhra," Andhrabhṛtya or Śatavāhana kings were Brāhmaṇas with a little admixture of Nāga blood. The Dvātriniśatputtalikā represents Śalivāhana (Śatavāhana) as of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Nāga origin. The Nāga connection is suggested by names like Skanda-nāga-Śatakana, while the claim to the rank of Brāhmaṇa is actually put forward in an inscription. In the Nāśik prāsasti of Gautamiputra Śatakarni the king is called "Eka-Bamhana," i.e., the unique Brāhmaṇa. Some scholars, however, are inclined to take Bamhana to mean merely a Brāhmaṇical Hindu, but this interpretation cannot be accepted in view of the fact that Gautamiputra is also called "Khatiya-dapa-māna-madana," i.e., the destroyer of the pride and conceit of the Kshatriyas. The expression "Eka-bamhana" when read along with the passage "Khatiya-dapa-māna-madana" leaves no room for doubt that Gautamiputra of the Śatavāhana family claimed to be a Brāhmaṇa like Parasurāma. As a matter of fact in the prāsasti the king is described as "the unique Brāhmaṇa in prowess equal to Rāma."

1 S.B.E. XVII, 88.

* For the origin and meaning of the names Śatavāhana and Śatakarni see also Camb. Hist. Ind. Vol. I, p. 266n; and J.B.O.R.8, 1917, December, p. 442n. Both Barnett and Jayaswal connect them with the Śātiyaputras.
According to the Purāṇas Simuka gave the final coup de grace to the Śunga-Kaṇva power. He was succeeded by his brother Krishṇa. This king has been identified with Kaṇha “Rāja of the Sādavāhana-kula” mentioned in a Nāsik inscription. The inscription tells us that a certain cave was caused to be made by an inhabitant of Nāsik in the time of King Kaṇha.

Kaṇha-Krishṇa was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Śātakarni. This Śātakarni has been identified with

(1) King Śātakarni Dakṣiṇāpatha-pati, son of Simuka Sātavāhana mentioned in the Nāṇāghāṭ Inscription of Nāyanikā.

(2) Śātakarni lord of the west who was defied by Kharavela, king of Kalinga.

(3) Rājan Śrī Śātakarni of a Sañchī Inscription.

(4) The elder Saragamana mentioned in the Periplus and

(5) Śātakarni lord of Pratisṭhāna, father of Sakti-kumāra mentioned in Indian literature.

The first and fifth identifications are accepted by all scholars. The second identification is also probable because the Purāṇas place Śātakarni, the successor of Krishṇa, after the Kaṇvas, i.e., in the first century B.C., while the Hāthigumpha Inscription places Kharavela 300 years after Nanda-raja, i.e., in the first century B.C.

Marshall objects to the third identification on the ground that Śrī Śātakarni who is mentioned in the Nāṇāghāṭ and Hāthigumpha Inscriptions reigned in the middle of the second century B.C.; his dominions, therefore, could not have included Eastern Malwa (the Sañchī region) which in the second century B.C., was ruled by the Śungas and not by the Andhras.¹ But we have seen

that the date of the Hāthigumpha Inscription is the first century B.C. (300 years after Nanda-rāja). Moreover, the Purāṇas place the kings mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ Inscription not earlier than the Kāṇvas, i.e., the first century B.C. The identification of the successor of Kṛiśṇa of the Satavāhana family with Sātakarni of the Saṅchī Inscription, therefore, does not conflict with what is known of the history of Eastern Mālwa in the second century B.C. Lastly, it would be natural for the first Sātakarni to be styled simply Sātakarni or the elder Sātakarni (Saraganus, from a Prākrit form like Sāda-ganna) while it would be equally natural for the later Sātakarnis to be distinguished from him by the addition of a geographical designation like Kuntala, or a metronymic like Gantamiputra or Vasishṭhiputra.

We learn from the Nānāghāṭ Inscriptions that Sātakarni, son of Simuka, entered into a matrimonial alliance with the powerful Arāgya family, the scions of which were called Mahāraṭhi, and became sovereign of the whole of Dakhini-patha. He also conquered Eastern Mālwa and performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice. The conquest of Eastern Mālwa is proved by the Saṅchī Inscription which records the gift of a certain Anānda, the son of Vasīṭhi, the foreman of the artisans of Rājān Sirī-Sātakarni. Sātakarni seems to have been the first prince to raise the Satavāhanas to the position of paramount sovereigns of Trans-Vindhyan India. Thus arose the first great empire in the Godāvari valley which rivalled in extent and power the Śuṅga empire in the Ganges valley and the Greek empire in the Land of the Five Rivers. According to the evidence of Indian as well as classical literature, the capital of the Satavāhana Empire was at Pratishṭhāna, "the modern Paithan on the north bank of the Godāvari in the Aurangabad District of Hyderabad."
After the death of Sātakarni his wife Nāyanikā or Nāganikā, daughter of the Mahārathī Transakayiro Kalāṣa, the scion of the Anjgiya family, was proclaimed regent during the minority of the princes Vedaśri and Sakti-Śri (Sati-Srimat) or Haku-Śri. The last mentioned prince is probably identical with Sakti-kumāra, son of Sālivāhana, mentioned in Jaina literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Sātavāhanas</th>
<th>Anjgiya-kula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sīmaka</td>
<td>Krīṣha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātakarṇī I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King of Daksīṇapatha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedaśri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devī Nāyanikā,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakti Srimat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sātavāhanas were not the only enemies of Magadhā in the first century B.C. We learn from the Hāthisumpa Inscription that when Sātakarni was ruling in the west, Kharavela of Kalinga carried his arms to Northern India and humbled the king of Rājagriha.

Kharavela belonged to the Cheta dynasty. Prof. Chanda points out that Cheta princes are mentioned in the Vessantara Jātaka (No. 547). The Milinda-pañho contains a statement which seems to indicate that the Chetas were connected with the Chetas or Chedis. The particulars given in that work regarding the Cheta king Sura Parichara agree with what we know about the Chedi king Upārichara.1

Very little is known regarding the history of Kalinga from the death of Aśoka to the rise of the Cheta dynasty in the first century B.C. (three hundred years after the Nandas). The names of the first two kings of the Cheta line are not given in the Hāthisumpa inscription. Lüders Ins. No. 1347 mentions a king named Vakradeva.

---

1 Ryō Darida, Milinda, p. 267; Mbh. I, 63, 14.
But we do not know whether he was a predecessor or successor of Kāravela. During the rule of the second king, who must have reigned for at least 9 years, Kāravela occupied the position of Yuvarāja. When he had completed his 24th year, he was anointed Mahārāja of Kaliṅga.¹ In the first year of his reign he repaired the gates and ramparts of his capital, Kaliṅga-nagara. In the next year, without taking heed of Sātakarpi, he sent a large army to the west and took the city of Masika (?) with the help of the Kusambas. He followed up his success by further operations in the west and, in his fourth year, compelled the Rāṭhikas and Bhojakas to do him homage. In the fifth year he had an aqueduct that had not been used for 300 years since Nandarāja conducted into his capital.

Emboldened by his successes in the Deccan the Kaliṅga king turned his attention to the North.² In the eighth year he harassed the king of Rājagriha so that he fled to Mathurā. If Mr. Jayaswal is right in identifying this king with Bṛhaspatimitra, then king Bṛhaspati must have ruled over Magadha after the Kāṇva dynasty. Udaka of the Pabhosā Inscription who came later than Bṛhaspatimitra cannot, in that case, be identified with the fifth Sūṅga king who must be identified with Bhāgabhadra.

The attack on Northern India was repeated in the tenth and twelfth years. In the tenth year the Kaliṅga king organised a grand expedition against Bhāratavarsha, perhaps identical with the valley of the Jumna, the scene of the exploits of Bharata Dauḥsanti and his descendants, where the king of Rājagriha had fled for shelter. He

¹ Kāravela’s chief queen was the daughter of a prince named Lālāka, the great grandson of Hathishāha.
² Some scholars find in line 8 of the Rāṭhagūmpā Ins. a reference to a Yuvams-rāja.
could not achieve any great success in that region. He simply claims to have harassed the kings of Uttarāpatha and watered his elephants in the Gāṇḍū. But in Magadha he was more successful; the repeated blows certainly "struck terror into the Magadhas," and compelled the Magadha king (Bṛhaspatimitra?) to bow at his feet. Having subjugated Magadha, the invader once more turned his attention to southern India. Already in his eleventh year "he had Pithuda ploughed with a plough drawn by an ass." Lévi identifies this city with Pihunda of the Uttarādhyayana (21), and Pitundra metropolis of Ptolemy in the interior of the country of Masulipatam (Maisoloi). The conqueror seems to have pushed further to the south and made his power felt even by the King of the Pandyā country. In the thirteenth year Khāravela erected pillars on the Kumāri Hill in the vicinity of the dwelling of the Arhats.

III. The End of Greek Rule in North-West India.

While the Magadhan monarchy was falling before the onslaughts of the Sātavāhanas and the Chetas, the Greek power in the North-West was also hastening towards dissolution. We have already referred to the feuds of Demetrios and Eukratides. The dissensions of these two princes led to a double succession, one derived from Demetrios holding Śākala (Śālkoṭ) with a considerable portion of the Indian interior, the other derived from Eukratides holding Takshaśilā, Pushkarāvatī, Kāpiśa and Bactria. According to Gardner and Rapson, Apollodotos, Antimachos, Pantaleon, Agathokles, Agathokeia, the Stratos, Menander, Dionysios, Zoilos, Hippostratos and Apollonophanes belonged to the house of Euthydemos and Demetrios. Most of these sovereigns used the same coin-types, specially the figure of the goddess Athene hurling

1 Ind. Ant. 1928. 145.
the thunderbolt, which is characteristic of the Euthydemian line. Pantaleon and Agathokles strike coins with almost identical types. They both adopt the metal nickel for their coins, and they alone use in their legends the Brāhma alphabet. They seem, therefore, to have been closely connected probably as brothers. It is not improbable that Agathokleia was their sister. Agathokles issued a series of coins in commemoration of Alexander, Antiochos Nikator (Antiochos III Megas according to Malala), Diodotos, and Euthydemos.

Apollodotos, the Stratos, Menander and some later kings use the Athene type of coins. Apolloidoto and Menander are mentioned together in literature. The author of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea says that "to the present day ancient drachmae are current in Barygaza bearing inscriptions in Greek letters, and the devices of those who reigned after Alexander, Apolloidoto and Menander." Again, in the title of the lost forty-first book of Justin's work, Menander and Apolloydoto are mentioned as Indian kings. It appears from the Milindapañho that the capital of the dynasty to which Menander belonged was Śākala or Sāgala. We learn from Ptolemy the geographer that the city had another name Euthymedia (Euthydemia ?) a designation which was probably derived from the Euthydemian line.

To the family of Eukratides belonged Heliokles and probably Lysias and Antialkidas who ruled conjointly. A common type of Antialkidas is the Pilei of the Dioscuri, which seems to connect him with Eukratides; his portrait according to Gardner resembles that of Heliokles. It is

---

1 Dancing girl in oriental costume according to Whitehead; Māyā, mother of the Brahma, in the nativity scene according to Foucher (JRAS., 1918, p. 99).
2 Bhaya Davida, Milinda, p. xix.
3 "'Athi Yevskana' nasiṣṭabdham Sāgala nāma nagaram." "Jambodipo Sāgala nāga Mālinda nāma Rājā akosai." "'Athi kho Nāgaesa Sāgalā nāma nagaresa, tatāha Mālinda nāma Rāja raijan kharesi."
not improbable that he was an immediate successor of Heliokles. A Besnagar Inscription makes him a contemporary of Kāśiputra Bhāgabhadra of Vidiśā who probably ruled in the third quarter of the second century B.C. (sometime after Agnimitra). The capital of Antialkidas was probably at Takshaśilā or Taxila, the place whence his ambassador Heliodoros went to the kingdom of Bhāgabhadra. But his dominions seem also to have included Kāpiśi. After his death the western Greek kingdom probably split up into three parts, viz., Takshaśilā (ruled by Archebios), Pushkalāvatī (governed by Diomedes, Epander, Philoxenos, Artemidoros, and Peukelaos), and Kāpiśi held successively by Amyntas and Hermæus (Hermiaios).

The Greek power must have been greatly weakened by the feuds of the rival lines of Demetrios and Eukratides. The evils of internal dissension were aggravated by foreign inroads. We learn from Strabo that the Parthians deprived Eukratides by force of arms of a part of Bactriana, which embraced the satrapies of Asponus and Turiva. There is reason to believe that the Parthian king Mithradates I penetrated even into India. Orosius, a Roman historian who flourished about 400 A.D., makes a definite statement to the effect that Mithridates or Mithradates subdued the natives between the Hydaspes and the Indus. His conquest thus drove a wedge between the kingdom of Eukratides and that of his rival of the house of Euthydemos.

The causes of the final downfall of the Bactrian Greeks are thus stated by Justin: “the Bactrians

---

1 Gardener, Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum, p. xxxiv.
4 In the Cambridge History, p. 568, however, this river has been identified with a Persian stream, the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil.
harassed by various wars lost not only their dominions but their liberty; for having suffered from contentions with the Sogdians, the Drangians and the Indians they were at last overcome as if exhausted by the weaker Parthians."

The **Sogdians** were the people of the region now known as Samarkand and Bukhārā. They were separated from Bactriana by the Oxus. By the term Sogdian Justin probably refers not only to the Sogdiani proper but also to the well-known tribes which, according to Strabo, they were probably deprived the Greeks of Bactriana, *viz.*, the Asii, Pasisani, Tochari, Sacaraulis and the Sacae or Šakas. The story of the Šaka occupation of the Indo-Greek possessions will be told in the next chapter. The Latin historian Pompeius Trogus describes how Diodotos had to fight Scythian tribes, the Saranaces and Asiani, who finally conquered Sogdiana and Bactria. The occupation of Sogdiana probably entitled them to the designation Sogdian used by Justin. Sten Konow suggests the identification of the Tochari of the Classical writers with the Ta-hia of the Chinese historians. He further identifies the Asii, Asioi or Asiani with the Yue-chi. We are inclined to identify the Tochari with the Tukhāras who formed an important element of the Bactrian population in the time of Ptolemy and are described by that author as a great people. They are apparently "the warlike nation of the Bactrians" of the time of the Periplus.

The **Drangians** referred to by Justin inhabited the country between Areia, Gedrosia and Arachosia, including the province now called Sīstān (Šakasthāna). Numismatic evidence indicates that a Drangian family, *viz.*, the **dynasty of Vonones** supplanted Greek rule in a considerable part of Afghanistan specially in Arachosia.

---

Vonones is a Parthian (Imperial) name. Hence some scholars call his dynasty a Parthian family. But names are not sure proofs of nationality. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar calls the dynasty Śaka.\(^1\) The best name for the family would be Drangian, because their home territory was Drangiana. On coins Vonones is associated with two princes, \textit{viz.},

(i) Spalahora who is called Mahārāja-bhrāta.
(ii) Spalaga-dama, son of Spalahora.

There is one coin which Thomas and Cunningham attributed to Vonones and Azes I. But the coin really belongs to Maues.\(^2\) There is a silver coin of a prince named Spalirises which bears on the obverse the legend Basileus Adelphoy Spaliriso, and on the reverse “Mahārāja Bhṛahā Dhramiṣa Spalirishasa,” \textit{i.e.}, Spalirises the Just, brother of the king. This king has been identified with Vonones. Vonones thus was a supreme ruler, and he appointed his brothers Spalirises and Spalahora viceroys to govern the provinces conquered by him, and after the death of the latter, conferred the viceroyalty on his nephew Spalaga-dama. Vonones was succeeded as supreme ruler by his brother Spalirises. The coins of Spalirises present two varieties, \textit{viz.},

1. Coins which bear his name alone in both the legends;
2. Coins on which his name occurs on the obverse in the Greek legend, and those of Azes on the reverse in the Khaṇḍaḥī legend. The second variety proves that Spalirises had a colleague named Azes who governed a territory where the prevailing script was Khaṇḍaḥī. This Azes has been identified with king Azes of the Pañjab about whom we shall speak in the next chapter.

\(^1\) Isidore of Charax (Z. D. M. G., 1906, pp. 57-58; JRAS., 1916, p. 831) refers to Sigal in Samosata as the residence of a Śaka king.
As regards the Indian enemies of the Bactrian Greeks we must refer in the first place to the Śunghas who are represented in Kālidāsa’s Mālavikāgnimitram as defeating the Yavanaś on the Sindhu. An Indian named Bhaḍrayaśas seems to have had some share in the destruction of the Greek Kingdom of the Eastern Pañjāb. The Nūṣik praśasti of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi represents that king as the destroyer of the Yavanaś, apparently of Western India.

The final destruction of Greek rule was, as Justin says, the work of the Parthians. Marshall tells us\(^1\) that the last surviving Greek principality, that of Hermaion in the Kābul valley, was overthrown by the Parthian king Gondophrernes. The Chinese historian Fan-ye also refers to the Parthian occupation of Kābul.\(^2\) “Whenever any of the three kingdoms of Tien Tchou, Ki-pin or Ngansi became powerful, it brought Kābul into subjection. When it grew weak it lost Kābul............Later, Kābul fell under the rule of Parthia.”

---

SCYTHIAN RULE IN NORTHERN INDIA.

I. The Śakas.

In the second and first centuries B.C., Greek rule in parts of Kāśrīstān and Gandhāra was supplanted by that of the Śakas. The history of the First Han Dynasty states "formerly when the Hiung-nu conquered the Ta-Yue-tchi the latter emigrated to the west, and subjugated the Ta-hia; whereupon the Sai-wang went to the south, and ruled over Kipiu." 1 Sten Konow points out that the Sai-wang are the same people which are known in Indian tradition under the designation Śaka-murūnda, Murūnda being a later form of a Saka word which has the same meaning as Chinese "wang," i.e., master, lord. In Indian inscriptions and coins it has frequently been translated with the Indian word Svāmin.

The name of the Saka king who occupied Kipin is not known. The earliest ruler of that region mentioned in Chinese records is Wu-t'ou-lao whose son was ousted by Yin-mo-fu, the son of the prince of Jung-k'ū, who established himself as king of Kipin during the reign of the Emperor Hsūan-ti, which lasted from 73 to 48 B.C., and killed the envoys sent in the reign of the Emperor Yüanti (B.C. 48-32). In the reign of Cheng-ti (32-7 B.C.) the support of China was sought without success by the king of Kipin, probably the successor of Yin-mo-fu, who was in danger from some powerful adversary, apparently a king of the Yue-chi, who had relations with China about this time as is proved by the communication of certain Buddhist books to a Chinese Official in 2 B.C. 2

1 JRAS., 1903, p. 22; Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 464.
2 Ciel. Rev., Feb., 1924, pp. 251, 252; Smith, BHI, p. 238a; JRAS., 1913, 647.
S. Lévi identifies Kipin with Kaśmir. But his view has been ably controverted by Sten Konow who accepts Chavannes' identification with Kāpiśa. Gandhāra was the eastern part of Kipin. A passage of Hemachandra's Abhidhāna-Chintāmani seems to suggest that the capital of the Sāi-wang (Śaka-Muṇḍāḥ) was Lampāka or Lāghman (Lampākāstū Muṇḍāḥ Syuḥ). Sten Konow says that the Sāi, i.e., the Śakas, passed Hientu, i.e., the gorge west of Skardu on their way to Kipin. Though the Śakas wrested Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra) from the hands of the Greeks they could not permanently subjugate Kābul, where the Greeks maintained a precarious existence. They were more successful in India. Inscriptions at Mathurā and Nāsik prove that the Śakas extended their sway as far as the Jumna in the east and the Godāvari in the south, and destroyed the power of the Mitras of Mathurā and the Śatavāhanas of Paithān.

No connected or detailed account of the Śaka kings of Kipin is possible. Śakas are mentioned along with the Yāvanas in the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, the Manuṣaṁhitā and the Mahābhāṣya. The Harivaṃśa informs us that they shaved one half of their heads, and the Jaina work Kālacāchārya-kathānaka states that their kings were called Sāhi.

The Śakas are also mentioned in the Praśastis of Gautamiputra Śatakarnī and Samudra Gupt. Their

---

1 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 291.
2 The country drained by the northern tributaries of the river Kābul, ibid., p. 290; cf. Watts, Yuan Chwang, Vol. 1, 259-260.
3 Ep. Ind. XIV, 291.
5 I. 54. 22; IV. 48. 12.
6 II. 32. 17.
7 X. 44.
8 Ind. Ant. 1875, 244.
9 Chap. 14. 16.
10 Z. D. M. G., 34, p. 252.
kingdom or empire "Sakasthāna" is probably mentioned in the Mahāmāyūrī (95) and in the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscription. The passage in the inscription containing the word Sakasthāna runs thus:—

Sarvasa Sakastanasa puyae.

Cunningham interpreted the passage as meaning "for the merit of the people of Sakastan." Dr. Fleet, however, maintained that "there are no real grounds for thinking that the Sakas ever figured as invaders of any part of northern India above Kathiawād and the western and southern parts of the territory now known as Mālwa." He took Sarva to be a proper name and translated the inscriptional passage referred to above as "a gift of Sarva in honour of his home."

Fleet's objection is ineffective. Chinese evidence clearly establishes the presence of Sakas in Kipin, i.e., Kāpiśa-Gandhāra. As regards the presence of the tribe at Mathurā, the site of the inscription, we should note that the Mārkandeya Purāṇa refers to a Saka settlement in the Madhyadeśa. Dr. Thomas points out that the epigraphs on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Saka and Persian nomenclature. The name Mevaki, for instance, which occurs in the inscriptions is a variant of the Scythian name Mauakes. The termination "-ūs" in Komūsā and Šamūšo seems to be Scythic. Dr. Thomas further points out that there is no difficulty in the expression of honour to the "whole realm of the Sakas" since we find in the Wardak, Sue Vihrār and other ins-

---

1 JARS, 1906, 155; Mr. N. G. Majumdar (JASB., 1926, 17) takes Sakasthana to mean "Sakraschāna, i.e., 'the place of Indra.'"
2 Chapter 58.
3 Ep. Ind. IX, pp. 188ff.
4 cf. Maukas, Moga, and Navakesh the commander of the Sakas who went to the aid of Darius Odomansus, (Obinnock, Arrian, p. 142).
criptions even more comprehensive expressions, e.g., Sarva sattvanam—of all living creatures. As regards Fleet’s renderings “svaka” and “sakatthana” one’s own place, Dr. Thomas says that it does not seem natural to inscribe on the stone honour to somebody’s own home. A pūjā addressed to a country is unusual, but inscription G of the Lion Capital contains a similar pūjā addressed to the chief representatives of the Saka dominion.

Sakasthāna, doubtless, included the district of Scythia mentioned in the Periplus, “from which flows down the river Sinthus, the greatest of all the rivers that flow into the Erythrean Sea.” The metropolis of “Scythia” in the time of the Periplus was Minnagara; and its market-town was Barbaricum on the seashore.

Princes bearing Saka names are mentioned in several inscriptions discovered in Taxila, Mathurā and western India. According to Dr. Thomas “whatever Saka dynasties may have existed in the Pañjab or India, reached India neither through Afghanistan nor through Kaśmīr but, as Cunningham contended, by way of Sind and the valley of the Indus.”¹ This theory cannot be accepted in its entirety in view of the Chinese account of the Saka occupation of Kipin and the epigraphic evidence regarding the existence of a Scythian Satrapy at Kaśpi.² We cannot also overlook the fact that some of the Saka names hitherto discovered are those of the Northern Sakas who lived near the Sogdianoi,³ e.g., the names Maues, Moga (Taxila plate) and Mevaki (Mathurā Lion Capital) are variants of the Saka name Mauakes. We learn from Arrian that a chief named Mauakes or Mavaces led the “Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwelt in Asia,” who lived outside the jurisdiction of the

¹ JRAI., 1906, p. 216.
² JASB., 1924, 14.
³ Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 369-400.
Persian governor of the Bactrians and the Sogdianians, but were in alliance with the Persian king. Kshaharāta or Khakharāta, the family designation of a Satrapal house of Western and Southern India, is perhaps equivalent to Karatai the name of a Saka tribe of the North.1

The conquest of the Lower Indus valley, Cutch and part of Western India may, however, have been effected by the Sakas of western Sakasthāna (Sīstān) who are mentioned by Isidore of Charax. The name of the capitals of "Scythia" (i.e., the Lower Indus valley) and of the Kingdom of Mambarus (Nambanus?) in the time of the Periplus was Minnapara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Sakasthāna mentioned by Isidore.2 Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the names of the western Kshatrapas of Chashtāna's line, viz., "Damān" (dama) is found also in the name of a prince of the Drangianian house of Vonones. Lastly, the Kārdamaka family from which the daughter of the Mahākshatrapa Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Kārdamsa river in Persia.3

The earliest Šaka king mentioned in Indian inscriptions and coins is, perhaps, Maues (usually identified with Moga of the Taxila plate). He was a paramount sovereign (Maharaya). His dominions included Taxila which was ruled by a Satrapal family.

The dates assigned to Maues by various scholars range from B.C. 135 to A. D. 154. His coins are found ordinarily in the Pañjab, and chiefly in the western portion of the province of which Taxila was the ancient capital. There can thus be no doubt that Maues was the king of Gandhāra. Now it is impossible to find for Maues a

---

1 Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400.
3 Shamsastry's trans. of Arthaśāstra, p. 86e6.
place in the history of the Pañjab before the Greek king Antialkidas who was reigning at Taxila when king Bhāgabhadrā was on the throne of Vidiśa for fourteen years. The date of Bhāgabhadrā is uncertain but he must be placed later than Agnimitra Śuṅga who ruled from B.C. 149-141. The fourteenth year of Bhāgabhadrā, therefore, could not have fallen before 127 B.C. Consequently Antialkidas must have been ruling in the second half of the second century B.C., and his reign could not have ended before 127 B.C. The Saka occupation of Gandhāra must, therefore, be later than 127 B.C. All scholars except Fleet identify Maues with Maharaya Moga of the Sirsukh or Taxila platé dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era. The generally accepted view is that the era is of Saka institution. As the era is used only in N. India and the border land it is permissible to conjecture that it came into existence after the Saka occupation of those regions. We have already seen that this occupation could not have taken place before 127 B.C. The era used in the Taxila plate could not, therefore, have originated before 127 B.C. The year 78 of the era could not have fallen before B.C. \((127-78=49\). Consequently Maues-Moga cannot be placed before B.C. 49. He must be placed even later, because we learn from the Chinese records that Yin-mo-fu was in possession of Kipin or Kāpiśa-Gandhāra about 48–33 B.C. Maues, therefore, will have to be placed after 33 B.C. He cannot perhaps be placed later than the middle of the first century A.D., because we learn from Apollonios and the author of the Periplus that about that time or a little later both Taxila and Minnagara, the metropolis of Scythia or the Saka kingdom in the Indus valley, had passed into the hands of the Parthians. It seems, therefore, that Maues ruled after 33 B.C., but before the closing years of the first century A.D. It is not altogether improbable that he
flourished in the year 22 A. D.—the year 78 of the era commencing 58 B. C., which afterwards came to be known as the Kṛita-Mālava-Vikrama era. But the matter must be regarded as not finally settled.

Numismatists say that Maues was succeeded on the throne of the Western Pañjāb by Azes who put an end to Greek rule in the Eastern Pañjāb by annexing the kingdom of Hipposstratos. The coins of Azes are very closely related to the issues of the Vonones family, and the assumption has always been made that Azes, the king of the Pañjāb, is identical with Azes, the colleague of Spalirises. Some scholars think that there were two kings of the name of Azes and that the first Azes was the immediate successor, not of Maues, but of Spalirises, and that Maues came not only after Azes I, but also after Azes II. But the last part of the theory cannot be accepted in view of the synchronism of Gondophernes and Azes II proved by the fact that Aspavarma served as Strategos under both the monarchs. 1 As Gondophernes ruled in the year 103, 2 while Maues-Moga ruled in the year 78, 3 and as both these dates are referred by scholars to the same era, both Gondophernes and his contemporary Azes II must be later than Maues-Moga. There is no room for Maues-Moga between Azes I and Azes II, because we shall see presently that the succession from Azes I to Azes II is clearly established by numismatic evidence. Maues came either before Azes I or after Azes II; but we have already seen that he could not have reigned after Azes II. He must, therefore, be placed before Azes I. He must have been ruling in the Pañjāb when Vonones was ruling in Sistān. When Vonones was succeeded by Spalirises, Maues was succeeded by Azes I. We have already seen

1 Whitehead, Catalogue of Coins in the Pañjāb Museum, p. 150.
2 Cf. the Takht-i-Rahai Inscription.
3 Cf. the Taxila Plate of Patika.
that Spalirises and Azes I issued joint coins. The relationship between the two monarchs is not known. They may have been related by blood, or they may have been mere allies like Hermaios and Kujula Kadphises.²

King Azes I struck some coins bearing his own name in Greek on the obverse, and that of Azilises in Kharoshthi on the reverse. Then again we have another type of coins on which the name in Greek is Azilises, and in Kharoshthi is Aya (Azes). Dr. Bhandarkar and Smith postulate that these two joint types, when considered together, prove that Azilises, before his accession to independent power, was the subordinate colleague of an Azes, and that an Azes similarly was subsequently the subordinate colleague of Azilises. The two princes named Azes cannot be, therefore, identical, and they must be distinguished as Azes I and Azes II. Whitehead, however, observes that the silver coins of Azilises are better executed and earlier in style than those of Azes. The best didrachms of Azes compare unfavourably with the fine silver coins of Azilises with Zeus obverse and Dioskouri reverse, and with other rare silver types of Azilises. If Azilises preceded Azes, then following Dr. Smith we must have Azilises I and Azilises II, instead of Azes I and Azes II. In conclusion Whitehead says that the differences in type and style between the abundant issues of Azes can be adequately explained by reasons of locality alone, operating through a long reign.³ Marshall, however, says that the stratification of coins at Taxila clearly proves the

³ Rapson on pp. 673-674 of CHI identifies Azes, the colleague of Spalirises, with Azes II, and makes him the son of Spalirises. On page 373, however, the suggestion is found that Azes II was the son and successor of Azilises. It is difficult to see how the two views can be reconciled.


⁵ See Konow not only rejects the duplication of Azes, but suggests the identification of Azes with Azilises.
correctness of Smith's theory, according to which Azes I was succeeded by Azilises, and Azilises by Azes II. ¹

Recent discoveries have unearthed the gold coin of a king named Athama. Whitehead has no hesitation in recognising him as a member of the dynasty of Azes and Azilises. His date is, however, uncertain.

Unlike the Indo-Greek princes, the Saka kings style themselves on their coins Basileus Basileon, corresponding to the Prakrit on the reverse Maharajasa Rajarajasa. They also appropriate the epithet Mahatasa, corresponding to the Greek Megaloy, which we find on the coins of Greek kings. The title Rajaraja—king of kings—was not an empty boast. Moga had under him the Viceroy's Liaka and Patika of Taxila. Azes had under him at least two subordinate rulers, e.g., the Satrap Zeionises and the Strategos Aspavarma. The title Satrap or Kshatrapa occurs in the Behistun Inscription in the form Kshatrapavam which means 'protector of the kingdom' (cf. Gopatri). The word 'Strategos' means a general. It is obvious that the Scythians revived in North-Western India the system of government by Satraps and military governors. Coins and Inscriptions prove the existence of several other Satrapal families besides those mentioned above.

The North Indian Kshatrapas or Satraps may be divided into three main groups, viz.:

1. The Satraps of Kāpiśi.
2. The Satraps of the Western Pañjāb.
3. The Satraps of Mathurā.

A Manikiala inscription affords the bare mention of a Satrap of Kāpiśi, who was the son of the Satrap Graṇafaka.²

¹ The coins which Smith assigns to Azes II are found generally nearer the surface than those of Azes I (J.R.A.S., 1914, 979). For Konow's view, see Ep. Ind., 1906, 274.
The Pañjab Satraps belonged to three families, viz.:

(a) The Kusulac or Kusuluka Group.—It consisted of Liaka and his son Pātika, of Chhahara family? and Chuksha. According to Fleet there were two Pātikas. But according to Marshall there was only one Viceroy of the name of Pātika. The Satrapal line of Kusuluka was intimately connected with the Satraps of Mathūra. The coins of Liaka Kusuluka show the transition of the district to which they belonged, i.e., the Taxila region, from the rule of the Greek house of Eukratides to the Sakas. We know from the Taxila or Sirsukh plate, dated in the year 78, that Liaka was a Satrap of the great king Moga and that Pātika was the Crown Prince (Yovaraa).

(b) Manigul or Managula and his son Zeionises or Jihunia.—They were probably Satraps of Pushkalavati during the reign of Azes II.

(c) The House of Indravarma.—It consisted of Indravarman, his son Aspavarman, and Aspa’s nephew Sasas. Aspavarman acted as governor of both Azes II and Gondopherines, while Sasas served under Gondopherines and Pakores.

The Satraps of Mathura.

The earliest of this line of princes probably were the associated rulers Hagana and Hagamasha. They were perhaps succeeded by Rañjubula. A genealogical table of the house of Rañjubula is given below:

1 Böhler, Ep. Ind., IV, p. 54.
2 J.R.A.S., 1907, p. 1036.
4 Cf. Inscription G on the Mathurak Lion Capital.
5 Rapson’s Ancient India, p. 164.
Rañjubula, Rañuvula or Räjula is known from inscriptions as well as coins. An inscription in Brāhmi characters at Mora near Mathurā calls him a Mahākṣatrapa. But the Greek legend on some of his coins describes him as “king of kings, the Saviour” showing that he probably declared his independence.

Rañjubula was probably succeeded by his son Śodāsa. Inscription B on the Mathurā Lion Capital mentions him as a Chhatrava (Satrap) and as the son of Mahāchhatrava Räjula (Rañjubula). But later inscriptions at Mathurā written in Brāhmi characters call him a Mahākṣatrapa. One of these inscriptions gives a date for him in the year 72 of an unspecified era. It is clear that during his father’s lifetime he was only a Satrap. But on his father’s death sometime before the year 72, he became a Great Satrap. Sten Konow adduces good grounds for believing that Śodāsa dated his inscription in the Vikrama era. Consequently the year 72 corresponds to A.D. 15.

Dr. Majumdar refers the dates of the Northern Satraps (of Taxila and Mathurā) to the Saka era, and places them in the middle of the second century A.D. But Ptolemy, who flourished about that time, places neither Taxila nor Mathurā within Indo-Scythia, i.e., the Saka dominion. This shows that neither Taxila nor Mathurā was a Saka possession in the second century A.D. The principal Indo-Scythian possessions in Ptolemy’s time were Patalene (the Indus Delta), Abiria (the Ābhir country), and Syrastrene (Kathiāwār). This is exactly what we find in

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, pp. 139-141.
2 Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 354.
the Junągađh inscription of the Śaka ruler Rudradāman who flourished in the middle of the second century A.D. In Ptolemy’s time Taxila was included within the Arsa (Saus. Uraśā) territory,¹ and Mathurā belonged to the Kaspeiraioi.² Dr. Majumdar suggests that Ptolemy probably noticed the Śaka empire of Maues and his successors (which included Taxila, Mathurā and Ujjāyini) under the name of Kaspeiraioi.³ But we should remember that far from including Taxila, Mathurā and Western India within one empire, Ptolemy sharply distinguishes the Kaspeiraioi from Indo-Scythia which was the real Śaka domain in the middle of the second century A.D. ⁴ Moreover, the territory of the Kaspeiraioi must have included Kaśmir (the land of Kaśyapa⁵); and there is no evidence that the dynasty of Maues ever ruled in Kaśmir. It was only under the kings of Kanishka’s dynasty that Kaśmir and Mathurā formed parts of one and the same empire. The Kaspeiraioi of Ptolemy evidently referred to the Kushān empire.

We learn from the Mathurā Lion Capital that when Sudāsa, i.e., Śojaśa was ruling as a mere Kshatrapa, Padika, i.e., Pātika was a Mahākshatrapa. As Śojaśa was a Mahākshatrapa in the year 72, he must have been a Kshatrapa before 72. Consequently Padika or Pātika must have been reigning as a Mahākshatrapa contemporary of the Kshatrapa Śojaśa before the year 72. The Taxila plate of the year 78, however, styles Pātika as a mere yovara (Crown Prince).⁶ Dr. Fleet thinks that we have to do with two different Pātikas. But Marshall and

¹ Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 345.
² Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 350.
⁵ Rejastanaghītī, I, 27.
Sten Konow think that Pātika, who issued the Taxila plate, is identical with the Mahākshatrapa Padika of the Mathurā Lion Capital, therefore the era in which the inscription of Sam 72 is dated, is not the same as in the Taxila plate of Sam 78. In other words while Fleet duplicates kings, Marshall and Sten Konow duplicate eras. It is difficult to come to any final decision from the scanty data at our disposal. We should, however, remember that there are instances among the Western Kshatrapas of Chashtana's line, of Mahākshatrapas being reduced to a humbler rank \(^1\) and of a Kshatrapa (Jayadāman) being mentioned without the satrapal title.\(^3\) It is, therefore, not altogether improbable that the inscription of Sam 72 and that of Sam 78 are dated in the same era, and yet the two Pātikas are identical. In the Jānibigha inscription king Lakshmāna Sena has no royal title prefixed to his name. If Sir John Marshall is right in reading the name of Aya (Azes) in the Taxila Inscription of 186, we have an additional instance of a king being mentioned without any royal title.

Kharaosta was a grandson (daughter's son) of Raṇjugbula and was consequently a nephew of Sodāsa. The inscriptions A and E on the Mathurā Lion Capital mention him as the Yuvaraya Kharaosta. His coins are of one class only, presenting legends in Greek characters on the obverse and in Kharoshṭhī on the reverse. The Kharoshṭhī legend runs thus: "Chhatrapasapra Kharaosta Artasa putrasa."

The coins of the family of Raṇjugbula are imitated from those of the Stratos and also of a line of Hindu princes who ruled at Mathurā. This shows that in the Jumna valley Scythian rule superseded that of both Greek and Hindu princes.

\(^1\) Cf. Majumdar, the Date of Kanishka, Ind. Ant., 1917.
\(^3\) Amulam Inscriptions.
A fragmentary inscription found by Vogel on the site of Ganeshra near Mathurā revealed the name of a Satrap of the Kshaharāta family called Ghataka.¹

The Nationality of the Northern Satraps.

Cunningham held that the inscription P on the Mathurā Lion Capital—Sarvasa Sakastanasa puyae—gave decisive proof that Rañjubula or Rājuvula, Sodasa and other connected Satraps were of Saka nationality. Dr. Thomas shows, however, that the Satraps of Northern India were the representatives of a mixed Parthian and Saka domination. This is strongly supported a priori by the fact that Pātika of Taxila, who bears himself a Persian name, mentions as his overlord the great king Moga whose name is Saka. The inscriptions of the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Persian and Saka nomenclature.²

II. The Pahlavas or Parthians.

Already in the time of Eukratides, Mithradates I, King of Parthia, had conquered portions of the Pañjāb, and in the days of the Saka Emperors of the family of Maues-Moga, princes of mixed Saka-Pahlava origin ruled as Satraps in Northern India. Towards the middle of the first century A. D., Saka sovereignty in parts of Gandhāra was probably supplanted by that of the Pahlavas or Parthians. In the year 44 A. D., when Apollonios of Tyana is reputed to have visited Taxila, the throne was occupied by a Parthian named Phraotes who was independent of Vardanes, the king of Babylon, and himself powerful enough to exercise suzerain power over the Satrapy of Gandhāra. Christian writers refer to a

¹ J.B.A.S., 1912, p. 121.
king of India named Gundaphar and his brother Gad who were converted by the apostle St. Thomas and who therefore lived in the first century A.D. We have no independent confirmation of the story of Apollonios. But the "so-called" Takht-i-Bahai record of the year 103 (of an unspecified era) shows that there was actually in the Peshawar district a king named Gudufara (Gondophernes). The names of Gondophernes and of his brother Gad are also found on coins.¹ According to Rapson the two brothers were associated as sub-kings under the suzerainty of Orthagnes (Verethragna). Dr. Fleet referred the date of the Takht-i-Bahai inscription to the Mālava-Vikrama era, and so placed the record in A.D. 47.² He remarked "there should be no hesitation about referring the year 103 to the established Vikrama era of B.C. 58; instead of having recourse, as in other cases too, to some otherwise unknown era beginning at about the same time. This places Gondophernes in A.D. 47 which suits exactly the Christian tradition which makes him a contemporary of St. Thomas the Apostle."

The power of Gondophernes did not at first extend to the Gandhāra region which, if Apollonios is to be believed, was ruled in A.D. 44 by Phraotes. His rule seems to have been restricted at first to southern Afghanistan. He probably succeeded in annexing the Peshawar district after the death of Phraotes (if such a king really existed). There is no epigraphic evidence that he conquered Eastern Gandhāra (Taxila) though he certainly wrested some provinces from the Azes family. The story of the supersession of the rule of Azes II by him in one of the Scythian provinces is told by the coins of Aspavarma. The latter at first acknowledged the suzerainty of Azes (II)

¹ Whitehead, p. 155. Gondophernes—Vindapharna (Rapson).  
but later on obeyed Gondophernes as his overlord. Evidence of the ousting of Saka rule by the Parthians in the Lower Indus valley is furnished by the author of the Periplus in whose time (about 60 or 80 A.D.), Minnagar, the metropolis of Scythia, i.e., the Saka kingdom in the Lower Indus valley, was subject to Parthian princes who were constantly driving each other out. If Sir John Marshall is right in reading the name of Aya or Azes in the Taxila Inscription of 136, then it is clear that Saka rule survived in a part of Eastern Gandhāra, while Peshawar and the Lower Indus valley passed into the hands of the Parthians.

The Greek principality in the upper Kabul valley was extinguished about this time. We learn from Justin that the Parthians gave the coup de grace to the rule of the Bactrian Greeks. This is quite in accordance with the evidence of Archaeology. Marshall says that Gondophernes annexed the Kabul valley, overthrew the Greek principality in that region, and drove out the last prince Hermias.

With Gondophernes were associated as subordinate rulers his nephew Abdagases, his generals Aspavaraman and Sasas, and his governors Sapedana and Satavastra.

After the death of the great Parthian monarch his empire split up into smaller principalities. One of these was ruled by Sanabares, another by Pakores and others by princes whose coins Marshall recovered for the first time at Taxila. Among them was Sasas who acknowledged the nominal sway of Pakores. The internecine strife among these Parthian princes is probably alluded to by the author of the Periplus in the following passage:—

---

1 For the correct interpretation of “Sa 133 ayana”, see Calcutta Review, 1923, December, 493-494.
"Before it (Barbaricum) there lies a small island, and inland behind it is the metropolis of Scythia, Munagara; it is subject to Parthian princes who are constantly driving each other out."

Epigraphic evidence proves that the Pahlava or Parthian rule in Afghanistān, the Pañjab and Sind was supplanted by that of the Gusana or Kusana or Kushan dynasty. We know that Gondopheres was ruling in Peshawar in the year 103 (A. D. 47 according to Fleet). But we learn from the Panjtar inscription that in the year 122 (A. D. 66?) the sovereignty of the region had passed to a Gusana or Kushān king. In the year 136 (A. D. 79?) the Kushān suzerainty had extended to Taxila. An inscription of that year (belonging probably to the reign of Azes II who was now a petty chief and a subordinate ally of the Kushāns) mentions the interment of some relics of Buddha in a chapel at Taxila "for the bestowal of perfect health upon the Maharāja, rājātirāja devaputra Khushana." The Sue Vihār Inscription proves the Kushān conquest of the Lower Indus valley. The Chinese writer Panku who died in A. D. 92 refers to the Yueh-chi occupation of Kao-fou or Kabul. This shows that the race to which the Kushāns belonged took possession of Kabul before A. D. 92. It is, however, asserted that Kao-fou is a mistake for Tou-mi. But the mistake in Kennedy's opinion would not have been possible, had the Yueh-chi not been in possession of Kao-fou in the time of Panku. The important thing to remember is that a Chinese writer of 92 A. D., thought Kao-fou to have been a Yueh-chi possession long before his time. If Steen Konow is to be believed the Kushāns had established some sort of connection with the Indian borderland as early as the time of

1 J.E.A.S., 1912, p. 270.
Gondophernes. In line 5 of the Takht-i-Bahai inscription Sten Konow reads "erjhana Kap[sha]sa puyae"1 "in honour of prince Kapsha," i.e., Kujula Kadphises, the Kushân king who succeeded Hermaios in the Kâbul valley. Kujula Kadphises has been identified with the Koneichouang (Kushân) prince Kieou-tsieou-kio who took possession of Kao-fou, Pota and Kipin. It appears from numismatic evidence that this Kushân chief was an ally of Hermaios with whom he issued joint coins. The destruction of Hermaios' kingdom by the Parthians probably supplied him with a casus belli. He made war on the latter and destroyed their power in North-West India.

III. The Great Kushâns.

We are informed by the Chinese historians that the Kushâns were a clan of the Yueh-chi race. The modern Chinese pronunciation of the name according to Kingsmill is said to be Yue-ti. M. Lévi and other French scholars write Yue-tchi or Yuê-tchi.

We learn from Ssû-ma-ch'ien who recorded the story of the travels of Chang-K'ien, that in or about B. C. 166 the Yueh-chi were dwelling between the Tseun-hoang country and the K'ilien mountains, or Tien-chan Range in Chinese Turkestan. At that date the Yueh-chi were defeated and expelled from their country by the Hùng-nû who slew their king and made a drinking vessel out of his skull. The widow of the slain king succeeded to her husband's power. Under her guidance the Yueh-chi in the course of their westward migration attacked the Wu-sun whose king was killed. After this exploit the Yueh-chi attacked the Sakas who fled into Kipin (Kâpiša-Lampâka-Gandhâra). Meantime the son of the slain Wu-sun king grew up to manhood and drove the

---

Yueh-chi further west into the Ta-hia (Dahae?) territory washed by the Oxus. The Ta-hia who were devoted to commerce, unskilled in war and wanting in cohesion were easily reduced to a condition of vassalage by the Yueh-chi who established their capital or royal encampment to the north of the Oxus, in the territory now belonging to Bakhārah. The Yueh-chi capital was still in the same position when visited by Chang-kien in or about B. C. 125.¹

The adventures of Chang-Kien as related by Ssū-mi-chen in the Ssc-ki (completed before B. C. 91) were retold in Pan-ku's history of the First Han Dynasty (completed by Pan-ku's sister after his death in A. D. 92), with three important additions, namely:—

1. That the kingdom of the Ta-Yueh-chi has for its capital the town of Kien-chi (Lan-chau) and Kipin lies on its southern frontier.

2. That the Yueh-chi were no longer nomads.

3. That the Yueh-chi kingdom had become divided into five principalities, viz., Hieou-mi (Wakhân?), Chouamgo (Chitral?), Kouei-chouang (Kushān), Hithum (Bamiyan region) and Kao-fou (Kābui).²

We next obtain a glimpse of the Yueh-chi in Fan-Ye's history of the Later Han Dynasty which covers the period between A. D. 25 and 220. Fan-Ye based his account on the report of Pan-young (cir. A. D. 125) and others. He himself died in 445 A. D. He gives the following account of the Yueh-chi conquest. "In old days the Yueh-chi were vanquished by the Hiung-nū. They then went to Ta-hia and divided the kingdom among five Hi-hous or Yabgous, viz., those of Hieou-mi, Chouang-mi, Kouei-chouang, Hitouen and Tou-mi. More than hundred

² A later historian regards Kao-fou as a mistake for Tou-mi.
years after that, the Yabgou (Yavuga) of Konei-chouang (Kushân) named K'ieou-tsieou-kio attacked and vanquished the four other Yabgous and called himself king (Waag); he invaded Ngan-si (Parthia?) and took possession of the territory of Kao-fou (Kabul), overcame Po-ta\(^1\) and Kipin and became completely master of these kingdoms. K'ieou-tsieou-kio died at the age of more than eighty. His son Yen-kao-tchen succeeded him as king. In his turn he conquered Tien-tchou (India), and established there a chief for governing it. From this time the Yueh-chi became extremely powerful. All the other countries designate them Kushân after their king, but the Han retained the old name, and called them Ta-Yueh-chi."

"K'ieou-tsieou-kio" has been identified with Kujula (cf. Kusuluka) Kadphises, or Kozola Kaduphases, the first Kushân king who struck coins to the south of the Hindu-kush. Numismatic evidence shows that he was the colleague, and afterwards the successor, of Hermaios, the last Greek prince of the Kabul valley. The prevalent view that Kadphises conquered Hermaios is, in the opinion of Marshall, wrong. Sten Konow finds his name mentioned in the Takht-i-Bahai inscription of the year 168 belonging to the reign of Gondophernes. The inscription probably belongs to a period when the Kushân and Parthian sovereigns were on friendly terms. But the Parthian attack on the kingdom of Hermaios apparently led to a rupture which ended in war. The result was that the Parthians were ousted by Kadphises I.

Marshall identifies Kadphises I with the Kushân king of the Panjtar record (of the year 122) and the Taxila scroll of the year 136.\(^2\) We should, however, remember

\(^1\) Perhaps identical with the country of Po-tai which in the time of Sung-yun sent two young lions to the King of Gandhara as presents (Beal, Records of the Western World, Vol. I, cl). Konow (Ep. Ind., XVIII, 278) identifies Pu-ta with Ghaunt.

\(^2\) J.B.A.S., 1914, pp. 977-78.
that in the Taxila inscription of 136 the Kushān king is called Devaputra, a title which was characteristic of the Kanishka group and not of Kadphises I or II. The monogram on the scroll is by no means characteristic only of coins of the Kadphises group, but it is also found, in Marshall's and Konow's opinion, on coins of Zeionises and Kuyūla Kara Kaphsha.

Kadphises I coined no gold. His coinage shows unmistakable influence of Rome. He copied the issues of Augustus or those of Tiberius, and used the titles Yavuga and Maharāja Rajātirāja.

"K'ien-tsieou-kio" or Kadphises I was succeeded by his son Yen-kao-tchen, the Hima, Vima or Wema Kadphises of the coins, who is usually designated as Kadphises II. We have already seen that he conquered Tien-tchou or the Indian interior and set up a chief who governed in the name of the Yueh-chi. According to Sten Konow and Smith it was Kadphises II who established the Śaka Era of A.D. 78. If this view is accepted then he was the overlord of Nahapana, and was the Kushān monarch who was defeated by the Chinese and compelled to pay tribute to the emperor Ho-ti (A.D. 89-105). But there is no direct evidence that Kadphises II established any era. No inscriptions or coins of this monarch contain any dates which are referable to an era of his institution. On the contrary we have evidence that Kanishka did establish an era, that is to say, his method of dating was continued by his successors, and we have dates ranging from the year 3 to 99.

1 Rome and its people, Romakas, first appear in the Mahābhārata (II. 31, 17) and occur not unfrequently in later literature. Diplomatic relations between Rome and India were established as early as the time of Augustus who received an embassy from king 'Pandion' (Cassib, Hist, Ind. 597) about 22 B.C. An Indian embassy was also received by Trajan shortly after 99 A.D. Strabo, Pliny and the Periplus refer to a brisk trade between India and the Roman Empire in the first century A.D.

2 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141.

3 The Oxford History of India, p. 129.
The conquests of the Kadphises Kings opened up the path of commerce between China and the Roman Empire, and India. Roman gold began to pour into this country in payment for silk, spices and gems. Kadphises II began to issue gold coins. He had an extensive bilingual gold and copper coinage. The obverse design gives us a new lifelike representation of the monarch. The reverse is confined to the worship of Śiva which was gaining ground since the days of the Śiva-Bhāgavatas mentioned by Patañjali. In the Kharoshṭhī inscription Kadphises II is called “the great king, king of kings, lord of the world, the Mahīśvara, the defender.”

We learn from Yu-Houan, the author of the Wei-liao composed between A.D. 239-265 that the Yueh-chi power was flourishing in Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra), Ta-hia (Oxus Valley), Kao-tou (Kābul) and Tien-Tchou (India) as late as the third century A.D. But the early Chinese annalists are silent about the names of the successors of Yen-kao-tchen (Kadphises II). Inscriptions discovered in India have, however, preserved the names with dates of the following great Kushān sovereigns besides the Kadphises group, viz., Kanishka I (83-23),

Vāsishka (24-28), Huvishka (31-60), Kanishka II, son of Vājesheska (41), and Vāsudeva (74-98). Huvishka, Vā-jesheska and Kanishka II are probably referred to by Kalhaṇa as Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka who apparently ruled conjointly. It will be seen that Kanishka II ruled in the year 41, a date which falls within the reign of Huvishka (31-60). Thus the account of Kalhaṇa is confirmed by epigraphic evidence.

In the chronological order generally accepted by numismatists, the Kanishka group succeeded the Kadphises group. But this view is not accepted by many scholars. Moreover, there is little agreement among scholars who

place the Kanishka group after the Kadphises kings. The various theories of Kanishka's date are given below:

1. According to Dr. Fleet, Kanishka reigned before the Kadphises group, and was the founder of that reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, which afterwards came to be known as the Vikrama Samvat. His view was accepted by Kennedy, but was ably controverted by Dr. Thomas, and can no longer be upheld after the discoveries of Marshall.\(^1\) Inscriptions, coins as well as the testimony of Hiuen-Tsang clearly prove that Kanishka's dominions included Gandhāra, but we have already seen that according to Chinese evidence Yin-mo-fu, and not the Kushāns, ruled Kipin (Kāpiša-Gandhāra) in the second half of the first century B.C.

2. According to Marshall, Sten Konow, Smith and several other scholars Kanishka's rule began about 125 A.D., and ended in the second half of the second century A.D. Now, we learn from the Sue Vihār inscription that Kanishka's dominions included the Lower Indus Valley. Again we learn from the Junāgadh inscription of Rudradāman, that the Mahākṣatrapa's conquests extended to Sindhu and Sauvira (which included Multan according to Alberuni). Rudradāman certainly lived from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. He did not owe his position as Mahākṣatrapa to anybody else (svayam adhigata Mahākṣatrapa nāma). If Kanishka flourished in the middle of the second century A.D., how are we to reconcile his mastery over the Lower Indus Valley with the contemporary sovereignty of Rudradāman? Again Kanishka's dates 3-23, Vāshiska's dates 24-28, Huvishka's dates 31-60, and Vasudeva's dates 74-98 suggest a continuous reckoning. In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an

\(^1\) Thomas, J.E.A.S., 1913; Marshall, J.E.A.S., 1914.
era. But we know of no era current in North-West India which commenced in the second century A.D.

3. Dr. Majumdar thinks that the era founded by Kanishka was the Traikutaka-Kalachuri-Chedi era of 248-49 A.D. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil points out that this is not possible.1

"In fact, the reign of Vasudeva, the last of the Kushans, came to an end 100 years after the beginning of the reign of Kanishka. Numerous inscriptions prove that Vasudeva reigned at Mathura. It is certain that this country over which extended the empire of Vasudeva was occupied about 350 A.D. by the Yaudheyas and the Nagas and it is probable that they reigned in this place nearly one century before they were subjugated by Samudra Gupt. The capitals of the Nagas were Mathura, Kāntipura and Padmavati." The theory of Dr. Majumdar cannot, moreover, be reconciled with the Tibetan tradition which makes Kanishka a contemporary of King Vijayakirti of Khotan,2 and the Indian tradition which makes Huvishka a contemporary of Nāgarjuna and hence of a king of the Śātavāhana line of Kosala,3 i.e., the upper Deccan which became extinguished in the first half of the third century A.D. Lastly, the catalogues of the Chinese Tripitaka state that An-Shih-Kao (148-170 A.D.) translated the Mārgabhumi Sūtra of Saṅgharaksha, who was the chaplain of Kanishka.4 This shows conclusively that Kanishka flourished long before 170 A.D. The arguments against the theory of Dr. Majumdar are equally applicable to the surmise of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who places Kanishka’s accession in A. D. 278.

4. According to Fergusson, Oldenberg, Thomas, Banerji, Rapson and many other scholars Kanishka was the

---

1 Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 31.
2 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 142.
4 Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, I, p. 64n.
founder of that reckoning commencing A.D. 78, which came to be known as the Saka era. This view is not accepted by Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil on the following grounds:

(a) If we admit that Kujula-Kadphises and Hermaios reigned about 50 A.D. and that Kanishka founded the Saka era in 78 A.D., we have scarcely 29 years for the duration of the end of the reigns of Kadphises I and the whole of the reign of Kadphises II.

(But the period of 28 years is not too short in view of the fact that Kadphises II succeeded an octogenarian. When Kadphises I died “at the age of more than eighty” his son must have been an old man. It is, therefore, improbable that “his reign was protracted.”)

(b) Mr. Marshall, says Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil, has discovered at Taxila in the Chir Stupa a document dated 136, which, in the Vikrama era, corresponds to 79 A.D. and the king mentioned therein is probably Kadphises I, but certainly not Kanishka.

(Now, the epithet Devaputra applied to the Kushan king of the Taxila scroll of 136, is characteristic of the Kanishka group, and not of the Kadphises kings. So the discovery, far from shaking the conviction of those that attribute to Kanishka the era of 78 A.D., rather strengthens it. The omission of the personal name of the Kushan monarch does not necessarily imply that the first Kushan is meant. In several inscriptions of the time of Kumāra Gupta and Buddha Gupta, the king is referred to simply as Gupta nāipa).

(c) Prof. J. Dubreuil says: “Mr. Sten Konow has shown that the Tibetan and Chinese documents tend to

1 The Kadphises Kings meant here are Kujula (Kadphises I), and Vima (Wima) and not Kuyula Kasa Kadphasa whose identification with Kadphises I is a mere surmise. Even if Kuyula Kasa be identical with Kujula and the Kushan King of the Taxila inscription of 136, it may be pointed out that it is not means certain that the date 136 refers to the Vikrama era.
prove that Kanishka reigned in the second century.” (This Kanishka may have been Kanishka of the Āra Inscription of the year 41 which, if referred to the Śaka era, would give a date in the second century A.D. Po-t’iao of Sten Konow¹ may have been one of the successors of Vāsudeva I: “coins bearing the name of Vāsudeva continued to be struck long after he had passed away.”² Dr. Smith and Mr. R. D. Banerji clearly recognise the existence of more than one Vāsudeva.³

(d) Mr. Sten Konow has shown that the inscriptions of the Kanishka era and those of the Saka era are not dated in the same fashion. [But the same scholar also shows that all the inscriptions of the Kanishka era are also not dated in the same fashion. In the Kharoshṭhī inscriptions, Kanishka and his successors recorded the dates in the same way as their Śaka-Pahlava predecessors, giving the name of the month and the day within the month. On the other hand, in their Brāhmi records, Kanishka and his successors adopted the Ancient Indian way of dating.⁴ Are we to conclude from this that the Kharoshṭhī dates of Kanishka’s inscriptions, are not to be referred to the same era to which the dates of the Brāhmi records are to be ascribed? If Kanishka adopted two different ways of dating, we fail to understand why he could not have adopted a third method to suit the local conditions in western India. Sten Konow himself points out that in the Saka dates we have the name of the month as in the Kharoshṭhī records, with the addition of the Paksha. “The Saka era which they (the western Kshatrapas) used was a direct imitation of the reckoning used by their cousins in the north-west,

² R.E.I., p. 272.
³ Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 272-278.
⁴ Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141.
the additional mentioning of the “paksha” being perhaps a concession to the custom in the part of the country where they ruled.” It is not improbable that just as Kanishka in the borderland used the old Saka-Pahlava method, and in Hindustan used the ancient Indian way of dating prevalent there, so in western India his officers added the “paksha” to suit the custom in that part of the country]

Kanishka completed the Kushān conquest of upper India and ruled over a wide realm which extended from Gandhāra and Kaśmir to Benares. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sākta) and Pātali-putra are preserved by Tibetan and Chinese writers. Epigraphic records give contemporary notices of him, with dates, not only from Zeda in the Yuzufzai country and from Māṇikiala near Rawalpindi, but also from Sue Vihār (north of Sind), from Mathurā and Srāvasti, and from Sārnāth near Benares. His coins are found in considerable quantities as far eastwards as Ghāzipur and Gorakhpur. The eastern portion of his empire was apparently governed by the Maha-Kshatrāpa Kharapalāna and the Kshatrāpa Vanashpara. He fixed his own residence at Peshāwar (Parushapura) and established Kanishkapura in Kaśmir. It is, however, probable that Kanishkapura was established by his namesake of the Āra inscription. After making himself master of the south (i.e., India) Kanishka turned to the west and defeated the King of the Parthians. In his old age he led an army against the north and died in an attempt to cross the Tsungling mountains between Gandhāra and Khotan. The Northern expedition is apparently referred to by Huen Tsang who speaks of Chinese Princes detained as hostages at his court.

2 Ind. Ant., 1908, p. 382.
It is not improbable that Kanishka was the Kushān King repulsed by general Pan-ch’ao during the reign of the Emperor Ho-ti. It has no doubt been argued that Kanishka, “must have been a monarch of some celebrity and if the Chinese had come into victorious contact with him, their historians would have mentioned it.” But if we identify Pan-ch’ao’s Kushān contemporary with Kadphises II, the silence of the Chinese becomes still more mysterious and inexplicable because he was certainly well known to the Annalists. On the other hand, Kanishka was not known to them, and the non-mention of his name, if he were Pan-ch’ao’s contemporary, cannot be more surprising than that of his predecessor, Wema. In favour of Kanishka’s identity with Pan-ch’ao’s antagonist we may urge that Kanishka is known to have come into conflict with the Chinese, but the same cannot be said with regard to Wema, the events of whose reign as recorded by Chinese annalists do not include a first class war with China. The legend of Kanishka’s death published by S. Lévi contains a significant passage which runs thus:—“I have subjugated three regions; all men have taken refuge with me, the region of the north alone has not come in to make its submission.” Have we not here a covert allusion to his failure in the encounter with his mighty northern neighbour?

Kanishka’s fame rests not so much on his conquests, as on his patronage of the religion of Śākyamuni. Numismatic evidence shows that he actually became a convert to Buddhism. He showed his zeal for his new faith by building the celebrated relic tower and Sanghārāma at Purushapura or Peshāwar which excited the wonder of the Chinese and Arab travellers. He convoked the last great Buddhist council which was held in Kaśmīr or Jālandhar. But though a Buddhist the Kushān monarch continued to honour his old Greek, Zoroastrian, Elamite, Mithraic and Hindu
The court of Kanishka was adorned by Ásvaghosha, Charaka, Nāgārjuna, Vasmītra, Pārśva, Samgharaksha, Māthara, Agesilnos the Greek and other worthies who played a leading part in the literary, scientific, religious, philosophical and artistic activities of the reign. Excavations at Māt ucar Mathurā have disclosed a lifesize statue of the great king.²

After Kanishka came Vasishka, Huvishka and Kanishka of the Āra inscription. We have got two inscriptions of Vasishka dated 24 and 28. He may have been identical with Vājheshka, the father of Kanishka of the Āra inscription, and Jushka of the Rājatarangini.

Huvishka’s dates range from 31 to 60. A newly discovered Mathurā Inscription³ represents him as the grandson of a king who has the appellation “Sacha dharma thita,” i.e., steadfast in the true Law, which occurs only on the coins of Kadphises I. Kalhana’s narrative leaves the impression that Huvishka ruled simultaneously with Jushka and Kanishka, i.e., Vājheshka and Kanishka of the Āra inscription of the year 41. The Wardak vase inscription proves the inclusion of Kābul within his dominions. But there is no evidence that he retained his hold on Sind which was probably wrested from the successors of Kanishka I by Rudradāman. In Kaśmīr Huvishka built a town named Hushkapura. Like Kanishka I he was a patron of Buddhism and built a splendid monastery at Mathurā. He also resembled Kanishka in an eclectic taste for a medley of Greek, Persian and Indian deities. The newly discovered


² B.H.I., p. 272.

Mathurā inscription refers to the restoration during his reign of a delapidated Devakula of his grandfather.

Smith does not admit that the Kanishka of the Āra inscription of the year 41 was different from the great Kanishka. Lüders and Sten Know, however, distinguish the two Kanishkas. According to Lüders Kanishka of the Āra inscription was a son of Vāsishka and probably a grandson of Kanishka I. Kanishka II had the titles Mahārāja, Rājātirāja, Devaputra, and Kaisara. It is possible that he, and not Kanishka I, was the founder of the town of Kanishka-pura in Kaśmir.

The last notable king of Kanishka's line was Vāsudeva. His dates range from the year 74 to 98, i.e., A.D. 152 to 176 according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages. He does not appear to have been a Buddhist. His coins exhibit the figure of Śiva attended by Nandi. There can be no doubt that he reverted to Saivism, the religion professed by his great predecessor Kadphises II. A king named Vāsudeva is mentioned in the Kāvyā Mimāmsā as a patron of poets and a Sabhāpati. That the Kushān Age was a period of great literary activity is proved by the works of Aśvaghoṣha, Nāgārjuna and others. It was also a period of religious ferment and missionary activity. It witnessed the development of Saivism, Mahāyāna and the cults of Mihira and of Vāsudeva Krishṇa and it saw the introduction of Buddhism into China by Kaśyapa Mātaṅga (62 A.D.).

The inscriptions of Vāsudeva have been found only in the Mathurā region. From this it is not unreasonable to surmise that he lost his hold over the North-Western portion of the Kushān dominions.

In the third century A.D., we hear of the existence of not less than four kingdoms all 'dependent on the

1 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 143.
Yueh-chi, and ruled probably by princes of the Yueh-chi stock. These were Ta-hia (Oxus region), Ki-pin (Kāpiśa), Kao-fou (Kābul) and Tien-tchou (India proper). The Yueh-chi kingdom of Tien-tchou probably disappeared in the fourth century A.D., being conquered by the Nāgas.

IV. The Nāgas and Later Kushāns.

The prevalence of Nāga rule over a considerable portion of northern and central India in the third and fourth centuries A.D., is amply attested by epigraphic evidence. A Lahore copper seal inscription of the fourth century A.D. refers to a king named Maheśvara Nāga, the son of Nāgabhaṭṭa. The Allahabad Pillar Inscription refers to King Ganapati Nāga, while several Vākšāka records mention Bhava Nāga, king of the Bhāraśivas, whose grandson's grandson Rudrasena II was a contemporary of Chandra-Gupta II, and who accordingly must have flourished long before the rise of the Gupta Empire. Some idea of the great power of Bhava Nāga's dynasty and the territory over which they ruled may be gathered from the fact that they performed ten Aśvamedha sacrifices and "were besprinkled on the forehead with the pure water of (the river) Bhāgirathī that had been obtained by their valour." The performance of ten Aśvamedha sacrifices indicates that they were not a feudatory family owing allegiance to the Kushāns. We

1 Among the successors of Vāsudeva may be mentioned Kanishka (III), Vasu (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, pp. 211-213), and Grumbastes (Smith, E.H., p. 274). The last king of Kanishka's race was Lagāśārman who was overthrown by his Brahman minister Kullar (Alberuni, II, 13). For an alleged invasion of India in the later Kushān period by Ardešir Bābāgān (A.D. 226-241), the founder of the Sasanian dynasty, see Periplus (Eliot and Dowson vi, p. 55); cf. also the Pehlevi inscription at Persepolis referred to in the Amrita Bazar Patrika, May 24, 1924, which suggests that the Sasanians exercised suzerainty over N. W. India up to the time of Sapor II.

2 CIJ, p. 283.

learn from the Purāṇas that the Nāgas established themselves at Vidiśā, Padmāvatī, Kaṭūtīparī, and even Mathurā which was the southern capital of Kanishka and his successors.¹ The greatest of the Nāga Kings was perhaps Chandrāmśa, 'the second Nakhavant,' who was probably identical with the great king Chandra of the Delhi Iron Pillar inscription. The hand of a Nāga princess was sought by Chandra Gupta II in the fifth century, and a Nāga officer governed the Gangetic Doāb as late as the time of Skanda Gupta.² The Kushāns, however, continued to rule in the Kābul valley. One of them gave his daughter in marriage to Hormisdas II, the Sassanian King of Persia (A.D. 301-309). Sapur II seems to have exercised suzerainty over his Scythic neighbours and "when he besieged Amida in A.D. 350 Indian elephants served under his command."³ Shortly afterwards the Sassanian supremacy was replaced by that of the Guptas, and the "Daivaputraśāhī sāhānusāhī" sent valuable presents to Samudra Gupta. In the fifth century the Kidara Kushāns established their rule over Gandhāra and Kaśmīr.⁴ In the sixth century the Kushāns had to fight hard against the Huns. Kābul, their capital, was finally taken by the Moslems in 870 A.D. After that date the royal residence was shifted to Ohind, on the Indus. The line of Kanishka was finally extinguished by the Brāhmaṇa Kallār.

² For later traces of Nāga rule, see Bom. Gaz. 1, 2, pp. 291, 292, 313, 574; Ep. Ind., X, 25.
SCYTHIAN RULE IN SOUTHERN AND WESTERN INDIA

I. The Kshaharatas.

We have seen that in the second and first centuries B.C., the Scythians possessed Ki-pin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra) and afterwards extended their sway over a large part of Northern India. The principal Scythic dynasties continued to rule in the north. But a Satrapal family, the Kshaharātas, extended their power to western India and the Deccan, and wrested Mahārāṣṭra from the Sātavāhanas. The Sātavāhana King apparently retired to the southern part of his dominions, probably to the Janapada of the Bellary District which came to be known as Sātavāhani-hāra, and was at one time under the direct administration of a military governor (mahāsenāpati) named Skandanaṅga.¹ The name of the Scythian conquerors of Mahārāṣṭra, Kshaharāta, seems to be identical with “Karatai,” the designation of a famous Saka tribe mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy.²

The known members of the Kshaharāta, Khakharāta, or Ohaharata family are Ghataka, Bhumaka and Nahapāna. Of these Ghataka belonged to the Mathurā region. Bhumaka was a Kshatrapa of Kāthiāwār. Rapson says that he preceded Nahapāna. His coin types are “arrow, discus and thunderbolt.” These types may be compared with the reverse type “discus, bow and arrow” of certain copper coins struck conjointly by Spaliris and Azes I.

Nahapāna was the greatest of the Kshaharāta Satraps. Eight Cave Inscriptions discovered at Pāṇḍulena, near

¹ Rp. Ind., XIV, 155.
² Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400. Mr. Y. K. Gupta points out (Ind. Antb., 1926, 178) that among the shepherds of the Deccan we have the surname Kharota which he considers to be a shortened form of Khakharāta (Kshaharāta).
Nāsik, Junnar and Karle (in the Poona District) prove the inclusion of a considerable portion of Maharashtra within his dominions. Seven of these inscriptions describe the benefactions of his son-in-law Ushavadāta, the Saka, while the eighth inscription specifies the charitable works of Ayama the Amātya. Ushavadāta’s inscriptions indicate that Nahapāna’s political influence extended from Poona (in Maharashtra) and Sūrpāraka (in North Konkan) to Mandasor (Dašapura in Mālva) and the district of Ajmir including Pushkara, the place of pilgrimage to which Ushavadāta resorted for consecration after his victory over the Malayas or Mālavas.

The Nāsik and Karle records give the dates 41, 42, 45, of an unspecified era, and call Nahapāna a Kshatrapa, while the Junnar epigraph of Ayama specifies the date 46 and speaks of Nahapāna as Mahākshatrapa. The generally accepted view is that these dates are to be referred to the Saka era of 78 A. D. The name Nahapāna is no doubt Persian, but the Kshaharāta tribe to which Nahapāna belonged was probably a Saka tribe, and Ushavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, distinctly calls himself a Saka. It is, therefore, probable that the era of 78 A.D. derives its name of Saka era from the Saka princes of the House of Nahapāna. Rapson accepts the view that Nahapāna’s dates are recorded in years of the Saka era, beginning in 78 A.D., and therefore assigns Nahapāna to the period A.D. 119 to A. D. 124. Several scholars identify Nahapāna with Mambarus (Nambanus?) of the Periplus whose capital was Minnagara in Ariake. According to Professor Bhandarkar Minnagara is modern Mandasor, and Ariake is Aparāntika. Mr. R. D. Banerji and Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil

1 J.B.A.S., 1912, p. 785.
3 Ariake may be Aryaka of Varshamihrā’s Brihat Saṃhitā.
are, however, of opinion that Nahapāna’s dates are not referable to the Śaka era. They say that if we admit that the inscriptions of Nahapāna are dated in the Śaka era, there will be only an interval of five years between the inscription of this king, dated 46 and the inscriptions of Rudradāman, dated 52. Within these years must have taken place:

1. The end of Nahapāna’s reign;
2. The destruction of the Kshaharātas;
3. The accession of Chashtana as Kshatrapa, his reign as Kshatrapa, his accession as a Mahākshatrapa, and his reign as Mahākshatrapa;
4. The accession of Jayadāman as Kshatrapa, his reign as Kshatrapa, and perhaps also his reign as Mahākshatrapa;
5. The accession of Rudradāman and the beginning of his reign.

There is no necessity, however, of crowding the events mentioned above within five years (between the year 46, the last known date of Nahapāna, and the year 52, the first known date of Rudradāman). There is nothing to show that Chashtana’s family came to power after the destruction of the Kshaharātas. The line of Chashtana may have been ruling in Cutch (as the Andhau inscriptions of the year 53 suggest) while the Kshaharātas were ruling in parts of Malwa and Mahārāṣṭra. Moreover, there is no good ground for believing that a long interval elapsed from the accession of Chashtana to that of Rudradāman. Professors Bhandarkar and Majumdar have pointed out that the Andhau inscriptions clearly prove that Chashtana and Rudradāman ruled conjointly in the year 52. Prof. J. Dubreuil rejects their view on the ground that there is no “oha” after Rudradāman in the text of
the inscription (Rājā Chasṭanasa Yśāmotika-putrasa rājāa Rudradāmasa Jayadāma-putrasa varshe dvipachāse 50, 2). Prof. Dubreuil translates the passage thus:

In the 52nd year, in the reign of Rudradāman, son of Jayadāman, grandson of Chasṭana and great-grandson of Yśāmotika.

The Professor who objects to a cha, himself makes use not only of “and” but also of the words “grandson” and “great-grandson” no trace of which can be found in the original record. Had his translation been what the writer of the Andhau inscriptions intended, we should have expected to find the name of Yśāmotika first, and then the name of Chasṭana followed by those of Jayadāman and Rudradāman—Yśāmotika prapautrasa Chasṭana pautrasa Jayadāma-putrasa Rudradāmasa. Moreover, it is significant that in the text of the inscription there is no royal title prefixed to the name of Jayadāman who ruled between Chasṭana and Rudradāman according to Dubreuil. On the other hand, both Chasṭana and Rudradāman are called rāja. The two are mentioned in exactly the same way—with the honorific Rājā and the patronymic. The literal translation of the insessional passage is “in the year 52 of king Chasṭana son of Yśāmotika, of king Rudradāman son of Jayadāman,” and this certainly indicates that the year 52 belonged to the reign both of Chasṭana and Rudradāman. The conjoint rule of two kings was known to ancient Hindu writers on polity. The theory of the conjoint rule of

1 Cf. the Gāpda and Jassdhan inscriptions.

2 Cf. Dhārāja in Atharva Veda (V. 20, 9); Dhārāja in Kauṭilya’s Arthasastra, p. 325; Durāja of Ayāraśa Sūtra; the classical account of Pataleena, p. 160 ante, the case of Dhārāja and Duryodhana in the Great Epic; of Bakṣādā and his son in Jaina’s work; of Śrīrāma I and Śrīrāma II of Aśva and Asūra, etc., etc. The Mahāvana (III. 433) refers to the conjoint rule of three brothers: “Kalāṅgeha Śūhapharṣaḥ nāma nagaram tatra traya bhratāra ekamārthikā tājyāca hārayaśāti.”
Chasṭāna and his grandson is supported by the fact that Jayadāman did not live to be Mahākṣatrāpa and must have predeceased his father Chasṭāna as, unlike Chasṭāna and Rudradāman, he is called simply a Kṣatrāpa (not Mahākṣatrāpa and Bhadramukha) even in the inscriptions of his descendants.¹ We have already noticed the fact that the title rāja, which is given to Chasṭāna and Rudradāman in the Andhau inscriptions, is not given to Jayadāman.

Mr. R. D. Banerji says that the inscriptions of Nahapāna cannot be referred to the same era as used on the coins and inscriptions of Chasṭāna’s dynasty because if we assume that Nahapāna was dethroned in 46 S. E., Gautamiputra must have held Nāsik up to 52 S. E. (from his 18th to his 24th year), then Pulumāyi held the city up to the 22nd year of his reign, i.e., up to at least 74 S. E. But Rudradāman is known to have defeated Pulumāyi and taken Nāsik before that time. Banerji’s error lies in the tacit assumption that Rudradāman twice occupied Nāsik before the year 73 of the Saka era. Another untenable assumption of Mr. Banerji is that Rudradāman finished his conquests before the year 52 or A. D. 130, whereas the Andhau inscriptions merely imply the possession of Cutch by the House of Chasṭāna.

The theory of those who refer Nahapāna’s dates to the Saka era, is confirmed by the fact pointed out by Prof. Bhandarkar and others that a Nāsik inscription of Nahapāna refers to the gold currency of the Kushāns who could not have ruled in India before the first century A. D.

The power of Nahapāna and his allies was threatened by the Malayas (Malavas) from the north, and the Śatavāhanas from the south. The incursion of the Malavas was repelled by Ushavadāta. But the Śatavāhana attack

¹ Cf. the Guḍa and Jānāhan inscriptions.
proved fatal to Saka rule in Mahārāṣṭra. The Nāṣik
praśasti calls Gautamiputra Satakarni the uprooter of the
Kshaharāta race and the restorer of the Sātavāhana
power. That Nahapāna himself was overthrown by
Gautamiputra is proved by the testimony of the Jogal-
tembhī hoard which consisted of Nahapāna's own coins
and coins restruck by Gautamiputra. In the restruck
coins there was not a single one belonging to any prince
other than Nahapāna as would certainly have been the
case if any ruler had intervened between Nahapāna and
Gautamiputra.

II. The Restoration of the Sātavāhana Empire.

Gautamiputra's victory over the Kshaharātas led to
the restoration of the Sātavāhana power in Mahārāṣṭra
and the adjoining provinces. The recovery of Maharāṣ-
tra is proved by a Nāṣik inscription dated in the year 18
and a Karle epigraph addressed to the Anśaya in charge
of Māmāla (the district round Karle, modern Māval).
But this was not the only achievement of Gautamiputra.
We learn from the Nāṣik record of queen Gautami that
her son destroyed the Sakas, Yavanas and Pahlavas,
and that his dominions extended not only over Asika,2
Asaka (Āśmaka on the Godāvari, i.e., Mahārāṣṭra),2
and Mulaka (the district round Paithan), but also over Suratha
(Kāthiāvar), Kukura (in Western Central or India, near
the Pāriyātra or the Western Vindhyas),4 Aparānta (North
Konkan), Anupa (district round Māhiṃmati on the Nar-
madā), Vidarbha (Berar), and Ākara-Avantī (East and
West Mālwa). He is further styled lord of all the

1 The Nāṣik Edict was issued from the victorious camp at Vejayantī and was
addressed to the Anśaya in charge of Govardhanī (Nāṣik).
3 Siindarāstra's translation of the Arthaśāstra, p. 143, n. 2.
4 Ekhilat Sakhita, XIV, 4.
mountains from the Vindhyas to the Travancore hills. The names of the Andhra country (Andhrāpatha) and South Kosala are, however, conspicuous by their absence. Inscriptions and the testimony of Hiuen Tsang prove that both these territories were at one time or other included within the Sātavāhana empire. The earliest Sātavāhana king whose inscriptions have been found in the Andhra region is Pulumāyi, son of Gautamiputra.

In the Nāsik praśasti Gautamiputra figures not only as a conqueror, but also as a social reformer. "He crushed down the pride and conceit of the Kshatriyas, furthered the interest of Dvijas and Kutubas (agriculturists) and stopped the contamination of the four varṇas."

According to Sir B. G. Bhandarkar and Prof. Bhandarkar, Gautamiputra reigned conjointly with his son Pulumāyi. They give the following reasons:—

(1) In Gautami's inscription (dated in the 19th year of her grandson Pulumāyi) she is called the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king. This statement would be pointless if she were not both at one and the same time.

(2) If it were a fact that Gautamiputra was dead when the queen-mother's inscription was written, and Pulumāyi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter also celebrated in the inscription. But there is not a word in praise of him. A king dead for 19 years is extolled, and the reigning king passed over in silence.

(3) The inscription dated in the year 24, engraved on the east wall of the Veranda of the Nāsik Cave No. 3, which records a grant made by Gautamiputra and his mother, "whose son is living," in favour of certain Buddhist monks "dwelling in the cave which was a pious

---

1 The possession of Vejayanti in the Kānarese country is specially referred to in the Nāsik Inscription of the year 18.
gift of theirs," presupposes the gift of the Nasik Cave No. 3 in the 19th year of Pulumāyi. Consequently Gautamiputra was alive after the 19th year of his son.

As regards point (1), it may be said that usually a queen sees only her husband and son on the throne. Queen Gautami Balaśri, on the other hand, was one of the fortunate (or unfortunate) few who saw grandchildren on the throne. Therefore she claimed to be the mother of a great king and the grandmother of a great king.

As to point (2), although it is not customary for an ordinary subject to extol a dead king and pass over a reigning monarch in silence, still it is perfectly natural for a queen-mother in her old age to recount the glories of a son who was associated with her in a previous gift.

As to point (3), it is not clear that the gift referred to in the postscript of the year 24 was identical with the grant of the year 19 of Pulumāyi. The donors in the postscript were king Gautamiputra and his mother, the donor in the year 19 of Pulumāyi was the queen-mother alone. In the inscription of the year 24, the queen-mother is called Mahādeva jivasuta Rajamātā. In Pulumāyi’s inscription the epithets Mahādevi and Rajamātā are retained but the epithet "Jivasuta" is significantly omitted. The donees in the former grant were the Tekirasi ascetics in general, the donees in the latter grant were the Bhadavānīya monks. The object of grant in the former case may have been merely the Veranda of Cave No. 3, which contains the postscript of the year 24, and whose existence before the 19th year of Pulumāyi is attested by an edict of Gautamiputra of the year 18. On the other hand, the cave given away to the Bhadavānīya monks was the whole of Cave No. 3.

If Gautamiputra and his son reigned simultaneously, and if the latter ruled as his father’s colleague in
Mahārāṣṭra then it is difficult to explain why Gautamiputra was styled “Govadhanasa Benākaṭakasvāmi,” and why he addressed the officer at Govardhana directly, ignoring his son who is represented as ruling over Mahārāṣṭra, while in the record of the year 19, Pulumāyi was considered as so important that the date was recorded in the years of his reign, and not in that of his father who was the senior ruler.¹

The generally accepted view is that Pulumāyi succeeded Gautamiputra. We learn from Ptolemy that his capital was Baithan, i.e., Paithan or Pratishthāna on the Godāvari, identified by Bhandarkar with Navanara, or Navauagara, i.e., the new city. Inscriptions and coins prove that Pulumāyi’s dominions included the Krishnag district as well as Mahārāṣṭra. We have already seen that the Andhra country is not mentioned in the list of territories over which Gautamiputra held his sway. It is not altogether improbable that Vasishthiputra Pulumāyi was the first to establish the Satavahana power in that region. Sukhtankar identifies him with Sri Pulumāyi, king of the Satavāhanas, mentioned in an inscription discovered in the Adoni taluk of the Bellary district. But the absence of the distinguishing metronymic probably indicates that the king referred to in the inscription is Pulumāyi I of the Purānas. Rapson identifies Pulumāyi with Vasishthiputra Sri Satakarni who is represented in a Kanheri inscription as the husband of a daughter of the Mahākṣatrapa Ru(dra). He further identifies this Rudra with Rudradāman I and says that Pulumāyi must be identified with Satakarni, lord of the Deccan, whom Rudradāman “twice in fair fight completely defeated, but did not destroy on account of the nearness of their connection.” Prof. Bhandarkar, however, does not accept the identification of Pulumāyi with Vasishthiputra.

¹ Cf. R. D Banerji, J. R. A. S., 1917, pp. 281 et. seq. Note also the epithet (Oakshepa) pathedrāra applied to Pulumāyi in the prafasti of the year 19.
Śri Satakarni of the Kanheri Cave Inscription. He identifies the latter with Siva Śri Satakarni, the Śiva Śri of the Matsya Purāṇa, probably a brother of Pulumāyi. Another brother of Pulumāyi was probably Śri Chandra Sāti. A Nānaghat Inscription discloses the existence of a Vāsishṭhiputra Chaturapanca Satakarni, whose identity, however, remains undetermined.

The next important kings were Śri Sāta (mis-called Sakasena) and Yajñāśrī Satakarni. Yajñāśrī’s inscriptions, which prove that he reigned for at least 27 years, are found at the following places, viz., Nāsik in Mahārāṣṭra, Kanheri in Aparānta, and China in the Krishnā district. His coins are found in Gujarāt, Kathiawar, East Mālwa, Aparānta, the Central Provinces, and the Krishnā district. There can be no doubt that he ruled over both Mahārāṣṭra and the Andhra country. Smith says that his silver coins imitating the coinage of the Saka rulers of Ujjain probably point to victories over the latter, and that the coins bearing the figure of a ship suggest the inference that the king’s power extended over the sea. He thus anticipated the naval ventures of Sivaji and Angria.

Yajñāśrī was the last great king of his dynasty. After his death the Sātavāhana probably lost Mahārāṣṭra to the Ābhira king Īśvarasena.1 The later Sātavāhana

---

1 The earliest reference to the Ābhira to which a date can be assigned is that contained in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The Mahābhāṣya, as well as the Mahābhārata connect them with the Sūdras—the Scyths of Alexander’s historians. Their country—Ābhiras—Anda mention in the Periplus. In the third quarter of the second century A.D., Ābhiras chieftains figured as generals of the Saka rulers of Western India. Shortly afterwards a chief named Īśvaradatta, probably an Ābhira, became Mahāsakasaptapada. His relation to the Ābhira king Mādhariputra Īvara Sena, son of Śiva Datta, remains doubtful. But some scholars are inclined to identify the two chieftains. It is also suggested that this dynasty of Īvara Sena is identical with the Traukula line of Aparānta, and that the establishment of the Traukula era in A.D. 949 marks the date at which the Ābhira succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the Government of Northern Mahārāṣṭra and the adjoining region. The last known rulers of the Traukula line were Indrachatta, his son Dharmasena (466-8 A.D.), and his son Vīṣṇusena (469-80), after whom the kingdom seems to have been conquered by the Vakşaṇa king Harîsena.
princes—Sri Rudra Satakarni, Sri Krishna (II) Satakarni, Sri Chandra II and others—ruled in Eastern Deccan and were supplanted by the Ikshvakuṣ 1 and the Pallavas. 2

1 The Ikshvakuṣ are known from inscriptions discovered on the ruins of the Jaguyrapula stūpa in the Krishnā District. They were matrilineally connected with the Kosalya, probably a ruling family of Ancient Mysore (Dhavale, A.H., pp. 88, 101). The only known ruler of the Ikshvaku family of Eastern Deccan is the Vira Purushottama. The Ikshvakuṣ were succeeded by the Bhūmir-phalāṣṭayana of Kadurāhāna (near Mampīvam), the Sāthābhāyanas of Vēgha (cf. the Sāthākoni of Pōlemu), and the Vishvakumaras of Lōnīhu (near Vēgha).

2 The Pallavas—a people of unknown origin, claiming descent from Aṅavāthāram—are the most important of all the dynasties that succeeded the Satavāhanas in the Far South. Their first great king Siva-skandavaraman is known from the inscriptions found at Māyāvala (in Gujarāt) and Hiraṇkāgala (in Belur) to have ruled over an extensive empire including Kāṭchi, Andhrāpura and Sāthābhamāra, and performed the Áśvamedha sacrifice. The evidence of the Ponkākona plates and the Tālgūnda inscription seems to suggest that the Pallava supremacy was acknowledged by the early Gupta of Southern Mysore and the early Kadamba of Vējīyanāth (Banarasa). About the middle of the fourth century d. C. the emperor Samudra Gupta invaded Southern India, defeated the ruling Pallava king Vishṇugopa, and gave a severe blow to the power and prestige of the Empire of Kāṭchi which probably led to its fall. The history of the Pallavas during the next two centuries is obscure. Inscriptions disclose the names of the following kings, but very little is known about them:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings of Krishnā, Gapurũ, and Nellore Districts</th>
<th>Kings of Kāṭchi, and Vējīyanāth (Banarasa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamālavishāya</td>
<td>Visṇugopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavaraman I</td>
<td>Skandavaraman (Skanda-bhūṣya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viravarmaman</td>
<td>Kathirvēḷa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Skandavaraman II (Tambrakāḷa)</td>
<td>Vējīya Visṇugopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Vējīya Ninbā Kāṭchikāla Visṇugopa (Palakkuḍa)</td>
<td>Vējīya Visṇugopa, I, recovered Kāṭchi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Śimhavarmaman (Dāma-ramana, Menmūṭān and Vējīyanāth)</td>
<td>Budhavarmaman, defeated Goliṣṭhāna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Vējīya Vējīya Visṇugopa</td>
<td>Kumbha Visṇu II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavacīhāṇa and Panumkōnda plates?</td>
<td>Skandavarmanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ Śimhavarmaman</td>
<td>{ Nandiraman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ Skandavarmaman</td>
<td>{ Śimhavārman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ Nandiraman</td>
<td>{ Śimhavārman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendravarmaman</td>
<td>{ Mahendravarmaman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasīhavarmaman I</td>
<td>Contemporary of Pulino-sūna II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sātakarnis of Kuntala, or the Kanarese districts,—Hāritiputra Vishṇukada-Chutakulānanda Sātakarni, Rāja of Vajjayantipura, his daughter’s son Hāritiputra Śiva-Skanda-varman (Śiva-Skand-Nāga Śrī or Skanda-Nāga Sātaka) and others were succeeded by the Kadambas. A new power—the Vākṣṭaka—arose in the central Deccan probably towards the close of the third century A.D.

III. The Sakas of Ujjain.

The greatest rivals of the restored Sātavāhana Empire were at first the Śaka Kshatrapas of Ujjain. The progenitor of the Śaka princes of Ujjain was Yasomotika who was the father of Chashana, the first Mahākshatrapa of the family. The name of Yasomotika is Scythic. His descendant, who was killed by Chandra Gupta II, is called a Śaka king by Bāna in his Harshacharita. It is, therefore, assumed by scholars that the Kshatrapa family of Ujjain was of Śaka nationality.

The proper name of the dynasty is not known. Rapson says that it may have been Kārddamaka. The daughter of Rudradaman boasts that she is descended from the family of Kārddamaka kings; but she may have been indebted to her mother for this distinction. The Kārddamaka kings apparently derive their name from the Kārda, a river in Persia.

The Kadamba dynasty was founded by Mayurasvarana, a Brāhmāṇḍa, who rose against the Pallavas and, helped by “Vṛhad Bāna” and other kings, compelled the lord of Kāśchī to confer on him the title of sovereignty. He soon pushed his conquests to the western ocean, destroying the power of the Sātakarnis of Vaijayanti. His great-grandson Kākuntha-varman gave his daughters in marriage to the Guptas and other kings. His grandson Mrigade-varman defeated the Gaṅgas and Pallavas and had his capital at Vaijayanti. Other branches of the family ruled at Pataliputra, UchhatāONGL and Tripuravata. The Kadambas were finally overthrown by the Chalukyas.

1 J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 211.
2 Pānasa, Shama Fastry’s translation of Kauṭilya, p. 96.
According to Dubreuil, Chashtana ascended the throne in A.D. 78, and was the founder of the Śaka era. But this is improbable in view of the fact that the capital of Chashtana (Tiastanes) was Ujjain (Ozene of Ptolemy), whereas we learn from the Periplus that Ozene was not a capital in the seventies of the first century A.D.¹ The Periplus speaks of Ozene as a former capital, implying that it was not a capital in its own time. The earliest known date of Chashtana is S. E. 52, i.e., A. D. 130. We learn from the Andhau inscriptions that in the year A. D. 130 Chashtana was ruling conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman. Professors Rapson and Bhandarkar point out that his foreign title Kshatrapa, and the use of the Kharoshthī alphabet on his coins, clearly show that he was a Vicerey of some northern power—probably of the Kushans. Jayadāman, son of Chashtana, seems to have acted merely as a Kshatrapa and to have pre-deceased his father, and the latter was succeeded as Mahākshatrapa by Rudradāman.

Rudradāman became an independent Mahākshatrapa sometime between the years 52 and 72 (A. D. 130 and 150). We learn from the Junagadh Rock Inscription of the year 72 that men of all castes chose him as protector and that he won for himself the title of Mahākshatrapa. This probably indicates that the power of his house had been shaken by some enemy (Gautamiputra?), and he had to restore the supreme Satrapal dignity by his own prowess.

The place names in the inscription seem to show that the rule of Rudradāman extended over Pūrv-āpar-ākara-āvanti (East and West Mālwa), Anupanivrit or the Māhishmati (Māndhāta?) region, Ānartta ² (district round

¹ The Periplus mentions Malichos (Mallku), the king of the Nahataeans who died in A. D. 78, and Zoacleas (Za Hakale), king of the Aurnaites who reigned from A. D. 78 to 89 (J. R. A. S., 1917, 927-982).

² Ānartta may, however, designate the district round Vadanagār (Bom. Gaz. I, i, 6). In that case Kukura should be placed in the Dwārakā region. The
Dwārakā, Surāshṭra (district round Junāgadh), Svabhra (the country on the banks of the Sābarmati), Maru (Mārwār), Kachchha (Cutch), Sindhu-Sauvira (the Lower Indus Valley),

Kukura (part of Central India, probably near the Pāriyātra Mt. according to the Bṛihat Saṁhitā, XIV, 4), Aparānta (N. Konkan), Nishāda (in the region of the Sarasvatī and the Western Vindhya, of. Nishāda-
rāṣṭra, Mbh. iii. 130. 4; and Pāriyātrakaraḥ, Mbh., xii. 135,3-5), etc. Of these places Surāshṭra, Kukura, Aparānta, Anupa, and Ākarāvanti formed part of Gautamiputra’s dominions, and must have been conquered either from that king or one of his sons. The Junāgadh inscription gives the information that Rudradāman twice defeated Śātakarni, lord of the Deccan, but did not destroy him on account of their near relationship. According to Professor Bhandarkar this Śātakarni was Gautamiputra himself whose son Vāśishthiputra Śātakarni was Rudradāman’s son-in-law. According to Rapson the lord of the Deccan defeated by the Saka ruler was Pulumāyi.

The great Satrap also conquered the Yaudheyas, who are known, from a stone inscription, to have occupied the Bijayagadh region in the Bharatpur state. If the Kushān chronology accepted by us be correct then he must have wrested Sindhu-Sauvira from one of the successors of Kanishka I.

Rudradāman apparently held his court at Ujjain, which is mentioned by Ptolemy as the capital of his grandfather Chashtana, placing the provinces of Anarta and Surāshṭra under his Pahlava (Parthian) Amātya

Bhāgavata Purāṇa refers to Dwārakā as “Kukur-Udbhaka-Vrishşibibhupurạḥ” (I, 11, 10).

1 Sindhu is the inland portion lying to the west of the Indus (Watters, Yuan Chwáng, II, 262, 263, read with 266). Sauvira includes the littoral (Mihinda Pāñho, S.B.R., XXXVI, 260), as well as the inland portion lying to the east of the Indus as far as Malton (Albercati, I, 302).
Suvisākha, who constructed a new dam on the famous Sudarśana Lake which owed its origin to the “care bestowed by the Maurya government upon the question of irrigation, even in the most remote Provinces.”

The great Kshatrapa is said to have gained fame by studying grammar (śabda), polity (artha), music (gāndharva), logic (nyāya), etc. As a test of the civilised character of his rule it may be noted that he took, and kept to the end of his life, the vow to stop killing men except in battle. The Sudarśana embankment was built and the lake reconstructed by “expenditure a great amount of money from his own treasury, without oppressing the people of the town and of the province by exacting taxes (Kara), forced labour (Vṛṣṭi), benevolences (Prapaya), and the like.” The king was helped in the work of government by an able staff of officials, who were “fully endowed with the qualifications of ministers” (amātya gūpa samudyuktaḥ) and were divided into two classes, viz., Mati-sachiva (Councillors) and Karma-sachiva (Executive Officers).

Rudradāman was succeeded by his eldest son Dāmaghśāda I. After Dāmaghśāda there were (according to Rapson) two claimants for the succession: his son Jivadhāman and his brother Rudra Simha I. The struggle was eventually decided in favour of the latter. To Rudra Simha’s reign belongs the Gunda inscription of the year 103 (= A.D. 181) which records the digging of a tank by an Ābhira general named Rudrabhūti, son of the general Bāhaka. The Ābhiras afterwards usurped the position of Mahākṣatrapa. According to Professor Bhandarkar an Ābhira named Iśvaradatta was the Mahākṣatrapa of the period 188-90 A.D. But Rapson places Iśvaradatta after A.D. 236.

1 Bomb. Gaz., 7, 1, 20.
Rudra Simha I was followed by his sons Rudrasena I, Sañghadāman and Dāmasena. Three of Dāmasena's sons became Mahākṣatrapas, viz., Yaśodāman, Vijayasena and Dāmajāda Śrī. This last prince was succeeded by his nephew Rudrasena II who was followed by his sons Viṣvasimha and Bhartridāman. Under Bhartridāman his son Viṣvasena served as Kṣatrapa.

The connection of Bhartridāman and Viṣvasena with the next Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman II and his successors cannot be ascertained. The last known member of the line was Rudra Simha III who ruled up to at least A.D. 388.

The rule of the Sakas of Western India was destroyed by the Guptas. Already in the time of Samudra Gupta the Sakas appear among the peoples represented as doing respectful homage to him. The Udayagiri Inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II testify to that monarch's conquest of Eastern Mālwa. One of the inscriptions commemorates the construction of a cave by a minister of Chandra Gupta who "came here, accompanied by the king in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world." The subjugation of western Mālwa is probably hinted at by the epithet "Simha-vikrānta-gāmini," or vassal of Simha-Vikrama, i.e., Chandra Gupta II applied to Naravarman of Mandasor. Evidence of the conquest of Surāśṭra is to be seen in Chandra Gupta's silver coins which are imitated from those of the Saka Satraps. Lastly, Bāṇja in his Harshacharita refers to the slaying of the Saka king by Chandra Gupta (Alipure cha para-kalatra kāmukam kāmini-veṣa-guptasccha Chandra Guptaḥ Saka-patim aśātayadit)."
IV. Administrative Machinery of the Scythian Period.¹

The little that we know about the administration of the Scythian Epoch leaves no room for doubt that the institutions of the age were not haphazard improvisations of military upstarts, having no relations with the past, but a highly developed and organised system—the fruit of the labours of generations of political thinkers and statesmen (Vaktri-Prayoktri).

The influence of Arthachintakas on Indo-Scythian Polity is evident. The ablest among the princes of the time assiduously studied the Arthavidya²; and the care taken to train the occupant of the throne, the employment of officers endowed with Amatyaguna, the classification of Sachivas, abstention from oppressive imposition of Pranaya, Vishli, etc. and the solicitude for the welfare of the Pauras and Janapadas clearly show that the teaching of the Arthasastra writers was not lost upon the Scythian conquerors of India. There was no great cleavage with the past, and the reference to Mahāmātras,³ Rajjukas,⁴ and Samcharamitaka⁵ spies, indicate that the official machinery of the Maurya period had not ceased to function at least in Southern India.

gupta disguised as Druvadetri while the former was making advances of love. The grīṅgāprakāśa by Bhoja throws additional light on the point, quoting passages from the Devīchandragupta (see Deviśandraguptam by A. Rangaswami Saravasti, Ind. Ant., 1928, p. 181 ff).

¹ The expression "Scythian Period" has been used in this section in a broad sense to denote the epoch of all the Post-Mauryan dynasties that ruled in India during the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era. During the greater part of this period the most powerful potentate in India was the Scythian "King of Kings" who had his metropolis in the North-West, but whose commands were not unoften obeyed on the banks of the Ganges and the Godāvati, See Cal. Rev., Sept., 1928.
³ Lüders' Ins. Nos. 607, 1144. Note the employment of a śramaṇa as Mahāmātra by a gāntavahān ruler. 
⁴ Ins. Nos. 415, 1195, 
⁵ Ins. No. 1200.
But we must not suppose that the entire administrative structure of the period was a replica of the Maurya constitution. The foreign conquerors of North-Western India brought with them several institutions which had been prevalent for ages in the countries through which they passed. Thus the Persian system of government by Satraps was introduced in several provinces of Northern, Western and Southern India, and officials with the Greek titles of Meridarch and Strategos ruled contemporaneously with functionaries having the Indian designations of Amātya and Mahāsenāpati.

The tide of Scythian invasion could not sweep away the tribal republics which continued to flourish as in the days of Buddha and Alexander. Inscriptions and coins testify to the existence of many such communities, and like the Līchhehavas and Sākyas of old, the most powerful among them were found very often ranged against their aggressive royal neighbours who were now mostly Scythian. Unfortunately, the contemporary records do not throw much light on their internal organisation, and it serves no useful purpose to ascribe to them institutions which really belong to their predecessors or successors.

Though the Scythians could not annihilate the republican clans, they did destroy many monarchies of Northern and Western India, and introduce a more exalted type of kingship. The exaltation of monarchy is apparent from two facts, namely, the assumption of high sounding semi-divine honorifics by reigning monarchs, and the apotheosis of deceased rulers. The deification of rulers, and the use of big titles are not unknown to ancient Indian literature, but it is worthy of note that a supreme ruler like Aśoka, whose dominions embraced the greater part of Indis and Afghanistan, was content

1 e.g., the Mālaras (Malayas), Yaudheya, Arjunyana, Udumbara, Kolitae, Kunindas (see Camb. Hist. 528, 529), and Uttamakhadras.
with the titles of "Rāja" and "Devānampiya." The great rulers of the Scythian age, on the other hand, were no longer satisfied with these modest epithets, but assumed more dignified titles like Chakravarti, Adhīrāja, Rājātirāja and Devaputra (the son and not merely the beloved of the gods).

In Southern India we come across titles of a semi-religious character like Bhiṣṭhrāja, Kṣhema- rāja,1 and Dharma-Mahārajādhirāja2 assumed by pious defenders of Indian faiths, probably to distinguish themselves from the unbelieving foreigners and barbarian outcasts of the North-West.3

The assumption of big titles by kings and emperors was paralleled by the use of equally exalted epithets in reference to their chief consorts. Aśoka's queens appear to have been styled merely Devī. The mother of Tīvara, for instance, is called "Dutī Devī" and the implication is that the elder queen was Prathama Devī. But in the Scythian epoch we come across the titles of Agra-Mahisī and Mahādevī which distinguished the chief queen from her rivals. Among such chief consorts may be mentioned Nādasi-Akasa, Nāganikā, and Balaśrī.

The apotheosis of deceased rulers is strikingly illustrated by the growing practice of erecting Devakulas or "Royal galleries of portrait statues." The most famous of these structures was the Devakula of the Pitāmaha of Huvishka referred to in a Mathurā inscription.4

---

1 Lüders' Ins. No. 1345.
2 Lüders' Ins. Nos. 1193, 1209.
3 It is a characteristic of Indian history that imperial titles of one period became fondateary titles in the next. Thus the title Rājā used by Aśoka became a fondateary title in the Scythian and Gupta periods, when designations like Rājādhirāja and Mahārajādhirāja came into general use. But even Mahārajādhirāja became a fondateary designation in the age of the Prabhavas when the loftier style of Paramābhayō, Mahārajādhirāja, Paramāvarta was assumed by sovereign rulers.
existence of numerous royal Devakulas as well as ordinary temples, and the presence of the living Devaputra probably earned for Mathurā its secondary name of “The city of the gods.”

The exaltation of royalty had the sanction of certain Rājadharma writers who represented the king as a “Ma-hatī devata” in human shape. But it was probably due, in the first instance, to the Scythians who acted as carriers of Persian, Chinese and Roman ideas of kingship. The title Rājātirāja, as Rapson points out, is “distinctively Persian.” “It has a long history from the Kshāthiyānām Kshāyathiya of the inscriptions of Darius down to the Shāhān Shāh of the present day.”1 The epithet “Devaputra” is apparently of Chinese origin.2 If Lüders is to be believed, one at least of the Indo-Scythian sovereigns (Kanishka of the Āra Inscription) assumed the Roman title of “Kaisar,” and the dedication of temples in honour of emperors on the banks of the Tiber may have had something to do with the growing practice of erecting Devakulas on the banks of the Jumna.

A remarkable feature of the Scythian Age was the wide prevalence of the system of Dvairājya in Northern and Western India, and Yauvarājya in N. W. India and the Far South. Under both these forms of government the sovereign’s brother, son, grandson, or nephew had an important share in the administration as co-ruler or subordinate colleague. In a Dvairājya the rulers appear to have been of equal status, but in a Yauvarājya the ruling prince was apparently a vice-gerent. As instances of Dvairājya may be mentioned the cases of Lysias and

1 The expressions Kshātriyānām Kshāyathiya (Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upanishad, I. 4, 14), Achenśa, Chaikravarti, etc., are, no doubt, known to our ancient literature. But there is no proof of the use of the last two as formal styles of sovereigns till the Post-Mauryan period, while the first is never so used.
2 J. R. A. S., 1912, 671, 682.
Antialkidas, Agathokleia and Strato I, Strato I and Strato II, Spalirises and Azes, Hagāna and Hagāmasha, Gondophrēnes and Gudana, Gondophrēnes and Alēdagases, Chashtana and Rudradāman, Kanishka II and Huvishka, etc., etc. Among ruling Yuvarājas may be mentioned Pātika, Kharaosta and the Pallava Yuva-Mahārājas Śiva-Śkanda-varman, Vijaya-Śkanda-varman, and Vishṇugopa of Paleakkada.

The king, or viceroy resided in cities called Adhisṭhāna. The number of such Adhisṭhānas and various other kinds of cities (Nagara, Nagār), was fairly numerous. But regarding their administration our information is very meagre. We hear only of a city official called Nagarākshadāraśa¹ whose functions are nowhere distinctly stated.

Regarding general administration, and the government of provinces, districts and villages we have more detailed information. The designations of some of the highest officers of state did not differ from those in vogue during the Maurya period. Mahāmātras, and Rajjukas play an important part in the days of the Śatavāhanas and Scythians as in the time of Aśoka. But side by side with these functionaries we hear of others who do not figure in inscriptions of the Maurya Epoch, although some of them appear in the Arthāśāstra attributed to Kaṭilya.

The officers most intimately associated with the sovereign were the privy councillors,—the Matisachivas of the Junāgaḍh epigraph and the Rahasyādhikrīta of the Pallava grants. Among other prominent court officials must be mentioned the Rāja Vaidya² and the Rāja Lipikara.³

¹ Lüders' Ins. No. 1351 (Udayagiri Cave Inscription).
² Ins. 1190-93.
³ Ins. 271, Kaṭilya II, 10.
Not less important than the privy councillors were the high military officials—the Mahāsenāpati, the Dandaṇāyaka and the Mahādandaṇāyaka who probably correspond to the Senāpati and Nāyaka of Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra. These important functionaries had probably under them subordinates like Senāgopas, Gaumikās (captains), Āraṇkṣhādhikritis (guards), Aśvārakas (troopers), Bhātamanushyas, etc.

We have already referred to one class of civil officers (Amātyas or Sachivas), viz., the Mati Sachivas. There was another class of Amātyas who served as executive officers (Karma Sachivas). From them were chosen Governors, Treasurers, Superintendents and Secretaries as in the days of Megasthenes.

Among treasury officials mention is made of the Gamjavaras, and the Bhāndāgarikas who was one of the principal ministers of state (Rājāmātya). But we have no epigraphic reference to the Sannidhātṛi or the Samākṣaḥtrī till the days of the Somavamsi kings of Kaṭak. The main heads of revenue received into the Bhāndāgāra or Kosā were, as enumerated in the Junāgaḍh Inscription, Bali, Sulka and Bhāga. These sufficed to fill the exchequer of a benevolent prince like Rudradāman with kanaka, rajata, vajra, vaidurya ratna, etc. Rulers

1 1194, 1465.
2 1028, cf. Majumdar’s List of Kharoṣṭhī Ins., No. 96.
3 Kauṭ., Bk. X, Ch. 1, 2, 5.
5 Lāḍers, 1200.
6 Lāḍers, 351, 728.
7 Lāḍers, 1200.
8 Lāḍers, Ins. 965.
9 1141.
10 1186.
11 1196.
12 Lāḍers, 82. Note the employment of a Brāhmaṇa treasurer by a Scythian ruler.
13 Lāḍers, 1141.
less scrupulous than the Mahâkshatrapas doubtless oppressed the people with arbitrary imposts (kara-vishti-praṇaya-kriyâbhiḥ). Besides the Bhâñḍâgara whose existence is implied by Lüders' Ins. No. 1141, we have reference to the store-house, Kosthâgara, (in Ins. No. 937), which is described in Book II, Chapter 15 of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. The inscriptions afford us glimpses of the way in which the revenue was spent. The attempts to provide for pâniya are specially noteworthy. The Junâgaḍh Inscription tells us how “by the expenditure of a vast amount of money from his own treasury” a great Scythian ruler and his amâtya restored the Sudarśana lake. References to the construction or repair of Pushkarinîs, udâpánas, hradas or tadâgas are fairly common. Lüders' Ins. No. 1137 makes mention of makers of hydraulic engines (Audayantrika), while another epigraph refers to a royal official called Pâniyagharika or superintendent of water houses. Inscription No. 1186, after recording the gift of a tadâga, a nâga and a vihâra, refers to the Amâtya Skandasvâti who was the Karmanâtika (superintendent of the work), an official designation known to the Arthaśāstra (Bk. I, Ch. 12).

In the Department of Foreign Affairs we have the Dūta, but we do not as yet hear of dignitaries like the Sāmdhivigrâhika and Kumārâmâtya who figure so prominently in inscriptions of the Gupta and Post-Gupta periods.

Inscriptions refer to officials like the Mahâsâmîyas who preserved records, and others whose exact functions and status are nowhere indicated. Amongst these may be mentioned the Abhyamtaropasthâyaka, Mâḍabika, Tûthika and Neyika.

The big empires of North-Western India were split up into vast satrapies ruled by Mahâkshatrapas and

* Lüders, 1279.*
Kshatrapas. These satrapies as well as the kingdoms outside the limits of the Scythian Empire, were divided into districts called Rāṣṭra, Āhāra, Janapada, Deśa or Vishaya. We do not as yet hear of the organisation into Bhūtis so widely prevalent in Post-Scythian times. Rāṣṭra, Āhāra (or Ḫāra) and Janapada seem to have been synonymous terms, as is proved by the case of Sātahani-raṭṭha (rāṣṭra) or Sātavāhani-hāra which is styled a janapada in the Myakadoni Inscription. The chief officer in a Rāṣṭra or Āhāra was the Rāṣṭrika (Raṭhika) or Amātya. The Amātya Suvisākha, for instance, governed Surāṣṭra under the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman. The Amātyas Vishnupāliita, Śyāmaka, and Sīva-skanda-datta successively governed the Āhāra or district of Govardhana (Nasik) in the time of Gautamiputra Sātakarni and Pulumāyi, while the neighbouring Āhāra of Māmalā (Poona District) was under an Amātya whose name ended in—Gupta. In the Far South the chief officer of the Āhāra seems to have been called 'Vyāprita.' The Janapadas, particularly those on vulnerable frontiers, were sometimes placed under the charge of military governors (strategos, Mahāsenāpati, etc.). The Janapada of Sātavāhani-hāra was, for instance, under the Mahāsenāpati Skandarāga (of the Myakadoni Inscription), and portions of the Indian borderland were governed by a line of Strategoi (Aspavarman, Sasas) under Azes and Gondophernes.

Deśa, too, is often used as a synonym of Rāṣṭra or Janapada. It was under a Deśadhikrīta (the Deshmukh of mediæval times), an officer mentioned in the Hirahadagallli grant of Sīva-skanda-varman. The next smaller unit was apparently the Vishaya governed by the Vishayapati. But sometimes even 'Vishaya—

1 Lādēra, 1227, 1229.  
2 928n (Lādēra).
was used as a synonym of Deśa or Rāṣṭra, and there were cases in the Post-Gupta period of the use of the term to designate a larger area than a rāṣṭra.\(^1\)

The smallest administrative units were the villages called Grāma or Grāmāhāra,\(^2\) and the little towns called Nigama. The affairs of a grāma were controlled by officers styled Gāmeyika Ayutta\(^3\) who were apparently headed by the Grāmānti,\(^4\) Grāmika,\(^5\) Grāmabhōjaka\(^6\) or (Grāma) Mahattaraka. Lüders’ (Mathura) Inscription, No. 48, gives the names of two such Grāmikas, Jayadeva and Jayanāga. In Southern India we have the curious title “Muluda” applied to the head of a village.\(^7\) The chief men of the Nigamas were the Gahapatis, the counterparts of the Grāmarvīddhas of villages. In Lüders’ Inscription No. 1158 we have evidence of the corporate activity of a dhamma-nigama headed by the Gahapati. The Grāma and Nigama organisation was the most durable part of the Ancient Indian system of government, and centuries of Scythian rule could not wipe it out of existence. The village and the Nigama were also the nurseries of those ideas of associate life which found vent in the organisation of Goshthis,\(^8\) Nikāyas,\(^9\) Parishades,\(^10\) Samghas,\(^11\) etc., about which the Inscriptions of the period speak so much. Not the least interesting of these institutions was the “Goshtī” which afforded a field for co-operation between kings and

\(^1\) Fleet, CII, 32u.
\(^2\) Ins. No. 1195.
\(^3\) 1827.
\(^4\) 1333.
\(^5\) 48,66c.
\(^6\) 120a.
\(^7\) Ins. 1194.
\(^8\) Lüders’ Ins. 273, 1333, 1335, 1338.
\(^9\) 1133.
\(^10\) 125, 925.
\(^11\) 5, 1197.
villagers. Lüders' Ins. Nos. 1332 to 1338 speak of a "Goshti" which was headed by the Rājan, and which counted among its officials the son of a village headman.

A less pleasing feature of ancient Indian polity in the Scythian as in other times was the employment of spies, particularly of the "Saṃcharasūtras," whose functions are described with gruesome details in the Arthaśāstra. The evidence of foreign witnesses in Maurya and Gupta periods seems, however, to suggest that political morality did not actually sink so low as a study of the Arthaśāstra would lead us to think. Vatsyāyana probably voices the real feelings of his countrymen when he says:

न शास्त्रानांि सावत्र प्रथमी कारणं भवेत्।
शास्त्रानि व्यापिनी विवाचु व्रोणांि हैदेशाणि कानु॥
रस्वीमथि विपाकाः हि भ्रमास्माः स्वाधिप वैदयके॥
अनिमित्तं दति तत् विं खायः भविनीयं विचत्ति॥

The text contains Sanskrit verse which translates to:

When a king's laws do not exist, the world will fall.
When a king's laws are universal, the world is safe.

By his example, the king's laws should be seen as both food and medicine.

Simple virtues and good deeds are given by the king's laws.

A man who comes to the king should be a womb for the king's laws.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE SAKAS OF UJJAIN.

Yeṣmōṭika
   \|-- Chaśṭana
      \|-- Jayadāman
          \|-- Radradāman I

                  Dāmajada Śrī I
                      \|-- Satyadāman
                      \|-- Jivadāman

                 Rudrasena I
                     \|-- Śaṅkhadāman
                     \|-- Dāmasena
                          \|-- Pṛśhīrīhena
                          \|-- Dāmajada Śrī II
                              \|-- Viṁśodāman
                              \|-- Yūṣodāman I
                                  \|-- Viṁya-
                                    \|-- Śrī III
                                        \|-- Dāmajada
                                          \|-- Śrī II
                                              \|-- Viṁ-
                                                  \|-- Śrī
                                                      \|-- Rhra-
                                                              \|-- Śrī II

                     Vīraśiśhna
                          \|-- Bhartrihāman
                          \|-- Viśvasona

Śrāni Jivadāman

                 Rudrasena II
                      \|-- Yaśodāman II

                          \|-- Rudrasena III
                              \|-- Daughter
                                  \|-- Śīrhasena
                                  \|-- Śatya Śīrhas
                                      \|-- Rudra Śīrha III
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THE GUPTA EMPIRE: THE RISE OF THE GUPTA POWER.

I. The Foundation of the Gupta Dynasty.

We have seen that the tide of Scythian conquest, which was rolled back for a time by the Sātavāhanas, was finally stemmed by the Gupta Emperors. It is interesting to note that there were many Guptas among the officials of the Sātavāhana conquerors of the Sakas, e.g., Śīva Gupta of the Nāsik Inscription of the year 18,—Gupta of the Karle inscription, and Śivaskanda Gupta of the same inscription. It is difficult to say whether there was any connection between these Guptas and the Imperial Gupta family of Northern India.

Scions of the Gupta family are not uncommon mentioned in old Brāhmi Inscriptions. The Ichchhāwar (Bāndā district) Buddhist Statuette Inscription mentions the benefaction of Mahādevi, queen of Śrī Haridāsa, sprung from the Gupta race (Gupta vamsodita). A Bharaut Buddhist Pillar Inscription of the Śunga period refers to a “Gaupti” as the queen of Rājan Visadeva, and the grandmother of Dhanabhūti, probably a feudatory of the Śungas.

Traces of Gupta rule in Magadha are found as early as the second century A. D. I-Tsing, a Chinese pilgrim, who travelled in India in the seventh century A. D., mentions a Mahārāja Śrī Gupta who built a temple near Mrigāśikhāvana. I-Tsing’s date would place him about A.D. 175. Allan rejects the date, and identifies Śrī Gupta with Gupta the great-grandfather of Samudra Gupta, on the ground that it is unlikely that we should have two

1 Lēdara, No. 11.
2 Lēdara, No. 687.
different rulers in the same territory, of the same name, within a brief period. But, have we not two Chandra Guptas and two Kumāra Guptas within brief periods? There is no cogent reason for identifying Śri Gupta of A. D. 175 with Samudra Gupta’s great-grandfather who must have flourished about a century later.

The names of Śri Gupta’s immediate successors are not known. The earliest name of the Gupta family of Magadha which appears in inscriptions is that of Mahārāja Gupta who was succeeded by his son Mahārāja Ghatotkacha.

II. Chandra Gupta I.

The first independent sovereign (Mahārajadhiraja)\(^1\) of the line was Chandra Gupta I, son of Ghatotkacha, who ascended the throne in 320 A. D., the initial date of the Gupta Era. Like his great fore-runner Bimbisāra he strengthened his position by a matrimonial alliance with the Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli, and laid the foundations of the Second Magadhan Empire. The union of Chandra Gupta I with the Lichchhavi family is commemorated by a series of coins having on the obverse standing figures of Chandra Gupta and his queen, the Lichchhavi Princess Kumāradevi, and on the reverse a figure of Lakshmi with the legend “Lichchhavayaḥ” probably signifying that the prosperity of Chandra Gupta was due to his Lichchhavi alliance. Smith suggests that the Lichchhavis were ruling in Pātaliputra as tributaries or feudatories of the Kushāns and that through his marriage Chandra Gupta succeeded to the power of his wife’s relatives. But Allan points

\(^1\) In the Riddhapur plates (J.A.S.B., 1924, 58), however, Chandra Gupta I and even Samudra Gupta are called simply Mahārāja.
out that Pātaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Śrī Gupta’s time.¹

From our knowledge of Samudra Gupta’s conquests it may be deduced that his father’s rule was confined to Magadha and the adjoining territories. In the opinion of Allan the Purānic verses defining the Guptā dominions refer to his reign:

Anugāṅgā Prayāgamcha Śāketam Magadhāṁstathā
Etān janapadān sarvāṁ bhokshyante Guptavamśajāh.

It will be seen that Vaiśāli is not included in this list of Guptā possessions. Therefore, we cannot concur in Allan’s view that Vaiśāli was one of Chandra Gupta’s earliest conquests. Nor does Vaiśāli occur in the list of Samudra Gupta’s acquisitions. It first appears as a Guptā possession in the time of Chandra Gupta II, and constituted a Viceroyalty under an Imperial Prince.

III. Samudra Guptā Parākramānaka.²

Chandra Gupta I was succeeded by his son Samudra Gupta. It is clear from the Allahabad Praśasti and from the epithet tatparigrihita applied to Samudra Gupta in other inscriptions that the prince was selected from among his sons by Chandra Gupta I as best fitted to succeed him. The new monarch seems also to have been known as Kācha.³

It was the aim of Samudra Gupta to bring about the political unification of India and make himself an Ekarat like Mahāpadma. But his only permanent annexation

¹ Khilkha’s North Indian Inscription No. 541, however, suggests some connection between the Lichhāvīs and Puehpupura (Pātaliputra).
² The titles Parākrama and Parākramānaka are found on coins (Allan Catalogue, p. 11) and in the Allahabad Praśasti (Clii, p. 6).
³ The epithet Sarvā-nājocchhattā found on Kācha’s coins shows that he was identical with Samudra Gupta.
was that of portions of Āryāvarta. Following his "Sarvakshatrantaka" predecessor, this Sarva-rajanakshettā uprooted Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Chandravaran, Ganaḍapati Nāga, Nāgasena, Achyuta, Nandi, Balavaran and many other kings of Āryāvarta, captured the soion of the family of Kota and made all kings of the forest countries (ṭavika-raja) his servants. Rudradeva has been identified by Dikshit with Rudrasena Vākāṭaka. But the Vākāṭakas can hardly be regarded as rulers of Āryāvarta, and they were far from being uprooted in the time of Samudra Gupta. Matila has been identified with a person named Mattila mentioned in a seal found in Bulandshahr. The absence of any honorific title on the seal leads Allan to suggest that it was a private one. But we have already come across many instances of princes being mentioned without any honorific. Chandravaran has been identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Susunia (Bankura District) inscription, who was the ruler of Pokharana or Pushkarana. Some scholars identify this place with Pokarnā in Marwar, and further equate Siddhavaran, the name of the father of Chandravaran, with that of Simhavaran of the Mandasor family. But there is very little to be said in support of this conjecture. Pokharana is really a village on the Damodara river in the Bankura District, some 25 miles east of Susunia Hill.1

Ganaḍapati Nāga, Nāgasena and Nandi seem to have been Nāga princes. That Ganaḍapati Nāga was a Nāga

---

1 See I.H.Q., I, 2, 254.
2 Cf. S.K. Chatterji, "The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language," II, 106; I.H.Q., I, 2, 255. Pandit H.P. Sastri believes that this petty king is identical also with the mighty sovereign Chandra of the Maharanil Iron Pillar Inscription who "in battle in the Vāhika countries turned back with his breast the enemies who uniting together came against him, and by whom having crossed in warfare the seven mouths of the Indus the Vāhilkas were conquered." It should, however, be noted that the Purāṇas represent the Nāgas as ruling in
prince is evident. This ruler is also known from coins found at Narwar and Besnagar.\(^1\) Nāgasena, scion of the house of Padmāvatī\(^2\) (near Narwar on the Sindh River between Gwalior and Jhansi) is mentioned in the Harshacharita (Nāga-kula-janmanah sārikāśrāvita mantrasya āśāduśo Nāgasenasya Padmāvatyām). Nandi was also probably a Nāga prince. In the Purāṇas Sīśu Nandi and Nandiyaśas are connected with the Nāga family of Central India. We know also the name of a Nāga prince named Sivanaṇḍi.\(^3\) Achyuta was probably a king of Abichchhatrā, the modern Rāmnagar in the Bareli District. To him has been attributed the small copper coins bearing the syllables 'achyū’ found at Abichchhatrā.\(^4\) As to the Kota-kula Rapson\(^5\) draws our attention to certain coins bearing the inscription Kota. These resemble the “Śruta coins” attributed to a ruler of Śravasti, and should apparently be referred to that region.

The conquered territories were constituted as vishayas or Imperial sub-provinces. Two of these vishayas are known from later inscriptions, namely, Antarvedi and Arikiṇa. It is significant that Nāgas (e.g., the Visayapati Sarvanāga) figure as rulers of Antarvedi as late as the time of Skanda Gupta.

---

1. I.B.Q., II. 2. 266.
2. Padmāvatī = Padam Pawāya (25 miles n. e. of Narwar) in the apex of the confines of the Sindh and Pān. Nāga coins have been found here; also a Palmsheaf capital with an inscription of the first or second century B.C.” EHI, p. 300.
The annexation of the northern kingdoms named above was not the only achievement of Samudra Gupta. He made the rulers of the Ātavika rājyas his servants, led an expedition to the south, and made his power felt by the potentates of Eastern Deccan. We perceive, however, a difference between his northern and southern campaigns. In the north he played the part of a digvijayī of the Early Magadhan type. But in the south he followed the Epic and Kauṭilyan ideal of a dharmavijayī, i.e., he defeated the kings but did not annex their territory.

The Ātavika rājyas undoubtedly included the realm of Ālavaka (Ghāzipur) as well as the Forest kingdoms connected with Ḍabhālā, i.e., the Jhabalpur region. The conquest of this region by Samudra Gupta is proved also by his Eran inscription. One of the Ātavika states was apparently Keśāvāvī mentioned in the commentary on the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākara Nandi (p. 36). In Ep. Ind. VII, p. 126, we have a reference to a place called Vaṭāvati.

The Kings of Dakshinapatha who came into conflict with the great Gupta were Mahendra of Kosala, Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra, Maṇṭarāja of Kaurāla, Svāmidatta of Koṭṭūra, a chieftain of Pishtapura whose precise name is uncertain, Damana of Eranḍapalla, Vishnuṣugopa of Kāñchī, Nilarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Vengī, Ugrasena of Palakka, Kuvera of Devarāṣṭra, and Dhanāṇjaya of Kusthalapura.

Kosala is South Kosala which comprised the modern Bilāspur, Raipur and Sambalpur districts, and occasionally

---

1 This kind of Vijaya is termed Asara-vijaya in the Athāśāstra (p. 342). The name may have been derived from the Assyrions, the ruthlessness of whose conquests is well known. Conquest of this type is first met with in India in the sixth century B.C. (cf. Aśṭāśītra's conquest of the Lichchhavis and Vijaya's conquest of the Śkyas) when Persia served as a link between Assyrions and India.

2 Fleet, CII, p. 114; Ep. Ind., VIII, 284-287.
even a part of Gañjām. Its capital was Śripura, the modern Sirpur, about forty miles east by north from Raipur. Mahākāntāra is apparently a wild tract of Central India probably identical with the Jaso State. Kaurāla, probably a variant of Kerala, is apparently the district of which the capital in later times was Yayātinagarī on the Mahānādi (near Sonpur). The poet Dhoyi, in his Pavanadūtam, connects the Keralis with Yayātinagarī:

Lilāṁ netum nayana-padavām Keralinām rateschet Gachchheḥ khyātāṁ jagati nagarim ākhyayātāṁ Yayāteḥ.

Dr. Barnett, however, suggests the identification of Kaurāla with one of the villages that now bear the name Korāda.

Kottāra has been identified with Kothoor, 12 miles south-east of Mahendragiri in Gañjām. Pīśāpurā is Pithāpuram in the Godāvari district. Erandapalla is identified by Fleet with Erandol in Khandesh, and by Dubreuil with Erandapali “a town probably near Chicacoled” in the Gañjām district. But G. Ramdas suggests the identification of Erandapalla with Yeddi-palli in Vizagapatam or Enḍapilli in Ellore Taluk, Kanchi is Conjeeveram near Madras. Avamukta cannot be satisfactorily identified. But the name of its king Nilarāja reminds us of Nilapalli “an old seaport near

1 Kodgoda, Sp. Ind., VI, 14.
2 Fleet, CII, p. 282.
4 Fleet, CII, p. 13.
5 Sp. Ind., XI, p. 189. Kaurāla cannot be Kolleru or Colair which must have been included within the territory of Hastivarman of Yeddi.
6 There is another Kottāra ‘at the foot of the hills’ in the Vizagapatam district (Vis. Dist. Gaz., I, 137).
7 Dubreuil, A. H. D., pp. 58-60.
8 I.H.Q., I, 4, p. 653.
Yanam in the Godāvari district. Vengi has been identified with Vegi or Pedda-Vegi, 7 miles north of Ellore (Krishṇa District). Its King Hastivarman has been identified by Hultsch with Attivarman of the Pallava race. Palakka is probably identical with Palakkada, the seat of a Pallava viceroyalty. G. Ramdas locates it in the Nellore District. Devarāṣṭra is the Yellamanchili tract in the Vizagapatam district. Kusthalapura is according to Dr. Barnett probably Kuttalur, near Polur, in North Arcot.

The capture and liberation of the southern kings, notably of the ruler of Koṭṭūra near Mahendragiri, reminds us of the following lines of Kālidāsa’s Rāghuvirāma:

Gṛihita-pratimuk�asya sa dharma-vijayi nṛipah
Śriyaṁ Mahendra-nāthasya jahārā natu mediniṁū

It is not a little surprising that the Allahabad Praśasti contains no reference to the Vākāṭakas who were now the predominant power in the region between Bundelkhand and Karpṭa. The earliest reference to the Vākāṭakas occurs in certain inscriptions of Amarāvatī. The dynasty rose to power under Vindhyāśakti and his son Pravarasena I. Pravarasena appears to have been succeeded by his grandson Rudrasena I. Prīthivisheṇa I, the son and successor of Rudrasena I, must have been a contemporary of Samudra Gupta inasmuch as his son Rudrasena II was a contemporary of Samudra Gupta’s son Chandra Gupta II. Prīthivisheṇa I’s political influence

---

extended from Nachnā-ki-talai and Ganj in Bundelkhand to the borders of Kuntala, i.e., the Kanarese country. One of the Ajanta inscriptions credits him with having conquered the lord of Kuntala. The Nachnā-ki-talai and Ganj regions were ruled by his vassal Vyāghradeva. Prof. Dubreuil, however, says that the Nachnā and Ganj inscriptions which mention Vyāghra, belong not to Prthivishena I but to his descendant Prthivishena II. But this is improbable in view of the fact that from the time of Prthivishena II’s great-grandfather, if not from a period still earlier, down to at least A.D. 528, the princes of the region which intervenes between Nachnā and Ganj and the Vakātaka territory, owned the sway of the Gupta empire. Now as Vyāghra of the Nachnā and Ganj records acknowledges the supremacy of the Vakātaka Prthivishena, this Prthivishena can only be Prthivishena I who ruled before the establishment of the Gupta supremacy in Central India by Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II (cf. the Eran and Udayagiri Inscriptions), and not Prthivishena II during whose rule the Guptas, and not the Vakātakas, were the acknowledged suzerains of the Central Provinces as we know from the records of the Parivarājaka Mahārājas.

The absence of any reference to Prthivishena I in Harishena’s Prāśasti is explained by the fact that Samudra Gupta’s operations were confined to the eastern part of Trans-Vindhyān India. There is no reliable evidence that the Gupta conqueror carried his arms to the central and western parts of the Deccan, i.e., the territory ruled by Prthivishena I himself. Prof. Dubreuil has shown that the identification of Devarāṣṭra with Mahārāṣṭra and of Erāṇḍapalla with Erāṇḍol in Khandesh, is wrong.

Though Samudra Gupta did not invade the Western Deccan it is clear from his Erāṇ Inscription that he did deprive the Vākāṭakas of their possessions in Central India. But these possessions were not directly governed by the Vākāṭaka monarch, but were under a vassal prince. In the time of Prithivishena this prince was Vyāghra. We should naturally expect a conflict between the Vākāṭaka feudatory and the Gupta conqueror. Curiously enough the Allahabad Praśasti refers to Samudra Gupta's victory over Vyāghra-rāja of Mahākāntāra. It is probable that this Vyāghra-rāja is identical with the Vyāghra of the Nāchnā inscription who was the Central Indian feudatory of Prithivishena. As a result of Samudra Gupta's victory the Guptas succeeded the Vākāṭakas as the paramount power of Central India. Henceforth the Vākāṭakas appear as a purely southern power.

The victorious career of Samudra Gupta must have produced a deep impression on the pratyanta rāpatis or frontier kings of North-East India and the Himalayan region, and the tribal states of the Paṇjāb, Western India and Mālwa who are said to have gratified his imperious commands (Prachanda Sāsana) "by giving all kinds of taxes, obeying his orders and coming to perform obeisance." The most important among the North-East Indian frontier kingdoms which submitted to the mighty Gupta Emperor were Samataṭa (part of East Bengal bordering on the sea, having its capital probably at Karmānta or Kāmpa near Comilla), Daśāka (not satisfactorily identified) and Kamarūpa (in Assam); we learn from the Damodarapur plates that Pundravardhana or North Bengal formed an integral part of the Gupta Empire and was governed by a line of Uparika Mahārājās as vassals of the Gupta Emperor. The identification of Daśāka with certain districts of North Bengal is, therefore, wrong. The Northern Pratyantas were Nepāl and Kartripura. The
latter principality comprised probably Katarpur in the Jalandhar district, and the territory of the Katur, Katuria or Katýur rājas of Kumaun, Garhwal and Rohilkhand.

The tribal states which paid homage were situated on the western and south-western fringe of Áryávarta proper. Among these the most important were the Málavas, Árjunāyananas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Ábhīras, Prārjunas, Sanakánikas, Kakas and Kharaparikas.

The Málavas were in the Pañjáb in the time of Alexander. They were probably in Rājaputāna when they came into conflict with Ushavadāta. Their exact location in the time of Samudra Gupta cannot be determined. In the time of Samudra Gupta’s successors they were probably connected with the Mandasor region. We find princes of Mandasor using the reckoning (commencing B.C. 58) handed down traditionally by the Málava-gaṇa (Málava-gaṇ-āmnāta).

The Árjunāyananas and the Yaudheyas are placed in the northern division of India by the author of the Brihat-Samhita. They may have been connected with the Pandoonoi or Pañdava tribe mentioned by Ptolomy as settled in the Pañjáb. The connection of the Árjunāyananas with the Pañdava Arjuna is apparent. Yaudheya appears as the name of a son of Yudhishthira in the Mahābhārata. The Harivamśa, a later authority, connects the Yaudheyas with Uśīnara. A clue to the locality of this tribe is given by the Bijayagūḍh inscription. The hill fort of Bijayagūḍh lies about two miles to the south-west of Byāna in the Bharatpur state of Rājaputāna. According to Dr. V. Smith the Yaudhe-
yas occupied the tract still known as Jobiya-bār along both banks of the Sutlej.

The Madrakas had their capital at Sākala or Siākōt in the Pañjāb. The Ābhiras occupied the tract in western Rājputāna, near Vīnaśāna in the district called Abiria by the Periplus. We have already seen that an Ābhira became Mahakshatrāpa of western India and supplanted the Sātavāhanas in a part of Māharāśṭra in the second or third century A.D. The territories of the Prārjunas, Sanakānikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas lay probably in Central India. The Prārjunakas are mentioned in the Arthaśāstra of Kaṇṭilya (p. 194) and are located by Smith in the Narsinhapur District of C.P. A clue to the locality of the Sanakānikas is given by one of the Udayagiri inscriptions of Chandra Gupta I. The Kākas find mention in Mbh. VI. 9.64—Rishiśa Vidobhāh Kākas Taṅganā-Paratenganā. In the Bombay Gazetteer Kāka is identified with Kākūpur near Bithur. Smith suggests that the name may be locally associated with Kākanāda (Saśicht). The Kharaparikas may have occupied the Damoh District of C.P.

The rise of a new indigenous Imperial power could not be a matter of indifference to the foreign potentates of the UttarāPATHA, Malwa and Surāśhṭra who hastened to buy peace "by acts of homage, such as self-sacrifice, the bringing of gifts of maidens, the soliciting of charters confirming in the enjoyment of their territories, bearing the Garuḍa seal." The foreign powers who thus established diplomatic relations with Samudra Gupta were the Daivaputra-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhi and the Saka Muruṇḍas as well as the people of Simhala and all other dwellers in Islands.

1 Śaḍrābhūraṇa prati śvastād yatra nasmū Sarasvati, Mbh. IX. 37.1.
2 J.R.A.S., 1897, p. 862.
3 Bh maṇḍarkar, I.H.Q., 1925, 258; Ep. Ind., XII., 46.
The Daivaputra-Shāhi-Shāhanushāhi was apparently the Kushān ruler of the north-west, a descendant of the Great Kanishka. The Śaka Muruṇḍa were apparently the Scythian chieftains of Surāśṭra and Central India, the representatives of a power which once dominated even the Ganges valley. Sten Konow tells us that Muruṇḍa is a Śaka word meaning lord, Sanskrit Svāmin. The epithet Svāmin was used by the Kshatrapas of Surāśṭra and Ujjain. A Sāñchi inscription recently discovered by Marshall discloses the existence of another Śaka principality ruled about A.D. 319 by the Mahādaśanāyaka Śṛṅdaravarman. A Muruṇḍa Svāmin is mentioned in a Khoh Inscription (Central India). The existence of a Muruṇḍa power in the Ganges valley in the second century A.D. is vouched for by Ptolemy.

Samudra Gupta’s Ceylonese contemporary was Meghavarna. A Chinese historian relates that Meghavarna sent an embassy with gifts to Samudra Gupta and obtained his permission to erect a splendid monastery to the north of the holy tree at Bodh Gaya for the use of pilgrims from the Island.

Allan thinks that it was at the conclusion of his campaigns that the Gupta conqueror celebrated the horse-sacrifice which, we are told in the inscriptions of his successors, had long been in abeyance. But it should be noted that the Aśvamedha was celebrated by several kings during the interval which elapsed from the time of Pushyamitra to that of Samudra Gupta, e.g., Śatakarnī, the husband of Nāyanikā, Pravarasena I Vākātaka, great-grandfather of Prithivishena I, the contemporary of Samudra Gupta, the Pallava Siva-skanda-varman of the Prākrit Hirahadagallī record, and the Nāga kings of the house of Bhāraśiva. It is probable, however, that the

2 Ind. Ant., 1884, 377.
court poets of the Guptas knew little about these monarchs. After the horse sacrifice Samudra Gupta apparently took the title of Aśva-medha-parākramaḥ.

If Harishena, the writer of the Allahabad Prāṣasti, is to be believed, the great Gupta was a man of versatile genius. "He put to shame the preceptor of the lord of Gods and Tumburu and Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and choral skill and musical accomplishments. He established his title of Kavirāja by various poetical compositions". Unfortunately none of these compositions have survived. But the testimony of Harishena to his musical abilities finds corroboration in the lyric type of his coins.

The attribution of the coins bearing the name Kācha to Samudra Gupta may be accepted. But the emperor's identification with Dharmāditya of a Faridpur grant is clearly wrong. The titles used by this monarch were Apratiratha, Kṛitāṇā-paraśu, Sarva-rāj-ochchhetā, Vṛgāhā-parākrama, Aśva-medha-parākrama, and Parākramāṇka but not Dharmāditya.

We possess no dated documents for Samudra Gupta's reign. The Gaya grant professes to be dated in the year 9, but no reliance can be placed on it and the reading of the numeral is uncertain. Smith's date (230-375) for Samudra Gupta is conjectural. As the earliest known date of Chandra Gupta II is A.D. 401, it is not improbable that his father and predecessor died sometime after A.D. 375.

---

1 According to the Kṛṣṇa Mālamśa (G.O.S. pp. xvi, 19) a "Kavirāja is one stage further than a Mahākavi, and is defined as one who is unrestrained in various languages various sorts of poetical compositions and various sentiments".

For the intellectual activities of the Gupta Age, see Bhandarkar, "A Peep into the Early History of India" pp. 61-74.

2 Cf. the epithet "Sarva-kalāmātrāntāk" applied to his great fore-runner Mahāpadma Nanda.
THE GUPTA EMPIRE—(continued): THE AGE OF THE VIKRAMĀDITYAS.

I. Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya.

Samudra Gupta was succeeded by his son Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya (also called Simha Chandra and Simha Vikrama), born of queen Dattadevi. Chandra Gupta was chosen out of many sons by his father as the best fitted to succeed him. Another name of the new monarch disclosed by certain Vakāṭaka inscriptions, the Archer type of coins and the Sāñchi inscription of A.D. 412 was Deva Gupta, Deva-śrī or Deva-rāja.¹

For his reign we possess a number of dated inscriptions so that its limits may be defined with more accuracy than those of his predecessors. His accession should be placed before A.D. 401-2, and his death in or about A.D. 413-14.

The most important external events of the reign were the Emperor's matrimonial alliance with the Vakāṭaka king Rudrasena II, son of Pṛthivishēna I, and the war with the Saka Satraps which added Mālwa and Surāśṭra to the Gupta dominions.

Matrimonial alliances occupy a prominent place in the foreign policy of the Guptas. The Lichchhavi alliance had strengthened their position in Bihar. After the conquest of the upper provinces they sought alliances with other ruling families whose help was needed to consolidate the Gupta power in the newly acquired territory and prepare the ground for fresh conquests. Thus Chandra Gupta II married Kuveranāgā, a princess of Nāga lineage,² and had by her a daughter named

² Nāga-kulōptanā, cf. JASS, 1924, p. 58.
Prabhāvatī, whom he gave in marriage to Rudrasena II, the Vakāṭaka king of the Central Deccan. According to Dr. Smith ¹ “the Vakāṭaka Mahārāja occupied a geographical position in which he could be of much service or disservice to the northern invader of the dominions of the Śaka Satraps of Gujarāt and Surāshṭra. Chandra Gupta adopted a prudent precaution in giving his daughter to the Vakāṭaka prince and so securing his subordinate alliance.”

The campaign against the western Satraps is apparently alluded to in the Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Virasena Śāba in the following passage “he (Śāba) came here, accompanied by the king (Chandra Gupta) in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world.” Śāba was an inhabitant of Pataliputra who held the position, acquired by hereditary descent, of being a Sachiva of Chandra Gupta II and was placed by his sovereign in charge of the Department of Peace and War. He naturally accompanied his master when the great western expedition was undertaken. The campaign against the Śakas was eminently successful. The fall of the Śaka Satrap is alluded to by Bāga. The annexation of his territory is proved by coins.

Chief Cities of the Empire—The original Gupta metropolis seems to have been at Pātaliputra. But after his western conquests Chandra Gupta made Ujjain a second capital. Certain chiefs of the Kanarese districts who claimed descent from Chandra Gupta (Vikramāditya), referred to their ancestor as Ujjayinī-puravar-ādhiśvara as well as Pātali-puravar-ādhiśvara. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies Chandra Gupta with the traditional Vikramāditya Śakāri of Ujjain. ² The titles Śrī Vikramāṇ,

¹ JBSAS, 1914, p. 324.
² In literature Vikramāditya is represented as ruling at Pataliputra (Katha śruti-edgara VII, 4.3): Vikramāditya ityādṛṣṭa Pātaliputra-kā) as well as Ujjayini.
Simha-vikramaḥ, Ajita-vikramaḥ, Vikramākṣa and Vikramāditya actually occur on Chandra Gupta’s coins.

We have no detailed contemporary account of Ujjayini (also called Viṣālā, Padmāvatī, Bhogavatī, Hiranyavatī) in the days of Chandra Gupta. But Fa-hien who visited India from A.D. 405 to 411 has left an interesting account of Pātaliputra. The pilgrim refers to the royal palace of Aśoka and halls in the midst of the city, “which exist now as of old,” and were according to him all made by spirits which Aśoka employed, and which piled up the stones, reared the walls and gates, and executed the elegant carving and inlaid sculpture-work,—in a way which no human hands of this world could accomplish. “The inhabitants are rich and prosperous, and vie with one another in the practice of benevolence and righteousness. Every year on the eighth day of the second month they celebrate a procession of images... The Heads of the Vaiśya families establish houses for dispensing charity and medicines.” The principal port of the empire on the east coast was Tāmrālipti or Tamulk from which ships set sail for Ceylon, Java (then a centre of Brahmanism) and China.

Much light is thrown on the character of Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya’s administration by the narrative of Fa-hien and the inscriptions that have hitherto been discovered.

Speaking of the Middle Kingdom (the dominions of Chandra Gupta) the Chinese pilgrim says “the people are numerous and happy; they have not to register their households, or attend to any magistrates and their rules; only those who cultivate the royal land have to pay a portion of the gain from it. If they want to go, they go:

---

if they want to stay on, they stay. The king governs without decapitation or other corporal punishments. Criminals are simply fined, lightly or heavily, according to the circumstances of each case. Even in cases of repeated attempts at wicked rebellion they only have their right hands cut off. The king’s body-guards and attendants all have salaries. Throughout the whole country the people do not kill any living creature, nor drink intoxicating liquor, nor eat onions or garlic. The only exception is that of the Chaṇḍālas. In buying and selling commodities they use cowries” (Legge). The last statement evidently refers to such small transactions as Pa-hien had occasion to make (Allan). The pilgrim does not seem to have met with the gold coins which would only be required for large transactions. That they were actually in currency, we know from the references to donations of dināras and sāvāṇas in the inscriptions.

That Chandra Gupta was a good monarch may be inferred also from the inscriptions. He was himself a devout Vaishnava (Parama-bhāgavata). But he appointed men of other sects to high offices. His general Āmrakārdava, the hero of a hundred fights (anāka-samar-āvāpta-vijaya-yaśas-patākaḥ) appears to have been a Buddhist, while his Minister of Peace and War (Śāba-Virasena) and perhaps also his Mantrin, Śīkharasvāmin, were Śaivas.

Regarding the machinery of Government we have no detailed information. But the following facts may be gleaned from the inscriptions.

As in Maurya times the head of the state was the Rājā who was apparently nominated by his predecessor. He was assisted by a body of high Ministers whose office was very often hereditary (cf. the phrase “anvaya-prāpta Śāchivyā”). The most important among the High Ministers were the Mantrin, the Śaṅdhi-vigrahika and
the Akshapāṭal-ādhikrīta. Like the Maurya Mantrin, the Gupta Sāndhi-vighraha accompanied the sovereign to the battle-field. As in the case of most of the Pradhānas of Śivājī, there was no clear-cut division between civil and military officials. The same person could be Sāndhi-vighraha and Mahā-danda-nāyaka, and a Mantrin could become a Mahā-bal-ādhikrīta.

It is not clear whether the Guptas had a central Mantrtriparishad. ¹ But the existence of local parishads (e.g., the Parishad of Udānakūpa) is proved by a Basār̥h seal discovered by Bloch.

The empire was divided into a number of Provinces (Deśas, Bhuktiś, etc.) sub-divided into districts called Pradeśas or Vishayas. Among Deśas the Gupta inscriptions mention Sukulidesa, Surāṣṭra, Dabhāla (Dāhala or Chedi of later times) and “Kalindi Narmadayor Madhya” are also perhaps to be placed under this category.

Among Bhuktis we have reference to Pundra-vardhana bhukti, Tirabhukti, Nagara bhukti, Śrāvasī bhukti and Ahichchhatarā bhukti. Among Pradeśas or Vishayas mention is made of Lāta-vishaya, Tripuri-vishaya, Arikina (called Pradesa in Samudra Gupta’s Era inscription, and Vishaya in that of Toramāna), Antarvedi, Vālavi, Gayā, Koṭivarsha, Mahākhushāpara and Kuṇḍadbāṇi.

The Deśas were governed by officials called Goptrīs or Wardens of the Marches (cf. Sarveshū Deśeshu vidhāya Goptrin). The Bhuktis were governed by Uparika Mahā-rājas who were sometimes princes of the Imperial family (e.g., Rājā-putra-deva-bhaṭṭāraka, Governor of Pundra-vardhana bhukti mentioned in a Dāmodarpur plate, Govinda Gupta, Governor of Tirabhukti mentioned in the Basār̥h seals ² and Ghaṭotkacha Gupta). The office of Vishaya-pati

¹ The Biland Ins. (CII, 44) refers to a [Pa] rash. But there is nothing to show that it was a central political assembly.

² Govinda Gupta is known also from the newly discovered Mandasor Ins. (ASI, Annual Report, 1923-24; Cal. Ins. 1926 July, 155) which mentions his Samudra
or District Officer was held by Imperial officials like the Kumār-āmātya and Āyuktaka, as well as by feudatory Mahārājas (q.v. Matrīvīshṇu). Some of the Vishaya-patis (e.g., Sarvanāga of Antarvedi) were directly under the Emperor, while others (e.g., those of Koṭīvarsha, Arikina and Tripurī) were under provincial governors. The Governors and District Officers were no doubt helped by officials like the Chaur-oddharāṇika, Daṇḍika, Daṇḍapāśika and others. Every Vishaya consisted of a number of grāmas or villages which were administered by the Grāmikas, Mahattaras or Bhojakas.

Outside the limits of the Imperial provinces lay the vassal kingdoms and republics mentioned in the Allahabad prāṣasti and other documents.

The Basārī seals throw some interesting sidelight on the provincial and municipal government as well as the economic organisation of the province of Tirabhukti. The province was apparently governed by prince Govinda Gupta, a son of the Emperor by the Mahādevī Śrī Dhruvasvāminī, who had his capital at Vaiśāli. The seals mention several officials like the Upārika (Governor), the Kumār-āmātya, the Mahā-pratibhāra (the great chamberlain), the Mahā-daṇḍa-nāyaka (the great general), the Vinaya-sthiti-shāpaka (the censor), and the Bhaṭāvpati (lord of the army and cavalry), and the following offices, e.g., Yuvarāja-pādiya Kumār-āmāty-ādikaraṇa (office of the minister of His Highness the Crown Prince, according to Vogel), Raṇa-bhāṇḍāgār-ādikaraṇa (office of the chief treasurer of the war department), Balādhi-kaṇā (office of the chief of the military forces), Daṇḍapāś-ādikaraṇa (office of the chief of Police), Tīra-bhukty-upārik-ādikaraṇa (office of the governor of Tirhut), Tīrabhuktau Vinaya-sthiti-sthāpaka-ādikaraṇa

(office of the Censor of Tīrhubut), Vaiśāky-ādhiśthānādhikaraṇa (office of the governor of Vaiśālī), Sṛi-paramabhāṭṭaraka-pādīya Kumār-āmāty-ādhikaraṇa (office of the minister of the Prince waiting on His Majesty).

The reference to the Parishad of Udānakūpa shows that the Parishad still formed an important element of the Hindu machinery of government. The mention of the corporation of bankers, traders and merchants (Śreṣṭhi-sārthavāha-kulika-nīgama) is of interest to students of economics.

Chandra Guptā I had at least two queens, Dhruva-devī and Kuveranāgā. The first queen was the mother of Govinda Guptā and Kumāra Guptā I. The second queen was the mother of Prabhāvaṭi who became queen of the Vākaṭakas and gave birth to Divākarasena, Dāmodarasena and Pravarasena II. Certain medieval chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Guptā. The origin of these chiefs is probably to be traced to some unrecorded adventures of Vikramāditya in the Deccan.

GENEALOGY OF THE VĀKAṬAKAS.

Vindhyākṣita
   | Mahārāja Pravarasena I. Bhavanāga, King of Bhāravirā
   | Gantamāputra—daughter

Samodra Guptā
   | Mahārāja Rudrasena I

Mahārāja Dvārakācārya
   | Chandra Guptā II

Prabhāvaṭi = Mahārāja Rudrasena II

Yuvārāja Divākarasena Dāmodarasena Pravarasena II
   | Ajjhīshahāsthāri-kā Narendrasena
   | Princess of Kuntala

Pythivishena II
   | Devasena
   | Harishena
II. Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrāditya.

Chandra Gupta II's successor was Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrāditya ¹ whose certain dates range from A.D. 415 to A.D. 455. His extensive coinage, and the wide distribution of his inscriptions show that he was able to retain his father's empire including the western provinces. One of his viceroys, Chirātadatta, governed Purdravardhana Bhukti or north Bengal; ² another viceroy, prince Ghaṭotkacha Gupta governed the province of Eran which included Tumbavana; ³ a third viceroy or feudatory, Bandhuvarman, governed Daśapura. ⁴ The Karamadaḍaṇḍe inscription of A.D. 436 mentions Prithivishena who was a Mantrin and Kumārāmatya, and afterwards Mahā-baladhikrīta or general under Kumāra Gupta, probably stationed in Oudh.

Like his father Kumāra was a tolerant king. During his rule the worship of Śvāmī Mahāśeṇa (Kūrttikēya), Buddha, Śiva in the linga form, and the sun, as well as that of Viṣṇu, flourished peacefully side by side. ⁵

The two notable events of Kumāra's reign are: the celebration of the horse sacrifice (evidenced by the rare Aśvamedha type of his gold coinage), and the temporary eclipse of the Gupta power by the Pushyamitra. The reading Pushyamitra in the Bhitarī inscription is, however, not accepted by some scholars because the second syllable of this name is damaged. ⁶ Mr. H. R.

¹ Also called Sri Mahendra, Aśvamedha Mahendra, Ajita Mahendra, Siddha Mahendra, Sri Mahendra Siddha, Mahendrakumāra, Siddha Vikramo (Allan, Gupta Coins, p. 80), Vyaśgru-bala-parākrama, and Sri Prathapa.
² Cf. the Bāmodarpur plate of the years 124 and 129.
³ M. R. Garde, Ind. Ant., 1920, p. 114, Tamain Incription of the year 116, i.e., A.D. 435.
⁴ Mandāsar Inscription of A.D. 437-8.
⁵ Cf. the Bile, Mankarān, Karamadaḍaṇḍe, and Mandāsar inscriptions.
⁶ Cf. Flett GII, p. 55 n.
Divekar in his article "Puṣyamitraś in Gupta Period" makes the plausible emendation Yudhy-āmitrāṃś-ṛṣa for Dr. Fleet’s reading Puṣyamitrāṃś-ṛṣa in C.I.I., iii, p. 55. It is admitted on all hands that during the concluding years of Kumāra’s reign the Gupta Empire “had been made to totter.” Whether the reference in the inscription is simply to Amitra (enemies), or to Pushyamitraś, cannot be satisfactorily determined. We should, however, remember in this connection that a people called Pushyamitraś is actually referred to in the Vishṇu Purāṇa and probably also in the Jain Kalpasūtra. The fallen fortunes of the Gupta family were restored by prince Skanda Gupta.

Kumāra’s chief queen was Anantadevi. He had at least two sons, viz., Purā Gupta, son of Anantadevi, and Skanda Gupta the name of whose mother is not given in the inscriptions. Hīn Tsang calls Buddha Gupta (Fo-to-kio-to) or Budha Gupta a son of Sakrāditya. The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had this title was Kumāra Gupta I who is called Mahendrađitya on coins. Mahendra is the same as Śakra. The use of synonymous terms as names was not unknown in the Gupta period. Vikramāditya was also called Vikramaṇaka. Skanda is called both Vikramāditya and Kramāditya, both the words meaning “sun of power.” If Sakrāditya of Hīn Tsang be identical with Mahendrađitya or Kumāra I, Budha Gupta was a son of Kumāra. Another son of the latter was apparently Ghatotkacha Gupta.

1 Annals of the Bandarkar Institute.  
2 SSE XXII, 202.  
3 Cf. the Bhātari inscription.  
4 The name Fo-to-kio-to has been restored as Buddha Gupta. But we have no independent evidence regarding the existence of a king named Buddha Gupta about this period. The synchronism of his successor’s successor Bāllāditya with Mihrakula indicates that the king meant was Budha Gupta, see p. 303, note.  
5 Cf. the Tumain inscription referred to by Mr. Garde, also the Basseh seal mentioning Gṛt Ghatotkacha Gupta.
In an interesting paper read before the members of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Dr. R. C. Majumdar suggested that after Kumāra's death there was a fratricidal struggle in which Skanda Gupta came off victorious after defeating his brothers including Pura Gupta, the rightful claimant, and rescued his mother just as Kṛishṇa rescued Devaki. Dr. Majumdar says that the omission of the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta in the Bihār Stone Pillar and Bhūtari Inscriptions indicates that she was not a Mahādevi, and Skanda was not the rightful heir. The rightful heir of Kumāra was Pura Gupta, the son of the Mahādevī Anantadevi.

We should, however, remember that there was no rule prohibiting the mention of non-Mahādevis in inscriptions. The mother of Prabhāvatī, Kuberanāgā, was not Chandra Gupta II’s Mahādevi. Nevertheless she is mentioned in the inscriptions of her daughter. On the other hand the names of queens, the mothers of kings, were sometimes omitted. In the genealogical portion of the Banskhera and Madhuban plates the name of Yasomati as Harsha’s mother is not mentioned, but in the Sonpat seal she is mentioned both as the mother of Rājya-vardhana and as the mother of Harsha. The Pāla inscriptions mention Lajjā, the queen of Vigraha Pāla I and mother of Nārayana Pāla, but do not mention the queen of Nārayana Pāla who was the mother of Rājya Pāla. They again mention Bāgyadevi the queen of Rājya Pāla and mother of Gopāla II. In the Banagahr Inscription of Mahi Pāla I we have a reference to his great-grandmother Bāgyadevi, but no mention of his

1 Cf. the Bhūtari Inscription.
2 The name of the father of a reigning king was also sometimes omitted (cf. Kielhorn’s N. Ins. Nos. 454, 458).
own mother. The omission of the name of Skanda's mother from inscriptions is, at best, an *argumentum ex silentio* which can only be accepted if it can be proved that the mention of the name of a Mahādevī was compulsory and that the mention of the name of an ordinary queen was prohibited. The case of Kuberanāgā shows that there was no rule prohibiting the mention of an ordinary wife of a Gupta king.

As to the question of rightful claim to the succession, we should remember that the cases of Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II suggest that the ablest among the princes was chosen irrespective of any claim arising out of birth.

There is nothing to show that the struggle at the end of Kumāra's reign, referred to in the Bhitarī inscription, was a fratricidal struggle. The relevant text of the inscription runs thus:


The enemies (ari) who made the Vamśa-lakṣhmi of Skanda Gupta "vipluta" after the death of his father were apparently enemies of the Gupta family, i.e., outsiders not belonging to the Gupta lineage. As a matter of fact the enemies expressly mentioned in the Bhitarī inscription were outsiders, e.g., the Pushyamitrās and the Hūpas. There is not the slightest reference to a fratricidal war. There is no doubt a passage in the Junaṅgaṇḍa-inscription of Skanda which says that "the goddess of fortune and splendour of her own accord

---

1 Even if the reference be merely to "Āmitras" (see ante, p. 354), these amitrās could not have included an older brother, as the passage "kṣitipura-cārūpa-piśhe sthīpita vāma pādaḥ" clearly shows.
selected (Skanda) as her husband......having discarded all the other sons of kings.” But it does not necessarily imply that there was a struggle between the sons of Kumāra in which Skanda came off victorious. It only means that among the princes he was considered to be best fitted to rule. In the Allahabad prāṣasti we have a similar passage:—“who (Samudra Gupta) being looked at with envy by the faces, melancholy through the rejection of themselves, of others of equal birth......was hidden by his father,—who exclaiming ‘verily he is worthy’ embraced him—to govern of a surety the whole world.” It may be argued that there is no proof that Skanda was selected by Kumāra. On the contrary he is said to have been selected by Lakshmi of her own accord. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the empire was made to totter at the close of Kumāra’s reign, and Skanda owed its restoration to his own prowess. The important thing to remember is that the avowed enemies of Skanda Gupta mentioned in his inscriptions were outsiders like the Pushyamitrās, Hūnas and Mlechchas. The Manujendra-putras of the Junāgadh inscription are mentioned only as disappointed princes, not as defeated enemies, like the brothers of Samudra Gupta who were discarded by Chandra Gupta I. We are, therefore, inclined to think that as the tottering Gupta empire was saved from its enemies (e.g., the Pushyamitrās) by Skanda Gupta, it was he who was considered to be best fitted to rule. There is no evidence that his brothers disputed his claim and actually fought for the crown. There is nothing to show that Skanda shed his brothers’ blood and that the epithet “amalātmā” applied to him in the Bhitārī inscription was unjustified.

1 Bhitārī Ins.
2 Junāgadh Ins.
Skanda Gupta assumed the titles of Kramāditya and Vikramāditya. From the evidence of coins and inscriptions we know that he ruled from A.D. 455 to 467.

The first achievement of Skanda was the restoration of the Gupta Empire. From an inscriptive passage we learn, that while preparing to restore the fallen fortunes of his family he was reduced to such straits that he had to spend a night sleeping on the bare earth. Line twelve of the Bhātari Inscription tells us that when Kumāra Gupta I, had attained the skies, Skanda conquered his enemies by the strength of his arms. From the context it seems that those enemies were the Pushyamitrav, who had developed great power and wealth.

The struggle with the Pushyamitrav was followed by conflicts with the Hūnas and probably also with the Vākāṭakas in which the emperor was presumably victorious in the end. The invasion of the Hūnas took place not later than A.D. 458 if we identify them with the Mlechchhas of the Junāgaṇḍ inscription. The memory of the victory over the Mlechchhas is preserved in the story of king Vikramāditya, son of Mahendra, of Ujjain in Somadeva's Kathā-sarit-sāgara. Central India and Surāshtra seem to have been the vulnerable parts of the Gupta empire. The Bālāghat plates refer to Narendraśa Vākāṭaka, son of Skanda Gupta's cousin Pravarasena II, as "Kosalā Mekalā-Mālav-adhipaty-abhyarchita sāsana." The Junāgaṇḍ inscription tells us "he (Skanda) deliberated for days and nights before"

1 Allan, catalogue, pp. 117, 122; cf. Fleet, GIII, p. 53 —
"Vīrya-bala-unātis-vvīkramēṣa kramēṣa
pratidinam-abhuyogūd-ipseinam yēna labhavā."

2 The Hūnas are mentioned not only in inscriptions, but in the Mahābhārata, the Pāṇḍya, the Rāghavāśa and later in the Hariścandra and the Nītrāvyaśa of Soundara. The Lallō Vāsāna (translated by Dharmaraka, d. 313) mentions the Hūnas (Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 206).
3 Allan, Gupta Coins, Introductory, p. xlix.
making up his mind who could be trusted with the important task of guarding the lands of the Surāśṭras.” Allan deduces from this and from the words “ Sarveshu deseshu vidhāya guptin ” that the emperor was at particular pains to appoint a series of Wardens of the Marches to protect his dominions from future invasion. One of these Wardens was Parnadatta, governor of Surāśṭra. In spite of all his efforts Skanda Gupta could not save the westernmost part of his empire from future troubles. During his lifetime he, no doubt, retained his hold over Surāśṭra and the adjoining portions of Mālwa. But his successors do not appear to have been so fortunate. Not a single inscription has yet been discovered which shows that Surāśṭra and western Mālwa formed part of the Gupta empire after the death of Skanda Gupta. On the contrary Harishena Vākātaka, grandson of Narendrasena, claims victories over Lāta and Avanti, besides Trikuta, Kuntala, Andhra, Kalinga, and Kosala, while the Maitrakas of Valabhi gradually assume independence.

The later years of Skanda seem to have been tranquil.\(^1\) The emperor was helped in the work of administration by a number of able governors like Parnadatta, viceroy of the west, Sarvanāga Vīshṇuapati of Antarvedi or the Doāb, and Bhīmavarman, the ruler of the Kosam region. Chakrāpalita, son of Parnadatta, restored in A.D. 457-8 the embankment forming the lake Sudarśana which had burst two years previously. The emperor continued the tolerant policy of his fore-fathers. Himself a Vaiṣṇava, he and his officers did not discourage other faiths, \textit{e.g.}, Jainism and solar worship. The people were also tolerant. The Kahaum inscription commemorates the erection of Jaina images by a person “full of affection for Brāhmaṇas.” The Indore plate records a deed by a Brāhmaṇa endowing a lamp in a temple of the Sun.

\(^1\) Cf. the Kahaum Ins.
The Gupta Empire (continued): The Later Guptas.


It is now admitted by all scholars that the reign of Skanda Gupta ended about A.D. 467. When he passed away the empire did not wholly perish. We have epigraphic as well as literary evidence of the continuance of the Gupta empire in the later half of the fifth as well as the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. The Dāmodarpur plates, Sārnāth inscriptions and the Erān epigraph of Buddha Gupta prove that from A.D. 477 to 496 the Gupta empire extended from Bengal to Eastern Mālwa. The Betul plates of the Parivṛṣṭa Mahārāja Samkṣhobha dated in the year 199 G.E. (Śrīmati pravardhamāna-vijaya-rājya samvatsara-sate nava-navatya-uttare Gupta nṛpa rājya-bhuktau), i.e., 518 A.D., testify to the fact that the Gupta sway at this period was acknowledged in Dabhāla, which included the Tripuri Vishaya (Jabhalpur region). Another inscription of Saṁkṣhobha found in the valley near the village of Khōh in Baghelkhand, dated in A.D. 528, proves that the Gupta empire included the Central Provinces even in A.D. 528. Five years later the grant of a village in the Kotivarsha Vishaya of Pundra-vardhana-bhukti “during the reign of Parama-daivata Parama-bhaṭṭaraka Mahārājadhirāja Sri ...............Gupta,” shows that the Gupta empire at this period included the eastern as well as the central

1 Smith, the Oxford History of India, additions and corrections, p. 171, end.
4 Fleet, G.I.I, III, pp. 128-16.
5 Ep. Ind., XV, p. 112 ff.
provinces. Towards the close of the sixth century a Gupta king, a contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushpabhūti family of Śrīkanṭha (Thānēśar), was ruling in Mālava. Two sons of this king, Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon the princes Rājya-vardhana and Harsha of Thānēśar. From the Apshaj inscription of Ādityasēna we learn that the fame of the father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, marked with honour of victory in war over Susthiavarmāna, king of Kāmarūpa, was constantly sung on the banks of the river Lōhiya or Brahmaputra. This indicates that even in A.D. 660 (the time of Prabhākara-vardhana) the sway of the Gupta dynasty extended from Malava to the Brahmaputra.

In the first half of the seventh century the Gupta power was no doubt overshadowed by that of Harsha. But after the death of the great Kanauj monarch, the Gupta empire was revived by Ādityasēna, son of Mādhava Gupta, who “ruled the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans,” performed the Aśvamedha and other great sacrifices and assumed the titles of Parama-bhāttāraka and Maharajādhīrāja.

---

1 The correct spelling is probably Prabhābūti (Ep. Ind. I, 68).
2 Mālava seems to have been under the direct rule of the Guptas in the sixth and seventh centuries. Magadhā was administered by the viceregal family of Varmara (cf. Nāgārjuna Hill cave Ins. CI, 226; also Varmarāma mentioned by Himin Tsang). The precise location and extent of the Mālava of the later Guptas cannot be determined. In Ep. Ind. V, 229 the Baghpatyaka Anavartaka, a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI, is said to have subdued the Saptal Mālava countries up to the Himalaya Mountains. This proves that there were as many as seven countries called Māhāra. These were probably: (1) Māhāra (Māhāraka-bhātra of Valabhi grants) on the Mahi governed by the Mahārakas. (2) Avanti ruled by a Bhādraka family in the time of H. Tsang. (3) Pūrṇa-Māhāra (round Bihār). (4) District round Prayāga. (5) Bāhāpur District of U. P. (6) Cīrīn-ūtāj districts of the Pañjāb. (7) Some Himalayan territory. The Later Guptas probably held (2) and (4).
3 Cf. Hoerle in JRAS, 1903, 561.
4 An allusion to the later Guptas seems to occur in the Kādabrāhmodh of Bhās, which says that the lotus feet of Kāraka, the poet's great-grandfather, were worshipped by many a Gupta.
II. Puru Gupta and Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya.

We shall now proceed to give an account of Skanda Gupta’s successors. The immediate successor of Skanda Gupta seems to have been his brother Puru Gupta. The existence of this king was unknown till the discovery of the Bhitarī seal of Kumāra Gupta II in 1889, and its publication by Smith and Hoernle. This seal describes Puru Gupta as the son of Kumāra I by the queen Anantadevi, and does not mention Skanda Gupta. The mention of Puru Gupta immediately after Kumāra with the prefix Tat-pād-ānudhyāta does not necessarily prove that Puru Gupta was the immediate successor of his father, and a contemporary and rival of his brother or half-brother Skanda Gupta. In the Manahali grant Madanapāla is described as Śrī-Rāmapāla-Deva-pād-ānudhyāta, although he was preceded by his elder brother Kumārapāla. In Kielborn’s Northern Inscription, No. 39, Vijāyapāla is described as the successor of Kṣitipāla, although he was preceded by his brother Devaṇḍa (Ins. No. 31). Dr. Smith has shown that Skanda ruled over the whole empire including the eastern and the central as well as the western provinces. There was no room for a rival Mahārajadhārāja in Northern India during his reign. He was a man of mature years at the time of his death.

JESBER, 1889, pp. 84-105.

The omission of Skanda’s name in the Bhitarī seal of his brother’s grandson does not necessarily imply that the relations between him and Puru’s family were unfriendly. The name of Pulakesin II is omitted in an inscription of his brother and Regent Vishṇuvardhana (Śrī-Vinaya-grāma, Ind. Ant. 1890, p. 277). The name of Śrīla II of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty is not mentioned in the Pārthāngam inscription of his nephew Mahendrapāla, but it is mentioned in an inscription of his brother Vīrāyaṇapāla, the father of Mahendrapāla. Besides, there was no custom prohibiting the mention of the name of a rival uncle or brother. Mungalea and Gorinda II are mentioned in the inscriptions of their rivals and their descendants. On the other hand even an ancestor of a reigning king was sometimes omitted, e.g., Rājunāman II is omitted in one Ajanta inscription, Dharapatī is omitted in his son’s inscription (Kielborn, N. Ins. No. 464).
cir. A.D. 467. His brother and successor Pura Gupta, too, must have been an old man at that time. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that he had a very short reign and died sometime before A.D. 473 when his grandson Kumāra Gupta II was ruling. Pura Gupta’s queen was Śrī Vatsadevi, the mother of Narasīmha Gupta Bāláditya.

The coins of Pura Gupta have the reverse legend Śrī Vikramaḥ. Allan identifies him with king Vikrama-ditya of Ayodhyā, father of Bāláditya, who was a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu. The importance of this identification lies in the fact that it proves that the immediate successors of Skanda Gupta had a capital at Ayodhyā probably till the rise of the Maukharis. If the spurious Gaya plate is to be believed Ayodhyā was the seat of a Gupta Jaya-skandhāvāra as early as the time of Samudra Gupta.

The principal capital of Bāláditya and his successors appears to have been Kāśi. The evidence of the Bhardhar hoard seems to suggest that a king styled Prakāśaditya came shortly after Skanda Gupta. Prakāśaditya may have been a biruda of Pura Gupta Śrī Vikrama, or of his grandson Kumāra Kramāditya, preferably the latter as the letters Ke seem to occur on Prakāśaditya’s coins. That the same king might have two “Āditya” names is proved by the cases of Skanda Gupta (Vikramāditya-and Kramāditya) and Śilāditya Dharmāditya of Valabhi.

Pura Gupta was succeeded by his son Narasīmha Gupta Bāláditya. This king has been identified with king Bāláditya who is represented by Hiuen Tsang as having overthrown the tyrant Mihirakula. It has been overlooked that Hiuen Tsang’s Bāláditya was the immediate successor of Tathāgata Gupta who was himself the

CII, 285.

immediate successor of Buddha Gupta, whereas Narasimha Gupta Baladitya was the son and successor of Para Gupta who in his turn was the son of Kumara Gupta I and the successor of Skanda Gupta. The son and successor of Huen Tsang’s Baladitya was Vajra² while the son and successor of Narasimha was Kumara Gupta II. It is obvious that the conqueror of Mihirakula was not the son of Para Gupta but an altogether different individual.³ The existence of several kings of the Madhyadésa having the Biruta Baladitya is proved by the Sarnath Inscription of Prakataaditya.⁴ Narasimha Gupta must have died in or about the year A.D. 473. He was succeeded by his son Kumara Gupta II Kramaditya by queen Mahalakshmi-devi.

III. Kumara Gupta II.

Kumara Gupta II has been identified with the king of that name mentioned in the Sarnath Buddhist Image inscription of the year 151 G.E., i.e., A.D. 473-74. Messrs. Bhattasali and R. G. Basak think that the two Kumara Guptas were not identical. The former places Kumara, son of Narasimha, long after A.D. 500.⁵ But his theory is based upon the wrong identification of Narasimha with the conqueror of Mihirakula. According to Mr. Basak Kumara of the Sarnath Inscription was the immediate successor of Skanda. In his opinion there were two rival Gupta lines ruling simultaneously, one

¹ Fo-to-kio-to. Beal, Fleet and Watters render the term by Buddha Gupta, a name unknown to Gupta epigraphy. The synchronism of his grandson Baladitya with Mihirakula proves that Buddha Gupta is meant, see p. 366, note.
² Yune Chewang, II, p. 155.
³ Mr. Bhattasali who upholds the identification of Huen Tsang’s Baladitya with the son of Para Gupta not only ignores the evidence of the Life of Huen Tsang p. 111, but makes the astounding suggestion that Vajra was a family name.
⁵ Dacca Review, May and June, 1920, pp. 51-57.
KUMĀRA II, AND BUDHA GUPTA

consisting of Skanda, Kumāra of Sārnāth and Budha, the other consisting of Pura, Narasimha and his son Kumāra of the Bhītāri seal. But there is not the slightest evidence of the disruption of the Gupta empire in the latter half of the fifth century A.D. On the contrary inscriptions prove that both Skanda and Budha ruled over the whole empire from Bengal to Western India. There is thus no cogent reason for doubting the identity of Kumāra of the Bhītāri seal with his namesake of the Sārnāth inscription.

Kumāra II's reign must have terminated in or about the year A.D. 476-77, the first known date of Budha Gupta. The reigns of Pura, Narasimha and Kumāra II appear to be abnormally short, amounting together to only ten years (A.D. 467-77). This is by no means a unique case. In Vengi three Eastern Chalukya Monarchs, viz., Vijayāditya IV, his son Ammarāja I, and Ammarāja's son, another Vijayāditya, ruled only for seven years and six and a half months.¹ In Kāśmira five kings Suravarman I, Pārtha, Samkaravardhana, Unmattāvantī and Suravarman II, ruled within six years (A.D. 933-939); and three generations of kings, viz., Yaśaskara, his uncle Vānḍa, and his son Samgrāmadeva ruled for ten years (A.D. 939-949).

IV. Budha Gupta.

For Budha Gupta, the successor of Kumāra II, we have a number of dated inscriptions and coins which prove that he ruled for about twenty years (A.D. 477-86). We learn from Hiuen Tsang that he was a son of Sakrāditya. The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had that title was Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrāditya (Mahendra = Śakra). It seems probable that Budha was the youngest

son of Kumāra I, and consequently a brother or half-brother of Skanda and Pura. Fleet correctly points out that the name of Sakrāditya's son as given by Hiuen Tsang is Fo-to-kio-to, i.e., Buddha Gupta and not Budha Gupta. Similarly Watters points out that Punna-fa-tan-na of the pilgrim is equivalent to Punya-vardhana and not Pundra-vardhana. But just as there is no proof of the existence of a place called Punya-vardhana apart from the well-known Pundra-vardhana, so there is no proof of the existence of a Gupta king name Buddha apart from the well-known Budha Gupta. The synchronism of Fo-to-kio-to's grandson Bālāditya with Mihirakula proves that Budha Gupta is meant. If Fo-to-kio-to is identified with Budha Gupta, and his father Sakrāditya with Mahendra-ditya (Kumāra Gupta I), we understand why Fa Hien, who visited India in the time of Chandra Gupta II, father of Kumāra Gupta I Mahendra-ditya, is silent about the buildings at Nālanda constructed by Sakrāditya and Budha Gupta about which Hiuen Tsang (7th century A.D.) speaks so much.

Two copper-plate inscriptions discovered in the village of Dāmodarpur in the district of Dinajpur testify to the fact that Budha Gupta's empire included Pundravardhana bhukti (North Bengal) which was governed by his viceroy (Uparika Mahārāja) Brahmadatta and Jayadatta. The Sarnāth inscription of A.D. 476-77 proves his possession of the Kāśi country. In A.D. 484-85 the erection of a Dhvaja-stambha by the Mahārāja Māтриvishṇu, ruler of Eran, and his brother Dhanyavishṇu while Budha Gupta was reigning, and Suraśmichandra was governing the land between the Kālindī and the Narmadā, indicates that Budha Gupta's dominions included Central India as well as Kāśi and Bengal. The coins of this emperor are dated in the year A.D. 495-8. They continue the types of the Gupta silver coinage;
their legend is the claim to be lord of the earth and to have won heaven,—found on the coins of Kumāra I, and Skanda.

V. Successors of Budha Gupta.

According to the Life of Huien Tsang Budha Gupta was succeeded by Tathāgata Gupta, after whom Baladitya succeeded to the empire. At this period the supremacy of the Guptas in Central India was challenged by the Hun king Toramāṇa. We have seen that in A.D. 484-85 a Mahārāja named Mātrivishṇu ruled in the Arikīṇa Vishaya (Erāṇ) as a vassal of the emperor Budha Gupta, but after his death his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu acknowledged the supremacy of Toramāṇa. The success of the Huns in Central India was however short-lived. In 510-11 we find a general name Goparāja fighting by the side of a Gupta king at Erāṇ and king Hastin of the neighbouring province of Daabhāla acknowledging the sovereignty of the Guptas. In 518 the suzerainty of the Guptas is acknowledged in the Tripūrī vishaya. In the year 528-29 the Gupta sway was still acknowledged by the Parivṛṭjakas Mahārāja of Daabhāla. The Parivṛṭjakas Hastin and Samkshobha seem to have been the bulwarks of the Gupta empire in the Central Provinces. The Harsha Charita of Bāṇa recognises the possession of Mālava by the Guptas as late as the time of Prabhākara-vardhana (A.D. 600). There can be no doubt that the expulsion of the Huns from Central India was final. The recovery of the Central Provinces was probably effected by Bālāditya who is represented by Huien Tsang as having overthrown Mihirakula, the son and successor of Toramāṇa, and left him the ruler of a “small kingdom in the north.”

1 Beal, Si-yu-ki, II, p. 168; the Life, p. 111. 2 Si-yu-ki, I, p. 171.
a *Birūda* of the "glorious Bhana Gupta, the bravest man on the earth, a mighty king, equal to Partha" along with whom Goparāja went to Erāṇa and having fought a "very famous battle" died shortly before A.D. 510-11.

Mihrakula was finally subdued by the Janendra Yasodharman of Mendasor shortly before A.D. 533. Line 6 of the Mendasor Stone Pillar inscription leaves the impression that in the time of Yasodharman Mihrakula was the king of a Himalayan country ("small kingdom in the north"), i.e., Kaśmir and that neighbourhood, who was compelled "to pay respect to the two feet" of the victorious Janendra probably when the latter carried his arms to "the mountain of snow the table lands of which are embraced by the Ganges."

Yasodharman claims to have extended his sway as far as the Lauhitya or Brahmāputra in the east. It is not improbable that he defeated and killed Vajra the son and successor of Bālāṁiya, and extinguished the viceroyal family of the Dattas of Pūndravardhana. Huien Tsang mentions a king of Central India as the successor of Vajra. The Dattas who governed Pundravardhana from the time of Kumāra Gupta I disappear about this time. But Yasodharman's success must have been short-lived, because in A.D. 533-34, the very year of the Mendasor inscription which mentions the Janendra Yasodharman as victorious, the son and viceroy of a Gupta Pavana-bhāṭitaraka Mahārāja-dhirāja Prithivipati, and not any official of the Central Indian Janendra, was governing the Pūndra-vardhana-bhukti, a province which lay between the Indian interior and the Lauhitya.

VI. The line of Krishṇa Gupta.

The name of the Gupta emperor in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 533-34 is unfortunately lost. The Apsad

---

inscription, however, discloses the names of a number of Gupta kings the fourth of whom Kumāra Gupta (III) was a contemporary of Iśānavarman Maukhari who is known from the Harāhā inscription to have been ruling in A.D. 554.¹ Kumāra Gupta III, and his three predecessors, viz., Krishṇa, Harsha and Jīvita should probably be placed in the period between A.D. 510, the date of Bhānu Gupta, and 554 the date of Iśānavarman. It is probable that one of these kings is identical with the Gupta emperor mentioned in the Dāmodarpur plate of 533-34.² The absence of high-sounding titles like Mahārājādhīrāja or Parama-bhāttāraka in the Slokas of the Aḥsasād inscription does not necessarily prove that the kings mentioned there were petty chiefs. No such titles are attached to the name of Kumāra I in the Mandasār inscription, or to the name of Budha in the Eraṇ inscription. On the other hand the queen of Mādhava Gupta, one of the kings mentioned in the Aḥsasād inscription, is called Parama-bhāttārikā and Mahādevi in the Dēō Baranārk epigraph.

Regarding Krishṇa Gupta we know very little. The Aḥsasād inscription describes him as a hero whose arm played the part of a lion, in bruising the foreheads of the array of the rutting elephants of (his) haughty enemy (dṛiptārāti) (and) in being victorious by (its) prowess over countless foes. The dṛiptārāti against whom he had to fight may have been Yaśodharman. The next king Harsha had to engage in terrible contests with those who were “averse to the abode of the goddess of fortune being with (him, her) own lord.” There were wounds from many weapons on his chest. The names of the enemies who tried to deprive him of his rightful possessions are

² Mr. Y. B. Gupta (Ind. Hist. Journal) reads the name of Kumāra in the inscription of A.D. 533-34, but he identifies him with the son of Narasīhā Gupta.
not given. Harsha's son Jivita Gupta I probably succeeded in re-establishing the power of his family. "The very terrible scorching fever (of fear) left not (his) haughty foes, even though they stood on seaside shores that were cool with the flowing and ebbing currents of water, (and) were covered with the branches of plantain-trees severed by the trunks of elephants roaming through the lofty groves of palmyra palms; (or) even though they stood on (that) mountain (Himālaya) which is cold with the water of the rushing and waving torrents full of snow." The "haughty foes" on seaside shores were probably the Gaudas who had already launched into a career of conquest about this time and who are described as living on the sea shore (samudraśraya) in the Harāhā inscription of A.D. 554.

The next king, Kumara Gupta III, had to encounter a sea of troubles. The Gaudas were issuing from their "proper realm" which was western Bengal as it bordered on the sea and included Karnasuvarga and Rādhāpurī. The lord of the Andhras who had thousands of three-fold rutting elephants, and the Śūlikas who had an army of countless galloping horses, were powers to be reckoned with. The Andhra king was probably Mādhavavarman II of the Vishnukundin family who "crossed the river Godāvari with the desire to conquer the eastern region." The Śūlikas were probably the Chalukyas. In the Mahākūta pillar inscription the name appears as Chalikya. In the Gujarāt records we find the forms Solaki and Solanki. Śūlika may be another dialectic variant. The Mahākūta pillar inscription tells us that in the sixth century A.D. Kirtivarman I of the "Chalikya" dynasty

---

1 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 110 at seg.
2 M. Chakravarti, J. A. S. B., 1908, p. 274.
3 Pradhāna-chandrodaya, Act II.
4 Dubrisol, A.H.D., p. 92.
5 In the Brāhat-Sūkhītā XIV, 8 the Śaulikas are associated with Vidarbhā.
gained victories over the kings of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Magadha, etc.

A new power was rising in the upper Ganges valley which was destined to engage in a death grapple with the Guptas for the mastery of northern India. This was the Mukhara or Maukharī power. The Maukharis claimed descent from the hundred sons whom king Asvapati got from Vaivasvata, i.e., Yama (not Manu). The family consisted of two distinct groups. The stone inscriptions of one group have been discovered in the Jaunpur and Bārā Banki districts of the United Provinces, while the stone inscriptions of the other group have been discovered in the Gayā district of Bihār. The Maukharis of Gayā namely Yajñavarman, Sārdūlavarman and Anantavarman were a feudatory family. Sārālā is expressly called sāmantachudāmani in the Barābar Hill Cave Inscription of his son. The Maukharis of the United Provinces were also probably feudatories at first. The earliest princes of this family, viz., Harivarman, Adityavarman, and Iśvaravarman were simply Mahārājas. Adityavarman’s wife was Harsha Guptā, probably a sister of king Harsha Gupta. The wife of his son and successor Iśvaravarman was also probably a Guptā princess named Upa-Guptā. In the Harābā inscription Isanavarman, son of Iśvaravarman and Upa-Guptā, claims victories over the Andhras, the Sutikas and the Gaudas and is the first to assume the Imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja. It was this which probably brought him into conflict with king Kumāra Guptā III. Thus began a duel between

1 The family was called both Mukhara and Maukharī. “Śoura Sūrya-rādhāvīra Pushpabhūti Mukhara Vasāt,” “Sakalabhuvana, namaskrito Maukharī Vasāt” (Harshacarita, Parab’s ed., pp. 141, 146). Cf. also G.I.I., p. 229.
3 The victory over the Andhras is also alluded to in the Jaunpur stone inscription (C.I.I.I. p. 230) which also seems to refer to a conflict with Dharā, the capital of western Mālava (?).
the Maukhars and the Guptas which ended only when the latter with the help of the Dauds wiped out the Maukhari power in the time of Grahavarman, brother-in-law of Harshavardhana.

We have seen that Isanavarman’s mother and grandmother were Gupta princesses. The mother of Prabhakara-vardhana, the other empire-builder of the second half of the sixth century, was also a Gupta princess. It seems that the Gupta marriages in this period were as efficacious in stimulating imperial ambition as the Lichchhavi marriages of more ancient times.

Kumara Gupta III claims to have “churned that formidable milk-ocean, the cause of the attainment of fortune, which was the army of the glorious Isanavarman, a very moon among kings.” This was not an empty boast, for the Maukhari records do not claim any victory over the Guptas. Kumara Gupta III’s funeral rites took place at Prayaga which probably formed a part of his dominions.

The son and successor of this king was Damodara Gupta. He continued the struggle with the Maukharis and fought against them. “Breaking up the proudly-stopping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukharis, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops

2 Aplsted Ins.
3 The Maukhari opponent of Damodara Gupta was either Suryavarman or Sarvarman (both being sons of Isanavarman). A Suryavarman is described in the Saurashtra inscription of Mahāvira Gupta as “born in the unblemished family of Varmans great on account of their Adhipatiya (supremacy) over Magadha.” If this Suryavarman be identical with Suryavarman, the son of Isanavarman, then it is certain that for a time the supremacy of Magadha passed from the hands of the Guptas to that of the Maukharis. The Dec-Barnogtck Inscription (Shahabad District) of Jivita Gupta II also suggests (CII, pp. 218-219) that the Maukharis Sarvarman and Aravindvarman held a considerable part of Magadha some time after Bālāditya-vardhan. After the loss of Magadha the latter Guptas were apparently confined to “Mahava,” till Mahāsena Gupta once more pushed his conquests as far as the Lakhayta.
of the Hunas (in order to trample them to death), he became unconscious (and expired in the fight)."

Dāmodara Gupta was succeeded by his son Mahasena Gupta. He is probably the king of Mālava mentioned in the Harshacharita whose sons Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon Bājya-vardhana and Harsha-vardhana by their father king Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushpabhūti family of Śrīkanṭha (Thānōsar). The intimate relations between the family of Mahāsenā Gupta and that of Prabhākara-vardhana is proved by the Madhuban grant and the Sonpat copper seal inscription of Harsha which represent Mahāsenā Gupta Devī as the mother of Prabhākara, and the Aphṣad inscription of Ādityasena which alludes to the association of Mādhava Gupta, son of Mahāsenā Gupta with Harsha.

The Pushpabhūti alliance of Mahāsenā Gupta was probably due to his fear of the rising power of the Maukharis. The policy was eminently successful, and during his reign we do not hear of any struggle with that family. But a new danger threatened from the east. A strong monarchy was at this time established in Kamarpua by a line of princes who claimed descent from Bhagadatta. King Susthitavarman of this family came into conflict with Mahāsenā Gupta and was defeated. "The mighty fame of Mahāsenā Gupta," says the Aphṣad inscription. "marked with honour of victory in war over the illustrious Susthitavarman... is still constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohiya."

Between Mahāsenā Gupta, the contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana, and his youngest son Mādhava Gupta, the contemporary of Harsha, we have to place a king named Deva Gupta II who is mentioned by name in

1 See the Nidhanapur plates.
2 The Emperor Chandras Gupta II was Deva Gupta I.
the Madhuban and Banskhera inscriptions of Harsha as the most prominent among the kings "who resembled wicked horses" who were all subdued by Rājya-vardhana. As the Gupta princes are uniformly connected with Mālava in the Harshacharita there can be no doubt that the wicked Deva Gupta is identical with the wicked Lord of Mālava who cut off Grahavarman Maukhari, and who was himself defeated "with ridiculous ease" by Rājya-vardhana. It is difficult to determine the position of Deva Gupta in the dynastic list of the Guptas. He may have been the eldest son of Mahāsena Gupta, and an elder brother of Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta. His name is omitted in the Aphpad list, just as the name of Skanda Gupta is omitted in the Bhitari list.

Shortly before his death king Prabhākara-vardhana had given his daughter Rājyaśri in marriage to Grahavarman the eldest son of the Maukhari king Avantivarman. The alliance of the Pushpabhūtis with the sworn enemies of his family must have alienated Deva Gupta who formed a counter-alliance with the Gaudas whose hostility towards the Maukharis dated from the reign of Iśānavarman. The Gupta king and the Gauda king, Śaśānaka, made a joint attack on the Maukhari kingdom. "Grahavarman was by the wicked lord of Mālava cut off from the living along with his noble deeds. Rājyaśri also, the princess, was confined like a brigand's wife with a pair of iron fetters kissing her feet and cast into prison at Kanyākubja." "The villain, deeming the army leaderless purposes to invade and seize this country as well." Rājya-vardhana, though he routed the Mālava army "with ridiculous ease," was "allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the king of Gauda, and then weaponless, confiding and alone despatched in his own quarters."

1 Hoernle, JRAS, 1903, p. 562.
2 Harshacharita.
To meet the formidable league between the Guptas and the Gaudas, Harsha, the successor of Rājya-vardhana, concluded an alliance with Bhāskaravarman, king of Kāmarūpa, whose father Susthitavarman had fought against the predecessor of Deva Gupta. This alliance was disastrous for the Gaudas as we know from the Nidhanapur plate of Bhāskara. At the time of the issuing of the plate Bhāskaravarman was in possession of Karṇāsuvāraṇa, the capital of the Gauḍa king, Śaśāṇa. The Gauḍa people, however, did not tamely acquiesce in the loss of their independence. They became a thorn in the side of Kānauj and Kāmarūpa, and their hostility towards those two powers was inherited by the Pāla and Śeṇa successors of Śaśāṇa.

During the long reign of Harsha, Madhava Gupta, the successor of Deva Gupta, remained a subordinate ally of Kānauj. After Harsha’s death the Gupta empire was revived by Ādityasena, a prince of remarkable vigour and ability who found his opportunity in the commotion which followed the usurpation of Harsha’s throne by Arjuna. For this king we have a number of inscriptions which prove that he ruled over a wide territory extending to the shores of the oceans. The Aḥṣaṭ, Shāhpur, and Māndār inscriptions recognise his undisputed possession of south and east Bihār. Another inscription, noticed by Fleet, describes him as the ruler of the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans, and the performer of the Aśvamedha and the other great sacrifices. The then Maukhari chief, Bhogavarman, accepted the hands of his daughter and presumably became his subordinate ally. The Dēṅ-Varanārāk inscription refers to the Jayaskandhavāra of his great-grandson Jīvita Gupta II at Gomatkottaka. This clearly suggests that the Later Guptas and not the

1 C.I.I., p. 213 a.
2 Kiéconom, I.N.I. 561.
Maukharis, dominated the Gomati valley in the Madhyadeśa. The Mandara inscription applies to Ādityasena the titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhīrāja. We learn from the Shāhpur stone image inscription that he was ruling in the year A.D. 672-73. It is not improbable that he or his son Deva Gupta III is the Sakal-ottara-patha-nātha who was defeated by the Chalukya kings Vinayādītya (A.D. 680-696) and Vijayādītya.¹

We learn from the Dēō-Baraḍārk inscription that Ādityasena was succeeded by his son Deva Gupta (III) who in his turn was succeeded by his son Vishnu Gupta who is probably identical with Visnu Gupta Chandrādītya of the coins.² The last king was Jivita Gupta II, son of Visnu. All these kings continued to assume imperial titles. That these were not empty forms appears from the records of the Western Chalukyas of Vatāpi which testify to the existence of a Pan-North Indian empire in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D. The only North Indian sovereigns (Uttarāpatha-nātha), who laid claim to the imperial dignity during this period, and actually dominated Magadha and the Madhyadeśa as is proved by the Apśad and Dēō-Baraḍārk inscriptions, were Ādityasena and his successors.

The Gupta empire was probably finally destroyed by the Gaudas who could never forgive Mādhava Gupta's desertion of their cause. In the time of Yaśovarman of Kanauj, i.e., in the first half of the eighth century A.D., a Gauda king occupied the throne of Magadha.³

Petty Gupta dynasties, apparently connected with the imperial line, ruled in the Kanarese districts during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries A.D., and are frequently mentioned in inscriptions. Evidence of an

² Allah, Gupta Coins, p. 145.
³ Of the Gaṇḍhāra by Yākpatīrāja. Panerji confounds the Gaṇḍhas with the later Guptas, but cf. the Harāhā Ins.
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earlier connection of the Guptas with the Kanarese country is furnished by the Tālaṅgund inscription which says that Kākustha-varman of the Kadamba dynasty gave his daughters in marriage to the Guptas and other kings. In the sixth century A.D. the Vākāṭaka king Harishena, a descendant of Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya through his daughter Prabhāvatī Gupta, is said to have effected conquests in Kuntala, i.e., the Kanarese country.\(^1\) Curiously enough the Gutta or Gupta chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya,\(^2\) lord of Ujjayini.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Jauvane-Dabrenil, A.H.D., p. 79.


\(^3\) The account of the Later Guptas was first published in the J.A.S.B., 1920, No. 7.
THE IMPERIAL GUPTAS.

Gupta
| Ghatotkacha | Licchhavis |
| Chandra Gupta I = Kundan Devi |
| A.D. 320 |
| Samudra Gupta = Datta Devi |
| Dhrupa Devi = Devagupta I (Chandra Gupta II) Vikramaditya = Kshmera Naga |
| A.D. 401-413 |
| Govinda Gupta |
| Kamara Gupta I Mahendraaditya (Sakradeitya ?) |
| A.D. 415-455 |
| = Ananta Devi |
| Guttas of Guttal Prabhavati |
| Vakataka kings of Maharastra |
| Skanda Gupta |
| Praa Gupta |
| Ghatotkacha Gupta |
| Budha Gupta A.D. 477-496 |
| Vikramaditya II |
| = Vatsa Devi |
| Narasimha Gupta |
| (Bharaditya) |
| = Mahalakshmi Devi |
| Tukhagata Gupta |
| = Kundra Gupta II, Kramaditya, Bahladitya II (Bahlou Gupta ?) |
| A.D. 478-474 |
| Vajra |
| A.D. 510 |
THE LATEST GUPTAS

THE LATEST GUPTAS.

Krishna Gupta

Harsha Gupta

Jivita Gupta I

Kumara Gupta III

Demodara Gupta

Mahesana Gupta

Mahesana Gupta = Atyanvardhana Graharman

Suryavarman Sarvarman

Pushyabhuti

Rajyavardhana I

Avantivarman?

Mahesana Gupta

Mukarsa Gupta = Atyanvardhana

Deva Gupta II (?)

Kumara Gupta

Madhava Gupta = Erinadi Devi

Atyantara = Kopa Devi

Rajyavardhana II

Harshavardhana

Rajyavedi = Graharman

Maukharri

daughter = Dhruvasena II of Valabhi

Bhogavarman = daughter

Maukharri

Vatsa Devi

Jayadeva Parakhakrama 789 A.D.

= Rajramati, daughter of Harshodara?

Deva Gupta III = Kamlal Devi

Vishnu Gupta = Iti Devi

Jivita Gupta II.
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Page 2, l. 14.—The remarkable discoveries at Mahen-jo-Daro and Harappa have no doubt supplemented the purely literary evidence regarding the ancient history of India. But the civilisation disclosed is that of Sanvira or Sovira (Sophir, Ophir?) in the pre-Pāñkāhita period. And the monuments exhumed offer little direct contribution to the materials for political history, particularly of the Madhyadesa.

Page 3, l. 14.—The present Rāmāyaṇa consists of 24,000 Ślokas (I. 4. 2—Chaturvirīśa sahasrāṇi ślokānām uktavān rishbi). But even in the first or second century A.D. the epic seems to have contained only 12,000 Ślokas (J.B.A.S. 1907, p. 39 ff.), as the evidence of the Buddhist Mahāvīvibāḥṣa suggests.

Page 4, l. 31 ff.—In a recent work Dr. Keith shows excessive scepticism about the historical value of the epics and the Purāṇas, and wonders at the naïve simplicity of those who believe in the historicity of any event not explicitly mentioned in the Vedas, e.g., the Bhārata War. It cannot be denied that the epics and Purāṇas, in their present shape, contain a good deal of what is untrustworthy; but it has been rightly said that "it is absurd to suppose that fiction completely ousted the truth." The epigraphic or numismatic records of the Sātavāhanas, Abhīras, Vākāṭakas, Nāgas, Guptas and many other dynasties fully bear out the observation of Dr. Smith that "Modern European writers have been inclined to disparage unduly the authority of the Purāṇic lists, but closer study finds in them much genuine and valuable historical tradition." As to the Bhārata War we have indeed no epigraphic corroboration, because contemporary inscriptions are lacking. But as stated in the text (ante p. 20
including footnote) Vedic literature contains many hints that the story of the great conflict is not wholly fictitious. Many of the principal figures in the Kurukshetra story (e.g., Dhrītarāṣṭra Vaiśitrāvīrya and Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra) are mentioned in some of the earliest Vedic texts, and battle songs describing the internecine strife among the Bhārata and the tragic fate of Dhrītarāṣṭra's progeny must have been current at least as early as the fifth century B.C., because Vaiśampāyana and his version of the Mahābhārata are well known to Āśvalāyana and Pāṇini. If the Bhārata War took place in the 9th century B.C. (see ante pp. 1, 17), tradition about the conflict dating from a period not later than the fifth century B.C. cannot be dismissed as wholly unworthy of credence.

Parpeter, on the other hand, is inclined to give more weight to Purānic tradition than to Vedic evidence, and his conclusions have apparently been accepted by Dr. Barnett (Calcutta Review, Feb., 1924, p. 249). It has recently been urged by the former (Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 9 ff.) that Vedic literature "lacks the historical sense" and "is not always to be trusted." But do the Purāyas which represent Śākya as one individual, include Siddhārtha in the list of kings, make Prasenajit the immediate lineal successor of Rāhula, place Pradyota several generations before Bimbisāra, dismiss Aśoka with one sentence, and represent Śri Śātakarṣu as the son of Kṛṣṇa, possess the historical sense in a remarkable degree, and are "always to be trusted"? Parpeter himself, not unoften, rejects Epic and Purānic evidence (cf. A.I.H.T., pp. 178 n. 1; 298 n. 7) when it is opposed to certain theories. In this connection it will not be quite out of place to quote the following observations of Mr. V Gordon Childe (The Aryans, p. 32):—"The
Kṣatriya tradition (i.e., Epic and Purānic tradition) is hardly an unpolluted source of history. The orthodox view is not really based on the priestly tradition, as embodied in exegetical works, but rather on the internal evidence of the Veda itself. The latter carries conviction precisely because the historical and geographical references in the hymns are introduced only incidentally and in a thoroughly ingenious manner... The same cannot be said of Kṣatriya tradition, which in its recorded form dates from an age (perhaps as late as 200 A.D.) when myth-making had had many centuries to work in, and which might serve dynastic ends." Priority of date and comparative freedom from textual corruption are two strong points in favour of Vedic literature.

Page 68, l. 23.—For the Hindu colonisation of Champā see Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. III, p. 137 ff. The oldest Sanskrit inscription (that of Vaca) dates from the third century A.D. The inscription mentions a Buddhist King of the family of Śrimūra rāja.


Page 89 u.—Several scholars reject the identification of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa of the Mahābhārata with the historical Kṛṣṇa of the Chhāndogya Upanishad (iii. 17). But we should remember that—

(a) Both the Kṛṣṇas have the metronymic Devakīputra.

(b) the teacher of the Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa belonged to a family (Āṅgirasa) closely associated with the Bhojas (Bṛṣī-Ṛṣa III, 58,7), the kindreds of the Epic Kṛṣṇa (Mbh. ii, 14,32-34).

(c) the Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa and his Guru Ghrārā Āṅgirasa were worshippers of Sūrya. We are told in the Sāntiparva (335,19) that the Śātvata
vidhi taught by the Epic Krishna was Prāk Śūrya-mukha-nāyikāta.

(b) An Āgirasa was the Guru of the Upanishadic Krishna. Āgirasi Śrutī is quoted as “Śrutānām uttamaḥ Śrutīḥ” by the Epic Krishna (Mbh. viii. 69, 85).

(c) the Upanishadic Krishna is taught the worship of the sun, the noblest of all lights (Jyotiruttamamiti), high above all darkness (tamasas pari), and also the virtues of Tapodānām ārījavam-abhināś satya-vachanam. The Epic-Krishna teaches practically the same thing in the Gitā (xiii, 18—Jyotishāmapi taṭjyotis tamanah param uchyațe; xvi, 1-2—Dānām damaścha yajñaścha svādhyaṇaṁ tapa ārījavam abhināś satyam).

Page 94, l. 27.—For the Hindu colony of “Kamboja” in the Trans-Gangetic peninsula, see Bliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. III, p. 100 ff.

Page 95, l. 14 ff.—For the Kambojas see also S. Lévi: “pre-Aryen et pre-Dravidien dans l’Inde” J. A. 1928.

Page 126, l. 22.—Dr. Smith disbelieves the Buddhist tradition about the murder of Bimbisāra by Ájātaśatru. But he does not adduce any strong and convincing argument in support of his contention that the story is “the product of odium theologicum,” or sectarian rancour. On the contrary he shows excessive scepticism in regard to the evidence of the Pāli canon and chronicles, the general credibility of which has been maintained by scholars like Rhys Davids and Geiger whose conclusions seem to be confirmed in many respects by the testimony of independent classical and Jaina writers.

Page 138, l. 2.—The Purāṇas as well as the Mahābhārata are unanimous in taking ‘Nava’ to mean nine (and not new).

Page 144, l. 9.—Pargiter suggests (Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 26, n. 35) that deva-nabhaḥ may be the correct reading instead of “deir asḥabhiḥ.”
Page 192, l. 20.—Rapson (C.H.I. pp. 514, 515) seems to think that the Gandhāras, Kambojas, Yavanas, Rāṣṭrīkās, Bhujās, Patañkās, Pulindas and Andhras lay beyond Aśoka's dominions, and were not his subjects, though regarded as coming within his sphere of influence. But this surmise can hardly be accepted in view of the fact that Aśoka's Dharma-mahāmātrās were employed amongst them "on the revision of (sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of) release" (Rocks Edict V). In Rock Edict XIII, they seem to be included within the Rāja-vishaya, and are distinguished from the real border peoples (aṁta, prachānta) viz. the Greeks of the realm of Antiochus and the Tamil peoples of the south (Nīcha). But while we are unable to accept the views of Rapson, we find it equally difficult to agree with Prof. Bhandarkar (Aśoka, 25) who denies the existence of Yonas and others as feudatory chieftains in Aśoka's dominions. The case of the Yavanarāja Tushāśpa clearly establishes the existence of such vassal chiefs whose peoples undoubtedly enjoyed partial autonomy, though subject to the jurisdiction of special Imperial officers like the Dharma-Mahāmātrās.

Page 195, l. 28.—Ātavi may also refer to Ālavi mentioned on page 119 ante.

Page 239, l. 27.—The use of regnal years by Aśoka points to the same conclusion.

Page 257, l. 30.—The form Sātvāhana is found in the Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla, and the form Śālivāhana in literature.


1932, pp. 250 ff. As to the expression Kṛita used in reference to the era in the earliest records, cf., the Kṛitiya rulers mentioned by Huen Tsang (Beal, Si-yu-ki, I. 156 ff). The Śatavāhanas could not have founded this or any other era because they always use regnal years, and Indian literature distinguishes between Vikrama and Śalivāhana. As to the claims of Azes, see Calcutta Review, 1922, Dec., pp. 493-494; regarding Vikrama see Bhand. Com. Vol. cited above.

Page 296, l. 5.—For the Traikūṭaka Era see J.R.A.S., 1905, pp. 566-568.

Page 297, l. 3.—For the origin of the Śaka era, see Fleet, C.I.I. preface, p. 56; J.R.A.S., 1913, pp. 635, 650, 987 ff; Dubrac, A.H.D., 26; Rapson, Andhra-coins, cv. Nahapāna, who was not even a Mahākṣatrapa in the years 42-45 and who never became a paramount sovereign, could not have been the founder of the era. Chashāna has no better claims, and the evidence of the Periplus shows that he could not have ruled at Ujjain in 78 A.D.

Page 300, l. 31. —The fame of the Kanishka Mahāvihāra remained undiminished till the days of the Pāla Kings of Bengal as is apparent from the Ghoshavan inscription of the time of Devapāla.

Page 368, l. 6 f.—The ascription of the title of Vikramāditya to Yaśodharman of Mandasor, and the representation of this chief as a ruler of Ujjain, the father of Śilāditya of Mo-la-po and the father-in-law of Prabhākara-vardhana, are absolutely unwarranted.
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Kingdoms, Peoples and Dynasties of Trans-Vindhyan India chronologically arranged.

Brāhmaṇa Period:—1. Nishadhas (capital Giriprastha, Mbh. III. 324.12).
   2. Vidarbhas (capital Kurujina) and other Bhojas.
   3. Dasyu tribes—Andhras, Śabaras, Pulindas and Muṭibas.

Sūtra Period:—1. Māhiśmati (Mandhāra?).
   2. Bhārigu-Kaśabhā (Budhchhā).
   3. Sūrpāraka (Sopara in the Konkan).
   4. Aśmaka (capital Paudanya).
   5. Mulaka (capital Pratisishṭhāna).
   7. (?) Ukkala (N. Orissa).


Maurya Period:—

1. Aparāntas proper (capital Sūrpāraka).
2. Bhojas (capital Kurujina?)
3. Rāśṭrakusas (capital Nāsik?)
4. Panemikas (of Pratisishṭhāna?)
5. Pulindas (capital Pulindanagar).

Maurya Empire.

6. Andhras (capital Bezvāda?)
7. Aṭavi.
8. Kalingas (including Tosali and Samaṇa).
10. Āhāra of Isīla.
11. Cholas.
15. Tāmraparṇī (Ceylon).
Early Post-Maurya Period:—1. Kingdom of Vidarbha.
   2. Śatavāhanas of Dakshinapatha.
   3. Chetas of Kaliṅga.
   4. Kingdom of Pithūḍa near Masulipatam.
   5. " " Chola.
   7. " " Kerala.
   8. " " Ceylon (sometimes ruled by Chola princes.)

Age of the Periplus:—

1. Ariake under Mambarus (or Nambarus?).
2. Dachinabades (under Saraganas and his successors) i.e. the Deccan under the Śatavāhana-Śatakarniś.
3. Damirica including:—
   (a) Cerobotra (Keralaputra).
   (b) Pandian Kingdom.
   (c) (Kingdom of) Aragur (= Urupur).
4. Masalia (Masulipatam).
5. Dosareno (= Tesali?).

Age of Ptolemy:—1. Kingdom of Baithana (Pratishṭhāna) ruled by Pulumṣyi (Śatavāhana).
2. Kingdom of Hippokoura (Kolhapur?), ruled by Baleokoura (Vilivayuktra).
4. " " Kareura ruled by Kerobothros (Keralaputra).
5. Pounnata (S. W. Mysore).
7. Kingdom of the Kareoi (Tamraparṇi Valley).
8. Kingdom of Modoura ruled by Pandion.
10. Kingdom of Orthoura, ruled by " Sornagos."
11. Kingdom of Sora (Chola) ruled by Arkatos.
12. Kingdom of Malanga (Kāñchi?), ruled by Basarangas.

A.D. 150-350:—
1. Abhiras (N. Mahārāṣṭra and W. India).
2. Vākṣṭakas (Berar and adjoining provinces), and chiefs of Mahākāntāra.
4. Kingdom of Vengi:—
   (a) Ikshvākus.
   (b) Brihatphalāyanas of Kudura.
   (c) Śalaṅkāyanas (Salakenoi of Ptolemy?) of Vengipur.
   (d) Hastivarman of Vengi.
5. Pallavas of Kāñchi.
6. Śātaṅkaris of Kuntala.

A.D. 350-600:—
1. Traikūpākas and Mauryas of Konkan; and Lātas, Nāgas and Gūrjaras of South Gujarāt.
2. Vākṣṭakas (C. Deccan).
5. Kingdoms of Udra, Koṅgoda and Pishṭapura; Lenuṭura (under Vishnukumārais in East Deccan).
6. Pallavas of Kāñchi (in Dramila or Dvārija).
7. Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, Mūrthakas, and Keralas of the Far South.
10. Nalas of Ballary District.
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11. Early Chalukyas of Värsäpi.
After A.D. 600:—1. Śilāhāras of Konkan.
2. Early Chalukyas, Rashtrakūtas, Later Chālu-
   kyas, Kalachuryas and Yādavas of W.
   Deccan.
3. Haihayas, Kalachuris or Chedis of Tripuri
   and Ratnapura, and Nāgas of Chakrakuṭa,
   (C.P.).
4. Eastern Chalukyas, Chiefs of Vellāyū, and
   Kākatiyas of the Telugu Country, Eastern Gangas of Kaliṅga and Orissa,
   Sabaras and Somavamsi Guptas of Mahā-
   nādi Valley (N. E. Deccan).
5. Western Gaṅgas and Hoysalas (Mysore).
6. Pallavas of Kāṭchi, Kalabhara of Tinnevelly
   Districts, Cholas of Tanjore, Varmans of
   Keralā and Kolamba, and Pāṇḍyas of
   Mādura (Far South).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Synchronistic</td>
<td>Table II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Columns:**
- **Row 1:** Size, Type, Table, Rows, Columns, Description
- **Row 2:** Size, Synchronistic, Table II, 5, 5, |
- **Row 3:** Size, Synchronistic, Table II, 5, 5, |
- **Row 4:** Size, Synchronistic, Table II, 5, 5, |
- **Row 5:** Size, Synchronistic, Table II, 5, 5, |

**Description:**
- Size: 1756
- Type: Synchronistic
- Table: Table II
- Rows: 5
- Columns: 5
- Description: |
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Arauma, 447
Arunaktaka, 311
Arvedhis, 209
Archer, 76
Ardeviriz, 206
Ardezer, 297
Arigar, 297
Arilke, 306
Artidza, 336, 350, 397
Artigara, Aritha Jangka, 40f
Arjaghara, 115
Arjun, King of Kamauj, 375
Arjuna (Matya), 87
Arjuna Pusavas, 49, 77
Arjunesvarama, 329, 542
Arjumans, 163
Arjuna (Parthian), 341
Armaitra (Urmìa), 191
Arista, 268
Artebaheva, 93
Artemisidus, 269
Arthasamhita, 321
Arthavida, 5, 319, 391
Arupa, 19
Arupa king, 99
Arum (sage), 97
Arupu, 16, 27, 34
Arayaka, 194
Asandimitra, 204
Asentaman, 12, 18, 20
Askeptana, 262
Achekaka, 143
Asanti, 270
Aril, 270
Arsika, 210
Asim, 49
Asivaitiga, 19
Asmakh Asaka, Asalu, 55, 226, 148, 310
Aksa, 4
Aksakadendra, 118
Aksa Maurya, 157f
Arpakan, 148
Arpavarna, 279, 281f
Asvalayana, Asvalayana, 18, 28, 65, 99, 149
Assembly of Village Heads, 111, 128, 170
Asinakinsana, 145
Asita, 190
Asyvoni, 177
Asuravijaya, 337
Asvini, 27
Asvaghosha, 301f
Asvakaj, 161
Asvala, 32, 47
Asvamedhadhata, 29f
Asvapati, King of the Ksrayas, 37
Asvapati, King of the Madras, 86, 304
Asvapati (Valley), 29, 97
Asvatihaman, 326, 325
Asvatiheka, 326
Asvat, 192
Asvika, 326, 337
Asvityah, 86, 109, 105
Athaama, 221
Athene, 207
Atbara, 53, 53f
Athokalamsayavan, 21
Aundyantrika, 297
Aurama, 296
Auramamayavan, 87
Avaha, 60
Avaha, 303
Avamukta, 275
Avasti, 92, 126, 128, 310
Avastiputta, 93, 119
Avantivarman, 379, 374
Avikshiti, 7
Avya, 267
Ayama, 306
Ayaputa, 207
Ayusi Kumpal, 263
Ayanea, 48
Ayoodya, 47, 63, 67, 141
Ayogava, 108
Ayu, 14
Ayukta, Ayukta, 108, 591
Azna I, 271, 270f
Azna II, 270f
Azilaza, 280f

Babar, 160
Badr, 89
Babyloun, 92, 168, 280
Bactria, 14
Bactrian, 4, 147, 109, 247
Bactrians, 342
Bactrians (Greeces), 241f
Baghikanda, 390
Baha, 319
Bahapatmaka, 287
Bhahan, 337
Bhaktismitra, 287, 292, 300, 397
Bahl, 14
Bahmenabad, 100
Bahrole, 63
Balalasha, 29, 50
Baltrai, 39, 57
Baltsan, 319
Bajji, 60
Balshikarana, 321
Balshyaksha, 178
Balshitya I, 383
Balshitya II, 387
Balshita, 59, 60
Balshyadha, 178f
Balshet, 232, 312, 323
Balshwarman, 336
Balshika, 14
Balsh, 395
Balshpragacn, 300
Balsh, 36
Balshama, 266
Balseyangan, 391
Balshgarb, 355
Bhandari, 87
Bhandhana, 80, 123
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Coronation oath, 199
Cours de Justice, 173, 176
Craterus, 508
Cretans, 159
Cromer, 163
Cuch, 307, 318
Cyclo Alkydhas, 110
Cyrene, 506
Cyprus, 145

D

Dubiares, 95
Daahilas, 350, 360, 367
Doddarapura, 82
Dedhivahan, 59
Dahm, 16
Dahrasena, 314
Daiyana, 86
Daivypotra, 344
Daivyviratha, 88
Dakshasi, 88n
Dakeba, 88n
Dakshayaanga Sacrifice, 75
Dakshiyaga 38, 101
Dakshabhi, Mathuris, 205
Dakshagapadi, 63
Dakshapathagopa, 55, 92, 150, 337
Dakshapathapati, 593
Daksikshiyaga, 63, 91
Dakshiyahas Chhalasaya, 44
Dakshiyaha Kekin, 48f
Damaghostha, 82
Damaagnishtha, 319
Damaikasa 36, 320
Damauna, 877
Damasena, 350
Damaraphala Gupta, 372
Damosdarapura, 841, 360, 353, 364
Dapuka, 56
Daspot, 26
Daspotaka, 226
Daspapadukara, 331
Daspapalika, 361
Daspot Charita, 297
Daspotaka, 361
Danish invasion, 183
Dantakura, 35
Dantiarasangara, 55
Dantavakra, 56n
Darasa I, 94, 139, 146
Darasa III, 147, 276n
Darata, 136f
Darshabharana, 151
Daurasama, 138
Davasupra, 353
Davasara (Okulravak), 47, 84
Davasara Maurya, 230f
Davarpa, 59
Dasasiddhaka, 142
Dasya tribe, 87
Datadviri, 315
Datamitra, 4
Datamitira, 344
Dattas, 368

Davashunti, 14
Davaka, 341
Dacca, 85f, 91, 142, 157, 195, 293
Dahmaciene, 186
Delhi, 84
Democritus Polis, 344
Demosthenes, 242f, 267
Democracy, 180
Dea, 329
Deadhukrita, 328
Dea, 178 u
Deabundhi, 335f
Deadvhandi, 366f
Deavachandra, 135
Dea Gravan, 13
Dea Gupta I, 186
Dea Gupta II, 373
Dea Gupta III, 276
Deavakipatra, 383
Deavakulas, 302, 323
Deavamunjipya, 164, 189
Deavamunjipya Dasa, 221
Deavamunjipya Piyadas, 189
Deavamunjipya Tissa, 208
Deavapala, 363
Deapita, 303
Deavapatha, 303 f
Deavasita, 366
Deavasita, 367f
Deavasita, 48
Devas, 204, 226
Devasvarman, 320, 322
Devavata, 13
Dhammika, Law of Pintya, 211f
Dhammamitra, 303, 333
Dhammanagama, 329
Dhammanidaya, 317
Dhammavijaya, 304f
Dhammavayas, 213
Dhana (Nanda), 142
Dhanyabhuti, 333
Dhanadajya, 44
Dhanadajya Koravaya, 84
Dhunika, 228
Dhavanakada, 87
Dhanavyasapika, 357
Dharas, 371
Dharma, (see Dhamma) Dharmadiya, 345
Dharma-mahakas马拉, 212, 220
Dharma-Maharakshatrapa, 333
Dharmarayagita, 393f
Dharmasoka, 189
Dharmasthaliya, 176n.
Dharmavajaya, 397, 399
Dhataratha of Abga, 49
Dh答复, 101
Dhaval, 228
Dhavelappadara, 253
Dhavishayumma, 49
Dhishakotesa, 89
Dharitarnavdha, Prince of Kashi, 23, 46, 51
Dharitarnavdha Vaijrichatavirya, 14, 369
Dhriti, 39, 69
Dhurvasavindu, 360
Dhurmavasa, 75
Dhvanas Dwatavas, 39
Dhbha, 87
Dighamkhyana, 133
Dighatu (Digvatu), 87, 98, 111
Digvayana, 111
Digvijaya, 186, 397
Diodora, 361, 366
Dionysius, 233
Dionysius, Ambassador, 196
Dionysius god, 149
Dionysius, 299
Divakara, 67
Divakara, Patishwa, 43
Divya (Dios), 293
Dios, 12, 14, 85 (see Antares)
Dioscorae, 267
Drangiana, 270
Drangianian house, 270f
Dravida, 77
Dravida, 87, 197
Drishavatman, 70, 132
Drishkottam (Obitsang), 12
Driti, 26, 41
Drug of Vahadipya, 116
Drugs of the Epic, 265
Drusamukha, 178n
Druha, 26
Drujita, 83
Droupidas, 43
Dummukha Lichchhavi, 79
Dummukha Pancala, 81, 83
Durgharsh, 133
Durmukha, see Dumukha
Duryodhana, 362
Dueshaksh, 331
Dueshaksh, 413
Dutra, 106, 108
Dvaitridaya, 300, 304
Dwaatavas, 39
Dyurola, 36, 318

Eastern Chalukya, 365
Edomene, 3
Egypt, 146, 268, 219
Eka-Bamana, 202
Elchehar, 42
Ekepar, 106, 141
Ekatanasana, 171
Elilina, 167
Ellora, 338
Epander, 289
Ephecri, 181
Epyros, 238
Epykropo, 191
Era of Samprati, 399
Eran (see Arikina)
Erandapalli, 338
Erandapalla, 338
Erandjol, 338
Eranocce, 170
Eryx, 148
Eryxkamas, 199
Esapalina, 148
Esamnos, 162

Bhaktaridas, 305, 344, 429
Bhaktydemisa, 346, 368
Bhaktydemisa, 346, 368
Bhaktydemisa, 346
Bhaktydemisa, 346

Female guards, 172
Po-to-kto, 306
Po-to-kto, 306
Farrukhabad, 49

Gad, 287
Gubara, 34, 146
Gubretatos, 239
Guggaras, 69
Gundaya Ayuta, 329
Gomayawara, 268
Gonapati Naga, 303, 335
Gonapati, 81, 129
Gundarsh, 153
Gundharsha, 39, 89, 114, 190f, 192, 277
Gundhartha, 34
Gungas, 77
Gungas of Mycena, 315
Gungaridas, 142, 194
Gurgle, 32
Gurgle Balekia, 89, 46
Garuda Pillar inscription, 256
Guris, 301
Gaula, 126
Gupakasas, 320
Gupakshya, 33
Gustamani, Arupa Aupavefi, 37
Gustamani, Bala, (see Bala)
Gustamapiutra, 310f
Gaya, 72
Gaya, 39
Gedrosia, 138
Ghotaka, 365, 366
Ghoulajkob, 383
Ghoulajkob, Geota, 363
Ghora Xagiras, 224
Ghikshita, 79
Girina, 197
Giriraja (see Kekyra), 36
Giriraja (see Magadha), 50, 70, 116
Gisunakshaya, 153f
Giswinas, 162
Gomati Kottaka, 375
Gomit, 287
Gosanda, 235
Gondophernus, 279, 288, 287
Gopatka, 123
Gopali Valhadari, 329
Gopati, 907
Goptri, 198, 281
Gorathagiri, 70
Gotha, 129, 302
Gothhina, 329
Gosama Buddh, (see Buddh Tathagata),
Gosama Bhaqyamana, 30
Gosana, 8
Kāṃsanda, 4
Kāmarūpa, 341
Kambaja, 33, 94f, 145, 192
Kambayapura, 55
Kammaraaddumma, 64
Kānpiyā, Kampilā, 42, 85, 129
Kausa of Kosala, 96
Kausa of Mathurā, 96
Kāmyāla, 11
Kanakagri, 195 n
Kanakabali, 98
Kāśchī, 207, 216, 228
Kaplessa, 204 f
Kamishka II, 294, 301 f
Kamishka III, 303 n
Kamishka I, 209
Kākha, 105 n
Kapja-kosham, 170 n, 200
Kanta, 99, 113
Kāntipur, 926, 301
Kāpya, 226, 255
Kanyakabja, Kanyaj, 95, 229
Ko-fou, 200 f
Kapaka, 192
Kāpeya, 29
Kapilavastu, 48, 99, 117
Kāpi, 145, 247, 267
Kāpi, 203, 276, 281
Kāpa, 200
Kāpya Pataschala, 26, 88
Kara, 126
Karma, 51 f
Kapajya, 51, 54
Karatai, 105
Kāśchamaka, 277, 316
Karunāntika, 327
Karma Stohivas, 173 n, 319, 336
Larga, 64, 97
Karpasuvarga, 185
Kurñā, 340
Kareci, 307
Kattrura, 357
Kāntipur, 341
Kāravela, 48
Kārvākā, 227, 224
Kāst, 44, 92, 60, 98
Kasila, 79
Kāśinatra Bhagabhadra, 352
Kāśmira, 97, 98, 126, 221
Kāspuryasa, 99
Kaspetrail, 284
Kāspiyap Arhata, 202
Kāstrīna, 99 n
Kāta Chālyā, 62
Kātyūpa Māthaka, 203
Kātyūpa, 19
Kāthakuricha, 389
Kāṭha, 159
Kathaci, 143
Kanjojinya, 84
Karnāla, 356
Kāvāmbī, Kāsambī, 12, 22, 41, 82, 131,
Kāvāka, 19
Kāvāka, 19
Kāvākya, 5, 32, 178 (see Chānayya), 19
Kavanāḥ Kāṭyayana, 36
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Kavasheya, 9, 19, 27, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Kaviraja, 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Kaveripattinam, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Kekaya, 31, 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ken, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Kerali, 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Kosaputta, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Keila, 42, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Ketalaputo, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kevallip, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Kevanta, Minister, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Khalatika Pavaka, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Khapaljha, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Khosarosta, 283, 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Kharpallana, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Kharsapukha, 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Khawravela, 117, 257, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Khans, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Khelalagala, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Khelashyshah, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Khilar Kuala, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Khun-taiao-lu, 590 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Khaza, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kinda of rulership, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>King-mukur, 105, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kingship, 100 f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Kl-zen, 299 f, 299 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kiraka, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Kirerweman, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Klesphya, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Kob-i-Mor, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Kojamba, 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Kolvise, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Kolja, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Komai, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Kolllaga, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Kolleru, 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Konakayana, 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Kondge, 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Koravaya, Koravaya, 6, 21, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Kota, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Kosala (North), 47, 83, 16, 120, 125, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Kosala (South), 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Kosar, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kozhagara, 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>Kotala, 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Kotakula, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Kota-sya, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Kotya-sya, 193 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Kotyura, 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Kraavya, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Kralcochebanda, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Kramaditya, Kumara Gupta II, 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Kranaditya, Khanda Gupta, 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Kranagana, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Krihaga Gupta, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Krihaga Shatavahana, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Krihaca Vasa-deva, 89, 101, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Kritishekha, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Kritamala, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Krita-Malava-Vikrama Era, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Krii, 49 f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Krii, 42 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Kshaharshya, 303, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Kshatravanan, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Kshatrasya Kshatra, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Kshayatithyanam Kshayatithya, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kshemaka, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Kshemarayya, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Kshudraka, 145, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Kshudra Parnadh, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Kshiraka, 199 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Kshura Kadphisa, 290, 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Kukusha, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Kuktis, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Kumara, 192, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kumara Devi (Gaharwar Queen), 192, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kumara Devi, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Kumara Guptha I, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Kumara Guptha II, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Kumara Guptha, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Kumara Guptha, Prince, 309, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Kumarashtyna, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Kumarshtyna, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Kumbhavati, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Kusaena, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Kusastra, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Kushtagama, Kuspsa, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Kupalina, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Kupiya, 75, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Kusastra, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Kuslsuda, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Kusmadara, 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Kusala, 8, 96, 96, 96, 96, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Kusul, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Kusula, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Kusuloka, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Kusumapura, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kusmaragya, 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Kusmaragya, 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Kusmasita, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Kusphalpura, 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kuspre, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Kusula, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Kusula, 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Laccademonians, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Ladhya, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368n</td>
<td>Lagatorum, 368n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Laghman, 274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nandīnagar, 95
Nandīsa, 92
Nandīvardhana, 126
Nandīvarman, 215
Napal-kā, 126
Nāraka, 93, 127
Nārānchhīa Gnipa Bālādītys, 363
Nārānchhīa Varman, 315
Nāravarman, 320
Nārāyaṇa Kṛṣṇa, 250
Nārāyaṇagālā, 355, 394
Narmātha, 12, 92
Nātāgūra, 82
Nāśik, 197
Nāśik Prāsāti, 310f
Nān Naṃ Dahre, (Nander), 142
Nāvādayakōh, 179
Navannaka, 127, 353
Navantar, 313
Nāvī, 171f
Nāyakā, 129, 323
Nāyika, 207
Nemi, 557
Nepal, 28, 63, 74, 79, 120, 216
Neykka, 397
Nguyet, 273, 279
Nichanka, 19, 22, 41, 49
Nischohivir, 77
Nishtān, 101
Mīlīnagpur, 375
Nīlītā Śīgar, 193
Nīlīma, 329
Nīlīma nagapallūs, 178f
Nīlīmpōthī Nākāputta, 290
Nīlīma, 195
Nīlīy, 130, 320
Nīlīpallī, 336
Nīlīrājā, 337
Nīlīrāntas, 219
Nīrākāra, 129
Nīrākāra Temple, 79
Nīshāda, 118, 319
Nīshādana, 338
Nīlī, 76
Nīshtāṭhā, 177
Nīvīghtāgū, 178
Nīvūka, 21
Nōmarch, 163
Nōrsīmha, 193
Nōrsīmha, 193
Nōsīrōkavan, 119
Nīya, 149

Osh (Coronation), 109
Oḍiṣa, 67
Oḍrāra, 269
Oblad, 304
Ockākā, 80, 104
Olympic Games, 106
Oṃphī, 151
Ophir, 309
Opsī, 158
Orīs, 65
Orossa, 127

Orīs, 65
Orīs, 367
Orīs, 367
Osadhi, 126
Öppṣadhā, 78
Öndh, 47, 69
Önna, 270, 291
Öydrakai, 160f
Öykanos, 159
Özene, 317

Pabbo, 99
Pada, 201
Padhā, 266
Padağāli, 104, 112
Paghī, 60
Paghīa, 295
Padhāva, city, 296, 304, 336
Padmāvatī, queen of Üdayana, 192
Fāhīvan, 4, 295
Paghī, 156
Palīkā, 253, 299
Paghīa, 145
Paghī, 145
Paghīnā, 196
Paghīna, 307
Paghī, 104
Paghī, 133, 131, 194
Paghī, 313, 837
Paghī, 219
Palībōthra, Polimbothra, 141, 170
Palībōthra, 195
Palīna, 57, 315
Palī, 190m
Pambā, 336
Pāṇi, 38f, 42f, 85f, 96, 101, 223
Pāṇi, 135
Pāṇi, 305
Pandā, 203
Pāṇivās, 21, 94
Pāṇivās, 206
Pāṇivāgar, 145
Pāṇivā, 142
Pāṇivā, 10, 18, 30
Pāṇivā, 206, 287, 292n
Pāṇivā, 287
Pānī, 269
Pāntōlu, 267f
Pāsā Khārā, 51
Pāsā Khārā, 51, 65
Pāsā Khārā, 51, 65
Pāsā Khārā, 334
Pāsā Khārā, 338
Pāsā Khārā, 103
Pāsā Khārā, 333
Pāsā Khārā, 167
Pāsā Khārā, 192
Pāsā Khārā, 207
Pāsā Khārā, 49
Pāsā Khārā, 816
Pāsā Khārā, 209
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Pāsā Khārā, 6f
Rashoda, 182
Rāhitya, 395
Rāhitya kr̥ita, 389
Rāhityapāda, king, 143
Rāhityapāda, 141
Rāhityapānas, 193f, 512
Rāhityaśu, 186, 181
Rāthariṣṭita, 23
Ratna, 107
Rāvalipinī, 39
Rāgo, 54, 51
Sahabhāsī, 118
Sahatamastra Pañcava Chākra Sthapati, 113
Riksha, 14
Ripūjyaya, 71
Rāṣṭhahadastta, 197
Rāṣṭhipriya, 70
Rākṣapara, 61f
Rāmsa (Maurya), 177
Rohi, 117
Rohita, 64, 65
Romakas, Rome, 4, 93, 203
Romākṣa, 119
Rudrā, 313
Rudrabhūti, 519
Rudrakṣamani I, 5u, 295, 307, 313, 17f
Rudrakṣamani II, 220
Rudracara, 385
Rudra Pāsūnavi, 196
Rudrasena I, Kabatraga, 390
Rudrasena II, 390
Rudrasena I, Vaiś kom, 390
Rudrasena II, 390, 399
Rudrasena III, 310
Rudrasena I, Tif, 320
Rudrasena II, 399
Rudrayana, 119
Rūmadeva, 113, 216
Rūpadevika, 178
Rupāṅkha, 106
S.
Śaṃsā, 347, 349
Śabdāravas, 157
Śabara, 57
Śabara, 59
Śabarmati, 318
Śabdarthika, 123
Śabda, 319
Śācā, 147
Śacarati, 370
Śacastana, 271f
Śačiva, 173, 236, 321
Śadā-chandra, 335
Śālaganna, 384
Śadānirū, 28, 30, 32
Śāgala, Śāgalasamagra, 37, 119, 243f, 267f
Śāgarāvīpa, 247
Śāgarākā, 193
Śahdeva Pāṇḍita, 21
Śahdeva Bāṭrāja, 63
Śahdeva, father of Romaka, 51, 33
Śahdeva, son of Jahnanda, 71
Śahadeva of Vaiṣhāli, 75
Śahājāti, 81
GENERAL INDEX

Samudravijaya, 72
Samudra, 388
Samudravikrama, 342, 343
Samudra, 139
Samudra, 343
Samudra, 27, 49
Samudra, 164f
Sangacaka, 161
Sangala, 158
Sangala, 220f
Sangha (Buddhist), 214
Sangha, 85, 86, 91, 111, 170, 180
Sanghabhadra, 319
Sanghamukha, 89
Sanghasiha, 296
Sanghabodhi, 131
Sangha, 176c
Sanghajaya, 135
Sanghajaya of Magadha, 135
Sanghajaya of Pañjaka, 86
Sanghajaya of Pahliqubul, 101
Sanghajaya (Gata), 107n
Sanghavijaya, 27
Sanghakara (commentator), 320
Sanghasena, 29, 120
Sanghyavarni, 178
Sangha, 16
Samadhānta, 317
Sāpa (Coronation oath), 106, 109
Sāpeka, 283
Sphallā, 65
Sāpur II, 308f
Sṛgajña, 28, 61
Sārakabala, 149
Sārakabhūta, 368
Sārakasena, 104
Sārakasena, 363
Sārakasena, 34
Sāranakura, 260
Sāranakura, 243
Sāranasena, 11f, 30, 30f, 106, 152, 158
Goddesa, 210
Sāraya, 47, 93
Sābulavarama, 371
Sārkiṣeṇa, 37
Sārkiṣeṇa, 17, 20
Sāriyikā, 69
Sāraḥsūtra, 18, 106
Sāraḥsūtra, 109
Sāsana, 174
Sāsana, 108
Sāsana, 374
Sāsana, 262
Sāsana, 306f
Sāsana, 220, 222
Sāsana, 315, 316
Sāsana, 353
Sāsana, 193
Sāsana, 91
Sāsana, 371
Sāsana, 277
Stavālana, 251, 305
Waghil, 196n
Warden of the Marches, 196, 237
Wardhā, 94
Wema Kadphises, 393
Wessex, 110, 363
Westminster, 63
Wu-sun, 209
Wu-t'ou-iso, 273

X
Xandrames, 142
Xathroi, 165
Xerxes, 147

Y
Yağsyn, Yasuga, 301, 393
Yaśava, Yasu, 64, 56, 77, 93
Yajñasena of Pāśchala, 43
Yajñasena of Vīrārbha, 237
Yajñastri, 314
Yāśajñavalāka, 267, 32, 110, 233
Yājñārvamana, 371
Yaksha (Yukhā), 119, 132, 135f
Yavasaka Pratihārya, 216n
Yavana, 65, 67
Yukṣakāra, 355
Yaka, 9
Yad-śiśman, 390
Yadchharaṇa, 389
Yakṣamātī, 325
Yasavartman, 376
Yadhavas, 156, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 402
Yavana, Yavana, 3, 4, 5, 161, 163, 169, 180, 212, 250, 240f, 251, 294, 300f, 372
Yauvarāja, 394
Yavanacāya, 197
Yayāti, 14, 30
Yavātinagari, 336
Yukṣa-muṣṭi, 339
Yon-kao-chen, 237
Yin-me-fu, 297, 298
Yogana (mythical), 138
Yoma, 170, 193
Yomasrāja, 192, 206
Yosamottak, 305, 316
Yudhāhāra-prasabi, 109
Yudhāhārāṇya, Yuddhāṭhāla, 21, 84, 303
Yueh-chi, 290
Yiṣanti, 273
Yuktas, Yutas, 196, 200, 214
Yuva Mahārāja, 325
Yuvaśāva, 64

Z
Zi Haku, Ziouas, 317
Z. D. M. G., 274n
Zece, 999
Zeinías, 291f, 293
Zeus, 347, 393
Zeules, 267
Zoroastrois, 172
## CORRIGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>line</th>
<th>For Prove</th>
<th>Read Proves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>For Prove</td>
<td>Read Proves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Vahulāśva</td>
<td>Bahulāśva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pushkārvati</td>
<td>Pushkarāvati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Somaśūshma</td>
<td>Somaśūshma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Serve</td>
<td>Sarva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Makes</td>
<td>Make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>After Kartari</td>
<td>(This is doubtful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>For 1177</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>two and a half years</td>
<td>two and a half years of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timita</td>
<td>Timitra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>p. xxli</td>
<td>Tylor, Notes, p. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>had had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>JARS</td>
<td>JHASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sten Konow</td>
<td>Sten Konow apparently following G. Hoffmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rapson</td>
<td>Whitehead, p. 146 and Rapson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>titles...Rājātirāja</td>
<td>title yavaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>central or</td>
<td>or central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mahādeva</td>
<td>Mahādevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td>references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>reminds</td>
<td>remind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>iGuptas</td>
<td>Guptaś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376A (Map)</td>
<td>Kachchha</td>
<td>Kachchha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388A</td>
<td>Jejakabukti</td>
<td>Jejakabukti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388A</td>
<td>Saladru</td>
<td>Saladru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388A</td>
<td>Nandadevi</td>
<td>Nandadevi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388A</td>
<td>Satya</td>
<td>Aioi (Sātiya?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. The Early History of the Vaishnava Sect
Published by the Calcutta University.

OPINIONS AND REVIEWS

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, America.—
"Your book has given me great satisfaction... I am particularly pleased to see an incisive study of this kind in the realm of religious history......... Believe me, in the hope of further contributions of this character from your able pen............"

Professor A. Berriedale Keith, Edinburgh University.—
"While I do not concur in your view as to the original character of Kṛṣṇa, I recognise the care with which you have investigated the issue, and value highly the elaborate collation of the evidence which your work contains, and which will render it of much service to all students of this, doubtless insoluble, problem. The stress laid on the epigraphic evidence and the full use made of it is of special value, while in many details your opinions are of interest and value, as in the case of the date of Pāṇini............."

Sir George Grierson.—"Very interesting and informing...... The book is full of matter which is of great importance for the history of religion in India and will form a valued addition to my collection of books on the subject............."

F. E. Pickering, Oxford.—"I agree with you in discarding various theories, but I don't think that Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra is the famous Kṛṣṇa, and it seems to me your exposition can stand just as well without the identification as with it. Your book will help to elucidate the whole matter, but are you sure that the cult does not owe something to Christianity ?"

Professor F. Otto Schrader, Kiel, Germany.—"I perfectly agree with your opinion that the Chāndogya passage on Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra and his teaching is to be considered as the first historical
record of Bhāgavatism. There were, of course, many Kṛṣṇas, but to
conjecture that more than one was also a Devakīputra, is, to my mind
an unscientific boldness which is the less justifiable as the teachings
mentioned in that passage, as you show, perfectly agree with those
e.g., of the Bhagavad-gītā and the Rk quoted with the famous
शविष्ठ: परं स्वतः !..................

Professor Garbe, Tübingen, Germany.—"I have read your
book with the greatest interest and perfectly agree with you in the
main points, as to the personality of Kṛṣṇa and the development
of Bhāgavatism........You have brought together much important
material and elucidated the dark early history of Bhāgavatism as
far as possible."

The Times Literary Supplement, May 18, 1921.—"The
lectures of Mr. Hemechandra Ray-chaudhuri on the Early History
of the Vaishnava Sect read almost as would a Bampton lecture on the
"Historical Christ" to a Christian audience. They are an attempt to
disentangle the authentic figure of Krishna from the mass of Puranic
legend and gross tradition, from the wild conjectures and mistaken, if
reasoned, theories which surround his name. The worship of Krishna
is not a superstitious idolatry; it is the expression of the Bhakti,
the devotional faith of an intellectual people, and many missionaries,
illequipped for dealing with a dimly understood creed would do
well to study this little volume..........

Journal Asiatique, January-March, 1923, Paris.—"Dans le
domaine historique, signalons un travail plein de mérite de M.
Hemechandra Ray-Chaudhuri: Materials for the study of the Early
History of the Vaishnava Sect." (Dr. Jules Bloch of Paris).

Dr. Jules Bloch, Paris.—"My Guru, Sylvain Lévi, who has
come back from his travels, told me also of his esteem for that
book."

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain.—
"The scope of this small book is rightly expressed in its title. The
author, who is lecturer in History in the Calcutta University, has
collected and discussed statements, references, and allusions from the
early literature to throw light on the position and life of Kṛṣṇa and
the growth of Bhāgavatism. He deals with the various theories that
have been put forward, and with good reasons discards the views
that Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva was a solar deity or a trial god or a vegetation
deity. He is right in treating Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva as one person, the
Vṛṣṇi chief, but he unnecessarily identifies him with Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra,
the scholar mentioned in the Chāndogya Upanishad............."
(F. E. Pargiter).

The Bombay Chronicle, June 19, 1921.—"In this small book of a hundred and seventeen pages, Mr. Hemchandra Ray-Chaudhuri of the Calcutta University has collected much valuable material from which he has succeeded in tracing the origin and growth of the Vaishnava creed. The Historicity of Shrikrishna—or as the author calls Him Krishna Vāsudeva, is also handled with remarkable clearness..... .........."

2. Political History of India

From the Accession of Parikshit to the coronation of Bimbisara.

Reprint from the Journal of the Department of Letters, Vol. IX. Royal 8vo, 96 pp. :-

Professor E. Waseburn Hopkins.—"It is a fine augury for Indian scholarship when native scholars of the first rank take seriously in hand the great problem of untangling the web of Indian history. To this work your book is a valuable contribution."

Professor H. Jacob, Bonn.—"Very suggestive and contains some important details."

Professor F. Otto Schradde.—"I have read the book with increasing interest and do not hesitate to say that it contains a great many details which will be found useful by later historians. The portion I enjoyed most is that on the sixteen Mahājana padas."

Professor A. Berriedale Keith.—"Full of useful information."

Professor L. D. Barnett, British Museum.—"Presents the facts very well. It will be very useful to students."

Professor E. J. Rapson, Cambridge.—"I write to thank you for your kindness in sending me copies of your interesting papers."

W. Charles de Silva, Colombo.—"I have the greatest pleasure to express my high appreciation of your very valuable and learned article."

3. The Laksmana Sena Era

Reprint from Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, Vol. III, Orientalia, Part 2, Calcutta.—Published by the Calcutta University and Printed at the Baptist Mission Press, 1921, and 1923.
OPINIONS

PROFESSOR DR. SVEN KONOW, KRISTIANIA, NORWAY.—“Many thanks for the reprints which you have been good enough to send me. I have read them with great pleasure. They are written in a thoroughly scholarlike way, and more especially it seems to me that your paper about the Lākṣmāṇa Sena era deserves very careful attention.”

4. The Mahābhārata and the Besnagar Inscription of Heliodoros

JASB, 1922, No. 5.

PROFESSOR H. JACOB. —“The verification of the Bhāgavata credo in the Besnagar inscription is a find on which you may be congratulated.”

PROFESSOR E. WASBURN HOPKINS. —“It is certainly a remarkable resemblance which you have established and I should be inclined to agree with your conclusion.”

PROFESSOR JARL CHARPENTIER. —“The identification of some words in this very important document with a passage in the Mahābhārata seems to be a most happy find.”

5. Political History of Ancient India

From the Accession of Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty

First Edition.

Royal 8vo. 350 pp. Price Rs. 4.

Published by the Calcutta University.

DR. L. D. BARNETT, LONDON.—“The author treats his materials with a certain degree of originality, but at the same time he preserves throughout a well-balanced judgment and never sacrifices critical caution to the passion for novel theories.......This interesting book.......shews judgment, ingenuity, and learning. And not the least of the author's merits is that he can write plain English.”

PROFESSOR HULTZSCH, HALLE, GERMANY.—“Your valuable work.......is the outcome of extensive researches and throws much light on the darkest and most debated periods of Indian history.”
You have succeeded in building up an intelligible account from the stray and imperfect materials which are available to the historian of those times."

**Professor Jolly, Würzburg, Germany.**—"Many thanks for your splendid volume. What an enormous mass of evidence has been collected and discussed in this work, an important feature of which is the quotation of the original texts along with their translation which makes it easy to control the conclusions arrived at. The ancient geography, not less than the ancient history of India, has been greatly furthered by your researches and much new light has been thrown on some of the most vexed problems of Indian Archaeology and Chronology. The indices are very copious and the study of your work is greatly facilitated by them."

**Professor Pelliot, Paris.**—"Le nom de l'auteur est garant du sérieux du travail."

**Professor J. A. F. Dantzig, Upsala, Sweden.**—"Professor Raychaudhuri belongs to a set of young Hindu scholars who, combining the traditional education of a Pandit with a thorough training in English, German or French Universities, have lately been carrying on deep and fruitful researches in the various domains of Indian lore. Even the student, who on essential points does differ widely from the opinions expressed by Professor Raychaudhuri, must willingly recognize his high merits as a scholar."
Some Contribution of South India to Indian Culture.

BY S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR, M.A., PH.D.


Dr. Aiyangar’s lectures form a contribution of some considerable value to the growing amount of literature on Indian anthropological studies. The author analyses the influences exerted on and by South India when orthodox Hinduism was tainted by alien influences, and shows how South India is responsible for the spread of Hindu Culture to the Eastern Islands and China. The whole work is full of interest to the inquirer, is of much value to the scholar and not without utility to the administrator.

Social Organisation in North-East India in Buddha’s Time.

BY RICHARD FICKE.


Translation from Die Soziale Gliederung in Nordostlichen Indien in Buddha’s zeit by Sisirkumar Maitra, M.A., Ph.D. Those ignorant of German will profit by reading this translation which is worthy of the book and of invaluable assistance to all interested in the social and administrative history of Buddhist India.
PUBLISHED BY THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA
1927