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PREFACE

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 Bhārata war to the rise of Buddhism as incapable of arrangement in definite chronological order. The author's aim has been to present materials for an authentic chronological history of Ancient India, including the neglected Post-Bhārata period, but excluding the Epoch of the Kanauj Empires which properly falls within the domain of the historian of Mediaeval India.

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

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

The writer of these pages offers his tribute of respect to the Hon'ble Sir Asutosh Mookerjee for providing opportunities for study which render it possible for a young learner to carry on investigation in the subject of his choice. To Professor D. R. Bhandarkar the author is grateful for the interest taken in the progress of the work. His acknowledgments are also due to Messrs. Girindramohan Sarkar and Rameschandra 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.

H. C. R.

*July 16, 1923.*
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POLITICAL HISTORY OF 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 researches of a multitude of scholars have disclosed an unexpected wealth of materials for the reconstruction of the ancient history of our country.

The first 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 political history of Ancient India including the neglected period. I have taken as my starting point the accession of Parikshit, which according to Epic and Paurāṇic tradition took place shortly after the Bhārata War.

Valuable information regarding the Pārīkshtita and the post-Pārīkshtita periods has been supplied by eminent
scholars like Oldenberg, Macdonell, Keith, Rhys Davids, Pargiter, Bhandarkar and others. But the attempt to give a connected history from Parikshit to Bimbisāra is, 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 pre-Bimbisārian period. 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-Pārikshita-pre-Bimbisārian age may be divided into five classes, viz.:—

I. Brāhmanical literature of the post-Pārikshita-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 Bṛhadāranyaka, Chhāndogya and other classical Upanishads.

That these works belong to the post-Pārikshita 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 Chhandogya 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-Bimbisāriān period. To this class belong the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. The present Rāmāyaṇa not only mentions Buddha Tathāgata (II. 169. 34), but distinctly refers to the struggles of the Hindus with mixed hordes of Yavanas and Śakas, यवनमित्रितानु (I. 54. 21). In the Kishkindhyā Kāṇḍa (IV. 43. 11-12), Sugrīva places the country of the Yavanas and the cities of the Śakas between the country of the Kurus and the Madras, and the Himalayas. This shows that the Greco-Scythians at that time occupied parts of the Pañjāb.

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 edūkas or Buddhistic monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. Thus in III. 190. 65 ‘They will revere edūkas, they will neglect the gods’; ib. 67 ‘the earth shall be piled with edūkas, not adorned with godhouses.’ With such expressions may be compared the thoroughly Buddhistic epithet, Cātur-mahārājīka 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 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 Mahāvaṁsa and the Aśokavādāna 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 Purāṇas.

III. The third class of literature comprises Brāhmaṇical works of the post-Bimbisārian period to which a definite date may be assigned, e.g., the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya who flourished in fourth century B.C., the Mahābhāshya of Patañjali (second century B.C.), etc. The value as dated literature 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 Paurānic 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-Śuṅga 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.

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 supply 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 Parikshit\'s.

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

Was there really a king named Parikshit? True, he is mentioned in the Mahâbhârata and the Purânas. 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 Paurânic account.

Parikshit appears in a passage of the Twentieth Book of the Atharva Veda Samhita (A.V., XX. 127. 7-10) as a king in whose realm, that of the Kuras, prosperity and peace abound. We quote the entire passage below.

"Râjñö viśvajanînasya yo devomartyām ati
Vaiśvânarasya sushtutimā sunotā Parikshitāh
Parichchhinah kshemamakarot tama āsanamācharan
Kulâyana kṛīvan Kauravyaḥ patirvadati jāyaya
Katarat ta āharāṇi dadhi manthām pari śrutam
Jāyāḥ patim vi prichchhati rāṣṭre rājñāḥ Parikshitāḥ
Abhīvasvah pra jihāte yavaḥ pakkaḥ patho bilam
Janaḥ sa bhadramedhati rāṣṭre rājñāḥ Parikshitāḥ"

"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 procured 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 not as a human king at all. But Zimmer and Oldenberg recognise Parikshit as a real king, a view supported by the fact that in the Aitareya and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas king Janamejaya bears the patronymic Parikshitā. Cf. the following passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 21).

"Etena ha vā Aindrena mahābhishekena Turah Kāvasheyo Janamejayam Pārikshitamabhishishecha."

Referring to king Parikshit Macdonell and Keith observe (Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 494). "The Epic makes him grand-father of Pratiśravas and great-grand-father of Pratipa." Now, the Epic has really two Parikshits, one a son of Avikshit or Anaśvā and an ancestor of Pratiśravas and Pratipa, the other a descendant of Pratipa and a son of Abhimanyu (Mahābhārata, Ādiparva, 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, Bhīmasena and Śrutasena (Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 520). The Epic Parikshit I, on the other hand, had only one son (Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 95, verse 42 of the Ādiparva of the Mahābhārata, and seven sons (Janamejaya, Kakshasena, Ugrasena, Chitrasena, Indrasena, Sūshena and Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 94, verses 54-55, and among these the name of Śrutasena does not occur. Even Janamejaya is omitted in Chapter 95 and in the Java text (JRAS, 1913). The Epic poet, therefore, was not quite sure whether this Parikshit (I) was the father of Janamejaya and Śrutasena. On the other hand, according
to the unanimous testimony of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas Parikṣhit II had undoubtedly a son named Janamejaya who succeeded him on the throne. Thus, the Mahābhārata, referring to Parikṣhit II, the son of Abhimanyu, says (I. 95. 85):

"Parikṣhit khalu Mādravatīṁ nāmopayeme tvan-mātaram. Tasyāṁ bhavāṁ Janamejayaḥ."

The Matsya Purāṇa says (Mat. 50. 57):

"Abhimanyoh Parikṣhittu putraḥ parapuraṇajayah
Janamejayaḥ Parikṣhitaḥ putraḥ paramadḥārmikah."

This Janamejaya had three brothers, namely, Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena:—"Janamejayaḥ Parikṣhitaḥ saha bhrāṭribhīḥ Kurukṣhetre dirgha satram upāste tasya bhrātara strayah Śrutasena Ugraseno Bhīmasena iti (Mbh. I. 3. 1).

Particulars regarding the son and successor of the Vedic Parikṣhit agree well with what we know of the son and successor of the Epic and Paurāṇic Parikṣhit II. Janamejaya, the son of the Vedic Parikṣhit, is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as a performer of the Aśvamedha. The priest who performed the sacrifice for him was Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka. On the other hand, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which also mentions his Aśvamedha names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. The statements of the 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 Parikṣhit II, says:

Dviraśvamedhamāhrītya mahāvājasaneyakaḥ
Pravartayitvā tain sarvam rishim Vājasaneyakam
Vivāde Brāhmaṇailḥ sārdhdhamabhīṣaptō vanain yayau.

(Mat. 50. 63-64.)
The quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas, alluded to in the last line, is also mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 27).

Parikṣhit II has thus a greater claim than Parikṣhit I to be regarded as identical with the Vedic Parikṣhit. It is, however, possible that Parikṣhit I and Parikṣhit II were really one and the same individual, but the Epic and Paurāṇic 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 Parikṣhit, but the names of most of the sons (in the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa the names of all the sons) are common to both, points to the same conclusion. We shall now later that a Kuru prince named Abhipratarin Kākhaseni (i.e., the son of Kākhasena) was one of the immediate successors of the Vedic Janamejaya. Kākhasena 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 Parikṣhit I, in chapter 94 of the Mahābhārata. This fact seems to identify the Vedic Parikṣhit with Parikṣhit I of the Epic. But we have already seen that other facts are in favour of an identification with Parikṣhit II. Parikṣhit I and Parikṣhit II, therefore, appear to have been really one and the same individual. That there was a good deal of confusion regarding the parentage of Parikṣhit, 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 Vīṣṇu Purāṇa. The latter work says (IV. 20. 1) "Parikṣhito Janamejaya Śrutasenograsena Bhīmasenāśchatvāraḥ putrāḥ." It then gives the names of Kuru princes down to the Pāṇḍuṣ and Parikṣhit II, and adds (IV. 21. 1) "Atahparam bhavyānahaṁ bhūmipālāṁ kirtayishye. Yaṁ śāṃpratam avanipatiḥ tasyāpi Janamejaya Śrutasenograsena Bhīmasenāḥ putrāśchatvāro bhavishyanti." The confusion
may have been due to the fact that according to one tradition Parikshit, the father of Janamejaya, was the ancestor of the Pāṇḍus, while according to another tradition he was their descendant, and the Epic and the Paurāṇic 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. This 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.

Many stories about Parikshit in the epic and the Purāṇas are obviously legendary. The only facts that can be accepted as historical are that he was a king of the Kurus, that the people lived prosperously under his rule, that he had many sons, and that the eldest 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 Sarasvatī to the Ganges, and was divided into three parts, Kurujāṅgala, the Kurus and Kurukshetra (Mbh. I. 109. 1). The boundaries of Kurukshetra are given in a passage of the Taittiriya Aranyaka (Vedic Index, I., pp. 169-70) as being Khāṇḍava on the south, the Tūrghna on the north, and the Parīnah on the west. Roughly speaking, it corresponded to the modern Sirhind. Within the kingdom flowed the rivers Dṛishadvatī, Kauśikī, Aruṇā and Sarasvatī, as well as the Āpayā. Here, too, was situated Śaryanāvant, which appears to have been a lake, like that known to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa by the name of
Anyatah-plaksha. According to Pischel there was also in Kurukshetra a stream called Pasyā.

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.

Gangayāpahṛite tasmin nagare Nāgasāhvaye
Tyaktvā Nichakshu nagaram Kauśāmbyāṃ sanivatsyati.
(Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 5.)

According to epic tradition the kings of Kurukshetra belonged to the Bharata family. The connection of the Bharatas with the Kuru country is amply attested by Vedic evidence. Oldenberg says (Buddha, pp. 409-410):—“We find in the Rīk-Samhitā 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 Bhāratī, the personified divine 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 Maṇḍala, which specially extols the Bharatas (III. 23), the two Bhāratas, Deva-gravas and Deva-vāta, are spoken of, who have generated Agni by friction: on the Drishadvatī, on the Āpayā, 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 Kuru-kshetra. 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 Bhāratī, the sacredness of the Sarasvatī and Drishadvatī.

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

Among those kings who are mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Ādi-pārva, Chapters 94 and 95) as ancestors and predecessors of Parikshit, the names of the following occur in the Vedic literature.

Puru-ravas Aila (Rig-Veda, X. 95: Sat-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), Pūru (R. V., VII. 8. 4; 18. 13), Bharata Dauhshanti Saudyumni (Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 11-12), Ajāmiḍha (R. V., IV. 44. 6), Riksha (R. V., VIII. 68. 15), Kuru (frequently mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa literature), Uchchailārvas (Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa III. 29. 1-3), Pratīpa Prātipatvanā or Prātipatvanā (Atharva Veda, XX. 129. 2), Balhika Pratipīya (Sat. Br., XII. 9. 3. 3), Śaṁtanu (R. V., X. 98), Dhṛitaraṣṭra Vaichitravīrya (Kāthaka Samhitā, X. 6).
The date of Parikshit is a matter regarding which the Vedic texts supply 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, Viṣṇu, and Bhāgavata Purāṇas), years before Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king of Magadha.

Mahāpadma-ābhishhekāṭṭu
Yāvajjānma Parikshitaḥ
Evaṁ varsha sahasraṁtṛu
Jñeyam pāṇeśaduttaram.

(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. (1359 B.C. according to the e Vāyu and Viṣṇu Purāṇas). If, on the other hand, we give credence to the testimony of the Vāyu Purāṇa (99. 328-329, “Aṣṭāvimśati varshāni prithivīm pālayishyatī,” 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 + 40 + 1,050 = 1412 B.C. (1377 B.C. according to the e Vāyu and Viṣṇu Purāṇas). He is said to have come to the throne 36 years later in 1376 or 1341 B.C. (cf. Mahābhārata Maushalaparva, “Shaṭṭrimiṣe tvatha samprāpte varshe,” etc., and Mahāprasthānikaparva, “abhiṣichya svarāje cha rājānañccha Parikshitam.”)

It is clear that epic and Paurānic 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 six generations of teachers from the time of Janaka and his contemporary Uddālaka Āruni. At the end of
the Kaushitaki Āranyaka (Adhyāya 15) we find a vāṃśa 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 vāṃśa. Adoration to the Brahman. Adoration to the teachers! We have learnt this text from Guṇākhya Śaṅkhāyana, Guṇākhya Śaṅkhāyana from Kahola Kaushitaki, Kahola Kaushitaki from Uddālaka Aruṇī."

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

From the passage quoted above it is clear that Śaṅkhāyana was separated by two generations from the time of Uddālaka who was separated by six generations from the time of Janamejaya. Śaṅkhāyana, therefore, flourished eight generations after Janamejaya, and nine generations after Parikshit. If this Śaṅkhāyana (Guṇākhya Śaṅkhāyana) be identical with the author of the Śaṅkhāyana Grihya 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 Kauśalya, i.e., an inhabitant of Kosala, and a contemporary of Kavandhi Kātyāyana. These facts enable us to identify him with Assalāyana of Śaṭvatthi mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya (II. 147 et seq) as a contemporary of Gotama Buddha and, hence, of Kakuda or Pakudha Kachchhāyana. Consequently Āśvalāyana must have lived in the sixth century B.C. If the identification of Guṇākhya Śaṅkhāyana with the Grihya Sutrakāra be correct, then he, too, must have lived in the sixth century B.C. Professor Rhys Davids in his Buddhist Suttas assigns 150 years to the five Theras from Upāli to Mahinda. We may therefore assign 270 years to the nine generations from Parikshit to Śaṅkhāyana, and place Parikshit in the ninth century B.C. It is, however,
possible that Guṇākhya Śāṅkhya-yāyana was not identical with the Grīhya Sūtrakāra (cf. S. B. E. XXIX, pp. 4-5).

Parikshit was succeeded on the Kuru throne by his eldest son Janamejaya. The Mahābhārata refers to a great snake sacrifice performed by this king. In this connection it is mentioned that the king conquered Taxila. Although a passage of the Pañchavimśa 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 a historical fact, because King Janamejaya is represented as a great conqueror in the Brāhmaṇas. Thus the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa says (VIII. 21) “Janamejayah Pārikshitah samantam sarvataḥ prithiviṁ jayan pariyāyāśvena cha medhyeneje tadesha bhī yajūa gāthā giyate :

Āsandivati dhānyadaṁ rukmiṇaṁ harita srajam
Āsvāṁ babandha sāraṅgaṁ devēbhyo Janamejaya iti”

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

“Evamvidāṁ hi vai mā mevaṁvīda yājayaṁti tasmā-dahāṁ jayāmyabhītvarīṁ senāṁ jayāmyabhītvāyā senayā namā divyā na mānushya ishava richchhantye shyāmi sarva māyuṁ sarva bhūmir bhaviṣhāyāmiti.”

The Purāṇas state that Janamejaya performed two horse sacrifices and had a dispute with Vaiśampāyana and the Brāhmaṇas. The Matsya version, which is considered by Pargiter to be the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for sometime, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest; but the Vāyu version has abridged the verses, and says he perished and the Brāhmaṇas made his son king. The Paurānic narrative is strikingly confirmed by the evidence of the Brāhmaṇas. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa refers to one
of the horse sacrifices, and says that the priest who performed the sacrifice for him was Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa mentions the other sacrifice and names Tura Kāvāsheya as his priest. It also contains a tale stating that at one sacrifice of his he did not employ the Kaśyapas, but the Bhūtāvīras. Thereupon a family of the Kaśyapas called Asita-mṛiga forcibly took away the conduct of the offering from the Bhūtāvīras. We have here probably the germ of the Paurāṇic stories about Janamejaya’s dispute with the Brāhmaṇas. An allusion to this quarrel occurs also in Kauṭiliya’s Arthaśāstra (Cf. “Kopāj Janamejayo Brāhmaṇeshu vikrāntāḥ”).

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

Janamejaya’s capital according to a gathā quoted in the Śatapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas was Āsandivat, probably identical with the famous city of Hāstinapura mentioned not only in the Mahābhārata, but also in the Rāmāyaṇa, II.68.13, and the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini, VI. 2. 101. The gathā 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.”


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 95.)
It was at the court of Janamejaya that Vaiśampāyana is said to have related the story of the great struggle between the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus. No direct independent proof of this war is forthcoming, but a dim allusion to the battle of Kurukshetra is probably contained in the following verse of the Chhāṇdogya Upanishad (VI.17.9).

Yato yata āvartate tad tad gachchhati mānavaḥ Kurun aśvābhīrakshati.

This gāthā has been referred to by Hopkins (The Great Epic of India, p 385).

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 silentio is always a weak argument, 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 calls Bhīma, Nakula and Sahadeva Kurus (Ind. Ant. I. p. 350). Hindu tradition is unanimous in representing the Pāṇḍavas as an offshoot of the Kuru race. The testimony of Buddhist literature points to the same conclusion. In the Dasa-Brāhmaṇa Jātaka (Jātaka No. 495) a king “of the stock of Yuddhitthila” reigning “in the kingdom of Kuru and the city called Indapatta” is distinctly called “Koravya” i.e., Kauravya—“belonging to the Kuru race.”

Already in the time of Âśvalāyana’s Grihya Sūtra (III. 4) Vaiśampāyana was known as Mahābhāratāchārya. Vaiśampāyana is also mentioned in the Taṅtiriya Âraṇyaka (I. 7. 5) and the Ashtādhyāyi 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 "Itiḥāsas" (A. V. XV. 6. 11-12). It is well known that the story recited by Vaiśampāyana to Janamejaya was at first called an Itiḥāsa and was named "Jaya" or victory, i.e., victory of the Pāṇḍus, the ancestors of the king.

"Muchyate sarva pāpebhyo Rāhuṇā Chandramā yathā Jayo nāmetiḥāso'yaṁ śrotavyo viṣṇiṣṭhunā"

(Mbh. Ādi. 62. 20).

Janamejaya's brothers, Bhīmasena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena appear in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII 5. 4. 3) and the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XVI. 9. 7) as performers of the horse-sacrifice. In the Bṛhadāranyaka Upanishad the question whither they have gone is made the subject of a philosophical discussion. It is clear that the Pārīkshitas had passed away before the time of the Upanishad, and it is also clear that there had been some serious scandal mingled with their greatness which they had atoned for by their horse-sacrifice. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa quotes a gāthā which says:—

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

The Purāṇas state that Janamejaya was succeeded by Śatānikā. Śatānikā's son and successor was Aśvamedhadatta. From Aśvamedhadatta was born Adhisimakrishṇa. Adhisimakrishṇa's son was Nichakshu. During king Nichakshu's reign the city of Hāstina-pura is said to have been carried away by the Ganges, and the king is said to have transferred his capital to Kauśāmbi (Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 5).
The Vedic texts do not refer to any of these successors of Janamejaya. The Rigveda no doubt mentions a king named Aśvamedha (V. 27. 4-6), but there is nothing to show that he is identical with Aśvamedhadatta. A Śatānīka Śatrājīta is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa as a great king who defeated Dhritarāṣṭra, the prince of Kāsi, and took away his sacrificial horse. He was probably a Bharata, but the patronymic Śatrājīta indicates that he was different from Śatānīka the son of Janamejaya. The Pañchaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa and the Chhāndogya Upanishad mention a Kuru king named Abhipratārīn Kākhaseni who was a contemporary of Girkshit Auckchamanyaya, Śaunaka Kāpeya, and Driti Ain-drota. As Driti Aindrota was the son and pupil of Indrota Dāvāpa Śaunaka the priest of Janamejaya (Vaiśā Brāhmaṇa; Vedic Index, Vol. I, pp. 27, 373), Abhipratārīn, son of Kākhasena, appears to have been one of the immediate successors of Janamejaya. We have already seen that Kākhasena appears in the Mahābhārata (I. 94.54) as the name of a brother of Janamejaya. Abhipratārīn was thus Janamejaya's nephew. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XV. 16. 10-13) refer to a prince named Vṛiddhadyumna Ābhipratārīṇa, apparently the son of Abhipratārīn. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (Trivedi's translation, pp. 322-323) mentions his son Rathagṛītasa and priest Suchivriksha Gaupālāyana. The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra informs us that Vṛiddhadyumna erred in a sacrifice, when a Brāhmaṇa prophesied that the result would be the expulsion of the Kurus from Kurukshetra, an event which actually came to pass.

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

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 Yuddhíthila gotta (Yudhishthira gotra), long after the destruction of Hastinapura, and the removal of the main line of Kuru kings to Kauśāmbi.

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 Kauśāmbi is proved by the evidence of Bhāsa. Udayana king of Kauśāmbi is described in the Svapnavāsavadatta (ed. Ganapati Śāstrī, p. 138) as a scion of the Bharata family:—

Bhāratānām kule jaṭo vinito jñānavādchhuchi
Tannārhasi balāddhartum rājadharmsya desıkah.

**Genealogy of the Pārikshita Family.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parikshita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janamejaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śatāntika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aśvamedhādatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhisimakrisna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīchakṣaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings of Kauśāmbi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. That the great Janaka was later than the Pārīkshitas admits of no doubt. We shall show later that he was a contemporary probably of Nichakshu, and certainly of Ushasti Chakrayana during whose time disaster befell the Kurus. In Janaka's time we find the prosperity, the sin, the expiation and the fall of the Pārīkshitas apparently still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of controversy in the royal court of Mithilā. In the Brihadāranyaka Upanishad we find a rival of Yājñavalkya, the ornament of the court of Janaka, testing him with a question, the solution of which the former had previously obtained from a Gandharva who held in his possession the daughter of Kāpya Patañchala of the country of the Madras:

"Kva Pārīkshitā bhavan" (Brihad Upanishad, III, 3.1) whither have the Pārīkshitas gone? The solution of which therefore appears to have been looked upon as extremely difficult.

Yājñavalkya answers: "Thither where all Aśvamedha sacrificers go."

Consequently the Pārīkshitas (sons of Parikshit) must at that time have been extinct. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people, and a subject of general curiosity.

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

Sadasya śchābhavad Vyāsaḥ putra śishya sahāyavān
Uddalakah Pramatakah Śvetaketuścha Pingalakah

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

The Vishnupurāṇa says that Śatānīka, the son and successor of Janamejaya, learned the Vedas from Yājñavalkya (Vishṇu, P. IV. 21. 2). The unreliability of the epic and Paurānic tradition in this respect is proved by the evidence of the Vedic texts. We learn from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5, 4, 1) that Indrota Daivāpa or Daivapi Šaunaka was a contemporary of Janamejaya. His pupil was Driti Aindrota or Aindroti according to the Jaiminiya Upanishad and Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇas. Driti's pupil was Pulusha Prāchīnayogya (Vedic Index, II, p. 9). The latter taught Paulushi Satyayajña. We learn from the Chhandogya Upanishad (V. 11. 1-2) that Paulushi Satyayajña was a contemporary of Buḍila Āsvataraśvi and of Uddalaka Āruni, two prominent figures of Janaka's Court (vide Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, V. 14. 8. "Janako Vaideho Buḍilam Āsvataraśvim uvācha"; and III. 7. 1). Satyayajña was therefore certainly a contemporary of Janaka of Videha. He was an elder contemporary because his pupil Somaśushma Śātyayajñī Prāchīnayogya is mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XI. 6, 2, 1-3) as having met Janaka. As Śātyayajñī certainly flourished long after Indrota Daivāpi Šaunaka, 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 Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, Tura Kāvasheya, the priest of Janamejaya, appears as a very ancient sage who was eleventh in the ascending line
from Sānjīvīputra, whereas Yājñavalkya, the contemporary of Janaka, was only fifth in the ascending line from the same teacher. We quote the lists below:—

Janamejaya Tura Kāvashēya
Yājñavachaś Rājastambhāyana
Kuṣri
Sāṇḍilya
Vātsya
Vāmakakshāyana
Māhitthi Yājñavalkya Janaka
Kautsa Āsuri
Māṇḍavya Āsurāyana
Māṇḍūkāyani Prāśniputra Āsurivāsin
Sānjīvīputra Sānjīvīputra

It is clear from what has been stated above that Janaka was separated by five or six generations from Janamejaya's time. Prof. Rhys Davids in his Buddhist Suttas (Introduction, p. xlvii) adduces good grounds for assigning a period of about 150 years to the five Theras from Upāli to Mahinda. If the five Theras are assigned a period of 150 years, the five or six teachers from Indrota to Somaśūshma, and from Tura to Vāmakakshāyana, the teacher of Māhitthi the contemporary of Yājñavalkya 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 Parikshita. If, following the Purāṇas, we place Parikshita in the fourteenth century B.C., we must place Janaka in the twelfth century. If, on the other hand, accepting the identification of Guṇākhya Śānkhaśāyana with the author of the Śānkhaśāyana Grihya Śūtra, we place Parikshita in the ninth century B.C., then we must place Janaka in the seventh century B.C.

The kingdom of Vidcha, over which Janaka ruled, corresponds roughly to the modern Tirhut in Bihār. It
was separated from Kosala by the river Sadānīrā, probably the modern Gaṇḍak 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 Gaṇḍakī from the Sadānīrā "Gaṇḍakīṇcha Mahāśoṇam Sadānīrām tathaivacha." Pargiter 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).

Mithilā, the capital of Videha, is not mentioned in the Vedic texts, but is constantly mentioned in the Jātakas and the epics. It is stated in the Suruchi Jātaka that the city covered seven leagues. We have the following description of Mithilā in the Mahājanaka Jātaka (Cowell’s Jātaka, 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,
Videha’s far famed capital, gay with its knights and
warrior swarms,
Clad in their robes of tiger-skins, with banners
spread and flashing arnis,
Its Brāhmins dressed in Kaṭi 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 Mithilā was founded by a king named Nimi. His son was Mithi, and Mithi’s son was Janaka I. The epic then continues the genealogy to Janaka II (father of Siṭā) and
his brother Kuṣadhvaja, King of Sāṅkāśya. The Vāyu (88, 7-8; 89, 3-4) and the Vishnu (IV.5.1) Purāṇas represent Nimi or Nemi as a son of Ikshvāku, and give him the epithet Videha (Saśāpēna Vasishṭhasya Videhah samapadyata—Vāyu P.) His son was Mithi whom both the Purāṇas identify with Janaka I. The genealogy is then continued to Stradhvaja who is called the father of Sītā, and is therefore identical with Janaka II of the Rāmāyaṇa. Then starting from Stradhvaja the Purāṇas carry on the dynasty to its close. The last king is named Kṛiti, and the family is called Janakavamsa.

Dhrīteṣu Vahulāśvo bhud Vahulāśva sutah Kṛitiḥ Tasmin santishṭhate vamśo Janakānām mahātmanām Vāyu Purāṇa (89, 23).

The Vedic texts know a king of Videha named Namī Sāpya (Vedic Index, I. 436). But he is nowhere represented as the founder of the dynasty of Mithilā. On the contrary, a story of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa seems to indicate that the Videha kingdom was founded by Videgha Māthava (Ved. Ind., II. 298; Śat. Br. 1. 4. 1, etc; Oldenberg’s Buddha, pp. 398-399. Pargiter, J.A.S.B. 1897, p. 87. et seq.), Videgha Māthava, whose family priest was Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, was at one time on the Sarasvatī. Agni Vaiśvānara thence went burning along this earth towards the east, followed by Māthava and his priest, till he came to the river Sadāntrā which flows from the northern mountain, and which he did not burn over. This river Brāhmaṇas did not cross in former times, thinking “it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara.” At that time the land to the westward was very uncultivated, and marshy, but at the time of Māthava’s arrival many Brāhmaṇas were there, and it was highly cultivated, for the Brāhmaṇas had caused Agni to taste it through sacrifices. Māthava the Videgha then said to Agni, “where
am I to abide?” “To the east of this river be thy abode,” he replied. Even now, the writer of the Satapatha Brähmana adds, this forms the boundary between the Kosalas and the Videhas. The name of the second king in the epic and the Paurānic lists, Mithi Vaideha, is reminiscent of Māthava Videgha.

If Māthava Videgha was the founder of the royal line of Mithilā, Nimi, Nemi or Namī must be a later king of Videha. In the Nimi Jātaka, Nimi is said to have been born to “round off” the royal house of Mithilā, “the family of hermits.” The combined evidence of Vedic and Buddhist texts thus shows that Nimi was not the first, but probably one of the later kings. The Majjhima Nikāya (II.74-83) and the Nimi Jātaka mention Makhādeva as the progenitor of the kings of Mithilā.

As the entire dynasty of Maithila kings was called Janaka vamsa (Vaṁśo Janakānām mahātmanām), 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 favours his identification with Siradhvaja of the Paurānic 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 Uddālaka Arunī and Buḍila Āsvatarāśvi frequented the courts of both these princes (Ved. Ind., II. 69; Chh. Up., V. 11. 1-4; Brīh. Up., III. 7).

It is more 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:
'Mithilā's palaces may burn
But naught of mine is burned thereby'

indeed reminds us of the great philosopher-king.

In the Mahābhārata (xii. 219.50) we find the same saying attributed to a king of Mithilā.

Api cha bhavati Maithilena gītam
Nagaramupāhitam agnīnābhivikṣhya
Na khalu mamahidahyate'tra kīchit
Svayam idamāha kila sma bhūmipālah.

The name of the king is given as Janaka (xii. 17. 18-19). In the Jaina Uttarādhyayana the saying is attributed to Nami (S. B. E., XLV. 37). This fact coupled with the mention of Nemi in juxtaposition with Arishṭa in the Vishnu Purāṇa (IV. 5. 13) probably points to the identification of Namī or Nemi with Mahā-Janaka II who is represented in the Jātaka as the son of Aritṭha. If Mahā-Janaka II was identical with Nami, he cannot be identified with Janaka who is clearly distinguished from Namī in the Vedic texts. It is tempting to identify the Vedic Janaka with Mahā-Janaka I of the Jātaka.

In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and in the Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad Janaka is called "Samrāṭ." This shows that he was a greater personage than a "Rājan." Although there is no trace in the Vedic literature of the use of the word "Samrāj" as Emperor in the sense of an overlord of kings, still the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa distinctly says that the Samrāj was a higher authority than a "Rājan"; "by offering the Rājasūya he becomes king, and by the Vājapeya he becomes Samrāj; and the office of king is the lower, and that of Samrāj the higher" (Śat. Br., V. 1. 1. 13; XII. 8. 3. 4; XIV. 1. 3. 8). In Āśvalāyana Śrauta-Sūtra X. 3. 14 Janaka is mentioned as a great sacrificer.
The court of Janaka was thronged with Brāhmaṇas from Kosala and the Kuru-Paṁchāla countries (e.g., Aśvala, Jāratkārava Ārtabhāga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Ushasta Chākrāyaṇa, Kahoda Kaushītakeya, Gārgī Vāchaknavī, Uddālaka Āruṇi, Vidagdha Śākalya). The tournaments of argument which were here held form a prominent feature in the third book of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad. The hero of these was Yājñavalkya Vājasaneya, who was a pupil of Uddālaka Āruṇi. Referring to Janaka’s relations with the Kuru-Paṁchāla 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 Upanishads 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. Paṁchāla
8. Kāśi
9. Kosala

Gandhāra included the north-western part of the Pañjab and the adjoining portions of the N. W. Frontier Province (Rāmāyaṇa vii. 113. 11; 114. 11; Sindhorubhayataḥ Pārśve). We learn from the Mahābhārata (XII. 207.43) that it formed a part of Uttarāpatha:

Uttarāpathajjanmānaḥ kirtayishyāmi tān api Yauna Kāmboja Gāndhāraḥ Kirāta Barbaraiḥ saha.
We learn from the epic and Paurānic literature that Gandhāra contained two great cities, *viz.*, Takshaśilā and Pushkarāvatī.

Gāndhāra vishaye siddhe, tayoh puryau mahātmanoḥ Takshasya dikshu vikhyāta ramyā Takshaśilā purī Pushkarasyāpi virasya vikhyāta Pushkarāvatī.


The remains of Takshaśila or Taxila are situated immediately to the east and north-east of Saraikala, a junction on the railway, twenty miles north-west of Rawalpindi. 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 Bhirmound (Marshall, A Guide to Taxila, pp. 1-4).

Pushkarāvatī or Pushkalāvatī (Prākrit Pukkalāoti, whence the Peucelaotis of Arrian) is represented by the modern Prang and Chārsadda, 17 miles N. E. of Peshawar, on the Suwāt river (Schöff, The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea, pp. 183-184; Foucher, Gandhāra, p. 11).

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 Mūjavants, 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 instructions in the three Vedas and the eighteen branches of knowledge.

In a significant passage of the Chhāndogya Upanishad (VI. 14) Uddālaka Āruṇi mentions Gandhāra to illustrate
the desirability of having a duly qualified teacher from whom a pupil "learns (his way) and thus remains liberated (from all 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 Gandhārebhyo’ bhinaddhāksham āniya tam tato’tijane visṛijet, sa yathā tatra prāṇ vā uḍān vādharān vā pratyan vā pradhmāyita—abhinaddhākshā ānīto’ bhinaddhāksho visṛisītāḥ. Tasya yathābhinahanāṁ pramuchya prabruyādetāṁ diśaṁ Gandhārā etāṁ diśāṁ vṛajēti. Sa grāmād grāmām pṛichchhan pāṇḍito medhāvī Gandhārāne vopasampadyeta, evamevehāchāryavyān 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 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 thou by this way.’ The sensible man proceeds from village to village, enquiring the way and reaches at last the (province) of Gandhāra. Even thus a man who has a duly qualified teacher learns (his way)."¹

¹ The full import of the illustration becomes apparent when we remember that the Uddālaka Jātaka (No. 487) represents Uddālaka as having journeyed to Takshaśila (Takkasila) and learnt there of a world-renowned teacher. The Setaketu Jātaka (No. 377) says that Setaketu, son of Uddālaka, went to Takshaśila and learnt all the arts. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions the fact that Uddālaka Ārūṇī used to drive about (dhāvayāṁ chakāra) amongst

¹ Dr. R. L. Mitra’s translation of the Chhāndogya Upanishad, p. 114.
the people of the northern country (Sat. 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 Takshaśilā as a university town. Pāṇini, himself a native of Gandhāra, refers to the city in sūtra iv. 3. 98.

The *Kekayas* were settled in the Pañjāb 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 their capital city, but we learn from the Rāmāyaṇa that the metropolis was Rājagriha or Girivraja (identified by Cunningham with Girjāk or Jalalpur on the Jhelam).

"Ubhau Bharata Śatrughnau Kekayeshu parantapau
Pure Rajagrihe ramye mātāmaha niveśane"

(Rām., II. 67. 7).

"Girivrajam puravaram śīghramāseduraṇjasā"

(Rām., II. 68. 22).

There was another Rājagriha-Girivraja in Magadhā, 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 Magadhā capital, the latter city was called "Girivraja of the Magadhās" (S. B. E., XIII, p. 150).

We learn from the Purāṇas (Matsya, 48. 10-20, Vāyu 99. 12-23) that the Uśīnaras, 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).

The king of Kekaya in the time of Janaka was Aśvapati who is probably identical with the king of the same name mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa as the father of
Yudhajít and Kaikeyí, and the grandfather of Bharata. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (X. 6. 1. 2) and the Chhāndogya Upanishad (V. 11. 4 et seq.) say that king Āsvapati instructed a number of Brāhmaṇas, e.g., Aruna Aupaveśi Gautama, Satyayajña Paulushí, Mahāsāla Jābāla. Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi, Indra-dyumna Bhāllaveya, Jana Śārkarakshya, Prāchīnaśāla Aupamanyava, and Uddālaka Ārūṇī.

The Jaina writers tell us that one-half of the kingdom of Kekaya was Aryan, and refer to the Kekaya city called "Śeyaviyā." (Ind. Ant., 1891, p. 375.)

Madra roughly corresponds to Sialkot and its adjacent districts in the central Panjāb. Its capital was Sākala or Sāgalanagara (modern Sialkot). This city is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (II.32.14) and several Jātakas (e.g., Kālingabodhi Jātaka, No. 479, Kusa Jātaka No. 531). The name of the ruler of Madra in the time of Janaka is not known. The Brāhadrāṇyaka Upanishad says that Madra was the native land of Kāpya Patañchala (see p. 16, ante; Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 126), one of the teachers of the celebrated Uddālaka Ārūṇī (Bṛhad. Up. III. 7.1). The Madra people were divided into two sections. The southern Madras lived in the Pañjāb. But the northern Madras, known as Uttara-Madras, are referred to in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa as living beyond the Himālayas in the neighbourhood of the Uttara-Kurus, probably, as Zimmer conjectures, in the land of Kāśmīr. The Madras are represented in the Mahābhārata and the Jātakas as living under a monarchical constitution.

The country of the Uśīnaras was situated in the Madhyadesa. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14) says "asyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratishtāyāṁ diśi" lie the realms of the Kuru Pañchālas together with Vaśas and Uśīnaras. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad
also the Uśinaras are associated with the Matsyas, the Kuru Pañchālas and the Vaśas. They probably lived in the northernmost part of the Madhyadesa for in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa the Uśinaras and Vaśas are mentioned just before the Udīcyas or northerners (Gop. Br., II. 9): Kuru Pañchāleshu Anga Magadhesu Kāsi Kausalyesu Śālva Matsyeshu sa Vaśa Uśinareshuddīchyeshu.

In the Kathāsaritsāgara (edited by Pandit Durgāprasād and Kāsināth Pāndurang Parab, third edition, p. 5) Uśinargiri is placed near Kanakhala the “sanctifying place of pilgrimage, at the point where the Ganges issues from the hills.” Uśinargiri is, doubtless, identical with Usiragiri of the Divyavadana (p. 22) and Usiradhva of the Vinaya Texts (Part II, p. 39). Pāṇini refers to the Uśnara country in the sūtras II. 4. 20 and IV. 2. 118. In sūtra II. 4. 20 Uśinara is mentioned in juxtaposition with Kantha (Kathaioi ?). Its capital was Bhoganagara or Bhojanagara (Mbh. V. 118.2).

The Rig Veda (X. 59. 10) mentions a queen named Uśinaraṇī. The Mahābhārata, the Anukramani and several Jātakas mention a king named Uśinara and his son Śibi (Mbh., XII. 29. 39; Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 103, Mahā-Kaṇṭha Jātaka, No. 469; Nimi Jātaka, No. 541; Mahā Nārada Kassapa Jātaka, No. 544, etc.). We do not know the name of Janaka's Uśinara contemporary. We learn from the Kaushitaki Upanishad that Gārgya Bālāki, a contemporary of Ajātaśatru of Kāsi, and of Janaka, lived for some time in the Uśinara 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 Vīrāta of the Mahābhārata, in whose court the five Pāṇḍava brothers resided incognito during the last year of their
Banishment. His capital has been identified with Bairat in the Jaipur State. Pargiter thinks that the Matsya capital was Upalavlya. But according to Nilkantha Upalavlya (Mbh. IV. 72.14) was "Virātanagara samipastha nagarāntaram."

The Matsyas 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. In the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa (I. 2. 9) they appear in connexion with the Śālavas, in the Kaushitaki Upanishad (IV.1) in connexion with the Usāinaras and the Kuru Pañchālas, and in the Mahābhārata in connexion with the Chadis (V. 74.16). In the Manu-Saṁhitā the Matsyas together with the Kurukshetras, the Pañchālas, and the Śurasenakas comprise the land of the Brāhmaṇa Rishis (Brahmarshi-desā).

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 9) 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)."

The Mahābhārata mentions the lake Dvaitavana as well as a forest called Dvaitavana which spread over the banks of the river Sarasvati (Mbh. III. 24-25).

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

The Kuru country fully maintained its reputation as the centre of Brāhmaṇical culture in the age of Janaka. Kuru Brāhmaṇas (e.g., Ushasti Chākrāyana) 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 Kuru, and led to an exodus of large sections of the Kuru people including Ushasti himself. The Chhândogya-Upanishad (I.10.1) says “Maṭachī-hateshu Kurushu ātīkyā saha jāyayā Ushastir ha Chākrāyaṇa ibhya-grāme pradrāṇaka uvāsa.” One commentator took Maṭachī to mean rakta-varnāḥ kshudra-pakshi viśeṣaḥ. Professor Bhandarkar says that the explanation of this commentator is confirmed by the fact that Maṭachī 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. Satānīka  ...  2. Driti Aindrota (son-and pupil)
3. Aśvamedhadatta  ...  3. Pulusha Prāchīnayogya (pupil)
4. Adhisūmakṛishṇa  ...  4. Paulushi Satyayajña (pupil)
5. Nichakshu  ...  5. Somaśushma Sātyayajña (pupil); Janaka's contemporary

Curiously enough it is Nichakshu who is represented in the Purāṇas as the remover of the seat of government from Hāstina pura 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 Proti Kauśāmbeya a contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi who figured in the court of Janaka. It is thus clear that Kauśāmbeya was a contemporary of Janaka. Now, Harīsvāmin in his commentary on the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa understood Kauśāmbeya to mean a 'native of the town of Kauśāmbi.' It is therefore permissible to think that Kauśāmbi existed in the time of Janaka, and hence of Nichakṣu. There is thus no difficulty in the way of accepting the Paurānic statement. According to the Purāṇaś 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 Maṭacāṭ. From this time the Kuruś 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).

Pañcāla roughly corresponds to the Budaon, Farrukhabad and the adjoining districts of the United Provinces. There is no trace in the Vedic literature of the epic and Jātaka division of the Pañcālas into northern (Uttara) and southern (Dakśina). But the Vedic texts knew a division into eastern and western, because the Saṃhitopanishad Brāhmaṇa makes mention of the Prāchya Pañcālas (Ved. Ind., I. 469). The most ancient capital of Pañcāla was Kāmpilya which has been identified with Kampil on the old Ganges between Budaon and Farrukhabad. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 7) mentions another Pañcāla town Parivakrā or Parichakrā identified by Weber with Ekachakrā of the Mahābhārata (Ved. Ind., I. 494).

The Pañcālas were also called Krivi in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Krivis appear in the Rig Veda as settled on the Sindhu (Indus) and Asiknā (Chenab). Oldenberg
observes (Buddha, p. 404) "We are to look to find in the people of the Pañchālas, of the stock of the Rik Saṃhitā, the Turvaças also as well as the Krivis." He supports the conjecture by quoting a passage of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 16) which says "when Śatrāsāha (king of the Pañchālas) makes the Aśvamedha offering the Taurvaças arise, six thousand and six and thirty clad in mail."

The Pañchālas also included the Keśins (Ved. Ind., I. 187) and probably the Śrīṇjayas (Pargiter, Mārkaṇḍeya Pūrāṇa, p. 353; Mbh. I. 138.37; V. 48.41). In Mbh., VIII. 11. 31 Uttamaujas is called a Pañchālya, while in VIII. 75. 9 he is called a Śrīṇjaya.

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. 363; II., pp. 95, 454). But they are not mentioned as Pañchāla kings. In the Mahābhārata Drupada is also called Yajñasena and one of his sons was named Śikhaṇḍin (Mbh. Ādi. 166. 24; Bhīsmā, 190, et seq.). A Śikhaṇḍin Yajñasena is mentioned in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa (VII. 4) but he is described not as a prince, but 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 Kurus. The Mahābhārata preserves traditions of conflict between the Kurus and the Pañchālas. We learn from chapter 166 of the Ādiparva that Uttara Pañchāla was wrested from the Pañchālas by the Kurus and given away to their preceptor. Curiously
enough the Somanassa Jātaka (No. 505) places Uttara Pañchālanagāra in Kururaṭṭha.

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

Among the most famous kings of the Pañchālas mentioned in the Vedic literature are Kraivya, Kesin Dālbbhya, Šona Sātrāsāha, Pravāhana Jaivali and Durmukha. Durmukha is also mentioned in the Kumbhakāra Jātaka (No. 408). His kingdom is called Uttāra Pañchālaraṭṭha and his capital Kampillanagāra. He is represented as a contemporary of Nimi, king of Videha. If Nimi be the penultimate king of Janaka’s family as the Nimi Jātaka (No. 541) suggests, 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 Āruṇī, Svetaketu, Šilaka Šālavatya, and Chaikitāyana Dālbbhya (Brihad. Up., VI. 2; Chh. Up., 1.S. 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 (Jātaka No. 391). It had its capital at Bārānasī also called Surundhana, Sudassana, Brahmavaddhana, Pupphavati, Ramma city, and Molini (Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 50-51). The walls of Bārānasī were twelve leagues round by themselves (Tāṇḍulanāli Jātaka).
The Kaśis, 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 Jātaka (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 Paurāṇic lists of Kāśi sovereigns (Vāyu 92. 21-74; Vishṇu IV. 8. 2-9), nor does the name of Dhrītarāśatra, king of Kāśi, who was defeated by Śatānīka Satrajita with the result that the Kaśis down to the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa gave up the kindling of the sacred fire. The Purāṇas represent the Kāśi family as 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 Kaśi.

In the Mahāgovinda Suttanta Dhataratṭha, king of Kāśi, who must be identified with Dhrītarāśtra, king of Kāśi mentioned in the Satapatha 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. Haritkrishna Dev (Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 56). The Matsya Purāṇa refers to a dynasty consisting of one hundred Brahmadattas:

Śataṁ vai Brahmadattānām
Virānāṁ Kuravaḥ śatam

(Matsya p. 273. 71.)

The “hundred Brahmadattas” are also mentioned in the Mahābhārata, II. 8. 23.

In the Dummedha Jātaka the name Brahmadatta is applied both to the reigning king and to his son. (Cf. the Susima Jātaka, the Kunimā Sapiṇḍa Jātaka, the Atthāna Jātaka, Lomasa Kassapa Jātaka, etc.).

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

mutto' mhi Kāsirājena Vedehena yasassinā ti.

In the Sambula Jātaka (No. 519) prince Sotthisena son of Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi 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.
Ajatasatru appears in the Upanishads as engaged in philosophical discussions with Gargya Balaki. 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 Ājātaśatrava who is said to have been bewitched by Uddālaka Āruni. Macdonell and Keith call him a king of Kāśi. He was apparently the son and successor of Ajatasatru (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.

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 Janaka was Ayodhya which stood on the banks of the Sarayu and covered twelve yojanas (Rām. I. 55-7). The Vedic works do not refer to the Ikshvaku king Daśaratha who is represented in the Rāmāyaṇa as the Kosalan contemporary of 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 Bāraṇaśī, and disavows Sītā’s connection with Janaka.

Kosala was probably the fatherland of Janaka’s Hotri priest Āśvala who was very probably an ancestor of Āśvalayana Kausalya mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad as a disciple of Pippalāda and a contemporary of Sukeśa Bhāradvāja and of Hiraṅyanābha, a Kosalan prince.

The details of Kosalan history will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.
Later Vaidehas of Mithila

The Purāṇas give the following lists of Janaka's successors:

:\textit{Vayu} (89. 18-23)

- Svāgataḥ Śakunena putraḥ
- Svuvarchā stat sutah śmṛitaḥ
- Śrutoyastasya dāyadāḥ
- Śusruta stasya chātmajāḥ
- Svusrusatasya Jayaḥ putro
- Jayasya Vijayaḥ sutah
- Vijayasya Ritaḥ putra
- Ritasya Sunayaḥ śmṛitaḥ
- Sunayād Viṭahavyastu
- Viṭahavyātmaḥo Dhrūtiḥ
- Dhrūtestu Vahulaśvo'bhūd
- Vahulaśva sutah Kritiḥ
- Tasmin santishthate vaṁśo
- Janakānāṁ mahātmanāṁ

:\textit{Vishnu} (IV. 5. 12-13)

- Sīradhvajasya patyam Bhānumān Bhanumataḥ Śatadyumnaḥ, tasya Śuṣitaḥ tasmād Urjavahonāma putro jajne—tasyāpi Satvariḍhvajaḥ, tataḥ Kuniḥ, Kumeranjanaḥ
- tatputraḥ Ritujit, tato' rishṭa-Nemiḥ, tasmāt Śrutāyuḥ, tataḥ Śūryāsvaḥ, tasmād Saṁjayaḥ, tataḥ Kshemārīḥ, tasmād Anenaḥ, tasmān Mīnarathaḥ, tasya Satyaratāḥ, tasya Śaṭyaratthiḥ, Śaṭyarattherupaguh, tasmāt Upaguptaḥ, tasmāt Śāśvataḥ, tasmāt Sudhanvā (Suvurchāḥ) tasyāpi Subhāṣaḥ, tataḥ Suśrūtaḥ tasmāj-Jayaḥ, Jayaputro Viṭayāḥ, tasya Ritaḥ, Ritāt Sunayāḥ tato Viṭahavyaḥ. Tasmād Sanjayaḥ
- tasmād Kshemāsvaḥ, tasmāt Dhrūtiḥ, Dhrūtee Vahulaśvaḥ, tasya putraḥ, Kritiḥ, Kritau santishthate, yaṁ
- Janaka vaṁśaḥ.
It will be seen that the two Paurānic lists do not wholly agree with each other. The Vāyu Purāṇa omits many names including those of Arishṭa and Nemi. The Vishnū Purāṇa, or the scribe who wrote the dynastic list contained in it, probably confounded the names Arishṭa and Nemi and made one out of two kings. Arishṭa is very probably identical with Ariṭṭha Janaka of the Mahā-Janaka Jātaka. Nemi is very probably the same as Nami of the Uttarādhhyayana Sūtra to whom is ascribed the same saying ("when Mithilā is on fire, nothing is burned that belongs to me") which is attributed to Mahā-Janaka II, son of Ariṭṭha, in the Mahā-Janaka Jātaka.

With the exception of Arishṭa and Nemi or Nami none of the kings in the Paurānic 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 Purānic lists are historical.

The Vedic texts mention besides Māthava and Janaka two other Vaideha kings, namely, Para Ālhāra and Namī Sāpya. Macdonell and Keith identify Para Ālhāra with Para Aṭnāra, king of Kosala, about whom we shall speak in a subsequent chapter. Namī Sāpya was probably identical with king Namī of the Uttarādhhyayana Sūtra, Nemi of the Vishnū Purāṇa, and Nimi of the Makhādeva Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Nimi Jātaka. 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 Uttarādhhyayana Sūtra (S. B. E., XLV. 87) he was a contemporary of Dummukha (Dvimukha) king of Pañchāla, Naggaji (Naggati) of Gandhāra, and of Karandu (Karakandu) of Kaliṅga. This synchronism accords with Vedic evidence. Durmukha the Pañchāla king had a priest named Brīhadukthta (Vedic Index, I. 370) 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 was a contemporary of Bhima king of Vidarbha and Nagnajit king of Gandhāra (Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII. 34). From this it is clear that Durmukha was a contemporary of Nagnajit. This is exactly what we find in the Kumbhakāra Jātaka and the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra.

In the Pañchavimśa or Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa (XXV. 10. 17-18) Namī is mentioned as a famous sacrificer. 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 Kalāra Janaka (Makhādeva Sutta of the Majjhimanikāya II. 82; Nimi Jātaka) 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 his Arthaśāstra Kauṭilya says "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." Karāla, the Vaideha, who perished along with his kingdom and relations, must be identified with Kalāra (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 Kāśi people had a share in the overthrow of the Vaideha monarchy. Already in the time of the great Janaka, Ajātaśatru king of Kāśi could hardly conceal his jealousy of the Videhan
king's fame. The passage "Yathā Kāśyo vā Vaideho vograputra ujjyam dhanau radhijyam kritvā dvau vāna vantau sapatnātivyādhinau haste kritvopotishthed" (Brihad Upanishad III. 8. 2.) probably refers to frequent struggles between the kings of Kāśi and Videha. The Mahābhārata (XII. 99. 1-2) refers to the old story (itihāsam purātanaṃ) of a great battle between Pratar-dana (king of Kāśi according to the Ramāyana VII. 48. 15) and Janaka king of Mithilā. It is stated in the Pāli commentary Paramatthajotikā (Vol. I, pp. 158-165) that the Lichchhavis, who succeeded Janaka's dynasty as the strongest political power in Videha, and formed the most important element of the Vajjian Confederacy, 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. Dākshinātya is found in Pāṇini (IV. 2. 98). Dakshināpatha is mentioned by Baudhāyana coupled with Surāśrtra (Bau. Sūtra I. 1. 29). It is however extremely difficult to say what Pāṇini or Baudhāyana exactly meant by Dākshinātya or Dakshināpatha.

Whatever may be 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 established several states in the Deccan. One of these states was Vidarbha. Vidarbha or Berar was certainly a famous kingdom in the time of Nami or Nimi. 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.

"Etam haiwa prochatuḥ Parvata Nāradau Somakāya Sāhadevyāya Sahadevyāya Sārūjayāya Babhrave Daivāvṛidhāya Bhīmāya Vaidarbhāya Nagnajite Gandhārāya."

Vidarbha therefore existed as an independent kingdom in the time of Nimi. The kingdom is mentioned in the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa (II. 440; Ved. Ind. II. 297). It was famous for its Māchalas (perhaps a species of dog) which killed tigers. The Praśna Upanishad mentions a sage of Vidarbha named Bhārgava as a contemporary of Asvālāyana. A sage called Vidarbhi Kaundineya is mentioned in the Brihadārānyaka Upanishad. The name Kaundineya is apparently derived from the city of Kūṇḍīna, the capital of Vidarbha (Mbh. III. 73. 1-2; Harivamsa, Vishnuparva, 59-60), represented by the modern Kauḍinīyapurā on the banks of the Wardhā in the Chandur 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, Nagnajit king of Gandhāra and Bhīma king of Vidarbha must be considered to be contemporaries of Karandu of Kaliṅga. It follows from this that the kingdom of Kaliṅga 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 Uttarādhayayana Śūtra. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta (Dialogues of the Buddha, II. 270) makes Sattabhu king of Kaliṅga a contemporary of Reṇu
king of Mithilā, and of Dhataraṭṭha or Dhṛitarāśṭra king of Kāśi (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 comprised the whole coast from the river Vaitaranī (Mbh. III. 114. 4) in Orissa to the borders of the Andhra territory. We learn from the Jātakas that the capital of Kalinga was Dantapuranagara (Dantakura, Mbh. V. 48. 76). The Mahābhārata mentions another capital called Rājapura (XII. 4. 3). The Jaina writers refer to a third city called Kaṃchanaṇapura (Ind. Ant. 1891, p. 375).

The Mahāgovinda Suttanta refers to another southern realm, namely, Assaka which existed in the time of Renu and Dhataraṭṭha (Dhṛitarāśṭra). 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 “dakshiṇasyāṃ diśi ye ke cha Satvataṁ rājano Bhaujyāyaivate ’bhishichyante Bhojetye-nānabhishiktānāchakshata.” 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 Asvamedha are referred to. These Satvats must have lived near Bharata’s realm, i.e., near the Ganges and the Yamunā (cf. Sat. Br. XIII. 5. 4. 11). But in the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa they must have moved southward. Their kings were called Bhojas. This account of the Satvats and the Bhojas, deduced from the Brāhmaṇical statements, accords strikingly with Paurāṇic evidence. It is stated in the Purāṇas that the Sātvatas and the Bhojas were offshoots of the Yadu family which dwelt at Mathurā on the banks of the Yamunā (Matsya, 43. 48; 44. 46-48; Vāyu, 94. 52; 95. 48; 96. 1-2; Vishṇu, 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; Vāyu 95. 35-36). We have evidence of a closer connection between the Bhojas and Vidarbha. The inclusion of a place called Bhojakaṭa in Vidarbha is proved by the Harivaṃśa (Vishṇu Parva, 60. 32) and the Mahābhārata (V. 157. 15-16). The Chammak grant of the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II makes it clear that the Bhojakaṭa territory was equivalent to the Ilichpur district in Berar or Vidarbha (J. R. A. S., 1914, p. 329). Dr. Smith says, "The name Bhojakaṭa '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 Asoka."

Kālidāsa 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 Brāhmaṇa refers to several Bhoja kings of the south. A line of Bhojas must have ruled in Daṇḍaka. A passage in the Arthaśāstra (Ed. 1919, p. 11) runs thus:

"Dāṇḍakyaṃ nāma Bhojaḥ Kāmāṭ Brāhmaṇā-kanyām abhimanyamānas sabandhu rāṣṭro vinanāśa"—a Bhoja known as Dāṇḍakya, or king of Daṇḍaka, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa girl, perished along with his relations and kingdom. We learn from the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka (No. 522) that the kingdom of Daṇḍaki had its capital at Kumbhavatī. According to the Rāmāyaṇa (VII. 92. 18) the name of the capital was Madhumanta.

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, namely, the Bhoja kingdoms, one of which was Vidarbha, and another, probably, Daṇḍaka, as well as Kaliṅga and Assaka (on the Godāvari, Sutta Nipāṭa S. B. E., X, pt. II, p. 184). With the exception of these states the whole of Trans-Vindhyan India was occupied by non-Aryan (dasyu) tribes such as the
Andhras, Ṣabararas, Pulindas and probably also the Mūtības (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 Krīshṇā. Mr. P. T. Srinivas Iyengar argues that the Andhras were originally a Vindhyan tribe, and that the extension of Andhra power was from the west to the east down the Godāvari and Krīshṇā valleys (Ind. Ant., 1913, pp. 276-8). Prof. Bhandarkar, however, points out that the Serivāṇij Jātaka places Andhapura, i.e., the pura or capital of the Andhras, on the river Telavāha which is either the modern Tel or Telingiri both not far distant from each other and flowing near the confines of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. (Ind. Ant., 1918, p. 71.)

The Ṣabararas and the Pulindas are described in the Matsya and the Vāyu Purāṇas as Dakshiṇāpathavāsīnāḥ, together with the Vaidarbhas and the Daṇḍakas:

Teshāṁ pare janapadā Dakshiṇāpathavāsīnāḥ
* * *
Kārūṃśāṣeça sahaishīkā ātabyāḥ Ṣabarāṣtathā
Pulinda Vindhya Pushikā Vaidarbha Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
(Matsya. 114. 46-48.)

Ābhīrāḥ Sahacaishīkāḥ ātabyāḥ Ṣabarāṣeṣa ye
Pulindā Vindhya Mulikā Vaidarbha Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
(Vāyu. 45, 126.)

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

Dakshiṇāpathajanmānaḥ sarvenaravarāndhrakāḥ
Guhāḥ Pulindaḥ Ṣabarās Chuchukā Madrakaiḥ saha.
(Mbh. XII. 207. 42.)

The capital of the Pulindas (Pulindanagara) probably lay to the south-east of Daśārṇa (Mbh. II. 5-10), i.e., the Vidiśā or Bhilsa 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 Sabaras, is not so certain. In the Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XV. 26. 6) the Mutibas are called Muchīpa or Mūvīpa. It is not altogether improbable that they are the people who appear in the Maṛkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (57. 46) under the designation of Mushika. A 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 the Paurānic scribes to introduce further variations.

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 Mahākosal, the father-in-law of Bimbisāra. But we know from the Buddhist Āṅguttara Nikāya that during this period there were sixteen states of considerable extent and power known as the Soloṣa Mahājanapada. These states were:

3. Aṅga 11. Machchha (Matsya)
5. Vajji 13. Assaka
7. Chetiya (Chedi) 15. Gandhāra

These Mahājanapadas flourished together during a period posterior to Kalāra-Janaka but anterior to Mahākosal, 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 Mahākosalapāla and formed an integral part of the Kosalan monarchy in the sixth century B.C.

The Jaina Bhagavatī Sūtra gives a slightly different list of the sixteen Mahājanapadas:

1. Aṅga
2. Baṅga
3. Magaha (Magadha)
4. Malaya
5. Mālava
6. Achehha
7. Vachchhha (Vatsa)
8. Kochehha (Kachchha?)
9. Pādha (Pāṇḍya?)
10. Lādha (Rājha)
11. Bajji (Vajji)
12. Moli
13. Kāsi
14. Kosala
15. Avaha
16. Sambhuttara (Sumhot-tara?)

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

Of the sixteen Mahājanapadas Kāsi was probably at first the most powerful. We have already seen that Kāsi probably played a prominent part in the subversion of the Videhan monarchy. Several Jātakas bear witness to the superiority of its capital Benares over the other cities, and the imperial ambition of its rulers. The Guttila Jātaka (No. 243) says that the city of Benares is the chief city in all India. It extended over twelve leagues
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(“dvâdasayojanikam sakala Bârânasinagaram”—Sam-bhava Jâtaka, No. 515; Sarabha-miga J. 483; Bhûridatta J. 543) whereas Mithilâ and Indapatta were each only seven leagues in extent (Suruchi J. 489: Vidhurapandîta J. 545). Several Kâsi monarchs are described as aspirants for the dignity of “sabbarâjûnam aggarâjâ,” and lord of sakala-Jambudîpa (Bhaddasâla Jâtaka, 465; Dhanasâkha Jâtaka 353). The Mahâvagga also mentions the fact that Kâsi was a great realm in former times:

“Bhûtapubbhâ bhikkhave Bârânasiyam Brahmadatto nàma Kâsirâjâ ahosi adhâho mahaddhano Mahabhogo mahabbalo mahâvâhano mahâvijito paripunçakosa kot- thai gâro.”

(Mahâvagga X. 2. 3; Vinaya Piṭakam I. 342.)

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

Already in the Brâhmaṇa period a king of Kâsi named Dhâtitarâsîtra attempted to offer a horse sacrifice, but was defeated by Sâtrâjîta Satânîka with the result that the Kâsis, down to the time of the Satapatha Brâhmaṇa, gave up the kindling of the sacred fire (Sat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 19). Some of the other Kâsi monarchs were more fortunate. Thus in the Brahmâchatta Jâtaka (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 Savatthi and took the king prisoner. The Kosambi Jâtaka (No. 428), the Kunâla Jâtaka (No. 536) and the Mahâvagga (S.B.E., Vol. XIII, pp. 294-299) refer to the annexation of the kingdom of Kosala by the Brahmadattas of Kâsi. The Assaka Jâtaka (No. 207) refers to the city of Potali, the capital of Assaka in Southern India, as a city of the kingdom of Kâsi. Evidently the reigning prince of Potali was a vassal of the sovereign of Kâsi. In the Sona-Nanda
Jātaka (No. 532) Manoja, king of Benares, is said to have subdued the kings of Kosala, Ánga, and Magadha. In the Mahābhārata (XIII. 30) Pratardana king of Kāśi, is said to have crushed the power of the 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 Kāśi was at one time a stronger power than many of its neighbours including Kosala.

Prof. Bhandarkar has pointed out that several Kāśi 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 Bhallātiya of Jātaka No. 504 are mentioned in the Purāṇas as Vishvakasena, Udakasena, and Bhallāta (Matsya 49. 57 et seq.; Vāyu 99. 180 et seq.; Vishnū IV. 19. 13).

We know from the Bhojājāniya 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 mediæval Rome, being the coveted prize of its more warlike but less civilized neighbours.

The kingdom of Kosala was bounded on the west by Pañchāla, on the south by the Sarpikā or Syandikā (Sai) river (Rām II. 49.11-12; 50.1), on the east by the Sadānīrā which separated it from Videha, and on the north by the Nepal 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 Āditchas by family, Sākiyas by birth; from that family I have wandered out, not
longing for sensual pleasures." This passage leaves no room for doubt that the Sākiyas or Sākyas 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 khattiyo, Bhagavā pi Kosalako, aham pi Kosalako, Bhagavā pi āsitiko, aham pi āsitiko."

Kosala proper contained three important cities, namely, Ayodhyā, Sāketa and Sāvatthi or Śrāvasti.

Ayodhyā (Oudh) was a town on the river Sarayū. Sāketa is often supposed to be the same as Ayodhyā, 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 Viśālā or Vaiśālī (Rāmāyaṇa I. 47. 11-12), at Mithilā (Vāyu. P. 89. 3) and at Kusināra (The Kusa Jātaka 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:

Mandhātri 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 Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 3. 12) he is called an Aikshvāka.

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

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

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

Bhagiratha (Vāyu 88. 167) is mentioned in the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa (IV. 6. 12) and is called Aikshvāka.

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

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

Rāma (Vāyu 88. 185) may be the person of the same name mentioned in the Rig Veda (X. 93. 14). But Rāma in the Vedic passage is not connected with either the Ikshvāku family or with Kosala.
Hiranyanābha 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 Āṭnāra Haṁyanābha, the Kosala king mentioned in a gāthā occurring in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XIII. 5. 4. 4. According to the Praśna Upanishad Hiranyanābha was a contemporary of Sukēṣā Bhāradvāja (VI. 1) who was himself a contemporary of Kausalya Āśvalāyana (Prāśna I. 1). If it be true, as seems probable, that Āśvalāyana of Kosala is identical with Assalāyana of Śaṭvatāyaṇa that Assalāyana 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 Hiranyanābha, too, must have lived in that century. The patronymic "Hairanyanābha" of Para Āṭnāra probably indicates that he was a son of Hiranyanābha.

Some of the later princes of the Paurāṇic list (e.g. Śākya, Śuddhodana, Siddhārtha, Rāhula and Prasenajit) are mentioned in Buddhist texts. The relations of Hiranyanābha 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 Paurāṇic 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., Trasadasyu, king of the Pūrus (Rig Veda, IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3), Ruparpāṇa, king of Ṣaphāla (Baud. Śrauta Śūtra, XX. 12), Sudhodana of Kapilavastu and Prasenajit, king of Śrāvasti, 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 Śrāvastī, is represented as the lineal successor of Siddhārtha, and Rāhula, 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 Āṭnāra and Mahākosalā.

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

It is not easy to find out all the kings of the Paurānic list who actually ruled over Kosala. The names of some of the earlier kings of the Paurānic list, *e.g.*, Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Hariśchandra, Rohita, Rituparna and a few others, are omitted from the dynastic list of the kings of Ayodhyā given in the Rāmayāṇa (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 Rājās mentioned in the Paurānic list who are known from Vedic and early Buddhist texts to have reigned in Kosala, or over some part of it, are Hiranyanābha, Prasenajit and Śuddhodana.

The Vedic texts mention another king named Para Āṭnāra. The Buddhist works mention a few other kings of Kosala, but their names do not occur in the epic and Paurānic lists. Some of these kings had their capital at Ayodhyā, others at Sāketa, and the rest at Śrāvasti. Of the princes of Ayodhyā the Ghata Jātaka (No. 454) mentions Kālasena. A Kosalarāja reigning in Sāketa is mentioned in the Nandiyaṃgī Jātaka (No. 385). Vaṅka, Mahākosalā and many others had their capital at Savatthī or Śrāvasti. Ayodhyā seems to have been the
earliest capital, and Sāketa the next. The last capital was Śrāvastī. Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town in Buddha's time (Buddhist India, p. 34), but Sāketa and Śrāvastī were included among the six great cities of India (Mahāparinibbāna Sūṭta, S.B.E. XI, p. 99).

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. (Dīghīti nāma Kosalarājā ahosi daliddo appadhano appabhogo appabalo appavāhano appavijito aparipuṇṇakosakotṭhāgāro).

In the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. Kosala was a mighty kingdom which contended first with Kāsi, and afterwards with Magadha for the mastery of the Madhyadesā. 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. The Aṅga dominions, however, at one time included Magadha and extended to the shores of the sea. The Vidhura Pāṇḍita Jātaka (No. 545) describes Rajagriha as a city of Aṅga. The Śānti Parva of the Mahābhārata (29.35) refers to an Aṅga king who sacrificed on Mount Vishnupada at Gayā. The Sabhā-parva (44.9) mentions Aṅga and Vaṅga as forming one Vishaya or kingdom. The Kathā-sarit-sagara says that Viṭānkapur, a city of the Aṅgas, was situated on the shore of the sea (Tawney, Kathā-sarit-sagara, II, ch. 82, p. 272; I, ch. 25, pp. 206, 207; ch. 26, p. 225).

Champā, the famous capital of Aṅga, stood on the river of the same name (Jātaka 506; modern Chāndan) and the Ganges (Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, 181). Cunningham points out that there still exist near Bhāgalpur
two villages, Champanagara and Champapura, which most probably represent the actual site of the ancient capital. It is stated in the Purāṇas and the Harivamśa that the ancient name of Champā was Mālinī (Matsya, 48. 97; Vāyu, 99. 105-06; Hariv. 32. 49; cf. Mbh. XII. 5. 6-7):

Champasya tu purī Champā
Ya Mālinyabhavat purā.

In the Jātaka stories the city is also called Kāla-Champā. In the Mahā-Janaka Jataka (No. 539) it is stated 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 Rājagriha, Śrāvasti, Sāketa, Kauśāmbī, and Benares (Mahāparinibbāna Sutta). Champā increased in wealth and traders sailed from it to Suvarṇabhûmi for trading purposes (Jātaka, Camb, Ed. VI, 539, p. 20). Emigrants from Champā to Cochin China named their settlement after this famous Indian city (Ind. Ant. VI. 229, Itsing, 58).

Aṅga is mentioned 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 Aṅga. It is related in that epic that Madana having incurred the displeasure of Mahādeva fled from the hermitage of the latter to escape his consuming anger, and the region where “he cast off his body (Aṅga)” has since been known by the name of Aṅga (Nundolal Dey, Notes on Ancient Aṅga, J. A. S. B., 1914, p. 317). The Mahābhārata attributes the foundation of the Aṅga 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 Dhataratthā of Áṅga (Dialogues of the Buddha, II, 270). The Buddhist texts mention a queen named Gaggarā who gave her name to a famous lake in Champā. The Puraṇas (Matsya, 48. 91-108; Vāyu 99. 100-112) give lists of the early kings of Áṅga. One of these kings Dadhivāhana is known to Jaina tradition. The Puraṇas and the Harivamśa (32.43) represent him as the son and immediate successor of Áṅga. Jaina tradition places him in the beginning of the sixth century B.C. His daughter Chandana or Chandravālā was the first female who embraced Jainism shortly after Mahāvira had attained the Kevaliship (J.A.S.B., 1914, pp. 320-321). Śatānīka, king of Kauśāmbī attacked Champā, 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 Áṅga and Magadha (Champeyya Jātaka). The Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka describes Rājagriha as a city of Áṅga, while the Mahābhārata refers to a sacrifice which an Áṅga king performed at Mt. Vishṇupada at Gayā. These facts probably indicate that at one time the Áṅga king annexed Magadha. Brahmadatta, king of Áṅga, is actually known to have defeated Bhaṭṭiya, king of Magadha. Áṅga had, at this time, an ally in the king of the Vatsas. Śrī Harsha speaks of a king of Áṅga named Driḍhavarmma being restored to his kingdom by Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī (Priyadarśikā, Act IV).

The destruction of the kingdom of Áṅga was effected by Bhaṭṭiya'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 Rājagriha (J.A.S.B., 1914, p. 321).
Magadha corresponds roughly to the present Patna and Gaya districts of Bihar. Its earliest capital was Girkvraja, or old Rajagriha, near Rajgir among the hills near Gaya. The Mahavagga (S.B.E., XIII, 150) calls it Giribbaja of the Magadhas to distinguish it from other cities of the same name (cf. Girkvraja in Kekaya). The Mahabhbara calls it Girkvraja and Magadhapor (Goratham girimasadya dadhisur Magadhampuram II. 20. 30) and says that it was an impregnable city, puram duradharsham samantatah, being protected by five hills, Vaihara "Vipula sailo," Varaha, Vrishabha, Rishigiri and Chaityaka. From the Ramayana we learn that the city had another name Vasumati (I. 32. 8). The Life of Hiuen Tsang (p. 113) mentions another name, Kusagarapura.

In a passage of the Rig Veda (III. 53. 14) mention is made of a territory called Kikata ruled by a chieftain named Pramaganda. Yaska (Nirukta VI. 32) declares that Kikata was the name of a non-Aryan country. In later works Kikata is given as a synonym of Magadha (cf. Bhagavata Purana I. 3. 24 Buddhonamnaijanasutah Kikateshu bhavishyati).

The name Magadha first appears in the Atharva Veda (V. 22. 14) where fever is wished away to the Gandhiris, Muvavants, Angas, and Magadhas. The men of Magadha are always spoken of in the Vedic literature in terms of contempt. In the Vrata (XV) book of the Atharva Samhita, the Vrata, i.e., the Indian living outside the pale of Brahmanism, is brought into very special relation to the Pumschali and the Magadha, faith is called his harlot, the Mitra his Magadha (Weber Hist. Ind. Lit., p. 112). In the Srauta Sutras the equipment characteristic of the Vrata is said to be given, when the latter is admitted into the Aryan Brahmanical community, to the so-called Brahmananas living in Magadha (Brahmanbandhu Magadhadesiya, Vedic Index II. 116). The
Brāhmaṇas of Magadha are here spoken of in a sneering tone as *Brahma bandhu*. The Vedic dislike of the Magadhas was in all probability due, as Oldenberg (Buddha 400,n) thinks, 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 Bṛihadratha, the son of Vasu Chaidyoparichara, and the father of Jarasandha. The Rāmāyaṇa (I. 32. 7) makes Vasu himself the founder of Girivraja or Vasumati. A Bṛihadratha 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 Jarasandha. The Purāṇas give lists of the Bṛahadratha kings from Jarasandha's son Sahadeva to Ripuñjaya. But in the absence of independent external corroboration it is not safe to accept the Purānic accounts of these princes as sober history. The Bṛahadrathas 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 Bṛahadratha dynasty came to an end in the sixth century B.C. The Jaina writers mention two early kings of Rājagriha named Samudravijaya and his son Gaya (S.B.E., XLV, 86). Gaya is said to have reached perfection which has been taught by the Jinas. But very little reliance can be placed on the uncorroborated assertions of late Jaina writers.

The second Magadhan dynasty, according to the Purāṇas, was the Śāisūnāga dynasty founded by a king named Śisunāga. Bimbisāra, the contemporary of Buddha,
is said to have belonged to this dynasty. The Mahāvamśa however makes Susunāga the founder of a dynasty which succeeded that of Bimbisāra. The Purāṇas themselves relate that Śiṣunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and will be king:

Ashta-trimsachchhatam bhāvyāḥ
Prādyotāḥ pañcha te sutāḥ
Hatvā teshāṁ yaśāḥ kṛiṣṇam
Śiṣunāga bhavishyati.

(Vāyu Purāṇa, 99, 314).

If this statement be true, then Śiṣunāga must be later than the first Pradyota, namely Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena, who was, according to the early Pāli texts, a contemporary of Bimbisāra. It follows that Śiṣunāga must be later than Bimbisāra. But we have seen that the Purāṇas make Śiṣunāga an ancestor of Bimbisāra. Thus the Purāṇas, in their present form, are self-contradictory. The inclusion of Vārānasī within Śiṣunāga’s dominions (Dynasties of the Kali Age, 21), proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru who were the first to establish Magadhan authority in Kāśi. The Mālālañkārāvatthu tells us (S.B.E., XI, p. xvi) that Rājagriha lost her rank of royal city from the time of Śiṣunāga. This indicates that Śiṣunāga came after the palmy days of Rājagriha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. Prof. Bhandarkar in his Carmichael Lectures, 1918, accepts the Ceylonese version and rejects the Paurāṇic account of Bimbisāra’s lineage. He makes Bimbisāra the founder of a dynasty, and says that he was a general who carved out a kingdom for himself at the expense of the Vajjis. The Mahāvamśa however states (Geiger’s translation, p. 12) that Bimbisāra was anointed king by his own father when he was only 15 years old. Mr. Nundolal Dey mentions Bhaṭṭīya as the name of the father (J.A.S.B., 1914, 321). We have already
mentioned his defeat at the hands of Brahmadatta, king of Aṅga. 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 Kalinga.

The Vajjis, according to Prof. Rhys Davids and Cunningham, included eight confederate clans (āṭṭhakula), of whom the Videhans and the Lichchhavis were the most important. Among the other clans we may mention the Jñātrikas and the Vajjis proper.

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

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

Viśālāṁ nagarim ramyāṁ divyāṁ svargopamāṁ tadā.

We learn from the introductory portion of the Ekapanā Jātaka (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 Jñātrikas were the clan of Siddhārtha and his son Mahāvīra the Jina. They had their seats at Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma and Kollāga, suburbs of Vesālī. Nevertheless they were known as “Vesālie,” i.e., inhabitants of Vesālī (Hoernle, Uvāsagadasāṇo, II, p. 4n).

The Vajjis or Vrijis are mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. 2. 131). Kautilya (Mysore Edition, 1919, p. 378) distinguishes the Vrijikas or Vajjis from the Lichchhivikas. Yuan Chwang (Watters, II. 81) also distinguishes the
Fu-li-chih (Vriji) country from Fei-shhe-li (Vaisāli). 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 sometimes associated with the city of Vēsāli which was not only the capital of the Lichchhavi clan, but also the metropolis of the entire confederacy. (Cf. Majjhima Nikāya, II. 101; the Book of the Kindred Sayings, Samyutta Nikāya, by Mrs. Rhys Davids, pp. 257, 259.) A Buddhist tradition quoted by Rockhill (Life of Buddha, p. 62) mentions the city of Vēsāli as consisting of three districts. The three districts were probably at one time the seats of three different clans. The remaining clans of the confederacy resided in the suburbs like Kundagrāma, Kollāga, Vāniyagāma, etc.

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; Vishṇu, IV. 1. 18) state that Viśāla, too, was at first ruled by kings. The founder of the Vaisālikas dynasty is said to have been Viśāla, a son of Ikshvāku according to the Rāmāyana; a descendant of Nābhāga, the brother of Ikshvāku, according to the Purāṇas. Viśāla is said to have given his name to the city. After Viśāla came Hemachandra, Suchandra, Dhumrāśva, Śṛiṇjaya, Sahadeva, Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kākutstha and Sumati. We do not know how much of the Rāmāyānic and Paurānic account of the Vaisālikas nṛipas can be accepted as sober history. A king named Sahadeva Sārījaya is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (II. 4, 4, 3. 4) as having once been called Suplan Sārījaya, and as having changed his name because of his success in performing the Dakshāyaṇa Sacrifice. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34, 9) he is mentioned with Somaka Sāhadevya. None of these kings, however, are connected with Vaisāli in the Vedic literature.
The Vajjian confederation must have been organised after the fall of the royal houses of Videha. 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 Mithilā has already been stated. Regarding the change at Viśāla we know nothing,

Several eminent scholars have sought to prove that the Lichhavīs, the most famous clan of the Vajjian confederacy, were of foreign origin. According to Dr. Smith the Lichhavīs 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 Lichchhavīs were originally Persians and came from the Persian city of Nisibi.² Indian tradition is, however, unanimous in representing the Lichchhavīs as Kshatriyas. Thus we

¹ Ind. Ant., 1903, p. 238.
² Ind. Ant., 1908, p. 78.
read in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta "and the Lichchhavis of Vesāli heard the news that the Exalted One had died at Kusinārā. 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 Kalpa Sūtra Tris'ala, 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 says (X, 22):

Jhallo Vallaścha rājanyād vrātyāṇ Nīchchhivireva cha Naṭaścha Kasaṇaśchaiva Khaso Drāviḍa 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 Drāviḍas referred to in Manu's sloka and the Gurjara-Pratihāras of mediæval times. But, unlike the Pratihāras and Drāviḍas, 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 Vṛatyā Rājanyas. The great mediæval Rājput families (though sometimes descended from foreign immigrants) were never spoken of in these terms. On the contrary, they were supplied with pedigrees going back to Rāma, Lakṣhmaṇa, Yadu, Arjuna and others. My impression is that a body of foreigners, who were unfriendly towards the Brāhmaṇas, could not have been accepted as Kshatriyas. The obvious conclusion seems to be that the Lichchhavis were indigenous Kshatriyas who were degraded to the position of Vṛatyas when they became champions of non-Brāhmaṇical creeds. The Pāli commentary
Paramatthajotikā (Vol. I, pp. 158-165) contains a legend regarding the Lichchhavis which traces their origin to a queen of Benares.

The date of the foundation of the Lichchhavi power is not known. But it is certain that the authority of the clan was firmly established in the time of Mahāvīra 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 Tāvatiṃsa gods, gaze upon this company of the Lichchhavis, behold this company of the Lichchhavis, compare this company of the Lichchhavis—even as a company of Tāvatiṃsa gods.”

Buddhist tradition has preserved the names of eminent Lichchhavis like prince Abhaya, Otthaddha, Mahāli, general Siha, Dummukha and Sunakkhatta.¹

In the introductory portions of the Ekapanna (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 Gaṇarājjas of Kāsi-Kośala. We learn from the Nirayāvalī Sūtra that an important leader of this confederacy was Chetaka ² whose sister Triśalā or Videhadattā was the mother of Mahāvīra, and whose daughter Chellanā or Vedehi was, according to Jaina writers, the mother of Kūnīka-Ajātaśatru.

The destruction of the confederacy of Vaiśālī was the work of Ajātaśatru. The preliminaries to the conquest

¹ Anguttara Nikāya, III, 74; Mahāli Sutta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, p. 198; Mahāvagga, SBE., XVII, p. 108; Majjhima N., I. 234; 68; II. 252; The Book of the Kindred Sayings, 295.

² In the opinion of several scholars Chetaka was a Lichchhavi. But the secondary names of his sister (Videhadattā) and daughter (Vedehi) probably indicate that he was a Videhan domiciled at Vesālī.
of Vesāli are described in the Mahāvagga and the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (SBE., XVII, p. 191; XI, pp. 1-5).

The Malla territory had for its capital the city of Kusāvatī or Kusinārā (Kusa Jātaka No. 531; Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 161-162). The exact site of Kusinārā is not yet known. In the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta it is stated that the Sāla Grove of the Mallas, the Upavattana of Kusinārā lay near the river Hiranyavatī. Smith identifies the Hiranyavatī with the Gaṇḍak and says that Kuśinagara (Kusinārā) was situated in Nepāl, beyond the first range of hills, at the junction of the Little, or Eastern Rāptī with the Gaṇḍak (EHI., p. 159n). He, however, adds that the discovery in the large stupa behind the Nirvāṇa temple near Kasia of an inscribed copper plate bearing the words "[parini] r vāna-chaitye tāmrapatṭa iti," has revived and supported the old theory, propounded by Wilson and accepted by Cunningham, that the remains near Kasia (on the Chota Gandak), in the east of the Gorakhpur District, represent Kuśinagara.

The Mallas together with the Lichchhavis are classed by Manu as Vrātya Kshatriyas. They too, like the Lichchhavis, were ardent champions of Buddhism. In the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta they are sometimes called Vāseṭṭhas (Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 162, 179, 181).

Like Videha, Mallaraṭṭha (Mallarāśṭra, Mbh., VI. 9. 44) had a monarchical constitution at first. The Kusa Jātaka mentions a Malla king named Okkāka (Ikshvāku). The name Okkāka probably indicates that like the Sākyas (cf. Dialogues, Part I, pp. 114-115) the Malla kings also belonged to the Ikshvāku family. The Mahāsudassana Sutta mentions another king named Mahāsudassana (SBE., XI, p. 248). These kings Okkāka and Mahāsudassana may or may not have been historical individuals. The important
thing to remember is that Mallarattha 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; Kautīlya's Arthaśāstra, 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 Kusinārā.

The Mallas had two other important cities namely Pāvā (SBE., XI, p. 133) and Bhoga-nagara (Sutta Nipāta, 194, Uvāsagadasāo, II, Appendix, p. 57).

The relations of the Mallas with the Lichchhavis were sometimes hostile and sometimes friendly. The introductory story of the Bhaddasāla Jātaka (No. 465) contains an account of a conflict between Bandhula the Mallian (Commander-in-chief of the king of Kosala) and 500 kings of the Lichchhavis. The Jaina Kalpasūtra, however, refers to nine Mallakis as having formed a league with nine Lichchhavis, and the eighteen Gaṇarājyas 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 (paritāḥ Kurūṇ, Mbh. IV. i. 11) and lay near the Jumna

¹ Nava Mallai nava Lechchhai Kāsi Kosalasya atthārasa vi gaṇarayano. Jacobi translates the passage thus:

The eighteen confederate kings of Kāsi and Kosala, the nine Mallakis and nine Lichchhavis.
(1. 63. 2-58). It corresponds roughly to the modern Bundelkhand and the adjoining region. We learn from the Chetiya Jataka (No. 422) that its capital was Sotthivatinagara. The Mahābhārata calls the capital Śuktimatī (III. 20.50) or Śukti-sāhvaya (XIV. 83.2). According to Mr. Nundolal Dey Sotthivati is the same as Śuktimatī (Ind. Ant., 1919, p. vii of "Geographical Dictionary"). The Mahābhārata mentions a river called Śuktimatī which flowed by the capital of Rājā Uparichara of Chedivishaya (I. 63, 35). Pargiter identifies the river with the Ken, and places the capital Śuktimatī in the neighbourhood of Banda (J.A.S.B., 1895, 255, Märkandeya p. 359).

The Chedi people are mentioned as early as the Rig Veda. Their king Kaśu Chaidya is praised in a Dānastuti occurring at the end of one hymn (VIII. 5. 37-39).

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

```
Mahāsammata
   | Roja
   | Vararcja
   | Kalyāna
   | Varakalyāna
   | Uposatha
   | Māndhāta
   | Varamāndhāta
   | Chara
   | Upachara or Apachara
```
The last king's five sons are said to have founded the cities of Hatthipura, Assapura, Sihapura, Uttarapañchāla and Daddarapura. Upachara, king of Chedi, is probably identical with Uparichara Vasu, the Paurava king of Chedi mentioned in the Mahābhārata (I. 63. 1-2), whose five sons founded five lines of kings (I. 63. 30).

Epic tradition makes the royal houses of Kauśāmbī, Mahodaya and Girivraja branches of Vasu's family (Rāmāyaṇa I. 32. 6-9; Mahābhārata I. 63. 30-33).

The Jātaka and epic accounts of the early kings of Chedi are essentially legendary and, in the absence of more reliable evidence, cannot be accepted as genuine history.

We learn from the Vedabbha Jātaka (No. 48) that the road from Kāsi to Chedi was unsafe being infested by robbers.

Vamsa or Vatsa is the country of which Kauśāmbī, modern Kosam near Allahabad, was the capital. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions a teacher named Proti Kauśāmbeya (Sat. Br., XII. 2. 2. 13) whom Harisvāmin, the commentator, considers to be a native of the town Kauśāmbī. Epic tradition attributes the foundation of the city of Kauśāmbī to a Chedi prince (Rām. I. 32. 3-6; Mbh., I. 63. 31). The origin of the Vatsa people, however, is traced to a king of Kāsi (Harivamśa, 29, 73, Mbh. XII., 49, 80). It is stated in the Purāṇas that when the city of Hāstinapura was carried away by the Ganges, Nichakshu, the great-great-grandson of Janamejaya, abandoned it, and removed his residence to Kauśāmbī. We have already seen that the Paurānic tradition about the Bharata or Kuru origin of the later kings of Kauśāmbī is confirmed by Bhāsa. Udayana king of Kauśāmbī is described in the Svapnavāsavadatta (Ed. Ganapati Śastri, p. 138) as a scion of the Bharata kula.
The Purāṇas give a list of Nichakshu’s successors down to Kshemaka and cite the following genealogical verse:

\[\text{Brahmakshatrasya yo yonir vamśo devarshi satkṛitaḥ} \\
\text{Kshemakam prāpya rājānam saṃsthām prāpsyati vai} \\
\text{kalau.}\]

The earliest king of Kauśāmbī about whom we know anything is Śatānīka II of the Paurāṇic list. His father’s name was Vasudāna according to the Purāṇas, and Sahasrānīka according to Bhāsa. Śatānīka himself was also styled Parantapa (Buddhist India, p. iii). He married a princess of Videha as his son is called Vaidehi-putra. He is said to have attacked Champā, 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 Sumsumāragiri was a dependency of Vatsa (Jātaka No. 353; Carmichael Lec., p. 63). The Mahābhārata (II. 30. 10-11) and the Hari-vamsa (29. 73) testify to the close association of Vatsabhūmi and Bharga.

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 Yuddhīṭhīlā gōta, i.e., the family of Yudhīshthīra (Dhumakāri Jātaka No. 413; Dasa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka No. 495). The capital was Indapatta or Indapattana, i.e., Indraprastha or Indrapat near the modern Delhi. It extended over seven leagues (Jātakas No. 537, 545).

The Jātakas mention the following Kuru kings and princes: Dhanaśīja Korabya (Kurudhamma Jātaka No. 276; Dhūmakāri Jātaka No. 413; Sambhava Jātaka No. 515; Vidhurapandita Jātaka No. 545); Koravya (Dasa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka No. 495; Mahāsutasoma Jātaka No.
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537); Sutasoma (Mahāsutasoma Jātaka, cf. the Mahābhārata I. 95. 75 where Sutasoma appears as the name of a son of Bhīma). We can not vouch for the historical existence of these princes in the absence of further evidence.

The Jaina Uttarādhyayana Sūtra mentions a king Ishukāra ruling at the town called Ishukāra in the Kuru country (SBE. XLV, 62). It seems probable that after the removal of the main royal family to Kauśāmbi, the Kuru country was parcelled out into small states of which Indapatta and Ishukāra were apparently the most important. Later on the little principalities gave place to a Saṅgha or republic (Arthasastra, 1919, 378).

Panchala 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 Bhāgirathi (Ganges) formed the dividing line (Mbh. I. 138. 70). According to the Great Epic Northern Pańchāla had its capital at Ahichechhatra (the modern Rāmnagar near Aonlā in the Bareilly District), while Southern Pańchāla had its capital at Kampilya, and stretched from the Ganges to the Chambal (Mbh. 138. 73-74). A great struggle raged in ancient times between the Kurus and the Pańchālas for the possession of Uttara Pańchāla. Sometimes Uttara Pańchāla was included in Kururaṭṭha (Somanassa Jātaka No. 505; Mahābhārata I. 138) and had its capital at Hāṣtinapura (Divyāvadāna, p. 435), at other times it formed a part of Kampillaratṭha (Brahmadatta Jātaka No. 323, Jayaddisa Jātaka No. 513 and Gandatindu Jātaka No. 520). Sometimes kings of Kampillaratṭha held court at Uttara Pańchālanagara, at other times kings of Uttara Pańchālaratṭha held court at Kampilla (Kumbhakāra Jātaka No. 408).
The history of Pañchāla from the death of Pravāhana Jaivala or Jaivali to the time of Bimbisāra of Magadha is obscure. The only king who may be referred to this period is Durmukha (Dummukha) the contemporary of Nimi (Jātaka No. 408) the penultimate sovereign of Mithilā (Jātaka No. 541). In the Kumbhakāra Jātaka it is stated that Dummukha's kingdom was styled Uttara Pañchālaraṭṭha; his capital was not Ahichchhatra but Kampillanagara. He is represented as a contemporary of Karnaṇḍu king of Kaliṅga, 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 Brihaduktha:

Etam ha vā Aindram Mahābhishkaṁ Brihadukthāna Rishir Durmukhāya Pañchālāya provācha tasmādu Durmukhaḥ Pañchālo Rājā sanvidyayaḥ samantam sarvataḥ prīthivīṁ jayan pariṣyaya.

A great Pañchāla king named Chulani Brahmadatta is mentioned in the Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka (546), the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (SBE, XLV. 57-61), the Svapna-vāsavadatta (Act V) and the Rāmāyana (I. 32). In the last mentioned work he is said to have married the daughters (Kanyāḥ) of Kuśanābha 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 Rāmāyanic legend regarding the king is only important as showing the connection of the early Pañchālas with the foundation of the famous city of Kanyakubja or Kanauj.

The Uttarādhyayana Sūtra mentions a king of Kampilya named Saṅjaya 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 kingly power. But there is reason to believe that the Pañchālas, like the Videhas, Mallas and Kurus, established a Saṅgha form of Government of the Rājaśabdopajīvin type (Arthaśāstra, 1919, p. 378).

**Matsya** had its capital at Virātanagara or Bairāṭ in the modern Jaipur State (Carmichael Lec., 1919, p. 53).

The early history of the Matsyas has already been related. Its history during the centuries which immediately preceded the reign of Bimbisāra of Magadha is not known. It is not included by Kautilya 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 Rāmāyaṇa (II. 71. 5) has a reference to the Vira Matsyas.

The **Surasena** country had its capital at Mathurā on the Yamunā. Neither Śūrasena nor Mathurā finds any mention in the Vedic literature. But the Greek writers refer to the Sourasenoi and their cities Methora and Cleisobora.

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 Śatvatas were subdivided into several branches, e. g., the Daiśāvridhas, Andhakas, Mahābhojas and Vrishnīs (Vishṇu, IV. 13. 1; Vāyu, 96. 1-2).

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

We learn from the Rig Veda (I. 36. 18; VI. 45. 1) that Yadu and Turvāṇa came from a distant land. The Śatvatas or Satvats also appear to be mentioned in the Vedic texts. In the Satapatha 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 Āsvamedhā are referred to. The geographical position of Bharata’s kingdom is clearly shown by the fact that he made offerings on 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 Paurānic tradition which places them in the Mathurā district is thus amply confirmed. At a later time, however, a branch of the Satvats must have migrated southward, for in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14. 3), the Satvats 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 (Vishṇu IV, 13. 1-6):

“Bhajina-Bhajamāna-dīvyāṇdhaka-Devāvridha-Mahābhōja-Vrishṇī-samjñāḥ Satvatasya putrā babhūvuh...... Mahā Bhojastvati dharmātmā tasyānvaye Bhojamārtikā vata babhūvuh.”

It is also stated that several southern states, Māhismatī, Vidarbha, etc., were founded by princes of Yadu lineage (Mat., p. 43. 10-29; 44. 36; Vāyu, 94. 26; 95.35).
Not only the Bhojas, but the Devāvṛidha branch of the Satvatas is also mentioned in the Vedic literature. Babhru Daivāvṛidha (Vāyu, 96. 15, Vishṇu, IV. 13. 3-5) is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34) as a contemporary of Bhīma, king of Vidarbha and Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra. The Andhakas and Vrishnis are referred to in the Ashṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (IV. 1. 114; VI. 2. 34). In Kauṭilya’s Arthasastra (p. 12) the Vrishnis are described as a Saṅgha, i.e., a republican corporation. The Mahābhārata, too, refers to the Vrishnis, Andhakas and other associate tribes as a Saṅgha (XII. 81. 25), and Vāsudeva as a Saṅghamukhya. The name of the Vrishni corporation has been preserved by a unique coin (Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, p. 119). It is stated in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas that Kaṁsa, like Peisistratus and others of Greek history, tried to make himself tyrant at Mathurā by overpowering the Yādavas, and that Krishṇa, a scion of the Vrishni family, killed him. The slaying of Kaṁsa by Krishṇa is referred to by Pātañjali and the Ghata Jātaka (No. 454). The latter work confirms the Hindu tradition about the association of Krishṇa-Vāsudeva’s family with Mathurā (“Uttara Madhurā”).

The final overthrow of the Vrishnis is ascribed to their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas (Mahābhārata, Maushala Parva, I. 15-22; 2. 10; Arthasastra, p. 12; Jātaka, IV., pp. 55-56, V., p. 138). It is interesting to note in this connection, that the Vrishnis and the Andhakas are branded as Vṛātyas in the Drona Parva of the Mahābhārata (141-15).

The Buddhist texts refer to Avantiputta king of the Śūrasenas in the time of Maha Kachchāna (M. 2. 83) who

---

1 The question of the historical existence of Krishṇa Vāsudeva has been discussed in my Early History of the Vaishnava Sect, pp. 26-35.
was the first among the chief disciples of Śākyamuni through whose agency Buddhism gained ground in the Mathurā region. The Śūrasenas 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. The Aśmakas are mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. 1. 173). 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 Aśmakas in North-West India referred to by the Greek writers as the Assakenoi.

The capital of Assaka was Potana or Potali (Chullakālinga Jātaka No. 301; D. 2. 235). 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 Ikshvāku family. This probably indicates that the Aśmaka and Mulaka kingdoms were believed to have been founded by Ikshvāku chiefs, just as Vidarbha and Danda 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 Sovīra, Ruṇu king of Videha, Dhatarattha king of Āṅga and Dhatarattha king of Kāsi.
SIXTEEN MAHAJANAPADAS

(Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, p. 270). The Mahābhārata (I. 177. 47) refers to "Aśmako nāma Rājarśiḥ Paudanyam yo nyavesayat." Paudanya is evidently identical with Potana or Potali.

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 mentions a king of Assaka named Aruṇa and his minister Nandisena, and refers to a victory which they won over the king of Kaliṅga.

Avanti roughly corresponds to modern Mālwa, Nimar and the adjoining parts of the Central Provinces. Prof. Bhandarkar points out that Avanti was divided into two parts: the northern part had its capital at Ujjain and the southern part called Avanti Dakshināpatha had its capital at Māhiṃsatī or Mahiṃśmatī, modern Māndhātā on the Narmādā.

The Mahāgovinda Suttanta mentions Māhiṃsatī as the capital of the Avantis, and refers to their king Vessabhu. The Mahābhārata distinguishes between the kingdoms of Avanti and Mahiṃśmatī, but locates Vinda and Anuvinda of Avanti near the Narmadā (Narmadā-mabhitah, II. 31. 10).

The Purāṇas attribute the foundation of Mahiṃśmatī, 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 Mahiṃśmatī as Haihaya (Matsya, 43. 8-29; Vāyu, 94. 5-26). The Haihaya family is referred to by such an ancient authority as Kauṭilya (Arthasastra, 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 Haihayas namely Vītihotras, Bhojas, Avantis, Kunḍikeras or Tunḍikeras and the Tālajaṅghas (43. 48-49). When the Vītihotras and Avantis passed away, a minister named Pulika is said to have killed his master and anointed his own son Pradyota 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 Kāśmīr as well as the Takshaśilā region. Takshaśilā, the capital city, lay 2,000 leagues from Benares (Telapatta Jātaka No. 96; Susima Jātaka No. 163).

The Purāṇas represent the Gandhāra kings as the descendants of Druhyu (Matsya 48. 6; Vāyu 99. 9). Druhyu 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 Purānic 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 Pañchāla, and Bhīma king of Vidarbha, the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Naggaji or Nagnajit (Kumbhakāra Jātaka; Ait. Br. VII. 34; Sat. Br. VIII. 1. 4. 10). We learn from the Kumbhakāra Jātaka that his capital was Takshaśilā. The Jaina Uttarādhyayana Sūtra mentions “Dvimukha” of Pañchāla, Nami of Videha, “Naggati” of Gandhāra, and “Karakanḍu” of Kaliṅga, 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 (Śat. 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. 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 (Gadara) appear among the subject peoples of the Achaemenian Empire (see "Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenidan Inscriptions" by Herbert Cushing Tolman, Vanderbilt Oriental Series, Vol. VI).

Kamboja is constantly associated with Gandhāra in literature and inscriptions (Mbh. XII. 207. 43; Ānguttara N. I. 213; 4. 252, 256, 260; Rock Edict V of Aśoka). Like Gandhāra it is included in the Uttarāpatha (cf. Mbh. XII. 207. 43). It must therefore be located in some part of North-west India not far from Gandhāra. Rhys Davids (Bud. Ind. 28) mentions its capital Dvāraka. We learn from a passage of the Mahābhārata that a place called Rājapura was the home of the Kāmbojas (Mbh., VII. 4. 5, "Karna Rājapuraṁ gatvā Kāmboja nirjīta stvayā"). The association of the Kāmbojas with the Gandhāras enables us to identify this Rājapura with the Rājapura of Hiuen Tsang (Watters, Yuan Chwang, Vol. I, p. 284), which lay to the south or south-east of Punach.

The Vedic texts do not mention any king of Kamboja. But they refer to a teacher named Kamboja Aupamanyava (Vamiśa Br.) who was probably connected with this territory.
In the Bhūridatta Jātaka (No. 543) the Kambojas are credited with savage customs:

ete hi dhamma anariyarūpā
Kambojākanam vitathā bahunnan ti.

Jātaka, VI. 208.

These are your savage customs which I hate,
Such as Kamboja hordes might emulate.

Cowel's Jātaka, VI. 110.

This description of the Kāmbojas agrees wonderfully with Hiuen Tsang's account of Rājapura and the adjoining countries. "From Lampa to Rājapura 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."

The Kambojas are known as Kambujiya in the old Persian inscriptions. In the Mahābhārata the Kambojas are represented as living under a monarchical constitution (cf. II. 4. 22; V. 165. 1-3, etc.). Kautilya (p. 378) mentions the Kshatriya srenī of Kamboja as an illustration of a "Vārtāśastropajivin" Saṅgha.

The epic account of the Mahājanapadas:

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

The Pañchālas, Kurus, Mātyas, Śūrasenas and the Chedis receive unstinted praise:

Kuravah saha Pañchālāḥ Śālva Mātysāḥ sa Naimishāḥ
Chedayaścha mahābhāgā dharmam jānanti śāsvatam
Brāhmaṁ Pañchālāḥ Kauraveyāstu dharmam
Satyaiṁ Mātysāḥ Śūrasenaścā yajñaṁ

The Kauravas with the Pañchālas, the Śālvas, the Mātysas, the Naimishas and the Chedis who are all highly blessed, know what the eternal religion is.¹

¹ Mahābhārata, VIII. 45. 14-16; 28; 34.
The Pañchālas observe the Vedas, the Kauravas observe Dharma, the Matsyas observe the truth, and the Śūrasenas perform sacrifices.¹

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

In-gitajñāscha Magadhāḥ prekshitajñāscha Kosalāḥ.¹

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

Āturānām parityāga sadārasūtvikrayah
Aṅgeshu vartate Kṛṣṇa yeshāmadhipatir bhavaṁ.

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

Madrakeshu cha saṁspishṭaṁ saucham Gāndhāraka-

keshucha

Rājayājakayājyecha nasṭaṁ dattaṁ havirbhavet.

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.²

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 Kāsi and the Ascendancy of Kosala.

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

¹ Mahābhārata, VIII. 45. 14–16; 26; 34.
² Ibid. 45. 40; 40. 29.
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 Dīghati, king of Kosala, of his kingdom, and put him to death. In the Kunāla 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. 51) king Mahāsīlava of Kāsi is said to have been deprived of his realm by the king of Kosala. In the Ghata Jātaka (No. 355) and the Ekarāja Jātaka (No. 303) Vaṅka and Dabbasena, 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 Kāmsa, as the epithet "Bārānasiggaho," i.e., conqueror of Benares, is a standing addition to his name (the Seyya Jātaka No. 282 and the Tesakuṇa Jātaka No. 521, Buddhist India, p. 25). The interval of time between Kāmsa’s conquest of Kāsi and 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 Kosalādevi, to king Bimbisāra of Magadha, he gave a village of Kāsi producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money (Harita Māta Jātaka No. 239; Vaddhaki Sūkara Jātaka No. 283).

In the time of Mahākosalā's son and successor Pasenadi or Prasenajit Kāsi still formed a part of the Kosalan empire. In the Lohichcha Sutta (Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, 288-97) 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 Samyukta Nikāya (the Book of the Kindred Sayings, translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 106) 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 include Hiranyanābha Kausalya who, as we have seen, was a contemporary of Sukesā Bhāradvāja and Āsvalāyana and consequently of Buddha and Pasenadi, if our identification of Āsvalāyana Kausalya with Assalāyana of Sāvatthi mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya be correct.

Another Rājā of the group was probably the Sākya chief of Kapilavastu. From the introductory portion of the Bhaddasāla Jātaka (No. 465) we learn that the Sākya territory was subordinate to the Kosalan monarch. The inclusion of the Sākya territory, the birthplace of Buddha, within the Kosalan empire is also proved by the Sutta Nipāta (SBE, X, Part II, pp. 68-69) and the Majjhima
Nikāya, Vol. II, p. 124, which describe Buddha and his people as Kosalans.

It was probably during the reign of Mahākosala, that Bimbisāra ascended the throne of Magadha. The Mahāvaiṣṇa (Geiger’s Translation, p. 12) 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 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, their civil and military services, the checks on their authority, etc.

The different kinds of rulerships prevalent in different parts of India are thus described in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.¹

Etasyāṁ Prāchyaṁ diśi ye ke cha Prāchyaṁnaṁ rājānaḥ Śamrajyaṁvaiva te’bhishichyante Samrāti-
tyenānabhishiktānāchakshha etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimānu.

Etasyāṁ dakshiṇasya diśi ye ke cha Satvatoṁ Rājano Bhaujyaṁvaiva te’bhishichyante Bhojetyenānabhishiki-
tkānāchakshha etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimānu.

Etasyāṁ Pratikhyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Ničhya-
naṁ Rājano ye’pāchyaṁnaṁ Svārajyaṁvaiva te’

¹ VIII 14.
bhishichyante Svarālityenānabhishiktanāchakshata etāmeva Devānāṃ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṃ Udichyāṃ diśi ye ke cha pārena Himavantam Janapadā Uttara Kurava Uttara Madrā iti Vairājyaiva te' bhishichyante Virālityenāna bhishiktanāchakshata etāmeva Devānāṃ vihitimanu

Etasyāṃ dhruvāyāṃ Madhyamāyāṃpratishthāyāṃ diśi ye ke cha Kuru Pañchālānēṃ Rājānaḥ sa Vaśos-īnārānēṃ Rājyāyaiva te'bhishichyante Rājetyenānabhiphiliktanāchakshata etāmeva Devānāṃ vihitimanu.

Several scholars assert that Vairājya means a kingless state. But in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa¹ a king consecrated with Indra’s great unction is called Virāṭ and worth of Vairājya. When a king consecrated with the Punaṭ-bhīsheka ascends his Āsanda or throne, he prays for attaining Vairājya as well as other kinds of royal dignity. Sāyāna takes the word Vairājyaṃ to mean “itarebbhyo bhupatibhyo vaisīṣhtyam.” It is also stated in the Sukrasniti (B.K. Sarkar’s translation, p. 24) that the Virāṭ was a superior kind of monarch. In the Mahābhārata (XII. 43.11) Krishṇa is called Samrāṭ, Virāṭ, Svarāṭ and Surarāja. Cf. XII., 68.54.

It is not easy to decide whether all the terms Samrāḍya, Bhauṭya, Svarāḍya, Vairāḍya and Rāḍya referred to essentially different forms of royal authority in the Brāhmanic period. But two terms at least, namely, Sāmṛāḍya and Rāḍya are clearly distinguished by the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa² and also the Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.³

Rājā vai Rājasūyenesṭvā bhavati, Samrāḍ Vājapeyenāvaramhi Rājyaṃ paraṁ Sāmṛāḍyaṃ kāmayeta vai Rāja Samrāḍ bhavitum avarāmhi rājyaṃ paramsamrājyaṃ.⁴

¹ VIII. 17. ² V. 1. 1. 13. ³ XV. 1. 1. 2. ⁴ Sat. Br. V. 1. 1. 13.
"By offering the Rājasūya he becomes Rāja 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 Samrājas would not wish to become Rājās 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 Caesar 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 texts Svarājya means uncontrolled dominion, and is opposed to Rājya.

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." We have, however, references to Śūdra and Āyogava kings in the Vedic texts. King Janaśruti Pautrāyaṇa is called a Śūdra in the Chhāndogya Upanishad. King Marutta Avikshita is styled "Āyogava" in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Āyogava denotes a member of a mixed caste, a descendant of a Śūdra by a Vaiśya wife. 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.

1 Kāṭhaka Samāhitā, XIV. 5; Maitrāyaṇi Samāhitā, I. 11. 5, etc.
2 Vedic Index, II. 221.
4 IV. 2. 1-5.
5 XIII. 5. 4. 6.
6 Manusūkhitā, X. 12.
(cf. the Pārikshitas and the kings of Janaka's line; cf. also the expression Daśapurushaṁraja—an kingdom of ten generations occurring in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XII. 9. 3. 3), 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 Yāska¹ of the Kuru brothers Devāpi and Ģantānu. In the Śāmvarā 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."

Sometimes the popular choice fell on persons who did not belong to the royal family. It is stated in the Pādaṇjali Jātaka, No. 247, that when a certain king of Benares died, his son Pādaṇjali 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 Sachchamkira 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) 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 had four queens the Mahishi, the Parivrākti, the Vāvātā, and the Pāḷāgali. The Mahisi was the chief wife, being the first one married according to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.² The Parivrākti was the neglected wife, probably one that had no son. The Vāvātā is the favourite, while the Pāḷāgali was, according to Weber, the daughter of the last of the court officials.³

¹ Nirukta, II. 10. Ved. Ind. II. 211. ² VI. 5. 3. 1. ³ Ved. Ind., I. 478.
the Jātaka period several kings kept a fairly big harem. We are told in the Kusa Jātaka, No. 531, that king Okkāko had sixteen thousand wives among whom Silavatī was the chief (aggamahesī). 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 Mithilā says: "Ours is a great kingdom, the city of Mithilā covers seven leagues, the measure of the whole kingdom is 300 leagues. Such a king should have sixteen-thousand women at the least." Sixteen thousand appears to have been a stock phrase. The number is evidently exaggerated. But it indicates that the kings of the Jātaka period were extreme polygamists who frequently exceeded the Brāhmanic number of four queens.

The king was consecrated after his succession or election with an elaborate ritual which is described in several Brāhmanaś, and for which the Mantras are given in the Sāṁhitās. Those who aided in the consecration of the king were called Rājakartṛ or Rājakṛt, "kingmaker." In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the persons meant and specified are the Śūta (minstrel and chronicler or charioteer), and the Grāmaṁ, 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 Punarabhisheka and the Aindra Mahābhisheka.

The Vājapeya bestowed on the performer a superior kind of kingship called "Śamrajya," while the Rājasūya merely conferred the ordinary royal dignity. 2 The Punarabhisekh made the king elect eligible for all sorts of royal

---

1 The Fundamental Unity of India, p. 83.
The object of Aindra Mahabhisekha is thus described:

"Sa ya ichchhedevarhvit Kshatriyamayam sarvājitirjayetayam sarvānlokiin vindetayamsarveshām Rājām Śrāishtyāmatishthām paramatāṃ gachchheta Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svarājya, Vairājya, Paramēśthya, Maharajya, Adhipatyām samantaparyātyaṁ syat Sārvabhaumah sārvātaysa a'ntādā parārdhāt Pri-thivyai Samudraparyantāy ā karāl iti tametena Aindrenā Mahābhishkeṇa kshatriyam śapayitva'bhishinched."

Ait. Br., VIII, 15.

The Vajapeya rites include a chariot race, 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 the sacrificial post 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."2 The royal sacrificer having descended from the post, 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."3

The Rajasūya consisted of a long succession of sacrificial performances spread over a period of upwards of

---

1 Ait. Br. VIII. 6.  
2 Sat. Br. V. 2. 1. 22.  
two years (SBE, XLI, p. xxvi). The rite is described at
great length in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.¹ Besides much
mere priestly elaboration, the ritual contains traces of
popular ceremonial (Ved. Ind., II. 219). For example,
the king is clothed in the ceremonial garments of his
rank, and provided with bow and arrow as emblems
of sovereignty. He performs a mimic cow raid against a
relative of his;² or engages in a show fight with a
Rājanya.³ A game of dice is played in which he is
made to be the victim; he symbolically ascends the
quarters of the sky as an indication of his universal rule;
and steps on a tiger skin, thus gaining the strength and
the pre-eminence of the tiger. A notable feature of the
Rājasūya is the ceremony of the Ratna-havis or jewel
offerings. The recipients of these sacrificial honours, the
Ratnaḥ, were the chief members of the royal household
and of the king’s civil and military service: 
viz.—

1. The Senānī (Commander of the army).
2. The Purohita (Chaplain of the king).
3. The Mahishī (Chief Queen).
4. The Sūta (Court Minstrel and Chronicler).
5. The Grāmaṇī (Village Headman).
6. The Kshattrī (Chamberlain).
7. The Samgrahītṛī (Treasurer).
8. The Bhāgadugha (Carver).
10. The Go-vikartaṇa (King’s Companion in the
    chase).
11. The Pālāgala (Courier).

The next essential part of the Rājasūya was the
Abhisheka or besprinkling. It began with offerings to
Savitā Satyaprasava, Agni Grīhapatī, Soma Vanaspati,
Bṛhaspati Vāk, Indra Jyesṭha, Rudra Paśupati, Mitra Satya and Varuṇa Dharmapati. The consecration water (Abhishechanīyā Ṛṣā) was made up of seventeen kinds including the water of the Sarasvatī, Sea-water, and water from a whirlpool, a pond, a well and dew. The sprinkling was performed by a Brāhmaṇa, a kinsman or brother of the king elect, a friendly Rājanya and a Vaiśya.

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

The Punarabhisheka or Second Coronation is described in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 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 Āsandī which was made of Udumbara wood with the exception of the interwoven part (Vivayana) which consisted of Muṇja grass. Then came the besprinkling. Among other things the priest said "Rājñāṁ tvam Adhirājo bhavaḥ; Mahāntam tvā mahāṁ Samrājaṇ charshaṇināṁ." The king was next required to get down from the throne and make obeisance to the Brāhmaṇās "Brahmaṇa eva tat Kshatram vaśa meti tad yatra vai Brahmanāḥ kshatram vaśameti tad rāṣṭram sampiddham tadvīravadā hāsmin viro jāyate" (Ait. Br., VIII. 9). Here there is ample provision for the prevention of royal absolutism.

Janamejaya, the son of Parikṣit, was evidently consecrated with the Punarabhisheka (Ait. Br. VIII. 11). The Aindra Mahābhisheka or Indra's great unction consisted of three important ceremonies, viz.:

1. Ārohaṇa (Ascending the throne).
2. Utkroṣana (Singing the king's praise).
3. Abhimantraṇa (repetition of special formulas or Mantras).
The following kings are said to have been consecrated with the Aindra Mahabhishka: Janamejaya, Saryata, Satanika, Ambashthya, Yudhamdraushti, Vishvakarma, Sudas, Marutta, Angus and Bharata (Ait. Br. VIII. 21-23). The first-mentioned king, and probably the third, fourth, fifth and ninth also belonged to the Post-Parikshit period.1

Powerful kings and princes performed another important sacrifice called the Asvamedha. The Apastamba Srauta Sutra (XX. i. 1) says that a Sarvabhauma Raja may perform the Asvamedha. Among the kings and princes who performed the Asvamedha were Janamejaya, his brothers Bhimasena, Ugrasena, and Ugratasena, and Para Atmara, king of Kosala.

Kingship during the Parikshita-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 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad Janaka says to Yajnavalkya "So'ham Bhagavate Videhan dadami mañchäpi saha dasyayeti" (Brih. Up., IV. 4. 23). The king is called "Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati" and is further described as the devourer of the people—Viśamatta (Ait. Br. VIII. 17). "Rājā ta ekāṁ mukham tena mukhena Viś'o' tsī" (Kaush. Up., II. 6).

The king, however, was not an absolute despot in practice. His power was checked, in the first place, by

1 Satanika defeated Dhritarashtra of Kasi who, according to the Mahâgövinda Suttanta, was a contemporary of Sattabahu of Kaliuga and Brahmadatta of Assaka. As the Deccan kingdoms are not referred to in pre-Parikshita works, it is probable that Satanika and his contemporaries flourished after Parikshita. Ambashthya and Yudhamdraushti were contemporaries of Parvata and Narada who were very near in time to Nagnajit the contemporary of Nimi the penultimate king of Vidisa. Angus was probably the immediate predecessor of Dadhivâhana who, according to Jaina evidence, flourished in the 6th century B.C.
the Brāhmaṇas. We have seen that the most powerful sovereigns, even those who were consecrated with the Punarabhisheka, had to descend from the throne and make obeisance to the Brāhmaṇas who formed the higher educated community of those days. We learn from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 27) and Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra (Ed. 1919, p. 11) 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 (Sangha), 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 Grāmaṇī are styled Rājakartṛi or Rājakṛit, i.e., “King-maker” (Sat. Br., III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18). 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 (SBE, XVII. 304) “King Brahmadatta of Kāsi, O Bhikkhus, having entered Benares, convoked his ministers and counsellors 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 assāroha Jātaka (No. 302) refers to a king who by beat of drum through the city gathered together his counsellors. In the Mahāvagga we find the following passage (SBE, XVII, p. 1) “Now when Seniya Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha, 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
king headed by his general. These were asked to elect a king (Cowell’s Jataka, V, p. 97). The king-making power of the councillors is recognised also in the Pādañjalī and Sonaka Jatakas.

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 Utkrosāna passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 17) the people (Janāḥ) are clearly distinguished from the Rājakartāraḥ among whom, according to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18) were included the Śūta 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 “Paṅchālānāṁ Samitimēyāya,” “Paṅchālānāṁ Parishadamājagāma.” The Chhāndogya Upanishad (V. 3. 1) mentions the Samiti of the Paṅchāla people presided over by king Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, “Śvetaketurhāruneyah Paṅchālānāṁ Samitimēyāya; tam ha Pravāhaṇo Jaivaliruvācha.” The Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (VI. 2. 1) uses the term Parishad instead of Samiti “Śvetaketurhavā Āruneyah Paṅchālānāṁ Parishadamājagāma.” 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. We have evidence that the people sometimes expelled and even executed their princes together with unpopular officials. Thus it is stated in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XII. 9. 3. 1 et seq.; Eggeling, V., 269) “Now Dushtaritu
Paumāṇyana had been expelled from the kingdom which had come to him through ten generations and the Śrīńjayas also expelled Revottaras Pāṭava Chākra Sthapati." 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 Kshatriya consecrated with the Punarabhīsheka. 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 (cf. Lodge, Modern Europe, p. 517). 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

...he 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 Padakusalaṇāvā Jātaka (No. 432) tells a story how the town and country folk 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 Sacehamkīra Jātaka (No. 73). We are told in the Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka that the people of one kingdom killed the minister, deposed the king, made him an outcast and anointed a prince as king. The ex-king was not allowed to enter into the capital city. Prof. Bhandarkar points out that in the Telapatta Jātaka a king of Takshasila 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 dadāmī," 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 "Utkroṣana" 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, "Amitrāṇāṁ hanta," i.e., destroyer of enemies, "Brāhmaṇāṇāṁ Goptā," i.e., protector of the Brāhmaṇas, "Dharmasya Goptā," 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.
POLITICAL HISTORY OF INDIA

PART II

From the Coronation of Bimbisara 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 Asoka 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 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 previous 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."

My treatment of the history of the Early Post-Mauryan and Scythian periods, though not entirely

1 The chapter on the Later Mauryas was published in the J.A.S.B. 1920.
original, is different in many respects from that of previous writers. I have not been able to accept the current views with regard to the history and chronology of several dynasties, notably of the Early Sātavāhanas, the Greeks of Sākala, and the Śaka-Palhavas of the Uttarāpatha.

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 Samudragupta with the Vākāṭakas have been discussed, and an attempt has been made to present a connected history of the later Guptas.¹

¹ The chapter on the Later Guptas was published in the JASB, 1920.
THE RISE OF MAGADHA.

1. 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 history of Pre-Norman England, and Prussia in the history of modern Germany.

The founder of the Magadhan imperial power was Bimbisāra or Śrenika (called also Seniya Bimbisāra) son of Bhattiya. The Mahāvamsa (Geiger's translation, p. 12) 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 (SBE, X. II, 67) that Bimbisāra's capital was at Rājagaha or Rājagṛihā, "the Giribbaja in Magadhā."

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 Kusinārā and Pāvā.1 An account of both these peoples has already been given. Among the smaller republics Rhys Davids mentions the Śākyas of Kapilavastu,2 the Koliyas of Rāmagāma, the Bhaggas of Suṁsumāra Hill, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Kālāmas of Kesaputta, and the Moriyas of Pipphalivana.

1 Twelve miles from Kusinārā (Cunningham, AGI, p. 434).
2 Piprāwā in the north of the Basti district; or Tilaura Kōṭ in the Tarāi (Smith, BHI, p. 159).
The Sākyas, as we have already seen, acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of Kosala. The Koliyas were their neighbours. The introductory portion of the Kunāla Jātaka says that the Sākya and Koliya tribes had the river Rohini¹ 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 Sākyas had the custom of marrying their own sisters. In the Tirthajātra section of the Vanaparva of the Mahābhārata (III. 84. 31) 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 Sākyas.

The Bhagga state was a dependency of the Vatsa kingdom; for we learn from the preface to the Dhonasākha Jātaka, No. 353, that prince Bodhi, the son of Udayana king of the Vatsas, dwelt in Sumsumāragiri and built a palace called Kokanada. The Mahābhārata and the Harivamśa also testify to the close connection between the Vatsas and the Bhargas (Bhaggas):

Vatsabhūmiṇīcha Kaunteyo vijīge balavān balat.

Bhargāṇāmadhipaṇchaiva Nishādādhipatim tathā (MBh. II. 30. 10-11).

Pratardanasya putrau dvau Vatsa Bhargau babhu-vatuḥ (Hariv. 29. 73).

Regarding the Bulis and the Kālāmas we know very little. The name of the Kālāma capital, Kesaputta, reminds us of the Kesins, a people mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (Ved. Ind., Vol. I, p. 186) and probably also in the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini (VI. 4, 165).

¹ A tributary of the Rāpī (Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 96).
The Moriyas were undoubtedly the same clan which gave Magadha its greatest dynasty (cf. Geiger, Mahāvaṁsa, p. 27). Pipphalivana, the Moriya Capital, is apparently identical with the Nyagrodhavana or Banyan Grove, mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, where stood the famous Embers Tope (Rhys Davids, Buddhist Suttas, p. 135; Watters Yuan Chwang, II, pp. 23-24; Cunningham, AGI, pp. 429, 433). Fa Hien tells us that the Tope lay twelve Yojanas to the west of Kusinārā (Legge, Fa Hien, p. 70).

Among the smaller kingdoms may be mentioned Gandhāra ruled by Pukkusāti, Roruka ruled by Rudrāyana (Divyāvadāna, p. 545), Sūrasena ruled by Avantiputta, and Āṅga ruled by Brahmadatta.

The most famous amongst the non-Aryan principalities was the realm of the Yakkha Ālavaka (Sutta Nipāta, SBE., X, II, 29-30). The realm of Ālavaka was situated near the Ganges and had Ālavī (Sutta Nipāta; the Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 275) for its capital. Ālavī seems to be identical with the town of Ālabhiyā mentioned in the Uvāsagadasāo (II, p. 103; Appendix, pp. 51-53). Near the city there was a large forest (cf. The Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 160). According to Hoernle the name of the kingdom represents the Sanskrit Atavī which means a forest.—The same scholar points out that in the Abhidhānappadipikā Ālavī is mentioned in a list of twenty names of cities including Bārānasī, Sāvatthi, Vessālī, Mithilā, Ālavī, Kosambhi, Ujjenī, Takka-silā, Champa, Sāgala, Sumsumāragira, Rajagaha, Kapilavatthu, Sāketa, Indapaṭṭa, Ukkaṭtha, Pāṭaliputta, Jettuttara, Sāmkassa, and Kusinārā.

In the Uvāsagadasāo the king of Ālabhiyā is named Jiyasattū. But Jiyasattū seems to have been a common

1 "Then did the Brāhmaṇa Cānakka anoint a glorious youth, known by the name Candagatta, as king over all Jambudīpa, born of a noble clan, the Moriyas."
designation of kings like the epithet Devanampiya of a later age. The name Jiyasatī is given also to the rulers of Sāvatthi, Kampilla, Mithila, Champā, Vāniyagama Bārānāsi and Polasapura (cf. Hoernle Uvasagadasā, II, pp. 6, 64, 100, 103, 106, 118, 166).


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 Śākya 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 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” (Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, p. 134).

We learn from the Ambattha and Lohichcha Suttas (Dialogues, I, pp. 108, 288) 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 (Gagga Jātaka, No. 155).

He had many queens, e.g., Mallikā, daughter of the chief of garland makers in Śāvatthi, and Vāsabha Khattiya born to a Śākyan named Mahānāman from a slave woman. He had a daughter called Vajirā or Vajirī Kumāri (Majjhima, II, p. 110) and a son named Viḍūdabha whose mother was Vāsabha Khattiya. Prince Viḍūdabha at first appears to have served as his father’s Senāpati or General. Afterwards he succeeded to the throne and perpetrated a ferocious massacre of the Śākyas.

Hoernle in the Uvāsagadasāo (II, Appendix, p. 56) refers to Mrigadhara, who is said to have been the first minister of Prasenajit or Pasenadi. Prof. Bhandarkar refers to another minister called Siri-Vaddha. Another important official was Dīgha Chārāyaṇa (Majjhima N. II, p. 118). He is probably identical with Dīrgha Chārāyaṇa mentioned by Kauṭilya as an author of a treatise on kingly duties, and by Vātsyāyana 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 Seniya Bimbisāra and the Visālikā Lichchhavi. But he was much troubled by robbers like Angulimālo. We read in the Mahāvagga (SBE, XIII, p. 220) 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 Śatānika 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 Vāsuladatta or Vāsavādattā, the daughter of Pradyota, king of Avanti, became his wife. In the preface to the Mātanga Jātaka it is related that in a fit of drunken rage he had Pīndola tortured by having a nest of ants tied to him. The Kathāsarit-sāgara of Somadeva a writer of the eleventh century A.D. contains a long account of Udayana's Digvijaya (Tawney's Translations, Vol. I, p. 148 ff). But it is difficult to decide how much of it is folklore and how much sober history. The Priyadarśikā of Śrīharsha (Act IV) speaks of a king of Anāga named Dṛḍhavarman being restored by Udayana.

We have already referred to Vāsavādattā, the chief queen of Udayana. The Svapna-Vāsavādatta of Bāsa mentions another queen named Padmāvatī who is represented as sister to king Darsaka of Magadha. Prof. Bhandarkar mentions a queen named Māgandiyā, and Rhys Davids refers to one named Sāmavatī (Bud. Ind., p. 7). The Ratnāvali tells the story of the love of the king of Vatsa and of Sāgariṅkā an attendant of his queen Vāsavādattā. Stories about Udayana were widely current in Avanti in the time of Kālidāsa (cf. Meghadūta, "prāpya-vantim Udayana kathā kovida grāmavṛiddhān"). 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 and Magadha.
The throne of Avanti was at this time occupied by Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena who had two sons named Gopālaka and Pālaka, and a daughter named Vāsavadattā, the queen of Udayana. Regarding the character of Pradyota the Mahāvagga says that he was cruel (SBE, XVII, p. 187). The Purāṇas say that he was “nayavarjita,” i.e., destitute of good policy. The same authorities observe that “he will indeed have the neighbouring kings subject to him—Sa vai pranata sāmantaḥ.” 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.

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 Jīvaka. He contracted matrimonial alliances with the ruling families of Kosala and Vaiśālī. These marriages are 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 (Jātaka Nos. 239, 283, 492). According to the Thusa Jataka (No. 338) and Musika Jātaka (No. 373) 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 Nikāya (The Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 110) Paseṇadi of Kosala calls Ajātaśatru his nephew. On page 38 of the Book of the Kindred Sayings Maddā appears as the
name of Ajātaśatru’s mother. The Jaina writers, on the other hand, represent Chellanā, daughter of Chetaka of Vaiśālī, as the mother of Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru. The Nikāyas call Ajātaśatru Vedehiputta. This seems to confirm the Jaina tradition because Vaiśālī was situated in Videha. Buddhaghosa, however, resolves “Vedehi” into Veda-Iha, Vedena Ihati or intellectual effort (The Book of the Kindred Sayings, p. 109 n.). In this connection we should remember that even Kosalan monarchs had sometimes the epithet Vaideha (cf. Vedic Index, Vol. I, pp. 190, 491. Para Āṭnāra is called both Vaideha and Kausalya). 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 Āṅga which he annexed after defeating Brahmadatta (JASB, 1914, p. 321). The annexation of Āṅga by Bimbisāra is proved by the evidence of the Mahāvagga (SBE, XVII, p. 1) and of the Sonadanda Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya in which it is stated that the revenues of the town of Champā have been bestowed by King Bimbisāra on the Brāhmaṇa Sonadanda. We learn from Jaina Sources (Hemachandra, the author of the Sthavirāvali; cf. also the Bhagavatī Sūtra, and the Nirayāvalī Sūtra) that Āṅga was governed as a separate province under a Magadhan prince with Champā as its capital. Thus by war and policy Bimbisāra added Āṅga and a part of Kāsi to the Magadhan dominions, and launched Magadha in that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kalinga. We learn from the Mahāvagga that Bimbisāra’s dominions embraced 80,000 townships, the overseers (Gāmikas) of which used to meet in a great assembly.
Bimbisāra had many sons, namely, Kūnika-Ajātaśatru, Abhaya, Silavat, Vimala-Koṇḍañña, and Vehalla. Ajātaśatru seems to have acted as his father’s Viceroy at Champā (Bhagavatī Sūtra, Nirayāvali Sūtra and the Parisīṣṭaparvan). He is said to have killed his father and seized the entire kingdom.

II. Kūnika-Ajātaśatru.

The reign of Kūnika-Ajātaśatru was the highwater mark of the power of the Bimbisārian dynasty. He not only humbled Kosala and permanently annexed Kāsi, but also absorbed the state of Vaiśālī. The traditional account of his duel with Kosala is given in the Samyutta Nikāya (The Book of the Kindred Sayings, pp. 109-110), and the Haritamāta, Vaḍḍhaki-Sūkara, Kummā Sapiṇḍa, Tachchha Sūkara, and the Bhaddasāla Jātakas. It is said that after Ajātaśatru murdered Bimbisāra, his father, the queen Kosala Devī died of love for him. Even after her death Ajātaśatru still enjoyed the revenues of the Kāsi 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 fled 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 Kāsi village for her bath money. It is stated in the Bhaddasāla Jātaka that during Pasenadi’s absence in a country town, Dīgha Chārāyāna, the Commander-in-Chief, raised prince Viḍūḍabha to the throne. The ex-king sent 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-Kūṇika’s war with Vaiśāli is given by Jaina writers. King Seniya Bimbisāra is said to have given his famous elephant Seyanaga together with a huge necklace of eighteen strings of jewels, to his younger son Vehalla by his wife Chellana, the daughter of King Čhetaka of Vaiśāli. His eldest son Kuniya (Ajātaśatru) after usurping his father’s throne, on the instigation of his wife Paumāvaī demanded from his younger brother the return of both gifts. On the latter refusing to give them up and flying with them to his grandfather Čhetaka in Vaiśāli, Kuniya having failed peacefully to obtain the extradition of the fugitive, commenced war with Čhetaka (Uvāsagadasā, II Appendix, p. 7). According to Buddhaghosha’s commentary the Sumaṅgala vilāsinī (Burmese Edition, Part II, p. 99) 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 Vaiśāli are described in the Mahāvagga and the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta. In the Mahāvagga it is related that Sunidha and Vassakara, two ministers of Magadha, were building a fort at Pātaligāma in order to repel the Vajjis. The Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta says “the Blessed One was once dwelling in Rājagaha on the hill called the Vulture’s Peak. Now at that time Ajātasattu Vedehiputta, the king of Magadha, was desirous of attacking the Vajjis; and he said to himself, ‘I will root out these Vajjians, mighty and powerful though they be, I will destroy these Vajjians, I will bring these Vajjians to utter ruin.’

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

In the Nirayāvali Sūtra it is related that when Kūnīka (Ajātāsatru) prepared to attack Chetaka of Vaiśāli the latter called together the eighteen Gaṇarājjas of Kāsi and Kosala, together with the Liṅchhavīs and Mallakis, and asked them whether they would satisfy Kūnīka’s demands, or go to war with him. The good relations subsisting between Kosala and Vaiśāli are referred to in the Majjhima Nikāya, Vol. II, p. 101. There is thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Jainī statement regarding the alliance between Kāsi-Kosala on the one hand and Vaiśāli on the other. It seems that all the enemies of Ajātāsatru 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 Ajātāsatru is said to have made use of Mahāsilākanṭaga and rahamusala. 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 (Uvāsagadāsāo, Vol. II, Appendix, p. 60). The rahamusala may be compared to the tanks used in the great European war.

The war synchronised with the death of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta. Sixteen years later at the time of Mahāvīra’s death the anti-Magadhan confederacy was still in existence. We learn from the Kalpa Sūtra that
on the death of Mahāvīra the confederate kings mentioned in the Nirayāvali 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 Magadha statesmen to sow the seeds of dissension among the Vaiśālians and thus bring about their downfall (cf. Modern Review, July 1919, pp. 55-56).

The absorption of Vaiśāli and Kāśi as a result of the Kosalan and Vajjian wars probably brought the aspiring ruler of Magadha face to face with the equally ambitious sovereign of Avanti. We have already referred to a statement of the Majjhima Nikāya that on one occasion 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 Udāybhadha was the son of Ajātaśatru and probably also his successor. Jaina tradition recorded in the Pariśiṣṭaparvan (p. 42) also represents Udāyin as the immediate successor of Kūṃika.

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-yu-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" (Beal, Si-yu-ki, II, p. 192). The name of the second Saṅghārāma was probably derived from that of Darṣaka 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 Champā (Jacobi, Parisishtaparvan, p. 42). The Parisishtaparvan further informs us that he founded a new capital on the bank of the Ganges which came to be known as Pātaliputra. This part of the Jaina tradition is confirmed by the testimony of the Vāyu Purāṇa according to which Udaya built the city of Kusumapura in the fourth year of his reign. The Parisishtaparvan (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 Vaiśāli 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 Kathāsaritsaṅgara (Tawney's Translation, Vol. II, p. 484) is to be believed the kingdom of Kauśāmbī was at this time annexed to the realm of Pālaka of Avanti, the successor 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 during the reign of Udāyin. The issue was finally decided in the time of Siśunāga.

In the opinion of Mr. Jayaswal one of the famous “Patna Statues” in the Bhārhut 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 Bhagavata list of Saiśunāga kings, and with Udāyin of the Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa 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). Dr. Majumdar reads: Gate (Yakhe?) Lechchhai (vi) 40, 4.

Udāyin’s successors according to the Purāṇas were Nandivardhana and Mahānandin. But the Ceylonese chronicles place after Udaya the kings named Anuruddha, Munda and Nāga Dāsaka. Here again the Ceylonese account is partially confirmed by the Āṅguttara Nikāya

1 Indian Antiquary, March, 1919.
which refers to Munda, King of Pataliputra. Prof. Bhandarkar mentions his queen Bhadrādevī and treasurer Priyaka. The Auguttara Nikāya by mentioning Pataliputra as the capital of Munda indirectly confirms the tradition regarding the transfer of the Magadhan metropolis from Rājagriha to Kusumapura or Pataliputra.

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 āmātya named Susu Nāga (Śiśunāga) 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 āmātyas as provincial governors need not cause surprise. The custom was prevalent as late as the time of Gautamiputra Śatakarni.

The Purānic statement that Śiśunāga 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 Śiśunāga was the progenitor of Bimbisāra's family. It may be argued that as Śiśunāga had his capital at Girivraja he must have flourished before Udāyin who was the first to remove the capital to Pataliputra. But the fact that Kālāśoka, the son and successor of Śiśunāga, had to retransfer the royal residence from Rājagriha to Pataliputra (SBE, XI, p. xvi) shows that one of his predecessors had reverted to the old capital. Who this predecessor was is made clear by the Purānic statement that Śiśunāga "will make Girivraja his own abode." The inclusion of Benares within Śiśunāga's dominions also proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru who were the first to establish Magadhan authority in Kāsi.
From a statement in the Mālālaṅkāravatthu, a Pāli work of modern date, but following very closely the more ancient books, it appears that Śisunāga had a royal residence at Vaiśālī which ultimately became his capital (SBE, XI, p. xvi). "That monarch (Susunāga), not unmindful of his mother's origin, re-established the city of Vesāli, 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 Rājagiriha lost her rank of royal city from the time of Śisunāga, proves that Śisunāga came after the palmy days of Rājagiriha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru.

The most important achievement of Śisunāga 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 Pālaka after whom came Āryaka. The Purāṇas place after Āryaka or Ajaka a king named Nandivardhana, or Vartivardhana (Avanti-vardhana ?), and add that Śisunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and be king. Mr. Jayaswal identifies Ajaka and Nandivardhana of the Avanti list with Aja-Udāya and Nandivardhana of the Purānic list of Śaiśunāga kings. But Prof. Bhandarkar says that Āryaka or Ajaka was the son of Gopāla, the elder brother of Pālaka. The important thing to remember is that the Pradyota dynasty was humbled by Śisunāga. Whether the Śaiśunāga occupation of Avanti took place immediately after Pālaka, or two generations later, is immaterial.

Śisunāga was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by his son Kākavarna, according to the Ceylonese chronicles by his son Kālāśoka. Professors Jacobi, Geiger and Bhandarkar suggest that Kālāśoka, "the black Aśoka" and Kākavarna, "the crow-coloured" are one and the same person. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence
of the Asokavadana which places Kākavarnin after Muṇḍa, and does not mention Kālaśoka (Geiger, Mahāvaṃsa, p. xli). The two most important events of the reign of Kālaśoka are the holding of the Second Buddhist Council at Vaiśālī, and the retransfer of the capital to Pātaliputra. Bāna in his Harshacharita (edited by Kāsināth Pāṇḍuraṅga Parab, p. 223) gives a curious legend concerning the death of Kākavarna (Kālaśoka). It is stated there that Kākavarna Šaiśunāgī had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The story about the tragic end of Kākavarna-Kālaśoka is, as we shall see later, confirmed by Greek evidence.

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

Sapa (or Sava) khaṭe Vaṭa Naṁdi.

He regards Vaṭa Naṁdi as an abbreviation of Vartivar-dhana (the name of Nandivardhana in the Vāyu list) and Nandivardhana. Mr. R. D. Banerji in the June number of the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, 1919, says that there cannot be two opinions about the reading Vaṭa Naṁdi. 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 (?) rvāta naṁdi.
Dr. Majumdar says that the inscription may be read as follows:

Yakhe saṁ Vajināṁ 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. Referring to Mr. Jayaswal's suggestion that the form Vaṭa Naṁdi is composed of two variant proper names (Vartivardhana and Naṁdivardhana) he says that Chandragupta II was also known as Devagupta, and Vigrahapāla had a second name Śurapala; but who has ever heard of compound names like Chandra-Deva or Deva-Chandra, and Śura-Vigraha or Vīgраha-Śūra?

Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstri takes Vaṭa Naṁdi to mean Vṛātya Naṁdi and says that the statue has most of the articles of dress as given by Kātyāyana to the Vṛātya Kshatriya. In the Purāṇas the Śiśunāga kings are mentioned as Kshattrabandhus, i. e., Vṛātya Kshatriyas. The Mahāmahopādhyāya thus inclines to the view of Mr. Jayaswal that the statue in question is a portrait of a Śaiśunāga king.¹

Mr. Ordhendra Coomar Gangoly regards the statue as a Yaksha image, and draws our attention to the catalogue of Yakshas in the Mahāmayuri and the passage "Nandi cha Vardhanaḥ chaiva nagare Nandi-vardhane."² Dr. Barnett is also not satisfied that the four syllables which may be read as Vaṭa Naṁdi mention the name of a Śaiśunāga king. Dr. Smith however in the third edition of his "Aśoka" admits the possibility

¹ JBORS, December, 1919. ² Modern Review, October, 1919.
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 Śāisunāga king. The script seems to be late.

Messrs. R. D. Banerji and Jayaswal propose to identify Nandivardhana, the Śāisunāga king, with Nandarāja mentioned in the Hāṭhigumpha inscription of Khāravela king of Kaliṅga. One of the passages containing the name of Nandarāja runs thus:—

Paṁchame cha dāni vase Na (m) da-rāja-tivasasata-ō (ghā ?) ītam Tanasuliyavātā panādim nagaram pavesa...

“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 Kshemendra’s reference to the Pūrvanandāḥ who, we are told, should be distinguished from the Navanandāḥ or Later Nandas, and identified with Nandivardhana and Mahānandin (The Oxford History of India, Additions and Corrections). In the Kathā Sarit-Sāgara, however, Pūrvananda is distinguished, not from the Navanandāḥ, but from Yogananda. The Purāṇas and the Ceylonese authorities know of the existence of only one Nanda line. The Purāṇas and the Mahābodhivamsa represent Nandivardhana as a king of the Śāisunāga line—a dynasty which is sharply distinguished from the Nandas. Moreover, as Prof. Chanda points out (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 1, p. 11), the Purāṇas contain nothing to show that Nandivardhana had anything to do with Kaliṅga. On the contrary we are distinctly told by those authorities that when the kings of the Śāisunāga dynasty and their predecessors were reigning in Magadha 32 kings reigned in Kaliṅga 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 Naṁdarāja of the Ḣāthigumpha inscription who held possession of Kāliṅga 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 Śaśvāna dynasty was supplanted by the Nanda line.

IV. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIMBISĀRA-ŚIŚUNĀGA GROUP.

There is considerable disagreement between the Purāṇas and the Ceylonese Chronicles regarding the chronology of the kings of the Bimbiśāri (or Nāga) and Śaśvāna dynasties. Even Dr. Smith is not disposed to accept all the dates given in the Purāṇas. Prof Bhandarkar observes (Carm. Lec., 1918, p. 68) "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." According to the Ceylonese Chronicles Bimbiśāra ruled for fifty-two years, Ajātaśatru for 32 years, Udaya for 16 years, Anuruddha and Muniḍa for 8 years, Nāgaḍāṣaka for 24 years, Susunāga for 18 years, Kālāsoka for 28 years, and Kālāsoka's sons for 22 years. Gautama Buddha died when Ajātaśatru was on the throne for 8 years (Carm. Lec., p. 70), i.e., 52 + 8 = 60 years after the accession of Bimbiśāra. Fleet and Geiger adduce good grounds for believing that the Parinirvāna really took place in 483 B. C. (JRAS, 1909, pp. 1-34; Geiger, Mahāvaṃśa, p. xxviii). Adding 60 to 483 B. C. we get the year 543 B. C. as the date of the accession of Bimbiśāra. In the time of Bimbiśāra 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.

V. The Nandas.

We have seen that the Śaśiṇūga dynasty was supplanted by the line of Nanda. The name of the first Nanda was Mahāpadma according to the Purāṇas, and Ugrasena according to the Mahābodhivamsa. The Purāṇas describe him as Śudragarbhodbhava, i.e., born of a Śūdra mother. The Jaina Parisīṣṭaparvan (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 says (McCrindle, The Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 222) "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 Kālāsoka-Kākavarna who had a tragic end as we know from the Harshacharita. Kākavarna Śaiśunāgi, says Bāṇa, had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The young princes referred to by Curtius were evidently the sons of Kālāsoka-Kākavarna. The Greek account of the rise of the family of Agrammes fits in well with the Ceylonese account of the end of the Śaiśunāga line and the rise of the Nandas, but not with the Purānic story which represents the first Nanda as a son of the last Śaiśunāga by a Śūdra woman, and makes no mention of the young princes. The name Agrammes is probably a corruption of the Sanskrit Augrasainya, "son of Ugrasena." Ugrasena is, as we have seen, the name of the first Nanda according to the Mahābodhivamsa. His son may aptly be termed Augrasainya which the Greeks corrupted into Agrammes and later on into Xandrames.

The Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas call Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king, the destroyer of all the Kshatriyas (Sarva Kshatrāntaka) and sole monarch (ekarat) of the earth which was under his undisputed sway which terms imply that he overthrew all the dynasties which ruled contemporaneously with the Śaiśunāgas, viz., the Ikshvākus, Haihayaś, Kaliṅgas, Aṣmakas, Śūrasenas, 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 Kathāsaritsāgara (Tawney's Translation, p. 21) which refers to the camp of king Nanda in Ayodhyā. 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 (Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 3). But these are of comparatively modern date, the twelfth century, and too much cannot be built upon their statements. More important is the evidence of the Hāthigumpha inscription 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 that king Nanda carried away as trophies the statue (or footprints) of the first Jina and heirlooms of the Kaliṅga kings to Magadha (JBORS, 1917, December, pp. 447, 457-458). In view of Nanda's possession of Kaliṅga, the conquest of regions lying further south does not seem to be altogether improbable.

The Matsya Purāṇa assigns 88 years to the reign of the first Nanda, but 88 (Ashtāśṭī) is probably a mistake for 28 (Ashtāvimśati), as the Vāyu assigns only 28 years. According to Tāranāth Nanda reigned 29 years (Ind. Ant., 1875, p. 362). 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., Sukalpā. The Mahābodhivāmsa gives the following names, Paṇḍuka, Paṇḍugati, Bhūtapāla,
Rāṣṭrapāla, Govishāṇaka, 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 Augrasainya.

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 Gangaridae and the Prasii kept in the field for guarding the approaches to his country 20,000 cavalry and 200,000 infantry, besides 2,000 four-horsed chariots, and, what was the most formidable force of all, a troop of elephants 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 (Beginnings of South Indian History, p. 89) 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 Kathāsaritsāgara says (Tawney’s Translation, Vol. I, p. 21) that king Nanda possessed 990 millions of gold pieces.

The Ashtādhyañī of Pāṇini, 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 Arthaśāstra, Kāmandaka’s Nitisāra, the Purāṇas, 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 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" (M'Crindle, The Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 222).

The Purānic passage about the revolution stands as follows:

Uddharishyati tān sarvān
Kautilyo vai dvīr ashtabhīh
Kautilyāś Chandraguptaṁ tu
Tato rājye' bhishekṣhyati.

Mr. Jayaswal (Ind. Ant., 1914, p. 124) proposes to read Virashṭrābhīh instead of dvirastabhīh. Virashtras he takes to mean the Āraṭṭas, and adds that Kautilya was helped by the Āraṭṭas "the band of robbers" of Justin.

The Milinda-Pañho (cf. SBE., XXXVI, pp. 147-48) 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 (cf. Ind. Ant., 1914, p. 124 n.).
THE PERSIAN AND MACEDONIAN INVASIONS.

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 Uttarāpatha beyond the Madhyadeśa, like the rest of India, was parcelled out into a number of small states the most important of which were Gandhāra and Kamboja. No sovereign arose in this part of India capable of welding together the warring communities, as Ugrasena-Mahāpadma 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 (558-529 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 (H. and F. Strabo, III., p. 74). But he was more successful in the Kābul valley. We learn from Pliny that he destroyed the famous city of Kāpiśa. Arrian informs us (Chinnock's Edition, p. 399) that "the district west of the river Indus as far as the river Cophen (Kābul) is inhabited by the Astaceni (Aṣvātakas, Mbh. VI. 51) and the Assaceni (Aṣmakas), 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 Hydracae (the Kshudrakas) from India (i.e., the Pañjāb) to attend them as mercenaries.
In the Behistun inscription of Dārayavaush or Darius, (522-486 B.C.), the third sovereign of the Achaemenian dynasty, the people of Gandhāra (Gadāra) appear among the subject peoples of the Persian Empire. But no mention is there made of the Hidus (people of the Indus Valley) who are included with the Gandhārians in the lists of subject peoples given by the inscriptions on the palace of Darius at Persepolis, and on his tomb at Nakshi-Rustum. From this Rapson infers that the Indians (Hidus) were conquered at some date between 516 B.C., (the 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 (M’Crindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, pp. 4-5) "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 and the country of Paktyike sailed down the river towards the east and sunrise to the sea; then sailing on the sea westwards, they arrived in the thirtieth month at that place where the king of Egypt despatched the Phoenicians, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented the sea."

Herodotus tells us that "India" constituted the twentieth and the most populous satrapy of the Persian Empire, and that it paid a tribute proportionately larger than all the rest, 360 talents of gold dust. Gandhāra was included in the seventh satrapy. The details regarding India left by Herodotus leave no room for doubt that it embraced the Indus valley and was bounded on the

1 Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenidan Inscriptions by H. C. Tolman.
east by the desert of Rajaputāna. “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.”

Khshayarsha or Xerxes (480-464 B.C.), the son and successor of Darius, maintained his hold on the Indian provinces. In the great army which he led against Hellas both Gandhāra and “India” were represented. The Gandhārians are described by Herodotus as bearing bows of reed and short spears, and the “Indians” as being clad in cotton garments and bearing cane bows with arrows tipped with iron. An interesting relic of Persian influence in India is a Taxila inscription in Aramaic characters of the fourth or fifth century B.C. (JRAS., 1915, pp. 340-47).

Indians figured in the army which Darius Codomannus (335-330 B.C.) led against Alexander. “The Indians who were conterminous with the Bactrians, as also the Bactrians themselves and the Sogdianians had come to the aid of Darius, all being under the command of Bessus, the Viceroy of the land of Bactria. They were followed by the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwell in Asia. These were not subject to Bessus but were in alliance with Darius....Barsaentes, the Viceroy of Arachotia, led the Arachotians and the men who were called mountaineer Indians...There were a few Elephants, about fifteen in number, belonging to the Indians who live this side of the Indus. With these forces Darius had encamped at Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about 600 stades distant from the city of Arbela.”

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

1 Chinnock, Arrian’s Anabasis, pp. 142-143.
innumerable kingdoms and republics. A list of the more important among these states is given below:—

1. The Aspasian territory:
   It lay in the difficult hill country north of the Kābul river. The chieftain of the Aspasians dwelt in a city on or near the river Euaspla, supposed to be identical with the Kunār, a tributary of the Kābul. Other Aspasian cities were Andaca and Arigaeum.¹

2. The country of the Guraeans:
   It was washed by the river Guraeus (Pañjkora) and lay between the land of the Aspasians and the country of the Assakenians.

3. The kingdom of Assakenus:
   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 Märkanḍeeya Purāṇa and the Brīhat Samhitā. A branch of this people probably settled in the Deccan, and gave their name to the Assaka Mahājana-pada 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 brother (Invasion of Alexander, p. 378) called Eryx by Curtius and Aphrike by Diodoros.

4. Peukelaotis:
   It lay on the road from Kābul to the Indus. Arrian tells us (Chinnock's Edition, p. 403) that the Kābul falls into the Indus in the land called Peukelaotis, taking with

¹ Chinnock's Arrian pp. 230-231.
itself the Malantus, Soastus and Guraeus. Peukelaotis represents the Sanskrit Pushkaraśatī. It formed the western part of the old kingdom of Gandhāra. The capital is represented by the modern Chārsadda, 17 miles N. E. of Peshāwar, on the Swāt river, the Soastus of Arrian, and the Suvāśtu of the Vedic texts.

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

5. 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. Arrian says (Chinnock's Edition, p. 399) "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.

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 (Invasion of Alexander, p. 81).

6. Taxila or Takshaśilā:

Strabo says (H. & F.'s Ed. III, p. 90) "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.

1 Chinnock, Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander and Indica, p. 228.
In B.C. 327 the Taxilian throne was occupied by a prince whom the Greeks called Taxiles. When Alexander of Macedon arrived in the Kabul valley he sent a 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 Kautilya, the famous minister, refers to a school of political philosophers called Āmbhiyas, and Dr. F. W. Thomas connects them with Taxila (Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra, Introduction, p. 15).

7. Abhisāra:
Strabo says (H. & F.'s Ed. III, p. 90) that the kingdom was situated among the mountains above the Taxila country. The position of this state was correctly defined by Stein who observed that Dārvābhisāra (cf. Mbh. VII. 91.43) comprised the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Jihlam and the Chināb. Abisares, 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, Abisares intended to join his forces with those of the latter (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 276).

8. The kingdom of Arsakes:
It represents the Sanskrit Uraśā, the modern Hazāra district. It adjoined the realm of Abisares.

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. Strabo tells us (H. & F.'s Ed. III, p. 91) that it was an extensive and fertile district containing nearly 300 cities. Diodoros informs us (Invasion of
Alexander, p. 274) 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 Sarasvatī. In the time of Alexander we find them on the Hydaspes (Jihlam). The Mahā-bhārata also refers to a “Puram Paurava-rakshitam” which lay not far from Kaśmīra (Sabhā, 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 Glauganicians by Aristobulus, Glausians (Govāsas? Mbh. VIII. 73.17) by Ptolemy:

This country was conterminous with the dominion of Poros (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 276).

11. Gandaris:

It lay between the Chināb and the Rāvi and probably represented the easternmost part of the old Mahājanapada of Gandhāra. 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):

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

13. Kathaioi or Cathaeans:

Strabo says (H. & F.’s Ed. III, p. 92) “some writers place Cathaia and the country of Sopeithes, one of the nomarchs, in the tract between the rivers (Hydaspes and Acesines, 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) or Krātha (Mbh. VIII. 85.16). 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 (JRAS., 1903, p. 687).

The Kathaians enjoyed the highest reputation for courage and skill in the art of war. Onesikritos tells us that in Kathaia the handsomest man was chosen as king (M’Crindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 38).

14. The kingdom of Sophytes (Saubhūti):

In the opinion of Smith, the position of this kingdom is fixed by the remark of Strabo (H. & F.’s Ed. III, p. 93) that it included a mountain composed of fossil salt sufficient for the whole of India; Sophytes was therefore the “lord of the fastnesses of the Salt Range stretching from Jihlam to the Indus.” But we have already seen that the classical writers agree in placing Sophytes’ kingdom east of the Jiham. Curtius tells us (Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 219) that the nation ruled by Sopeithes (Sophytes), in the opinion of the “barbarians,” excelled in wisdom, and lived under good laws and customs. They did not acknowledge and rear children according to the will of the parents, but as the officers entrusted with the medical inspection of infants might direct, for if they remarked anything deformed or defective in the limbs of a child they ordered it to be killed. In contracting marriages they did not seek an alliance with high birth, but made their choice by the looks, for beauty in the children was highly appreciated. Strabo informs us (H. & F. III, p. 93) that the dogs in the territory of Sopeithes (Sophytes) were
said to possess remarkable courage. We have some coins of Sophytes bearing on the obverse the head of the king, and on the reverse the figure of a cock. Strabo calls Sophytes a nomarch which probably indicates that he was not an independent sovereign, but only a viceroy of some other king.

15. The kingdom of Phegelas or Phegeus:

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 Gaṇapātha (Invasion of Alexander, p. 401).

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, Bhalānases, and Viṣāṇīs the honour of being defeated by Sudās (Vedic Index, Vol. II, pp. 381-382). The Jātakas mention a Sivi country and its cities Ariṭṭhapura (Ummadanti Jātaka, No. 527; cf. Pāṇini VI. 2. 100) and Jetuttara (Vessantara Jātaka No. 547). 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 (Ved. Ind., II, p. 382). 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 Sibis. (Ep. Ind., 1921, p. 16.)

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 Śvis ruled by king Uśinara, which lay not far from the Yamunā. It is not altogether improbable that
the Ušinara country (vide pp. 27, 28 ante) was at one time the home of the Īvis. We find them also in Madhyamikā in Rājaputāna (Carm. Lec. 1918, p. 173).

17. The Agalassoi:
They lived near the Siboi.

18. The Sudra-cae or Oxydrakai:
They dwelt on the banks of the Hyphasis (Bias). Their name represents the Sanskrit Kshudraka (Mbh. VII. 68.9).

19. The Malloi:
They occupied the valley of the Hydraotes (Rāvi), on both banks of the river. Their name represents the Sanskrit Mālava. Weber informs us that Āpiṣali, one of the teachers cited by Pāṇini, speaks of the formation of the compound—"Kshaudraka-Mālavā." Dr. Smith pointed out that the Mahābhārata coupled the tribes in question as forming part of the Kaurava host in the Kurukshetra war (EHI., 1914, p. 94 n; Mbh. VI. 59.135). Curtius tells us (Invasion of Alexander, p. 234) that the Sudra-cae and the Malli had an army consisting of 90,000 foot soldiers, 10,000 cavalry and 900 war chariots.

According to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar Pāṇini refers to the Mālavas as living by the profession of arms (Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 200). In later times the Mālavas are found in Rājaputāna, Avanti and the Māhi valley.

20. The Abastanoi:
Diodorus calls them the Sambastai (Invasion of Alexander, p. 292), Arrian Abastanoi, Curtius Sabarcae, and Orosius Sabagrae. They were settled on the lower Aksines. Their name represents the Sanskrit Ambashtha. The Ambashthas are mentioned in several Sanskrit works. An Ambashtha king is mentioned in the Aitareya Brähmaṇa (VIII. 21) whose priest was Nārada. The Mahābhārata (II. 52. 14-15) mentions the Ambashthas along with the Īvis, Kshudrakas, Mālavas and other north-western tribes. In the Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra (Ed. F. W. Thomas
p. 21) the Ambashṭha country is mentioned in conjunction with Sind:

Kāśmīra-Hūn-Āmbashṭha-Sindhavah.

In the Ambattha Sutta (Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, p. 109) an Ambattha is called a Brāhmaṇa. In the Smṛiti literature, on the other hand, Ambashṭha denotes a man of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Vaiśya parentage. According to Jātaka IV. 363 the Ambatthas were farmers. It seems that the Ambashṭhas were a tribe who were at first mainly a fighting race, but some of whom took to other occupations, viz., those of priests, farmers, and according to the Smṛiti writers, physicians (Ambashṭhānāṁ chikitsitam, Manu, X. 47).

In the time of Alexander the Ambashṭhas were a powerful tribe having a democratic government. Their army consisted of 60,000 foot, 6,000 cavalry and 500 chariots (Invasion of Alexander, p. 252).

21. The Xathroi and the Ossadioi:

The Xathroi are according to M’Crindle (Invasion of Alexander, p. 156 n.) the Kshatri of Sanskrit 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 Vaśāti of the Mahābhārata (VII. 19.11; 89.37; VIII. 44.46).

22. The Sodrai (Sogdoi) and the Massanoi (occupying N. Sind).

23. The kingdom of Mousikanos:

It included a large part of modern Sind. Its capital has been identified with Alor in the Sukkur district. The following peculiarities of the inhabitants of the kingdom of Mousikanos are noticed by Strabo (H. and F., III, p. 96):

"The following are their peculiarities: to have a kind of Lacedaemonian common meal, where they eat in public. Their food consists of what is taken in the chase. They make no use of gold nor silver, although
they have mines of these metals. Instead of slaves, they employed youths in the flower of their age, as the Cretans employ the Aphamiotae, 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 (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 319).

24. The principality of Oxykanos:

Curtius calls the subjects of Oxykanos the Praesti (Proshṭhas? 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 (Invasion of Alexander, p. 158).

25. The principality of Sambos:

Sambos was the ruler of a mountainous country adjoining the kingdom of Mousikanos, with whom he was at feud. His capital, called Sindimana, has been identified with Sehwan, a city on the Indus (M’Crindle, Invasion of Alexander, p. 404).

26. Patalene:

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

Diodorus tells us (Inv. Alex., p. 296) that Tauala (Patala) had a political constitution drawn on the same
lines as the Spartan; for in this community the command in war was vested in two hereditary kings of different houses, while a Council of Elders ruled the whole state with paramount authority. One of the kings in the time of Alexander was called Moeres (Inv. Alex., p. 256).

The states described above had little tendency to unity or combination. Curtius tells us (Inv. Alex., p. 202) that Āmbhi, 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 Mālavas (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 279). 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.

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, Diodoros Siculus, Plutarch and Justin. We learn from Curtius that Scythians and Dahae served in the Macedonian army (Inv. Alex., p. 208). 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 Kūnika-Ajātaśatru. On the contrary he obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Āmbhi of Taxila, Sangaeus (Sañjaya?) of Pushkaravatī, Kophaios or Cophaeus, Assagetes (Aśvajit?), Sisikottos (Saśīgupta)
who got as his reward the satrapy of the Assakenians (Inv. Alex., p. 112). 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?), the Aspasians, the Assakenians, the elder Poros, the Kathaians, 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 Hydaspes (B. C. 326), the Malloi and the Oxydrakai were also no doubt crushed. But Alexander found that his Indian antagonists were different from the effete troops of Persia. Diodoros informs us (Inv. Alex., p. 270) 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 (cf. Bury, Greece, pp. 428-429). The Malloi almost succeeded in killing the Macedonian king. But all this was of no avail. A disunited people could not long resist the united forces of the Hellenic world led by the greatest captain of ancient Europe. Alexander succeeded in conquering the old Persian satrapies of Gandhāra and “India,” but was unable to try conclusions with Agrammes king of the Gangaridāe and the Prasii, 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 Praisiai” 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. The city of Alexandria in the land of the Parapanisadæ, i. e., the Kābul region.
2. Nikaia, where the battle with Poros took place.
3. Boukephala, on the spot whence the Macedonian king had started to cross the Hydaspes (Jihlam).
4. Alexandria in Sind, in the vicinity of the countries of the Sodrai or Sogdoi, and Massanoi, who occupied the banks of the Indus (Inv. Alex., pp. 293, 354).

Aśoka recognised the existence of Yona settlers on the northern fringe of his empire. Boukephala Alexandria flourished as late as the time of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (Schoff’s Ed., p. 41). One of the Alexandrias (Alasanda) is mentioned in the Mahāvamsa (Geiger’s Ed., p. 194).

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 Chandra-gupta Maurya in the east, Alexander was the forerunner of that emperor in the north-west.
THE MAURYA EMPIRE; THE ERA OF DIGVIJAYA

1. 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 Madhyadesa. Agrammes was confronted with a crisis not unlike that which Arminius had to face when Varus carried the Roman Eagle to the Teutoburg Forest, or which Charles Martel had to face when the Saracens carried the Crescent 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 a different stuff. This was Chandragupta, the Sandrocottus of the classical writers. The rise of Chandragupta is thus described by Justin (Watson’s Ed., p. 142):

"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.

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 battle 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 Parishishtaparvan (p. 56) represents him as the son of a daughter of the chief of the village of Mayuraposhaka. The Mahāvamsa (Geiger's Translation, p. 27) calls him a scion of the Moriya clan. In the Divyāvadāna (Cowell and Neil's Ed., p. 370) Bindusāra, the son of Chandragupta, claims to be a Kshatriya Mūrdhābhishikta. In the same work (p. 409) Aśoka, the son of Bindusāra, calls himself a Kshatriya. In the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta (SBE. XI, pp. 134-35) 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 Chandragupta. The Moriyas were no longer ruler, 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 (Life of Alexander, LXII) "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 Saugrāma Sinha who invited Bābar to put an end to the rule of Ibrāhīm Lodi. 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. Chandragupta apparently thought of ridding his country of both the tyrants, Macedonian as well as Indian. With the help of Kauṭilya, also called Chāṇakya or Vishnugupta, he overthrew the infamous Nanda. Traditional accounts of the conflict between Chandragupta and the last Nanda are preserved in the
Milindapañho, the Purāṇas, the Mudrārākshasa and the Jaina Parishīṣṭaparvan. The Milindapañho (SBE, Vol. XXXVI, p. 147) tells us that the Nanda army was commanded by Bhaddasāla. The Nanda troops were evidently defeated with great slaughter, an exaggerated account of which is preserved in the Milindapañho.

"Sometime after" his acquisition of sovereignty, Chandragupta went to war with the prefects or generals of Alexander (cf. Smith, Asoka, third edition, p. 14 n.) and crushed their power.

The overthrow of the Nandas, and the liberation of the Pañjāb were not the only achievements of the great Maurya. Plutarch tells us (Alex. LXII) 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 Paraṇar or Param Koṛṛanār and Kallil Āttiraiyanār. The advanced party of the invasion was composed of a warlike people called Kośar (Kośalas ?). The invaders advanced from the Konkan passing the hills Elilmalai, 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 (Beginnings of South Indian History, p. 89) would seem to suggest that the first Maurya, i.e., Chandragupta was meant.

Certain Mysore Inscriptions refer to Chandragupta's rule in north Mysore. Thus one inscription says that
Nāgakhanḍa in the Shikarpur Taluq was protected by the wise Chandragupta, "an abode of the usages of eminent Kshatriyas" (Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 10). This is of the fourteenth century and little reliance can be placed upon it. But when the statements of Plutarch, Justin, Māmulanār, and the Mysore inscriptions referred to by Rice, are read together they seem to suggest that the first Maurya did conquer a considerable portion of trans-Vindhyan India.

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

_The Seleukidan War._

We learn from Justin (Watson's Ed., p. 143) 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 says (Ind. Ant. Vol. VI, p. 114) 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 says 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 (H. & F., III, p. 125):

"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." *Ibid*, p. 78.

It will be seen that the classical writers do not give 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 *Āsoka* (Third Ed., p. 15) 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 Paropanisadai, *i. e.*, Herāt, Kandahār, Makrān and Kābul. The inclusion of the Kābul valley within the Maurya Empire is proved by the inscriptions of Āsoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, which speak of the Yonas and Gandhāras as vassals of the Empire.
We learn from the classical writers that after the war the Syrian and Indian emperors lived on friendly terms. Athenaios tells us that Chandragupta sent presents including certain powerful aphrodisiacs to the Syrian monarch (Inv. Alex., p. 405). Seleukos sent an envoy to the Maurya court, whose name was Megasthenes. Arrian tells us (Chinnock’s Ed., p. 254) that Megasthenes originally lived with Sibyrtios the satrap of Arachosia. He was sent from thence to Pataliputra 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 and others, have been collected by Schwanbeck, and translated by M’Crindle. 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 Pataliputra 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 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) in length, and that its breadth is fifteen (1½ 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 Pataliputra. 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 and Ujjain.

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 Ekbatana 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 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 Kumrahar (Smith, The Oxford History of India, p. 77). The unearthing of the ruins of the Maurya piliar-hall and palace near Kumrahar, 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 (JRAS, 1915, pp. 63 ff, 405 ff). 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 observed, “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 (H. & F.’s Ed., Vol. III, p. 106; cf. Smith, EHI, p. 123) that the king usually remained within the palace under the protection of female guards (cf. strī 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, but a great administrator. Kautilya and Megasthenes have left detailed accounts of his system of government, and the edicts of his grandson Asoka confirm in many respects the particulars of the organisation

1 M’Crindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, pp. 141-42.
of the empire given by the great minister and the distinguished envoy.

The supreme Government consisted of two main parts:
1. The Rājā, and
2. the Mahāmātras, Amātyas or Sachivas.

The Rājā 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 (cf. Kauṭilya, Bk. X). He considered plans of military operations with his Senāpati (Kauṭ., p. 38).

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" (H. & F., Strabo, III, pp. 106-107). Kauṭilya says (Shamasastry's translation, p. 43), "when in the court, he (the king) shall never cause his petitioners to wait at the door, for when a king makes himself inaccessible to his people and entrusts his work to his immediate officers, he may be sure to engender confusion in business, and to cause thereby public disaffection, and himself a prey to his enemies. He shall, therefore, personally attend to the business of gods, of heretics, of Brāhmaṇas learned in the Vedas, of cattle, of sacred places, of minors, the aged, the afflicted, the helpless and of women;—all this in order (of enumeration) or according to the urgency or pressure of those works. All urgent calls he shall hear at once.

As to the king's legislative function we should note that Kauṭilya (Bk. III, Chap. I) calls him "dharmaprarvartaka," and includes Rājasāsana among the sources of law.
Among executive functions of the king, Kautilya (Bk. I, Ch. XVI; XVIII; Bk. VIII, Ch. I) mentions the posting of watchmen, attending to the accounts of receipts and expenditure, appointment of ministers, priests and superintendents, corresponding with the Mantriparishad, collection of the secret information gathered by spies, reception of envoys, etc.

Kautilya holds that Rājatya (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 Kautilya 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 (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 413).

The most important amongst the Sachivas or Amātyas were undoubtedly the Mantrins or High Ministers. They were selected from those Amātyas whose character had been tested under all kinds of allurements (Sārvopadha śuddhān Mantrināh kuryāt, Arthasastra, p. 17). They were given the highest salary, viz., 48,000 panas per annum (ibid, p. 247). They assisted the king in examining the character of the Amātyas who were employed in ordinary departments (ibid, p. 16). All kinds of administrative measures were preceded by consultation with three or four of them (ibid, pp. 26, 28). In works of emergency (ātyāyike kārye) they were summoned along with the Mantriparishad (ibid, p. 29). They exercised a certain amount of control over the Imperial Princes (ibid, p. 333). They accompanied the king to the battlefield, and gave encouragement to the troops (ibid, p. 368). Kautilya was evidently one of these Mantrins. That there were 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 Arthaśāstra but by the third- and sixth Rock Edicts of Asoka. The members of the Mantriparishad were not identical with the Mantrins. In several passages of Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra the Mantrins are sharply distinguished from the Mantriparishad (cf. pp. 20, 29, 247). The latter evidently occupied an inferior position. Their salary was only 12,000 paṇas whereas the salary of a Mantri 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 (Bhūyishṭhāh). They also attended the king at the time of the reception of envoys (p. 45). From the passage “Mantriparishadāṁ dvādaśāmātyāṅ kurvita” 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 Mānavas, Bārhaspatyas and the Auśanasas, and his reference to Indra’s Parishad of a thousand Rishis, it may be presumed that his master was prevailed upon 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. Kauṭilya says (p. 17) that the “dharmopadhāśuddha” Amātyas should be employed in civil and criminal courts; the “arthopadhāśuddha” Amātyas should be employed as Samāhartri and Sannidhāṭri, the “kāmopadhāśuddha” Amātyas should be
appointed to superintend the pleasure grounds, the “bhayopadhāśuddha” Amātyas should be appointed to immediate service (āsanna kārya) while those who are proved impure should be employed in mines, timber and elephant forests, and manufactories. Untried Amātyas were to be employed in ordinary departments (sāmānya adhikaraṇa). Persons endowed with the qualifications required in an Amātya (Amātya sampadopeta) were appointed Nisṛishṭārthāḥ (ministers plenipotentiary), Lekhakas or Ministers of Correspondence, and Adhyakshas or Superintendents.

The statements of Kauṭilya regarding the employment of Amātyas as the chief executive and judicial officers, are confirmed by the classical writers. Arrian says “from them are chosen their rulers, governors of provinces, deputies, treasurers, generals, admirals, controllers of expenditure, and superintendents of agriculture.” Strabo also observes (H. and F. Vol. III, p. 103) “the seventh caste consists of counsellors and assessors of the king. To these persons belong the offices of state, tribunals of justice, and the whole administration of affairs.”

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, 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 are divided into six bodies of five each.¹ 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."²

The Magistrates in charge of the city and those in charge of military affairs are evidently the same as the Nagarādhyakshas and Balādhyakshas of the Arthaśāstra (Mysore Ed., 1919, p. 55. Nagarā Dhānya Vyāvahārika Kārmāntika Balādhyakshāh). Dr. Smith remarks (EHL, 1914, p. 141) "the Boards described by Megasthenes as in charge of the business of the capital and the army are unknown to the author (Kauṭilya), 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 Kauṭilya distinctly says "Bahumukhyam anityam chādhikaraṇām sthāpayet" each department shall be officered by several temporary heads³; "Adhyakshāḥ Saṅkhyāyaka Lekhaka Rūpadārśaka Nivṛghakottarādhyakshasakhāḥ karmāṇi kuryuh." Evidently Dr. Smith notices only the Adhyakshas but ignores the existence of the Uttarādhyakshas and others. As in regard to the Arthaśāstra Smith notices only the Adhyakshas, so in regard to the classical accounts he

¹ Each body was responsible for one of the following departments, viz., the mechanical arts, foreign residents, registration of births and deaths, sales and exchanges, supervision of artisans, and 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 Viṣṇi Karmanī of Kauṭilya, Bk. X., Ch. IV) the infantry, the cavalry, the chariots and the elephants.

³ Arthaśāstra, 1919, p. 69. On page 57 we have the following passage—Hastyaśvaratathāpādātamanekamukhyamavasthāpayet, i.e., elephants, cavalry, chariots, and infantry shall each be placed under many chiefs.
takes note only of the Boards, but ignores the chiefs who are expressly mentioned in two passages, *viz.*—(H. & F. Strabo, III, p. 104):

"One division is associated with the *Chief Naval Superintendent,*" "another (division) is associated with the *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 Nāvadvyaksha and Go'adhyaksha of the *Arthasastra.*

The central popular assemblies like those that existed among the Lichchhavis, 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.

**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, *viz.*:

1. Uttarāpatha ... capital, Taxila
2. Avanti ... " Ujjayinī
3. Dakshinālatha ... " Suvarṇagiri (?)
4. Kaliṅga ... " Tosali
5. Prāchya (Prasii) ... " Pāṭaliputra

Of these only the first two and the last one can be said, with any amount of certainty, to have formed parts of Chandragupta's Empire. But it is not altogether improbable that Dakshināpatha, 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 *Arthasastra* (p. 247) that the salary of a Kumāra was 12,000 paṇas per annum.
The Home Provinces, *i.e.*, Prāchya and the Madhyadesa, were directly ruled by the Emperor himself.

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 (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 413). Kautilya (p. 378) refers to a number of Saṅghas, *e.g.*, Kamboja, Surāśṭra, etc. The Kambojas are referred to as an autonomous tribe even in the Thirteenth Rock Edict of Āśoka. That Surāśṭra was also autonomous in the time of Āśoka seems probable from Rudradāman’s inscription at Junāgaḍh which refers to its Rājā, the Yavana Tushāspha, the contemporary and vassal of Āśoka. The Yavanarāja was probably a Greek chief of the North-West who was appointed supervisor of the Surāśṭra Saṅgha by Āśoka, just as Rājā Mānsingh of Amber was appointed Sūbadāra of Bengal by Akbar. His title of Rājā probably indicates that he enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy. His relations with Āśoka remind us of the relationship subsisting between the Rājā of the Śākyya state and Pasenadi. In the time of the first Maurya Surāśṭra had an officer named Pushyagupta, the Vaiśya, who is described as a Rāshṭriya of Chandragupta. In the Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part I, p. 13, the word Rāshṭriya was taken to mean a brother-in-law. Kielhorn, however, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, 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. Rāshṭriya seems to have been a sort of Imperial High Commissioner, and the position of Pushyagupta in Surāśṭra was probably like that of Lord Cromer in Egypt. Neither the Arthaśāstra nor the Edicts of Āśoka mention any class of officials called Rāshṭriya. It is, however, probable that
the Rāṣṭriyas were identical with the Rāṣṭrapālas whose salary was equal to that of Kumāras (Arthasastra, p. 247).

Overseers and Spies.

The classical writers refer to a class of men called Overseers who "overlook what is done throughout the country and in the cities, and make reports to the king where the Indians are ruled by a king, or the magistrates where the people have a democratic government (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 413). Strabo calls this class of men the Ephorí 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" (H. & F. Strabo, III, p. 103). The overseers of Arrian and the Inspectors of Strabo probably correspond either to the Pradeshtīpis or the Chāras of the Arthasastra. Dr. Thomas derives the word Pradeshtī from Pradesa which means "report" (JRAS., 1915, p. 97) by the rule of Pāṇini, II. 2. 15 (Ṭrijakābhyāṁ 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, viz.:  

1. Samsthāḥ consisting of Kāpatika, Udāsthita, Grihapatika, Vaidelaka and Tāpasa, i.e., fraudulent disciples, recluses, householders, merchants and ascetics.  

2. Saucharāḥ including Satri, Tikshna and Rashada, i.e., class-mates, firebrands, and poisoners, and certain women described as Bhikshukis, Parivrajikās, Mundās and Vrishalīs. It is to the last class, viz., the Vrishalīs that Strabo evidently refers. We have explicit references
to courtesan (Pūnśchali, veśyā, rūpājivā) spies on pp. 221, 249, 316 of the Arthāśāstra.

Village Administration.

The administration of villages was carried on by the Grāmikas (Arthāśāstra, pp. 157, 172) who were, no doubt, assisted by the Grāmavṛṣidhas (pp. 48, 168, 169) or village elders. The omission of the Grāmika from the list of salaried officials given in Bk. V, Ch. III of the Arthāśāstra 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 Grāmabhṛtaka (pp. 175, 248). Above the Grāmika were the Gopa, who looked after 5 or 10 villages, and the Sthānika who controlled one quarter of a janapada or district. The work of these officers was supervised by the Samāhatrī (p. 142) with the help of the Pradesṭhrīs.

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 Kalbappu Hill, i.e., Chandragiri, as marked by the footprints of Bhadravāhu and Chandragupta Munipati (Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, pp. 3-4). Dr. Smith observes (The Oxford History of India, p. 76) “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 Parisīshṭaparvan of Hemachandra is to be believed Chandragupta had a queen named Durdharā who became the mother of Bindusāra, the son who succeeded
him on the throne. In the absence of corroborative evidence, however, the name of the queen cannot be accepted as genuine.

II. The Reign of Bindusāra.

Chandragupta Maurya was succeeded in or about the year 298 B.C. by his son Bindusāra Amitraghāta. The name or title Amitraghāta (slayer of foes) is a restoration in Sanskrit of the Amitrachates of Athenaios, and Allitrochades of Strabo, who is stated to have been the son of Sandrocottus. Dr. Fleet prefers the rendering Amitrakhāda or devourer of enemies, which is said to occur as an epithet of Indra (JRAS., 1909, p. 24). From Aśoka’s Rock Edict VIII (Kālsī Text) it appears that Bindusāra, as well as other predecessors of Aśoka, used the style Devānampiya.

If Hemachandra and Tāranātha are to be believed, Kauṭilya or Chānakya continued to serve as minister for some time after the accession of Bindusāra (Jacobi, Pariśishtaparvan, p. 62; Ind. Ant., 1875, p. 364). “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 annexation of the Deccan. But we should not forget that already in the time of Chandragupta the Maurya Empire extended from Surāśṭra to Bengal (Gangaridae), i.e., from the western to the eastern sea. Tāranātha’s statement need mean nothing more than the suppression of a general revolt. No 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 (Cowell and Neil’s Ed., p. 371) 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 (Dushtāmātyāḥ) insult us.” The high-handedness of the Maurya officials in the outlying provinces is alluded to by Aśoka himself in his Kalinga Edict (Aśoka, third edition, pp. 194-195). Addressing his Mahāmāstras 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 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 (Mahāmātra) 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. Pliny (M'Crindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 108) 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 (Aśoka, third edition, p. 19) that Patrokles, an officer who served under both Seleukos and his son, sailed in the Indian seas and collected much geographical information which Strabo and Pliny were glad to utilize. Athenaios tells an anecdote of private friendly correspondence between Antiochus, 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 Antiochus asking that king to buy and send him sweet wine, dried figs, and a sophist, and Antiochus replied: we shall send you the figs and the wine, but in Greece the laws forbid a sophist to be sold (M'Crindle, Inv. 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 Dharmamahāmātras are described, that Aśoka had many brothers and sisters. The Divyāvadāna mentions two of these brothers, namely, Susīma 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. Susīma-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. 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. (Aśoka, p. 73). 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 Agrāmatya (Chief Minister). Dr. Smith observes (The Oxford History of India, p. 93), "the fact that his formal consecration or coronation (abhisheka) was delayed for some four years until 269 B. C. confirms the tradition that his succession was contested, and it may be true that his rival was an elder brother named Susīma." In his Aśoka (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 (JBORS, 1917, p. 438) gives the following explanation for the delay in Aśoka's coronation: "It seems that in those days for obtaining royal abhisheka¹ the age of 25 was a condition precedent. This seems to explain why Aśoka was not crowned for three or four years after accession."

¹ There were other abhishekas also, e.g., that of Yuvarāja, Kumāra, Senāpati.
Dr. Smith characterises (EHI, p. 155) 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.”

Like his predecessors (cf. Rock Edict VIII, Kālsī Text) Aśoka assumed the title of Devānāṃpiya. He generally described himself as Devānāṃpiya Piyadasi. The name Aśoka is found only in literature, and in two ancient inscriptions, viz., the Māski Edict of Aśoka himself, and the Junāgadī inscription of the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman. The name Dharmāśoka is found in one Medieval epigraph, viz., the Sārnath inscription of Kumāradevi (Dharmāśokanarādhipasya samaye Śrī Dharmachakro Jino yādrik tannaya rakṣitaḥ punaray-aνchakre tatopyadbhutam).

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 Seleukidan war. Like Chandragupta and Bindusāra he was aggressive.
at home but pacific abroad. 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 Kāliṅga. 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 (Mbh. III. 114. 4), the Amarakantaka Hills in the west (Kūrma Purāṇa II. 39. 9) and Mahendragiri in the south (Raghuvaṃśa IV. 38-43; VI. 53-54).

An account of the Kāliṅga war and its effects is given in Rock Edict XIII. We have already seen that Kāliṅga formed a part of the Magadhan dominions in the time of the Nandas. Why was it necessary for Aśoka to reconquer it? The question admits of only one answer, viz., that Kāliṅga severed its connection with Magadha after the fall of the Nandas. If the story of a general revolt in the time of Bindusāra be correct then it is not unlikely that Kāliṅga, 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 Kāliṅga 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 (Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 338) "the tribes called Calingae are nearest the sea......the royal city of the Calingae is called Parthalis. Over their king 60,000 foot soldiers, 1,000 horsemen, 700 elephants keep watch and ward in 'procinct of war.'"

The Kāliṅga 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 her cost what a powerful Kalinga meant, in the time of Kharavela.

We learn from the thirteenth Rock Edict that Asoka made war on the Kalinga country and annexed it to his empire. “One hundred and fifty thousand persons were carried away captive, one hundred thousand were slain, and many times that number died.” Violence, slaughter, and separation from their beloved ones befell not only to combatants, but also to the Brāhmaṇas and 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 Gaṇjam). They are addressed to the Mahāmatras or High Officers at Tosali and Samāpā. In these documents the Emperor makes the famous declaration “all men are my children,” and charges his officers to see that justice is done to the people.

The conquest of Kalinga was a great landmark in the history of Magadha, and of India. It marks the close of that career of conquest and aggrandisement which was ushered in by Bimbisāra’s annexation of Aṅga. It opens a new era—an era of peace, of social progress, of religious propaganda and at the same time of political stagnation and, perhaps, of military inefficiency during which the martial spirit of imperial Magadha was dying out for want of exercise. The era of 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 Pāñāliputra, Khalatikapavata, Kosambī, Lumbminigāma, Kaliṅga (including Tosali and Samāpā), Suvarṇagiri, Ujjayinī and Takshaśilā expressly as being among those places which were under his rule.

Beyond Takshaśilā lay the vassal states of the Yonas, Kambojas and the Gandhāras. The exact situation of the Yona state has not yet been determined. The Mahāvaṃsa evidently refers to it and its chief city Alasanda which Geiger identifies with the town of Alexandria founded by the Macedonian conqueror near Kābul (Geiger, Mahāvaṃsa, p. 191). Kamboja, as we have already seen, corresponds to Rājapura or Rajaur near Punch in Kaśmīr. The territory of the Gandhāras at this time lay to the west of the Indus, and did not include Takshaśilā which was ruled by a princely Viceroy, and was the capital of the province of Uttarāpatha (cf. Kaliṅga Edict; Divyāvadāna, p. 407, Rājñō'sokasyottarāpathe Takshaśilā nagaram, etc). The capital of the vassal state of Gandhāra was apparently Pushkarāvati (cf. Carm. Lec., 1918, p. 54).

The inclusion of Kaśmīra within Aṣoka's empire is proved by the testimony of Hiuen Tsang's Records (Watters, Vol. I, pp. 267-271) and Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgini (I. 102-107): Kalhaṇa says: "The faithful Aṣoka, reigned over the earth. This, king who had freed himself from sins and had embraced the doctrine of Jīna, covered Śuṣkaletra and Vītastātra with numerous Stūpas. At the town of Vītastātra 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 Śrīnagarī. 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 Kalhana himself that he is indebted for much of the above account to an earlier chronicler named Chhavillākara.

The inscriptions on the Rummindeī and the Nīglīva pillars prove the inclusion of the Tarāi within the limits of Aśoka's Empire, while the monuments at Lalitapātan attest his possession of the valley of Nepāl. Further evidence of the inclusion of the Himalayan region within Aśoka's empire is furnished by Rock Edict XIII which refers to the Nabhapamitis of Nabhaka (Na-pei-kea of FaHien? Legge, 64).

According to Bühler the Rock Edict XIII mentions two vassal tribes Viša 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 Inscriptions of Aśoka, published by the University of Calcutta, Part I, p. 53) the Shāhbażgarhi and Mānsahra texts read Vishavajri. Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra (p. 378) 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 an autonomous vassal state within the Maurya Empire. The capital of the state was, of course, Vaisāli. A tribe called Besatae is mentioned in the Periplus of the Erythraean sea (Schoff's Ed., p. 48) and is located on the borders of the land of This, 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 (mentioned in Arthasastra, p. 79) were derived from them. In the commentary on the Arthasastra (Shamasastri’s Translation, p. 91, n. 10) it is stated that the twelve villages producing Bisi and Mahābisi, are situated on the Himalayas.

We learn from the classical writers that the country of the Gangaridae, i.e., Bengal, formed a part of the dominion of the king of the Prasii, i.e., Magadha, as early as the time of Agrammes, i.e., the last Nanda King (M’Crindle, Inv. Alex., pp. 221, 281). A passage of Pliny clearly suggests that the “Palibothri” dominated the whole tract along the Ganges (Ind. Ant, 1877, 339). That the Magadhan kings retained their hold on Bengal as late as the time of Aśoka is proved by the testimony of the Divyāvadāna (cf. Smith’s Aśoka, 3rd ed., p. 255) and of Hiuen Tsang who saw Stupas of that monarch near Tamra-lipti and Karṇasuvarna (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 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. The major part of the Deccan was ruled by the viceregal princes of Tosali and Suvarṇagiri. 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 separate name but as an adjective qualifying Rāṣṭrika (Edict V) and Bhoja (Edict XIII). The Professor draws our attention to certain passages in the Āṅguttara Nikāya
EARLY YEARS OF ASOKA

(III. 70, 300) where the term Pettanika occurs in the sense of one who enjoys property given by father (Ind. Ant., 1919, p. 80). The Andras 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 from Megasthenes, says that the Andrae (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 (Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 339). The Andhra capital (Andhapura) was situated on the Telavāha river which, says Prof. 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.

Pulindrome Vindhya Pushikā Vaidarbha Dāṇḍakaih saha (Matsya. p. 114, 48).

Pulindrome Vindhya Mulikā Vaidarbha Dāṇḍakaih saha (Vāyu, 55, 126).

Their capital Pulindanagara lay not far from Bhilsā.

The Bhojas and the Rāṣṭrikas were apparently the ancestors of the Mahābhojas and the Mahārathis of the Sātavāhana period (Smith, Asoka, third ed., pp. 169-170). The Bhojas apparently dwelt in Berar, and the Rāṣṭrikas in Mahārāṣṭra.

In the west Asoka’s Empire extended to the Arabian Sea and included Aparānta (Śūrpāraka, Nāsik, etc., according to Mārkandeya P. 57. 49-52) and the vassal state of Surāshṭra which was governed by the Yavanarāja Tushāshpha. Dr. Smith says that the form of the name shows that the Yavanarāja must have been a Persian, but according to this interpretation the Yavana Dhammadeva, the Śaka Ushavadāta (Rishabhadatta) and the Kushān Vāsudeva must have been all native Hindus of India. If Greeks
and other foreigners adopted Hindu names there is no wonder that some of them assumed Irānic appellations. There is, then, no good ground for assuming that Tushāshphā 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 Parishad in Rock Edicts III and VI. Senart took Parishā to mean Saṅgha 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 Arthasastra. The inscriptions prove that Asoka retained also the system of Provincial Government existing under his forefathers. Tosali, Suvarṇagiri, Ujjayinī and Takshaśilā were each under a prince of the blood royal (Kumāla or Ayaputa).

The Emperor and the Princes were helped by a host of officials who fell under the following classes:—

2. The Rajukas.
3. The Pradesikas or Prādesikas.
4. The Yutas (the Yuktas of the Arthasastra, pp. 59, 65, 199, Rāmāyaṇa, VI, 127.34; Manu, VIII, 34).
5. Pulisa.
6. Pativedakā.
7. Vachabhumikā.

There was a body of Mahāmātras in each great city and district (āhāla) of the empire. The inscriptions mention the Mahāmātras of Kauśāmbi, Tosali, Samāpā, Suvarṇagiri and Isila. In the Kālinga Edicts we have certain Mahāmātras distinguished by the term Nagala Viyohālakā. The Nagala Viyohālakā of the Edicts correspond to the Pauravyāvahārīkas of the Arthasastra.
(p. 20) and no doubt administered justice in cities. In Pillar Edict I mention is made of the Antapālas of the Arthaśāstra (pp. 20, 217) and the Goptris of the age of Skanda Gupta. Kautilya tells us that the salary of an Antapāla was equal to that of a Kumāra, a Pauravyāvahārika, 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 Stryadhyakshas (the Guards of the Ladies) of the Mahābhārata (IX. 29.68, 90; XV. 22, 20; 23, 12).

As to the Rājukas, Dr. Smith takes the word to mean a governor next below a Kumāra (Aśoka 3rd, p. 94). Bühler identifies the Rājuka of the Aśokan inscriptions with the Rajjuka or the Rajjugāhaka amachcha of the Jātakas (The Social Organisation in North-east India by Fick, translated by S. Maitra, pp. 148-151). Pillar Edict IV refers to the Rājukas as officers “set over many hundred thousands of people,” and charged with the duty of promoting the welfare of the Jānapadas, to whom Aśoka granted independence in the award of honours and penalties. The reference to the award of penalties (Danda) probably indicates that the Rājukas had judicial duties. In Rock Edict III as well as in Pillar Edict IV they are associated with the Yutas. Strabo (H. and E., Vol. III, p. 103) refers to a class of Magistrates 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 these Magistrates with the Rajjugāhaka Amachcha of the Jātakas (cf. Maitra, Fick, pp. 148-149) while the power of rewarding and punishing people connects them with the Rājukas of Aśoka. It is probable, therefore, that the Magistrates referred to by Strabo were

1 Cf. also Nagara-dhānya Vyāvahārika, p. 55.
identical with the Rajukas and the Rajjugāhaka Amachchas. The Arthaśāstra (p. 234) refers to a class of officials called “Chora Rajjukas,” but there is no reference to the Rajjukas proper, although on p. 60 “Rajju” is mentioned in conjunction with “Chora Rajju.”

As regards the Pradesikas or Prādesikas, Senart, Kern and Bühler understood the term to denote local governors or local chiefs. Smith took it to mean District Officers. The word occurs only in the third Rock Edict where the functionaries in question are included with the Rājukas and the Yutas in the ordinance of the Anusamāyāna. Thomas derives the word from pradeśa which means report (JRAS, 1915, p. 97; Arthaśāstra, p. 111) by the rule of Pāṇini trijakābhyām kartari (II. 2.15) and identifies the Prādesikas or Pradesikas of the Edict with the Pradeshtṛis of the Arthaśāstra. The most important functions of the Pradeshtṛis were Balipragraha (collection of taxes, or suppression of recalcitrant chiefs), Kaṇṭakaśodhana (administration of criminal justice), Choramārgana (tracking of thieves) and Adhyakshanam adhyaksha purushānām cha niyamanam (checking superintendents and their men). They acted as intermediaries between the Samāhatṛi on the one hand, and the Gopas, Sthānikas and Adhyakshas on the other (cf. Arthaśāstra, pp. 142, 200, 217, 222).

As to the Yutas or Yuktas they are represented by Manu (VIII. 34) as the custodians of Praṇaṣṭādhigata 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. The Pulisa are apparently identical with the Purushas or Rāja Purushas of the Arthaśāstra (pp. 59, 75). The Pativedakā are doubtless the Chāras referred to in Chap. 16 (p. 38), while the Vachabhūmikas were evidently charged with the superintendence of “Vraja” referred to in chapter 24 (pp. 59-60).
THE MAURYA EMPIRE: THE ERA OF DHAMMAVIJAYA AND DECLINE.

1. Aśoka after the Kalinga War.

We have already seen that the Kalinga 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 Kalinga 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 Gosāla Maṅkhali-putta.
3. The Nirgranthas or Jainas, i.e., the followers of Nigañṭha Nāṭaputta who is commonly called Mahāvīra 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-yātras (tours of pleasure, cf. Mahābhārata, XV. 1,18,1 Kauṭilya, p. 332), in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised (R. Edict VIII). The people performed various ceremonies (māṃgala) 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 (R. Edict IX).

The Change of Asoka’s Religion.

Aśoka 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 anusochanam, "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 (dhramanuśāti)."

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

1 Vihārayātraṁ punaḥ Kururājo Yudhiṣṭhirāḥ Sarvān kāmāṁ mahātejāḥ pradadh Ārambikāsaute.
2 For "Mangāla" see also Jātakas No. 87, and No. 163 (Hatthimaṅgala).
3 For Āvāha and Virāha see also Mbh. V. 141. 14.
found fault with unseemly behaviour towards Brāhmaṇas (Edict IV), and inculcated liberality to the same class. He was perfectly tolerant. "The king does reverence to men of all sects" (Edict XII). He reprobad Atmapāśanda-pujā when coupled with Para-pāśanda-garaha. That he was sincere in his professions is proved by the Barābar Cave Dedications to the Ājīvīka monks. His hostility was chiefly directed, not towards the Devas and the Brāhmaṇas, but to the killing of men in war and Samājas, and the slaughter of animals in sacrifice.

The Change of Foreign Policy.

The effect of the change of religion was at once felt in foreign policy. The Emperor declared that "of all the people who were slain, done to death, or carried away captive in Kaliṅga, if the hundredth part or the thousandth part were now to suffer the same fate, it would be matter of regret to His Sacred Majesty. Moreover, should any one do him wrong, that too must be borne with by His Sacred Majesty, so far as it can possibly be borne with." In Kaliṅga Edict I, the Emperor expressed his desire that the unconquered peoples in the frontiers of his realm (Aṁta avijita) 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 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 asu navāṁ vijayaṁ 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 Asoka made no attempt to annex the frontier (Prachāñṭa) kingdoms, viz., Chola, Pāṇḍya, Satiyaputra, Keralaputra, Taṁbapatīṇi (Ceylon) and the realm of Aṁtiyako 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 (Hultsch, SII, Vol. I, p. 34) that Hara 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 Cholas “the Kāverī had her current obstructed by the causeway formed by his elephants.” The Chola capital was Uraiyūr (Sanskrit Uragapura?) or Old Trichinopoly.

The Pāṇḍya country corresponded to the Madurā and Tinnevally districts and had its capital at Madurā (Dakśiṇa Mathurā). The rivers Kṛītamāla or Vaigai and Tāmrapārṇī 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 Pandoouoi 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 Pāṇḍyas with the Pāṇḍus receives some support from the fact that the name of the Pāṇḍya
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capital (Madura) was identical with the famous city of Mathura in the Śūrasena 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 Śūrasenas, and the Pāṇḍyas seems to be alluded to in the confused stories narrated by Megasthenes regarding Herakles and Pandaia (Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 249).

Satiyaputra is identified by Mr. Venkatesvaraiyar (JRAS, 1918, pp. 541-42) with Satyavratakshetra or Kannchipuram. But Prof. K. Aiyangar points out that the term Satyavratakshetra is applied to the town Kannchi 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 (JRAS, 1919, pp. 581-584). According to Dr. Smith (Aśoka, Third Ed., p. 161) Satiyaputra is represented by the Satyamangalam Tāluk of Coimbatore.

Keralaputra (Ketalaputra or Chera) is Mālabār. Its capital was Vañji near Cochin.

Ceylon was known in ancient times as Pārasamudra (Greek Palaesimundu, see Ray Chaudhuri, Ind. Ant., 1919, pp. 195-96) as well as Tāmraparṇī (Greek Taprobane). Tāmbaparṇī, i.e., Tāmraparṇī is mentioned in Rock Edicts II and XIII of Aśoka. Dr. Smith now (Aśoka, 3rd Ed., p. 162) takes the word to mean not Ceylon but the river Tāmraparṇī in Tinnevally. He refers to the Girnar text “ā Tāmbaparṇī” which according to him indicates that the river is meant not the island. Now, in Edict II the phrase “ā Tāmbaparṇī” comes after Ketalaputo and not after Pāda. The expression “Ketalaputo as

1 On reading Law’s Ancient Hindu Polity (p. 87 n.) I find that the identification was also suggested by Mr. N. L. Dey.
far as the Tamraparni " is hardly appropriate, because the Tamraparni is a Pāṇḍya river. We, therefore, prefer to take Tamraparni to mean Ceylon. Aśoka’s Ceylonese contemporary was Devānampiya Tissa whose accession may be dated about 251 or 247 B. C.

Aśoka maintained friendly relations not only with the Tamil powers of the south, but also with his Hellenistic frontager Antiochos Theos, king of Syria and Western Asia (B. C. 261-246); and even with the kings the neighbours of Antiochos, 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 Dr. Smith. Beloch and Hultsch, however suggested (JRAS, 1914, pp. 943 ff.) that Alikasudara of Edict XIII is Alexander of Corinth (B. C. 252—Cir. 244) and not Alexander of Epirus (272-cir. 255) son of Pyrrhus.

Though Aśoka did not covet the territories of his neighbours, there is evidence that he gave them advice on occasions, and established philanthropic institutions in their dominions. In other words he regarded them as objects of religious conquest (Dhammavijaya).

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

"Among his frontagers the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, the Satiyaputra, 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), Antigonus (Amtekina), Magas (Maga or Maka), and Alexander (Alikasudaro)—(likewise) in the south, the Cholas and Pāṇḍyas as far as Tamābapammi....Even where the envoys (duta) 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 Suvaṇṇabhūmi (Pegu and Moulemein according to Dr. Smith). The Ceylonese mission was headed by prince Mahendra. No reference to Suvaṇṇabhūmi 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 also in internal affairs. The principal objects of his complaint according to Rock Edict IV and the Kalinga Edicts were:

1. The sacrificial slaughter (ārambhō) of living creatures.
2. Violence (vihīṃsā) to animate beings.
3. Unseemly behaviour (asampratipati) to kinsmen (jūṭī).
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 Kautilya (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 Asoka, 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 Samajás. Dr. Thomas (JRAS, 1914, pp. 392 ff.) describes the disapproved Samaja as “a celebration of games or contests taking place in an arena or amphitheatre surrounded by platforms (mañcha) for spectators (Preksha).” This kind of Samaja is apparently referred to in the following lines of the Virāta parva of the Mahābhārata.

Ye cha kechin niyotsyanti Samajeshu niyodhakāh
(Virata, 2, 7.)

Tatra Mallah samāpetur digbhyo rājan sahasrasaśah
Samāje Brahmaṇo rājan tathā Paśupaterapi
Mahākāyāḥ mahāvīryāḥ Kālakañjā ivāsurāḥ.

(Ibid, 13, 15-16.)

The harmless Samaja is probably the one referred to in Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra (Pakṣasya māsasya vā prajñāte’ hani Sarasvatyā bhavane niyuktānām nityāṁ Samājāḥ).

Asoka determined to put a stop to the practices, referred to above, which he did not approve. At the same time he wanted 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). 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.
In the first place, Asoka instituted the Quinquennial Anusâmâyana or circuit of the Yutas, Râjukas, Pradesikas, and Mahâmâtrás. Mr. Jayaswal and Dr. Smith (Asoka, 3rd edition, p. 164) are of opinion that the whole administrative staff from the Râjuka and the Prâdesika 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 anusâmâyana of the Yutas, Râjukas and Pradesikas was mainly intended for propaganda work. The anusâmâyana of the Mahâmâtrás was specially instituted for the purpose of checking miscarriage of justice, arbitrary imprisonment, and torture in the outlying Provinces (Kâliṅga, Ujjayini and Takshasila).

Secondly, Asoka created a number of new posts, e.g., Dharmamahâmâtrás and Dharmayutás. The Dharma mahâmâtrás were given a protective mission among people of all sects including the Brâhmaṇas and the Nirgranthas or Jainas, and among the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandhāras, Rāshtrikas and all the Aparântas. "Among servants and masters, Brâhmaṇas and the wealthy, among the helpless and the aged, they are employed in freeing from worldly cares their subordinates (in the department) of the Law of Piety. They are also employed on the revision of (sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of) release, on the grounds of motive, having children, instigation, or advanced years. . . . . At Pāṭaliputra and in all provincial towns, in the female establishments of the king's brothers and sisters, as well as of other relatives, they are everywhere employed." The Dharmamahâmâtrás 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."

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

It is apparent from the Kalinga Edicts and Rock Edict VI that Asoka kept a watchful eye on the Mahāmātras especially on those who administered justice in cities. But he was more indulgent towards his Rajukas who were "eager to serve him." To the Rajukas "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 Asoka issued certain regulations restricting slaughter and mutilation of animals, and up to the twenty-seventh year of his coronation effected twenty-five jail deliveries.

Measures adopted to disseminate Instructions in the Law of Piety.

The Law of Piety according to the Second Pillar Edict, consisted in Apāsinave, bahukayāne, dayā, dāne 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."

We learn from Minor Rock Edict I that for more than two-and-a-half years Aśoka was a lay disciple without exerting himself strenuously. He then entered the 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 Prādesikas to inculcate the same while they set out for the anusamāyāna. The dharma which they were to preach was explained thus:

"An excellent thing is the hearkening to father and mother; an excellent thing is liberality to friends, acquaintances, relatives, Brāhmaṇas and ascetics; excellent is abstention from the slaughter of living creatures; excellent is small expense with small accumulation."

When he had been consecrated thirteen years, Aśoka created the new officials called Dharma mahāmātras who were specially entrusted with the work of dhammadhi-thāna and dhammavadhi, i.e., the establishment and increase of Piety.

The Emperor also exhibited spectacles of the dwellings of the gods (Vimānadasanā), spectacles of elephants

---

1 The interpretation of Vyutha as missionary was pointed out by Senart and accepted by Dr. Smith (Asoka, third Ed., p. 153). Prof. Bhandarkar takes Vyutha or Vivutha to mean "officials on tour."
(Hastidasanā), masses of fire (Agikhamdhāni) and other representations of a divine nature. Prof. Bhandarkar (Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 26) refers to the Pāli Vimanavatthu 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. As regards Agikamdha (Agniskandha) the Professor draws our attention to the Jātaka No. 40 which refers to a blazing fire pit created by Mara on the surface of which the Bodhisattva strode and gave a bowl to a hungry Pachcheka Buddha and extolled alms-giving.

While his officers were busy preaching the new Gospel, the Emperor himself did not remain idle. In his eleventh regnal year he went out to Bodh Gayā (ayāya Sambodhim 1) and thus 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 Rummindelī and Niglīva epigraphs in the Nepalese Tarāi. 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.”

1 Some scholars take Sambodhi to mean supreme knowledge. But Prof. Bhandarkar contends that Sambodhi is equivalent to Bodhi or Mahābodhi.
**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 vihārayātrās or tours of pleasure in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised. Pillar Edict V contains a code of regulations (Dhammaniyama) 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 and trees planted for the enjoyment of man and beast.

Pillar Edict VII refers to the employment of superior officers (mukhyas) in the distribution of alms, both the emperor's own and those of the queens and princes. One of the Minor Pillar Edicts refers to the donations of the second Queen Kāruvāki, mother of Tivara: "Whatever gift has been given here by the second Queen—be it a mango-garden, or pleasure-grove, 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 Ajīvika 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 “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 sādhu).

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 (Smith, Aśoka, third Ed., p. 55).

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. 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 Govindachandra of the Gaharwār 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 Kāliṅga
completed the unification of non-Tamil India under the
hegemony of Magadha.

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 Puru 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. Aśoka’s attempt to end war met with
the same fate as the similar endeavour of President Wilson.

According to Dr. Smith’s chronology Aśoka 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 (The Oxford History of India, pp.
116-120).

II. THE LATER MAURYAS AND THE DECLINE OF
THEIR POWER.

The Magadha Empire under Aśoka extended from
the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil
country. But the withdrawal of the strong arm of
Piyadasi was perhaps the signal for the disintegration of
this mighty monarchy. "His sceptre was the bow of
Ulysses which could not be drawn by any weaker hand."
The provinces fell off one by one. Foreign barbarians
began to pour across the north-western gates of the
dominion, and a time came when the proud monarchs of
Pātaliputra and Rājagriha had to bend their knees before
the despised provincials of Andhra and Kaliṅga.
Unfortunately, no Kautilya or Megasthenes has left any account of the later Mauryas. It is impossible to reconstruct a detailed history of As'oka's successors from the scanty data furnished by one or two inscriptions and a few Brahmanical, Jaina and Buddhist works.

As'oka 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 the Kumāras who represented the Imperial authority at Takshaśila, Ujjayinī, Suvarṇagiri and Tosali. Tivara, the son of queen Kāruvāki, the only prince named in the inscriptions, does not appear to have mounted the throne. Three other sons, namely, Kunāla (Suyaśas), Jalauka and Mahendra are mentioned in literature. It is, however, uncertain whether Mahendra was a son of As'oka or his brother.

The Vāyu Purāṇa says that after As'oka's death his son Kunāla reigned for eight years. Kunāla's son and successor was Bandhupalita, and Bandhupalita's dayāda or heir was Indrapālita. After Indrapālita came Devavarman, Ṣatadhānus and Brihradṛatha.

The Matsya Purāṇa gives the following list of As'oka's successors:—Daśaratha, Samprati, Ṣatadhanvan and Brihradṛatha.

The Vishnu Purāṇa furnishes the following names:—Suyaśas, Daśaratha, Saṅgata, Śaliśūka, Somaśarman, Ṣatadhānvan and Brihradṛatha.

The Divyāvadāna (p. 433) has the following names:—Saṃpadī, Vrihaspati, Vrishasena, Pushyadharman and Pushyamitra.

The Rājatarangini mentions Jalauka as the successor of As'oka in Kasmir.

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 Sāmpadī) as well as the evidence of the Pāṭaliputtrakalpa of Jinaprabhasuri, the well known Jaina writer. The name Suyaśas found in the Vishṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas was probably a birūḍa 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 Sāmpadī, who is described by the Jaina and Buddhist writers as the immediate successor of Aśoka.

Kunāla’s son was Bandhupālīta according to the Vāyu Purāṇa, and Sāmpadī (Sāmpadī) according to the Divyāvadāna and the Pāṭaliputtrakalpa. Either these princes were identical or they were brothers. If the latter view be correct then Bandhupālīta must be identified with Daśaratha whose reality is established by the brief dedicatory inscriptions on the walls of cave-dwellings at the Nāgārjuni Hills which he bestowed upon the Ājīvkas. Daśaratha, who receives the epithet “devānāmipīya” in the inscriptions, was a grandson of Aśoka according to the Matsya and Vishṇu Purāṇas, and the predecessor of Sāmpadī (variant Saṅgata) according to the same authorities.

Indrapālīta must be identified with Sāmpadī or Saṃsiśūka according as we identify Bandhupālīta with Daśaratha or Sāmpadī. In the matter of the propagation of the Jaina faith, Jaina records speak as highly of Sāmpadī as Buddhist records do of Aśoka. Jinaprabhasuri says, “in Pāṭaliputra flourished the great king Sāmpadī, 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 (third Ed., p. 70) 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 Pātaliputra as well as Ujjayini. His name is mentioned in the Purānic list of Aśoka’s Magadhan successors.

The existence of Śālisūka is proved not only by the testimony of the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa but also by that of the Gārgī Śamhitā ¹ and the e Vāyu manuscript referred to by Pargiter. He may have been identical with Vṛihaspati, son of Samprati according to the Divyāvadāna.

Devavarman and Somaśarman are variant readings of the same name. The same is the case with Śatadhanus and Śatadhanvan. It is not easy to identify Vṛihasena and Pushyadharma; possibly they are merely birudas or secondary names of Devavarman and Śatadhanvan.

The last Imperial Maurya of Magadha, Bṛihadratha, is mentioned not only in the Purāṇas but also in Bāna’s Harshacharita. He was assassinated by his general Pushyamitra Śungra 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 Dhaivala of the Maurya dynasty is referred to in the Kanaswa inscription of A. D. 738. Prof. Bhandarkar identifies him with Dhaivalappadeva the

¹ Kielhorn’s Bihatsamhitā, p. 37.

The Gārgī Śamhitā says “There will be Śālisūka a wicked quarrelsome king. Unrighteous, although theorising on righteousness (dharma-vādi adhārmikāḥ) he cruelly oppresses his country.”
overlord of Dhanika mentioned in the Dabok (Mewar) inscription of A. D. 725 (Ep. Ind., XII, p. 11). Maurya chiefs of the Koṅkaṇa are referred to in the Early Chalukya epigraphs. A Maurya Prince of Magadha named Pūrṇavarman is mentioned by Hiuen Tsang.

There can be no doubt that during the rule of the later Mauryas the Magadha Empire experienced a gradual decay. Aśoka 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 Gārgi Saṁhitā bears testimony to the decline of the Maurya power in the Madhya-deśa after the reign of Śāliśūka:

Tataḥ Saṅketam ākramya Pañchālam Mathurāmstathā Yavanaḥ dusṛtavikrāntaḥ prāpsyati Kusumadhvajām Tataḥ Pushpapūre prāpte karddame prathite hite Ākulā vishayā sarve bhavishyanti na saṁsāyāḥ.

(Kern, Brihat Saṁhitā, p. 37.)

Where was now the power that had expelled the prefects of Alexander and hurled back the battalions of Seleukos? According to Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstrī (JASB, 1910, p. 259) 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 Pāṇḍit Śāstrī'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
As'oka Brāhmaṇa sages whose teachings have found a place in the Holy Śrutī, the most sacred literature of the Brāhmaṇas, declared themselves in no uncertain terms against sacrifices, and in favour of Ahimsā. In the Mūndaka Upanishad (1. 2. 7) we have the following Sloka:

Plavaḥ hyete adriḍhā yaḍñarūpā
Ashtādaśoktamavarain yeshu karma
Etachchhreyo ye'bhīnandantimūḍhā
Jārāmītyuṁ 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 Āṅgirasa lays great stress on Ahimsā.

As to the second statement we should remember that tradition is not unanimous in representing the Mauryas as Śūdras. The Purāṇas, assert, no doubt, that after Mahāpadma there will be kings of Śūdra origin. But this statement cannot be taken to mean that all the Post-Mahāpadman kings were Śūdras, as in that case the Śūngas and the Kāṇyas also will have to be classed as Śūdras. The Mūdrārākshasa which calls Chandragupta a Śūdra, is a late work, and its evidence is contradicted by earlier books. In the Mahāparinibbānasutta the Moriyas (Mauryas) are represented as belonging to the Kṣatriya caste. The Mahāvaṁsa (Geiger's Translation, p. 27) refers to the Moriyas as a noble (kṣatriya) clan and represents Chandragupta as a scion of this clan. In the Divyāvadāna (p. 370) Bindusāra, son of Chandragupta said to a girl "Tvam Nāpinī aham Rāja Kṣatriyo Mūrdhābhishiktaḥ katham mayā sārdham samāgamā bhavishyati." In the same work (p. 409) Asoka says to one of his queens
(Tishyarakshitā) “Devi aham Kshatriyāḥ katham palāṇḍum paribhakshhayāmi.” In a Mysore inscription Chandragupta is described as “an abode of the usages of eminent kshatriyas” (Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 10). Kautilya’s preference of an “abhijāta” king seems also to suggest that his sovereign was born of a noble family (cf. Arthasastra, p. 326).

Having referred to the prohibition of animal sacrifices Pāṇḍit Śāstrī 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.”

The original passage referred to above runs thus:—

Y (i)-imāya kālāya Jambudipasi amisā devā husu te dāni m (i) s-kaṭā.

Pāṇḍit Śāstrī followed the interpretation of Senart. But Prof. Sylvain Levi has shown that the word amisā cannot stand for Sanskrit amrīṣā, for in the Bhābrud edict we find Musā and not Misā for Sanskrit mṛishā. The recently discovered Māski version reads misibhūṭa for misam-katā showing that the original form was misribhūṭa. It will be grammatically incorrect to form misibhūṭa from Sanskrit mṛishā. The word mīśra means mixed. And mīśribhūṭa 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.” (Cf. Āpastamba Dharmasūtra, II, 7. 16. 1). There is thus no question of “showing up” anybody. The true import

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.
of the passage has been pointed out by Prof. Bhandarkar in the Indian Antiquary, 1912, p. 170.

Pañdit Sāstrī adds that the appointment by Aśoka of Dharmamahāmātrās, 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 Dharmamahāmātrās 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, Rāṣṭrīkas, Brāhmaṇas and others, revision of sentences of imprisonment or execution, the supervision of the female establishments of the Emperor's brothers and other relatives, and the administration of almsgiving (Aśoka, third Ed., pp. 168-169). 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 Dharmamahāmātrās 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 Daṇḍasamata and Vyāvahārasamata. Pañdit 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 Daṇḍasamata and Vyāvahārasamata 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 Bajukas 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 (Vyāvahārasamatā) and uniformity in penalties (Dandaśamatā), 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 Vyāvahārasamatā and Dandaśamatā 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. He wanted to maintain some uniformity (samatā) both in Daṇḍa (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 Samatā which he enforced involved a curtailment of the autonomy of the Rājukas and did not necessarily infringe on the alleged immunity of the Brāhmaṇas from capital punishment.

But were the Brāhmaṇas really immune from capital punishment in ancient India? The immunity was certainly not known to the Kuru-Pañchāla 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 Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa (Vedic Index, II, p. 81) that a Purohita might be punished with death for treachery to his master. Kautilya, 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

---

1 I am indebted for this suggestion to Mr. S. N. Majumdar.
on Māṇḍavya (Ādi, 107) and Likhita (Śānti, 23, 36). The life of a Brāhmaṇa was not so sacrosanct in ancient as in medieval 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 Aśoka we have the positive evidence of some of his inscriptions which proves the Emperor's solicitude for the well-being of the Brāhmaṇas. Thus in Rock Edict III he inculcates liberality to Brāhmaṇas. In Edict IV he speaks with disapproval of unseemly behaviour towards Brāhmaṇas. In Edict V he refers to the employment of Dharma-mahāmatras to promote the welfare and happiness of the Brāhmaṇas.

Pāṇḍit Śāstri 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 Kāśmīr 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 Śāstri 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 Bhaṛhut 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 Brāhmanist followers. The Empire was a shrivelled and attenuated carcase long before the Śuṅga coup d'état of 185 B.C. We learn from the Rājatarāṅgini that immediately after the death of Aśoka one of his own sons, Jālauka, made himself independent in Kaśmir and conquered the plains including Kanauj. The loss of the northern provinces is confirmed by Greek evidence. We learn from Polybius that about 206 B.C., there ruled over them a king named Sophagasenus (Subhāgasena). We quote the passage referring to the king below:

"He (Antiochos the Great) 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."

It will be seen that Subhāgasena was a king and not a petty chief of the Kābul 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 Sophagasenus, 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 bad previous dealings with Antiochus. Consequently he must have come to the throne sometime before 206 B.C. The existence of an independent kingdom in the north-west before 206 B.C. shows that the Maurya Empire must have begun to break up nearly a quarter of a century before the usurpation of Pushyamitra.

We have seen that the theory which ascribes the decline and dismemberment of the Maurya Empire to a Brāhmiṇical revolution led by Pushyamitra Śunga does not bear scrutiny. Was the Maurya disruption due primarily to the Greek invasions? The earliest Greek invasion after Asoka, that of Antiochus the Great, took place about 206 B.C., and we have seen that the combined testimony of Kalhana and Polybius leaves no room for doubt that the dissolution of the empire began long before the raid of the Hellenistic monarch.

What then were the primary causes of the disintegration of the mighty empire? There are good grounds for believing that the government of the outlying provinces by the imperial officials was oppressive. Already in the time of Bindusāra ministerial oppression had goaded the people of Taxila to open rebellion. The Divyāvadāna says (p. 371):—

"Atha Rājñō Vindusārasya Takshaśilā nāma nagaram viruddham. Tatra Rājñā Vindusāren Āsoko visarjitaḥ... yāvat Kumāraschaturangena balakāyena Takshaśilāṁ gataḥ, śrutvā Takshaśilā nivāsinaḥ paurāḥ pratyudgamya cha kathayanti 'na vagam Kumārasya viruddhāḥ nāpi Rājñō Vindusārasya api -tu dusḥāmātyā asmākaṁ paribhavam kurvanti.'"

"Now Taxila a city of Bindusāra's revolted. The king Bindusāra despatched Asoka there......while the prince was nearing Taxila with the four-fold army, the resident Pauras 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. "Rājñiošokasyottarāpathe Takshaśilā nagaram viruddham...." Prince Kunāla was deputed to the government of the city. When the prince went there the people said "na vayaṁ Kumārasyaviruddhā na rājūo' śokasyāpitu dushtātmāno 'mātyā āgatyāsmākam apamānaṁ kurvanti."

The Divyāavadāna is no doubt a late work, but the reality of ministerial oppression to which it refers is affirmed by Aśoka himself in the Kalinga Edicts. Addressing the High officers (Mahāmātras) in charge of Tosali he says: "All men are my children; and just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind 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 townsfolk 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" (Smith, Aśoka, third Ed., pp. 194-196).
From the concluding words of the Edict it appears that official maladministration was not confined to the province of Kalinga. 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 dusñamātyas 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 Dhammavijaya 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 Dhammaghosa than of Bherighosa. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the rois faineants who succeeded to the imperial throne of Pāṭaliputra proved unequal to the task of maintaining the integrity of the mighty fabric reared by the genius of Chandragupta and Chāṇakya.

The disintegration which set in before 206 B.C. was accelerated by the invasions led by the Yavanas referred to in the Gārgī Samhitā and the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The final coup de grâce was given by Pushyamitra Śuṅga.

1 On the contrary, if the Gārgī Samhitā is to be believed, one of his successors, namely, Śāliśūka actually quickened the pace by his tyranny—Sarāṣṭra mardato ghorauḥ dharmavādi adhārmikauḥ.
THE ŚUNGA EMPIRE AND THE BACTRIAN GREEKS.

I. The Reign of Pushyamitra.

Bṛihadratha, the last Maurya Emperor of Magadha, was, according to the Purāṇas and the Harshaeharita, 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 Iranians, 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 Bharadvājas. Śauṅgiputra “son of a female descendant of Śuṅga” is the name of a teacher in the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (VI. 4. 31). Śauṅgāyani “descendant of Śauṅga” is the name of a teacher in the Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa. Maconell and Keith point out that the Śuṅgas are known as teachers in the Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra (XII. 13. 5, etc.). 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 Drojā, Kripta and Āsvatthāman in the Mahābhārata).

The dominions of Pushyamitra extended to the river Narmadā, and included the cities of Pāṭaliputra, Vidiśā and, if Tāranātha is to be believed, Jalandhara. It appears from the Divyāvadāna, p. 434, that the Emperor himself continued to reside in Pāṭaliputra. The Mālavikāgnimitram tells us that Vidiśā was governed by
Prince Agnimitra, probably as his father’s Viceroy. Agnimitra’s queen had a brother of inferior caste, named Virasena. He was placed in command of a frontier fortress on the banks of the Narmadā (Atthi devie vanā-varo bhādā Viraseno nāma, so bhaṭṭinā antavāladugge Nammadāttre thāvido). Lāders’ 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 Amātya refers to the kingdom as achirādhishṭhita (established not long ago) and compares its king to a tree which is newly planted and therefore not firm (navasamropāpasīthilastaru). The king of Vidarbha is represented as a relation of the Maurya minister (Sachiva) and a natural enemy (prakṛityamitra) of the Śuṅgas. It appears that during the reign of Bṛihadratha Maurya there were two parties or factions in the Magadha Empire, one headed by the king’s Sachiva or minister, the other headed by his Senāpati or general. The minister’s partisan Yajñāsenā was appointed governor of Vidarbha, while the general’s son Agnimitra got the Viceroyalty of Vidiśā. When the general organised his coup d’etat, killed the king, and imprisoned the minister, Yajñāsenā apparently declared his independence and commenced hostilities against the usurping family. This is why he is called achirādhishṭhitarājya and prakṛityamitra by Agnimitra and his Amātya.

The Mālavikāgnimitram says that when Kumāra Mādhavasena, a cousin of Yajñāsenā and a partisan of Agnimitra, was secretly on his way to Vidiśā, 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 Śū nga Prince who ordered Virasena to march against Vidarbha. Yajñasena was defeated. Mādhavasena 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 Śū nga dominions from Kalinga. In his Oxford History of India (Additions and Corrections and p. 58 n.) Dr. Smith accepts the view that Khāravela, king of Kalinga, defeated Pushyamitra who is called Bahapatimita or Bahasatimita in the Hāthigumphā Inscription. Prof. Dubreuil also seems to endorse the view that Khāravela was the antagonist of Pushyamitra, and that the Hāthigumphā Inscription is dated the 165th year of Rāja-Muriyakāla which corresponds to the 13th year of the reign of Khāravela.

Dr. Majumdar points out (Ind. Ant., 1919, p. 189) that of the six letters of the Hāthigumphā Inscription which have been read as Bahasatimitam, 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 Bahasatimitam or Bahapatimitam be accepted as correct, the identification of Bahasati (Bṛihaspatimitra) with Pushyamitra on the ground that Bṛihaspati is the regent of the nakshatra or Zodiacal asterism Pushya, also named Tishyā, 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 Pāṭaliputra as the residence of
Pushyamitra whereas the Magadhan antagonist of Khāravela is called Rājagahanapa and apparently resided in the city of Rājagriha.

The date "165th year of the Muriyakāla" is deduced from a passage of the Hāthigumpha inscription which was read as follows (Jayaswal, JBORS, 1917, p. 459):

Pānaṃtariyasathivasasate Rāja-Muriya-kālevochhine.

There is another passage in the same inscription which runs thus:

Panamtariyasat-hivasasate Raja-Muriya-kalevochchhine.

If Pānaṃtariya satīhivasasate be taken to mean 165 years, tivasasata should be taken to mean 103 years and we shall have to conclude that Khāravela flourished 165 years after a Maurya king and only 103 years after Nandarāja which is impossible as the Nandas preceded the Mauryas. If on the other hand tivasasata be taken to mean 300 years, pānaṃtariyasathivasasate should be taken to mean not 165 but 6,500 years. In other words Khāravela will have to be placed 6,500 years after a Maurya which is also impossible. Mr. Jayaswal has himself now given up the reading "pānaṃtariya-sathi-

The particle cha after vochhine makes
it difficult to read it as vochhinam qualifying the substantive Muriyakālam. Even if we overlook vochhino, 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 trace of the existence of a Maurya era.

Mr. Jayaswal takes tivasasata to mean 300 years and places Khāravela and Pushyamitra three centuries after Nandarāja whom he identifies with Nandavardhana. But we have already seen that Nandavardhana or Nandivardhana was a Śaiśunāga king, and that the Śaiśunāgas 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 Kshatriyās’ or the old reigning families. So we should identify Nāndarāja of the Ḫāṭhigumpha inscription who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons.” (M. A. S. I., No. I, p. 12.) As Mahāpadma and his sons ruled in the fourth century B.C. Khāravela must be assigned either to the third century B.C. (taking tivasasata to mean 103) or to the first century B.C. (taking tivasasata to mean 300). In either case he could not have been a contemporary of Pushyamitra Śuṅga 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’etat of 185 B.C. and the Vidarbhā war, are the Greek invasion from the North-West referred to by Patañjali and Kalidāsa, 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
Māhābhāshya—iha Pushyamitram yājayaṁaḥ "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 been begun but not finished (Ind. Ant., 1872, p. 300). The instances given by Patañjali of the use of the imperfect to indicate an action well-known to people, but not witnessed by the speaker, and still possible to have been seen by him, are, Arunad 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 (near Chitor; cf. Mbh. II. 32.8) when Patañjali wrote this. Kālidāsa in his Mālavikāagnimitram 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 Māhābhāshya or the Mālavikāagnimitram. 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 Seleukidan Empire. 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 Seleukidan Empire.

The successor of Theodotus II (Diodotos II) was Euthydemos. We learn from Strabo (H. & F.'s Ed., Vol. II, p. 251) 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 "Antiochus the Great received the young prince (Demetrios, son of Euthydemos) and judging from his appearance, conversation and the dignity of his manners that he was worthy of royal honour he first promised to give him one of his daughters, and secondly, conceded the royal title to his father. And having on the other points caused a written treaty to be drawn up and the terms of the treaty to be confirmed on oath, he marched away, after liberally provisioning his troops, and accepting the elephants belonging to Euthydemos. He crossed 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 Antiochus 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, but of the kingdoms of Saraostos (Surāśṭra or Kāthiāwār), and Sigerdis (probably Sāgaradvipa of the

---

1 i.e., the Hyphasis or Vīpāśa (the Bean).
2 The Trisāśā? In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (V. 10. 17) a river of this name is mentioned in conjunction with the Kauśikī, Mandākiṇī, Yamunā, etc.
Mahābhārata, II. 31. 66, i.e. Cutch) which constitute the remainder of the coast. Apollodorus in short says that Bactriana is the ornament of all Ariana. They extended their empire even as far as the Seres and Phryni.” (Strabo, Hamilton and Falconer, Vol. II, pp. 252-253.)

Strabo gives the credit for spreading the Greek dominion furthest to the east into India partly to Menander and partly to Demetrios, son of Euthydemos and son-in-law of Antiochus the Great.

Menander has been identified with the king Milinda who is mentioned in the Milinda-pañho as a contemporary of the Buddhist Thera Nāgasena. This monarch was born at Kalsigrāma (Trenckner, Milinda-pañho, p. 83) in the Island of Alasanda or Alexandria (ibid, p. 82) and had his capital at Sāgala or Sākala, modern Siālākot, in the Pañjab (ibid, pp. 3, 14), and not at Kābul as Dr. Smith seemed to think (EHI., 1914, p. 225). The extent of his conquest 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 (SBE., Vol. XXXV, p. xx). 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 (I. 139. 23) and the “grete Emetreus, the king of Inde” of Chaucer’s Knightes Tale. 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 (JRAS., 1915, p. 830) we have
a reference to a city named Demetrias Polis in Arachosia.
The Mahābhāshya mentions a city in Sauvira called
Dattāmitri (Ind. Ant., 1911, Foreign Elements in the
Hindu Population ; Bomb. Gaz., I. ii. 11). Ptolemy the
Geographer mentions the city of Euthymedia (Euthy-
demia ?) which was identical with Śākala (Ind. Ant.,
1884, pp. 349-350) 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 con-
quering kings, viz., Menander and Demetrios, was identi-
cal with the, Yavana invader who penetrated to Śāketa in
Oudh, Madhyamikā near Chitor, and the river Sindhū 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 (Trisāmā ?). 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 garri-
son of only 300 soldiers, he repulsed, by continual sallies,

1 Trisāmā is a river mentioned in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, together with the
Kauśiki, Mandākī, Yamunā, etc.
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 Sungra 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 (Watson's Ed., p. 277). Eukratides was killed by his son with whom he had shared his throne (ibid, 277). The identity of the parricide is uncertain but no one says that he was Menander.¹

Justin furnishes the important information that the prince who murdered Eukratides was a colleague of his father. We know that Greek rulers who reigned jointly 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 Hermaios and Kalliope. 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

¹ 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 Eukratides but was on the other hand a ruler of Kápiśa who was ousted by Eukratides (JRAS., 1905, 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.
Heliokles and Laodike were the father and mother of Eukratides. But Von Sallet (Ind. Ant., 1880, p. 256) 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 Sākala was ruled by Menander who thus might have been a younger contemporary of Eukratides (cir. 171 B.C.) and consequently of Pushyamitra Śuṅga (cir. 185-149 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:

Bhavishyantiḥa Yavanā dharmataḥ kāmato'rthataḥ naiva mūrdhahishiktāṃ te bhavishyanti nāradhipaḥ yuga-dosha-durācharā bhavishyanti nṛpās tu te strīnām bāla-vadhenaiva hatsa chaiva parasparam.

"There will be Yavanas here by reason of religious feeling or ambition or plunder; they will not be kings solemnly anointed but will follow evil customs by reason
of the corruptions of the age. Massacring women and children and *killing one another*, kings will enjoy the earth at the end of the Kali age.” (Pargiter.)

The Gārgī Samhitā says—

Madhyadesa na sthāsyanti Yavana yuddha durmadah Teshāmānyonya sambhāvā (?) bhavishyanti nasamśayah Ātmachakrotthitātī mhorāṁ yuddhāṁ paramadārūṇam

“The fiercely fighting Greeks will not stay in the Madhya- desa; there will be a cruel, dreadful war in their own kingdom, caused between themselves” (Kern, Brihat Samhitā, p. 38).

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 Megalou Eukratidou. On the reverse there is the figure of Zeus and the legend Kavisīye, nagara-devatā. They are often coins of Apollodotos restruck (Rapson, J.R.A.S., 1905, 785). 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 out (J.R.A.S., 1905, pp. 165 ff) that Heliokles restruck the coins of 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 Milindapañho, Milinda or Menander flourished “500 years” (*i.e.*, in the fifth century, *cf.* Smith, EHI, 3rd edition, 328) after the Parinirvāṇa (parinibbānato pañchavassasate atikkante etc upajjissanti, Trenckner, the Milinda-panho, p. 3). 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 the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra Śunga. It is Demetrios who should, therefore, be identified with the Yavana invader referred to by Patañjali and Kalidāsa.

*The Åsvamedha 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
Brāhmanical 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 Bhārhat erected “during the supremacy of the Śuṅgas” do not bear out the theory that the Śuṅgas were the leaders of a militant Brāhmanism. Though staunch adherents of orthodox Hinduism the Śuṅgas do not appear to have been so intolerant as some writers represent them to be.

The Mantriparishad in the Śuṅga Period.

If Kālidāsa is to be believed the Mantriparishad (Assembly of Councillors) continued to be an important element of the governmental machinery during the reign of Pushyamitra. The poet supplies us with the important information that even the viceregal princes were assisted by Parishads.¹ The Mālavikāgnimitram refers in clear terms to the dealings of Prince Agnimitra, the viceroy of Vidiśā, with his own Parishad:

“Deva! evam Amātyaparishado vijñāpayāmi”

“Mantriparishado’pyetadeva darśanam
Dvidhā vibhaktām śriyamudvahantau
dhuraṁ rathāśvāviva samgrahituḥ
sthāshyataste nripate nideše
parasparāvagrahāhanirvikārau
Rājā: tena hi Mantriparishadaṁ brūhi senānye Virasenāya
lekhyaṁ evaṁ kriyatāmiti.”

It seems that the Amātyaparishad or Mantriparishad was duly consulted whenever an important matter of foreign policy had to be decided.

¹ Bühler points out that Aśoka’s Kumaras also are each assisted by a body of Mahāmātras. These probably correspond to the Kumarāmātyas of the Gupta period.
II. AGNIMITRA AND HIS SUCCESSORS.

Pushyamitra died in or about 149 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 (Coins of Ancient India, p. 79) was of opinion that this prince was probably not a Śuṅga, 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 Purāṇas.

2. The coins are very rarely found beyond the limits of North Pañchāla.

As to the first point Rivett-Carnac (Ind. Ant., 1880, 311) and Jayaswal have shown (JBOIS, 1917, p. 479) that several coin-names besides that of Agnimitra can be identified with those found in the Purānic lists of Śuṅga and Kāṇva kings; for example, Jethamitra may be identified with the successor of Agnimitra, Vasu-Jyesṭha or Su-Jyesṭha who is called simply Jyesṭha in the k Vishṇu manuscript (Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 31, n.12). Bhadraghosa may be identified with Ghosha the seventh king of the Purānic list of Śuṅga kings. Bhūmimitra may be identified with the Kāṇva king of that name. Several names indeed cannot be identified, but they may have been names of those Śuṅgas who survived the usurpation of Vasudeva Kāṇva, and the remnant of whose power was destroyed by the Andhrabhṛityas and Śiśunandi (Dynasties of the Kali Age, 49).

As to the second point we should remember that Mitra coins have been found at Kosāmbi, Ayodhyā and Mathurā as well as in Pañchāla. Names of the Mitra kings Brahmapitita 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 Jyeshṭha of the k Vishṇu manuscript who is very probably identical with Jethamitra of the coins (Coins of Ancient India, p. 74).

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.

Vasumitra’s successor is called Bhadraka in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Ārdraka and Odruka in the Vishṇu, Andhraka in the Vāyu, and Antaka in the Matsya Purāṇa. Mr. Jayaswal identifies him with Udāka mentioned in a Pabhosa Inscription which runs thus: “By Āsādhasena, the son of Gopāli Vaihidari and maternal uncle of king Bahasatimitra, son of Gopāli, a cave was caused to be made in the tenth year of Udāka for the use of the Kassapiya Arhats.” We learn from another Pabhosa Inscription that Āsādhasena belonged to the royal family of Adhichhatra, the capital of North Pañchāla.

Mr. Jayaswal maintains that Odraka (Udāka) was the paramount Śunga sovereign, while the family of Āsādhasena was either gubernatorial or feudatory to the Magadha throne. Marshall (A Guide to Sānci, p. 11 n.) on the other hand identifies the fifth Śunga with king Kāsiputra Bhagabhakdra mentioned in a Garuḍa Pillar Inscription found in the old city of Vidiṣā, now Besnagar.

Mr. Jayaswal identifies Bhāga-bhadra with Bhāga Śunga, i.e., Bhāgavata of the Purāṇas. This theory has to be given up in view of the discovery of another Besnagar Garuḍa Pillar Inscription (of the twelth year after the
installation of Maharaja Bhagavata) which proves that there was at Vidiśā a king named Bhagavata apart from king Kāśiputra Bhagabhādra. In the absence of clear evidence connecting Udaka with Vidiśā it cannot be confidently asserted that he belonged to the house of Agnimitra and Bhagavata. 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 Pañjab. The policy of the Bactrian Greeks in this respect resembled that of their Seleukidan predecessors. Seleukos, we know, first tried to conquer the Magadha 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 Śungas. We learn from the Besnagar Inscription of the reign of Bhagabhādra that Heliodora, the son of Diya (Dion) a native of Taxila came as an Ambassador from Maharaja Anitalikita (Antialkidas) to Rajan Kāśiputra Bhagabhādra the Saviour (Trīṭāra), who was prospering in the fourteenth year of his reign. The ambassador, though a Greek, professed the Bhagavata religion and set up a Garudadhvaja in honour of Vasudeva, the god of gods. He was apparently well-versed in the Mahābhārata which he might have heard recited in his native city of Taxila.

Nothing in particular is known regarding the three immediate successors of Bhadraka. The ninth king Bhagavata had a long reign which extended over 32 years. Prof. Bhandarkar identifies him with the Maharaja Bhagavata mentioned in one of the Besnagar

1 The three immortal precepts (dama, chāga, āpramāda), mentioned in the second part of Heliodora's inscription, occur in the Mahābhārata (XI.7.23: Damasyātyāgo' pramādāvecha te trayo Brahmaṇo hāyāḥ). Cf. also Gītā, XVI. 1.2.
Inscriptions mentioned above. Bhāgavata's successor Devabhūti or Devabhūmi was a young and dissolute prince. The Purāṇas state that he was overthrown after a reign of 10 years by his Amātya Vasudeva. Bāṇa in his Harshacharita says that the over-libidinous Śuṅga was bereft of his life by his Amātya Vasudeva with the help of a daughter of Devabhūti's slave woman (Dāsi) disguised as his queen. Bāṇa's statement does not necessarily imply that Devabhūti was identical with the murdered Śuṅga. His statement may be construed to mean that Vasudeva entered into a conspiracy with the emissaries of Devabhūti to bring about the downfall of the reigning Śuṅga (Bhāgavata), and to raise Devabhūti to the throne. But in view of the unanimous testimony of the Purāṇas this interpretation of the statement of Bāṇa cannot be upheld.

The Śuṅga power was not altogether extinguished after the tragic end of Devabhūti. It probably survived in Central India (cf. Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 49) till the rise of the Andhrabhīrityas or Sātavāhanas who "swept away the remains of the Śuṅga power" and probably appointed Śiśunandi (ibid, p. 49) to govern the Vidiṣā region. Śiśunandi's younger brother had a grandson (dauhitra) named Śiśuka who became the ruler of Purikā. Curiously enough Śiśuka is also the Purānic name of the first king of the Andhrabhṛitya dynasty. It is not improbable that the two Śišukas were identical, and that after overthrowing the Śuṅgas, Śišuka (Śimuka of the Inscriptions) annexed Purikā but placed Vidiṣā under his maternal relations.
THE FALL OF THE MAGADHAN AND INDO-GREEK POWERS.

1. THE KĀNVAS AND THE LATER ŠUŃGAS.

Vasudeva at whose instance the "overlibidinous Šunga" was "reft of his life" founded about 73 B.C. a new line of kings known as the Kāńva or Kānvāyana dynasty. The Purāṇas give the following account of this family. "He (Vasudeva), the Kānvāyana, will be king 9 years. His son Bhūmimitra will reign 14 years. His son Nārāyana will reign 12 years. His son Susārman will reign 10 years. These are remembered as the Šuṅgabhṛitya Kānvāyana kings. These four Kāńva Brāhmaṇas 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 Kāńva dynasty is a matter of controversy. In his Early History of the Deccan, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observes "the founder of the Andhrabhṛityas is said to have uprooted not only the Kāńvas, but ‘whatever was left of the power of the Šuṅgas’. And the Kāńvas are pointedly spoken of as Šuṅgabhṛityas or servants of the Šuṅgas. It therefore appears likely that when the princes of the Šuṅga family became weak, the Kāńvas 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 Šuṅgas include the 45 assigned to the Kāńvas."
Now, the Purānic evidence only proves that certain princes belonging to the Śuṅga stock continued to rule till the Andhrabhṛitya conquest and were the contemporaries of the Kāṇvas. But there is nothing to show that these *rois faîneants* of the Śuṅga stock were identical with any of the ten Śuṅga kings mentioned by name in the Purānic lists who reigned 112 years. On the contrary the distinct testimony of the Purāṇas that Devabhūti the tenth and last Śuṅga of the Purānic lists was the person slain by Vasudeva the first Kāṇva, probably shows that the rois faîneants, 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 Śuṅga 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.

II. THE SĀTAVĀHANAS AND THE CETAS.

While the Śuṅgas and Kāṇvas were engaged in their petty feuds, new powers were rising in trans-Vindhyan India. These were the Sātavāhana or Andhrabhṛitya kingdom of Dakshiṇāpatha and the Cheta kingdom of Kaliṅga.

The founder of the Sātavāhana or Andhrabhṛitya dynasty was Simuka whose name is misspelt as Śiśuka, Sindhuka and Śipraka in the Purāṇas. The Purāṇas state that the Andhra Simuka will assail the Kāṇvāyanas and Suṣarman, and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas’ 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 found in certain Purāṇas but not in all, 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 Nāṇāghāṭ record of Nayanikā, daughter-in-law of Simuka?

2. What is the actual date of Khāravela’s Hāthigumpha Inscription which refers to a Śātakarnī who was apparently a successor of Simuka?

3. What is the exact number of Andhrabhṛtya kings and what is the duration of their rule?

As to the first point we should note that according to Prof. Chanda the inscription of Nayanikā is later than the Besnagar Inscription of Bhāgavata the penultimate king of the Early Śuṅga dynasty (MASI. No. 1, pp. 14-15.) Consequently Simuka may be placed in the Kāṇva period i.e. in the first century B.C.—a date which accords with Purāṇic evidence.

As to the second point Mr. R. D. Banerji gives good grounds for believing that the expression Ti-vasa-sata occurring in the passage “Pamchame cha dānī vase Namdarāja ti-vasa-sata………” of the Hāthigumpha Inscription means not 103 but 300 (JBORS. 1917, 495-497.) This is also the view of Mr. Jayaswal and Prof. Chanda.* If

* In his fifth year Khāravela extended an aqueduct that had not been used for tiyasa-sata since Nandarāja. If “tiyasa-sata” is taken to mean 103, Khāravela’s accession must be placed 103—5=98 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of Yuvrāja took place 9 years before that i.e. 98—9=89 years after Nandarāja (i.e., not later than 323 B.C.—89=234 B.C.) Khāravela’s father must have been on the throne at that time, and he was preceded by his father. But we learn from Aśoka’s inscriptions that Kaliṅga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya Kumāra under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore tiyasa-sata should be taken to mean 300 and not 103.
Tivasa-sata means 300 Khāravela and his contemporary Śātakarni must have flourished 300 years after Nandarāja, i.e. in or about 23 B.C. This agrees with the Purānic evidence which makes Śātakarni's father a contemporary of the last Kānva king Susārman (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:—

"Ekōnavimśatirhyete Andhrā bhokshyanti vai mahīm," but it gives thirty names.

The Vāyu Purāṇa with the exception of the 'M' manuscript says—

"Ityete vai nṛpās trimśad Andhrā bhokshyantiye 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 šatāni syus' chatvārishashtīr'eva cha.

Another Matsya manuscript puts it slightly differently.

Dvādasādhikam eteshām rājyam śatachatushtayam.

While a Vāyu passage gives altogether a different tradition:

Andhrā bhokshyanti vasudhām šate dve cha śatam cha vai.

Obviously according to one tradition there were about nineteen kings who probably ruled for 300 years as the Vāyu says, while according to another tradition there were thirty kings the lengths of whose reigns covered a period of more than 400 years. In the opinion of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar the longer list includes the names of princes belonging to all the branches of
the Andhrabhriṭya 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 Vāyu Purāṇa, and hinted at in the Matsya, refer to the main branch. That there was at least one line of Satakarnis 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 Satakarnis who ruled over Kuntala (the Kanarese districts) before the Kadambas. The Matsya list includes at least two kings of this line named Skandasvāti and Kuntala Satakarni, but the Vayu list does not. Skandanaṅga-Sātaka actually appears as the name of a prince of the Kanarese line of Satakarnis in a Kanheri inscription. (Rapson, Andhra Coins, liii.) As to Kuntala Satakarni, the commentary on Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra takes the word Kuntala in the name Kuntala Satakarni Sātavāhana to mean "Kuntalavishaye jātatvāt tatsamākhyāḥ." 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. On the other hand the Vāyu Purāṇa omits the Satakarnis of Kuntala and mentions only about 19 kings who presumably belonged to the main line and ruled for 300 years. If the main line of Sātavāhana 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 came to an end 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 Satakarnis is really more than 400 years. The kings of the Kuntala line are
no doubt placed before Gautamiputra and his successors. But we have other instances of the inversion of the order of kings in the Purāṇas (see pp. 52, 58 ante).

Regarding the original home of the Sātavāhana family there is also a good deal of controversy. Some scholars think that the Sātavāhanas were not Andhras but merely Andhrabhṛityas of Kanarese origin. In the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XIV (1917) Dr. Sukthankar edited an Inscription of Siri-Pulumāvi "king of the Sātavāhanas" which mentions a place called Sātavāhani-hāra. The place occurs also in the Hira-Hadagalli copper-plate inscription of the Pallava king Śivaskandavarman in the slightly altered form of Sātāhani-raṭṭha. Dr. Sukthankar suggests that the territorial division Sātavahani-Sātāhani must have comprised a good portion of the modern Bellary district, and that it was the original home of the Sātavāhana family. Other indications point to the territory immediately south of the Madhyadesa as the original home of the Sātavāhana-Śatakarnis. The Vinaya Texts (S.B.E., XVII, 38) mention a town called "Setakannika" which lay on the southern frontier of the Majjhimadesa. 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 Krishṇā.

There is reason to believe that the Andhrabhṛitya or Sātavāhana kings were Brāhmaṇas with a little admixture of Nāga blood. The Dvātrimśatputtalikā represents Śālivāhana as of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Nāga origin. The Nāga connection is suggested by names like Skandanāga-Satakā, while the claim to the rank of Brāhmaṇa is actually put forward in an inscription. In the Nāsik
praśasti of Gautamiputra Śatakarni the king is called “Eka Bamhana,” i.e., the unique Brahmāṇa. Some scholars, however, are inclined to take Bamhana to mean merely a Brahmāṇical 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 “Ekabamhana” when read along with the passage “Khatiya-dapa-māna-madana” leaves no room for doubt that Gautamiputra of the Satavāhana family claimed to be a Brahmāṇa like Parasurāma. As a matter of fact in the praśasti the king is described as “the unique Brahmāṇa in prowess equal to Rāma.”

According to the Purāṇas Simuka gave the final coup de grace to the Śuṅga-Kāṇva power. He was succeeded by his brother Kṛiṣṇa. This king has been identified with Kanha “Rājā of the Śadavāhanakula” 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 Kanha.

Kanha-Krīṣṇa was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Śatakarni. This Śatakarni has been identified with

(1) King Śatakarni Dakshiṇāpatha-pati, son of Simuka Satavāhana mentioned in the Nānāghat Inscription of Nayanikā.

(2) Śatakarni lord of the west who was defied by Khāravela, king of Kalinga.

(3) Rājan Śrī Śatakarni of a Sāñchī Inscription and

(4) The elder Saraganus mentioned in the Periplus.

The first identification is accepted by all scholars. The second identification is also probable because the Purāṇas place Śatakarni the successor of Kṛiṣṇa, after the Kāṇyas, i.e., in the first century B.C., while the Hāthigumpha Inscription places Khāravela 300 years after Nanda-raja, i.e., in the first century B.C.
Marshall objects to the third identification on the ground that Sri Satakarni who is mentioned in the Nanaghat and Hathigumpha Inscriptions reigned in the middle of the second century B.C.; his dominions therefore could not have included Eastern Malwa (the Sāñchī region) which in the second century B.C., was ruled by the Śunghas and not by the Andhras (A Guide to Sāñchī p. 13). But we have seen that the date of the Hathigumpha Inscription is the first century B.C. (300 years after Nanda-rāja). Moreover the Purāṇas place the kings mentioned in the Nanaghat Inscription not earlier than the Kāṇvas, i.e., the first century B.C. The identification of the successor of Kṛishṇa of the Śatavāhana family with Satakarni of the Sāñchī Inscription, therefore, does not conflict with what is known of the history of Eastern Malwa in the second century B.C. Lastly, it would be natural for the first Satakarni to be styled simply Satakarni or the elder Satakarni (Saraganus, from a Prākrit form like Sāḷaganna) while it would be equally natural for the later Satakarnīs to be distinguished from him by the addition of a geographical designation like Kuntala, or a metronymic like Gautamiputra or Vāsishṭhiputra.

We learn from the Nanaghat Inscription that Satakarni, son of Simuka, was the sovereign of the whole of Dakṣiṇāpatha. He conquered Eastern Malwa and performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice. The conquest of Eastern Malwa is proved by the Sāñchī Inscription which records the gift of a certain Ānaimda, the son of Vasiṣṭhī, the foreman of the artisans of Rājan Siri-Satakani. Satakarni seems to have been the first prince to raise the Śatavāhanas 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 Śunga empire in the Ganges valley and the Greek empire in the Land of the Five Rivers.
After the death of Satakarnī his wife Nayanikā or Nāganikā daughter of the Mahārathi Tranakayiro Kalalaya, the scion of the Āngiya family, was proclaimed regent during the minority of the princes Vedīśrī and Sakti-Śrī (Sati-Srimat) or Haku-Śrī.

The Sātavāhanas were not the only enemies of Magadha in the first century B.C. We learn from the Hathigumpha Inscription that when Satakarnī was ruling in the west, Khāravela of Kalinga carried his arms to Northern India and humbled the king of Rājagriha.

Khāravela belonged to the Cheta dynasty. Prof. Chanda points out that Cheta princes are mentioned in the Vessantara Jātaka (No. 547). The Milindapañho contains a statement which seems to indicate that the Chetas were connected with the Chetis or Chedis. The particulars given in that work regarding the Cheta king Sura Parichara agree with what we know about the Chedi king Uparichara (Rhys Davids, Milinda, p 287 ; Mbh. I. 63. 14).

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 Hathigumpha inscription. Lüders Ins. No. 1347 mentions a king named Vakradeva. But we do not know whether he was a predecessor or successor of Khāravela. During the rule of the second king, who must have reigned for at least 9 years, Khāravela occupied the position of Yuvarāja. When he had completed his 24th year, he was anointed Mahārāja of Kalinga. In the first year of his reign he repaired the gates and ramparts of his capital, Kalinganagara. In the next year, without taking head of Satakarnī, he sent a large army to the west and took the city of Masika (?) with the help of the

1 Khāravela's chief queen was the daughter of a prince named Lalaka the great grandson of Hathisimha.
Kusambas. He followed up his success by further operations in the west and, in his fourth year, compelled the Raṭḥikas 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 Kalinga king turned his attention to the North. 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 Bṛihaspatimitra, then king Bṛihaspati must have ruled over Magadha after the Kāṇva dynasty. Udāka of the Pabhosā Inscription who came later than Bṛihaspatimitra cannot, in that case, be identified with the fifth Śaṅga king who must be identified with Bhāgabhadra.

The attack on Northern India was repeated in the tenth and twelth years. In the tenth year the Kalinga 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 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 Gaṅgā. But in Magadha he was more successful; the repeated blows certainly “struck terror into the Magadhas,” and compelled the Magadha king (Bṛihaspatimitra?) to bow at his feet. Having subjugated Magadha, the invader once more turned his attention to southern India and made his power felt even by the King of the Pāṇḍya 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 (Sialkot) with a considerable portion of the Indian interior, the other derived from Eukratides holding Takshaśilā, the Kābul valley and Bactria. According to Gardner and Rapson, Apollodotos, Pantaleon, Agathokles, Agathokleia, the Stratos and Menander 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 the thunderbolt, which is characteristic of the Euthydemian line. Pantaleon and Agathocles strike coins with almost identical types.¹ They both adopt the metal nickel for their coins, and they alone use in their legends the Brāhmī 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 and Menandar use the Athene type of coins. Apollodotos and Menander are mentioned together in literature. The author of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea says that “to the present day ancient drachmae are current in Barygaza bearing inscriptions in Greek letters, and the devices of those who reigned after Alexander, Apollodotos and Menander.” Again, in the

¹ Dancing girl in oriental costume according to Whitehead; Māyā, mother of the Buddha, in the nativity scene according to Foucher (JRAS., 1919, p. 90).
title of the lost forty-first book of Justin's work, Menander and Apollodotos are mentioned as Indian kings (Rhys Davids, Milinda, p. xix). It appears from the Milindapañho that the capital of the dynasty to which Menander belonged was Śākala or Sāgala.¹ 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 not improbable that he was an immediate successor of Heliokles. (Gardner, Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum, p. xxxiv). 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 Takthaśilā or Taxila, the place whence his ambassador Heliodoros went to the kingdom of Bhāgabhadra.

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 (H. & F.'s Ed. vol. II, pp. 251-253) that the Parthians deprived Eukratides by force of arms of a part of Bactriana, which embraced the satrapies of Aspionus and Turiva. There is reason to believe that the Parthian king Mithridates 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 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 who, according to Strabo (H. and P's Ed. vol. II pp. 245-246) deprived the Greeks of Bactriana, viz., the Asii, Pasiani, Tochari, Sacarauli and the Sacae or Šakas. The story of the Šaka occupation of the Indo-Greek possessions will be told in the next chapter. The Latin historian Pompeius Trogus describes how Diodotos had to fight Scythian tribes, the Saranceae and Asiani, who finally conquered Sogdiana and Bactria. The occupation of Sogdiana probably entitled them to the designation Sogdian used by Justin. Sten Konow (Modern Review, 1921, April, p. 464) 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 (Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 395-396.) 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 Aria, Gedrosia and Arachosia, including the province now called Sistan (Śakasthana). 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 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

¹ Isidore of Charax (JRAS. 1915, p. 831) refers to Sigal in Sacastene as the residence of a Śaka king.
Spalirises had a colleague named Azes who governed a territory where the prevailing script was Kharoshthi. This Azes has been identified with king Azes of the Pañjāb about whom we shall speak in the next chapter.

As regards the Indian enemies of the Bactrian Greeks we need only refer to the Śūngas who are represented in Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitram as coming into conflict with the Yavanas. In the Nāsik praśasti of Gautamiputra Śātakarni the king is said to have defeated the Yavanas.

The final destruction of Greek rule was, as Justin says, the work of the Parthians. Marshall tells us (A Guide to Taxila p. 14) that the last surviving Greek principality, that of Hermaios in the Kābul valley, was overthrown by the Parthian king Gondophernes. The Chinese historian Fan-yealso refers to the Parthian occupation of Kābul (Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, vol. I p. 81): "Whenever any of the three kingdoms of Tien Tch-ou, Ki-pin or Ngansi became bowerful, 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.

1. THE ŚAKAS.

In the first century B. C. Greek rule in 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 Kipin" (JRAS., 1903, p. 22; Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 464). Sten Konow points out that the Sai-wang are the same people which are known in Indian tradition under the designation Śakamurunda, Murunda being a later form of a Śaka word which has the same meaning as Chinese wang, master, lord. In Indian inscriptions and coins it has frequently been translated with the Indian word Svāmin.

The Chinese Emperor Yuenti (B. C. 48-33) refused to take any notice of an insult offered to his envoy by In-mo-fu, the king of Kipin, and the Emperor Ching-ti (B. C. 32-7) declined to acknowledge an embassy sent from Kipin (JRAS, 1903, p. 29).

S. Lévi identifies Kipin with Kasmīr. But his view has been ably controverted by Sten Konow (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 291) who accepts Chavannes' identification with Kāpiśa (the country drained by the northern tributaries of the river Kābul, ibid, p. 290; cf. Watters, Yuan Chhwang, Vol. I, 259-260). Gandhāra was the eastern part of Kipin. A passage of Hemachandra's Abhidhāna-Chintāmanī seems to suggest that the capital of the Sai-wang (Śaka-Murundaśas) was Lampāka or Laghman (Lampākāstu Murunḍāḥ Ṣyuḥ) Sten Konow says that the Sai,
i.e., the Sakas, passed Hientu, i.e., the gorge west of Skardu on their way to Kipin (p. 291). Though the Sakas wrested Kipin (Kāpiṣa-Gandhāra) from the hands of the Greeks they could not permanently subjugate Kābul (Journal of the Department of Letters, Vol. I, p. 81), where the Greeks maintained a precarious existence. They were more successful in India. Inscriptions at Mathurā and Nāsik prove that the Sakas extended their sway as far as the Jumna in the east and the Godāvari in the south.

No connected or detailed account of the Saka kings of Kipin is possible. Sakas are mentioned along with the Yavanas in the Rāmāyana (I. 54. 22; IV. 43. 12), the Māhābhārata (II. 32. 17), the Manuṣamhitā (X. 44), and the Mahābhāshya (Ind. Ant. 1875, 244). The Hari-vanśa (Chap. 14.16) informs us that they shaved one half of their heads, and the Jaina work Kālakāchāryaka-thānaka states that their Kings were called Sāhi. (Z. D. M. G., 34, p. 262).

The Sakas are also mentioned in the Praśastis of Gautamiputra Sātakarni and Samudra Gupta. Their empire "Sakasthāna" is probably mentioned in the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscription. The passage containing the word Sakasthāna runs thus:—

Sarvasa Sakasthanasa 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 Kāthiawād and the western and southern parts of the territory now known as Mālwa." He took Sarva to be a proper name and translated the insessional passage referred to above as "a gift of Sarva in honour of his home."

Fleet's objection is ineffective. Chinese evidence clearly establishes the presence of Sakas in Kipin, i.e.,
Kāpiśa-Gandhāra. As regards the presence of the tribe at Mathurā, the site of the inscription, we should note that the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Chapter 58) refers to a Śaka settlement in the Madhyadesa. Dr. Thomas (Ep. Ind., IX, pp. 138 ff.) points out that the epigraphs on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Śaka and Persian nomenclature. The name Mevaki, for instance, which occurs in the inscriptions is a variant of the Scythian name Mauakes (cf. Maues, Moga, and Mavaces the commander of the Śakas who went to the aid of Darius Codomannus, Chinnock, Arrian, p. 142). The termination "us" in Komusa and Samuso seems to be Scythic. Dr. Thomas further points out that there is no difficulty in the expression of honour to the "whole realm of the Śakas" since we find in the Wardak, Sue Vihār and other inscriptions 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 Śaka dominion.

Śakasthāna, 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 Erythraean Sea." The metropolis of "Scythia," in the time of the Periplus was Minnagara; and its market-town was Barbaricum on the seashore.

Princes bearing Śaka names are mentioned in several inscriptions discovered in Taxila, Mathurā and western India. According to Dr. Thomas "whatever Śaka dynasties may have existed in the 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" (JRAS, 1906, p. 216). This theory cannot be accepted in its entirety in view of the Chinese account of the Śaka occupation of Kipin, and the fact that some of the Śaka names hitherto discovered are those of the Northern Śakas who lived near the Sogdianoi (Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 399-400), e.g., the names—Maues, Moga (Taxila plate) and Mevaki (Mathura Lion Capital) are variants of the Śaka 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 Persian governor of the Bactrians and the Sogdianians, but were in alliance with the Persian king. Kshaharāta or Khaharata, the family designation of a Satrapal house of Western and Southern India, is perhaps equivalent to Karatai the name of a Śaka tribe of the North (Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400).

The conquest of the Lower Indus valley and part of western India may, however, have been effected by the Śakas of western Śakasthāna (Sīstān) who are mentioned by Isidore of Charax. The name of the capitals of "Scythia" (i.e., Lower Indus valley) and of the Kingdom of Mambarus (Nambanus?) in the time of the Periplus was Minnagara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Śakasthāna mentioned by Isidore (JRAS, 1915, p. 830). Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the names of the western Kshatrapas of Chashtana's line, viz., "Dāman" 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 Kārdama river in Persia (Shamsastry's trans. of Arthasastra, p. 861).
The earliest Śaka king mentioned in Indian inscriptions and coins is, perhaps, Maues (identified with Moga of the Taxila plate). He was a paramount sovereign (Maha-raya). 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 Pañjāb, and chiefly in the western portion of the province of which Taxila was the ancient capital. There can thus be no doubt that Maues was the king of Gandhāra. Now it is impossible to find for Maues a place in the history of the Pañjāb before the Greek king Antialkidas who was reigning at Taxila when king Bhāgabhadrā was on the throne of Vidiśā 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 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 Śaka 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 plate dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era. The generally accepted view is that the era is of Śaka institution. As the era is used only in N. India and the border land it is permissible to conjecture that it marks the completion of the Śaka 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. 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 In-mo-fu was in possession of Kipin or Kāpiṣa-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 Śaka 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 Mālava-Vikrama era. But the matter must be regarded as not finally settled.

Numismatists say that Maues was succeeded on the throne of the Pañjab by Azes. 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 Pañjab, is identical with Azes, the colleague of Spalirises. Some scholars think that Azes was the immediate successor, not of Maues, but of Spalirises, and that Maues came not only after Azes, better known as Azes I, but also after Azes II. But this 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 (Whitehead, Catalogue of Coins in the Pañjab Museum, p. 150). As Gondophernes ruled in the year 103 (cf. the Takht-i-Bahai Inscription), while Maues-Moga ruled in the year 78 (cf. the Taxila Plate of Patika), and as both these dates are referred by scholars to the same era, both Gondophernes and 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 Pañjab when Vonones was ruling in Sistan. When Vonones was succeeded by Spalirises, Maues was succeeded by Azes I. We have already seen 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 (cf. Whitehead, p. 178, Marshall—Taxila, p. 16).

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 or 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 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. Marshall however says that the stratification of coins at
Taxila clearly proves the correctness of Smith's theory, according to which Azes I was succeeded by Azilises, and Azilises by Azes II.

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 Mahārajasa Rājārajasa. They also appropriate the epithet Mahatasa, corresponding to the Greek Megaloy, which we find on the coins of Greek kings. The title Rājaraja—king of kings—was not an empty boast. Moga had under him the Viceroy Liaka and Patika of Chhabara and Chukhsa near 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 Kšatrapāvan which means protector of the kingdom (cf. Goptri). 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 Kāpiṣa,
2. The Satraps of the Western Pañjāb,
3. The Satraps of Mathurā.

Rapson tells us (Ancient India, p. 141) that an inscription affords the bare mention of a Satrap of Kāpiṣa.

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).
The Pañjab Satraps belonged to three families, viz.:

(a) The Kusulaa or Kusuluka family.—It consisted of Liaka and his son Patika, and governed the territories of Chhahara and Chukhsa (Bühler, Ep. Ind., IV, p. 54). According to Fleet there were two Patikas (JRAS, 1907, p. 1035). But according to Marshall there was only one Viceroy of the name of Patika (JRAS, 1914, pp. 979 ff). The Satrapal family of Kusuluka was intimately connected with the Satraps of Mathurā (cf. Inscription G on the Mathurā Lion Capital). The coins of Liaka Kusuluka show the transition of the district to which they belonged from the rule of the Greek house of Eukratides to the Śakas (Rapson’s Ancient India, p. 154). We know from the Taxila or Sirsukh plate, dated in the year 78, that Liaka was a Satrap of the great king Moga.

(b) Manigul or Managula and his son Zeionises or Jihonia.—They were probably Satraps of Taxila during the reign of Azes II.

(c) Indravarma and his son Aspavarma.—The latter acted as governor of both Azes II and Gondophrernes.

The Satraps of Mathurā.

The earliest of this line of princes probably were the associated rulers Hagāna and Hagāmāsha. They were perhaps succeeded by Raṇjubula. A genealogical table of the house of Raṇjubula is given below:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Raṇjubula—Yasi-kamudha} & \text{Nhada-kasa-Arta} & \text{Kharaosta} \\
\text{Sodāsa} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Raṇjubula is known from inscriptions as well as coins. An inscription in Brāhmī characters at Mora near Mathurā calls him a Mahākshatrapa. 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 Sodāsa. Inscription B on the Mathurā Lion Capital mentions him as a Chhattarava (Satrap) and as the son of Mahāchhattrava Rājula (Rañjubula). But later inscriptions at Mathurā written in Brāhmī characters call him a Mahākshatrapa. 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 Sodāsa dated his inscription in the Vikrama era (Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, pp. 139-141). Consequently the year 72 corresponds to A.D. 15.

Dr. Majumdar refers the dates of the Northern satraps (of Taxila and Mathurā) to the Śaka 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-Seythia, i.e., the Śaka dominion. This shows that neither Taxila nor Mathurā was a Śaka possession in the second century A.D. The principal Indo-Seythian possessions in Ptolemy’s time were Patalene (the Indus Delta) Abiria and Syrastrene (Kathiāwār) (Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 354). This is exactly what we find in the Junāgaḍh 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 (Sans. Uraśa) territory (Ind. Ant., 1884 p. 348) and Mathurā belonged to the Kaspeiraioi (Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 350). Dr. Majumdar suggests that Ptolemy probably noticed the Śaka empire of Maues and his successors (which included Taxila, Mathurā and Ujjayini) under the name of Kaspeiraioi (University of Calcutta Journal of the Department of Letters, Vol. I, p. 98 n). But we should remember that far from including Taxila, Mathurā and Western India within one empire, Ptolemy sharply
distinguishes the Kaspeiraioi from Indo-Skythia which was the real Saka domain in the middle of the second century A.D. (cf. Ptolemy, Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 354, and the Junagadh inscription of the Saka ruler Rudradaman). Moreover, the territory of the Kaspeiraioi must have included Kaśmīr (the land of Kaśyapa); and there is no evidence that the dynasty of Maues ever ruled in Kaśmīr. It was only under the kings of Kanishka’s dynasty that Kaśmīr 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 Šudāsa, i.e., Šoḍāsa was ruling as a mere Kshatrapa, Padika, i.e., Patika was a Mahākṣhattrapa. As Šoḍāsa was a Mahākṣhattrapa in the year 72, he must have been a Kshatrapa before 72. Consequently Padika or Patika must have been reigning as a Mahākṣhattrapa contemporary of the Kshatrapa Šoḍāsa before the year 72. The Taxila plate of the year 78 however does not style Patika even as Kshatrapa. Dr. Fleet thinks that we have to do with two different Patikas. But Marshall and Sten Konow think that Patika, who issued the Taxila plate, is identical with the Mahākṣhattrapa Padika of the Mathurā Lion Capital, and that 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 Mahākṣhattrapas being reduced to the rank of Kshatrapas (cf. Majumdar, the Date of Kanishka, Ind. Ant., 1917), and of a Kshatrapa (Jayadāman) being mentioned without a title (Andhau Inscriptions). It is therefore not altogether improbable that the inscription of Sam 72 and that of Sam 78 are dated in the same era, and that the two
Patikas are identical. In the Jānibighā inscription king Lakshmana Sena has no title prefixed to his name. If Sir John Marshall is right in reading the name of Aya (Azes) in the Taxila Inscription of 136, we have an additional instance of a king being mentioned without any title.

Kharaosta was a grandson (daughter's son) of Raṅjubula and was consequently a nephew of Śodāsa. 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 Kharaostasa Artasa putrasa.”

The coins of the family of Raṅjubula 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.

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 (JRAS, 1912, p. 121).

The Nationality of the Northern Satraps.

Cunningham held that the inscription P on the Mathurā Lion Capital—Sarvasa Śakastanasa puyae—gave decisive proof that Raṅjubula or Rajugvula, Śodāsa and other connected Satraps were of Śaka nationality. Dr. Thomas shows, however, that the Satraps of Northern India were the representatives of a mixed Parthian and Śaka domination. This is strongly supported a priori by the fact that Patika of Taxila, who bears himself a Persian name, mentions as his overlord the great king Moga whose name is Śaka. The inscriptions of the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Persian and Śaka nomenclature. (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 138 ff.).
II. The Pahlavas or Parthians.

Already in the time 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 rule 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 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 Takht-i-Bahai record of the year 103 (of an unspecified era) shows that there was actually in the Peshwār district a king named Gondophernes. The names of Gondophernes and of his brother Gad are also found on coins (Whitehead, p. 155). 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 (JRAS, 1905, pp. 223-235; 1906, pp. 706-710; 1907, pp. 169-172; 1013-1040; 1913, pp. 999-1003). 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 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 Peshwār 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) but later on obeyed Gondophernes as his overlord. Evidence of the ousting of Šaka 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.), Minnagara, the metropolis of Scythia, i.e., the Šaka 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 Šaka rule survived in a part of Eastern Gandhāra, while Peshwār and the Lower Indus valley passed into the hands of the Parthians.

The Greek principality in the upper Kābul valley was extinguished about this time. We learn from Justin that the Parthians gave the coup de grâce to the rule of the Bactrian Greeks. This is quite in accordance with the evidence of Archæology. Marshall says that Gondophernes annexed the Kābul valley, overthrew the Greek principality in that region, and drove out the last prince Hermaios.

After the death of Gondophernes his empire split up into smaller principalities. One of these was ruled by Abdagases, another by Orthagnes and Pakores and others by princes whose coins Marshall recovered for the first time at Taxila. Among them were Sasan, Sapedanes and Satavastra. The internecine strife among
these Parthian princelings is probably alluded to by the author of the Periplus in the following passage:—

"Before it (Barbaricum) there lies a small Island, and inland behind it is the metropolis of Scythia, Minnagara; it is subject to Parthian princes who are constantly driving each other out."

Epigraphic evidence proves that the Pahlava or Parthian rule in Afghanistan, the Pañjāb and Sind was supplanted by that of the Gusana or Kusana or Kushān dynasty. We know that Gondophernes was ruling in Peshwār 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 103 (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) mentions the interment of some relics of Buddha in a chapel at Taxila. "for the bestowal of perfect health upon the Mahārāja, 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 Kābul. This shows that the race to which the Kushāns belonged took possession of Kābul 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.¹ The important thing to remember is that a Chinese writer of 92 A.D., thought Kao-fou to have been a Yueh-chi possession long before his time. If Sten Konow is to be believed the Kushāns had established some sort of connection with the Indian borderland as early as the

¹ J. R. A. S., 1912.
time of Gondophernes. In line 5 of the Takht-i-Bahai
inscription Sten Konow reads “erjhuna Kapsasa puyae”
(Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 294) “in honour of prince Kapsa”
i.e., Kujula Kadphises, the Kushān king who succeeded
Hermaios in the Kābul valley. Kujula Kadphises has
been identified with the Kouei-chouang (Kushān) prince
Kiw-utsie-kio who took possession of Kao-fou, Pota and
Kipin. It appears from coins that this Kushān 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 KUSHĀNS.

We are informed by the Chinese historians that the
Kushāns 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 Yué-tchi.

We learn from Ssu-ma-ch’ien who recorded the story
of the travels of Chang-K’ien, that in or about B. C. 165
the Yueh-chi were dwelling between the Tsenh-hoang
country and the K’ilien mountains, or T’ien-chan Range
in Chinese Turkestan. At that date the Yueh-chi were
defeated and expelled from their country by the Hiung-
nū who slew their king and made a drinking vessel
out of his skull. The widow of the slain 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 Šakas who fled into Kipin
(Kāpiša-Lampāka-Gandhāra). Meantime the son of the
slain Wu-sun king grew up to manhood and drove the
Yueh-chi further west into the Tahia (Dahae?) territory
washed by the Oxus. The Tahia 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 Bukhārā. The Yueh-chi capital was still in the same position when visited by Chang-kien in or about B. C. 125 (J. R. A. S., 1903, pp. 19-20).

The adventures of Chang-Kien as related by Ssu-ma-ch'ien in the Sse-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, Chouang-mo, Kouei-chouang (Kushān), Hi-thum (Bamiyan region) and Kao-fou (Kābul).¹

We next obtain a glimpse of the Yueh-chi in Fanye'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 145 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 Tahia and divided the kingdom among five Yabgous, viz., those of Hicou-mi, Chouang-mi, Kouei-chouang, Hitouen and Tou-mi. More than hundred years after that, the Yabgou of Kouei-chouang (Kushān) named K'ieou-tsieou-kio attacked and vanquished the four other Yabgous and

¹ A later historian regards Kaofou as a mistake for Tou-mi.
called himself king; he invaded Ngan-si (Parthia?) and took possession of the territory of Kao-fou (Kābul), overcame Po-tai 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 T'ien-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 Kushān 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 Kadphises, Kozola Kadaphes or Kujula kara Kadphises, the first Kushān king who struck coins to the south of the Hindukush. Numismatic evidence shows that he was the colleague, and afterwards the successor, of Hermaios, the last Greek prince of the Kābul 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 103 belonging to the reign of Gondophernes. The inscription probably belongs to a period when the Kushān 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 Kushān king of the Panjtar record (of the year 122) and the Taxila scroll of the year 136 (JRAS, 1914, pp. 977-78). The monogram on the scroll is characteristic of coins of Vima Kadphises (II), but it is also found on coins of his predecessor. We should, however, remember that in the

1 Perhaps identical with the country of Po-tai which in the time of Sung-yun sent two young lions to the King of Gandhāra as present (Beal, Records of the Western World, Vol. I, ci).
Taxila inscription of 136 the Kushan king is called Devaputra, a title which was characteristic of the Kanishka group and not of Kadphises I or II.

Kadphises I coined no gold. His coinage shows unmistakable influence of Rome. He copied the issues of Augustus or those of Tiberius. He used the titles Yavuga and Mahārāja Rājātirāja.

"K'ieou-tsieou-kio" or Kadphises 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 (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141) and Smith (The Oxford History of India, p. 128) Kadphises II established the Śaka Era of A.D. 78. If this view be accepted then he was the overlord of Nahapāna, and was the Kushan monarch who was defeated by the Chinese and compelled to pay tribute to the emperor Hoti (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.

The conquests of the Kadphises Kings opened up the path of commerce between 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 life-like representation of the monarch. The reverse is confined to the worship of Śiva. In the Kharoshṭhī inscription he
is called "the great king, king of kings, lord of the world, the Māhiśvara, the defender."

We learn from Yu-Houan, the author of the Wei-lio, composed between A.D. 233-265 that the Yuch-chi power was flourishing in Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra), Ta-hia (Oxus Valley), Kao-fou (Kābul) and Tien-Tchou (India) as late as the third century A.D. But the Chinese authors are silent about the names of the successors of Yen-kao-tchen (Kadphises II). Inscriptions discovered in India have preserved the names with dates of the following great Kushān sovereigns besides the Kadphises group, viz., Kanishka I (3-18), Vāsishka (24-28), Huvishka (33-60), Kanishka II son of Vājheshka (41), and Vāsudeva (74-98). Huvishka, Vājheshka and Kanishka II are probably referred to by Kalhana 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 (33-60). Thus the account of Kalhana 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 (Thomas, J.R.A.S., 1913; Marshall, J.R.A.S., 1914). Inscriptions, coins as well as the testimony of Hiuen-Tsang clearly prove that Kanishka's dominions included Gandhāra, but we have already seen that according
to Chinese evidence the Sai-wang, *i.e.*, Saka kings, and not the Kushāns, ruled Kipin (Kāpiṣa-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 Mahākshatrapa's conquests extended to Sindhu and Sauvīra. Rudradāman certainly lived from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. He did not owe his position as Mahākshatrapa to anybody else (svayam adhigata Mahākshatrapa 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 3-18, Vāshishka's dates 24-28, Huvishka's dates 31-60, and Vāsudeva's dates 74-98 suggest a continuous reckoning. In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an era. But we know of no era which commenced in the second century A.D.

3. Dr. Majumdar thinks that the era founded by Kanishka was the Kalachuri era of 248-49 A.D. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil points out that this is not possible (Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 31). "In fact, the reign of Vāsudeva, the last of the Kushāns, came to an end 100 years after the beginning of the reign of Kanishka. Numerous inscriptions prove that Vāsudeva reigned at Mathurā. It is certain that this country over which extended the empire of Vāsudeva was occupied about 350 A.D. by the Yaudheyas and the Nāgas and it is probable that they reigned in this place nearly one century before they were subjugated by Samudra Gupta. The capitals of the Nāgas were Mathurā, Kāntipura
and Padmāvatī." The theory of Dr. Majumdar cannot moreover be reconciled with the Tibetan tradition which makes Kanishka a contemporary of King Vijayakirti of Khotan (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 142) and the Indian tradition which makes Huvishka a contemporary of Nāgarjuna and hence of a king of the Śatavahana line of Kosala i.e., the upper Deccan which became extinguished in the first half of the third century A. D. The arguments against the theory of Dr. Majumdar are equally applicable to the theory of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who places Kanishka's accession in A. D. 278.

4. According to Oldenberg, Thomas, R. D. Banerji, Rapson and many other scholars Kanishka was the founder of that reckoning commencing A. D. 78 which came to be known as the Śaka 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 Śaka era in 78 A. D. we have scarcely 28 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 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 Kushān 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 Budha Gupta, the king is referred to simply as Gupta nripa).

(c) Prof. J. Dubreuil says "Mr. Sten Konow has shown that the Tibetan and Chinese documents tend to prove that Kanishka reigned in the second century." (This Kanishka may have been Kanishka of the 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 (Vāsudeva? Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141) 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" EHI, p. 272; Dr. Smith and Mr. R. D. Banerji clearly recognised the existence of more than one Vāsudeva (ibid, pp. 272-278).

(d) Mr. Sten Konow has shown that the inscriptions of the Kanishka era and those of the Śaka era are not dated in the same fashion. [But the same scholar also shows that the inscriptions of the Kanishka era are also not dated in the same fashion. In the Kharoshthī 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 Brāhmī records, Kanishka and his successors adopted the ancient Indian way of dating (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141). Are we to conclude from this that the Kharoshthī dates of Kanishka's inscriptions, are not to be referred to the same era to which the dates of the Brāhmī records are to be ascribed? If Kanishka adopted two different ways of dating, we fail to understand why he could not have adopted a third
method to suit the local conditions in western India. Sten Konow himself points out that in the Śaka dates we have the name of the month, as in the Kharoshṭhī records, with the addition of the Paksha. “The Śaka era which they (the western Kshatrapas) used was a direct imitation of the reckoning used by their cousins in the north-west, 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 Śaka-Pahlava method, and in Hindusthān 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 Kaśmīr to Benares. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sāketa) and Pāṭaliputra are preserved by Tibetan and Chinese writers (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 142; Ind. Ant., 1903, p. 382). Epigraphic records give contemporary notices of him, with dates, not only from Zeda in the Yuzufzai country and from Manikiala near Rawalpindi, but also from Sue Vihrā (north of Sind), from Mathurā and Śrāvasti, and from Sārnāth near Benares. His coins are found in considerable quantities as far eastwards as Gāzipur. The eastern portion of his empire was apparently governed by the Mahā Kshatrapa Kharapallāna and the Kshatrapa Vanashpara. He fixed his own residence at Peshāwar (Purushapura) and established Kanishkapura in Kaśmīr. 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 (Ind. Ant., 1903, p. 382). 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 Hiuen Tsang who speaks of Chinese Princes detained as hostages at his court.

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 at Purushapura or Peshāwar which excited the wonder of the Chinese pilgrims. He convoked the last great Buddhist council. But though a Buddhist the Kushāṇ monarch continued to honour his old Zoroastrian, Greek, Mithraic and Hindu gods. The court of Kanishka was adorned by Aśvaghoṣha, Charaka, Nāgārjuna and other worthies.

After Kanishka came Vāsishka, Huvishka and Kanishka of the Āra inscription. We have got two inscriptions of Vāsishka dated 24 and 28. He may have been identical with Vājheshka the father of Kanishka of the Āra inscription, and Jushka of the Rājataraṅginī.

Huvishka's dates range from 33 to 60. Kalhana's narrative leaves the impression that he ruled simultaneously with Jushka and Kanishka, i.e., Vā-jheshka 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.

Smith does not admit that the Kanishka of the Āra inscription of the year 41 was different from the great
Kanishka. Lüders and Sten Konow however distinguish the two Kanishkas. According to Lüders Kanishka of the Åra inscription was a son of Vāsishka and probably a grandson of Kanishka I (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 143). 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 Kanishkapura in Kaśmīra.

The last notable king of Kanishka's line was Vāsudeva. His dates range from the year 74 to 99, i.e., A.D. 152 to 177 according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages. He does not appear to have been a Buddhist. His coins exhibit the figure of Śiva attended by Nandi. There can be no doubt that he reverted to Śaivism, the religion professed by his great predecessor Kadphises II.

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 Yüeh-chi,' i.e., ruled by princes of the Yüeh-chi stock.1 These were Ta-hia (Oxus region), Ki-pin (Kāpiṣa), Kao-fou (Kābul) and Tien-tchou (India proper). The Yüeh-chi kingdom of Tien-tchou probably disappeared in the fourth century A. D., being conquered by the Nāgas. The prevalence of Nāga rule over a considerable portion of northern and central India in the third and fourth centuries A.D., is amply attested by epigraphic evidence. A Lahore copper seal inscription of the fourth century A. D., refers to a king named Mahēśvara Nāga, the son of Nāgabhāṭṭa

---
1 Among the successors of Vāsudeva may be mentioned Kanishko (111), Vasu (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, pp. 211-212), and Grumbates (Smith, EHI, p. 274). The last king of Kanishka's race was Lagaturman who was overthrown by his Brāhmaṇa minister Kallār (Alberuni, II, 10).
(CII, p. 283). The Allahabad Pillar Inscription refers to King Ganapati Nāga, while several Vākātaka records mention Bhava Nāga king of the Bhārasīvas whose grand-son’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. We learn from the Purāṇas that the Nāgas established themselves at Vidiśā, Padmāvatī, Kāntipuri and even Mathurā which was the southern capital of Kanishka and his successors (JRAS, 1905, p. 233). The greatest of the Nāga Kings was perhaps Chandrāṁśa ‘the second Nakhavant,’ who was probably identical with the great king Chandra of the Delhi Iron Pillar inscription. The Kushāns however continued to rule in the Kābūl valley. One of them was probably the Daivaputraśāhi sāhānuśāhi who sent valuable presents to Samudra Gupta. 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.
SCYTHIAN RULE IN SOUTHERN
AND WESTERN INDIA

I. THE KSHAHARĀTAS.

We have seen that in the first century 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 Sātavahani-hāra, and was at one time under the direct administration of a military governor (mahāsenāpati) named Skandanāga (Ep. Ind., XIV, 155). The name of the Scythian conquerors of Mahārāṣṭra, Kshaharāta, seems to be identical with "Karatai," the designation of a famous Śaka tribe mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy (Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400).

The known members of the Kshaharāta, Khararāta, or Chaharata, 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 Spalirises and Azes I.

Nahapāna was the greatest of the Kshaharāta Satraps. Eight Cave Inscriptions discovered at Pāṇḍulena, near Nāsik, Junnar and Karle (in the Poona District) prove the inclusion of a considerable portion of Mahārāṣṭra
within his dominions. Seven of these inscriptions describe the benefactions of his son-in-law Ushavadāta, the Śaka, while the eighth inscription specifies the charitable works of Ayama the Amātya. Ushavadāta's inscriptions indicate that Nahapāṇa's political influence extended from Poona (in Mahārāṣṭra) and Śūrpara (in North Konkon) to Mandasor (Daśapura in Mālwa) and the district of Ajmir including Pushkāra, 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 Nahapāṇa a Kshatrapa, while the Junnar epigraph of Ayama specifies the date 46 and speaks of Nahapāṇa as Mahākshatrapa. The generally accepted view is that these dates are to be referred to the Śaka era of 78 A.D. The name Nahapāṇa is no doubt Persian, but the Kshaharāta tribe to which Nahapāṇa belonged was probably a Śaka tribe, and Ushavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāṇa, distinctly calls himself a Śaka. It is therefore probable that the era of 78 A.D. derives its name of Śaka era from the Śaka princes of the House of Nahapāṇa. Rapson accepts the view that Nahapāṇa's dates are recorded in years of the Śaka era, beginning in 78 A.D., and therefore assigns Nahapāṇa to the period A.D. 119 to A.D. 124. Several scholars identify Nahapāṇa with Mambarūs (Nambanus?) of the Periplus whose capital was Minnāgara in Ariake. According to Prof. Bhandarkar Minnāgara is modern Mandasor,¹ and Ariake is Aparantika.² Mr. R. D. Banerji and Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil are, however, of opinion that Nahapāṇa's dates are not referable to the Śaka era. They say that if we admit that the inscriptions of Nahapāṇa are dated in the Śaka era, there will be only an interval of five years

¹ See also Bomb. Gaz., i. i. 15 n.
² Ariake may be Arya-a of Varāhamihira's Brīhat Samhitā.
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 52 suggest) while the Kshaharātas were ruling in Mālwa and Maharāṣṭra. 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 “cha” after Rudradāman in the text of the inscription (Rajna Chashtanasa Ysāmotikaputrasa rajña Rudradamasa Jayadamaputrasa varshe dvipachāse 50, 2). Prof. Dubreuil translates the passage thus:

In the 52nd year, in the reign of Rudradāman, son of Jayadāman, grandson of Chashtana and great-grandson of Ysāmotika.
The Professor who objects to a cha, himself makes use not only of “and” but also of the words “grandson” and “great-grandson” no trace of which can be found in the original record. Had his translation been what the writer of the Andhau inscriptions intended, we should have expected to find the name of Ysāmotika first, and then the name of Chashtana followed by those of Jayadāman and Rudradāman—Ysāmotika prapautrasa Chashtana pautrasa Jayadāmaputrasa Rudradāmasa (cf. the Guṇḍa and Jasdhan inscriptions). Moreover, it is significant that in the text of the inscription there is no royal title prefixed to the name of Jayadāman who ruled between Chashtana and Rudradāman according to Dubreuil. On the other hand both Chashtana and Rudradāman are called rājā. The two are mentioned in exactly the same way—with the honorific Rājā and the patronymic. The literal translation of the inscriptive passage is “in the year 52 of king Chashtana son of Ysāmotika, of king Rudradāman son of Jayadāman,” and this certainly indicates that the year 52 belonged to the reign both of Chashtana and Rudradāman. The conjoint rule of two kings was known to ancient Hindu writers on polity (cf. Dvairājya in Kautilya’s Arthasastra, p. 325). The theory of the conjoint rule of Chashtana and his grandson is supported by the fact that Jayadāman did not live to be Mahākshatrapa and must have predeceased his father Chashtana as, unlike Chashtana and Rudradāman, he is called simply a Kṣatrapa (not Mahākshatrapa and Bhadramukha) even in the inscriptions of his descendants (cf. the Guṇḍa and Jasdhan inscriptions). We have already noticed the fact that the title rājā, which is given to Chashtana and Rudradāman in the Andhau inscriptions, is not given to Jayadāman.

1 Cf. also the classical account of Patalene, p. 134 ante; the case of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Duryodhana in the Great Epic; of Eukratides and his son in Justin’s work; of Strato I and Strato II; of Azes and Azilises, etc., etc.
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 Chashtana’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 71 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 Chashtana.

The theory of those who refer Nahapāna’s dates to the Saka era, is confirmed by the fact pointed out by Prof. Bhandarkar 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 (Mālavas) from the north, and the Sātavāhanas from the south. The incursion of the Mālavas was repelled by Ushavadāta. But the Sātavāhana attack proved fatal to Saka rule in Mahārāṣṭra. The Nāsik prāśasti 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 Jogaltembhi 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 Sātavāhāna Empire.

Gautamiputra’s victory over the Kshaharātas led to the restoration of the Sātavāhana power in Mahārāṣṭra and the adjoining provinces. The recovery of Mahārāṣṭra is proved by a Nasik inscription dated in the year 18 and a Karle epigraph addressed to the Amātya in charge of Māmāla (the district round Karle, modern Māval). But this was not the only achievement of Gautamiputra. We learn from the Nasik record of queen Gautami that her son destroyed the Sakas, Yavanas and Pahlavas, and that his dominions extended not only over Asika, Asaka (Asmaka on the Godāvarī, i.e., Mahārāṣṭra), and Mulaka (the district round Paithan), but also over Suratha (Kāthiāwār), Kukura (in Central India, probably near the Pāriyātra or the Western Vindhyas (Brihat Samhīta, XIV. 4), Aparānta (North Konkon), Anupa (district round Māhiśmati on the Narmada), Vidarbha (Berar), and Ākara-Avanti (East and West Mālwa). He is further styled lord of all the mountains from the Vindhyas to the Travancore hills. The names of the Andhra country (Andhrāpatha) and 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.

According to Sir R. 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 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 gift of theirs," presupposes the gift of the Nāsik 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 Gautamī Balasri, 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 Mahādevī jirasutā Rajamātā. In Pulumāyi's inscription the epithets Mahādevī and Rajamātā are retained but
the epithet “Jivasuta” is significantly omitted. The donees in the former grant were the Tekirasi ascetics, the donees in the latter grant were the Bhadavâniya 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 Pulumâyi is attested by an edict of Gautamîputra of the year 18. On the other hand the cave given away to the Bhadavâniya monks was the whole of Cave No. 3.

If Gautamîputra and his son reigned simultaneously, and if the latter ruled as his father’s colleague in Mahârâšṭra, then it is difficult to explain why Gautamîputra addressed the officer at Govardhana directly, ignoring his son who is represented as ruling over Mahârâšṭra, while in the record of the year 19, Pulumâyi is considered as so important that the date is 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 Pulumâyi succeeded Gautamîputra. We learn from Ptolemy that his capital was Baithan, i. e., Paithan or Pratisṭhâna on the Godâvari, identified by Bhandarkar with Navanara. Inscriptions and coins prove that Pulumâyi’s dominions included the Krishnâ district as well as Mahârâšṭra. We have already seen that the Andhra country is not mentioned in the list of countries over which Gautamîputra held his sway. It is not altogether improbable that Vasishṭhîputra Pulumâyi was the first to establish the Sâtavâhana power in that region. Sukhtankar identifies him with Siri Pulumâyi, king of the Sâtavâhanas, mentioned in an inscription discovered in the Ādoni taluk of the Bellary district. But the absence of the distinguishing matronymic probably indicates that the king referred

to the inscription is Pulumāyi I of the Purāṇas. Rapson identified Pulumāyi with Vāsisṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarni 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 and says that Pulumāyi must be identified with Śātakarni, 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 does not accept the identification of Pulumāyi with Vāsisṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarni of the Kanheri Cave Inscription. He identifies the latter with Śiva Śrī Śātakarni, the Śiva Śrī of the Matsya Purāṇa, probably a brother and successor of Pulumāyi. Another brother of Pulumāyi was probably Śrī Chandra Sati.

The next important kings were Śrī Sāta (mis-called Sakasena) and Yajñāśrī Śātakarni. Yajñāśrī’s inscriptions, which prove that he reigned for at least 2/1 years, are found at the following places, viz., Nāsik, Kanheri, and China (Kṛishṇā district). His coins are found in Gujarat, Kāthiāwār, East Mālwa, Aparānta, the Central Provinces, and the Kṛishṇā 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.

Yajñāśrī was the last great king of his dynasty. After his death the Śātavāhanas probably lost Mahārāṣṭra to the Ābhira king Īśvarasena. The later Śātavāhana princes—Śrī Rudra Śātakarni, Śrī Krishṇa Śātakarni and others—ruled in Eastern Deccan and were supplanted by the Ikṣvākus and the Pallavas. The Śātakarnīs of Kuntala, or the Kanarese districts, were supplanted by the Pallavas.
and Kadambas. A new power—the Vākātaka—arose in
the central Deccan probably towards the close of the third
century A. D.

III. THE ŚAKAS OF UJJAIN.

The greatest rivals of the restored Satavāhana Empire
were at first the Śaka Kshatrapas of Ujjain. The progeni-
tor of the Śaka princes of Ujjain was Ysāmotika who was
the father of Chashtana, the first Mahākshatrapa of the
family. The name of Ysāmotika is Scythic (JRAS, 1906,
p. 211). His descendant, who was killed by Chandra
Gupta II, is called a Śaka king by Bāna in his Harsha-
charita. It is therefore assumed by scholars that the
Kshatrapa family of Ujjain was a Śaka family.

The proper name of the dynasty is not known. Rapson
says that it may have been Kārddamaka. The daughter
of Rudradāman boasts that she is descended from the
family of Kārddamaka kings; but she may have been
indebted to her mother for this distinction. The Kārdda-
ma kings apparently derive their name from the Kārda-
ma, a river in Persia (Pārasika, Shama Sastry's transla-
tion of Kautilya, p. 86).

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. 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 Ś. E. 52 i. e.
A. D. 130. We learn from the Andhau inscriptions that

1 The Periplus mentions Malicho (Maliku) the king of the Nabataeans who died
in A. D. 75, and Zoscales (Za Hakale) king of the Anxumites who reigned from
A. D. 76 to 80 (JRAS, 1917, 827–830).
in the year A. D. 130 Chashtana was ruling conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman. Prof. Bhandarkar points out that his foreign title Kshatrāpa, and the use of the Kharoshthī alphabet on his coins, clearly show that he was a Viceroy of some northern power—probably of the Kushāns. Jayadāman, son of Chashtana, seems to have acted merely as a Kshatrāpa and to have pre-deceased his father, and the latter was succeeded as Mahākshatrāpa by Rudradāman.

Rudradāman became an independent Mahākshatrāpa sometime between the years 52 and 72 (A. D. 130 and 150). We learn from the Junāgadh Rock Inscription of the year 72 that men of all caste chose him as protector and that he won for himself the title of Mahākshatrāpa. This probably indicates that he declared his independence.

The place names in the inscription seem to show that the rule of Rudradāman extended over Pūrva-paṛakara-vanti (East and West Mālwa), Anupanivrit or the Māhishmati (Māndhata?) region, Anurāta (district round Dwārakā), Surāśṭra (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 Brihat Sāmhitā, XIV, 4), Aparānta (N. Konkon), Nishāda (in the region of the Western Vindhyas, cf. Pāriyāt-tracharaḥ, Mbh., xii. 135,3-5), etc. Of these places Surāśṭra, Kukura, Aparāṇa, Anupa, and Ākara-vanti formed part of Gautamiputra’s dominions, and must have been conquered either from that king or one of his sons. The

1 Ānurāta may however designate the district round Vādanagāra (Bom. Gaz. i, i, 6). In that case Kukura should be placed in the Dwārakā region. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa refers to Dwārakā as “Kukurāṇdha-kvāvrahiḥ-pihhiḥ-guptiḥ” (I. 11. 10).

2 Sindhu is the inland portion (Watters, Yuau Chwang II. 252, 253, read with 256). Sauvira is the littoral (Milinda Panho, SBE., XXXVI, 269).
Junāgadh inscription supplies the information that Rudrarāman twice defeated Sātakarni, lord of the Deccan, but did not destroy him on account of their near relationship. According to Prof. Bhandarkar this Sātakarni was Gautamiputra himself whose son Vāsishthiputra Sātakarni was Rudradāman’s son-in-law. According to Rapson the lord of the Deccan defeated by Rudradāman was Pulumāyi.

Rudradāman also conquered the Yaudheyas, who are known, from a stone inscription to have occupied the Bijayagaḍḍh region in the Bharatpur state. If the Kushān chronology accepted by us be correct then he must have wrested Sindhu-Saúvīra from one of the successors of Kanishka I.

Rudradāman apparently held his court at Ujjain, which is mentioned by Ptolemy as the capital of his grandfather Chashtana, placing the provinces of Ānarta and Surāshṭra under his Pallava Amātya, Suvisākha, who constructed a new dam on the Sudarṣana Lake.

The great Kšatrāpa is said to have gained fame by studying grammar (Śabda), polity (artba), 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 Sudarṣana embankment was built and the lake reconstructed by “expending a great amount of money from his own treasury, without oppressing the people of the town and of the province by exacting taxes (Kara), forced labour (Vishti); benevolences (Pranāya), and the like” (Bomb. Gaz., I, 1, 3. 9). 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 guna samudyuktaiḥ) and were divided into two classes, viz., Matisachiva (councillors) and Karmasachiva (Executive officers).
Rudradāman was succeeded by his eldest son Dama
ghsāda I. After Dāmaghsāda there were (according to Rapson) two claimants for the succession: his son Jīradāman and his brother Rudra Simha I. The struggle was eventually decided in favour of the latter. To Rudra Simha’s reign belongs the Guṇḍa inscription of the year 103 (=A. D. 181) which records the digging of a tank by an Ābhīra general named Rudrabhūti, son of the general Bāpaka. The Ābhīras afterwards usurped the position of Mahākshatrapa. According to Prof. Bhandarkar an Ābhīra namedĪśvaradatta was the Mahākshatrapa of the period 188-90 A. D. But Rapson placesĪśvaradatta after A. D. 236.

Rudra Simha I was followed by his sons Rudrasena I, Saṅghadāman and Dāmasena. Three of Dāmasena’s sons became Mahākshatrapas, viz., Yasodāman, Vijayasena and Dāmajāda Śrī. This last prince was succeeded by his nephew Rudrasena II who was followed by his sons Viṣva
simha and Bhartridāman. Under Bhartridāman his son Viśvasena served as Kshatrapa.

The connection of Bhartridāman and Viśvasena with the next Mahākshatrapa 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 Śakas of Western India was destroyed by the Guptas. Already in the time of Samudra Gupta the Śakas 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 commemo
rates the construction of a cave by a minister of Chandra

1 To Rudrasena’s reign belongs the Mulwasar inscription of A. D. 200, and Jasdhana inscription of A. D. 205. In the latter inscription we have the title Bhadra.mukha applied to all the ancestors of Rudrasena, excepting Jayadāma.
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 "Simhavikrāntagāminī," or vassal of Simha-Vikrama, i.e., Chandra Gupta II applied to Naravarman of Mandasor (Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 162). Evidence of the conquest of Surāśṭra is to be seen in Chandra Gupta's silver coins which are imitated from those of the Śaka Satraps. Lastly, Bāna in his Harshacharita refers to the slaying of the Śaka king by Chandra Gupta (Aripure cha parakalatra kāmukam kāminiveśaguptaścha Chandra Guptaḥ Śakapatimaśātayaditi).
THE GUPTA EMPIRE

I. THE RISE OF THE GUPTA POWER.

We have seen that the tide of Scythian conquest, which was rolled back for a time by the Sātavāhanas, was finally stemmed by the Gupta Emperors. It is interesting to note that there were many Guptas among the officials of the Sātavāhana conquerors of the Sakas, e.g., Siva Gupta of the Nāsik Inscription of the year 18,—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 unoften mentioned in old Brāhmī Inscriptions. The Ichchhāwar (Bāndā district) Buddhist Statuette inscription (Lüders, No. 11) mentions the benefaction of Mahādevī queen of Śrī Haridāsa, sprung from the Gupta race (Gupta vāṃśodita). A Bharaut Buddhist Pillar Inscription (Lüders, No. 687) of the Śunga period refers to a "Gauptī" as the queen of Rājan Visadeva, and the grandmother of Dhanabhūti a feudatory of the Śuṅgas.

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 Mṛgasīkhāvana. I-Tsing's date would place him about A. D. 175 (Allan, Gupta Coins, Introduction, p. xv). Allan rejects the date and identifies Śrī Gupta with Gupta the great-grand-father of Samudra Gupta on the ground that it is unlikely that we should have two different rulers in
the same territory, of the same name, within a brief period. But, have we not two Chandra Guptas and two Kumāra Guptas within brief periods? There is no cogent reason for identifying Śrī Gupta of A. D. 175 with Samudra Gupta’s great-grand-father who must have flourished about a century later.

The names of Śrī 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.

**Chandra Gupta I.**

The first independent sovereign (Mahārājādhirāja) 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 “Lichchhavayah” 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 out that Pātaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Śrī Gupta’s time.

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 Puranic verses defining the Gupta dominions refer to his reign:

AnuGaṅgā Prayaṅgamcha Šāketam Magadhāṁstathā
Etān janapadān sarvān bhokshyante Guptavaṁśajāh.

It will be seen that Vaiśālī is not included in this list of Gupta possessions. Therefore we cannot concur in Allan’s view that Vaiśālī was one of Chandra Gupta’s earliest conquests. Nor does Vaiśālī occur in the list of Samudra Gupta’s acquisitions. It first appears as a Gupta possession in the time of Chandra Gupta II, and constituted a Viceroyalty under an Imperial Prince.

_Para[kramāṇa]k._

Chandra Gupta I was succeeded by his son Samudra Gupta. It is clear from the Allahabad prasasti and from the epithet tatparigṛhitā 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.¹

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 was that of portions of Āryavarta. Following his “Sarvakshatranātaka” predecessor, he uprooted Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Chandravarman, Gaṇapati Nāga, Nāgasena, Aĉyuta, Nandi, Balavarman and many other kings of Āryavarta, captured the scion of the family of Kota and made all kings of the forest countries (āṭavika-rāja) his servants. Matila has been identified with a person named Mattila mentioned in a seal found in Bulandshahr. The

¹ The epithet Sarvarājochchhettā found on Kācha’s coins shows that he was identical with Samudra Gupta.
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. Chandravarman has been identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Susunia inscription, who was the ruler of Pushkarāmbudhi in Rājaputāna. Pandit H. P. Śastri believes that this king is identical also with the mighty sovereign Chandra of the Meharauli Iron Pillar Inscription "who in battle in the Vaṅga countries turned back with his breast the enemies who uniting together came against him, and by whom having crossed in warfare the seven mouths of the Indus the Vāhlikas were conquered." It should, however, be noted that the Purāṇas represent the Nāgas as ruling in the Jumna valley and Central India in the fourth century A.D. We learn from the Vishṇu Purāṇa that Nāga dynasties ruled at Padmāvatī and Mathurā. A Nāga line probably ruled also at Vidiśā (Pargiter, Kali Age, p. 49). Two kings named Sada-Chandra and Chandrāṁśa "the second Nakhavant" are mentioned among the post-Andhran kings of Nāga lineage. One of these, preferably the latter, may have been the Chandra of the Meharauli inscription. Ganapati Nāga, Nāgasena and Nandi also seem to have been Nāga princes. The statement that Ganapati-Nāga was a Nāga prince requires no proof. This prince is also known from coins. Nāgasena, heir of the house of Padmāvatī (Narwar in the Gwalior territory) is mentioned in the Harshacharita (Nāga kulajanmanañ sārikāsārivita mantrasya āśidnāsa Nāgasenasya Padmāvatyām). Nandi was also probably a Nāga prince. In the Purāṇas Siśu Nandi and Nandiyaśas are connected with the Nāga family of Central India. We know the name of a Nāga prince named Śivanamdi (Dubreuil, Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 31). Achyuta was probably a king of Ahichchhatrā. To him has been attributed the small
copper coins bearing the syllables ‘achyu’ found at Ahichchhatra (Allan, Gupta Coins, xxii).

The conquered territories were constituted as vishayas or Imperial sub-provinces. Two of these vishayas are known from later inscriptions, namely Antarvedi and Arikina.

The annexation of the northern kingdoms was not the only achievement of Samudra Gupta. He made the rulers of the Āṭavika rājayas 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 digvijayi of the Early Magadhan type. But in the south he followed the Kauṭilyan ideal of a dharmavijayi, i.e., he defeated the kings but did not annex their territory.

The Āṭavika rājayas were closely connected with Ṛabhāla (Fleet, CII, p. 114), i.e., the Jabbalpur region (Ep. Ind., VIII, 284-287). The conquest of this region by Samudra Gupta is proved also by his Eran inscription. One of the Āṭavika states was Koṭāṭavi which reminds us of the “Kota-Kula” which the Gupta monarch overthrew.

The Kings of Dakshināpatha who came into conflict with the great Gupta were Mahendra of Kosala, Vyāghraraṇa of Mahākāntāra, Manṭarāja of Kaurāla, Svāmidatta of Pishtapura and of Koṭṭūra on Mahendragiri, Damana of Eranḍapalla, Vishṇugopa of Kāñchî, Nilarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Vengī, Ugrasena of Palakka Kuvera of Devarāṣṭra, and Dhanaṇjaya of Kusthalapura.

Kosala is South Kosala which comprised the modern Raipur and Sambalpur districts. Mahākāntāra is apparently a wild tract of Central India probably identical with the Jaso State. Kaurāla (probably a variant of Kerala, Fleet, CII, p. 13) is apparently the district of which the capital in later times was
Yayatinagarı on the Mahānadi (Ep. Ind., XI, p. 189).  
The poet Dhoyi, in his Pavanadūtam, connects the Keralis with Yayatinagarı:

Lilām netum nayanapadavim Keralinām rateschet
Gachchhe khyātām jagati nagarim ākhyāvatām Yayāteḥ.

Pishtapura is Pithāpuram in the Godāvari district. Koṭṭura has been identified with Kothoor, 12 miles south-south-east of Mahendragiri in Gaṇjam, and Eraṇḍapalla with Erandapali “a town probably near Chicacole” (Dubreuil, A. H. D., pp. 58-60). Kāṇchi is Conjeeveram near Madras. Avamukta cannot be satisfactorily identified. But the name of its king Nilarāja reminds us of Nīlapallī “an old seaport near Yanam” in the Godāvari district (Gazetteer of the Godavāri District, Vol. I, p. 213). Vengi has been identified with Vegi or Pedda-Vegi 7 miles north of Ellore (Krishnā District). Palakka is probably identical with Palakkada, the seat of a Pallava viceroyalty. Devarāṣṭhra is the Yellamanchili tract in the Vizagapatam district (Dubreuil, A. H. D., p. 160). Kusthalapura cannot be satisfactorily identified.

The capture and liberation of the southern kings, notably of the ruler of Koṭṭura on Mahendragiri, reminds us of the following lines of Kālidāsa’s Rāghuvaṁśa:—

Grihitapratimuktasya sa dharma vijayi nṛpaḥ
Śriyām Mahendranāṭhasya jahara natu mediniṁ.

It is not a little surprising that the Allahabad prāṣasti contains no reference to the Vākāṭakas who were now the predominant power in the region between Bundelkhand and Karnāṭa. The earliest reference to the Vākāṭakas occurs in certain inscriptions of Amarāvati.

1 Kaurāla cannot be Kolleru or colair which must have been included within the territory of Hastivarman of Vengi.
2 There is another Koṭṭura “at the foot of the hills” in the Vizagapatam district (Viz. Dist. Gaz., I, 137).
The dynasty rose to power under Vindhyāśakti and his son Pravarasena I. Pravarasena appears to have been succeeded by his grandson Rudrasena I. Prithivisena 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. Prithivisena I’s political influence extended from Nachnē-ki-talai in Bundelkhand (Fleet, CII, p. 233) to the borders of Kuntala (or Karnāṭa, Ind. Ant., 1876, p. 318), i.e., the Kanarese country. One of the Ajanṭā inscriptions credits him with having conquered the lord of Kuntala. The Nach-nē-ki-talāī region was ruled by his vassal Vyaghra. However, says that the Nachnā inscription which mentions Vyāghra, belongs not to Prithivisena I but to his descendant Prithivisena II. But this is improbable in view of the fact that from the time of Prithivisena II’s great-grand-father, if not from a period still earlier, down to at least A.D. 528, the princes of the region which intervenes between Nachnā and the Vakātaka territory, owned the sway of the Gupta empire. Now as Vyāghra of the Nachnā record acknowledges the supremacy of the Vākātaka Prithivisena, this Prithivisena can only be Prithivisena 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 Prithivisena II during whose rule the Guptas, and not the Vākātakas, were the acknowledged suzerains of the Central Provinces as we know from the records of the Parivṛājaka Mahārājās (cf. Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 475).

The absence of any reference to Prithivisena I in Harishena’s prāṣasti is explained by the fact that Samudra Gupta’s operations were confined to the eastern part of the
Deccan. There is no evidence that the Gupta conqueror carried his arms to the central and western parts of the Deccan, *i.e.*, the territory ruled by Prithivisena I himself. Prof. Dubreuil has shown that the identification of Devarāśṭra with Mahārāśṭra and of Eranḍapalla with Eranḍol in Khandesh, is wrong (cf. Modern Review, 1921, p. 457).

Though Samudra Gupta did not invade the Western Deccan it is clear from his Eran Inscription that he did deprive the Vākāṭakas of their possessions in Central India. But these possessions were not directly governed by the Vākāṭaka monarch, but were under a vassal prince. In the time of Prithivisena 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 Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra. It is probable that this Vyāghrarāja is identical with the Vyāghra of the Nāchnā inscription who was the Central Indian feudatory of Prithivisena. 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 nripatis or frontier kings of East India and the Himalayan region, and the tribal states of the Pañjab, Western India and Mālwa who are said to have gratified his imperious commands (Prachanda Śasana) “by giving all kinds of taxes, obeying his orders and coming to perform obeisance.” The most important among the East Indian frontier kingdoms which submitted to the mighty Gupta Emperor were Samatata (part of East Bengal bordering on the sea), Davāka (not satisfactorily identified) and Kāmarūpa (in Assam); we learn from the Dāmodarapur
plates that Pundravardhana or North Bengal formed an integral part of the Gupta Empire and was governed by a line of Uparika Mahārājas as vassals of the Gupta Emperor. The identification of Davāka 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 Katyur rājas of Kumaun, Garhwal and Rohilkhand.

The tribal states which paid homage were situated on the western and south-western fringe of Āryāvarta proper. Among these the most important were the Mālavas, Arjunāyanas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Ābhīras, Prārjunas, Sanakānikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas.

The Mālavas were in the Pañjab 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 Mālavagaṇa (Mālavaganaṁnāta).

The Ārjunāyanas and the Yaudheyas are placed in the northern division of India by the author of the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā. They may have been connected with the Pandououoi or Pāṇḍava tribe mentioned by Ptolemy as settled in the Pañjab (Ind. Ant, XIII, 331, 349). The connection of the Ārjunāyanas with the Pāṇḍava Arjuna is apparent. Yaudheya appears as the name of a son of Yudhishtīra in the Mahābhārata (Adi, 95, 76). The Harivamśa, a later authority, connects the Yaudheyas with Uśīnara (Pargiter, Mārkanaḍeya Purāṇa, p. 380). A clue to the locality of the Yaudheyas is given by the Bijayagadh inscription (Fleet, CII, p. 251). The hill fort
of Bijayagadh lies about two miles to the south-west of Byañ in the Bharatpur state of Rājaputāna.

The Madrakas had their capital at Śākala or Sialkot in the Pañjāb. The Ābhīras occupied the tract near Vinaśana (Śūdrabhīrān prati dvēshād yatro nashta Sarasvatī, Mbh. IX. 37.1) in the territory called Abiria by the Periplus. We have already seen that an Ābhīra became Mahākshatrapa of western India and supplanted the Sātavāhanas in a part of Mahārāṣṭra in the second or third century A.D. The lands of the Prārjunas, Sanakānīkas, Kākas and Kharaparikas lay probably in central India. The Prārjunakas are mentioned in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya (p. 194). A clue to the locality of the Sanakānīkas is given by one of the Udayagiri inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II. The name of the Kākas reminds us of the “Kankas” who are placed in Mid-India by the author of the Bṛihat Śamhitā (XIV. 4). In the Bombay Gazetteer Kāka is identified with Kākūpur near Bithur.

The rise of a new indigenous Imperial power could not be a matter of indifference to the foreign potentates of the Uttarāpatha and Surāṣṭra 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 Garuđa seal.” The foreign powers who thus established diplomatic relations with Samudra Gupta were the Daivaputra Śāhi Shāhānushāhi and the Śaka Murunḍas as well as the people of Simhala and all other dwellers in Islands.

The Daivaputra Śāhi Shāhānushāhi was apparently the Kushān ruler of the north-west, a descendant of the Great Kanishka. The Śaka Murunḍas were apparently the Kshatrapas of Ujjain. Sten Konow tells us that Murunḍa is a Śaka word meaning lord, Sanskrit Svāmin. The epithet Svāmin was used by the Kshatrapas of Ujjain.
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., Śatakarni the husband of Nayanikā, Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka, great-grand-father of Prithivīseṇa I, the contemporary of Samudra Gupta, and the Pallava Sivaskandavarman of the Prākrit Hirahadagalli record. It is probable, however, that the court poets of the Guptas knew little about these southern monarchs. After the horse sacrifice Samudra Gupta apparently took the title of Aśvamedhaparākramaḥ.

If Harishena, the writer of the Allahabad Praśasti, is to be believed the great Gupta was a man of versatile genius. "He put to shame the preceptor of the lord of Gods and Tumburu and Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and choral skill and musical accomplishments. He established his title of Kavirāja by various poetical compositions." Unfortunately none of these compositions have survived. But the testimony of Harishena to his musical abilities finds corroboration in the lyrist type of his coins.

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 the emperor were
Apratiratha, Kritāntaparasu, Sarvarājochchhetā, Vyāgh-raparakrama, Aśvamedhaparakrama, and Parākramānka but not Dharmāditya.

We possess no dated documents for Samudra Gupta's reign. The Gayā 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 (330-375) for Samudra Gupta is conjectural. As the earliest known date of Chandra Gupta II is A.D. 401, it is not improbable that Samudra Gupta died sometime after A.D. 375.

II. The Age of the Vikramādityas.

Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya.

Samudra Gupta was succeeded by his son Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya (also called Simhachandra and Simha Vikrama), born of queen Dattadevi. Chandra Gupta was chosen out of many sons by Samudra Gupta as the best fitted to succeed him. Another name of the new monarch disclosed by certain Vākāṭaka inscriptions and the Sāñchi inscription of A.D. 412 was Deva Gupta or Devarāja (Bhandarkar, Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 160).

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 Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II, son of Prīthivisena I, and the war with the Śaka Satraps which added Mālwa and Surāśṭra to the Gupta dominions.

1 Cf. the epithet "Sarvakshattrāntaka" applied to his great fore-runner Mahā-padma Nanda.
Chandra Gupta II had a daughter named Prabhavatis, by his consort Kuveranaga a princess of Naga lineage, whom he gave in marriage to Rudrasena II, the Vakataka king of the Deccan. According to Dr. Smith (JRAS, 1914, p. 324) “the Vakataka 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 Gujarāṭ and Surāśṭra, Chandra Gupta adopted a prudent precaution in giving his daughter to the Vakataka prince and so securing his subordinate alliance.”

The campaign against the western Satraps is apparently alluded to in the Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Vīrasena-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 Pāṭaliputra 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 Bāna. The annexation of his territory is proved by coins.

**Capitals of the Empire**—The original Gupta capital seems to have been at Pāṭaliputra. 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 Ujjayinipuravarādhiśvara as well as Pāṭaliputrapuravarādhiśvara. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies Chandra Gupta with the traditional Vikramāditya Śakāri of Ujjain.1 The titles Śrīvikramah,

---

1 In literature Vikramāditya is represented as ruling at Pāṭaliputra (Kathāsaritasurāgara VII, 4.3. Vikramāditya ityāśidrājā Pāṭaliputratrake) as well as Ujjayinī.
Simhavikrama, Ajitavikrama, Vikramāṅka and Vikramāditya actually occur on Chandra Gupta's coins.

We have no detailed contemporary account of Ujjayini (also called Viśāla, Padmāvatī, Bhogavatī, Hiraṇyavatī) in the days of Chandra Gupta. But Fa-hsien who visited India from A.D. 405 to 411 has left an interesting account of Pāṭaliputra. 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."

Much light is thrown on the character of Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya's administration by the narrative of Fa-hsien 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 Chandalas.... In buying and selling commodities they use cowries.” The last statement evidently refers to such small transactions as Fa-hien had occasion to make (Allan). He 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 suvarṇas in the inscriptions.

That Chandra Gupta was a good monarch may be inferred also from the inscriptions. He himself was a Vaishnava (Paramabhāgavata). But he appointed men of other sects to high offices. His general Āmrakārdava, the hero of a hundred fights (anēka-samar-āvāpta-vijayayaśas-patākaḥ) appears to have been a Buddhist, while his minister of Peace and War (Śāba-Virasena) and perhaps also his Mantrin, Śikharasvāmin, 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 “anvayaprāpta Sāchivyā”). The most important among the High Ministers were the Mantrin, the Sāṃdhivigrāhika and the Akshapataladhikrīta. Like the Maurya Mantrin, the Gupta Sāṃdhivigrāhika accompanied the sovereign to the battle-field. There was no clear-cut division between civil and military officials. The same person could be Sāṃdhivigrāhika and Mahādanāṇayaka, and a Mantrin could become a Mahābalādhikrīta.
It is not clear whether the Guptas had a central Mantriparishad. But the existence of local parishads (e.g. the Parishad of Udānakūpa) is proved by a Basārh seal discovered by Bloch.

The empire was divided into a number of Provinces (Desās, Bhuktis, etc.) sub-divided into districts called Pradeśas or Vishayas. Among Deśas the Gupta inscriptions mention Sukulideśa, Surāshṭra, Dabhālā and "Kālindī Narmadayor Madhya" are also perhaps to be placed under this category.

Among Bhuktis we have reference to Tirabhukti, Puṇḍravardhana bhukti, Śrāvasti bhukti and Nagara bhukti. Among Pradeśas or Vishayas mention is made of Lātavishaya, Tripurivishaya, Arikīna (called Pradeśa in Samudra Gupta's Eran inscription, and Vishaya in that of Toramāna), Antarvedi, Vālavī, Gayā, Koṭīvarsha, Mahākhus̄hāpāra and Kuṇḍadhaṇi.

The Deśas were governed by officers called Goptris or Wardens of the Marches (cf. Sarveshu Deśeshu vidhāya Gopti in). The Bhuktis were governed by Uparika Mahārājas who were sometimes princes of the Imperial family (e.g., Rajputrdevabhattāraka, Governor of Puṇḍravar-dhanabhukti mentioned in a Damodarapur plate, and Govinda Gupta Governor of Tirabhukti mentioned in the Basārh seals). The office of Vishyapati or District Officer was held by Imperial officials like the Kumāramātya and Āyuktaka, as well as by feudatory Mahārājas (cf. Matri-vishṇu). Some of the Vishayapatis (e.g., Sarvanāga of Antarvedi) were directly under the Emperor, while others (e.g., those of Koṭīvarsha, Arikīna and Tripuri) were under provincial governors. The Governors and District Officers were no doubt helped by officials like the Chauroddhānika, Dāṇḍika, Daṇḍapūṣika 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 Basārh 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 Mahādevi Śrī Dhruvasvāminī, who had his capital at Vaiśālī. The seals mention several officials like the Uparika (Governor), the Kumāramātya, the Mahāpratihāra (the great chamberlain), the Mahādandañāyaka (the great general), the Vinaayasṭhiti-sthāpaka (the censor), and the Bhatāśvāpati (lord of the army and cavalry), and the following offices, e.g., Yuvarājapādiya Kumāramātyādhikaraṇa (office of the minister of His Highness the Crown Prince, according to Vogel), Raṇabhāṇḍāgarādhikaraṇa (office of the chief treasurer of the war department), Balādhikaraṇa (office of the chief of the military forces), Daṇḍapāśādhikaraṇa (office of the chief of Police), Tirabhuktyuparikādhikaraṇa (office of the governor of Tirhut), Tirabhuktau Vinayasṭhiti-sthāpakādhikaraṇa (office of the Censor of Tirhut), Vaiśālyādhísthānādhikaraṇa (office of the governor of Vaiśālī), Śrīparamabhāttārakāpādiya Kumāramātyādhi-

karaṇa (office of the minister of the Prince waiting on His Majesty).

The reference to the Parishad of Udaṇakūpa shows that the Parishad still formed an important element of the Hindu machinery of government. The reference to the corporation of bankers, traders and merchants (Śrēṣṭhī-sārthavāha-kulika-nigama) is of interest to students of economics.

Chandra Gupta II had at least two queens, Dhruvadevī and Kuveranāgā. The first queen was the mother of Kumāra Gupta I and Govinda Gupta. The second queen
was the mother of Prabhāvatī who became queen of the Vākāṭakas. Certain mediæval chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta.

_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 Pundravardhana Bhukti or north Bengal (cf. the Dāmodarpur plates of the years 124 and 129); another viceroy, prince Ghaṭotkacha Gupta, governed the province of Eraṇ which included Tumbavana (M.B. Garde, Ind. Ant., 1920, p. 114, Tumain Inscription of the year 116, i.e., A.D. 435); a third viceroy or feudatory, Bandhuvarman, governed Daśapura (Mandasor Inscription of A.D. 437-8). The Karamadande inscription of A.D. 436 mentions Prithivishena who was a Mantrin and Kumārāmātya, and afterwards Mahābalādhikṛita or general under Kumāra Gupta, probably stationed in Oudh.

Like his father Kumāra was a tolerant king. During his rule the worship of Svāmī Mahāsena (Kārtikeya), Buddha, Śiva in the linga form, and the sun, as well as that of Viṣṇu, flourished peacefully side by side (cf. the Bilsad, Mankuwar, Karamadande, and Mandasor inscriptions).

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 Pushyamitras. The

¹ Also called Sṛl Mahendra, Aśvamedha Mahendra, Ajīta Mahendra, Śiṁha Mahendra, Sṛl Mahendra Śiṁha, Mahendrakumāra, Śiṁha Vikrama (Allan, Gupta Coins, p. 80), Vyāghrabalāparākrama, and Sṛl Pratāja.
reading Pushyamitra in the Bhitari inscription is, however, not accepted by some scholars because the second syllable of this name is damaged (cf.: CII, p. 55 n). Mr. H. R. Divekar in his article “Pushyamitrás in Gupta Period” (Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute) makes the plausible emendation Yudhy = amitraṁś = ca for Dr. Fleet’s reading Puṣyamitrāṁś = ca 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 Amitras or enemies, or to Pushyamitrás, cannot be satisfactorily determined. We should, however, remember in this connection that a people called Pushyamitra is actually referred to in the Vishnu Purāṇa. The fallen fortunes of the Gupta family were restored by prince Skanda Gupta (cf. the Bhitari Inscription).

Kumāra’s chief queen was Anantadevi. He had at least two sons, viz., Pura Gupta, son of Anantadevi, and Skanda Gupta the name of whose mother is not given in the inscriptions. Hiuen Tsang calls Buddha Gupta (Fo-to-kio-to) or Budha Gupta¹ a son of Śakraḍitya. The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had this title was Kumāra Gupta I who is called Mahendraḍitya 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 Vikramānka. Skanda is called both Vikramāditya and Kramāditya, both the words meaning “sun of power.” If Śakraḍitya of Hiuen Tsang be identical with Mahendraḍitya or Kumāra I, Budha Gupta was a son of Kumāra. Another son of the latter was apparently Ghaṭotkacha Gupta (cf. the

¹ 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. The synchronism of his successor’s successor Bālāditya with Mihirakula indicates that the king meant was Budha Gupta.
Tumain Inscription referred to by Mr. Garde; also the Basarh seal mentioning Śrī Ghaṭotkacha Gupta).

**Skanda Gupta Vikramāditya.**

In an interesting paper read before the members of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Dr. 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 Krishna rescued Devaki (cf. the Bhitarī Inscription). Dr. Majumdar says that the omission of the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta in the Bihār Stone Pillar and Bhitarī Inscriptions indicates that she was not a Mahādevī, 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-Mahādevīs in inscriptions. The mother of Prabhāvatī, Kuberanāgā, was not Chandra Gupta II’s Mahādevī. 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.¹ In the genealogical portion of the Banskhera and Madhuban plates the name of Yaśomatī as Harsha’s mother is not mentioned, but in the Sonpat seal she is mentioned both as the mother of Rājyavardhana and as the mother of Harsha. The Pāla Inscriptions mention Lajjā the queen of Vīgraḥa Pāla I and mother of Nārāyaṇa Pāla, but do not mention the queen of Nārāyaṇa Pāla who was the mother of Rājya Pāla. They again mention Bhāgyadevi the queen of Rājya Pāla and mother of Gopāla II. In the Bānagarh Inscription

¹ The name of the father of a reigning king was also sometimes omitted (cf. Kielhorn’s N. Ins. Nos. 464, 468).
of Mahā Pāla I we have a reference to his great-grand-mother Bhāgyadevī, but no mention of his 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:

Pitari divam upētē viplutāṁ vamśa-lakṣhmiṁ bhujā balā-vijit-ārir-yayāḥ pratishṭāpya bhūyāḥ jitam-iti paritoshān- mātarāṁ sāsra-netrāṁ hata-ripur-iva Krishṇo Devakīṁ-abhyupetaḥ.

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 Pushyamitras and the Hūṇas. There is not the slightest reference to a fratricidal war. There is no doubt a passage in the Junāgadh-inscription of Skanda which says that “the goddess of fortune and splendour of her own accord 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 prāśasti we have a similar passage “who (Samudra Gupta) being looked at with envy by the faces, melancholy through the rejection of themselves, of others of equal birth... was bidden by his father,— who, exclaiming ‘verily he is worthy’ embraced him— to govern of a surety the whole world.” It may be argued that there is no proof that Skanda was selected by Kumāra. On the contrary he is said to have been selected by Lakshmī 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 Pushyamitras, Hūnas (Bhitari Ins.) and Mlechchhas (Junāgadhi Ins.). The Manujendra-putras of the Junāgadhi 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 Pushyamitras) 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 Bhitari inscription was unjustified.

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 Bhitari 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 these enemies were the Pushyamitrasth who had developed great power and wealth.

The struggle with the sth who had developed great power and wealth. The struggle with the Pushyamitrasth was followed by a terrible conflict with the Hindu in which the emperor was presumably victorious. The invasion of the Hindu took place not later than A.D. 458 if we identify them with the Mlechchhas of the Junaga inscription. The memory of the victory over the Mlechchhas is preserved in the story of king Vikramaditya son of Mahendra of Ujjain in Somadeva’s Kathasaritsāgara (Allan, Gupta Coins, Introduction). Surāṣṭra seems to have been the vulnerable part of the Gupta empire. The Junaga inscription tells us “he (Skanda) deliberated for days and nights before making up his mind who could be trusted with the important task of guarding the lands of the Surāṣṭras.” Allan deduces from this and from the words “Sarveshu deseshuvihāya gopṭra” 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 Surāṣṭra. Inspite 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 Surāṣṭra. But his successors do not appear to have been so fortunate. Not a single inscription has yet been discovered which shows that Surāṣṭra formed a part of the Gupta empire after the death of Skanda Gupta.
The later years of Skanda seem to have been tranquil (cf. the Kahaum Ins.). The emperor was helped in the work of administration by a number of able governors like Parṇadatta viceroy of the west, Sarvanāga Vishayapati of Antaravedi or the Doāb, and Bhīmavarman the ruler of the Kosam region. Chakrapālīta, son of Parṇadatta, restored in A.D. 457-S the embankment forming the lake Sudarśana which had burst two years previously. The emperor continued the tolerant policy of his forefathers. Himself a Vaishnava, he and his officers did not discourage other faiths, 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.

III. 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 latter half of the fifth as well as the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. The Dāmodarapur plates, Sārnāth inscriptions and the Erān epigraph of Budha Gupta prove that from A.D. 477 to 496 the Gupta empire extended from Bengal to Mālwa. The Betul plates of the Parivrājaka Mahārāja Saṃkshōbha dated in the year 199 G. E. (Śrimati pravarddhānavijayarājye samvatsarasāte navanavatyuttare Gupta nripa rājyabhuktu), i.e., 518 A. D., testify to the fact that the Gupta sway at this period was acknowledged in Ďabhāḷa, which included the Tripuri Vishaya.
(Jabalpur region). Another inscription of Samkshobha found in the valley near the village of Khoh 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 Pundravardhanabhukti "during the reign of Paramadaivata Paramabhataraka Maharaajadhiraja Sri ..........Gupta," shows that the Gupta empire at this period included the eastern as well as the central provinces. Towards the close of the sixth century a Gupta king, a contemporary of Prabhakaravardhana of the Pushpabhuti family of Srikantha (Thanesar), was ruling in Malava. Two sons of this king, Kumara Gupta and Madhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon the princes Rajyavardhana and Harsha of Thanesar. From the Aphshad inscription of Adityasena we learn that the fame of the father of Madhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, marked with honour of victory in war over Susthitavarman, king of Kamarupa, was constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohitya or Brahmaputra. This indicates that even in A.D. 600 (the time of Prabhakaravardhana) 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 Adityasena, son of Madhava Gupta, who "ruled the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans," performed the Asvamedha and other great sacrifices and assumed the titles of Paramabhataraka and Maharaajadhiraja.

2 Fleet, C.I.I., III, pp. 113-16.
3 Ep. Ind., XV, p. 113 ff.
4 Malava seems to have been under the direct rule of the Guptas in the sixth and seventh centuries. Magadha was administered by the viceroyal family of Varmans (cf. Nagariuni Hill cave Ins., CII, 226; also Pargavarman mentioned by Hsen Tsang).
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 Pura 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 (JASB, 1889, pp. 84-105). This seal describes Pura Gupta as the son of Kumāra I by the queen Anantadevi, and does not mention Skanda Gupta. The mention of Pura Gupta immediately after Kumāra with the prefix Tatpadānudhyāta does not necessarily prove that Pura 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 Pādānudhyāta, although he was preceded by his elder brother Kumārapāla. In Kielhorn's Northern Inscriptions, No. 39, Vijayapāla is described as the successor of Kshiti-pāla, although he was preceded by his brother Devapāla (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 Mahārājādhirāja in Northern India during his reign. He was a man of mature years at the time of his death 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.

The omission of Skanda's name in the Bhitarī seal of his brother's grandson does not necessarily show that the relations between him and Pura's family were unfriendly. The name of Pulakesin II is omitted in an inscription of his brother and Regent Vishnuvardhana. The name of Bhoja II of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty is not mentioned in the Partabgarh inscription of his nephew Mahendrapāla II, but it is mentioned in an inscription of his brother Vināyakapāla, the father of Mahendrapāla. Besides, there was no custom prohibiting the mention of the name of a rival uncle or brother. Mangalesa and Govinda II are mentioned in the inscriptions of their rivals and their descendants. On the other hand even an ancestor of a reigning king was sometimes omitted, e.g., Rudrasena II is omitted in one Ajantā inscription. Dhara-paṭṭa is omitted in his son's inscription (Kielhorn, N. Ins. No. 464).
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 Narasimhā Gupta Bālāditya.

The coins of Pura Gupta have the reverse legend Śrī Vikramaṁ. Allan identifies him with king Vikramāditya of Ayodhyā, father of Bālāditya, who was a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu. The importance of this identification lies in the fact that it proves that the immediate successors of Skanda Gupta had a capital at Ayodhyā probably till the rise of the Maukharis. If the spurious Gayā plate is to be believed Ayodhyā was the seat of a Gupta Jayaskandhāvāra as early as the time of Samudra Gupta.

The principal capital of Bālāditya and his successors appears to have been Kāśi (CTII, 255). The evidence of the Bharsar hoard seems to suggest that a king styled Prakāśāditya came shortly after Skanda Gupta. Prakāśāditya may have been a biruda of Pura Gupta Śrī Vikrama, or of his grandson Kumāra Kramāditya, preferably the latter as the letters Ku seem to occur on Prakāśāditya’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 Narasimhā Gupta Bālāditya. This king has been identified with king Bālāditya who is represented by Hiuen Tsang as having overthrown the tyrant Mihirakula. It has been overlooked that Hiuen Tsang’s Bālāditya was the immediate successor of Tathāgata Gupta1 who was himself the immediate successor of Budha Gupta2 whereas Narasimha Gupta

---

2 Fo-to-kio-to. Beal, Fleet and Watters render the term by Buddha Gupta, a name unknown to Indian epigraphy. The synchronism of his grandson Bālāditya with Mihirakula proves that Budha Gupta is meant.
Bālāditya was the son and successor of Pura Gupta who in his turn was the son of Kumāra Gupta I and the successor of Skanda Gupta. The son and successor of Hiuen Tsang’s Bālāditya was Vajra (Yuan Chwang, II, p. 165) while the son and successor of Narasimha was Kumāra Gupta II. It is obvious that the conqueror of Mihirakula was not the son of Pura Gupta but an altogether different individual. The existence of several kings of the Madhyadēsa having the Birüda Bālāditya is proved by the Sārnāth Inscription of Prakatajāditya (C.I.I., p. 285). Narasimha Gupta must have died in or about the year A.D. 473. He was succeeded by his son Kumāra Gupta II Kramāditya by queen Mahālakshmīdevī.

Kumāra Gupta II has been identified with the king of that name mentioned in the Sārnāth Buddhist Image inscription of the year 154 G.E., i.e., A.D. 473-74. Messrs. Bhaṭṭasālī and R. G. Basāk think that the two Kumāra Guptas were not identical. The former places Kumāra son of Narasimha long after A.D. 500; (Dacca Review, May and June, 1920, pp. 54-57). But his theory is based upon the wrong identification of Narasimha with the conqueror of Mihirakula. According to Mr. Basāk Kumāra of the Sārnāth inscription was the immediate successor of Skanda. In his opinion there were two rival Gupta lines ruling simultaneously, one consisting of Skanda, Kumāra of Sārnāth and Budha, the other consisting of Pura, Narasimha and his son Kumāra of the Bhitarī 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 Bhitarī 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 Ammarājā I, and Ammarājā’s son, another Vijayāditya, ruled only for seven years and six and a half months (Hultzsch, S.I.I., Vol. I, p. 46). In Kaśmīra five kings Suravarman I, Pārtha, Samkara-vardhana, Unmattāvanti and Suravarman II, ruled within six years (A.D. 933-939); and three generations of kings, viz., Yasaskara, his uncle Varṇāta, and his son Samgrāmadeva ruled for ten years (A.D. 939-949).

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. 477-96). We learn from Hiuen Tsang that he was a son of Śakrāditya. 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 Śakrāditya’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 Puṇyavardhana and not Puṇḍravardhana. But just as there is no proof of the existence of a place called Puṇyavardhana apart from the well-known Puṇḍravardhana, 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 Śakrāditya
with Mahendrāditya Kumāra Gupta I), we understand why Fa Hien, who visited India in the time of Chāndra Gupta II, father of Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrāditya, is silent about the buildings at Nālanda constructed by Śakrāditya 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 Dinājpur testify to the fact that Budha Gupta's empire included Puṇḍravardhanabhukti (North Bengal) which was governed by his viceroys (Uparika Mahārāja) Brahmadatta and Jayadatta. The Sārnāth inscription of A.D. 476-77 proves his possession of the Kāsi country. In A.D. 484-85 the erection of a Dhvajastambha by the Mahārāja Mātrīvishṇu, ruler of Eran, and his brother Dhanyavishṇu while Budha Gupta was reigning, and Suraśmichandra was governing the land between the Kālīndi and the Narmadā, indicates that Budha Gupta's dominions included Central India as well as Kāsi and Bengal. The coins of this emperor are dated in the year A.D. 495-6. 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.

According to Hiuen Tsang Budha Gupta was succeeded by Tathāgata Gupta, after whom Bālāditya succeeded to the empire (Beal, Si-yu-ki, II, p. 168; the Life, p. 111). At this period the supremacy of the Guptas in Central India was challenged by the Hun king Tūra-ṃaṇa. We have seen that in A.D. 484-85 a Mahārāja named Mātrīvishṇu ruled in the Arikaṇa Vīshaya (Eraṇ) as a vassal of the emperor Budha Gupta, but after his death his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu acknowledged the supremacy of Tūra-ṃaṇa. 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 Eran and king Hastin of the neighbouring province of Dabhālā acknowledging the sovereignty of the Guptas. In 518 the suzerainty of the Guptas is acknowledged in the Tripurivishaya. In the year 528-29 the Gupta sway was still acknowledged by the Parivrājaka Maharāja of Dabhālā. The Parivrājakas Hastin and Samkshōbha 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 Bāładitya who is represented by Hiuen Tsang as having overthrown Mihirakula, the son and successor of Toramāṇa, and left him the ruler of a “small kingdom in the north” (Si-yu-ki, I, p. 171). It is not improbable that Bāładitya was a Biruda of the “glorious Bhānu Gupta, the bravest man on the earth, a mighty king, equal to Pārtha” along with whom Goparāja went to Eran and having fought a “very famous battle” died shortly before A.D. 510-11.

Mihirakula was finally subjugated by the Janendra Yasōdharman of Mandasōr shortly before A.D. 533. Line 6 of the Mandasōr Stone Pillar inscription (C.I.I., pp. 146-147; Jayaswal, The Historical Position of Kalki, p. 9) leaves the impression that in the time of Yasōdharman Mihirakula 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 Gaṅgā.”

Yasōdharman claims to have extended his sway as far as the Lauhitya or Brahmaputra in the east. It is not improbable that he defeated and killed Vajra the son and
successor of Bālāditya, and extinguished the viceregal family of the Dattas of Puṇḍravardhana. Hiuen Tsang mentions a king of Central India as the successor of Vajra. The Dattas who governed Puṇḍravardhana from the time of Kumāra Guptā I disappear about this time. But Yaśōdharmān’s success must have been short-lived, because in A.D. 533-34, the very year of the Mandasar inscription which mentions the Janendra Yaśodharman as victorious, the son and viceroy of a Guptā Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Prithivipathi, and not any official of the Central Indian Janendra, was governing the Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti, a province which lay between the Indian interior and the Lauhitya.

The name of the Guptā emperor in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 533-34 is unfortunately lost. The Aphsadā inscription however discloses the names of a number of Guptā kings the fourth of whom Kumāra Guptā (III) was a contemporary of Ḫīnnavarman Maukhari who is known from the Harāhā inscription to have been ruling in A.D. 554 (H. Sastri, Ep. Ind., XIV, pp. 110 ff). The three predecessors of Kumāra Guptā III, viz., Krishṇa, Harsha and Jīvita should probably be placed in the period between A.D. 510, the date of Bhānu Guptā, and 554 the date of Kumāra. It is probable that one of these kings is identical with the Guptā emperor mentioned in the Dāmodarpur plate of 533-34. The absence of high-sounding titles like Mahārājādhirāja or Paramabhaṭṭāraka in the ślokas of the Aphsadā 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 Mandasar inscription, or to the name of Budha in the Eran inscription. On the other hand the queen of Mādhava Guptā, one of the kings mentioned in the Aphsadā inscription, is called Paramabhaṭṭārikā and Mahādevi in the Deo Baranārk epigraph.
Regarding Krishna Gupta we know very little. The Aphsad 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 Yasodharman. 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 not given. Harsha’s son, Jīvita Gupta I probably succeeded in re-establishing the power of his family. “The very terrible searing 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 as who had already launched into a career of conquest about this time and who are described as living on the sea shore (samudrāśraya) in the Harāhā inscription of A.D. 554 (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 110 et seq.).

The next king, Kumāra Gupta III, had to encounter a sea of troubles. The Gauḍas were issuing from their “proper realm” which was western Bengal as it bordered on the sea and included Karnasuvrāṇa (M. Chakravarti, J.A.S.B., 1908, p. 274) and Rādhāpurū (Prabodhachandrodāya, Act II). 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 Mādhavavarmān II of the Vishnukundin family who “crossed the river Godāvari with the desire to conquer the eastern region (Dubreuil, A.H.D., p. 92). The Sūlikas were probably the Chalukyas. In the Mahākūta pillar inscription the name appears as Chalikya. In the Gujarat records we find the forms Solaki and Solaṅki. Sūlika may be another dialectic variant. The Mahākūta pillar inscription tells us that in the sixth century A.D. Kirtivarman I of the Chalikya dynasty gained victories over the kings of Vaṅga, Ānga, 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 Maukharī2 power. The Maukharis claimed descent from the hundred sons whom king Aśvapati got from Vaivasvata, i.e., Yama. The family consisted of two distinct groups. The stone inscriptions of one group have been discovered in the Jaunpur and Bārā Bānki 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 Yajñāvarman, Śārdūlavarmāna and Anantavarmāna were a feudatory family. Śārdūla is expressly called sāmanta-chūḍāmanī in the Barābar Hill Cave Inscription of his son (C.I.I., p. 223). The Maukharis of the United Provinces were also probably feudatories at first. The earliest princes of this family, viz., Harivarman, Ādityavarman, and Ṣvavarman were simply Mahārājas. Ādityavarman’s wife was Harsha Guptā, probably a sister of king Harsha Guptā. The wife of his son and successor

1 In the Brīhat Samhītā XIV. 8 the Sālikas are associated with Vidarbha.
2 The family was called both Mukhara and Maukharī. “Soma Sūrya vaṁśāviva Pushpabūti Mukhara Vaṁśau,” “Sakalabhuvana naamaskrito Maukhari Vahusāh” (Harshacharita Parab’s ed., pp. 141, 146. Cf. also C.I.I., p. 229).
Isvaravarman was also probably a Gupta princess named Upa-Guptā. In the Harāhā inscription Isānavarman, son of Isvaravarman and Upa Guptā, claims victories over the Andhras, the Sūlikas 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 Gupta III. Thus began a duel between the Maukharis and the Guptas which ended only when the latter with the help of the Gaudas wiped out the 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 Prabhākara-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.

Kumāra Gupta III claims to have “churned that formidable milk-ocean, the cause of the attainment of fortune, which was the army of the glorious Isānavarman, a very moon among kings (Aphsad Ins.).” This was not an empty boast, for the Maukhari records do not claim any victory over the Guptas. Kumāra Gupta III’s funeral rites took place at Prayāga which probably formed a part of his dominions.

The son and successor of this king was Dāmodara Gupta. He continued the struggle with the Maukharis and fell fighting against them. “Breaking up the

1 The Maukhari opponent of Dāmodara Gupta was either Suryavarman or Sarva-varman (both being sons of Isānavarman). A Sūryavarman is described in the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāśiva Gupta as “born in the unblemished family of the Varmanas great on account of their Ādhipatya (supremacy) over Magadha.” If this Sūryavarman be identical with Sūryavarman the son of Isānavarman then it is certain that for a time the supremacy of Magadha passed from the hands of the Guptas to that of the Maukharis.
proudly-stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūṇas (in order to trample them to death), he became unconscious (and expired in the fight).”

Dāmodara Gupta was succeeded by his son Mahāsena Gupta. He is probably the king of Mālava mentioned in the Harshacharita whose sons Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon Rājyavardhana and Harshavardhana by their father king Prabhākara- vardhana of the Pushpabhūti family of Śrīkaṇṭha (Thānēsar). The intimate relations between the family of Mahāsena Gupta and that of Prabhākara- vardhana is proved by the Madhuban grant and the Sonpat copper seal inscription of Harsha which represent Mahāsena Gupta Devī as the mother of Prabhākara, and the Apsād inscription of Ādityasēna which alludes to the association of Mādhava Gupta, son of Mahāsena Gupta with Harsha.

The Pushpabhūti alliance of Mahāsena Gupta was probably due to his fear of the rising power of the Maukhari. 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 Kāmarūpa by a line of princes who claimed descent from Bhagadatta. King Susthitavarman (see the Nidhanapur plates) of this family came into conflict with Mahāsena Gupta and was defeated. “The mighty fame of Mahāsena Gupta,” says the Apsād inscription, “marked with honour of victory in war over the illustrious Susthitavarman,.....is still constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohitya.”

Between Mahāsena Gupta, the contemporary of Prabhākara- vardhana, and his youngest son Mādhava Gupta, the contemporary of Harsha, we have to place a king
named Deva Gupta II who is mentioned by name in the Madhuban and Banskhera inscriptions of Harsha as the most prominent among the kings "who resembled wicked horses" who were all subdued by Rājyavardhana. 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 Rājyavardhana. 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 Madhava Gupta. His name is omitted in the Aphṣaḍ list, just as the name of Skanda Gupta is omitted in the Bhitari list.

Shortly before his death king Prabhākaravardhana 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 Gauḍas whose hostility towards the Maukharis dated from the reign of Ṣaṇavarman. The Gupta king and the Gauḍa king Ṣaṇāṅka 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 Kanyakubja." "The villain, deeming the army leaderless purposes to invade and seize this country as well" (Harshacharita). Rājyavardhana, though he routed the Mālava army "with ridiculous ease," was "allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the king of Gauḍa, and then

---

1 The Emperor Chandra Gupta II was Deva Gupta I.
weaponless, confiding and alone despatched in his own quarters."

To meet the formidable league between the Guptas and the Gauḍas, Harsha, the successor of Rājyavardhana, 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 Gauḍas as we know from the Nidhanapur plate of Bhāskara. At the time of the issuing of the plate Bhāskaravarman was in possession of Karṇasuvāra, the capital of the Gauḍa king Śaśāṅka. The Gauḍa people, however, did not tamely acquiesce in the loss of their independence. They became a thorn in the side of Kanauj and Kāmarūpa, and their hostility towards those two powers was inherited by the Pāla and Sēṇa successors of Śaśāṅka.

During the long reign of Harsha, Mādhava Gupta, the successor of Deva Gupta, remained a subordinate ally of Kanauj. 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 Aphsad, Shāhpur, and Mandār inscriptions recognise his undisputed possession of south and east Bihār. Another inscription, noticed by Fleet (C.I.I., p. 213 n.) describes him as the ruler of the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans, and the performer of the Āsvamedha and the other great sacrifices. The Dēṣa-Baranārk inscription refers to the Jayaskandhāvāra of his great-grandson Jivita Gupta II at Gomatikottaka. This clearly suggests that the Later Guptas dominated the Gomati valley in the Madhyadeśa. The Māṇḍāra inscription applies to Ādityasena the titles of Paramabhaṭṭaraka
and Mahārājādhirāja. We learn from the Shahpur 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 Sakalottarāpathanātha who was defeated by the Chalukya kings Vinayāditya (A.D. 680-696) and Vijayāditya (Bomb. Gaz., Vol. I, Part II, pp. 189, 368, 371; Kendur plates).

We learn from the Dēo-Baranārk inscription that Adityasena was succeeded by his son Deva Gupta (III) who in his turn was succeeded by his son Vishṇu Gupta who is probably identical with Vishṇu Gupta Chandrāditya of the coins (Allan, Gupta Coins, p. 145). The last king was Jivita Gupta II, son of Vishṇu. All these kings continued to assume imperial titles. That these were not empty forms appears from the records of the Western Chalukyas of Vātāpi 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 (Uttarāpathanātha,) who laid claim to the imperial dignity during this period, and actually dominated Magadha and the Madhyadesa as is proved by Aphiṣad and Dēo-Baranārk inscriptions, were Adityasena and his successors.

The Gupta empire was probably finally destroyed by the Gaudās who could never forgive Madhava 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 (cf. the Gaudavaho by Vākpatirāja).

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 earlier connection of the Guptas with the Kanarese country is furnished by the Tālagund inscription which says that Kakusthavarman 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. Curiously enough the Gutta or Gupta chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya, lord of Ujjayini.  

1 Jouveau-Dubreuil, A.H.D., p. 76.  
3 The account of the Later Guptas was first published in the J.A.S.B., 1920, No. 7.
APPENDIX.

Page ii, l. 7.—For some spurious plates of Janamejaya, see Ep. Ind., VII, App., pp. 162-163.

Page iii, l. 18.—The present Rāmāyāna (VI. 69,32) apparently refers to the Purānic episode of the uplifting of Mount Govardhāna (parigrihya gīrīṁ dorhīyaṁ vapur Vishnōr viṭambayan). For other Purānic allusions see Calcutta Review, March, 1922, pp. 500-502.

Page iv, l. 4.—The present Mahābhārata (I. 67, 13-14) refers to King Aśoka who is represented as an incarnation of a Mahāsura, and is described as "maha-vīryo'-parājitah." We have also a reference (Mbh. 1, 139, 21-23) to a Greek overlord (Yavanādhī- paḥ) of Sauvīra and his compatriot Dattāmitra (Demetrios?). The Śānti Parva mentions Yāska, the author of the Nirukta (342,73), Varṣhaganyā (318, 59) the Sāṁkhya philosopher who flourished in the fifth century after Christ, (J. R. A. S., 1905, pp. 47-51), and Kāmandaka (123, 11), the authority on Dharma and Artha, who is probably to be identified with the famous disciple of Kautilya.

Page 2, l. 33.—There is no Janamejaya after Parikshit I., also in the Kuru-Pāṇḍu genealogy given in the Chellūr or Cocanada grant of Vīra Chotrā (Hultzsh, S. I. I., Vol. I, p. 57).

Page 3.—The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (IX, 22,25-26) distinctly mentions Tura Kāvasheya as the priest of Janamejaya, the grandson of Abhimanyu, and the son of Parikshit II.

Page 12, l. 5.—The battle of Kurukshetra is very often described as a fight between the Kurus and the Śrīṇjayas (Mbh. vi. 45,2 ; 60, 29 ; 72, 15 ; 73, 41 ; vii. 20, 41 ; 149, 40 ; viii. 47, 23 ; 57, 12 ; 59, 1 ; 93, 1). The unfriendly feeling between these two peoples is distinctly alluded to in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇā (Vedic Index, II, p. 63).
Page 12, l. 22.—The polyandrous marriage of the Pândavas does not necessarily indicate that they are of non-Kuru origin. The system of Niyoga prevalent among the Kurs of the Madhyadeśa was not far removed from fraternal polyandry (Mbh. I. 103, 9-10; 105, 37-38), while the Law (Dharma) of marriage honoured by the Northern Kurs was admittedly lax (Mbh. I. 122,1). See also my “Political History” pp. 95-96, Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta University), Vol. IX.

Page 73n.—Several scholars reject the identification of Vásudeva Krishṇa of the Mahābhārata with the historical Krishṇa of the Chhāndogya Upanishad (iii. 17). But we should remember that—

(a) Both the Krishṇas have the metronymic Devakī-putra.

(b) the teacher of the Upanishadic Krishṇa belonged to a family (Āṅgirasa) closely connected with the Bhojas (Rig-Veda III, 53,7), the kindreds of the Epic Krishṇa (Mbh. ii, 14,32-34).

(c) the Upanishadic Krishṇa and his Guru Ghora Āṅgirasa were worshippers of Śūrya. We are told in the Sāntiparva (335,19) that the Śātvata vidhi taught by the Epic Krishṇa was Frāk Śūrya-mukha-nihṛṣita.

(d) an Āṅgirasa was the Guru of the Upanishadic Krishṇa. Āṅgirasi Śruti is quoted as “Śrutināṁ uttama Śrutaḥ” by the Epic Krishṇa (Mbh. viii. 69, 83).

(e) the Upanishadic Krishṇa is taught the worship of the sun, the noblest of all lights (Jyotiruttamamiti), high above all darkness (tamasas pari), and also the virtues of Tapodānam ārjjavam-ahiṁsā satya-vachanam. The Epic Krishṇa teaches the same thing in the Gītā (xiii, 18— jyotishāmapi tajjyotis tamasāḥ param uchyaте; xvi, 1-2—Dānam damaśeḥ yajnaśeḥ svādhyāyam tata ārjjavam ahiṁsā satyam).
Page 86, l. 15.—The number of four queens was exceeded even in the Brāhmaṇic period. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII, 13), for instance, refers to the hundred wives of King Harischandra.

Page 89, l. 31ff.—The Abhisheka was preceded by an oath taken by the King to the priest. Keith takes “utkroṣana” to mean proclamation. Trivedī takes it in the sense of gunakirtuna.

Page 99, l. 18.—The realm of Alavaka is probably identical with the Chan-chu country visited by Hinen Tsang. Dr. Smith seems to identify the country with the Ghazipur region (Watters, Yuan Chwang, Vol. II, pp. 61, 340).

Page 101, l. 18.—For the employment of princes as senāpati see Kautilya (Mysore edition, 1919), p. 34.

Page 112, l. 7.—Susunāga, according to the Mahāvaṃsa (Turnour’s Mahāvaṃsa, xxxvii), was the son of a Lichchhavi rāja of Vaiśālī. He was conceived by a nagara-sobhini and brought up by an officer of state.

Page 115, l. 24.—Yogananda (Pseudo-Nanda) is the name given to the reanimated corpse of King Nanda (Kathāsaritsāgara, Durgāprasād and Parab’s edition p. 7).

Page 120, l. 22; 121. l. 5.—“The youngest brother was called Dhana Nanda, from his being addicted to hoarding treasure . . . . He collected riches to the amount of eighty kotis—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, gums, trees and stones he amassed further treasures which he disposed of similarly.” (Turnour, Mahāvaṃsa p. xxxix.).

Page 139, l. 25.—Regarding the conduct of Sangrāma Simha see Tod’s Rājasthān, Vol. I, p. 240n(2).
Page 147, l. 33.—Another minister (or Pradeshtri?) was apparently Maniyatappo, a Jaṭilian, who "conferred the blessings of peace on the country by extirpating marauders" (Turnour's Mahāvaiṣṇa, p. xlii).


Page 213n.—See JASB, 1922, pp. 269-271.

Page 251, l. 6-7.—Rājataranginī I, 173; Harshacharita (Cowell) p. 252; Watters, Yuan-Chwang, ii, p. 200.

Page 251, last line.—The Kadphises Kings meant here are Kuṭula (Kadphises I), and Vima (Wema) and not Kuṭulakara Kaphsa whose identification with Kadphises I is a mere surmise. Even if Kuṭulakara be identical with Kuṭula and the Kushan King of the Taxila inscription of 186, it may be pointed out that it is by no means certain that the date 186 refers to the Vikrama era.

Page 256, l. 4.—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," (C. I. I. p. 241; A. H. D. p. 72). The performance of ten Aśvamedha sacrifices indicates that they were not a feudatory family owing allegiance to the Kushāns.

Page 284 l. 5.—Meghadūta (I, 31) and Kathāsārītuṣāgara (Tawney's translation, Vol II. p. 275).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhidhāna Chintāmani</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranyaka, Kaushitaki</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranyaka, Taittirīya</td>
<td>5, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristobulus</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Gañapati Naga, 256, 273, 274
Ganarâjas, 63, 65, 107
Gandhârî, 24, 54, 56
Gangaridae, 120, 135, 155, 164
Gârgi, 23
Gârgya Bâlâki, 28, 36
Gântas, 303, 305, 308, 309.
Gânapâlâyana, 14
Gautama, Aruña Aupavesi, 27
Gautâmi Balaśri, 262, 283
Gautâmiputra, 220ff, 262ff
Gaya, 57
Gâyâ 53, 55, 56, 256, 297, 304
Gedrosia, 1-2, 142, 237
Ghâtaka, 211, 257
Ghâtottkacha 272
Ghâtottkacha Gupta, 288
Ghora Aúgîrâsâ, 188, 312
Girikshita, 14
Girivraja (in Kekaya), 26, 56
Girivraja (in Magadha), 26, 56, 111.

Furrukhabad, 31
Fu-li-chih, 60

G. 

Glausians, 128
Gomati Kottaka, 308
Gondophernes, 229
Gopâlaka, 103
Gopâl Vaihidari, 212
Goparâja, 300, 301
Goptri, 94, 167, 237, 286
Gorathâgiri, 56
Gosâla, 107, 169
Gotama Buddha, 9, 51, 54, 57, 63, 81, 116, 169
Gotama Râhuâna, 20
Govardhana, 311
Govikartana, 88
Govinda Gupta, 286, 287
Grahavarman 307
Grámabhritaka, 154
Grâmapûri, 86, 88, 91, 92
Grâmapriddha, 134
Grâmakas, 91, 92, 104, 151, 154, 286
Gupabharma, 172
Guvâkhyâ Sânikhâyana 9, 10, 18
Gupta, Mahâraja, 272
Gurâeans, 123
Gurjara, 62
Gusana, 244
Guttas, 310
GENERAL INDEX

H.

Hagāmāsha, 238
Hagāna, 238
Haihayā, 75, 118
Hairanvanābha, 51
Hakus'iri, 223
Hapsburg, 93
Hariscbandra, 50, 52, 192, 313
Harishena, King, 310
Harishena, Prasastikara, 277, 281
Harivarman, 304
Harsha, 55, 290, 295, 306ff
Harsha Gupta, 303, 304
Hasti, 126, 135, 180
Hastin, 301
Hāstinapura, 6, 11, 13, 15, 30, 67, 69
Hastivarman, 275, 276n
Hatthipura, 67

Heliodoros, 213, 226
Heliokles, 200, 206ff, 226
Hellas, 124
Hemachandra, king, 60
Hephacestion 126
Hermiaos, 206, 229, 236, 243, 245, 247, 251
Hidus, 123
Hima, 248
Himavanta, 48, 83
Hiranyanābha, 36, 51, 52, 81
Hiranyavati, 64
Hiung-nu, 230, 245, 246
Hohenzollern, 93
Hūnas, 256, 291ff, 300ff, 306
Hushkapura, 254
Huvishka, 249, 254
Hydaspes, 135, 136, 188, 227.

I.

Ibhīyagrāma, 30
Ikhnaton, 183
Ikshvāku, 20, 36, 49ff, 69, 64, 71, 118, 192
Indapatta, see Indraprastha
Indo-Greek, 215
Indo-Seythia, 39, 240
Indrayumma, 27
Indra Jyeṣṭha, 89
Indra Mitra, 211
Indrapālita, 184, 185
Indraprastha, Indapatta, Indapattana
12, 15, 47, 68, 69, 99, 172, 173
Indrasena, 2
Indravarma, 238
Indra Vṛtrahan, 29
Indrota Daivāpa (Daivāpi) Śaunaka, 3, 11, 14, 17, 18, 30,
In-mo-fu, 230, 235
Isānavarman, 305
Ishukāra, 69
Isila, 166
Iṣvaradatta, 269
Iṣvarasena, 265
Iṣvaravarman, 304
Ithijhakamahāmātratas, 167
Ithiḥāsas, 13

J.

Jābala, 27
Jaivali, 33, 70, 92
Jala Jāṅkakariya, 34
Jalanka, 181, 193
Jambudvīpa, 47, 99, 189, 226 n.
Janaka, ii, 8, 15-23, 26-31, 33-36
90, 13, 191
Janakapura, 59
Janakavāmśa, 20, 21, 37
Janamejava ii, 2, 3, 5, 8-18, 76, 89-91, 311
Jana Śārkarākshya, 27
Janaśruti, 84
Jāraśandha, 57
Jāratekārava, 23
Jaya (Ithiḥāsa), 13
Jayadāman, 240, 259, 260, 267, 269n
Jayadatta, 300
Kekaya, 21, 23, 26-27
Ken, 66
Keralī, 276
Kesaputta, 97, 98
Kesins, 32, 98
Ketalaputo, 172-174
Kevatta, 70
Khāndava, 5
Kharaosta, 238, 241
Kharapallana, 253
Kharaparikas, 279, 280
Khasa, 62
Khshayarsha, 124
Kieu-tsieu-kio, 245 IT.
Kikata, 56
Kingship, 82 ff.
Ki-pin, 229 ff., 233, 285, 245 ff., 255, 257
Kirata, 23
Kirtivarman, 304
Kleophis, 125
Koh-i-Mor, 126
Koliyas, 97, 98
Kollaga, 59
Kolleru, 276 n.
Kolivisa, 91
Konfikainana, 180
Koravya, Kauravya, 12, 69, 131
Kosala (North), 9, 19, 21, 23, 34, 36, 45, 48ff., 79ff., 98, 100ff.
Kosala (South), 251, 262, 275
Kosar, 140
Kotakula, 275
Kōtātavi, 275
Koṭīvarsha, 286
Koṭūrā, 275, 276
Kraivya, 33
Kramāditya, Kumāra Gupta II, 297
Kramāditya, Skanda Gupta, 289, 292, 297
Krishna Gupta, 303
Krisngha Śatavahana, 221
Krisngha Vāsudeva, 73, 290, 312
Kritamālā, 172
Kṛiti, 20, 37
Krivi, 31, 32
Kshaharāta, 283, 257ff.
Kshatrapa, 233, 237, 240, 253, 257ff., 266ff., 280
Kshenaka, 68
Kshudrakas, 122, 131, 134, 135
Kshudra Parishad, 148
Kukura, 262, 267
Kumāra, 151, 158a, 184, 194, 195, 210a, 217n
Kumāradevi (Gaharwar Queen), 159
Kumāradevi, 272
Kumāra Gupta I, 288
Kumāra Gupta II, 296, 298ff.
Kumāra Gupta III, 302ff.
Kumāra Gupta, Prince, 295, 306
Kumāramātya, 210, 286, 287
Kumārapāla, 296
Kumbhavati, 43
Kunāla, 184, 185, 195
Kuṇḍalag āma, Kuṇḍapura, 59
Kuṇḍalīna, 41
Kuusbandika, 53, 65, 104ff., 134
Kuntala, 119, 219, 222, 265, 277, 310
Kuntala Śātakarni, 219
Kurujitgala, 5
Kurukshetra, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 29, 131, 311
Kururaṭṭha, 33, 69
Kurus 1, 5, 7, 12, 14ff., 23, 27ff., 45, 68, 69, 78, 83, 311, 312
Kurush, 122
Kusadhvaja, 20
Kusāgārapura, 56
Kusāvatī, 64, 65
Kushāns, 245ff.
Kusambas, 224
Kusīnāra, 49, 62, 64, 65, 97, 99
Kusthalapura, 276
Kuśri, 18
Kusula, 238
Kusumapura, 109, 111
Kuvera, 275
Kuveranāga, 283, 257, 290, 291
Kuyula Kadphises, 245, 314
Kuyulakara Kaphsa 247 314
L.
Lacedaemonians, 132, 133
Lādhā, 46
Lagaturman, 255n
Laghman, 230
Lāhyāyani, 23
Lakshmana, 241
Lakshmana Sena, 241
Lalaka, 223n
Lallitapatan, 153
Lampa, 78
Lampaka, 230
Laodike, 206, 207
Lātavishaya, 286
Lekhkas, 119, 150
Liaka, 37, 238
Libya, 123
Līchhehavis, 40, 59-65, 101, 106, 107, 151, 172, 305
Likhita, 192
Little Rapti, 64
Lohicci, 81
Lohitva, Lauhitya, 295, 301, 302, 306
London, 49
Lumminigama, 162
Lysias, 206, 226

M.
Madanapāla, 296
Maddā, 103
Mādhava Gupta, 295, 306, 308
Mādhavasena, 198, 199
Mādhavavarman II, 304
Madhumanta, 43
Madhrurā, Uttara, 73
Madhyadeśa, Majjhimadeśa, 24, 27, 28, 53, 79, 137, 152, 187, 208, 220, 232, 298, 308, 309, 312
Madhyamikā, 131, 202, 205
Madra, 16, 23, 27, 79, 79, 280
Mādravatī, 3
Madurā, 172, 173
Maga, 175
Magadha, 8, 26, 28, 45, 46, 53ff, 79, 81, 91, 97ff, 223, 234, 271, 272, 295, 304, 305, 309
Māgadhapura, 56
Māgandiyā, 102
Mahābalādhikrita, High Officer in Charge of the Army, 285
Mahābhōja, 72, 165
Mahābīsi, 164
Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, general, 285, 287
Mahājanaka I, 22
Mahājanaka II, 21, 22, 38
Mahājanapadas 45ff
Mahākachchana, 73
Mahākāntāra, 275, 278
Mahākosala, King, 45, 46, 52, 81, 82
Mahālakshmidevi, 298
Mahāli, 63
Mahāmātras, 146, 156, 161, 166ff, 177ff, 195, 210n
Mahānandin, 110, 115
Mahāpadma, 8, 115, 116, 117, 122, 169, 201, 273, 282n
Mahāpratihāra, 287
Mahārājya, 87
Mahārāṣṭra 165, 257ff, 280
Mahārathis, 165
Mahāśāla, 27
Mahāsammata, 66
Mahāsena, Pradyota, 58, 103
Mahāsena Gupta, 306, 307
Mahāsenapati, 257
Mahāsilākantaka, 107
Mahāsudassana, 64
Mahāvira, 47, 55, 59, 63, 107, 108, 169
Mahendra Maurya, 158, 175, 184
Mahendra, 275
Mahendraditya, 288, 289, 299, 300
Mahendragiri, 100, 275, 276
Mahendrapāla II, 296
Mahinda, 9, 18
Mahipāla I, 291
Mahishī, 85, 88
Mahismatī, 72, 75, 262, 267
Mahotaya, 67
Makhādeva, 21
Mālava, 46, 261, 279, 295
Malaya 46
Malayas, 258, 261
Malichos 266
Mālinī, 54
Malla, 45, 46, 64, 65, 97, 151, 176, 192
Mallakis, 68, 65
Mallī, 101
Mallīoī, 131, 135
Māmāla, 262
Mambarns, 233, 258
Malaḥavva, 192
Maknala, 170
Manigul, 238
Maniyyatappo, 314
Mantharāja, 275
Mantrin, 147, 255
Mantriparishad, 148, 166, 210, 286
Marutta, 84, 90
Māskī, 189
Masasa, 125, 135
Maṭachī, 14, 30, 31
Māṭhava, 20, 21, 38
Mathurā, Methora, 42, 71ff, 172, 173, 187, 204, 211, 212, 224, 231ff, 237ff, 239
Mathila, 273
Māṭrīvishnū, 286, 300
Matsya, 23, 28, 29, 45, 71, 78, 79
Maues, 228, 23ff
Maukharis, 297, 304ff

Nabataeans, 266 n.
Nābhāga, 60
Nabhaka, 163
Nabhapantī, 163
Nāchne-ki-talai, 277
Nadasī-Akasā, 238
Nāga, 75, 220, 250, 255, 256, 274, 283, 314
Nāgabhaṭṭa, 255
Nāgā Dāsaka, 110, 111, 116
Nāgadatta, 273
Nāgakhanḍa, 141
Nāgala Viyohālakā, 166
Nāganiṅka, Nāyaniṅka, 223
Nagarabhukti, 286

Nāraṇī, 122
Megasthenes, 143, 145, 147, 150, 161, 165, 173, 184
Mēghavarmā, 281
Menander, 203ff
Mevaki, 232, 234
Mihirakula, 297, 299, 301
Mālinda see Menander
Min, 233
Minnavara 232ff
Mīthradates, Mithridates, 205, 206, 226, 227
Mithi, 19, 20
Mithilā, 16, 19ff, 37ff, 47, 49, 54, 60, 70, 86, 99, 100
Mitra Kings, 211, 212
Mēṛčchhas, 292
Moga 232ff
Moli 46
Molini 33
Morīyas, 97, 99, 138, 139, 188
Mousikanos, 132, ff.
Mṛgadharā, 101
Mṛgāśīkāhāvana, 271
Māēhipā, Mūṭiba, Muvipa, 44, 45
Mūjāvant, 24, 54, 56
Mulaka, 74, 262
Mūnḍa, 110, 111, 116
Mūnḍās, 53
Mūriyakāla, 200, 201
Mūruliṇḍa, 233, 250

Nagarādhyaṅka, 150
Nāgārjuna, 251, 254
Nāgārjuni, Hill 185, 295
Nāgasaṅhāyā (Hāstinaṇpura), 6
Nāgasena, Āśā, 226 n.
Nāgasena, king, 273, 274
Nagade (Naggajī, Naggati) 38, 39, 41, 73, 76, 77, 90
Nahapāna, 248, 257, 258, 259, 261
Nahushya 7
Nakhavānt, 256, 274
Naksh-i-Rustam, 123
Nakula, 12
Nālanda, 300
Nambanus, 233, 258
Nami, Nimi, 1:2-22, 37-41, 70, 76
Nanda 8, 97, 115 ff, 200, 201, 217 ff, 318
Nandi, 255
Nandi, king, 273, 274
Nandivardhana, 110, 111 ff, 201
Na-pei-kea, 163
Nārada, 255
Nārāyaṇa Kāṇya, 215
Nārāyaṇapāla, 290
Nāsik Praśasti, 221, 229
Nāvadhyaksha, 151
Navanara, 264
Ngansi, 229, 247
Nichakshu, 6, 13, 15, 16, 30, 31, 67
Nichchhivi, 62
Nichyas, 82
Nidhanapur, 306, 308
Nīgartha Nātapattra, 169
Nīglīvā, 163, 180
Nīkaia, 136
Nīlapalli, 276
Nīlarāja, 275, 276
Nīrgranthas, 169
Nīrvāṇa era, 117
Nīshāda, 267
Nisib, 61
Nīsīrīrātha, 149
Nīyoga, 312
Nyagrodhavana, 99
Nysa, 126

O.

Odruka, 212
Ohind, 956
O欤kāka, 64, 8
Olympian Games, 87
Omphis, 127
Orissa, 42
Orosius, 131, 226
Orthagnes, 243

P.

Pādā, 174
Pādañjali, 85
Pāṭha, 46
Padika, 240
Pādmapati, city, 256, 274
Pādmapati, queen, 102
Pahlavas, iii, 242, 244, 261, 265, 268
Pakores, 243
Pakthas, 130
Pakteke, 123
Pakudha, 9
Palasimundu, 173
Pālāgala, 88
Pālāgali, 85
Pālaka, 103, 109, 111, 313
Pālakkaka, Pālakkada, 275, 276
Palibothra, Palimbothra, 118, 143
Palibothri, 164

Nicelihivi, 62
Nīthyas, 82
Nīthhanpur, 306, 308
Nīgαuθha Nātapattra, 169
Nīglīvā, 163, 180
Nīkaia, 136
Nīlapalli, 276
Nīlarāja, 275, 276
Nīrgranthas, 169
Nīrvāṇa era, 117
Nīshāda, 267
Nisib, 61
Nīsīrīrātha, 149
Nīyoga, 312
Nyagrodhavana, 99
Nysa, 126

Ossadioi, 132
Otthadha, 63
Oudh, 36, 48, 205, 288
Oxus, 227, 246, 249, 255
Oxydrakai, 131, 135
Oxykanos, 133
Ozene, 266

Pallava, 265, 276, 281
Punjâhâla, 23, 27-29, 31-33, 45, 69-71, 78, 83, 9, 187, 211, 212
Pandaia, 173
Pâyāvâs, 4, 12, 28, 33, 312
Pandoooui, 172, 279
Pâyāvâs, 1, 4, 5, 12, 13,
Pâyāvâya, 46, 172, 173, 174, 175, 224
Panku, 244
I antaleon, 225
Para Åţâra, 38, 51, 52, 90,104
Parâkramâṇka, 273, 282
Parantapa, 68
Pārasamudra, 173
Pârasīka, 266
Parâśurâma, 221
Parikshit 1ff, 311
Pānikshitas, 1 ff
Parishad, 92, 148, 165, 166, 175, 179, 286
Parivāra, Parichakra, 31
Parivrajaka, Mahārājas, 277, 294, 295, 301,
Parivrajikās, 153
Parivritti, 85
Priyāra, 262, 267
Parkham, 108
Parvadatta, 293, 294
Parvaniśa, 152
Parvarta, 262, 267
Parvānasa, 27
Prāchya, 82, 151, 153
Prāchya Pāñchala, 31
Pradeshtris, 153, 154, 168, 314
Pradesikas, Prādesikas, 166, 168, 177
Pradyot, 57, 58, 76, 102, 103, 108 ff
Prasenajit, Pasenadi, 49, 51, 52, 81
Prasias Prasii, 120, 135, 143, 151, 164
Pratardana, 34, 40
Pratiyoga, 82
Pratiharas, 62, 296 n
Partipa, 2, 7
Pratishtha, 264
Pravahana Jaivali, 33, 70, 92
Pravarasena I, 277, 281
Pravarasena II, 43
Prathivasheka I, 277, 278
Prathivasheka II, 277
Prathivasheka, mantrin, 288
Protis Kauśāmbī, 31, 67
Ptolemy, Georgapher, 239, 257, 266
Ptolemy, historian, 128
Ptolemy, King, 157, 174
Pukkuśati, 77, 103, 116, 117
Pulakesin, II 172
Pulika, 57, 76
Pulinda nagara, 44, 165
Pulindas, 44, 45, 165
Pulisā, 166, 168
Pulumāyī, 261 ff
Pulula Prāchīnayogya, 17, 30
Punnarabhisheka, 86, 89, 91, 93
Punhavardhana, 164, 186, 288, 299
Pupphavati, 33
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Pura Gupta, 290, 296, 297
Pūrṇavarman, 187, 295
Purohita, 88, 191
Pūrus, 7, 51, 72
Purakutsa, 50, 51
Pūrūravas, 7, 34
Purushapura, 253, 254

Pūrkavāna, 187, 295
Pūrṣapura, 187
Pūshyadharman, 184, 186
Pūshyagupta, 141, 152
Pūshyamīra, 184, 186, 107 ff
Pūshyamitras, 289 ff

Rā'ha, 46
Rādhagupta, 158
Rā ṭāpurī, 303
Rahamusala, 107
Rāhugaṇa, 20
Rāhulas, 51, 52
Rājagriha (Kettya), 26
Rājagriha (Magadha), 26, 53, 58, 97, 99, 103, 107, 106, 112, 183, 200, 223, 224
Rājagrīha (Balkh), 26
Rājakartṛi, Rājakrit, 86, 91, 92
Rājapura (Kaliuga), 42
Rājapura (Kamojha), 77, 78, 162
Rājapurushas, 168
Rājāsāsana, 146
Rājastamlāyanā, 18
Rājāsāyā, 54, 88
Rājjugāhaka, 167, 168
Rājjuka, Rājukas, 166 ff, 177 ff, 190 ff
Rājuvula, 241
Rājypāla, 290
Rājyaśrī, 307
Rājyavardhana, 295, 306 ff
Rāma, 36, 50, 62
Rāmagāma, 97
Rāmpāla, 296
Rāmmma city, 33
Rānabhāndāgāra, 287
Rāṇjūbula, 238 ff
Rāptī, 49

Rāṣṭrapāla, 120, 153, 167
Rāṣṭrikas, 164, 165, 177, 190
Rāṣṭrīya, 141, 152, 153
Rathagriśa, 14, 15
Ratnī, 88
Reṇu, 41, 42, 74
Revottarasa Pājava Chākra Sthapati, 93
Riksha, 7
Rishabhadatta, 165
Rishigiri, 56
Rituparna, 50, 51, 52
Rohini, 98
Rohita, 50, 52
Romakas, Rome, iii, 39, 48, 84
Roruka, 99
Rudra, 265
Rudrabhūti, 269
Rudrabhāta, 152, 239, 240, 250, 253, 259 ff, 265 ff
Rudrādamāna I, 152, 239, 240, 250, 254, 259 ff, 265 ff
Rudrādama II, 269
Rudradeva, 273
Rudrasena I, Kṣhatraśa, 269
Rudrasena II, " 269
Rudrasena I, Vākaṇaka, 277
Rudrasena II, 256, 277, 282, 283
Rudrasiṃha I, 269
Rudrasiṃha III, 269
Rudrāyaṇa, 99
Rummindee, 168, 180
Rūpadarśaka, 150

Sāba, 283, 285
Sābaras, 44, 45
Sābarmati, 267
Sābda, 268
Sācae, 227

Sacarauni, 227
Sacastane, 228
Sāchiva, 146, 147, 198, 285
Sāḍā-chandra, 274
Sāḍaganna, 222
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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 Крішна, 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 पाँचिनी.............”

Sir George Grierson.—“Very interesting and informing.....The book is full of matter which is of great importance for the history of religion in India and will form a valued addition to my collection of books on the subject.............”

F. E. Pargiter, Oxford.—“I agree with you in discarding various theories, but I don’t think that Krishна Devakiputra is the famous Krishна, 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 Крішна Devakiputra and his teaching is to be considered as the first historical record of Bhāgavatism. There were, of course, many Крішна, but to
OPINIONS AND REVIEWS.

conjecture that more than one was also a Devakiputra, 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 Ṛk quoted with the famous

dandamā: parsm' padam... "

The Times Literary Supplement, May 12, 1921.—"The
lectures of Mr. Hemeandra 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,
ill-equipped for dealing with a dimly understood creed would do well
to study this little volume..."

Journal Asiatick, January-March, 1923, Paris.—"Dans le
domaine historique, signalons un travail plein de merite de M.
Hemeandra Ray-chaudhuri: Materials for the study of the Early
History of the Vaishnava Sect." (Dr. Jules Bloch of Paris).

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
eyary 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 reason discredit's the views
that Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva was a solar deity or a tri al 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 Devaki-
putra, 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. Hemeandra 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..."
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from the Accession of Parikshit to the coronation of Bimbisara.

Reprint from the Journal of the Department of Letters, Vol. IX. Royal 8 Vo., 96 pp.:—

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins:—"It is a fine augury for Indian scholarship when native scholars of the first rank take seriously in hand the great problem of untangling the web of Indian history. To this work your book is a valuable contribution."

Professor H. Jacobi, Bonn:—"Very suggestive and contain some important details."

Professor F. Otto Schrader:—"I have read the book with increasing interest and do not hesitate to say that it contains a great many details which will be found useful by later historians. The portion I enjoyed most is that on the sixteen Mahājanapadas."

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 Laksmanasena Era

Reprint from Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, Orientalia, Calcutta—Published by the Calcutta University and Printed at the Baptist Mission Press 1921.

Professor Dr. Stenk 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 Laksmanasena era deserves very careful attention."
4. The Mahabharata and the Besnagar Inscription of Heliodoros

JASB, 1922, No. 5,

Professor H. Jacobi:—"The verification of the Bhāgavata credo in the Besnagar inscription is a find on which you may be congratulated."

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins:—"It is certainly a remarkable resemblance which you have established and I should be inclined to agree with your conclusion."
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