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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 Medieval 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 Brāhmanical literature, such a narrative of the political vicissitudes of the Post-Parikshita-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.

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 Parikshita and the post-Parikshita 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-Parikshita-pre-Bimbisārian age may be divided into five classes, viz.:

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

   (a) The last book of the Atharva Veda.

   (b) The Aitareya, Śatapatha, Taittirīya and other ancient Brāhmaṇas.

   (c) The Brīhadāraṇyaka, Chhāndogya and other classical Upanishads.

That these works belong to the post-Parikshita period is proved by repeated references to Parikshit, to his son Janamejaya, and to Janaka of Videha at whose court the fate of the Parikshitas 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 Brähmanical works to which no definite date can be assigned, but large portions of which, in the opinion of competent critics, belong to the post-Bimbisārian period. To this class belong the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. The present Rāmāyaṇa not only mentions Buddha Tathāgata (II. 109. 34), but distinctly refers to the struggles of the Hindus with mixed hordes of Yavanas and Śakas, यवनमितन (I. 54. 21). In the Kishkindhya Kanda (IV. 43. 11-12), Sugriva places the country of the Yavanas and the cities of the Śakas between the country of the Kurs and the Madras, and the Himalayas. This shows that the Greco-Scythians at that time occupied parts of the Panjab.

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 edukas or Buddhistic monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. Thus in III. 190. 65 ‘They will revere edukas, they will neglect the gods’; ib. 67 ‘the earth shall be piled with edukas, not adorned with godhouses.’ With such expressions may be compared the thoroughly Buddhistic epithet, Caturmahārājika 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 Aśokāvadāna 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 Brāhma- nical 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 Mahā-bhāṣya 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
SOURCES

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 Parikshitas.

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

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

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

"Rājāo viśvajanīnasya yo devomartyalh ati
Vaiśvānarasya sushtutimā sunotā Parikshitaḥ
Parichchhinnāh kshemamakarot tama āsanamācharan
Kūlāyan kriyavān Kauravyaḥ patirvadati jāyayā
Katarat ta aharāṇi dadhi manthāṃ pari śrutam
Jāyāḥ patiṃ vi prichchhati rāṣṭre rājñaḥ Parikshitaḥ
Abhivasvah pra jihite yavah pakkaḥ patho bilam
Janaḥ sa bhadramedhati rāṣṭre rājñaḥ Parikshitaḥ."

"Listen ye to the high praise of the king who rules over all peoples, the god who is above mortals, of Vaiśvānara Parikshit! Parikshit has 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 Satapatha Brāhmaṇas king Janamejaya bears the patronymic Parikshita. Cf. the following passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 21).

"Etena ha vā Aindreṇa mahābhishkeṇa Turaḥ Kāvasheyo Janamejayaṁ Pārikshitamabhishchecha."

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, Adiparva, 94.52 and 95.41). We shall call the former Parikshit I and the latter Parikshit II. Was Parikshit I of the Epic identical with the Vedic Parikshit? The Vedic Parikshit had four sons, namely, Janamejaya, Ugrasena, Bhimasena and Śrutasena (Vedic Index, Vol. I, p. 520). The Epic Parikshit I, on the other hand, had only one son (Bhimasena) according to Chapter 95, verse 42 of the Adiparva of the Mahābhārata, and seven sons (Janamejaya, Kakshasena, Ugrasena, Chirasena, Indrasena, Sushena and Bhimasena) 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 Parikshit II had undoubtedly a son named Janamejaya who succeeded him on the throne. Thus, the Mahābhārata, referring to Parikshit II, the son of Abhimanyu, says (I. 95. 85):

“Parikshit khalu Mādravatim nāmopayeme tvanmātaram. Tasyāṁ bhavān Janamejayaḥ.”

The Matsya Purāṇa says (Mat. 50. 57):

“Abhimanyoḥ Parikshittu putraḥ parapuraṇjayayaḥ
Janamejayaḥ Parikshitaḥ putraḥ paramadharmikah.”

This Janamejaya had three brothers, namely, Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhimasena:—“Janamejayaḥ Parikshitaḥ saha bhratṛbhiḥ Kurukshetre dirgha satram upāste tasya bhratara strayaḥ Śrutasena Ugraseno Bhimasena iti (Mbh. I. 3. 1).

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

Dviraśvamedhamāhītya mahāvājasaneyakah
Pravartayitvā tairi sarvam rishim Vājasaneyakam
Vivāde Brāhmaṇaḥ sūrddhamabhīsapto vanaṁ yāyau.

(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 Vishṇu Purāṇa the names of all the sons) are common to both, points to the same conclusion. We shall show later that a Kuru prince named Abhipratārīn Kākhasena (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 Vishṇu Purāṇa. The latter work says (IV. 20. 1) “Parikṣhito Jana mejaya Śrutasenāgraśatvāraḥ putrāḥ.” It then gives the names of Kuru princes down to the Pāṇḍus and Parikṣhit II, and adds (IV. 21. 1) “Atapharam bhavishyānaḥ bhūmpalaṁ kirtayishye. Yo ‘yaṁ sāṃpratam avanipatiḥ tasyāpi Jana mejaya Śrutasenagrasena Bhima senāḥ putrāschatvāro 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, Kurujāngala, the Kuru and Kurukshetra (Mbh. I. 109. 1). The boundaries of Kurukshetra are given in a passage of the Taittirīya Arāṇyaka (Vedic Index, I., pp. 169-70) as being Khāmpāva on the south, the Tūrghna on the north, and the Parinah on the west. Roughly speaking, it corresponded to the modern Sirhind. Within the kingdom flowed the rivers Drīshadvatī, Kauśikī, Aruṇā and Sarasvatī, as well as the Āpayā. Here, too, was situated Sāryanāvant, which appears to have been a lake, like that known to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa by the name of
According to Pischel there was also in Kurukshetra a stream called Pastya.

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

Gangayāpahṛite tasmin nagare Nāgasāhvaye
Tyaktvā Nichakshu nagaraṁ Kausāmbyāṁ 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 Bhāratt, the personified divine protective power of the Bharatas. We find the Sarasvatī constantly named in connection with her; must not the sacred river Sarasvatī be the river of the holy people, the Bharatas? In one ode of the Māndala, which specially extols the Bharatas (III. 23), the two Bhāratas, Devaravas and Devavatā, 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 Kurukshetra. Thus the testimonies of the Samhitā and the
Brahmaṇa combine to establish the close connection of the ideas Bharata, Kuru, Sarasvati.

"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 Sarasvati and Drishadvati. The weapons of the Bharata princes and the poetical fame of their Rishis may have co-operated to acquire for the cult of the Bharatas the character of universally acknowledged rule, and for the Bharatas a kind of sacral hegemony: hence Agni as friend of the Bharatas, the goddess Bhārati, the sacredness of the Sarasvati and Drishadvati.

"Then came the period, when the countless small stocks of the Samhitā age were fused together to form the greater peoples of the Brāhmaṇa period. The Bharatas found their place, probably together with their old enemies, the 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-parva, Chapters 94 and 95) as ancestors and predecessors of Parikshit, the names of the following occur in the Vedic literature.

Purū-ravas Aila (Rig-Veda, X. 95; Sat-Br.,XI.5.1.1), Āyu (Rig-Veda I. 53. 10, II. 14. 7, etc.), Yayati Nahushya (R. V., I. 31. 17; X. 63. 1), Pūru (R. V., VII. 8. 4 ; 18. 13), Bharata Daunshanti Saudyumni (Sat. Br.,XIII.5.4.11-12), Ajamīlha (R. V., IV. 44. 6), Riksha (R. V., VIII. 68. 15), Kuru (frequently mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa literature), Uchchailśravas (Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa III. 29. 1-3), Pratipa Pratisatvana or Pratisutvana (Atharva Veda, XX. 129. 2), Balhika Pratipīya (Sat. Br., XII. 9. 3. 3), Sārītanu (R. V., X. 98), Dhṛtarāśtra Vaichitravirya (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, Vishnu, and Bhāgavata Purāṇas), years before Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king of Magadha.

Mahāpadma-abhisheka-ttu
Yāvajjanma Parikshitaḥ
Evam varsha sahasraṁtū
dīeyam pāñcaśaduttaram.

(Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 58.)

If, accepting the Ceylonese chronology (Geiger, Maha- vamsa, 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 Vishnu Purāṇas). If, on the other hand, we give credence to the testimony of the Vāyu Purāṇa (99. 328-329, “Ashtāvimśati varshāni prithivirām pālayishyati,” etc.) and take 40 years (Mahāpadma, 28 + his sons’ 12) to be the reign-period of Nanda and his sons, then Parikshit’s birth must be dated about $322 + 40 + 1,050 = 1412$ B.C. (1377 B.C. according to the e Vāyu and Vishnu Purāṇas). He is said to have come to the throne 36 years later in 1376 or 1341 B.C. (cf. Mahābhārata Maushalaparva, “Shattriṃśe tvatha samprāpte varshe,” etc., and Mahāprasthānikaparva, “abhishichya svarājye cha rājānañcha 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 Ārūṇī. At the end of
the Kaushitaki Āraṇyaka (Adhyāya 15) we find a vāṃśa or list of the teachers by whom the knowledge contained in that Āraṇyaka 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 Śāṅkhāyana, Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana from Kahola Kaushitaki, Kahola Kaushitaki from Uddālaka Aruṇī."

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

From the passage quoted above it is clear that Śāṅkhāyana was separated by two generations from the time of Uddālaka who was separated by six generations from the time of Janamejaya. Śāṅkhāyana, therefore, flourished eight generations after Janamejaya, and nine generations after Parikshit. If this Śāṅkhāyana (Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana) be identical with the author of the Śāṅkhāyana 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 Kavandhī Kātyāyana. These facts enable us to identify him with Assalāyana of Sāvatthi mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya (II. 147 et seq) as a contemporary of Gotama Buddha and, hence, of Kakuda or Pakudha Kachchāyana. Consequently Āśvalāyana must have lived in the sixth century B.C. If the identification of Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana with the Grihya Sūtrakāra 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 Śāṅkhāyana, and place Parikshit in the ninth century B.C. It is, however,
possible that Gunākhya Śāukhyayana was not identical with the Gṛihya 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) "Janamejayaḥ Parikshitah samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithiviṁ jayan pariyaśśvena cha medhyeneje tadeshaḥbhi yajña gāthā giyate:

Åsandivati dhānayaḍam rukmiṇam harita srajam
Aśvam babandha sārāṇgam devebhyyo Janamejaya iti"

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

"Evaṁvidāṁ hi vai mā mevaṁvida yājayaṁti tasmā-daham jayāmyabhitvarīṁ senāṁ jayāmyabhitvarīya senayah namā divyā na mānushya ishava richchhantye shyāmi sarva māyuh sarva bhūmir bhavishyāmiti."

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 Purānic 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 Kāvasheya as his priest. It also contains a tale stating that at one sacrifice of his he did not employ the Kāśyapas, but the Bhūtaviras. Thereupon a family of the Kāśyapas called Asita-mṛiga forcibly took away the conduct of the offering from the Bhūtaviras. 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 Kautilya's Arthasastra (Cf. "Kopāj Janamejayo Brāhmaṇeshu vikrāntah").

The Gopatha Brāhmaṇa narrates an anecdote of Janamejaya and two ganders, pointing out the importance of Brāhmaṇcharya, 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 gāthā quoted in the Śatapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas was Āsandivant, probably identical with the famous city of Hāstinapura mentioned not only in the Mahābhārata, but also in the Rāmāyaṇa, II.68.13, and the Ashtadhyāyī of Pāṇini, VI.2.101. The gāthā 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 93.)
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 Chhāndogya Upanishad (VI.17.9).

Yato yata āvartate tat tad gachchhati mānavaḥ 
Kurun āśvābhīrakshati.

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 Bhima, Nakula and Sahadeva Kurus (Ind. Ant. I. p. 330). 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-Brahmana Jātaka (Jātaka No. 495) a king "of the stock of Yuddhiṭṭhila" reigning "in the kingdom of Kuru and the city called Indapatta" is distinctly called "Koravya" i.e., Kauravya—"belonging to the Kuru race."

Already in the time of Āśvalāyana's Grihyā Sūtra (III. 1) Vaiśampāyana was known as Mahābhāratacārya. Vaiśampāyana is also mentioned in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (I. 7. 5) and the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini (IV. 3. 104). Whether Vaiśampāyana was a contemporary of Janamejaya or not, cannot be ascertained at the present
moment. But I have found nothing in the Vedic literature itself which goes against the epic tradition.

The early Vedic texts no doubt make no reference to the Mahābhārata, but they mention “Itiḥāsas” (A. V. XV. 6. 11-12). It is well known that the story recited by Vaiṣampāyana 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 pīpebhyo Rāhuṇā Chandramā yathā Jayo nāmetiḥāsō’yaṁ śrotavyo vijīgishunā”

(Mbh. Ādi. 62. 20).

Janamejaya’s brothers, Bhīmasena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena appear in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII 5. 4. 3) and the Śāukhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (XVI. 9. 7) as performers of the horse-sacrifice. In the Brīhadāraṇyaka Upanishad the question whither they have gone is made the subject of a philosophical discussion. It is clear that the Pārīkṣhitas 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 Pārīkṣhitas, performing horse sacrifices, by their righteous work did away with sinful work one after another.”

The Purāṇas state that Janamejaya was succeeded by Śatāṅka. Śatāṅka’s son and successor was Aśvamedhadatta. From Aśvamedhadatta was born Adhisimakrishṇa. Adhisimakrishṇa’s son was Nichakshu. During king Nichakshu’s reign the city of Hastinapura is said to have been carried away by the Ganges, and the king is said to have transferred his capital to Kauśāmṇi (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 Āśvamedha (V. 27. 4-6), but there is nothing to show that he is identical with Āśvamedhadatta. A Śatānika Śatrājīta is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as a great king who defeated Dhritarāṣṭra, the prince of Kasi, and took away his sacrificial horse. He was probably a Bharata, but the patronymic Śatrājīta indicates that he was different from Śatānika the son of Janamejaya. The Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa, Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa and the Chhāndogya Upanishad mention a Kuru king named Abhiprātarin Kākhaseni who was a contemporary of Girkshit Aanchchamanyava, Saunaka Kāpeya, and Dṛiti Aindrōta. As Dṛiti Aindrōta was the son and pupil of Indrōta Daivāpa Śaunaka the priest of Janamejaya (Vamsa Brāhmaṇa; Vedic Index, Vol. I, pp. 27, 373), Abhiprātarin, son of Kakhasena, appears to have been one of the immediate successors of Janamejaya. We have already seen that Kakhasena appears in the Mahabharata (I. 94.54) as the name of a brother of Janamejaya. Abhiprātarin was thus Janamejaya's nephew. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śānkhyāyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra (XV. 16. 10-13) refer to a prince named Vṛiddhadyumna Abhiprātarin, apparently the son of Abhiprātarin. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (Trivedi's translation, pp. 322-323) mentions his son Rathagritsa and priest Šūchivriksha Gaupālāyaṇa. The Śānkhyāyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra informs us that Vṛiddhadyumna erred in a sacrifice, when a Brāhmaṇa prophesied that the result would be the expulsion of the Kūtrus 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 (Bṛhad. Upanishad, 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 Kakhasena. The junior branch probably resided at Indraprastha or Indapatta which probably continued to be the seat of a race of kings belonging to the Yuddhithila gotta (Yudhishthir gotra), long after the destruction of Hastinapura, and the removal of the main line of Kuru kings to Kausāmbī.

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 Kausāmbī is proved by the evidence of Bhāsa. Udayana king of Kausāmbī is described in the Svapnavasavadatta (ed. Ganapati Śāstri, p. 138) as a scion of the Bharata family:

Bhāratānām kule jāto vinito jñānavāñchhuchi
Tannārhasi balāddhartum rājadharmasya desikaḥ.

**Genealogy of the Pārīkṣhit Family.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pārīkṣhit Family</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janamejaya</td>
<td>Kakhasena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śatānka</td>
<td>Abhiprāśārin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aśvamedhadatta</td>
<td>Vṛddhādyumna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhismākrishṇa</td>
<td>Rathagrīśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichakshu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings of Kauśāmbī</td>
<td>Kings of Indapatta (?)</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 Pārikshitas admits of no doubt. We shall show later that he was a contemporary probably of Nichakshu, and certainly of Ushasti Chākrāyana during whose time disaster befell the Kurus. In Janaka's time we find the prosperity, the sin, the expiation and the fall of the Pārikshitas apparently still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of controversy in the royal court of Mithilā. In the Brīhādāraṇyaka Upanishad we find a rival of Yaśñavalkya, the ornament of the court of Janaka, testing him with a question, the solution of which the former had previously obtained from a Gandhārva who held in his possession the daughter of Kāpya Patañchala of the country of the Madras:—

"Kva Pārikshi bhavan" (Brīhād Upanishad, III, 3. 1) whither have the Pārikshitas gone? The solution of which therefore appears to have been looked upon as extremely difficult.

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

Consequently the Pārikshitas (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
Uddālaka (a prominent figure of Janaka’s court) and his son Śvetaketu attended the Sarpa-satra of Janamejaya:—

Sadasya schābhavad Vyāsaḥ putra śishya sahāyavān
Uddālakataḥ Pramatakaḥ Śvetaketusaḥ Pingalāḥ

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

The Vishṇupurāṇa says that Śatāntika, the son and successor of Janamejaya, learned the Vedas from Yājñavalkya (Vishnu, P. IV. 21. 2). The unreliability of the epic and Paurāṇic tradition in this respect is proved by the evidence of the Vedic texts. We learn from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5, 4, 1) that Indrota Daivāpa or Daivapi Śaunaka was a contemporary of Janamejaya. His pupil was Driti Aindrota or Aindroti according to the Jaiminiya Upanishad and Vamśa Brāhmaṇas. Driti’s pupil was Pulusha Prāchinalayogya (Vedic Index, II, p. 9). The latter taught Paulushi Satyayajña. We learn from the Chhāndogya Upanishad (V. 11. 1-2) that Paulushi Satyayajña was a contemporary of Budilā Āsvataraśvi and of Uddālaka Āruni, two prominent figures of Janaka’s Court (vide Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, V. 14. 8. “Janako Vaideho Budilam 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 Śatayajñī Prāchinalayogya is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XI. 6, 2, 1-3) as having met Janaka. As Satyayajñī certainly flourished long after Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka, his contemporary Janaka must be considerably later than Janamejaya the contemporary of Indrota.

We should also note that, in the lists of teachers given at the end of the tenth book of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, and the sixth chapter of the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, Tūra Kāvasheya, the priest of Janamejaya, appears as a very ancient sage who was eleventh in the ascending line.
from Sañjiviputra, whereas Yajñavalkya, the contemporary of Janaka, was only fifth in the ascending line from the same teacher. We quote the lists below:

Janamejaya Tūra Kāvasheya
   Yajñavachas Rājastambhāyana
   Kuśri
   Śāndilya
   Vātsyā
   Vāmakakshāyana
Māhitthi  Yajñavalkya  Janaka
Kautsa  Āsuri
Māṇḍavya  Āsurāyana
Māṇḍūkāyani  Prāśnīputra  Āsurivāsin
Sañjiviputra  Sañjiviputra

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 Somaśushma, and from Tūra to Vāmakakshāyana, the teacher of Māhitthi the contemporary of Yajñavalkya and Janaka, must be assigned 150 or 180 years. It is therefore reasonable to think that Janaka flourished about 150 or 180 years after Janamejaya, and two centuries after Parikshit. If, following the Purāṇas, we place Parikshit in the fourteenth century B.C., we must place Janaka in the twelfth century. If, on the other hand, accepting the identification of Guṇakhya Śāṅkhāyana with the author of the Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, we place Parikshit in the ninth century B.C., then we must place Janaka in the seventh century B.C.

The kingdom of Videha, over which Janaka ruled, corresponds roughly to the modern Tirhut in Bihār. It
was separated from Kosala by the river Sadāntrā, probably the modern Gaṇḍak which, rising in Nepāl, 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 Sadāntrā “Gaṇḍakīṇaḥ Mahāśoṇam Sadāntrām tathaivachā.” Pargiter identifies the Sadāntrā 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 Jataka, Vol. VI, p. 30).

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

According to the Rāmāyana (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 Sītā) and
his brother Kuśadhvaja, King of Sākāśya. 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 (Saśāpena Vasiṣṭhasya Videhaḥ samapadyata—Vāyu P.) His son was Mithi whom both the Purāṇas identify with Janaka I. The genealogy is then continued to Siradhvaja who is called the father of Sītā, and is therefore identical with Janaka II of the Rāmāyaṇa. Then starting from Siradhvaja the Purāṇas carry on the dynasty to its close. The last king is named Kṛiti, and the family is called Janakavarmāśa.

Dhritestu Vahulaśvo bhud Vahulaśva sutah Kṛitiḥ
Tasmin santishṭate vanśo Janakānāṁ mahātmanāṁ
Vāyu Purāṇa (89, 23).

The Vedic texts know a king of Videha named Nāmi 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; Sat. 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 Rāhuṇa, was at one time on the Sarasvati. Agni Vaiśvānara thence went burning along this earth towards the east; followed by Māthava and his priest, till he came to the river Sādāntrā 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 Brahmana adds, this forms the boundary between the Kosalas and the Videhas. The name of the second king in the epic and the Paurânic lists, Mithi Vaideha, is reminiscent of Mâthava Videgha.

If Mâthava Videgha was the founder of the royal line of Mithilâ, Nimi, Nemi or Nami must be a later king of Videha. In the Nimi Jataka, Nimi is said to have been born to “round off” the royal house of Mithilâ, “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 Nikâya (II.74-83) and the Nimi Jataka mention Makhâdeva as the progenitor of the kings of Mithilâ.

As the entire dynasty of Maithila kings was called Janaka vaṃsa (Vaṃśo Janakânāṁ mahātmanam), 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 Paurânic list, i.e., the father of Sîtâ. The father of Sîtâ is, in the Râmâyana, a younger contemporary of Aśvapati king of the Kekayas (maternal grand-father of Bharata, Râmâyana, II. 9. 22). Janaka of the Vedic texts is also a contemporary of Aśvapati, prince of the Kekayas, as Uddâlaka Âruṇi and Budila Âśvatarâśvi frequented the courts of both these princes (Ved. Ind., II. 69; Chh. Up., V. 11. 1-4; Brîh. Up., III. 7).

It is more difficult to identify our Janaka with any of the kings of that name mentioned in the Buddhist Jâtakas. Prof. Rhys Davids (Bud. Ind., p. 26) seems to identify him with Mahâ-Janaka of the Jataka No. 559. The utterance of Mahâ-Janaka II of that Jataka:
Mithila’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 gitam
Nagaramupāhitam agninābhivikshya
Na khalu mamahidahyate'atra kiśchit
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 Arishta in the Vishnu Purāṇa (IV. 5. 13) probably points to the identification of Nemi or Nami with Mahā-Janaka II who is represented in the Jātaka as the son of Arittha. If Mahā-Janaka II was identical with Nami, he cannot be identified with Janaka who is clearly distinguished from Nami 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 Brhadāranyaka Upanishad Janaka is called “Samrāt.” 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 Vajapeya 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-Pañchāla countries (e.g., Āsvala, Jāratkārava Ārthabhāga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Ushasā Chākrāyaṇa, Kañoḍa Kaushitakeya, Gārgī Vāchaknati, Uddālaka Āruṇi, Vidagdha Śakalya). The tournaments of argument which were here held form a prominent feature in the third book of the Brāhadāranyaka Upanishad. The hero of these was Yājñavalkya Vājasaneya, who was a pupil of Uddālaka Āruṇi. Referring to Janaka’s relations with the Kuru-Pañchāla 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. Usīnara
5. Matsya
6. Kuru
7. Pañchāla
8. Kāsi
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; Sindhorubhayaṭaḥ Pārśve). We learn from the Mahābhārata (XII. 207.43) that it formed a part of Uttarāpatha:—

Uttarāpathajanmanmānah kīrtayishyāmi tān api
Yauna Kāmboja Gāndhāraḥ Kirātā Barbaraiḥ saha.
We learn from the epic and Paurāpic literature that Gandhāra contained two great cities, viz., Takshašilā and Pushkarāvatī.

Gandhāra vishaye siddhe, tayoh puryau mahātmanoḥ
Takshasya dikshu vikhyāta ramyā Takshašilā purī
Pushkarasyāpi virasya vikhyāta Pushkarāvatī.


The remains of Takshašilā 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 Charadda, 17 miles N. E. of Peshawar, on the Suwāt river (Schoff, The Periplus of the Erythraean 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 Mūjāvants, 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 Ārūṇi 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' bhinaddhā-ksham ānīya tam tato'ṭijane visṛjēt, sa yathā tatra prān vā udān vādharān vā pratyaṅ vā pradhāyīta—abhinaddhāksha ānīto' bhinaddhākṣho visṛṣītaḥ. Tasya yathā-bhinahanām pramuchya prabrūyādetāṁ disāṁ Gandhārā etāṁ disāṁ vrajeti. Sa grāmād grāmam prichchhan paṇḍito medhāvi Gandhārāneḥ pasampadyeta, evamev-hāčāryavān 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 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 Takshasila as a university town. Panini, himself a native of Gandhāra, refers to the city in sūtra iv. 3. 93.

The Kekayas were settled in the Pañjab between Gandhāra and the Beas. From the Rāmāyaṇa (II. 68. 19-22; VII. 118-114) 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 Satrughnau Kekayeshu parantapau
Pure Rājagrihe ramye mātāmaha niveśane"
(Rām., II. 67. 7).

"Girivrajam puravaram śīghramāsedurañjasā"
(Rām., II. 68. 22).

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

We learn from the Purāṇas (Matsya, 48. 10-20, Vāyu 99. 12-23) that the Uśnaras, 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
Yudhājit and Kaikeyi, and the grandfather of Bharata. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (X. 6. 1. 2) and the Chhāndogya Upanishad (V. 11. 4 et seq.) say that king Aśvapati instructed a number of Brāhmaṇas, e.g., Aruna Aupavesi Gautama, Satyayajña Paulushi, Mahāśāla Jābala. Buḍila Aśvatarāsvi, Indra-dyumna Bhālleveya, Jana Śārkaraśvyā, Prāchīnāśāla Aupamanyaya, and Uddalaka Ārūṇi.

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

Madra roughly corresponds to Siālkot and its adjacent districts in the central Pañjāb. Its capital was Sākala or Sāgalanagara (modern Siālkot). 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 Brāhmadāranāyaka Upanishad says that Madra was the native land of Kāpya Pataṇchala (see p. 16, ante; Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 126), one of the teachers of the celebrated Uddalaka Ārūṇī (Brihad. 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 Himalayas in the neighbourhood of the Uttara-Kurus, probably, as Zimmer conjectures, in the land of Kāśiṇṭr. The Madras are represented in the Mahābhārata and the Jātakas as living under a monarchical constitution.

The country of the Uśināras was situated in the Madhyadeśa. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14) says “asyām dhruvāyām madhyamāyām pratishtāyām diśi” lie the realms of the Kuru Pañchālas together with Vaṣas and Uśināras. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad
also the Usinaras are associated with the Matsyas, the Kuru Pañchálas and the Vañas. They probably lived in the northernmost part of the Madhyadesa for in the Gopatha Brahmana the Usinaras and Vañas are mentioned just before the Udichyas or northerners (Gop. Br., II. 9): Kuru Pañcháleshu Anga Magadheshu Kasi Kausalyeshu Ísva Matsyeshu sa Vaśa Usinareshudhíchyeshu.

In the Kathásaritságara (edited by Pandit Durgá-prasad and Kásináth Pándurang Parah, third edition, p. 5) Usinaragiri is placed near Kanakhala the "sanctifying place of pilgrimage, at the point where the Ganges issues from the hills." Usinaragiri is, doubtless, identical with Usiragiri of the Divyavadana (p. 22) and Usiradhvaja of the Vinaya Texts (Part II, p. 39). Páñini refers to the Usinara country in the sūtras II. 4. 20 and IV. 2. 118. In sūtra II. 4. 20 Usinara is mentioned in juxtaposition with Kantha (Kathaoi?). Its capital was Bhoganagara or Bhojanagara (Mbh. V. 118.2).

The Rig Veda (X. 59. 10) mentions a queen named Usinaráñī. The Mahábhárata, the Anukramaṇi and several Játakas mention a king named Usinara and his son Śibi (Mbh., XII. 29. 39; Vedic Index, Vol. I., p. 103, Mahá-Kañha Játaka, No. 469; Nimi Játaka, No. 541; Mahá Nárada Kassapa Játaka, No. 544, etc.). We do not know the name of Janaka’s Usinara contemporary. We learn from the Kaushitaki Upanishad that Gárgya Bālákī, a contemporary of Ajátaśatru of Kási, and of Janaka, lived for some time in the Usinara 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 Viráta of the Mahábhárata, in whose court the five Pándava 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 Upaplavya. But according to Nilkantha Upaplavya (Mbh. IV. 72.14) was "Virātanagara sampastha 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 Śālvas, in the Kaushitaki Upanishad (IV.1) in connexion with the Uśīnaras and the Kuru Pañcchalas, and in the Mahābhārata in connexion with the Chedis (V. 74.16). In the Manu-Samhitā the Matsyas together with the Kuruśalas, the Pañchalas, and the Śurasenakas comprise the land of the Brāhmaṇa Rishiṣ (Brahmarshi-deśa).

The Śatapatha 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 Vītrahān, 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 Kāśi, 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 Chākrāyaṇa) played a prominent part in the philosophical discussions of
Janaka's court. But it was precisely at this time that a great calamity befell the Kurus, and led to an exodus of large sections of the Kuru people including Ushasti himself. The Chhândogya-Upanishad (I.10.1) says "Maṟaṟi-hateshu Kurushu ātikyā saha jāyā Ushastir ha Chākrāyana ibhya-grāme pradrāṇaka uvāsa." One commentator took Maṟaṟi to mean rakta-varṇāḥ kshudra-pakshi viṣeshāḥ. Professor Bhandarkar says that the explanation of this commentator is confirmed by the fact that Maṟaṟi 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 Nicbakshu was probably the Kuru king in the time of Janaka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Janamejaya</th>
<th>1. Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Śatānīka</td>
<td>2. Driti Aindrota (son- and pupil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aśvamedhadatta</td>
<td>3. Pulusha Prāchinayo- gya (pupil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adhisimakrīṣṇa</td>
<td>4. Paulushi Satyayajña (pupil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nichakshu</td>
<td>5. Somaśushma Satya- yajñī (pupil); Janaka's contemporary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Satapatha
Brāhmaṇa makes Protī Kausāmbeya a contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi who figured in the court of Jaṇaka. It is thus clear that Kausāmbeya was a contemporary of Janaka. Now, Harisvāmin in his commentary on the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa understood Kausāmbeya to mean a ‘native of the town of Kauśāmbī.’ It is therefore permissible to think that Kauśāmbī existed in the time of Janaka, and hence of Nichakshu. There is thus no difficulty in the way of accepting the Paurānic statement. According to the Purāṇas the change of capital was due to the inroad of the river Ganges. Another, and a more potent, cause was perhaps the devastation of the Kuru country by Mañjūci. From this time the Kurus appear to have lost their political importance. They sank to the level of a second-rate power.

But the Bharata dynasty, as distinguished from the Kuru people, exercised wide sway down to the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5.1.11).

Pañchāla roughly corresponds to the Budaon, Furrukhabad and the adjoining districts of the United Provinces. There is no trace in the Vedic literature of the epic and Jātaka division of the Pañchalas into northern (Uttara) and southern (Dakshina). But the Vedic texts knew a division into eastern and western, because the Samhitopanishad Brāhmaṇa makes mention of the Prāchya Pañchālas (Ved. Ind., I. 469). The most ancient capital of Pañchāla was Kāmpilya which has been identified with Kampil on the old Ganges between Budaon and Furrukhabad. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 7) mentions another Pañchāla town Parivakrā or Parichakra identified by Weber with Ekachakra of the Mahābhārata (Ved. Ind., I. 491).

The Pañchalas were also called Krivi in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Krivis appear in the Rig Veda as settled on the Sindhu (Indus) and Asikul (Chenab). Oldenberg
observes (Buddha, p. 404) "We are to look to find in the people of the Pañchālas, of the stock of the Rik Saṁhitā, 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 Āsvamedha offering the Taurvaças arise, six thousand and six and thirty clad in mail."

The Pañchālas also included the Kesins (Ved. Ind., I. 187) and probably the Śrīñjayas (Pargiter, Markandeya Purāṇa, 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 Śrīñjaya.

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 Śikhandin (Mbh. Ādi. 166. 24; Bhīṣma, 190, et seq.). A Śikhandin Yajñasena is mentioned in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa (VII. 4) but he is described not as a prince, but as a priest of Kesin 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 Ādi-parva 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 Pañchālanagara in Kururuṭṭha.

The relations between the two peoples (Kurus and Pañchālas) were sometimes friendly and they were connected by matrimonial alliances. Kesin Dālbhya or Dārbhya, a king of the Pañchālas, was sister's son to Uchchaiśravas, king of the Kuru (Ved. Ind. I. 84. 157. 468). Uchchaiśravas 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 Dālbhya, Śona Sātrāśāha, Pravāḥaṇa Jaivali and Durmukha. Durmukha is also mentioned in the Kumbhakāra Jātaka (No. 408). His kingdom is called Uttāra Pañchālaratthī and his capital Kampillanagara. 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.

Pravāḥaṇa Jaivali, on the other hand, was Janaka's contemporary. This prince appears in the Upanishads as engaged in philosophical discussions with Áruṇi, Śvetaketu, Śīlaka Śalavatya, and Chaikitāyana Dālbhya (Brihad. Up., VI. 2; Chh. Up., 1.8. 1; V. 3.1). The first two teachers are known to have been contemporaries of Janaka.

The kingdom of Kāśi was 300 leagues in extent (Jātaka No. 391). It had its capital at Bārāṇasi also called Surundhana, Sudassana, Brahmavaddhana, Pupphavati, Ramma city, and Molinī (Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 50-51). The walls of Bārāṇasi were twelve leagues round by themselves (Ṭaṇḍulanāli Jātaka).
The Kāsīs, i.e., the people of Kāsi, 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 Kāsi, 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, Ajātasastru was on the throne of Kāsi.

Very little is known regarding the ancestors of Ajātasastru. His name does not occur in the Paurānic lists of Kāsi sovereigns (Vāyu 92. 21-74; Vishnu IV. c. 2-9), nor does the name of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, king of Kāsi, who was defeated by Śatānika Śatrājīta with the result that the Kāsis gave up the kālaṅg of the sacred fire. The Purāṇas represent the Kāsi 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 Kāsi.

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

The Bharata dynasty of Kāsi 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:

Śatam vai Brahmadattānām
Virānām Kuravaḥ satam

(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 Kumā Sapiṇḍa Jātaka, the Atīthāna 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 Sambula bhariyā, evaṁ jānāhi dānava,
Vedehaputto bhaddan te vane basati āturo.

Ajātaśatru, the Kāśya contemporary of Janaka, seems to have belonged to the Brahmadatta family. The Upanishadic evidence shows that he was a contemporary of Uddālaka. The Uddālaka Jātaka tells us that the reigning king of Benares in the time of Uddālaka was Brahmadatta.
Ajātaśatru appears in the Upanishads as engaged in philosophical discussions with Gārgya Balāki. In the Kaushitaki Upanishad he is represented as being jealous of Janaka's fame as a patron of learning.

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

The kingdom of Kosala corresponds roughly to the modern Oudh. It was separated from Videha by the river Sādanāra. 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 Ayodhyā which stood on the banks of the Sarayū and covered twelve yojanas (Rām. I. 55-7). The Vedic works do not refer to the Ikshvāku 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 Bārāṇasi, 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 Āśvalāyana Kaśyapa mentioned in the Praśna Upanishad as a disciple of Pippalāda and a contemporary of Suksesā Bhāradvāja and of Hiranyanābha, a Kosalan prince.

The details of Kosalan history will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.
The Purāṇas give the following lists of Janaka’s successors:

**Vāyu** (99. 18-23)

- Stradhvajattu jātastu
- Bhanumāṇṇāma Maithilā
- Tasya Bhanumataḥ putraḥ
- Pradyumnaścha pratāpavan
- Munistasya suta śchāpi
- Tasmād Urjavahāḥ smrītaḥ
- Urjavahāt sutadvājaḥ
- Sakunī stasya chātmajāḥ

**Vishnu** (IV. 5. 12-13)

- Stradhvajasya patyaṁ Bhanumāṇṇāma Maithilā
- Tasja Bhanumataḥ putraḥ
- Pradyumnaścha pratāpavan
- Munistasya suta śchāpi
- Tasmād Urjavahāḥ smrītaḥ
- Urjavahāt sutadvājaḥ
- Sakunī stasya chātmajāḥ

- Tatputraḥ Ritujit, tato’ rish-

- Šrutayuḥ, tataḥ Sūryāśvaḥ, tasmād
- Saṃjayaḥ, tataḥ Kshemāriḥ
- Tasmād Anenāḥ, tasmān
- Minarathaḥ, tasya Satyara-

- Ṛthih, Ṣtāyaratherupaguh, tasmāt
- Upaguptah, tasmāt

- Saṃvātaḥ, tasmāt Sudhanvā
- (Suvarcchāḥ) tasyāpi Subhā-

- Sah, tataḥ Suṣrutaḥ tasmāj-
- Jayāḥ, Jayaputro Vijayaḥ, tasya
- Ritah, Ritāt Sunayaḥ
- tato Vitahavyāḥ. Tasmād

- Sanjayaḥ

- Sunayaḥ Vitahavyaṣṭu
- Vitahavyātmajō Dhritiḥ
- Dhritestu Vahulāśvo’bhūd
- Vahulāśva sutaḥ Kritiḥ
- Tasmin santishthate vamśo
- Janakānāṃ mahātmanāṃ

- tasmād Kshemāśvaḥ, tasmāt
- Dhritiḥ, Dhriter Vahulāś-

- vah, tasya putraḥ, Kritiḥ,
- Kritau santishthate, yam

Janaka vamśaḥ.
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 Arishta and Nemi. The Vishṇu Purāṇa, or the scribe who wrote the dynastic list contained in it, probably confounded the names Arishta and Nemi and made one out of two kings. Arishta is very probably identical with Arittha Janaka of the Mahā-Janaka Jātaka. Nemi is very probably the same as Nami of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra to whom is ascribed the same saying (“when Mithilā is on fire, nothing is burned that belongs to me”) which is attributed to Mahā-Janaka II, son of Arittha, in the Mahā-Janaka Jātaka.

With the exception of Arishta 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 Paurānic 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 Āhlāra with Para Aṭṭāra, king of Kosala, about whom we shall speak in a subsequent chapter. Namī Sāpya was probably identical with king Nami of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra, Nemi of the Vishṇu 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 Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (S. B. E., XLV. 87) he was a contemporary of Dummukha (Dvimmukha) king of Pañchāla, Naggajī (Naggati) of Gandhāra, and of Karanḍu (Karakaṇḍu) of Kaliṅga. This synchronism accords with Vedic evidence. Dummukha the Pañchāla king had a priest named Brihaduktha (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 Kumbbākara Jātaka and the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra.

In the Pañchavimśā or Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa (XXV. 10. 17-18) Nami 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 Arthasastra Kautilya says “Bhoja, known also by the name Dāndakya, 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 Kāsi people had a share in the overthrow of the Vaideha monarchy. Already in the time of the great Janaka, Ajātaśatru, king of Kāsi could hardly conceal his jealousy of the Videhan
king's fame. The passage "Yathā Kāśyo vā Vaideho vograputra ujjyam dhanu radhijyam kritvā dvau väna vantau sapatnātivyādhinau haste kritvapotishthed" (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 purātanam) of a great battle between Pratardana (king of Kāśi according to the Rāmāyana VII. 48. 15) and Janaka king of Mithilā. It is stated in the Pāli commentary Paramatthajotika (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 "Dakshinapadā" occurs in the Rig Veda (X. 61. 8) and refers to the place where the exile goes on being expelled. In the opinion of several scholars this simply means "the South" beyond the limits of the recognised Aryan world. Dakshinātya is found in Pāṇini (IV. 2. 98). Dakshināpatha is mentioned by Baudhāyana coupled with Surāśṭra (Bau. Sūtra I. 1. 29). It is however extremely difficult to say what Pāṇini or Baudhāyana exactly meant by Dakshinātya 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 Uttarādhyayana make him a contemporary of Naggai, Naggatī or Nagnajit king of Gandhāra. We learn from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34) that Nagnajit was a contemporary of Bhima king of Vidarbha.

“Etamu haiva prochatuḥ Parvata Nāradau Somakāya Sāhadevyāya Sāhadevāya Sārūjayāya Babhrave Daivavṛidhāya Bhūmāya Vaidarbhāya Nagnajite Gāndhārāya.”

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 Prāśna Upanishad mentions a sage of Vidarbha named Bhaṅgava as a contemporary of Aśvalāyana. A sage called Vidarbhē Kauṇḍīneya is mentioned in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad. The name Kauṇḍīneya is apparently derived from the city of Kuṇḍina, the capital of Vidarbha (Mbh. III. 73. 1-2; Harivarpaśa, Vishnuparva, 59-60), represented by the modern Kuṇḍinya-pura on the banks of the Wardī in the Chāṇdur 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 Karanḍu of Kalinga. It follows from this that the kingdom of Kalinga was in existence in the time of Nimi and his contemporaries of the Brāhmaṇa period. The evidence of the Jātaka is confirmed by that of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta (Dialogues of the Buddha, II. 270) makes Sattabhu king of Kalinga a contemporary of Renu.
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king of Mithilā, and of Dhatarattha or Dhṛtarāśṭra king of Kaśī (mentioned in the Satapatha 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 Vaitārāṇī (Mbh. III. 114. 4) in Orissa to the borders of the Andhra territory. We learn from the Jātakas that the capital of Kalinga was Dantapuraṇā (Dantakura, Mbh. V. 48. 76). The Mahābhārata mentions another capital called Rājapura (XII. 4. 3). The Jain writers refer to a third city called Kaṃchānapura (Ind. Ant. 1891, p. 375).

The Mahāgovinda Suttanta refers to another southern realm, namely, Assaka which existed in the time of Reṇu and Dhatarattha (Dhṛtarāśtra). 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 "dakṣiṇasyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ rājāno Bhaujyāyaivaśe 'bhishichyante Bhojyena-nānabhishiktānāchakshata." In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 21) the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats, and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an Āsvamedha 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; Vishnū, 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 Bhojakatā in Vidarbha is proved by the Harivamśa (Vishnū Parva, 60. 32) and the Mahabhārata (V. 157. 15-16). The Chammak grant of the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II makes it clear that the Bhojakatā territory was equivalent to the Ilichpur-district in Berar or Vidarbha (J. R. A. S., 1914, p. 329). Dr. Smith says, "The name Bhojakatā ‘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.” Kalidasa 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 Dāndaka. A passage in the Arthaśāstra (Ed. 1919, p. 11) runs thus:—

"Dāndakya nāma Bhojaḥ Kāmāt Brāhmaṇa-kanyām abhimanuyamānas sabandhu rāshṭro vinanāśa”—a Bhoja known as Dāndakya, or king of Dāndaka, 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 Dāndaki 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, Dāndaka, as well as Kalinga and Assaka (on the Godāvāri, Sutta Nipāta 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, Sabaras, Pulindas and probably also the Mūtibas (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 Krishnā. 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 Krishnā 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 Sabaras and the Pulindas are described in the Matsya and the Vāyu Purāṇas as Dakshiṇāpathavāsinah, together with the Vaidarbhas and the Dāndakas:

Teshāṁ pare janapadā Dakshiṇāpathavāsinah
*K * * *
Karūṣhā̄cha sahaishikā ātábyāḥ Šabarāstathā
Pulindā Vindhya Pushikā Vaidarbhā Dañc’akaiḥ saha
(Matsya. 114. 46-48.)

Ābhṛrāḥ Sahachaishikāh ātábyāḥ Šabarāśeṣa ye
Pulindā Vindhya Mulikā Vaidarbhā Dañc’akaiḥ saha
(Vāyu. 4ि, 126.)

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

Dakshiṇāpathayaṇmanyāḥ sarvenaraavāndhrakāḥ
Guhāḥ Pulindāḥ ŠabarāŚ 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 Mūtibas, another Dasyu tribe mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa along with the Andhras, Pulindas, and Śabaras, is not so certain. In the Sāṁkhyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra (XV. 26. 6) the Mūtibas are called Mūchipa or Mūvipa. It is not altogether improbable that they are the people who appear in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (57. 46) under the designation of Mushika. A comparison of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa with the Sāṁkhyaṇa 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 Paurāṇic 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 Mahākosala, the father-in-law of Bimbisāra. But we know from the Buddhist Aṅguttara Nikāya that during this period there were sixteen states of considerable extent and power known as the Solsa Mahājanapada. These states were:

3. Aūga 11. Macechha (Matsya)
5. Vajji 13. Assaka
7. Chetiya (Chedi) 15. Gandhāra

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

1. Aṅga
2. Baṅga
3. Magaha (Magadha)
4. Malaya
5. Mālava
6. Achchha
7. Vachchha (Vatsa.)
8. Koebhha (Kacbchha?)
9. Pāḍha (Pāṇḍya?)
10. Lāḍha (Rājha)
11. Baji (Vajji)
12. Moli
13. Kāsi
14. Kosala
15. Avaha
16. Sambhuttara (Sumbhot-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 Guttīla 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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(“dvādasayojanikam sakala BārānasinagaraP”—Sambhava Jātaka, No. 515; Sarabha-miga J. 483; Bhūridatta J. 543) whereas Mithilā and Indapatta were each only seven leagues in extent (Suruchi J. 489; Vidhurapandita J. 545). Several Kāsi monarchs are described as aspirants for the dignity of “sabbarājūnam aggarājā,” and lord of sakala-Jambudīpa (Bhaddasāla Jātaka, 465; Dhonasākha Jātaka 353). The Mahāvagga also mentions the fact that Kāsi was a great realm in former times:

“Bhūtapubbam bhikkhave Bārānasīyam Brahmadatto nāma Kāsirājā ahosi adgho mahaddhano Mahābhogo mahabhalo mahāvāhano mahāvijito paripunnakosa kothāgāro.”

(Mahāvagga X. 2. 3; Vinaya Piṭaka I. 342.)

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

Already in the Brahmaṇa period a king of Kāsi named Dhṛitarāṣṭra attempted to offer a horse sacrifice, but was defeated by Sātrājīta Śatānīka with the result that the Kāsis, down to the time of the Śatapatha Brahmaṇa, gave up the kindling of the sacred fire (Śat. Br., XIII. 5. 4. 19). Some of the other Kāsi monarchs were more fortunate. Thus in the Brahāchatta Jātaka (No. 336) a king of Benares is said to have gone against the king of Kosala with a large army: He entered the city of Sāvatthi and took the king prisoner. The Kosambi Jātaka (No. 429), the Kunāla Jātaka (No. 536) and the Mahāvagga (S.B.E., Vol. XIII, pp. 294–299) refer to the annexation of the kingdom of Kosala by the Brahmadattas of Kāsi. The Assaka Jātaka (No. 207) refers to the city of Potalī, the capital of Assaka in Southern India, as a city of the kingdom of Kāsi. Evidently the reigning prince of Potalī was a vassal of the sovereign of Kāsi. In the Sona-Nanda
Jātaka (No. 532) Manoja, king of Benares, is said to have subdued the kings of Kosala, Aṅga, and Magadha. In the Mahābhārata (XIII. 30) Pratardana king of Kāsi, is said to have crushed the power of the Vīthahavyas or Haihayas. In the absence of corroborative evidence it is difficult to say how far the account of the achievements of individual kings, mentioned in the Jātakas and the epic, is authentic. But the combined testimony of many Jātakas and the Mahāvagga clearly proves that Kāsi was at one time a stronger power than many of its neighbours including Kosala.

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

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

The kingdom of Kosala was bounded on the west by Paṇchāla, on the south by the Sarpikā or Syandikā (Sai) river (Rām II. 49.11-12; 50.1), on the east by the Sadānirā 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 Nipata (S.B.E., X, Part II, 68-69) Buddha says “just beside Himavanta there lives a people endowed with the power of wealth, the inhabitants of Kosala. They are Ādichchas by family, Śākiyas 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 Śākyas were included among the inhabitants of Kosala. If any doubt is still entertained it is set at rest by Pasenadi’s words recorded in the Majjhima Nikāya (II. 124):

“Bhagava pi khattiyo, ahām pi khattiyo, Bhagava pi Kosalako, ahām pi Kosalako, Bhagava pi āsitiko, ahām pi āsitiko.”

Kosala proper contained three important cities, namely, Ayodhya, Sāketa and Savatthi or Śrāvasti.

Ayodhya (Oudh) was a town on the river Sarayū. Sāketa is often supposed to be the same as Ayodhya, but Prof. Rhys Davids points out that both cities are mentioned as existing in the Buddha’s time. They were possibly adjoining like London and Westminster. Savatthi is the great ruined city on the south bank of the Rapti 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 Satapatha Brāhmaṇa the Kosalas appear as falling later than the Kuru Pañchālas, but earlier than the Videhas, under the influence of Brāhmaṇical civilisation.

In the Rāmāyaṇa and in the Purāṇas the royal family of Kosala is represented as being descended from a king named Ikshvāku. Branches of this family are represented as ruling at Viśāla or Vaiśāli (Rāmāyaṇa I. 47. 11-12), at Mithilā (Vāyu. P. 89. 3) and at Kusinārā (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. 3) 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:

Mandhātrī 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.

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

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

Trisāṅku (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.

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

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

Some of the later princes of the Paurāṇic list (e.g. Śākya, Suddhodana, Siddhārtha, Rāhula and Prasenajit) are mentioned in Buddhist texts. The relations of Hiranāyanābha 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., Trasādasyu, king of the Pūrūs (Rig Veda, IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3), Rituparna, king of Śaphāla (Baud. Śrauta Sūtra, XX. 12), Suddhodana 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 Śrāvasti, 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 Mahākosala.

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

It is not easy to find out all the kings of the Paurānic list who actually ruled over Kosala. The names of some of the earlier kings of the Paurānic list, e.g., Purukutsa, Trasadaysu, Hariśchandra, Rohita, Rituparna and a few others, are omitted from the dynastic list of the kings of Ayodhya given in the Rāmāyana (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 Suddhodana.

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 Ayodhya, others at Sāketa, and the rest at Śrāvasti. Of the princes of Ayodhya the Ghata Jātaka (No. 454) mentions Kālasena. A Kosalarāja reigning in Sāketa is mentioned in the Nandiyamiga Jātaka (No. 385). Vankha, Mahākosala and many others had their capital at Sāvatthii or Śrāvasti. Ayodhya seems to have been the
earliest capital, and Sāketa the next. The last capital was Śrāvasti. Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town in Buddha's time (Buddhist India, p. 34), but Sāketa and Śrāvasti were included among the six great cities of India (Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, S.B.E. XI, p. 99).

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. (Dīghitī nāma Kosalarāja ahosi daliddo appadhano appabhogo appabalo appavāhano appavijito aparipuṇṇakosakothaṅgāro).

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 Madhyadesa. 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 Anga dominions, however, at one time included Magadha and extended to the shores of the sea. The Vīdhura Pandīta Jātaka (No. 545) describes Rājagriha as a city of Anga. The Sānti Parva of the Mahābhārata (29.35) refers to an Anga king who sacrificed on Mount Vishṇupada at Gayā. The Sabhā-parva (44.9) mentions Anga and Vaṅga as forming one Vishaya or kingdom. The Kathā-sarit-sagara says that Vitaṅkapur, 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, 151). 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 Purānas and the Harivṃśa that the ancient name of Champā was Mālīṇī (Matsya, 48. 97; Vayu, 99. 105-06; Hariv. 32. 49; cf. Mbh. XII. 5. 6-7):

Champasya tu purī Champā 
Ya Mālīnabhavat 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, Sravasti, Sāketa, Kaśāmbya, and Benares (Mahāparinibbāna Sutta). Champā increased in wealth and traders sailed from it to Suvarṇabhūmi 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 Gandhārīs, Mujavants, and Magadhas. The Rāmāyāṇa 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
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anointed kings in the Aitareya Brahmaṇa (VIII. 22). The Mahāgovinda Suttanta mentions king Dhataratthā of Aṅga (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 Purāṇas: (Matsya, 48. 91-108; Vāyu 99. 100-112) give lists of the early kings of Aṅga. One of these kings Dadhivāhanā is known to Jaina tradition. The Purāṇas and the Harivarmanśa (32.43) represent him as the son and immediate successor of Aṅga. Jaina tradition places him in the beginning of the sixth century B.C. His daughter Chandanā or Chandravālā was the first female who embraced Jainism shortly after Mahāvīra had attained the Kevaliship (J.A.S.B., 1914, pp. 320-321). Satānīka, king of Kuṣmāṇḍi 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 Aṅga and Magadha (Champeyya Jātaka). The Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka describes Rājagriha as a city of Aṅga, while the Mahābharata refers to a sacrifice which an Aṅga king performed at Mt. Vīṣṇupada at Gayā. These facts probably indicate that at one time the Aṅga king annexed Magadha. Brahmadatta, king of Aṅga, is actually known to have defeated Bhaṭṭiya, king of Magadha. Aṅga had, at this time, an ally in the king of the Vatsas. Śrī Harsha speaks of a king of Aṅga named Dṛḍhavarmanṇā being restored to his kingdom by Udayana, king of Kuṣmāṇḍi (Priyadarsīkā, Act IV).

The destruction of the kingdom of Aṅga was effected by Bhaṭṭiya's son Bimbisāra Śrēṇika 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 Giri-vraja, or old Rājagṛiha, near Rājgir among the hills near Gaya. The Mahāvagga (S.B.E., XIII, 150) calls it Giribbaja of the Magadhas to distinguish it from other cities of the same name (cf. Girivraja in Kekaya). The Mahābhārata calls it Girivraja and Māgadhapura (Goratham girimā-sādya dadriśur Māgadhampuram II. 20. 30) and says that it was an impregnable city, puram durādharmam samanta-taḥ, being protected by five hills, Vaihāra “Vipulāḥ sailo,” Varāha, Vrīshabha, Rishigiri and Chaityaka. From the Rāmāyana we learn that the city had another name Vasumatī (I. 32. 8). The Life of Hiuen Tsang (p. 113) mentions another name, Kusāgarapura.

In a passage of the Rig Veda (III. 53. 14) mention is made of a territory called Kikata ruled by a chieftain named Pramaganda. Yāska (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. Bhāgavata Purāṇa I. 3. 24 Buddhonāmnā'njanasutaḥ Kikateshu bhavishyati).

The name Magadha first appears in the Atharva Veda (V. 22. 14) where fever is wished away to the Gandhāris, Mujavants, Aṅgas, and Māgadhās. The men of Magadha are always spoken of in the Vedic literature in terms of contempt. In the Vṛātya (XV) book of the Atharva Śāṁhitā, the Vṛātya, i.e., the Indian living outside the pale of Brāhmaṇism, is brought into very special relation to the Pumśchali and the Māgadhā, faith is called his harlota, the Mitra his Māgadhā (Weber Hist. Ind. Lit., p. 112). In the Śrauta Śūtras the equipment characteristic of the Vṛātya is said to be given, when the latter is admitted into the Aryan Brāhmaṇical community, to the so-called Brāhmaṇas living in Magadha (Brahma-bandhu Māgadhadesiya, 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 Brihadratha, 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 Brihadratha 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 Barhadratha 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 Barhadrathas 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 Barhadratha dynasty came to an end in the sixth century B.C.

The Jaina writers mention two early kings of Bājagriha 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 Śaisunāga dynasty founded by a king named Śiśunāga. Bimbisāra, the contemporary of Buddha,
is said to have belonged to this dynasty. The Mahāvaṃśa however makes Susunāga the founder of a dynasty which succeeded that of Bimbisāra. The Purāṇas themselves relate that Śisunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and will be king:

Ashta-trīṇśachchañḥam bhāvyāḥ
Prādyotāḥ paṁcha te sutaḥ
Hatva teshāṁ yaśaḥ kṛitisath
Śisunāga bhavishyati.

(Vāyu Purāṇa, 99, 314).

If this statement be true, then Śisunāga 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 Śisunāga must be later than Bimbisāra. But we have seen that the Purāṇas make Śisunāga an ancestor of Bimbisāra. Thus the Purāṇas, in their present form, are self-contradictory. The inclusion of Vāraṇasi within Śisunāga'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 Mālālāṅkāra-vatthu tells us (S.B.E., XI, p. xvi) that Rājaṅgiha lost her rank of royal city from the time of Śisunāga. This indicates that Śisunāga came after the palmy days of Rājaṅgiha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. Prof. Bhandarkar in his Carmichael Lectures, 1918, accepts the Ceylonese version and rejects the Purāṇic account of Bimbisāra's lineage. He makes Bimbisāra the founder of a dynasty, and says that he was a general who carved out a kingdom for himself at the expense of the Vajjis. The Mahāvaṃśa 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 Bhaṭṭiya 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 Anga. The defeat was avenged by Bimbisāra who launched Magadha into that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Asoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kāliṅga.

The Vajjīs, according to Prof. Rhys Davids and Cunningham, included eight confederate clans (aṭṭhakula), of whom the Videhans and the Lichchhavis were the most important. Among the other clans we may mention the Jñātrikas and the Vajjīs 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 Vaiśālī. To this section probably belonged the princess Trīṣalā, also called Videhadattā, mother of Mahāvīra.

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

\[\text{Viśālāṁ nāgarāṁ rāmyāṁ svargopamaṁ tādā.}\]

We learn from the introductory portion of the Eka-pancha 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 "Vesālī," i.e., inhabitants of Vesālī (Hoernle, UVāsaγaḍaśā, II, p. 4n).

The Vajjīs or Vrijīs are mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. 2. 131). Kuṇṭilya (Mysore Edition, 1919, p. 378) distinguishes the Vrijīkas or Vajjīs from the Lichchhivikas. Yuan Chwang (Watters, II. 81) also distinguishes the
Fu-li-chih (Vrijji) country from Fei-she-li (Vaiśāli). 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 Vesāli 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 Vesāli 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 Kuṇḍagāma, Kollāga, Vāṇiyagāma, 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 Vaiśālikā dynasty is said to have been Viśāla, a son of Ikṣvāku according to the Rāmāyana; a descendant of Nābbāga, the brother of Ikṣvāku, according to the Purāṇas. Viśāla is said to have given his name to the city. After Viśāla came Hemachandra, Suchandra, Dhumrāśva, Śrīnijaya, Sahadeva, Kuṣāśva, Somadatta, Kākutstha and Sumati. We do not know how much of the Rāmāyanic and Paurānic account of the Vaiśālikā nṛipas can be accepted as sober history. A king named Sahadeva Sārṇjaya is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (II. 4, 4, 3. 4) as having once been called Suplan Sārṇjaya, and as having changed his name because of his success in performing the Dākshāyaṇa Sacrifice. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34, 9) he is mentioned with Somaka Sahadevya. None of these kings, however, are connected with Vaiśāli 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 Mithila has already been stated. Regarding the change at Viśālā we know nothing.

Several eminent scholars have sought to prove that the Lichchhavis, the most famous clan of the Vajjian confederacy, were of foreign origin. According to Dr. Smith the Lichchhavis were Tibetans in their origin. He infers this from their judicial system and the disposal of their dead. Dr. S. C. Vidyābhushana held that the Lichchhavis were originally Persians and came from the Persian city of Nisibī. Indian tradition is, however, unanimous in representing the Lichchhavis as Kshatriyas. Thus we

1 Ind. Ant., 1903, p. 233.
2 Ind. Ant., 1908, p. 78.
read in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta "and the Līchchhavis of Vessāli heard the news that the Exalted One had died at Kusinārā. And the Līchchhavis of Vessāli 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 Trisāla, sister to Chetaka who is regarded by several scholars as a Līchchhavi chief of Vessāli, is styled Kshatriya (S.B.E., XXII, pp. xii, 227).

Manu says (X, 22):

Jhallo Vallaśca rājanyād vṛātyān Nichchhivireva cha
Nātāśca Karanaśchaiva Khaso Drāvida eva cha.

It may be argued that the Līchchhavis, though originally non-Aryans or foreigners, ranked as Kshatriyas when they were admitted into the fold of Brāhmaṇism, like the Drāvidas referred to in Manu’s śloka and the Gurjara-Pratihāras of medival times. But, unlike the Pratihāras and Drāvidas, the Līchchhavis never appear to be very friendly towards Brāhmaṇism. On the contrary, they were always to be found among the foremost champions of non-Brāhmaṇic creeds like Jainism and Buddhism. As a matter of fact Manu brands them as the children of the Vṛātya Rājanyas. The great medival 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, Lakshmana, 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 Līchchhavis were indigenous Kshatriyas who were degraded to the position of Vṛātyas when they became champions of non-Brāhmaṇical creeds. The Pāli commentary
Paramatthajotika (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 Tāvatimsa gods, gaze upon this company of the Lichchhavis, behold this company of the Lichchhavis, compare this company of the Lichchhavis—even as a company of Tāvatimsa gods.”

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

In the introductory portions of the Ekapalajjā (149) and Chulla Kāliṅga (301) Jātakas it is stated that the Lichchhavis of the ruling family numbered 7,707. There was a like number of viceroys, generals, and treasurers. The Jaina Kalpasūtra (§128) refers to the “nine Lichchhavis” as having formed a confederacy with nine Mallakis and eighteen Gaṇarājas of Kāsi-Kośala. We learn from the Nirayāvalli Sūtra that an important leader of this confederacy was Chetaka whose sister Trisala or Videhadatta was the mother of Mahāvīra, and whose daughter Chellana or Vedehi was, according to Jaina writers, the mother of Kūnika-Ajātaśatru.

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

---

1 Aṅguttara Nikāya, III, 74; Mahāli Sutta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, p. 198; Mahāvagga, SBE., XVII, p. 108; Majjhima N., I. 234; 68; II. 232; 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 Vesali.
of Vesāli are described in the Mahāvagga and the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta (SBE., XVII, p. 191; XI, pp. 1-5).

The Malla territory had for its capital the city of Kusavati or Kusinārā (Kusa Jataka No. 531; Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, pp. 161-162). The exact site of Kusinārā is not yet known. In the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta it is stated that the Sala Grove of the Mallas, the Upavattana of Kusinārā lay near the river Hiranyavati. Smith identifies the Hiranyavati with the Gandāk and says that Kusinagara (Kusinārā) was situated in Nepal, beyond the first range of hills, at the junction of the Little, or Eastern Rāpti with the Gandāk (EHI., p. 159n). He, however, adds that the discovery in the large stupa behind the Nirvāṇa temple near Kasi found an inscribed copper plate bearing the words “[parini] vāna-chaitye tāmrapaṭṭa iti,” has revived and supported the old theory, propounded by Wilson and accepted by Cunningham, that the remains near Kasi (on the Chota Gandak), in the east of the Gorakhpur District, represent Kusinagara.

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

Like Videha, Mallaraṭṭha (Mallarāṣṭhra, Mbh., VI. 9. 41) had a monarchical constitution at first. The Kusa Jataka mentions a Malla king named Okkāka (Ikshvāku). The name Okkāka probably indicates that like the Śākyas (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 Mallaraṭṭha 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; Kauṭilya’s Arthasastra, 1919, p. 378); and the metropolis had sunk to the level of a “little wattel and daub town” a “branch township” surrounded by jungles. It was then styled Kusinārā.

The Mallas had two other important cities namely Pāvā (SBE., XI, p. 133) and Bhoga-nagara (Sutta Nipāta, 194, Uvāsagadasāro, 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 Gaṇarājas of Kāśi-Kosala.1

The league was evidently aimed against Kūṇika-Ajāṭhāsatru 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 (paritaḥ Kurūṇ, Mbh. IV. i. 11) and lay near the Jumna

1 Nava Mallai nava Lechchhai Kāśi Kosalaye aṭṭhārasa vi gaṇarāyapo. Jacobi translates the passage thus:

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

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

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

```
Mahāsammta
  Roja
  Varācja
  Kalyāna
  Varakalyāna
  Uposatha
  Māndhatā
  Varamāndhatā
  Chara
  Upachara or Apachara
```
The last king's five sons are said to have founded the cities of Hatthipura, Assapura, Sihapura, Uttarapañchāla and Daddarapurā. 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 (Rāmāyana 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 Vedabhā 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 Protī Kauśāmbeyā (Śat. Br., XII. 2. 2. 13) whom Harivāmin, 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 Hastinapura 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 Paurāṇic 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 Śastrī, p. 138) as a scion of the Bharata kula.
The Purânas give a list of Nichakshu's successors down to Kshemaka and cite the following genealogical verse:

Brahmakshatrasya yo yonir vaṁso devarshi satkṛitaḥ
Kshemakam prāpya rājānam saṁsthām prāpsyati vai kalau.

The earliest king of Kauśāmbi about whom we know anything is Śatānīka II of the Paurānic 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. 3). He married a princess of Videha as his son is called Videha-putra. He is said to have attacked Champā the capital of Āṅga during the reign of Dadhīvāhana (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-vamśa (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 Yuddhiṭhila-gotta, i.e., the family of Yudhishthira (Dhūmakārī 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: Dhanaṇḍaya Korabya (Kurudhamma Jātaka No. 276; Dhūmakārī 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 Kauśambī, 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 Doab. The Mahābhārata, the Jātakas and the Divyāvadāna (p. 435) refer to the division of this state into northern and southern. The Bhāgirathī (Ganges) formed the dividing line (Mbh. I. 138. 70). According to the Great Epic Northern Pāṇchala had its capital at Ahichchhatra (the modern Rāmnagar near Aonlā in the Bareilly District), while Southern Pāṇchala had its capital at Kāmpilya, and stretched from the Ganges to the Chambal (Mbh. 138. 73-74). A great struggle raged in ancient times between the Kurus and the Pāṇchālas for the possession of Uttara Pāṇchāla. Sometimes Uttara Pāṇchāla was included in Kururaṭṭha (Somanassa Jātaka No. 505; Mahābhārata I. 138) and had its capital at Hāṣṭināpura (Divyāvadāna, p. 435), at other times it formed a part of Kāmpillarattha (Brahmadatta Jātaka No. 323, Jayaddisa Jātaka No. 513 and Gandhatindu Jātaka No. 520). Sometimes kings of Kāmpillarattha held court at Uttara Pāṇchālanagara, at other times kings of Uttara Pāṇchalāratṭha held court at Kāmpilla (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 Durmukha's kingdom was styled Uttara Pañchāla-rajṭha; his capital was not Ahichchhatra but Kampilla-nagara. He is represented as a contemporary of Kāraṇḍu king of Kalinga, Naggaji (Nagnajit) king of Gandhāra and Nimi king of Videha. We learn from the Aitareya Brahmana (VIII. 23) that Durmukha, the Pañchāla king, made extensive conquests. His priest was Brihaduktha:

Etam ha vā Aindraṃ Mahābhīshkaṃ Brihaduktha Rishir Durmukhāya Pañchālāya pravācha tasmādu Durmukhah Pañchālo Rājā sanvīdayā samantam sargvatəḥ pṛthivin jayan parīyāya.

A great Pañchāla king named Chulani Brahmadatta is mentioned in the Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka (546), the Uttarādhayayana Sūtra (SBE, XLV. 57-61), the Svapnavasavadatta (Act V) and the Rāmāyaṇa (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 Uttarādhayayana Brahmadatta is styled a Universal monarch. The story of Brahmadatta is, however, essentially legendary, and little reliance can be placed on it. The Rāmāyaṇic legend regarding the king is only important as showing the connection of the early Pañchālas with the foundation of the famous city of Kānyakubja or Kanauj.

The Uttarādhayayana Sūtra mentions a king of Kampilya named Sañjaya who gave up his kingly power and
adopted the faith of the Jinas (SBE, XLV. 80-82). We do not know what happened after Sañjaya gave up his 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 (Arthasastra, 1919, p. 378).

Matsya had its capital at Virātanagara or Bairāṭ in the modern Jaipur State (Carmichael Leè., 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 Kauṭilya among those states which had a Saṅgha form of Government. The probability is that the monarchical constitution endured till the loss of its independence. It was probably at one time annexed to the neighbouring kingdom of Chedi. The Mahābhārata (V. 74. 16) refers to a king named Sahaja who reigned over both the Chedis and the Matsyas. It was finally absorbed into the Magadhan Empire. Some of the most famous edicts of Aśoka have been found at Bairāṭ.

The Mahābhārata (II. 31. 4) mentions a people called the Apara Matsyas who probably occupied the hill tract on the north bank of the Chambal (J.A.S.B., 1895, 251). The 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 Vīthotras, Sātvatas, etc. (Matsya, 43-44; Vāyu, 94-96).
The Sātvatas were subdivided into several branches, *e.g.*, the Daivāvridhas, Andhakas, Mahābhhojas and Vrishnis (Vishnu, IV. 13. 1; Vāyu, 96. 1-2).

Yadu and his tribe are repeatedly mentioned in the Rig Veda. He is closely associated with Turvasa and in one place (I. 108. 8) with Druhyu, Anu and Pūru. This association is also proved by the epic and Paurāṇic legends which state that Yadu and Turvasu 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 Turvasa came from a distant land. The Sātvatas or Satvats also appear to be mentioned in the Vedic texts. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIII. 5. 4. 21) the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats or Satvants and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an Aśvamedha are referred to: The geographical position of Bharata’s kingdom is clearly shown by the fact that he made offerings on the Yamuna and the Ganges (Ait. Br. VIII, 23; Mbh. VII. 66. 8). The Satvats must have been occupying some adjoining region. The epic and Paurāṇic tradition which places them in the Mathura 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 Paurāṇas also we find that a branch of the Satvats was styled Bhoja (Vishnu IV, 13. 1-6):

“Bhajina-Bhajamana-divyāndhaka-Devāvridha-Mahābhhoja-Vrishnī-samjōāḥ Satvatasya putrā babhūvuh…… Mahā Bhojastrati dharmātmā tasyānvaye Bhojamārtikā vata babhūvuh.”

It is also stated that several southern states, Māhis-matt, 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 Devāvṛīda branch of the Satvatas is also mentioned in the Vedic literature. Babhru Daivavṛīda (Vāyu, 96. 15, Vishṇu, IV. 13. 3-5) is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34) as a contemporary of Bhima, king of Vidarbha and Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra. The Andhakas and Vrishnīs are referred to in the Asṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (IV. 1. 114; VI. 2. 34). In Kautilya’s Arthasastra (p. 12) the Vrishnīs are described as a Saṅgha, i.e., a republican corporation. The Mahābhārata, too, refers to the Vrishnīs, Andhakas and other associate tribes as a Saṅgha (XII. 81. 25), and Vāsudeva as a Saṅghamukhya. The name of the Vrishnī 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 Vrishnī 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 Vrishnīs 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 Vrishnīs and the Andhakas are branded as Vrātyas in the Droṇa Parva of the Mahābhārata (141-15).

The Buddhist texts refer to Avantiputta king of the Śūrasenas in the time of Mahā Kachchhāna (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 Godhāvari (Sutta Nipāta, 977). The name of the territory represents the Sanskrit Āśmaka. The Āśmakas are mentioned by Panini (IV. 1. 173). As the grammarian refers to Dākshinātya (IV. 2. 98) and Kālīga (IV. 1. 178) his Āśmaka may be Assaka in the Deccan. It may however also denote the Āśmakas 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 (Carin. 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 Kālīga. He suggests that in later times Assaka seems to have included Mulaka, and also perhaps Kālīga. 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) Āśmaka and Mulaka appear as scions of the Ikṣvāku family. This probably indicates that the Āśmaka and Mulaka kingdoms were believed to have been founded by Ikṣvāku chiefs, just as Vidarbha and Daṇḍaka were founded by princes of the Yadu (Bhoja) family. The Mahāgovinda Suttanta mentions Brahmadatta king of the Assakas who was a contemporary of Sattabhu king of Kālīga, Vessabhu king of Avanti, Bharata king of Sovira, Reṇu king of Videha, Dhatarattha king of Aṅga and Dhatarattha king of Kāsi.
SIXTEEN MAHÁJANAPADAS

(Dialogues of the Buddha, Part II, p. 270). Thq Mahabháraata (I. 177. 47) refers to "Aśmako náma Rájarshi Paudanyám yo nyavesayat." Paudanya is evidently identical with Potana or Potali.

We learn from the Assaka Játaka (No. 207) that at one time the city of Potali was included in the kingdom of Kási, and its prince Assaka was presumably a vassal of the Kási monarch. The Chulla Kálinga Játaka mentions a king of Assaka named Aruṇa and his minister Nandísenā, and refers to a victory which they won over the king of Kálinga.

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 Dakshinápatha had its capital at Māhissatt or Māhiśmati, modern Mándhátá on the Narmadā.

The Mahágovinda Suttanta mentions Māhissatt as the capital of the Avantis, and refers to their king Vessabhū. The Mahabháraata distinguishes between the kingdoms of Avanti and Māhiśmati, but locates Vinda and Anuvinda of Avanti near the Narmadā (Narmadabhítaḥ, II. 31. 10).

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

The Puráṇas style the first dynasty of Māhiśmati as Haihaya (Matsya, 43. 8-29; Váyu, 94. 5-26). The Haihaya family is referred to by such an ancient authority as Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, p. 11). The Haihayas are said to have overthrown the Nágas who must have been the
aboriginal inhabitants of the Narmadā region (cf. Nāgpur). The Matsya Purāṇa mentions five branches of the Haihayas namely, Vīthotras, Bhojas, Avantis, Kūṇḍikeras, or Tūṇḍikeras and the Tālatāṅghas (43. 48-49). When the Vīthotras 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 Kāśmir as well as the Takhaśilā region. Takhaśilā, 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.

Takhaśilā 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 Paṇchāla, and Bhima king of Vidarbha, the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Naggaji or Nagnajit (Kumbhakāra Jātaka; Ait. Br. VII. 34; Śat. Br. VIII. 1. 4. 10). We learn from the Kumbhakāra Jātaka that his capital was Takhaśilā. The Jaina Uttarādhyayana Sūtra mentions “Drimukha” of Paṇchāla, Nami of Videha, “Naggati” of Gandhāra, and “Karakanḍu” of Kalinga, and says that “these bulls of kings have adopted the faith of the Jainas” (SBE, XLI, 87). As Pārśva (777 B.C.) was the first historical Jina, Naggati or Nagnajit is probably to be placed between
777 B.C. and 543 B.C. (the date of Pukkusāti the Gandhārian contemporary of Bimbisāra). We do not, however, say that implicit reliance can be placed on a statement of the Uttarādhyayana.

Nagnajit was succeeded by his son Svarjit (Sat. Br., VIII. 1. 4. 10).

In the middle of the sixth century B.C. the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Pukkusāti who is said to have sent an embassy and a letter to king Bimbisāra of Magadha. 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; Aṅguttara N. I. 213; 4. 252, 256, 260; Rock Edict V of Asoka). 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 Drāraka. We learn from a passage of the Mahābhārata that a place called Rājapura was the home of the Kāmbojas (Mbh., VII. 4. 5, “Kṛṣṇa Rājapurāṁ gatvā Kāmbojā nirjītā stvayā ”). The association of the Kāmbojas with the Gāndhāras enables us to identify this Rājapura with the Rājapura of Huien 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 Anpaman-yava (Vamsa Br.) who was probably connected with this territory.
In the Bhūridatta Jātaka (No. 543) the Kambojas are credited with savage customs:

ete hi dhamma anariyarūpa
Kambojākanam āvitaḥ bhunnaḥ tt.

Jātaka, VI. 208.

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

Cowell's Jātaka, VI. 110.

This description of the Kambojas agrees wonderfully with Hsiian Tsang's account of Rajapura and the adjoining countries. "From Lampa to Rajapura 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 Kambujya 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 "Vārāhastropajīvin" Sangha.

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, Mātysas, Śūrasenas and the Chedis receive unstinted praise:

Kuravaḥ saha Pañcālāḥ Śālvā Mātysāḥ sa Naimishāḥ
Chedayaścā mahābhaṅgā dharmam jānanti sāśvataṁ
Bṛhmaṁ Pañcālāḥ Kauraveyāstur dharmaṁ
SATyāṁ Mātysāḥ Śūrasenaścā yajñām

The Kauravas with the Pañchālas, the Śālvās, 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 Pāṇchālas observe the Vedas, the Kauravas observe Dharma, the Mātysas observe the truth, and the Sūrásenas perform sacrifices.1

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

Ingitajñāscha Magadhāḥ prekṣhitajñāscha Kosālāḥ.1

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

Āturāṇāṁ parityāga sadārasutavikrayaḥ
Aṅgeshu vartate Kṛṣṇa yeshāmadhipitrirbhavān.

The abandonment of the afflicted and the sale of wives and children are, O Kṛṣṇa, prevalent among the Aṅgas whose king thou art.3

Madrakeshu cha samarīṣhtam saucham Gandhāra-

keshuchā

Rājayājakayājyečā nashtam dattam havirbhavet.

Amongst the Madrakas all acts of friendship are lost as purity among the Gandhārakas, and the libations poured in a sacrifice in which the king is himself the sacrificer and priest.4

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; 28; 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 Brahachatta 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 Mahāsilava Jātaka (No. 51) king Mahāsilava 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) Vanki 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 Kaṁsa, as the epithet "Bārānasiggaḥo," i.e., conqueror of Benares, is a standing addition to his name (the Seyya Jātaka No. 282 and the Tesakūṇa Jātaka No. 521, Buddhist India, p. 23). The interval of time between Kaṁsa'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 Kosalādevī, 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 Pasenādi or Prasenajīt Kāsi still formed a part of the Kosalan empire. In the Lohichcha Sutta (Dialogue of the Buddha, Part I, 288-97) Buddha asks a person named Lohichcha the following questions: “Now what think you Lohichcha? Is not king Pasenādi 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 Pasenādi.

The Samyukta Nikāya (the Book of the Kindred Sayings, translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 106) mentions Pasenādi 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 Hiranyanābbha Kausalya who, as we have seen, was a contemporary of Sukeśā Bhāradvāja and Āśvalāyana and consequently of Buddha and Pasenādi, if our identification of Āśvalāyana Kausalya with Assalāyana of Sāvatthī 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 Mahāvamsā (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, and 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:

Etasyāṁ Prāchyaṁ disi ye ke cha Prāchyānāṁ rājānāṁ Śaṁrājyayaiva te'bhisichyante Samrāti-tyenaṁabhishiktānāchakshhata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ dakṣināsyaṁ disi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ Rājano Bhauijyayaiva te'bhisichyante Bhojetyenaṁabhishiki-ktānāchakshhata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ Pratichyāṁ disi ye ke cha Nīchya-ṇāṁ Rājāno ye'pāchyānāṁ Svārājyayaiva te'
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bhishichyante Svarālītyenānabhishiktānāchakshhata etāmeva Devānaṁ vihitimānau.


Several scholars assert that Vairājya means a kingless state. But in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 1 a king consecrated with Indra's great unction is called Virat and worthy of Vairājya. When a king consecrated with the Punaraḥbhisheka ascends his Āsandī or throne, he prays for attaining Vairājya as well as other kinds of royal dignity. Sāyaṇa takes the word Vairājyaṁ to mean "itarebhyo bhupatibhyo vaiśishtyam." It is also stated in the Śukra-niti (B.K. Sarkar's translation, p. 24) that the Virat was a superior kind of monarch. In the Mahābhārata (XII. 43.11) Kṛṣṇa is called Samrāt, Virat, Svarat and Surāraṭ. Cf. XII., 68.54.

It is not easy to decide whether all the terms Śamrājya, Bhaujetya, Svarājya, Vairājya and Rājya referred to essentially different forms of royal authority in the Brāhmaṇic period. But two terms at least, namely, Samrājya and Rājya are clearly distinguished by the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 2 and also the Katyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.3

Rājā vai Rājasūyeneshtvas bhavati, Samrād Vājapeyenaḥvaramahi Rājyaṁ param Śamrājyaṁ kāmayeta vai Rājā Samrād bhavitum avarānhi rājyaṁ paramsamrājyaṁ.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 Vajapeya 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 Rājas 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 Cesar 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 Svarajya means uncontrolled dominion, and is opposed to Rāja.

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...
(cf. the Parikshitas and the kings of Janaka's line; cf. also the expression Daśapurushaṁraja— a 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 Yāska of the Kuru brothers Devāpi and Santanu. In the Saṁvarā Jātaka (No. 463) 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 Pādaṅjali Jātaka, No. 247, that when a certain king of Benares died, his son Pādaṅjali 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 Mahishī, the Parivṛiktī, the Vāvāṭā, and the Palāgali. The Mahishī was the chief wife, being the first one married according to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Parivṛiktī was the neglected wife, probably one that had no son. The Vāvāṭā is the favourite, while the Palāgali was, according to Weber, the daughter of the last of the court officials. In

1 Nirukta, II. 10. Ved. Ind. II. 211. 2 Vf. 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 Silavati was the chief (aggamahesi). The king of Benares according to the Dasaratha Jātaka, No. 461, had an equal number of wives. In the Suruchi Jātaka, No. 489, a king of 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 Brahmānic number of four queens.

The king was consecrated after his succession or election with an elaborate ritual which is described in several Brāhmaṇas, and for which the Mantras are given in the Samhitās. Those who aided in the consecration of the king were called Rājakartṛi or Rājakṛit, "kingmaker." In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the persons meant and specified are the Sūta (minstrel and chronicler or charioteer), and the Grāmaṇi, village chief. Prof. Rādha Kumud Mookerji observes: "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 Vajapeya, the Rājasūya, the Punarabhiseka and the Aindra Mahābhiseka.

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

1 The Fundamental Unity of India, p 83.
dignity, viz., Rājya, Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svārajya, Vairājya, Pārameshthya, Māhārājya, Ādhipatyā, Svāvasya and Ātishthatva. The object of Aindra Mahabhisekha is thus described:

"Sa ya ichchhedevamvit Kshatriyayam sarvā jitrajeyetāya sarvāṁ lokān vindetāyam sarvārgbham Rājāṁ Śraishthyamatishthāṁ paramatāṁ gachchheta Sāmrājyaṁ; Bhaujyaṁ; Svārajyaṁ; Vairājyaṁ; Pārameshthyaṁ; Rajyaṁ; Māhārājyaṁ Ādhipatyām ayāṁ samantaparyāyaṁ syat Sārvabhaumaḥ śārayusha āntāda parārdhāt Pri-thivyai Samudraparyantāya ekarāl iti tametena Aindrenā Mahābhishhekena kshatriyam śaipayitvaḥ bhishinched."

Ait. Br., VIII, 16.

The Vājapeya 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." 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."

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

1 Ait. Br. VII. 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. 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; or engages in a show fight with a Rājanya. 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 Ratninaḥ, were the chief members of the royal household and of the king’s civil and military service: viz.—

1. The Senāni (Commander of the army).
2. The Purohita (Chaplain of the king).
3. The Mahisht (Chief Queen).
4. The Šūta (Court Minstrel and Chronicler).
5. The Grāmānt (Village Headman).
6. The Kshattrī (Chamberlain).
7. The Saṁgrahitri (Treasurer).
8. The Bhāgadugha (Carver).
10. The Go-vikartana (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 Grihapati, Soma Vanaspati,
Brihaspati Vâk, Indra Jyesṭha, Rudra Paśupati, Mitra Satya and Varuṇa Dharmapati. The consecration water (Abhishechanīyā Āpah) was made up of seventeen kinds including the water of the Sarasvati, Sea-water, and water from a whirlpool, a pond, a well and dew. The sprinkling was performed by a Brāhmaṇa, a kinsman or brother of the king elect, a friendly Rajanya and a Vaiśya.

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

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 “Rajāṁ tvam Adhirājo bhaveha; Mahāntaṁ tvā mahāṁ Samrājam charshaṇānāṁ.”¹ The king was next required to get down from the throne and make obeisance to the Brāhmaṇas “Brahmaṇa eva tat Kshatram vaśa meti tad yatra vai Brahmanah kshatram vasameti tad rāṣṭram sampiddham tadvīravadā hāsmin vīro jāyate” (Ait. Br., VIII. 9). Here there is ample provision for the prevention of royal absolutism.

Janamejaya, the son of Parikṣhit, 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).

¹ Ait. Br. VIII. 7.
The following kings are said to have been consecrated with the Āindra Mahābhiseka: Janamejaya, Śāryāta, Śātānīka, Āmbāṣṭhya, Yudhāṃśrauṣṭi, Viśvakarma, Sudās, Marutta, Āṅga 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 Aṣvamedha. The Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra (XX. i. 1) says that a Sārvabhaumā Rāja may perform the Aṣvamedha. Among the kings and princes who performed the Aṣvamedha were Janamejaya, his brothers Bhīmasena, Ugrasena, and Śrutasena, and Para Āṭānāra, 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 Brihadāranyaka Upanishad Janaka says to Yājñavalkya "Soḥam Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi māṇḍāpi saha dāsyāyeti" (Brih. Up., IV. 4. 23). The king is called "Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati" and is further described as the devourer of the people—Viśāmattā (Ait. Br. VIII. 17). "Rājā ta ekāṃ mukham tena mukhana Viśoṭsī" (Kaush. Up., II. 6).

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

¹ Śatānīka defeated Dhūtarāṣṭra of Kūdī who, according to the Mahāgovinda Suttanta, was a contemporary of Satābhu of Kaliṅga and Brahmadatta of Asoka. As the Deccan kingdoms are not referred to in pre-Parikshita works, it is probable that Śatānīka and his contemporaries flourished after Parikshit. Āmbāṣṭhya and Yudhāṃśrauṣṭi were contemporaries of Parvata and Nārada who were very near in time to Nāgasott the contemporary of Nimi the penultimate king of Videha. Āṅga was probably the immediate predecessor of Dādhivāhana 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 Kautilya's Arthaśāstra (Ed. 1919, p. 11) that even a powerful king like Janamejāya was humbled by the Brāhmaṇas. The Vṛishnis perished on account of their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas. This shows that not only the kings, but the republican corporations (Saṅgha) too, had to cultivate friendly relations with the Brāhmaṇas.

The second check was supplied by the ministers and village headmen who aided in the consecration of the king and whom the king consulted regularly. In the Vedic texts the Sūta and the Grāmaṇi are styled Rājakaṛṭi or Rājakrīt, i.e., "King-maker" (Sat. Br., lit. 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 Maha assaroha 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 Magadhā, was holding an assembly of the eighty thousand Grāmikas he sent message to Sona Kolivisa." The Chulla-Sutasoma Jātaka also refers to the eighty thousand councillors of a
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 Pādañjali and Sonaka Jātakas.

Another check was supplied by the general body of the people (Janāḥ) who were distinct from the ministers and Grāmaṇis or Grāmikas, and who used to meet in an assembly styled Samiti or Parishad in the Upanishads. In the Utkroṣana passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 17) the people (Janāḥ) are clearly distinguished from the Rajākartaḥ among whom, according to the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18) were included the Sūta and the Grāmaṇi. That the Samiti or Parishad was an assembly of the Janāḥ, i.e., the whole people, is apparent from such expressions as “Pañcchālānāṁ Samitimeyāya,” “Pañcchālānāṁ Parishadamājagāma.” The Chhandogya Upanishad (V. 3. 1) mentions the Samiti of the Pañcchāla people presided over by king Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, “Śvetaketurāruṇeyayaḥ Pañcchālanāṁ Samitimeyāya; tamaḥ Pravāhaṇo Jaivaliruvācha.” The Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (VI. 2. 1) uses the term Parishad instead of Samiti “Śvetaketurbhārūṇeyayaḥ Pañcchālanāṁ 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
Paumāśayana had been expelled from the kingdom which had come to him through ten generations and the Śrīñjayas 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 Punarabhisheka. 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.

The people then will act, methinks, against your son and you.

The king replied:

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

The Padakusalamāṇava Jātaka (No. 432) tells a story how the town and 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 Sachchāmikira 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 Takshaśilā says that he has no power over the subjects of his kingdom. This is in striking contrast with the utterance of Janaka quoted above ("Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi," etc.). Evidently the royal power had declined appreciably, at least in the North-west, since the days of Janaka.
The more important attributes of kingship are referred to in the "Utkrośana" passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 17). The monarch is there described as "Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati," i.e., sovereign lord of all beings. "Viśamattā," i.e., devourer of the people, "Amitrāṇāṁ hanta," i.e., destroyer of enemies, "Bṛhmaṇāṇāṁ Goptā," i.e., protector of the Bṛhmaṇas, "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 Aśoka I cannot claim much originality. The subject has been treated by Professor Rhys Davids and Dr. Smith, and a flood of new light has been thrown on the history of particular dynasties by Professors Geiger, Bhandarkar, Rapson, Jayaswal 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 Śākala, 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 Śrenīka (called also Seṇiya Bimbisāra) son of Bhaṭṭiya. 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 Rājagṛiha, "the Giribbaja in Magadha."

The early Buddhist texts throw a flood of light on the political condition of India in the time of Bimbisāra. There were, as Prof. Rhys Davids observes, "besides a still surviving number of small aristocratic republics four kingdoms of considerable extent and power." In addition to these there were a number of smaller kingdoms, and some non-Aryan principalities. The most important amongst the republics were the Vajjians of Vaiśāli 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 Rāmagama, the Bhaggas of Sunsumāra Hill, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Kālāmas of Kesaputta, and the Moriyas of Pipphalivana.

¹ Twelve miles from Kusinārā (Cunningham, AGI, p. 434).
² Pipāśvā in the north of the Basti district; or Tilaṇa Kāṭ in the Tarti (Smith, EHI, p. 159).
The Śakyas, 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 Śākya and Koliya tribes had the river Rohintī 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 Śakyas had the custom of marrying their own sisters. In the Tirthajātrā section of the Vanaparva of the Mahābhārata (III. 81. 31) mention is made of a place called Kapilavata. It is not altogether improbable that we have here a Brāhmaṇical reference to the capital of the Śakyas.

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

Vatsabhūmiṁcha Kaunteyo vijigye balavān balāt.

Bhargānamadhipaṁchaiva Nīshādhipatiṁ tathā (MBh. II. 30. 10-11).

Pratardanasya putrau dvau Vatsa Bhargau babhu­vatuh (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 Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Ved. Ind., Vol. I, p. 186) and probably also in the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini (VI. 4, 165).

1 A tributary of the Rāpi (Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 96).
The Moriyas were undoubtedly the same clan which gave Magadha its greatest dynasty (cf. Geiger, Mahāvaṃsa, 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. 133; 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 Rudrāyaṇa (Divyavadāna, p. 543), Śūrasena ruled by Avantiputta, and Anga 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 Uvasagadasāṇo (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, Sāvatthī, Vesāli, Mithilā, Ālavī, Kosambhī, Ujjēnī, Takkasilā, Champa, Sāgala, Sumsumāragīra, Rājagaha, Kapilavatthu, Sāketa, Indapattā, Ukkaṭṭha, Pāṭaliputta, Jetuttara, Samkassa, and Kusinārā.

In the Uvasagadasāṇo 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 Čaudagotta, 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 Jiyasattu is given also to the rulers of Savatthī, Kampilla, Mithilā, Champā, Vāniyagāma Bārānasi and Polasapura (cf. Hoernle Uvāsagadasā, 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 Śākyya 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 Savatthī, 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 Ambatthā 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 Savatthi, and Vāsabha Khattiya born to a Śākya named Mahānāmān from a slave woman. He had a daughter called Vajrā or Vairi Kumārī (Majjhima, II, p. 110) and a son named Vidūḍabhā whose mother was Vāsabha Khattiya. Prince Vidūḍabhā at first appears to have served as his father’s Senapati or General. Afterwards he succeeded to the throne and perpetrated a ferocious massacre of the Śākyas.

Hoernle in the Uvāsagadāsāro (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 Sirivaddha. Another important official was Digha Čhāriyāna (Majjhima N. II, p. 118). He is probably identical with Dirgha Čhāriyana mentioned by Kautilya as an author of a treatise on kingly duties, and by Vatsyayana 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 Senuya Bimbisāra and the Visālikā Lichchhavī. But he was much troubled by robbers like Angulimalo. 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 Śatānīka Parantapa was succeeded by his son Udayana who is the hero of many Indian legends. The commentary of the Dhammapada gives the story of the way in which Vāsuladattā or Vāsavadattā, 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 Piṇḍola tortured by having a nest of ants tied to him. The Kathāsarat-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 Aṅga named Drīḍhavarman being restored by Udayana.

We have already referred to Vāsavadattā, the chief queen of Udayana. The Svapna-Vāsavacatta of Bhāsa mentions another queen named Padmāvatī who is represented as sister to king Darśaka of Magadha. Prof. Bhandarkar mentions a queen named Māgandiyā, and Rhys Davids refers to one named Sāmavati (Bud. Ind., p. 7). The Ratnāvalī tells the story of the love of the king of Vatsu and of Sāgarikā an attendant of his queen Vāsavadattā. Stories about Udayana were widely current in Avanti in the time of Kālidāsa (cf. Meghadūta, “prāpyāvantim Udayana kathā kovida grāmavrīddhān”). 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 Jivaka. He contracted matrimonial alliances with the ruling families of Kosala and Vaiśali. 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 Thūsā Jātaka (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) Pase-nadi 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 Chellana, daughter of Četaka of Vaiśāli, as the mother of Kūnika-Ajātaśatru. The Nikāyas call Ajātaśatru Vedehiputta. This seems to confirm the Jaina tradition because Vaiśāli 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 Āṭārā 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 Aṅga which he annexed after defeating Brahmadatta (JASE, 1914, p. 321). The annexation of Aṅga by Bimbisāra is proved by the evidence of the Mahāvagga (SBE, XVII, p. 1) and of the Somānda Sutta of the Digha Nikāya in which it is stated that the revenues of the town of Champā have been bestowed by King Bimbisāra on the Brāhmaṇa Somānda. We learn from Jaina Sources (Hemachandra, the author of the Sthāvirāvali; cf. also the Bhagavatī Sūtra, and the Nirayāvali Sūtra) that Aṅga was governed as a separate province under a Magadhan prince with Champā as its capital. Thus by war and policy Bimbisāra added Aṅga and a part of Kāśi to the Magadhan dominions, and launched Magadha in that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kāliṅga. 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.
**AJATAŚATRU**

Bimbisāra had many sons, namely, Kūnika-Ajātaśatru, Abbaya, Silavat, Vimala-Koṇḍañña, and Vehalla. Ajātaśatru seems to have acted as his father’s Viceroy at Champā (Bhagavati Sūtra, Nirayāvali Sūtra and the Parisiṣṭaparvan). He is said to have killed his father and seized the entire kingdom.

**II. KŪNIKA-ĀJATAŚATRU.**

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 Vaiśāli. 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, Vaddhaki-Sūkara, Kumā 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 Viśudhabha to the throne. The ex-king sent out for Rājagaha, resolved to take his nephew (Ajātaśatru) with him and capture Viśudhabha. But he died from exposure outside the gates of Rājagaha.
The traditional account of Ajātaśatru-Kūṇika's war with Vaiśālī is given by Jaina writers. King Senuya 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 Chellaṇā, the daughter of King Cheṭaka of Vaiśālī. His eldest son Kūṇiya (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 Cheṭaka in Vaiśālī, Kūṇiya having failed peacefully to obtain the extradition of the fugitive, commenced war with Cheṭaka (Uvāsagadasāṇo, II Appendix, p. 7). According to Buddhaghosha's commentary the Sūmaṅgala 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 Vaiśālī are described in the Mahāvagga and the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta. In the Mahāvagga it is related that Sunidha and Vassakāra, two ministers of Magadha, were building a fort at Pātaligāma in order to repel the Vajjīs. The Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta says "the Blessed One was once dwelling in Rājagaha on the hill called the Vulture's Peak. Now at that time Ajātaśatru Vedehiputta, the king of Magadha, was desirous of attacking the Vajjians; and he said to himself, 'I will root out these Vajjians, mighty and powerful though they be, I will destroy these Vajjians, I will bring these Vajjians to utter ruin.'

So he spake to the Brāhmaṇa Vassakāra, the prime minister of Magadha, and said Come now, Brāhmaṇa, do you go to the Blessed One, and ... tell him that 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 Nirayāvalī Śutra it is related that when Kūnika (Ajātasatru) prepared to attack Chetaka of Vaiśāli the latter called together the eighteen Gaṇarājas of Kāsi and Kosala, together with the Lichchhavis and Mallakis, and asked them whether they would satisfy Kūnika's demands, or go to war with him. The good relations subsisting between Kosala and Vaiśāli are referred to in the Majjhima Nikāya, Vol. II, p. 101. There is thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Jaina statement regarding the alliance between Kāsi-Kosala on the one hand and Vaiśāli on the other. It seems that all the enemies of Ajātasatru 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 Kūṇiya Ajātasatru 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 (Uvāsagadasāṇa, 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 Māṇḍkhaliputta. Sixteen years later at the time of Mahāvīra's death the anti-Magadhan confederacy was still in existence. We learn from the Kalpa Śutra that
on the death of Mahāvīra the confederate kings mentioned in the Nirayāvalī Sūtra instituted a festival to be held in memory of that event. The struggle between the Magadha king and the powers arrayed against him thus seems to have been protracted for more than sixteen years. The Atthakathā gives an account of the Machiavellian tactics adopted by 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. AJĀTAṢATRŪ'S SUCCESSORS.

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

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 Ajātāsatru. 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 rāja” (Beal, Si-yu-ki, II, p. 192). The name of the second Saṅghārāma was probably derived from that of Darśaka who is here represented as the last descendant of Bimbisāra.

Udayin: Before his accession to the throne Udayin or Udayībhadda, the son of Ajātāsatru, seems to have acted as his father’s Viceroy at Champā (Jacobi, Parisiśṭāparvan, p. 42). The Parisiśṭāparvan 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 Parisiśṭāparvan (pp. 45-46) refers to the king of Avanti as the enemy of Udayin. 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 Kathāsaritsāgara (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 Udayin. The issue was finally decided in the time of Siśunāga.

In the opinion of Mr. Jayaswal one of the famous "Patna Statues" in the Bharhut Gallery of the Indian Museum is a portrait of Udayin. According to him the statue bears the following words:

Bhage ACHO chhonidhise.

He identifies ACHO with king Aja mentioned in the Bhāgavata list of Saiśunāga kings, and with Udayin 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., Vaiśrāvana).1 Dr. Majumdar reads: Gate (Yakhe ?) Lechchhai (vi) 40, 4.

Udayin's successors according to the Purānas 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 Anguttara Nikāya

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

The Ceylonese chronicles state that all the kings from Ajatasatru to Naga-Dasaka were parricides. The people became angry, banished the dynasty and raised an amātya named Susu Naga (Śisunaga) 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 amātyas as provincial governors need not cause surprise. The custom was prevalent as late as the time of Gautamtputra Śatakarni.

The Purānic statement that Śisunaga 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 Śisunaga was the progenitor of Bimbisāra's family. It may be argued that as Śisunaga 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 Śisunaga, had to retransfer the royal residence from Rajagriha 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 Śisunaga "will make Girivraja his own abode." The inclusion of Benares within Śisunaga's dominions also proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajatasatru who were the first to establish Magadhan authority in Kāsi.
From a statement in the Mālālanākāravatthu, a Pāli work of modern date, but following very closely the more ancient books, it appears that Śiśunāga had a royal residence at Vaiśāli 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 Rājagriha lost her rank of royal city—from the time of Śiśunāga, proves that Śiśunāga came after the palmy days of Rājagriha, i.e., the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātašatru.

The most important achievement of Śiśunāga 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 (Avantivardhana?), and add that Śiśunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and be king. Mr. Jayaswal identifies Ajaka and Nandivardhana of the Avanti list with Aja-Udāyin and Nandivardhana of the Purānic list of Śaśunāga 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 Śiśunāga. Whether the Śaśunāga occupation of Avanti took place immediately after Pālaka, or two generations later, is immaterial.

Śiśunāga was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by his son Kākavarna, according to the Ceylonese chronicles by his son Kalāśoka. Professors Jacobi, Geiger and Bhandarkar suggest that Kalāśoka, “the black Aśoka” and Kākavarna, “the crow-coloured” are one and the same person. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence
of the Asokavadāna which places Kākavarnin after Muṇḍa, and does not mention Kālaśoka (Geiger, Mahāvaṃśa, 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 Pāṭaliputra. Bāṇa in his Harshacharita (edited by Kāsināṭh Pāṇḍuraṅg Parab, p. 223) gives a curious legend concerning the death of Kākavarna (Kālaśoka). It is stated there that Kākavarna Śaiśunāgi 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 Mahābodhiśāstra were Bhadrasena, Koraṇḍavarṇa, Mangura, Sarvaṇjaha, Jalika, Ubbaka, Saṅjaya, Koravya, Nandivardhana and Pañcharama. Prof. Bhandarkar suggests that Nandivardhana of the Mahābodhiśāstra 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 Vata Naṃdi.

He regards Vata Naṃdi as an abbreviation of Vartivardhana (the name of Nandivardhana in the Vāyu list) and Nandivardhana. Mr. R. D. Banerji in the June number of the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, 1919, says that there cannot be two opinions about the reading Vata Naṃdi. 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 (?) ṛvata naṃdi.
Dr. Majumdar says that the inscription may be read as follows:—

Yakhe sam Vajinām 70.

He places the inscription in the second century A.D., and supports the Yaksha theory propounded by Cunningham and upheld by Prof. Chanda. He does not agree with those scholars who conclude that the statue is a portrait of a Śaisunāga sovereign simply because there are some letters in the inscription under discussion which may be construed as a name of a Śaisunāga. Referring to Mr. Jayaswal’s suggestion that the form Vaṭa Naṁdi is composed of two variant proper names (Vartivar dhana and Nāṁdivar dhana) 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 Vigraha-Śura?

Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprāśīd Śāstrī takes Vaṭa Naṁdi to mean Vṛatya Naṁdi and says that the statue has most of the articles of dress as given by Katyāyana to the Vṛatya Kshatriya. In the Purāṇas the Śisunāga kings are mentioned as Kshattrabandhus, i.e., Vṛatya Kshatriyas. The Mahāmahopādhyāya thus inclines to the view of Mr. Jayaswal that the statue in question is a portrait of a Śaisunāga king.

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 Vardhanaś chaiva nagare Nandivardhane.” Dr. Barnett is also not satisfied that the four syllables which may be read as Vaṭa Naṁdi mention the name of a Śaisunāga king. Dr. Smith however in the third edition of his “Asoka” admits the possibility...
of Mr. Jayaswal's contention. We regard the problem as still unsolved. The data at our disposal are too scanty to warrant the conclusion that the inscription on the Patna statue mentions a 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 Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela king of Kaliṅga. One of the passages containing the name of Nandarāja runs thus:—

Pamchame cha dāni vase Na (ṁ) da-rāja-tivasasata-o (ghā?) titam Tanasuliyavāṭa panādiṁ 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-Sagara, 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 Mahābodhiśāmasa 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 Magadhā 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 Naññadāraja of the Hathigumpha inscription who held possession of Kalinga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons.

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

IV. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIMBISĀRA-ŚĪṢUNĀGA GROUP.

There is considerable disagreement between the Purāṇas and the Ceylonese Chronicles regarding the chronology of the kings of the Bimbisārian (or Nāga) and Śaisunāga 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 Bimbisāra ruled for fifty-two years, Ajātaśatru for 32 years, Udaya for 16 years, Anuruddha and Mūnda for 8 years, Nāgadāsaka 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 Bimbisāra. Fleet and Geiger adduce good grounds for believing that the Parinirvāna really took place in 483 B. C. (JRAS, 1909, pp. 1-34; Geiger, Mahāvamsa, p. xxviii). Adding 60 to 483 B. C. we get the year 543 B. C. as the date of the accession of Bimbisāra. In the time of Bimbisāra Gandhāra was an independent kingdom ruled by a king named Pukkusāti. By B. C. 516 Gandhāra had lost its independence and had become subject to Persia, as we know from the Behistun
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inscription of Darius. It is thus clear that Pukkusâti and his contemporary Bimbisâra 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 Nirvâna 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 Nirvâna era was reckoned from 483 B. C. There can thus be no doubt that the era of 483 B. C. was the real Nirvâna 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 Bimbisâra, and was at first current in Magadha. Later on it travelled to distant lands including Ceylon and was confounded with the Nirvâna era of 483 B. C. Then the real Nirvâna era fell into disuse, and the era of 544 B. C. came to occupy its place.

V. THE NANDAS.

We have seen that the Śaśunâga dynasty was supplanted by the line of Nanda. The name of the first Nanda was Mahâpadma according to the Purânas, and Ugrasena according to the Mahâbodhivamsa. The Purânas describe him as Sudragarbhodbhava, i.e., born of a Śudra mother. The Jaina Parisishthaparvan (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 (McCridle, 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 Kālaśoka-Kākavarṇa who had a tragic end as we know from the Harshacharita. Kākavarṇa 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 Kālaśoka-Kākavarṇa. The Greek account of the rise of the family of Agrammes fits in well with the Ceylonese account of the end of the 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 Śudra 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 Mahābodhīvaṃsa. 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, Haihayas, Kaliṅgas, Aṣmakaś, 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
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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 Ayodhya. Several Mysore inscriptions state that Kuntala, a province which included the southern part of the Bombay Presidency and the north of Mysore, was ruled by the Nandas (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 Kharavela 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 Kharavela'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 (Ashtaṣṭiti) is probably a mistake for 28 (Ashtavimsati), 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., Sukalpa. The Mahābodhivamsa gives the following names, Panduka, Pandugati, Bhūtapāla,
Rāṣṭrapāla, Goviṣhāṇaka, Daśasiddhaka, Kaivarta and Dhana. The last king is called by the classical writers Agrāmmes or Xandrames. Agrāmmes 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 Agrāmmes 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 Kathāsārīt-sāgarasays (Tawney's Translation, Vol. I, p. 21) that king Nanda possessed 990 millions of gold pieces.

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

Nandopakramāni mānāni.

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

We learn from Kautilya's Arthasastra, Kamandaka's Nitisāra, the Purāṇas, and the Mudrārākshasa 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
Kauṭīlyo vai dvir ashtabhīḥ
Kauṭīlyāś Chandraguptaṁ tu
Tato rājye' bhishekṣyati.

Mr. Jayaswal (Ind. Ant., 1914, p. 124) proposes to read Virashtrābhīḥ instead of dvirāṣṭabhīḥ. Virashtrās he takes to mean the Āraṭṭas, and adds that Kauṭīlyā 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 battlefield." 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 Achaemenian 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 Kabul 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 Astacenians (Aśvātakas, ? Mbh. VI. 51) and the Assacenians (Aśmakas), Indian tribes. These were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes, and finally they submitted to the Persians, and paid tribute to Cyrus the son of Cambyses as ruler of their land.” Strabo tells us that on one occasion the Persians summoned the Hydraces (the Kshudrakas) from India (i.e., the Pañjāb) to attend them as mercenaries.
In the Behistun inscription\(^1\) 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.\(^1\) 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 Caspaturus 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 Phœncians, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented the sea.”

Herodotus tells us that “India” constituted the twentieth and the most populous satrapy of the Persian Empire, and that it paid a tribute proportionately larger than all the rest, 360 talents of gold dust. 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 Achaemenian Inscriptions by H. C. Tolman.
east by the desert of Rājaputāna. "That part of India towards the rising sun is all sand; for of the people with whom we are acquainted, the Indians live the furthest towards the east and the sunrise, of all the inhabitants of Asia, for the Indians' country towards the east is a desert by reason of the sands."

Khshayārsha or Xerxes (486-464 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." 1 The hold of the Achaemenians 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 Kabul river. The chieftain of the Aspasians dwelt in a city on or near the river Euaspla, supposed to be identical with the Kunár, a tributary of the Kabul. Other Aspasian cities were Andaca and Arigaeum.

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 Panini (IV. 1. 173). They are placed in the north-west by the authors of the Markandeya Purāṇa and the Brihat Samhitā. A branch of this people probably settled in the Deccan, and gave their name to the Assaka Mahajana-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 Aphrikes by Diodoros.

4. Peukelaotis:

   It lay on the road from Kabul to the Indus. Arrian tells us (Chinnock's Edition, p. 403) that the Kabul 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 Pushkaravatt. 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 Suvāstu 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 Takshaśila:

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.
2 Mr'Crindle, Invasion of Alexander, p. 79; Hamilton and Falconer, Strabo, Vol. III, p. 76.
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 Āmabhī) succeeded to the government. Curiously enough Kautilya, the famous minister, refers to a school of political philosophers called Āmabhīyas, and Dr. F. W. Thomas connects them with Taxila (Bārhaspatya Arthāśāstra, 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 Dārvābhiṣāra (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 150 elephants. He was in alliance with Embisaros, i.e., the king of Abhisāra.

Poros probably represents the Sanskrit Puru or Paurava. In the Rig Veda the Pūrus are expressly mentioned as on the Sarasvati. In the time of Alexander we find them on the Hydaspes (Jihlam). The Mahābhārata also refers to a “Puram Paurava-rakshitam” which lay not far from Kaśmīra (Sabha, 27, 15-17).

It is suggested in the Vedic Index (Vol. II, pp. 12-13) that either the Hydaspes was the earlier home of the Pūrus, where some remained after the others had wandered east, or the later Pūrus represent a successful onslaught upon the west from the east.

10. The country of the people called Glauganicrians 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 monarchs, 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 Sāṅgala. 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 Gaṇapāṭha (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 Viṣāṇins 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 Śibis. (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 Śivis ruled by king Uśīnara, which lay not far from the Yamunā. It is not altogether improbable that
the Usinara country (vide pp. 27, 28 ante) was at one time the home of the Sivis. We find them also in Madhyamika in Rajaputana (Carm. Lec. 1913, p. 173).

17. The Agalassoi:
They lived near the Siboi.

18. The Sudracae 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 (Ravi), on both banks of the river. Their name represents the Sanskrit Malava. Weber informs us that Apišali, one of the teachers cited by Pāṇini, speaks of the formation of the compound—"Kshaudraka-Malava." 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 Sudracae 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 Malavas as living by the profession of arms (Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 200). In later times the Malavas are found in Rajaputana, Avanti and the Mahi valley.

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

Kaśmira-Hūn-Āmbashṭha-Sindhavah.

In the Ambaṭṭha Sutta (Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, p. 109) an Ambaṭṭha is called a Brāhmaṇa. In the Smṛiti literature, on the other hand, Ambaśṭha denotes a man of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Vaiśya parentage. According to Jātaka IV. 363 the Ambaṭṭhas were farmers. It seems that the Ambaśṭhas 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 (Ambaśṭhanām chikitsitam, Manu, X. 47).

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

From the account left by Arrian it appears that the “Brachmans,” i.e., the Brāhmaṇas exercised considerable influence in the country. They were the instigators of a revolt against the Macedonian invader (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 319).

24. The principality of Oxykanos:

Curtius calls the subjects of Oxykanos the Praesti (Proshthas? Mbh. VI. 9.61). Oxykanos himself is called both by Strabo and Diodoros Portikanos. Cunningham places his territory to the west of the Indus in the level country around Larkhāna (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 Taual (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 Mousikanas 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 Uttarapatha. 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 Seythians and Dahae served in the Macedonian army (Inv. Alex., p. 208). The expedition led by Alexander was thus a combined Šaka-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-Ajatāšatru. On the contrary he obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Āmbhi of Taxila, Sangaes (Sañjaya?) of Pushkaravatī, Kophaios or Cophaeus, Assagetes (Aśvajit?), Sisikottos (Saśigupta)
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 Malavas (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 Aspasiants, the Assakenians, the elder Poros, the Kathaians, the Malloi, the Oxydrakai, and the Brâhmanas 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 Gangaridæ 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 Praisai" 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 Parapanisadae, 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 Sogdai, and Massanoi, who occupied the banks of the Indus (Inv. Alex., pp. 293, 354).

Asoka 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 Erythrean Sea (Schoff's Ed., p. 41). One of the Alexandrias (Alasanda) is mentioned in the Mahāvaṃsa (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 Chandragupta 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 Madhyadeśa. 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 Parisishṭa-parvan (p. 56) represents him as the son of a daughter of the chief of the village of Mayuraposhaka. The Mahāvaṁsa (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 Mūrdhābhīshikta. 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 Morigyas 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 Rāṇā Sangrāma Sinha who invited Bābar to put an end to the rule of Ibrahim 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
Milinda Panha, the Puranas, the Mudrarakshasa and the Jaina Parisishtaparvan. The Milinda Panha (SBE, Vol. XXXVI, p. 147) tells us that the Nanda army was commanded by Bhaddasala. The Nanda troops were evidently defeated with great slaughter, an exaggerated account of which is preserved in the Milinda Panha.

"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 Pañjab 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 Māmulaṇār, 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 Parāṇar or Pāram Kēṟanēr and Kallil Āṭṭiraivanēr. The advanced party of the invasion was composed of a warlike people called Kośar (Kośalas?). The invaders advanced from the Konkan passing the hills Eliilmalai, 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
Nāgakhaṅḍa 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, Māmulaṇār, and the Mysore inscriptions referred to by Rice, are read together they seem to suggest that the first Magyāya did conquer a considerable portion of trans-Vindhyān 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 Surāṣṭra in Western India. The Jūnāγadhi Rock Inscription of the Mahā-khaṭrāpa Rudradāman refers to his Rāṣṭrīya, 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. & E., 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 Aśoka (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 Paropanisadae, i.e., Herat, Kandahar, Makran and Kabul. The inclusion of the Kabul valley within the Maurya Empire is proved by the inscriptions of Aśoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, which speak of the Yonas and Gandhāras as vassals of the Empire.
Megasthenes.

We learn from the classical writers that after the war the Syrian and Indian emperors lived on friendly terms. Athenaios tells us that Chandragupta sent presents including certain powerful aphrodisiacs to the Syrian monarch (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 Pātaliputra 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 Pātaliputra 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 670 towers and 64 gates.”
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There were many other cities in the empire besides Pātaliputra. 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.

Elian 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, EII, p. 123) that the king usually remained within the palace under the protection of female guards (cf. Str. Gaṇapair 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, Aśoka, confirm in many respects the particulars of the organisation

1 McRindle, 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 (Shāmasastry'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 "dharmapravartaka," 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 Rājatva (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 (Sarvopadhā suddhān Mantrinaḥ kuryat, Arthasastra, p. 17). They were given the highest salary, viz., 48,000 pānas 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 Mantrinaḥ.
In addition to the Mantrins there was the Mantri-parishad or Assembly of Imperial Councillors. The existence of the Parishad as an important element of the Maurya constitution is proved not only by the Arthasastra but by the third and sixth Rock Edicts of Asoka. The members of the Mantri-parishad were not identical with the Mantrins. In several passages of Kautilya's Arthasastra the Mantrins are sharply distinguished from the Mantri-parishad (cf. pp. 20, 29, 247). The latter evidently occupied an inferior position. Their salary was only 12,000 pānas 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 Ātīyika kārya, i.e., works of emergency had to be transacted. The king was to be guided by the decision of the majority (Bhūyishṭaḥ). They also attended the king at the time of the reception of envoys (p. 45). From the passage "Mantri-parishadāṁ dvādaśāmātyaḥ kurvita" it appears that the Parishad used to be recruited from all kinds of Amātyas (not necessarily from Mantrins). From Kautilya's denunciation of a king with a "Kshudraparishad" (p. 259), his rejection of the views of the Mānavas, Bārhaspatyas and the Ausanasas, 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 Mantri-parishad, there was another class of Amātyas who filled the great administrative and judicial appointments. Kautilya says (p. 17) that the "dharmopadhāsuddha" Amātyas should be employed in civil and criminal courts; the "arthopadhāsuddha" Amātyas should be employed as Samahartṛi and Sannidhāṭrī, the "kāmopadhāsuddha" Amātyas should be
appointed to superintend the pleasure grounds, the "bhayopadhasuddha" 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 Nīrishtārthāśa (ministers plenipotentiary), Lekhakas or Ministers of Correspondence, and Adhyakshas or Superintendents.

The statements of Kautilya 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."

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 Dhānāya Vyāvahārika Kārmāntika Balādhyakshāḥ). Dr. Smith remarks (EHI., 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 "Bahumukhyaṁ anityāṁ chādhikaraṇapāṁ sthāpayet" each department shall be officered by several temporary heads; "Adhyakshāḥ Saṁkhyāyāka Lekhaka Rūpadārāsaka Nīvārīghakottarādhyakshasakhāṁ karmāṇi kuryaḥ." 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. Vīkhyā Karmāṇi 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—Hastyāvarathapādātamanacakauṁkhyamavartasthāpayet, 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 Nāvadhyaksha and Go'adhyaksha of the Arthasastra.

The central popular assemblies like those that existed among the Lichchhavis, Mallas, Śakyas 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 Asoka there were at least five, viz.:

1. Uttarāpatha ... capital, Taxila
2. Avanti ... Ujjayini
3. Dakshināpatha ... Suvargātī (?)
4. Kaliṅga ... Tosali
5. Prāchya (Prasii) ... Pātaliputra

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 Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (p. 247) that the salary of a Kumāra was 12,000 paṇas per annum.
The Home Provinces, i.e., Prāchya and the Madhyadeśa, 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 (Chinmoy, 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 Aśoka. That Surāśṭra was also autonomous in the time of Aśoka seems probable from Rudracāman’s inscription at Junāgadh which refers to its Rājā, the Yavana Tushāśpa, the contemporary and vassal of Aśoka. The Yavanarājā was probably a Greek chief of the North-West who was appointed supervisor of the Surāśṭra Saṅgha by Aśoka, 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 Aśoka remind us of the relationship subsisting between the Rājā of the Śākya state and Pasenadi. In the time of the first Maurya Surāśṭra had an officer named Pushyagupta, the Vaiśya, who is described as a Rāṣṭriya of Chandragupta. In the Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part I, p. 13, the word Rāṣṭriya 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. Rāṣṭriya 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 Aśoka mention any class of officials called Rāṣṭriya. It is, however, probable that
the Rāśṭriyas were identical with the Rāśtrapālas 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 Ephori or Inspectors. "They are," says he, "intrusted with the superintendence of all that is going on, and it is their duty to report privately to the king...The best and the most faithful persons are appointed to the office of Inspector" (H. & F. Strabo, III, p. 103). The overseers of Arrian and the Inspectors of Strabo probably correspond either to the Pradeshtris or the Chāras of the Arthasastra. Dr. Thomas derives the word Pradeshtri from Pradeśa which means "report" (JRAŚ., 1915, p. 97) by the rule of Pāṇini, II. 2. 15 (Trijakābhyām kārtari).

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, Vaidehaka and Tāpasa, *i.e.*, fraudulent disciples, recluses, householders, merchants and ascetics.

2. Sañchārāḥ including Satri, Tikṣhaṇa and Rashada, *i.e.*, class-mates, firebrands, and poisoners, and certain women described as Bhikshukis, Parivrājikas, Mūndas and Vṛshalls. It is to the last class, *viz.*, the Vṛshalls that Strabo evidently refers. We have explicit references
to courtesan (Pumschalli, veṣya, rūpājīvā) spies on pp. 221, 249, 316 of the Arthasastra.

Village Administration.

The administration of villages was carried on by the Grāmikas (Arthasastra, pp. 157, 172) who were, no doubt, assisted by the Grāmavṛidhas (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 Arthasastra 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 Grāmabhṛitaka (pp. 175, 248). Above the Grāmika were the Gopa, who looked after 5 or 10 villages, and the Sthānīka who controlled one quarter of a janapada or district. The work of these officers was supervised by the Samāhātri (p. 142) with the help of the Pradeshtris.

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 Parisishtaparvan 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 Indrā (JRAS., 1909, p. 24). From Aśoka's Rock Edict VIII (Kālši Text) it appears that Bindusāra, as well as other predecessors of Aśoka, used the style Devānampiya.

If Hemachandra and Tāranātha are to be believed, Kautilya or Chanakya continued to serve as minister for some time after the accession of Bindusāra (Jacobi, Parisishṭaparvan, p. 62; Ind. Ant., 1875, p. 364). “Chanaka,” 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 Surāshṭra to Bengal (Gangaridæ), 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 Mahāmātras the Emperor says:

"All men are my children; and, just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same for all men. You, however, do not grasp this truth to its full extent. Some individual, per­chance, pays heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well established. Again, it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture, and when the result is his imprisonment without due cause, many other people are 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 over­pass 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 Antiochos, king of Syria, and Bindusāra which indicates that the Indian monarch communicated with his Hellenistic contemporaries on terms of equality and friendliness. We are told that Amitrochates (Bindusāra) the king of the Indians, wrote to Antiochos asking that king to buy and send him sweet wine, dried figs, and a sophist, and Antiochos replied: we shall send you the figs and the wine, but in Greece the laws forbid a sophist to be sold (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 Dharma-mahāmātras are described, that Aśoka had many brothers and sisters. The Divyāvadāna mentions two of these brothers, namely, Susima and Vigataśoka. The Ceylonese Chronicles seem also to refer to these two princes though under different names, calling the former Sumana and the latter Tishya. Susima-Sumana is said to have been the eldest son of Bindusāra and a step-brother of Aśoka, while Vigataśoka-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 Rādhaṅgupta whom he made his Agrāmātya (Chief Minister). Dr. Smith observes (The Oxford History of India, p. 93), “the fact that his formal consecration or coronation (abhiseka) 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 abhiseka 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 Asoka slew many of his brothers as silly because Asoka 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 bhātinām) 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 Asoka’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, Kālṣi Text) Asoka assumed the title of Devānampiya. He generally described himself as Devānampiya Piyadasi. The name Asoka is found only in literature, and in two ancient inscriptions, viz., the Māski Edict of Asoka himself, and the Junāgadh inscription of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman. The name Dharmāsoka is found in one Mediaeval epigraph, viz., the Sārnath inscription of Kumārādevi (Dharmāsokanārādhipasya samaye Śrī Dharmachakro Jīno yādrik tannaya rakṣitaḥ punaray-aṅchakre tatopyadbhubam).

During the first thirteen years of his reign Asoka 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 Divyavadana credits him with the suppression of a revolt of Taxila. In the thirteenth year of his reign (eight years after consecration) he effected the conquest of Kalinga. We do not know the exact limits of this kingdom in the time of Aśoka. But if the Sanskrit epics and Purāṇas are to be believed, it extended to the river Vaitarani in the north (Mbh. III. 114. 4), the Amarakantaka Hills in the west (Kūrma Purāṇa II. 39. 9) and Mahendragiri in the south (Raghuvarmśa IV. 38-43; VI. 53-54).

An account of the Kalinga war and its effects is given in Rock Edict XIII. We have already seen that Kaliṅga formed a part of the Magadhan dominions in the time of the Nandās. Why was it necessary for Aśoka to reconquer it? The question admits of only one answer, viz., that Kaliṅga severed its connection with Magadha after the fall of the Nandās. If the story of a general revolt in the time of Bindusāra be correct then it is not unlikely that Kaliṅga, like Taxila threw off the allegiance of Magadha during the reign of Bindusāra. It appears, however, from Pliny who probably based his account on the Indica of Megasthenes, that Kaliṅga was already an independent kingdom in the time of Chandragupta. In that case there can be no question of a revolt in the time of Bindusāra. Pliny says (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 Kaliṅga kings probably increased their army considerably during the period which elapsed from the time of Megasthenes to that of Aśoka, because during the war with Aśoka the casualties exceeded 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 Kaliṅga meant, in the time of Khāravela.

We learn from the thirteenth Rock Edict that Asoka made war on the Kaliṅga 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 Gaṅjam). They are addressed to the Mahāmātras 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 Kaliṅga 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 Pātaliputra, Khalatikapavata, Kosambi, Lumbminigama, Kalinga (including Tosali and Samapā), Suvarṇagiri, Ujjayint 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 Mahāvaṁsa 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, Mahāvaṁsa, p. 194). Kamboja, as we have already seen, corresponds to Rajapura or Rajaur near Punch in Kaśmir. 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. Kalinga Edict; Divyavādanā, p. 407, Rājno'sokasyottarāpathe Takshaśilā nagaraṁ, etc). The capital of the vassal state of Gandhāra was apparently Pushkarāvati (cf. Carm. Lec., 1918, p. 54).

The inclusion of Kaśmir within Asoka's empire is proved by the testimony of Hiuen Tsang's Records (Watters, Vol. I, pp. 267-271) and Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgint (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 Jina, covered Suskaletra and Vitastatra with numerous Stupas. At the town of Vitastatra there stood within the precincts of the Dharmāraṇya Vihaṇa a Chaitya built by him, the height of which could not be reached by the eye. That illustrious king built the town of Śrinagari. This sinless prince after removing the old stuccoed enclosure of
the shrine of Vijayesvara built in its stead a new one of stone. He...erected within the enclosure of Vijayesaha, 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 Chhavillakara.

The inscriptions on the Rummindel and the Niglīva pillars prove the inclusion of the Tarāī within the limits of Aśoka's Empire, while the monuments at Lalitapatan 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 Nabhapamātis of Nabhaka (Na-pei-kea of FaHien, 64).

According to Bühler the Rock Edict XIII mentions two vassal tribes Viśa 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 Shahbazgarhi and Mānsahra texts read Vishavajri. Kautilya in his Arthasastra (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, Vaiśali. 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 Visbas 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 Divyavādāna (cf. Smith’s Aśoka, 3rd ed., p. 255) and of Hiu'en Tsang who saw Stūpas of that monarch near Tamraliptī and Karṇasuvārṇa (in West Bengal), in Samatata (East Bengal) as well as in Puṇḍravardhana (North Bengal). Kāmarūpa (Assam) seems to have lain outside the empire. The Chinese pilgrim saw no monument of Aśoka in that country.

We have seen that in the south the Maurya power, at one time, had 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 Aṅguttara Nikāya
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(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 Andarae (Andhras) possessed numerous villages, thirty towns defended by walls and towers, and supplied their king with an army of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants (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.


Pulindā Vindhya Mulikā Vaidarbha Daṇḍakaiḥ saha (Vāyu, 55, 126).

Their capital Pulindanagara lay not far from Bhilsā.

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

In the west Aśoka's Empire extended to the Arabian Sea and included Aparānta (Śūrparaka, Nāṣik, etc., according to Mārkaṇḍeya P. 57. 49-52) and the vassal state of Surāṣṭra which was governed by the Yavanarāja Tushāshphā. 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 Ushhavadata (Rishabhadatta) and the Kūṣhān 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 Tushāshpha 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 Arthaśāstra. The inscriptions prove that Asoka retained also the system of Provincial Government existing under his forefathers. Tosali, Suvarṇagiri, Ujjain, 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 Rājukas.
3. The Pradesikas or Prādesikas.
4. The Yutas (the Yuktas of the Arthaśāstra, pp. 59, 63, 189, Rāmāyana, VI, 127.34; Manu, VIII, 34).
5. Pulisā.
6. Pativedakā.
7. Vachabhumikā.

There was a body of Mahāmatras in each great city and district (āhala) of the empire. The inscriptions mention the Mahāmatras of Kauśāmbī, Tosali, Samāpā, Suvarṇagiri and Isila. In the Kalinga Edicts we have certain Mahāmatras distinguished by the term Nagala Viyohālakā. The Nagala Viyohālakā of the Edicts correspond to the Pauravyāvahārikas of the Arthaśāstra.
EARLY YEARS OF AŚOKA

(p. 20) and no doubt administered justice in cities.\(^1\) In Pillar Edict I mention is made of the Anāta Mahāmatras or the Wardens of the Marches, who correspond to the Antapālas of the Arthasastra (pp. 20, 247) 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 Mahāmatras 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 (Asoka 3rd, p. 94). Bühlé 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 (Daṇḍa) 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 F., 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 Rajjugahaka Amachchas. The Arthasastra (p. 234) refers to a class of officials called “Chora Rajjukas,” but there is no reference to the Rajjukas proper, although on p. 60 “Rajju” is mentioned in conjunction with “Chora Rajju.”

As regards the Pradesikas or Pradesikas, 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 Rajukas and the Yutas in the ordinance of the Anusaṇyāna. Thomas derives the word from pradesa which means report (JRAS, 1915, p. 97; Arthasastra, p. 111) by the rule of Pañini tṛjākābhyāṁkarta (II. 2.15) and identifies the Pradesikas or Pradesikas of the Edict with the Pradeshtris of the Arthasastra. The most important functions of the Pradeshtris were Balipragraha (collection of taxes, or suppression of recalcitrant chiefs), Kaṇṭakaśodhana (administration of criminal justice), Choramārgaṇa (tracking of thieves) and Adhyakṣhāṇam adhyakṣaṇam cha niyamanam (checking superintendents and their men). They acted as intermediaries between the Samāhaṭri on the one hand, and the Gopas, Stāṇikas and Adhyakshas on the other (cf. Arthasastra, pp. 142, 200, 217, 222).

As to the Yutas or Yuktas they are represented by Manu (VIII.34) as the custodians of Prāṇashtādhigata dravya (lost property which was recovered). In the Arthasastra, too, they are mentioned in connection with Samudaya or state funds which they are represented as misappropriating. The Pulisā are apparently identical with the Purushas or Rāja Purushas of the Arthasastra (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. AŠOKA 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 Ašoka 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 Kautilya 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 Ašoka 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 Maṇkhali-putta.
3. The Nirgranthas or Jainas, i.e., the followers of Nigantha Nātaputta who is commonly called Mahāvira or Vardhamāna.
4. The followers of Gautama Buddha Śākyamuni.

In Edict IV we have the following account of the prevailing state of society: “for a long period past, even for many hundred years, have increased the sacrificial
slaughter of living creatures, the killing of animate beings, unseemly behaviour to relatives, unseemly behaviour to Brāhmaṇas and ascetics (Śramaṇas)." The kings used to go out on so-called Vihāra-yātrās (tours of pleasure, cf. Māhābhārata, XV. 1,18,1 Kautilya, p. 332), in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised (R. Edict VIII). The people performed various ceremonies (maṅgala) on occasions of sickness, weddings of sons, the weddings of daughters, the birth of children, and departure on journeys. The womankind performed many, manifold, trivial and worthless ceremonies (R. Edict IX).

The Change of Asoka's Religion.

Asoka himself was at first a Deva-worshipper. He had no scruple about the slaughter of men and animals; "formerly, in the kitchen of His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King each day many hundred thousands of living creatures were slaughtered to make curries." The hecatomb of the Kalinga 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 Kalingas had been annexed began His Sacred Majesty's zealous protection of the Law of Piety (dharmapalanam), his love of that Law (dhramakamata), and his inculcation of that Law (dhramanuṣati)."

Although Asoka 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 Devaṇāmīpiya. He

1 Vihāra-yātrān punah Kurur̄jyo Yudhiṣṭhirabh
Sarvān kāmān mahātejāḥ pradad Āravibikāsute.
2 For "Mangala" see also Jātakas No. 87, and No. 163 (Hatthimaṅgala).
3 For Ārāba 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 reprobated Ātmapāsāṇḍa-pujā when coupled with Para-pāsāṇḍa-garabā. That he was sincere in his professions is proved by the Barābar Cave Dedications to the Ājivika monks. His hostility was chiefly directed, not towards the Devas and the Brāhmaṇas, but to the killing of men in war and Śamājas, 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 (Arītā avijītā) 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 vijayāṁ 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
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Kalinga war the history of India was the history of the expansion of Magadha from a tiny state in South Bihar to a gigantic Empire extending from the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil country. After the Kalinga war ensued a period of stagnation at the end of which the process is reversed. The empire gradually dwindled down in extent till it sank to the position from which Bimbisāra and his successors had raised it.

True to his principle Aśoka made no attempt to annex the frontier (Prachāṁta) kingdoms, viz., Chola, Päṇḍya, Satiyaputra, Keralaputra, Tambaparni (Ceylon) and the realm of Amṭiyako Yonarája. On the contrary he maintained friendly relations with them.

The Chola country was drained by the river Káverī and comprised the districts of Trichinopoli and Tanjore. We learn from a South Indian inscription (Hultzsch, SIT, 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 Káverī”? When Pulakesin II strove to conquer the Cholas “the Káverī had her current obstructed by the causeway formed by his elephants.” The Chola capital was Uraiyü (Sanskrit Uragapura?) or Old Trichinopoly.

The Päṇḍya country corresponded to the Madurā and Tinnevally districts and had its capital at Madurā (Dakshiṇa Mathurā). The rivers Kṛitamālā or Vaigai and Tāmraparṇi flowed through it. Kātyāyana derives Päṇḍya 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 Pandououoi in the Pañjab. 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
capital (Madurā) was identical with the famous city of Mathurā 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 Kaṁchipura. But Prof. K. Aiyangar points out that the term Satyavratakshetra is applied to the town Kaṁchip or a part of it, not to the country dependent upon it. There is besides the point whether vṛata could become pūta. 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 (Āsoka, Third Ed., p. 161) Satiyaputra is represented by the Satyamangalam Taluk of Coimbatore.

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

Ceylon was known in ancient times as Pārasamudra (Greek Palaeisimundu, see Ray Chaudhuri, Ind. Ant., 1919, pp. 195-961) as well as Tāmraparṇī (Greek Taprobane). Tāmraparṇī, 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 “a Tāmraparṇī” which according to him indicates that the river is meant not the island. Now, in Edict II the phrase “a Tāmbapamī” comes after Ketalaputo and not after Pādā. 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 Devānāṃpiya 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); Antigonos Gonatas, king of Macedonia (B.C. 277-239); and Alexander who ruled over Epirus according to Dr. Smith. Beloch and Hultzsch, however suggested (JRAS, 1914, pp. 943 ff.) that Alkasudara 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 (Turamayo). Antigonus (Amitkina), Magas (Maga or Maka), and Alexander (Alikasudaro)—(likewise) in the south, the Cholas and Pandyas as far as Tambapañini... 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 Suvañabhūmi (Pégu and Moulemein according to Dr. Smith). The Ceylonese mission was headed by prince Mahendra. No reference to Suvañabhūmi occurs in the Edicts hitherto discovered.

The Change in Internal Policy.

The effects of Asoka'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 (ārambhā) of living creatures.
2. Violence (vihīṁsa) to animate beings.
3. Unseemly behaviour (asampratipati) to kinsmen (jñāti).
4. Unseemly behaviour to Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas.
5. Maladministration in the Provinces.

According to Rock Edict I, Asoka 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 Samajas. 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 Virata parva of the Mahābhārata.

Ye cha kechin niyotsyanti Samajeshu niyodhakah

(Virata, 2, 7.)

Tatra Mallah samāpetur digbhyo rājan sahasrasah
Samāje Brahmaṇo rājan tathā Pāsupaterapi
Mahākāyāh mahāviryāh Kālakaṇṭā jivasurāh.

(Ibid, 13, 15-16.)

The harmless Samaja is probably the one referred to in Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra (Pakṣhasya māsasya vā prajñāte’ hani Sarasvatya bhavane niyuktanām nityāṃ Samajāḥ).

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.
Administrative Reforms.

In the first place, Asoka instituted the Quinquennial Anusamayana or circuit of the Yutas, Rajukas, Pradevikas, and Mahamatras. Mr. Jayaswal and Dr. Smith (Asoka, 3rd edition, p. 164) are of opinion that the whole administrative staff from the Rajuka and the Pradevika 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 anusamayana of the Yutas, Rajukas and Pradevikas was mainly intended for propaganda work. The anusamayana of the Mahamatras was specially instituted for the purpose of checking miscarriage of justice, arbitrary imprisonment, and torture in the outlying Provinces (Kalinga, Ujjayini and Takshasila).

Secondly, Asoka created a number of new posts, e.g., Dharmamahamatrás and Dharmayutas. The Dharma mahamatrás were given a protective mission among people of all sects including the Brahmanas and the Nirgranthas or Jainas, and among the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandharas, Rashtrakutas and all the Aparantas. “Among servants and masters, Brahmanas 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 Pataliputra 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 Dharmamahamatrás 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 Mahāmatras 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 Mahāmatras 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 Mahāmatras 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, bahukāyāne, 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 Asoka 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 (Vyuttha) 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. Asoka 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 anusāmyāna. 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, Asoka created the new officials called Dharma mahāmātras who were specially entrusted with the work of dhammadhi-thāna and dhammadvadhi, 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 Vyuttha as missionary was pointed out by Senart and accepted by Dr. Smith (Asoka, third Ed., p 153). Prof. Bhandarkar takes Vyuttha or Virutha to mean "officials on tour."
(Hastidasana), masses of fire (Agikhanndhani) and other representations of a divine nature. Prof. Bhandarkar (Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 26) refers to the Pali Vimānavatthu which describes the splendour of the various celestial abodes (Vimānas) in order to induce listeners and spectators to lead good and unblemished lives and thereby attain to these. Aśoka seems to have made representations of these Vimānas and paraded them in various places. Hasti, according to Prof. Bhandarkar, is Sveto hasti, i.e., Buddha himself who is also described as "Gajatama," i.e., Gajottama. As regards Agikharhdhi (Agniskandha) the Professor draws our attention to the Jātaka No. 40 which refers to a blazing fire pit created by Māra on the surface of which the Bodhisattva strode and gave a bowl to a hungry 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 Gaya (ayāya Sambodhim ¹) and thus commenced the tours of Piety (Dhammayatā) in the place of the old tours of pleasure (Vihārayatā). In the tours of Piety this was the practice—visiting ascetics and Brāhmaṇas, with liberality to them; visiting elders, with largess of gold; visiting the people of the country (Janapada) with instruction in the Law of Piety, and discussion of that Law. The memory of a pious tour in Aśoka’s twenty-first regnal year (B.C. 249 according to Smith) is preserved by the Rummindet and Niglīva epigraphs in the Nepalese Tarāi. These records prove that Aśoka visited the birthplace 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.
Asoka abolished the sacrificial slaughter of animals and offensive Samajās and the massacre of living creatures to make curries in the imperial kitchen. Rock Edict VIII refers to the abolition of the vihārayāttras 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 Arthasastra.

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 Pātaliputra 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 empire, and a time came when the proud monarchs of Pataliputra and Rajagriha had to bend their knees before the despised provincials of Andhra and Kalinga.
Unfortunately, no Kautilya or Megasthenes has left any account of the later Mauryas. It is impossible to reconstruct a detailed history of Aśoka's successors from the scanty data furnished by one or two inscriptions and a few Brāhmaṇical, Jaina and Buddhist works.

Aśoka had many children. In Pillar Edict VII, he pays attention to the distribution of alms made by all his children, and in particular to those made by the “Princes, sons of the Queens.” It is to this last category that belonged the Kumāras who represented the Imperial authority at Takshaśilā, 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 (Suyāśas), Jalauka and Mahendra are mentioned in literature. It is, however, uncertain whether Mahendra was a son of Aśoka or his brother.

The Vāyu Purāṇa says that after Aśoka's death his son Kunāla reigned for eight years. Kunāla's son and successor was Bandhupālita, and Bandhupālita's dayāda or heir was Indrapālita. After Indrapālita came Devarman, Satadhanau and Brihadratha.

The Matsya Purāṇa gives the following list of Aśoka's successors:—Daśaratha, Samprati, Satadhanvan and Brihadratha.

The Vishṇu Purāṇa furnishes the following names:—Suyāśas, Daśaratha, Saṅgata, Śāliśūka, Somaśarman, Satadhanvan and Brihadratha.

The Divyāvadāna (p. 433) has the following names:—Sampadī, Vṛihaspati, Vṛishasena, Pushyadharman and Pushyamitra.

The Rājatarangini mentions Jalauka as the successor of Aśoka in Kaśmir.

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 Sāmpadi) as well as the evidence of the Pāṭaliputra kalpa of Jinaprabhasuri, the well known Jaina writer. The name Suyaśas found in the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas was probably a biruḍa or epithet of this prince. Tradition is not unanimous regarding the accession of Kunāla to the imperial throne. He is reputed to have been blind. His position was, therefore, probably like that of Dhṛtarāṣṭra of the Great Epic and though nominally regarded as the sovereign, he was physically unfit to carry on the work of government which was presumably entrusted to his favourite son Samprati, who is described by the Jaina and Buddhist writers as the immediate successor of Asoka.

Kunāla’s son was Bandhupalīta according to the Vāyu Purāṇa, and Sāmpadi (Samprati) according to the Divyāvadāna and the Pāṭaliputra kalpa. Either these princes were identical or they were brothers. If the latter view be correct then Bandhupalīta must be identified with Daśaratha whose reality is established by the brief dedicatory inscriptions on the walls of cave-dwellings at the Nāgarjuni Hills which he bestowed upon the Ājīvikas. Daśaratha, who receives the epithet “devānāṃpiya” in the inscriptions, was a grandson of Asoka according to the Matsya and Viṣṇu Purāṇas, and the predecessor of Samprati (variant Saṅgata) according to the same authorities.

Indrapalīta must be identified with Samprati or Saḷiśūka according as we identify Bandhupalīta with Daśaratha or Samprati. In the matter of the propagation of the Jaina faith, Jaina records speak as highly of Samprati as Buddhist records do of Asoka. Jinaprabhasuri says, “in Pāṭaliputra flourished the great king Samprati, son of Kunāla, lord or Bhārata with its three continents, the
great Arhanta who established Vihāras for Śramaṇas even in non-Aryan countries." Dr. Smith shows good grounds for believing that the dominions of Samprati included Avanti and western India.

In his Aśoka (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 Śalisūka is proved not only by the testimony of the Vishnū Purāṇa but also by that of the Gārgī Samhitā and the Vāyu manuscript referred to by Pargiter. He may have been identical with Vrīhaspāti, 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 Vṛishasena and Pushyadharmar; 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 Bāṇa’s Harshacharita. He was assassinated by his general Pushyamitra Śuṅga who is wrongly described by the Divyāvadāna as of Maurya descent.

Petty Maurya kings continued to rule in western India as well as Magadha long after the extinction of the Imperial line. King Dhavala of the Maurya dynasty is referred to in the Kānaswa inscription of A. D. 738. Prof. Bhandarkar identifies him with Dhavalappadeva the

---

1 Kielhorn’s Bṛihastamūlīka, p. 37.

The Gārgī Samhitā says "There will be Śalisūka a wicked quarrelsome king, Unrighteous, although theorising on righteousness (dharmaśādi adhārmikaḥ) 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 Koukaṇa 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 Gārgī Saṁhitā bears testimony to the decline of the Maurya power in the Madhya-deśa after the reign of Śaliśūka:

Tataḥ Saketam ākramya Pañchālam Mathurāmstatthā
Yavanaḥ dushtavikrāntaḥ praśyati Kusumadhvajam
Tataḥ Pushpapure prāpto karddame prathite hite
Ākulā vishaya sarve bhavishyanti na saṁśayaḥ.

(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 Śastri (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 Paṇḍit Śastri's opinion was certainly directed against the Brāhmaṇas as a class and was specially offensive because it was promulgated by a Śūdra ruler. As to the first point we should remember that prohibition of animal sacrifices did not necessarily imply hostility towards Brāhmaṇas. Long before
Aśoka Brahmāṇa sages whose teachings have found a place in the Holy Śruti, the most sacred literature of the Brahmāṇas, declared themselves in no uncertain terms against sacrifices, and in favour of Ahimsā. In the Mundaka Upanishad (1. 2. 7) we have the following Śloka:—

Plavā hyete adṛṣṭāḥ yajñarūpā
Ashtādaśoktamavaram yeshu karma
Etsachehreyo ye'bhinandantimūḍhā
Jārāṃśityum te punārevāpi 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 Chāndogya 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 Śūrāgas and the Kāṇvas 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 Kshatriya caste. The Mahāvaṁsa (Geiger's Translation, p. 27) refers to the Moriyas as a noble (kshatriya) clan and represents Chandragupta as a scion of this clan. In the Divyāva-dāna (p. 370) Binduśāra, son of Chandragupta said to a girl "Tvam Nāpini abham Rāja Kshatriyo Murdhabhishiktāḥ katham mayā sārdham samāgamo bhavishyati." In the same work (p. 409) Aśoka says to one of his queens
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(Tishyarakshita) "Deviaham kshatriyaḥ katham pālandum paribhakshayami." 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. Arthaśāstra, p. 326).

Having referred to the prohibition of animal sacrifices Paṇḍit Śāstri 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 kālaya Jambudipasi amisā devā husu te dāni m (i) s-kaṭā.

Paṇḍit Śāstri followed the interpretation of Senart. But Prof. Sylvain Levi has shown that the word amisā cannot stand for Sanskrit amṛṣibā, for in the Bhābru edict we find Musā and not Misā for Sanskrit mṛṣibā. The recently discovered Māski version reads misibhūtā for misam-katā showing that the original form was misribhūtā. It will be grammatically incorrect to form misibhūtā from Sanskrit mṛṣihā. The word misra means mixed. And misribhūtā 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).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.

Pandit Sastri adds that the appointment by Asoka of Dharmamahamatras, i.e., of superintendents of morals was a direct invasion of the rights and privileges of the Brahmanas. It is hardly correct to represent the Dharmamahamatras as mere superintendents of morals when their duties consisted in the establishment of the Law of Piety (which included liberality to Brahmanas), the promotion of the welfare of the Yavanas, Kambjas, Gândháras, Ráshtrikas, Brahmanas 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 (Asoka, 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 Brahmanas. Moreover there is nothing to show that the Dharmamahamatras were wholly recruited from non-Brahmanas.

Our attention is next drawn to the passage where Asoka insists upon his officers strictly observing the principles of Dandasamata and Vyavaharasamata. Pandit Sastri 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 Brahmanas who claimed many privileges including immunity from capital punishment.

The passage containing the expressions Dandasamata and Vyavaharasamata 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 Rájukas 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
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should be uniformity in judicial procedure (Vyāvahārasamata) and uniformity in penalties (Daṇḍasamata). 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 Vyāvahārasamata and Daṇḍasamata is to be understood in connection with the general policy of decentralisation which the Emperor introduced. Asoka granted independence to the Rajukas in the award of penalties, but he did not like that the Daṇḍa and Vyāvahāra prevalent within the jurisdiction of one Rajuka should be entirely different from those prevailing within the jurisdiction of others. He wanted to maintain some uniformity (samata) 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 Samata which he enforced involved a curtailment of the autonomy of the Rajukas 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-Paṇchāla Brāhmaṇas who thronged to the court of Janaka. In the Brahadāranyaka 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 Pañchavimśā Brāhmaṇa (Vedic Index, II, p. 84) 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 Mandavya (Adi, 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 Dharmamahāmātrás to promote the welfare and happiness of the Brāhmaṇas.

Pāṇḍit Śāstrī says further that as soon as the strong hand of Aśoka was removed the Brāhmaṇas seemed to have stood against his successors. We have no evidence of any such conflict between the children of Aśoka and the Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand if the Brāhmaṇa historian of Kaśmir is to be believed the relations between Jalauka, one of the sons and successors of Aśoka and the Brāhmaṇical Hindus were entirely friendly.

In conclusion Pāṇḍit Śāstrī refers to the assassination of the last Maurya Emperor of Magadh by Pushyamitra Śunga and says, “We clearly see the hands of the Brāhmaṇas in the great revolution.” But the Buddhist remains at Bharhut erected “during the supremacy of the Śungas” 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 Taranāth 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 Brahmanist followers. The Empire was a shrivelled and attenuated carcase long before the Śunga coup d'état of 185 B.C. We learn from the Rājataṅgini that immediately after the death of Aśoka one of his own sons, Jalauka, made himself independent in Kāsmīr 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 Subhāgasena (Subhūgasena). We quote the passage referring to the king below:—

“He (Antiochus 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 Androsthenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him.”

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

We have seen that the theory which ascribes the decline and dismemberment of the Maurya Empire to a Brahmanical revolution led by Pushyamitra Sunga does not bear scrutiny. Was the Maurya disruption due primarily to the Greek invasions? The earliest Greek invasion after Asoka, that of Antiochos the Great, took place about 206 B.C., and we have seen that the combined testimony of Kalthana 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 Bindusara ministerial oppression had goaded the people of Taxila to open rebellion. The Divyavadana says (p. 371):

"Atha Rājā Vindusārasa Takshaśilā nāma nagaram viruddham. Tatra Rājā Vindusāren Āsoko visarjitaḥ... yāvat Kumāraśchaturangena balakāyena Takshaśilāṁ gataḥ, śrutvā Takshaśilā nivāsinaḥ paurāḥ pratyudgamya cha kathayanti 'na vayam Kumārasa viruddhāḥ nāpi Rājā Vindusārasa api tu dushṭāṁtyā asmākam paribhavam kurvanti.'"

"Now Taxila a city of Bindusāra's revolted. The king Bindusāra despatched Āsoka 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. "Rājñāsokasyottarāpathe Takṣasilā nagaram viruddham...." Prince Kunāla was deputed to the government of the city. When the prince went there the people said "na vayam Kunārasyaviruddhā na rājñā sokaṣyāpitum dushṭātmāno mātya āgatyāsmākam apamānam kuvanti."

The Divyavadāna 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 townspeople 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 dushtāmātyas 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 Pātaliputra proved unequal to the task of maintaining the integrity of the mighty fabric reared by the genius of Chandragupta and Chāṇakya.

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

---

1 On the contrary, if the Gārgī Saṁhitā is to be believed, one of his successors, namely, Śalisaḥka actually quickened the pace by his tyranny—Saṁhitā mandate gheraṃ dharmavādī adhārmakaḥ.
THE SUNGA EMPIRE AND THE BACTRIAN GREEKS.

I. THE REIGN OF PUSHYAMITRA.

Bṛihadratha, the last Maurya Emperor of Magadha, was, according to the Purāṇas and the Harshacharita, assassinated by his general Pushyamitra Śuṅga who usurped the throne, and founded a new dynasty—that of the Śuṅgas.

The origin of the Śuṅga family is wrapped up in obscurity. According to one theory the Śuṅgas were Irānians, 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 Bharadvajās. Saṅgītāputra “son of a female descendant of Śuṅga” is the name of a teacher in the Brāhadāranyaka Upanishad (VI. 4. 31). Saṅgīyānai “descendant of Śuṅga” is the name of a teacher in the Vārāṇa Brāhmaṇa. Macdonell and Keith point out that the Śuṅgas are known as teachers in the Āśvalayana Srautasūtra (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 Asoka 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 Droja, Kṛipa and Aśvatthāman in the Mahābhārata).

The dominions of Pushyamitra extended to the river Narmada, and included the cities of Pāṭaliputra, Vidiśā and, if Tāranātha is to be believed, Jalandhara. It appears from the Divyāradāna, 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 Narmada (Atthi devie vanavarō bhadā Viraseno nāma, so bhaṭṭinā antavāladugge Nammadātire thāvido). Lüders' Inscriptions, Nos. 687-688, seem to suggest that Bharhut (in Baghelkhand) was governed by a Śuṅga feudatory.

**Affairs in the Deccan.**

It appears from the Mālavikāgnimitram that the foundation of the Śuṅga dynasty synchronised with the establishment of a new kingdom in the Deccan, viz., Vidarbha. Agnimitra's Amāṭya refers to the kingdom as achirādhishṭita (established not long ago) and compares its king to a tree which is newly planted and therefore not firm (navasamropanasīvhabhās). The king of Vidarbha is represented as a relation of the Maurya minister (Sachīva) and a natural enemy (prakṛitya-mitra) 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 Sachīva or minister, the other headed by his Senāpati or general. The minister's partisan Yajñāsena was appointed governor of Vidarbha, while the general's son Agnimitra got the Viceroyalty of Vidiśā. When the general organised his coup d'état, killed the king, and imprisoned the minister, Yajñāsena apparently declared his independence and commenced hostilities against the usurping family. This is why he is called achirādhishṭitarājya and prakṛitya-mitra by Agnimitra and his Amāṭya.

The Mālavikāgnimitram says that when Kumāra Mādhavasena, a cousin of Yajñāsena 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 Śuṅga Prince who ordered Vrasena to march against Vidarbha. Yajñasena was defeated. Madhavasena was released and the kingdom of Vidarbha was divided between the two cousins, the river Varadā forming the boundary between the two states.

In the opinion of several scholars an enemy more formidable than Yajñasena threatened the Śuṅga dominions from Kaliṅga. In his Oxford History of India (Additions and Corrections and p. 58 n.) Dr. Smith accepts the view that Khāravela, king of Kaliṅga, defeated Pushyamitra who is called Bahapatimita or Bahasatimita in the Hāthigumpha Inscription. Prof. Dubreuil also seems to endorse the view that Khāravela was the antagonist of Pushyamitra, and that the Hāthigumpha 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 Hāthigumpha 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 (Bṛhaspatimitra) with Pushyamitra on the ground that Bṛhaspati is the regent of the nakshatra or Zodiacal asterism Pushya, also named Tishya, in the constellation Cancer or the Crab, cannot be regarded as final in the absence of further evidence. In this connection we should note that the Divyāvadāna (p. 434) represents 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 Háthigumpha inscription which was read as follows (Jayaswal, JBORS, 1917, p. 459):

Pānamārtariyasathivasasate Rāja-Muriya-kālevochchhine.

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

Paṃchame cha dānti vase Nampa-rāja ti-vasa-sata (m?)—oghātiśam Tanasuliya-vata-panādīm Nagaram pavesa-ti (ibid, p. 455).

If Pānamārtariya sathivasasate 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, pānamārtariyasathivasasate 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 “pānamārtariya-sathivasa-sate Rāja-Muriya-kāle vochchhine cha chhe-yathi Argasi ti kaṃṭariyam upādiyati” in line 16, and proposes to read “pānatariya sata-sahasehi Muriya kālam vochhinam cha choyathi agasatikamāntariyam upādyayati.” He translates the expression beginning with Muriyakāla “he (the king) completes the Muriya time (era), counted, and being of an interval of 64 with a century” (JBORS, Vol. IV, Part IV). With regard to this new reading and translation Professor Chanda observes (M. A. S. I., No. 1, p. 10) “the rendering of vochhine as ‘counted’ is even more far-fetched than ‘expired.’ The particle cha after vochhine makes
it difficult to read it as vochhinam qualifying the substantive Muriyakālam. Even if we overlook vochhine, the passage appears to be a very unusual way of stating a date. Still more unusual is the statement of a date as an independent achievement in a praśasti.” 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 Śāsiunāga king, and that the Śāsiunāgas do not appear to have had anything to do with Kaliṅga. “It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought ‘all under his sole sway’ and ‘uprooted all Kshatriyas’ or the old reigning families. So we should identify Nandarāja of the Hāthigumpha 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 Yavuna Invasion.

The only undoubted historical events of Pushyamitra’s time, besides the coup d’etat of 185 B.C. and the Vidarbha war, are the Greek invasion from the North-West referred to by Patañjali and Kālidāsa, and the celebration of the horse sacrifice.

Patañjali was a contemporary of Pushyamitra. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar draws our attention to the passage in the
Mahābhāṣya—iha Pushyamitram yājayāmaḥ “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 Mālavikāgnimitram refers to a conflict between the Śunga prince Vasumitra and a Yavana on the southern bank of the Sindhu. Unfortunately the name of the invader is not given either in the Mahābhāṣya or the Mālavikāgnimitram. There is a considerable divergence of opinion with regard to his identity. But all agree that he was a Bactrian Greek.

The Bactrian Greeks were originally subjects of the 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 Sarasostos (Surashtra or Kathiawar), and Sigerdis (probably Sagaradvipa of the

1 i.e., the Hyphasis or Vipaśa (the Bena).
2 The Triaśāni. In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (V. 10. 17) a river of this name is mentioned in conjunction with the Kauśāki, Mandākini, 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 Antiochos the Great.

Menander has been identified with the king Milinda who is mentioned in the Milindapañho as a contemporary of the Buddhist Thera Nāgasena. This monarch was born at Kalsigrāma (Irenceker, Milindapañho, p. 83) in the Island of Alasanda or Alexandria (ibid, p. 82) and had his capital at Sāgala or Sākala, modern Sālkot, 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 Mahābhāṣya mentions a city in Sauvira called Dāttāmītri (Ind. Ant., 1911, Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population; Bomb. Gaz., I. ii. 11). Ptolemy the Geographer mentions the city of Euthymedia (Euthymedia?) 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 conquering kings, viz., Menander and Demetrios, was identical with the, Yavana invader who penetrated to Śāketa in Oudh, Madhyamikā near Chitor, and the river Sindh in Central India, in the time of Pushyamitra. Goldstücker, Smith and many other scholars identified the invader with Menander who crossed the Hypanis and penetrated as far as the Isamus (Trisāma ¹?). On the other hand, Prof. Bhandarkar suggested, in his Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population, the identification of the invader with Demetrios. We learn from Polybius that Demetrios was a young man at the time of Antiochus III's invasion cir. 206 B.C. Justin says that Demetrios was "king of the Indians" when Eukratides was king of the Bactrians and Mithridates was king of the Parthians. "Almost at the same time that Mithridates ascended the throne among the Parthians, Eukratides began to reign among the Bactrians; both of them being great men ... Eukratides carried on several wars with great spirit, and though much reduced by his losses in them, yet, when he was besieged by Demetrios king of the Indians, with a garrison of only 300 soldiers, he repulsed, by continual sallies,

¹ Trisāma is a river mentioned in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, together with the Kauśikī, Mandukūti, 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 203 B. C. We now find that he ruled as king of the Indians in the middle of the second century B. C. He was, therefore, the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra Śunga who ruled from 185 to 149 B. C. Menander, on the other hand, must have ruled over the Indo-Greek kingdom much later, as will be apparent from the facts noted below. Justin tells us that Demetrios was deprived of his Indian possessions by Eukratides (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 conjointly sometimes issued joint coins. Thus we have joint coins of Lysias and Antialkidas, of Strato and Agathokleia, of Strato I and Strato II, and of Hermia 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 Rapson shows good reasons for believing that Apollodotos did not belong to the family of Eukratides but was on the other hand a ruler of Kapiša who was ousted by Eukratides (JRAS, 1905, pp. 784-785). 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 Śunga (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:

"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 Śamhitā says—

Madhyadeśe na sthāsyanti Yavana yuddha durmadāḥ
Teshāmanyonya saṁbhāvā (?) bhavishyanti nasamśayaḥ
Ātmachakrotthitam ghoraṁ yuddhāṁ paramadūrṇām

"The fiercely fighting Greeks will not stay in the Madhya- deśa; there will be a cruel, dreadful war in their own kingdom, caused between themselves” (Kern, Brihat Śamhitā, 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 Kavisiye nāgara-devatā. They are often coins of Apollodotos restruck (Rapson, JRAS., 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 (JRAS., 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 imme-
diately 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 Milinda-pañho, Milinda or Menander flourished “500 years” (i.e., in the fifth century, cf. Smith, EHI, 3rd edition, 328) after the Parinirvāṇa (pariṇibbānato pañcavassasate atikkante ete upajjissanti, Trenckner, the Milinda-pañho, 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 Śūṅga. It is Demetrios who should, therefore, be identified with the Yavana invader referred to by Patañjali and Kālidāsa.

The Aśvamedha Sacrifice.

After the victorious wars with Vidarbha and the Yavanas Pushyamitra celebrated a horse-sacrifice. This sacrifice is regarded by some scholars as marking an early stage in the
Brāhmaṇical reaction which was fully developed five centuries later in the time of Samudra Gupta and his successors. Late Buddhist writers are alleged to represent Pushyamitra as a cruel persecutor of the religion of Śākyamuni. But the Buddhist monuments at Bhārbut erected “during the supremacy of the Śuṅgas” do not bear out the theory that the Śuṅgas were the leaders of a militant Brāhmaṇism. 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 Kalidāsa 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. The Mālavikāgnimitram refers in clear terms to the dealings of Prince Agnimitra, the viceroy of Vidiśā, with his own Parishad:

“Deva! evam Amātyaparishado vijnāpayāmi”

“Mantriparishado’pyetadeva darśanam
Dvidhā vibhaktām śriyamudvaḥahantu
dhurām rathāśvāviva saṃgraḥitṛuḥ
sthāshyatāste nripate nideśe
parasparāvagranirvikhāru
Rājā: tena hi Mantriparishadām bruḥi senānye Viraśenāya
lekhyatāmevaṃ kriyatāmīti.”

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 Kumaṇtras also are each assisted by a body of Mahāmātrās. These probably correspond to the Kumārāṃśyonas 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 Śunga, but belonged to a local dynasty of North Pañchāla (Rohilkhand). He gave two reasons for this conclusion:

1. Agnimitra's is the only coin-name found in the Purānic lists. The names of the other Mitra kings do not agree with those found in the Purānas.

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

As to the first point Rivett-Carnac (Ind. Ant., 1880, 311) and Jayaswal have shown (JBORS, 1917, p. 479) that several coin-names besides that of Agnimitra can be identified with those found in the Purānic lists of Śunga and Kāṇva kings; for example, Jethamitra may be identified with the successor of Agnimitra, Vasu-Jyeshṭha or Su-Jyeshṭha who is called simply Jyeshṭha in the Kīśu manuscript (Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 31, n.12). Bhadraghosha may be identified with Ghosha the seventh king of the Purānic list of Śunga 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 Śungas who survived the usurpation of Vasudeva Kāṇva, and the remnant of whose power was destroyed by the Andhrabhṛttyas and Śiśunandi (Dynasties of the Kali Age, 49).

As to the second point we should remember that Mitra coins have been found at Kosāmbi, Ayodhya and Mathura as well as in Pañchāla. Names of the Mitra kings Brahmamitra and Indramitra are found engraved
on two rail pillars at Baudh 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 Vishnu 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 Vishnu, Andhraka in the Vāyu, and Antaka in the Mātśya Purāṇa. Mr. Jayaswal identifies him with Udāka mentioned in a Pabhosā Inscription which runs thus: “By Āsādhasena, the son of Gopāl Vaihidari and maternal uncle of king Bahasatimitra, son of Gopāl, a cave was caused to be made in the tenth year of Udāka for the use of the Kassapiya Arhats.” We learn from another Pabhosā 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 Sānehi, p. 11 n.) on the other hand identifies the fifth Śunga with king Kāsiputra Bhāgabhadra mentioned in a Garuda Pillar Inscription found in the old city of Vidiśā, 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 Garuda Pillar Inscription (of the twelfth year after the
installation of Mahārāja Bhāgavata) which proves that there was at Vidisā a king named Bhāgavata apart from king Kāśiputra Bhāgabhadra. In the absence of clear evidence connecting Udāka with Vidisā it cannot be confidently asserted that he belonged to the house of Agnimitra and Bhāgavata. The view of Marshall seems to be more probable.

It appears that the successors of Agnimitra at Vidisā cultivated friendly relations with the Greek sovereigns of the Pañjāb. The policy of the Bactrian Greeks in this respect resembled that of their Seleukidan predecessors. Seleukos, we know, first tried to conquer the Magadha 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 Śunāgas. We learn from the Besnagar Inscription of the reign of Bhāgabhadra that Heliodora, the son of Diya (Dion) a native of Taxila came as an Ambassador from Mahārāja Antalikita (Antialkidas) to Rājan Kāśiputra Bhāgabhadra the Saviour (Trātāra), who was prospering in the fourteenth year of his reign. The ambassador, though a Greek, professed the Bhāgavata religion and set up a Garuḍadhvaja 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 Bhdraka. The ninth king Bhāgavata had a long reign which extended over 32 years. Prof. Bhandarkar identifies him with the Mahārāja Bhāgavata mentioned in one of the Besnagar

1 The three immortal precepts (dama, chāga, apramāda), mentioned in the second part of Heliodora’s inscription, occur in the Mahābhārata (X.7.23: Damaṁ tyāgo’ pramādāścha te trayo Brahmaṇo ṣayāḥ). Cf. also Gitā, 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 Śuna 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 Śuna. His statement may be construed to mean that Vāsudeva entered into a conspiracy with the emissaries of Devabhūti to bring about the downfall of the reigning Śuna (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 Śuna 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 Andhrabhṛityas or Satavāhanas who "swept away the remains of the Śuna power" and probably appointed Śiśunandi (ibid, p. 49) to govern the Vidiśa region. Śiśunandi's younger brother had a grandson (dauhitra) named Śiśuka who became the ruler of Purika. Curiously enough Śiśuka is also the Purānic name of the first king of the Andhrabhṛitya dynasty. It is not improbable that the two Śiśukas were identical, and that after overthrowing the Śuṅgas, Śiśuka (Śimuka of the Inscriptions) annexed Purika but placed Vidiśa under his maternal relations.
THE FALL OF THE MAGADHAN AND INDO-GREEK POWERS.

1. THE KĀNVAS AND THE LATER ŚUṅGAS.

Vasudeva at whose instance the "overlibidinous Śūṅga" was "reft of his life" founded about 73 B.C. a new line of kings known as the Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana dynasty. The Purāṇas give the following account of this family. "He (Vasudeva), the Kāṇvāyana, will be king 9 years. His son Bhūmimitra will reign 14 years. His son Nārāyaṇa will reign 12 years. His son Suṣarman will reign 10 years. These are remembered as the Śungabhṛitya Kāṇvāyana kings. These four Kāṇva Brāhmaṇas will enjoy the earth. They will be righteous. In succession to them the earth will pass to the Andhras." Bhūmimitra seems to be identical with the king of that name known from coins.

The chronology of the Kāṇva dynasty is a matter of controversy. In his Early History of the Deccan, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observes "the founder of the Andhrabhṛityas is said to have uprooted not only the Kāṇvas, but 'whatever was left of the power of the Śungas'. And the Kāṇvas are pointedly spoken of as Śungabhṛityas or servants of the Śungas. It therefore appears likely that when the princes of the Śunga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped the whole power and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns. Thus then these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śungas include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas."
Now, the Purānic evidence only proves that certain princes belonging to the Śuṅga stock continued to rule till the Andhrabhṛitya conquest and were the contemporaries of the Kāṇvas. But there is nothing to show that these rois faineants of the Śuṅga stock were identical with any of the ten Śuṅga kings mentioned by name in the Purānic lists who reigned 112 years. On the contrary the distinct testimony of the Purāṇas that Devabhūti, the tenth and last Śuṅga of the Purānic lists was the person slain by Vasudeva the first Kāṇva, probably shows that the rois faineants, who ruled contemporaneously with Vasudeva and his successors, were later than 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 Chetas.

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 Dakshināpatha 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 Kāṅvāyanas and Suśārman, 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
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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 Nānāghāṭ record of Nayanikā, daughter-in-law of Simuka?

2. What is the actual date of Kharavela's Hāṭhigumpha Inscription which refers to a Sātakarṇi 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 Bhagavata the penultimate king of the Early Śūṅga 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 Purānic evidence.

As to the second point Mr. R. D. Banerji gives good grounds for believing that the expression Tī-vasa-sata occurring in the passage "Pamchame cha dānti vasa Nandarāja ti-vasa-sata . . . . . ." of the Hāṭhigumpha 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 Kharavela extended an aqueduct that had not been used for Tī-vasa-sata since Nandarāja. If "tīvasa-sata" is taken to mean 103, Kharavela's accession must be placed 103 - 5 = 98 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of Yuvarāja 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.) Kharavela'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 Kalinga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya Kumāra under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore tīvasa-sata should be taken to mean 300 and not 103.
Tivasa-sata means 300 Khāravela and his contemporary Śatakarni must have flourished 300 years after Nandarāja, i.e. in or about 23 B. C. This agrees with the Purānic evidence which makes Śatakarni’s father a contemporary of the last Kāṇva king Suśarman (38-28 B. C.)

We now come to the third point viz. the determination of the exact number of Śatavāhana 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:—

“Ekānavimśatirhyete Andhra bhokshyanti vai mahim,” but it gives thirty names.

The Vāyu Purāṇa with the exception of the ‘M’ manuscript says—

“Ityete vai nṛpās trimśad Andhra bhokshyantiye mahim,” 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—

Tesham varsha śatāni syuṣ chatvārishashṭir eva cha.
Another Matsya manuscript puts it slightly differently.
Dvādasadhikam eteshāṁ rājyam satachatuṣṭāyaṁ.
While a Vāyu passage gives altogether a different tradition:

Andhrā bhokshyanti vasudhām sate 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
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the Andhrabhṛtya 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 Śatakarnis 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 Śatakarnis who ruled over Kuntala (the Kanarese districts) before the Kadambas. The Matsya list includes at least two kings of this line named Skandavati and Kuntala Śatakarni, but the Vayu list does not. Skanda-

nāga-Śataka actually appears as the name of a prince of the Kanarese line of Śatakarnis in a Kanheri inscription. (Rapson, Andhra Coins, liii.) As to Kuntala Śatakarni, the commentary on Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra takes the word Kuntala in the name Kuntala Śatakarni Śatavāhana to mean “Kuntalavishaye jātatvāt tattamākhyāḥ.” It is therefore fair to conclude that the Matsya Purāṇa which mentions 30 Śatavāhana kings includes not only the main branch but also the Kuntala line. On the other hand the Vāyu Purāṇa omits the Śatakarnis 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 Śatavāhana kings consisted only of about nineteen princes, and if the duration of their rule be three centuries, there is no difficulty in accepting the Purānic statement that Simuka flourished in the first century B.C. and that his dynasty 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 Śatakarnis 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, 53 ante).

Regarding the original home of the Satavahana family there is also a good deal of controversy. Some scholars think that the Satavahanas were not Andhras but merely Andhrabhṛityas of Kanarese origin. In the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XIV (1917) Dr. Sukthankar edited an Inscription of Sirī-Pulumāñi "king of the Satavāhanas" which mentions a place called Sātavāhanī-hāra. The place occurs also in the Hira-Hadagalli copper-plate inscription of the Pallava king Śivaskandavarman in the slightly altered form of Sātāhanī-ratṭha. Dr. Sukthankar suggests that the territorial division Sātavahanī-Sātāhanī 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-Satarkāṁśis. The Vinaya Texts (S.B.E., XVII, 38) mention a town called "Setakannika" which lay on the southern frontier of the Majjhimadēsa. It is significant that the earliest records of the Satarkāṁśis 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 Kṛishṇā.

There is reason to believe that the Andhrabhṛitya or Sātavāhana kings were Brahmāṇas with a little admixture of Nāga blood. The Dvātrīṁśatputtalikā represents Śālavāhana as of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Nāga origin. The Nāga connection is suggested by names like Skandanāga-Sataka, 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 Brahmaṇa. 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 Śatavahana family claimed to be a Brahmaṇa like Parāśurāma. As a matter of fact in the praśasti the king is described as "the unique Brahmaṇa 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 *Kṛishṇa*. 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-Kṛishṇa was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Śatakarni. This Śatakarni has been identified with

1. King Śatakarni Dakṣināpatha-pati, son of Simuka Śatavahana mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ Inscription of Nayanika.

2. Śatakarni lord of the west who was defied by Kharavela, king of Kalinga.

3. Rājan Śrī Śatakarni of a Saṅcht 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 Kṛishṇa, after the Kāṇvas, *i.e.*, in the first century B.C., while the Ḥathigumpha Inscription places Kharavela 300 years after Nanda-raja, *i.e.*, in the first century B.C.
Marshall objects to the third identification on the ground that Śrī Śatakarni who is mentioned in the Nānāghat and Hāthigumphā 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 Śunga and not by the Andhras (A Guide to Sāñchī p. 13). But we have seen that the date of the Hāthigumphā Inscription is the first century B.C. (300 years after Nanda-rāja). Moreover the Purāṇas place the kings mentioned in the Nānāghat Inscription not earlier than the Kāṇvas, i.e., the first century B.C. The identification of the successor of Kṛśṇa of the Satavāhana family with Śatakarni 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 Śatakarni to be styled simply Śatakarni or the elder Śatakarni (Saraganus, from a Prakrit form like Sauaganna) while it would be equally natural for the later Śatakarnis to be distinguished from him by the addition of a geographical designation like Kuntala, or a metronymic like Gautamiputra or Vāsisṭhitiputra.

We learn from the Nānāghat Inscription that Śatakarni, son of Simuka, was the sovereign of the whole of Dakshināpatha. 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 Ānanda, the son of Vasithī, the foreman of the artisans of Rājan Sirī-Śatakarni. Śatakarni seems to have been the first prince to raise the Satavāhanas to the position of paramount sovereigns of Trans-Vindhyan India. Thus arose the first great empire in the Godāvari valley which rivalled in extent and power the Śunga empire in the Ganges valley and the Greek empire in the Land of the Five Rivers.
After the death of Śatakarni his wife Nayanikā or Nāganikā daughter of the Mahārathī Tranakayiro Kalālaya, the scion of the Aṇgiya family, was proclaimed regent during the minority of the princes Vediśrī and Saktī-Śrī (Sati-Srimat) or Haku-Śrī.

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

Khāravela belonged to the Cheta dynasty. Prof. Chanda points out that Cheta princes are mentioned in the Vessantara Jātaka (No. 517). 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 Kaliṅga 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. 1317 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 Kaliṅga.¹ 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 Śatakarni, 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 Rāṭhikas and Bhojakas to do him homage. In the fifth year he had an aqueduct that had not been used for 300 years since Nandarāja conducted into his capital.

Emboldened by his successes in the Deccan the Kaliṅga king turned his attention to the North. In the eighth year he harassed the king of Rājagriha so that he fled to Mathurā. If Mr. Jayaswal is right in identifying this king with Bṛhaspatimitra, then king Bṛhaspati must have ruled over Magadha after the Kāṇva dynasty. Udāka of the Pabhosā Inscription who came later than Bṛhaspatimitra cannot, in that case, be identified with the fifth Śunga king who must be identified with Bhāgabhadra.

The attack on Northern India was repeated in the tenth and twelfth years. In the tenth year the Kaliṅga king organised a grand expedition against Bharatavarsha, 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 Uttarapatha and watered his elephants in the Gāṅgā. But in Magadha he was more successful; the repeated blows certainly "struck terror into the Magadhas," and compelled the Magadha king (Bṛhaspatimitra?) to bow at his feet. Having subjugated Magadha, the invader once more turned his attention to southern India 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 Satavahanas 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 Sākala (Sialkot) with a considerable portion of the Indian interior, the other derived from Eukratides holding Takšašila, the Kabul 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. They both adopt the metal nickel for their coins, and they alone use in their legends the Brāhmi alphabet. They seem, therefore, to have been closely connected probably as brothers. It is not improbable that Agathokleia was their sister. Agathokles issued a series of coins in commemoration of Alexander, Antiochos Nikator (Antiochos III Megas according to Malala), Diodotos, and Euthydemos.

Apollodotos, the Stratos and Menander 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 hook of Justin’s work, Menander and Apollodotus are mentioned as Indian kings (Rhys Davids, Milinda, p. xix). It appears from the Milindapanho that the capital of the dynasty to which Menander belonged was Šakala or Sāgala. We learn from Ptolemy the geographer that the city had another name Euthymedia (Euthydemia?) a designation which was probably derived from the Euthydemian line.

To the family of Eukratides belonged Heliokles and probably Lysias and Antialkidas who ruled conjointly. A common type of Antialkidas is the Pilei of the Dioscuri, which seems to connect him with Eukratides; his portrait according to Gardner resembles that of Heliokles. It is 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 Takshasila 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 F's Ed. vol. II pp. 245-246) deprived the Greeks of Bactriana, i.e., the Asii, Pasiani, Tochari, Sacarauli and the Sacae or Šakas. The story of the Šaka occupation of the Indo-Greek possessions will be told in the next chapter. The Latin historian Pompeius Trogus describes how Diodotos had to fight Scythian tribes, the Sarancae 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 Areia, Gedrosia and Arachosia, including the province now called Sistan (Sakasthana). 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 Saka.¹ The best name for the family would be Drangian, because their home territory was Drangiana. On coins Vonones is associated with two princes, viz:

i. Spalahora who is called Mahārājaabhūtā.

ii. Spalagadama, son of Spalahora.

There is one coin which Thomas and Cunningham attributed to Vonones and Azes I. But the coin really belongs to Maues (Whitehead, Catalogue of Coins in the Panjab Museum, p. 93.) There is a silver coin of a prince named Spalirises which bears on the obverse, the legend Basileus Adelphoy Spalirisoy, and on the reverse "Maharaja Bhraha Dhramiasa Spalarishisa," i.e., Spalirises the Just, brother of the king. This king has been identified with Vonones. Vonones thus was a supreme ruler, and he appointed his brothers Spalirises and Spalahora viceroys to govern the provinces conquered by him, and after the death of the latter, conferred the viceroyalty on his nephew Spalagadama. Vonones was succeeded as supreme ruler by his brother Spalirises. The coins of Spalirises present two varieties, viz:

1. Coins which bear his name alone in both the legends;

2. Coins on which his name occurs on the obverse in the Greek legend, and those of Azes on the reverse in the Kharoshthi legend. The second variety proves that

¹ Isidore of Charax (JRAS. 1915, p. 831) refers to Sigal in Sscastene as the residence of a Saka 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 Śaṅgas who are represented in Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitram as coming into conflict with the Yavanas. In the Nāsik prāśasti of Gautamiputra Sātakarni 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-ye also 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 Tchou, Ki-pin or Ngansi became powerful, it brought Kābul into subjection. When it grew weak it lost Kābul.......Later, Kābul fell under the rule of Parthia."
SCYTHIAN RULE IN NORTHERN INDIA.

I. THE ŚAKAS.

In the 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 Śakamurundā, 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 Kaśmir. But his view has been ably controverted by Sten Konow (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 291) who accepts Chavannes' identification with Kapiśa (the country drained by the northern tributaries of the river Kābul, ibid, p. 290; cf. Watters, Yuan Chwang, 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-Muraṇḍas) was Lampāka or Laghman (Lampakāstu Muraṇḍah Syuḥ) 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 Kabul (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 Mathūra and Nāsik prove that the Sakas extended their sway as far as the Jumna in the east and the Godāvarī 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 Rāmāyaṇa (I. 54. 22; IV. 43. 12), the Māhābhārata (II. 32. 17), the Manuṣaṁhitā (X. 44), and the Māhābhāṣya (Ind. Ant. 1875, 244). The Hari-varśa (Chap. 14.16) informs us that they shaved one half of their heads, and the Jaina work Kālakāḥaryakathānaka states that their Kings were called Sāhi. (Z. D. M. G., 34, p. 262).

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

Sarvasa Sakastanasasa 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 Kāthiāwa and the western and southern parts of the territory now known as Mālwa." He took Sarva to be a proper name and translated the inscriptive 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 Mathura, the site of the inscription, we should note that the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Chapter 58) refers to a Śaka settlement in the Madhyadeśa. 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 Vibār and other inscriptions even more comprehensive expressions, e.g., Sarva sattvanam—of all living creatures. As regards Fleet’s renderings “svaka” and “sakathana” 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 Erythrean Sea.” The metropolis of “Scythia” in the time of the Periplus was Minnagara; and its market-town was Barbaricum on the seashore.

Princes bearing Śaka names are mentioned in several inscriptions discovered in Taxila, Mathurā and western India. According to Dr. Thomas “whatever Śaka dynasties may have existed in the Pañjāb or India reached India neither through Afghanistan nor through Kaśmir.
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 Saka occupation of Kipin, and the fact that some of the Saka names hitherto discovered are those of the Northern Sakas who lived near the Sogdianoi (Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 399-400), e.g., the names—Maues, Moga (Taxila plate) and Mevāki (Mathura Lion Capital) are variants of the Saka name Mauakes. We learn from Arrian that a chief named Mauakes or Mavaces led the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwelt in Asia, who lived outside the jurisdiction of the 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 Saka 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 Sakas of western Sakasthana (Sistān) 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 Sakasthana 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 Mahākšatrapa Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Kārdama river in Persia (Shamsastry’s trans. of Arthasastra, p. 861).
The earliest Saka 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 Pañjáb, 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 Pañjáb 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 Saka occupation of Gandhāra must therefore be later than 127 B.C. All scholars except Fleet identify Maues with Maharaya Moga of the Sirsukh or Taxila plate dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era. The generally accepted view is that the era is of Saka institution. As the era is used only in N. India and the border land it is permissible to conjecture that it marks the completion of the Saka occupation of those regions. We have already seen that this occupation could not have taken place before 127 B.C. The era used in the Taxila plate could not therefore have originated before 127 B.C. The year 78 of the era could not have fallen before B.C. 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 Kāpisa-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 Mahava-Vikrama era. But the matter must be regarded as not finally settled.

Numismatists say that Maues was succeeded on the throne of the Pañjāb 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 Pañjāb, 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 Pañjāb 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 Panjab 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.¹

Recent discoveries have unearthed the gold coin of a king named Athama. Whitehead has no hesitation in recognising him as a member of the dynasty of Azes and Azilises. His date is however uncertain.

Unlike the Indo-Greek princes, the Saka kings style themselves on their coins Basileus Basileon, corresponding to the Prakrit on the reverse Mahārājasa Rājārājasa. They also appropriate the epithet Mahatasa, corresponding to the Greek Megaloy, which we find on the coins of Greek kings. The title Rājarāja—king of kings—was not an empty boast. Moga had under him the Vice-roys Liaka and Patika of Chhahara 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 Kshatrapāvan 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 Kāpisa,
2. The Satraps of the Western Pañjab,
3. The Satraps of Mathurā.

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

¹ The coins which Smith assigns to Azes II are found generally nearer the surface than those of Azes I (J.R.A.S., 1914, 979).
The Pañjāb Satraps belonged to three families, viz.:

(a) *The Kusula 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 Gondophernes.

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

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rañjubula—Yasi-kamudha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šudheja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Rañjubula 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 Śodāsa. Inscription B on the Mathurā Lion Capital mentions him as a Chhatrava (Satrap) and as the son of Mahāchhatrava Rājula (Rañjubula). But later inscriptions at Mathurā written in Brāhmī characters call him a Mahākṣhātrapa. One of these inscriptions gives a date for him in the year 72 of an unspecified era. It is clear that during his father’s lifetime he was only a Satrap. But on his father’s death sometime before the year 72, he became a Great Satrap. Sten Konow adduces good grounds for believing that Śodāsa dated his inscription in the Vikrama era (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-Scythia, 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-Scythian possessions in Ptolemy’s time were Patalene (the Indus Delta) Abiria and Syrastrene (Kathiāwār) (Ind. Ant., 1881, p. 354). This is exactly what we find in the Junā gadā 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. 343) and Mathurā belonged to the Kaspeiraioi (Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 350). Dr. Majumdar suggests that Ptolemy probably noticed the Śaka empire of Mauēs 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 Šaka domain in the middle of the second century A.D. (cf. Ptolemy, Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 354, and the Junagadh inscription of the Šaka ruler Rudradāman). 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 Śuḍāsa, i.e., Śoḍāsa was ruling as a mere Kshatrapa, Padika, i.e., Patika was a Mahākshatrapa. As Śoḍāsa was a Mahākshatrapa in the year 72, he must have been a Kshatrapa before 72. Consequently Padika or Patika must have been reigning as a Mahākshatrapa contemporary of the Kshatrapa Śoḍāsa 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 Mahākshatrapa 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 Mahākshatrapas 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 Rañjubula and was consequently a nephew of Soḍāsa. 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 Kharoshthi on the reverse. The Kharoshthi legend runs thus: “Chhatrapasapra Kharaostasa Artasa putrasa.”

The coins of the family of Rañjubula 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 Ganesha near Mathurā revealed the name of a Satrap of the Kshaharatā 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 Sakastanasa puyae—gave decisive proof that Rañjubula or Rājuvula, Soḍāsa and other connected Satraps were of Saka nationality. Dr. Thomas shows, however, that the Satraps of Northern India were the representatives of a mixed Parthian and Saka domination. This is strongly supported a priori by the fact that Patika of Taxila, who bears himself a Persian name, mentions as his overlord the great king Moga whose name is Saka. The inscriptions of the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Persian and Saka nomenclature. (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. 233-235; 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 believe,
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 Saka rule by the Parthians in the Lower Indus valley is furnished by the author of the Periplus in whose time (about 60 or 80 A.D.), Minnagara, the metropolis of Scythia, i.e., the Saka kingdom in the Lower Indus valley, was subject to Parthian princes who were constantly driving each other out. If Sir John Marshall is right in reading the name of Aya or Azes in the Taxila Inscription of 136, then it is clear that Saka rule survived in a part of Eastern Gandhāra, while 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 Archaeology. 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 Satavasth. 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 Pañjab 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 Maharāja, rājātirāja devaputra Khushana." The Sūr 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. 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 Gondophaernes. 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-chhouang (Kushān) prince
Kieū-tsieū-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-chī 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 Yue-tchi.

We learn from Ssū-ma-ch’ien who recorded the story
of the travels of Chang-K’ien, that in or about B. C. 165
the Yueh-chī were dwelling between the Tsenn-hoang
country and the K’i-lien mountains, or T’ien-chan Range
in Chinese Turkestan. At that date the Yueh-chī 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-chī attacked the Sakas who fled into Kipin
(Kāpīsā-Lampāka-Gandhāra). Meantime the son of the
slain Wu-sun king grew up to manhood and drove the
Yueh-chī further west into the Tahia (Dahae?) territory
washed by the Oxus. The Tabia 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 Ssūma-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), Hitouen (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 445 A.D. He gives the following account of the Yueh-chi conquest. “In old days the Yueh-chi were vanquished by the Hiung-nū. They then went to Tahia and divided the kingdom among five Yabgous, viz., those of Hieou-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 (Kabul), overcame Po-ta 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 Kushan 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 cara Kadphises, the first Kushan 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 Kabul valley. The prevalent view that Kadphises conquered Hermaios is, in the opinion of Marshall, wrong. Sten Konow finds his name mentioned in the Takht-i-Bahai inscription of the year 103 belonging to the reign of Gondophrernes. The inscription probably belongs to a period when the Kushan 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 Kushan 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
Taxila inscription of 136 the Kushān king is called Devasputra, 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 Rājāṭirāja.

"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 Kushān 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 Kharoshthi inscription he
THE KUSHĀNS

KUSHANS is called "the great king, king of kings, lord of the world, the Mahiśvara, the defender."

We learn from Yu-Houan, the author of the Wei-lío, composed between A.D. 231-265 that the Yueh-chi power was flourishing in Kipin (Kāpiṣa-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), Vāśishka (24-28), Huvishka (33-60), Kanishka II son of Vajheshka (41), and Vāsudeva (74-98). Huvishka, Vājheshka and Kanishka II are probably referred to by Kalhaṇa as Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka who apparently ruled conjointly. It will be seen that Kanishka II ruled in the year 41, a date which falls within the reign of Huvishka (33-60). Thus the account of Kalhaṇa is confirmed by epigraphic evidence.

In the chronological order generally accepted by numismatists, the Kanishka group succeeded the Kadphises group. But this view is not accepted by many scholars. Moreover there is little agreement among scholars who place the Kanishka group after the Kadphises kings. The various theories of Kanishka's date are given below:

1. According to Dr. Fleet, Kanishka reigned before the Kadphises group, and was the founder of that reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, which afterwards came to be known as the Vikrama Samvat. His view was accepted by Kennedy, but was ably controverted by Dr. Thomas, and can no longer be upheld after the discoveries of Marshall (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 Kushans, ruled Kipin (Kāpiśa-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 Nāgārjuna and hence of a king of the Sātavāhana line of Kośala 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 Saka era. This view is not accepted by Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil on the following grounds:

(a) If we admit that Kujula-Kadphises and Hermaios reigned about 50 A.D. and that Kanishka founded the Saka era in 78 A.D. we have scarcely 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 Kushāṇ 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 Kumara 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 Kharoshthi inscriptions Kanishka and his successors recorded the dates in the same way as their Śaka-Pahlava predecessors, giving the name of the month and the day within the month. On the other hand in their Brāhmi records, Kanishka and his successors adopted the ancient Indian way of dating (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141). Are we to conclude from this that the Kharoshthi dates of Kanishka's inscriptions, are not to be referred to the same era to which the dates of the Brāhmi records are to be ascribed? If Kanishka adopted two different ways of dating, we fail to understand why he could not have adopted a third
method to suit the local conditions in western India. Sten Konow himself points out that in the Śaka dates we have the name of the month, as in the Kharoshthī 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 Hindustān used the ancient Indian way of dating prevalent there, so in western India his officers added the paksha to suit the custom in that part of the country].

Kanishka completed the Kushān conquest of upper India and ruled over a wide realm which extended from Gandhāra and Kaśmir to Benares. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sāketa) and Pātaliputra 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 Sua Vihear (north of Sind), from Mathura and Śravasti, and from Sarnāth near Benares. His coins are found in considerable quantities as far eastwards as Gazipur. The eastern portion of his empire was apparently governed by the Mahā Kshatrapa Kharapallāna and the Kshatrapa Vanashupara. He fixed his own residence at Peshawar (Purushapura) and established Kanishkapura in Kaśmir. It is however probable that Kanishkapura was established by his namesake of the Āra inscription. After making himself master of the South (i.e. India) Kanishka turned to the west and defeated the King of the Parthians (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 Sākyamuni. 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 Kushān monarch continued to honour his old Zoroastrian, Greek, Mithraic and Hindu gods. The court of Kanishka was adorned by Asvaghosha, 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 Vājheška the father of Kanishka of the Āra inscription, and Jushka of the Rājatarangini.

Huvishka's dates range from 33 to 60. Kalhana's narrative leaves the impression that he ruled simultaneously with Jushka and Kanishka, i.e., Vājheška and Kanishka of the Āra inscription of the year 41. The Wardak vase inscription proves the inclusion of Kabul 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 Budradāman. In Kaśmir 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 Āra 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 Kaśmira.

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. These were Ta-hia (Oxus region), Ki-pin (Kāpiṣa), Kao-fou (Kābul) and Tien-tcho (India proper). The Yüeh-chi kingdom of Tien-tcho 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 epigraphical evidence. A Lahore copper seal inscription of the fourth century A.D., refers to a king named Maheśvara Nāga, the son of Nāgabhaṭṭa.

1 Among the successors of Vāsudeva may be mentioned Kanishko (III), 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 Kaliṅkr (Alberuni, II, 10).
The Allahabad Pillar Inscription refers to King Ganapati Nāga, while several Vākāṭaka records mention Bhava Nāga king of the Bhārasivas 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, Kāntipurī 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 Kābul valley. One of them was probably the Daivaputrasāhi sāhānsāhi 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 KSHAHARATAS.

We have seen that in the first century B.C., the Scythians possessed Ki-pin (Kapiša-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 Sāvatāhanas. 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 Skandunāga (Ep. Ind., XIV, 155). The name of the Scythian conquerors of Mahārāṣṭra, Kshaharāta, seems to be identical with “Karatai,” the designation of a famous Saka tribe mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy (Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400).

The known members of the Kshaharāta, Khabarāta, or Chaharata, family are Ghataka, Bhumaka and Nahapāna. Of these Ghataka belonged to the Mathura region. Bhumaka was a Kshatrapa of Kathiāwar. 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 Pāṇḍulema, 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 Amāṭya. Ushavadāta’s inscriptions indicate that Nahapāna’s political influence extended from Poona (in Mahārāṣṭra) and Śūrūraka (in North Konkon) to Mandasor (Dasapura in Mālwa) and the district of Ajmir including Pushkara, the place of pilgrimage to which Ushavadāta resorted for consecration after his victory over the Malayas or Mālavas.

The Nāsik and Karle records give the dates 41, 42, 43 of an unspecified era, and call Nahapāna a Kshatrapa, while the Junnar epigraph of Ayama specifies the date 46 and speaks of Nahapāna as Mahākṣatrapa. The generally accepted view is that these dates are to be referred to the Śaka era of 78 A.D. The name Nahapāna is no doubt Persian, but the Kṣaharāta tribe to which Nahapāna belonged was probably a Śaka tribe, and Ushavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, 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 Nahapāna. Rapson accepts the view that Nahapāna’s dates are recorded in years of the Śaka era, beginning in 78 A.D., and therefore assigns Nahapāna to the period A. D. 119 to A. D. 124. Several scholars identify Nahapāna with Māmbarus (Nambanus?) of the Periplus whose capital was Minnagara in Ariake. According to Prof. Bhandarkar Minnagara is modern Mandasor, and Ariake is Aparāntika. Mr. R. D. Banerji and Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil are, however, of opinion that Nahapāna’s dates are not referable to the Śaka era. They say that if we admit that the inscriptions of Nahapāna are dated in the Śaka era, there will be only an interval of five years

1 See also Boush. Gaz., I. I. 15 n.
2 Ariake may be Arya’s of Varāhamihira’s Brāhat Samāhitā.
between the inscription of this king, dated 46, and the inscriptions of Rudradama, dated 52. Within these years must have taken place:

(1) The end of Nahapana’s reign;
(2) The destruction of the Kshaharatatas;
(3) The accession of Chashtana as Kshatrapa, his reign as Kshatrapa, his accession as a Mahakshatrapa, and his reign as Mahakshatrapa;
(4) The accession of Jayadaman as Kshatrapa, his reign as Kshatrapa, and perhaps also his reign as Mahakshatrapa;
(5) The accession of Rudradama 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 Nahapana, and the year 52, the first known date of Rudradama). There is nothing to show that Chashtana’s family came to power after the destruction of the Kshaharatatas. The line of Chashtana may have been ruling in Cutch (as the Andhau inscriptions of the year 52 suggest) while the Kshaharatatas were ruling in Malwa and Mahashtra. Moreover there is no good ground for believing that a long interval elapsed from the accession of Chashtana to that of Rudradama. Professors Bhandarkar and Majumdar have pointed out that the Andhau inscriptions clearly prove that Chashtana and Rudradama ruled conjointly in the year 52. Prof. J. Dubreuil rejects their view on the ground that there is no “cha” after Rudradama in the text of the inscription (Rajna Chashtanasa Yasamotikaputrasa, rajna Rudradamasa Jayadamaputrasa varshe dvipachase 50, 2). Prof. Dubreuil translates the passage thus:

In the 52nd year, in the reign of Rudradama, son of Jayadama, grandson of Chashtana and great-grandson of Yasamotika.
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 Ysämotika first, and then the name of Chashtana followed by those of Jayadāman and Rudradāman—Ysämotika prapautrasa Chashtana pautrasa Jayadāmaputrasa Rudradāmasa (*cf.* the Gunda 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 inscrpitional 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 Kauṭilya's *Arthasastra*, p. 325).1 The theory of the conjoint rule of Chashtana and his grandson is supported by the fact that Jayadāman did not live to be Mahākshatrāpa and must have predeceased his father Chashtana as, unlike Chashtana and Rudradāman, he is called simply a Kshatrāpa (not Mahākshatrāpa and Bhadramukha) even in the inscriptions of his descendants (*cf.* the Gunda 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. 124 *ante*; the case of Dhritarāshiṭra 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 74 S. E. But Rudradāman is known to have defeated Pulumāyi and taken Nāsik before that time. Banerji's error lies in the tacit assumption that Rudradāman twice occupied Nāsik before the year 73 of the Saka era. Another untenable assumption of Mr. Banerji is that Rudradāman finished his conquests before the year 52 or A. D. 130, whereas the Andhau inscriptions merely imply the possession of Cutch by the House of 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 prasasti calls Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi 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 Sātavāhana Empire.

Gautamiputra's victory over the Kshaharatas 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 (Aśmaka on the Godāvari, i.e., Mahārāṣṭra), and Mullaka (the district round Paithan), but also over Suratha (Kāthiāvāīr), Kukura (in Central India, probably near the Pāriyātra or the Western Vindhyas (Brihat Samhitā, 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 (Andhrapyātha) 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

1 Shamsastry's translation of the Arthasastra, p. 143, n. 2.
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 Gautami 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 Mahādevi jicasulā Rajamātā. In Pulumāyi's inscription the epithets Māhadevi 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 Bhadavânya 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 21, and whose existence before the 19th year of Pulumâyi is attested by an edict of Gautâmiputra of the year 18. On the other hand the cave given away to the Bhadavânya monks was the whole of Cave No. 3.

If Gautâmiputra and his son reigned simultaneously, and if the latter ruled as his father's colleague in Mâhârâshâtra, then it is difficult to explain why Gautâmiputra addressed the officer at Govardhana directly, ignoring his son who is represented as ruling over Mâhârâshâtra, 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.

The generally accepted view is that Pulumâyi succeeded Gautâmiputra. We learn from Ptolemy that his capital was Baithan, i. e., Paithan or Pratishthana on the Godavari, identified by Bhandarkar with Navanara. Inscriptions and coins prove that Pulumâyi's dominions included the Kṛishnâ district as well as Mâhârâshâtra. We have already seen that the Andhra country is not mentioned in the list of countries over which Gantamiputra held his sway. It is not altogether improbable that Vâsishthiputra 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 Adoni taluk of the Bellary district. But the absence of the distinguishing matronymic probably indicates that the king referred

to in the inscription is Pulumāyi I of the Purānas. Rapson identified Pulumāyi with Vāsishṭhiputra Śrī Śatākarnī who is represented in a Kanheri inscription as the husband of a daughter of the Mahākshatrapa Ru(dra). He further identifies this Rudra with Rudradāman and says that Pulumāyi must be identified with Śatākarnī, 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 Vāsishṭhiputra Śrī Śatākarnī of the Kanheri Cave Inscription. He identifies the latter with Śiva Śrī Śatākarnī, the Śiva Śrī of the Matsya Purāṇa, probably a brother and successor of Pulumāyi. Another brother of Pulumāyi was probably Śrī Chandra Śati.

The next important kings were Śrī Sāta (mis-called Sakaśena) and Yajñāsri Śatākarnī. Yajñāsri’s inscriptions, which prove that he reigned for at least 21 years, are found at the following places, eiz., Nāsik, Kanheri, and China (Kṛishṇa district). His coins are found in Gujarāt, Kāthiāwār, East Malwa, Aparānta, the Central Provinces, and the Kṛishṇa district. There can be no doubt that he ruled over both Mahāyāṣṭra and the Andhra country. Smith says that his silver coins imitating the coinage of the Śaka 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.

Yajñāsri was the last great king of his dynasty. After his death the Śatavahānas probably lost Mahārāṣṭra to the Ābhira king Īśvarasena. The later Śatavahana princes—Śrī Rudra Śatākarnī, Śrī Kṛishṇa Śatākarnī and others—ruled in Eastern Deccan and were supplanted by the Ikshvākus and the Pallavas. The Śatākarnīs of Kuntala, or the Kanarese districts, were supplanted by the Pallavas.
and Kadambas. A new power—the Vakataka—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 Satavahana Empire were at first the Śaka Kshatrapas of Ujjain. The progenitor 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 Bāgra 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 Kārdhamaka. The daughter of Rudradāman boasts that she is descended from the family of Kārdhamaka kings; but she may have been indebted to her mother for this distinction. The Kārdhamaka kings apparently derive their name from the Kārdama, a river in Persia (Parasika, Shama Sastry's translation 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 Malichos (Maliku) the king of the Nabataeans who died in A.D. 75, and Zoscales (Za Hakale) king of the Axumites who reigned from A.D. 76 to 89 (JRAS, 1917, 827-830).
in the year A. D. 130 Chashtana was ruling jointly with his grandson Rudradaman. Prof. Bhandarkar points out that his foreign title Kshatrapa, and the use of the Kharoshthi alphabet on his coins, clearly show that he was a Viceroy of some northern power—probably of the Kushâns. Jayadâman, son of Chashtana, seems to have acted merely as a Kshatrapa and to have pre-deceased his father, and the latter was succeeded as Mahâkshatrapa by Rudradâman.

Rudradâman became an independent Mahâkshatrapa sometime between the years 52 and 72 (A. D. 130 and 150). We learn from the Junâga4h Rock Inscription of the year 72 that men of all caste chose him as protector and that he won for himself the title of Mahâkshatrapa. This probably indicates that he declared his independence.

The place names in the inscription seem to show that the rule of Rudradâman extended over Purvâparâkarâvânti (East and West Mâlwa), Anupanivriti or the Mâhishmati (Mândhata?) region, Anârâta ¹ (district round Dwârakâ), Surâshâtra (district round Junâga4h), Svabhra (the country on the banks of the Sâbarmatl), Maru (Mârwar), Kachchhâ (Cutch), Sindhu-Sauvira (the Lower Indus valley ²), Kukura (part of central India, probably near the Pâriyâtra Mt, according to the Bâhâvatâ Purâna, references to Dwârakâ as "Kukurândhâkaś及àpâhâya" [I. 11. 10].

¹ Anârâta may however designate the district round Vajjângâtra (Bom. Gaz. I., i, 6). In that case Kukura should be placed in the Dwârakâ region. The Bâhâvatâ Purâna refers to Dwârakâ as "Kukurângâkârâcâhâya" [I. 11. 10].

² Sindhu is the inland portion (Watters, Yanau Chwang II. 232, 253, read with 256). Sauvira is the littoral (Milinda Panho, SBE. XXXVI, 269).
Junagadh inscription supplies the information that Rudradāman twice defeated Satakarni, lord of the Deccan, but did not destroy him on account of their near relationship. According to Prof. Bhandarkar this Satakarni was Gautamiputra himself whose son Vāsishthiputra Satakarni 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 Bijayagadh region in the Bharatpur state. If the Kushān chronology accepted by us be correct then he must have wrested Sindhu-Sauvira from one of the successors of Kanishka I.

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

The great Kshatrapa is said to have gained fame by studying grammar (Śabda), polity (artha), music (gāndharva), logic (nyāya), etc. As a test of the civilised character of his rule it may be noted that he took, and kept to the end of his life, the vow to stop killing men except in battle. The Sudarśana embankment was built and the lake reconstructed by “expend ing 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 (Visṛṭi); benevolences (Praṇaya), 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 guṇa samudyuktaḥ) and were divided into two classes, viz., Matisachiva (councillors) and Karmasachiva (Executive officers).
Rudradāman was succeeded by his eldest son Dāma- 
ghsāda I. After Dāmaghsāda there were (according 
to Rapson) two claimants for the succession: his son 
Jīvadāman 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 Ābhira general named Rudrabhūti, son of the 
general Bāpaka. The Ābhiras afterwards usurped the 
position of Mahākṣatrapa. According to Prof. Bhandarka 
an Ābhira named Iśvaradatta was the Mahākṣatrapa of 
the period 188-90 A. D. But Rapson places Iśvaradatta 
after A. D. 236.

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

The connection of Bhartridāman and Viśvasena with 
the next Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman II and his succes-
sors 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 comemo-
rates the construction of a cave by a minister of Chandra

\footnote{To Rudrasena’s reign belongs the Mulwasar inscription of A. D. 200, and Jasdan inscription of A. D. 205. In the latter inscription we have the title Bhudra- 
mūtha 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 Malwa is probably hinted at by the epithet "Simhavikrantagamini," 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 Surashtra is to be seen in Chandra Gupta's silver coins which are imitated from those of the Saka Satraps. Lastly, Bana in his Harshacharita refers to the slaying of the Saka king by Chandra Gupta (Aripure cha parakalatra kāmuṇakā kāminiveśaguptaḥ cha Chandra Guptaḥ Sākapatimaśātayaditi).
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 Śakas, 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 Brāhmi Inscriptions. The Ichchhāwar (Bāndā district) Buddhist Statuette inscription (Lüders, No. 11) mentions the benefaction of Mahādevī queen of Śri Hariḍāsa, sprung from the Gupta race (Gupta vamsodita). A Bharaut Buddhist Pillar Inscription (Lüders, No. 687) of the Śunga period refers to a “Gaupti” as the queen of Rājan Visadeva, and the grandmother of Dhanabhūti a feudatory of the Śungas.

Traces of Gupta rule in Magadha are found as early as the second century A. D. I-Tsing, a Chinese pilgrim, who travelled in India in the seventh century A. D., mentions a Mahārāja Śri Gupta who built a temple near Mrīgaśikhāvana. I-Tsing’s date would place him about A. D. 175 (Allan, Gupta Coins, Introduction, p. xv). Allan rejects the date and identifies Śri 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 Śri Gupta of A. D. 175 with Samudra Gupta’s great-grand-father who must have flourished about a century later.

The names of Śri Gupta’s immediate successors are not known. The earliest name of the Gupta family of Magadha which appears in inscriptions is that of Mahārāja Gupta who was succeeded by his son Mahārāja Ghatotkacha.

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 Vaisāli, and laid the foundations of the Second Magadhan Empire. The union of Chandra Gupta I with the Lichchhavi family is commemorated by a series of coins having on the obverse standing figures of Chandra Gupta and his queen, the Lichchhavi Princess Kumāradevi, and on the reverse a figure of Lakshmi with the legend “Lichchhavayaḥ” probably signifying that the prosperity of Chandra Gupta was due to his Lichchhavi alliance. Smith suggests that the Lichchhavis were ruling in Pātaliputra as tributaries or feudatories of the Kushāns, and that through his marriage Chandra Gupta succeeded to the power of his wife’s relatives. But Allan points out that Pātaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Śri 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:

AnuGангā Prayāgamcha Śāketam Magadhāṃstathā
Etān janapadān sarvān bhokshyante Guptavāṃśajāḥ.

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.

Samudra Gupta Parākramānka.

Chandra Gupta I was succeeded by his son Samudra Gupta. It is clear from the Allahabad prasasti and from the epithet tatparigrihita applied to Samudra Gupta in other inscriptions that the prince was selected from among his sons by Chandra Gupta I as best fitted to succeed him. The new monarch seems also to have been known as Kācha.1

It was the aim of Samudra Gupta to bring about the political unification of India and make himself an Ekārāṭ like Mahāpadma. But his only permanent annexation was that of portions of Āryāvarta. Following his "Sarvakshatrāntaka" predecessor, he uprooted Rudradeva, Matīla, Nāgadatta, Chandravarman, Gaṇapati Nāga, Nāgasena, Achyuta, Nandi, Balavarman and many other kings of Āryāvarta, captured the scion of the family of Kota and made all kings of the forest countries (atavika-rāja) his servants. Matīla has been identified with a person named Mattila mentioned in a seal found in Bulandshahr. The

1 The epithet Sarvakshatrāntaka 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 Vāṅga 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 Vahlikas 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 Vishnu 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 Sadā-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 kulajanmanab sārikāśrāvita mantrasya āśtināśo Nāgasenasya Padmāvatyām). Nandi was also probably a Nāga prince. In the Purāṇas Sīṣu Nandi and Nandiyāsas are connected with the Nāga family of Central India. We know the name of a Nāga prince named Śivanaṁdi (Dubreuil, Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 31). Achyuta was probably a king of Abichchhatrā. 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 Arikaṇa.

The annexation of the northern kingdoms was not the only achievement of Samudra Gupta. He made the rulers of the Āṭavika rājyas his servants, led an expedition to the south and made his power felt by the potentates of Eastern Deccan. We perceive, however, a difference between his northern and southern campaigns. In the north he played the part of a digvijayi of the Early Magadhan type. But in the south he followed the Kautilyan ideal of a dharma-vijayi, i.e., he defeated the kings but did not annex their territory.

The Āṭavika rājyas were closely connected with Ḍabbaḷa (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 Dakshiṇāpatha who came into conflict with the great Gupta were Mahendra of Kosala, Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra, Maṇṭarāja of Kaurāla, Svāmidatta of Pishṭapura and of Koṭṭūra on Mahendragiri, Damana of Erāṇḍapalla, Vishṇugopa of Kāṇchī, Nilarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Vengī, Ugrasena of Palakka Kuvera of Devarāṣṭa, 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
POLITICAL HISTORY OF INDIA

Yayatinagari on the Mahanadi (Ep. Ind., XI, p. 189). The poet Dhoyi, in his Pavanadutsam, connects the Keralis with Yayatinagari:

Lilāṁ netum nayanapada vīṁ Keralīnāṁ rateschet
gachchheṁ khyātāṁ jagati nagarīṁ akhyāyātāṁ Yayateḥ.

Pishtapura is Pithapuram in the Godavari district, Koṭṭura has been identified with Kothoor, 12 miles south-south-east of Mahendragiri in Gaṅjam, and Erandapalli “a town probably near Chica cole” (Dubreuil, A. H. D., pp. 58-60). Kāśchī is Conjeeveram near Madras. Avamukta cannot be satisfactorily identified. But the name of its king Nilarāja reminds us of Nilapalli “an old seaport near Yanam” in the Godavari district (Gazetteer of the Godavari District, Vol. I, p. 213). Vengi has been identified with Vegi or Ṛedda-Vegi 7 miles north of Ellore (Kṛishṇa District). Palakka is probably identical with Palakkada, the seat of a Pallava viceroyalty. Devarāṣṭra 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 Rāghuvamśa:

Grihitapratimuktasya sa dharmavijayi nrispha
Śriyāṁ Mahendraṁāthasya jahāra ntu medinīṁ.

It is not a little surprising that the Allahabad prasasti contains no reference to the Vākāṭakas who were now the predominant power in the region between Bundelkhand and Kāṛṇāṭa. 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, 187).
(Ep. Ind., XV, pp. 261, 267). The dynasty rose to power under Vindhyāśakti and his son Pravarasena I. Pravarasena appears to have been succeeded by his grandson Rudrasena I. Prithvisena 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. Prithvisena I's political influence extended from Nachne-kt-talai in Bundelkhand (Fleet, CII, p. 233) to the borders of Kuntala (or Karnāta, Ind. Ant., 1876, p. 318), i.e., the Kanarese country. One of the Ajantā inscriptions credits him with having conquered the lord of Kuntala. The Nach-nē-kt-talāt region was ruled by his vassal Vyāghrādeva. Prof. Dubreuil, however, says that the Nachnā inscription which mentions Vyāghra, belongs not to Prithvisena I but to his descendant Prithvisena II. But this is improbable in view of the fact that from the time of Prithvisena 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 Vākāṭaka territory, owned the sway of the Gupta empire. Now as Vyāghra of the Nachnā record acknowledges the supremacy of the Vākāṭaka Prithvisena, this Prithvisena can only be Prithvisena 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 Prithvisena II during whose rule the Guptas, and not the Vākāṭakas, were the acknowledged suzerains of the Central Provinces as we know from the records of the Parivṛṣajaka Mahārājās (cf. Modern Review, April, 1931, p. 475).

The absence of any reference to Prithvisena I in Harishena's praśasti is explained by the fact that Samudra Gupta's operations were confined to the eastern part of the
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 Devarashtra with Maharashtra and of Eranjapalla with Erandol in Khandesh, is wrong (cf. Modern Review, 1921, p. 457).

Though Samudra Gupta did not invade the Western Deccan it is clear from his Era inscription that he did deprive the Vakatakas of their possessions in Central India. But these possessions were not directly governed by the Vakataka monarch, but were under a vassal prince. In the time of Prithivisena this prince was Vyaghra. We should naturally expect a conflict between the Vakataka feudatory and the Gupta conqueror. Curiously enough the Allahabad prasasti refers to Samudra Gupta's victory over Vyaghrraja of Mahakantara. It is probable that this Vyaghrraja is identical with the Vyaghra of the Nachna inscription who was the Central Indian feudatory of Prithivisena. As a result of Samudra Gupta's victory the Guptas succeeded the Vakatakas as the paramount power of Central India. Henceforth the Vakatakas appear as a purely southern power.

The victorious career of Samudra Gupta must have produced a deep impression on the pratyanta nipatis or frontier kings of East India and the Himalayan region, and the tribal states of the Panjab, Western India and Malwa who are said to have gratified his imperious commands (Prachanda Sasan) "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), Davaka (not satisfactorily identified) and Kamarupa (in Assam); we learn from the Dhamodarapur
plates that Purāvardhana 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 Nepal and Kartripura, the latter principality comprised probably Katāpur in the Jalandhar district, and the territory of the Katur, Katuría or Katyur rājas of Kumaun, Garhwal and Rohilkhand.

The tribal states which paid homage were situated on the western and south-western fringe of Ārvāvarta proper. Among these the most important were the Mālāvas, Arjunāyanas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Ābhiras, Prājrūnas, Sanakānīkas, Kākas and Kharaparikas.

The Mālāvas 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 Mālavagañā (Mālavaganaṃnāta).

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

The Madrakas had their capital at Śākala or Siālkot in the Pañjab. The Ābhiras occupied the tract near Vinaśana (Śūdrābhīrān prati dvēšād yatro nashta Sarasvati, Mbh. IX. 37.1) in the territory called Abiria by the Periplus. We have already seen that an Ābhira became Mahākshatrapa of western India and supplanted the Śatavāhanas in a part of Mahārāṣṭra in the second or third century A.D. The lands of the Prāṇjunas, Sanakāṇikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas lay probably in central India. The Prāṇjunakas are mentioned in the Arthasastra of Kautilya (p. 194). A clue to the locality of the Sanakāṇikas 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 Brihat Samhitā (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 Surāśṭra 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 Garuda seal."

The foreign powers who thus established diplomatic relations with Śamudra Gupta were the Daivaputra Śāhi Śāhānuśāhī and the Śaka Murunḍas as well as the people of Simhala and all other dwellers in Islands.

The Daivaputra Śāhi Śāhānuśāhī 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 Asvamedha was celebrated by several kings during the interval which elapsed from the time of Pushyamitra to that of Samudra Gupta, e.g., Satakarni the husband of Nayanikā, Pravarasena I Vakāataka, great-grand-father of Prithivisena I, the contemporary of Samudra Gupta, and the Pallava Sivaskandavarman of the Prakrit 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 Asvamedhaparākramaḥ.

If Harishena, the writer of the Allahabad Prasasti, 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 Kāvirāja by various poetical compositions.” Unfortunately none of these compositions have survived. But the testimony of Harishena to his musical abilities finds corroboration in the lyricist 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, Kritāntaparaśu, Sarvarājochchhetta, Vyāghraparākrama, Aśvamedhaparākrama, and Parākramāṇaka but not Dharmāditya.

We possess no dated documents for Samudra Gupta's reign. The Gaya grant professes to be dated in the year 9, but no reliance can be placed on it and the reading of the numeral is uncertain. Smith's date (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 VIKRAMĀDIṬYAS.

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 Sānchi 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 Prithivisena I, and the war with the Śaka Satraps which added Mālwa and Surāśṭra to the Gupta dominions.

1 Cf. the epithet "Sarvakṣhetrāntaka" applied to his great fore-runner Mahāpadma Nanda.
Chandra Gupta II had a daughter named Prabhavatt, 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 Maharaja occupied a geographical position in which he could be of much service or disservice to the northern invader of the dominions of the Sakas Satraps of Gujarati and Surashtra, 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 Virasena-Saba in the following passage "he (Saba) came here, accompanied by the king (Chandra Gupta) in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world." Saba was an inhabitant of Pataliputra who held the position, acquired by hereditary descent, of being a sachiva of Chandra Gupta II and was placed by his sovereign in charge of the Department of Peace and War. He naturally accompanied his master when the great western expedition was undertaken. The campaign against the Sakas was eminently successful. The fall of the Saka Satrap is alluded to by Bana. The annexation of his territory is proved by coins.

Capitals of the Empire—The original Gupta capital seems to have been at Pataliputra. But after his western conquests Chandra Gupta made Ujjain a second capital. Certain chiefs of the Kanarese districts, who claimed descent from Chandra Gupta Vikramaditya, referred to their ancestor as Ujjayinipuravaradhvarah as well as Pataliputrapuravaradhtsvara. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies Chandra Gupta with the traditional Vikramaditya Sakari of Ujjain. The titles Srivikrama,

1 In literature Vikramaditya is represented as ruling at Pataliputra (Kathasaritasagara VII, 43. Vikramaditya tityaruddha Pataliputra) as well as Ujjayin.
Siṃhavikramaḥ, Ajitavikramaḥ, Vikramāka and Vikramāditya actually occur on Chandra Gupta’s coins.

We have no detailed contemporary account of Ujjaini (also called Viśāla, Padmāvatī, Bhogavati, Hiraṇyavati) in the days of Chandra Gupta. But Fa-hien who visited India from A.D. 405 to 411 has left an interesting account of Pātaliputra. The pilgrim refers to the royal palace of Aśoka and halls in the midst of the city, “which exist now as of old,” and were according to him all made by spirits which Aśoka employed, and which piled up the stones, reared the walls and gates, and executed the elegant carving and inlaid sculpture-work,—in a way which no human hands of this world could accomplish. “The inhabitants are rich and prosperous, and vie with one another in the practice of benevolence and righteousness. Every year on the eighth day of the second month they celebrate a procession of images.... The Heads of the Vaiśya families establish houses for dispensing charity and medicines.”

Much light is thrown on the character of Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya’s administration by the narrative of Fa-hien and the inscriptions that have hitherto been discovered.

Speaking of the Middle Kingdom (the dominions of Chandra Gupta) the Chinese pilgrim says “the people are numerous and happy; they have not to register their households, or attend to any magistrates and their rules; only those who cultivate the royal land have to pay a portion of the gain from it. If they want to go, they go; if they want to stay on, they stay. The king governs without decapitation or other corporal punishments. Criminals are simply fined, lightly or heavily, according to the circumstances of each case. Even in cases of repeated attempts at wicked rebellion, they only have their right hands cut off. The king’s body-guards and attendants
all have salaries. Throughout the whole country the people do not kill any living creature, nor drink intoxicating liquor, nor eat onions or garlic. The only exception is that of the Chandālas. In buying and selling commodities they use cowries." The last statement evidently refers to such small transactions as Fa-bien 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 (Śābavirasena) 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 Sāchivya"). The most important among the High Ministers were the Mantrin, the Śāmdhivigrāhika and the Akṣhapaṭalādhikītā. Like the Maurya Mantrin, the Gupta Śāmdhivigrāhika accompanied the sovereign to the battle-field. There was no clear-cut division between civil and military officials. The same person could be Śāmdhivigrāhika and Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, and a Mantrin could become a Mahābalādhikītā.
It is not clear whether the Guptas had a central Mantriparishad. But the existence of local parishads (e.g. the Parishad of Udānakupa) is proved by a Basārh seal discovered by Bloch.

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

Among Bhuktis we have reference to Tirabhukti, Pundravaradhana bhukti, Śrāvasti bhukti and Nāgara bhukti. Among Pradeśas or Vishayas mention is made of Lātavishaya, Tripurivishaya, Arikīpa (called Pradeśa in Samudra Gupta's Eran inscription, and Vishaya in that of Toramāṇa), Antarvedi, Vālavi, Gayā, Kotivarsha, Mahākhusāpāra and Kuṇḍadhāṇi.

The Deśas were governed by officers called Goptris or Wardens of the Marches (cf. Sarveshu Deśeshu vidhāya Goptrīn). The Bhuktis were governed by Uparika Maḥārājas who were sometimes princes of the Imperial family (e.g., Rajāputrādevaḥṭāraka, Governor of Pundravaradhana bhukti 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 Kumārāmātya and Āyuktaka, as well as by feudatory Maḥārājas (cf. Mātrīvishṇu). Some of the Vishyapatis (e.g., Sarvanāga of Antarvedi) were directly under the Emperor, while others (e.g., those of Kotivarsha, Arikīpa and Tripuri) were under provincial governors. The Governors and District Officers were no doubt helped by officials like the Chauroddhānikā, Dāṇḍika, Dāṇḍapāśika 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 prāsasti 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 Mahādevī Śrī Dhruvasvāmin, who had his capital at Vaisālī. The seals mention several officials like the Uparika (Governor), the Kumārāṃśtyā, the Mahāpratihāra (the great chamberlain), the Mahāḍaṇḍanāyaka (the great general), the Vīnaya-sthiti-sthāpaka (the censor), and the Bhātāsvapati (lord of the army and cavalry), and the following offices, e.g., Yuvarājapādīya Kumārāṃśtyādhikaraṇa (office of the minister of His Highness the Crown Prince, according to Vogel), Raṇabhāṇḍāgārhādhikaraṇa (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 Vīnaya-sthiti-sthāpakādhikaraṇa (office of the Censor of Tirhut), Vaiśālīyādhisthānādhikaraṇa (office of the governor of Vaisālī), Śrīparamabhaṭṭārakapādīya Kumārāṃśtyādhikaraṇa (office of the minister of the Prince waiting on His Majesty).

The reference to the Parishad of Udānākūpa 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 (Śresṭhī-sārthavāha-kulika-nigama) is of interest to students of economics.

Chandra Gupta II had at least two queens, Dhruvadevi 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 medieval chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta.

Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrādītya.

Chandra Gupta II's successor was Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrādītya¹ 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 Bhakti or north Bengal (cf. the Dāmodarpur plates of the years 124 and 129); another viceroy, prince Ghaṭotkacha Gupta, governed the province of Eran 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, Bandhuvaman, governed Daśapura (Mandasor Inscription of A.D. 437-8). The Karamadande inscription of A.D. 436 mentions Prithivishena who was a Mantrin and Kumārānātīya, 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 Svāmi Mahāśeṇa (Kārtikeya), Buddha, Śiva in the līṅga 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 Sṛ Mahendra, Aśvamedha Mahendra, Ajita Mahendra, Śiṅha Mahendra, Sṛ Mahendra Śiṅha, Mahendraśīṅha, Śiṅha Viṣṇu (Allan, Gupta Coins, p. 80), Vyāghrubudaparākrama, and Śr Pratāpa.
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 "Pushyamitas in Gupta Period" (Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute) makes the plausible emendation Yudhy=amitrāṁś=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 Pushyamitas, cannot be satisfactorily determined. We should, however, remember in this connection that a people called Pushyamitra is actually referred to in the Vishnū 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. Hiuenu Tsang calls Buddha Gupta (Fo-to-kio-to) or Budha Gupta1 a son of Śakrāditya. The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had this title was Kumāra Gupta I who is called Mahendrāditya 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 Vikramāṇka. Skanda is called both Vikramāditya and Kramāditya, both the words meaning "sun of power." If Śakrāditya of Hiuenu Tsang be identical with Mahendrāditya 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 Rājaḍitya 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 Kṛṣṇa rescued Dvākapāla (cf. the Bhitari Inscription). Dr. Majumdar says that the omission of the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta in the Bihār Stone Pillar and Bhitari Inscriptions indicates that she was not a Mahādevi, and Skanda was not the rightful heir. The rightful heir of Kumāra was Pura Gupta, the son of the Mahādevi Anantadevi.

We should however remember that there was no rule prohibiting the mention of non-Mahādevis in inscriptions. The mother of Prabhāvati, Kuberanāgā, was not Chandra Gupta II’s Mahādevi. Nevertheless she is mentioned in the inscriptions of her daughter. On the other hand the names of queens, the mothers of kings, were sometimes omitted. In the genealogical portion of the Banskhera and Madhuban plates the name of Yaśomati 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 Lājjā the queen of Vīgrahā Pāla I and mother of Nārāyaṇa Pāla, but do not mention the queen of Narāyana 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 Bhāgyadevi, 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 upēte viplutām vamśa-lakṣhmīn
bhuja-bala-vijit-ār-yyah pratishthāpya bhūyāh
jitam-iti paritoshān-mātarām sāra-nettrām
hata-ripur-iva Krishno Devakīm-abhyupetaḥ.

The enemies (ari) who made the Vamśa-lakṣhmī 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 Hūnas. 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 prasasti 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 Lakshmir 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, Ḫuṇas (Bhitari Ins.) and Mlechchhas (Junāgadh Ins.). The Manujendra-putras of the Junāgadh inscription are mentioned only as disappointed princes, not as defeated enemies, like the brothers of Samudra Gupta who were discarded by Chandrā 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 "amalātma" 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 insessional 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 Bhitarl 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 Pushyamitras "who had developed great power and wealth."

The struggle with the Pushyamitras was followed by a terrible conflict with the Hūṇas in which the emperor was presumably victorious. The invasion of the Hūṇas took place not later than A.D. 458 if we identify them with the Mlechchhas of the Junāgaḍh inscription. The memory of the victory over the Mlechchhas is preserved in the story of king Vikramāditya son of Mahendra ditya of Ujjain in Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara (Allan, Gupta Coins, Introduction). Surāśṭra seems to have been the vulnerable part of the Gupta empire. The Junāgaḍh 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 Surāśṭras." Allan deduces from this and from the words "Sarveshu deseshuvirdhaya gopṭrin" that the emperor was at particular pains to appoint a series of Wardens of the Marches to protect his dominions from future invasion. One of these Wardens was Parnadatta, governor of Surāśṭra. 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 Surāśṭra. But his successors do not appear to have been so fortunate. Not a single inscription has yet been discovered which shows that Surāśṭra 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 Pāṇḍadatta viceroy of the west, Sarvanāga Vīshayapati of Antaravedi or the Doāb, and Bhīmavarman the ruler of the Kosam region. Chakrapālita, son of Pāṇḍadatta, restored in A.D. 457-8 the embankment forming the lake Sudarsāna which had burst two years previously. The emperor continued the tolerant policy of his forefathers. Himself a Vaishālīa, 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 Brahmaṇas." The Indore plate records a deed by a Brahmaṇa 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. 467.¹ 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 Eraṇ epigraph of Budha Gupta prove that from A.D. 477 to 498 the Gupta empire extended from Bengal to Mālwa. The Betul plates of the Parivṛājaka Mahārāja Saṅkshobha dated in the year 199 G. E. (Śrimati pravarddhamā- navijayarājye samvatsaraśate navanavyuttare Gupta nīpa rājyabhuktau), i.e., 518 A. D., testify to the fact that the Gupta sway at this period was acknowledged in Ḍabhālā, which included the Tripuri Vīshaya.

¹ Smith, the Oxford History of India, additions and corrections, p. 171, end.
Another inscription of Saṃkshobha found in the valley near the village of Khōh in Baghel-
khand 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 Koṭīvarsha Vishaya of Puṇḍravardhanabhukti “during the reign of Paramadaivata Paramabhaṭṭaraka Mahārājādhirāja Śrī ..........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 Prabhākaraṇavardhana of the Pushpabhūti family of Śrīkanṭha (Thānēsar), was ruling in Mālava. Two sons of this king, Kumāra Guptā and Mādhava Guptā were appointed to wait upon the princes Rājyavardhana and Harsha of Thānēsar. From the Aphṣaṭ inscription of Ādityaśēna we learn that the fame of the father of Mādhava Guptā, the associate of Harsha, marked with honour of victory in war over Sūṣṭhitavarman, king of Kāmarūpa, was constantly sung on the banks of the river Lōhitya or Brahmaputra. This indicates that even in A.D. 600 (the time of Prabhākaraṇavardhana) the sway of the Gupta dynasty extended from Mālava 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 Ādityaśēna, son of Mādhava Guptā, who “ruled the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans,” performed the Aṣvamedha and other great sacrifices and assumed the titles of Paramabhaṭṭaraka and Mahārājādhirāja.

2 Fleet, C.I.I., III, pp. 113-16.
3 Ep. Ind., XV, p. 113 ff.
4 Mālava seems to have been under the direct rule of the Guptas in the sixth and seventh centuries. Yagadha was administered by the viceregal family of Varmana (cf. Nāgarjuni Hill cave Ins., CII, 228; also Pāṇḍavarman mentioned by Hiuen 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 Bhitari 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 Tatpādānudhyāta 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 circ. A.D. 467. His brother and successor Pura Gupta, too, must have been an old man at that time. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that he had a very short reign.
and died sometime before A.D. 473 when his grandson Kumāra Gupta II was ruling. Pura Gupta’s queen was Śrī Vatsadevi, the mother of Narasimha Gupta Bālāditya.

The coins of Pura Gupta have the reverse legend Śrī Vikramājī. Allan identifies him with king Vikramādiṭya 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 Gaya 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 Kāśī (CII, 285). The evidence of the Bharsar hoard seems to suggest that a king styled Prakāśaditya came shortly after Skanda Gupta. Prakāśaditya may have been a biruda of Pura Gupta Śrī Vikrama, or of his grandson Kumāra Kramāditya, preferably the latter as the letters Kṣ seem to occur on Prakāśaditya’s coins. That the same king might have two “Āditya” names is proved by the cases of Skanda Gupta (Vikramāditya and Kramāditya) and Śilāditya Dharmāditya of Valabhi.

Pura Gupta was succeeded by his son Narasimha 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

1 Si-yo-ki, II, p. 168: Life of Hiuen Tsang, p. 111.
2 F. C. Politics, Real, 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.
Baladitya 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 Baladitya 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 Biruda Baladitya is proved by the Sārnāth Inscription of Prakātagditya (C.I.I., p. 283). 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 Mahālakshmi Devi.

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. Basak 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 Bhitari 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 Bhitari seal with his namesake of the Sārnāth inscription.
Kumāra II’s reign must have terminated in or about the year A.D. 476-77, the first known date of Budha Gupta. The reigns of Pura, Narasimha and Kumāra II appear to be abnormally short, amounting together to only ten years (A.D. 467-77). This is by no means a unique case. In Vengi three Eastern Chalukya Monarchs, viz., Vijayāditya IV, his son Ammarāja I, and Ammarāja’s son, another Vijayāditya, ruled only for seven years and six and a half months (Hultzsch, S.I.I., Vol. I, p. 46). In Kaśmira five kings Śravavarman I, Pārtha, Samkara-vardhana, Unmattavanti and Sravarman II, ruled within six years (A.D. 933-939); and three generations of kings, viz., Yasasakra, his uncle Varṇaṭa, 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. 477-95). We learn from Hiuen Tsang that he was a son of Śakra ditya. The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had that title was Kumāra Gupta I Mahendra ditya (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 Śakra ditya’s son as given by Hiuen Tsang is Fo-to-kio-to, i.e., Budha Gupta and not Budha Gupta. Similarly Watters points out that Punna-ta-ta-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 Bāḷāditya with Mihirakula proves that Budha Gupta is meant. If Fo-to-kio-to is identified with Budha Gupta, and his father Śakra ditya
with Mahendrāditya · Kumāra Gupta I), we understand why Fa Hien, who visited India in the time of Chandra 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 Damodarpur in the district of Dinajpur testify to the fact that Budha Gupta’s empire included Pundravardhana-bhukti (North Bengal) which was governed by his viceroys (Uparika Mahārāja) Brahmadatta and Jayadatta. The Sarnāth 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 Mātrivishṇu, ruler of Eraṇ, and his brother Dhanyavishṇu while Budha Gupta was reigning, and Suraśmichandra was governing the land between the Kālindi and the Narmada, 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. 163; the Life, p. 111). At this period the supremacy of the Guptas in Central India was challenged by the Hun king Toramāṇa. We have seen that in A.D. 484-85 a Mahārāja named Mātrivishṇu ruled in the Arikina Vishaya (Eraṇ) as a vassal of the emperor Budha Gupta, but after his death his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu acknowledged the supremacy of Toramāṇa. The success of the Huns in Central India was however short-lived. In 510-11 we find a general name Goparāja fighting by the side of
a Gupta king at Era 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 Parivrājakā Mahārāja of Dabhālā. The Parivrājakas Hastin and Samkshobha seem to have been the bulwarks of the Gupta empire in the Central Provinces. The Harsha Charita of Bāṇa recognises the possession of Mālava by the Guptas as late as the time of Prabhākara-vardhana (A.D. 600). There can be no doubt that the expulsion of the Huns from Central India was final. The recovery of the Central Provinces was probably effected by Bālāditya who is represented by 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 Bālāditya was a Biruda of the "glorious Bhānu Gupta, the bravest man on the earth, a mighty king, equal to Partha" along with whom Goparāja went to Era and having fought a "very famous battle" died shortly before A.D. 510-11.

Mihirakula was finally subjugated by the Janendra Yasodharman of Mandasor shortly before A.D. 533. Line 6 of the Mandasor 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 Yasodharman Mihirakula was the king of a Himalayan country ("small kingdom in the north"), i.e., Kaśmīr 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 Ganga."

Yasodharman 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 Vajpa the son and
successor of Balāditya, and extinguished the viceregal family of the Dattas of Pundravardhana. Hiuen Tsang mentions a king of Central India as the successor of Vajra. The Dattas who governed Pundravardhana from the time of Kumāra Gupta I disappear about this time. But Yasōdharmān’s success must have been short-lived, because in A.D. 533-34, the very year of the Mandasor inscription which mentions the Janendra Yasōdharmān as victorious, the son and viceroy of a Gupta Paramabhattāraka Mahārājādhirāja Prithivipati, and not any official of the Central Indian Janendra, was governing the Pundravardhana-bhukti, a province which lay between the Indian interior and the Lauhitya.

The name of the Gupta emperor in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 533-34 is unfortunately lost. The Aphsad inscription however discloses the names of a number of Gupta kings the fourth of whom Kumāra Gupta (III) was a contemporary of Isānavarman Maukhari who is known from the Harahā inscription to have been ruling in A.D. 554 (H. Sastri, Ep. Ind., XIV, pp. 110 ff). The three predecessors of Kumāra Gupta III, viz., Kṛishṇa, Harsha and Jivita should probably be placed in the period between A.D. 510, the date of Bhānu Gupta, and 554 the date of Kumāra. It is probable that one of these kings is identical with the Gupta emperor mentioned in the Dāmodarpur plate of 533-34. The absence of high-sounding titles like Mahārājādhirāja or Paramabhaṭṭāraka in the slokas of the Aphsad inscription does not necessarily prove that the Kings mentioned there were petty chiefs. No such titles are attached to the name of Kumāra I in the Mandasor inscription, or to the name of Budha in the Eran inscription. On the other hand the queen of Mādhava Gupta, one of the kings mentioned in the Aphsad inscription, is called Paramabhaṭṭārikā and Mahādevi in the Deo Baraṇārak epigraph.
Regarding *Krishna Gupta* we know very little. The *Aphsag* 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 (*driptārāti*) (and) in being victorious by (its) prowess over countless foes. The *driptārāti* against whom he had to fight may have been *Yaśodharman*. The next king Harsha had to engage in terrible contests with those who were “averse to the abode of the goddess of fortune being with (him, her) own lord.” There were, wounds from many weapons on his chest. The names of the enemies who tried to deprive him of his rightful possessions are not given. Harsha’s son, Jivita Gupta I probably succeeded in re-establishing the power of his family. “The very terrible scorching fever (of fear) left not (his) haughty foes, even though they stood on seaside shores that were cool with the flowing and ebbing currents of water, (and) were covered with the branches of plantain-trees severed by the trunks of elephants roaming through the lofty groves of palmyra palms; (or) even though they stood on (that) mountain (*Himalaya*) which is cold with the water of the rushing and waving torrents full of snow.” The “haughty foes” on seaside shores were probably the *Gauḍa* 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 *Karnasuvāra* (M. Chakravarti, J.A S.B., 1908, p. 274) and *Rādhāpurī* (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 Madhavavarman II of the Vishnukunjin family who "crossed the river Godavari with the desire to conquer the eastern region (Dubreuil, A.H.D., p. 92). The Sulikas were probably the Chalukyas. In the Mahakuta pillar inscription the name appears as Chalikya. In the Gujarāt records we find the forms Solaki and Solanki. Sulika may be another dialectic variant. The Mahakuta pillar inscription tells us that in the sixth century A.D. Kirtivarman I of the Chalikya dynasty gained victories over the kings of Vanga, Anga, 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 Maukhari 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 Banki districts of the United Provinces, while the stone inscriptions of the other group have been discovered in the Gayā district of Bihar. The Maukharis of Gayā namely Yajñavarman, Sārdulavarman and Anantavarman were a feudatory family. Sārdula is expressly called sāmanta-chūḍāmani in the Barabar 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 Īsvaravarman were simply Mahārājas. Ādityavarman's wife was Harsha Gupta, probably a sister of king Harsha Gupta. The wife of his son and successor

1 In the Brihat Samhitā XIV. 8 the Śanalikas are associated with Vidarbha.
2 The family was called both Mukhara and Maukhari. "Somu Suryaśāvīra Pusppabhūti Mukhara Varśānū, " Sakalabhuvana nanasukrīto Maukhari Vrātānāh" (Harshacharita Parāb's ed., pp. 141, 146. Cf. also C.I.I., p. 229).
Iśvaravarman was also probably a Gupta princess named Upa-Guptā. In the Harāhā inscription Iśānavarman, son of Iśvaravarman and Upa Guptā, claims victories over the Andhras, the Śūlikas and the Gaudas and is the first to assume the Imperial title of Maharājādhirāja. It was this which probably brought him into conflict with king Kumāra Gupta III. Thus began a duel between the Maukhari and the Guptas which ended only when the latter with the help of the Gaudas wiped out the Maukharī power in the time of Grahavarman, brother-in-law of Harshavardhana.

We have seen that Iśānavarman’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 Lichchhāvi 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 Iśānavarman, a very moon among kings (Aphsad Ins.).” This was not an empty boast, for the Maukharī 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 Maukharīs and fell fighting against them. “Breaking up the

1 The Maukharī opponent of Dāmodara Gupta was either Sūryavarman or Śrīva-varman (both being sons of Iśānavarman). A Sūryavarman is described in the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāśiva Gupta as “born in the unblemished family of the Varmans great on account of their Ādhipatya (supremacy) over Magadha.” If this Sūryavarman be identical with Śrīya-varman the son of Iśānavarman then it is certain that for a time the supremacy of Magadh passed from the hands of the Guptas to that of the Maukharīs.
proudly-stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūgas (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 Prabhākara­vardhana of the Pushpabhūti family of Śrīkaṇṭha (Thānēsar). The intimate relations between the family of Mahāsena Gupta and that of Prabhākara­vardhana 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 Aphsād inscription of Ādityasena 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 Susthitavarmāna (see the Nidhanapur plates) of this family came into conflict with Mahāsena Gupta and was defeated. “The mighty fame of Mahāsena Gupta,” says the Aphsād inscription, “marked with honour of victory in war over the illustrious Susthitavarmāna,......is still constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohitya.”

Between Mahāsena Gupta, the contemporary of Prabhākara­vardhana, 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 Mādhava Gupta. His name is omitted in the Aphaśāl 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 Isanavarman. The Gupta king and the Gauḍa king Śaśāṅka 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 Karṇasuvarna, the capital of the Gauḍa king Śaṅka. 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 Śeṇa successors of Śaṅka.

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 Aphisad, 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 Aśvamedha and the other great sacrifices. The Deo-Barānārk 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 Maṇḍāra inscription applies to Ādityasena the titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka
and Mahārājādhirāja. We learn from the Shāhpur stone image inscription that he was ruling in the year A.D. 672-73. It is not improbable that he or his son Deva Gupta III is the Sakalottārāpathanātha 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 Vīshṇu Gupta who is probably identical with Vīshṇu Gupta Chandrāditya. of the coins (Allan, Gupta Coins, p. 145). The last king was Jīvita Gupta II, son of Vīshṇu. All these kings continued to assume imperial titles. That these were not empty forms appears from the records of the Western Chalukyas of Vatapi 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 Magadh and the Madhyadeśa as is proved by Aḥṣaṇa and Dēo-Baranārk inscriptions, were Adityasena and his successors.

The Gupta empire was probably finally destroyed by the Gauḍas who could never forgive Mādhava Gupta’s desertion of their cause. In the time of Yaśovarman of Kanauj, i.e., in the first half of the eighth century A.D., a Gauḍa king occupied the throne of Magadha (cf. the Gauḍāvaha 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 Tālāgund 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 Prabhāvati 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 Ujjayinī.

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 Rāmāyaṇa (VI. 69,32) apparently refers to the Purūṣic episode of the uplifting of Mount Govardhāṇa (parīṣṭhāṇa girīṁ dorbhyāṁ vāpur Viśnuḥ viḍāmbayan). For other Purūṣic allusions see Calcutta Review, March, 1922, pp. 500-502.

Page iv, l. 4.—The present Mahābhārata (I. 67, 13-14) refers to King Asoka who is represented as an incarnation of a Mahāsura, and is described as “mahāvīryo'-parājītaḥ.” We have also a reference (Mbh. I. 139, 21-23) to a Greek overlord (Yavānādhī-ppaḥ) of Sauvira and his compatriot Dattāmitra (Demetrios?). The Sānti Parva mentions Yāska, the author of the Nirukta (342,73), Varṣhagāṇya (318, 59) the Sāṃkhya philosopher who flourished in the fifth century after Christ, (J. B. A. S., 1905, pp. 47-51), and Kāmanda (128, 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 Parīkṣhit I., also in the Kuru-Pându genealogy given in the Chellūr or Cočanada grant of Vira Chośa (Hultzsh, S. I. I., Vol. I, p. 67).

Page 3.—The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (IX, 22-23) distinctly mentions Tura Kāvasheya as the priest of Janamejaya, the grandson of Abhimanyu, and the son of Parīkṣhit II.

Page 12, l. 5.—The battle of Kurukṣetra is very often described as a fight between the Kurus and the Śrīṇjayas (Mbh. vi. 45, 2; 60, 29; 72, 15; 73, 41; vii. 10, 41; 119, 40; viii. 47, 23; 57, 12; 59, 1; 98, 1). The unfriendly feeling between these two peoples is distinctly alluded to in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Vedic Index, II, p. 63).
Page 12, l. 22.—The polyandrous marriage of the Pāṇḍavas does not necessarily indicate that they are of non-Kuru origin. The system of Niyoga prevalent among the Kurus of the Madhyaadesa 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 Kurus was admittedly lax (Mbh. I. 122,7). See also my "Political History" pp. 95-96, Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta University), Vol. IX.

Page 73a.—Several scholars reject the identification of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa of the Mahābhārata with the historical Kṛṣṇa of the Chāndogya Upanishad (iii. 17). But we should remember that—

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

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

(c) the Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa and his Guru Ghora Āṅgirasa were worshippers of Śūrya. We are told in the Sāntiparva (335,19) that the Śātavat-vidhi taught by the Epic Kṛṣṇa was Frāk Śūrya-mukhā-nīñāśita.

(d) an Āṅgirasa was the Guru of the Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa. Āṅgirasī Śruti is quoted as "Śruti-nām uttanā Śrutiḥ" by the Epic Kṛṣṇa (Mbh. viii. 69, 85).

(e) the Upanishadic Kṛṣṇa 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 ārja-vam-abhiṃsā satya-vachanam. The Epic Kṛṣṇa teaches the same thing in the Gītā (xiii, 18—jyotiḥśāmapi tajjyotis tamasāḥ param uchyate; xvi, 1-2—Dānam damaścha yajnaśeṣa svādhyāyam tapa ārja-vam abhiṃsā satyam).
Page 86, l. 15.—The number of four queens was exceeded even in the Brāhmaṇa 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. Trivedi takes it in the sense of guṇakirtana.

Page 99, l. 18.—The realm of Ālavaka is probably identical with the Chan-chu country visited by Hiuen 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 Kaṇṭiliya (Mysore edition, 1919), p. 34.

Page 112, l. 7.—Susunāga, according to the Mahāvaṃsaratkā (Turnour's Mahāvaṃsa, xxxvii), was the son of a Licēhāvi rāja of Vaiśāli. He was conceived by a nagara-suddhiṣ and brought up by an officer of state.

L. 20.—Avantivardhana was a son of Pālaka according to the Kathāsaritsāgara (Tawney's translation, II, p. 485).

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. 10).

Page 120, l. 24; 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 koṭis—in a rock in the bed of the river (Ganges) having caused a great excavation to be made, he buried the treasure there . . . "Levying taxes among other articles, even on skins, 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 Sanggrāma Sinhā see Tod's Rājasthān, Vol. I, p. 240n(2).
Page 147, 1. 33.—Another minister (or Pradeshtri?) was apparently Maniyatappo, a Jațilian, who “conferred the blessings of peace on the country by extirpating marauders” (Turnour's Mahāvaṁśa, p. xlii).


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

Page 251, 1. 6-7.—Rājarāpanini I, 173; Harshacharita (Cowell) p. 252; Watters, Yuau-Chwang, ii, p. 200.

Page 251, last line.—The Kadphises Kings meant here are Kujula (Kadphises I), and Vima (Wema) and not Kuyulakara Kaphṣa whose identification with Kadphises I is a mere surmise. Even if Kuyulakara be identical with Kujula and the Kushāṇ King of the Taxila inscription of 136, it may be pointed out that it is by no means certain that the date 136 refers to the Vikrama era.

Page 256, 1. 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 Āśvamedha 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 Āśvamedha sacrifices indicates that they were not a feudatory family owing allegiance to the Kushāṇs.

Page 284 I. 5.—Meghadūta (I, 31) and Kathāśāritsāgara (Tawney's translation, Vol II. p. 275).
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Ellilmalai, 140
Ellore, 276
Ephori, 153
Epirus, 174
Eratapali, 276
Ferri-le, 60
Fo-ti-kio-to, 283n, 297n, 299

F.

Fei-shi-li, 60
Furrukhabad, 31
Fu-li-chih, 60

G.

Gadara, 71, 123
Gaggari, 55
Gauapati Naga, 256, 273, 274
Ganarajas, 63, 65, 107
Gandhari, 24, 54, 56
Gangaridae, 120, 135, 155, 164
Gargi, 23
Gargya Balaki, 27
Gautami BalaSri, 262, 263
Gautamiputra, 262, 263
Gautamiputra, 262, 263
Gaya, 303, 305, 308, 309.
Gaupaityana, 14
Gau Parmasastrya, 27
Gautamiputra, 262, 263
Gautamiputra, 262, 263
Gauja, 57
Gauja 53, 55, 56, 250, 297, 304
Gadrosia, 20, 142, 142, 227
Ghataka, 211, 257
Ghatotkach, 272
Ghatotkachal Gupta, 288
Ghona Ahegirasa, 183, 312
Girikshit 4
Giriraja (in Kekaya), 26, 56
Giriraja (in Magadha), 26, 56, 111.
Gunduchandra, 205, 206, 206n, 207, 208, 209, 225, 226, 227, 260n
Gundphernes, 229
Gopala, 103
Gopal Vaibhav, 212
Goparaja, 300, 301
Goptri, 94, 167, 237, 280
Govardhana, 311
Govindacharya, 88
Govinda Gupta, 286, 287
Grahamarman, 307
Grainabhrtaka, 154
Grama, 91, 92, 93, 104, 154, 154, 256
Gunanabara, 172
Guniakha, 9, 10, 18
Gupta, 103
Gururaj, 125
Gururaj, 62
Gusana, 244
Guttas, 310
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hagāmaśa</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagūra</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haihya</td>
<td>75, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairanyānābha</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakusīra</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapsburg</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harśchandra</td>
<td>50, 51, 192, 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harśhena King</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harśhena, Praśastikāra</td>
<td>277, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harivarman</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haro</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsha</td>
<td>55, 290, 295, 306ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsha Gupta</td>
<td>303, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasti</td>
<td>126, 135, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastin</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāṣṭināpura</td>
<td>6, 11, 13, 15, 30, 67, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastivarman</td>
<td>275, 276n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatthipura</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidus</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himavanta</td>
<td>48, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiranyānābha</td>
<td>36, 51, 52, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiranyavati</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiung-nu</td>
<td>230, 245, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohenzollern</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huus</td>
<td>256, 291ff, 300ff, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huskakapura</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huviskā</td>
<td>249, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydaspes</td>
<td>135, 136, 138, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indraprastha</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra Vīraśrava</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrota Daivāpi (Daivāpi) Śaunaka</td>
<td>3, 11, 14, 17, 18, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-mo-fu</td>
<td>230, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isāvarvarman</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishukāra</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isila</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvaradatta</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvarasena</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indraprastha, Indapattana</td>
<td>12, 15, 47, 68, 69, 99, 172, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrasena</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ištitihāsaj:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabāla</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāvali</td>
<td>53, 70, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāla Jātukarṣya</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambudvīpa</td>
<td>47, 99, 189, 226 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānaka</td>
<td>184, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānakeśa</td>
<td>20, 21, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānakeśa II</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 8-18, 76, 89-91, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janamejava ii</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janaśrutija</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarāsandha</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaratkārava</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaya (Ithihasa)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadāman</td>
<td>210, 219, 260, 867, 269w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaradatta</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Jethamitra, 211, 212
Jettuttara, Jettuttara, 99, 130
Jihujia, 238
Jinaprabhasuri, 185
Jivadamana, 269
Jivaka, 103
Jivita Gupta I, 302, 303
Jivita Gupta II, 308, 309
Jiyatattu, 98, 100
Jharkrakas, 59
Jushka, 249, 254

K.

Kabul, 122, 125, 136, 142, 162, 193, 204, 225, 229 ff, 254, 256, 285
Kacha, 273, 281
Kachchha, 46, 267
Kadamboc, 197, 219, 266, 309
Kadphises I, 244 ff, 314
Kadphises II, 248 ff, 314
Kahola, 9, 23
Kakku, 122, 125, 136, 142, 162, 193, 204, 225, 254, 256, 285
Kachchhayana, 9
Kakudan, 54
Kalama, 97, 98
Kaliana, 39, 45
Kalasena, 52
Kalasoka, 111 ff.
Kalidasa, 43
Kalioga, 38, 41, 42, 43, 59, 74, 104, 115 ff, 151, 160 ff, 169 ff, 195 ff, 199, 201
Kalinganagara, 223
Kalara, 255 n.
Kaliope, 206
Kalsigrama, 204
Kamandaka, 311
Kamarupa, 278, 295, 306, 308
Kamboja, 23, 45, 77-75, 122, 128, 152, 162, 177, 190
Kamchatrapura, 42
Kampilya, Kampilla, 31, 33, 69, 70, 100
Kamsa of Kosala, 50
Kamsa of Mathurā, 73
Kanakhala, 28
Kanishka, 173, 275, 276
Kanishka, 249 ff.
Kanishka II, 255
Kantakasodhana, 168
Kanfa, 28, 129
Kanvas, 188, 211, 215 ff. 224
Kanyakubja, Kanyan, 70, 193, 307
Kapalika, 153
Kapilavastu, 48, 81, 97, 98, 99
Kapesa, 245
Kappala, Patashaka, 16, 27
Karandu, 38, 41, 70
Kariddamaka, 233, 266
Karja, 77, 79
Karjasuvarta, 164, 303 308
Karjuta, 276, 277
Kartripura, 279
Karusha, 44
Karuvala, 181, 184
Kasi, 14, 19, 23, 25, 33-36, 39, 40, 45-48, 67, 75, 79, 81, 100 ff, 297, 300
Kasra, 64
Kasippurā Bhagabhadra, 212, 213, 226
Kasmapa, 27, 76, 167, 168, 184, 192, 193, 230, 232, 240, 253 ff, 299, 301
Kaspeiroīni, 239, 240
Kaśu Chaidya, 66
Kasupañi, 14
Kathava, 28, 128
Kauṭijñeya, Kauṭijñyana, 41
Kauṭhya, 275, 276 n.
Kauśambi, Kusumal, 6, 13, 15, 30, 31, 54, 55, 67, 68, 109, 162, 166, 211
Kauśikī, 5
Kautulya, 121, 139, 311
Kavandbi Kārvāyana, 9
Kavasheya, 2, 3, 11, 17, 18, 311
Kaviśyās, 281
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kekaya</td>
<td>21, 23, 26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerali</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessputta</td>
<td>97, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesins</td>
<td>32, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketálaputo</td>
<td>172-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevatta</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khöradava</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharaoesta</td>
<td>288, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharapallana</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharaparikas</td>
<td>97, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketalaputo</td>
<td>112-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevatta</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Körri</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshaharatva</td>
<td>233, 257ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatraka</td>
<td>239, 237, 240, 253, 257ff, 266ff, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshemaka</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshudraka</td>
<td>122, 131, 134, 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshudrā Parishad</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukura</td>
<td>262, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumara</td>
<td>151, 158n, 184, 194, 195, 210n, 217n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārdevī</td>
<td>(Gaharwār Queen), 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārdevī</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāra Gupta I</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāra Gupta II</td>
<td>296, 298ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāra Gupta III</td>
<td>302ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāra Gupta, Prince</td>
<td>295, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārāmātya</td>
<td>210, 286, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārapāla</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumbhavati</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunsāla</td>
<td>184, 185, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupḍag śāma</td>
<td>Kundapura, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupṭāna</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūpika</td>
<td>53, 65, 104ff, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntala</td>
<td>119, 219, 222, 265, 277, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntala Śatakarni</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurujāgrala</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurukshetra</td>
<td>3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 23, 131, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurus i</td>
<td>1, 5, 7, 12, 14ff, 23, 27ff, 45, 65, 69, 78, 83, 211, 813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kursi</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusadha</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusāgārapura</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusāvati</td>
<td>64, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kushāns</td>
<td>246ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusambas</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusināra</td>
<td>49, 62, 64, 65, 97, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kushtalapura</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusiri</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusūla</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusumpura</td>
<td>109, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuvem</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuveranāga</td>
<td>283, 287, 290, 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyula Kadphises</td>
<td>245, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyulakara Kapbsa</td>
<td>247, 314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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L.

Lacedaemonians, 132, 133
Ladha, 46
Lagaturman, 255a
Laghman, 230
Laghryani, 23
Lajja, 290
Lakshmana, 62
Lakshmana Sena, 241
Lalaka, 223
Lalitapatan, 163
Lampa, 78
Lampika, 230
Laodike, 206, 207
Latavishaya, 286
Lekhakas, 119, 150
Lanka, v, 37, 238
Libya, 123
Lichchhavis, 40, 59-65, 101, 106,
107, 151, 72, 305
Likhitas, 192
Little Rapti, 64
Lohicela, 81
Lohitya, Labhitya, 295, 301, 302, 306
London, 49
Lumminigama, 162
Lysias, 206, 226

M.

Madanapala, 296
Madh, 103
Madhava Gupta, 295, 306, 308
Madhavasena, 198, 199
Madhavavarman II, 304
Mailhumanta, 43
Madhyamara, Uttara, 73
Madhyadea, Majhímadea, 24, 27,
28, 53, 79, 137, 152, 157, 206, 
220, 232, 298, 308, 309, 312
Madhyamikā, 131, 202, 205
Madra, 18, 23, 27, 79, v79, 280
Madravat, 3
Madura, 172, 173
Maga, 175
Magadha, 8, 26, 28, 45, 46, 53ff, 79,
81, 91, 97ff, 223, 224, 271, 272, 
295, 304, 305, 309
Magadhapura, 56
Magandiyā, 102
Mahābālādhikārikā, High Officer in 
Charge of the Army, 255
Mahābhōja, 72, 165
Mahābisi, 104
Mahālandanāyaka, general, 285, 287
Mahājanaka I, 22
Mahājanaka II, 21, 22, 33
Mahājanapadas 43ff
Mahākachchhāra, 73
Mahākāntāra, 275, 278
Mahākosalā, King, 45, 46, 52, 51, 82
Mahākṣatrapāla, 298
Mahālakṣmīdevī, 298
Mahāli, 63
Mahāmātīras, 146, 156, 161, 166ff, 
177ff, 193, 210a
Mahānandin, 110, 115
Mahājadma, 8, 115, 116, 117, 122, 
169, 201, 273, 252a
Mahāpratihāra, 287
Mahārāja, 87
Mahārāṣṭra 165, 257ff, 280
Mahāraṭha, 165
Mahāśāla, 97
Mahāśaṃmata, 66
Mahāśena, Pradyota, 58, 103
Mahāśena Gupta, 306, 307
Mahāśenapati, 257
Mahāśaktañcanga, 107
Mahāśudassana, 64
Mahāvīra, 47, 55, 59, 63, 107, 108, 
169
Mahendra Maurya, 158, 175, 184
Mahendra, 275
Mahendradītya, 298, 299, 300
Mahendragiri, 275, 276
Mahendrapāla II, 296
Mahinda, 9, 18
Mahīprāla, 291
Mahishā, 55, 88
Mahishmati, 72, 75, 262, 267
Mahottaya, 67
Makhādeva, 21
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Mālava, 46, 261, 279, 295
Malaya 46
Malayas, 258, 261
Mālīchosa 266a
Mālīnī, 54
Malla, 45, 46, 64, 65, 97, 151, 176, 192
Mallakās, 63, 65, 107
Mallikā, 101
Mallōī, 131, 135
Māmālā, 262
Māmbarus, 233, 258
Mānīgala, 192
Māngala, 170
Manipūrā, 238
Māniyatappo, 314
Mantarāja, 275
Mantrin, 147, 255
Mantriparishad, 148, 166, 210, 286
Marutta, 84, 90
Māski, 189
Massaga, 125, 135
Mātachī, 14, 30, 31
Māthāvita, 20, 21, 38
Māthurā, Methora, 42, 71ff, 172, 173, 177, 204, 211, 212, 224, 231ff, 237ff, 455
Matilī, 273
Mātrīvishpu, 286, 300
Māteya 23, 28, 29, 45, 71, 78, 79
Mānes 228, 23ff
Maukharis, 297, 304ff
Maurya, iv, 8, 110, 121, 139ff
Medes, 182
Megasthenes, 143, 145, 147, 150, 161, 165, 173, 184
Meghavarna, 281
Menander, 203ff
Movaki, 232, 233
Mihirakula, 297, 299, 301
Mithila see Menander
Mīn, 233
Mīndāvara 232ff
Mithridates, Mithridates, 205, 306, 226, 227
Mithi, 19, 20
Mithilā, 16, 19ff, 37ff, 47, 49, 54, 60, 70, 86, 99, 100
Mitra Kings, 211, 212
Mlechchhas 292
Moga 232ff
Moli 46
Molīni 33
Morīyas 97, 99, 138, 139, 188
Mousikanos, 132, ff
Mrigadhara, 101
Mrigasikāvānas, 271
Mūchippa, Mātība, Muvīpa, 44, 45
Mūjavanta, 24, 54, 56
Mukāka, 74, 282
Mundā, 110, 111, 116
Mundjas, 155
Muriyakāla, 200, 201
Murūya, 233, 280

N.

Nabataeans, 266 n.
Nābīlagā, 60
Nābhaka, 163
Nābhāpamti, 163
Nāchéne-ki-talai, 277
Nādasi-Akāsā, 238
Nāga, 75, 220, 250, 255, 256, 274, 283, 314
Nāgabhātta, 255
Nāgā Daśaka, 110, 111, 116
Nāgaratnā, 273
Nāgākhanī, 141
Nāgala Viyohālākā, 166
Nāganikā, Nāyanikā, 223
Nāgarabhukti, 286
Nāgāρādhikā, 150
Nāgārjuna, 251, 254
Nāgārjuna, Hill 185, 293
Nāgāśāhavya (Hāstinapura), 6
Nāgāṣena, Sage, 226 n.
Nāgāṣena, king, 273, 274
Nāgāṣēnā( Nāggai, Nāggatī) 38, 39, 41, 73, 76, 77, 90
Nāhapāna, 248, 257, 258, 259, 261
Nāhushyā 7
Nakhatrānt, 256, 274
Naksh-i-Rustam, 123
Nakula, 12
Nālanda, 300
Nāmantanus, 233, 258
Nami, Nimi, 12-22, 37-41, 70, 76
Nanda, 8,97, 115 ff, 200, 201, 217 ff, 313.
Nandi, 555
Nandi, king, 273, 274
Nandivardhana, 110, 112 ff, 201
Na-pei-kesa, 163
Nārada, 41, 80, 131, 251
Narasiṁha Gupta Bālālītya, 297
Nāravarman, 270
Nārāyana Kāyva, 215
NārāyanaPāla, 290
Nīsik Prāsaṭi, 221, 229
Nāvadhyaksha, 151
NavaNara, 264
Ngaun, 229, 247
Niehakshu, 6, 13, 15, 16, 30, 31, 67
Niechhivi, 62
Niechyas, 82
Nidhanapur, 306, 309
Nīganṭha Nāṭapattra, 169
Nīgīva, 163, 180
Nīkāsia, 136
Nilapalli, 276
Nīlava, 275, 276
Nirgranthas, 169
Nīrūvāna era, 117
Nīshāda, 267
Nīsībi, 61
Nīsīshṭārtha, 149
Niyoga, 312
Nyagrodhavana, 99
Nya, 126

O.
Odruka, 212
Ohind, 356
Oktaka, 36, 82
Olympian Games, 87
Omphis, 127
Orissa, 42
Orosius, 131, 226
Orthagnes, 243
Ossadiou, 132
Otthaddha, 63
Oudh, 36, 48, 205, 288
Oxus, 227, 246, 249, 255
Oxydrakia, 131, 135
Oxykanoe, 133
Ozene, 266

P.
Pāḍā, 174
Pāḍaṇjali, 85
Pāḍha, 46
Pādika, 240
Pādmāvatī, city, 256, 274
Pādmāvatī, queen, 102
Pāhlava, 3, 242, 244, 263, 265, 268
Pākore, 243
Pākhara, 130
Pāktyike, 123
Pakođha, 9
Pahāesimundu, 173
Pālāga, 88
Pālār, 85
Pālaka, 103, 109, 113, 313
Pālakka, Pālakkuda, 275, 276
Pālboothra, Pālboothra, 118, 143
Pālboothri, 104
Pallava, 265, 276, 281
Paučhāla, 23, 27-29, 31-33, 45, 69-71, 78, 83, 91, 187, 211, 212
Pandaia, 173
Pāṇavas, 4, 12, 28, 33, 312
Pandoonui, 172, 279
Pāṇi, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13
Pāṇīya, 46, 172, 173, 174, 175, 214
Pānku, 244
Pāntaleon, 225
Para Āṭaika, 38, 51, 52, 90, 104
Pārākramānka, 273, 282
Pārāntapa, 68
Pārasamudra, 173
Pārasika, 206
Pātrasurāna, 221
Parikshit 1 ff, 311
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Pārīkhīta, 1 ff
Parishad, 92, 148, 163, 166, 178, 179, 286
Parivakrā, Parichakrā, 31
Parivrajaka, Mahārājjas, 277, 294, 295, 301
Parivrajikās, 153
Parivrikā, 85
Priyātra, 262, 267
Parkham, 108
Parānāsātra, 293, 294
Paro, 26
Paros, 127, 134 ff
Paroة, 247
Parīti, 42, 74, 75
Patanā, 301
Prabhāvatī, 83, 288
Prachahita, Pratyanta, 172, 278
Prāchinasāla, 27
Prāchya, 82, 151, 152
Prāchya Pāṇichāla, 31
Pradeshātis, 153, 154, 168, 314
Pradesikās, Prādesikās, 168, 168, 177
Pradyota, 57, 58, 76, 102, 103, 108 ff, 286
Prāest, 133
Prakāśāditya, 297
Prakāśāditya, 298
Pranaganda, 56, 57
Pranaya, 265
Prājunas, 279, 280
Prasenajit (Pasenadi), 49, 51, 52, 81, 100 ff
Prasians Prasii, 120, 135, 143, 151, 164
Pratardana, 4, 10
Pratichya, 82
Prathāras, 62, 296 n
Pratipa, 2, 7
Pratishthāna, 264
Pravahana Jāvali, 33, 70, 92
Pravarasena I, 277, 281
Pravarasena II, 43
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1. The Early History of the Vaishnava Sect
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Published by the Calcutta University.

OPINIONS AND REVIEWS

PROFESSOR E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, YALE UNIVERSITY, AMERICA—
"Your book has given me great satisfaction..........I am particularly pleased to see an incisive study of this kind in the realm of religious history..........Believe me, in the hope of further contributions of this character from your able pen............"

PROFESSOR A. BERRIDALE KIETH, EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY.—
"While I do not concur in your view as to the original character of Kṛṣṇa, I recognise the care with which you have investigated the issue, and value highly the elaborate collation of the evidence which your work contains, and which will render it of much service to all students of this, doubtless insoluble, problem. The stress laid on the epigraphic evidence and the full use made of it is of special value, while in many details your opinions are of interest and value, as in the case of the date of Pāṇini.........."

SIR GEORGE GRIBBON.—"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. PAGET, OXFORD.—"I agree with you in discarding various theories, but I don't think that Kṛṣṇa Devakiāṭra is the famous Kṛṣṇa, and it seems to me your exposition can stand just as well without the identification as with it. Your book will help to elucidate the whole matter, but are you sure that the cult does not owe something to Christianity?"

PROFESSOR F. OTTO SCHRADE, KIEL, GERMANY.—"I perfectly agree with your opinion that the Chāndogya passage on Kṛṣṇa Devakiāṭra and his teaching is to be considered as the first historical record of Bhāgavatism. There were, of course, many Kṛṣṇas, but to
conjecture that more than one was also a 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 Bhūk quoted with the famous śāstra: pārśa's prātam padiṣṭ..."

**The Times Literary Supplement, May 12, 1921.**—"The lectures of Mr. Hemchandra 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 of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain.**—"The scope of this small book is rightly expressed in its title. The author, who is lecturer in History in the Calcutta University, has collected and discussed statements, references, and allusions from the early literature to throw light on the position and life of Kṛṣṇa and the growth of Bhāgavatism. He deals with the various theories that have been put forward, and with good reason discards the views that Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva was a solar deity or a tri ad 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 Devakiputra, the scholar mentioned in the Chāndogya Upanishad...." (F. E. Pargiter).

**The Bombay Chronicle, June 19, 1921.**—"In this small book of a hundred and seventeen pages, Mr. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri of the Calcutta University has collected much valuable material from which he has succeeded in tracing the origin and growth of the Vaishnava creed. The Historicity of Shrikrishna—or as the author calls Him Krishna Vāsudeva, is also handled with remarkable clearness...."
2. Political History of India

from the Accession of Parikshit to the coronation of Bimbisara.

Reprint from the Journal of the Department of Letters, Vol. IX.
Royal 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. Jacob, 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 Mahājanaśādās."

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. Rasson, 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. Steen 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."
OPINIONS AND REVIEWS.

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.”