

EARLY HISTORY OF RAJASTHAN

DR. DINESH CHANDRA SHUKLA
Ph.D.

Dep't. of History, Jodhpur University,
Jodhpur.

BHARATIYA VIDYA PRAKASHAN
DELHI : : VARANASI
(INDIA)

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|--------|
| PREFACE | ix |
| SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION | xii |
| ABBREVIATIONS | xiii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1-8 |
| <i>Chapters</i> | |
| I. THE JANAPADAS OF RAJASTHAN AND THE MAGADHAN EMPIRE | 9-45 |
| The Matsya Janapāda | 12 |
| Rajasthan and the Magadhan Empire | 15 |
| The Mālavas | 24 |
| The Śibis | 27 |
| The Ārjunāyānas | 30 |
| The Yaudheyas | 32 |
| The Ābhīras | 34 |
| The Śūdras | 35 |
| The Rājanyas | 36 |
| The Uddehikas | 36 |
| Date of the Arrival of the Punjab Tribes in Rajasthan | 38 |
| II. RAJASTHAN IN THE SCYTHIAN PERIOD | 46-80 |
| The Political Background | 46 |
| Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The First Phase | 48 |
| Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The Second Phase | 52 |
| Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The Third Phase | 60 |
| The Yaudheyas | 66 |
| Rajasthan on the Eve of the Rise of the Guptas : Transition to Monarchism | 68 |
| III. RAJASTHAN IN THE AGE OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE | 81-131 |
| Rise of the Guptas | 81 |
| Samudragupta and Rajasthan | 83 |

| | |
|---|---------|
| Continuity of the Gupta Rule in Rajasthan | 90 |
| The Aulikaras (Varmans) of Daśapura- | |
| Madhyamikā Region | 93 |
| The Yaudheya Region | 97 |
| The Vākāṭaka Invasion of Rajasthan in the | |
| Middle of the Fifth Century | 99 |
| The Hūṇa Invasion : First and Second Phases | 106 |
| Rajasthan and the Aulikara (Vardhanā) | |
| Empire | 112 |
| The Hūṇa Invasion : Third Phase | 118 |
| IV. RAJASTHAN IN THE MAUKHARI- | |
| VARDHANA AGE | 132-174 |
| The Later Guptas of Rājasthan | 132 |
| The Age of the Maukhari Domination | 139 |
| The Age of the Gauda Supremacy | 146 |
| The Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura | 148 |
| The Gurjaras or Chāpas of Bhillamāla | 157 |
| Other Powers of Post-Gupta Rajasthan : | |
| The Chāhamānas | 162 |
| The Guhilas | 163 |
| Rajasthan and Harshavardhīana of Kanauj | 168 |
| V. RAJASTHAN IN THE POST-HARSHA | |
| CENTURY | 175-201 |
| The Guhilas of Medapāṭa | 175 |
| The Guhilas of Chāṭsu | 183 |
| The Mauryas of Mewar | 185 |
| The Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura | 186 |
| The Arab Invasion of Rajasthan | 190 |
| Invasions of Yaśovarman of Kanauj and | |
| Lalitāditya Muktāpīda of Kashmir | 192 |
| The Rise of the Imperial Pratihāras | 197 |
| APPENDIX | |
| Origin and Evolution of Vikramāditya Legend | 202 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 217 |
| INDEX | 249 |

PREFACE

It may be regarded as an audacious presumption on my part to attempt on a subject the study of the various aspects of which has been undertaken by such illustrious scholars as James Tod, G.H. Ojha, D.R. Bhandarkar, B.N. Reu, C.V. Vaidya, H.C. Ray, D.C. Ganguli, G.C. Raychaudhuri, A.C. Banerji, D.C. Sircar, R.C. Majumdar, A.K. Majumdar, Dasharatha Sharma and G.N. Sharma. But these great scholars have mostly given the history of pre-Imperial Pratihāra period of Rajasthan only a cursory treatment, usually as a sort of background to their esteemed monographs on the various Rajput dynasties and states. Partly because of the glory associated with the name of the Rajputs and partly because of the wealth of materials available for their history, it was but natural for these savants to concentrate on the early medieval periods of the history of Rajasthan. However, I feel that the researches of the last few decades have resulted in a great advance of our knowledge of the pre-Pratihāra Rajasthan also and, therefore, a detailed study of the early history of this region may now be attempted. If the present work fills up this lacuna in the historiography of Rajasthan I shall consider my labour amply rewarded.

I became interested in the history and culture of this glorious land ever since I joined the University Department of History as a lecturer in 1964. This interest, however, remained sterile till my supervisor Dr. S.R. Goyal joined the Department as a Reader in 1970. No amount of conventional expression of gratitude can do justice to my deep sense of indebtedness to him. Right from the beginning of my research work he has been the

main source of inspiration to me. He has given me friendly guidance and brotherly encouragement and has willingly rendered all sort of help. I just cannot thank him adequately. His help would remain a *riñga* which I can never repay.

I express my profound gratitude to Professor G.R. Sharma, Head of the Department of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, University of Allahabad, Dr. G.C. Pande, former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, and presently Professor in the Département of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, University of Allahabad, Professor B.N.S. Yadav of the same University, Professor Lallanji Gopal of the Département of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, Bānarās Hindu University, Varānasi and Dr. S.N. Chaturvedi, Reader, Département of Ancient History, Archaeology and Culture, University of Gorakhpur for their kind encouragement and valuable suggestions given to me from time to time.

I am grateful to Professor K S. Lal, Head of the Department of History, University of Jodhpur, who helped me several ways during the course of my research work.

I am highly obliged to Dr. S.D. Kapoor (Lecturer, Department of English, University of Jodhpur), Dr. A.D. Singh (Lecturer, Department of Sanskrit, University of Jodhpur), and Dr. M.H. Qureshi (Associate Professor, J.L. Nehru University, Dēlhi) for their help and constructive suggestions.

I am also grateful to all of my colleagues and friends, particularly Dr. S.K. Lal (Reader, Department of Sociology University of Jodhpur), Dr. S.P. Dikshit (Reader Department of Hindi Lucknow University), Dr. P.D. Pathak (Senior Research Officer, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur), Sri M.C. Joshi and Dr. S.K. Purohit (Lecturers, Department of History University of Jodhpur). I express my sincere thanks to all of them for helping me in so many ways.

I will not disburden myself by thanking Dr. H.P. Srivastava (Lecturer, Department of Botany, University of Jodhpur) for his constant encouragement.

It is my duty to place on record my thanks to the authorities of the Allahābād University Library, Allahābād, National Museum Library, Delhi, Jodhpur University Library, Jodhpur,

Sumer Public Library, Jodhpur and Oriental Research Institute Library, Jodhpur, for facilities provided to me.

Who would be happier than my revered *pitṛivya* Sāhitya Vāridhi Kāvyālaṅkārāchārya Professor R.S. Shukla 'Rasal' D. Litt. when he will find that his long cherished desire has been fulfilled and even I, the prodigal son of the family, have ultimately offered my respects at the feet of Sarasvati? Finally a word of appreciation to my wife Smt. Sumāri Shukla, M.A. for her assistance and cooperation in multiple ways that made it possible for me to complete the present work.

This book is substantially the thesis submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. the University of Jodhpur in 1975. It owes considerably for its publication to the University Grants Commission's subsidy (for publication of doctoral thesis) of Rs. 3,000/-generously sanctioned by the University of Jodhpur for which I express my gratitude to the University.

Its timely publication has been mainly due to the willing cooperation extended to me by my friend Sri Kishore Chandra Jain of the Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi. I take this opportunity to extend my thanks to him.

D.C. SHUKLA

Jodhpur
Vasant Pañchami
Māgha, 2034 V.S.
(February 12, 1978)

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

| | | | |
|-------------|-----|----|----|
| অ | a | ঢ | ঢ় |
| আ | ā | ঢ় | ঢ় |
| ই | i | ত | ত |
| ু | u | ত | ত |
| ় | ু | ত | ত |
| ে | e | ত | ত |
| ো | ai | ত | ত |
| ুৰ | o | ত | ত |
| ুৰি | au | ত | ত |
| ুৰি | ri | ত | ত |
| ুৰি | k | ত | ত |
| ় | gh | ত | ত |
| ় | gh | ত | ত |
| ় | n | ত | ত |
| ় | ch | ত | ত |
| ় | chh | ত | ত |
| ় | j | ত | ত |
| ় | jh | ত | ত |
| ় | n̤ | ত | ত |
| ় | t | ত | ত |
| ় | th | ত | ত |
| ় | d | ত | ত |
| Anusvāra | | ত | ত |
| Visarga (:) | | ত | ত |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| ABORI | Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. |
| AHD | Ancient History of the Deccan. By G. Jouveau Dubreuil, Pondichery, 1920. |
| AIG | The Age of the Imperial Guptas. By R.D. Banerji, Banaras, 1933. |
| AIU | The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. II., The Age of Imperial Unity. Edited by R.C. Majumdar and Pusalker, Bombay, 1960. |
| AIK | The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. IV., The Age of Imperial Kanauj. Edited by R.C. Majumdar, A.D. Pusalker and A.K. Majumdar, Bombay, 1964. |
| ĀMMK | Ārya Mañjuśrī Mūla-Kalpa. |
| ANM | Age of the Nandas and Mauryas. Edited by K.A.N. Sastri, Banaras, 1952. |
| Ancient Malwa | Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition, by D.C. Sircar, Delhi, 1969. |
| ASIR | Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports. |
| Bhandarkar List | A List of Inscriptions of Northern India, by D.R. Bhandarkar (Appendix to EI, XIX-XXIII). |
| Bhārata Kaumudi | Studies in Indology in Honour of R.K. Mookerji, 2 Parts. Allahabad, 1945, 1947. |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| BMC-AWK | Catalogue of the Coins of the Āndhra Dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas, the Traikutaka dynasty and the Bodhi dynasty (Catalogue of the Indian Coins in the British Museum, Vol. IV) London, 1908. By E.J. Rapson. |
| BMC-GD | Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties and of Śaśāṅka, King of Gauḍa (In the British Museum) by John Allan, London, 1914. |
| CA | The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. III., The Classical Age. Edited by R.C. Majumdar, A.D. Pusalkar and A.K. Majumdar. Bombay, 1962. |
| CII | Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III (Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their Successors), by J.F. Fleet, Varanasi, 1963. |
| Coinage | The Coinage of the Gupta Empire. By A.S. Altekar, Banaras, 1957. |
| Comp. Hist. Ind. | Comprehensive History of India, Vol. II. Edited by K.A.N. Sastri, Bombay, 1957. |
| DKA | Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age. By F.E. Pargiter, Varanasi, 1962. |
| DKM | The Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha By B.P. Sinha, Patna, 1954. |
| EHI | The Early History of India. By Vincent A. Smith, 4th Ed. Oxford, 1962. |
| EHNI | Early History of North India. By S. Chattopadhyaya. Calcutta, 1958. |
| EI | Epigraphia Indica. |
| HIG | A History of the Imperial Guptas. By S.R. Goyal. Allahabad, 1966. |
| Hist. Ind. | History of India, A.D. 150-350. By K.P. Jayaswal, Lahore, 1933. |
| HNEI | History of North-Eastern India. By R.G. Basak, Calcutta, 1934. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| IA | Indian Antiquary, Bombay. |
| IC | Indian Culture, Calcutta. |
| IHI | The Imperial History of India. By K.P. Jayaswal, Lahore, 1934. |
| IHQ | Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta. |
| JA | Journal Asiatique, Paris. |
| JAIH | Journal of Ancient Indian History, Calcutta. |
| JASB | Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. |
| JASB (L) | Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal : Letters, Calcutta. |
| JBRS | Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Patna. |
| JBBRAS | Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay. |
| JBORS | Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna. |
| JDL | Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University Calcutta. |
| JIH | Journal of Indian History, Madras. |
| JNSI | Journal of the Numismatic Society of India, Bombay, Varanasi. |
| JPASB | Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. |
| JOI | Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda. |
| JRAS | Journal of the Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London. |
| JRASB (L) | Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. |
| JRASB | Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal : Letters, Calcutta. |
| NHIP | New History of the Indian People. Vol. VI (The Vākāṭaka Gupta Age). Edited by R.C. Majumdar and A.S. Altekar, Lahore, 1946. (Reprint 1954). |

PASB Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.

PHAI Political History of Ancient India. By H.C. Raychaudhuri. 6th Ed. Calcutta, 1953.

PIHC Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.

PRHC Proceedings of the Rajasthan History Congress.

PTS Pali Text Society, London.

RTA Rajasthan Through the Ages, Vol. I. Edited by Daśharatha Sharma, Bikaner, 1966

SI Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization. Vol. I. By D.C. Sircar, Calcutta, 1965.

CHAPTER I

THE JANAPADAS OF RAJASTHAN AND THE MAGADHAN EMPIRE

The historical period of India commences with the age of Mahāvīra and Buddha. The date of the latter has been fixed with tolerable degree of certainty from 563 B.C. to 483 B.C.¹ and the former is supposed to have died a few years after the latter.² While dealing with the lives of Mahāvīra and Buddha and the history of their respective faiths, the early Buddhist and Jain literature provide us very useful material for the reconstruction of Indian history from the rise of Bimbisāra to the accession of Aśoka. There is in addition the evidence available in the Brahmanical sources. In the age of the Buddha we find India passing through the last phase of the Vedic political tradition.³ The Aryan states which in the Rigvedic period were tribal in character (*janas*) became territorial in nature (*janapadas*) in the Later Vedic Age owing to the operation of several factors such as the second Urban revolution,⁴ introduction of iron,⁵ growth of trade and com-

1. The date of Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* is a controversial question. Some scholars believe that it took place in 544 B.C., while others assign it to 486 or 483 B.C. For a brief review of the different theories cf. Geiger, W. *Mahāvīra*, p. xii; Raychaudhuri, H. C., *Political History of Ancient India*, pp. 186 ff.; Winternitz, M., *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 597; Smith, V.A., *Early History of India*, pp. 49-50; Majumdar and Pusalker (ed.), *The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp. 38 ff.

2. *AIU*, p. 37.

3. Cf. Rao, V.B., *Uttara Vaidika Samāja evam Saṃskriti*, pp. 162 ff.

4. Cf. Bandyopadhyaya, N.C., *Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India*, Vol. I, pp. 240 ff., 285 ff.

5. Cf. Banerjee, N.R., *The Iron Age in India*.

merce¹ and money economy² and the emergence of the art of writing.³ Gradually the Vedic tribes settled down permanently in the various parts of the country according to their convenience and opportunities. One of the results of the territorialisation of the Vedic states was an increase in their internal struggles. With the emergence of the idea of definite territorial boundaries, it was natural for the rulers of the various states to conquer additional lands for the satisfaction of their people, the fulfilment of their economic necessities, and for their own glorification. This tendency started the process of the expansion of the more powerful *janapadas* at the cost of the weaker ones.

In the beginning of the sixth century B.C. we find North India divided into a large number of states (*janapadas*), some of which were autonomous clans with a republican or oligarchical form of government, while others were monarchies.⁴ The Buddhist⁵ and the Jain⁶ texts provide a list of sixteen great states (*Śoḍaśa Mahājanapada*) which were flourishing before the age of the Buddha. They are pretty well-known, and we need not enumerate them here. The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini⁷

1. Cf. Motichandra, *Sārthavāha*; Majumdar, R.C., *Corporate Life in Ancient India*; Malalascker, G.P., *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, Vol. II; *AIU*, pp. 599 ff.
2. Cf. Bhandarkar, D.R., *Carmichael Lectures on Ancient Indian Numismatics*, Lecture II; *AIU*, pp. 607-608.
3. Cf. Bühler, *Indian Palaeography*, pp. 1 ff.
4. Cf. Rhys Davids, T.W., *Buddhist India*, Ch. II; Bhandarkar, D.R., *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, (Lectures I and II).
5. *Ānguttara*, I, 213; IV, 252, 256, 260; *Mahāvastu*, I, 34; II, 3; *Dīgha*, II, 235.
6. *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, Saya XV, Uddessa I (Hoernle, *Uvāsagadasāo*, II, App.). The list here is slightly different and includes other states of the far east and far south of India. This list according to H.C. Raychaudhuri is later than the one given in the Buddhist *Ānguttara* (*Political History of Ancient India*, VI ed., Calcutta, 1953, p. 96).
7. For a detailed analysis, Vide, Agrawal, V.S., *India as Known to Pāṇini*.

(c. 500 B.C.)¹ depicts a similar picture by mentioning both the classes of states, viz. republics (*saṅghas* or *gaṇas*) and kingdoms (*janapadas*). The *Purāṇas* also mention states like those of the Haihayas, the Viśihotras and others which flourished before the rise of the Nandas.² Many of these states, specially the famous four monarchies—Vatsa, Avanti, Kosala and Magadha—made a bid for supremacy. Of them Magadha ultimately succeeded and became a paramount power by the time the Nandas appeared in the political arena towards the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century B.C.³

While the *Madhyadeśa* and eastern India were undergoing the process of political unification, the North-Western frontier regions of the country were subjected to foreign invasions. The mighty Achaeminid empire of Iran, founded by Cyrus (558-530 B.C.) was first to threaten and absorb a good portion of these undefended and insecure territories.⁴ Nearly two centuries afterwards India fell a victim to the invasion of Alexander, when in the year 327 B.C. the Macedonian adventurer crossed the Hindukush after the completion of his Iranian conquests.⁵ But the tide of the Greek onslaught was soon checked when Chandragupta Maurya, after expelling the foreigners from the Panjab and overthrowing the Nandas in Magadha, founded an all-India empire.⁶ It is against this background that we have to study the history of Rajasthan in the age of Magadhan imperialism.

1. Agrawal, V. S. *Ibid.* Some scholars such as Goldstrücker place this work in the pre-Buddha period while many others assign a somewhat later date to it (*ibid.*).
2. Pargiter, F.E., *Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 23-24, 69.
3. For a detailed account, vide, Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, pp. 95 ff, 187 ff; *AIU*, pp. 3 ff; Sastri, K.A.N., (ed.), *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, pp. 9. ff.
4. *AIU*, pp. 39 ff. For a detailed analysis cf. Chattopadhyaya, S., *The Achaeminids in India*; Rapson, E.J., (ed.), *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I (Ancient India), Ch. XIV.
5. Cf. Smith, *EHI*, Ch. III-IV; *ANM*, Ch. II.
6. Cf. *PHAI*, pp. 264 ff; *ANM*, Ch. IV; *AIU*, pp. 54 ff.

In the list of *Sodaśa Mahājanapadas* provided by the *Ānguttara Nikāya* there is only one state which may be located in Rajasthan. That is the famous Matsya or Machchha *janapada* which roughly corresponded to the modern Jaipur division including the whole of the present territory of Alwar as well as a portion of Bharatpur. Other *janapadas* of Rajasthan which might have existed in that period are not mentioned anywhere in our sources. However, some *janapadas* which primarily belonged to the regions that are now outside the boundaries of the present Rajasthan might have included some portions of this state as well. At least they were intimately connected with the history of this region. Most important of such states were Śūrasena and Avanti belonging to the present Mathura and Ujjain regions respectively. The role of the Śūrasenas which they might have played in the history of Rajasthan of this period is not known, but some glimpses of the impact of the imperialism of the Avantis on this area are available from our literary sources. We shall discuss them at the proper place.

The Matsya Janapada

As we have already seen,¹ the Matsyas were one of the most prominent Kshatriya tribes that made up the Vedic Aryan people. In the *Mahābhārata* the Matsya *janapada* is said to have been rich in the wealth of cows for which the Trigarttas and the Kurus led predatory raids against it.² They were highly respected for the purity of their culture.³ As in the early period, in the Great Epic they figure alongwith several other Vedic Kshatriya tribes such as the Chedis, the Karushas, the Pañchālas, etc.⁴ According to the *Manusāṃhitā* also “the plains of the Kurus, the (country of the) Matsyas, Pañchālas and Śūrasenakas, these (form) indeed, the country of the Brahmarshis (Brāhmaṇa sages) which ranks immediately after Brahmāvarta. From a Brāhmaṇa born in that country let all men on

1. *Supra*, Introduction.

2. Cf. Law, B.C., *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 357.

3. *Ibid*, p. 359.

4. *Mahābhārata*, *Bhīshmaparvan*, Ch. 9; Ch. 52, 9; Ch. 54, 8.

earth learn their several usages".¹ From this passage it appears that the Matsyas were regarded as belonging to the most orthodox followers of Brahmanism in ancient times. Elsewhere Manu prescribes (when laying down rules for marshalling of troops on the battle-field), "(Men born in) Kurushetra, Matsyas, Pañchālas, and those born in Śūrasena, let him (i.e. the king or leader) cause to fight in the van of the battle as well as (others who are) tall and light".² It is because of their purity of conduct and customs and bravery in the battle-field that the Matsyas occupied a pre-eminent position in the contemporary socio-political system.

According to Cunningham, "in ancient times the whole of the country lying between the Aravalli hills of Alwar and the river Jumna was divided between Matsya on the W. and Śūrasena on the E., with Daśārṇa on the S. and S.E. border. Matsya then included the whole of the present Alwar territory, with portions of Jaipur and Bharatpur. Vairat and Machari were both in Matsyadeśa... To the E. were the Pañchālas..."³ The capital of this state was Virāṭanagara (modern Vairat or Bairat), occasionally called Matsyanagara. It was the seat of the Epic king Virāṭa who was a friend and relative of the Pāṇḍavas.⁴ The earliest historical mention of Vairāṭa is that of Yuan-Chwang, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India in the first half of the seventh century A.D. According to him,⁵ Po-li-ye-ta-lo (Virat or Bairat) was 14 or 15 Li, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles in circuit corresponding almost exactly with the size of the ancient mound on which the present town is built. The people of this city were brave and bold and their king, who was of the Fei-she (Vaiśya)⁶ race, was famous for his courage and

1. *Manusāṁhitā*, II, 19-20 ; S.B.E., Vol. XXV, pp. 32-33.

2. *Ibid*, VII, 193 ; SBE, Vol. XXV, p. 247.

3. *Archaeological Survey of India*, Vol. 20, p. 2 ; Cunningham, A., *Ancient Geography of India*, pp. 343-45.

4. Law, B.C., *op. cit.*, p. 361.

5. Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. I, p. 300.

6. Cunningham (*Ancient Geography*, p. 343) unnecessarily conjectures that the terms Fei-she corresponds to Bais Rajput.

skill in war.¹ Another important city of the Matsya kingdom was Upaplavya where according to the *Mahābhārata*, the Pāṇḍavas retired from Virāṭa on the completion of their exile.² Its exact site is, however, as yet uncertain.

In the Pāli literature the Matsyas are intimately associated with the Śūrasenas and the Kāśīs.³ But it seems that at that time they did not have much political importance surrounded as they were by the powerful kingdoms of Avanti, Śūrasena and Gandhāra. To us it appears quite likely that in the age of the Buddha Rajasthan became a bone of contention between Gandhāra and Avanti and consequently the Matsyas had to submit to (one or the other) as the situation demanded. According to a tradition, the king Pukkusāti (Pushkarasārin) of Gandhāra waged war on Pradyota of Avanti in which the latter was defeated.⁴ If there is any truth in this tradition, it will have to be admitted that Pradyota, the ruler of Avanti, had already expanded his kingdom towards the north which included greater part of Rajasthan sometime before his war against Pukkusāti. For it is inconceivable that the king of Gandhāra, who must have been feeling the pressure of Iranians at that time and was soon to submit to the overlordship of the Achaemenian emperors,⁵ could dare to advance as far as western Malwa. Evidently, therefore, one must presume that like the rulers of eastern India, who were trying to expand their empires at the cost of their neighbouring states, the powerful monarch of Avanti also tried to satisfy his ambition at the expense of Matsya and other territories of Rajasthan.

Not much is known about the history of Rajasthan in the post-Buddha age. This was the time when the country had to face the Iranian invasion on the North-West, which started with the eastern campaigns of Cyrus (558-530 B.C.). The

1. Watters, *T. Loc. cit.*

2. *Mahābhārata*, IV, 72, 14.

3. *Dīghanikāya*, Vol. II, p. 200.

4. Malalasekera, G.P., *op. cit.*, p. 215; Felix Lacote, *Essay on Guṇāḍhya* (Eng. Tra. by Rev. A.M. Tabard) p. 176.

5. Cf., *AIU*, pp. 41-42.

Persian hold on the Indian border-lands continued up to 330 B.C. when we find Darius III, the last of the Achaemenian emperors, using the services of an Indian contingent in his war against Alexander.¹ But there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever to suggest that the Iranians ever tried to invade Rajasthan. In the east it was the age of the rise of Magadha, but so far the Magadhan kings were only one of the four rival powers to make a bid for supremacy; they were yet to conquer Kosala and Vatsa. Therefore, Rajasthan, being situated on the western frontier of the Madhyadeśa, was left for a considerable period without any substantial pressure from the eastern direction. According to Raychaudhuri, as the Matsya kingdom is not included by the Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* among those states which had a *Saṅgha* or non-monarchical form of governments,² the possibility is that its monarchical constitution endured till it lost its independence.³ Raychaudhuri also conjectures that the Matsya kingdom was at one time annexed to the neighbouring state of Chedi, for the *Mahābhārata* refers to a king named Sahaja who ruled over the Chedis as well as the Matsyas.⁴ The suggestion may have some element of truth, though it cannot be proved in the present state of our knowledge.

Rajasthan and the Magadhan Empire

It is not definitely known when the Matsya kingdom was finally absorbed in the Magadhan empire. This much, however, is certain that the Haryākas and Śaiśunāgas had nothing to do with this part of the country while it was undoubtedly included in the empire of the great Mauryas. As regards the Nandas, who ruled in between the Śaiśunāgas and the Mauryas, no definite information is forthcoming. From the Purānic and the Classical evidence it is evident that the Nandas carved out a vast empire which comprised the greater part of

1. *AIU*, pp. 39-43.

2. Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 137.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. *Loc. cit.*

North India and some portions of the Deccan.¹ The Purāṇas speak of the extermination by Mahāpadma Nanda of all the Kshatriya families which ruled contemporaneously with the Śaiśunāgas, viz., the Ikshvākus, Pañchālas, Kāśeyas, Haihayas, Kaliṅgas, Aśmakas, Kurus, Maithilas, Śūrasenas and the Vīthotras.² The Classical writers state that Agrammes, the king of the Gangaridae and the Prasii, who was the Nanda contemporary of Alexander, ruled up to Beas³ in the west and the evidence of the Hathigumphā Cave Inscription of Khāravela⁴ proves that the Nandas invaded Kaliṅga. These facts give sufficient weight to the Purāṇic testimony.

However, none of the kingdoms that Mahāpadma Nanda is supposed to have uprooted can definitely be located in Rajasthan though many of them such as Haihayas, Śūrasenas and Vīthotras were occupying areas adjacent to this region.⁵ However, the possibility that Rajasthan was also included in the vast Nanda empire cannot be ruled out. The fact Matsyas remain unheard in the countries immediately following the rise of the Nandas points to the same direction. But such a presumption would not be based on definite evidence. Further, the fact that the Matsyas, whose kingdom was in existence in the age of the Buddha, are not enumerated among the Kshatriya families uprooted by the great Nanda emperor would go against the assumption of the Nanda rule over Rajasthan. We, therefore, feel that in the present state of our knowledge the question of Nanda suzerainty over Rajasthan should be left open.

Rajasthan was definitely included in mighty Maurya empire. The positive evidence in this respect comes from the Calcutta—Bairat (Bhabru) Stone Slab Inscription⁶ and,

1. *ANM*, pp. 16 ff.

2. Pargiter, *DKA*, p. 23.

3. Mc Crindle, J.W., *The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great as described by Q. Curtius, Diodorus, Plutarch and Justin* (tr., Westminister, 1896) pp. 221-22.

4. Sircar, D.C., *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, Vol. I, pp. 213 ff.

5. *ANM*, pp. 17-20.

6. Pandey, R.B., *Aśoka ke Abhilekha*, Varanasi, V.S. 2022, p. 115.

Bairat Minor Rock Inscription¹ of Aśoka. Indirectly it is proved by the fact that the Magadhan empire expanded as far west as Surāshṭra as is indicated by the Sopara Rock Edict² of Aśoka and the Junagarh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I dated Śaka Year 72 (150 A.D.).³ Further, it may be noted that all the areas around Rajasthan, viz., U.P., Panjab, Sindh, Gujarat and Malwa were included in the Maurya empire. In such a situation it can hardly be maintained that Rajasthan alone remained outside the dominion of the Mauryas.

But the question regarding the identity of the first Maurya conqueror of this part of the country is rather difficult to answer. We feel that it was most likely Chandragupta Maurya himself. Firstly, he is known to have pushed the frontiers of his empires as far as Surāshṭra or Kathiawar in the west. This is attested to by the Junagarh Rock Inscription of the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman which refers to Chandragupta's Rāshṭriya or High Commissioner Vaiśya Pushyagupta, who constructed the famous Sudarśana lake.⁴ The incorporation of this region within the Magadhan empire, argues Raychaudhuri, "implies control over Avanti or Malwa".⁵ Ujjain, the capital of Avanti, long remained the seat of a Maurya viceroyalty. Jain writers include the 'Muriyas' or Mauryas among the successors of Pālaka of Avanti.⁶ It is quite obvious that Chandragupta Maurya could have hardly extended his suzerainty up to Surāshṭra and Avanti without establishing his hold over Rajasthan. Now the inscriptions of Aśoka credit him only with the conquest of Kaliṅga.⁷ But the geographical distribution of his epigraphs as well as their internal evidence shows that his empire extended up to Mysore

1. Panday, R. B. *Ibid.*, p. 114.

2. *Ibid.*, 109.

3. Sircar, D C., *SI.*, pp. 175 ff.

4. *Loc. cit.*

5. *ANM*, p. 155.

6. Jacobi, *Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, 1879, p. 7; *Pariśiṣṭāparvan*, ed. by Jacobi, p. xx, quoted by H.C. Raychaudhuri, in *ANM*, p. 155 fn. 3. Chandragupta Maurya has been referred to as the 'lord of Ujjayani' by a Jain text *Ārādhanākathā Kosha* of Nemidatta.

7. Rock Edicts XIII, Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 58.

in the south and Kandhar in the north-west.¹ Aśoka's father Bindusāra Amitraghāta is not known to history as a conqueror and is supposed to have been a man of peaceful temperament interested in wine, figs and philosophy.² It thus stands to reason that the empire over which Aśoka ruled was mostly the creation of his grandfather Chandragupta Maurya.³ This conclusion is quite in keeping with the accounts of the Classical writers. According to them, after the liberation of Panjab by putting to death of the prefects of Alexander, Chandragupta collected a huge army and conquered the whole country. Plutarch tells us that "Andicottus (Chandragupta Maurya) who had by that time mounted the throne...overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men."⁴ Justin also informs us that he was "in possession of India."⁵ The *Mudrārākshasa* describes him as the "king over all Jambudvīpa", and sole monarch of the country that extends "from the lord of the mountains (*Sailendra*, i.e. the Himalayas), cooled by showers of the spray of the divine stream (*Gangā*) playing about among its rocks, to the shores of the Southern ocean (*dakshināranya*) marked by the brilliance of gems flashing with various colours."⁶

The Maurya conquest of Rajasthan marked a turning point in the history of this region. Though it had experienced the influx of neighbouring tribes and peoples and occasional rule of neighbouring kings even in earlier periods, it was for the first time in the Maurya age that Rajasthan became an integral part of an all-India empire and experienced the pleasures and pains of being a part of the main stream of national life. The best evidence for this transformation is

1. *PHAI*, pp. 307-315; *AIU*, pp. 77-78.

2. McCrindle, *Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*, p. 409.

3. *AIU*, p. 61.

4. *The Classical Accounts of India*, ed. by R.C. Majumdar, p. 198.

5. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 193; *PHAI*, p. 269; *ANM*, p. 137.

6. Act. III., verse 19 quoted in the *ANM*, p. 156. For details, see, Mookerji, R.K. *Chandragupta Maurya and his Times* Ch. II.; Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, pt. II, Ch. IV; *ANM*, Ch. IV; *AIU*, pp. 57-62.

provided, by the inscriptions of Aśoka. For example, the Bhabru edict found in the Jaipur division refers to the jurisdiction of the Magadhan Buddhist Church in Rajasthan.¹ Further, it refers to a number of Buddhist texts² the study of which was enjoined by Aśoka for the monks, the nuns as well as the laity. The reference to these sacred texts is significant not only from the point of view of the history of Buddhism and its literature but also from the point of view of the cultural history of Rajasthan; for it proves that Rajasthan was greatly influenced by the missionary activities of Aśoka as well as Buddhist *sangha*. It appears that Buddhism had acquired strong roots in this part of the country in the third century B.C. The impact of Buddhism must have brought about some significant changes in the cultural life of the people as in the earlier period, this area was a great centre of the Brahmanical religion. Actually, it continued to give greater patronage to Brahmanical faiths even in the later period.

The empire of Aśoka declined and disintegrated within half a century after his death (236 B.C.).³ His successors continued to occupy the imperial throne till 185 B.C.⁴ The dynasty ended with the assassination of Brihadratha, its last king, by his general Pushyamitra Śunga. During the later

1. पियदसि लाजा मागधं संवं अभिवादेतनं आहा***

Some scholars such as Hultsch take the word *Māgadha* to be an adjective of *lājā*. But in the Aśokan epigraphs the adjectives of *lājā* usually precede it. Cf. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 115.

2. इमानि भंते धंम पलियायानि विनयसमुक्से

अलिय वसाणि अनागतभयानि मुनिगाथा

मोनियसुते उपतिसपसिने ए चा लाघुलो-

वादे मुसावादं अधिगिन्य भगवता वृथेन भासिते

एतानि भंते धंम पालियायानि इच्छामि किति बहुके

भिखुपाये चा भिखुनिये चा अभिखिनं सुनेयु चा

उपधालययू चा हेवमेवा उपासका चा उपासिका चा***

Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 115 and fn. p. 116.

3. *AIU*, pp. 88-89 and App., pp. 92-94.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

Mauryas distant provinces of the empire became independent one after another.¹ What happened in Rajasthan in the age of the decline of the Mauryas is not definitely known. However, according to the Jain sources Pushyamitra Śunga, the founder of the Śunga dynasty, who succeeded to the imperial throne of Magadha after the Mauryas in 185 B.C., was the governor of Ujjayanī before he murdered his royal master. Further, according to some Purāṇas,² Pushyamitra ruled for 60 years while according to others he was on the throne for only 36 years.³ The Jain sources have given him a reign period of 30 years—but in connection with the history of Malwa. Therefore, it has been very plausibly suggested that his reign of 60 years includes the period of his governorship of Malwa as well as the period when he was de jure emperor of Magadha. If this surmise is correct it would follow that Pushyamitra ruled as a governor of the Maurya emperors over West Malwa and obviously the adjoining regions of South Rajasthan in the post Aśokan Maurya epoch.⁴

1. According to *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (I, 115-17), Aśoka's son Jālauka made himself an independent king in Kashmir and conquered the country upto Kanauj. He is said to have crushed the invading Mlechchha horde'. According to Tārānātha Vīrasena, another successor of Aśoka, carved out an independent kingdom in Gandhāra. The *Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa testified to the independence of Vidarbha in the age of Brihadratha. The Greek writer Polybius, refers to Sophagases (Subhāgasena) as an independent king on north-western frontiers of India at the time of the invasion of Antiochus III (206 B.C.); cf. *PHAI*, pp. 361-62; *ANM*, pp. 243-246; *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, pp. 43-47. For details, vide, Thapar, R., *Aśoka and the Decline of the Maurya*, Ch. VI and VII.
2. *DKM*, p. 70 fn. 12.
3. *Therāvāli* by Merutuṅga as quoted in *EHNI*, pp. 8-9.
4. The *Matsya Purāṇa* assigns a rule of 36 years to Pushyamitra while the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* assign 60 years. Here it may be noted that while the Purāṇas give a period of 137 years to the Mauryas, the Jaina writer Merutuṅga splits it into two parts i.e. 108 years for the Mauryas and 30 years for Pushyamitra. Merutuṅga is a late writer (fourteenth century A.D.). His statement may, therefore, not be correct. But as pointed out by R.C. Majumdar (*IHQ*, I, pp. 91 ff), the Jain account was written from the point of view of Avanti while

The Sunga period witnessed many important developments which greatly influenced the course of the history of Rajasthan. The most prominent event was the invasion of the Yavanas which was also the direct cause of the arrival of a large number of tribes from the Panjab to this part of the country. The Yavanas, i.e. the Greeks had established an independent kingdom in Bactria in the middle of the third century B.C. when Aśoka was presiding over the destiny of India. The founder of this kingdom was Diodotus I¹ whose son Diodotus II was overthrown by one Euthydemus who in turn had to face the invasion of the Seleucid emperor Antiochus III between c. 208 and 206 B.C. However on account of the efforts mainly of Demetrius, the son of Euthydemus, the independence of the Bactrian kingdom was saved. Towards the end of his rule Euthydemus extended his sway over some parts of north-western India.² But the man who established Greek supremacy over the Indian soil seems to have been his son Demetrius who proved to be a great conqueror. There is some controversy regarding the identity of Demetrius, the conqueror of India. W.W. Tarn³ identified him with the son of Euthydemus while A.K. Narain⁴ gives the credit of widespread conquests in India to another king of the same name. Be whatever it may, it is certain that the Greeks invaded the very heartland of India. The *Yuga Purāna* section of the *Gārgī Samhitā* speaks of a Yavana invasion of North India sometime after the reign of the Maurya king Śālisūka (c. 200 B.C.)⁵

the Purānas deal with the history of Pāṭaliputra. Therefore, longer reign period of Pushyamitra might have consisted of two different periods, the period of his governorship at Vidiśā under the Mauryas (when he was *de facto* ruler of the whole empire) and the period of his *de jure* rule as emperor after he overthrew Brihadratha. Sten Konow also has split up the reign of Pushyamitra into two parts—30 years of rule in Malwa and 6 years in Magadha (quoted in *Comprehensive History of India*. Vol. II, p. 100 fn. 1; cf. Pargiter, *DKA*, pp. 30-33, 70).

1. The accession of Diodotus I is usually placed in c. 255 B.C.
2. *AIU*, p. 105.
3. Tarn, W.W., *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 155.
4. Narain, A.K., *The Indo-Greeks*, pp. 28 ff.
5. *AIU*, p. 106.

in the following words : "Then the viciously valiant Greeks, after reducing Sāketa, the Pañchāla country and Mathurā, will reach (or take) Kusumadhlivaja".¹ Patañjali, who was a contemporary of Pushyamitra Śuṅga,² also refers to Yavana expedition in his *Mahābhāshya* while illustrating the use of the affix *lāñ*, which denotes an action that happened out of sight in the absence of the narrator. Patañjali gives the example, "the Yavana besieged Sāketa (Ayodhyā), the Yavana besieged Madhyamikā (near Chitor)."³ From our point of view the testimony of the *Mahābhāshya* is very important because it explicitly refers to the occupation of Madhyamikā in Rajasthan by the Yavanas. This invasion took place either before the accession of Pushyamitra Śuṅga or in the initial years of his reign. However the Śuṅga monarch was successful in repulsing the invaders. It is quite likely that the internal dissensions among the Greeks themselves were mainly responsible for their debacle.⁴ Anyway, it cannot be denied that Pushyamitra Śuṅga succeeded in establishing his authority up to the river Indus. Rajasthan, at that time, was most likely included in his empire, though it is very difficult to prove this supposition.⁵ At any rate, it must

1. *JBORS*, XIV, 1928, p. 402; cf. Narain, A.K., *op. cit.*, App. IV pp. 174-179.

2. *AIU*, p. 107.

3. अरुणाद् यवनः साकेतम् ।

अरुणाद् यवनः मध्यमिकाम् ।

Mahābhāshya, III, 2.111.

4. According to the *Gārgī-Saṁhitā* (*JBORS*, XIV, 1923, p. 403) there will be undoubtedly a civil war among them, arising in their own country, there will be a very terrible and a ferocious war". This shows that the Yavanas who besieged Pāṭaliputra did not stay for a long time in Madhyadeśa. The Greeks appear to have lost Madhyadeśa and parts of Panjab and the lower Sindhu valley to Pushyamitra at least temporarily. (cf. *AIU*, pp. 95-97 and 107).

5. From the testimony of *Mālavīkāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa it appears that at the time when Agnimitra, the son of Pushyamitra, was ruling over Vidiśā as the governor of his father, Vasumitra, son of Agnimitra and grandson of Pushyamitra, was the commandar of the Śuṅga army

have felt the impact of the main current of the Śuṅga Greek rivalry.

The invasion of India by the Greeks was a landmark in the history of the country. It was also an event of far-reaching consequences from the point of view of the history of Rajasthan. It started the process of migration of a large number of tribes from the Panjab into this region. Rajasthan, as we have noted earlier was a sort of *cul-de-sac* where people from the adjoining regions used to take shelter whenever they were pressed hard by the imperialist powers of the Ganga Valley or the invaders from the north-west. It happened on a grand scale in this period when Mālavas, Śibis, Ārjunāyanas, Ābhīras, etc., of Punjab migrated into various parts of Rajasthan when they were pressed hard by the Greeks.

The history of the tribes that entered Rajasthan in the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period is not sufficiently known, based as it is mainly on the numismatic data, a few inscriptions and some scattered literary references. However, as a result of the research work of modern scholars during the last hundred years or so we are in a position to present a broad outline of the circumstances leading to the migration of these tribes into Rajasthan. In other words we can now try to bring into focus the main features of the picture of the political geography of Rajasthan in the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period.

which accompanied the horse of the *Aśvamedha* performed by the Śuṅga monarch. As at that time Vasumitra was mature enough to lead the imperial forces, it may be assumed that this event took place towards the close of Pushyamitra's reign. This also suggests that the Śuṅga-Greek clash on the southern or right bank of the river 'Sindhu' which must be identified with the Indus (cf. the statement of the Buddhist writers that Pushyamitra made a declaration regarding the persecution of the Buddhist at Śākala) was different from the one reported by the *Mahābhāṣṭya* and the *Gārgī Saṃhitā*. Further it indicates, though it does not conclusively prove, that Rajasthan, situated to the east of river Indus, was included in the Śuṅga empire under Pushyamitra.

The Mālavas

Let us first take up the history of the Mālavas. The Mālavas claimed descent from the illustrious Ikshvāku dynasty of Śrī Rāmchandra.¹ In the *Valmīkiya Rāmāyaṇa* Malla has been mentioned as an epithet of Lakṣmaṇa's son Chandra-ketu.² It is generally believed that Malla was the founder of the Malla rāshṭra. The word Malla is the Prakrit form of the word Madra as 'dṛ' is a changed form of 'll'³. That is why in the *Mahābhārata*⁴ Mālavas have been described as the descendants of Aśvapati, the king of Madras, who is said to have obtained one hundred sons called 'the Mālavas' through his queen Mālavī as a result of one of the boons granted by Yama to the king's daughter Śāvitri, married to the Śālva prince Satyavān. We shall discuss this problem presently.

The Mālavas were a tribe of famous warriors. According to the *Mahābhārata*, they helped the Kauravas against the Pāṇḍavas in many crucial battles. When Alexander invaded north-western India in the fourth century B.C., the Mālavas (called Malloi by the Classical writers) lived in the region lying to the north of the confluence of the Ravi and the Chenab and were probably confederated with the Kshudrakas (Oxydrakai or Sudracai of the Greek historians) who were inhabiting the Montgomery region of Panjab of modern

1. Altekar, A.S., *The State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 111; cf. Nāndśā Yūpa Inscriptions, *EI*. XXVII, pp. 252-60; *IHQ*; XXIX, pp. 80 ff.

2. *Rāmāyaṇa*, VII, 102.9.

3. Przyluski, J., *JA*, 1926, pp. 1 ff.

4. *Mahābhārata*, III. 296. 56-60 :

पितुश्च ते पुत्रश्चतं भविता तव मातरि ।

मालव्यां मालवा नाम शाश्वताः पुत्रपौत्रिणः ॥

⁴ Cf. Harabā Inscription of Isānavarman (654 A.D.), Sircar, D.C., *SI*, p. 386; *IC*, I, pp. 298 ff. The Tradition also suggests that the Mālavas represented a branch of the Madra people of the Śialkot region, cf. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, p. 20 fn. 22.

Pakistan.¹ Some scholars, such as P.L. Gupta,² doubt this identification, though without adducing sufficient reasons. The close association of the Malloi with the Oxydrakai itself is a proof of the identification of the Malloi with the Mālavas, for Patañjali (first half of the second century B.C.) in his *Mahābhāṣya*³ also refers to the close relationship of the Mālavas with the Kshudrakas when he speaks of the Kshudraka—Mālava as an example of the *dvandva* compound and refers to Āpiśali as speaking of Kshudraka—Mālavi (*senā*).⁴ Further, both these tribes are mentioned together in the early Sanskrit literature.⁵ The fact that the Mālavas lived in Panjab⁶ is attested by the *Mahābhārata*. It states that Aśvapati, the king of Madradeśa, obtained one hundred sons called the Mālavas through his queen Mālavi as a result of a boon granted by Yama to Sāvitri, the daughter of Aśvapati.⁷ Thus, according to this legend, the Mālavas who dominated the political scene of Rajasthan in the century preceding and following the birth of Christ were originally a branch of the Madras of Panjab.

In Panjab the Mālavas developed a fairly advanced state of civilization and their description by the Classical writers speak volumes for their greatness and prosperity. According to the Classical writers, the envoys of the Mālavas and Kshudrakas brought very rare and sumptuous gifts to Alexander. The presents included four-horsed chariots (the number being 1030 or 500), one thousand locally manufactured bucklers, one hundred talents of white iron (probably steel or nickel), a large quantity of linen goods, three hundred horse-men, some tortoise shells, skins of large lizards (crocodiles) and tame

1. Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, pp. 254-55.

2. Gupta, P.L., *Gupta Sāmrājya*, pp. 262-63.

3. *Mahābhāṣya*, IV, 2.45.

4. V, 3.114. cf. Weber, *JASB.*, pt. I, Vol. Lxi, 1892, p. 60. For critical analysis vide Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity* (third ed. Bangalore, 1955), p. 60 fn. 1.

5. Smith, V.A. *EHI*, p. 98 fn. 1.

6. *PHAI*, pp. 254-55.

7. *Mahābhārata*, III, 296, 59-60.

lions and tigers.¹ In this list coins are conspicuous by their absence. It shows that by this time they had not developed a currency system of their own. They were mainly devoted to agriculture. Probably their economy depended upon the exploitation of slaves, for Patañjali remarks that only the members of the ruling class among the Mālavas and the Kshudrakas were called Mālavya and Kshandrakya ; the slaves and free labourers were not permitted to use these titles.² Thus it appears they had a privileged aristocracy which looked after the administration and enjoyed the fruits of the labour of the slaves and others. The Macedonians were very much impressed by the appearance of the Mālavas as "they were of great stature and were amongst the tallest men in Asia. Their complexion was black, but they were simple in their habits."³

From the evidence of the Classical writers it appears that the Mālavas and the Kshudrakas were ordinarily at war with each other. But at the time of the invasion of Alexander they resolved to forget old enmity and make common cause against the invader.⁴ According to Diodorus, the two tribes cemented their alliance by large scale inter-marriages by giving and taking in exchange ten thousand young women for wives.⁵ This information is of great significance for after the

1. For details, vide, Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, II, (especially, accounts of Arrian and Curtius) pp. 5 ff; cf. Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 102 fn. 1; for the Mālavas' struggle with Alexander, *Ibid.*, pp. 98-102.

2. *Mahābhāshya*, IV. 1.163.

इदं तर्हि शीद्रकाणामपत्तं मालवानामपत्त्वमिति ।

अत्रापि शीद्रक्यः मालव्य इति नैतत्तेषां दारे वा

भवति कर्मकरे वा । कि तर्हि ? तेषामेव कस्तुदित्तव् वा ।

It is interesting to note, however, that the Mālavas do not find mention in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭāñgāyāyi*. The absence of Mālavas in the *Aṣṭāñgāyāyi* may be due to the fact that they had not attained sufficient importance in the time of the great grammarian.

3. Mc Crindle, J.W., *Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*, p. 85; cf. Das Gupta, K.K., *The Mālavas*, pp. 26-27; Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, p. 178.

4. Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 99.

5. Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, p. 176; for details regarding the Maloi-Oxydrakai confederacy and their fate against Alexander, vide, Smith, V.A., *op. cit.*, pp. 99-112.

invasion of Alexander the Kshudrakas do not figure in our sources. Probably the Mālavas, who migrated to Rajasthan in the post-Alexanderian period, were a mixed tribe comprising both Mālavas and Kshudrakas. It may explain the vigour with which the Mālavas colonized and dominated large tracts of Rajasthan for centuries together.

From Panjab the Mālavas might have moved towards Rajasthan by way of Bhātinda where their name seems to have survived in the Malawai dialect found prevalent in the region extending from Ferozepur to Bhatinda.¹ In Rajasthan they settled down in the Jaipur division as the discovery of their coins as well as inscriptions from their region proves.

The Śibis

The Śibis (the Siboi of the Classical writers), another tribe of Panjab, which resisted Alexander on his return march, entered Rajasthan separately or alongwith the Mālavas but in the same general period. They were also an ancient people. They are generally identified with the Śivas, a tribe of the *Rigveda*, which is said to have been defeated by the king Sudās in the Dāśarājña.² They were intimately connected with Uśinara *janapada*.³ At one time their government was monarchial in character as is evident from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* which knows of a Śibi king.⁴ This fact is further corroborated by the *Gītā* which mentions their king Saibya,⁵ and also by the *Vishṇu-Dharmottara Mīhāpurāṇa* which mentions king Prabhadraka of the Śibis as ruling somewhere to the west of the

1. Grierson, *Linguistic Survey of India*, IX, i, p. 709. quoted by K.K. Das Gupta in the *Mālavas*, p. 4 fn. 38; cf. Sharau, M.K., *Tribal coins—A Study*, pp. 180-181.

2. *Vedic Index*, II, pp. 381-82. There can hardly be any doubt as to the identity of the Rigvedic Śivas with the Siboi of the Classical writers.

3. *Baudhāyanī Śrauta Sūtra* (III, 53, 22) quoted by B.G. Law in *Traces in Ancient India*, p. 82; it is not altogether improbable, therefore, that the Uśinara country was at one time the home of the Śibis (*PHAI*, p. 253).

4. *Vedic Index*, II, pp. 381-82.

5. *Gītā*, I, 5.

capital of Sarvatāta, who must have been an independent monarch as only such sovereigns were entitled to perform this sacrifice.¹

The inscription of Sarvatāta is important from the point of view of the history of the evolution of early Vaishnavism. Firstly, it is the earliest epigraph from Rajasthan which throws light on this religion. Secondly, it provides the first definite reference to the identification of Nārāyaṇa with Vāsudeva. Thirdly, it makes mention of the worship of Satikarshana and Vāsudeva and thus provides an important landmark for the history of the *mūha* doctrine. And, lastly, it refers to the *pūjā* of a *śilā* among the worshippers of Vāsudeva.²

The Ārjunīyāṇas

In the Śuṅga-Kaṇva period the north-eastern part of Rajasthan i.e. the area of the former Bharatpur and Alwar

1. Some scholars such as J.C. Ghosh (quoted in *EI*, XXII, p. 205), believe that Sarvatāta was a Kaṇva king. But there is absolutely no evidence to prove that such was the case. Kaṇvas did not have anything to do with Rajasthan. Further, the name Sarvatāta (Sanskrit Sarvatrāta) does not figure in the Tuṇīc list of Kaṇva kings (Sircar, *SI*, p. 91, fn. 1). The suggestion that the Gājīyana *gotra* to which Sarvatāta belonged should be identified with the Gāṇḍāyana or Godāyana *gotra* mentioned in the *Maṭṭya Purāṇa* as an individual *gotra* or with Gaṅgāyana of the Sanaka or Kasyapa group, is also untenable. These are mere conjectures which cannot be upheld or denied in the present state of our knowledge (vide Jain, K.C., *Ancient cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, p. 95, fn. 1.). This may be noted, however, that Pārākara Brāhmaṇas, to whose family the mother of Sarvatāta belonged, are still found in large number in the Fushlār region near Ajmer.
2. The exact significance of the term *pūjā-śilā-prākāra* is not known. D.R. Bhandarkar translates it as "a stone enclosure round an object of worship" (*EI*, XXII, p. 201). J.C. Ghosh believes that it refers to "a rampart for the stone object" (which he identifies as *śāligrāma* of vaishnav worship (*IHQ*, IX, p. 766). However the best suggestion has come from V.S. Agrawala (*Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, V.S. 2014, pp. 116 ff.), who suggests that in that period the Vaishnavas worshipped stone slabs (*pūjā-śilās*) of the type of the *āyagapattas* of the Jains and that Sarvatāta constructed an enclosure (*prākāra*) for the worship of such a *pūjā-śilā*. The tradition of constructing such enclosures goes back to the days of Aśoka who built a *śilā-vigadabhūcha* at Lumbini. Cf. Bhandarkar, D.R., *EI*, XXII, pp. 202-203; Agrawala, R.C., *Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, V.S. 2011, pp. 116 ff.; Srivastava, V.S., *Maru Bhāratī*, year 11, pt. 2, 1963, pp. 46 ff.

states and the adjoining parts of U.P. west of Agra and Mathura, was occupied by the famous tribal republic of the Ārjunāyanas. They probably claimed descent from the Pāñdava prince Arjuna or the Haihaya king of that name.¹ Pāṇini in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* refers to Ārjunakas, i.e., the devotees of Arjuna together with the worshippers of Vāsudeva called Vāsudevaka.² It means that Arjuna was treated as a deity by a section of the people in the age of Pāṇini. But it is not certain if the Ārjunāyanas of Rajasthan and U.P. were the descendants of the Ārjunakas of the celebrated grammarian. Similarly, their identification with the Prārjunas of the *Prayāga praśasti* of Samudragupta³ and Prājjunakas (Prārjunakas) of Kautilya,⁴ suggested by Buddha Prakash,⁵ can hardly be accepted as the *Prayāga praśasti* enumerates the Ārjunāyanas and the Prārjunas in the same list separately. It is, however, probable that the Ārjunāyanas and the Prārjunas both were the splinter groups of an ancient tribe which regarded itself as the descendant of Arjuna just as the Yaudheyas looked upon themselves as the descendants of Yaudheya, a son of Yudhishṭhira. Buddha Prakash has also suggested that Ārjunāyanas were a Scythian tribe. He has pointed out that some oases-states of the Tarim basin in Central Asia dotting the northern trade route, running from Kashghar to Tun-huang, were constantly associated with the name of Arjuna.⁶ But the evidence cited by him is hardly sufficient to prove the point.

The coins of the Ārjunāyanas, found in Alwar-Bharatpur-Mathura-Agra tract, bear the legend Ārjunāyanānām jayāḥ

1. *AIU*; p. 162. In view of the fact that the contemporary Yaudheya tribe is supposed to have claimed descent from Yudhishṭhira Pāñdava, the former alternative may be correct.

2. वासुदेवार्जुनाभ्यां वृत्, *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, IV, 3.98; for a detailed analysis of this evidence vide, Agrawal, V.S., *Pāṇinikālina Bhāratavarsha*, pp. 352 ff.

3. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, pp. 202 ff.

4. *Arthaśāstra*, III. 18, (ed. R. Shamasastri), p. 194.

5. Buddha Prakash, *Political and Social Movements in Ancient Panjab* (Delhi, 1964), p. 93.

6. Buddha Prakash, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

(victory to the Ārjunāyanas)¹ in the early Brāhmi script. According to McCindle, they were known to the Classical writers as Agalassi or Agalassoi.² In that case it may be presumed that they migrated from the Panjab to north eastern Rajasthan and adjoining parts of U.P. along with their neighbours, the Siboi and the Malloi. The close association of the Malloi Siboi and the Agalassoi with each other becomes clear by the statement of the Classical writers that Alexander had to conquer the latter two tribes in order to prevent them from joining the powerful Malloi.³

The Yaudheyas

The Yaudheyas were perhaps the most important and the strongest tribe of northern Rajasthan. They also occupied the adjoining parts of western U.P. and south-eastern Panjab in the centuries immediately preceding and following the commencement of the Christian era. The forms *Yaudheya* or *Yodheya* are derived from *Yodha*, which signifies 'a warrior'.⁴ In the *Mahābhārata* 'Yaudheya' appears as the name of a son of Yudhiṣṭhīra,⁵ the eldest of the Pāṇḍavas, and it is quite likely that the Yaudheyas claimed descent from the former.⁶ They are mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini and are grouped in this work with the Trigaritas, Bharatas, Uśinaras and other people of the *dyudha-jñi* *Sāṅgha* category,⁷ and are equated with the *Parśus*⁸ (perhaps the Persians). The *Purāṇas*⁹ connect them with the Uśinaras, who dominated eastern Panjab in the post-Vedic period. On the basis

1. Cf. the legend, *Mālarāṇḍījayaḥ* on the Mālava coins.

2. Quoted in the *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 126; D. Sharma supports this suggestion (*RTA*, I, p. 49). Contra K. A. N. Sastri (*Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 126).

3. Cf. *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, p. 70.

4. *AIU*, p. 165.

5. *Mahābhārata* I, 95, 76. For a discussion see Cunningham, A., *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, XIV, p. 141.

6. Buddha Prakash has suggested the association of the Yaudheyas with Yudhiṣṭhīra on linguistic grounds also, (*op. cit.*, pp. 103-5).

7. *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, V, 3, 117; IV, 1, 178.

8. *Ibid.*, V, 3, 117.

9. Pargiter, F. E., *Mārkandeya Purāṇa*, p. 380.

of the Purāṇic tradition, Pargiter suggests that king Uśinara established the kingdoms of the Yaudheyas, Ambashṭhas, Navarāshṭras and the city Krimīla and his son Śiva founded the town of Śivipura.¹ Buddha Prakash believes that the Yaudheyas were a foreign tribe and were related with the Yautiyas of Laristan, the Ouitio of Transcaucasia and the Jut nomads of Kirman.² But this theory has nothing to commend itself to. The *Mahābhārata* refers to Rohitaka in the Bahudhānyaka region as their capital.³ According to A.S. Altekar,⁴ there were three federating units of the Yaudheya power : Rohtak in the Panjab was the capital of one; northern Pañchāla, known as Bahudhānyaka, was the centre of the second ; and northern Rajputana was occupied by the third. It appears that the heart of the Yaudheya republic was eastern Panjab, but it dominated over the adjoining regions of the U.P. and Rajasthan also.⁵

The coins of the Yaudheyas are available in six distinct classes each divisible into several varieties.⁶ The earliest Yaudheya coins, which may be assigned to a period about the close of the first century B.C., bear the legend *bahudhānak-* *Yodheyānām* (of the Yaudheyas of the Bahudhānyaka country). They were struck probably with the idea of emphasising the original home of the tribe. Other classes of the Yaudheya coins belonging to the later periods of their history, are discussed in the next chapter.

1. Pargiter, F.E., *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 264.

2. Buddha Prakash, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

3. ततो बहुधनं रम्यं गवाद्यं धनधान्यवत् ।

कात्तिकेयस्य दयितं रोहीतकमुपाद्रवत् ॥

तत्र युद्धं महच्चासीच् छर्मत्तमयूरके ।

मरुभूमिस्तथान्येन तथैव बहुधान्यकम् ॥

Mahābhārata, *Sabhā*, 32, 4-5.

4. Altekar, A.S., *State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 119.

5. *AIU*, p. 168.

6. For details see Allan, John, *A Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum* (London, 1936), Int.; Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, Calcutta, Vol. I (Oxford, 1906).

The Ābhīras

Another important tribe, which had several settlements in different parts of the country and which played a prominent role in the history of Rajasthan, was the Ābhīras. The origin of this tribe is shrouded in mystery. It is usually believed that it was a foreign tribe which entered India sometime in the first half of the first millennium B.C. and spread in the Panjab and later on in different parts of western, central and southern India.¹ According to some scholars, the Ābhīras were connected with the Apīru (Khāpīru) who played a very prominent role in the history of western Asia in the second millennium B.C.² In Hebrew literature these people are mentioned as Ibīri (an adjectival form of Apīru) and in the Egyptian records they figure as A-pi-ru.³ It is quite likely, that a section of these people came to India also. In the *Mahābhārata* a tradition has been recorded according to which the river Sarasvatī disappeared near Vīnaśana as a consequence of the foul contact of the Ābhīras.⁴ This indicates that an account of the advent of Ābhīras, the supremacy of Kūrus in Kurukshetra region slowly faded away. In the *Muśalaparvan* of the same work the Ābhīras are said to have inflicted a crushing defeat on Arjuna, when he was returning with the women of the Yādavas from Dvārakā after the *Mahābhārata* war.⁵ In the epics and the Purāṇas the Ābhīras have been called Mlech-

1. Cf. Mitra, Mrs. D., *PIHC*, 1951, pp. 91-100.

2. Buddha Prakash, *Political and Social Movements in Ancient Panjab*, p. 132.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. ततो विनशनं राजन् जगामाथ हलायुधः ।

शूद्राभीरान् प्रति हैपाद् यत्र नष्टा सरस्वती ॥

Mahābhārata IX, 37.1 (critical ed.) cf. also XIV, 20.16.

5. आभीरेरनुसृत्याजी हृताः पञ्चनदालयैः ।

धनुरादाय तत्राहं नाशकं तस्य पूरणे ।

यथा पुरा च मे वीर्यं भुजयोस्तत्र नाभवत् ।

अस्त्राणि मे प्रणश्टानि विविधानि महामुने ॥

Mahābhārata, XVI, 8, 17-18.

chhas and Dasyus and are said to have been very notorious.¹ In the course of their migration they settled down in south-western part of Rajasthan also which according to the Classical writers was known as Abria.² We find them in the neighbourhood of Ghatiyala (Jodhpur area) in the ninth century A.D.³ But the history of this branch of the Ābhīras is not revealed by the available sources.

The Śūdras

The Śūdra or Śaudrāyaṇa⁴ tribe, which was distinct from the fourth varṇa,⁵ was an important tribe of north-western India at the time of Alexander's invasion. Greek writers refer to them as Scdras (also Sogdi, Sogdri, Sogdoi) in association with the Massanoi, both of them occupying portions of modern Sine.⁶ In Sanskrit literature the Śūdras are usually associated with the Ābhīras.⁷ According to the *Mahābhārata* the Sarasvatī disappeared in the territory of the Śūdras and Ābhīras.⁸ The Purāṇas include them in the list of the people of Udīchya division suggesting thereby that their earlier settlement was in north-western India.⁹ It is also indicated by the *Atharvaveda* which mentions a Śūdra woman along with the Mujavantas and the Bāhlīkas.¹⁰ The north-western settlement

1. *Mahābhārata*, XVI, 7, 46-47, 60-62, *Rāmāyaṇa*, Yuddhakāṇḍa, 22, 30-33; *Brahma-Purāṇa*, 101.16.24; at one place the *Mahābhārata* (XIV, 29, 16) calls them Vṛishala and *Vishnu-Purāṇa* (V, 38-28, 49) knows them as Gopālas.
2. Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, pp. 101 and 372; for other references, vii, *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 331.
3. *EI*, IX, pp. 277-81.
4. *Gāṇapāṭha*, IV, 2.45.
5. Cf. Sharma, R.S., *Śūdras in Ancient India*, p. 32. *Vedic Index*, II, pp. 39I-92; *Cambridge History of India*, I, p. 89; Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, p. 149.
6. Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 257; Law, B.C., *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 350; cf. Majumdar, R.C., *op. cit.*, pp. 180-81.
7. *Mahābhārata*, VII, 19.6; IX, 37.1.; *Mahābhāshya*, 1.2.3. The *Purāṇa* also associates them with the Ābhīras and other tribes (*Mārkaṇḍeya*, 57.35; *Brahma*, 19.17; *Vishnu*, II, 3; *Bhāgavata*, XII, 1, 36).
8. *Mahābhārata*, IX, 37.1; cf. XIV, 29.16.
9. *Vāyu-Purāṇa*, 45.115 ff.; *Vāmana-Purāṇa*, 13.37 ff.; *Kūrma Purāṇa*, 1.46-42; *Matsya-Purāṇa*, 133.40 ff.; *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa*, 1.2.16.46 ff.
10. *Atharvaveda*, V, 22.7-8.

of the Śūdras is also mentioned by the Classical writers. According to Diodorus, Alexander founded a city called Alexandria in the republic of Sodrai and planted a colony of 10,000 men there.¹ It appears that a part of these, north-western Śūdra people migrated towards Rajasthan along with other tribes mentioned above.

The Rājanyas

Originally the Rājanyas² lived in the Hoshiarpur district of Panjab, where their coins of the second and first century B.C. bearing the legend *rājana-janapadasa* (of the Rājanya *janapada*) have been found.³ Perhaps they also migrated towards northern and north-western Rajasthan, for their coinage bearing legends both in the Brāhmī and Kharoshṭhī scripts⁴ have also been discovered in the area lying between Bharatpur and Mathura, suggesting their occupation of this part of the country in the Śunga-Kaṇva period.

The Uddehikas

The *janapada* of the Uddehikas⁵ was not very far from the Rājanya state. Varāhamihira places the Uddehikas in the Madhyadeśa,⁶ but Alberuni locates them near Bazana in Bharatpur district.⁷ Their coins bear the legend *Udehaki*.⁸ One of the coins reveals the name of a certain Suyamita (Sūryamitra). The absence of any royal title for him suggests an

1. Majumdar, R.C., *Classical Accounts of India*, p. 181.

2. Here the term Rājanya is not synonym of Kshatriya, but is the name of a separate tribe. It was not noticed by the Classical writers in the fourth century B.C.; cf. Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, pp. 85 and 151.

3. Allan, J., *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum*, Int. p. 141.

4. *AIU*, p. 160 fn. 5.

5. For the term Udehaki for Auddehika, vide, Rapson, E.J., *JRAS*, 1900, p. 99.

6. *Brihat-Saṁhitā*, XIV, 3 (*IA*, XXII, p. 192), quoted in the *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 134.

7. Allan, J., *op. cit.*; Sect. 47; cf. *AIU*, p. 159 fn. 3.

8. These coins are presently in the British Museum. Their provenance is however not known.

and Mālavas, a branch of the Madras, who came to Rajasthan from Panjab, brought some foreign cultural elements with them. According to Przyluski, the very name Vyushitāśva, the legendary ancestor of the Madras and Śālvās may be the Sanskritized form of the Iranian name Vistaspa, a name adopted also by the father of Darius.¹ The name Madra is itself equated with the Iranian name Mada or Mede.² In the *Mahābhārata* Mādri, the queen of Pāṇḍu, is given the title Bālhīki.³ In the *Mahāmāyūrī* the Yaksha Kharaposta is mentioned as the guardian deity of Bhadraśaila identified by Przyluski with Bhadrapura or Śākala, the capital of the Madras.⁴ The very name Śākala or Sagala is also apparently derived from the name of Śaka tribe and is a strong proof of the arrival and settlement of the Śakas in the land of the Madras long before the advent of the later Sakas who entered India after the decline of the Indo-Greeks in the first century B C.⁵ The reference to the Yaksha Kharaposta in the *Mahāmāyūrī* is also very interesting, because the name Kharaposta was translated into Chinese as, skin of an ass,⁶ and this meaning may be obtained only when we seek its origin in the Iranian word *post* meaning 'skin'.⁷ All these facts strongly suggest that prior to their arrival in Rajasthan the Madras, Śālvās and the tribes allied to them had undergone strong Iranian influence.

Date of The Arrival of The Panjab Tribes In Rajasthan

The above-mentioned tribes left Panjab for Rajasthan definitely after the invasion of Alexander. But the exact period

1. Przyluski, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

2. Deb, H.K., Mede or Madra, *JRASB*, 1925, p. 205.

3. इत्युक्त्वा तं चितान्निस्यं धर्मपत्नी नरपत्नम् ।

मदराजसुता तूर्णमन्वारोहदयशस्वनी ॥

धन्या त्वमसि वाल्हीकि मत्तो भाग्यतरा तथा ।

Mahābhārata, I, 125, 25-31.

4. *Indian Studies : Past and Present*, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 40; Cf. Buddha Prakash, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

5. *Indian Studies : Past and Present*, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 39.

6. Cf. Levi, Sylvain, *J.A.*, 1915, I, pp. 39, 74.

7. Przyluski, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

of their migration is difficult to determine. Once these tribes were settled in Rajasthan many of them issued their own currency with legends in Brāhmī script. Therefore, if the initial date of these coins, specially those of the Mālavas, could be determined, the latest possible date of the arrival of these tribes in Rajasthan could be fixed with a reasonable degree of certainty. A review of these coins, therefore becomes quite important.

In the vast range of ancient Indian coinage, the coins of the Mālavas are "among the most curious and enigmatical".¹ Several thousands of these copper coins have been recovered from Rajasthan.² It is surprising that Panjab, the original home of the tribe, has not yielded any Mālava coins so far.³ The Mālava coins from Rajasthan are all made of copper and majority of them bear their tribal name. Some coins contain a number of peculiar legends. Generally they are round in shape, though rectangular pieces are also not uncommon. They are broadly divisible into three classes. The first of them bears the legend *Mālavānām jayāḥ* (i.e. victory to

1. Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, Vol. I, (Oxford, 1908), p. 161.
2. The Mālava coins mainly come from Nagar or Karkoṭa Nagar (Ancient Mālavanagara) situated about 15 miles to the south-west of Uniyara Tehsil of the present Tonk District and from Rairh, 34 miles from Nagar and 56 miles from Jaipur. Carleyle obtained more than six thousand coins from Nagar in 1871-72 and 1872-73 (for detailed discussion and analysis, vide Cunningham, A., *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports*, Vol. VI, pp. 162 ff; Vol. XIV, pp. 149 ff.; Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 160 ff; 170 ff; Allan, J., *A Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum*, pp. CIV ff; Rapson, E.J., *Indian Coins*, pp. 12-13; Sircar, D.C., *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India* (1962), XXIV, pts. I and II, p. 1 ff). Over three hundred coins of the Mālavas were discovered in the course of excavation at Rairh. This site also yielded a lead seal which bears the legend *Mālava janapadasa* (For details, vide Puri, K.N., *Excavations at Rairh*, V.S. 1995 and 1996, pp. 63 ff; also *Local Coins of Northern India* No. 2, 1968, pp. 23 ff.).
3. Coins of this class are small and light. The smallest one (2" in diameter and 1.7 grains in weight) of this class is considered to be the smallest known coin of the world. Cf. Smith, V.A., *op. cit.*, Coin No. 106.

the Mālavas) its variants being *Mālavagaṇasya jayah* (i.e. victory to the Mālava republic), *Mālava jaya* (the Malava victory), or *Mālavāna jaya*, *Malavana jaya*, *Mālavana jaya*, *Malavahna jaya* (victory to the Mālavas) in Prakrit, etc. One coin contains the legend *Mālava Sujaya* (the well-conquering Mālava). The other two classes are ascribed to the Mālavas primarily because they were found alongwith the Mālava coins and resemble the latter in fabric. The coins of the second class bear no legend while those of the third category have mysterious legends,¹ such as *Bhāpānyana* (*Bhāmpāyana* according to Jayaswal),² *Gajava*, *Gojara*, *Haraya* (supposed to stand for the royal title *Mahārāja* though *ma* is not clear),³ *Jamaka*, *Jamaku*, *Jamapaya*, *Magacha*, *Magaja*, *Magajaśa*, *Magajava*, *Māśpa*, *Majupa*, *Mapaka*, *Mapojaya*, *Maraja*, *Masapa*, *Pachha*, *Paya*, *Tama* (may be read backward as *Maya*) etc. In the coin No.70 of Smiths Catalogue the legendu has Mālava and Mapojo both written from right to left. It may be regarded as an additional connecting link between the Mālavas and these coins.

Apart from these, Rairh has yielded a number of other interesting Mālava coins. Among them are included the lot of six copper coins bearing Ujjain symbol and legend *Senāpatis Vachhaghosa*.⁴ Their shape, size and weight greatly vary. K.N. Puri, the excavator of Rairh, suggested that they were issued by some commander-in-Chief named Vachhaghosa (=Vatsaghosha) and associated him with Pushyamitra Śunga.⁵ D.C. Sircar also thinks that Vachhaghosa was a *Senāpati* or a semi-independent provincial governor.⁶ A.S. Altekar thinks that

1. No satisfactory explanation of these legends has been offered so far. Some scholars such as Smith (*op. cit.*, p. 161 ff.) consider them to be the names of the tribal chiefs of foreign origin, while scholars like Allan (*op. cit.*, pp. CIV-CVIII) take them to be meaningless attempts to reproduce parts of the legend *Mālavānāṁ jayah*. Cf. Carleyle, *op. cit.*, p. 174; Bhandarkar, *ABORI*, XXIII, p. 224; Sircar, *JNSI*, XXIV, pp. 3 ff. Dasgupta, K.K., *The Mālavas*, pp. 16-21.
2. Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, p. 381 (App.)
3. *Loc. cit.*; Cf. *ABORI*, XXIII, p. 224.
4. Puri, K.N., *Excavations at Rairh*, pp. 50-51.
5. *Loc. cit.*
6. Sircar, D.C., *JNSI*, IV, pp. 148-49.

he was perhaps a general of the Yaudheyas or the Ārjunāyanas.¹ We ourselves feel that in this matter the suggestion of K.K. Das Gupta deserves serious consideration. He believes that *Vachhaghosa* of these coins is a place name.² In this connection he cites the evidence of the *Bṛihatsaṁhitā* (XIV. 2) which uses this name as a place name : *Maru Vatsaghosha Yamuna Sarasvata Matsya Mādhyamikāḥ*. Therefore, on the analogy of some earlier coins found from the Bulandshahar district of U.P. on which the legend *Gomitasa bārānāva* occurs which may mean Gomitasa of Bārānāva, Das Gupta asserts, that "Vachhaghosha was the name of the mint town whencefrom the coins in question were issued by one *Senāpati* who was either a provincial governor of some unknown king or perhaps Pushyamitra Śunga."³

The site of Rairh also yielded some other rare coins, including a group of seven square copper coins bearing the legend *Vapu* on the obverse in Brāhmi script.⁴ Puri believed that Vapu was probably a name of some unknown Mālava chief.⁵ Another group of fourteen copper coins from Rairh reveals three *mitra* ending names (Sūryamitra, Brahmamitra and Dhruvamitra) and contains the additional legend *Sudavana*, which on one coin is replaced by the legend *Udehaki* while one specimen (of Brahmamitra) does not contain any addi-

1. Altekar, A.S., *Ibid*, XIII, No. 1, p. 7. The suggestion is apparently wrong. Rairh was certainly included in the Mālava principality and was perhaps another capital of the Malavas. In any case it was not very far from Nagar (Mālavanagara) (*Excavations at Rairh*, p. 71, plate XXVI. 22). Besides, we have from Rairh a seal bearing the legend *Mālava janapadasa*. Further, Puri collected about 280 coins from Rairh (*ibid*, p. 65) which definitely belong to the Mālavas. Cf. *Local Coins of Northern India*, No. 2, 1968, pp. 23-24.
2. Das Gupta, K.K., *JNSI*, XXVIII, No. 1, pp. 50-52.
3. Das Gupta, K.K., *Loc. cit.* We do not contribute to the latter part of his suggestion that these coins belong to the first Śunga emperor, Pushyamitra Śunga.
4. *Excavations at Rairh*, pp. 53, 68-69, plate, xxvi, 15-16.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

tional legend.¹ The nature of the association of these coins with the Mālavas is not yet clear. It is quite obvious, however, that *Sudavapa* must have some special connotation here as it appears after the proper name of the rulers. K.N. Dikshit suggested that *Sudavapa* as a title or a family name,² while K.N. Puri takes it to be the name of a mint town.³ The suggestion of Puri, if accepted would go against the theory of K.K. Das Gupta according to which *Vachhaghosa* was the ancient name of Rairh, for the same site could not be called by two different names i.e. *Sudavapa* and *Vachhaghosa* almost at the same time.

The chronology of the above mentioned coins poses before us an interesting problem. In the absence of any definite evidence they can be dated only with the help of their palaeography and whatever circumstantial indications bearing on this problem are available. As regards the later possible limit of the period, to which these coins may be assigned, it is generally accepted⁴ that the cessation of the Mālava coinage, along with the coinage of other tribes of western and north-western India, was caused by the imposition of Gupta supre-

1. *Excavations at Rairh* pp. 66-68, plate, xxvi, 9.14. The name Sūryamittra is found not only on the coins obtained from Rairh but also on coins connected with Mathura, Kanauj and Ahichchhatra. According to Bela Lahiri (*PIHC*, 1972, pp. 653-58) the Ujjain symbol is common to the Mathura, Kanauj and Sudavapa series, the triangle-headed standard is found on Kanauj and Sudavapa pieces while tree-in-railing appears on Kanauj and Uddehiki issues. Lahiri is certain that the Sūryamittra of Kanauj was identical with the Sūryamittra of Mathura coins, but hesitates to identify the Sūryamittra of the Sudavapa coins from Rairh with the former till the significance of the term Sudavapa is not definitely known. The Sūryamittra of the Pañchāla coins was obviously a different personage, as his coins have nothing in common with the coins of the rulers of his name. Recently a small inscription of Sūryamittra from Mathura (presently with Shri H.P. Poddar of Calcutta) has come to light (*PIHC*, 1972 pp. 653-58). Bela Lahiri (*Loc. cit.*) suggests his identification with the Sūryamittra of the Mathura coins.

2. *JNSI*, III, No. 1, pp. 47-48.

3. *Excavations at Rairh*, pp. 52-53.

4. Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, p. 162, and *corrigenda et addenda*, p. xviii.

macy over them in the middle of the fourth century A.D. The fact that many of Nāga coins are somewhat similar in fabric to the coins of Mālavas supports this view.¹ But the problem of the lower limit of this period i.e. the determination of the initial date of the Mālava and other tribal coinage is more difficult. Carlleyle,² Cunningham³ and following them Altekar⁴ think that the Mālava coins were issued from the middle of the third century B.C. onwards, while Rapson⁵ and Smith⁶ suggest that their initial date could not be earlier than 150 B.C. These scholars have sought to solve this problem with the help of the palaeography of these coins. But palaeographical chronology itself depends upon other datable facts and conclusions derived from this have in many cases proved to be extremely wide off the mark. For example, Fleet on the basis of palaeography ascribed the inscriptions of Pravarasena II Vākāṭaka to the last decade of the seventh century A.D.⁷ while they actually belong to the first half of the fifth century A.D. Similarly, the identification of the king Vyāghra of the Nachne-Talai⁸ and Ganj⁹ inscriptions has been a controversial question because some epigraphists of repute ascribe them, on palaeographic grounds, to the second half of the fourth century A.D.¹⁰ while equally competent authorities place them a century later.¹¹ In the case of coins which contain very short legends the assessment of paleographic evidence is even more difficult. That is why scholars so widely differ on the

1. Cf. Rapson, E.J., *Indian Coins*, p. 15.

2. Carlleyle, A.C., *ASIR*, VI, pp. 162 ff; 178 ff.

3. Cunningham, A., *Ibid.*, pp. 149 ff; 182.

4. Cf. Altekar, A.S., *EI*, XXVII, p. 259.

5. Rapson, E.J., *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

6. Smith, V.A., *op. cit.*, pp. 160 ff; 170 ff.

7. Fleet, F., *CII*, III, p. 15.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 233 ff.

9. Sircar, *SI*, p. 456.

10. Sircar, D.C., *CA*, p. 179.

11. Mirashi, V.V., *Studies in Indology*, II, p. 167 ff. Now Sircar has grudgingly accepted the view of Mirashi (*SI*, p. 456, fn. 1).

question of the initial date of these coins some lowering it down to the age of Aśoka Maurya while others putting them a century or two later. We, therefore, believe that the initial date of these coins should be determined with the help of external evidence. In this connection the most important factor to be considered is the quantum of pressure which the foreign invaders exerted on the Panjab tribes pushing the latter towards Rajasthan. We feel that atleast politically the invasion of Alexander was merely an episode, the temporary effect of which was nullified by the extermination of Greek rule from Panjab by Chandragupta Maurya. Therefore, the view of D. Sharma that these tribal migrations were caused by the invasion of Alexander himself¹ is not tenable. On the other hand, the invasions of Panjab by the Indo-Greeks were constant in nature and resulted in prolonged foreign occupation of that region. It was, therefore, a far greater pressure on the Panjab tribes and could cause their migration into Rajasthan. To us it also appears quite likely that the Greek invasion on Madhyamikā in Rajasthan in the first half of the second century B.C., which has been mentioned by Patañjali in his *Mahābhāshya*,² was in the nature of the pursuit of these valiant tribes of the Panjab by the Greeks when the former were migrating into Rajasthan in order to retain their independence and self-respect. Here it may also be remembered that the fashion of mentioning the names of the ruling authority in the coinlegend was inspired and popularised in India by foreign kings beginning with the Indo-Greeks. In this situation Indian coins bearing such legends may hardly be assigned to a date much earlier than the middle of the second century B.C.

Thus we conclude that the Panjab tribes, discussed

1. Sharma, D., *RTA*, p. 49,

2. अरण्ड यवनः साकेतम् ।

अरण्ड यवनः मध्यमिकाम् ।

above, migrated into Rajasthan in the first half of the second century B.C. at the earliest and that the initial date of the coins issued by them should be put a few decades later than the middle of that century, for they must have taken some time to settle down in their new home before they could think of issuing their own currency. /

CHAPTER II

RAJASTHAN IN THE SCYTHIAN PERIOD

The Political Background

The migration of the Mālavas into Rajasthan, along with many other tribes, took place, as we have seen,¹ some time in the early Śunga period. In Rajasthan the Mālavas settled down in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region as has been proved by the discovery of a large number of coins and inscriptions from this area.² The course of their history in this part of the country was determined mainly by the nature of their relationship with other tribes and the states of Rajasthan and the impact of the fast changing political scene of the country. As discussed elsewhere,³ Rajasthan is an area of relative isolation and it usually played the role of a temporary *col de sac* for the people who, when pressurised by the foreign tribes and indigenous powers of surrounding regions, used to take shelter in the sandy deserts and hills and forests of the Aravallis.⁴ But even here they could not live in peace, for they were, time

1. *Supra*, Ch. 1.

2. For the discovery of the Mālava coins from this area vide, *NHIP*, p. 35 fn. 1.; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pt. I, p. 20; *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, p. 20; *Local Coins of Northern India*, (No. 2), ed. by A.K. Narain, pp. 1-5; pp. 23-28; *JNSI*, Vol. XXVIII, pt. I, 1966, pp. 50-54; Vol. XXVIII, pt. II, 1966, pp. 203, 205. It is significant that Nāndśā, from where the inscriptions of Nandisoma and Bhaṭṭisoma (*EI*, XXVII, pp. 252-67) have been discovered, is located in Mewar.

3. Cf. *supra*, Ch. 1.

4. Cf. Sharma, Dasharatha, *RTA*, Vol. I, pp. 1-19; Ojba, G.H., *History of Rajputana*, pt. I, pp. 1-2, fn. 1; Sharma, G.N., *The Social Life in Medieval Rājasthān*, pp. 1-21, and 33.

and again, continued to be pressurised from the various directions by the ambitious neighbouring powers, especially the imperial powers of the Indus and Gangetic basins and the powerful states of Gujarat and the Deccan. Thus Rajasthan was always an area where political interests of the ruling powers of the Gangetic and Indus basins, western India and central Deccan clashed with each other. The history of the various tribes of Rajasthan in the early centuries of the Christian era was no exception to this general trend.¹

By the time the process of colonisation of the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region by the Mālavas was over (and it must have taken at least several decades), almost all the Indo-Greek kingdoms of the Panjab were well on the way of decline.² They were gradually displaced by the Śakas and Pahlavas who in turn were overthrown, at least in north-western and northern India, by the Kushāṇas in the second half of the first century.³ The Kushāṇas succeeded in establishing a mighty empire which included large tracts of northern and north-western India and the adjoining countries.⁴ They apparently succeeded in uprooting the imperial Śakas and Pahlavas of the North-West but the kingdom of the Śaka Kshatrapas of western India continued to exist even during the palmy days of Koshāṇa imperialism, though its relation with the Kushāṇa empire is rather difficult to be determined.⁴ We shall discuss this problem in detail later. Here it would be

1. For the history of the Indo-Greeks during the age of their decline and fall see Narain, A.K., *The Indo-Greeks*, Chs. V and VI (pp. 101 ff.).
2. *Ibid.* cf. *AIU*, Chs., VIII and IX; *Comp. Hist. India*, Vol. II, Ch VIII; Chattopadhyaya, S., *Early History of North India*, Ch. IV.
3. For a detailed history of the Kushāṇas, vide, *AIU*, Ch. IX; *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, Ch. VIII; Puri, B.N., *The Kushāṇas in India*; For a recent study of the Kushāṇas cf. Baldev Kumar, *The Early Kushāṇas*, New Delhi, 1973.
4. It is usually believed that the western Kshatrapas were subordinate to the Kushāṇas. But from the time of Rudradāman I the Western Kshatrapas appear to have become independent though they continued to adopt the title Mahākshatrapa which, in the earlier days, was indicative of subordinate status.

sufficient to remark that most likely the relationship between the Kushāṇa empire and the Śaka Kingdoms of western India continued to change from time to time according to the nature of circumstances in different periods. In the Scythian period, that is in the age when the Śakas and Kushāṇas dominated the North Indian political scene, the Satavāhanas of central Deccan enjoyed imperial status in the South.¹ Their rivalry with the Western Kshatrapas forms one of the most important themes of the history of the country in the early centuries of the Christian era. The result of the various phases of this struggle had immediate and important bearing on the history of Rajasthan. It is against this background that the history of the various tribes and states which dotted the landscape of this region in this period has to be studied.

Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The First Phase

The central theme of the history of Rajasthan in the early centuries of the Christian era was the struggle of the Mālavas against the Śakas—the latter trying to impose their suzerainty over the whole of Rajasthan and the former struggling to maintain their independence. The history of this struggle is extremely fascinating and its very first phase poses before modern historians one of the most interesting problems of ancient Indian history, viz. the problem of the historicity of Vikramāditya of legends.

According to the Jain tradition contained in the *Kālakāchāryakathānaka*² the Śakas entered western Malwa from Seistan via Sindh and Kathiawar during the reign of Gardabilla (or Gardabhila) of Ujjayani and stayed in the city for four years: they were defeated and ousted from there by Gardabhilla's son Vikramāditya who founded the famous Vikrama (Kṛita-Māla) era of 57 B.C. The story of Vikramāditya is found in several different forms in a large number of

1. For the History of the Satavāhanas, cf. *AIU*, Ch. XIII; *Comp. Hist. India*, II, Ch. X and XI.
2. *Śrikālakasūricharitam*, (verses 1 to 156) of the *Prabhāvakacharita* (ed. by Jinavijaya Muni), quoted in App. 1 of R.B. Pandey's *Vikramāditya*, Varanasi, 1960.

ancient Indian works.¹ Its various facets, most of which have nothing to do with our present problem, need not be discussed here.² If the Vikramāditya of legends is not a historical personality, a view to which we subscribe, a detailed discussion on his achievements will be pointless. For our present purpose it is sufficient to state that several imperial Gupta rulers assumed the title Vikramāditya and in many ways their achievements and personalities recall the legend of Vikramāditya. The evidence of the literary works of the Gupta and post-Gupta period may, therefore, be explained as having its origin in the cycle of stories which must have come into existence as a result of the achievements of the Gupta emperors. As regards the pre-Gupta literature, the Purāṇas which know all the mighty conquerors of the pre-Gupta period, and are also aware of the existence of the Gardabhillas³ and the Śakas, do not refer to Vikramāditya at all. Actually, but for a Gāthā of a very doubtful date, found in the *Gāhā Sattasaī* of Hāla⁴ and the claim that the now non-existent *Bṛihatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya contained a story based on the life of Vikramāditya⁵—a claim which cannot be proved or disproved in the absence of the work of Guṇāḍhya—no evidence for the existence of Vikramāditya *kathā* in the pre-Gupta period can possibly be adduced. It has been argued that though the original *Bṛihatkathā* which was composed in Prakrit, is now non-existent, three Sanskrit versions of this work are now available. i.e. the *Bṛihatkathāślokasaṅgraha* of Budhasvāmin (c. ninth

1. For a detailed account and analysis cf. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 12-36. He believes in the historicity of Vikramāditya of legends. For other interpretations vide *Vikrama Volume*, Ujjain, 1948; Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1969, Chs. VI and VII.
2. Cf. App. to this Chapter.
3. Pargiter, F.E., *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 45.
4. संवाहनसुहरसतोसियेण देन्तेण तुह करे लक्खम् ।
चललेण विक्कमाइत्त-नरिणं श्रगुसिक्षियं तिस्सा ॥
5. *Gāthā*, 564., quoted by Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 12 fn. 1.
6. Winternitz, M., *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. III, pt. I, p. 348; *Bhārata Kaumudi*, pt. II, pp. 575 ff.

century), probably of Nepal, the *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī* of Kshemendra and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, (both belonging to the eleventh century Kashmir). The fact that all these three works contain the story of Vikramāditya proves that the original *Bṛihatkathā* included a version of the Vikramāditya saga. We beg to differ. For this line of argument only proves that the *Bṛihatkathā*, as it was known to Budhasvāmin, Somadeva and Kshemendra contained a version of the Vikramāditya story; it does not prove that the original *Bṛihatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya also contained this story. The volume of the *Bṛihatkathā*, like that of *Mahābhārata*, must have increased with the passage of time.¹ In other words, the volume of the original *Bṛihatkathā* must have been much smaller than the volume of this work which was available to the above mentioned Sanskrit scholars. Therefore, the possibility remains that the Vikramāditya legend was incorporated in the *Bṛihatkathā* some time after its initial composition and before the age of Budhasvāmin.² Here it may also be noted that in the first century B.C. the centre of the activities of the Mālavas was Kārakoṭanagara or Mālavanagara (modern Nagar in the former Uniyāra Thikana in Jaipur District of Rajasthan) and not Ujjain, as the *Kālakāchāryakathānaka* and other ancient texts lead us to believe. Further, despite the fact that the Mālavas were the first Indian people to use the Mālava era, the belief in the Indian origin of this reckoning is not acceptable to many; at least quite a large number of modern historians do not contribute to the view that it was founded by the legendary Vikramāditya. They rightly point out that the names Mālava and Vikrama were not associated with this era till the fifth and the ninth century A.D., instead it was known as the Kṛita era in the pre-Gupta age.³

1. Keith, A.B., *History of the Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 266 ff.

2. Cf. Sircar, D.C., *op.cit.*, p. 109; also H.C. Raychaudhuri in the *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 483 ff.

3. For detailed discussion on this point cf. Sircar, D.C., *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 251-258; *Ancient Malwa*, pp. 162-166; *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 1-19; 57-69, 115-136, 289-302, 557-586; Kielhorn, *IA*, Vols. XIX, XX; Cunningham, *JRAS*, 1913, p. 627; Marshall, *JRAS*, 1914, p. 973; 1915, p. 191.

The arguments advanced against the historicity of Vikramādityā are weighty enough. But despite them it may be conceded that the element of Śaka-Mālava struggle in the Vikramāditya legend is based on some actual occurrence. It is quite possible that such an event was the nucleus round which the details of the later Vikramāditya tradition were woven. This theoretical possibility of Śaka-Mālava struggle in the middle of the first century B.C. has found some substance in the recent discoveries of some copper coins from Ujjain and Vidiśā,¹ though here it needs to be re-emphasised that they in no way prove the historicity of Vikramāditya. These copper coins bear striking similarity to the local coinage of Ujjain. Some of the names of their issuers written in the early Brāhmaṇī script are Hamugama, Valāka, Mahu, Sauma, Dāsa, Hauma, etc. As pointed out by K.D. Bajpai, looking to the names of Indian kings occurring on some other coins of Malwa, e.g. Dharmapāla, Indragupta, Śivagupta and Vishākha-deva, etc., it is doubtful if these names can represent local Indian rulers.² On the other hand, a comparison of the names of these rulers with those of the Śakas already known to us from inscriptions and coins such as Hagāmasha; Hagāna, Chaṭaka, Hayuara, Hana, Aduthama, Pharagula, Ayama, Khalamāsa, Maṇigula, Abuhola, etc., leave little scope for doubt that the rulers of the coins under discussion were foreigners, most likely of Scythian origin.³ And if this is so, it must be admitted that even before the establishment of the Kshaharata kingdom in western India in the middle of the first century A.D., a branch of the Śakas had penetrated at least western Malwa, for on palaeographical grounds these coins are assigned to the third or early second century B.C. by Altekar⁴ and to '100 B.C., in any case to a period not later than 50 B.C.' by Bajpai.⁵ In our opinion the later view is more likely to be correct. In

1. K.D. Bajpai's article in the *Seminar Papers of the Tribal Coins of Northern India*, pp. 4-5; *JNSI*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 46-50.

2. *JNSI*, XXVIII, p. 47.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. Quoted by Bajpai, *op.cit.*, p. 47.

5. *Loc. cit.*

the light of this evidence it may be conjectured that in the first century B.C. the Mālavas of Rajasthan clashed with the Śakas of Ujjayani and in the later epochs, when Ujjayani became the seat of the Mālavas themselves, it was mistakenly believed that the Mālavas were occupying that city even in the first century B.C.

Śaka-Mālava Struggle : The Second Phase

The Śakas who curbed the growing power of the Mālavas and conquered large parts of Rajasthan were the Western Kshatrapas of the Kshaharata dynasty. The first Śaka chief of this family who appears to have conquered some area of western and southern Rajasthan was Bhūmaka, the first known member of the Kshaharata dynasty. His coins have been discovered, apart from other places, in the Ajmer region of Rajasthan.¹ According to D.C. Sircar, the use of the Kharoshthī alongwith the Brāhmī script on his coin-legends, also points to the fact that his kingdom comprised not only Brāhmī using areas but also western Rajputana and Sindh where Kharoshthī appears to have been in use,² though some scholars are inclined to associate the use of this script with the northern origin of Kshaharatas.³

For the reign of Nahapāna, the successor of Bhūmaka, we have more detailed evidence for the Śaka penetration in Rajasthan and the defeat of Mālavas at their hands. The coins of Nahapāna have been discovered in Ajmer in the north to Nasik in the south,⁴ indicating that large parts of Rajasthan covering Ajmer and the region south of it were included in the Śaka dominion. Further, in connection with the benefactions of Ushavadāta (Sanskrit Rishabhadaṭṭa), the son of Dīnṭka and the son-in-law of Nahapāna, the Kshaharata inscriptions refer to, among other sacred places, Pushkara near

1. *AIU*, p., 197.

2. *Loc. cit.*

3. Quoted in *AIU*, p. 197.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 180.

Ajmer also.¹ And, finally, one of the Nasik Cave Inscriptions of Nahapāna² states that at the command of his 'Bhaṭṭāraka', Rishabhadatta went to relieve the chief of the Uttamabhadra tribe who was besieged by the Malayas, i.e. Mālavas.³ "By the orders of my lord" he records, "I went in the rainy season to relieve the Uttamabhadras who were besieged by the Mālavas; and those Mālavas fled even on hearing my battle-cry. They were made prisoners of the Uttamabhadra Kshatriyas".⁴ Dasharatha Sharma translates the word *parigraha* as 'sub-ordinate' and not as 'prisoner'.⁵ But *parigraha* also means 'captive'⁶ and this meaning yields a better sense here. For it is difficult to believe that a tribe as powerful as the Mālavas could be made subordinate to the almost unknown Uttamabhadras. Be what it may, after inflicting a crushing defeat on the Mālavas Rishabhadatta is said to have gone to the Pushkara lake for ceremonial consecration.⁷ It is obvious, therefore, that the Ajmer region in Rajasthan, along with the

1. ततोस्मि गतो पोक्षरानि तत्र च मया अधिसेको कृतो... Nasik Cave Ins., Sircar, *SI*, p. 169. Situated 11 kms to the west of Ajmer, Pushkara is one of the most sacred places of the Hindus in India. It finds mention in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Vāmana Purāṇa* and the inscriptions from second century B.C. onwards (*El*, II, pp. 394, 396, 397 and 398). For details cf. Jain, K.C., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, pp. 100-105.

2. Sircar, *op.cit.*, pp. 167 ff.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 169.

4. भट्टारका-अजातिया च गतोस्मि वर्षी-

रत्नं मालयेहि हित्यं उत्तमभाद्रं मोचयितुं ।
से च मालया प्रनादेनेव अपयाता
उत्तमभद्रकानं च क्षत्रियानं सर्वे परिग्रहा कृता ॥

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

5. Sharma, D., *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, Vol. X, No. 2, Dec. 1960, p. 182.

6. Williams, M., *A Sanskrit English Dictionary*, Delhi 1964, p. 593; Apte, V.S., *The Students Sanskrit English Dictionary*, Delhi, 1965, p. 319.

7. Sircar, *op.cit.*, p. 169.

other parts of the Mālava state, lay within the sphere of Nahapāna's influence, while the Uttamabhadras, whose identification is discussed below, were the subordinate allies of the Śakas.

Thus the conquest of Nahapāna for the first time made the Śakas an important factor in the political life of Rajasthan. Here two questions, viz. the problem of the date of Nahapāna and his relation with the Kushāṇas, demand further attention and solution. The determination of the date of Nahapāna is important because it will help us in fixing the date of Kshaharāta-Mālava struggle. Nahapāna's inscriptions yield four dates for him, 41, 42, 45 (Nasik Cave Inscriptions)¹ and 46 (Junnar Cave Inscription).² But whether these are the dates of his reign or they are the years of some era has not been specified. According to Rapson, Nahapāna used the Śaka era which was the era of his Kushāṇa overlords.³ In that case his last known date would be 124 A.D. But this supposition is not free from difficulties. As is well known Nahapāna was overthrown by Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi, while the rule of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi over several Kshaharāta provinces was brought to an end by Rudradāman I whose first known date is 130 A.D. (known from the Andhau Stone Inscription of year 52=130 A.D.).⁴ The first fact is conclusively proved by the discovery of the Jogalchembī hoard of the silver coins of Nahapāna two thirds of which, i.e. about 9270, were restruck by Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi.⁵ As this hoard does not contain even a single coin of the possible successors of Nahapāna, it must be admitted that it was Nahapāna himself who was overthrown by Gautamiputra. Secondly, in the Nasik inscription of the year 19 of the reign of Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāyi (Vāsishṭhīputra Pulu-

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-167.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 172-173.

3. For Rapson's view Cf. *AMC, BWK*, pp. XXVI-XXVII; also, *AIU*, p. 144 fn. 1 and p. 180; *Comp. Hist. Ind.* II, p. 241.

4. *SI*, pp. 173-75.

5. *Comp. Hist. India*, II, pp. 275; this hoard shows that Gautamiputra and Nahapāna were contemporaries, cf. *AIU*, p. 180 fn. 1.

māvi),¹ Gautamīputra has been explicitly called not only the destroyer of the Śakas, the Yavanas and the Pahlavas but also the extirpator of the 'Khakharātas' (Kshaharātas).² Thirdly, in his Nasik inscription³ of the year 18, Gautamīputra informs us that he gave certain lands to the monks residing on the Trirāsmi hill and says that "to that day" it was enjoyed by Ushavadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna.⁴ And lastly, the Jaina tradition contained in a commentary of Āvaśyakasūtraniryukti mentions that 'Nahavāna' (Nahagāna) was overthrown by 'Sālavāhana' (Sātavāhana).⁵

Thus we conclude that Nahapāna was overthrown by Gautamīputra in or immediately after 124 A.D., while the latter himself was ousted from several former Kshaharāta provinces by Rudradāman I whose earliest date is 130 A.D., known from the Andhau inscription.⁶ This short interval is apparently quite insufficient for placing so momentous events as the total extermination of the Kshaharātas, the rule of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi at least for some time and the rise of the Kārdamakas on the political horizon of Western India. The difficulty is further accentuated by the evidence of the *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea* (latter half of the first century A.D.)⁷ which refers to Nambanus, usually identified with

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 203-207.

2. खतिय-दप-मान-मदनस सक-यवन-पलहवनिसूदनस.....

खखरात-वंस-निरवसेसकरस.....

—*ibid.*, p. 204.

3. Sircar, *ibid.*, pp. 197-199.

4. गामे अपर-करवडिये य खेतं अजकालकियं उसभदातेन

भूतं निवतन.....इमेस पवजितानं तेक्किरसिण वितराम

—*ibid.*, p. 193.

5. Quoted in *JBORS*, XVI, 1930, p. 288 and *Comp. Hist. India*, II, p. 279.

6. For further analysis of Rapson's theory cf. Mirashi, V.V., *JIH*, XLIII, pp. 112 ff; Sircar, D.C., *AIU*, p. 180; Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, pp. 430 ff and pp. 405-9; Bhandarkar, D.R., *IA*, 1913, pp. 76 ff; Banerjee, R.D., *JRAS*, 1971, pp. 273 ff; *ibid.*, 1925, pp. 1-19; Sastri, K.A.N., *JRAS*, 1926, pp. 643 ff.

7. Smith, V.A., *The History of India*, 1962, p. 245 fn. 2.

Nahapāna, as the ruler of Ariake (i.e. Aparānta=Northern Konkan) with one of its capitals at Minnagara (situated near Ratnagiri).¹ Secondly, according to the *Geography* of Ptolemy (written about A.D. 140 with materials gathered a few years earlier),² Tiastenes (a Greek corruption of the name Chashana), was ruling over Ozera, i.e. Ujjayani³ while Siri Pulumāvi, identified with Siri Pulumāvi, was the ruler of Raithana, i.e. Peśāra (Pratishāna).⁴ On the other hand, the view of Rapson would place Pulumāvi in Akarāvanti (which included the city of Ujjayani) in the year 149 A.D. In view of these difficulties Cunningham⁵ and Nilakanta Sastrī⁶ refer the dates of Nahapāna to the Vikrama era. But their suggestion can hardly be accepted as Nahapāna knew gold coins⁷ which were introduced for the first time in India by Wima Kadphises.⁸ Moreover, Gautamiputra, the contemporary of Nahapāna cannot be placed in so early a period. We are, therefore, inclined to accept the suggestions of Banerjee, Gopalachari⁹ etc. that the inscriptions of Nahapāna are dated in his own regnal years. Therefore the reign of Nahapāna may be placed between c. 60 A.D. and 110 A.D. while Gautamiputra Śātakarī, who ruled for at least 24 years, should be assigned to the period from c. 90 A.D. to 115 A.D. In that case Pulumāvi the successor of Gautamiputra, who ruled for at least 26 years (as is evident from his Kārtikeya Inscription),¹⁰ must have ruled from c. 115 A.D. to 145 A.D. This chronological scheme reconciles all the known facts of history, viz.

1. Gopalachari, K., *Early History of the Satavahana dynasty*, p. 52; Altekar, A.S., *SIH*, XIII, pp. 33 ff.
2. *SIH*, p. 183.
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. *Geog. Hist. Ind*, II, p. 316.
5. *SIH*, 829 ff. 1.
6. *SIH*, p. 813 ff. 1.
7. *SIH*, p. 252-255.
8. *Loc. cit.*
9. *Loc. cit.*
10. *SIH*, 87, pp. 210-211.

the reference to Nahapāna by the author of the *Pariplus* in the latter half of the first century A.D., the fact that Nahapāna was aware of the gold coins, the rule of Pulumāvi over Ujjayani till 140 A.D. and the Jaina tradition that Nahapāna ruled for 40 to 42 years, and also proves that Rajasthan was invaded by the Kshaharāta Śakas sometime towards the close of the first century A.D. or towards the beginning of the second century A.D.

This brings us to our next problem viz. the nature of Kshaharāta-Kushāṇa relationship. This problem is intimately connected with the question of the date of Kanishka I who is now generally regarded as the founder of the Śaka era of 78 A.D. We have no intention to review this problem as it lies beyond the scope of our present inquiry. However, it may be noted that in the International Conference on the date of Kanishka held at London in April 1960 most of the scholars supported dates ranging from 78 A.D. to 144 A.D.¹ Of these 78 A.D. is borne out by the evidence of Indian tradition and epigraphy. We have, therefore, accepted it, as a working hypothesis. It means that Kanishka ruled from 78 A.D. to at least 101 A.D.² He was, thus, according to the Kshaharāta chronology accepted above, a contemporary of Nahapāna. Now the question arises whether Nahapāna accepted the overlordship of Kanishka I? If it was so, it would mean that the Kushāṇas exercised at least indirect control over those regions of Rajasthan which were included in the kingdom of the Kshaharāta Kshatrapas. Most of the scholars including Baldev Kumar,³ the recent-most historian on the early Kushāṇa period, subscribe to this view. It must, however, be admitted that the evidence on this point is not conclusive.⁴ As regards

1. Basham, A.L., (ed.) *Papers on the Date of Kanishka*, Leiden, 1968.

2. *AIU.*, p. 144.

3. Kumar, B. *The Early Kushāṇas*, Delhi, 1973, p. 79, 107.

4. Nahapāna's status was higher (cf. the title of *rāṇa* of his coins) than that of Kanishka's other Kshatrapas (*Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 241.)

the numismatic evidence, it has been rightly pointed out by J.N. Banerjee¹ that there is absolutely nothing in the Kshaharāta coins which may suggest their subordination to the Kushāṇas. On the other hand, the obverse device of Bhūmaka's coins, viz. an arrow, discus and thunder-bolt, which also invariably figures on all the known silver and copper coins of Nahapāna, reminds one of the 'discus, bow and arrow' reverse of some copper coins jointly issued by Spalirises and Azes-II.² Therefore, it is quite possible that Bhūmaka and Nahapāna ruled over Western India as the Kshatrapas of the Pahlavas.³ Secondly, if the dates of Nahapāna accepted above are correct, it would follow that Nahapāna did not use the era of Kanishka though he was a contemporary of the great Kushāṇa emperor. This fact may be regarded as an indication of his independence from the Kushāṇa domination. As regards the epigraphic evidence, there is certainly a reference in a Nasik inscription to the 'Bhaṭṭāraka' who was the overlord of Ushavadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna.⁴ It was at the command of 'the Bhaṭṭāraka' that Ushavadāta went to invade the Mālava tribe. It is quite likely that here may be a reference to the Kushāṇa overlord of the Kshaharātas. But it is equally possible that in this document the title 'Bhaṭṭāraka' stands for Nahapāna himself who was obviously the immediate master of Ushavadāta. The fact that the Kshaharātas knew gold coins⁵ does not prove anything because Kushāṇa gold coins must have been known to them whether they were subject to the Kushāṇa authority or not. In one of the Nasik cave inscriptions of Nahapāna there is another controversial word *Kushāṇa mūla*⁶

1. *Comp. Hist. Ind.*, II, p. 274.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 203 and 274.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 274.

4. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 167-169.

5. Cf. Sircar, *SI*, p. 165 fn. 5.

6. दत्त चानेन अक्षयनिधिकाहापण-सहस्रानि त्रीणि
३००० संघस चातुर्दिसस ये इयत्स्म लेणे वसांतानं
भविसंति बिदरिक कुशाणमूले च ।

—*Ibid.*, p. 165.

India as a viceroy of the Kushāga emperors. It appears that when the Kshaharāṭas were overthrown by the Sātavāhanas in the early years of the second century, the Kushāga emperors decided to intervene in the politics of Malwa and Rajasthan and entrusted the task of establishing Kushāga hegemony in these regions to Chashtra, their viceroy in Kachchha. It is quite possible that Chashtra invaded Malwa and Rajasthan from Kachchha while the imperial army operated from the north. In any case the Kārāvāka adventure was entirely successful and they imposed their hold over several provinces including the whole of Malwa, Marudesh and some other regions of Rajasthan.

The main part in this victorious campaign was played probably by Rudradāman I who succeeded Chashtra as Mahākshatrapa some time after 130 A.D. (the date of the later Andhra records¹ when he was only a joint-ruler with Chashtra) and before 150 A.D. (the date of his Jinnagari record² when he was a Mahākshatrapa). It is significant that in this epigraph Rudradāman claims to have conquered Malwa, Gujarat and Kathiawar, Sindhu-Sauvira, Western Vindhya and the Aravalli range (Nishāda) and, Maru (the Marwar region).³ It appears that by the year 150 A.D., i.e. during the reign of the successors of Kārāvāka I, who were possibly not so powerful, Rudradāman I refused to continue to acknowledge Kushāga suzerainty and became independent,⁴ though, like Pushyamitra Śunga, he and his successors continued to adopt the title Mahākshatrapa on their coins and in inscriptions.⁵ Rudradāman I's rule over almost whole of Rajasthan is proved

1. Sircar, *SL*, pp. 172-175.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 176-180.

3. युद्धोदिवं एकादश रथ्युद्धो द्वितीय रथ्युद्धो तृतीय रथ्युद्धो -

द्वादश रथ्युद्धो तिसरी रथ्युद्धो चतुर्थ रथ्युद्धो चूती रथ्युद्धो चूती ।

Ibid., p. 173 and fn. 4

4. *ANU*, p. 185.

5. Sircar, *SL*, pp. 175 ff and pp. 188-189; *Compt. Hist. Ind. II*, pp. 222-223.

by the fact of his decisive victory over the Yaudheyas¹ who were then occupying northern parts of Rajasthan and the adjoining regions of Panjab and Harayana. The western part of Rajputana, i.e., the region of the Thar desert or the Marudeśa, was also certainly included in his dominion because along with Sindhu and Sauvīra, i.e. western part of the lower Sindhu Valley and eastern part of the lower Sindhu Valley,² which lay to the west of Rajasthan, has been included in the list of the regions conquered by him. His reference to Yaudheyas as a tribe which was known for its valour (*viraśabda-jāta*)³ shows that he had to make great efforts for making this martial tribe, the 'heroes among all Kshatriyas', submissive to him.

Rudradāman I not only imposed his suzerainty over the Yaudheyas but appears to have carried his victorious arms upto Sialkot (in the present Pakistani part of the former Panjab state). This fact is known from a Buddhist legend contained in the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, also known as *Kalpanālāṅkritikā*, of Kumāralāta composed about 150 A.D.⁴ It is a collection of parables, mostly Buddhistic in character. Fragments of its manuscript were discovered at Turfan in Central Asia.⁵ In 405 A.D. it was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva who gave it the name of *Sūtrālāṅkāra* and through inadvertence attributed it to Aśvaghosha.⁶ The poet Kumāralāta who, flourished towards the middle of the second century A.D., was a native of Taxila. He, therefore, must have been the contemporary of the immediate successors of Kanishka I and

1. सर्वक्षत्राविष्कृतं-वीर-शब्द-जातोत्सेकाविधेयानां यौधेयानां प्रसाह्योत्सादकेन.....

Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 178, and fn. 4.

2. *AIU.*, pp. 184-185.

3. Sircar, *SI*, p. 178.

4. Chatterjee, C.D., *JAIH*, Vol. I, pt. 1-2, 1967-68, pp. 115-116.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

6. *Loc. cit.* cf. Wilhalm, F., In *Papers on the Date of Kanishka* (ed. by A.L. Basham), pp. 337-44.

Rudradāman I.¹ Viewed against this background his evidence regarding some political events of his period cannot be lightly brushed aside. Most pertinent in this connection is his reference to Kanishka I as an earlier king (which incidently proves that Kanishka I must be placed appreciably before the middle of the second century A.D.) and his reference to the northern expedition of Rudradāman (i.e. Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman I) as far as Sagal.² This important event of the reign of Rudradāman I might have taken place when he had gone to invade the Yaudheyas who were residing in northern Rajasthan and southern Panjab. This fact also proves that Rudradāman I must have been in control of the whole of Rajasthan, otherwise he could not have dared to advance from Ujjain as far north as Sialkot. Incidentally, it also suggests that Rudradāman I flourished later than Kanishka I, for he could have hardly invaded the heartland of the Kushāṇa empire during the reign of this great emperor himself.

The Śaka domination over Rajasthan continued for about three quarters of a century more, i.e. till the end of the first quarter of the third century A.D. There is no positive evidence to help us in the reconstruction of the history of this period. But the continuation of Śaka rule over Rajasthan is indicated by the discovery of the coins of the successors of Rudradāman I from this region. Two coins of Atridāman, who may be identified with Bhartridāman, and Asadāman (identical with Yaśodāman) were found at Nagari by Carleyle.³ A big hoard containing 2393 Śaka coins was found at Saravaniya in the former Banswara State. This important hoard yielded coins of many Śaka rulers of post-Rudradāman period.⁴ How-

1. *JAIH*, I, 1-2, pp. 115-116; cf. *Itihāsa Samikshā*, 2, II, 1972, pp. 173-180; *JAIH*, II, 1-2, 1968-69, pp. 129-158; cf. also Basbam, A.L., *op. cit.*, pp. 137-44 and other relevant papers.

2. *JAIH*, I, 1-2, pp. 115-116.

3. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, p. 55.

4. E.g., Rudrasimha I, Rudrasena, Saṅghadāman, Dāmasena, Dāma-jadaśī II, Yaśodāman, Viradāman, Vijayasena, Dāmajadaśī III, Yaśodāman II, and Rudrasimha III; cf. *Rajputana Museum Ajmer, Annual Report*, 1913, pp. 3-8; Ojha, G.H., *History of Banswara State*, 1st ed., Ajmer, 1937, pp. 26-32; also *Marubhūlati*, VIII, pt. 4, p. 70; *The Researcher*, Vols. XII-XIII, 1972-73.

ever, owing to their joint rule system, wars of succession and several other factors the Śaka power gradually became weaker.¹ Meanwhile the power of the Kushāṇas also, who ruled over an extensive empire in north India till the last decades of second century A.D. under the leadership of the house of Kanishka, declined after the reign of Vāsudeva I (A.D. 145-175).² Whether they tried and succeeded in penetrating Rajasthan at the expense of the Śakas in the post-Rudradāman period is not definitely known. It may, however, be noted that they ruled over the Indus basin at least from the time of Wima Kadphises (who has in the Chinese Annals been given the credit of being the first Kushāṇa king who conquered Tien-tchou).³ Their hold over that region continued during the reign of Kanishka I (vide his Sui-Vihar Inscription of year 11=88 A.D.)⁴ and his successors upto Vāsudeva I (as is proved by the discovery of a large hoard of Kushāṇa coins numbering 1438 from Mohenjo-Daro in which the issues of Vāsudeva I are the latest).⁵ In Rajasthan itself coins of Wima Kadphises were discovered in Suratgarh and Hanumangarh by A. Stein and the isolated findings of the coins of other Kushāṇa rulers have been reported from Rangmahal, Sambhar, etc.⁶ Of these only the Sui-Vihar epigraph may be regarded as the positive proof of the Kushāṇa hold over the Bahawalpur area of northern Rajasthan.⁷ But whether the successors of Kanishka I continued to hold their sway over it is rather difficult to determine with the meagre numismatic evidence at our disposal. Probably they could not. By and large we are not in a position to give the Kushāṇas the credit of ruling over Rajasthan after the conquests of Rudradāman I, who, as we have seen, invaded Sialkot itself which was situated in the heartland of the Kushāṇa empire.

1. *NHIP.*, p. 47 ff.

2. *AIU.*, p. 151.

3. *AIU.*, p. 139; *Comp. Hist. Ind.* II, pp. 230-33; *The Early Kushāṇas*, pp. 41-43.

4. Sircar, *SI.*, pp. 139-40.

5. Mukherjee, B.N., in *Papers on the Date of Kanishka* (ed. by A.L. Basham), pp. 200-205; also cf. Marshall, J., (ed.), *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, Vol. I, pp. 127-128, fn 1.

6. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, pp. 55.

The Yaudheyas

By the beginning of the third century A.D. the power of the Kārdamakas themselves had appreciably declined. The Yaudheyas of Rajasthan exploited this opportunity and became independent. According to Altekar, the credit of giving the first blow to the Kushāṅga empire in India really belongs to the Yaudheyas.¹ They were a martial and freedom-loving people who could not tolerate the foreign yoke for a long time. According to Altekar, they "raised their standard of revolt in c. 145 A.D. somewhere in the north-eastern Rajputana".² But at that time Rudradāman I (who was, according to Altekar, the governor of the Kushāṅgas) crushed their rebellion successfully. However, the Yaudheyas were not dismayed by this reverse. "They bided their time for a few decades and made a second bid for independence towards the end of the second century A.D. This time they were successful in their venture and succeeded in their homeland and ousting the Kushāṅgas beyond the Sutlej".³

The above view of Altekar is based exclusively on numismatic evidence. The coins of Kanishka III (c. 180—210 A.D.) and Vāsudeva II (c. 210—240 A.D.) who ruled after Vāsudeva I, the last great Kushāṅga emperor, are not found to the east of Sutlej. It indicates that by that time they had lost all their cis-Sutlej territories. On the other hand, the post-Kushāṅga coins of Yaudheyas having legends in the characters of third or fourth century A.D. are found in large numbers between the Sutlej and the Yamuna. It shows that they were ruling over this region as an independent power from the beginning of the third century A.D. The region lying on both the banks of Sutlej right up to the borders of the former Bahawalpur state is still known as Johiyawar after the Yaudheyas.⁴ "It is, therefore, clear," Altekar asserts, "that the state of Patiala and the greater part of northern Rajputana must

1. *NHIF*, pp. 22 ff.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

3. *Lec. cit.*

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-30.

have been included within the dominions of the resuscitated Yaudheya republic.”¹

The theory of Altekar is basically correct and the Yaudheyas may be given the credit of freeing these regions from the Kushāṇa domination. However, we do not agree with the suggestion that the Yaudheyas were the first Indian power to raise the banner of revolt against Kushāṇas. For the chain of rebellions against the Kushāṇa domination had commenced in India several decades earlier when the Maghas of Kauśāmbī and Baghelkhand became independent sometime in the third quarter of the second century A.D.² The Bhāraśiva Nāgas of Padmāvatī whose nine generations had ruled over this city before the Guptas rose to power,³ achieved independence obviously sometime in the last decade of the second century A.D., i.e. earlier than the Yaudheyas. However, the achievement of the Yaudheyas was a remarkable one. They were already known as Kshatriyas *par-excellence*. Now they began to claim that they possessed a mystic formula ensuring victory in all circumstances and against all odds (*Yaudheyānām jayamantrādharaṇām*).⁴ They must have achieved this success sometime in the beginning of the third century A.D. when the Kushāṇas

1. *NHIP*, p. 30.

2. The Maghas started their political career under Mahārāja Vāśishthi-putra Bhīmasena (c. 120-14¹ A.D.), known from inscriptions and a seal from Bhīta. He was succeeded by Kautsīputra Poṭhasiri (Praushṭhaśrī) who ruled from c. 140 to 170 A.D. along with his son Bhadramagha (c. 155-175 A.D.); cf. *Comp. Hist. India*, II, pp. 259-262; *NHIP*, p. 41 ff.

3. Pargiter, F.E., *DKA*, p. 53; coins reveal the name of ten Nāga kings. They are : Bhīmanāga, Vibhūnāga, Prabhākaranāga, Skandanāga, Bṛīhaspatināga, Vyāghranāga, Basunāga, Devanāga, Bhavanāga and Gaṇapatināga. Bhavanāga has been mentioned in the Vākāṭaka inscriptions. Gaṇapatināga finds mention in the Prayāga *praśasti* as one of the kings uprooted by Samudragupta. This record also mentions Nāgadatta, Nāgasena, Nandi and Achyuta whose Nāga lineage is regarded as beyond doubt by historians.

4. *NHIP*, p. 30, fn. 1.

were pressed hard by the Nāgas in the east¹ and the Iranians in the West.²

When the Yaudheyas were fighting for their freedom, the Mālavas were not sitting on the fence. They also unfurled the banner of independence against their Śaka overlords and became free, perhaps in the year 226 A.D., when their leader Śrī Soma or Nandisoma performed *Ekashashthirātra* sacrifice probably to proclaim the independence of the Mālava republic. This fact is evidenced by the Nāndśā Yūpa Inscription of the Kṛita Samvat 282 (=226 A.D.).³ This epigraph records that freedom and prosperity had returned by that year to the country of the Mālavas as a result of the brilliant achievements of their leader. Thus the chapter of the prolonged struggle of the republican tribes of Rajasthan against Scythian domination finally came to a close.⁴

Rajasthan on the Eve of the Rise of the Guptas : Transition to Monarchism

The history of the tribes of Rajasthan from about 226 A.D., the date of the Nāndśā record of Śrī Soma or Nandi Soma,⁵ to the middle of the fourth century A.D., when the Guptas rose to power and brought them within the sphere of their influence, is not known in detail. However, with the help of the scanty information at our disposal, which is mainly numismatic and epigraphic, we can endeavour to reconstruct the main outline of their history in this period.

Most of the tribes of Rajasthan enjoyed almost complete freedom in the century preceding the rise of the Guptas. Let us first take up the case of the Yaudheyas. Their victory over the imperial Kushāṇas had increased their prestige. They were already famous as a brave people since the days of Pāṇini,⁶ and even Rudradāman I, their redoubtable enemy, had to

1. *NHIP.*, p. 14.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

3. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252-267.

4. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252-269.

5. *Supra*, Ch. 1.

praise their heroism though he succeeded in obtaining a smashing victory over them.¹ After their glorious success against foreigners they rightly celebrated their victory by issuing a new currency which bears a resemblance to the Kushāṇa coinage which it replaced in weight and general fabric.² It was, however, more Indian in nature, as in it the foreign Greek and Kharoshṭhī scripts were replaced by Brāhmī, and Kārttīkeya, the *senāpati* of gods, was given a place of honour.³ Kārttīkeya or Mahāsena has been regarded as the tutelary deity of the Yaudheyas in the Mahābhārata also.

The south-eastern neighbours of the Yaudheyas were the Ārjunāyanas who were occupying the Delhi-Agra-Jaipur region. They had obviously also been subject to the Kushāṇa authority and had rebelled against it when the Yaudheyas and other tribes started their war of liberation. Unfortunately, they did not issue any independent coinage in the post-Kushāṇa period, though their existence as a separate republican state is proved beyond doubt by the Prayāga *prāśasti* of Samudragupta, in which they figure in the list of the tributaries of Gupta emperor.⁴ The total absence of their coinage in this period is rather intriguing. According to Altekar, it is quite likely that in this period they formed a kind of loose confederation with the Yaudheyas which obviated the necessity of a separate coinage for them.⁵ According to tradition, the Yaudheyas and the Ārjunāyanas were the descendants of the Pāṇḍava brothers Yudhishṭhira and Arjuna. This belief could have helped them in coalescing with each other.⁶ The numismatic evidence for this hypothesis is provided by the words

1. Sircar, *SI*, p. 178.

2. *NHIP*, p. 30.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. मालवार्जुनायन-यौवेय माद्रकाभीर-प्रार्जुन-सनको-

नीक-काक-खरपरिकादिभिष्वच सर्व-कर-

दानाज्ञाकरण-प्रणामागमन-परितोषित-प्रचण्ड-शासनस्य

Sircar, *SI*, pp. 265-66.

5. *NHIP*, p. 32.

6. *Loc. cit.*

dvi and *tri* found on the Yaudheya coins after the legend *Yaudheyaganasya jayah*. It is quite likely that these terms refer to the *Arjunāyanas* and other tribes, who, according to Altekar, became members of the Yaudheya Confederation.¹

Now the Malavas emerged as the most important and the strongest republican tribe of Rajasthan of the post-Kushāṇa period. During the course of their struggle against the Kushāṇas the Mālavas had probably developed strong monarchical tendencies, for in the Nāndśā Yūpa inscription their leader Śri Soma or Nandi Soma is described as supporting the ancestral yoke of public administration.² It is true that neither he nor his father or grandfather is given any royal or military titles like *Mahārāja* or *Senāpati*, but interestingly enough he claims that his family was as respectable as that of the royal family of the Ikshvākus.³ He and his ancestors obviously led the state armies in times of war and organised the civil administration in times of peace. The monarchical tendency was even stronger among the Yaudheyas, for the head of the Yaudheya state was permitted the regal title of *Mahārāja* (though his post was still elective, as is evident from their Bijayagadh Stone Inscription.⁴ and he was not permitted to put his name on the state currency). On the Yaudheya coin the legend is always *Yaudheyaganasya jayah*. Thus we find that among the

1. Probably Kuṇindas were one of the members of this confederation also. They were occupying the regions between the upper courses of the Sutlej and the Beas. Like the Yaudheyas they were an independent republic before the middle of the first century A.D. They are not included in the list of the tribes which accepted the overlordship of Samudragupta. It may, therefore, be assumed that by the middle of the fourth century they had completely merged with the Yaudheyas of the Punjab and Rajasthan.

✓2. पितृपौत्रामहीन्धुरम्—

EI, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.

3. इक्ष्वाकुप्रथितराज्ञिवंशे मालववंशे प्रसूतस्य.....

—*Ibid.*

4. यौधेयगणपुरस्कृतस्य महाराजमहासेनापते:.....

—*Sircar, SI*, p. 252.

Mālavas and other tribes by this time monarchical tendencies had developed, though, by and large, they were still adhering to their republican traditions.

It is generally assumed that from 226 A.D., the date of the Nāndśā Yūpa inscription, the Mālavas enjoyed complete independence till their subjugation by Samudragupta sometime in the middle of the fourth century A.D. It is, however, just possible that in the third century A.D. they had to accept the suzerainty of the Nāgas of Padmāvatī (Padma Pawaya near Narwar in the Shivpuri district of M.P.),¹ though we admit that the evidence on this point is not very conclusive. The Bhāraśiva Nāgas were the eastern neighbours of the Mālavas. Therefore, when the city of Padmāvatī produced a Nāga dynasty which performed as many as ten Aśvamedhas,² the Mālavas were bound to feel pressure of the new power. Viewed against this background it becomes very significant that the name Kārkoṭanagara was often applied to the Mālava capital. It is indicative of the possibility that for sometime it had become intimately associated with the Kārboṭas or the Nāgas.³ Secondly, it may also be noted that Nāga influence is quite manifest on some of the later Mālava coins.⁴ The fact that the various place names such as Nagari, Nāgdā (and his variations like Nāgahṛida, Nāgadraha, Nāgadṛhapur), Nāgaur (and its variations Ahipura, Nāgapur), Nāgapalli, Takshakagadha, etc.,⁵ are derived from the name Nāga and that Nāga worship is quite prevalent in various parts of Rajasthan, may or may not be connected with the supposed Nāga domination. It is thus just a possibility that sometime in the third fourth century A.D., i.e. after the end of the Kushāṇa

1. Cf. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, p. 6.

2. पराक्रमाधिगतभागीरथपत्तजलमूर्द्धभिपिक्तानान्दशाश्वमेघावभृत्यस्ता-
तानाम्भारशिवानाम्भहाराजश्री(श्री) भवतागदीहित्रस्य

—Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājā-*

vāṁśa kā Itihāsa lathe Abhilekha, p. 149.

3. Goyal, S.R., *PRHC*, Vol. VI, 1973, p. 15.

4. Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of Coins*, pp. 162 ff.

5. For references and description of these places see Jain, K.G., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*.

domination and before the rise of the Guptas, the Bhāraśiva Nāgas of Padmāvatī brought the Mālavas of Rajasthan under their hegemony.

However, the Nāga domination over the Mālavas, if a historical fact, must have been a very short-lived affair. Actually by and large it was the age of the Mālava glory ; the period when the Mālavas made their influence felt over very large tracts of Rajasthan and even in the region south of it. It was the period of their expansion. But it was their ambition, for expansion which made their inherent weakness explicit. It is quite obvious that the republican form of government is never suited for imperialistic expansion. There are very few cases in ancient history of mankind where a republican state succeeded in creating an empire, and all such cases were undoubtedly the result of highly exceptional circumstances which could not be easily repeated.¹ The Lichchhavis failed against Ajātaśatru because of this inherent weakness in their political set up. They could at the most aspire to repulse an invasion whenever it took place ; they could not put an end to the recurrence of invasions by imposing their own authority over the invader. The very nature of their political set up precluded this possibility. On the other hand, once their resistance was broken they could easily be amalgamated by the victor in his ever increasing empire. That is what happened with them. Similar was the fate which awaited the Mālavas of Rajasthan. As a republican tribe they could not hope to expand and yet maintain their unity. In other words, any imperialistic venture by them was out of question. Therefore, when they tried to colonise other parts of Rajasthan and the region south of it, the disintegration of their tribal unity could not be avoided.

We have reasons to believe that the gradual expansion of the Mālava tribe did result in the disintegration of their republic, leading to the emergence of several independent, or semi-independent entities which were ruled over by the people of Mālava stock. The most important of such Mālava state

1. Cf. *PRHG*, VI, 1973, p. 16.

was the parent state itself situated in the (Jaipur-Ajmer-Mewar) region since the Śuṅga period. As we have seen it achieved its independence from the foreign yoke under the leadership of Śrī Soma or Nandi Soma in 226 A.D.¹ He claims that he was born in the Mālava family and belonged to the clan of Sogins; and that his family was as famous as the royal family of the Ikshvākus.² Another inscription³ of the Sogins discovered not very far from the site of the Nāndā Yūpa reveals the name of a certain Mahāsenāpati Bhaṭṭisoma who also belonged to the clan of the Sogins.⁴ As this epigraph is undated, Bhaṭṭisoma cannot be given a precise date. But from the palaeography of his record it appears that he was a near contemporary of Nandi Soma and, as his name suggests, was most likely a member of the same family. A.S. Altekar even suggests the possibility of his being identical with Nandi Soma himself.⁵ We, however, do not think that such was the case, for *soma* ending names were quite popular among the Sogins and therefore, Bhaṭṭisoma could very well have been a separate individual. From his title *Mahāsenāpati* it appears that he was probably a powerful member of the clan which controlled the military and political affairs of the Mālava state.

Another important branch of the Mālava tribe was the Maukharis. Till now the Maukhariṣ have been looked upon as quite different and distinct from the Mālavas, but now it has been very convincingly shown⁶ that the Maukhariṣ known

1. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.

2. इश्वाकुप्रथितराजपिवंशे मालववंशे प्रसूतस्य
जयनर्तनपु (प्र) भा (भा) ग्र वर्द्धन पौत्रस्य
जयसोमपुत्रस्य सोगिने (तः) श्री सोम...

—*Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 266-67.

4. महासेनापतिस्य (पते:) भट्टिसोमस्य
सोगिस्य (सोगे:) म-

—*Ibid.*, p. 286 f.

5. *EI*, XXVII, p. 267.

6. Goyal, S.R., *PRHC*, VI, 1973, 16-17.

from the Bādvā Yūpa Inscription of Kṛita (Mālava) era 295 (239 A.D.)¹ as well as the later imperial Maukhariṣ of Kanauj belonged to the Mālava stock. This fact is borne out by the use of the Kṛita Mālava era by them (a fact which assumes some significance when we find that the Maukhariṣ were a close neighbour of the Mālavas of Rajasthan), and also by the earliest epigraphical references to their origin. According to the Harahā Stone Inscription of Isānavarman,² the Maukhariṣ were the descendants of the hundred sons whom king Aśvapati obtained through the grace of Vaivasvata.³ On the other hand, according to the *Mahābhārata* the Madra king Aśvapati obtained one hundred sons called the Mālavas born to his queen Mālavī as a result of the *varadāna* granted by Yama Vaivasvata to the king's daughter Sāvitri.⁴ Thus, the combined testimony of the Harahā inscription and the *Mahābhārata* conclusively proves that the Mālavas and the Maukhariṣ belonged to the same stock and country. Further, we have several other interesting indications which tend to support this conclusion. Firstly, our sources, viz. the *Mahābhārata*, the Harahā inscription and the Nāndśā Yūpa inscription, connect both of these tribes to the solar branch of Kshatriyas. Secondly, like the Mālavas⁵ the Maukhariṣ were also great champions of the Vedic Yajña cult. According to the Harahā record Imperial Maukhariṣ of Kanauj were great patrons of Vedic sacrifices.⁶ Similarly, from the Bādvā record we learn that all the three known sons of Bala performed a Trirātra

1. *EI*, XXIII, pp. 42-52; cf. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 251-253.

2. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 385 ff.

3. सुत-शतं लेभे नृपोऽश्वपतिवर्वदवस्वतादद्गुणोदितम् ।
तत्प्रसूता दुरित-वृत्ति-स्था मुखरा: क्षितीशाः क्षतारयः ॥३॥

—*Ibid.*, p. 386.

4. पितुश्च ते पुत्रशतं भविता तव मातरि ।

मालवां मालवा नाम शाश्वताः पुत्रपीत्रिणः ॥

Mahābhārata (BORI), III, 281, 58.

5. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.; cf. Minasor Ins. of 533 A.D., Sircar, *SI*, 411 ff.

6. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 385 ff.

sacrifice.¹ Lastly, the fact that Maukhari principality existed in Kota region (quite close to the Mālava Janapada) the rulers of which used the Krita-Mālava era is itself not without significance. These indications are not very strong separately, but when taken collectively they tend to strengthen the theory that the Maukharis and the Mālavas belonged to the same parent stock.

Another splinter group of the Mālava tribe appears to have established itself in the old Bharatpur state. This fact is indicated by a dated stone pillar inscription found at Bijayagadh² near Bayana which commemorates the erection of a Yūpa (obviously the same on which the inscription is engraved) by the king Vishṇuvardhana on the completion of a Pundarika Yajña.³ The date, 428, is given both in word and numerical symbols as is the case with the inscription 'A' of the Nāndśā Yūpa.⁴ According to Fleet, its script and the find-spot indicate that it must refer its date to the Mālava (or Vikrama) era. In that case it was engraved in the year 371-72 A.D. expired or 372-73 A.D. current.⁵ The alternative that the era used in it is identical with the Śaka era goes against the palaeography of the record. Further, there is no evidence to suggest that the Śaka reckoning was popular in this part of the country in the fourth century A.D.⁶ Thus king Vishṇuvardhana used the era of the Mālavas and like that tribe was interested in the performance of the Vedic sacrifices. Further, his family members adopted *vardhana*-ending names (viz., Vishṇuvardhana, the king of this record and his father Yaśovardhana). Such names were quite popular among the Mālavas also. For example, the grandfather of Nandi Soma of the Nāndśā inscription was Prabhagra (Bhṛigu ?) *vardhana* and the kings of Western

1. *EI*, XXIII, pp. 42-52.

2. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 252-54.

3. कृतौ पृष्ठरीके यूपोऽप्यस्त्रित्यापित.....

Ibid., p. 253.

4. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.

5. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 253 fn. 1.

Malwa and Rajasthan in the sixth century adopted such names as Ādityavardhana, Dravyavardhana and Vishṇuvardhana.¹ The family of Mahārāja Gauri of the Mandasor Fragmentary Inscription of 490 A.D.² included kings having the names Rāshtravardhana and Rājyavardhana. These facts when taken together strongly suggest that the Varṣika tribe to which king Vishṇuvardhana of the Bijayagadhi document belonged, was also an offshoot of the Mālava stock. The evidence at our disposal on this point is obviously not conclusive but the existence of a ruling family in Bhartpur area, the fourth member of which, viz. Vishṇuvardhana, was ruling in 371-72 A.D. is itself quite an interesting fact. It means that he was a contemporary and also probably a feudatory of Samudragupta and that his family came into power in northern Rajasthan about a century earlier, i.e., towards that last quarter of the third century A.D.

The last and perhaps the most important branch of the Mālavas was the Aulikaras who migrated to and settled down in the Avanti region, i.e. Ujjayini Dhārā—Mandasor area. This branch popularised the use of the Mālava era there and gave the name Mālava (Malwa) to this region, though here it must be noted and emphasised that the name Malwa for this Janapada became popular only in the post-Harsha period.³ As we have discussed elsewhere, till then it continued to be known as Avanti and the authors of the Gupta age made a clear distinction between Mālava Janapada and Avanti *dēśa* usually locating the former to the north of the latter.

¹ The Aulikaras of Avanti probably supplanted the Kārdamakas in this area but were themselves subdued by Samudragupta who imposed Gupta overlordship over this region. Their history during the Gupta age is intimately connected with the fortunes of southern Rajasthan in that period. We will discuss it in the next chapter. *

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 410, ff.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 410 and fn. 1; cf. *El*, XXX, pp. 120 ff.

3. *Vids*, Ch. IV.

The expansion and disintegration of the Mālavas in later times is also indicated by the existence of several localities named Mālava in the various parts of the country, though it is not at all necessary to assume that the Mālavas existed as a political force in all of them. The *Mahābhārata* is aware of the three-fold division of the Mālavas, viz. the Mālavas of eastern, western and northern region. Tārānātha, the Buddhist historian of Tibet, speaks of a Mālava in Prayāga region and villages named Mallāvān and Malawān actually exist respectively in the Hardoi and Fatchpur districts of U.P.¹ Then there is a Mālava country in the Western Ghats which seems to be associated with the present Malavan in the Ratnagiri district. A feudatory of Vikramāditya VI Chālukya is said to have subdued the *sapta Mālavas* upto the Himalayas.² Here it may be noted however, that all these regions which acquired the name Mālava were not necessarily connected with the Mālavas of Rajasthan, but their existence, no doubt, proves that at some point of time in their history the Mālavas migrated into different parts of the country. We suggest that this expansion took place in the third-fourth century A.D. when, after their victory over the Śakas, the Mālavas were at the height of their glory and there was no powerful empire which could check their migration to distant regions.

Be it what it may, it cannot be doubted that at least in Rajasthan and adjoining regions the Mālavas established several, independent and semi-independent states in the post-Kushāṇa period. But, as noted above, a republican tribe could not adopt a career of expansionism without losing its tribal homogeneity. The process of the expansion of the Mālavas was, therefore, bound to be accompanied by the process of their disintegration. Their disintegration was further accentuated by the internal crisis through which they, together with many other republican tribes of the period, were passing. These tribes which dotted the map of north India in this period were gradually realising that they could not hold their own against

1. Cf. Sircar, D.G., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, pp. 2-3.

2. *Loc. cit.*

the onslaughts of their mighty neighbouring kings. Hence we find that some tribes carried out the experiment of forming loose confederacies (e.g. Yaudheya—Ārjunāyana—Kunīnda confederacy). But the greatest and most important development which took place as a sort of counter-action to the danger from the monarchical states was that the tribal republics themselves, consciously or unconsciously, absorbed the elements of monarchical polity. For example, though the Lichchhavi relations of the Guptas had a tribal form of policy as the word *Lichchhavayah* i.e. the Lichchhavis occurring on the reverse of the Chandragupta-Kumāradevi types of coins and the term Lichchhavi-dauhitra i.e. daughters' son of the Lichchhavi, used for Samudragupta in the Gupta epigraphs indicates,¹ it is almost certain that the father of Kumāradevi was a hereditary chief. For, otherwise, how could the son of Kumāradevi² or Kumāradevi herself,³ 'inherit' the state of the Lichchhavis? The same tendency towards monarchism may be detected in the polity of the republican tribes of Rajasthan in this period. The post of the head of the Yaudheya state, for example, was elective and he was not permitted to put his name on the state coinage; however, he was allowed the royal title *Mahārāja* along with the military title *Mahāsenāpati*.⁴ The latter title indicates that the source of the strength of the Yaudheya Mahārajas was their control over military organisation.⁵ Among the Mālavas also the leadership of the tribe had already passed into the hands of persons like Śri Soma (or Nandi Soma) who, in the Nāndsā Yūpa inscription of the Krīta year 282 (226 A.D.) claims that he was a scion of the Mālava

1. Altekar, A.S., *The Coinage of the Gupta Empire*, pp. 27 ff; *JIH*, VI, Suppl, p. 10 ff.

2. Goyal, S.R., *HIG*, pp. 94 ff.

3. Altekar, A.S., *Coinage*, pp. 30-31.

4. Fleet, *CH*, III, pp. 251-52.

5. In Central India the Sanakānikas (who figure as a tribal republic in the Prayāga *prāastī*) had adopted a monarchical constitution several generations earlier than the Udayagiri record of the Sanakānika feudatory of Chandragupta II which was engraved in Gupta year 82 (401 A.D.)—Sircar, *SI*, pp. 279-80.

family¹ which was as famous as the royal Ikshvāku family of Purānic fame.² He further informs us that he carried on the yoke of administration descending down from his father and grandfather.³ Obviously, he and his ancestors hereditarily led the state army in times of war and organised civil administration in times of peace.⁴ The power and wealth of Śrī Soma or Nandi Soma are also evidenced by the fact that he caused an Ekashashṭī Sacrifice to be performed (he could not perform it himself as he was a Kshatriya and the sacrifice could be performed by the Brāhmaṇas only)⁵ in which "a stream of wealth as it were on the sacrificial ground leading to the fulfilment of the streams of all desire was offered to the Brāhmaṇas."⁶ In another passage of the inscription he tells us that a fee of several hundreds of thousands of cows was offered as Dakshinā to the Brāhmaṇas,⁷ a claim which may remind any student of contemporary history of a similar claim made by as great an emperor as Samudragupta.⁸ In this connection the statement that Śrī Soma or Nandi Soma gave building sites to the temples of Brahmā, Indra Prajāpati, the great sages and Vishnu may also be noted.⁹ Further, if the suggestion of Altekar regarding the identity of Nandi Soma with Bhaṭṭi Soma

✓1. राजपिवंशे मालववंशे प्रसूतस्य

...*EI*, XXVII, p. 252 ff.

2. इक्ष्वाकुप्रथित

...*Loc. cit.*

3. पितृपूत्रामहीन्दुरम्

...*Loc. cit.*

4. *NHIP*, p. 35.

5. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.

6. *Loc. cit.*

7. अनेकशतगोसहस्रदक्षिणा

...*Loc. cit.*

8. अनेकगोशतसहस्रप्रदायिनः

...*Sircar, SI*, p. 200.

9. ब्रह्मेन्द्रप्रजापतिमहीपिविष्णु

(स्थानेषु कृतावकाशस्य पापति)

...*EI*, XXVII, pp. 252 ff.

known from another Nāndśā Yūpa inscription¹ (which unfortunately carries no date but may, on palaeographical grounds, be regarded as contemporary to the Nāndśā record) with Nandi Soma is correct, it may be assumed that the Mālava chief, like his Yaudheya counterpart, was given the title of *Mahāsenāpali*.² In any case, it is quite obvious that when the leadership of a tribal state passed into the hands of hereditary chiefs who were military leaders and claimed royal descent, in reality it could hardly be distinguished from a monarchy though the fiction of its being a *gaṇa*, i.e. a republic, still continued, as the reference to the Mālava *gaṇa vishaya* (i.e. the territory of the Mālava republic) in the line three of the Nāndśā Yūpa inscription 'A' of Nandi Soma proves.³ This gradual transition of the Mālavas and other tribes from republicanism to monarchical form of government was symptomatic of their inner crisis which must have rendered them inherently weak. No wonder, therefore, if they could not put up a brave resistance to the attempts of Samudragupta to bring them within the sphere of his influence.⁴

1. *EI*, XXVII, pp. 266-67.

2. महासेनापतिस्य (पते:) भद्रिसोमस्य
सोगिस्य (सोगे:)-म-

Loc. cit.

3. Cf. Shukla, D.C., *PRHC*, VI, 1973, pp. 1 ff.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

CHAPTER III

RAJASTHAN IN THE AGE OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE

Rise of the Guptas

In the last chapter we brought the history of Rajasthan up to the close of the third and the beginning of the fourth century A.D. In the middle of the fourth century the political map of the country was totally changed by the expansion of the Gupta empire under Samudragupta. The Gupta dynasty was founded by Mahārāja Gupta sometime towards the close of the third century.¹ The power and prestige of the dynasty was greatly augmented by the next king Ghajotkacha who contracted a matrimonial alliance with the Lichchhavis of Magadha² and married his son Chandragupta I with Kumāradevi, the daughter of the Lichchhavi chief.³ It is now also almost beyond doubt that Samudragupta, son of Mahādevi Kumāradevi was a *dvāmushyāyaṇa* and was regarded as the successor

1. For the original kingdom of the Imperial Guptas, see Allan, *BMC, GD*, (Intro.) p. xiv; Basak, R.G., *HNEI*, p. 8; Banerji, R.D., *AIG*, p. 8; Alekar, *NHIP*, p. 2; Saletore, R.N. *Life in the Gupta Age*, p. 9; Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 295; Dandekar, R.N., *Hist. Gup.*, p. 20; Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 528; B.P. Sinha suggests that the home of the Guptas may have been near Ayodhya (*JBORS*, xxxvii, p. 133). But S.R. Goyal believes that the Guptas originally belonged to eastern U.P. with Prayāga as the centre of their power (*HIG*, pp. 41 ff.).
2. In the fourth century A.D. the Lichchhavis were ruling not only over northern Bihar but Magadha also. Cf. Goyal, *op. cit.* pp. 52-53.
3. महाराजश्री-गुप्त-प्रपोत्रस्य महाराज-श्री-घटोत्कच-पोत्रस्य महाराजाधिराज-श्री-चन्द्रगुप्त-पुत्रस्य लिच्छविदौहित्रस्य महादेव्यां कुमारदेव्यामुत्पन्नस्य महाराजाधिराज-श्री-समुद्रगुप्तस्य...

to his father as well as his maternal grandfather, who probably did not have any male issue to succeed him.¹ However, till the accession of Samudragupta in c. 350 A.D.,² the hold of the Gupta emperor was confined to eastern U.P. (including Prayāga and Sāketa) and Magadha along with Northern Bihar.³ But Samudragupta turned out to be a great conqueror. He succeeded in simplifying the political map of the country by exterminating the nine kings of Āryāvarta and reducing the frontier states of eastern and northern regions as well as the tribal states of the Panjab, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh to submission.⁴ Further, he defeated the twelve kings of Deccan and made the Scythian potentates of the North-Western and Western India as well as the kings and peoples of Ceylon and South-East Asia to establish friendly (in some cases probably subordinate) relations with him.⁵ Thus he succeeded in effecting political unification of the greater part of the sub-continent by destroying the independence of a large number of states which had come into existence in the post-Kushāṇa period. It is against this background that the history of Rajasthan

1. Cf. Pathak, V.S., *JNSI*, XIX, pt. II, p. 141.

2. The *AMMK* gives only twenty-two years and five months to Samudragupta. In that case he must have ascended the throne shortly after 350 A.D. This tradition is corroborated by the fact that Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka who ruled till c. 335 A.D. (*NHIP*, p. 95) [and Bhavanāga, the Bhāraśiva ruler, who died c. 340 A.D. (*ibid.*, p. 38) were very senior contemporaries of Samudragupta. It is quite significant that Bhavanāga does not figure in the list of the Nāga kings uprooted by Samudragupta.

3. According to the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* (Pargiter, *DKA*, p. 53., fn. 8) the early Gupta kingdom was a joint-state of the Guptas and the Magadhas (obviously the Lichchhavis) and Prayāga, the region along the Gāngā and Magadha were included in it (*HIG*, p. 50 ff; *NHIP*, p. 134). The description of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* adds Sāketa to the list of these regions (Pargiter, *op.cit.*, p. 73).

4. Sircar, *SI*, p. 264 f.

5. Sircar, *ibid.*; p. 266; for a detailed analysis of the evidence of the Prayāga *prāśasti* of Samudragupta, vide *CA*, pp. 8 ff; *NHIP*, pp. 139 ff; *HIG*, pp. 128 ff.

in the two centuries that elapsed from the accession of Samudragupta to the fall of the Gupta empire should be studied.

Samudragupta And Rajasthan

At the time when empire-building activities of Samudragupta commenced, Rajasthan was inhabited by a large number of ancient tribes such as the Mālavas of the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region, the Ārjunāyanas of the Jaipur-Delhi-Agra division, the Yaudheyas of northern Rajasthan and the adjoining regions of the Panjab and the Ābhīras of Abiria in southern Rajasthan. All the tribes have been enumerated by Harisheṇa in the *prāśasti* of his master.¹ We have discussed their history up to the beginning of the fourth century in the preceding chapter. Apart from them, there was one more tribe which does not find mention in the *Prayāga prāśasti*. That is the Varika tribe of the Bharatpur area. It is not known to have existed in the pre-Samudragupta period. Its existence is revealed only by a stone pillar inscription found at Bijayagadh near Bayana.² It records the erection of a *yūpa* or pillar (obviously the same on which the inscription is engraved) by the king Vishṇuvardhana on the completion of a *Puṇḍarika* sacrifice.³ The inscription carries a date—428—which is given both in words and numerical symbols. It describes the king Vishṇuvardhana as the excellent son of Yaśovardhana and the excellent son's son of Yaśorāṭa and the excellent son of the son's son of Vyāghrarāṭa.⁴ Thus, from the inscription it would appear that

✓1. मालवार्जुनायन्त-यौधेय-माद्रकाभीर-प्रार्जुन-
सनकानीक-काक-खरपरिकादिभिश्च.....

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 265.

✓2. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 252 ff.

3. कृती पुण्डरीके यूपोऽयम्प्रतिष्ठापितः...

—*Ibid.*, p. 253.

4. सुप्रतिष्ठितराज्यनामधेयेन श्रीविष्णुवर्द्धनेन
वरिकेण यशोवर्द्धन-सत्पुत्रेण यशोरात-सत्पीत्वेण
ध्यान्नरातसत्प्रपौत्वेण

—*Loc. cit.*

the family of Vishṇuvardhana was in existence at least for four generations before the year 428 A.D., though probably not as a political power. Unfortunately, the record does not mention the era to which its date is to be referred, but, as pointed out by Fleet,¹ the script and the findspot of this inscription indicate that it was no other than the famous Kṛita-Mālava era. The date of the inscription consequently comes to 371-72 A.D. expired, or 372-73 A.D. current. Thus Vishṇuvardhana Varika was apparently a contemporary, probably a feudatory of Samudragupta. We shall discuss the nature of the relationship of this ruler with the Gupta emperor later in greater detail.

Here it may be noted that the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta does not mention the Maukhāri principality of Badva (in the former Kota state) the existence of which in [the third century is revealed by the Badva Stone Pillar (Yūpa) Inscription of the Kṛita year 295 (=238 A.D.) of the sons of Mahāsenāpati Bala.² It is quite possible that this branch of the Maukhāris had disappeared from the political scene of Rajasthan by the middle of the fourth century or had become subordinate to some neighbouring power which rendered its separate mention in the Prayāga *prāśasti* unnecessary.

In the Prayāga *prāśasti* of Samudragupta and Mālavas, the Ārjunāyanas, the Yaudheyas and the Ābhīras of Rajasthan and some other tribes of the Panjab and Madhya Pradesh have been grouped with the *pratyanta* states of eastern and northern India whose kings were compelled to pay all kinds of taxes (*Sarvvakaradāna*), carry out the imperial commands (*ājñākarāṇa*) and pay personal homage to the emperor (*prāṇamāgamaṇa*).³ Here it is interesting to note that like the monarchical states, the rulers of these tribal republics were also expected to attend the royal court personally. It shows that in the eyes of the emperor their status in their own respective

1. *Loc. cit.*

2. Vide, the preceding ch; *EI*, XXII, p. 52; Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 91 f.

3. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

states was not very much different from that of the kings of monarchical *pratyanta* states. In any case, from the Prayāga *prāśasti* it is quite apparent that Samudragupta established his suzerainty over the greater part of Rajasthan. But how and when his suzerainty was imposed over the republics of Rajasthan is not known. This problem is inextricably connected with the question of the basis on which the powers defeated or subjugated by Samudragupta have been enumerated in the four lists of the prose passage of his *prāśasti*. Some scholars such as Jayaswal believe that they have been enumerated in geographical sequence,¹ but it is palpably wrong because in the third list, in which the republican states of Rajasthan have been included, Harisheṇa, the author of the *prāśasti*, has also enumerated the powers of eastern India, Himalayan region, the Panjab and Madhya Pradesh. Similarly, the suggestion that Harisheṇa has enumerated these powers in chronological order—that is in the order in which they were defeated²—is also obviously wrong; for it would be absurd to assume that all the powers of any particular list were subdued by Samudragupta at one particular time. Harisheṇa has grouped all the powers defeated or subjugated by Samudragupta in different periods of his career into four lists in accordance with the policies adopted towards them. This suggestion throws a new light on the *modus operandi* of the policy of the emperor towards Rajasthan. For it means that the “nature of the challenge which these states threw to his statesmanship and conditions in which they were placed and his responses must have differed accordingly. In the initial stages of his empire-building activities, when he had yet to emerge as the supreme ruler of Āryāvarta, he must have moved very cautiously. It is quite possible that at that time he tried to cultivate friendship with the tribal people of the Punjab and Rajasthan who, being situated beyond the Nāga Kingdoms were, according to the *mandala* doctrine of interstate relations, his natural friends (*mitras*) and later on, when

1. Jayaswal, K.P., *Hist. Ind.*, p. 135.

2. Dubreuil, J., *AHD*, p. 61.

he became undisputed master of Āryāvarta, he reduced his erstwhile friends to the status of his subordinate allies. May be, in some cases he had to exert some pressure to bring these lovers of freedom to their senses, as he might have put. It is also quite possible that some of the tribal states offered voluntary submission and rendered him some help against the neighbouring kings or against those to whom at that time they were owing their allegiance.”¹

For the post-Samudragupta period there is no record comparable to the *Prayāga prāśasti* which may help us in assessing the extent of the hold of the successors of Samudragupta over this part of the country. In view of this fact some scholars such as A.S. Altekar² have opined that the tribal republics mentioned in the *Prayāga prāśasti* continued to flourish even after Samudragupta. “It is important to note in this connection”, he argues, “that we have no evidence whatsoever to show that the homelands of these republics were ever annexed to the Gupta empire. The fact that no monuments of the Gupta rule have been found, in Rajputana or beyond Mathura shows that the Guptas could hardly exercise any effective control over these republics. They may well have continued their semi-independent existence down to the middle of the 5th century A.D. when they appear to have been engulfed in the Hūṇa avalanche.”³ The theory of Altekar is now supported by some other scholars also.⁴ But we are not inclined to accept this view. Firstly, it is a patent fact of history that the tribal republics of Rajasthan which were in existence till the middle of the fourth century are not mentioned anywhere as independent or semi-independent entities in the post-Samudragupta period. They, no doubt, continued to exist as social groups or castes and in some cases (as is the case with the Mālavas) their names continued to exist as the name of the people living in a particular region which acquired the name

1. Dubreuil, J., *AHD*, p. 155.

2. *NHIP*, p. 35.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

4. Thakur, U., *The Hūṇas in India*, p. 223.

of that tribe. No amount of explanation by the supporters of Altekar's theory can explain this basic fact away. It is, indeed, one of the most important proofs of the great hold of the imperial Guptas over Rajasthan for a considerably long period. For, at least in the present state of our knowledge, one cannot give any cogent reason for explaining the disappearance of the tribal republics of Rajasthan from the middle of the fourth century A.D. other than the imperialistic policy followed by Samudragupta. It may, however, be pointed out that the policy of Samudragupta of destroying the existence of these republics of Rajasthan as political entities could not succeed so effectively if they had not become inherently weak on account of the growth of the monarchical tendencies in their polity which we have already discussed.¹

Here it would not be out of place to evaluate K.P. Jayaswal's criticism of Samudragupta's policy towards republican tribes. Jayaswal wrote his famous *History of India, from 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.* (Lahore, 1933) in a period when Indian nation was struggling against British imperialism. It was quite natural for our historians of that period to glorify the ancient empire-builders of our country while at the same time idolising our republican tradition.² But sometimes the desire to glorify the empire-building activities of our great rulers ran counter to the glorification of our republican heritage. Jayaswal's book apparently suffers from this dichotomy. He, on the one hand, highly appreciates the efforts of Samudragupta to unify the country. "It should be noted" he states, "that he (Samudragupta) did not over-do militarism. He was fully conscious of the value of a policy of peace.....The psychology of the nation was entirely changed and the outlook became lofty and magnanimous. It was a psychology directly borrowed from the Emperor. The Hindus of his day thought of big undertakings. They contributed high, elegant and magnani-

1. Cf. *supra*, Ch. 2.

2. For a discussion on the impact of national movement on Indian historiography see Philips', *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, pp. 417 ff.

mous literature. The literary people became literary Kuberas to their countrymen and literary empire-builders outside India.....Sanskrit became the official language, and it became entirely a new language. Like the Gupta coins and Gupta sculpture, it reproduced the Emperor, it became majestic and musical, as it had never been before and as it never became after again. The Gupta emperor made a new language, and in fact a new nation.”¹ But after having lavished this praise on Samudragupta, in the following pages of his work, Jayaswal does not hesitate to denounce him for the destruction of the republican tribes. “Samudragupta, like Alexander”, he laments, “killed the free spirit of his country. He destroyed the Mālavas and the Yaudheyas who were the nursery of freedom and many others of their class. The social system of the republican communities was based on equality. They knew no caste. They consisted of one caste only. The orthodox system, on the other hand, was based on inequality and caste where mass patriotism could not be mobilised as it could easily be done amongst the Mālavas, the Yaudheyas, the Madrakas, the Pushyamitras, the Ābhīras and the Lichchhavis. They were the exercise ground for state-making, for patriotism, for individual ambitions, capabilities and leadership. But under Samudragupta and his descendants they all merged into an organised, officialised, orthodox caste-system and an orthodox political system which recognised and fostered monarch and imperialism.....The life-giving element was gone.....They (the Guptas) were tyrants to Hindu constitutional freedom.....²

From the passages quite above it is quite apparent that Jayaswal was suffering from dichotomy of eulogizing the empire-building activities of Samudragupta which led to the unification of the large part of the country and at the same time showing that the destruction of the lofty republican traditions of our ancient tribes was the result of the wicked and

1. Jayaswal, *Hist. Ind.*, pp. 204-6.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 210-11.

selfish policy of the Gupta emperor. Such an approach was quite natural for a historian who was, consciously or unconsciously, trying to show that political unity of India is not something new and that it was the imperialistic policy of the Britishers in modern times which was responsible for the destruction of the democratic way of life in our country. But now it can easily be conceded that Samudragupta's achievements, which could not have been possible without the establishment of a unified empire, cannot be appreciated if we denounce him for the destruction of the republican tribes of Rajasthan and adjoining areas.

The exact nature of the policy of Samudragupta towards the various tribal republics of Rajasthan is not definitely known. For example, it is not even certain whether the tribal state of the Mālavas mentioned in the *Prāyāga prāśasti* and the Aulikara state of Daśapura were identical. So far no scholar appears to have discussed this question in detail, although many of them have tacitly assumed that these two political entities were not different. To us it does not appear to be so. We feel that the Mālava tribe mentioned in the *Prayāga prāśasti* lived in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area and that the Aulikaras who emerged as a political power in the middle of the fourth century in the Deśapura-Madhyamikā region of Malwa and Southern Rajasthan were a separate political entity though racially they were probably a branch of the Mālavas themselves. For we have good grounds to believe that Mālava Janapadā, as a political entity distinct from the Avanti Janapada, continued to exist till at least the sixth-seventh century A.D. We shall have occasion to discuss this point in detail later. It is, however, more or less, certain that it ceased to enjoy its old tribal constitution and became a monarchical state.

In the political system of Samudragupta Yaudheya and other tribal Janapadas of Rajasthan were forced to pay all the taxes, obey imperial commands and send their chiefs to pay personal homage to the emperor.¹ In other matters, perhaps,

1. सर्व-कर-दानाज्ञाकर्त्ता-राज-प्रग्नामागमन-परितोपित-प्रचाह-यात्तर्यात्तर्या
Sircar, *SI*, pp. 255 ff.

they were given a measure of internal autonomy though it could not have been very great as the subjects taken over by the central government did not leave much scope for the local rulers. It appears that Samudragupta tried to evolve a feudal structure in this region. The policy of *sarvakaradāna*, *ājnākarāṇa* and *prajāmāgamana* proves that in actual practice the position of the ruling chiefs must have been something like that of the *sāmantas* of Harsha as described in the *Harshacharita* of Bāṇa. According to the second chapter of this work when Bāṇa visited the camp of Harsha he found that a large number of *sāmantas* had come to pay homage to the emperor personally (प्रणाम-विडवनाभयचलायमानमौलिभिरिव). Apparently, a status somewhat akin to the one enjoyed by the *sāmantas* of Harsha was accorded to the Rajasthan feudatories of Samudragupta.

Continuity of the Gupta Rule in Rajasthan

According to R.G. Majumdar, the tribal republics of Rajasthan were brought under the direct governance of the Guptas by Chandragupta II, the son and successor of Samudragupta, on whom "fell the task of completing the conquest begun by Samudragupta,...and assimilating into the organisation of the empire, not only the tribal states and kingdoms on the border but also the territories ruled by foreign hordes like the Śakas and the Kushāṇas."¹ Some other scholars have also opined, without adducing any reason whatsoever, that the republican states of Rajasthan enumerated in the *Prayāga prāśasti* were finally merged in the Gupta imperial system during the rule of Chandragupta II.² We beg to differ. So far as the available evidence goes we do not know anything about the activities and achievements of Chandragupta II in Rajasthan, though he is known to have conquered the neighbouring regions of Gujarat towards the close of his reign,

1. *CA*, p. 23.

2. Upadhyaya, V., *Gupta Sāmrājya kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, p. 90.

probably sometime after 410 A.D.¹ But this fact cannot be pressed into service for proving the persuance of the policy of the total amalgamation of the republics of Rajasthan by him. We, therefore, believe that unless some evidence to the contrary is forthcoming the credit for the political reorganisation of Rajasthan should be given to Samudragupta himself who was one of the greatest empire builders of ancient India.

¶ The continuity of the Gupta rule over Rajasthan in the post-Samudragupta period is also indicated by the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana (known date 532 A.D.).² Yaśodharman was the ruler of Malwa and the greater part of Rajasthan, and belonged to the Mālava tribe of the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region. As discussed below Yaśodharman himself ruled over this region. Now, in his epigraphs he claims that he conquered even those regions which were not enjoyed by the Gupta Lords.³ This reference to Gupta rulers in plural by a king belonging to the Mālava tribe of Rajasthan who himself ruled over the greater part of this region may be regarded as a proof of the fact that the Guptas ruled over Rajasthan for a considerably long time and not in the reign period of Samudragupta alone. /

Unfortunately, no Gupta record has so far been discovered in Rajasthan except probably a small seal which refers to the *adikarana* of some Kumārāmātya.⁴ It was found at Dhalia near Bikaner. But the non-discovery of such inscriptions from a

1. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 246 ff. Goyal has given good grounds to believe that the Śaka conquest of Chandragupta II took place towards the close of his reign, and not earlier.
2. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 418 ff.
3. ये भुवता गुप्त-नार्थनं सकल-वसुधाक्लान्ति-द्वृ-प्रतापै:...

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

Fleet (*op. cit.*, p. 148) translated the term 'Guptanātha' as 'Lords of the Gupta'; Jayaswal (*IHI*, pp. 40-41) corrected the translation as the 'Gupta-Lord's.

4. Sharma, Dasharatha, *Rajasthan through the Ages*, Vol. I, p. 69.

particular region cannot be regarded as a proof of its independence. After all we do not have even a single Gupta inscription from Bihar belonging to the first 150 years of the Gupta rule (c.320 to c.467 A.D.).¹ The first Gupta record found from this region is the famous Bihar stone Pillar Inscription belonging to some unknown successor of Skandagupta.²

However, numismatic evidence of the intimate relationship of the Guptas with Rajasthan is quite impressive. In this connection first of all we may mention the famous Bayana hoard found near Hullanpur village in the Bharatpur region. It is the biggest hoard of Gupta gold coins discovered so far. It consisted of about 2,100 coins, but only 1821 of them could be recovered.³ They included the coins of Chandragupta I, Samudragupta, Kācha, Chandragupta II, Kumāragupta I and Kramāditya (Skandagupta?).⁴ It is quite obvious that these coins must have been in circulation in eastern and northern Rajasthan and the adjoining regions of Panjab and Uttar Pradesh at the time when this hoard was buried towards the end

1. Excepting of course the *Gayā dānapatra* of Samudragupta which is either a spurious record or a late copy of a genuine record. For the various views on this subject vide Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 254 ff; Sircar, *SI*, pp. 272 ff; *EI*, XXVI, p. 135 f; Majumdar, R.C. *IC*, XI, pp. 225 ff; Ghosh, A., *EI*, XXV, p. 52 f; Goyal, *HIG*, p. 48, pp. 111 ff; Banerji, R.D., *AIG*, p. 7 f and Dandekar, R.N., *Hist. Gup.* p. 44.

2. Fleet (*op. cit.*, p. 48) ascribed this record to Skandagupta. But Majumdar (*IC*, X, pp. 70 ff) and Sinha (*DKM*, pp. 28 ff) have shown good grounds to believe that it belongs to the post-Skandagupta period.

3. Altekar, A.S., *The Coinage of the Gupta Empire*, pp. 310 ff.

4. The break up of the hoard is:—

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|
| Chandragupta I | — | 10 coins |
| Samudragupta | — | 183 „ |
| Kācha | — | 16 „ |
| Chandragupta II | — | 983 „ |
| Kumāragupta I | — | 628 „ |
| Kramāditya I (Skandagupta ?) | — | 1 „ |
| Total | | <u>1821</u> |

of the reign of Kunāragupta I or during the reign of Skandagupta. This fact is a very strong indication of the continuity of Gupta influence over this part of Rajasthan in the post-Samudragupta period. Other regions of Rajasthan have also yielded Gupta coins in considerable number.¹ Several coins of Chandragupta I, Samudragupta and Chandragupta II were found in a mound called Bundewali Dungri, near village Moroli, in the Jaipur area.² Some coins of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II were discovered at some unknown sites of Jaipur region. Mewar area had also yielded several Gupta gold and silver coins.³ Five silver Gupta coins were discovered by G.H. Ojha from Ajmer and one silver coin of Kumāragupta I was discovered by Satya Prakash from Naliasar—Sambhar.⁴ Further, in 1962, the Department of Archaeology of the Government of Rajasthan, obtained six coins from Bhairh near Raith in Tonk area, including one coin of Samudragupta, four of Chandragupta II and one of the king Kidāra of the Kushāṇa tribe.⁵

Apart from the evidence discussed above the impact of the Gupta 'classical-culture', especially in the domain of art, religion and socio-economic life, on Rajasthan indirectly suggests that this region like other parts of the vast Gupta empire was included within the Gupta politico-cultural orbit.

The Aulikaras (Varmanas) of Daśapura-Madhyamikā Region

Now let us discuss the history of the tribes of Rajasthan in the Gupta age in some detail. First, the Mālavas. To us it appears that their separate entity in the form of the Mālava Janapada (Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area) was maintained by Samudragupta but a branch of them, the Aulikaras by

1. Cf. *The Researcher*, Vols. XII-XIII, 1972-73, pp. 8 ff (App.).

2. Sharma, D, *RTA*, pp. 63.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. *Loc. cit.*

5. Sharma, G.N., *Rajasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, p. 23; *JNSI*, XXXII, pt. II, pp. 203 ff.

name, was turned into a monarchical state in the southern Rajasthan and Mandasor (ancient Madhyamikā-Daśapura area). For the history of the Gupta age, the Mandasor region which is even now surrounded on three sides by Rajasthan, may be regarded as a part of southern Rajasthan. The inscriptions of the early Aulikaras have been discovered, apart from other places, from Gangdhar¹ in Jhalawar District and of the Later-Aulikaras from Chhoti Sadri² and Chittor³ (ancient Madhyamikā). Apparently, therefore, the Aulikaras may be regarded as a power of southern Rajasthan with their political seat at Mandasor. They were a Mālava dynasty like the Sogins and Mankharis.⁴ According to D.C. Sircar perhaps they were responsible for the name Mālava being applied to Malwa—the wide region of central and western India including Avanti (region round Ujjayini) and Ākara or Daśārṇa (region round Vidiṣā).⁵ However, it would do well to remember that this region came to be known as Malwa only after the seventh century. Under the Guptas the Aulikaras enjoyed more internal independence than other protected states of the empire. They had the privilege of using their own reckoning i.e., the Kṛita era (also known as the Mālava or Vikrama era) in place of the era of their overlord.⁶ The first known ruler of Aulikara family was Jayavarman (360-75) who was succeeded in turn by Śimhavarman (c. 375-395), Naravarman (Known dates 404 and 417), Viśavavarman (known date 423) and Bandhuvavarman (known date 430). According to K.C. Jain Jayavarman seized the territory around Daśapura from

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 399 ff.

2. *EI*, Vol. XXX, pp. 120 ff; *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314 ff.

3. *EI*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 53 ff.

4. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and Vikramāditya Tradition*, p. 11. *PRHC*, Vol. V., 1972, pp. 16 ff.

5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

6. In the Bihar Kotra Stone Inscription of the time of Naravarman this era has been called 'ओलिकरस्य राज्यसंवत्सरे' (the Aulikara era).

Sircar, *SI*, p. 399.

the Śakas sometime during the reign of Mahākshatrapa Rudrasena II (351-364 A.D.).¹ This ruler belongs to the period when reorganisation of North Indian political set up took place under Samudragupta.² As the Varmanas of Assam and the Pāṇḍavas, Parivrājakas and Uchchakalpas of Bundelkhand—Baghelkhand began their career precisely³ in this period it may be reasonably assumed that Samudragupta followed the policy of appointing his partisans as his subordinate kings in the newly conquered regions and that all these powers, including the Aulikaras, owed their political emergence to the Gupta emperor. Jayavarman was succeeded by Simhavarman.⁴ He was identified by some earlier historians such as H.P. Shastri,⁵ V. Smith⁶ and R D. Banerji⁷ with Simhavarman, the father of Chandravarman of the Susunia inscription⁸ (West Bengal) who has been described in this record as the ruler of Pushkarāṇa. This place was identified by these scholars with Pushkara, near Ajmer in Rajasthan. Further, they identified Chandravarman of the Susunia inscription with the king Chandra of the Mehrauli Iron Pillar Inscription⁹ and concluded that the Aulikaras became imperial power in the period immediately preceding the rise of the Guptas. But now it has been conclusively established that Chandravarman of the Susunia record had nothing to do with the Aulikaras, and Pushkarāṇa, over which he ruled, was no other than Pokarana situated about twenty miles from Susunia.¹⁰

→ The Aulikara family, however, rose to prominence under Naravarman (known date 404 A.D.),¹¹ the son and successor of

1. Jain, K.C., *Malwa Through the Ages*, p. 251.
2. Mandasor Stone Inscription of the time of Naravarman, Sircar, *SI*, pp. 397 ff.
3. *EI*, XII., pp. 315 ff; XIII., p. 133.
4. *Early History of India*, 307. fn. 1.
5. *The Age of the Imperial Guptas*, p. 10 f.
6. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-52; *EI*, XIII., p. 133.
7. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 283 ff.
8. For a detailed criticism of this theory vide, Sharma, G.R., *IHQ*, XXI, pp. 202. ff.
9. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 397 ff.

Simhavarman, as is indicated by his high sounding epithets like Devendra—Vikrama.¹ He was succeeded by his son Viśvavarman (known date 423 A.D.)² The Gangdhar inscription omits the name of his suzerain and describes him as the bravest among kings.³ This fact and also the use of the Mālava era by the Varmans of Daśapura has led some scholars to believe that the Aulikaras became independent and threw off the yoke of Gupta suzerainty during the reign of Naravarman. While the use of the Gupta era by dynasty did indicate the acceptance by it of the authority of the imperial Guptas, the non-use of the Gupta era or use of a different era did not necessarily mean its independence from their suzerainty. It merely proves the popularity of that particular era in the region. It is significant that even Bandhuvarman, who was definitely subordinate to Kumāragupta I, used the Mālava era also in his Mandasor Stone Inscription.⁴ And if the Mālavas were subordinate to the Guptas in the time of Bandhuvarman what is there to prove that his ancestors enjoyed independent status? On the contrary, the use of the title *Simhavikrāntagāmi* (the follower of Simhavikrānta i.e. Chandragupta II)⁵ and of *Goptā* (which was used for governor in the Gupta administrative terminology)⁶ for Viśvavarman in the Mandasor Stone

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

2. Gangadhar Stone Inscription of Viśvavarman, Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 399 ff.

3. महीनृपतिप्रवीरे

—*Loc. cit.*

4. चतुर्स्समुद्रान्त-विलोल-मेखला

सुमेरु-कलाश-वृहत्पयोधराम् ।

वनान्त-वान्त-स्फुट-पुष्प-हासिनीं

कुमारगुप्ते प्रियवीरं (पृथिवीं) प्रशासति ॥

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 304.

For various views on this problem, cf. Fleet, *CII*, *III*, p. 29 ff.; Bhandarkar, *JBBRAS*, XVII, pt. II, pp. 94 ff.; Jagannath, *JIH*, XVIII, pp. 118 ff.; Sharma, *Dasharatha*, *IC*, VI, p. 110; Majumdar, R.C., *NHIP*, pp. 181 ff.

5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

6. Cf. Verse 7 of the Junagadh record in which Skandagupta claims to have appointed *goptās* in all the *desas* i.e. provinces (*SI*, p. 309).

Inscription¹ of the Mālava years 493 and 529 and the fact that Chandragupta II conquered the Śakas of the Western India (a success which could hardly be accomplished if he did not rule over Malwa) indicate that Daśapura must have been subject to the Gupta authority during the reign of Chandragupta II. And if Naravarman and Viśavarman (contemporaries of Chandragupta II) were subordinate to the imperial authority of the Guptas what is there to assume that Jayavarman and Siṁhavarman were independent rulers? Therefore, to us it appears to be a very reasonable assumption that these rulers were also subordinate to the Gupta authority and Jayavarman, the first king of the dynasty owed his royal glory to the Gupta emperor Samudragupta. ॑

The Yaudheya Region

In the pre-Gupta period the Yaudheyas were the most powerful state in North Rajasthan. Their history and importance during the Scythian period and their subsequent independence have been discussed in the preceding chapter. In the middle of the fourth century A.D. they were also incorporated in the expanding Gupta empire. Their history after their subordination to the Guptas is not known. However, in this connection we would like to draw the attention of the scholars to a very interesting fact. As is well known, a stone inscription of the Yaudheyas has been discovered from Bija-yagadh, about two miles to the south-west of Bayana in the former Bharatpur state of Rajasthan.² It is inscribed in Sanskrit language and from the point of view of script it may be dated c. fourth century A.D.³ It refers to a leader of Yaudheya tribe who was awarded the titles *Mahārāja* and *Mahāsenāpali*

१. समान-धीश्शुक्र-वृहस्पतिभ्यां
ललामभूतो शुचि पार्थिवानाम् ।
रणेषु यः पार्थ-समानकम्भी
वभूव गोप्ता नृप-विश्ववर्मी ॥२४॥

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

2. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 251 f.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 251.

by the republic.¹ His name has unfortunately been lost. Now from this very place, just near the fort wall where the above mentioned Yaudheya inscription was found, an inscription of the king Vishṇuvardhana of the Varika tribe has been discovered.² The epigraph states that the royalty and name of Vishṇuvardhana were well-established and that he had performed the ceremony of *Puṇḍarīka* sacrifice.³ The inscription also records the name of his three immediate ancestors, namely the father Yaśovardhana, the grandfather Yaśorāta and the great-grand-father Vyāghrarāta, though they have not been given any royal titles. According to this document the king Vishṇuvardhana was ruling in the year 428, obviously of the Kṛita-Mālava era,⁴ corresponding to 370-71 A.D. expired or 372-73 A.D. current. In the circumstances, it needs no arguments to prove that Vishṇuvardhana must have been a subordinate ruler under Samudragupta. Bijayagadh area was definitely included in the former Yaudheya state. This place is only two miles away from Bayana where the famous hoard of 1821 Gupta gold coins, the largest ever discovered in the country, was unearthed.⁵ It may, therefore, be concluded that after the submission of the Yaudheyas Samudragupta appointed Vishṇuvardhana as his subordinate in this region. As discussed above, the policy of appointing his partisans over the regions which were brought by him under his control was followed by him, in Kāmarūpa, Bundelkhand-Baghelkhand and Malwa also. It is also quite possible that Varika tribe to which king Vishṇuvardhana belonged was an off-shoot of the Mālava tribe, for he, like the Mālavas, used the Kṛita-Mālava era, performed Vedic sacrifice (so popular among the various branches of the Mālavas)⁶ and himself alongwith his family

1. यौधेयगणपुरस्कृतस्य महाराजमहासेनापते: ।

Fleet, CII, III, p. 251.

2. Fleet., *op. cit.*, pp. 252-254.

3. कृते पुण्डरीके यूपोऽयम्प्रतिष्ठापितः

—*ibid.*, p. 253.

4. Fleet, *Loc. cit.*

5. Altekar, A.S., *The Coinage of the Gupta Empire*, p. 310.

6. Cf. Ch. II.

members bore names popular among the Mālavas.¹ We, however, admit that the Mālava lineage of Vichṇuvardhana, though a possibility un-contradicted by any known fact of history, is yet to be definitely proved.

The Vākāṭaka Invasion of Rajasthan in the Middle of the Fifth Century

Apart from the Mālavas and Yaudheyas the history of any other tribe of Rajasthan enumerated in the *Prayāga pratisasti* (viz., the Ārjunāyanas and the Ābhītas) and the nature of the political set-up which Samudragupta might have created in their territories is not known. Actually the history of Rajasthan during the greater part of the fifth century which saw the high watermark of Gupta imperialism is only cursorily known, though it can hardly be doubted that in the third quarter of this century, i.e. till about the end of the rule of Skandagupta (last known date 467 A.D.) greater part of at least northern, eastern and southern Rajasthan, possibly the western region also, continued to be ruled by local powers which accepted Gupta suzerainty with varying degrees of subordination. But no connected account of their history is available from any source. There is, however, one important event which throws interesting light on the political turmoil in the southern part of Rajasthan. It is the possible invasion of the Vākāṭakas of this area in the early years of the second half of the fifth century A.D. A detailed background of the history of the Gupta-Vākāṭaka relations is, however, necessary to understand the cause and the nature of this invasion.

The Vākāṭaka dynasty of Vidarbha was by far the most important political power of southern India in the Gupta age. During the reign of Pravarasena I (c. 275-335 A.D.)² it became

1. The grandfather of Nandi Soma of the Nandṣa Yupa Inscription (*EI*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 12 ff.) was Prabhūgīra (?) vārdhana. The rulers of the Mandasor in the sixth century A.D. had *Vārdhana* ending names. Viz., Ādityavārdhana, Dravyavārdhana and Viṣhṇuvārdhana.
2. For the chronology of the Vākāṭakas see *NJHP*, pp. 94-95; Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaiśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, pp. 7-10; *IIIQ*, XXIV, pp. 148 ff.

an imperial power. He performed as many as four horse sacrifices.¹ But Rudrasena I, his grandson and successor, was defeated and killed by Samudragupta who incorporated the Vākāṭaka regions north of the Vindhya in his empire.² During the reign of Chandragupta II, the Vākāṭakas became an ally of the Guptas when Prabhāvatī, the daughter of Chandragupta II, was married to Rudrasena II, the grandson of Rudrasena I in c. 380 A.D. As she became a widow quite early in her life and to bear the burden of administration as the regent of her minor sons (one of whom, Divākarasena, died a premature death after the thirteenth year of his reign under the regency of Prabhāvatīguptā),³ the influence of Chandragupta II in the Vākāṭaka court became almost a political hold.⁴ Pravarasena II (the second son of Rudrasena II), who assumed the reins of government in 410 A.D., ruled for about 30 years.⁵ He was a man of amiable disposition and his relations with Kumāragupta I (415-455 A.D.), the step-brother of Prabhāvatī were apparently very cordial.⁶ He was greatly influenced by his mother who was alive at least till his 23rd regnal year⁷ and was apparently very proud of her father's family.⁸ But in the middle of the fifth century, when, on the one hand, Kumāragupta I became very old and

1. अग्निष्टोमप्राप्तोऽयमिक्ष्य-षोडश्यातिरात्र-वाजपेय-वृहस्पति-साद्यस्क-चतुर-
श्वमेध- याजिनः

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 443.

2. The identification of Rudrasena I with Rudrasena of the Prayāga *praśasti* proposed by Jayaswal (*Hist Ind*, pp. 141 ff) and others (Mookerji, R.K., *Gupta Empire*, p. 23; cf. *IHQ*. I, pt. II, p. 254) is doubted by Altekar (*NHIP*, p. 104; *IC*. IX, pp. 99 ff.).
3. Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavarṇīśa kā Itihāsa lathā Abhilekha*, pp. 29-30; Altekar, A.S., *NHIP*, pp. 111-115.
4. *NHIP*, p. 112.
5. Cf. his *Pandhurpā dānaśāsana* of 29th regnal year, (Mirashi *op. cit.*, p. 211).
6. Now more than a dozen grants of Pravarasena II are available but none of them mentions any of his military achievements.
7. Cf. his *Tiroḍī dānapatra* (Mirashi. *op. cit.*, p. 190).
8. Cf. that Prabhāvatī gives genealogy of her father's family in her own records and uses the cognomen-*guptī* even after her marriage.

the burden of the Gupta administration fell on the shoulders of young princes Skandagupta, Purugupta etc., and on the other, Narendrasena (c. 440-460 A.D.), the son of Pravarasena II, became the master of the Vākāṭaka kingdom, the bond of blood relationship between the two royal houses obviously became weaker. It was, therefore, not an unnatural ambition on the part of the Gupta princes to make a fresh attempt to bring the Vākāṭakas within the sphere of their influence. As has been shown in a recent study,¹ the Guptas did it when they gave help to the Nala king Bhavattavarman of South Kosala to invade the Vākāṭakas in that period. As Bhavattavarman, after succeeding in conquering the Vākāṭaka capital itself, retired to Prayāga, the capital of the Guptas,² and as it was probably he who issued the *repoussé* coins bearing the title 'Mahendrāditya' and 'Vikramāditya' (the titles of Kumāragupta I and Skandagupta) and as he was (like Kumāragupta I) a devotee of Kārttikeya and named his son Skandavarman (who became a devotee of lord Vishṇu),³ it needs no further evidence to show that in this period the Nalas were a subordinate ally of the Guptas and they invaded the Vākāṭaka territory with the back-¹¹⁵ and support of their overlords.

But very soon the tables were turned when the foundations of the Gupta empire were shaken by the Hūṇa invasion⁴

1. Goyal, S.R., *HIG*, pp. 258-261.

2. Cf. the Rīthpur plates of Bhīwatiwarman. For the arguments to show that Prayāga and not Pāṭaliputra was the capital of the Imperial Guptas, see Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 41 ff.

3. For a detailed analysis of all these and other additional arguments cf. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 258-261.

4. हूणीर्थस्य समागतस्य समरे दोभ्यां धरा कंपिता भीमावत्तं करस्य

—Verse 8, Bhījari Stone Pillar Inscription, Sircar, *SI.*, p. 323.; आमूल-भग्न-दर्प्पि तिवंचना म्लेच्छदेशेषु

—Junagarh Rock Inscription, Sircar, *ibid.*, p. 309.; cf. also नरपतिमुजगानां मानदर्प्पोत्कणानां प्रतिकृतिगृहानां निविपीं चावकर्त्ता ॥

—Sircar, *ibid.*, p. 308.

and the war of succession broke out between Skandagupta and his rival brothers.¹ Taking advantage of this new situation Narendrasena not only reconquered his lost kingdom but, as is claimed in the Balaghat plates of his son Prithivishena II, imposed his sovereignty over Kosalā, Mekalā and Mālava.² The Kosalā kingdom of this record was obviously the Nāla state. Mekalā, the region situated to the south of the upper courses of Narmada, was ruled over in this period by the Pāñdava king Bharatabala, known from the Bamhani inscription.³ Significantly the Pushyamitras, who according to the Bhītari record created great trouble for Skandagupta,⁴ are said to have been the inhabitants of Mekalā in the *Vishnu Purāṇa*.⁵ Thus, the combined testimony of these sources very strongly suggests that Narendrasena paid the Guptas in their own coins and encouraged Bhāratabala of the Pāñdava dynasty of the Pushyamitras who inhabited Mekalā to carry out raids deep into the Gupta empire.

But from our point of view the most important achievement of Narendrasena was his victory over Mālava Janapada. So far scholars have identified it with Western Mālava. But

1. क्रमेण दुद्धचा निपुणं प्रधार्य घ्यत्वा च कृतस्तान्गुण-दोष-हेतुन् ।

व्यपेत्य सर्वान्मनुजेन्द्रपुत्रान् लक्ष्मीः स्वयं यं वरयांचकार ॥ ५ ॥

—Sircar, *ibid.*, p. 309.

2. कोसलामेकलामालवाधिपतिभिरस्यच्छतशासनस्य

—Mirashi, V.V., *op. cit.*, p. 227.

For details regarding various problems faced by Skandagupta cf., *HIG*, pp. 266-286; 304 ff.

3. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-235.

4. विचलित-कुल-लक्ष्मी-स्तम्भनायोद्यतेन

क्षितितल-शयनीये येन श्रीता त्रियामा

समुदित-वल-कोशान्पुष्यमित्रांश्च जित्वा

क्षितिप-चरणपीठे स्थापितो वाम-पादः ॥ ४ ॥

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

5. *Vishnu Purāṇa*, Wilson's translation, p. 383.

Cf. also Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 568; Jagannath, *IHQ*, XXII, pp. 112 ff; Thakur, U., *IHQ*, XXXVII, pp. 279 ff.

now it has been shown that in the fifth century A. D. Mālava was not as yet known as 'Mālava Janapada'; it was known as Avanti. As we have shown in the preceding chapter, the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region was known as Mālava Janapada in the third century A. D. It had its capital at Mālavanagera, modern Nagar in the Uniyara Tehsil of the former Jaipur state. The find-spots of the coins and inscriptions of the Mālavas in that area prove this point conclusively. The situation apparently did not change in the fifth and sixth centuries. The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, usually assigned to the Gupta age,¹ clearly distinguishes between Mālava and Avanti Janapadas.² In the eyes of Vātsyāyana these were two distinct geographical regions. Secondly, Varāhamihira in his *Bṛihāśāṁhitā*, composed in the sixth century A. D.,³ makes a similar distinction between Avanti and Mālava regions and places the latter in the northern division.⁴ As Varāhamihira himself was an Āvantika i.e. a resident of Avanti, this evidence cannot be lightly brushed aside. Thirdly, in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, the date of which, according to Raychaudhuri, is not far removed from the Later Gupta period, Mālava Janapada was associated with Arbuda or Abu and was different from Avanti.⁵

Thus it is apparent that at least till the sixth century A.D. Mālava-deśa was regarded as different from Malwa or Avanti. The Vākāṭakas themselves were aware of the difference. For in the Ajanta Cave record, Harisheṇa Vākāṭaka claims to have brought Avanti (and not Mālava) under the spheres of his influence.⁶ The combined testimony of the

1. *CA*, p. 324.

2. *Kāmasūtra*, 1.5.22, 24.

3. *CA*, pp. 321-323.

4. Shastri, A.M., *India as Seen in the Bṛihāśāṁhitā*, pp. 4-8, 70 & 80.

5. सौराष्ट्रावन्त्याभीराश्च शूरा अर्द्दसालवा:

—*Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 12.1.38 (Gita press edition)

6. स कुन्तलावन्ति-कलिंग-कीसल-त्रिकूट-लाटान्...

—Mirashi, *Vākāṭaka Rājavāṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, p. 262.

Balaghāt plates¹ of Prīthivisheṇa II (c. 480 A.D.) and the Ajanta Cave Inscription² of Harisheṇa (c. 500 A.D.), when juxtaposed with the contemporary literary evidence noted above, very strongly suggest that the two Vākāṭaka records are referring to two different territories. It may safely be suggested that when Prīthivisheṇa II Vākāṭaka claimed that the commands of his father Narendrasena were obeyed by the rulers of Mālava Janapada,³ he was referring not to Malwa of the medieval records but to the Mālava Janapada i.e., Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region of Rajasthan. During the troubled period of c. 450 to 455 A.D. when Skandagupta's hands were full with the Pushyamitra and Hūṇa invasions and the war of succession, Narendrasena could have proceeded from Mekalā and Bundelkhand (which was ruled by the Uchchakalpas whose king Vyāghra is known to have been a *pādānudhyāta* of Prīthivisheṇa II)⁴ to the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan. Thus this line of enquiry reveals a very important chapter of the history of Rajasthan in the middle of the fifth century A.D. and shows that, at least for some time, this part of the country had to accept the overlordship of the Vākāṭakas of the Deccan. This episode reminds one of the similar adventures of the Rāshṭrakūṭas in Malwa and Rajasthan in the early medieval period.

But the Vākāṭaka domination over the Mālava Janapada of Rajasthan was not destined to last very long. Actually they were not in a position to take advantage of their conquests partly because, like the Sātavāhanas of the earlier period and the Rāshṭrakūṭas of the later epochs, they were too deeply

1. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 224 ff; *El.*, IX, pp. 267 ff; XXII, pp. 207 ff.

2. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 254 ff.

3. वदपूतदंशाक्षियः कोसलामेकलामालवाद्यपतिभिः-
रस्याच्चतशासनस्य

—Balaghāt plates. Mirashi, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

4. दाकाटकातो महाराजश्रीपृथिविषेण-
पादानुध्यातो व्याघ्रदेवो-

—Nachanc-ki-Talai and Ganj Inscriptions, Mirashi,
op. cit., pp. 239 and 241.

involved in the politics of the Deccan to pay much attention to their northern possessions, partly because of the geographical difficulties involved and partly because of their unequal strength in comparison to that of the mighty Guptas who, under Skandagupta, very soon recovered from their temporary difficulties.

From the Mandasor Stone Inscription¹ of Mālava (Vikrama) year 524 (467 A.D.) we learn that a certain king Prabhākara, who defeated the enemies of the Guptas² was ruling over western Malwa and obviously, the adjoining regions of southern Rajasthan. Unfortunately the epigraph neither gives the full name of this ruler nor discloses the identity of his family. It is quite possible that he was not at all connected with the 'Aulikara' or 'Varman' family of Mandasor, the last known member of which viz., Bandhuvarman (known date 436 A.D.)³ or his successor either voluntarily transferred his allegiance from the Guptas to the Vākāṭakas or was forced to accept the overlordship of the latter. In either case it will have to be assumed that Prabhākara, a partisan of the Guptas, succeeded in expelling the aggressive Vākāṭakas from western Malwa and southern Rajasthan. Alternately, it is also possible that the Vākāṭakas ousted the Varmans from western Malwa and southern Rajasthan and Prabhākara (a relation of Bandhuvarman?) succeeded in re-imposing his authority and Gupta suzerainty over his paternal kingdom. It is also not beyond the bounds of possibility that the reference in the Junagarh *praśasti* of Skandagupta⁴ to the hostile kings "who were so many serpents lifting their hoods in pride and arrogance"⁵ includes a reference to the rebellious Varmans,

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 406 ff.

2. गुप्तान्वयारि-द्रुम-घूमकेतुः ।
प्रभाकरो भूमिपतिर्यमेनम् ।

—*ibid.*, p. 408.

3. Mandasor Stone Inscription, Sircar, *ibid.*, pp. 299 ff.

4. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 307 ff.

5. Fleet, *GII*, III, p. 62.

aggressive Vākāṭakas and their supporters. But Skandagupta subdued them¹ with the help of his local representatives (such as Prabhākara) "who were so many Garuḍas".² In any case, it is certain that Prabhākara had succeeded in doing so by 455 A.D. because, according to the Junagarh record in that year, Gupta sovereignty was acknowledged as far as Surāshṭra. Obviously the Varman kingdom situated to the east of Surāshṭra could not have been an independent state at that time.

The Hūṇa invasion : First and second phases

During the middle of the fifth century A.D. the greatest single external danger that threatened the security of the Gupta empire was the invasion of the Hūṇas, a ferocious tribe of Central Asia. The first invasion of this tribe on India took place probably in c. 370 A.D., for now it can be hardly doubted that the Juan-Juan of the Chinese records and the Chionites of the Roman writers, who are said to have invaded Iran in the third century and the Indian borderlands in the fourth century A.D. were no other than the Hephthalite Huns, the Hūṇas of Sanskrit literature.³ They came into India from Bactria or Vāhlīka. Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvamśa*, which was composed in the last decade of the fourth century,⁴ places them in Vāhlīka.⁵ They were obviously also identical with the Vāhlī-

1. नरपतिभुजगानां मानदप्पोत्करणानां

प्रतिकृति-गरुडाजां निविष्टौं चावकत्ती ॥२॥

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

2. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

3. Goyal, *HIQ*, pp. 173-174.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 217 ff. According to this recent study Kālidāsa was patronised both by Samudragupta and Chandragupta II (p. 219).

5. विनीताध्वश्रमास्तस्य वंशुतीरविचेष्टौः ।

दुष्टुवर्जिनः स्कन्धयांत्लग्नकुङ्कुमकेसरान् ॥६७॥

तत्र हूणावरोधानां भर्तृषु व्यक्तविक्रमम् ।

क्षपोलपाटलादेशि वभूव रघुचेष्टिम् ॥६८॥

—*Raghuvamśa*, IV.

kas who were repulsed by the king Chandra,¹ (probably identical with Samudragupta)² of the Meharauli Iron Pillar Inscription. In any case, the fact that the Hephthalite Huns crossed the Hindukush and invaded Peshawar sometime before 400 A.D., has been explicitly mentioned by Fa-hsien.³ But this invasion of the Hūṇas had nothing to do with Rajasthan. However, their second invasion which took place during the last years of the reign of Kumāragupta I, influenced this region at least indirectly. The credit of repulsing these invaders at that time goes to Kumāragupta I's son and successor Skandagupta.⁴ It is generally believed that he defeated the Hūṇa invaders in or shortly after 455 A.D. but before 456 A.D. Now it has been almost established that, on the one hand Kumāragupta I was alive till 455 A.D.⁵ and, on the other, all the major wars of Skanda-

1. तीर्त्वं सप्त मुखानि येन समरे सिन्धोजिज्ञता वाह्निका

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 283.

For the various suggestions regarding the identification of Chandra of the Meharauli inscription vide Seth, H.C., *JIH*, XXVI, pp. 177 ff.; Majumdar, R.C., *JASB (L)* IX, 1943, pp. 179 ff.; *Ancient India*, 1952, p. 246; *CA*, pp. 20 ff.; Shastri, H.P., *EI*, XII., pp. 315; Banerji, R.D., *AIG*, p. 10 f.; Raychaudhuri, H.C. *PHAI*, p. 481; Basak, R.G., *HNEI*, pp. 13 ff.; Hoernle, *IA*, XXI, pp. 43-44; Jayaswal, K.P., *JBORS*, XVIII, pp. 31 ff; Altekar, A.S., *NHIP*, p. 21; Dandekar, R.N., *Hist. Gupt.*, pp. 27 f; Sharma, G.R., *IHQ*, pp. 202 ff.

2. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 201 ff.

3. Giles, H.A., *The Travels of Fa-hsien*, p. 14.

4. हूणेर्यस्य समागतस्य समरे दोभ्यां धरा कंपिता
भीमावर्त्तकरस्य · · · · शत्रुघु शरा · · · ·

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-24.

अपि च जितमेव तेन प्रथयन्ति यशांसि यस्य रिपवोऽपि ।

आमूल-भग्न दर्प्पि निर्वचना म्लेच्छ-देशेषु ॥४॥

—Sircar, *ibid.*, p. 309.

The 'Mlechchhas' of the Junagarh record were identical with the Hūṇas of the Bhitari inscription. They may have advanced into Central India about the end of Kumāragupta's reign (*ibid.*, fn. 3); For details, cf. Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 570; Pande, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, p. 93 fn. 4; Chattopadhyaya, S. *EHNI*, p. 180; Chaudhary, R.K., *JBR*, XLV., p. 117.

5. A silver coin of Kumāragupta I dated G.E. 136 (455 A.D.) was seen by V. Smith (*JASB*, 1894, p. 175).

gupta, including his struggle against the Hūṇas, were fought and won pretty long before the early months of the Gupta year 126 (455 A.D.).¹ It means that the Hūṇas had invaded but were repulsed during the life time of Kumāragupta I and that Skandagupta defeated them, not as ruling sovereign but as a prince only.²

The story of this Hūṇa invasion on the Gupta empire (Rajasthan was included in it at that time) is mainly known from the Bhitari Stone Inscription³ of Skandagupta. But unfortunately it does not give any detail as to the route adopted by the invaders and the place where the Gupta-Hūṇa struggle took place. It is, therefore, very surprising that many scholars have opined, without any proof whatsoever, that the Hūṇas succeeded in penetrating the very heart of the Gupta empire.⁴ As regards Rajasthan⁵ itself, it is almost unanimously believed that this region became the victim of the Hūṇa depredations in this period. Upendra Thakur agrees with this general assumption.⁶ According to Jagannath⁷ the Hūṇas came to India in 455 A.D. via Bolan pass near Quetta and the object of their invasion were Surāshṭra and Malwa from where they advanced towards Rajasthan. He has argued that the Upper Helmand valley was known as Zabulistan, after the term *jabula*, (or *Jabol*) the title of the Hūṇa kings. But it has not yet been conclusively proved that the Hūṇas who gave their name to

1. According to the Junagarh inscription Skandagupta had defeated all of his enemies and appointed Parṇadaita as governor of Surāshṭra before the dam of the Sudarśana lake once again burst its embankment in the early part (in the month of Bhādra) of the year 136 (G.E.).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 194-197.
3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-24.
4. According to R.C. Majumdar 'they advanced still further into the heart of India' (*CA*, p. 26).
cf. Also, Jagannath, *PIHC*, 1940, p. 60; Sharma, D., *IG*, III, pp. 379 ff. For criticism of this view, vide *JBRs*, XLV, 1959, pp. 118-119; Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 286 ff.
5. *Rajasthan Through the Ages*, Vol. I, p. 61.
6. Thakur, Upendra, *The Hūṇas in India*, pp. 93, 112.
7. Jagannath, *PIHC*, 1958, p. 160 f.

this part of the Helmand valley were the same who invaded India during the reign of Skandagupta. On the other hand, the discovery of two short inscriptions from Uruzgan bearing the name of Mihirakula may indicate that this region was conquered by the Hūṇas in the sixth century A.D. The argument that Skandagupta appointed a new governor in Surāshṭra because of the Hūṇa menace¹ is pointless because Skandagupta is said to have appointed new governors in many (lit. 'all') provinces.² So far as the special qualities of Parṇadatta, enumerated in the Junagarh record, are concerned they did not have anything to do with Skandagupta's anxiety regarding the possibility of Hūṇa invasion of western India, because obviously, this description is imaginary and was intended to please Purṇadatta, the hero of the epigraph. After all, how could the poet of this *praśasti* living in Surāshṭra know the chain of thought of the Emperor living far away in the imperial capital? Thus the evidence of the Junagarh inscription does not throw either direct or indirect light on the supposed Hūṇa invasion on Surāshṭra, Malwa and Rajasthan.

Another record which supposedly throws some light on the Hūṇa invasion on Rajasthan is the Mandasor Stone Inscription dated in the Mālava years 493 and 529 (436 and 472 A.D.).³ According to this epigraph the guild of the silk-weavers got a temple of Sun god built at Daśapura in 436 A.D. By the year 472 A.D. 'in the course of a long time, under other kings, the temple was either damaged or had fallen into

1. Sinha, *DKH*, pp. 45-46; Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 309, fn. 6.

2. एवं स जित्वा पृथिवीं समग्रां
भग्नाग्रदर्पा (न्) द्विषतश्च कृत्वा
सर्वेषु देशेषु विघाय गोप्तन्
संचिन्तयामास वहु-प्रकारम् ॥७॥

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 290 ff.

'disrepair',¹ and the same guild got it repaired in that year.² It was to celebrate this achievement that this inscription was engraved. Now this record refers to the king Kumāragupta in such a way that it is not clear whether the author of the record associated him with the earlier date or the later one. There has been therefore, a long controversy regarding the correct interpretation of the relevant passage.³ Without entering into this controversy, with which we are not directly concerned, we submit that the suggestion of B.P. Sinha⁴ on this point seems to be the best. He has argued that as Kumāragupta I was ruling in the year 436 A.D. and Kumāragupta II of the Sarnath Buddhist Stone Image Inscription⁵ was the ruling emperor in the year 473 A.D. (G.E. 154) (he might have been ruling in 473 also), the author of Mandasor records of the silk weavers introduced an element of intelligent imagination by referring to the emperor Kumāragupta only once. Thus this record makes it quite obvious that Gupta sovereignty was acknowledged in southern Rajasthan till at least 472 A.D.⁶ However, in this inscription the period from 436 to 472 A.D. has been described as a time of great disturbances because after referring to Bandhuvarman, who was the local

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 89; Dasaratha Sharma translates the passage—'A part of this building was destroyed (damaged?) by other kings' and takes it as a reference to the Hūna occupation of central India in the reign of Skandagupta (*Ind. Cul.*, III, pp. 379 ff.). But according to D.C. Sircar this 'passage may refer to an attack on Daśapura by hostile kings and not to the occupation of the kingdom by the Hūnas, which probably took place later' (*SI*, p. 306, fn.).

2. बहुना समतीतेन कालेनान्यैच्च पार्थिवैः ।

व्यशीर्यतैकदेशोऽस्य भवनस्य ततोऽधुना ॥३६॥

—Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

3. For various interpretations, cf. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 299 ff; Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 79 ff; Sharma, D., *IC*, III, pp. 379 ff; IV, pp. 110; Jagannath, *JIH*, XVIII, pp. 118 ff; Shastri, R.V., *IC*, IV, pp. 361 ff; Mookerji, D.N., *IC*, V, 331 ff; Majumdar, R.C., *NHIP*, pp. 181-82.

4. Sinha, *DKM*, p. 70.

5. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 328-29.

6. *NHIP*, p., 182.

ruler of this region in 436 A.D., the inscription does not mention his successors. On the other hand, it has been vaguely, though significantly, stated that in this period several kings (the Sanskrit plural implying at least three) ruled whose names have not been given.¹ The reference to the damaged (?) condition of the sun temple has also been taken as an indication of the invasion of outsiders who could have been responsible for this damage. On the basis of these two facts it has been maintained by Dasharatha Sharma² and many others³ that the trouble which this region faced in between 436 and 472 A.D. was caused by the Hūṇa invasion, which is known to have taken place in or shortly before 455 A.D. But available evidence does not prove this point conclusively. The non-mention of the local kings in this record does not have anything to do with the possibility of the invasion of the Hūṇas on Malwa and southern Rajasthan in this period. One of the 'other kings' of this period, who do not find mention by their names in this epigraph, was obviously Prabhākara who was the local ruler of this region in 467 A.D.⁴ He is said to have fought against and driven out the enemies of the Guptas⁵ from this region. These enemies could have been the Vākāṭakas who, as we have already shown earlier, invaded the Mālava Janapada in this period. Thus there is hardly any need to visualise the existence of the Hūṇa kings or their subordinates in this part of the country in the middle of the fifth century. As

1. वहुना समतीतेन कालेनान्यैश्च पात्थिवै...

—Sircar, *SI*, p. 309.

2. *IC*, III, p. 379 ff.

3. Thakur, U., *The Hūṇas in India*; pp. 72-73; Dandekar, R.N., *Hist. Guṇ*, pp. 133-35.

4. Mandasor Stone Inscription of the time of Prabhākara-Mālava year 524, Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 406 ff.

5. गुप्तान्वयारि-द्रूम-धूमकेतुः
प्रभाकरो भूमिपतिर्यमेनम् ।

—Sircar, *ibid.* p. 406.

regards the damage to the Sun temple some scholars including D.C. Sircar¹ maintain that the inscription merely refers to the fact that the temple had fallen into desrepair—something which was quite possible after a lapse of 38 years. Even if it is to be assumed that it was damaged by invaders, where is the necessity to identify them with the Hūṇas in particular? As is well known, the Hūṇas who came with Toramāṇa were not hostile to Hinduism and Toramāṇa himself was, as revealed by his coins, a devout worshipper of the Sun god.² In view of these facts we find it very difficult to believe that any part of Rajasthan was directly invaded or occupied by the Hūṇas in the middle of the fifth century A.D., though, being a part of the Gupta empire, the north-western frontier of which was invaded by this ferocious tribe, it must have felt indirect strains of this invasion.

Rajasthan and the Aulikara (Vardhana) Empire

During the reign of Budhagupta the hold of the emperor over the various provinces became weaker and the Uchchakalpas transferred their allegiance to the Vākāṭakas, as is evident from the Nachne-ki-Talai and Ganj inscriptions³ of Vyāghra who claims to have been a *pādānudhyāta* of Prithivisheṇa II.⁴ In this period the western provinces including West Malwa, Rajasthan and Gujarat also appear to have slipped from the hands of the Guptas. The power which spearheaded this revolt was probably the Vardhana dynasty of Daśapura the kings of which were either descendants of Prabhākara or were responsible for the end of the rule of his dynasty in this region. It is also quite possible that they were the descendants of the earlier Varman family of Mandasor as, like the Varmans,

1. *SI*, p. 306, fn. 2.

2. Thakur, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

3. Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, pp. 239 ff.; *Studies in Indology*, Vol. II, pp. 67 ff.

4. वाकाटकानां महाराजश्रीपृथिविषेण-
पादानुद्यातो व्याघ्रदेवो

—Mirashi, V.V., *Vākāṭaka Rājavaṁśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha*, pp. 239-241.

their family is also said to have been famous for its Aulikara crest.¹

Until recently the history of West Malwa and South Rajasthan from 467 A.D., the date of Prabhākara,² to the year 532 A.D., the date of the Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman-Vishṇuvardhana, was not known.³ It was, therefore, believed that Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana was an upstart and that Western Malwa, Rajasthan and Gujarat continued to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Guptas till his rise.⁴ But now new epigraphic and literary evidence has come to light on the basis of which the history of Rajasthan and the adjoining regions in the first half of the sixth century A.D. may be reconstructed in greater detail. One such inscription is the Mandasor inscription of Mahārāja Gauri of the Mānavayāṇī family.⁵ It refers to one Narendra Ādityavardhana who was apparently the overlord of Gauri. In this record Ādityavardhana is said to have been the conqueror of his enemies whose identity is, however, not disclosed. Another epigraph found from Chhoti Sadri⁶ (near Neemueh) gives the year 547 of apparently Mālava Era (490 A.D.) for Gauri, which may be taken as the date of Ādityavardhana also. Neither of these documents refers to Budhagupta, the contemporary Gupta emperor. It is, therefore, quite possible, though not finally proved, that Ādityavardhana did not acknowledge their suzerainty.

Ādityavardhana was probably succeeded by Dravyavardhana of Avanti mentioned in *Bṛihatsaṃhitā* of Varāhamihira.⁷

1. प्रस्त्रात औलिकर-नाङ्छन श्रात्मवंशो

येनोदितोदितः पदं गमितो गरीयः ॥६॥

—Mandasor Stone Inscription of Yaśodharman-Mālava year 589, Sircar, *SI*, p. 413.

2. Mandasor Stone Inscription-Mālava year 524.

—Sircar, *op. cit.* pp. 406 ff.

3. Sircar, *ibid.*, pp. 411 ff.

4. Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, pp. 62 ff.

5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 410-411; *EI*, pp. 127-132; *XXXIII*, pp. 205 ff.

6. *EI*, XXX, pp. 120-127; *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314 ff.

7. *Bṛihatsaṃhitā*, LXXXVI, 1-4, as quoted by Mirashi, *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314-320; *Studies in Indology*, Vol. I, pp. 206-212; Vol. II, pp. 180-184.

On the one hand, this ruler could not have flourished earlier than the date of Prabhākara, i.e., 467 A.D. and, on the other, he cannot be placed after 587 A.D., the date of the death of Varāhamihira.¹ He may be reasonably placed in the early decades of the sixth century. Thus, now we know about three rulers—Ādityavardhana (known date 490 A.D.), Dravyavardhana (who flourished some time in the first half of the sixth century) and Vishṇuvardhana (known date 532 A.D.)—who ruled over West Malwa and South Rajasthan, who assumed *Vardhana* ending names and ruled almost immediately one after another. Apparently, therefore, they were related to each other. Possibly Dravyavardhana was the successor of Ādityavardhana and Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana was the successor of the former.²

The rulers of the house of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana were very powerful monarchs indeed. They were the overlords of the Maitrakas of Valabhi also, for it cannot be maintained that the rulers of Gujarat continued to accept the suzerainty of the Guptas even when Western Malwa had become independent. Further, it is apparent that the Vardhanas were ruling over the adjoining areas of southern Rajasthan from the time of Ādityavardhana onwards as is proved by the Chhoti Sadri inscription of Gauri.³ During the reign of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana they appear to have become the masters of the greater part of Rajasthan. This is proved by several lines of evidence. Firstly, this ruler claims to have conquered the territory extending upto the Himalayas⁴ (*luhina-sikharīṇa*). It indicates that the region north to the southern

1. Sengupta, P.C., *Ancient Indian Chronology*, p. 276.

2. Mirashi is of the view that Dravyavardhana was probably the father of Vishṇuvardhana.

3. *EI*, XXX, pp. 120 ff.; *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314 ff.

4. आ लौहित्योपकण्ठात्तलवन-गहनोपत्यकादा महेन्द्रा-

दा गद्गादिलष्ट-सानोस्तुहिनशिखरिणः पश्चमादा पयोधे: ।

—Mandasor Stone pillar Inscription,
Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

Rajasthan was included in his empire. Secondly, in his undated Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription¹ it is expressly stated that even *Dhanvan*, i.e. the desert region was included in his empire. Now according to *Amarakosha*² both *Dhanvan* and *Maru* stand for *Marudeśa*, i.e. desert region, Marwar and the region of Thar desert, comprising Jaisalmer, Bikaner, Barmer and Jodhpur districts of modern Rajasthan. The 'Girnar inscription³ of Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman of the year 72 (150 A.D.) also refers to *Maru-Dhanvan*. Thus the reference to the rule of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana over *Dhanvan* clearly indicates the inclusion of *Marudeśa* in his empire. We feel that this line of evidence, to which scholars have not paid much attention so far, is very important for the reconstruction of the history of the Vardhana rule in this part of the country. Thirdly, from the Mandasor stone inscription of M.E. 589⁴ we gather that the region under the control of one of the Rājasthāniyas of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana was bounded by the Arabian Sea, the Vindhya, the Revā or Narmadā and the Pāriyātra or the western Vindhya together with the

1. ये भुक्ता गुप्त-नाथैर्न सकल-वसुधावलान्ति-दृष्ट-प्रतापैन्त्रज्ञा हूणाधिपानां
क्षितिपति-मुकुटाध्यासिनी यान्प्रविष्टा ।
देशांस्ताः धन्व-जैल-द्रुम-श(ग) हन-सरिद्वीरवाहूपगृहान्वीर्यविस्कल्न-राज्ञः
स्व-गृह-परिसरावज्या यो भुनक्ति ॥४॥

—*ibid.*

2. समानौ मरुधन्वानौ

Amarakosha, Kāñḍa II, Bhūmivarga, 5
(Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series ed.)

मरुधन्वमतिकम्य...

—*Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 1.10.35.

According to Monier Williams *Dhanva* (*Dhanvan*) means dry soil or a desert (*A Sanskrit English Dictionary*, p. 509). Perhaps southern part of Marwar was called *Dhanva*. Cf. Ojha, G.G., *The History of Rajputana*, Vol. I, p. 1, fn. 1; Vol. IV, pt. I, p. 1; Rev. B.N. *Mārvarākā Itihāsa*, pt. I, p. 4.

3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 411-417.

Aravalli range.¹ And lastly, it is quite possible that the Later Guptas of the Mālava-Janapada which, as we have shown elsewhere, is to be located in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area, accepted the suzerainty of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana. Thus, almost the whole of Rajasthan, barring perhaps its northern and north-eastern regions, appears to have been under the direct or indirect sway of the Vardhana empire.

The discovery of the two fragmentary inscriptions² from Chitorgarh has thrown more light on the relations of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana with Southern Rajasthan, i.e., Mewar region. These inscriptions have been edited by D.C. Sircar and G.S. Gai. They resemble in script, language and details the Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana of the year 589 M.E. (532 A.D.)³ They have been assigned the first half of the sixth century A.D. In the Mandasor inscription we find a reference to a family of the the Naigamas,⁴ i.e. Vanijas or merchants, whose members served as high dignitaries of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana. The history of this family commenced with one Shashṭhīdatta whose son was Varāhadāsa. The latter was the father or brother of or identical with Ravikīrti. Ravikīrti had three sons : Bhagavaddosha, Abhayadatta, who was the Rājasthāniya of the land bounded by the Vindhya, the Revā, the Pāriyātra and the Sindhu,⁵ and Doshakumbha. The last of them had

1. विन्ध्यस्यावन्ध्य-कम्मर्णियखर-तट-पत्तपाण्डुरेवाम्बुराशे-
गोलाङ्गूलीः सहेल-प्लुति-नमित-तरोः पारियात्रस्य चाद्रेः ।
आ सिन्धोरन्तरालं निज-शुचि-सचिचाध्यासितानेक-देशं
राजस्थानीय-वृत्त्या सुरगुरुरिव यो वर्णनां भूतये (s) पात् ॥६॥

—Mandasor Stone Inscription—Mālava year 589.
Sircar, *SI*, pp. 415-416.

2. *EI*, XXXIV, pp. 53-58.

3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-417.

4. According to *Amarakosha* naigama and vanija are synonyms :
नैगमो वाणिजो वाणिक्... (Kāṇḍa II, Vaiśya Varga, 9.78.).

5. Sircar, *op. cit.*, 415-416.

two sons, Dharmadosha, who succeeded Abhayadatta as Rājasthāniya, and Daksha alias Nirdosha, the hero of the inscription who got a well excavated in the memory of his uncle Abhayadatta in the year 589 M.E. (=532 A.D.) during the reign of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana.

Now, the fragmentary inscriptions from Chitor mentioned above also describe the religious activity of a Rājasthāniya (whose name along with the name of his suzerain has been lost) of Daśapura and Madhyamā, i.e. ancient Madhyamikā in Rajasthan. This Rājasthāniya was the son of Vishṇudatta and the grandson of one Varāha who has been described as best among merchants.¹

The editors of the inscriptions have rightly suggested that the Varāha of the fragmentary Chitor inscriptions is identical with the Varāhadāsa of the Mandasor inscription, for both of them sprang in the families of famous merchants, bore identical names and belonged to the same period and region.²

Thus, it would appear that towards the close of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth century Gauri of the Mānavayāni family who administered over a part of Mewar and Mandasor region was replaced by the members of the Naigama or Vaṇija family of Varāha or Varāhadāsa. Varāha had at least two sons, Vishṇudatta and Ravikīrti. Perhaps the first to become the Rājasthāniya of that region was Vishṇudatta's son, the hero of Chitor epigraphs whose name is not traceable in the fragmentary inscriptions. On his death, his cousin Abhayadatta, the son of Ravikīrti was appointed the Rājasthāniya. He was succeeded by his nephew Dharmadosha, the son of Doshakumbha.

Thus, the combined testimony of the Chhoti Sadri, the Mandasor and the Chitor documents conclusively proves that southern Rajasthan was ruled over by the viceroys of the Varadhanas emperors throughout at least the last decade of the fifth and the early decades of the sixth century A.D. Here it is

1. *The Researcher*, Vol. V-VI, 1964-65, p. 8.

2. *EI*, XXXIV, pp. 55-56.

important to note that Mahārāja Gauri as well as thāniyas of the Mandasor and Chitor inscriptions the Daśapura region also. It means that even the vince of the Vardhana emperors was administered dinate king or Viceroy. It was a significant dep the Gupta administrative conventions where t ruled over the home provinces directly and the of the subordinate rulers and governors was rest frontier regions. This innovation might have been factors which made the Vardhana empire inhe weak and led to its disintegration within a after 532 A.D.

the Rājas-
ruled over
home pro-
by a subor-
arture from
the emperor
ppointment
cted to the
one of the
rently very
short while

Hūṇa Invasion : Third Phase

As we have seen, the second Hūṇa invasion which took place during the early years of the second half of the fifth century A.D., had nothing to do with Rajasthan directly, though as a part of the Gupta empire this region must have felt its indirect repercussions. The detailed history of the activities of the Hūṇas in the North-Western region is not known to us, though the evidence of Sunga-Yun, traveller who visited Gandhāra in 520 A.D., proves the occupation of this region by them two generations before Yun's visit, i.e. in c. 480 A.D. This feat was accomplished by them probably under Toramāṇa or his father. as Chavannes has shown, till the turn of the first decade of the sixth century A.D. the Hūṇas included in the Hūṇa empire.² But in the early beginning of the sixth century A.D., i.e. after Budhagupta, the Gupta empire, which was already suffering from the malady of increasing feudalistic ten

on of India,
ond half of
asthan dire-
region must
d history of
borderlands
ntury is not
the Chinese
es the occup-
e his (Sung-
ccomplished
However,
century no
region) was
years of the
turned their
hey succeed-
alage. In the
the death of
ady suffering
dencies³ and
V ff; XCIX ff.

1. Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, I, pp. X² ff (quoted in

2. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Toukive Occidentaux*, pp 21
NHIP, p. 198, fn. 2).

3. For a detailed analysis of the growth of feudalist
Gupta empire vide Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 295 ff.

Panjab is proved by his Kura Stone Inscription,¹ discovery of the coins from this region² and the testimony of the *Kuvalayamālā* of Udyotanasūri which refers to his rule over Pavvaiyā.³ His occupation of U.P. is proved by the *Kuvalayamālā* which mentions a certain Harigupta born in the Gupta lineage as his *guru*.⁴ This Harigupta has been identified with the Hari-gupta of Pañchāla coins of the sixth century A.D.⁵ Further the discovery of Toramāṇa's coins from U.P. and of his seals from Kauśāmbī⁶ prove that the whole of modern U.P. was occupied by him. His rule over Bihar and Bengal is evidenced by the *Ārya-māñjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*,⁷ the testimony of which is not opposed to any known facts of history.

But what about Rajasthan? Did the Hūṇas under Toramāṇa penetrate Rajasthan also? The evidence at our disposal is not very conclusive. So far no inscription of the Hūṇas themselves has been discovered from this region and the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription⁸ of Yaśodharman-Vishṇuvardhana who was the sovereign of the greater part of Rajasthan in the first half of the sixth century A.D. refers to the Hūṇas in a contemptuous way.⁹ Further, he claims that even the 'famous king Mihirakula, whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 422-424.

2. Chattopadhyaya, S., *Early History of North India*, p. 194, Narain, A.K., *JNSI*, XXIV, pp. 41 ff.

3. *Kuvalayamālā*, quoted in the *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, II, pt. I., p. 84.

4. तस्य गुरु हरिज्ञातो श्रावणियो श्रासि गुत्तवंसाऽमो ।

—*Kuvalayamālā*, quoted in the *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, II, pt. I, p. 84.

5. Mehta, N.C., *JBORS*, XIV, pp. 23 ff; *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 355 ff. Altekar, *Coinage*, pp. 318-321.

6. Sharma, G.R., *Excavations of Kauśāmbī*, 1957-59, p. 15 f.

7. पश्चाद्देशसमायातः हकाराल्यो महान्ृपः

प्राचि दिशिपर्यन्तं गंगातीरमतिष्ठत ॥७६३॥

—quoted from Jayaswal's *Imperial History of India*.

8. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 418-420.

9. *Ibid.*, Verse 4.

Chālukyas of Gujarat under Durlabharāja defeated the Hūṇas when he was returning from a military expedition.¹ Thus it is quite obvious that the Hūṇas were an important factor in the politics of Rajasthan in the early medieval period. This importance could not be achieved without an effective hold over this part of the country by them at least for a brief period. But there is no evidence of a major Hūṇa adventure in India in general and in Rajasthan in particular in the post-Yaśodharā period. Therefore, the importance which they acquired in the socio-political life of this region must have had its origin in their empire-building activities of the first half of the sixth century A.D.

Secondly, there are several indications of the fact that the Hūṇas penetrated Western India including Rajasthan sometimes in this period. These indications assume significance if we remember that they are not known to have launched any massive aggression on our country after the first half of the sixth century A.D., though isolated conflicts of indigo powers with them are on record in the post-Gupta period. Therefore, all the evidence which suggests substantial movements of the Hūṇas must relate to their invasion of either the middle of the fifth century or of the first half of the sixth century A.D., preferably the latter. Now, in their invasions the Hūṇas were not successful and were repulsed by Skandagupta probably before they could cross the north-western frontiers or immediately afterwards. Therefore, whatever evidence we have at our disposal regarding the successes in Western India may, with some degree of probability, be ascribed to Toramāṇa and Mihirakula. In this connection we would first draw the attention of scholars to the testimony of the Jaina author Somadeva Sūri, who flourished in the tenth century A.D. In his work *Nīlivākyāmrīta*,

1. Thakur, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

2. श्रूयते हि किल हूणाधिपतिः पण्यपुटवाहिभिः
सुभट्टैश्चत्रकूटं जग्राह...

—*Nīlivākyāmrīta*, p. 79 (Bombay edition).

referred to a tradition which says that a Hūṇa king (obviously Mihirakula) had conquered Chitrakūṭa. Some scholars have identified this place with the place of the same name, situated on the bank of the river Mandākini (Payasvani) near Karvi, a town of district Banda in U.P.¹ But we feel that it is better to identify this place with Chitor (ancient Madhyamikā) which was also famous as Chitrakūṭa. For example, the Udaipur inscription of the time of Guhila Rājamalla of V.S. 1515 (1488 A.D.)² speaks of Arisirīha as having given up his life in the protection of Chitrakūṭa (Chitor). There are host of other such references which prove that Chitor was famous as Chitrakūṭa in ancient and early medieval periods.³ A more positive evidence of the incursion of the Hūṇas into Rajasthan is provided by the Bhimchauri inscription of Kota region in which one Dhruvasvāmī, whose name is written in the Gupta script, is said to have fallen fighting against the Hūṇa army.⁴ Thirdly, the numismatic evidence of the association of the Hūṇas

1. Thakur, U., *op. cit.*, p. 136 and fn. 1., cf. Chaudhary, R.K., *JBRS*, XLV, 1959, p. 118, fn. 37.
2. Cf. *Bhandarkar's List.*, No. 862.
3. —Bonai grant (*JBORS*, XVI, p. 241) refers to Buddhist Mayūravatīśa which originally came from the Chitrakūṭa mountain.
—Haribhadra Sūri, who propagated Jainism in the eighth century A.D. was a priest of Jitāti, a ruler of Chitrakūṭa (*Purātanaprabandha Saṅgraha*, pp. 103 ff., ed. by Jinavijaya Muni, Calcutta, 1938).
—Benaras copper Plate of the Kalachuri Karṇa refers to Harsha Guhila as 'Chitrakūṭa bhūpāla' (*EI*, II, p. 336).
—Radhanpur and Waṇi grant of Rāshbṛṭa-kūṭa Govinda III refer to Chitrakūṭa (*EI*, VI, p. 248).
—The 'Chitrakūṭya śīlā, liṭa' is mentioned in an inscription dated V.S. 1221 of the temple of Pārśvanātha at Phalodhi (*Prāchīna Lekha Saṅgraha*, No. 21).
—Jinavallabha propagated Vidhimārga from Chitrakūṭa in the early twelfth century. (Jain, K.C., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, p. 231).
—A Chitor Inscription of 1278 A.D. refers to Tejasirīha as the lord of Chitrakūṭa (*Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer*, 1923, No. 8, p. 3).
—Rishivardhana Sūri composed Naladamayantīrāṣa in 1455 A.D. at Chitrakūṭa-giri (*Jaina Gurjara Kaviyom* by M.D. Desai, p. 48; cf. Jain, K.C.; *op. cit.*, p. 233).
4. Sharma, D., *RTA*, p. 61.

with Rajasthan is also quite strong. As is well known, the coins of the Hūṇas have been discovered from a large number of ancient sites of this region.¹ Somewhere in Marwar a hoard consisting of 175 Indo-Sassanian coins belonging to the Sassanian Bust type of Toramāṇa were discovered and examined by Hoernle. The obverse device of these coins bore the king's bust to right and the reverse that of a fire-altar with supporters.² Hoernle has assigned all these coins to Toramāṇa.³ Further a smaller class of copper coins bearing king's head of Sassanian type on the obverse and a Chakra or Sun-wheel on the reverse with the legend Tora or with the name of Zobola or Jabula have been assigned to Toramāṇa. They were discovered in Eastern Panjab and Rajputana.⁴ Abaneri, Khoh, Raniyawas, Khejroli, Losal (Distt. Sikar), Sambhar, Desuri, Nagor, Jalor, Cholitan, Sardargarh, Piplaj, Saira-Ranakpur Road, Junakheda (Distt. Jhalawar) and Mewar have also yielded silver and copper coins of the later Hūṇas in large numbers.⁵ According to Disalkar the famous Galhia (Gadhiyā) coins of the Hūṇas were nothing more than a rude imitation of the Sassanian and local Indian coinage.⁶ As many as 3871 Silver and copper Gadhiyā coins of three varieties were found in different sites of Rajputana, they were obviously current in this part of the country from the beginning of the seventh to the close of the eleventh century.⁷ Thus it is quite apparent that the Hūṇas were remembered by the subsequent Indian dynasties through their imitations of Hūṇa coinage, the specimens of which are found all over Rajasthan. This was not

1. Hoernle, *PASB*, 1889, p. 229.

2. Thakur, U., *op. cit.*, p. 283.

3. Hoernle, *op. cit.*

4. Thakur, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-86.

5. Parmar, B.S., *The Researcher*, Vols. XII-XIII, 1972-73, pp. 12-13 (App.).

6. *JNSI*, XIII, pp. 66 ff.

7. Reu, B.N., *Coins of Marwar*, preface; p. 8; cf. Webb, *Currencies of the Hindu States of Rajputana*, pp. 4-5; *Bibliography of Indian coins*, pt. I, pp. 88-89; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, pp. 133-34; *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pp. 25-26.

possible if the Hūṇas did not have at least indirect sway over this part of the country for sometime in the post-Gupta period.

The most remarkable and conclusive evidence of the Hūṇa activities in Rajasthan is provided by the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription¹ of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana. As we have noted above Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana established a very extensive empire which included not only West Malwa but almost the whole of Rajasthan and Surāshṭra. As we have shown in the next Chapter even the Maukharis of Kanauj acknowledged the suzerainty of the Vardhana emperor till the middle of the sixth century A.D. They were not, as is generally believed, the feudatories of the Gupta emperors. Now in the undated Stone pillar inscription emperor Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana refers to the Hūṇas in a very contemptuous way² claiming that his commands were obeyed in those regions also which were not subjugated even by the Hūṇas.³ But more than this, he claims that Mihirakula, who had not bowed his head before any one except Lord Sthāṇu (Śiva), was compelled by him to pay homage to his feet.⁴ In other words, Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana clearly claims that he vanquished the Hūṇa tyrant who by that time had not tasted the bitter fruit of defeat at the hands of any one else. It is thus obvious that Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana either expelled Mihirakula from those regions of the Vardhana empire which had been conquered by Toramāṇa or successfully repulsed the advance of Mihirakula from the Panjab, Haryana and U.P. into Rajasthan and Malwa. In any case it means that Rajasthan had to face the invasion of Hūṇas under Mihirakula.

The struggle of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana against Mihirakula poses several problems for historians. Firstly, there is the question of the chronological sequence of the wars which

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 418 ff.

2. Verse, 6.; *ibid.*, p. 419.

3. Verse, 4, *loc. cit.*

4. Verse, 6, *loc. cit.*, fn. 4.

were fought by Narasimha-gupta II Bālāditya, the contemporary Gupta emperor¹ and Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana against the Hūṇas. According to the testimony of Yuan Chwang when “Bālādityarāja, king of Magadha...heard of the cruel persecution and atrocities of Mihirakula...he...refused to pay tribute”,² consequently, Mihirakula launched a punitive expedition against Bālādityarāja who fled into the marshes in jungles, “to conceal his poor person”. But the invader was captured,³ obviously by the feudatories and generals of the Gupta emperor. However, at the intercession of his mother Bālāditya-rāja freed the Hūṇa tyrant in order to inculcate the virtue of forgiveness, “gave him in marriage to a young maiden and treated him with extreme courtesy. Then he assembled the troops he had left and added a guard to escort him from the island.”⁴ After this misadventure Mihirakula, who could not return to his parental kingdom of Gandhāra because of the revolt of his own brother there, took shelter in Kashmir which he occupied after murdering its ruler treacherously.⁵ Thus according to the Chinese traveller the power of the Hūṇas in India under Mihirakula was completely broken by Bālāditya. On the other hand the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription⁶ of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana states that the Mālava emperor compelled Mihirakula “whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save the god Sthāṇu”⁷ to pay homage to his feet. It means that before his defeat at the hands of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana, Mihirakula had not been defeated by any body including the Gupta emperor. It creates the interesting

1. As mentioned above, in this chapter we have accepted Goyal's reconstruction of the later imperial Gupta genealogy and chronology. According to this reconstruction the Gupta contemporary of Mihirakula was Narasimha-gupta II who was different from Narasimha-gupta I, the successor of Skandagupta (*HIG*, pp. 341 ff. 370 ff.)

2. Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, I, pp. 168-71.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. *Loc. cit.*

5. *Loc. cit.*

6. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 418 ff.

7. *Ibid.* p. 419, fn. 4.

problem of determining the Chronological sequence of these two Hūṇa wars. Smith believed that Yaśodharman and Narasiṁhagupta formed an alliance against Mihirakula.¹ Later on, however, he came to the conclusion that Indian princes formed a confederacy against the Hūṇas under the leadership of Yaśodharman.² But as pointed out by Allan³ these suggestions of Smith are against both of our authorities, Yuan-Chwang and the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription. Fleet expressed the opinion that Mihirakula was defeated by Bālādityarāja in the east and Yaśodharman in the West.⁴ Sinha has suggested that Bālāditya vanquished Mihirakula earlier while Yaśodharman achieved thefeat later in the north.⁵ These suggestions are also not in consonancy with the testimony of Yuan Chwang and the Mandasor inscription. Yet another suggestion adumbrated by Hoernle⁶ and developed by Goyal⁷ is that Yaśodharman was a feudal chief of Narasiṁhagupta II and was perhaps responsible for the capture of Mihirakula in the Gupta-Hūṇa struggle. But later on 'when he became an independent sovereign and carried his victorious arms even against the Guptas, he construed his victory over Mihirakula as an independent conquest.'⁸ But the suggestion of Hoernle and Goyal is hardly tenable. For, as Goyal⁹ has himself admitted, the Vardhanas had already emerged as an imperial power in Western India towards the close of the fifth century under Ādityavardhana (known date 490 A.D.) and Dravyavardhana (known from the *Bṛhat-saṁhitā* of Varāhamihira), who was probably the successor of Ādityavardhana and predecessor of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana as is apparent from the imperial epithet *Mahārājādhīrāja* of the latter. Here

1. Smith, V., *EHI*, 3rd., ed., p. 206.

2. *Ibid.*, 4th ed., p. 337.

3. Allan, J., *BMC, GD*, p. Lix.

4. Fleet, J.F., *IA*, 1869, p. 228.

5. Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, pp. 107 ff., cf. Raychaudhuri, H.C., *PHAI*, p. 596, fn. 3.

6. *JASB*, LVIII, pt. I, p. 90.

7. *HIG*, p. 351.

8. *Loc. cit.*

9. *HIG*, pp. 361-62.

it is also interesting to note that the Mandasor Stone Inscription¹ of 532 A.D. clearly mentions that the ministerial family which was responsible for engraving this record had served the predecessors of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana for several generations² implying thereby that Yaśodharman himself was not an upstart and his career was not as meteoric as is generally believed. We, therefore, agree with Heras³ and Majumdar⁴ who have opined that Mihirakula was defeated first by Yaśodharman earlier than his final defeat at the hands of the Gupta emperor Bālādityarāja. Against this assumption it has been argued that it would⁵ imply⁶ that Mihirakula re-imposed his authority in the interior of India up to Magadha sometime after the collapse of Yaśodharman's power. But the available evidence does not warrant such an assumption. It is not at all necessary to assume that Yaśodharman broke the power of Mihirakula completely so that the latter had to reimpose his authority in the interior⁷ of India. It is equally possible that Yaśodharman merely stopped the advance of Mihirakula into Rajasthan or, what is more likely, expelled the Hūṇas from this region when they advanced as far as Chitrakūṭa (Chitor) probably during their punitive expedition against Bālādityarāja. In other words, the Vardhana-Hūṇa and Gupta-Hūṇa conflicts were the two phases of the same battle though the enemies of the Hūṇas in them were different and their war against the Vardhanas took place somewhat earlier than their war against Narasimhagupta Bālādiya. Thus we conclude that there is no inherent difficulty in accepting the testimonies of Yuan-Chwang and Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription literally.

Let us now try to determine the date of Hūṇa invasion of Rajasthan. In this connection the testimonies of Sung—Yun.⁵ Yuann—Chwang⁶ and the Mandasor Stone Inscription⁷ (date

1. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 411-417.

2. *Loc. cit.*

3. Heras, H., *IHQ*, III, pp. 1 ff.

4. Majumdar, R.C., *NHIP*, pp. 199 ff.

5. Beal, S., *op. cit.*, I. pp. XV, ff. XCIX, ff.

6. Beal, *ibid.*, pp. 168 ff.

7. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 411 ff.

Mālava era 589=532 A.D.) of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana, when taken together, provide an interesting clue. Sung-Yun, the Chinese traveller, who was in Gandhāra in 520 A.D., informs us that Mihirakula 'had entered on a war with the country of Ki-pin (Kashmir)... and his troops had been already engaged in it for three years'.¹ It means this Kashmir war of the Hūṇa monarch lasted at least from 518 to 520 A.D. It must have been different from the 'treacherous' occupation of Kashmir by him referred to by Yuan Chwang. For, according to Sung Yun, when he visited Gandhāra Mihirakula was the master of India and was trying to conquer Kashmir with his base in Gandhāra while his activities in Kashmir as mentioned by Yuan Chwang took place when he had lost his hold over India proper and had been ousted from Gandhāra by his brother. Later on, Mihirakula occupied Kashmir by treachery, obviously taking advantage of his earlier relation with the Kashmir king. Thus, it is quite apparent that Mihirakula conquered Kashmir militarily shortly after 520 A.D. Now, in his Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription Yaśodharman states that before his victory over Mihirakula, the latter had falsified the pride of the Himalayas 'on being styled as an inaccessible fortress'.² It is obviously a reference to the Kashmir conquest of Mihirakula. We may, therefore, conclude that the Hūṇa invasion of Rajasthan took place some time after 520 A.D. The upper limit of this event cannot go beyond 532 A.D. (the known date of Yaśodharman). We may therefore, conclude that Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana's victory over Mihirakula took place definitely after 520 A.D. but before 532 A.D. It is quite likely that it took place between 527, the probable date of the Gwalior inscription of Mihira-

1. Beal, *op. cit.*, I, pp. XV. ff; XCIX, ff.

2. स्थाणोर्यत्त्र येन प्रणति-कृपणतां प्रापितं नोत्तमाङ्गं-यस्याक्षिलष्टो भुजाभ्यां वहति हिमगिरिर्द्धुं-शब्दाभिमानम् ।
नीचैस्तेनापि यस्य प्रणति-भुजबलावज्जनं-विलष्टमूर्द्धा-चूडा-पुष्पोपहारे-
मिमहिर-कुल-नृपेणाच्चितं पाद-युथमम् ॥६॥

kula and 532, the date of the Mandasor record of Yaśodharman.

In his war against the Hūṇas Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana was probably helped by the Maukharīs of Kanauj. The Maukharī royal house came into existence towards the close of the fifth century A.D. Its early history is revealed by the fragmentary Jaunpur Stone Inscription,¹ probably of Īśvaravarman, the third ruler of the dynasty, the Haraha Stone Inscription of Īśānavarman² (dated 553-54 A.D.), the son of Īśvaravarman and the Aphysad Stone Inscription³ of Ādityasena of the Later Gupta dynasty. According to the Jaunpur inscription Īśvaravarman, who flourished between 520 and 540 A.D., removed the obstacles created by the cruel people in the general happiness of the people.⁴ In the present state of our knowledge these cruel people may easily be identified with the Hūṇas. The assumption becomes almost a fact when we find that in the Aphysad inscription of Ādityasena, the army of the Maukharīs which fought against the Later Guptas during the reigns of Kumāragupta the contemporary of Īśānavarman and Dāmodaragupta, the son of Kumāragupta is described as the one which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūṇas.⁵ Thus it would seem that the Maukharīs who were subordinate to some imperial power had fought against the Hūṇas, obviously as a subordinate ally of their overlord. This is generally assumed that till the middle of the sixth century A.D., the Later Guptas and the Maukharīs both acknowledged the suzerainty of the imperial Guptas. But as we have shown elsewhere,⁶ the imperial power to which these two dynasties owed their allegiance was that of the Vardhanas of Malwa and Rajasthan. We, therefore, conclude that the Maukharīs were one of the feudatories of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana who helped their overlord in the Hūṇa war.

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 228 ff.

2. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 385 ff.

3. Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 200 ff.

4. Jaunpur Ins. Line 5, Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 230.

5. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

6. Cf. next Chapter.

Hūṇa invasion of Rajasthan was an event of momentous importance. Alongwith other parts of the country they left their deep imprint on the life of the people of this region also. Firstly, they disturbed, at least temporarily, the stability of the Vardhana empire. As is evident from the Mandasor inscription, Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana succeeded in expelling them from Rajasthan and Malwa, but it is quite possible that their penetration upto Chitrakūṭa (Chitor) shook the very foundations of the nascent Vardhana empire just as it has shaken the Gupta empire to its roots. That may partially explain the sudden collapse and disappearance of the Vardhana empire in the middle of the sixth century A.D.

Secondly, the Hūṇa invasion gave an opportunity to the local powers of Rajasthan to fish in the troubled waters. The process of disintegration which the Hūṇas set in was taken advantage of by the Later Guptas of the Mālava Janapada of Rajasthan and the Maukhari's of Kanauj who, as we have shown elsewhere,¹ were both subordinate to the Vardhana emperor. With the fall of the Vardhanas, a clash between these two dynasties became inevitable.²

According to some scholars, the Hūṇa invasion of Rajasthan "dealt a death-blow to the none-too-prosperous Indian republicanism which till then survived like an oasis in the vast imperial desert. The Hūṇa invasion engulfed the heroic Mālavas; they were wiped off the map of India, and by the middle of the fifth century A.D. these republics had disappeared from the Indian scene. The Yaudheyas alongwith the Kuṇindas, the Ambashṭhas and others vanished in the air...."³ This view implies that the republican tribes of Rajasthan were in a flourishing state till they were uprooted by the Hūṇas. But there is absolutely no evidence to show that they had survived as *republics* in the two centuries of the Gupta rule, while the history of the Vardhana empire outlined above clearly implies that they had ceased to exist when the Vardhanas redrew the political map of Malwa and Rajasthan.

1. Cf. next Chapter.

2. Cf. next Chapter.

3. Thakur, U, *op. cit.*, p. 232;
cf. Altekar, *NHIP*, p. 35-6.

CHAPTER IV

RAJASTHAN IN THE MAUKHARI- VARDHANA AGE

The later Guptas of Rajasthan

The mighty empire of the Aulikara (Vardhana) dynasty of Daśapura, which dominated the political scene of northern India in the second quarter of the sixth century, disintegrated soon after the death of Yaśodharman. No successor of Yaśodharman is definitely known to history. According to some scholars, he was succeeded by Mahārājādhirāja Dravyavardhana whose work on *śakunas* was utilised by Varāhamihira. Although this is not altogether impossible, it appears unlikely that Varāhamihira who died in 587 A.D.¹ could use in his *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* a work composed in the middle of the sixth century. We, therefore, feel that Dravyavardhana ruled earlier, and not later than Yaśodharman.² However, even if Dravyavardhana was not the successor of Yaśodharman it may easily be assumed that the latter was succeeded by either his son or brother or some one else, who is not known to us so far. But this unknown monarch could have hardly ruled for an appreciably long time, since the Vardhanas are not known to have played any role whatsoever in the struggle of the imperial supremacy which took place between the Later Guptas and the Maukharis. As a matter of fact in the southern part of central Rajasthan, the Vardhanas appear to have been supplanted by the Later Guptas themselves. We support the

1. Sengupta, P.C., *Ancient Indian Chronology*, p. 276. According to Āmarāja, the commentator of Brahmagupta's *Khaṇḍakhādyaka*. Varāhamihira died in the Śaka year 509 (=587 A.D.) while according to Alberuni the *Puñchasiddhāntikā* of Varāhamihira was composed in 505 A.D. (cf. Shastri, A.M., *India as Seen in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, pp. 4 ff.).
2. According to V.V. Mirashi (*PIGG*, 1957 pp. 101-106 : *IHQ*, XXXIII, pp. 314-20) Dravyavardhana was the predecessor, probably father, of Yaśodharman.

contention that the Later Gupta dynasty originally belonged to the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan and initially owed allegiance to the Vardhana dynasty of Yaśodharman, though later on, it became independent and tried to step into the shoes of the Vardhanas as an imperial power. It led to the beginning of its long-drawn struggle against the Maukhars of Kanauj which has been so vividly described in the Aphysad inscription of Ādityasena.¹ But before we discuss the career of the Later Guptas in detail it is essential to discuss the problem of their original home in brief in order to determine their association with Rajasthan.

The location of the original home of the Later Guptas is one of the most controversial problems of ancient Indian history. The early history of this dynasty is known only from its later inscriptions of the post-Harsha period which have been discovered from Magadha, namely the Aphysad,² Shahpur³ and Mandor⁴ inscriptions of Ādityasena, the Magraon⁵ and Kauleśvari Hill inscription of Vishṇugupta⁶ and the Deo-Baranark inscription of Jīvitagupta II.⁷ The find-spots of these records make it certain that from Ādityasena down to Jīvitagupta II Magadha formed the core of the Later Gupta kingdom. It naturally leads to the presumption that the predecessors of Ādityasena were the rulers of the same region unless it can be otherwise proved. Therefore, J.F. Fleet,⁸ R.C. Majumdar,⁹ R.D. Banerji,¹⁰ B.P. Sinha¹¹ and many others assume that the Later Gupta dynasty originated in Magadha. It has also been argued by these historians that the victories of Jīvitagupta I (which we shall discuss below) over some Himalayan tribes and over his enemies living on the sea-shore as well as the

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 200 ff.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 200 ff.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 208 ff.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 211 ff.

5. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 26 ff.

6. *EI*, XXX, 78 ff.

7. Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 ff.

8. *Ibid.*, Intro., p. 4.

9. *NHIP*, pp. 208-9.

10. *JBORS*, XIV, p. 254.

11. *DKM*, pp. 113 ff.

Kāmarūpa expedition of Mahāsenagupta, the grand-father of Ādityasena suggest that the Later Guptas ruled in the neighbourhood of the Bengal sea-shore, the Himalayas and Assam. The theory that the Later Guptas originally belonged to Magadha fits with this conclusion well.

However, another school of historians does not agree with this suggestion. It has pointed out that the discovery of the Later Gupta inscriptions of the post-Harsha period merely proves that Ādityasena and his successors were the kings of that region : it does not prove that the predecessors of Ādityasena also ruled over the same area. On the other hand, the testimony of the *Harsha Charita* of Bāṇa makes it certain that Mahāsenagupta, the grand-father of Ādityasena and the father of Mādhavagupta was known to the poet as the ruler of the Mālava kingdom. In his work Bāṇa informs us that Mādhavagupta, whom he describes as a constant companion of Harsha, was the son of the Mālava king.¹ As in his aphysad record, Mādhavagupta, the father of Ādityasena, is also said to have always been desirous of the company of Harsha.² It is almost unanimously believed that Mādhavagupta of the *Harsha Charita* is identical with the Mādhavagupta of the Aphysad record.³ Thus the testimony of Bāṇa proves that prior to their occupation of Magadha the Later Guptas ruled over the Mālava janapada. Therefore, Hoernle,⁴ Raychaudhuri,⁵ Vaidya,⁶ Pires⁷

1. ...मालव्यराजपुत्रो भ्रातरो भुजाविव मे
षरीरादव्यतिरिक्तो कुमारगुप्तमाघवगुप्तनामा-
नावस्माभिर्भवतोरनुचरत्वार्थमिमो निर्दिष्टौ ।

Harsha-Charitam, IV, pp. 235-39,
(Chaukhamba Vidyabhavan edition) ~

2. श्रीहर्षदेवनिजसंगमवाच्छया.....
Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

3. R.D. Banerji, (*JBORS*, XIV, p. 254) doubted this identification but as Raychaudhuri (*PHAI*, p. 623) has very aptly remarked, Harsha could hardly have been on very friendly terms with two persons having the same name Mādhavagupta.

4. Hoernle, *JRAS*, 1904. p. 551.

5. *PHAI*, p. 623.

6. *History of Medieval Hindu India*, I, p. 24.

7. *The Maukharts*, p. 59.

and Mookerjee¹ locate the original kingdom of the Later Guptas in Malwa.

The argument of Hoernle, Raychaudhuri and their supporters is certainly very forceful. But they have not identified the Mālava janapada of Mahāsenagupta correctly. In the early Medieval period the name Mālava was certainly used for modern Malwa i.e. Vidiśā-Avanti region, but in the Gupta age Vidiśā-Avanti region was yet to acquire this name.² Further, in the first half of the sixth century, western Malwa was the centre of the imperial power of Yaśodharman. It is, therefore, generally believed the Mālava janapada of Mahāsenagupta should be located in eastern Malwa.³ This view rests upon the evidence of Yaśodhara, the author of the *Jayamangalā* commentary on the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana. He states that Ujjayinī denotes western Malwa and where only Mālava is mentioned it should be taken to mean eastern Malwa.⁴ So far nobody seems to have doubted this conclusion. But according to Goyal there are reasons to believe that the statement of Yaśodhara who flourished in the thirteenth century⁵ cannot be applied to the sixth century A.D.⁶ His arguments may be summarized as follows :

(i) The Mālavas, who originally lived in the Panjab, settled down in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region of Rajasthan in the early Śunga period and are known to have been in occupation of that region at least till the rise of Samudragupta when they were forced to accept Gupta overlordship. They are also known to

1. *Harsha*, pp. 53-56.

2. In his *Kādambarī*, Bāṇa has no doubt referred to the women of Ujjayinī as Mālavīs. But it is an isolated reference; no other references of pre-Paramāra period mentioning the Avanti region as Mālava janapada are known to history.

3. For a detail analysis of this view, vide, Law, B.C., *Ancient Indian Tribes*, II, p. 41; Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, p. 532 fn. 5; Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kurauj*, p. 43 and Sircar, D.C., *JASB (L)*, XI, pp. 69 ff.

4. *Kāmasūtra* (D.D. Shastri ed.) p. 288.

5. Keith, A.B., *History of Sanskrit Literature* (Hindi ed.), p. 550.

6. Goyal, *PRHG*, V, 1972, p. 25.

have founded a city named Mālavanagara in this area. Thus till the early Gupta period the Mālava janapada denoted Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area of Rajasthan and not western Malwa which became famous by this name in the Paramāra period.

- (ii) The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana usually assigned to the Gupta age, quite clearly differentiates between Avanti (western Malwa) and Mālava janapada.¹ It is only his commentator Yaśodhara who states that Avanti denoted western Malwa, evidently here Yaśodhara has explained the statement of the *Kāmasūtra* in the light of the situation prevailing in his own days ; it has nothing to do with the situation of the Gupta age when the *Kāmasūtra* was composed.
- (iii) The evidence of Vātsyāyana is supported by the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*² in which Mālava country is associated with Arbuda or Abu and is distinguished from Avanti.
- (iv) Varāhamihira, who flourished in the sixth century A.D. and died in 587 A.D. (i.e. in the age of the Later Guptas themselves), in his *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* also distinguishes between Mālava and Avanti *deśas* and places the former in the northern division.³ As Varāhamihira was himself an inhabitant of Avanti⁴ his testimony cannot be lightly brushed aside.

From these arguments given by Goyal it is apparent that in the sixth century A.D. when the Later Guptas flourished, Mālava janapada was located in Rajasthan and Avanti had not acquired this name. Even Yuan Chwang was aware of this difference between the kingdoms of Ujjayinī and Mo-la-po, though his description⁵ leaves the location of the latter somewhat uncertain.

1. *Kāmasūtra*, 2.5.22 and 24.

2. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 12.1.38 (Gita Press edition).

3. Shastri, A.M., *India as seen in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, pp. 70 and 80.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

5. Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, II, pp. 242 and 250.

The conclusion that the Mālava janapada of the Later Guptas should be located in the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area of Rajasthan is strongly corroborated by the history of this dynasty. As is quite well-known, the history of the Later Gupta dynasty was intimately connected with the history of the Maukhars of Kanauj. During the first phase of their history the Later Guptas and Maukhars were on friendly terms with each other and at least once, and probably twice, they cemented their friendship with the bond of matrimonial alliance. In the Later Gupta dynasty Kṛishṇagupta, the founder of the family, was succeeded in turn by Harshagupta, Jīvitagupta I, Kumāragupta, Dāmodargupta and Mahāsenagupta, the father of Mādhavagupta, while in the Maukhari family the successors of Harivarman, the first king of the dynasty, were Ādityavarman, Iśvaravarman, Iśānavarman, Śarvavarman, Avantivarman, and Grahavarman, the brother-in-law of Harsha. Now from the Maukhari records we learn that Ādityavarman, the second Maukhari king, had Harshaguptā as his queen who was evidently the sister of Harshagupta, the second Later Gupta ruler.¹ Iśvaravarman, the son of Ādityavarman was also married to a Gupta princess named Upaguptā, whose Later Gupta origin is however uncertain.² In any case these facts tend to indicate that the early kings of both these dynasties were on friendly terms with each other.

The friendly relations of both the royal houses were also political in nature. This becomes evident by an analysis of their respective achievements against the background of contemporary political condition. It is generally believed that the early members of these royal houses owed allegiance to the imperial Guptas.³ We beg to differ; for the period when these

1. Fleet *CII*, III, 220.

2. *Loc. cit.* Some scholars believe that Upaguptā was the sister of Vishnugupta Chandrāditya (Vishnu=Upendra), the last Gupta emperor, while others have suggested that she was a Later Gupta princess. Both these suggestions are, however, conjectural.

3. *CA*, p. 67 and 72.

dynasties started their political career Malwa, Rajasthan and adjoining region of U.P. were dominated by the Aulikaras of Mandasor and Madhyamikā and not by the imperial Guptas. This fact, alongwith our suggestion that the Later Guptas originally belonged to Rajasthan, makes a reconstruction of the history of these dynasties imperative. As is well-known, the fourth member of the Maukhari dynasty, namely, Isānavarman fought a war against Kumāragupta, the fourth member of the Later Gupta dynasty.¹ And as Isānavarman was ruling in 554 A.D., the date of his Haraha record, the commencement of the political career of both the dynasties may be placed in c. 490 A.D. It was exactly the period when the imperial Aulikara or Vardhana dynasty of Western Malwa and Southern Rajasthan acquired imperial status, for, as we have seen, the first known date of this dynasty is 490 A.D., known from a Mandasor inscription of Mahārāja Gauri, a feudatory of Ādityavardhana.² It makes it quite likely that these two dynasties were brought into existence as their own feudatories by the Vardhana emperors. This possibility is strengthened by the subsequent history of these two dynasties. As we have noted above, according to the Apsad record Jīvitagupta I, the third king of the Later Gupta dynasty, defeated his enemies who are described as living in the Himalayas and on the sea-shore.³ In the same way the Jaunpur record informs us that Isāvaravarman,⁴ the third Maukhari ruler who must have been a contemporary of Jīvitagupta I, acquired some success in the Himalayan region while the Harsha record states that Isānavarman, the son of Isāvaravarman, defeated, among others, the Gauḍas, who inhabited the coastal regions of Bengal, *before* he ascended the throne, i.e. in the reign of his father Isāvaravarman himself. Now, according to generally accepted chronology based on the known date of Isāvaravarman (554 A.D.), Isāvaravarman and his Later Gupta contemporary Jīvitagupta I must have ruled in the third and the fourth decades of the

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 200 ff.

2. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 410-11.

3. Fleet, pp. 202-203.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 228 ff.

sixth century A.D. Therefore, they must have been contemporaries of Yaśodharman who claims that the chieftains upto the mountain Mahendra, the lands at the foot of which are impenetrable through the groves of palmyra trees, and upto the Himalayas bowed down before his feet.¹ As he is known to have fought a war on the banks of the river Lauhitya,² he must have conquered Bengal also. Thus Jivitagupta I, Īśvaravarman and Yaśodharman were not only contemporaries, some of their most remarkable achievements were identical. In the light of this fact the current theory that the Maukharis and the Later Guptas were feudatories of the imperial Guptas till the middle of the sixth century A.D. appears to be erroneous. They must now be regarded as the feudatories of the Vardhana emperors and their achievements, described above, must have been the result of their participation in the campaigns of their overlord.

Thus the early Maukharis were also the feudatories of the Vardhanas. There is nothing improbable in this suggestion because Kanauj, the seat of the Maukhari principality, was not very far away from Daśapura and Ujjayani; at any rate it was situated on the route from Daśapura to Kāmarūpa which Yaśodharman must have followed when he went to fight a war on the banks of Lauhitya. It also explains better the close relationship of the Later Gupta and Maukhari dynasties in the earlier phase of their history. Being the feudatories of the same imperial house it was quite natural for them to have been friendly to each other and to have contracted a matrimonial alliance when Harshaguptā, the sister of the second king of the Later Gupta dynasty, Harshagupta, was married to Ādityavarman, the second ruler of the Maukhari royal house. At that time they had no bone of contention between them. These facts made it quite natural for Jivitagupta I and Īśvaravarman to participate jointly in the campaigns of their overlord.

Age of the Maukhari Domination

The political situation in India entirely changed in the

1. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, p. 419.

2. *Ujj.*

middle of the sixth c. A.D. when the empire of the house of Yaśodharman—Vishṇuvardhana in western India and the imperial Gupta empire in the eastern part of the country ceased to exist. The political vacuum created by the disappearance of these empires could not be filled for sometime by any paramount authority though several regional powers tried to step into the shoes of the Aulikaras and the Guptas. The most important power which emerged in eastern India was that of the Gauḍas, who reached the zenith of their power during the reign of Śaśāṅka who had already conquered the region extending upto Kanauj when Grahavarman, the last Maukhari emperor was murdered in 606 A.D.¹ As we shall see, the Later Guptas of the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan had also to accept his overlordship for the time being during the reign of Mahāsenagupta. But before we discuss the career of Mahāsenagupta and his relationship with Śaśāṅka, let us try to reconstruct the history of former's dynasty after Jivitaguṇa I.

During the fourth generation of the Later Gupta and Maukhari royal houses (c. 540-560 A.D.) the Aulikara empire of the house of Yaśodharman finally collapsed. In this generation the ruler of the Later Gupta family was Kumāragupta, the son of Jivitaguṇa I while in the Maukhari house Īśavaravarman was succeeded by his son Īśānavarman. Both these monarchs, Kumāragupta and Īśānavarman, were ambitious and wanted to exploit the opportunity created by the fall of the Aulikara empire. The power and importance of their respective families was already established by their predecessors who conquered distant enemies either separately or jointly, either in their independent capacity or as the feudatories of their overlord. To us it appears that the Maukharis were earlier to throw off the yoke of the Aulikara overlordship and make an attempt for the acquisition of imperial status. It is suggested by the Jaunpur inscription, according to which Īśavaravarman was successful in extinguishing "a spark of fire that

1. As Grahavarman was murdered only a short while before the accession of Harshavardhana, which took place in 606 A.D., the death of Grahavarman may be placed in the same year.

had come by the road from (the city of) Dhārā".¹ It is quite likely that here reference is made to the probable expedition of the Aulikaras sent to suppress the rebellion of the Maukharis. Dhārā was an important city of western Malwa and it might have been the base of operations of the Aulikaras against the Maukharis. Though some scholars interpret this statement of the Jaunpur inscription differently,² the above interpretation given by J.F. Fleet is in consonance with the contemporary political situation and may, therefore, be accepted as correct.

The success of Iśvaravarman against the punitive expedition of the Aulikaras was probably the final act of the drama of the collapse of the Aulikara empire. Very soon the last vestiges of the Aulikara rule disappeared and the Later Guptas and Maukhiris were struggling with each other for imperial status. Their conflict is vividly described in the Aphysad inscription of Ādityasena. According to it Kumāragupta, the son of Jīvitagupta I, playing the part of the mountain Mahendra, "quickly 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, (and) which had for (its) spreading rows of waves the plantain trees that were wantonly shaken to and fro by the roaring wind (*caused by the marching of the troops*), (and) had (its) rocks, that were the ponderous and mighty rutting elephants (*of the forces*), whirled round and round by the masses of water that were the rising dust (*stirred up by the soldiers*). Cherishing heroism and adherence to the truth, (even) in (*the possession of*) wealth, he went to Prayāga; (and there), honourably decorated with flowers, plunged into a fire (*kindled*) with dry cow-dung cakes, as if (*simply plunging to bathe*) in water."³ The outcome of this war

1. Fleet, *CII*, III, pp. 228 ff.

2. According to Basak in this passage the word *dhārā* stands for the edge of sword (*HNEI*, p. 109). D.G. Sircar follows him closely (*JIH*, XLII, pp. 127 ff.). Cf. U.N. Roy, *Studies in Indian History and Civilization*.

3. Fleet, p. 208.

has been a matter of great controversy among historians. Majumdar,¹ Tripathi² and Sinha³ believed that Kumāragupta was victorious while Mookerji⁴ and Ray⁵ ascribe victory to Iśānavarman. We agree with the second view. The theory of Majumdar and his followers is based upon the erroneous assumption that a defeat of Kumāragupta could not be mentioned in an inscription of his successors. But instances are not unknown in which the defeat of a monarch is mentioned in his own inscriptions or in the inscriptions of his successors. For example in the Doobi plate⁶ of Bhāskaravarman it has been said that he, alongwith his brother Supratishthitavarman, was defeated and captured by a Gauda king.⁷ Here it is interesting to note that, while describing the war of Kumāragupta and Iśānavarman, the Aphysad record lays more emphasis on the military might of Iśānavarman than even on the personal valour of Kumāragupta. Actually it refers to the Maukhari army as the cause of the attainment of *Lakshmi* (Vijaya-lakshmi) and describes Iśānavarman as "a very moon among kings". When one finds that the author of the Aphysad inscription eulogises Iśānavarman and his army in the fashion and does not make any explicit reference to the victory of Kumāragupta, the conclusion can hardly be avoided that the poet avoided mentioning the defeat of Ādityasena's ancestor without taking recourse to falsehood.

The struggle of Kumāragupta and Iśānavarman is regarded as the first phase of the Later Gupta-Maukhari rivalry. For according to the Aphysad inscription "Breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūṇas (*in order to trample them to death*)", Dāmodaragupta, the son of Kumāragupta, "became unconscious (*and expired in the*

1. *CA*, p. 72.

2. *History of Kanauj*, p. 43.

3. *DKM*, pp. 168-69.

4. *Harsha*, pp. 54-55.

5. Quoted in *DKM*, p. 168.

6. *EI*, XXX, pp. 288 ff.

7. *Loc. cit.*, cf. *DKM*, p. 168 fn. 3.

first;) (and then, waking again in heaven) (and) making a choice among the women of the gods, saying (this one or that) belongs to me, he was revived by the pleasing touch of the water-lilies that were their hands.”¹

Like the description of Isānavarman-Kumāragupta struggle the present description of Dāmodaragupta’s war against the Maukhari is also not free from difficulties of interpretation. The first problem is posed by the fate of Dāmodaragupta—whether he died fighting or became unconscious only? K.C. Chattopadhyaya believed that Dāmodaragupta did not die in the battle-field. According to him the Later Gupta king only fell unconscious and after recovering from unconsciousness lived for sometime more.² But most of the other scholars accept the translation of Fleet as given above. The question of the identity of the victorious party has also been quite controversial. Ray,³ Basak⁴ and Tripathi⁵ give the credit of victory to Maukharis while Raychaudhuri,⁶ Majumdar,⁷ Aravamutham⁸ and Sinha⁹ believe that it was a case of posthumous victory for Dāmodaragupta. As regards the identity of the Maukhari adversary of Dāmodaragupta, whose name has not been revealed by the Aphysad record, Saletore¹⁰ believes that he was Sūryavarman, the son of Isānavarman known from the Harsha inscription¹¹ while Sinha¹² and many others¹³ think that Dāmodaragupta fought against Sarvavarman, another son

1. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

2. *D.R. Bhandarkar, Volume*, pp. 180-82.

3. *Calcutta Review*, 1928, pp. 201 ff.

4. *HNEI*, p. 115.

5. *History of Kanauj*, pp. 44-45.

6. *PHAI*, p. 512.

7. *History of Bengal*, Vol. I. p. 57.

8. *The Kaveri, the Maukhari and the Sangam Age*, p. 92.

9. *DKM*, pp. 173-75.

10. *Life in the Gupta Age*, p. 53.

11. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 385 ff.

12. *DKM*, 172-73.

13. Cf. Aravamutham, *op. cit.*, p. 92; Pires, E.A., *The Maukharis*, pp. 88 f.

and successor of Isānavarman. We, however, feel that the Later Gupta and Maukhari fought only one war which took place during the reign of Kumāragupta and Isānavarman in which the Later Guptas were defeated and that Dāmodaragupta, the son of Kumāragupta lost his life. It explains the reference to the adversary of Dāmodaragupta as merely "the Maukhari." Having mentioned Isānavarman in the earlier verse, the author of the epigraph obviously felt it unnecessary to give his name once again. It also provides us a sound reason for the suicide of Kumāragupta; he was not only defeated but also lost his son. He, therefore, gave up his life at Prayāga. Another instance of similar nature is provided by the *ĀMMK* according to which Bālāditya (Narasimhagupta Bālāditya I) put an end to his life when his son died a premature death.¹ Thus the above suggestion explains all the known facts of Later Gupta-Maukhari conflict satisfactorily. The Maukhari victory over the Later Guptas is further proved by the subsequent history of the two dynasties. In the second half of the sixth century the Maukhari ruled over a vast empire extending at least upto Magadha in the east,² eastern Panjab in the west,³ Kūlāñjara Mañḍala in the south⁴ and, as we have seen, the Mūlava janapada of Rajasthan in the south-west.

1. *Summaries of the Papers of the Indian History Congress*, Chandigarh Session (1973).
2. Several seals of the Maukhari were found at Nālandā (*EI*, XXI, p. 73 and XXIV, pp. 224). Sīryavatman is mentioned in the Sīpur *prasasti* of Mahāśivagupta as belonging to the family which was famous for its hold over Magadha (*EI*, XI, p. 184 f.). The Deo-Barnark inscription of Jīvitagupta II refers to the gifts of land made by Śarvavatman and Avantivatman in Magadha (*Fleet*, CII, III, p. 213 ff.).
3. The Nirmand inscription of Samudrāsenā refers to Śarvavatman (*Fleet*, BII, pp. 2-8 ff.). As the ancestors of Prabhākaravardhana of Bhārat were only Māhiśājas they must have been subordinate to the Maukhari.
4. The Barā Gopur Plate Inscription of Mihirabhoja Pratihāra (*Patel*, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, p. 187) refers to Śarvavatman's grant in the Kālāñjara Mañḍala. A seal of Śarvavatman was found at Alīgāla (*Fleet*, sp. cit., pp. 219 ff.).

The Later Guptas obviously had to accept the overlordship of the Maukharis. Many scholars believe that as Kumāragupta committed religious suicide at Prayāga, this city must have been included in his kingdom.¹ But they forget that the alternative that he was defeated by the Maukharis makes Prayāga quite accessible to him, because after his submission to the Maukharis he could easily go to any part of the Maukhari empire.

The emergence of the Maukharis as an imperial power and the relegation of the Later Guptas to an insignificant position at least for the time being is further proved by the fact that from the time of Śāṇavarman onwards the Maukharis adopted the imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja² while the Later Guptas adopted it for the first time during the reign of Ādityasena i.e. in the post-Harsha period.³ Moreover, the Maukharis are known to have issued their own coinage⁴ while the coins of the Later Guptas are not known so far. The greatness of the Maukharis is also reflected in the *Harshacharita* of Bāṇa where the Maukhari royal house is said to have been 'as venerable as the foot-prints of the lord Śiva'.⁵ Even the Later Gupta records which do not claim any imperial title for the predecessors of Ādityasena refer to Śarvavarman (c. 560-580 A.D.) and Avantivarman (c. 580-605 A.D.) as Parameśvaras.⁶ In the records of many other dynasties the Maukharis have been mentioned respectfully. Thus it is apparent that while the whole greatness of the Later Gupta rulers of the sixth century (the location of whose kingdom itself is a matter of controversy) depends upon their description in the Apsad record of Ādityasena, the greatness of the Maukharis of the same period

1. Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, pp. 169-70.

2. Fleet, *op.cit.*, 219 ff.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 213 ff.

4. *DKM*, pp. 427 ff.

5. धरणीधराणां च मूर्द्धन स्थितो माहेश्वरः पादन्यास इव सकलभुवननम-
स्थृतो मौखरो वंशः ।

—*Harshacharita*, IV.

6. Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 ff.

is proved by the vastness of their empire, their coinage, contemporary epigraphs, literary references and their respectful mention in the records of other dynasties.

Age of the Gauḍa Supremacy

From the above discussion it is apparent that Maukhariis were the overlords of the Later Guptas till the third quarter of the sixth century A.D. During the last years of the reign of Mahāsenagupta, the situation took a new turn. As we mentioned earlier, towards the close of the sixth century A.D., the Gauḍas became dominant in eastern India and Śaśāṅka, their redoubtable king, established an extensive empire.¹ The known dates of Śaśāṅka are 606 A.D. (as according to the *Harshacharita* he killed Rājyavardhana² very shortly before the accession of Harsha which took place in 606 A.D.) and 619 A.D. (the date given in his Ganjam copper plates).³ By the year 606 A.D. he had apparently established a vast empire extending from Gauḍa to Kanauj. He must, therefore, have started his career much earlier, for in the initial stage of his political life he was merely a Mahāsāmanta.⁴ He was thus a junior contemporary of Mahāsenagupta whose son Mādhavagupta was almost exact contemporary of Harsha.⁵ This relative chronology provides better explanation to some of the interesting facts of the history of this period.⁶ As the Maukhariis had thwarted the imperial ambitions of the Later Guptas, it was quite natural for the latter to cultivate friendly relations with the Gauḍas. In this situation it is quite likely that Mahāsen-

1. For a detailed history of Śaśāṅka, vide, Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, pp. 225-262; Majumdar, R.C., *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, pp. 59-76; *CA*, pp. 78-81.
2. *Harshacarita*, VI.
3. *EI*, VI, pp. 143 ff.
4. Vide his Rohtasgadh seal (*Fleet, op. cit.*, p. 283) in which he has been mentioned only as a Mahāsāmanta.
5. In his early years Mādhavagupta was made a companion of Harsha and he acquired the throne of Magadha either as a feudatory of Harsha during the last years of the reign of the latter or as an independent king after the death of the Vardhana emperor.
6. Goyal, S.R., *loc. cit.*

gupta had accepted the overlordship of Śāśāṅka who happens to be his contemporary. Further we know that Devagupta, the Mālava king, was an ally of Śāśāṅka and had helped him in his Kanauj campaign.¹ Therefore, it may be regarded as within the bounds of possibilities that some sort of political dealings existed between Mahāsenagupta and Śāśāṅka also.

In the light of these facts the evidence of Doobi copper plates of Bhāskaravarman² assumes great significance. According to these plates when Bhāskaravarman was merely a prince, i.e. in the period immediately before 606 A.D. (for according to the *Harshacharita* Bhāskaravarman was already on the throne when Harsha started his reign in that year), a king of Gauda in vicinity of Kāmarūpa, fought a successful battle on the banks of Lauhitya and captured young Bhāskara and his elder brother Supratishthita, the sons of Susthitavarman.³ The name of this Gauda king is not mentioned in this record but, as is evident from the contemporary political situation, he was most likely Śāśāṅka himself.⁴ Now the Aphysad inscription of Ādityasena, also informs us that Mahāsenagupta, who was, as we have just seen, a senior contemporary of Śāśāṅka, also fought a war on the banks of Lauhitya against Susthitavarman, the Kāmarūpa king.⁵ In the light of the possibility of the Gauda-Later Gupta dealings, suggested above, the assumption of Goyal that Mahāsenagupta must have fought this war as a feudatory of Śāśāṅka appears to be quite convincing.⁶ This logical interpretation of the Lauhitya war of Mahāsenagupta imparts a new dimension to the contemporary history. In particular, it throws a flood of light on the history of Rajasthan in this period and proves that sometime towards the close of the sixth century A.D., the Later Guptas of the Mālava janapada of Rajasthan threw off the yoke of the Maukhari overlordship and became subordinate to the Gauda supremacy.

1. *DKM*, p. 246; *CA*; p. 79.

2. *EI*, XXX, p. 287.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. Cf. *CA*, p. 92.

5. Fleet, *CII*, III, p. 206.

6. Goyal, S.R., *loc. cit.*

The history of the Later Guptas of Rajasthan after Mahāsenagupta is not very clear. But there are two facts which can hardly be doubted. Firstly, according to the *Harshacharita* Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta, whom Bāṇa describes as the sons of the Mālavarāja, took shelter with Prabhākaravardhana of Thanesar,¹ whose mother Mahāsenaguptā was apparently the sister of Mahāsenagupta. Secondly, from the combined testimony of the *Harshacharita* and the Banskheda inscription of Harsha² we learn that Devagupta, the ruler of Malwa, was an ally of Śaśāṅka and was responsible for the murder of Grahavarman, though he was himself defeated by Rājyavardhana II, the elder brother of Harsha.³ From these facts it has been rightly concluded that Devagupta was a relative of Mahāsenagupta and that he succeeded in capturing the Mālava throne at the cost of Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta.⁴ He must have been helped in his designs by the Gauḍa emperor Śaśāṅka though he met a pre-mature death at the hands of Rājyavardhana II.⁵ With him the history of the Later Gupta dynasty of the Mālava janapada comes to a close; it regained royal status once again in the later half of the seventh century A.D. but this time they ruled in Magadha and not in Rajasthan.

The Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura

The history of the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura, modern Mandor (five miles to the north of Jodhpur), is known only from the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka dated V.S. 894 (837 A.D.)⁶ and the five Ghatiyala inscriptions of his younger brother Kakkuka, three of which are dated in the year 918 V.S. (861 A.D.).⁷ According to these documents 'Harichandra, the

1. *Harshacharita*, IV.

2. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 145 ff.; *EI*, IV, pp. 208-11.

3. *DKM*, pp. 246-47; *CA*, p. 74.

4. *DMK*, p. 213.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 246 ff.

6. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87-99.

7. *EI*, IX, pp. 277-281; *JRAS*, 1895, pp. 513-521. Of these five inscriptions, four are in Sanskrit and one in Prakrit.

founder of this family and his successors ruled before the kings of these inscriptions. Therefore, it is generally believed that Harichandra flourished in the middle of the sixth century A.D.¹ Harichandra was a Brāhmaṇa by caste and belonged to the family of Pratīhāras. Now, there was another family of the Pratīhāras which ruled, at least from the time of Nāgabhaṭa II, with Kanauj as its capital. It is specifically called a family of Gurjara origin, though what the term 'Gurjara' denotes is a controversial question.² In any case it is certain that it was a Gurjara-Pratīhāra family whatever the significance of the term Gurjara might have been. A third family, which is said to have been of Gurjara extraction, ruled over Lāṭa (southern Gujarat) with Nāndipuri as its capital. It was to this family that Dadda, who saved the Valabhī king from the anger of Harshavar-dhana, belonged.³ According to the generally accepted view all the families were related with each other and all of them are usually put under the same category viz. 'the Gurjara-Pratīhāras'. The assumption finds some support from the fact that several names adopted by the royal houses of the Māṇḍavyapura and Kanauj are common⁴ and at least one is found both in the families of Māṇḍavyapura and Lāṭa⁵ (though no name is common in the families of Kanauj and Lāṭa). Further, according to R.C. Majumdar⁶ the Pratīhāras of Māṇḍavya-pura, like the Pratīhāras of Kanauj, refer to Lakṣmaṇa as

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.; *CA*, p. 65.

2. According to D.R. Bhandarkar (*Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population IA*, XL, 1911, pp. 3-37. re-printed in the *JAIH*, Vol. I, pt. 1-2, 1967-68, pp. 267-328) and R.C. Majumdar (*JDL*, p. 1 ff; *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff) 'Gurjara' was the name of a foreign tribe which entered India in the post-Gupta period while D. Sharma, (*RTA*, I, pp. 472 ff) and many others believe that 'Gurjara' is a geographical term and all the inhabitants of the Gurjara region were called Gurjarsas whatever their caste affiliations might have been.

3. *CA*, pp. 66 f, 104 f.

4. *Viz.*, Nāgabhaṭa and Kakkuka.

5. *Viz.* Dadda.

6. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

their earliest ancestor. But it has not been properly emphasised so far that while the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura nowhere use the term 'Gurjara' for themselves, the Gurjaras of Nāndipuri have not used the term 'Pratihāra' for their dynasty in any of their inscriptions. Secondly, though Lakshmaṇa, the younger brother of Rāma, has been mentioned in the invocatory verses of the documents of the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura and the imperial Pratihāras both, it is also a fact that the imperial Pratihāras are everywhere described as the Kshatriyas of the Solar dynasty, the Raghuvamśis and Raghukulachudāmanis,¹ the Pratihāras of Mandor trace their descent from Harichandra, a Brāhmaṇa. It were the sons born to his Kshatriya wife Bhadrā who for the first time acquired Kshatriya status in that family.² Further, as shown by Dasharatha Sharma, the imperial Pratihāras refer to Lakshmaṇa as their own ancestor while the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura refer to him simply because he had made the profession of the Pratihāras illustrious by performing the duties of a door-keeper.³ It is evident, there-

1. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, p. 215 and fn. 1; pp. 472 ff.

2. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

3. All that the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka states about the connection of Harichandra's family with Lakshmaṇa is the following :—

स्वन्नात्रा रामभद्रस्य प्रातिहार्यं कृतं यतः ।

श्रीप्रतीहारवंशोयमतश्चोन्तिमान्यात् ॥

(Verse 4. Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, p. 159).

R.C. Majumdar (*EI*, XVIII, pp. 95, 97) translates this verse thus: "Inasmuch as the very brother of Rāmabhadra performed the duty of door-keeper (*pratihāra*) this illustrious clan came to be known as Pratihāras. May it prosper." But according to Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, I, p. 475) this is a case of mistranslation. It gives the impression that the Pratihāras of Mandor regarded themselves as the descendants of Lakshmaṇa. Sharma translates this verse thus: "Inasmuch as the very brother of Rāmabhadra performed the duty of door-keeper (*pratihāra*), may this illustrious Pratihāra family attain eminence" (*ibid.*). According to this translation the author of the inscription merely expresses the desire that the Pratihāra family may attain greatness as once Rāma's brother Lakshmaṇa had himself acted as a *pratihāra* (*ibid.* p. 205 fn. 1; cf., pp. 475-476). The same idea is conveyed by the invocatory verse of the Ghatiyala Prakrit inscription (No. 2)

fore, that the imperial Pratihāras, who belonged to the Gurjara territory or tribe were Kshatriyas while the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura, who nowhere call themselves Gurjara, belonged to the Brāhmaṇa order and the royal family of Nāndipuri was of Gurjara origin, though it had nothing to do with the Pratihāras. Thus all these three families were totally unrelated with each other. In the reconstruction of the political history of this period a proper appreciation of this fact would help us much because, on the one hand, it would clear several misunderstandings which emanate from a wrong assumption of the blood relationship between the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura and Kanauj and, on the other, save us from such geographically impossible theories which seek to make the first member of the Nāndipuri (southern Gujarat) royal house a son of Harichandra of Māṇḍavyapura (western Rajasthan).

Thus the Pratihāra royal family of Māṇḍavyapura was a family of pious Brāhmaṇas. Here it is interesting to note that the later-Vedic literature knows *pratihāra* Brāhmaṇas who performed a particular function in sacrifice.¹ In other words the term *pratihāra* was a functional term in that period.² However, the members of the family of Harichandra obviously did not have anything to do with this religious function because by the beginning of the early medieval period the term *pratihāra* had become associated with the occupation of the door-keepers as the inscription of the Pratihāras of Mandor

रहुतिलओ पडिहारो आसी सिरिलक्खणो त्ति रामस्स ।

तेण पडिहारवन्सो समुण्णाइं एत्य सम्पत्तो ॥

(verse 2, *EI*, IX, pp. 279-81)

"Because Śrī Lakṣmaṇa, the *tilaka* of the Raghu family was the Pratihāra of Rāma, hence the Pratihāra *Vāṁśa* has attained greatness here". This verse also does not suggest that the Pratihāras were the descendants of Lakṣmaṇa; it merely says that they bore a name which had been glorified by its connection with Lakṣmaṇa (*ibid.*, p. 216, fn. 1).

1. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 12.9.2.

2. Cf., Pathak, V.S., *Ancient Historians of India*, p. 165.

and Kanauj reveal. The fact that the descendants of Hari-chandra evoked Lakshmaṇa because he had cast lustre on the *pratihāra* profession conclusively proves that the predecessors of Harichandra, though Brāhmaṇas, belonged to the occupational class of door-keepers.¹ As Brāhmaṇas they might have received some land during the fifth or early sixth century A.D. which might have started process of their rise. In this respect their history resembles the history of several other Brāhmaṇa families of the Gupta age such as the 'Vishṇu' family of Eraṇ,² the *Parivrājaka* dynasty of Bundelkhand³ and the Kadamba royal house of the South⁴ which were originally ordinary Brāhmaṇa families having nothing to do with politics but acquired royal status on account of the patronage of some imperial family or with the help of the sword.⁵ It is quite likely that many other later Rajput families also, such as the Chāhamānas, Guhilas, Paramāras and the Chaulukyas, who were most likely of Brāhmaṇa origin,⁶ started their career in the same fashion and acquired Kshatriyahood at a later date.

The inscriptions discovered from Jodhpur and Ghaiyala give the same genealogy of the *Pratihāras* of Mandor, though the names of some of the rulers are given in slightly different forms. According to them Bāuka and Kakkuka, sons of Kakka (though their mothers were different, Bāuka being the son of queen Padminī and Kakkuka being the son of the queen Durla-

1. In this connection it may be recalled that when Dantidurga the Rāshtrakūṭa emperor defeated the contemporary *Pratihāra* ruler he made the latter a door-keeper in the *Hiraṇyagarbhamahādāna* ceremony performed at Ujjain (*AIK*, p. 1).
2. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, pp. 334-36.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 394-96.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 473 ff.
5. For a discussion on the rise of the Brāhmaṇas as a political force in the Gupta age, cf. Goyal, *HIG*, p. 299 f.
6. For the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Chāhamānas, see D. Sharma *RTA*, I, p. 105; *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, pp. 3-10, 241-46; for the origin of the Guhilas, vide, *IHQ*, XXVIII, p. 82 f. For the origin of the Paramāras see, *Poona Orientalist*, II, pp. 49-56 also *Rājasthāna Bhāratī* III, pt. 2, pp. 2-3. For the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Chaulukyas vide, *Satyasraya, Origin of Chaulukyas*

bhadevi),¹ belonged to the twelfth generation of this family. Therefore Harichandra, its founder, may be placed in about 550 A.D. It is a very significant fact because it indicates that he was one of those adventurers who exploited the opportunity provided by the disintegration of the Vardhana (Aulikara) empire and founded a kingdom just as the Later Guptas and Maukharis had utilised this situation for making attempts for the acquisition of imperial status. According to the Jodhpur inscription, Harichandra first married a daughter of a Brāhmaṇa whose sons became Pratihāra Brāhmaṇas. Next he married Bhadrā belonging to a noble Kshatriya family whose sons became 'drinkers of wine' (*Madhupāyins*) i.e. *Kshatriyas*.² In this connection it is interesting to note that according to the Arab travellers of the ninth century it was a distinct characteristic of the Brāhmaṇas that they abstain from wine and fermented liquors,³ though *somapāna* was regarded as a usual feature in the life of a Brāhmaṇa.⁴

1. It appears that Durlabhadevi, the mother of Kakkuka, could have been the sister of Durlabharāja (I) Chāhamāna. It is suggested by the similarity of their names and their near contemporaneity. As is well known in ancient India brother and sister were sometimes given the same names (cf. the cases of Mahāsenagupta and Mahāsenaguptā; Harshagupta and Harshaguptā; Bhānugupta and Bhānuguptā, etc. For other references, vide, Devahuti, *Harsha*, p. 19). Now as Guvaka I, the son of Durlabharāja I, was a feudatory of Nāgabhaṭa II, the former must have flourished in the last years of the eighth century A.D. (cf. D. Sharma, *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, pp 24 ff.) while Kakka, the husband of Durlabhadevi, certainly ruled in the early decades of the ninth century, as his elder son Bāuka was already ruling in 837 A.D. It is, therefore, quite likely that Durlabhadevi was a younger sister of Durlabharāja Chāhamāna and was married to Kakka who was an important feudatory of the imperial Pratihāras. As both these families were originally Brāhmaṇa and were also close neighbours, this matrimonial relationship should be regarded as something quite natural.

2. प्रतिहारा द्विजा भूता न्राह्यण्यां येभवन्सुताः ।

राज्ञी भद्रा च यान्सूते ते भूता मधुपायिनः ॥

Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, p. 159.

3. Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, Vol. I, p. 16.

4. Cf. the statement of Bāṇa in his *Harshacharita*, II :

न्राह्यणोऽस्मि जातः सोमपायिनां वशे वात्स्यायनाताम् ।

It is not very easy to determine the status of Harichandra. He has not been given any royal title, though his wife Bhadrā has been called a 'rājñī'.¹ On the other hand, emphasis is given on his being 'well-versed in the meaning of the Vedas and the *Śūtras* and a preceptor like Prajāpati'.² The only *viruda* applied to him is 'Rohilladdhi'³ the meaning of which is rather uncertain.⁴ According to R.C. Majumdar it sounds rather outlandish,⁵ though other scholars differ on this point.⁶ The absence of any royal epithet for him would not conclusively prove that he was not an independent king.⁷ Such

1. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 159.

2. वभूव रोहिलद्वयंको वेदशास्त्रार्थपारगः ।

द्विजः श्रीहस्तिन्द्रार्थः प्रजापतिसमो गुरुः ॥

—*Loc. cit.*

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. According to N.R. Ray, (*IIHQ*, IV, p. 172) who believes in the foreign descent of the Pratihāras of Mandor, the adoption of the "names" Rohilladdhi etc. prove that kings of this dynasty did not belong to the Aryan fold. "Let us consider" he writes, "three names, viz., Harichandra, Narabhaṭa and Nāgabhaṭa...(they) are undoubtedly of Sanskritic origin ; but what do we say of their original names, Rohilladdhi; Pellapelli and Nāhaḍa, which they retained alongwith their Sanskritic Hindu names...? They do not seem to be Aryan Hindu names". But as pointed out by Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, I, p. 479 f) the argument is hardly tenable, When "in the Middle Indo-Aryan languages of Western India, names like *Subhaṭa*, *Vāgbhaṭa* and *Tyāgabhaṭa* become respectively *Suhāḍa*, *Vāhāḍa* and *Chāhāḍa*, it was not unnatural that the name *Nāgabhaṭa* got changed into *Nāhaḍa*. As for Pellapelli, why should Dr. Ray regard it as Narabhaṭa's original name when the inscription states in clear words that it was a *dvitiya* (second) name secured by him as a result of his brave deeds ? The word is formed from the root *pella* (to give pain, to throw, to press), which one finds used in standard Prakrit works like the *Setubandha*, *ojha-niryukti-bhāṣya*, *Samaraichchakahā*, *Kumārapālacharita* and *Prākṛitasarvasva*. We see it also in the Pāṇinian root *pelf*. Pellin, a noun formed from it, should have the sense of "one who habitually either gives pain to his enemies or pushes them back". This sense gets further emphasised by the duplication of the root in *Pellapelli*.

5. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

6. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, p. 480.

7. For various views on this problem, vide *EI*, XVIII, p. 87 ff.

omissions in versified documents were quite common in that period. For example, the Gwalior *praśasti* of Pratihāra king Bhoja I¹ adds no royal title to Nāgabhaṭa I, calls the fourth king of this family only *Kshmāpāla* while Nāgabhaṭa II and Bhoja I, two of the greatest kings of the dynasty, are introduced without any royal epithet.

Harichandra was followed by his four sons namely, Bhogabhaṭa, Kakka, Rajjila and Dadda, who were born to Bhadrā. These princes are said to have conquered the fort of Māṇḍavyapura by their own arms where they erected a high rampart which was "calculated to increase the fear of the enemies"² The immediate successor of Harichandra was probably Rajjila, his third son (c. 575-600 A.D.), for it was the latter whose line ruled over Mandor in the subsequent period. It is quite likely that the elder brother of Rajjila died a premature death. According to R.C. Majumdar all the four sons of Harichandra ruled over different regions, Rajjila having been the king of Māṇḍavyapura itself.³ This view is based upon the statement of the Jodhpur inscription according to which all the four sons of Harichandra were "fit to hold the earth"⁴ But to us the interpretation of Majumdar appears to be untenable for the Jodhpur inscription gives the sons of Harichandra the credit of conquering only Māṇḍavyapura. Had they conquered more distant territories, it would have found prominent mention in this record.

Majumdar believes that the Gurjara kingdom of Nāndipuri (South Gujarat) was founded by Dadda, the youngest son of Harichandra.⁵ The earliest known date of the third king of the Gurjara family of Nāndipuri is 629 A.D.⁶ "Allowing 50 years for the two generations that preceded him," argues Majumdar, "we get the date c. 580 A.D., for the Sāmanta

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99-114; Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 162 ff.

2. Majumdar, R.C., *loc. cit.*

3. *C.A.*, p. 65.

4. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Loc. cit.*

Dadda, who founded the line. The date corresponds so very well with that of Dadda, the youngest son of Harichandra, that the identity of the two may be at once presumed."³ We do not agree with Majumdar's interpretation. The supposition of Majumdar is based on the assumptions that like the dynasty of Nāndipuri, the Mandor dynasty of Harichandra was also Gurjara. But, as we have already seen, in no record are the Gurjaras of Nāndipuri called Pratihāras, and the Pratihāras of Mandor Gurjaras. Further, there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that the region lying between the two kingdoms was also under the occupation of either of the two dynasties, something which must have been a fact if Dadda, the youngest son of Harichandra, carved out a kingdom in the distant southern Gujarat. Moreover, it seems highly unlikely that these Pratihāra princes of Rajasthan whom the inscriptions of their own family give the credit of conquering only Māṇḍavyapura occupied a vast region extending up to southern Gujarat. To assume such a thing would be like arguing that in his *Prayāga prāśasti* Harisheṇa could mention only the conquest of Pāṭali-putra by Samudragupta, though the Gupta emperor made himself the master of almost the whole of India. We, therefore, think that these two kingdoms were not related with each other ; they were two distinct powers of two entirely different regions having nothing in common except the name of Dadda which was adopted by a king each in their respective ruling families.²

Rajjila was succeeded by his son Narabhaṭa (c. 600-625 A.D.) who was also called by his second name Pellāpelli on account of his valorous deeds. Nothing has been recorded about him. His successor was his son Nāgabhaṭa (c. 625-650

1. *Loc. cit.*

2. The similarity of names can hardly become the basis of the identification of two kings of two different families. For example, we have the kings of the names of Kumāragupta and Viṣṇugupta both in the imperial Gupta dynasty and the Later Gupta family. Similarity of royal names becomes significant only when such names are either unique or other facts tend to support the identity of the two rulers.

A.D.) who had his permanent capital at the great city Medāntaka (mod. Merta). Both these rulers were contemporaries of Harshavardhana, though there is absolutely nothing in the Pratihāra records to suggest that they acknowledged the suzerainty of the great Vardhana Emperor. The suggestion of R.C. Majumdar¹ that at the time of the visit of Yuan Chwang, the Chinese traveller, to the kingdom of Ku-che-lo² (Gurjara), which took place in c. 640 A.D., Tāta, the son of Nāgabhaṭa was already on the throne, though attractive, lacks sufficient evidence in its support. We shall discuss this question in the next chapter, when we shall deal with the history of the successors of Nāgabhaṭa.

The Gurjas or Chāpas of Bhillamāla

It is, however, necessary here to identify the kingdom of Ku-che-lo or Gurjara mentioned by Yuan Chwang. R.C. Majumdar identifies it with the Gurjara kingdom of the Pratihāras of Mandor.³ "The Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsiang," he argues, "visited a Gurjara kingdom which was about 300 miles north of Valabhī or Surath. It is a noticeable fact that the country round about Mandor exactly answers to this description. As Harichandra's dynasty was certainly ruling in the locality at the time of the pilgrim's visit, we are justified in identifying their kingdom with the one described by Hiuen-Tsiang."⁴ But, as pointed out by Dasharatha Sharma,⁵ the main objection to this view lies in the fact that Yuan Chwang's Pi-lo-mo-lo, the capital of Ku-Che-lo (Gurjara) cannot phonetically turn into Mandor. If we take it to be Barmer, as proposed by Majumdar in his later contribution on this subject,⁶ "We have to be sure of Barmer having been included within the kingdom of Mandor and enjoyed also the distinction of having been its capital. On the basis of Bāuka's inscription,

1. *EI*, XVIII, p. 92.

2. Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, p. 249.

3. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

4. *Loc. cit.*

5. *RTA*, I, p. 216 fn. 1.

6. *CA*, p. 154.

however, which is our only source of information on the point, all that can be said with certainty is that during the reign of Tāta and his father Nāgabhaṭa the kingdom included the territory intervening between Mandor and Merta which is nearly 100 miles to the north-east of it'.¹ Further, according to Yuan-Chwang, the population of Du-Che-lo kingdom was dense,² which could not have been the case with Pratihāra kingdom of Mandor and also with Barmer. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Pratihāra kingdom of Mandor has nowhere been called Gurjara while the kingdom visited by Yuan Chwang was known by this designation. Apparently this is the same Gurjara kingdom which is mentioned by Bāṇa who speaks of Prabhākaravardhana as the 'troubler of the sleep of the Gurjara',³ by the author of the Aihole inscription who refers to the 'Lāṭa-Mālava-Gurjarāḥ' as submitting to Pulakesin II⁴ and in the Nausari Plates of Pulakesin Avanijanāśraya of Lāṭa (c. 738 A.D.)⁵ which describes the destruction of 'Saindhava-Kachchhela Saurāshṭra—Chāvotaka—Maurya Gurjarādirāja' by the swords of the Tajikas, i.e., the Arabs. As, according to the Arab accounts, the Arab general Junaid conquered among others the kingdoms of Bailaman and Jurz also⁶ (the later being identical with Gurjara), it may be presumed that Bailaman or Vallamāṇḍala adjoined the Gurjara state. This location fits exactly the

1. *RTA*, I, p. 216 fn. 1.

2. Watters, *Loc. cit.*

3. गुर्जरप्रजागरो...

Harshacharita, IV.

4. Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, pp. 240 ff.

5. प्रतापावनता यस्य लाटमालवगूर्जराः ।

Bhandarkar List, No. 1220, cf. *Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, pt. I, p. 211, fn. 23.

6. Elliot, H.M., and Dowson, J., *The History of India* (as told by its own Historians), Vol. I, p. 126.

Ku-Che-lo kingdom of Yuan Chwang's account¹ and, therefore, the latter may be identified with Bhillamāla.

More light on the history of the kingdom of Bhillamāla is thrown by the famous Vasantgadh inscription of King Varmalāta, dated (Vikrama) Śaṁvat 682 (625 A.D.).² It was found about 5 miles south of Pindwara in the erstwhile Sirohi state. It is a Śākta epigraph and its opening verses evoke the blessings of Durgā and Kshemāryā (another name of Durgā). The verse 3 of this record speaks of a King Varmalāta on whom the next verse bestows only conventional praise. He is said to have had a feudatory of the name of Vajrabhaṭa Satyāśraya who was devoted to the worship of Mātā (Kshemāryā) and was able to guard 'the son of Himavat' i.e., the Arbuda (Abu) mountain.³ The son of Vajrabhaṭa was Rajjīla who behaved like Vaiśravaṇa, i.e. Kubera in Vaṭa (Vaṭakāra i.e. Vasantgadh) by lavishing wealth on Brāhmaṇas, personages deserving hospitality, subordinates and men skilled in arts.⁴ It was during his governorship that the temple of the goddess Kshemāryā was constructed⁵ by a *goshthī* at Vaṭakāra-sthāna (Vasantgadh). In the last five lines the *praśasti* gives a list of the members of the *goshthī* who built (or re-built) the temple. Among them are included, interestingly enough, a Pratīhāra named Boṭaka,⁶ a certain Ādityabhaṭa who was a Rājasthāniya and Būṭā, who was a *mātāgaṇikā* i.e. a *devadāsī*. Thus from this inscription we learn that king Varmalāta was ruling at Bhillamala in 625 A.D. Further information about this king is provided by the *Śiśupālavadha* of Māgha. According to this work, Suprabhadeva, the grandfather of Māgha was

1. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, pp. 109-110.

2. *EI*, IX, pp. 187-192.

3. Kielhorn, F., *ibid.*, p. 189.

4. *Ibid.*

5. According to D.R. Bhandarkar (*ibid.*, fn. 5) as a *gaṇikā* could not have been associated with the original construction of the temple, it must be presumed that it was "re-built" by the *goshthī* (management committee).

6. Perhaps this is the earliest epigraphical reference to the word Pratīhāra.

the minister of a king whose name is variously read as Varmalāta, Varmalākhyā, Dharmānābha and Dharmalābha.¹ Now Māgha certainly flourished in the latter half of the seventh century A.D. for he makes a clear reference² to the *Kāśikā-Vṛitti* and the *Nyāsa* (c. 700 A.D.) thereon and also knew the *Nāgānanda* of Harsha (606-646 A.D.).³ Therefore, almost everyone seems to have agreed with the suggestion of Kielhorn⁴ that out of the numerous forms found in the manuscript of the *Śiśupālavadha*, of the name of the king at whose court Māgha's grandfather Suprabhadeva is stated to have held the office of Prime Minister, the variant Varmalāta is to be selected as the most likely one. Unfortunately neither the Vasantgadh inscription nor the *Śiśupālavadha* of Māgha reveal the identity of the dynasty to which king Varmalāta belonged. This lacuna is filled by the *Brahmasphuṭa-Siddhānta* of Brahmagupta who is himself known as *Bhillamālakāchārya* i.e. the *āchārya* of Bhillamāla.⁵ He informs us that he composed his work in the Śaka year 550 (=628 A.D.),⁶ i.e. 3 years after the date of the Vasantgadh record, under the patronage of King Vyāghramukha of the Chāpa dynasty. Evidently Vyāghramukha was either the successor of Varmalāta or Varmalāta himself.⁷ In any event it would follow that the dynasty which ruled over Bhillamāla in the first half of the seventh century A.D. was known as Chāpa.

The Chāpas, also known as the Chāpotkaṭas or Chāvoṭakas (commonly known as Chāvāḍās, Chauḍā, Chaurā or Chavarā) were a famous Rajput clan of the early medieval

1. *CA*, p. 311.

2. *Śiśupālavadha*, 11.112.

3. Keith, A.B., *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 124; cf. Sharma, D., *RTA*, I, p. 517 fn. 2.

4. Quoted by D.R. Bhandarkar in *EI*. IX, p. 190; S. Konow is of the opinion that Jinendrabuddhi (the author of the *Nyāsa*) referred to by Māgha in his *Śiśupālavadha* was the contemporary of the latter and both lived in the beginning of the eighth century (*ibid.*).

5. *CA*, p. 154.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 323.

7. Ojha, G.H., *The History of Rajputana*, Vol. I, p. 145.

period. Apart from Bhillamāla they are known to have ruled over several other principalities including Vadhiār in Kathiawar and Anahilapāṭaka (modern Patan) in Gujarat.¹ We are not concerned with the history of other Chāpa dynasties. It may, however, be mentioned here that Haddālā plates² of Chāpa king Dharaṇivāraha dated 914 A.D. claim that the Chāpas were produced by the *chāpa*, that is the bow of Śaṅkara, at the request of the goddess earth for her defence.³ It is apparently a myth comparable with the *Agnikunḍa* legend of the origin of several Rajput families.⁴ From the circumstantial evidence discussed above, however, it appears certain that the Chāpas were the rulers of the Gurjara kingdom mentioned by Yuan-Chwang. Therefore, they were either a branch of the Gurjaras or ruled over them. Unlike Jackson and Indraji,⁵ scholars such as Majumdar⁶ and Ojha⁷ do not believe in the identity of the Chāpas and the Gurjaras. According to them the Navsari plates mention the Chāvoṭakas and Gurjaras side by side and, therefore, they must be regarded as different. But the argument is hardly tenable, for, as we have noted above, there were several Chāpa principalities in western India and the author of this record might have referred to the Chāvoṭakas of Bhillamāla as Gurjaras in order to differentiate them from other Chāpa principalities.

Here it is worthwhile to mention that the Chāpa rulers were great patrons of learning. They not only patronised Brahmagupta who wrote his famous astronomical treatise *Brahmasphuṭa-siddhānta* at Bhillamāla but also appointed Suprabhadeva, the grandfather of great poet Māgha, as their Prime

1. *CA*, p. 161.

2. *IA*, XII, p. 193.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. For the legendary origin of the Chāpas, vide, Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, p. 145.

5. *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, Part I, p. 155.

6. *CA*, pp. 153-54, 161.

7. *The History of Rajputana*, I, pp. 145-146.

Minister. Yuan Chwang also informs us that the young Kshatriya king who was ruling at Ku-Che-lo at the time of his visit and was celebrated for his wisdom and valour, was a profound believer in Buddhism and a patron of exceptional abilities.¹

✓Other Powers of Post-Gupta Rajasthan : The Chāhamānas

Two other powers of Rajasthan which started their political career in the post-Gupta period were the Chāhamānas and the Guhilas. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient data pertaining to their early history. They are included among the Rajput clans of Rajasthan which shot into prominence in the post-Gupta period and eclipsed the fortunes of the earlier Kshatriya dynasties.² The problem of the origin of Rajput dynasties is highly complex and controversial. We agree with Dasharatha Sharma that like the Pallavas, the Kadambas and the Pratihāras of Mandor,³ "the Guhilas, the Chauhans and the Paramāras were originally Brāhmaṇas who adopted a military career probably to defend their culture against foreign invaders."⁴

Very little is known about the Chāhamānas till they attained prominence as feudatories of the imperial Pratihāras

1. Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, p. 249; cf., Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. II, p. 270.
2. *RTA*, I, p. 103.
3. For the Pallavas and Kadambas, vide, Sircar, D.C., *Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan*, pp. 225; for the Pratihāras of Mandor, *supra*; *CA*, p. 65; *RTA*, I, p. 215.
4. *RTA*, I, p. 105; for detailed analysis of the problem of the origin of the Chāhamānas and Guhilas in particular and Rajputs in general, vide, *ibid.*, pp. 103-106, 108-119, 439-442; Sharma, D., *Lectures on Rajput History and Culture*, pp. 1-10; Tod, James, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, pp. 68-97; Vaidya, C.V., *History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, Vol. II (Rajputs), pp. 1-89; Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajputana*, Vol. I, pp. 41-76; Banerji, A.C., *Rajput Studies*, ch. I, Smith, V.A., *EHI*, pp. 407-415; Bhandarkar, D.R., *IA*, XLI, 1911, pp. 3-37, reprint in *JAIH*, Vol. I, pt. 1-2 (1967-68), pp. 267-328; *JBIRS*, XXI, pp. 405 ff; Majumdar, R.C., *JDL*, X, pp. 1-76; *Bhāratīya Vidyā, K.M. Munshi Diamond Jubilee Volume*, II, pp. 1-18; Ganguli, D.C., *IHQ*, X, pp. 613-23; Raychaudhuri, G.C., *D.R. Bhandarkar Volume*, pp. 311-16; Sharma, Mrs. M., *IHQ*, XXVIII, p. 83 f.

of the various dynasties of this clan, especially when we consider these traditions alongwith the divergent views of modern scholars.

A full genealogy of this family is found for the first time in the Atpur inscription of Śaktikumāra, dated A.D. 977.¹ It gives the name of 20 rulers from Guhadatta to Śaktikumāra. If we assume that a generation is to be allotted about 22 years, Guhadatta may be regarded as having flourished in the middle of the sixth century A.D.² As we have seen, it was precisely the period when the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura and the Chāhamānas of Sapādalaksha started their political career. It is, therefore, not unlikely that like his Pratihāra and Chāhamāna counterparts, the founder of the Guhila family also exploited the anarchical situation of north India created by the disintegration of the Gupta and Aulikara-Vardhana empires. The records of Śīla³ (Śīlāditya) and Aparājita,⁴ the fifth and sixth kings of the Atpur list, belonging to 646 A.D. and 661 A.D. respectively corroborate the suggestion that Guhadatta flourished in the sixth century A.D. This conclusion based on undeniable epigraphic evidence demolishes to its very root the traditional account recorded in the bardic tales that Guha or Guhila, the founder of the family, was the son of Śīlāditya, the last ruler of Valabhi.⁵ It is now definitely known that the Valabhi king Śīlāditya of the Maitraka dynasty ruled in the third quarter of the eighth century A.D.⁶ He, therefore, could not have been the royal father of Guhadatta.

The origin of the Guhilas has been made a matter of prolonged controversy. Medieval works such as *Akabarānāmā* of Abul-Fazl connect them with Iran⁷ while Tod who relied on

1. *IA*, 1910, p. 191; *Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, VIII, pp. 63 ff.

2. *CA*, p. 157.

3. Vide Samoli Inscription, *EI*, XX, pp. 97-99.

4. *EI*, VI, p. 29-32.

5. *CA*, p. 157.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

7. Cf. *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, pt. I, p. 102; Tod, J., *op. cit.*, I, pp. 71-72.

the tradition mentioned above believed that they were the descendants of the Valabhī rulers.¹ Many scholars including V.A. Smith² have suggested foreign origin of this clan. D.R. Bhandarkar³ twisted this theory to some extent and tried to prove that the Guhilas were Brāhmaṇas of foreign descent. G.H. Ojha⁴ and his supporters, however, neglected or misinterpreted the epigraphic evidence to show that the Guhilas were the descendants of the Vedic Kshatriyas of the Solar stock. But as Dasharatha Sharma,⁵ G.N. Sharma⁶ and many others⁷ have repeatedly emphasised, the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Guhilas is beyond doubt. According to D. Sharma the early records of the family present it as a *Vipra* i.e. a Brāhmaṇa family. Guhādatta has been called not only *Viprakulanandanaḥ* but also *Mahīdevaḥ*.⁸ Similarly, Bappā is called a *Vipra* in a Chittorgarh inscription⁹ of 1274 A.D. Further, in the Achaleshwar (Abu) inscription¹⁰ of 1285 A.D. Bappā is also said to have exchanged Brahma for Kshatra splendour,¹¹ which correctly indicates the position of the Guhilas among the Rajputs. "They were originally Brāhmaṇas", concludes D. Sharma, "but either ambition or political exigencies made them take to a military career

1. Tod, J., *op. cit.*, p. 247; 251-60; 275-77. Kavirāja Shyāmaldas (*Vīra Vinod*, pt. I, pp. 188, 239, 247-49) partially accepted the theory of Tod but differed with the latter in details.

2. *EHI*, pp. 407 ff.

3. *IA*, XVI, p. 347.

4. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 371-383.

5. *RTA*, I, pp. 105, 230.

6. *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, pp. 38-39; *PIHC*, 1951, pp. 367-372; *University of Rajasthan Studies*, 1965-68, pp. 5-10.

7. Sharma, Mrs. M., *IHQ*, XXVIII, p. 83 f.

8. *IA*, 1910, p. 191, quoted by D. Sharma in *RTA*, I, p. 234, fn. 1.

9. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, pt. IV, pp. 74-77.

10. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 83-87.

11. हारीतात्किल वप्पकोऽङ्गिवलयव्याजेन लेभे महः

क्षात्रं धातृनिभाद्वितीर्य(?) मुनये ब्राह्मं स्वसेवाच्छलात् ।

एतेऽयापि महीभुजः क्षितितले तद्वंशसंभूतयः

शोभंते सुतरामुपात्तवपुषः क्षात्रा हि धर्माद्व ॥

and the society in due course recognised them as Kshatriyas."¹ No epigraph belonging to a period earlier than the twelfth century expressly describes the Guhilas as Kshatriyas of the Solar race. This tradition originated and evolved in the medieval period.

So far as the original home of the Guhilas is concerned, in the later phase of their history, they are found ruling over Mewar. But they could not have originally belonged to Chitor. The Atpur inscription informs us that Guhadatta came from Anandapur which has been identified with Vadanager in the former Baroda State.² They belonged to Vaijavāpa *gotra* which is found mostly on the Gujarat side.³ Dasharatha Sharma conjectures that they might have migrated from Gujarat and their early home in Rajasthan might have been in south-west Mewar.⁴ From this region we have three of their early records, though the relationship of the kings mentioned in these inscriptions with the Guhilas of Mewar, known from the Atpur inscription,⁵ is difficult to determine. One of these epigraphs is dated in 73rd year. It was engraved in the reign of Mahārāja Bhaṭṭi of Kishkindhā i. e. Kalyanpur (about 68 km to the south of Udaipur).⁶ Another belongs to king Bhāvihita and carries the date 48.⁷ The third one was issued by the Guhila chief Bābhāṭa in the year 83.⁸ Dasharatha Sharma suggests that these rulers were related with each other and may be placed in the same chronological order which is indicated by the dates of their inscriptions. Scholars usually ascribe the date of these records to the Harsha era.⁹ In that case, Bhāvihita, Bhaṭṭi and Bābhāṭa would be placed in A.D. 654, 679 and 689 respectively. But D. Sharma suggests that they are dated in an era

1. *RTA*, I, p. 234.

2. *IA*, 1910, p. 191; *JPASB*, VIII, pp. 63 ff.

3. *RTA*, I, p. 234.

4. *Loc. cit.*, cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 389, 400 fn. 1.

5. *EI*, XXX, pp. 1 ff.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *EI*, XXXIV, pp. 177 ff.

8. *Ibid.*

9. Sircar, D.C., *EI*, XXX, pp. 6-6; Mirashi, V.V., (*EI*, XXX, p. 2) does not agree with this view and suggests that the years 73 of the Dhulev plate of Mahārāja Bhaṭṭi is of the Bhaṭṭika era.

founded by Guhila.¹ If this suggestion is correct no precise date for these rulers may be given as the date of accession of Guhila itself is unknown.

Guhila was regarded as their earliest ancestor both by the Guhilas of Kishkindhā as well as of Mewar.² No inscription of this ruler has come to light so far. As we have already seen, he may be placed in the middle of the sixth century A.D. In case he was the founder of an era, as Dasharatha Sharma suggests, he must have been a powerful king. Probably the whole of south-west Mewar and some adjoining regions lay within his dominion.³ Some silver coins, about 2000 in number discovered at Agra were ascribed to him by G.H. Ojha,⁴ while R.L. Samar has described 9 copper coins belonging to this ruler, 6 of which are silver plated.⁵

Guhila was succeeded by Bhoja who is described as the worshipper of Vishnu in Achalesvara (Abu) inscription (V.S. 1342=1285 A.D.) of Samarasimha.⁶ Two of his copper coins are known so far.⁷ Nothing more about him and his successor Mahendranāga is known from available sources. According to some scholars Mahendranāga was the founder of Nāgdā.⁸ Ojha, however, suggests that Mahendra and Nāga were two different rulers.⁹

According to G. H. Ojha, Nāgāditya was succeeded by Śīla or Śilāditya.¹⁰ His inscription dated (Vikrama) Sāmvat

1. *Loc. cit.* R.L. Samar (*JIH*, XL, p. 345 ff), however, suggests that this is a local era which was started from the date of the accession of Bappā.

2. For a detailed study, vide, Sircar, D.G., *The Guhilas of Kishkindhā*, Calcutta, 1965.

3. *RTA*, I, p. 235.

4. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, p. 400, fn. 1.

5. *JNSI*, XX, pp. 27-29; cf. Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa ke Srotas*, pt. I, 28.

6. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, V, p. 83-87.

7. *RTA*, I, p. 236.

8. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, 395, cf. Jain, K.C., *Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan*, p. 213.

9. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 395, 402.

10. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 402-403.

703 (=646 A.D.) was discovered from Samoli in Bhomat District of the former Mewar State.¹ It shows that Mewar-Sirohi border was included in his dominion. This epigraph describes him as a giver of delight to the gods, Brāhmaṇas and *gurus*, a conqueror of enemies and a moon on the earth for his clan and² refers to the building of a temple of Arāṇyavāsinī by the merchant chief Jejaka or Jentaka, who alongwith his friends migrated from Vāṭanagara,³ and had an *āgara* in the hilly area adjoining Samoli.⁴ Only one copper coin of Śilāditya is known so far.⁵ James Tod has identified him with Bappā of legends. We shall discuss this suggestion in the next chapter.

Rajasthan and Harshavardhana of Kanauj

In the first half of the seventh century A.D. the history of north India was greatly influenced by the political activities and conquests of Harshavardhana (606-c. 646 A.D.) of Kanauj. Unfortunately, nothing precisely is known of his relations with Rajasthan. The controversy regarding the extent

1. *EI*, XX, pp. 97-99.

2. जयति विजयी रिपूतां (णां) देवद्विजगुरु-

जरणा (ना) नन्दीः (नन्दी) ।

श्रीशीलादित्यो नरपति (तिः) स्वकुलाव (म्ब)

र चन्द्रमा (मा:) पृथ्वी (पृथ्व्याम्) ॥

ibid., p. 99.

3. Vāṭanagara has been identified by D.R. Bhandarkar (*EI*, IX, p. 189) and R.R. Halder (*EI*, XX, p. 93) with Vasantgadh in the former Sirohi state, about 16 miles from Samoli from where the epigraph was discovered, cf., Jain, K.C., *op. cit.*, pp. 163 ff.

4. जयति वटनगर विनिर्गत महाजन (नां) जे (न्त) क प्रमुखः ।

येनास्य लोकजीवनं ग्रा (नमा) गरमुप्ता (त्पा) दितं (त) मारण्यकगिरोः

(रौ) ।...तत्र (जेन्त) क महतर (तरः) श्री अरण्यवासिष्या (न्या) देव-
कुलं चक्रे महाजनादिष्ट (षुः) ॥

—*loc. cit.*

5. *RTA*, I, p. 237.

of his empire¹ makes this problem all the more difficult. According to group of historians including V.A. Smith, M.L. Ettinghausen and K.M. Panikkar, the empire of Harsha included almost the whole of northern India from Kāmarūpa in the east to Sindh in the west and Kashmir and Nepal in the north to the Narmada in the south,² though they disagree with each other regarding its detailed boundaries. Such a view implies that Harsha exercised his suzerainty over Rajasthan also. On the other hand, R.C. Majumdar believes that "at first Harsha's kingdom comprised merely the territories of the old states of Thaneswar and Kanauj, though he probably added some small principalities to the north and west. It may be said to have comprised the eastern Punjab and Uttar Pradesh. Towards the close of his reign, he had annexed Magadha and even pushed his conquest as far as Orissa and Kongoda".³ In such a view there is no scope to believe that Harsha had an effective control over Rajasthan. Now the problem of the extent of the empire of Harsha is beyond the scope of our present work; we are concerned only with the question whether he had anything to do with Rajasthan or not. The answer to this question is bound to depend entirely upon indirect and circumstantial evidence. For example, the first group of historians may argue that as the empire of Harsha included

1. For a detailed description and analysis vide, Smith, V.A., *EHI*, p. 352-354 and map, opp. p. 354; Ettinghausen, M.L., *Harshavardhana : Amperur at poste, etc.* (Paris, 1906) pp. 47 ff; Panikkar, K.M., *Sri Harshā of Kanauj* (Bombay, 1922) pp. 22 ff; Mookerji, R.K., *Harsha* (Oxford, 1928) pp. 37-43; Chatterji, G.S., *Harshavardhana* (in Hindi) (Allahabad, 1950) pp. 169 f.; Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj to the Moslem conquest* (Varanasi, 1959). IV-V; Devahuti, D., *Harsha : A Political Study* (Oxford, 1970) ch. 1V; Sharma, B.N., *Harsha and His Times* (Varanasi, 1970), ch. V-VI; Majumdar, R.C., *CA*, pp. 102ff; Goyal, S.R., *Itihāsa Samikshā*, 2, 1971, pp. 120 ff; Chattopadhyaya, S., *EHNI*, ch. IX, pp. 243-273.

2. Cf. e.g. "In the later years of his reign the sway of Harsha over the whole of the basin of the Ganges (including Nepal) from the Himalaya to the Narmadā, besides Malwa, Gujarat, and Surāshṭra, was undisputed" (*EHI*, p. 354).

3. *CA*, p. 113; cf. also Tripathi, R.S., *op. cit.*, p. 119.

by birth, was a young man celebrated for his wisdom and valour and he was a profound believer in Buddhism, and a patron of exceptional abilities.”¹ As has been suggested in the preceding pages, here Yuan Chwang has most likely referred to the Chāpa kingdom which had nothing to do with Harshavardhana. Thus Yuan Chwang did not see anything which would indicate Harsha’s suzerainty over Rajasthan.

Another line of inquiry is suggested by the testimony of Bāṇa. Firstly, he refers to the hostility of the kingdoms of Sindhu, Gurjara, Lāṭa and Mālava with Prabhākaravardhana who was a source of constant trouble for them.² It has been argued that their enmity to the Vardhanas might have continued in the next reign also. Further, according to Bāṇa, Harsha decided upon world-wide conquest and ordered his minister of War and Peace to issue a proclamation throughout India asking all the kings either to accept his suzerainty or to fight with him.³ After this declaration he commenced his march “for the subjugation of all the four quarters.”⁴ But unfortunately Bāṇa does not inform us about the progress and result of this campaign. It has given wide scope to scholars for imaginary reconstruction of the military achievements of Harshavardhana.

1. Watters, *Travels*, II, p. 249; cf. Beal, *Records*, II, p. 270.

2. हूणहरिणकेसरी सिन्धुराजज्वरो गुर्जरप्रजागरो
गान्धाराविपग्न्वद्विपकूटपाकलो
लाटपाटवपाटच्चरो मालवलक्ष्मीलतापरश्चः

Harshacharita, IV.

Cf. Eng. Trans. by E.B. Cowell and F.W. Thomas, p. 101; for their identification vide, Buddha Prakash, *Aspects of Indian History and Civilization*, pp. 170-72; for comments, *CA*, pp. 97-98.

3. *Harshacharita*, Trans. Cowell and Thomas, *op.cit.*, pp. 187-88.

4. ततश्च तथाकृतप्रतिज्ञे प्रयाणं विजयाय दिशां समादिशति...

op. cit., p. 194

अथ न चिरादिव प्रथमप्रयाण एव दिविवजयाय दिग्गजसमागममिव...

op. cit., p. 203.

Now, as regards the reference in the *Harshacharita* of the hostility of the Laias, Milavas and Gurjaras to the Vardhanas, it may be noted that the same powers have been enumerated in the *Whole inscription*¹ of the Chālukya king Pulakesin II. According to this epigraph these powers voluntarily accepted the overlordship of the Chālukya monarch.² Some scholars believe that one of the reasons which led these powers to accept this subordinate position was their anxiety to seek Chālukya protection against Vardhana imperialism.³ As the Gurjaras of this list definitely belonged to Rajasthan (whether to Mandor as R. C. Majumdar believes⁴ or Bhillamāla as we have suggested), such a view would imply that Harsha either exercised some influence over parts of Rajasthan or was a source of danger to this area. According to Majumdar the three powers enumerated above "formed a group of buffer states between Harsha and Pulakesin II, and could rely upon the protection of the latter against the aggressive designs of the former."⁵ But such an assumption is altogether unwarranted. There is nothing to show that these three states were afraid of Harsha or Harsha had sought to impose his suzerainty over them.

It may also be argued that the prevalence of the Harsha era⁶ in Rajasthan may indicate that Harsha had some sort of

1. Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions* (Varanasi, 1962), pp. 240 ff; *EI*, VI, pp. 10 ff.

2. प्रतापावनता यस्य लाटमालवगृजर्जराः ।
दण्डोपनतसामन्तचर्यर्य चार्यर्य इवाभवन् ॥

Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 243.

3. *EI*, VI, p. 10, f.n. 5.

4. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 92.

5. *CA*, p. 1, p. 5.

6. It is generally believed that the Harsha Samvat was founded by Harshvardhana in A.D. 606, the year of his accession. But according to R.C. Majumdar (*IHQ*, XXVII, pp. 183 ff; XXVIII, pp. 280 ff.) this view rests upon very slender foundations. Contrast D.C. Sircar (*ibid.*, XXVII, pp. 321 ff; XXIX, pp. 72 ff.) who subscribes to the former theory.

hold over this region. But the prevalence of an era in a particular area was not always preceded by the actual rule of the king who initiated that era in that particular region. The Mālava-Vikrama Samvat is found used over greater part of India, though neither the Mālavas nor the legendary Vikramāditya had anything to do with a number of regions where this era is found prevalent today. The case of the Śaka era is quite similar.¹

From the above discussion it is quite apparent that there is no *positive* evidence whatsoever to prove the sway of Harsha over Rajasthan. But lest we should be misunderstood, we must make it clear that the available data is not sufficient to believe that Harsha was regarded as their overlord by the contemporary rulers of Rajasthan and, therefore, in the present state of our knowledge it would be better not to include this part of the country within the sphere of Harsha's influence. However, it is quite likely that it is only a case of the limitation of available material. In future some evidence may turn up which may indicate that Harsha exercised some sort of influence over this area. Harsha certainly had something to do with Lāṭa and Saurāshṭra i.e. the kingdom of the Gurjaras of Baroach

1. In addition to Banskhera (*EI*, IV, pp. 208-11) and Madhuban (*EI*, I, pp. 67-75) copper plates of Harsha, following records are now generally believed to be dated according to the Harsha Samvat :
 - (i) Kot Inscription (Bharatpur) of the year 48. (*Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum*, Ajmer, 1916-17, p. 2)
 - (ii) Two copper grants from Dungarpur, dated in the 48 and 83 (*EI*, XXXIV, p. 167.)
 - (iii) Tasai Inscription (Alwar) of the year 182. (*EI*, XXXVI, pp. 49 ff.)
 - (iv) Dabak Inscription (Udaipur) of the year 207. (*EI*, XX, pp. 122-25.)
 - (v) Kaman Inscription (Bharatpur) of the year 263. (*EI*, XXVI, pp. 52 ff.)
 - (vi) Kaman Inscription (Bharatpur) containing seven different dates. (*EI*, XXIV, pp. 329-36.)

and of the Maitrakas of Valabhi.¹ Therefore, it should not be regarded as beyond the bounds of possibility that Rajasthan was also influenced by his military activities. But whether such was actually the case is something which may be decided by future discoveries only.

1. As is quite well known the inscriptions of the Gurjaras of Baroach exultingly mention the fact that Dadda II obtained great glory by protecting (or rescuing) the lord of Valabhi who had been overpowered by 'the great lord, the illustrious Harshadeva'. (IA, XIII, pp. 77--79.)

CHAPTER V

RAJASTHAN IN THE POST-HARSHA CENTURY

The history of North India in the post-Harsha period was marked by chaos and confusion for about a hundred years till the imperial Pratihāras in the west and Pālas in the east once again established two important centres of political power in North India. In the post-Harsha century several attempts were made, notably by the Later-Guptas (who, after the death of Harsha emerged in Magadha),¹ Yaśovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya Muktāpiḍa of Kashmir to establish an extensive and powerful empire, but none of them was successful. Ultimately it were the Pratihāras of Kanauj (who originated probably in Jalore)² and the Pālas of Bengal (who established their capital at Pāṭaliputra)³ who succeeded in bringing about ~~a~~ semblance of political order in North India. At least Rajasthan continued to remain fragmented into several political units till the rise of the imperial Pratihāras. The greatest local powers of this part of the country in this period were the Guhilas of Medapāṭa (Mewar) and the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura (Mandor).

The Guhilas of Medapāṭa

In the preceding chapter we discussed the history of Guhilas upto Śilāditya whose known date is Samvat (Vikrama) 703 (=646 A.D.).⁴ Before we proceed further it is necessary

1. For the history of the Later Guptas of Magadha vide, *CA*, pp. 126 ff; Sinha, B.P., *DKM*, Ch. X; Devahuti, *Harsha*, Ch. II.
2. Cf. Sharma, D., *RTA*, pp. 120 ff, 480-83.
3. For a detailed account see, Majumdar, R.C. (ed.), *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, Ch. IV; *Ancient History of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1971).
4. Cf. Samoli Inscription, *EI*, XX, pp. 96 ff.

here to discuss the problem of the identification of Bappā¹ Rāwal of legends. He has not been mentioned in the Atpur inscription of Śaktikumāra, dated A.D. 977,² but he heads the genealogical list given in the records dating from the thirteenth century A.D.³ The earlier records of this category inform us that Bappā came from Ānandapura, worshipped at the feet of a sage named Hārita-rāśi, and through the grace of the latter became the king of Chitrakūṭa (Chitorgarh).⁴ According to the later records, Bappā, who obtained the favour of Hārita-rāśi, conquered Chitorgarh from the Mori king Māna and adopted the title of Rāwal.⁵ The different chronicles agree in placing him in the first half of the eighth century.⁶ Tod is of the opinion that Bappā occupied Chitor in 720 A.D. and abdicated the throne in 764 A.D.⁷ Other authorities including Ojha give varying dates within these limits.⁸

From the facts given above it is apparent that Bappā could not have been the founder of the Guhilot dynasty. He must have flourished about two centuries after Guhadatta who heads the list of the Guhila kings in the Atpur record. In the Chitorgarh inscription of V.S. 1331 (=1274 A.D.)⁹ and the Achaleśvara (Abu) inscription of V.S. 1342 (=1285 A.D.)¹⁰ Bappā is mentioned as Guhila's father. But it cannot be a fact for an earlier inscription of Naravāhana's reign (V.S. 1028=971

1. Also spelled as Bapa, Bappa, Bappā, Bappaka, Bashpa, etc. Cf. Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajputana*, Vol. II, p. 405.

2. IA, XXXIX, pp. 190 ff.

3. CA, p. 158.

4. Cf. Achaleśvara (Abu) Inscription of V.S. 1342, *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, V, pp. 83 ff; J.P.A.S.B., 1909, p. 170; IHQ, XXVI, p. 263; XXVIII, p. 83, Banerjee, A.C., *Rajput Studies*, pp. 8 ff.

5. Cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 407 ff.; Tod, J., *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, pp. 260 ff.; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna kā Itihāsa*, pt. I, pp. 43 ff.

6. CA, p. 157.

7. Tod, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

8. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, p. 414; cf. IA, XXXIX pp. 190 ff; Shyāmaldās, Kavirāja, *Vīra Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 252. For an early date, vide, Sharma, G.N., *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49,

9. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, IV, pp. 74 ff.

10. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 83 ff.

A.D.)¹ known as the *Ekaliṅga prāśasti* mentions Bappaka as the moon in the family of Guhila. However, his historicity remains undoubted. He must, therefore, be regarded as identical with one or more of the Guhila kings, who flourished in the period discussed in the present chapter. As is obvious *Bappā* is not an individual name but an honorific title.² Therefore, any one of the kings belonging to this period could have been given this *biruda*. Even the discovery of a few coins of *Bappā* with the legend *Śrī-Vappa*³ would not prove that *Bappā* was the personal name of this ruler. Many coins of the Gupta rulers bear only their titles without disclosing their first names.⁴ It should also be kept in mind that the genuineness of 'Śrīvappa' coins is extremely doubtful as they depict an unusually large number of motifs connected with *Bappā Rāwāl* of tradition.

Bappā of tradition has been identified by Col. Tod⁵ and G. C. Raychaudhuri⁶ with Śīla or Śīlāditya of the Samoli inscription⁷ while Kavirāja Shyāmaldās⁸ identified him with Mahendra, G.H. Ojha⁹ with Kālabhoja and D.R. Bhandar-

1. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 69 ff. The name of *Bappā* finds a mention for the first time in this record (गुहिलगोत्रनरेण्द्रचन्द्रः श्रीवप्यकक्षितिपतिः क्षितिपीठरत्नम्). Dhuleva plate of Maharāja Bhaṭṭi (*EI*, XXX, pp. 1 ff.) also mentions one *Bappadālti* as the father of the former, who belonged to the Guhila family. But according to Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, p. 241) he was probably different from *Bappa* of Nāga, known from the above *Ekaliṅga prāśasti* of Naravāhana's reign.

2. Many scholars such as Kavirāja Shyāmaldās (*Vīra-Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 250), G.H. Ojha, (*op. cit.*, p. 405), R.C. Majumdar (*CA*, p. 158) and Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, I, p. 241) subscribe to this view. However, they disagree on the question of the identification of *Bappā*. Contra, Sharma, G.N., *op. cit.*, p. 47.

3. Ojha, G.H., *Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā*, I, pp. 241-285; *History of Rajputana*, Vol. II, pp. 415-16; Samar, R.L., *JNSI*, XX, pp. 28 ff; Altekar, A.S., *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

4. Altekar, A.S., *Coinage*, pp. 56, 60, 67.

5. Tod, James, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

6. *History of Mewar*, p. 30, quoted in *RTA*, I, pp. 236-37.

7. *EI*, XX, pp. 97-99.

8. *Vīra-Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 250.

9. *History of Rajputana*, Vol. II, pp. 406 ff.

kar¹ with Khummāṇa. R.C. Majumdar² prefers the last theory "in view of the celebrity of the name Khummāṇa in the history and tradition of Mewar."³ Dasharatha Sharma wants to leave this question open.⁴ In his view Bappā might have been any one of the above mentioned rulers or even some one else, the only certainty being that he flourished a good deal before 971 A.D. when the name Bappā finds mention for the first time in the inscriptions of the Guhilas of Mewar.⁵ As regards the theory of Tod and Raychaudhuri, it has been pointed out in its support that the Kumbhalgarh inscription of V.S. 1517 (=1480 A.D.)⁶ replaces the name of Śila by that of Bappā. Further, as has been pointed out by Dasharatha Sharma, if achievements alone be any consideration in deciding the issue of the identity of Bappā, Śilāditya has as good a claim as any other ruler of Mewar to this title,⁷ for he gave good rule to his people⁸ and had many political victories to his credit.⁹ In the Chitorgarh inscription of V.S. 1331 (1274 A.D.) it is said that he accepted the Goddess of Victory who had become disgraced by coming into contact with the inimical *Mātaṅgas*, after bathing her in the water from the edge of his sword.¹⁰ It seems that he restored the fortunes of the family, after its eclipse at the hands of the Bhils or Meds i. e. the *Mātaṅgas*.¹¹ But there is nothing in particular to support his identification with Bappā of tradition. To think that Kumbhalgarh inscription of 1480 A.D.¹² puts Bappā in

1. *IA*, 1910, p. 190. But Bhandarkar's list of North Indian inscriptions shows that he now identifies Bappā with Khummāṇa's grandson, Simha.

2. *CA*, p. 158.

3. Cf. Banerjee, A.C., *Rajput Studies*, p. 25.

4. *RTA*, I, p. 241.

5. *Loc. cit.*

6. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 314-28.

7. *RTA*, I, p. 237.

8. Cf. *EI*, XX, pp. 97 ff.

9. Cf. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, IV, pp. 74 ff.

10. *Loc. cit.*

11. *RTA*, I, p. 237.

12. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 314 ff.

place of Śilāditya is obviously a mistake, for according to the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* Bappā became an ascetic in V.S. 810 (= 753 A.D.)¹ while Śilāditya flourished a century earlier, his known date being 646 A.D.²

Shyāmaladās identifies Bappā with Kālabhoja's predecessor Mahendra³ because the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* mentions Bhoja (whom the *Kavirāja* identifies with Kālabhoja) as Bappā's son. But this hypothesis is untenable, for Bhoja of the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* was actually Guhila's son and hence he cannot be identified with Kālabhoja.⁴ Further, Mahendra must have ruled in the second half of the seventh century A. D. while according to the tradition accepted by the *Kavirāja* himself Bappā ruled up to c. 753 A.D.⁵

Śilāditya was succeeded by Aparājita whose inscription of V.S. 718 (= 661 A.D.)⁶ records the building of a temple by Yaśomati, the wife of his general Varāhaśīha. G. H. Ojha identifies Bappā with Kālabhoja, the grandson of Aparājita.⁷ That the reign of Kālabhoja was a remarkable one, can hardly be doubted. In the Achalesvara (Abu) inscription of V.S. 1342 (= c. 85 A.D.)⁸ he has been described as having achieved significant successes against the lords of Katīṭas and Chodas.⁹ It is difficult to determine the true significance of this claim. G.C. Raychaudhuri thinks that Kālabhoja fought against the Chālukya ruler Vinayāditya who claims to have led an expedition to north India.¹⁰ But Vinayāditya belonged to Bādāmī and not Chodā and he is not known to have invaded Mewar. We believe that Kālabhoja's achievements may be best explained by the hypothesis that he was a feudatory of

1. *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya*, Ch. 20, Verses 21-22.

2. Cf. Samoli Inscription of V.S. 703, *EI*, XX, pp. 27 ff.

3. *Vira-Vinoda*, pt. I, p. 250.

4. *RTA*, I, p. 238.

5. *Vira-Vinoda*, pt. I, pp. 250 ff.; cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 410 ff.

6. *EI*, I, V, p. 31.

7. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 400 ff.

8. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, V, pp. 83 ff.

9. *Loc. cit.*

10. *CA*, pp. 245-46; cf. *ibid.*, p. 130.

king Yaśovarman of Kanauj who is known to have overrun almost the whole of India. We shall discuss the relation of Yaśovarman with Rajasthan later.

In support of his contention that Bappā was Kālabhoja of inscription, Ojha has pointed out that Nainsī's *Khyāt*¹ and the *Rājapraśasti*² inform us that Khummāṇa was the son of Bappā while the Aṭpur inscription³ makes the former the son of Kālabhoja.⁴ With the help of *Ekaliṅgarāhātmya* and other sources⁵ Ojha assumes that Kālabhoja or Bappā ruled from V.S. 791 to 810 (=724-753 A.D.)⁶ But other scholars such as D.R. Bhandarkar⁷ and D. Sharma⁸ do not subscribe to this view. According to D. Sharma it is more prudent to rely on the official Kumbhalgarh inscription of V.S. 1517 (=1460 A.D.),⁹ of the reign of Mahārāṇā Kumbhakarṇa and professedly based on many earlier *praśastis*, rather than to believe a literary work composed in the same period.¹⁰ The capture of Chitor by Bappā¹¹ after 713 A.D.¹² is also a later legend. With the exception of the *Rājapraśasti* of V.S. 1732 (=1675 A.D.)¹³ not a single epigraph associates Bappā with the capture of Chitor. Abul-Fazl was also unaware of this tradition.¹⁴ It may be proved with the help of contemporary epigraphs that Mauryas (Moris) continued to rule over Chitor even after

1. Nainsī, *Khyāt*, Patra, II, p. 1.

2. *EI*, XXIX-XXX.

3. *IA*, XXXIX (1910), pp. 190 ff.

4. Ojha, *op. cit.*, p. 409.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 410-414.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 414.

7. *IA*, XXXIX (1910) pp. 190 ff.

8. *RTA*, I, pp. 238-241.

9. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 314 ff.

10. *RTA*, I, p. 240.

11. Nainsī, *Khyāt*, Patra, I, p. 2.

12. Cf. Ojha, G.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 408 ff.; Tod, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 919-22, *Rājasthāna Bhāratī*, year 9, II, pp. 30-31; *CA*, p. 163; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pt. I, pp. 51-52.

13. *EI*, XXIX-XXX.

14. *RTA*, I, p. 240.

753 A.D., the supposed date of Bappā's abdication.¹ According to Dasharatha Sharma, the first Guhila prince who is definitely known to have possessed Chitor was Jaitrasimha (c. 1213-1253 A.D.).² Therefore, G.C. Raychaudhuri seems to be correct in his conclusion that the tradition of Bappā's occupation of Chitor was fabricated in the seventeenth century.³ Further, against the view of Ojha it can also be shown that several *prāśastis* found from Chitor,⁴ Abu⁵ and Ranakapur⁶ mention Bappā and Kālabhoja together as separate individuals.

Kālabhoja was succeeded by his son Khummāṇa I.⁷ He evidently flourished in the first half of the eighth century A.D. This was the period when the Arabs invaded Sindh and parts of Rajasthan. Therefore, it is quite likely that Khummāṇa achieved some success against them.⁸ He was identified by D.R. Bhandarkar⁹ and R.C. Majumdar¹⁰ with Bappā Rāwal. Bhandarkar abandoned his theory later on,¹¹ but it is still adhered to by Majumdar. Bhandarkar calculated that the average reign period of individual rulers between Aparājita (661 A.D.) and Allaṭa (953 A.D.) comes to a little more than 24 years. Therefore, accepting 753 A.D. as the correct year for the abdication of Bappā, Bhandarkar identified him with Khummāṇa, the fourth ruler from Aparājita. But, as pointed by Dasharatha Sharma, this view is "not only against tradition which makes Khummāṇa a son of Bappā, but might be wrong

1. For details see *PIHC*, 1960, pt. I, pp. 86 ff; *JOI*, X, pp. 31-33; *RTA*, I, pp. 226-228.
2. *RTA*, I, p. 240.
3. *History of Mewar*, p. 31.
4. *Bhavanagar Inscriptions*, IV, pp. 74 ff.
5. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 83 ff.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 114; Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srotas*, pp. 139-41.
7. Cf. *IA*, XXXIX, pp. 190 ff.
8. Cf. Raychaudhuri, G.C., *op. cit.*, p. 32.
9. *Loc. cit.*
10. *CA*, p. 159.
11. From Bhandarkar's list of North Indian inscriptions it appears that he later identified Bappā with Khummāṇa's grandson, Simha.

otherwise too, for sometime the total of three reigns can be one hundred years or more.”¹

Thus no solution of the identification of Bappā Rāwal seems to be acceptable to the majority of scholars. Actually his personality is so much mixed up with myths, legends and folklore that now it has become extremely difficult to visualise even its bare outlines. Modern historians, who are somewhat influenced by their nationalistic fervour, try to reconstruct his history with these legends and make the confusion worst confounded. He is regarded as one of the greatest Mahārājā-dhirāja of his times, at least of Rajasthan, if not of the whole of India, though the subsequent history of the Guhilas i.e. the history of the period after 753 A.D. (when the age of Bappā Rāwal had definitely come to an end) does not indicate that they had achieved very remarkable successes in the preceding epoch. To us it appears that Bappā may be partly a legendary figure in the sense that his personality, as known to us, is composed of the stories which became current as a result of the achievements of several rulers of the Guhila family. It must be remembered that Bappā is possibly not an individual name but an honorific title and, therefore, the possibility cannot be ruled out that it was applied to more than one kings.² It is quite likely that the bardic tradition, according to which Bappā captured Chitor after repulsing the *mlechchhas* who had attacked the Mori kingdom, contains an echo of Khummāṇa’s successful fight against the Arabs. His success was probably due as much to his valour as to the natural strategic advantages of the territory over which he ruled.

The immediate successors of Khummāṇa I, namely Maittaṭa, Bharṭṛipaṭṭa, Sirīha, etc., who flourished in the later half of the eighth century A.D. had to accept the overlordship of the imperial Pratihāras. Their history does not fall within the scope of the present work.

1. *RTA*, I, p. 239.

2. Cf. the evolution of the Vikramāditya legend, *supra*, Ch. II, App.

The Guhilas of Chātsu

In addition to the Guhila family of Medapāṭa there was another Guhila dynasty which flourished in the post-Harsha period. It ruled over an extensive region in the Jaipur-Udaipur division. The founder of this dynasty was Bhartrīpaṭṭa who may be placed in the last decades of the sixth century or the beginning of the seventh century A.D. The early history of his family is known from two inscriptions, one found at Chātsu,¹ a town 26 miles to the north of Jaipur, and the other, dated V.S. 741 (684 A.D.), at Nagar,² in the Uniyara Tehsil of the old Jaipur state. Both the places are separated from each other by about 50 miles. According to the Chātsu epigraph, Bhartrīpaṭṭa, the founder of the family, was like Rāma (obviously Paraśurāma) endowed with both priestly and martial qualities (*Brahmakshatrānvita*). As is generally accepted, it means that just as Paraśurāma was a Brāhmaṇa by caste, but performed the feats of a Kshatriya, Bhartrīpaṭṭa also was Brāhmaṇa by birth but followed the vocation of Kshatriyas.³ Incidentally, it is an additional proof of the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Guhilas. Almost nothing is known about the next three rulers, viz. Īśānabhaṭṭa, Upandrabhaṭṭa and Guhila I. Guhila's son Dhanika is also known from the Nagar record mentioned above. It was during his reign that a step-well was constructed at Nagar in V.S. 741 (684 A.D.) 'for the use of his subjects, for the performance of the *Abhisheka* of Śaṅkara and for the acquisition of religious merit.'⁴ D.R. Bhandarkar⁵ identified him with the ruler of the same name known to us from the Dabok (a village 8 miles to the east of Udaipur) inscription of the time of Dhavalappadeva.⁶ Bhandarkar read the date of the Dabok record as 407 and referred it to the Gupta Era (A.D. 725).⁷ But R.R. Halder reads it as 207 and refers it to

1. *EI*, XII, pp. 10-17.

2. *Bhārata-Kaumudi*, I, pp. 287 ff.

3. Cf. *EI*, XII, p. 11; *CA*, p. 160.

4. *Bhārata-Kaumudi*, I, p. 269.

5. *EI*, XII, pp. 11-12.

6. *Ibid.*, XX, pp. 122-125.

7. *Ibid.*, XII, pp. 11-12.

the Harsha Era (A.D. 813).¹ R.C. Majumdar is inclined to accept the former reading.² He has rightly argued that Dhanika "could not have flourished in 207 H.E. (813 A.D.) as Harsharāja, fourth in descent from him, was contemporary of Pratihāra Bhoja I".³ According to the Dabok inscription Dhanika ruled over Dhavagartā i.e. Dhoḍ in the Jahajpur district of the former Udaipur state which was probably the capital of this dynasty.⁴ He was a feudatory of the Paramabhattaraka Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara Śrī Dhavalappadeva. According to D.R. Bhandarkar, this Dhavalappadeva should be identified with the Maurya ruler named Dhavala mentioned in the Kanaswa (old Kota state) inscription of V.S. 795 (738 A.D.).⁵ The suggestion, if correct, would indicate that the Guhilas of Chāṭsu were the feudatories of the Mauryas of the Udaipur region. R.C. Majumdar even goes a step further and suggests that the main branch of the Guhilots was also a feudatory of the Mauryas and Bappā founded an independent state on the ruins of the Maurya kingdom when it was destroyed by the Arabs.⁶ Dasharatha Sharma, however, doubts the validity of the identification of the two Dhanikas. According to him as since Dhavalappadeva is not mentioned in the Nagar inscription as Dhanika's sovereign, the latter cannot be identified with Dhanika, the feudatory of Dhavalappadeva.⁷ Against this argument it may be suggested that Dhanika of Nagar record could have accepted the overlordship of Dhavalappa Maurya after 684 A.D. If such was the case he obviously could not mention the Maurya Mahārājādhirāja in his earlier document.

The subsequent history of this branch of the Guhilas does not concern us as it belongs to the period when the Pratihāras of Jalore became an imperial power and the Guhilas were forced to accept their overlordship.

1. *EI*, XX, pp. 122 ff.

2. *CA*, p. 160 fn. 2.

3. *Loc. cit.*

4. *EI*, XII, p. 12.

5. *IA*, XIX, pp. 55 ff; Tod, J., *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, II, p. 917.

6. *CA*, p. 158.

7. *RTA*, p. 212.

The Mauryas of Mewar

In the seventh century or in the beginning of the eighth century, the Mauryas, evidently the same as the Mori Rajputs, had a strong principality in S. E. Rajasthan. They were perhaps the most prominent power in this region before the Pratihāras achieved imperial status. There is still a sub-clan of the Paramāras known as Morya or Maurya.¹ Whether the Mori Rajputs were connected with the imperial Mauryas, is difficult to determine in the present state of our knowledge. Their existence in this area is proved by the bardic tradition as well as several documents, but a connected account of their history with the help of these materials cannot be reconstructed. According to the bardic tradition, the Guhilot ruler Bappā conquered Chitor from the Mori king Manurāja.² This Manurāja has been identified by Tod with the king Maun of an inscription published by him in his *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*.³ He was preceded by three rulers, viz., Māhesvara, Bhīma and Bhoja. Bhīma is said to have been the ruler of Avantipura and a great warrior. His grandson Maun was the builder of the Mānasarovara lake. A certain king Mānabhaṅga is also mentioned in an inscription found at Shankarghatta. This record, dated V.S. 770 (=713 A.D.) describes him as a builder of magnificent palace and tanks, etc. at Chitor.⁴ The association of the Mauryas with Chitor is also indicated by the tradition which attributes the construction of Chitrāṅga tank to Chitrāṅgada Maurya. As the tank finds mention in a Chitor epigraph of V.S. 1344 (1287 A.D.),⁵ the tradition may

1. Tod, James, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, p. 265, fn. 3.

2. Nainsi, *Khyāt, Patra*, 1, p. 2; Ojha, G.H., *History of Rajasthan*, Vol. II, p. 408; Tod, *op. cit.*, pp. 265-66; *CA*, p. 158.

3. Tod, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 919-22. Because of its weight the original stone on which this record was engraved had to be thrown into the sea by Tod when he was on his way to England.

4. *Rājasthāna Bhāratī*, year 9, II, pp. 30-31. Dasharatha Sharma (*RTA*, pp. 296-7) wrongly believes that the Tod inscription is also dated M.E. 770 (713 A.D.).

5. Sharma, G.N., *Rājasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, p. 118.

have some truth in it. The existence of a Maurya family in S.E. Rajasthan is further proved by the Jhalrapatan inscription dated A.D. 690 which mentions Rājā Durgagaṇa of the Maurya lineage.¹ The Kanaswa (in the former Kota State) inscription² of V.S. 795 (738 A.D.) mentions a local Brāhmaṇa prince Śivagaṇa as a friend of king Dhavala of the Maurya dynasty.³ Probably this Dhavala has been mentioned in the Dabok (Dhod, Mewar) inscription⁴ also, as Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara Śrī Dhavalappadeva who was the overlord of Dhanika, the Guhilaputra.

The combined testimony of all these evidences mentioned above creates certain problems. For example, according to the bardic tradition Bappā conquered Chitor from the Mori king Manurāja or Māna whom Shankarghatta inscription places in 713 A.D. But Māna could have hardly been the last Maurya ruler in Udaipur if the king Dhavala of the Maurya lineage was ruling as late as 738 A.D., as the Kanaswa epigraph reveals. This doubt is further confirmed by the Dabok (Dhod) inscription of Dhanika which refers to the P.M.P. Dhavalappadeva as his overlord in 725 A.D. As Dhavalappadeva is generally identified with king Dhavala of Kanaswa record it can hardly be maintained that Bappā occupied Chitor before 738 A.D. Therefore, either the tradition which makes Bappā a conqueror of Manurāja or Māna is wrong or, the date given in the Shankarghatta inscription is not trustworthy.

The Mauryas fell victim to the Arab aggression. Their subsequent history which is not known in detail, does not concern us here.

The Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura

In the preceding chapter we carried the history of the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura upto the reign of Tāta. Accor-

1. *IA*, LVI, p. 213 quoted in *CA*, p. 162 fn. 3.

2. Tod, *op.cit.*, II, pp. 914 ff.

3. *IA*, XIX, p. 10.

4. *EI*, XX, pp. 122 ff.

ding to the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka dated V.S. 894 (837 A.D.)¹ Tāta "who realised that the world was evanescent as lightening," abdicated the kingdom in favour of his younger brother Bhoja and himself retired to the pious hermitage of Māṇḍavya and practised there the rites of true religion.² R.C. Majumdar believes that at the time of Yuan Chwang's visit to this part of the country Tāta was ruling over his ancestral kingdom.³ But, as we have discussed earlier,⁴ the Pi-lo-mo-lo kingdom mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim should be identified with the Chāpa kingdom of Billamāla and not with the Gurjara kingdom of the Pratihāras of Mandor, as Majumdar asks us to do.

Nothing is known about Bhoja. He was succeeded by Yaśovardhana, the son of Tāta. The former, in turn was succeeded by his son Chanduka. Of the reigns of these kings no fact worthy of mention has been recorded in the Jodhpur inscription. They may be assigned roughly to the second half of the seventh century and the early years of the eighth century A.D.

The next king Śiluka, the great grandson of Tāta, was, however, an important ruler. According to the Jodhpur inscription, he fixed a perpetual boundary between Stravaṇi (or Travaṇi) and Valla, and after knocking down the Bhaṭṭi king Devarāja on the ground, at once obtained from him the ensign

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87-99; Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions* pp. 158-161.

2. तातेन तेन लोकस्य विद्युच्चञ्चलजीवितम् ।
बुद्ध्वा राज्यं लघोभ्रतुः श्रीभोजस्य समर्पितम् ॥४॥
स्वयं च संस्थितस्तातः शुद्धं धर्मं समाचरन् ।
माण्डव्यस्याश्रमे पुण्ये नदीनिर्भरशोभिते ॥५॥

—*loc. cit.*

3. *EI*, XVIII, p. 92; cf. *CA*, pp. 153-54.

4. *Supra*, Ch. IV.

of the Umbrella.¹ He has been called *Valla-maṇḍala-pālaka*.² Although the exact significance of this statement of the Jodhpur record is not certain, yet it appears that Śiluka achieved some success against neighbouring powers. Perhaps the Pratihāra principality was very often raided by the people from the neighbouring Valla state. According to R.C. Majumdar, "if *Stravaṇi* be regarded as identical with *Taban* of the Arab writers which probably consisted of a part of the Panjab just to the north-west of Rajputana, Śiluka's kingdom must have roughly corresponded to modern Jodhpur and Bikaner. The Bhaṭṭī king *Devarāja* was probably the ruler of the Bhaṭṭī clan who occupied Jaisalmer, and by defeating him Śiluka established his supremacy in Rajputana."³ Dasharatha Sharma broadly concurs with Majumdar but on the question of the interpretation of another passage of the epigraph he disagrees with the latter.⁴ Any way, it is certain that Śiluka's success against the Bhaṭṭī king gave him a safe frontier on the northern as well as the north-western side of the Pratihāra kingdom. According to Majumdar, the title *Valla-maṇḍala-pālaka* presumably refers to a confederacy of states of which Śiluka was the recognised head.⁵ This view is based on the assumption that the Pratihāras of Mandor were Gurjaras and were a branch of the same horde to which the Gurjaras of Nāndipuri and the Gurjara Pratihāras of Malwa (i.e. the imperial Pratihāras) belonged. But, as we have already seen,⁶ there is no reason to believe that these three dynasties were racially

1. ततः श्रीशिलुको जातः पुत्रो दुर्बीरविक्रमः ।
येन सीमा कृता नित्या स्त्रवणीवल्लदेशयोः ॥६॥
भट्टिक देवराजं यो वल्लमण्डलपालकं(ः) ।
निपात्य तत्कर्णं भूमौ प्राप्तवानुच्छ्रवचिह्नकं(ः) ॥१६॥

—loc. cit.

2. *Loc. cit.*

3. *CA*, p. 154.

4. Cf. *RTA*, I, p. 217 fn. 1.

5. *CA*, p. 154.

6. *Supra*, Ch. IV.

related with each other and had formed a confederacy. The Gurjaras of Nāndipūri are nowhere called Pratihāras and the Pratihāras of Māṇḍavyapura are nowhere called Gurjaras. Further, whether the imperial Gurjara Pratihāras belonged to Malwa, as Majumdar believes, is also a most debated point.¹ "To speak of Śiluka of the Mandor Pratihāra family as the head of a Gurjara confederacy, therefore, can hardly be regarded as justified ; it needs much of evidence than the theoretical hypothesis put forward by Dr. Majumdar."²

From the Jodhpur inscription it appears that Śiluka was a religious-minded person. He not only founded a town but also excavated a tank and constructed a lofty temple of Siddheśvara Mahādeva at a holy place called Tretā.³ But whether his reign ended peacefully or not is doubtful. We know that either he or his successor was on the throne when the Arabs invaded Rajasthan and Gujarat and advanced as far as Ujjayinī. The Arab general Junaid conquered Bailman and Jurz and raided Marmad Mandal and Barus. Of these Marmad was most likely included in Śiluka's kingdom.⁴ However, the credit of hurling the invaders back and saving western India from them belongs to Nāgabhaṭa I, the imperial Pratihāra ruler, and Avanijanāśraya Pulakesirāja, the Chālukya king of Lāṭa (South Gujarat). We shall have occasion to refer to the achievements of these rulers later.

The history of Śiluka's immediate successors Jhoṭa (the son of Śiluka), Bhillāditya (the son of the former) and Kakka (the son of Bhillāditya and the father of Bāuka and (Kakkuka) is neither known in detail nor does it concern us; for it belongs to the period when the imperial Pratihāras had become para-

1. Cf. *RTA*, I, pp. 108 ff, 218.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 218.

3. पुष्करिणी कारिता येन त्रेतातीर्थे च पत्तनम् ।
सिद्धेश्वरो महादेवः कारितस्तुंगमंदिरः ॥२०॥

Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 180.

4. *EI*, IX, p. 278; cf. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 87 ff.

mount power in western India and the Pratihāras of Mandor had become subordinate to them.

The Arab Invasion of Rajasthan

The rise of the Arabs as a great power is one of the most remarkable events in the history of Asia. At the time of the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632 A.D., the temporal authority of the central Arab government, the chief of which came to be known as the Caliph, did not extend beyond the Arab peninsula. But within a little more than a century after the death of the Prophet, the Arabs had advanced as far as Spain and France in the west and Sindh in the east.¹ Their earliest expeditions against India were sent during the Caliphate of Umar (634-44 A.D.). The first of them was directed against Thana near Bombay while two others were aimed at Barwas (Broach) and Debal, a port at the mouth of the Indus.² Then the Arabs threatened the kingdoms of Kābul and Zābul under the dynasty of the Ummayides³ and made persistent efforts for their subjugation. But they could achieve no permanent gain. We are not concerned here with this phase of the history of their Indian invasions. From the point of view of the history of Rajasthan covered in this chapter, only the Arab military expedition against western India is relevant:

In the seventh century, Sindh was an independent kingdom. It succeeded in defending itself against the early Arab expeditions which took place in the middle of the seventh century.⁴ But ultimately it succumbed to the aggression of Muhammad-bin-Qasim,⁵ the nephew and son-in-law of Hajjāj, who was the governor of Iraq serving under the Khalif Walīd.⁶ At that time Sindh was ruled over by Dāhir or Dāhar who valiantly defended his kingdom but the treachery of the

1. *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III, ed. Wolseley Haig), p. 1.

2. Elliot, H.M. and Dowson, J., *The History of India (As Told by its own Historians)*, Vol. I, pp. 414-16.

3. Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, pp. 422 ff.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 415 ff.

5. Also called Muhammad bin Kasim Sakīfī or Muhammad-bin-Al-Kasim by Arab writers (*ibid.*, p. 432-3).

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 428-29.

Buddhist fifth columnists and the operation of certain other factors made the position of Muhammed strong. According to *Chach-nāmā* or *Tarikh-Hind wa Sindh*¹ in the battle of Raor (Rawar) on Thursday, the 10th Ramazan in the year 93 (June, 712 A.D.) Dāhar, who fought with valour and nearly succeeded in routing the Muslim army, suddenly died in the battle-field. It disheartened his men and officers.² Jaisimha (Jaisiya), the son of Dāhar, retreated to Brahmanabad but ultimately both Brahmanabad and the capital city Alor fell to the enemy despite the fact that people of these cities fought bravely.³

Meanwhile the internal politics of the Caliphate was fast changing. The death of Hajjāj in 714 A.D. and that of Caliph Walīd in the following year brought evil days for Muhammad-bin-Qasim.⁴ The new Caliph Sulaiman (715-717 A.D.) was an enemy of Hajjāj. He wreaked vengeance on the members of Hajjāj's family. Muhammad was recalled to Iraq where he was put to death by torture.⁵ Caliph Umar II (717-720) offered virtual independence to Indian princes on condition of their accepting Islam.⁶ Jaisimha accepted the offer, but during the Caliphate of Hishām (A.D. 724-743) he apostatized and declared war against Junaid, the Arab governor of Sindh. However, Junaid defeated him and took him prisoner.⁷

Junaid carried the Muslim arms into the interiors of India. According to the *Futuhu-l-Buldan* of Al Biladuri "He (Junaid) then sent his officers to Marmad, Mandal, Dahnaj, and Barus (Broach)... He sent a force against Uzain and he also sent Habid, son of Marra, with an army against the country of Māliba. They made incursion against Uzain, and they attacked Baharimad and burnt its suburbs. Junaid conquered at Bailamān and Jurz."⁸ Most of these places have been

1. For details, Muhammad-bin-Kasim Sakifi, pp. 131-211.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 170-71.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 171 ff.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 437.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 439; cf. *CHI*, III, pp. 7-8; *CA*, p. 172.

6. Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

7. *Ibid.* pp. 125-26, 441-42.

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 126, 441-42.

satisfactorily identified. Barus or Barwas is definitely Broach and Baimān stands for Bhillamāla¹ (Bhinmal) while the kingdom of Jurz is evidently identical with some Gurjara principality.² Māliba and Uzain no doubt stand for Malwa and its capital city Ujjain³ and Marmad for Maru-Māra, corresponding to Jaisalmer and part of Jodhpur. Thus it would appear that the Arabs advanced as far as Broach in the south and Malwa in the west and also penetrated deep into Rajasthan. The Navsari Plates of Chālukya Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja of Lāṭa (c. 738 A.D.) also speak of the defeat of the kings of the Saindhavas, the Kachchhelas, Saurāshṭra, the Chāvotīkas, the Mauryas and the Gurjara by the Tajikas, i.e., the Arabs.⁴ The two accounts agree remarkably, excepting that Saurāshṭra, denoting the Valabhi kingdom, is not included in the Arab account.⁵ These expeditions took place in the second quarter of the eighth century. They were successful at least temporarily but very soon Nāgabhaṭa I, the imperial Pratihāra ruler and Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja, Chālukya ruler of Lāṭa, checked the victorious advance of the Arabs. According to the Chālukya records the valorous stand taken by Pulakeśirāja earned him the titles "solid pillar of Dakshināpatha" and "the repeller of the unrepellable".⁶ As regards Nāgabhaṭa I, it is usually admitted that it was this success of the Pratihāra ruler against the Arabs which enhanced his power and glory and led his family to make an attempt for imperial status.

*Invasions of Yaśovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya
Muktāpiṭa of Kashmir*

In the first half of the eighth century A.D. Rajasthan had to face not only the invasion of the Arabs but also of

1. According to R.C. Majumdar (*CA*, pp. 154, 172) Baimān stands for Vallamaṇḍala of Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka.
2. Cf. Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, pp. 354-60.
3. *CA*, p. 172.
4. *Bhandarkar List*, No. 1220; cf. *ABORI*, X, p. 31.
5. *CA*, p. 173.
6. *Bhandarkar List*, No. 1220; *ABORI*, X, p. 31.

two indigenous powers. They were, Yaśovarman of Kanauj and Lalitāditya Muktāpiḍa of Kashmir. The exploits of Yaśovarman have been described in a contemporary Prakrit work called the *Gauḍavaho* which was composed by his court poet Vākpati. This work was planned on an enormous scale but on the whole contains "as little history as possible"¹ Some additional light on Yaśovarman's career is thrown by Kalhanā's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and Jain works such as the *Prabhāvakacharita*, the *Prabandha kosa*, and the *Bappabhaṭṭasūricharita*. We also have an inscription written in high-flown Sanskrit from Nalanda which belongs to the reign of Yaśovarman. It was engraved by Mālada, the son of a minister of this ruler.²

The antecedents and early history of this king are shrouded in considerable mystery. Vākpati informs us that his patron was "an ornament to the lunar race of kings"³ while *Bappabhaṭṭasūricharita*⁴ and the *Prabhāvakacharita*⁵ make him a descendent of Chandragupta Maurya. It is quite likely that he belonged to the Maukhari family which the later Jain writers mistakenly identified with the Maurya dynasty⁶

Vākpati gives a detailed account of *vijaya jātrā* of Yaśovarman in a manner of the *digvijaya* of a mythical world-conqueror, but nowhere does he refer to the defeated kings by their names, not even to the king of Gauḍa, though the

1. Keith, A.B., *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 160.

2. *EI*, XX, pp. 37 ff. Hirananda Sastri, the editor of this inscription, wrongly identified the king Yaśovarmmadeva of this record with Yaśodharman of the Mandasor inscriptions. For an analysis of different views on this point vide, Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj*, pp. 205-207.

3. *Gauḍa-Vaho* (S.P. Pandit's ed.) verses, 1064-65.

4. *JBBRAS*, Vol. III, 1928, pp. 103, 314.

5. *Prabhāvakacharita*, XI, verses 46-47, p. 131 (H.M. Sarma's ed. Bombay, 1909).

6. Cf. Cunningham, A., *Arch. Surv. Ind. Rep.*, XV, p. 164; Pires, E.A., *The Maukhari*, pp. 136-137; Ray, N., *Calcutta Review*, Feb., 1928, p. 216. Cf. the case of Pūrvavarman of Magadha who, according to Yuan Chwang (Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, II, p. 218) was a Maurya, though from circumstantial evidence it appears that he was a Maukhari. For a detailed analysis of this problem vide, Goyal, S.R., *PRHC*, X, 1972, pp. 16 ff.

poem is entitled *Gaudavaho* 'or the slaying of the king of Gauḍa'. The whole narrative is singularly devoid of factual details. The facts concerning Yaśovarman's relations with Rajasthan as narrated in the *Gaudavaho* may be summed up as follows :

After conquering Magadha, Vaṅga, the region of the Malaya mountain (the southern Sahyādri), the Deccan, the Pārasikas and western mountains i.e., the western Ghāṭs, Yaśovarman returned towards Narmadā. Then passing by the sea-coast he marched towards Marudeśa (Rajasthan Desert Marwar). From there he advanced towards Śrikanṭha, the district round Thanesar and from there proceeded towards Ayodhyā.¹ In this description the reference to Marudeśa is significant from our point of view. It indicates that Yaśovarman made an attempt to conquer western Rajasthan. It is quite possible that this invasion was in the nature of a counter-offensive against the Arabs. The Arabs are known to have advanced as far as Kiraj or Kira which corresponds to modern Kangra.² This must have been looked upon by Yaśovarman as a potential danger to his kingdom. No wonder if he tried to check the Arab inroads by bringing the Marudeśa within the sphere of his influence. After the conquest of Sindh, Arabs planned an expedition against Kanauj which did not meet with any success. The defeat of the Pārasikas by Yaśovarman probably refers to his victory over the Arabs of Sindh.³ From the Chinese sources we learn that Yi-sha-fu-mo (Yaśovarman), the king of central India, sent his minister, the Buddhist monk Pu-ta-sin (Buddhasena) to the court of Chinese emperor in 731 A.D.⁴ According to generally accepted view, this mission was

1. Scholars hold divergent opinion regarding the authenticity of this narration of Vākpati. V.A. Smith (*JRHS*, 1908, p. 779) sees nothing incredible in the assertion that Yaśovarman was a powerful conqueror while R.S. Tripathi (*op. cit.*, pp. 199-200) thinks that the description of the *dīgvijaya* is not based on actual facts.

2. *CA*, p. 173.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 130.

4. Chavannes, *Tou-kiue*, Additional Notes, p. 53 fn. 2; Bagchi, P.C., *Sino-Indian Studies*, I, p. 71 quoted by R.C. Majumdar in *CA*, p. 130 fn. 2. Cf. Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj*, p. 196.

sent to solicit Chinese help against the Arabs. If this view is correct, it may be admitted that Yaśovarman had gained some hold over Rajasthan.

When Yaśovarman was attempting to establish an all-India empire, Kashmir was becoming an important power under the leadership of Lalitāditya Muktāpīda. Kālhana, the author of *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, has drawn a magnificent picture of this celebrated king, who, "being eager for conquests", passed most of his time in expedition, abroad, "moving round the earth like the sun".¹ According to the Chinese sources he also sent an embassy to China in 732 or 733 A.D. and probably referred to Yaśovarman as an ally.² It appears that like Yaśovarman he was apprehensive of the Arab invaders when they advanced as far as Kangra, too near for his comfort. Although Yaśovarman and Lalitāditya joined hands against the foreign invaders, yet imperial ambition brought them into conflict with each other. According to the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, there was a prolonged struggle between the two monarchs. The war, at first, was cut short by a truce and a formal treaty was drawn up. But, as none of the contending parties would give precedence to the name of his rival in the peace document, the military activities were renewed.³ Ultimately Yaśovarman was defeated and was reduced to the position of a minister to eulogize Lalitāditya's virtues. The territory of Kānyakubja became like a courtyard of Lalitāditya's residence.⁴

After defeating Yaśovarman, Lalitāditya emulated the military career of his former rival. He reached Gauda and Kaliṅga in the East, Kāverī in the South and Dvārakā in the West. After giving this description of his *digvijaya*, Kālhana at one place describes how Lalitāditya was lured by a faithful minister of a king, who ruled near Bālukārṇava, (the Ocean of sand) to invade that kingdom and was trapped in the

1. *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, Bk. IV, verse 131, (Translation, Stein, p. 131).

2. Cf. *CA*, pp. 130 and 133 fn. 1.

3. *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, Bk. IV, Verses 135-140.

4. *Ibid.*, Verses 144-46.

Marudeśa. But Lalitāditya succeeded "in creating a river in the Maru land" and thus save his army.¹ Whatever the element of truth in this episode, it certainly indicates that like Yaśovarman, Lalitāditya also claimed some sort of success in western Rajasthan.

The dates of the invasions of Yaśovarman and Lalitāditya of Rajasthan depend upon the dates of the latter which may be determined with the help of internal evidence of the *Rājataranginī* and the Chinese sources. According to the data furnished by the *Rājataranginī*, Lalitāditya flourished 455 years, 7 months and 11 days before the reign of Jayasimha, the patron of Kalhaṇa.² On the basis of this fact, it has been calculated that Lalitāditya ascended the throne in 693 A.D. and ruled upto 730 A.D.³ But from the Chinese sources it appears that Chandrāpiṭa, the second predecessor of Lalitāditya sent an emissary to China in 713 A.D. and received investiture as king from the Emperor of China in 720 A.D. whereas, according to Kalhaṇa's chronology, Chandrāpiṭa was already dead in 689 A.D.⁴ Therefore, there is a mistake of at least 31 years in Kalhaṇa's calculation. Hence Lalitāditya's accession cannot be placed earlier than 724 A.D. In that case Yaśovarman will have to be assigned to the middle of the eighth century. According to the Jain writers also Yaśovarman was ruling in in V.S. 800 (743 A.D.). Further, Rajaśekhara (the author of *Prabandhakosha*) states that Bappabhaṭṭi, who was initiated as a Jain monk in 750 A.D., converted Āmarāja, the son and successor of Yaśovarman, to Jainism, apparently after this date. It proves that Yaśovarman must have died in or shortly before 750 A.D.⁵ The conquest of Rajasthan by Lalitāditya must also have taken place in this general period.

Nothing is known about the successors of Yaśovarman. At least they do not seem to have any thing to do with Rajasthan. They are mentioned by the Jain writers but without

1. *Rājataranginī*, Bk. IV, verses 282-306.

2. *Gauḍavaho*, S.P. Pandit ed., Introduction, pp. LXXXVI-XCII.

3. Cf. Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj*, p. 191; *CA*, p. 135 fn. 1.

4. Cf. Tripathi, R.S., *op. cit.*, p. 196.

5. Cf. *Collected works of Sir R.G. Bhandarkar*, Vol. II, pp. 429 ff.

any specific information. They were supplanted at Kanauj by the kings of the Āyudha dynasty which was overthrown by the imperial Pratihāras in the beginning of the ninth century A.D.

The Rise of the Imperial Pratihāras

The rise of the imperial Pratihāras marked a turning point in the history of North India in general and Rajasthan in particular. In the Gwalior *praśasti* of Mihirabhoja¹ they claim descent from Lakshmaṇa, the younger brother of Rāma.² Further, this record describes Vatsarāja as foremost amongst the most distinguished Kshatriyas and as one who stamped the noble race of Ikshvāku with his own name by virtue of his blameless conduct.³ This claim is further strengthened by Rājaśekhara who calls his patron Mahendrapāla *Raghukulatilaka* i.e., ornament of the race of Raghu,⁴ and “Raghugrāmaṇī” or leader of Raghu family⁵ and Mahipāla as “Raghuvamśamuktāmaṇī” or ‘the pearl jewel of the lineage of Raghu.’⁶ Thus there can be hardly any doubt that the imperial Pratihāras looked upon themselves as Kshatriyas of the solar race. The theory that they were foreigners and belonged to the Gurjara race is not favoured by competent authorities now.

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99-114; Pandey, R.B., *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*, pp. 162-166.

2. इलाध्यस्तस्यानुजोऽसी मधवमदमुषो मेघनादस्य संख्ये
सौमित्रिस्तीव्रदण्डः प्रतिहरणविधेर्यः प्रतीहार आसीत्

—Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 162, verse, 3, Cf. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 110-111, fn. 5.

3. एकः क्षत्रियपुङ्गवेषु च यशोगुर्वी धुरं प्रोद्वह-
निक्षवाकोः कुलमुन्तं सुचरितैश्चक्ते
स्वनामांकितं

—Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 161, verse, 7.

4. रघुकुलतिलको महेन्द्रः

—*Viddhaśālabhañjikā*, ed. Atre. Canto I, stanza 5.

5. देवो महेन्द्रपालनृपतिः शिष्यो रघुग्रामणिः

—*Bālabhārata*, Canto I, stanza ii.

6. *Ibid.*, canto I, stanza ii.

The term 'Gurjara' in this period had a geographical connotation and a racial one.¹

The early history of the imperial Pratihāra family is known mainly from the Gwalior *praśasti* of Mihirabhoja. Unfortunately, it does not mention the original home of this dynasty. According to R.C. Majumdar and many others, the dynasty belonged to western Malwa and had its capital at Ujjain (ancient Ujjayini)² This is sought to be proved with the help of the colophon to the Jain *Harivamśa Purāṇa* of Jinasena which mentions Vatsarāja as the king of Avanti.³ Further support for this theory is provided by the Sanjan plates of Amoghavarsha I, dated Śaka year 793 (871 A.D.)⁴ which refer to the Hiranyaagarbha *mahādāna* ceremony of Dantidurga Rāshṭrakūṭa at Ujjayini where the Gurjara lord and others were made door-keepers.⁵ But Dasharatha Sharma does not agree with this view. According to him, the translation of the relevant verse of the Jain *Harivamśa-Purāṇa* accepted by Majumdar and others is not correct. He thinks it better to take the 'Avantirāja' of this verse as the master of the east (*pūrvava*) and Vatsarāja as the lord of the western quarter (*para*) i.e. Rajasthan.⁶ As regards the evidence of the Rāshṭrakūṭa inscriptions, it actually does not prove any thing for it makes all the kings, and not only the Gurjara rulers, as door-keepers in the Hiranyaagarbha *mahādāna* ceremony of Dantidurga. Dasharatha Sharma has given some very cogent reasons

1. Cf. *Supra*, Ch. IV; *RTA*, I, pp. 108-119.

2. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99 ff; *JDL*, X, pp. 1-76; Tripathi, R.S., *History of Kanauj*, pp. 225-227; *The Age of the Imperial Kanauj*; pp. 19-24.

3. *Bombay Gazeteer*, 1896, Vol. I, pt. II, p. 197, fn. 2; *IA*, XV, pp. 141-42.

4. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 235-57; Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 245-56.

5. हिरण्यगर्भराजन्यैरुज्जयिन्यां यदासितम् ।

प्रतीहारीकृतं येन गुर्जंरेशादिराजकम् ॥

—First plate, Verse 9, Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 247.

Cf. the Ellora Dāśavatāra cave temple inscription, *ASI (West. Circle) Report*, V, p. 88.

6. *RTA*, I, p. 125.

to believe that Jalor in Rajasthan was the original home of the imperial Pratihāras.¹ The Buchkala inscription of 815 A.D. speaks of the locality as the *sva-vishaya* of Nāgabhaṭa II.² The Daulatpura plate of Bhojadeva I (V.S. 900=843 A.D.)³ and the Osia inscription (V.S. 1013=956 A.D.)⁴ reveal the fact that the region of Jalor was ruled by the Pratihāras from the time of, at least, Vatsarāja onwards.⁵ On the other hand, Malwa has yielded neither coins nor early inscriptions of the imperial Pratihāras. Further, the testimony of *ĀMMK* shows that in the first half of the seventh century, Avanti was ruled over by the rulers of Valabhī.⁶ Therefore, the Pratihāras had nothing to do with that region upto that period. Moreover, the *Kuvalayamālakathā* which was composed at Jalor in the reign of Vatsarāja speaks of the Mālava people as darkish in colour, irascible and ferocious.⁷ It could not have been the case if Vatsarāja had primarily been a ruler of Malwa. And, lastly, the tradition recorded in the *Purātanaprabandhasaṅgraha* shows that Nāgabhaṭa I established his capital at Jalor.⁸ Thus there are ample reasons to assume that the imperial Pratihāra dynasty originated in the Jalor area of Rajasthan.

The history of the imperial Pratihāras commences with Nāgabhaṭa I. To use the imagery of the Gwalior *praśasti* Nāgabhaṭa appeared like Nārāyaṇa, in response to the prayer of the oppressed people and crushed the large armies of the powerful Mlechchha king, the destroyer of virtue.⁹ Here

1. For detailed analysis vide, *RTA*, I, pp. 121 ff.

2. *EI*, IX, pp. 198 ff.

3. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 208 ff.

4. Sharma, G.N., *Rajasthāna ke Itihāsa ke Srotā*, pt. I, p. 63.

5. Cf. *RTA*, I, p. 125.

6. Cf. *PIHC*, 1980, sec. I, Presidential Address.

7. *Kuvalayamālā* (Singhi Jain Granthāvalī, Bombay Edition), lines 2-6, p. 153.

8. *RTA*, I, p. 128; Cf. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, XVIII, pt. III-IV, pp. 74 ff.

9. तद्वन्शे प्रतिहारकेतनभूतिसत्रैलोक्यरक्षास्पदे

देवो नागभटः पुरातनमुनेमूर्तो वभूवाद्भुतम् ।

येनासौ सुकृतप्रमाथिवलवन्म्लेच्छाधिपाक्षीहिणी-

क्षन्दानस्फुरदुग्रहेतिरुधिरैर्दोभिरुचतुर्भर्व भी ॥

—Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 162-63, Verse 4.

obviously is a reference to his success against the Arab invaders who had overrun the western borders of India including portions of Rajasthan in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D.¹ It was in the course of his struggle against the Arabs that Nāgabhaṭa carried his victorious arms as far as Broach which was ruled over by his Chāhamāna feudatory Bhartṛivadḍha II. According to Dasharatha Sharma, the Sanjan plates appear to have apportioned the main share in the war of liberation against the Arabs to Dantidurga and deliberately under-estimated the contribution of the Pratihāra king. The circumstantial evidences clearly show that the burden of freeing the country from the Arabs was mainly shouldered by Nāgabhaṭa I and his friends from Rajasthan.

Nāgabhaṭa was able to bequeath his successors a powerful dominion which included Bhillamāla, Lāṭa, Jalor, Abu and probably some other chunks of territory in Rajasthan and central India. Those who regard Malwa as the original homeland of the Pratihāras include it also within the Pratihāra kingdom. Nāgabhaṭa is said to have extended his patronage to a Jain scholar named Yakshadeva who has been identified with Kshamāśramaṇa Yakshadatta of the *Kuvalayamālākathā* whose pupils beautified Gurjaradeśa with many temples.²

Nāgabhaṭa I was succeeded by his nephew Kakkuka. Excepting the fact that he was a witty person,³ we know nothing about him. Kakkuka in turn was succeeded by his younger brother, Devarāja or Devaśakti. Gwalior *praśasti* indicates that at some time during his reign the Pratihāra authority was threatened by external danger. But he seems to have maintained the dignity of the family and paternal kingdom quite intact. According to Dasharatha Sharma, it would be wrong to identify him with Bhaṭṭika of the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka and conclude that he was defeated by Śiluka of the

1. Cf. Elliot and Dowson, *The History of India*, Vol. I, p. 126.

2. Cf. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, XVIII, pts. III-IV, pp. 74 ff.

3. Verse 5 of the Gwalior *praśasti*, *loc. cit.*

Pratihāra family of Mandor.¹ However, his son and successor Vatsarāja (known date 783 A.D.) earned real imperial status for his family.² With him the Pratihāras ceased to be a local power and became a claimant for imperial glory which they ultimately enjoyed for more than 200 years.

1. *RT.I*, I, p. 121 and fn. 2.

2. For detailed study vide, *AIK*, p. 21; *RT.I*, I, pp. 121 ff; *History of Kanauj*, pp. 223 ff.

APPENDIX

ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF VIKRAMĀDITYA LEGEND

The historicity of Vikramāditya, the greatest and the most remembered royal hero of Indian legends and folklore,¹ has a direct bearing on the history of Rajasthan, especially because he is said to have belonged to the Mālava tribe which occupied the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area in the first century B.C. In the preceding pages we have discussed the story of his life as given in the *Kālakāchāryakathānaka*. Apart from it there are numerous stories in Sanskrit, Prakrit and modern Indian languages, all characterised by exaggeration regarding the qualities of the head and heart of this ideal king. These stories deal with the various aspects of his character such as generosity, courage, gallantry, love for the brave, magical powers, patronage of learning, powers of producing excellent literary compositions and evaluating the works of other writers, etc.² Tradition has also depicted him as a worker of miracles, a champion of the weak and oppressed, an avenger of insult to the womanhood and an incarnation of courage and daring.³

The most important of his factual achievements as described in literature are the following :

The conquest of the whole earth, i.e. India and the adjoining countries including Iran, Ceylon and South-East Asia :⁴

1. Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1969, p. 108; cf., H.C. Raychaudhuri in the *Vikrama Volume*, Ujjain, 1948, pp. 483 ff.
2. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 106. For the analysis of these qualities and achievements, vide, *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 182 ff. and other relevant articles given in this work; also Pandey, R.B., *Vikramāditya (Saṁvat-Pravartaka)*, Varanasi, 1960, pp. 83 ff. and pp. 224 ff.
3. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 107.
4. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

patronage of learning including the fact that his court was graced by the famous *nava ratnas* (nine jewels) viz. Dhanvantari, Kshapañaka, Amarasiṁha, Sañku, Vetalabhaṭṭa, Ghaṭakarpara, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira and Vararuchi ;¹

initiation of the famous Vikrama Saṁvat ;² and extermination of the Śakas which is illustrated by his epithet *Sakāri* or *Sakadvisha*.³

Now the question arises as to how did these legends originate. Whether this king, so lionised by the Indian people, was a historical personage or merely a figment of popular imagination ? And if his historicity is to be believed, when did he flourish ? According to one school of historians there is no reason to doubt the existence of such a ruler and as the era founded by him commenced in 57 B.C., he should be placed in the middle of the century preceding the birth of Jesus Christ. According to their reasoning the traditional account regarding his reign should be accepted unless it is positively opposed to the known facts of history. The late lamented Dr. R.B. Pandey, who championed this view, wrote a full treatise⁴ in which he tried to give a detailed picture of the life and times of Vikramāditya on the basis of literary sources of diverse nature. He has accepted almost every fact recorded by tradition as authentic including the supposed contemporaneity of Vikramāditya with the famous nine gems and also the existence of a pan-Indian empire by him in the first century B.C. But the history of India in the first century A.D. as known from inscriptions and coins, the authenticity of which cannot be doubted, precludes any possibility of the existence of such an empire in that period. Therefore a large number of scholars

1. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-21; cf. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 71-114.

2. For a detailed account vide *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 1-19, 67-69, 115-156, 289-302, 557-586; *AIU*, pp. 124 ff; Sircar, D.C.. *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 219 ff; *Ancient Malwa*, pp. 140 ff.

3. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 88 ff.

4. *Vikramāditya (Saṁvat-Pravartaka)*.

including R.C. Majumdar,¹ A.S. Altekar,² H.C. Raychaudhuri,³ R.K. Mookerji,⁴ D.C. Sircar,⁵ S.R. Goyal,⁶ etc., do not believe in the historicity of this legendary king. They have usually propounded the view that Vikramāditya, the supposed founder of the Vikrama era, is merely a legend which originated and evolved round the achievements and personality of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya of the imperial Gupta dynasty. Some of these scholars also believe that the accomplishments of the several successors of Chandragupta II also contributed to the evolution of the Vikrama legend. However, many other scholars who do not believe in the traditional view, try to identify the original Vikramāditya either in the personality of Kṛta (the supposed Mālava chief)⁷ or Gautamiputra Śūtakarṇi⁸ or some other ancient Indian ruler of the pre-Gupta age. Now the question arises which of these identifications is correct.

At the very outset we would like to make a general comment on the nature of ancient Indian legends. As is wellknown, our ancestors did not have a modern sense of history, with the result that much of our history is found in the form of legends. Sometime these legends are based on actual historical events and sometime even the germs of actual happenings are completely missing, and the whole thing rests on confusion and misinterpretation of facts. As the mind of the ancients was very credulous, they did not usually hesitate in amplifying and elaborating their legends even with supernatural elements. The legend of Chandragupta Maurya, now called *Chandragupta Kathā*, was based on some historical facts which were later on extremely distorted. The accounts of the Mahābhārata war and the Rāma *Kathā* are also found in quite

1. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 289 ff.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 1 ff.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 483 ff.

4. *Ibid.*, Intro. pp. I-xxvii; pp. 323 ff.

5. *Ancient Malwa*, pp. 106 ff.

6. *HIG*, pp. 248 ff.

7. A.S., Altekar, in the *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 1 ff.

8. Jayaswal, K.P., quoted by R.K. Mookerji in the *Vikrama Volume*, pp.

an elaborated form, though it is difficult to determine whether they contain any germs of truth or not. Therefore, while trying to determine the actual amount of truth in the *Vikrama Kathā* one should be on one's guard against pitfalls of exaggeration and the gumble of the unhistorical material with the historical.

It should be quite obvious even to a layman that the veracity of the *Vikramāditya* legend in its present form is an impossibility. Such a ruler simply could not exist, as is apparent from the complex nature of his personality and achievements. For example, on the one hand the tradition asserts that he was the chief of the Mālava tribe, and on the other, it describes him as a universal ruler. Such a phenomenon was impossible in ancient Indian polity.¹ Even outside India there are extremely few cases in which a republic is known to have succeeded in establishing an empire. Being ruled by the people themselves, republics could not maintain their hold over the subject people. Such a thing was possible only in monarchical or imperial polity. The Roman Republic, no doubt, succeeded in building an empire but that was the result of the unique historical circumstances and political developments spreading over several centuries. Similarly, the success of the Athenian democracy in founding an empire for a short duration was also the result of some very special circumstances, viz., the transformation of the confederacy of Delos by trickery. We do not know any other example in ancient world history in which *Vikramāditya* legend would have us believe that the tiny Mālava republic of Avanti created a pan-Indian empire under the leadership of its hero *Vikramāditya*. Incidentally, it may also be noted that the Mālava republic, even in the third century A.D., was confined to the Mālavanagara of Rajasthan where their coins and inscriptions have been discovered. Contrary to this fact the *Vikrama Kathā* presumes that the Mālavas had already occupied Ujjayinī and that it was their capital as early as the first century B.C.

1. Goyal, S.R., *PRHC*. VI, 1973, p. 16.

Let us revert to the contradictions and impossibilities involved in the *Vikramāditya* legend. In the tradition the king *Vikramāditya* is described as an impossibly ideal person and ruler. He is the embodiment of all the virtues which the ancient Indian popular mind could imagine. He never shrank from charity to the needy, nor from battle against his enemies. He used to give away freely what was won by courage and endurance. He used his courage for the protection of *Dharma* and for the destruction of all those who did not tread the path of *Dharma*. His patronage of learning and love for Sanskrit language and literature has become proverbial. The nine gems who flourished at his court include talents of all types, such as poets, lexicographers, physicians, astronomers and grammarians, etc. In later periods kings and chieftains of India who collected round themselves a group of learned men and poets were compared on that account with *Vikramāditya*. The great hero is himself depicted as an accomplished poet and writer. In the anthologies, for instance, the *Subhāshitāvali* of *Vallabhadeva*, *Sāringadharapaddhati*, *Vidyākarasahasrakam* of *Vidyākaramiśra* and the *Saduktikaranāmṛita* of *Śridharadāsa* which have come down to us from the past, contain numerous verses attributed to *Vikramāditya*. A work on *Dhanurveda* and a lexicographical work named *Saṁsūrāvarta* have also been attributed to him.

A large number of stories are also current which describe *Vikramāditya*'s gallantry, romantic nature and association with *Vetāla Sādhanā*. He is said to have succeeded in acquiring all the eight types of magic power, viz., *Anīmā* (Minuteness), *Mahīmā* (Greatness), *Laghīmā* (Lightness), *Garīmā* (Heaviness), *Prāptī* (Acquisition), *Iśītā* (Supremacy), *Vetāla sādhanā*.¹

To us it appears that such a ruler who combined all these qualities in his personality could not have existed in reality. It seems that here either the virtues of several kings have been combined in the personality of this ideal hero or it is an altogether imaginary picture of what an ideal king

Appendix

should be. An analysis of the achievements and personalities of the historical Vikramādityas i.e., the Vikramādityas of the Gupta age suggests that probably the former alternative is the correct one.

As is well known, historically, the Imperial Guptas were the earliest kings to assume the title, 'Vikramāditya'. About half a dozen of the Gupta rulers are known to have adopted this *viruda*. On the basis of this fact the Gupta age is sometimes called 'the Age of Vikramādityas'. Till a few years ago Chandragupta II was supposed to be the earliest king to have assumed this title. But now we have at least one coin of Samudragupta also, found in the Bamnala hoard, on the reverse of which this ruler is given the title 'Śrī Vikrama' instead of his usual *viruda* Parākramāṅka. According to Diskalkar¹ and Altekar,² and following them many other scholars,³ this coin was struck during the early reign of Chandragupta II : the old die for the obverse of the coins of Samudragupta being used instead of the die of Chandragupta II's early coin of the 'Archer Type'. But this theory is totally unwarranted. The scepticism of Diskalkar and Altekar follows from the singleness of this coin.⁴ They also argue that the Gupta kings usually adopted one *viruda* only. But both these arguments are fallacious. It is one of the fundamental principles of numismatic studies that the evidence of a type, or variety, even if it is known only by one coin, should be accepted unless its acceptance is not incompatible with the definitely known facts of history. The solitary coin of Garuḍadhvaja variety of Kācha⁵ and the solitary specimen of the Gadahara coin containing the name 'Samudra'⁶ provide interestingly close and similar examples. It is also wrong to assume that no Gupta king is known to have used more than one *viruda*. Skandagupta is known to

1. *INSI*, V, pt. II, 135 ff.

2. *Coinage*, pp. 44-45.

3. Chatterjee, C.D., *Journal of the U.P. Historical Society*, II, p. 23.

4. *JNSI*, XXVII, pt. II, 1965, pp. 142-143.

5. Altekar, A.S., *Coinage*, p. 87.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

have assumed two *virudas*, i.e. Vikramāditya and Kramāditya which, according to Altekar himself, meant two different things.¹ Therefore, there is no valid reason to doubt that Samudragupta also assumed two *virudas* i.e., Parākrama and Vikrama.

Thus Samudragupta becomes the first Indian king to assume the title Vikrama. Here it may be pointed out that his usual title Parākramānka is a synonym of Vikramāditya or Vikramānka.² Following Samudragupta, his son Chandragupta II, latter's grandson Skandagupta (and probably Purugupta also),³ Purugupta's son Budhagupta and another Gupta king of unknown parentage, Chandragupta III,⁴ assumed this title. Thus from c. 350 A.D. to c. 500 A.D north India was ruled by a dynasty whose kings became famous as Vikramādityas. With the passage of time separate entity of such rulers could easily be forgotten by the people. In a society in which scientific history was not known and much of the past was remembered in the form of legends only, such a phenomenon was not impossible. In this situation if we find that most of the elements of the Vikramāditya legend may easily be traced in the lives, achievements and personalities of the Vikramādityas of the Gupta age, the possibility of above hypothesis being correct should be seriously investigated.

Let us begin with Samudragupta. The greatest contribution of the achievements of Samudragupta to the origin and evolution of the Vikramāditya legend belongs to the field of wars and conquests. The detailed description of the *digvijaya* i.e. world-wide conquest of Vikramāditya as found in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, *Bṛihatkālhāmañjari* and several other medieval works,⁵ reminds one of the conquests of Samudragupta. In fact, in the whole annals of ancient Indian history, barring

1. Altekar, A.S. *op. cit.*, p. 256.

2. Cf. that Chandragupta is known to history as Sāhasānka also which is a synonym of Vikramāditya.

3. *Coinage*, pp. 255-256; 262-63.

4. Goyal, S.R., *HIG*, p. 372.

5. Cf. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 12 ff.

Appendix

Chandragupta Maurya, who obviously could not have anything to do with the legendary Vikramāditya, it is only Samudragupta whose conquests resemble the conquests of Vikramāditya. Though the description of conquests of Vikramāditya as found in early medieval works has become somewhat confused and stereotyped, there are several passages which cannot fail to remind any impartial historian of almost identical, though briefer, passages of the *Prayāga prāśasti* of Samudragupta.¹ For example, in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* at one place Vikramāditya is addressed thus :

“You have conquered southern and western regions, Madhyadeśa, Saurāshṭra and the regions to the east of the Gaṅgā. The northern regions and Kashmir have become your tributary states. Various forts and islands have been conquered, the great hordes of the Mlechchhas have been destroyed and other kings have submitted.”² If this is an idealised description of the actual conquests of a historical king, then it is only Samudragupta to whose conquests it can be traced back. Here the mention of the conquests of the various islands by Vikramāditya may be specially noted. It reminds us of the *sarvadvilpavasibhiḥ*, etc., of the *Prayāga prāśasti*. In the same work it is said that the kings of Gauḍa, Karṇāṭaka, Lāṭa, Kashmir, Sindhu and Iran presented themselves to Vikramāditya³ i.e., they followed the policy of *ātmanivedana*.⁴ Here

1. Sircar, D.C., *SI*, pp. 262 ff.

2. सापरान्तश्च देवेन निर्जितो दक्षिणापयः ।

मध्यदेशः ससौराष्ट्रः सवंगांगा च पूर्वदिक् ॥

सकश्मीरा च कौवेरी काष्ठा च करदीकृता ।

तानि तान्य पि दुर्गाणि द्वीपानि विजितानि च ॥

म्लेच्छमध्याश्च निहिताः शेषाश्च स्वापिता वरे ।

ते ते विक्रमशक्तेश्च प्रविष्टाः कटके नृपाः ॥

KSS, 23, 1, 76-78, as quoted by Pandey,
op. cit., App. 3, pp. 250-51.

3. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 99.

4. Sircar, *SI*, p. 266 and fn. 1.

the reference to the submission of the emperor of Iran may be easily compared with the *ātmanivedāna* of the *Shāhānushāhī* i.e., the king of Iran, to Samudragupta.¹ The *Kathasaritsāgara* also refers to the presentation of his daughter by the king of Ceylon to Vikramāditya,² which is quite similar to the policy of *kanyopāyānādāna*³ followed by the foreign rulers, including the king of Ceylon, by which they tried to please the Gupta emperor.

Thus, the legends regarding the conquests of Vikramāditya and the establishment of an empire by him might have originated from the actual conquests of Samudragupta, though later writers gave an idealised description of them. Similarly, many other elements of the Vikrama tradition may be connected with Samudragupta. The Eran Stone Pillar Inscription⁴ refers to his *Suvarṇādāna* i.e., the gift of gold to the Brāhmaṇas. The *Prayāga prasasti* also describes him as a very kind-hearted and generous ruler who was devoted to the betterment of the poor and destitutes.⁵ His Nalanda⁶ and Gaya⁷ Copper Plate inscriptions, of which we possess only later copies,⁸ and also the inscriptions of his successors refer to the gift of gold coins and cows which were earned by him in accordance with *nyāya*.⁹ It is, therefore, quite possible that the stories regarding the generosity of the legendary Vikramāditya originated with the actual feats of Samudragupta in this field. Here it may also be mentioned that Samudragupta has been described as

1. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 175-177.

2. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 99.

3. Sircar, *SI*, p. 266.

4. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 269-270.

5. मृदुहृदयस्यानुकम्पावतो (S) नेक-गो-
शतसहस्र-प्रदायिनः कृपणदीनानायातुर-
जनोद्धरण

ibid., pp. 266-267.

6. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 271 ff.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 273 ff.

8. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 111 ff.

9. Sircar, *SI*, p. 321.

the overlord of Śakas and Ujjayinī, the capital of Malwa, was included in his empire.¹ He was also famous as a great patron of learning and literature. His court was graced by Harisheṇa, Vasubandhu the elder,² Siddhasena Divākara³ and also probably Kālidāsa.⁴ It is generally believed that Kālidāsa flourished in the Gupta age. Most of the scholars⁵ who hold this view place the period of the poet's creative activity in the first half of the fifth century A.D. and suggest that he was patronised by Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I. But Goyal has given very sound arguments to believe that Kālidāsa flourished in the second half of the fourth century A.D. graced the courts of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II.⁶

Samudragupta was succeeded by his elder son Rāmagupta who was overthrown by his younger brother Chandragupta II. There are a number of elements in the Vikrama legend which may be traced in the achievements and personality of Chandragupta II.⁷ The most important of them is the extermination of the Saka kingdom of western India by him, a fact which is known mainly from the numismatic evidence.⁸ His association with Ujjayinī, the capital of legendary Vikramāditya is revealed by some early medieval inscriptions and literary works in which he is described 'the lord of the great city of Ujjayinī'.⁹ The discovery of the drama *Devīchandragupta* of Viśākhadatta has brought to light a very significant fact which may easily be connected with the evolution of the Vikramāditya saga.¹⁰ In one of the available extracts of this

1. According to a tradition prince Chandragupta II passed the *Kāvya*kāra examination in this city.
2. Goyal, *HIG*, p. 126 f.; pp. 214 ff.
3. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 213-280.
4. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 217 ff.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 217 fn. 1.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 219.
7. For a detailed analysis Vide, *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 323-359, 483-511; Sircar, D.C., *Ancient Malwa*, pp. 130 ff.
8. Cf. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 131, 145 fn. 7.
9. Cf. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-145.
10. Goyal, S.R., *Prāchīna Bhārata kā Rājanītikā*.

drama it is said that when Chandragupta was thinking over the various alternatives of destroying the Šaka king who had besieged the Gupta camp, he contemplated over the possibility of *Vetāla sādhanā* (goblin-worship) also, because with the help of a *Vetāla* the Mlechchha king could easily be killed.¹ This fact has been alluded to in the Rāshṭrakūṭa inscription also. Chandragupta's faith in the efficacy of *Vetāla sādhanā* could have been the original source of the cycle of the legends which culminated in the stories found in the *Vetāla-pañchavimśatikā*. Thus a very important element of the *Vikrama Kathā* is directly traceable in the personality and achievements of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya. The fact that Chandragupta II was the patron of Kālidāsa is generally admitted by a large group of Indologists and their contention is too well known to need a repetition.

There are two other elements of the *Vikrama* legend which might have originated from the personality of Chandragupta II. As we all know the legendary Vikramāditya has been described as the great lover and a husband of a large number of queens, many of whom he won by his valour.² We also know that like his father Samudragupta, (who is said to have won the hands of Dattadevī, the mother of Chandragupta II, by paying the price of his personal valour,³ an additional point of similarity between the personalities of Samudragupta and the legendary Vikramāditya) Chandragupta II was also a great lover and a husband of several queens. One of his queens known from the Vākāṭaka epigraphs was Kuberanāgā, a Nāga princess.⁴ It is interesting to note that the *Brihatkathāmañjari* also mentions that Vikramāditya married a Nāga wife.⁵ Another queen of Chandragupta II was Dhruvadevī who was, it may be noted, about 15 years junior to Kubera-

1. *EI*, VII, p. 36; XVIII, p. 248.

2. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 79, 147.; cf. *Vikrama Volume*, pp. 173-175.

3. दत्तास्य पौरुष-पराक्रम दत्त-शुल्काः...

Eraṇ Stone Pillar Ins., *SI*, p. 269.

4. Sircar, *SI*, pp. 436-439.

5. *Vikrama Volume*, p. 175.

nāgā and yet was installed as Mahādevī by him. According to S.R. Goyal, Chandragupta II was a middle-aged man when he married Dhruvadevī, the wife of his elder brother Rāmagupta whom he murdered for the sake of the queen and the kingdom.¹ He was very much under the influence of her beauty, so much so that she was entrusted with the administration of a province, a privilege not known to have been accorded to any other Gupta queen.² Further, it was her son who became successor of Chandragupta II overriding the claims of the sons of Kuberanāgā.³ Chandragupta II is also not known to have devoted any attention to the expansion of his empire for several decades after his marriage with Dhruvadevī, probably because, like Prithvirāja and Jahangir, he found greater pleasure in his harem in the enchanting company of his beautiful queen rather than in the dry affairs of statecraft. The fact that he had a romantic nature is also recorded by Viśākhadatta, the author of the *Devīchandragupta* who gives a detailed description of the amorous relationship of Chandragupta II with a maid-servant named Mādhavasenā.⁴ It is also not beyond the bounds of probability that many of the princesses who were offered to the royal Gupta family in accordance with the *kanyopāyanadāna* policy during the reign of Samudragupta were actually married to Chandragupta II.⁵ Thus there are very good grounds to believe that romantic and amorous aspects of the personality of the legendary Vikramāditya owe their origin to the personality and character of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya.

There is yet another aspect of the Vikramāditya saga which may be connected with Chandragupta II. According to

1. *HIG*, p. 225.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 252 fn. 7 (Cont. on p. 253).

3. Samudragupta refers to a number of his grandsons in his Eran inscription (*SI*, pp. 269-70) while Kumāragupta I, the son of Chandragupta II begotten on Dhruvadevī, was obviously born after the murder of Rāmagupta which took place after the death of Samudragupta. Therefore, Kumāragupta I could hardly have been the eldest son of Chandragupta II.

4. *HIG*, p. 252.

5. According to the *Kathāsaritsāgara* a number of princesses were offered to him by the rulers defeated by his farther. Madanalekhā, the Sinhales princess was one of them.

legends Vikramāditya was the founder of the Vikrama Saṁvat, the initial date of which is 57 B.C. We know that this era became associated with the name Vikrama in the ninth century A.D. The Dhaulpur inscription of Chāṇḍa Mahāsenā dated 898 V.E.=841 A.D. is the first known document to use the name Vikrama for this era.¹ Between the fifth and the ninth centuries A.D. it was known as the Mālava Saṁvat and earlier than that it was called the Kṛita era. Therefore, the association of the name Vikramāditya with this era could not have been due to its initiation by that king. The question arises how and why the name of Vikramāditya came to be associated with this reckoning. The answer is furnished by an interesting theory propounded by P.L. Gupta² and S. Chattopadhyaya,³ according to which Chandragupta II was the founder of the Gupta era, though he counted it from the date of the accession of his grandfather Ghāndragupta I. We may explain the association of the name of Vikramāditya with the Kṛita-Mālava era thus: Chandragupta II, who was closely associated with the Avanti region and the city of Ujjayinī became famous as the founder of an era, but in the later periods the people of Ujjayinī who looked upon Vikramāditya i.e. Chandragupta II as their own king merely remembered the initiation of an era by him though they forgot the identity of that era. In such a situation, it was natural for them to identify the era of (Chandragupta) Vikramāditya with their own tribal era i.e. the Kṛita-Mālava era. Thus the name of Vikramāditya became associated with the ancient Kṛita-Mālava era. Once we concede such a possibility there remains no need for placing the legendary Vikramāditya in the first century B.C.

The next Gupta king who assumed the title Vikramāditya was Skandagupta. That his personality has contributed much to the Vikrama legend becomes evident from the fact that he was the son of Kumāraguptā Māhendrāditya, and in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* Vikramāditya has been described as the son

1. *Vikrama Volume*, p. 3, 123, 582.

2. *JBRs*, XLII, March '56, pp. 72 ff; XLIX, pt. I-IV, pp. 74 ff.

3. *EHNI*, p. 144.

of the king Mahendrāditya.¹ Secondly, Skandagupta is famous for his victory over the Hūṇas or Mlechchhas, a fact also ascribed to the legendary Vikramāditya in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and several other literary works.² The victory over the Hūṇas was one of the major achievements of the legendary Vikramāditya, and historically it is the name of Skandagupta which is explicitly associated with this achievement for the first time in the history of India,³ though it is quite possible that this fact was achieved by Samudragupta also.⁴

Here it will not be out of place to say a few words regarding the causes and process of the identification of all these three Gupta emperors into the imaginary personality of an ideal king, namely Vikramāditya, in the popular mind. As we have noted above, ancient Indians did not have any predilection for scientific history. In such a situation the popular memory was bound to forget the separateness of the individualities of the three kings all of whom assumed the same title and many of the achievements of whom were similar and overlapping. For example, Samudragupta was an enemy of the Śakas and Chandragupta II was the destroyer of this foreign tribe ; Skandagupta is known to have defeated the Hūṇas while the king Chandra of the Meharauli record, identified by Goyal with Samudragupta,⁵ defeated the Vāhlikas who were not different from the Hūṇas. In any case the Hūṇas certainly invaded Gandhāra sometime before the visit of Fahien and were repulsed by the local king with the help of the Gupta emperor.⁶ Thus Skandagupta and one of his predecessors both defeated the Hūṇas. Kālidāsa graced the court of Samudragupta and Chandragupta II both. All these kings were also associated with Ujjayinī. They were all nominated

1. *Vikrama Volume*, p. 125, 158, fn. 2; cf. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, pp. 72-76.

2. Pandey, R.B., *op. cit.*, p. 98.

3. *CA*, p. 27.

4. Goyal, *HIG*, pp. 168 ff.

5. *HIG*, pp. 201 ff.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 173 ff.

by their respective fathers to their ancestral throne.¹ Because of these common factors in their personalities and achievements, their individualities got fused together in popular imagination and the legendary personalities of an ideal king with all the virtues and attainments of these monarchs, gradually emerged. That explains the complex nature of the personality of Vikramāditya and that is how the Vikrama legend, the saga of the most popular Indian royal hero, originated.²

1. The facts that Samudragupta was nominated by Chandragupta I as his successor is recorded in the fourth verse of the *Prayāga prasasti* (SI, p. 263). The nomination of Chandragupta II by Samudragupta has been mentioned in the Bhitari record of Skandagupta (*ibid.*, p. 321) while the selection of the latter by his father Kumāragupta I is indicated by the *Kathāsaritasāgara* and the *Chandragarbhapariprīchchihā*.
2. For an analysis of the evidence of the *Gāhā Sattasai* of Hāla and *Brihat-kathā* of Guṇāḍhya, the only two pre-Gupta works cited to prove the existence of the legendary Vikramāditya, vide, *supra*.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL SOURCES : TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

INDIAN SOURCES

Āchārāṅga : Ed. by Jacobi, H., PTS., London, 1882.
Eng. trans. by Jacobi, H., SBE. Oxford, 1892.

Agni Purāṇa : Eng. trans. by Dutt, M.N. Calcutta, 1901.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa : Trans. by Keith, A.B., HOS., Vol. XXV. Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1920.

Amarakośa or Nāma-
liṅgānuśāsana of
Amarasimha : Ed. by Sastri, T., Ganapati, 4 parts, Trivandrum, 1914-17.

Āṅguttara Nikāya : Ed. Morris, R. and Hardy, E. PTS. London, 1885-1900.

Arthaśāstra of
Kauṭilya : Ed. by Shamasastri, R., Mysore, 1919.
Eng. trans. by Shamasastri, R., Bangalore, 1930. Text, Eng. trans. and a study by Kangle, R.P., 3 Vols., Bombay, 1960, 1963, 1965.

Ārya Mañjuśrī Mūla-
Kalpa : Ed. Sastri T. Ganapati, 3 parts, TTS. Trivandrum, 1920-25.
Ed. and Eng. trans., Jayaswal, K.P., The Imperial History of India, Lahore, 1934.

Aṣṭādhyāyī : Ed and trans. by Basu, S.C., 2 Vols., Allahabad, 1891-98.

Atharvaveda : Eng. trans. by Whitney, W.D., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1905.

Baudhāyana
Dharmasūtra : Ed. by Chinnasvami Shastri, Banaras, 1934.

| | |
|---|---|
| Baudhāyana Grīhya-sūtra | : Ed. by Shamasastri, R., Mysore. 1920, |
| Baudhāyana Śrauta-sūtra | : Ed. by Caland, W., Calcutta, 1904. |
| Bālabhārata of Rājaśekhara | : Ed. by Durgaprasad and Parab, K.P., NSP. Bombay, 1887 (included in the Karpūraśāñjari). |
| Bhagavad-gītā | : Sanskrit Text with Hindi trans., Gita Press, Gorakhpur V.S. 2017. Eng. trans. Radhakrishnana, S., London, 1948. |
| Bhagavati-sūtra | : 3 Vols. Bombay, 1918-21. |
| Bhāgavata Purāṇa | : Kumbakonam, 1916. Eng. trans. by Sanyal, J.M., Calcutta, 1930-34. Gita Press, Gorakhpur edition. |
| Brahma Purāṇa | : ASS., 1895. |
| Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa | : Pub. Venkatesvra Press, Bombay, 1913. |
| Bṛihat-Saṁhitā of Varāhamihira | : Ed. with Eng. trans. and notes by Subrahmanyā Sastri, V. and Ratnkrishna Bhat, M., 2 Vols., Bangalore, 1947. |
| Bṛihat-kathā-maṇjari of Kṣemendra | : Ed. by (Pandit) Siva Datta, M., and Parab, K.P., Bombay, 1931. |
| Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad | : Trans. Swami Madhavananda, Almora, 1950. Text, Gita Press, Gorakhpur. |
| Buddhavāṁsa | : Ed. by Morris, R., PTS., London, 1882. Eng. trans. by Law, B.C., PTS., London, 1938. |
| Chach-nāmā of Muḥammad 'Ali-Hamīdi Abū Bakr Kūfi' | : Trans. by Misza Kalich Beg Fredunbeg, 2 Vols. Karachi, 1900, 1902. Extracts trans. History of India Vol. I by Elliot and Dowson, pp. 131-211. |
| Chhāndogya Upani- shad | : Eng. trans. by Ganganatha Jha, Poona, 1942. |

Chulavāmsa : (the more recent part of the Mahāvāmsa) Ed. by Geiger, W., 2 Vols. PTS. London, 1925-27.

Devichandraguptam of Viśākhadatta : Collected in 'Śringāra Prakāśa of Bhoja' by Y. Raghavan, pp. 858-64.

Dīgha Nikāya : Ed. Rhys Davids, T.W. and Carpenter, J.E., 3 Vols., PTS. London, 1890-1911. Eng. trans. (Dialogues of the Buddha) by Rhys Davids, T.W., 3 Vols., SBE., London, 1899-1921.

Dīgha Nikāya : Hindi Trans. Rahula Sankritayana and Jagādīśa Kasyapā, Banaras, 1936.

Dīpavāmsa : Ed. and trans. by Oldenberg, H., London, 1879.

Divyāvadāna : Ed. Cowell, E.B. and Neil, F.A. Cambridge, 1886.

Garuḍa Purāṇa : Bombay, 1906. Eng. trans. by Dutta, M.N., Calcutta, 1908.

Gaudāvaho of Vākpati : Ed. by Pandit, S.P., BBS. Bombay, 1887; 2nd Ed. by utgikar, N.B., Poona, 1927.

Gārgī-Samhitā : JBORS, XIV, 1928.

Gopāthā Brāhmaṇā : Ed. by Mītra, Rajendralal and Vidyabhūshan, H. Calcutta, 1872.

Harivāmsa : Ed. by Kinnāwadekar, R., Poona, 1936; Pub. by Gita Press, Gorakhpur.

Harivāṁśapurāṇa of Jinaseṇī Śūri II : Pub. by MDJGM, Bombay, 1930.

Harivāṁśapurāṇa of Svayambhū Deva : Relevant references in Jain, J.P., The Jain Sources of the History of Ancient India, Delhi, 1964.

✓ Harsha-Charita of Bāṇa : Ed. by Kāne, P.V. Bombay, 1918 (Second ed. Delhi, 1965). Eng. trans. Cowell, E.B. and Thomas, F.W., London, 1929. Ed. by Pathak, Acharya, J., Varanasi, 1972.

Jātaka : Ed. by Fausböll, V., 7 Vols. (Vol. 7 Index by Anderson, D.), London, 1877-97.

Jātakamālā of Arya Sūra : Eng. trans. under the Editorship of Cowell, E.B., 7 Vols., Cambridge, 1895-1913.

Kādambarī of Bāṇa : Ed. by Kern, H., Boston, 1891. Eng. trans. by Speyer, J., SBB. London, 1895.

Kalpasūtra (Bṛihat-Kalpasūtra) of Bhadrabāhu : Ed. by Kane. P.V., Bombay, 1920. Eng. trans. Riddig, C.M., London, 1896.

Kālidāsa Granthāvalī : Being a collection of works of Kālidāsa. Ed. and Hindi trans. by Sītārāma Chaturvedi, Aligarh, 2019 V.S.

Kālakāchārya Kathānaka : Ed. by Jacobi, H., ZDMG, 1880. Eng. trans. Brown, W.N., Washington, 1933.

Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana : Ed: by Goswami, D.L., Banaras, 1928. Eng. trans. by Basu, B.N. revised by Ghose, R.L., 5th ed. Calcutta, 1944. Ed. with Hindi trans. by Sastri, Devadutta, Varanasi, 1964.

Kāmandakīya Nītiśāra : Ed. by Scholars of Sāṅga Veda Vidyalaya, Poona, 1858. Ed. trans. Dutta, M.N., Calcutta, 1896. Ed. by Mitra, R., BI, Calcutta, 1884.

Kathākoṣa : Translated by Tawney, C.H., London, 1895.

Kathāvatthu : Ed. by Taylor, A.C., PTS. London, 1894.
 Eng. trans. by Aung, S.J. and Mrs. Rhys Davids, PTS. London, 1915,

✓ Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva : Eng. trans. by Tawney, C.H., 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1880-84.

Kaumudi-Mahotsava of Vijjaka (?) : Ed. and trans. by Sakuntala Rao Sastri, Bombay, 1952.

Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa : Ed by Cowell, E.B., Calcutta, 1861.

Khyāt of Nainsī : Pub. by Nāgārī Prachāriṇī Sabhā, Kāśī (Banaras). V.S. 1982.
 Pub. by Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur, 3 Vols. Jodhpur, 1960-62.

Kitāb-ul Hind and Āthār-al-Bāquia of al-Beruni : Eng. trans. (Alberuni's India) by Sacchau. E.C., London, 1914. Indian Ed. Delhi, 1964.

Kitāb Futūh al Baldan of Ahmad ibn Yahya ibn-Jabir al-Balādhuri : Eng. trans. by Hitli, P.K. and Murgotten, F.C. Cf. History of India as told by its own Historians, by Elliot, H.M. and Dowson, John. 8 Vols. London, 1867-77, Vol. I.

Kūrma Purāṇa : Ed. by Mukhopadhyaya, N., BI, Calcutta, 1890.

✓ Kuvalayamālā of Uddyotana Sūri : Pub. Singhi Jain Series No. 45, Bombay 1959.

Lalitavistara : Ed. by Mitra, Rajendralal, Calcutta, 1977.

Liṅga Purāṇa : Ed. by Vidyasagar, J., BI, Calcutta, 1885.

Mahābhārata : (Bombay Ed.) Bd. by Kinjawadekar, R., Poona, 1929-33.
 (Calcutta Ed.) Edited by Siromani, N. and others. BI, Calcutta, 1834-39.
 (Kumbhakonam Ed.) Edited by Krishnacharya, T.R. and V. Vyasacharya, T.R., Bombay, 1905-10.
 (Critical Ed.) Edited by Sukthankar, V.S., Edgerton, F. Raghu Vira, De, S.K., Belvalkar, S.K., Vaidya, P.L. etc. Poona, 1927-1966 (in Progress.) Eng. trans. by M.N. Dutta, Calcutta, 1895-1905
 Gita Press Gorakhpur ed., V.S. 2012-2026.

Mahāvāṁsa : Edited by Geiger, W., PTS., London, 1908.
 Eng. trans. (The Great Chronicle of Ceylon) by Geiger, W. etc., London, 1912.

Mahāvastu : Edited by Senart, E., 3 Vols. Paris, 1882-97.

Mahābhāshya of Patañjali : Ed. by Kielhorn, F., 3 Vols., Bombay, 1892-1909.
 Ed. and trans. Chatterji, K.C., Calcutta, 1957.

Mahābodhivamśa of Upatissa : Edited by Strong, S.A. PTS. London, 1891.

Milindapañño : Edited by Trenckner, V., London 1880.
 Eng. trans. by Rhys Davids, T.W., SBE. Oxford, 1890-94.

Majjhima Nikāya : Edited by Trenckner, V. and Chalmers, R., PTS. London, 1888-1902.
 Eng. trans. (Further Dialogues of the Buddha) by Lord Chalmers, 2 Vols. SBE. London, 1926-27.

Mālavikāgnimitra of

Kālidāsa : Edited by Pandit, S.P., BBS. 2nd Ed. Bombay, 1889.
 Eng. trans. by Tawney, C.H., London, 1891.
 Ed. with Hindi trans. by Sitaram Chaturvedi, Aligarh, V.S. 2019.

Manu Dharmasāstra

(Mānava Dharmasāstra or Manu-Smṛiti)

: Edited by Jolly, J., London, 1887.
 Eng. trans. by Buhler, G., 'The Laws of Manu', SBE., Vol. XXV, Oxford, 1886.
 Eng. trans. (with notes) by Ganganatha Jha, 5 Vols. Calcutta, 1922-29.

Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa

: Edited by Banerjee, K.M., BI., Eng. trans. by Pargiter, F.E., Calcutta, 1904.

Matsya Purāṇa

: Ed. ASS, Poona, 1907.
 Eng. trans. Basu, B.D., Allahabad, 1916.

Mudrārākshasa of
Viśākhadatta

: Ed. with Eng. trans. by Dhruva, K.H., 2nd Ed. Poona, 1923.

Nārada Smṛiti

: Edited by Jolly, J., Calcutta, 1885.
 Eng. trans. Jolly, J. SBE. Vol. XXXIII, Oxford, 1889 (Longer version).

Navasāhasrāṅkachariṭa
of Padmagupta
alias Parimala

: Edited by Islampurkar, V.S., BSS., Bombay, 1895,

Nītivākyāmṛita of
Somadeva Sūri

: Edited by Soni, P.L., 2 Vols., SBH., Bombay, 1923, 1933.

Padma Purāṇa

: Edited by Mandlik, V.N., ASS., 4 Vols. Poona, 1893-94.

Pañchatantra : Edited by Edgerton, F., Poona, 1930.

Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa : Eng. trans. by Caland, W., Calcutta, 1931.

Pariśiṣṭaparvan or Sthavirāvalī-
charita : Being an appendix of the Trishashṭi-
śalākāpurusha-charita of Hemachandra.
Ed. by Jacobi, H., BI., Calcutta, 1883-
91; 2nd Ed., 1932.

Petavatthu : Edited by Minayeff, J., PTS., London,
1 88.

Prabandha-Chintā-
maṇi : Eng. trans. Tawney. C.H., Calcutta,
1899.

Purāṇa Text of the
Dynasties of the
Kali Age : By Pargiter, F.E., Oxford, 1913. 2nd
ed. Varanasi, 1962.

Raghuvarīśa of
Kālidāsa : Edited by Pandit, S.P., 3 Vols. BSS.
Bombay, 1869-74.
Ed. with Eng. trans. by Nandargikar,
G.R., 3rd Ed. Bombay, 1897.
Kālidāsa Granthāvalī, Ed. by. Sita-
rama Chaturvedi, Aligarh, V.S. 2019.

Rājatarāṅgiṇī of
Kalhaṇa : Edited by Durga Prasad, Bombay,
1892.
Eng. trans. by Stein, M.A., Westmin-
ster, 1900.
Ed. with Hindi trans. by Tejrama
Sastri, Varanasi, 1960.

Rājāvali Kathā : Cf. Fleet, J.F., Indian Antiquary, 1892,
pp. 157 ff.

Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki : Ed. Varamasarma Vashishtha, Banaras,
1957.

General Bibliography

Rigveda

Ed. with Eng. trans. Dutt, M.N., Calcutta, 1891-93.

Trans. with Eng. verse by Griffith, R.T.H., Banaras, 1915.

Critical Ed. by Raghu Vira, Lahore, 1938.

Gita Press, Gorakhpur Ed., 1969.

: Sāmhitā and Pada text with Sāyana's commentary critically edited by Vaidika Samśodhana Maṇḍala, Poona, 4 Vols., 1933-51.

Eng. trans. by Griffith, R.T.H., 2 Vols., 2nd Ed. Banaras, 1896-97.

Eng. trans. of the first six Maṇḍalas by Wilson, H.H., London, 1950-57.

Eng. trans. by Geldner, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A., 1951.

: Ed. with trans. by Th. Benfey. Leipzig, 1848.

Ed. by Satyavrata Samasrami, Calcutta, 1872.

: Ed. by Leon Freer, PTS., London, 1884-94.

Indexes by Mrs. Rhys Davids, London 1904.

Eng. trans. (Book of the Kindred Sayings or Grouped Suttas) by Mrs. Rhys Davids and Woodward, F.L., PTS., London, 1917-30.

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa : Edited by Weber, A., London, 1885.

Eng. trans. by Eggeling, J., SBE, Vols. XII, XXVI, XLI, XLI, XLIII, XLIV. Oxford, 1882-1900.

Śiśupālavadha of
Māgha

: Ed. NSP. 9th Ed. Bombay, 1927.

Ed. with Hindi trans. by Tripathi, R.P. (Sastri), Prayaga (Allahabad), V.S. 2009.

Sumanāgala Vilāsini : Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya. Edited by Rhys Davids, T.W. and Others, 3 Vols., PTS., London. 1886-1932.

Sutta Nipāta : Ed. by Anderson, D. and Smith, H., PTS., London, 1913.
Eng. trans. by Fausböll, V., SBE., Oxford, 1898.

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa : Edited by Mitra, R., 3 Vols. Calcutta, 1855-70.

Thera-gāthā : Edited by Pischel R., PTS., London, 1883.
Eng. trans. by Mrs. Rhys Davids, PTS., London, 1909.

Therī-gāthā : Ed. by Oldenberg. H., PTS., London, 1883.
Eng. trans. by Mrs. Rhys Davids, PTS., London, 1913.

The Upanishads : Ed. and trans. Müller, F. Max, SBE., Vols. I and XV, Oxford, 1879, 1884.

Upanishads, The Principal
Upanishads with Hindi Trans. and Bhāshya : Ed. Radhakrishnan, S., London, 1953.
: 4 Vols. Gita Press Ed. Gorakhpur, V.S. 1992-20.

Uttarādhyayana Sūtra : Ed. by Charpentier, J., Uppsala, 1922.
Eng. trans. by Jacobi, H., SBE., Oxford, 1895.

Vāyu Purāṇa : Edited by Mitra, R., 2 Vols., BI., Calcutta, 1880-88.

Viddhaśālabhañjikā of Rājasekhara : Ed. by Atre, B.R., Poona, 1886. Ed. with commentary by Chaudhuri, J.B., Calcutta, 1943.
Eng. trans. by Gray, L.H., JAOS, XXVII, pp. 1-71.

Vinaya Piṭaka : Ed. by Oldenberg, H., PTS., London, 1879-83.
 Eng. trans. (Vinaya Texts) by Rhys Davids, T.W. and Oldeberg, H., SBE., Vols. XIII, XVII, XX, Oxford, 1881, 1882, 1885.

Vishṇu Purāṇa : Gita Press, Gorakhpur Edition. Eng. trans. by Wilson, H.H., 5 Vols., London, 1864-70; Calcutta, 1961.

Vishṇudharmottara Purāṇa : Pub. Venkatesvara Press, Bombay, 1912.

Yājñavalkya-Smṛiti : Eng. trans. by Charpure, Bombay, 1936-44.

Yajurveda : Taittiriya Saṁhitā (Black Y.V.). Eng. trans. by Keith, A.B., 2 Vols., HOS., Vols. XVIII-XIX, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1914. Ed. Ananta Shastri Dhupkar, Aundh, 1945.
 Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā (White Y.V.). Eng. trans. by Griffith, R.T.H., Banaras, 1927.

FOREIGN SOURCES

(For a select bibliography of primary and secondary sources in Chinese except Fa-Hien, Yuan Chwang and I-tsing vide, Papers on the Date of Kanishka, Edited by A.L. Basham, Leiden, 1968, and Harsha : A Political Study, by D. Devāhuti, Oxford, 1970).

CHINESE

Fa-Hien : The Shaman Fa-Hien's account of his travels in India. Trans. by Legge, J., A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, etc., Oxford, 1886. Eng. trans. by Giles, H. A., The Travels of Fa-Hsien (A.D. 399-414) or Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, Cambridge, 1923. 2nd impression, London, 1956.

I-tsing

: A record of Buddhist Practices Sent Home from the Southern Sea.

Trans. by Takakusu, J., *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago* (A.D. 571-695), Oxford, 1896.

Shaman Hui-Li

: Life of the Master of the Law, Tripitaka, of the Great Monastery of Motherly Love. Eng. trans. by Beal, S., *The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang*, London, 1911. Reprint Delhi, 1973.

Yuan Chwang

: Si-yu-ki. Trans. by Beal, S., *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, 2 Vols. London, 1884, 1906. Reprint Delhi, 1961.

Trans. by Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travel's in India*, 2 Vols., Ed. after his death by Rhys Davids, T.W. and Bushell, S.W., London, 1904-5. Reprint, Delhi, 1961.

TIBETAN

Taranatha, Lama

: Eng, trans. *Mystic tales of Lama Taranatha* by Datta, B.N.. Calcutta, 1944.

Eng. trans. (*History of Buddhism in India*) by Ghoshal, U.N. and Dutt, N., IAQ, III, IV, VI, VII, VIII, X, XXVII, XXVIII.

GREEK AND LATIN

Mc Crindle, J.W.

(ed.)

: *Ancient India* as described by Megasthenes (*Fragments of the Indika of*) and Arrian (*first part of the Indika of*), Calcutta, 1877. Reprint, Calcutta, 1926.

Ancient India as described by Ptolemy, being a translation of (the relevant

parts of the) Geography, Calcutta, etc., 1885. Ed. by Majumdar, S.N., Calcutta, 1927.

: Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature, Westminster, 1901.

: The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great as Described by Arrian, Q. Curtius, Diodorus, Plutarch and Justin Westminster, 1896.

The Commerce and Navigation of the Erythraean Sea, being a translation of the Periplus Maris Erythraei, Calcutta, etc., 1879. Eng. trans. (The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.) by Schoff, W.H., London, 1912.

Majumdar, R.C. (ed.): The Classical Accounts of India, Calcutta, 1960.

ORIGINAL SOURCES : INSCRIPTIONS AND COINS
INSCRIPTIONS

Barua, B.M. : Aśoka and his Inscriptions, Culcutta, 1940.

Bhandarkar, D.R. : A List of Inscriptions of Northern India in Brāhmī and its Derivative Scripts, from about 200 A.C. Appendix to the Epigraphia Indica. Vols. XIX (1927-28)-XXIII (1935-36).

✓ Fleet, J.F. : Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III (Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their Successors), Calcutta, 1888, Reprint, Varanasi, 1963.

Luders, H. : A list of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the exception of those of Aśoka. Appendix to the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. X (1909-1910).

Mirashi, V.V. : Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. IV, 2 parts, Oatacamund, 1955.

— — — Vākāṭaka Rājavarṇśa kā Itihāsa tathā Abhilekha (in Hindi), Varanasi, 1964.

Pandey, R.B. : Aśoka ke Abhilekha (in Hindi), Varanasi, V.S. 2022.

— — — : Historical and Literary Inscriptions, Varanasi, 1962.

Sircar, D.C. : Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization, Vol. I (From the sixth century B.C. to the sixth century A.D.), Calcutta, 1942, 2nd Revised Ed., Calcutta, 1965.

Vidyavijaya (Ed.) : Prāchīna Lekha Samgraha, Bhavanagar, 1929.

COINS

Allan, J. : Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India (in the British Museum), London, 1933.

— — — : Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties and Śāśāṅka, King of Gauḍa (in the British Museum), London, 1914.

Altekar, A.S. : Catalogue of the Gupta Gold Coins in the Bayana Hoard, Bombay, 1954.

Altekar, A.S. : The Coinage of the Gupta Empire, Banaras, 1957.

Brown, C.J. : Catalogue of the Coins of the Guptas, Maukhari, etc. in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, Allahabad, 1920.

— — — : Coins of India, Calcutta, 1922.

Cunningham, A. : Coins of Ancient India from the Earliest Times down to the Seventh Century A.D., London, 1891.

— — — : Coins of Indo-Sythians. Reprinted from the Numismatic Chronicle, London, 1888-92.

— — — : Coins of Medieval India from the Seventh Century down to the Muhammadan Conquest, London, 1894.

— — — : Later Indo-Sythians, Reprinted from the Numismatic Chronocle, London, 1893-95. Cf. Complete work of A. Cunningham, Ed. by Narain, A.K. Varanasi, 1962.

Rapson, E.J. : Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas, the Traikutaka Dynasty and the Bodhi dynasty. (Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum, Vol. IV) London, 1908.

— — — : Indian Coins, Strassburg, 1897.

Reu, B.N. : Coins of Marwar, Jodhpur, 1946.

Singhal, C.R. : Bibliography of Indian Coins, Bombay, 1950.

Smith, V.A. : Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, including the Cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. I, Oxford, 1906.

Webb, W.W. : The Currencies of the Hindu States of Rajputana, Westminister, 1893. Reprint, Delhi, 1972.

Whitehead, R.B. : Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum, Lahore, Vol. I : Indo-Greek Coins. Oxford. 1914.

Modern General Works

Agrawal, V.S. : Harshacharita-Ex Sānskritika Adhyayana (in Hindi), Patna, 1953.

: India as known to Pāṇini—a study of the Cultural Material in the Ashṭādhāyī, Lucknow, 1953.

: Pāṇinikālīna Bhāratavarsha, Varanasi, V.S. 2012.

Aiyangar, S.K. : Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture. 2 Vols. Poona, 1941.

Allchin, Bridget and Raymond : The Birth of Indian Civilization (India and Pakistan before 500 B.C.) Penguin Books, 1968.

Altckar, A.S. : State and Government in Ancient India, Banaras, 1955.

Apte, V.S. : The Students' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Delhi, 1970.

Archaeology in India : Bureau of Education, India, Pub. No. 66. Delhi, 1950.

Arvamuthan, T.G. : The Kāverī, the Maukharis and the Sangam Age, Madras, 1925.

Asopa, R.K. : Mārawāra kā Mūla Itihāsa, Jodhpur, 1931.

Awasthi, A.B.L. : Rajput Polity, Lucknow, 1968.

Bagchi, P.C. : India and Central Asia, Calcutta, 1955.

— : India and China, Bombay, 1950.

— : The Aryan in North-Eastern India, Calcutta, 1934.

Bandyopadhyaya, N.C. : Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India, Part I, 2nd Ed. Calcutta, 1945.

Banerji, A. : Archaeological History of South-Eastern Rajasthan, Varanasi, 1971.

Banerji, A.C. : Rajput Studies, Calcutta, 1944.

Banerji, G.N. : Hellenism in Ancient India, Calcutta, 1920.

Banerjee, N.R. : The Iron Age in India, Delhi, 1965.

Banerji, R.D. : The Age of Imperial Guptas, Banaras, 1933.

Bapat, P.V. (ed.) : 2,500 years of Buddhism, Delhi, 1956.

Barnett, L.D. : Antiquities of India, London, 1913.

Barua, B. M. : Aśoka and His Inscriptions, Calcutta, 1946.

Basak, R.G. : History of North-Eastern India (c. A.D. 320-760) Calcutta, 1934.

Basham, A.L. : The Wonder that was India, London, 1954. Reprint, Delhi, 1971,

— : Studies in Indian History and Culture, Calcutta, 1964.

— (ed.) : Papers on the Date of Kanishka, Leiden, 1968.

B.C. Law Volume : 2 Parts, Calcutta, 1945.

Bhandarkar, D.R. : Lectures on the Ancient History of India (Carmichael Lectures, 1918). Calcutta, 1919.

— : Aśoka (Charmichael Lectures, 1923), Calcutta, 1932. Reprint, 1955.

— : Ancient Indian Numismatics, Calcutta, 1921.

— : Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, (Nandi Lectures, 1925). Varanasi, 1929.

— : Commemoration Volume, ed. B.C. Law, Calcutta, 1940.

Bhandarkar, R.G. : Early History of the Dekkan, 3rd. ed. Calcutta, 1928.

— : A Peep into the Early History of India, Bombay, 1920.

— : Commemoration Volume, Poona, 1917.

Bhatia, P. : The Paramaras, New Delhi, 1970.

Brown, W.N. : The Story of Kālaka, Texts, History, Legends, etc., Washington, 1933.

Buhler, J.G. : Indian Palaeography, ed. Fleet, J.F., I.A., Vol. XXXIII, Bombay, 1904.

Chanda, R.P. : The Indo-Aryan Races, Rajshahi, 1916.

Chatterji, G.S. : Harshavardhana (in Hindi), 2nd ed. Allahabad, 1950.

Chatterji, K.C. : Pātañjali Mahābhāṣya, Calcutta, 1950.

Chattpadhyaya, B. : The Age of Kushāṇas—A Numismatic Study, Calcutta, 1967.

Chattpadhyaya, K.C.: Date of Kālidāsa, Allahabad, 1926.

Chattpadhyaya, S. : Early History of North India, Calcutta 1958.

— : The Achaemenids and India, 2nd. Revised Ed., Delhi, 1974.

— : The Śakas in India, Shantiniketan, 1967.

Chaudhary, G.C. ✓ : Political History of Northern India From Jain Sources (c. 650 A.D. to 1300 A.D.) Amritsar, 1963.

Chaudhuri, P.C. : The History of the Civilization of the People of Assam to the Twelfth Century A.D., Gauhati, 1959.

Childe, V. Gordon. : Man Makes Himself, London, 1948.

Cunningham, A. : Books of Indian Eras, London, 1889.

— : The Ancient Geography of India, ed. S.N. Majumdar Shastri, Calcutta, 1924. Reprint, Varanasi, 1963.

Dandekar, R.N. : A History of the Guptas, Poona, 1941.

Dandekar, R.N., and Pusalker, A.D. : Oriental Studies in India, New Delhi, 1964.

Dange, S.A. : India from Pre-historic Communism to Slavery, Bombay, 1949.

Dani, A.H. : Indian Palaeography, Oxford, 1963.

Dasgupta, K.K. : The Mālavas, Calcutta, 1966.

De, S.C. : Kālidāsa and Vikramāditya, Calcutta, 1928.

Dey, N.L. : The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India, London, 1927.

Devahuti, D. : Harsha : A Political Study, Oxford, 1970.

Dikshitar, V.R.R. : The Purāṇa Index. 2 Vols., Madras, 1951, 1952.

— : Hindu Administrative Institutions, Madras, 1929.

— : The Mauryan Polity, Madras, 1932.

— : The Gupta Polity, Madras, 1952.

Drekmeier, C. : Kingship and Communities in Early India, Stanford, California, 1962.

Dutt, Sukumar : Buddhist Monks and Monasteries in India, London, 1962.

East, N.G. : Geography Behind History, London, 1958.

Elliot, Sir H.M. and Dowson, John (ed.) : History of India : as Told by Its own Historians (the Muhammadan Period), 8 Vols., London, 1867-77. Reprinted from Aligarh and Allahabad.

Ettinghausen, M.L. : Harshavardhana : Emperor et Poet, etc., London, 1906.

Fick, R. : The Social Organization in North-East India in Buddhas' time, Calcutta, 1920.

Ganguli, D.C. : History of Paramara Dynasty, Dacca, 1933.

Gehlot, J.S. : Rājpūtāne kā Itihāsa (History of various Princely States in different Parts in Hindi), Jodhpur, 1960.

Ghirshman, R. : Iran, Penguin Books, 1951.

Ghosh, A. (ed.) : Archaeological Remains, Monuments and Museums, Archaeological Survey of India, 2 Vols., New Delhi, 1964.

Ghoshal, U.N. : A History of Indian Political Ideas, Bombay, 1959.

— : Studies in Indian History and Culture, Calcutta, 1957.

Gokhale, B.G. : Samudragupta and His Times, Bombay, 1962.

Gopal, Lallanji. : The Economic Life of Northern India, A.D. 700-1200, Delhi, 1965.

Gopalachari, K. : Early History of the Andhra Country, Madras, 1941.

Gupta, P.L. : Gupta Sāmrājya (in Hindi) Varanasi, 1970.

Gupta, Parmanand. : Geography in Ancient Indian Inscriptions, Delhi, 1973.

Goyal, S.R. : A History of the Imperial Guptas, Allahabad, 1966.

— — — : Prāchīna Bhārata kā Rājanītika Itihās, pt. III (in Hindi), Allahabad, 1969.

— — — : Abhilekha Saṃhitā, M.S. (in Hindi). To be shortly published.

Grierson, G.A. : The Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. IX, pt. II, Calcutta, 1908.

Haig, Sir Wolseley (ed.) [: The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, Delhi, 1958.

Havell, E.B. : History of Aryan Rule in India from the Earliest Times to the Death of Akbar, London, 1918.

Helestermann, J.C. : The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration, The Hague, 1957.

Jain, J.C. ↗ Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canon, Bombay, 1947.

Jain, J.P. ↗ The Jain Sources of the History of Ancient India (100 B.C.-A.D. 900) Delhi, 1964.

Jain, K.C. : Ancient Cities and Towns of Rajasthan, Delhi, 1977.

— — — : Jainism in Rajasthan, Sholapur, 1963.

— — — ↗ Maṭṭwa Through the Ages, Delhi, 1972.

Jayaswal, K.P. : History of India, 150 A.D. to 350 A.D. Lahore, 1933.

— — — : Imperial History of India, Lahore, 1934.

— — — : Hindu Polity, 3rd ed., Bangalore, 1955.

Jayaswal, P.K. : Śaka Kālinā Bhārata (in Hindi), Allahabad, 1963.

Jha, D.N. : Revenue System in Post-Maurya and Gupta Times, Calcutta, 1967,

Jouveau-Dubreul, G. : Ancient History of the Deccan (trans. from the French by Dikshitar, V.S.S.), Pondichery, 1920.

Kane, P.V. : History of Dharmasāstra, Vols. I-V, Poona, 1930-62.

Keith, A.B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature, Oxford, 1928. Reprint, 1953.

Keith, A.B. and Macdonell, A.A. : Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, 2 Vols., London, 1912. Reprint, Varanasi, 1958.

Kosambi, D.D. : An Introduction to the Study of Indian History, Bombay 1956.

— — — : The Culture and Civilization of Ancient India in Historical Outline, London, 1965.

Kumar, Baldev : The Early Kushāṇas, New Delhi, 1973.

Lal, B.B. : Indian Archaeology Since Independence, Delhi, 1964.

Law, B.C. : Geography of Early Buddhism, London, 1926.

— — — : Ancient Indian Tribes, Lahore, 1926.

— — — : India as Described in the Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism, London, 1941.

— — — : Tribes in Ancient India, Poona, 1943.

— — — : Some Kshatriya Tribes of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1924.

— — — : Ancient Mid-Indian Kshatriya Tribes, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1924.

— — — : History of Pali Literature, 2 Vols., London, 1933.

— — — : Commemoration Volume, ed. Bhandarkar, D.R., Sastri, K.A.N. and Others, 2 Vols., Calcutta and Poona, 1945-46.

Law, M.M. : Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, Oxford, 1921.

— — — : Inter-state Relations in Ancient India, London, 1920.

Levi, S. : Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India (Eng. trans. by P.C. Bagchi), Calcutta, 1929.

Leeuwen, Van Lohuizen De, J.E. : The Scythian Period, Leiden, 1949.

Macdonell, A.A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature, London, 1900.

Maity, S.K. : Economic Life of Northern India in the Gupta Period, A.D. 300-500, Calcutta, 1958.

Majumdar, A.K. : Chaulukyas of Gujarat, Bombay, 1956.

Majumdar, D.N. : Races and Cultures of India, 4th ed., London, 1961.

Majumdar, M.R. (ed.): Historical and Cultural Chronology of Gujarat, Baroda, 1960.

Majumdar, R.C. : Ancient India, 6th ed., Delhi, 1971.

— — — : Corporate Life in Ancient India, 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1922.

— — — : Ancient History of Bengal, Calcutta, 1971.

— — (ed.): History of Bengal, Vol. I, Dacca, 1943.

Majumdar, R.C. and Altekar, A.S. (ed.): A New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI (The Vākāṭaka Gupta Age) Lahore, 1946; Reprint, Banaras, 1954.

Majumdar, R.C. (gen. ed.) and Pusalker, A.D., Majumdar, A.K. : The History and Culture of the Indian People. 11 Volume Project, Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay, 1951—in Progress.

— — — : Vol. I, Vedic Age, 4th impression, Bombay, 1965.

— — — : Vol. II, The Age of Imperial Unity, 3rd impression, Bombay, 1960.

— — — : Vol. III, The Classical Age, 2nd impression, Bombay, 1962.

— — — : Vol. IV, The Age of Imperial Kanauj, 2nd ed. Bombay, 1964.

Malalasekera, G.P. : Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 2 Vols., London, 1937. Reprint, 1960.

Marshal, Sir John : Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization, 3 Vols., London, 1931.

Mehta, R.L. : Pre-Buddhist India, Bombay, 1939.

Mirashi, V.V. : Studies in Indology, 3 Vols., Poona, 1960.

Mishra, V.B. : The Gurjara Pratiharas and their Times, Delhi, 1966.

Misra, V.N. : Palaeolithic Culture of Western Rajputana, Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, 21, Poona, 1961.

Mishra, G.S.P. : The Age of Vinaya, Delhi, 1972.

Mookerji, R.K. : Aśoka (Gaekwad Lectures), London, 1928.

— — — : Chandragupta Maurya and His Times, Madras, 1943. 2nd ed., Delhi, 1952.

— — — : Harsha, London, 1926.

— — — : The Gupta Empire, Bombay, 1948.

— — — : Local Self Government in Ancient India, Oxford, 1919. Reprint of 2nd ed., Delhi, 1958.

— — — : Hindu Civilization, London, 1936.

Mookerji, R.K. (ed.) : Vikrama Volume, Ujjain, 1948.

Motichandra. : Sārthavāha (in Hindi), Patna, 1953.

Moraes, G.M. : Kadamba-kula, Bombay, 1931.

Mukherjee, B.N. : The Kushāṇas and the Deccan, pt. I, Calcutta, 1968.

Munshi, K.M. : The Glory that was Gurjara-deśa (A.D. 500-1300), Bombay, 1954.

Narain, A.K. : The Indo-Greeks, Oxford, 1962.

Negi, J.S. : Groundwork of Ancient India History, Allahabad, 1958.

Niyogi, Roma. : The History of the Gahadavāla Dynasty, Calcutta, 1959.

Ojha, G.H. : The History of Rajputana, 5 Vols, (with parts, statewise) (in Hindi), Ajmer, 1927-40.

—

Ojha, K.C. : Bhāratīya Prāchīna Lipīmālā, Ajmer, 1918.

Pande, G.C. : The History of Foreign Rule in Ancient India, Allahabad, 1968.

—

Pande, A.B. : Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, Allahabad, 1957.

Pandey, M.S. : Buddha Dharma ke Vikāsa kā Itihāsa, Lucknow, 1962.

Pandey, R.B. : Early Medieval India, Allahabad, 1960.

—

Pandey, V.P. : Historical Geography and Topography of Bihar, Delhi, 1963.

Panikkar, K.M. : Vikramāditya-Samvata Pravartaka, Banaras, 1960.

—

Pargiter, E.F. : Vikramāditya of Ujjayani, Banaras, 1951.

—

Pathak, V.N. : Hindu Saṃskāras, Banaras, 1949.

—

Pathak, V.S. : Harivamśa Purāṇa : ek Sānskritika Adhyayana, Lucknow, 1960.

—

Pathak, V.S. : Geographical Factor in Indian History, Bombay, 1955.

—

Pathak, V.S. : Sri Harsha of Kanauj, Bombay, 1922.

—

Penzer, N.M. : Burāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, London, 1913, 2nd ed. Varanasi, 1962.

—

Pathak, V.S. : Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, Delhi, 1962.

—

Pathak, V.S. : Uttar Bhārata kā Rājanītika Itihāsa, A.D. 600-1290 (in Hindi), Lucknow, 1973.

—

Pathak, V.S. : Ancient Historians of India, Bombay, 1966.

—

Penzer, N.M. : Ocean of Stories, Vol. I-X, London, 1924-28.

Philip, C.H. (ed.) : *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, New York, 1961.

Piggott, Stuart. : *Pre-historic India*, Penguin Books, 1950.

Pizer, E.A. : *The Mauryans*, Madras, 1934.

Prakash, Kishan. : *Aspects of Indian History and Civilization*, Agra, 1965.

— : *Political and Social Movements in Ancient Punjab*, Delhi, 1964.

— : *Studies in History and Civilization*, Agra, 1965.

Prajad, Bhawani. : *History of Medieval India*, Allahabad, 1. to 6.

Puri, B.N. : *India Under the Kouravas*, Bombay, 1965.

— : *India as Described by Early Greek Writers*, Allahabad, 1959.

— : *The History of the Gurjara Pratiharas*, Bombay, 1967.

— : *Study of Indian History*, Bombay, 1971.

Puri, K.N. : *Excavations at Raith (District V.S., 1925-26)*, Jaipur, 1931.

Qazingo, K.R. : *Studies in Rajput History*, Delhi, 1969.

Rao, V.B. : *Uttar Vaidika Samaj-Swam Samikshya*, Varanasi, 1966.

Rapson, E.J. : *Ancient India*, Cambridge, 1922. Reprint, Delhi, 1962.

Rawlinson, H.G. : *Intercourse Between India and the Western World*, Cambridge, 1916.

Ray, H.G. : *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1931, 1936.

Raychandhuri, G.C. : *History of Mewar*, Calcutta.

Raychandhuri, H.C. : *Political History of Ancient India*, 4th ed., Calcutta, 1938, 6th ed., 1953.

✓ *Reu, B.N.* : *Mārvārā kā Itihāsa*, 2 pts., Jodhpur, 1938, 1940.

✓ *Rhys Davids, T.W.* : *Buddhist India*, London, 1903. Reprint, Calcutta 1959.

✓ *Risley, H.H.* : *The People of India*, ed. W. Crooke, London, 1915.

✓ *Roy, U.N.* : *Studies in Ancient Indian History and Culture*, Allahabad, 1969.

✓ *Rockhill, W.W.* : *The Life of the Buddha*, London, 1907.

✓ *Sahani, D.R.* : *Archaeological Remains and Excavations, at Sambhar (During V.S. 1993-94)*, Jaipur, 1940.

✓ *Saletore, R.N.* : *Life in the Gupta Age*, Bombay, 1943.

✓ *Sankalia, H.D.* : *Indian Archaeology Today*, Bombay, 1962.

— : *Pre-history and Proto-history in India and Pakistan*, Bombay, 1963.

✓ *Sastri, K.A.*

✓ *Nilakanta* : *Factors in Indian History*, Waltair, 1949.

—

— (ed.) : *History of India*, Vol. I, Madras, 1950.

— (ed.) : *A Comprehensive History of India, Vol. II, the Mauryas and Sātavāhanas, 325 B.C.-A.D. 300*, Madras, etc., 1957.

— (ed.) : *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, Banaras, 1952.

— and

✓ *Ramana, H.S.* : *Historical Method*, Madras, 1956.

✓ *Sharma, B.N.* : *Harsha and His Times*, Varanasi, 1970.

✓ *Sharma, Dasharatha* : *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, Delhi, 1959.

— : *Lectures on Rajput History and Culture*, Delhi, 1970.

— (ed.) : *Rajasthan Through the Ages*, Vol. I, Bikaner, 1966.

✓ *Sharma, G.R.* : *The excavations of Kausambi*, Allahabad, 1960.

— (ed.) : *Kushāṇa Studies*, Allahabad, 1968.

Sharma, G.N. : *Social Life in Medieval Rajasthan*, Agra, 1968.

— : *Rājasthān ke Itihāsa ke Srota*, pt. I, (in Hindi), Jaipur, 1973.

— : *Rājasthān kā Itihāsa*, pt. I. (in Hindi), Agra, 1973.

Sharma, M.L. : *Kota Rājya kā Itihāsa*, pt. I. (in Hindi) Kota, V.S. 1996.

Sharma, R.S. : *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1959, 2nd ed., 1968.

— : *Indian Feudalism : c. 300-1200 A.D.*, Calcutta, 1965.

— : *Śūdras in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1958.

Sharan, M.K. : *Tribal Coins—A Study*, Delhi, 1972.

Shastri, A.M. : *India as Seen in the Brīhat samhitā of Varāhamihra*, Delhi 1967.

Shyamaldas, Kaviraj : *Vīra Vinoda*, 4 Vols. Udaipur, V.S. 1943.

Sinha, B.P. : *The Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha (Cir. A.D. 455-1000)*, Patna, 1954.

Sinha, H.N. : *Sovereignty in Ancient Indian Polity*, London, 1938.

Singh, M.M. : *Life in North-Eastern India in Pre-Mauryan Time*, Delhi, 1967.

Singh, M.R. : *A Critical Study of the Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas*, Calcutta, 1972.

Sircar, D.C. : *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1965.

— — — : *Indian Epigraphy*, Delhi, 1975.

— — — : *Inscription of Aśoka*, Delhi, 1967.

— — — : *Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1966.

— — — : Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India, Calcutta, 1966.

— — — : Studies in Indian Coins, Delhi, 1968.

— — — : Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, Delhi, 1960.

— — — : The Guhilas of Kishkindhā, Calcutta,

— — — : The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan, Calcutta, 1938.

Sitaram, Lala. : History of Sirohi Raj, Allahabad 1920.

Smith, V.A. : The Early History of India, from 600. B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest, including the Invasion of Alexander 4th ed., Oxford, 1923. Reprint, 1962.

— — — : Aśoka, the Buddhist emperor of India 3rd ed., Oxford, 1924.

Sorenson, S.N. : Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata, London, 1904.

Spellman, J.W. : Political Theory of Ancient India, Oxford, 1964.

Sukthankar, V.S. : The Meaning of Mahābhārata, Bombay 1957.

— — — : Critical Study in the Mahābhārata, Poona, 1944.

Tarn, W.W. : The Greeks in Bactria and India, Cambridge, 1934.

Tessitori, L.P. : Bardic and Historical Survey of the Rajputana (Published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. X. 1914).

Thapur, R. : Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas, Oxford. 1961.

Thakur, Upendra. : The Hūṇas in India, Varanasi, 1967.

Tod, James. : Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, ed. W. Crooke. Oxford, 1914. Reprint 3 Vols., Delhi, 1971.

Tripathi, R.S. : History of Kānauj—To the Moslem Conquest, Banaras, 1927, Delhi, 1959.

Upadhyaya, B.S. : Buddha Kālīna Bhāratīya Bhūgola (in Hindi), Allahabad, 1939.

Vaidya, C.V. : History of Medieval Hindu India, 3 Vols., Poona, 1921, 1924, 1926.

Vidyalankar, S. : Maurya Sāmrājya kā Itihāsa (in Hindi), Mussoorie, 1971.

Virji, Krishna-kumari, J. : Ancient History of Saurashtra, Bombay 1955.

Wheeler, M. : Early India and Pakistan, Thames and Hudson, 1959.

— — — : The Indus Civilization, 3rd ed., Cambridge, 1968.

Williams, M.M. : A Sanskrit English Dictionary, Oxford, 1899. Reprint, Delhi, 1964.

Winternitz, M. : History of Indian Literature, Vol. I-III, Calcutta and Delhi, 1927, 1933 and 1963, 1967.

JOURNALS

Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Annals of Oriental Research, Madras.

Ancient India, Delhi.

Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer.

Annual Report of the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur.

Archaeological Survey of India :

—Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Calcutta.

—Annual Report, Calcutta.

—Annual Report of the Director General of Archaeology, Calcutta.

—Annual (Consolidated) Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Calcutta.

—Annual Progress Report of Archaeological Survey of India —Western Circle, Bombay.

—Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, Delhi.

Asiatic Society of Bengal :

- Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta,
- The Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
- Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, New Series.
- Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Third and Fourth Series (Title of Journal and name of Society vary : Current title, Journal of Asiatic Society, Calcutta.)
- Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.

Bhāratīya Vidyā, Bombay.

Bombay Gazetteer, Bombay.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London.

Bulletin of the Ancient Indian History and Archaeology, Sagar University, Sagar.

East and West, Rome.

Epigraphia Indica, Calcutta, Delhi, Oatacamund.

Indian Antiquary, Bombay.

Indian Archaeology—A Review, New Delhi.

Indian Culture, Calcutta.

Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.

Indian Numismatic Chronicle, Patna.

Itihāsa Samikshā, Jaipur.

Journal asiatique, Paris.

Journal of the Assam Research Society, Gauhati.

Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry.

Journal of Ancient Indian History, Calcutta.

Journal of Bihar Research Society, Patna,

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna.

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.

Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta.

Journal of the Ganga Nath Jha Research Institute, Allahabad.

Journal of Indian History, Trivandrum.

Journal of the Numismatic Society of India, published from "different places" presently, Varanasi.

Journal of the Orientel Institute, Baroda.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London.

Journal of the Rajasthan Institute of Historical Research, Jaipur.

Journal of the Uttar Pradesh Historical Society, Lucknow.

Maru Bhāratī (in Hindi), Pilani (Rajasthan): Modern Review, Calcutta.

Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā (in Hindi), Varanasi.

New Indian Antiquary, Bombay.

Parishada Patrikā, Patna.

Prachi Jyoti, Kurukshetra.

Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Published from different places. \diamond

Proceedings and Transactions of the All India Oriental Conference, published from different places.

Proceedings of the Rajasthan History Congress, published from different places.

Purātattva, New Delhi.

Quarterly Review of Historical Studies, Calcutta.

Rājasthan Bhāratī (in Hindi), Bikaner.

Researcher, Jaipur.

Śodha Patrikā (in Hindi), Udaipur.

University of Rajasthan Studies, Jaipur.

Varadā (in Hindi), Bisau (Rajasthan).

Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, Hoshiarpur (Panjab).