CHAPTER IX. SCYTHIAN RULE IN SOUTHERN AND WESTERN INDIA

SECTION I. THE KSHAHARĀTAS

We have seen that in the second and first centuries B.C., the Scythians possessed Ki-pin (Kāpiśā-Gandhāra) and Šakasthāna (Seistan) and soon extended their sway over a large part of Northern India. The principal Scythic dynasties continued to rule in the north. But a Satrapal family the Kshaharātas, extended their power to Western India and the Deccan, and wrested parts of Mahārāṣṭra from the Sātavāhanas. The Sātavāhana king apparently retired to the southern part of his dominions, probable to the Janapada of the Bellary District which came to be known as Sātavāhanihāra, and was at one time under the direct administration of a military governor (mahāsenāpati) named Skanda-nāga.¹ The waning power of the indigenous rulers of the Deccan and the waxing strength of the invaders seem to be hinted at in the following lines of the Periplus:

"The city of Calliena (Kalyāna) in the time of the elder Saraganus (probable Śātakarnī I) became a lawful market town; but since it came into the possession of Sandanes (possible Sunandana Śātakarnī)² the port is much obstructed, and Greek ships landing there may chance to be taken to Barygaza (Broach) under guard."

The name of the Scythian conquerors of the Broach region and of Mahārāṣṭra, Kshaharāta, seems to be identical with "Karatai," the designation of a famous

¹ Ep. Ind. XIV., 155.
² Wilson in JASB, 1904, 274; Smith ZDMG, Sept., 1903; IHQ, 1932, 234; JBORS. 1932, 7f. The adjective 'elder' becomes pointless unless the passage mentions a younger Saraganus, and this person can only refer to Sandanes from whom the elder king is distinguished.
Saka tribe of the north mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy.\(^1\)

The known members of the Kshaharāta, Khakharāta, or Chaharata family are Liaka, Patika, Ghaṭāka, Bhūmaka and Nahapāna. Of these Liaka, Patika, and Ghaṭāka belonged to the Taxila and Mathurā regions respectively. Bhūmaka was a Kṣatrapa of Kāṭhiāwār. Rapson says that he preceded Nahapāna. His coin-types are “arrow, discus and thunderbolt.” These types have been compared with the reverse type “discus, bow and arrow” of certain copper coins struck conjointly by Spaliris and Ayes (I).

Nahapāna was the greatest of the Kshaharāta Satraps. Eight Cave Inscriptions discovered at Paṇḍulena, near Nāsik, Junnar and Karle (in the Poona district) prove the inclusion of a considerable portion of Mahārāṣṭra within his dominions. Seven of these inscriptions describe the benefactions of his son-in-law Ushavadāta (Ṛshabhadatta) the Śaka, while the eighth inscription specifies the charitable works of Ayama, the Amālya (minister or district officer). Ushavadāta’s inscriptions indicate that Nahapāna’s political influence probably extended from Poona (in Mahārāṣṭra) and Sūrpāraka (in North Koṅkan) to Prābhasa in Kāṭhiāwār, Mandasar (Dašapura) and Ujjain in Mālwa and the district of Ajmer including Pushkara, the place of pilgrimage to which Ushavadāta resorted for consecration after his victory over the Mālayas or Mālavas.

The Nāsik records give the dates 41, 42, and 45, of an unspecified era, and call Nahapāna a Kṣatrapa, while the Junnar epigraph of Ayama specifies the date 46 and speaks of Nahapāna as Mahākṣatrapa. The generally accepted view is that these dates are to be referred to the Śaka era of 78 A.D. The name Nahapāna is no doubt Persian, but the Kshaharāta tribe

\(^1\) *Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 400. Mr. Y. R. Gupte points out (*Ind. Ant.*, 1926, 178), that among the shepherds of the Deccan we have the surname Kharāte which he considers to be a shortened form of Khakharāta (Kshaharāta).
to which Nahapāna belonged was probably of Śaka extraction and Ushavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, distinctly calls himself a Śaka. It is, therefore, probable that the era of 78 A.D. derives its name of Śaka era from the Śaka princes of the House of Nahapāna. Rapsōn accepts the view that Nahapāna’s dates are recorded in years of the Śaka era, beginning in 78 A.D., and, therefore, assigns Nahapāna to the period A.D. 119 to 124. Several scholars identify Nahapāna with Māmbarus (emended into Nambanus) of the Periplus whose capital was Minnagara in Ariake. According to one theory Minnagara is modern Mandasor, and Ariake is Aparantika.

R. D. Banerji and G. Jouveau-Dubreuil are of opinion that Nahapāna’s dates are not referable to the Śaka era. They say that if we admit that the inscriptions of Nahapāna are dated in the Śaka era, there will be only an interval of five years between the inscription of this king, dated 46 and the inscriptions of Rudradāman, dated 52. Within these years must have taken place:

(1) The end of Nahapāna’s reign;
(2) The destruction of the Kshaharātas;
(3) The accession of Chashtaṇa as Kshatrāpa, his

---

1 Allan thinks that the coins of Nahapāna cannot be assigned to so late a date in the second century A.D. He points among other things to the similarity of the bust on the obverse of Nahapāna’s silver coins and that on the coins of Rājūvīla. But he admits that this may be due to derivations from a common prototype such as the coins of Strato I (Camb. Short Hist., 861).

2 E.C., M. Boyer in Journal Asiatique, 1897, JASB, 1904, 272. In JRAS, 1918, 108, Kennedy points out that the name certainly ends in bāros and not in banaos.

3 JRAS, 1912, p. 785.

4 This is the view of D. R. Bhandarkar who apparently follows Bomb Gaz., I, 1, 15 n. Cf, however, Ind. Ant., 1926, p. 143, Capital of Nahapāna (=Junnar). Fleet identifies Minnagara with Dohad in the Pañch Mahāls (JRAS, 1912, p. 788; 1913, 939). In a paper read at the sixth conference of Orientalists at Patna Dr. Jayaswal referred to a Jaina work which mentions Broach as the capital of Nahapāna (see now Āvalyaka śūtra, JBORS, 1950, Sept. Dec., 290). For a different tradition see IHQ, 1929, 356. Vasudhara (?) nāgarī.

5 Cf. also IA, 7, 259, 263: Ariake may also be Āryaka of Varāhāmihira’s Brihat Saṃhitā.
reign as Kshatrapa, his accession as a Mahākshatrapa, and his reign as Mahākshatrapa;

(4) The accession of Jayadāman as Kshatrapa, his reign as Kshatrapa, and perhaps also his reign as Mahākshatrapa;

(5) The accession of Rudradāman and the beginning of his reign.

There is no necessity, however, of crowding the events mentioned above within five years (between the year 46, the last known date of Nahapāna, and the year 52, the first known date of Rudradāman). There is nothing to show that Chashtana's family came to power after the destruction of the Kshaharātās. The line of Chashtana may have been ruling in Cutch and perhaps some adjacent territories, as the Andhau inscriptions of the year 52 suggest, while the Kshaharātās were ruling in parts of Mālwa and Mahārāṣṭra. Moreover, there is no good ground for believing that a long interval elapsed from the accession of Chashtana to that of Rudradāman. Drs. Bhandarkar and R. C. Maumard have pointed out that the Andhau inscriptions clearly prove that Chashtana and Rudradāman ruled conjointly in the year 52. Professor J. Dubreuil rejects their view on the ground that there is no "cha" after Rudradāman in the text of the inscription: Rājīnā Chasṭanasas Yśāmotika-putrāsa rājīnā Rudradāmasas Jayadāma-putrāsa varshe dvipachāse, 50, 2. Professor Dubreuil translates the passage thus:

"In the 52nd year, in the reign of Rudradāman, son of Jayadāman, grandson of Chashtana and great-grandson of Yśāmotika."

The Professor who objects to a 'cha' himself makes use not only of "and" but also of the words "grandson" and "great-grandson" no trace of which can be found in the original record. Had his translation been what the writer of the Andhau inscriptions intended, we should have expected to find the name of Yśāmotika first, and then the name of Chashtana followed by those of Jayadāman and Rudradāman—Yśāmotika prapautrāsa
Moreover, it is significant that in the text of the inscription there is no royal title prefixed to the name of Jayadāman who ruled between Chashtaṇa and Rudradāman according to Dubreuil. On the other hand, both Chashtaṇa and Rudradāman are called Rājā. The two are mentioned in exactly the same way—with the honorific rājā and the patronymic. The literal translation of the inscriptional passage is "in the year 52 of king Chashtaṇa son of Ysāmotika, of King Rudradāman son of Jayadāman," and this certainly indicates that the year 52 belonged to the reign both of Chashtaṇa and Rudradāman.

The conjoint rule of two kings was known to ancient Hindu writers on polity. The theory of the conjoint rule of Chashtaṇa and his grandson is supported by the fact that Jayadāman did not live to be a Mahākshatrapa and must have predeceased his father, Chashtaṇa, as unlike Chashtaṇa and Rudradāman, he is called simply a Kshatrapa (not Mahākshatrapa and Bhadramukha) even in the inscriptions of his descendants. We have already noticed the fact that the title Rājā, which is given to Chashtaṇa and Rudradāman in the Andhau inscriptions, is not given to Jayadāman.

Mr. R. D. Banerji says that the inscriptions of Nahapāṇa cannot be referred to the same era as used on the coins and inscriptions of Chashtaṇa's dynasty because if we assume that Nahapāṇa was dethroned in 46 S. E., Gautamiputra must have held Nāsik up to 52 S. E. (from

1 Cf. the Junāgadh, Gunda and Jasdhān inscriptions.
2 Cf. the coin legends "Hermayasa Kalivaya," "Guduphavasasasa," "Khatapāṇa Ḍagāṇasa Ḍagāṇashasa," etc., where, too, we have no cha after the second name. Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, 86, 117; CHI, 538.
3 Cf. Durāja in the Atharva Veda (V, 20, 9); Durāja in the Kautūlya Asthāṣṭra, p. 325; Durāja of the Ayāraṅga Sutta; the classical account of Paratene, p. 259 ante; the case of Dhrītarāṣṭa and Duryodhana in the Great Epic; of Eukratides and his son in Justin's work; of Strato I and Strato II; of Ares and Arilises, etc., etc. The Mahāvastu (III, 432) refers to the conjoint rule of three brothers:—"Kalnigeshu Sūhāpurum nāma nagaram tatva tava bhītāra ekamātirikā maṇyaṁ kārayahtī." See also IA, 6, 29. Cf. Nilkantha Sastri, Pandyan Kingdom, 120, 122, 180.
4 Cf. the Gunda and Jasdhān inscriptions.
his 18th to his 24th year), then Pulumäy held the city up to the 22nd year of his reign, *i.e.*, up to at least 74 S. E. But Rudradäman is known to have defeated Pulumäy and taken Näsik before that time. Banerji's error lies in the tacit assumption that Rudradäman twice occupied Näsik before the year 73 of the Śaka era. There is no clear evidence to suggest that the Śatavāhanas lost Poona and Näsik to that great satrap though they may have lost Mālwa and the Koṅkan. Another untenable assumption of Mr. Banerji is that Rudradäman finished his conquests before the year 52 or A.D. 130, whereas the Andhau inscriptions merely imply the possession of Cutch and perhaps some adjoining tracts by the House of Chashtana.

The theory of those who refer Nahapāna's dates to the Śaka era, is confirmed by the fact pointed out by Professor Rapson, and Dr. Bhandarkar after him, that a Näsik inscription of Nahapāna refers to a gold currency, doubtless of the Kushāns who could not have ruled in India before the first century A.D.¹

The power of Nahapāna and his allies, the Uttama-
bhadras,² was threatened by the Mālavas (Mālavas) from the north, and the Śatavāhanas from the south. The incursion of the Mālavas was repelled by Ushavadāta. But the Śatavāhana attack proved fatal to Śaka rule in Mahārāṣṭra.

We know very little about Chakora and Śivasvāti mentioned in the Purāṇas as the immediate successors of Sunāndana during whose reign Śatavāhana prestige had sunk very low and marauders from Barygaza had been harrying the ports that had once enjoyed the


² The Uttamabhadradas may have been a section of the Bhadra tribe mentioned in a list of ganaś along with the Rohitakas (cf. Rohrak in south-east Punjab), the Āgryas (of Agra?) and the Mālavas (Mbh. III. 253.20). In *Mbh* VI. 50. 47 the Pra-bhadras are associated with the ganaś or corporations of the Dēserakas, apparently of the desert region of Rājputāna (Monier Williams, *Dict.* 405).
protection of the elder Śatakarnī, probably Śatakarnī I. But the king whose name occurs next in the list, viz., Gautamiputra, regained the lost power of the house and dealt a severe blow at the power of the intruders from the north. The Nāsik praśasti calls him the “uprooter of the Kshaharāta race,” and the “restorer, of the glory of the Śatavāhana family”. That Nahapāna himself was overthrown by Gautamiputra is proved by the testimony of the Jogalthembi hoard (in the Nāsik district) which consisted of Nahapāna’s own silver coins and coins restruck by Gautamiputra. In the restruck coins there was not a single one belonging to any prince other than Nahapāna as would certainly have been the case if any ruler had intervened between Nahapāna and Gautamiputra.

SECTION II. THE RESTORATION OF THE ŚATAVĀHANA EMPIRE

Gautamiputra’s victory over the Kshaharātas led to the restoration of the Śatavāhana power in Mahārāṣṭra and some adjoining provinces. The recovery of Mahārāṣṭra is proved by a Nāsik inscription, dated in the year 18,1 and a Karle epigraph addressed to the Amātya or the king’s officer in charge of Māmāla (the territory round Karle, modern Māval in the Poona district). But this was not the only achievement of Gautamiputra. We learn from the Nāsik record of queen Gautamī Balaśri that her son destroyed the Sakas (Scythians), Yavanas (Greeks) and Pahlavas (Parthians), and that his dominions extended not only over Asika,2 Asaka (Aśmaka on the Godāvari, a part

1 The Nāsik Edict was issued from the camp of victory of the Vejayanti army (Ep. Ind., VIII. 72) and was addressed to the Amātya or the king’s officer in charge of Govardhana (Nāsik). According to Sirca ‘Vejayanti’ is not a city but an epithet of Senā (army).

2 On the Krishnaṇā, i.e., the river Krishna (Khāravela’s in., IHQ, 1938, 275): cf. Ārshika, Paraśjali, IV. 2.2.
of Mahārāṣṭra),¹ and Mūlaka (the district around Pāiṭhan), but also over Suratha (South Kāṭhīāwār), Kukura (in Western or Central India, possibly near the Pāriyātra or the Western Vindhyas);² Aparānta (North Konkan), Anupa (district around Māhiśmati on the Narmadā), Vidarbha (Greater Berar), and Ākara-Avantī (east¹ and west Mālwā). He is further styled lord of all the mountains from the Vindhyas to the Malaya or Travancore hills, and from the Eastern (Mahendra) to the Western (Sahya) Ghāts. The possession of Vejayanti in the Kanarese country is possibly hinted at in the Nāsik inscription of the year 18. The names of the Andhra country (Andhrāpatha) and South Kosala are, however, conspicuous by their absence. Inscriptions, coins and the testimony of Hiuen Tsang prove that both these territories were at one time or other included within the Śatavāhana empire. The earliest Śatavāhana king whose inscriptions have been found in the Andhra region is Pulumāyi, son of Gautamiputra. It is, however, possible that some vague claim of suzerainty over the areas in question is implied in the boast that Gautamiputra was lord of the Vindhyas and the Eastern Ghāts (Mahendra) and that his chargers “drank the water of the three oceans” (tisamudato-yayā-pita-vāhana). Moreover “Asika” seems to have included a considerable portion of the valley of the Kṛishṇā.

In the Nāsik prāśasti Gautamiputra figures not only as a conqueror, but also as a social reformer. “He crushed down the pride and conceit of the Kshatriyas, furthered the interest of the twice-born, apparently the Brāhmaṇas, as well as the lowest orders (Dvujāvarakutubauvadhana)³

¹ Shamaśāstry’s translation of the Arthaśāstra, p. 143, n. 2. Its capital Potana probably corresponds to Bodhan in the Nizam’s dominions.
² Brihat Sāṁhitā, XIV, 4.
³ Eastern Malwa was possibly under Vāsishka, the successor of Kanishka. I in the year 28 of the Kushān Era which corresponds to A.D. 106 according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages. Ākara has been identified with Āgar, 33 miles north-east of Ujjain, Bomb. Gaz., Gujarat, 540; Ep. Ind., xxviii. 102.
⁴ Kusumba means ‘a household’, ‘a family’ and asura-kusuma may be taken to mean ‘households or families of the lowly’. The use of the word
and stopped the contamination of the four *varṇas* (castes)."

According to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar and Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Gautamiputra reigned conjointly with his son Pulumāyi. They give the following reasons in support of their theory:

1. In Gautami’s inscription (dated in the 19th year of her grandson Pulumāyi) she is called the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king. This statement would be pointless if she were not both at one and the same time.

2. If it were a fact that Gautamiputra was dead when the queen-mother’s inscription was written, and Pulumāyi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter also celebrated in the inscription. But there is not a word in praise of him. A king dead for 19 years is extolled, and the reigning king passed over in silence.

3. The inscription dated in the year 24, engraved on the east wall of the Veranda of the Nāsik Cave No. 3, which records a grant made by Gautamiputra and the "king’s mother whose son is living", in favour of certain Buddhist monks "dwelling in the cave which was a pious gift of theirs," presupposes the gift of the Nāsik Cave No. 3 in the 19th year of Pulumāyi. Consequently Gautamiputra was alive after the 19th year of his son.

As regards point (1), it may be said that usually a queen sees only her husband and sometimes a son on the throne. Queen Gautamī Balaśrī, on the other hand, was one of the fortunate (or unfortunate) few who saw grandchildren on the throne. Therefore, she claimed to be the mother of a great king and the grandmother of a great king.

As to point (2), is the silence satisfactorily explained by the theory of conjoint rule? Those who prefer the opposite view may point out that although it is not custom-

*kuṭūba* may suggest that the 'lowly' order or orders, whose families or households are referred to, are the traders and agriculturists (*kuṭumbika*).
ary for an ordinary subject to extol a dead king and pass over a reigning monarch in silence, still it is perfectly natural for a queen-mother in her old age to recount the glories of a son who was associated with her in a previous gift.

As to point (3), it is not clear that the gift referred to in the postscript of the year 24 was identical with the grant of the year 19 of Pulumāyi. The donors in the postscript were king Gautamiputra and the rājamātā, the king’s mother, apparently Balāsī, while the donor in the year 19 of Pulumāyi was the queen-mother alone. In the inscription of the year 24, the queen-mother is called Mahādevī Jīvasūtā Rājamātā, the great queen, the king’s mother, whose son is alive. In Pulumāyi’s inscription the epithets Mahādevī and Rājamātā are retained but the epithet “Jīvasūtā,” “whose son is alive,” is significantly omitted. The donees in the former grant were the Tekirāsi or Trirāśni ascetics in general, the donees in the latter grant were the monks of the Bhadavāniya school. The object of grant in the former case may have been merely the Veranda of Cave No. 3, which contains the postscript of the year 24, and whose existence before the 19th year of Pulumāyi is attested by an edict of Gautamiputra of the year 18. On the other hand, the cave given away to the Bhadavāniya monks was the whole of Cave No. 3.

If Gautamiputra and his son reigned simultaneously, and if the latter ruled as his father’s colleague in Mahārāṣṭra, then it is difficult to explain why Gautamiputra was styled “Govadhanasa Benākaṭakasvāmi,” “lord of Benākaṭaka in Govardhana” (Nāsik), and why he addressed the officer at Govardhana directly, ignoring his son who is represented as ruling over Mahārāṣṭra, while in

1 The use of the expression “Govadhanasa” suggests that there were other localities named Benākaṭaka from which this particular place is distinguished. A Bennākaṭa in the eastern part of the Vākāṭaka kingdom is mentioned in the Tiśoḍi plates of Pravarasena II (ⅡⅡ) (IHQ, 1955, 295; Ep. Ind. XXII 167 ff.). Beṇā or Bennā is apparently the name of a small stream in each case.
the record of the year 19, Pulumāyi was considered as so important that the date was recorded in the years of his reign, and not in that of his father who was the senior ruler.1

The generally accepted view is that Pulumāyi came after Gautamiputra.

The date of Gautamiputra Sātakarni is a matter regarding which there is a wide divergence of opinion. There are scholars who believe that the epithets yuvavāraṇavikrama, chānu-vikrama, “whose gait was beautiful like the gait of a choice elephant,” and Saka-nishūdana, destroyer of Šakas, suggest that he was the original of Rājā Vikramāditya of legend who founded the era of 58 B.C. But, as already pointed out, the use of regnal years by Gautamiputra and his descendants indicates that no era originated with the dynasty. Further, Indian literature clearly distinguishes between Vikramāditya of Ujjain and Śālivāhana or the Śālavāhanas of Pratishṭhāna. The view accepted in these pages is that Gautamiputra was the conqueror of Nahapāna and that his 18th year fell after the year 46 of the Saka era, the last recorded date of his vanquished opponent. In other words the conquest of Nāsik by Gautamiputra took place some time after A.D. 78 + 46 = 124, and his accession after A.D. 124 — 18 = 106. As he ruled for at least 24 years, his reign must have terminated after A.D. 130.

In the Purānic lists compiled by Pargiter the immediate successors of Gautamiputra are Pulomā, his son, and Sātakarni. Pulomā is doubtless identical with Siro P(t)olemaios of Baithana mentioned by Ptolemy and Vāsishṭhiputra Svāmi Śrī Pulumāvi of inscriptions and coins. Sātakarni is perhaps to be identified with Vāsishṭhiputra Śrī Sātakarni of a Kanheri Cave Inscription, or with Vāsishṭhiputra Chatarapana Sātakarni of a Nānāghat record. His exact position in the genealogical list cannot

1 Cf. R. D. Banerji, JRAS, 1917, pp. 281 et seq. Note also the epithet (Dakṣihīmaḥ) pathrśvāma ‘lord of the Deccan,’ applied to Pulumāyi in the pṛaśasti of the year 19.
be determined with precision. The Kanheri epigraph represents Vāsishṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarnī as the husband of a daughter of the Mahākśatrāpa Rudra. Rapson identifies this Rudra with Rudradāman I. There can hardly be any doubt that the Śātavāhana king mentioned in the Kanheri record, or one of his close relations who bore a similar name, was identical with Śātakarnī, lord of the Deccan, whom Rudradāman "twice in fair fight completely defeated, but did not destroy on account of the nearness of their connection." Dr. Bhandarkar's identification of Vāsishṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarnī of Kanheri with Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śiva Śrī Śātakarnī of coins and Śiva Śrī of the Matsya Purāṇa cannot be regarded as more than a conjecture. The ruler mentioned in the Kanheri Inscription may have been a brother of Pulumāyi.

We have seen that the capital of Pulumāyi was Bāithan, i.e., Pauṭhan or Pratishṭhāna on the Godāvari identified by Bhandarkar with Navanara or Navanagara, i.e., the new city. Inscriptions and coins prove that the dominions of this king included the Krishnā-Godāvari reign as well as Mahārāṣṭra. It has already been pointed out that the Andhra country is not clearly mentioned in the list of territories over which Gautamiṣṭhīputra held his sway. It is not altogether improbable that Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāyi was the first to establish the Śātavāhana power firmly in that region. Sukṭhankar identifies him with Śrī Pulumāyi, king of the Śātavāhana, mentioned in an inscription discovered in the Adoni taluk of the Bellary district. But the absence of the distinguishing metronymic makes the identification uncertain and probably indicates that the king referred to in the inscription is Pulumāyi I of the Purāṇas or some other prince of the dynasty who bore the same name. D. C. Sircar identifies him with the last king of Pargiter's list. Numismatic evidence suggests that the political influence of a Pulumāyi extended to the Coromandel coast, and possibly to the Chanda district of the Central Provinces. But in the absence of epigraphic corroboration the matter cannot be regarded as definitely
proved. Moreover, the absence of the metronymic Vāsishṭhāpūtra makes it uncertain in some cases as to whether the son of the great Gautamīputra is meant.

Vāsishṭhāpūtra Pulumāyi must have come to the throne some time after A.D. 130. He is known from a Karle epigraph to have ruled for at least 24 years, so that his reign terminated after A.D. 154.

The successors of Pulumā tablets compiled by Pargiter are Śiva, Śrī1 Pulumā and Śivaskanda (or Sivaskandha)Śātakarni.

Yajñaśrī Śātakarni

The immediate successor of Śivaskanda according to the collated text of Pargiter was Yajña Śrī. If the Puraṇas are to be believed his accession took place more than 35 years after the close of the reign of Gautamīputra Śātakarni, i.e., after A.D. 165 and ended after A.D. 194. Yajña Śrī's inscriptions, which prove that he reigned for at least 27 years, are found at the following places, viz., Nasik in Mahārāṣṭhra, Kanheri in Aparānta, and Chhīna in the Kṛishṇa district. His coins are found in Gujrāt,

1 Mirashi in the Journal of the Num. Soc 13 (1940), p. 88, attributes to him the coins of "Śiva Pulumāyi III" of the Tārāla hoard. He draws a distinction between this king (who was a pulumāyi) and Vāsishṭhāpūta Sivāsīri Śātakarni who is known to Rupson's Catalogue. The Puraṇa Purāṇa, however, represents Śivaśrī as a Śātakarni (and not a Pulumāyi). The matter must, therefore, be regarded as sub judice.

2 Mirashi (ibid. 89) identifies him with King Surkhada of Skanda Śātakarni of the Tārāla hoard (Akola district) and other coins whose name was wrongly read as Chaṇḍa Śātakarni by Smith and Rudra Śātakarni by Rupson. This "Rudra" was represented as a ruler of the Andhra-deśa.

4 In JRAS, July, 1934, 506ff, Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that the name of this king was Śrī Yajña Śātakarni as stated in inscriptions, and not Yajña Śrī (as stated in the Puraṇa). It should, however, be remembered that Śrī is here an honorific and it is frequently used as a suffix in the names of members of the Śātavāhana royal house (cf. Veda or Skanda-Sūri, Haku-Sūri, Bala-Sūri, Siva-Sūri, etc.; Rupson, Andhra Coins, pp. xlvi, i, lii). The mere fact that in certain documents Śrī precedes the name of a king does not prove conclusively that it was never used as a suffix. In the famous inscription of Khāravela the king is called both Śrī Khāravela and Khāravela-Sūri. In the Mudrāsūkha Śrīmat Chandragupta is also styled Chanda-Sūri. Cf. Asoka Śrī in Purāṇīṣṭhāpana, IX. 14.
Kāthiāwār, Aparānta, the Chanda district in the Central Provinces, and the Krishnā district of the Madras State. There can be no doubt that he ruled over both Mahārāṣṭra and the Andhra country and recovered Aparānta (N. Koṅkaṇ) from the successors of Rudradāman I. Smith says that his silver coins imitating the coinage of the Saka rulers of Ujjain probably point to victories over the latter, and that the coins bearing the figure of a ship suggest the inference that the king's power extended over the sea. He thus anticipated the naval ventures of the Kadambas of Goa, of Sivājī and of the Angriyas.¹

Yajñaśrī was the last great king of his dynasty. After his death the Sātavāhanas probably lost North-Western Mahārāṣṭra to the Ābhira king Iśvarasena.² The later Sātavāhana princes—Vijaya, Chaṇḍa Śrī (variant Chandra Śrī) and Pulomāvi of the Purāṇas—seem to have ruled in Berar, the Eastern Deccan and the Kanarese country.³

¹ Rapsom, however, says (Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, p. 22) in reference to certain lead coins (of the Coromandel coast): “obv. Ship with two masts. Inscr. not completely read, but apparently Śri-Pu (lūmā) vīṣa.”

² The earliest reference to the Ābhira to which an approximate date can be assigned is that contained in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The Mahābhāṣya as well as the Mahābhārata connects them with the Śūdras—the Sudras of Alexander's historians. Their country—Abiria—finds mention in the Periplois and the geography of Ptolemy. In the third quarter of the second century A.D., Abhira chieftains figured as generals of the Saka rulers of Western India. Shortly afterwards a chief named Iśvaradatta, probably an Abhira, became Mahābhāratapī. His relation to the Abhira king Mādhaviputra Iṣvāra Sena, son of Iṣvāra Datta, remains doubtful. But some scholars are inclined to identify the two chiefs. It is also suggested that this dynasty of Iṣvāra Sena is identical with the Traikūṭaka line of Aparānta, and that the establishment of the Traikūṭaka era in A.D. 248 marks the date at which the Abhiras succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the Government of Northern Mahārāṣṭra and the adjoining region. The last known of the Traikūṭaka line were Indradatta, his son Dahrasena (455-56 A.D.), and his son Vyāghrasena (480-90), after whom the kingdom seems to have been conquered by the Vākṣaṇa king Harishepa.

³ The Berar (Akola) group includes certain princes, not included in the Purāṇic lists, e.g., Śrī Kumbha Śatakarnī, Śrī Karṇa Śatakarnī (unless he is identified with the so-called Śvātikarṇa, the fourteenth king of Pargiter's list) and Śrī Śaka Śatakarnī (Mirashi, J. Num. Soc., II, 1940). Mirashi thinks that the real name of the so-called Kṛishṇa (II) of the Chanda hoard was Karṇa. Among kings of uncertain identity mention may be made of Śrī Sivamaka Śata of the Amaraṇavī inscription and Mādhaviputra Śrī Śata of Kanheri.
The existence of Vijaya seems now to be confirmed by numismatic evidence.\textsuperscript{1} Chaṇḍa Śrī may have been identical with Vāsīśṭhī-putra "Śāmi-siri Chaṇḍa Sāta" of the Kodavali rock-cut well Inscription discovered near Pīṭhāpuram in the Godāvarī region, while Pulomāvī is, in the opinion of Dr. D. C. Sircar, to be identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Myakadoni inscription of the Bellary district. Coins disclose the existence of a few other Kings of the line who must be assigned to the latest Sātavāhana period. Sātavāhana rule in the Krīṣṇa, Guṇṭur and Bellary districts was eventually supplanted by the Ikshvākus\textsuperscript{2} and the Pallavas.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} Mirashi, \textit{Journal of the Nums, Soc of India,} II (1940) p 90. The only clear letters are va-Sātaka. The ascription to Vijaya must be regarded as tentative.

\textsuperscript{2} The Ikshvākus are known from inscriptions discovered on the ruins of the Jagayapaṭa stūpa in the Krīṣṇa District and also at Nāgaśijnankaṇḍa and Guṇḍala in the Guṇḍūr District (Ep. Ind., 1926, 11; 1941, 123). They were matrimonially connected with the Kekayas, probably a ruling family of ancient Mysore (Dubreuil, \textit{AHD}, pp. 88, 101). The most well-known rulers of the Ikshvāku family of the Eastern Deccan are Chāndamūla, Śrī-Vīra-Purusha-datta, Ehuvala Chāntamūla II and possibly 'Ruluphūrisātta' (Ep. Ind., xxvi. 125).

The Ikshvākus were succeeded by the 'Ānanda' kings of Guṇṭūr, the Brijāphalayanās of Kudurāhāśa (near Masulipatam), the Sāḷāṅkāyanās of Veṅgi (cf. IA, 5. 175 and the Salakenoi of Ptolemy), and the Vishnukūḍams of Lenuḷa (near Veṅgi).

\textsuperscript{3} The Pallavas a people of unknown origin, claiming descent from Aśvatthāman and Nāga princesses, are the most important of all the dynasties that succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the Far South. The claim of descent from Bṛāhmaṇas of the Bharadvāja gotra, the performance of the \textit{Āvamēdha} and patronage of Sanskrit learning, connect the dynasty with the Śūṅgas, while the Bṛāhmaṇa-Nāga connection, (cf. Saṁkīrga-jati, \textit{Bṛāhma-ksattra}, II Vol. xii, Nos. 7, 48) the performance of Veda sacrifices including the horse-sacrifice, early association with the Sātavāhana Janaṭa in the Bellary district and the use of Pārśītra in their early records, connect the family with the Sātavāhanas. There is no question of any Parthian affinity as the genealogical lists of the family are singularly devoid of Parthian nomenclature. The elephant's scalp used as a crown is no test of race. The well-known hostility of the family to the Cholas and the decidedly northern character of their culture preclude the possibility of a pure Tamil extraction. The first great Pallava king, Śīva-Skanda-varman, is known from the inscriptions found at Mayidavolu (in Guṇṭūr) and Hirahāda-gallī (in Bellary) to have ruled over an extensive empire including Kāṭṭi, Andhrāpātha and Sāṭhabani vatiṭha, and performed the \textit{Āvamēdha} sacrifice. About the middle of the fourth century A.D. the emperor Samudra Gupta invaded Southern India, defeated the reigning Pallava king, Vishnugopa, and gave a severe blow to the power and prestige of the empire of Kāṭṭi which, in the long run, probably led to its disruption. The evidence of the Penukenḍa
Provincial Government under the Śātavāhanas

A word may be said here regarding the internal

Plates, the Tālagunda inscription and the Hebbata grant (IHQ, 1927, 134) seems to suggest that the Pallava supremacy continued for some time to be acknowledged by the early Gaṅgas of Ananthapura and East Mysore and the early Kadambas of Varajñanti (Banavasi) and Mahisha-Vishaya (Mysore). The history of the Pallavas during the fifth and sixth centuries is obscure. Certain inscriptions disclose the names of the following kings, but little is known about them.

Kings of Krishnā, Guṇṭūr and Nellore districts

| Vimeṇgopā I |
| Skandamīlā |
| Kāṅgopā |
| Virākṣīha II* |
| Skandavārman I (Skanda-viṣṇu) |
| Kumāravāṣṭu I, recovered Kāṅgali |
| Buddhavarman, defeated Cholas. |

| Skanda II Kumāravāṣṭu II |
| Buddhavarman |
| Skandavārman III |
| Vimeṇgopā II |
| Vishṇudāsa |
| Skandavārman IV |
| Simhavārman II |
| Virākṣīha II* |
| Skandavārman V |
| Simhavārman II |
| A.D. 496 |
| Skandavārman VI |
| Nandavarman I |
| Simhavārman III, IV, (two kings of this name) |
| Vimeṇgopā III |
| Simhavārman V |
| Simhavāṣṭu |
| Mahendravārman I |
| Natassimhavārman I |
| Contemporary of Pula-keśin II. |

| Vēyali, |
| Velupalam, |
| Darsi and |
| Chendalur |
| grants. |

* Kings marked with asterisks may have been identical. But this is by no means certain. The settlement of early Pallava genealogy and chronology must still await future discoveries.

1 A Simhavārman is mentioned in the Palkād inscription. But his identity and date are uncertain.
2 Tāmbāpa is identified with Chembrolu.
organisation of the Śatavāhana empire. The sovereign himself seems to have resided in Pratishtana or in "camps of victory" in Govardhana (Nāsik district), Vaijayantī (in North Kanara) and other places. The imperial dominions were divided into administrative units called āhāra or janapada and placed under rulers who fell into two classes, viz., (a) amātyas who were ordinary civil functionaries and (b) military governors and feudatories styled mahāsenāpati, mahāraṭhi, mahābhhoja, and even Rājan. Amātyas are mentioned in connection with Aparanta (North Konkan), Govardhana (Nāsik), Māmād(l)a (Poona), Banavasi (North Kanara) and Khāḍḍavali (Godavari region). Mahāraṭhis are found associated with Chitaldrug, Nānāhat, Karle and Kanheri (in the North Konkan). They intermarried with the imperial family (and at times adopted its nomenclature) and also with the Chuṭu, Kauśika and Vāśishṭha clans. The Mahābhhojas had close relations with Chuṭu rulers of Banavasi. Mahāsenāpatis are found in Nāsik in the days of Yajña Śri and in Bellary in the time of a Pulumāyi. The rule of these military governors, some of whom belonged to the Kauśika family or were maternally connected with it, was very much in evidence in the last days of the Śatavāhana empire. Potentates with the title of rājā ruled in the Kolhapur region. The most notable among these were: Vāśishṭhiputra Vīlīvāyakura, Māṭhariputra Śivalakura and Gautamiputra Vīlīvāyakura (II). The Vīlīvāyakura group cannot fail to remind one of Balezouros of Hippokoura mentioned by the Greek geographer Ptolemy (c. 150 A.D.).

It is from the ranks of military governors and feudatories that the princes who carved out independent

---

1 E.g., Navanara—perhaps really identical with the port of Calliena (Kalyāṇa, an ancient name of which, according to the Bombay Gazetteer, XIV. 114, is Navā Nagar).

2 Vasishṭhas figure as rulers of Kalinga in later times.

3 A Kauśikiputra Sātakarṇi is known from a coin (Bibliography of Indian Coins, Part I, 1950, p. 90).
principalities on the dissolution of the Śātavāhana empire, evidently sprang. The śālaṅkāvanas (Salakanoi), for example, who appear to have been a feudatory family in the Andhra country, afterwards set up an independent sovereignty. The Pallavas were doubtless connected with the military governors of the Bellary district.

The Śātakarnīs of Kuntala

In the days of the great Gautamiputra, son of Bala Śrī, Banavāsi or Vaijayantī (Kanara) seems to have been the capital of an imperial province under an amātya named Śivagupta. By an obscure transition the sovereignty of the territory passed into the hands of a family, possibly styled Chuṭu in inscriptions,¹ whose connection with the Śātavāhana-Śātakarnīs is not known. The evidence of the Myakadoni inscription and notices in the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana, the Gāthāsaptāśati and the Kāvyav Mīmāṃsā, probably suggest that a group of Śātavāhanas receded the so-called Chuṭu kula in Kuntala or the Kanarese country. Some of them were great patrons of Prākrit learning. The most famous amongst them was Hāla. Another king of the group was Kuntala Śātakarnī, mentioned in the Kāmasūtra whom the Purāṇas regard as a predecessor of Hāla. The Chuṭu line is represented by Harītiputra Vishnukaḍa-Chuṭu kulāṇanda Śātakarnī, Rājā of Vaijayantīpura, and his daughter’s son Śiva-Skandaṇāga Śrī who is identified by Rapson with Skandaṇāga Śataka of a Kanheri Inscription, and also with Harītiputra Śiva-[Skanda]-varman, lord of Vaijayanti, mentioned in a Malavallī record (in the Shimoga district of Mysore). The last identification seems to be doubtful as the mother and daughter of Vishnukaḍa could hardly have belonged to the same gotra. Harītiputra Śiva-varman was apparently succeeded by the Kadambas.²

¹ Some scholars do not accept the theory that Chuṭu is a dynastic designation. They regard it as a personal name. Prog. Rep. of the ASI, W. Circle, 1911-12, p. 5.
² The Kadamba line was founded by Mayūra Ṛṣṭhravarman, a Brāhmaṇa, who
SECTION III. THE ŚAKAS OF UJJAIN AND KĀTHIĀWĀR

The greatest rivals of the restored Sātavāhana Empire were at first the Śaka Kṣatrapas of Ujjain. The progenitor of the Śaka princes of Ujjain was Ysamotika who was the father of Chashtana, the first Mahākṣatrapa of the family. The name of Ysamotika is Scythic. His descendant, who was killed by Chandra Gupta II, is called a Śaka king by Bāna in his Haṣha-charita. It is, therefore, assumed by scholars that the Kṣatrapa family of Ujjain was of Śaka nationality.

The proper name of the dynasty is not known. Rapson says that it may have been Kārddamaka. The daughter of Rudradāman boasts that she is descended from the family of Kārddamaka kings; but she may have been indebted to her mother for this distinction. The Kārddamaka kings apparently derive their name from the Kārdana, a river in Persia.

According to Dubreuil, Chashtana ascended the throne in A.D. 78, and was the founder of the Śaka era. But this is improbable in view of the fact that the capital of Chashtana (Tiastanes) was Ujjain (Ozene of Ptolemy, whereas we learn from the Periplus that Ozene was not a capital in the seventies of the first century A.D.

rose against the Pallavas and helped by “Vrihad Bāna” and other kings, compelled the lord of Kaṇchi to confer on him the Pattabandha of military governorship. He soon pushed his conquests to the western ocean. His great-grandson Kākustha varman gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings. Krīṣṇa varman I performed the Asvamedha. Mrīgėśa varman defeated the Gaṅgas and Pallavas and had his capital at Vaijayatī. Junior branches of the family ruled at Palāsiṅga, Uchchaśṛṅgi and Tripūravāta. The Kadambas were finally overthrown by the Chalukyas. See Moraes, Kadamba-Kula; Sircar, I.H., 1926, 501 ff.

1 JRAS. 1906, p. 211. Lévi and Konow (Corpus, II. i. lxx) identify Ysamotika with Bhūmaka on the ground that the Śaka word “Ysama” means earth. But identity of meaning of names need not necessarily prove identity of persons. Cf. the cases of Kumāra Gupta and Skanda Gupta.

2 Pārisi, Shamasvastry’s translation of the Kaṇṭīla, p. 86. See also IHK., 1933, 57 ff. Cf. the Artaṁis of Ptolemy, VI. 11. 2, a tributary of the Oxis.

3 The Periplus mentions Malichos (Maliku), the king of the Nabataeans, who died in A.D. 75, and Zoscales (Za Hakale), king of the Auctānites, who reigned from A.D. 76 to 80 (JRAS, 1917, 827-830).
The *Periplus* speaks of Ozene as a former capital, implying that it was not a capital in its own time. The earliest known date of Chash’tana is S. E. 52, i.e., A.D. 130. We learn from the Andhau inscriptions that in the year A.D. 130 Chash’tana was ruling conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman. Professor Rapson and Dr. Bhandarkar point out that his foreign title *Kṣatrapa*, and the use of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet on his coins, clearly show that he was a viceroy of some northern power—probably of the Kushāṇs. Jayadāman, son of Chash’tana, seems to have acted merely as a *Kṣatrapa* and to have predeceased his father, and the latter was succeeded at *Mahākṣatrapa* by Rudradāman.

**Rudradāman** became an independent *Mahākṣatrapa* some time between the years 52 and 72 (A.D. 130 and 150). We learn from the Jūnāgadāh Rock Inscription of the year 72 that men of all castes chose him as protector and that he won for himself the title of *Mahākṣatrapa*. This probably indicates that the power of his house had been shaken by some enemy (possibly Gautamiputra), and he had to restore the supreme satrapal dignity by his own prowess.

The place names in the inscription seem to show that the rule of Rudradāman extended over Purv-āpar-Ākara-Āvanti (East and West Mālwa), Anupa-nivṛt or the Māhishmatī region (Māndhātā in Nimād, or Maheśvara), Ānarta (territory around Dwārakā), Surāśṭra (district around Jūnāgadāh), Svabhra (the country on the banks of

---

2 *IA*, 4. 346.
3 Ānatta may according to some, however, designate the district around Vāḍanagāra (*Bom. Gaz.* 1. i. 6). In that case Kukura may be placed in the Dwārakā region. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* refers to Dwārakā as "Kukura Andhaka-Vṛishñībhiḥ guptā" (1. 11. 10). The *Vāyu Purāṇa* (ch. 96. 134) represents Ugrasena, the Yādava rājā as Kukurodbhava, of Kukura extraction. In Mbh. III. 183. 32, too, Kukuras are closely associated with Dāśarhas and Andhakaś who are known to have been Yādava clans. In II. 52. 15 they are associated with the Ambasaṭhas and the Pahlavas. A branch of the people may have lived in the lower valley of the Chenab and the Indus, while another branch occupied a portion of Kāthiāwār.
the Sābarmatī, Maru (Mārwār), Kachchha (Cutch), Sindhu-Sauvīra (the Lower Indus Valley),¹ Kukura (probably between Sind and the Pāriyātra Mt.),² Aparānta (N. Koṅkan),³ Nīshāda (in the region of the Sarasvatī and the Western Vindhya),⁴ etc. Of these places Surāśṭra, Kukura, Aparānta, Anupa and Ākārāvanti formed part of Gautamiputra’s dominions, and must have been conquered either from that king or one of his immediate successors. The Junāgadh inscription gives the information that Rudradāman twice defeated Sātakarni, lord of the Deccan, but did not destroy him on account of their near relationship. According to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar this Sātakarni was Gautamiputra himself, whose son Vāsishṭhiputra Sātakarni was Rudradāman’s son-in-law. According to Rapson the lord of the Deccan defeated by the Śaka ruler was Pulumāyī. It is more probable that the defeated ruler was Vāsishṭhiputra Sātakarni himself, who may have been a brother and a predecessor of Pulumāyī.

The Great Satrap also conquered the Yaudheyas, possibly of Johiya-bār along the Sutlej, who are known, from a stone inscription, to have occupied also the Bijayagaḍh region in the Bharatpur state. If the Kushān

¹ Sindhu is the inland portion lying to the west of the Indus (Watters, Yuan Chwang, II. 232, 235, read with 236; Vātsyāyana, Kāmasūtra, Benares Ed. 295). Sauvīra includes the littoral (Miśinda Paṇho, S.B.E., XXXVI, 269) as well as the inland portion lying to the east of the Indus as far as Muliṭān (Alberuni, I, 302; IA, 7, 259). The Jaina Pravachanasūtaoddhāra names Vitabhaṇya as the capital.

² Brihat Samhiṭa, V. 71; XIV, 4.

³ Aparānta in its extended sense (cf. Aṭoka, RE, V) no doubt embraces not only Sūrāparaka but Nāṣik, Bharukaccha, the Mahi valley, Cutch, Surāśṭra, Anartta, Abu, etc. (Vāyu, 45, 129 f.; Matsya, 114, 50-51; Mārk. 57, 49 f.—the Purānic text is corrupt and Sūrāparakah Kacchāyāh and Anarttāh should be substituted for Sūrāparakah, Kāsmirāh and Āvantyāh). But as the Junāgadh record distinguishes Aparānta from Surāśṭra, Anartta, etc., it is clearly used here in its restricted sense.

⁴ Cf. Nīshāda-rāṣṭra, Mbh., III. 130. 4 (the place of the disappearance—Vinaśana—of the river Sarasvatī is described as the dvarā of Nīshādarāṣṭra); note also Pāriyātracarāṇaḥ, Mbh. XII. 135. 5-5. In Mbh. ii. 31. 4-7 a Nīshāda-bhūmi is placed between the Matsyas (of Jaipur) and the Chambal. The Vedic commentator Mahādhara explains the word Nīshāda as meaning a Bhil (Vedic Index, I. 454). According to Bühler (IA. 7, 269) Nīshāda probably corresponded with Hisar and Bhatnir.
chronology accepted by us be correct, then he must have wrested Sindhu-Sauvīra from one of the successors of Kanisha I.

Rudradāman apparently held his court at Ujjain, which is mentioned by Ptolemy as the capital of his grandfather Chasṭana, placing the provinces of Ānarta and Surāśṭra under his Pahlava (Parthian) Amātya Suviśākha. The Amātya constructed a new dam on the famous Sudārśana Lake which owed its origin to the "care bestowed by the Maurya government upon question of irrigation, even in the most remote provinces."

The Great Kṣatrapa is said to have gained fame by studying grammar (śabda), polity (artha), music (gandharva), logic (nyāya), etc. As a test of the civilised character of his rule it may be noted that he took and kept to the end of his life, the vow to stop killing men except in battle. The Sudārśana embankment was rebuilt and the lake reconstructed by "expendng a great amount of money from his own treasury, without oppressing the people of the town and of the province by exacting taxes (Kara), forced labour (Vishṭi) benevolences (Praṇaya), and the like." The king was helped in the work of government by an able staff of officials, who were "fully endowed with the qualifications of ministers" (amātya-guṇa samudyuktaiḥ) and were divided into two classes, viz., Matisachiva (Counsellors) and Karma-sachiva (Executive Officers).

Rudradāman had at least two sons and one daughter. The princess was given in marriage to Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī Śātakarṇi of the Śātavahana family of the Deccan. A Nāgārjunikōṇḍa inscription refers to a princess from

1 With this bureaucratic designation is to be contrasted the title Rāja applied to Tushāspha, the local ruler of Surāśtrā in the days of Aśoka, who "was more than a mere official" (I.A. 7. 257 n). While some of the Śaka provinces or districts were placed under amātayas or officers whose functions were mainly of a civil character, others seem to have been governed by generals (Mohādanaṇḍāyakas). The name of such a military governor is disclosed by a Sānchi inscription (JASB. 1923. 443).

3 Ep. Ind., XX. 1. 7.
Ujjain named Rudradhara Bhaṭṭārikā who was the queen (Mahādevī) of an Ikshvāku ruler of the Guṇṭūr district and some adjoining regions in the lower Krīṣṇā valley. It has been surmised by Vogel that she probably belonged to the house of Chasṭana. Her father is styled a Mahārāja, a title which seems to have been formally assumed by one of the latest successors of Rudradāman I, viz., Svāmī-Rudrasena III, who ruled from c. A.D. 348 to 378, and was, apparently, a contemporary of Samudra-Gupta. It is, however, difficult to say if the Ikshvāku queen was a daughter of Rudrasena III or of some earlier prince.

Rudradāman I was succeeded by his eldest son Dāmaghsada I. After Dāmaghsada there were, according to Rapson, two claimants for the succession: his son Jivadāman and his brother Rudra Śīṅhā I. The struggle was eventually decided in favour of the latter. To Rudra Śīṅhā’s reign belongs the Guṇḍa inscription of the year 103 (= A.D. 181) which records the digging of a tank by an Ābhira general named Rudradhūti, son of the general Bāpaka or Bāhaka. The Ābhiras afterwards possibly usurped the position of Mahākṣhatrapa. According to Dr. Bhandarkar an Ābhira named Iśvaradatta was the Mahākṣhatrapa of the period 188-90 A.D. But Rapson places Iśvaradatta after A.D. 236.

Rudra Śīṅhā I was followed by his sons RudrasenaI, 1 Saṅghadāman and Dāmasena. Three of Dāmasena’s sons became Mahākṣhatrapa, viz., Yaśodāman, Vijaysena and Dāmajada Śri. This last prince was succeeded by his nephew Rudrasena II who was followed by his sons Viśvasiṅhā and Bhartṛidāman. Under Bhartṛidāman his son Viśvasena served as Kṣhatrapa.

The connection of Bhartṛidāman and Viśvasena with the next Mahākṣhatrapa Rudradāman II and his successors cannot be ascertained. The last known member of

1 To Rudrasena’s reign belong the Mulwasar tank inscription, and the Jasdhvan Pillar Inscription of A.D. 205. In the latter epigraph we have the title Bhadrānukha applied to all the ancestors of Rudrasena, excepting Jayadāma.
the line was Rudra Simha III who ruled up to at least A.D. 388.

Rapson points out that from A.D. 295 to c. 340 there was no Mahākshatrapa. The elder branch of the family came to an end after 305 and passed by an obscure transition to a new line of Satraps and Great Satraps. The rulers from A.D. 295 to 332 held only the subordinate title of Satrap, and the higher title was not revived till a few years before A.D. 348, when Rudrasena III styled himself Rājā Mahākshatrapa and Mahārāja Kshatrapa. Now, it is precisely during the period when the old line passed away in obscurity, and the office of Mahākshatrapa remained in abeyance, that we find Śakasthāna and portions of Hind annexed to the Sassanian empire and dominated by Sassanian viceroys. The Sassanian conquest began before the end of the reign of Varhrān (Bahrām) II (A.D. 293) and the Sassanian suzerainty was maintained till the early part of the reign of Shāpūr II (A.D. 309-79). The hold of the Persians on the distant Indian provinces became weak in the middle of the fourth century A.D. when Rudrasena III assumed the title of Mahārāja, and Samudra Gupta, the prototype of the Raghu of Kālidāsa, forced the foreign potentates of the north-west borderland to do him homage.

The revived power of the Śakas of Western India did not last long, being finally destroyed by the Guptas. Already in the time of Samudra Gupta the Śakas appear among the peoples who hastened to buy peace by the offer of maidens and other acts of respectful submission. The Udayagiri Inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II testify to that monarch’s conquest of Eastern Mālwa. One of the Inscriptions commemorates the construction of a cave by a minister of Chandra Gupta who “came here, accompanied by the king in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world.” The subjugation of western Mālwa is probably hinted at by the epithet “Simha-vikrāntagāmini,” resorting to (as a vassal of) Simha Vikrama, i.e.,
Chandra Gupta II, applied to Naravarman of Mandasor. ¹ Evidence of the conquest of Surashṭra is to be seen in Chandra Gupta's silver coins which are imitated from those of Saka Satraps. Lastly, Bana in his Harsha-charita refers to the slaying of the Saka king by Chandra Gupta:

\[\text{Av(l ?) ipure cha para-kalatra kāmukam kāmini-vesa-guptaścha Chandra Guptah Saka-patim aśatayaditi.}\]

¹ Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 162. The small copper coins of Chandra Gupta II bearing a vase as type were probably struck by him in the Malava territory which may have been under Saka domination in the second century A.D. (Allan, GICAI, cvi).

² According to the commentator Sankara the Parakalatra and Kāmini referred to above was Dhrūva-devī, and the ruler of the Sakas was secretly killed by Chandragupta disguised as Dhrūva-devī while the former was making advances of love. The Śṛṅgārāprakāśa by Bhoja throws additional light on the point quoting passages from the Devīchandraguptam (see Aiyangar Com. Vol., 959 ff.; also Lévi, JA, 1923, 201 ff; Devīchandraguptam by A. Rangaswami Sarasvati, Ind. Ant., 1923, p. 181 ff.). The last mentioned work is a play by Viśākhadatta, the author of the Muddrākṣaṇa. Quotations from the Devīchandraguptam are also found in the Nātya darpaṇa of Rāmaṇanda and Guṇachandra.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE ŠAKAS
OF UJJAIN

Yasomotka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chashtana A.D. 130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jayadaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudradaman I A.D. 130-140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dama(g)hjada Sri I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasimha I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daugher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Väishṭhiputtra Sri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Satrap, A.D. 180-1,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrap, A.D. 181-88, A.D. 191-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyadaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jivadaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 178 (?), 197-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rudrasena I A.D. 200-222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanghadaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 222-223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāmasena Prabhudama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 222-226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prithvīshena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dama(g)jada Sri II Vira dāman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dama-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrī III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 234-238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 240-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 251-254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasena II A.D. 256 (?)-271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visvasimha A.D. 277-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhrtridāman A.D. 289-295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svānu Jivadāman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vīra dāman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyūla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 289-295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rudrasihina II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satrap, A.D. 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāman II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrap, A.D. 312-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 348-378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasena III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīrīhāsena A.D. 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satya Simha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasena IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 388+x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra Simha III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 588-x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV. Administrative Machinery of the Scythian Period.¹

The little that we know about the administration of the Scythian Epoch leaves no room for doubt that the institutions of the age were not haphazard improvisations of military upstarts, having no relations with the past, but a highly developed and organised system—the fruit of the labours of generations of political theorists and practical statesmen (*Vakti-Prayokthi*).

The influence of political thinkers (*Arthachintakas*) on Indo-Scythian Polity is evident. The ablest among the princes of the time assiduously studied the science of polity (*Arthavāndyā*); and the care taken to train the occupant of the throne, the employment of officers endowed with ministerial qualifications (*Amātyagunya*), the classification of ministers and other high officials (*Sachivas*), abstention from oppressive imposition of *Praṇaya* (Benevolences), *Vishṭi* (forced labour) etc., and the solicitude for the welfare of the *Pauras* and *Jānapadas*, people of cities as well as country parts, clearly show that the teaching of the writers of treatises on polity (*Arthaśāstra*) was not lost upon the Scythian conquerors of India. There was no great cleavage with the past, and the references to *Mahāmātras,*² *Rajjukas,*³ and *Samcharavintaka* or *Saṅchārīnī* spies, indicate that the official machinery of the Maurya period had not ceased to function at least in Southern India.

¹ The expression "Scythian Period" has been used in this section in a broad sense to denote the epoch of all the Post-Mauryan dynasties that ruled in India during the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era. During the greater part of this period the most powerful potentate in India was the Scythian "King of Kings" who had his metropolis in the North-West, but whose commands were not often obeyed on the banks of the Ganges and the Godāvari. See Cal. Rev., Sept., 1925.
² The Junāgadh Inscription of Ruddāman (*Ind. Ant.*, 1878, p. 261; Ep. Ind., VIII, 36 f.).
³ Lüders' Ins., Nos. 937, 1144. Note the employment of a *Śramaṇa* as *Mahāmātra* (High Officer) by a *Śatavahana* ruler.
⁴ Ins. Nos. 416, 1195. The *Rajjukas* were Surveyors and Judges in the country parts.
⁵ Ins., No. 1200; cf. IA, 5, 52, 155.
But we must not suppose that the entire administrative structure of the period was a replica of the Maurya constitution. The foreign conquerors of North-Western India brought with them several institutions which had been prevalent for ages in the countries through which they passed. Thus the Persian system of government by Satraps was introduced in several provinces of Northern, Western and Southern India, and officials with the Greek titles of Meridarch (probably District Officer) and Strategos (general or governor) ruled contemporaneously with functionaries having the Indian designation of Aṇiāya (minister or civil officer in charge of a district) and Mahāsenāpati (great general or military governor).

The tide of Scythian invasion could not sweep away the tribal republics which continued to flourish as in the days of Buddha and Alexander. Inscriptions and coins testify to the existence of many such communities; and like the Līchchhavī and Śākyas of old, the most powerful among them were found very often ranged against their aggressive royal neighbours who were now mostly Scythian. Unfortunately, the contemporary records do not throw much light on their internal organisation, and it serves no useful purpose to ascribe to them institutions which really belong to their predecessors or successors.

Though the Scythians could not annihilate the republican clans, they did destroy many monarchies of Northern and Western India, and introduce a more exalted type of kingship. The exaltation of monarchy is apparent from two facts, namely, the assumption of high-sounding semi-divine honorifics by reigning monarchs, and the apotheosis of deceased rulers. The deification of rulers, and the use of big titles are not unknown to ancient Indian

---

1 A Meridarkha Theodora is mentioned in a Swät Kharoshthi epigraph. Another Meridarkha is mentioned in a Taxila Kharoshthi inscription. The two meridarchi are mentioned as establishing Buddhist relics and sanctuaries (Corpus, II, i. xv).

2 E.g., the Mālavas (Mālayas), Yaudheyas, Ārjunāyanas and possibly the Audumbaras, Kulūtas, Kunindas (see Camb. Hist., 528, 529), and Uttama-bhadras. Cf. Smith. Catalogue of Coins. Sec. VII.
literature, but it is worthy of note that a supreme ruler like Aśoka, whose dominions embraced the greater part of India and possibly Afghanistān, was content with the titles of "Rāja" and "Devānampiya Piyadasi." The great rulers of the Scythian age, on the other hand, were no longer satisfied with those modest epithets, but assumed more dignified titles like Chakravartin (emperor of a circle of states), Adhirāja (super-king), Rājātṛāja (supreme king of kings), and Devaputra (the son and not merely the beloved of the gods).

In Southern India we come across titles of a semi-religious character like Kshemarāja; Dharma-Mahārāja-dhirāja and Dharma-Yuvamahārāja, assumed by pious defenders of Indian faiths, engaged in upholding dharma as practised by the ancient teachers and law-givers, and purging it of the evils of the Kali Age, probably to distinguish themselves from the unbelieving foreigners and barbarian outcasts of the North-West.

The assumption of big titles by kings and emperors was paralleled by the use of equally exalted epithets in reference to their chief consorts. Aśoka's queens appear to have been styled merely Devī. The mother of Tīvara, for instance, is called "Dutīā Devī" (the second queen) and the implication is that the elder queen was Prathamā.

---

1 'Of Gracious Mien, Beloved of the Gods.'
2 Luders' Ins., No. 1345. 'The beneficent or propitious king', 'prince of peace'.
3 'The Righteous King of Kings', 'the Righteous Crown Prince'. Luders' Ins., No. 1196, 1200. For the significance of the title, cf. 1A, 5, 51. 'Kalyyoga-dvāhāvakṣa-dharmoddharaṇa-nītya sannādha.' Cf. also the epithets 'Mātṛāti-fraṇṭa-viḍhāna-viḍhān-dharmā Dhrma-rāja i.e., 'piṅkhashā līta-kalihalānkhā' applied to the Maitraka Kings of Valabhi (Bhavangar Inscriptions, 51). Sometimes even Saka rulers and generals posed as Dharma vijayā (JASB, 1929, 343).
4 It is a characteristic of Indian history that imperial titles of one period became feudatory titles in the next. Thus the title Rājā used by Aśoka became a feudatory title in the Scythian and Gupta periods. When designations like Rāja-rāja, Rājadhirāja, Mahārāja-dhirāja, Parama-Bhaṭṭāraka and Parama-Rāja-dhirāja (Allan, 69), came into general use. But even Mahārāja-dhirāja became a feudatory designation in the age of the Pratihāras when the loftier style of Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārāja-dhirāja, Paramesvara was assumed by sovereign rulers.
Devī. But in the Scythian epoch we come across the titles of Agra-Mahishī and Mahādevī which distinguished the chief queen from her rivals. Among such chief consorts may be mentioned Ayasi-Kamuia, Nāganikā, and Balaśrī.

The apotheosis of deceased rulers is strikingly illustrated by the practice of erecting Devakulas or “Royal galleries of portrait statues.” The most famous of these structures was the Devakula of the Pitāmaha (grandfather) of Huśishka referred to in a Mathurā inscription. The existence of royal Devakulas as well as ordinary temples, and the presence of the living Devaputra probably earned for Mathurā its secondary name of “The city (?) of the gods.”

The exaltation of royalty in the epoch under review had the sanction of certain writers on kingly duty (Rājadharma) who represented the king as a “mahātī devatā,” a great divinity, in human shape. But it was probably due in the first instance to the Scythians who acted as carriers of Persian, Chinese and Roman ideas of kingship. The title Rājātirāja, supreme king overpassing

1 JRAS, 1924, p. 402. For images of later kings, cf. Beginnings of South Indian History 144, 153, Raverty, Tāmāt, I. 622 (ellis) of Bktāmātī). C. S. Srinivasachari, The Evolution of Political Institutions of South India Section IV (“The Young Men of India.” June and July, 1924), p. 7. Images of Sundara Chola and one of his queens were set up in the Tanjore temple and deified. C. V. Vaidya (Medieval Hindu India, I. 98) refers to the prevalence of the custom of raising some temples at the place of burial the dead body of the kings. But it is not clear if the temples contained images of the dead king and his queens. The deification and worship of the dead kings may be compared to devapirñāija referred to in the Kautīṣya (II. 6).


3 The titles ‘Theos’ and ‘Theotropos’ were used by certain Indo-Greek rulers, but their example does not seem to have been widely followed. Gondopheres, it is true, calls himself Devamitra, but not yet Deva or Devaputra. As to the theory that the Kūshāns had been invested competently with the title ‘son of the gods’ in opposition to the Hiungnu rather than to the Chinese, it has to be admitted that there is no definite evidence that the title in question originated with the Hiungnu, and was not borrowed in ancient times from the Chinese. Pace, B. C. Law Volume, II. 305 ff. The Kūshāns had direct contact with the Chinese in the time of Panchao.
other kings, as Rapson points out, is “distinctively Persian.” "It has a long history from the Xshāythīyānām Xshāyathya of the inscriptions of Darius down to the Shāhān Shāh of the present day.” The Kushān epithet “Deva-putra” is apparently of Chinese origin, being the literal translation of the Chinese emperors’ title “Son of Heaven” (Tien-tze; tien tsu).2 If Luders is to be believed, one at least of the Indo-Scythian sovereigns (Kanishka of the Ārā Inscription) assumed the Roman title of “Kaisar;” and the dedication of temples in honour of emperors on the banks of the Tiber may have had something to do with the practice of erecting Devakulas on the banks of the Jumna.

A remarkable feature of the Scythian Age was the wide prevalence of the system of Dvarājya or Diarchy in Northern and Western India and Yauvarājya (rule of a crown-prince) in N. W. India and the Far South. Under both these forms of government the sovereign’s brother, son, grandson, or nephew had an important share in the administration as co-ruler or subordinate colleague. In a Dvarājya or Diarchy the rulers appear to have been of equal status, but in a Yauvarājya (rule of a crown-prince) the reigning prince was apparently a viceroy. As instances of Dvarājya may be mentioned the cases of Lysias and Antialkidas, Agathokleia and Strato I, Strato I and Strato II, Spalirises and Azes, Hagāna and Hagāmasha, Gondophernes and Gad, Gondophernes and Abdagases, Chashtana and Rudradāman, Kanishka II and Huvishka etc., etc. Among ruling Yauvarājas may be mentioned

---

1 Cf. the use of the term ‘Kshapayitvā’ in connection with the subversion of the Suiya sovereignty by Simuka. The expressions Kshatrasya Kshatra (Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upanishad, I. 4. 14), Adhirāja, Chakravartin, etc., are, no doubt, known to our ancient literature. But there is no proof of the use of the last two as formal styles of sovereigns till the Post-Mauryan period, while the first is never so used.

2 JRAS, 1897, 903; 1912, 671, 682, Allan, Coins of the Gupta Dynasties, xxvii. Arthabanus (I or II) called himself 'son of a God' (Tarn, The Greeks, p. 92). This may suggest Greek influence too. Some writers fail to distinguish between occurrence of similar royal epithets in literature and their formal use in contemporary epigraphic records in the time of the Kings themselves (B. C. Law Volume, II, pp. 905 ff).
Kharaoosta and the Pallava Yuva-Mahârâjas Śiva-Skandavarman, Vijaya-Buddha-varman and Vishṇugopa of Palakkada.

The king or viceroy, resided in cities called Adhishṭhāna. The number of such Adhishṭhānas and various other kinds of cities (Nagara, Nagari), was fairly numerous. But regarding their administration our information is very meagre. We hear of "nigama-sabhās" or town councils and of a city official called Nagarākshadarśa whose functions are nowhere distinctly stated in the inscriptions but seem to have been similar to those of the Nagaravānahārikas, or city judges, of the Maurya Age.

Regarding general administration, and the government of provinces, districts and villages, we have more detailed information. The designations of some of the highest officers of state did not differ from those in vogue during the Maurya period. Mahāmātras, and Rajjukas play an important part in the days of the Śālavāhanas and Scythians as in the time of Aśoka. But side by side with these functionaries we hear of others who do not figure in inscriptions of the Maurya Epoch although some of them appear in the Arthaśāstra attributed to Kauṭīlya.

The officers most intimately associated with the sovereign were the privy councillors,—the Matisachivas of the Junāgadīh epigraph and the Rahasyādhirātra of the Pallava grants. Among other prominent court officials must be mentioned the Rāja Vardya, Royal Physician and the Rāja Lipikara, Royal Scribe.

Np less important than the privy councillors were

1 IHQ, 1933, 211.
2 EHI, 226; Lüders’ Ins., No. 1351 (Udayagari Cave Inscription). Cf. Akshadaria, Patañjali, Index of Words, Oka, Amarakośa, 123; Agni Purāṇa, 366, 3; Vin. iii. 47. According to the last mentioned text the ‘akhhadassus constituted a class of Mahāmallas, like their prototypes in the time of Aśoka. In later ages the Akshadaria might have had revenue functions. Cf. Kshita’s comment on the passage from the Amarakośa referred to above. The duties of the Akshapatalikas of the Gupta period may be mentioned in this connection.
3 Ins., 110-93.
4 Ins., 271; Kauṭ., II, 10.
the high military officials—the Mahāsenāpati, the Daṇḍanāyaka and the Mahādaṇḍa-nāyaka who probably correspond to the Senāpati and Nāyaka of the Kautiliya Arthasastra. These important functionaries had probably under them subordinates like Senāgopus (captains), Gaulimikas (commanders of platoons), Āraṇākṣhādhikritas (guards) Aśvāvārakas (troopers), Bhāṭamanushyas (mercenaries), etc.

We have already referred to one class of civil officers (Amātyas or Sachivas), viz., the Māla sachivas (counsellors). There was another class of Amātyas who served as executive officers (Karma sachivas). From them were chosen governors, treasurers, superintendents, and secretaries as in the days of Megasthenes.

Among treasury officials mention is made of the Gaṇijavara, the Kuṭṭhāgarika, who was one of the principal ministers of state (Rājamātya). But we have no epigraphic reference to the Samudhāṭa (lit. pillar) or the Samāhartya (collector) till the days of the “Śatila” kings of the Vindhyas and the Somavamśi kings of Kosala. The main heads of revenue received into the Bhāṇḍāgāra or Kosā (treasury) were, as enumerated in the Junāgadh Inscription, Bali (extra tribute), Śulka (duty), and Bhāga (customary share of the king). These sufficed to fill the exchequer of a benevolent prince like Rudradā-

---

1 1124, 1136.
3 Kautilya, Bk. X. Ch. 1, 2, 5.
4 Lüders’ Ins., 1200; Ep. Ind. XIV, 155; cf. Manu, VII, 190.
5 Lüders, 1200.
6 Lüders, 381, 728.
7 Lüders, 1200.
8 Lüders’ Ins., 965.
9 1141.
10 1186.
11 1125.
12 Lüders, 83; Rājatarangini. V. 177. Note the employment of a Brāhmaṇa treasurer by a Scythian ruler.
13 Ep Ind., XX, 28.
14 Lüders, 1141.
man with kanaka (gold), rajata (silver), vajra (diamond), vaiduryaratna (beryl), etc. Rulers less scrupulous than the Mahâkâshatraâpa doubtless oppressed the people with arbitrary imposts, forced labour and benevolences (kara-vishti-pranaya-kryâ-bhûh). Besides the Bhûndâgâra whose existence is implied by Lüders’ Ins., No. 1141, we have reference to the storehouse, Koshthâgâra,1 which is described in Book II, Chapter 15, of the Kautiliya Arthaśâstra. The inscriptions afford us glimpses of the way in which the revenue was spent. The attempts to provide for “pâniya” or drinkable water are specially noteworthy. The Junâgadh Inscription tells us how “by the expenditure of a vast amount of money from his own treasury” a great Scythian ruler and his amâtya restored the Sudarśana lake. References to the construction or repair of tanks, wells, lakes and other reservoirs of water, Pushkârîs, udâpânas, hradas or tâdâgas, are fairly common. Lüders’ Ins., No. 1137, makes mention of makers of hydraulic engines (Auddayantrika), while another epigraph2 refers to a royal official called Pâniyagharika or superintendent of water-houses. Inscription No. 1186, after recording the gift of a tâdâga (pond), a nâga (statue of a serpent deity) and a vîhâra (pleasance, monastery), refers to the Amâtya Skandâsvâti who was the Karmântika (superintendent of works), an official designation known to the Arthaśâstra.3

In the department of Foreign Affairs we have the Dûta (envoy or messenger), but we do not as yet hear of dignitaries like the Sàmâdhivigrahika (officer in charge of peace and war) and Kumârâmâtya4 who figure so prominently in inscriptions of the Gupta and Post-Gupta periods.

Inscriptions of the period under review refer also to

1 In Ins., No. 997.
2 Lüders, 1279.
3 Bk., I. Ch. 12.
4 Kumâra means ‘a youth’, ‘a prince’. Hence Kumârâmātha may mean ‘junior minister’, or ‘prince’s minister’. The word Kumâra as the opposite of Proudhâ may correspond to Chikka, Chenna or Immaḍi of the South. Another interpretation is also possible. Kumârâmâtya may mean an amâtya from one’s youth just as Kumâra-sevaka means âkaumâra-parichârakah.
officials like the Mahāsāmiyas who preserved records, and others whose exact functions and status are nowhere indicated. Amongst these may be mentioned the Abhyamantarapusthāyaka, ‘servant of the interior (harem?),’ Māḍabika, Tūṭhika and Neyawka.

The big empires of North Western India were split up into vast satrapies and smaller provinces ruled by Mahākshatrapas and Kshatrapas. The satrapies as well as the kingdoms outside the limits of the Scythian Empire, were divided into districts called Rāṣṭra, Āhāra, Janapada, Deśa or Vishaya. We do not as yet hear of the organisation into Bhūktis (lit. allotments, administrative divisions) so widely prevalent in Post-Scythian times. Rāṣṭra, Āhāra (or Hāra) and Janapada seem to have been synonymous terms in this age, as is proved by the case of the Sātahani-ṛaṭṭha (rāṣṭra) or Sātavāhanihāra which is styled a janapada in the Myakadoni Inscription. The chief officer in a Rāṣṭra or Āhāra was the Rāṣṭrapati, Rāṣṭrika (Raṭṭika) or Amātya. The Amātya Suvasākha, for instance, governed Surāṣṭra under the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman. The Amātyas Vishnu-pālita, Śyāmaka, and Śiva-skanda-datta successively governed the Āhāra or district of Govardhana (Nāsik) in the time of Gautamiputra Śatakarni and Pulumāyi, while the neighbouring Āhāra of Māmāla (Poona District) was under an Amātya whose name ended in—Gupta. In the Far South the chief officer of the Āhāra seems to have been called ‘Vyāprita.’ The Janapadas, particularly those on vulnerable frontiers, were sometimes placed under the charge of military governors (Strategos, Mahāsēnāpati, Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, etc.). The Janapada of Sātavāhāni-

---

1 For another interpretation see JBBRAS, N.S., IV, 1928, pp. 64, 72; IHO, 1933, 221. In the opinion of V. S. Bakhle the Mahāsāmiya “seems to refer to the resolution of the corporate assembly of the city or to that body itself.”

2 The word Māḍabika may perhaps be connected with Māḍamba of the Jaina Kalpasūtra, 89. Paśa, 62 refers to an official styled Māḍambiya (Burgomaster). For a tax Māḍapikā see Ep. Ind., XXIII. 137.

3 Surīcīn equates Neyika with Naivyogika.

4 Lüders, 1327, 1328.
hāra was, for instance, under the Mahāsenāpatai Skanda-
nāga.¹ Part of Eastern Malwa seems to have been governed
by a Saka Mahādānānāyaka shortly before its annexation
by the Imperial Guptas and portions of the Indian border-
land, were governed by a line of Strategoi (Aspavaran, 
Sasa)² under Azes and Gondophernes.

Deśa, too, is often used as a synonym of Rāṣṭrā, or
Janapada. It was under a Desādhikṛita, the Deshmukh of
mediaeval times, an officer mentioned in the Hiṅrahaḍagalli
grant of Śiva-Skanda-varman. The next smaller unit was
apparently the Vishaya governed by the Vishayapati.³ But
sometimes even Vishaya was used as a synonym of Deśa
or Rāṣṭrā, and there were cases in the Post-Gupta period
of the use of the term to designate a larger area than a
Rāṣṭrā.⁴

The smallest administrative units were the villages
called Grāma or Grāmāhāra,⁵ and the smaller towns or
emporia called Nāgama.⁶ The affairs of a Grāma were
controlled by officers styled Grāmeyeika Ayutta⁷ who were
apparently headed by the Grāmaṇi.⁸ Grāmika⁹ Grāma-
bhojaka¹⁰ or (Grāma) Mahattaraka Lüders' (Mathurā)
Inscription, No. 48, gives the names of two such Grāmikas,
Jayadeva and Jayanāga. In Southern India we have the
curious title "Mahuda" applied to the head of a village." The
chief men of the Nīgamas were the Gahaṣṭhā,¹¹ the

¹ Cf. the Myakadon inscription.
² For an amāra named Sasa, see the Kodavati Rock Inscription of the
Sātavāhana king Sirī Chandika Sāti or Sāta (Ep. Ind., XVII., 318).
³ 9890 (Lüders).
⁴ Flech., CII., 32 n.
⁵ Lüders, Ins., No. 1195.
⁶ In Pali literature Nīgamas are distinguished from grāmas, villages, as
well as from nāgamas, cities which had strong ramparts and gateways (dridha
prāhāra torana).
⁷ 1357.
⁸ 1933.
⁹ 1886-92.
¹⁰ 1200.
¹¹ Ins. 1194. Cf. Murunḍa = lord (Saka). For the presence of Śakas in the
Far South, see Ep. Ind., XX., 97.
¹² Gahaṣṭhā, house-lord, was a designation specially applied to the leading
men of the gentry, the wealthy middle class, Kalyāna-bhatṭika, men accustomed
counterparts of the Grāmavīddhas of villages. In Lüders' Inscription, No. 1153, we have evidence of the corporate activity of a dhamma-ngama headed by the Gahaṇapati. The Grāma and Nigama organisation was the most durable part of the Ancient Indian system of government, and centuries of Scythian rule could not wipe it out of existence. The village and the Nigamas were also the nurseries of those ideas of associate life which found vent in the organisation of societies, committees, assemblies and corporations styled Goshtiśā, Nikāyas, Parishads, Sainghas, etc., about which the inscriptions of the period speak so much. Not the least interesting of these institutions was the "Goshti" which afforded a field for co-operation between kings and villagers. Lüders' Ins., Nos. 1332 to 1338, speak of a Goshti which was headed by the Rājan, and which counted among its officials the son of a village headman.

A less pleasing feature of ancient Indian polity in the Scythian, as in other times, was the employment of spies, particularly of the "Samcharawintkas," or wandering emissaries, whose functions are described with gruesome details in the Arthaśāstra. The evidence of foreign witnesses in Maurya and Gupta periods seems, however, to suggest that political morality did not actually sink so low as a study of the Arthaśāstra would lead us to think. Vatsyāyana probably voices the real feelings of his countrymen when he says that every single maxim for which there is provision in a theoretical treatise need not be followed in actual practice, because theoretical manuals have to be comprehensive, but practical application should have a limited range. No sane man will think of eating dog's flesh simply because its flavour, tonic power, dressing, etc., are discussed in medical treatises.

to a good dictionary. They are often distinguished from priests and nobles (Rhys Davids and Stede).

1 Lüders' Ins., 273, 333, 335, 338.
2 1133
3 125, 925
4 5, 1157.
Na śāstramastītye tāvat prayoge kāranāṁbhavet
śāstrārthāṁ vyāpino udyāt prayogāṁstvekadeśikān
rasa-vīrya vipākā hi śvamāṁsasyāṁ vaidyake
kīrtitā iti tat kim syād bhakṣaṇīyaiṁ vichakṣhānaṁ
CHAPTER X. THE GUPTA EMPIRE: THE RISE OF THE GUPTA POWER.

Imāṁ sāgaraparyantāṁ Himavad-Vindhyā-kunḍalāṁ
mahīṁ ekātapatrāṅkāṁ Rājasimhaḥ praśāstu naḥ

—Dūtāvākyam.

SECTION I. THE FOUNDATION OF THE GUPTA DYNASTY

We have seen that the tide of Scythian conquest, which was rolled back for a time by the Śātavāhanas, was finally stemmed by the Gupta Emperors. It is interesting to note that there were many Guptas among the officials of the Śātavāhana conquerors of the Śākas e.g., Śiva Gupta of the Nāsik Inscription of the year 18, (Pura or Puru?) Gupta of the Karle Inscription, and Śiva-Skanda Gupta of the same epigraph. It is difficult to say whether there was any connection between these Guptas and the Imperial Gupta family of Northern India, two of whom actually bore the names of Skanda Gupta and Puru Gupta.¹

¹ With Rājasimha may be compared the epithet Narendrasimha occurring on coins of Chandra Gupta II (Allan, Gupta Coins, 43). All the letters here are not clearly legible (ibid., cxiii), but on many coins we find the analogous epithet Sinha-vikrama (pp. 38 ff.). The reference in the Dūtāvākyam must be to a paramount ruler of Northern India, bounded by the seas and the Himālayan and Vindhyān ranges, who had the epithet 'lion-like king'. The ruler who answers best to the description is Chandra Gupta II. The author of the Dūtāvākyam possibly refers to this monarch. If he is identical with Bhāsa, a distinguished predecessor of Kālidāsa, his career as a poet may have begun before the accession of Chandra Gupta II, Vikramadītya, 'Narendra-Sinna'. i.e., in the time of the great patron and 'king of poets' (Kavirāja) Samudra Gupta.

² In the Modern Review (November), 1929, p. 499 f., it has been suggested that the Guptas are of Kārashāra origin. But the evidence on the point is hardly conclusive. The identification of the "accursed" Chandrasena of the Kaumudimahotsava (adopted son of Sundaravarman), whose family was uprooted (p. 500) with Chandra Gupta I, son of Mahārāja Śrī Ghatotkacha whose dynasty ruled gloriously for centuries, is clearly untenable. The mere fact that Lichchhavis helped Chandrasena is not enough to prove that the prince in question is identical with Chandra Gupta I. Lichchhavis appear as enemies of Magadha as early as the fifth century B.C. For a summary of the
Scions of the Gupta family are not often mentioned in old Brāhmī Inscriptions. The Ichchhāwarī Buddhist Statuette Inscription mentions the benefaction of Mahādevi, queen of Śrī Haridāsa, sprung from the Gupta race (Gupta-varmāsodita). A Bharhut Buddhist Pillar Inscription of the Śunga period refers to a “Gaupti” as the queen of Rājan Visadēva, and the grandmother of Dhanabhūti, probably a feudatory of the Śungas.

Traces of “Gupta” rule in Magadha proper, or some neighboring tract down the Ganges, are found as early as the second century A.D. I-Tseng, a Chinese pilgrim, who travelled in India in the seventh century A.D., mentions a Mahārāja Śrī Guptā who built a temple near Mrigasikhāvana “which was about forty yojanas to the east of Nālandā, following the course of the Ganges.” I-Tseng’s date would place him about A.D. 175. Allan rejects the date, and identifies Śrī Gupta, with Guptā the great-grandfather of Samudra Guptā, on the ground that it is unlikely that we should have two different rulers in the same territory, of the same name, within a brief period.

plot of the drama, which is attributed by some to a female writer, see Aiyangar Com. Vol. 561. If Sundaravarman, and his son Kālānavarman are real historical figures, and if they actually ruled over Magadha, they must be placed either before Mahārāja Śrī Guptā or after Bālādīya (6th century A.D.). The memory of Varman ādhipatya over Magadha was fresh at the time of the Sirpur Stone Inscription of Mahāśīva Guptā (Ep. Ind., XI, 191). Cf. also Pūrnavarman and Devavarman mentioned by Chinese writers, as well as kings of the Maukharī line. The origin of the Imperial Guptā family is wrapped up in obscurity. We only know that they probably belonged to the Dhārāṇa gotra (IHQ. 1930, 505). They may have been related to Queen Dhārini, the chief consort of Agnimitra. Dr. R. C. Majumdar points out (IHQ. 1935, 930 ff.) that according to a Javanese text (Tantri Kāmāndaka) Mahārāja Aśvāryapāla of the Ikshvāku race traced his genealogy to the family of Samudra Guptā. Little reliance can, however, be placed on the uncorroborated assertions of late writers. Even more unreliable is the testimony of works like the Bhavishyottara Purāṇa which, according to some critics, “is a palpable modern forgery” (NHIP, VI. 135n). Cf. Proceedings of the I. H. Congress, 1944. pp. 119 ff.

1 Bāndā District.
2 Jātakas, No. 11.
3 Lüders, No. 687.
4 Dr. Majumdar in A New History of the Indian People, VI, 139.
   Dr. C. Ganguli, IHQ, XIV (1928), 532.
But have we not two Chandra Guptas and two Kumāra Guptas within brief periods? There is no cogent reason for identifying Śri Gupta of cir. A.D. 175, known to tradition, with Samudra Gupta’s great-grandfather who must have flourished about a century later.

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

SECTION II. CHANDRA GUPTA I.

The first independent sovereign (Mahārājādhirāja) of the line was Chandra Gupta I, son of Ghaṭotkacha, who may have ascended the throne in 320 A.D., the initial date of the Gupta Era. Like his great fore-runner Bimbisāra he strengthened his position at some stage of his career, by a matrimonial alliance with the Lichchhavis of Vaiśāli or of Nepāl, and laid the foundations of the Second Magadhan Empire. The union of Chandra Gupta I with the Lichchhavi family is commemorated by a series of coins having on the obverse standing figures of Chandra Gupta and his queen, the Lichchhavi princess Kumāradevī, and

1 In the Ruddhapur plates (JASB, 1924, 58), however, Chandra Gupta I and even Samudra Gupta are called (carelessly) simply Mahārāja.
2 JRAS, 1893, 80; Cunningham, Arch. Surv. Rep., Vol. IX, p. 21. The identity of the Gupta king with whom the era (Gupta prakāla, Guptaṇam kāla) of 320 A.D. originated, is by no means clear. The claims of Mahārāja Gupta (IHQ, 1942, 273 n) or even (less plausibly) of Samudra Gupta, cannot be altogether disregarded.
3 It is not suggested that the marriage took place after 320 A.D. The chronology of the Guptas before A.D. 380 is still in a stage of uncertainty. Nothing definite can be stated about the relative date of the marriage till we know more about the length of Chandragupta I’s reign, and the exact date of his accession, and that of his son and successor, Samudra Gupta. Some scholars think that Chandragupta I’s alliance was with the ruling family of Nepāl (JRAS, 1889, p. 55) or of Pātaliputra (JRAS, 1899, p. 81).
4 There is difference of opinion among scholars regarding the attribution of these coins, see Altekar in Num. Suppl. No. XLVII, JRASB, III (1937), No. 2, 346. It is difficult to come to any final conclusion till the discovery of coins whose attribution to Chandragupta I is beyond doubt.
on the reverse a figure of Lakṣmī, the goddess of luck with the legend "Lichchhavayah" probably signifying that the prosperity of Chandra Gupta was due to his Lichchhavi alliance. Smith suggests that the Lichchhavis were ruling in Pātaliputra as tributaries or feudatories of the Kushāns and that through his marriage Chandra Gupta succeeded to the power of his wife’s relatives. But Allan suggests that Pātaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Śrī Gupta’s time.\footnote{Kielhorn’s North Indian Inscription, No. 541, however, suggests some connection between the Lichchhavis and Pushpapura (Pātaliputra).}

From the record of Samudra Gupta’s conquests it has been deduced that his father’s rule was confined to Magadha and the adjoining territories. In the opinion of Allan the Purānic verses defining the Gupta dominions refer to his reign:

\textit{Anu-Gaṅgā-Prayāganīcha Sāketam Magadhānīstathā  
Etān janapadān sarvān bhokṣhyante Guptavamśajāh.}

“Kings born of the Gupta family will enjoy all these territories \textit{viz.}, Prayāga (Allahabad) on the Ganges,\footnote{Cf. \textit{Anu-Gaṅgāḥ Hastinapūram, Anu-Gaṅgām Vārānasī, Anu-Ṣoṇam Pātalipūram—Patajali, II. 1. 2.}} Sāketa (Oudh), and Magadha (South Bihār).”

It will be seen that Vaiśālī (North Bihār) is not included in this list of Gupta possessions. Therefore, it is difficult to concur in Allan’s view that Vaiśālī was one of Chandra Gupta’s earliest conquests. Nor does Vaiśālī occur in the list of Samudra Gupta’s acquisitions, though the reference to Nepāl as a border state in the famous Allahabad inscription may suggest that North Bihār was included within his dominions. It first appears definitely as a Gupta possession in the time of Chandra Gupta II, and constituted a viceroyalty under an imperial Prince. Prayāga (Allahabad) may have been conquered from a line of kings whose existence is disclosed in certain inscriptions.
discovered at Bhīṣa.\(^1\) Two of these kings, Mahārāja Gautamiputra Śrī Śivamagha and Rājan Vāsishṭhiputra Bhīmasena are assigned by Marshall to the second or third century A.D. The name Śivamegha (or Śivamagha) reminds us of the ‘Meghas’ (Maghas) who ruled in Kosalā in the third century A.D.\(^2\) Another king, Mahārāja Gautami-putra Vṛishadhvaja, is assigned to the third or fourth century A.D.

One of the most memorable acts of Chandra Gupta I was the selection, before the assembled councillors (Sabhyas) and princes of the blood, of Samudra Gupta as his successor.

Section III. Samudra Gupta Parākramānka.\(^3\)

The exact date when Chandra Gupta I was succeeded by his son, Samudra Gupta, is not known. If the evidence of the spurious Nālandā plate (issued from Nripura) has any value the event may have happened before the year 5 of the Gupta Era, i.e., A.D. 325. But this is doubtful. It is clear not only from the Allahabad Praśasti but from the epithet “tatpādaparigrihiṭa,” applied to Samudra Gupta in the Riddhapur inscription, that the prince was selected from among his sons by Chandra Gupta I as best fitted to succeed him. The new monarch may have been known also as Kācha.\(^4\)

\(^1\) And Bandhagar (Rewa)—Amrita Bazar Patrika, 11-10-38, p. 2; NHIP, VI, 41 ff. The Magha kings are also known from coins (Fatehpur hoard).

\(^2\) JRAS, 1911, 132; Pargiter, DKA, p. 51; see also a note on the Kosam Stone Inscription of Mahārāja Bhimavarman, by Mr. A. Ghosh in Indian Culture, III, 1936, 177 ff; see also IC, I, 694, 715.

\(^3\) The titles Parākrama, Vyāghraparākrama, and Parākramānka are found on coins (Allan, Catalogue, pp. cxi, 16) and in the Allahabad Praśasti (CII, p. 6). Recently a coin has been found with the legend Śrī Vikramaḥ on the reverse (Bamnāḷā hoard, Nimar district, J. Num. Soc. Ind., Vol. V, pt. 2, p. 140. December, 1943).

\(^4\) The epithet Sarva-rājo-chchhettā found on Kācha’s coins shows that he was in all probability identical with Samudra Gupta. Cf. Smith, Catalogue, 96; IA, 1902, 259 ff. For another view see Smith, JRAS, 1897, 19; Rapson, JRAS, 1893, 81; Heras, Annals of the Bhondkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol IX, p. 85 ff. To us it is unthinkable that the style “uprooter of all kings” could have been assumed by a Gupta monarch other than the one who is
It was the aim of Samudra Gupta to bring about the political unification of India (*dharani-bandha*) and make himself an *Ekarāt* or sole ruler like Mahāpadma. But his only permanent annexation was that of portions of Āryāvarta in the upper valley of the Ganges and its tributaries, together with certain districts in Central and Eastern India. Following his "*Sarvakshatrāntaka*" predecessor, this *Sarva-rājo-chchhettā*, "exterminator of all kings," uprooted Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Chandra-varman, Gaṇapati Nāga, Nāgasena, Achyuta, Nandi, Bala-varman, and many other kings of Āryāvarta, captured the scion of the family of Kota and made all the kings of forest countries (*āṭavika-rāja*) his servants. Rudradeva has been identified by Mr. Dikshit with Rudrasena Vākātaka. But the Vākātakas cannot hardly be regarded as rulers of Āryāvarta, and they were far from being uprooted in the time of Samudra Gupta.³ Equally untenable is the identification of Balavarman with a prince of Assam, a province that was then looked upon as a border state (*Pratyanta*) and not as a part of Āryāvarta. Matila has been identified with a person named "*Mattila*" mentioned in a seal found in Bulandshahr in the Central Doāb.⁴ The absence of any honorific

---

¹ Destroyer of all Kshatriyas, an epithet of Mahāpadma.

² Father Heras thinks (Ann. Bhan. Ins., IX, p. 88) that Samudra Gupta undertook two campaigns in Āryāvarta. But his theory involves the assumption that Achyuta and Nāgasena were "violently exterminated" in the second campaign after being "uprooted" in the first. To obviate the difficulty he takes "uprooted" to mean "defeated". This, is to say the least, unconvincing.

³ Cf., I.H.Q., 1, 2, 254. Rudrasena is connected with Deotek in the Chanda Dist. of C.F. Eighth Or. Conf. 615 ff. Ep. Ind., xxvi. 147, 150.
title on the seal leads Allan to suggest that it was a private one. But we have already come across several instances of princes being mentioned without any honorific. Chandravarman has been identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Susunia\(^1\) inscription, who was the ruler of Pushkaraṇa\(^*\) and was possibly the founder of Chandravarman-koṭa mentioned in the Ghugrahāṭā grant. Some scholars identify Pushkaraṇa with Pokran or Pokrīna in Mārwār, and further equate Simhavarman, the name of the father of Chandravarman, with Simhavarman of the Mandasor family. But there is very little to be said in support of this conjecture. No mention of Chandravarman, or reference to his exploits, is found in any epigraphic record of the Varman family of Western Mālwa. Pushkaraṇa is really to be identified with a village named Pokharaṇ in the Dāmodar river in the Bankura District, some 25 miles to the north-east of Susunia Hill.\(^2\)

\(^1\) "A sandstone hill 12 miles to the north-west of Bankura."

\(^2\) Cf. Dikshit, ASI, AR, 1927-28, p. 188; S. K. Chatterji, "The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language," II, 1061; IHQ, I, 2. 255. Pandit H. P. Sastri believed that this local ruler who bore the modest title of Mahāraṇa was identical with the mighty emperor (bhūmpati prāpta akāśūdyāya) Chandra of the Meharrati Iron Pillar Inscription who "in battle in the Vaṅga countries turned back with his breast the enemies who uniting together came against him and by whom having crossed in warfare the seven mouths of the Indus the Vāhlikas were conquered." Others suggest the identification of the great Chandra with one or other of the famous Chandra Gupta as of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty. But Chandra is never styled either Chandravarman or Chandra Gupta and, unlike the court poets of the Varmans and Guptas, the panegyrist of the mighty Chandra, who is said to have carried his arms to the distant corners of India, never gives the slightest hint about his pedigree. He does not even mention the name of his father. It may be noted here that the Purāṇas represent the Nāgas as ruling in the Jamna Valley and Central India early in the fourth century A.D. We learn from the Vishnupurāṇa that Nāga dynasties ruled at Padmāvatī and Mathurā. A Nāga line probably ruled also at Vidiśā (Pargiter, Kāli Age, p. 49). Two kings named Sādā-Chandra and Chandrānīśa, "the second Nakhabant," are mentioned among the post-Andhāvāna kings of Nāga lineage. One of these, preferably the latter, who was obviously a ruler of note, may have been the Chandra of the Meharrati Inscription. The Vāhlikas beyond "the seven mouths of the Indus" are apparently the Baktioī occupying the country near Arachosia in the time of the geographer Ptolemy (Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 408). An inscription of Mahāraṇāṭhūrya Śrī Chandra has been discovered on a Jaina image at Vaiśabhāra hill (ASI, AR, 1925-26, p. 125). The identity of this Chandra is not clear.
SUBJUGATION OF FOREST STATES

Ganapati Nāga, Nāgasena and Nandi seem to have been Nāga princes. That Ganapati Nāga was a Nāga prince is evident. This ruler is also known from coins found at Mathurā at Pawāyā near Narwar and at Besnagar. Nāgasena, who met his doom at Padmāvati near Narwar on the Sindh river between Gwalior and Jhansi, is mentioned as a scion of the Nāga family in the Harsha-charita (Nāga-kula-yaṁmāṇaṁ sārikāśrāvita mantrasya āśādāṅga Nāgasenaṁya Padmāvatyāṁ). Nandi was also probably a Nāga prince. In the Purāṇas Siśu Nandi and Nandiyaśas are connected with the Nāga family of Central India. We know also the name of a Nāga prince named Śivanandi. Achyuta was probably a king of Abichchhatrā, modern Rāmanagar in the Bareilly District. To him has been attributed the small copper coins bearing the syllables ‘achyu’ found at Abichchhatrā. As to the Kota-kula Rapson draws our attention to certain coins bearing the inscription Kota. These resemble the “Srūta coins” attributed to a ruler of Śrāvasti and should apparently be referred to the upper Gangetic region.”

1 Altekar, NHIP, vi, 37.
2 IHQ, I, 2, 255. Note the importance of the name of this king from the point of view of religious history. Cf. Gajamukha of the Bṛhat Samhita, 58. 58. A reference to king Ganapati Nāga in the Bhāva Sataka, a late work, is more than doubtful. Gajamukha śrī of that work is a misreading for Gata Vaktra śrī (IHQ, 1936, 135 ff Kāvyamāla, IV, pp. 461, 66).
3 Padamāvatī—“Padam Pawāyā (25 miles N.E. of Narwar) in the apex of the confluence of the Sondhi and the Pārā. Nāga coins have been found here; also a pulihala capital with an inscription of the first and second century B.C.” EHI, p. 906, ASI, AR, 1915-16, pp. 101 ff.
4 “In Padmāvatī Nāgasena, born in the Nāga family, whose confidential deliberations were divulged by a sārikā bird, met his doom.”
5 Dubreuil, Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 31. It is interesting to note that Garuḍa was the emblem of the Gupta kings who did much to curb the power of the Nāgas. Cf. the passage of the Junagadh inscription of Skanda Gupta:

Narapati bhujagānam mānadarpat pranānām
pratikhyā Garuḍājānam nirvishīṁ chāvākārtā
de

In the Purāṇas Kṛishna, the deity honoured by the Guptas, crushes the head of the serpent, nāga, Kāliya.
6 Allan, Gupta Coins, xxii; CCAI, Ixxix.
7 JRAS, 1898, 449 ff.
8 Smith (Coins in the Indian Museum, 258) points out that the Kota coins are common in the Eastern Pāňāb and the Delhi bazaar. A Kota tribe is
The conquered territories were constituted as Vishayas or Imperial sub-provinces. Two of these vishayas are known from later inscriptions of the family, 'namely, Antarvedi or the Gangetic Doab and Airikina in Eastern Malwa. It is significant that a Naga styled the Vishayapati Sarva-naga, figures as a ruler of Antarvedi as late as the time of Skanda Gupta:

The annexation of the northern kingdom named above was not the only achievement of Samudra Gupta. He made the rulers of the Ataviika rajas, or forest states, his servants. But his most daring exploit was an expedition to the south, which made his power felt by the potentates of the Eastern Deccan. We perceive, however, a difference between his northern and southern campaigns. In the north he played the part of a 'digvijayi' or 'conqueror of the quarters,' of the Early Magadhan type. But in the south he followed the Epic and Kautilyan ideal of a 'dharma-vijayi' or 'righteous conqueror,' i.e., he defeated the kings but did not annex their territory. He may have realised the futility of attempting to maintain effective control over these distant regions in the south from his remote base in the north-east of India. His successor tried to maintain his hold on the Deccan by a system of marriage alliances.

The Ataviika rajas undoubtedly included the realm of Alavaka ('Ghazipur) as well as the forest kingdoms

saud to exist also in the Nilgiris (JRAS, 1897, 363; Ind. Ant., iii, 96, 96, 205). The passage in the Allahabad Inscription that 'Samudra Gupta chased the scion of the Kota family to be captured by his armies and took pleasure at Pushpabhaya' has been taken by some scholars to suggest that the Kotas were at the time the ruling family of Pataliputra (cf. Jayaswal, History of India, c. 150 A.D. to 350 A.D., p. 113). The identification of the Kota kula, with the Magadha family of the Kaumudi-mahotsava lacks proof.

1 This kind of Vijaya or conquest is termed Asura-vijaya 'demon's conquest' in the Arthaśāstra (p. 384). The name may have been derived from the Assyrians, the ruthlessness of whose warfare is well known. For a discussion regarding the possible derivation of Asura from Asur, see JRAS, 1916, 355; 1924, 365ff. Conquest of this type is first met with in India in the sixth century B.C. (cf. Ajataśatru's subjugation of the Licchhavis and Viḍūḍabba's conquest of the Śākyas) when Persia served as a link between Assyria and India.
connected with Dabhālā or the Jabalpur territory. The conquest of this region by Samudra Gupta is suggested also by his Erā inscription.

The Kings of Dakshināpatha who came into conflict with the great Gupta were Mahendra of Kosala, Vyāghra-rāja of Mahākāntāra, Maṇḍarāja of Kaurāla, Svāmidatta of Koṭṭūra, a chieftain of Piśṭapura whose precise name is uncertain, Damana of Erāṇāpalla, Vishnugopa of Kāñcī, Nīrāja of Avanukta, Hastivarman of Veṅī, Ugrasena of Palakka, Kubera of Devarāṣṭra, Dhanañjaya of Kusthalapura and others.

Kosala in Dakshināpatha, i.e., South Kosala, comprised the modern Bilāspur, Raipur and Sambalpur districts, and occasionally possibly even a part of Gaṇjām. Its capital was Śrīpura, the modern Sirpur, about forty miles east by north from Raipur. Mahākāntāra is apparently a wild tract of the Central Provinces (Madhya Pradesh) which probably included Kāntāra which the Mahābhārata places between Veṅvātaṭa (the valley of the Wainganga) and Prāk-Kosala, the eastern part of Kosala mentioned above.  

1 Fleet, CII, p. 114; Ep. Ind., VIII, 284-287. In the latter part of the fifth and early part of the sixth century A.D., the Dabhālā country was governed by the Paurava-kā Mahārājas as feudatories of the Guptas. The Mbh. ii. 91, 13-15, like the Allahabad Prāsasti, distinguishes the Āṭavikas from the Kāntārakas. One of the Āṭavika states may have been Koṭṭāvi mentioned in the commentary on the Rāma-charita of Sandhyākara Nandi (p. 58). In one epigraphic record, Ep. Ind., VII, p. 126, we have a reference to a place called Vaṭṭāvi, while another, Lüder’s List, No. 1195, mentions Sahalāvi.

2 For the various interpretations of the passage “Paśiṭpuraka Mahendragiri Kauṭīraka Svāmidatta,” see Fleet, CII, Vol. 3, p. 7; JRAI, 1897, pp. 420, 868-870; IHQ, 1925, 252; Barua, Old Brāhma Inscriptions, 224. It is not improbable that Mahendragiri in this passage is a personal name. Cf. the name Kumāra-giri given to a chief of Koṇḍavidaṇḍu whose territories included a portion at least of the Godāvari district (Kielhorn, S. Ins., 596). In JRAI, 1897, 870, we have reference to Kamtagir, an ally of Sindhia.

3 Inclusion of Ratnapur, Ep. Ind., X, 26; of Koṅgoda, Ep. Ind., VI, 141. unless Kosala is a misreading for Tosala.


5 Mbh. II, 91, 12-15, G. Ramdas (IHQ, I, 4, 684) identifies Mahākāntāra with the ‘Jāhāḥ-khaṇḍ’ Agency tracts of Gaṇjām and Vizagapatam. The sway of the rājā of Mahākāntāra or “Greater Kāntāra”, may have extended northwards as far as Nādhna in the Ajaygarh (not Jaso) state (Smith, JRAI, 1914, 930). The identification of many of the southern kingdoms suggested by Mr. R. Sathianathaier (in his Studies in the Ancient History of Tondamanda-
Kaurāla cannot be Kolleru or Colair which must have been included within the territory of Hastivarman of Veṅgi mentioned separately. Dr. Barnett suggests its identification with one of the villages that now bears the name Korāda in South India. There is a place named Kolāḍa near Russelkonda in Gaṅjām.

Koṭṭūra has been identified with Koṭthoor, 12 miles south-east of Mahendragiri in Gaṅjām. Pishṭapuram is Pithāpuram in the Godāvarī district. Eraṇḍapalla is identified by Fleet with Eraṇḍol in Khandesh, and by Dubreuil with Eraṇḍapali, “a town probably near Chicacole” in the Gaṅjām district. But G. Ramdas suggests the identification of Eraṇḍapalla with Yeṇḍipalli in Vizagapatam or Eṇḍapilli in Ellore Tāluk. Kāṇchi is Conjeeveram near Madras. Avamukta cannot be satisfactorily identified. But the name of its king Nilarāja reminds us of Nilapalli, “an old seaport near Yanam” in the Godāvarī district. Veṅgi has been identified with Vegi or Pedda-Vegi, 7 miles north of Ellore between the Krishṇā and the Godāvari. Its king Hastivarman was identified by Hultsch with Attivarman (of the Ānanda family). But the more probable view is that he belonged to the Śālaṇ-

lams) does not carry conviction. His conclusion that Samudra Gūpta “first emerged on the east coast at Pithāpuram and conquered the Western Deccan” is based upon evidence that is clearly inadequate.

1 Cal. Rev., Feb., 1924, 258 n. Cf. Kurralam, T. 590 (A Topographical List of Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency, by V. Rangacharya). The identification with Yayātunagari (Ep. Ind., XI. 189), which Dhoyi connects with the sports of the Keralis, was suggested by some editions of this work. But the reading Kerali in the Pavanadāta is not beyond doubt. For Kolāḍa see Ep. Ind., XIX. 42

4 There is another Koṭṭūra ‘at the foot of the Hills’ in the Vizagapatam district (Vizag, District Gaz., I. 137). See also Koṭṭūru (IA, 4. 329) and Kottūnāḍu, MS. 333, Rangacharya’s List.

3 Dubreuil, AHD, pp. 58-60. A place called Eraṇḍavalli is mentioned in an inscription of Govinda III (Bhārata Itiḥāsa Sam. Maṇḍala, AR, XVI).

4 IHQ, 1, 4, p. 683. There is an Eraṇḍi fīrtha in Pāḍma, Svarga khaṇḍa, 45, 57, 61.


6 Attivarman was wrongly assigned to the Pallava race. Cf. IHQ, 1, 2,
kāyana dynasty. Palakka is probably identical with Palakkada, (or Pālakāṭa) a Pallava royal residence or seat of a viceroy in Guntur or Nellore in South India. Allan and G. Ramdas locate it in the Nellore district. Devarāśṭrā is the Yellamaṇḍhili tāluk of the Vizagapatam district. Kusthalapura is, according to Dr. Barnett, probably Kuttalur, near Polur, in North Arcot.

The capture and liberation of the southern kings, notably of the ruler of Koṭṭūra near Mt. Mahendragiri remind us of the following lines of Kālidāsa’s Rāghu varṇāsana:

Gṛihita-pratimuktasya sa dharma-vijayi mātyah
Sriyāṁ Mahendra-nāthaśya jahāra natu medinīṁ

"The righteous conqueror (Rāghu) took away from the lord of the Mahendra Mountain, who was made captive and then released, his glory but not his territory."

It is not a little surprising that the Allahabad Praśastī contains no clear reference to the Vākāṭakas who are known to have dominated part of the region between Bundelkhand and the Pentaṅgā in the fifth century A.D. The earliest reference to the Vākāṭakas occurs in certain inscriptions of Amarāvatī. The dynasty rose to power under Vindhyāśakti I and his son Pravarasena I. Pravarasena appears to have been succeeded in the northern part of his dominions by his grandson Rudrasena I. Pṛithivisheṇa I, the son and successor of Rudrasena I, may have been a contemporary of Samudra Gupta and perhaps also of his son Chandragupta II, inasmuch as his son Rudrasena


1 The name Hastivarman is actually found in a Śālaṅkāyana Varṇāśvalī (IHQ, 1927, 429; 1933, 212: Pedavegī plates of Nandivarman II)
II married the daughter of the last-mentioned Gupta emperor. Prithivisheṇa I’s political influence extended over a fairly wide territory. The Nach-nē-ki-talāī and Gaṇj regions were in all probability ruled by his vassal Vvāghra-deva. Professor Dubreuil, however, says that the Nāchnā and Gaṇj inscriptions, which mention Vyāghra, belong, not to Prithivisheṇa I, but to his great-great-grandson Prithivisheṇa II. This is improbable in view of the fact that from the time of Prithivisheṇa II’s great-grandfather, if not from a period still earlier, down to at least A.D. 528, the princes of the region which intervenes between Nāchnā and Gaṇj and the proper Vākāṭaka territory, owned the sway of the Gupta empire. Now as Vyāghra of the Nāchnā and Gaṇj records acknowledges the supremacy of the Vākāṭaka Prithivisheṇa, this Prithivisheṇa can only be Prithivisheṇa I, who ruled before the establishment of the Gupta supremacy in Central India by Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II and not Prithivisheṇa II during whose rule the Guptas, and not the Vākāṭakas, were apparently the acknowledged suzerains of the Madhya Pradeśa as we learn from the records of the Parivṛṣṭaka Mahārājās.

The absence of any clear reference to Prithivisheṇa I in Harisheṇa’s Praśasti is explained by the fact that Samudra Gupta’s operations were actually confined to the eastern part of Trans-Vindhyān India. There is no

---

2 This was Berar with the adjoining regions (cf. Ep. Ind., xxvi. 147). That Nāchnā and Gaṇj were in the Gupta Age apparently included within Dakshināpatha is suggested by the Brihat Samhitā (xiv. 19) which places even Chitrakūta in the Dakshina or Southern Division. A recent Vākāṭaka Inscription discovered in the Drug District contains an interesting reference to Padumputa which Professor Mirashi identifies with the ancestral home of Bhavabhūti and with the modern Padampur near Amgaon in the Bhāndārā District of the Central Provinces. IHQ, 1935, 299; Ep. Ind., xxii, 227 ff. The Basīm grant implies control of a branch of the family over the part of Berar south of the Ajanta range.
3 The Eran and Udayagiri Inscriptions. For evidence of Palaeography see JRASB., xii. 2, 1946, 73.
4 Cf. Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 475. For Dubreuil’s Views, see Ind. Ant., June, 1926.
reliable evidence that the Gupta conqueror carried his arms to the central and western parts of the Deccan proper, i.e., to the territory ruled by Prithivishaṇa I himself. Professor Dubreuil has shown that the identification of Devarāśṭra with Mahārāśṭra and of Eranḍlapalla with Eranḍol in Khandesh is probably wrong.¹

Though Samudra Gupta did not invade the Western Deccan it is clear from his Eran Inscription that he did deprive the Vākāṭakas of their possessions in Central India. These territories were not, however, directly governed by the Vākāṭaka monarch, but were under a vassal prince. In the time of Prithivishaṇa this prince was Vyāghra. We should naturally expect a conflict between the Vākāṭaka feudatory and the Gupta conqueror. Curiously enough, the Allahabad Praśasti refers to Samudra Gupta’s victory over Vyāghraraṇa of Mahākāntāra.² It is probable that this Vyāghraraṇa is identical with the Vyāghra of the Nāchnā Inscription who was the Central Indian feudatory of Prithivishaṇa. As a result of Samudra Gupta’s victory the Guptas succeeded the Vākāṭakas as the paramount power in parts of Central India. Henceforth the Vākāṭakas appear in fact as a purely southern power.

The victorious career of Samudra Gupta must have produced a deep impression on the Pratyanta² nripatis or frontier kings of North-East India and the Himālayan region, and the tribal states of the Pañjāb, Western India, Mālwa and the Central Provinces, who are said to have gratified his imperious command (prachanda sāsana) “by giving all kinds of taxes, obeying his orders and coming to perform obeisance.” The most important among the eastern kingdoms which submitted to the mighty Gupta Emperor were Samataṭa (part of Eastern Bengal bordering

² Has the title Vyāghra-parākrama, found on a type of Samudra Gupta’s coins that represents the king as trampling on a tiger, anything to do with the emperor’s victory over Vyāghra-rāja? It is not a little curious that the next sovereign, conqueror of Rudrasimha III, the last Satrap, assumed the title of Sinha-vikrama.
³ For the significance of the term, see Diriyaṇadāṇa, p. 22.
on the sea, having its capital probably at Karmmānta or Bad-Kamta near Comilla), 1 Đavāka (not yet satisfactorily identified) 2 and Kāmarūpa (in Lower Assam). We learn from the Dāmodarpur plates that the major portion of Northern Bengal, then known as Pundravardhana-bhukti, formed an integral part of the Gupta Empire from A.D. 443 to A.D. 543, and was governed by a line of Uparikas as vassals of the Gupta Emperor. The identification of Đavāka with certain districts of North Bengal is, therefore, probably wrong. The Northern Pratyantas were 3 Nēpāl and Karṣīppūra. The latter principality comprised probably Katārpur in the Jālandhar district, and the territory of the Katuria or Katyr rāj of Kumaun, Garhwāl and Rohilkhand.

The tribal states which paid homage were situated on the western and south-western fringe of Āryāvarta proper. Among these the most important were the Mālavas, Ārju-nāyanas, Yauḍheyas, Madrakas, Ābhiras, Prārjunas, Sana-kānikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas.

The Mālavas occupied part of the Pañjāb in the time of Alexander. They were probably in Eastern Rājapu-tāna 4 when they came into conflict with Ushavadāta. Their exact location in the time of Samudra Gupta cannot be determined. In the time of Samudra Gupta’s successors they were probably connected with the Mandasor region. We find princes of Mandasor using the reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, handed down traditionally by the Mālava-gaṇa (Mālava-gaṇāmnāla).

1 Bhattachary, Iconography, pp. 4 f. JASB, 1914, 85 ff. Cf. the position of Mahārāja Rudradatta under the emporer Vainya Gupta early in the sixth century A D (Gunaighar Ins.).
2 Cf. Dekaka (Dacca), Hovland, The Empire of the Great Mogol, 14.
3 Mr. K. J. Barua identifies Đavāka with the Kopili Valley in Middle Assam (Early History of Kāmarūpa, 12 f.) For the alleged use of Gupta era in the Dabokā region, see Ep., xxvii, 18 ff.
5 Cf. Smith, Catalogue, 161. Allan, CCAI, p. cv. Mālavā coins have been found in vast numbers in the Jaipur State (JRAS, 1897, 883).
TRIBAL TERRITORIES

The Arjunāyanas and the Yaudheyas are placed in the northern division of India by the author of the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā. They may have been connected with the Pandooouoi or Pāṇḍava tribe mentioned by Ptolemy as settled in the Pañjāb.¹ The connection of the Arjunāyanas with the Pāṇḍava Arjuna is apparent.² Yaudheya appears as the name of a son of Yudhishṭhira in the Mahābhārata.³ The Harivanśa, a later authority, connects the Yaudheyas with Uśīnara.⁴ A clue to the locality of this tribe is given by the Bijayagad Inscription.⁵ The hill-fort of Bijayagad lies about two miles to the south-west of Byānā in the Bharatpur state of Rājaputāna. But the Yaudheya territory must have extended beyond the limits of this area and embraced the tract still known as Johiyābār along both banks of the Sutlej on the border of the Bahāwalpur state:

The Madrakas had their capital at Śākala or Śiālkoṭ in the Pañjāb. The Ābhīras occupied the tract in the lower Indus valley and western Rājaputāna, near Vinaśana⁶ in the district called Abiria by the Perīplus⁷ and the geography of Ptolemy. We have already seen that an Abhīra possibly became Mahākṣatriya of Western India and probably supplanted the Śātavāhanas in a part of Mahārāṣṭra before the middle of the third century A.D. A section of the tribe apparently settled in Central India and gave its name to the Āhirwār country between Jhansi and Bhilsa.⁸ The territories of the Prājrunas, Sanakānikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas lay probably in Mālwa and the

¹ Ind. Ant., XIII, 331, 349.
² Their coins are found in the Mathurā region (Smith, Catalogue, 160). The Abhīdhana-chintāmani, p. 454, identifies a river called Arjuna with the Bāhudā (Rāmgāngā).
³ Adi., 99. 79. Yaudheya are already known to Pāṇini, V. 3, 117.
⁴ Pargiter, Mārkandeya Purāṇa, p. 380.
⁵ Fleet, CII, p. 251, Yaudheya votive tablets have been found in the Ludhiana District (J.R.A.S., 1897, 887). Coins have been found in the area extending from Saharanpur to Multan (Allan, CCAI, cli).
⁷ Sūdrābhīrā prati dveśād yatra nashīdā Sarasvatī, Mbh., IX, 37. 1.
⁸ Cf. Ind. Ant., III, 226 f.
Central Provinces. The Prājrjunakas are mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* attributed to Kauṭilya\(^1\) and are located by Smith\(^2\) in the Narsinhapur District of the Central Provinces. A clue to the locality of the Sanakānīkhas is given by one of the Udayagiri Inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II discovered in Eastern Mālwa. The Kākas find mention in the *Mahābhārata*—Ṛishikā Vidabhāh Kākās Taṅganāh-Parataṅganāḥ. In the Bombay Gazetteer Kāka is identified with Kākūpur near Bithur. Smith suggests that the name may be locally associated with Kākanāda (Sāñchī). The Kharaparikas may have occupied the Damoh District of the Central Provinces.\(^4\)

The rise of a new indigenous imperial power could not be a matter of indifference to the foreign potentates of the North-West Frontier, Mālwa and Surāshṭra (Kāṭhiāwār) who hastened to buy peace "by the acts of homage, such as offer of personal service, the bringing of gifts of maidens,\(^5\) begging for seals marked with the Garuḍa sign (Garutmadāṅka) to allow them to rule over their respective districts and provinces (svavishaya bhukti)."\(^6\) The foreign powers that thus established diplomatic relations with Samudra Gupta were the Daiva-putra-Śāhi-Śāhānushāhi and the Śaka Muruṇḍas\(^8\) as well as the people of Sirhala and all other dwellers in islands.\(^9\)

\(^1\) P. 194.
\(^2\) JRAS, 1897, p. 892.
\(^3\) Mbh. VI, 9. 64.
\(^5\) The presence of Scythian maidens in the Hindu imperial harem is not surprising in view of the known facts about Chandra Gupta Maurya's alliance with Seleukos and the marriage of a Śātakarni with the daughter of a great sattap. Cf. also Penzer, II, 47; III, 170.
\(^6\) Cf. Nilakanta Sastri, *The Pandyan Kingdom*, 145. "The victor restored the crown and country of the Chola in the form of a religious gift, which was confirmed by the issue of a royal rescript with the Pandyan seal on it."
\(^7\) As to the form *Daiva*, see Achaemenian inscriptions of Xerxes, and forms like Bhaimaranthi (instead of Bhimarathi).
\(^8\) Note the imitation by Samudra Gupta of coins of Kushān type with *Ardochko reverse* (Allan, xxviii, xxxiv, lxvi). Such coins were, according to scholars, issued by Scythians of the North-West.
\(^9\) Some control over the islands in the neighbouring seas is possibly hinted
The *Daiwputra-Shahi-Shahānushahi* belonged apparently to the Kushān dynasty of the north-west, which derived its origin from the *Devaputra* Kanishka.¹ The Śaka *Murunḍas* must have included the northern chiefs of Scythian nationality who issued the *Ardochesho* coins as well as the Śaka chieftains of Surāśṭra and Central India, the representatives of a power which once dominated even the Ganges valley. Sten Konow tells us that *Murunḍa* is a Śaka word meaning lord, Sanskrit *Śvāmin*. The epithet *Śvāmin* was used by the *Kshatrapas* of Surāśṭra and Ujjain. A Sāñchī Inscription discovered by Marshall discloses the existence of another Śaka principality or province which was ruled about A.D. 319 by the *Mahādanāṇḍanaśaka* Srīdhavara varman, son of Nanda.² A Murunḍa *Śvāminī* (noble lady) is mentioned in a Khoi Inscription of Central India.³ To Scythian chiefs of the Vindhyā region should perhaps be attributed the so-called “Puri Kushān” coins which are found in large numbers in the neighbourhood of the Eastern Vindhyas and some adjoining tracts. The existence of a Murunḍa power in the Ganges valley a couple of centuries before Samudra Gupta is vouched for by Ptolemy.⁴ The Jaina *Prabhāvaka-charita* testifies to the control that a Murunḍa family once exercised over the imperial city of Pāṭaliputra.⁵

at in the epithet *Dhanada-Varanṇendrāntakasama*, the equal of Dhanada (Kuvera, lord of wealth, guardian of the north), *Varuna* (the Indian Sea-god the guardian of the west), Indra, king of the celestials and guardian of the east, and Antaka (Yama, god of death, and guardian of the south). The comparison of Samudra Gupta with these deities is not opposite and possibly refers not only to his conquests in all directions, but to his possession of immense riches, *suzerainty over the seas*, the spread of his fame to the celestial region and his extirpation of various kings. Inscriptions discovered in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago testify to the activities of Indian navigators (*e.g.*, the *Mahānāvīka* from Raktaśrottikī mentioned in a Malayan epigraph) and military adventures in the Gupta Age.

¹ Smith (JRAS, 1897, 32) identified him with Grumbates. Some scholars take the expression to refer to different kings and chieftains. Cf. Allan, xxvii. There may also be a reference to the Sassanids as well.

² Ep. Ind., xvi, p. 252; JRAS, 1923, 357 ff.

³ Ind. Ant., 1884, 377; Allan, xxix; cf. *India Antiqua* (Vogel Volume, 1947), 171 ff. Murunḍas in the Ganges Valley c. 245 A.D. mentioned by the Chinese.

Samudra Gupta’s Ceylonese contemporary was Meghavanā. A Chinese writer, Wang Huen ts'ē, relates that Chi-mi-kia-po-mo (i.e., Śrī Meghavarnā or Meghavarnā) sent an embassy with gifts to Samudra Gupta and obtained his permission to erect a splendid monastery to the north of the holy tree at Bodh Gayā for the use of pilgrims from the Island.¹

Allan thinks that it was at the conclusion of his campaigns that the Gupta conqueror celebrated the horse-sacrifice² which, we are told in the inscriptions of his successors, had long been in abeyance. But it should be noted that the Aśvamedha was celebrated by several kings during the interval which elapsed from the time of Pushyamitra to that of Samudra Gupta, e.g., Pārāśarî-putra Sarvatāta, Śātakarni, the husband of Nāyanikā, Vāśishṭhiputra Ikshvāku Śrī-Chāṃtāmūla, Devavarman Śālaṅkāyana, Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka, Śiva-skandavarman Pallava and the Nāga kings of the house of Bhāraśīva. It is probable, however; that the court poets of the Guptas knew little about these monarchs. After the horse-sacrifice Samudra Gupta apparently issued coins bearing the legend Aśva-mādha-parākramah, ‘whose prowess was demonstrated by the performance of the horse-sacrifice.’³

If Harishena, the writer of the Allahabad Praśasti, is to be believed, the great Gupta was a man of versatile genius. “He put to shame the preceptor of the lord of

¹ Geiger, the Mahāvānśa (trans.), p. xxxix; Lévi, Journ. As., 1900 pp. 316 ff., 401 ff.; Ind. Ant., 1902, 194.
² Cf. Divekar, Annals of the Bhandarhar Institute, VII, pp. 164-65. "Allahabad Praśasti and Aśvamedha." In the Poona plates Samudra Gupta receives the epithet anēkāśvamedhayājīn. He was believed to have celebrated more than one horse-sacrifice. Some of the campaigns described in the Allahabad panegyric may have been actually conducted by Princes or officers who kept guard over the sacrificial horse that was allowed to roam at large. In the inscription of Harishena the credit for capturing some of the vanquished chieftains is given to the army. Among the great commanders were men like Tilabhaṭṭaka and Harishena himself, who was the son of Dhruvabhūti.
³ Rapson and Allan refer to a seal bearing a horse and the legend Parākrama, and the stone figure of a horse, now in Lucknow, which are probably reminiscent of the Aśvamedha of Samudra Gupta. (JNAS, 1901, 102; Gupta Coins, xxxi.)
Gods and Tumburu' and Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and choral skill and musical accomplishments. He established his title of Kaviṛāja by various poetical compositions." He alone is worthy of the thoughts of the learned... His is the poetic style which is worthy of study, and his are the poetic works which multiply the spiritual treasures of poets." Unfortunately none of these compositions have survived. But the testimony of Harisheṇa to his musical abilities finds corroboration in the lyricist type of his coins. Himself a poet like Harsha, Mahendravarnman and other kings of a later age, the Gupta monarch associated with men of letters who were none too prosperous and "put an end to the war between good poetry and plenty" (satkāvyāśrīvirodha). As a result "he enjoyed in the world of the learned, a far-extending sovereignty whose shining glory endured in many poems."

Samudra Gupta favoured poetry as well as the Śāstra, while Ashoka seems to have specialised in scriptural studies alone. The former undertook military campaigns with the object of sarva-prithivi-jaya, conquest of the whole earth, as known to his panegyrist, the latter eschewed military conquest after the Kalinga war and organised missions to effect Dhamma-vijaya, conquest of the hearts of men, in three continents. Yet in spite of these differences there was much that was common to these remarkable men. Both laid stress on parākrama, ceaseless exertion in the cause in which they believed. Both expressed solici-

---

1 For Tumburu see Adbhuta-Rāmāyaṇa, VI. 7:EI, I. 296.
2 According to the Kāvyā Mīmāṃsā (3rd ed., GOS, pp. xv, xxxii, 19) a "Kaviṛāja is one stage further than a Mahākavi, and is defined as one who is unrestrained in various languages, various sorts of poetical compositions and various sentiments." For the intellectual activities of the Gupta Age see Bhandarkar, "A Peep into the Early History of India," pp. 61-74 and Bühler, IA, 1913. The son and successor of Samudra Gupta had the title Rūpakriti, 'maker of plays'.
3 A poetical work called the Kṛishṇa-charitam is attributed to Vikramānka Mahārājābhīrāja Paramabhisāgavata 9th Samudra Gupta (IC, X, 79, etc.). But the ascription has been doubted by competent critics (cf. Jagannātha in Annals, BORI, and others).
4 A lute-player (Vina-gāthin) plays an important part in the Aṣvamedha.
tude for the people committed to their care, and were kind even to vanquished enemies. And both laid emphasis on Dharma. Samudra Gupta, no less than Dharmāśoka, made firm the rampart of the true law (Dharma-prāchīra-bandhah).

The attribution of the coins bearing the name Kācha to Samudra Gupta may be accepted. But the emperor's identification with Dharmāditya (sun of the true faith) of a Faridpur grant is clearly wrong. The titles used by this monarch were Apratiratha, 'unrivalled char-warrior,' Aprativrāvyavīrya, 'of irresistible valour,' Kritānta-paraśu, 'axe of death,' sarvārāj-ochchhettā, 'uprooter of all kings,' Vyāghra-parākrama, 'possessed of the strength of a tiger,' Aśva-medha-parākrama, 'whose might was demonstrated by the horse-sacrifice,' and Parākramaṇika, 'marked with prowess,' but not Dharmāditya. Most of these epithets are connected with particular types of coins issued by the emperor. Thus Parākrama is found on the reverse of coins of the standard type, Apratiratha on coins of the archer type, Kritānta-paraśu on coins of the battle-axe type, sarvarājochchhettā on coins of the Kācha type, Vyāghraparākrama (Rājā) on the tiger type of coins, and Aśvamedha-parākrama on the Aśvamedha type. The appearance of a goddess seated on a lion (simha-vāhinī, i.e., Durgā or Pārvatī, Vindhyā-vāsinī or Haimavatī) may point to the extension of the Gupta dominions to the Vindhyā and the Himavat. The tiger and river-goddess (makaravāhinī) type may indicate that the sway of Samudra Gupta spread from the Ganges valley to the realm of the 'Tiger king' in Mahākāntāra. The figures of Gaṅgā and Yamunā occur frequently in door jambs of the Gupta Age.

1 Cf. the epithet 'sarva-kshatrāntaka' applied to his great fore-runner, Mahāpādā Nanda.
2 The battle-axe appears also on coins of the Udumbaras, CHI, 559; and Jayadāman, Rapson (Andhrā, etc.), 76.
3 Cf. 'Horse facing post' which appears also on a square coin attributed to Chashtana (Rapson, ibid., 75) whose dynasty was overthrown by the Guptas.
4 Nana on lion of Huvishka's coins (Whitehead, 207) may have suggested this type.
It has been surmised that they symbolise connection with the Gangetic Doāb.

Samudra Gupta's 'virtuous and faithful wife,' possibly Datta Devī, appears to be mentioned in an Eraṇ inscription referable to the period of his rule. We possess no genuine dated documents for the reign of the great emperor. The Nālandā' and Gayā grants profess to be dated in the years 5 and 9 respectively, but no reliance can be placed on them and the reading of the numeral in the Gayā record is uncertain. Smith's date (A.D. 330-375) for Samudra Gupta is conjectural. As the earliest known date of the next sovereign is A.D. 380-381 it is not improbable that his father and predecessor died some time after A.D. 375. One of the last acts of Samudra Gupta was apparently the selection of his successor. The choice fell on Chandra Gupta, his son by Datta Devī.

1 ASI, AR., 1947-48, p. 158.
2 An inscription of Chandra Gupta II, dated in the year 61, corresponding to A.D. 580-81 was discovered in the Mathurā District (Eś. Ind., XXI, p ff.).
3 Sircar (IHQ, 1942, 272) reads the dated portion of the inscription of the year 61 as Śrī Chandra Guptasya vijaya-rājya samvatsare pāṭhame—the fifth regnal year of Chandra Gupta (II). Therefore, his first year may be taken to be A.D. 576-77.