CHAPTER XI. THE GUPTA EMPIRE—(continued):
THE AGE OF THE VIKRAMĀDITYAS.

Kāmaṁ nripāṁ santu sahasraśo' nye
rājaṇvatimāhuranena bhūmin
nakṣatra-tārā-graha saṅkulāpi
jyotishmati Chandramasaiva rātrīh.

—Raghunāṁśam.

SECTION I. CHANDRA GUPTA II VIKRAMĀDITYA.

Epigraphic evidence indicates that Samudra Gupta was succeeded by his son Chandra Gupta II, Vikramaditya, also called Narendra Chandra, Simha Chandra, Narendra Simha and Simha Vikrama, born of queen Dattadevi. Chandra Gupta was chosen out of many sons by his father as the best fitted to succeed him. Another name

1 Cf. the name Vikrama Simha of Ujjaini, Penzer, III. 11. The story narrated in Vrishnavila Lāmbaka, has, for its hero Vikramāditya, son of Mahendrāditya, who is apparently to be identified with Skanda Gupta. But some of the motifs such as strīvesha (Kathā Sūtr. XVIII. 3. 42), visit to the enemy’s own place with a Vētāla (5. 40 f.) were probably taken from the cycle of legends associated with Chandra Gupta II, father of Mahendra.

2 That Samudra Gupta had many sons and grandsons appears clear from the Ēraṇ epigraph. The theory of Dr. Altekar (JBORS, XIV, pp. 223-53; XV, pt. i-ii, pp. 134 f.) and others that a king named Rāma (Sarma? Sena?) Gupta intervened between Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II is unsupported by any contemporary epigraphic evidence. The tradition that a Gupta king killed his brother and took his wife and crown, dates only from a ninth century epigraph. The literary evidence on the point is discrepant and hardly conclusive. The version given by Bāna in the seventh century differs in important respects from the story known to the author of the Kāśyapa-Mimāṃsā. Cir. 900 A.D. (Cf. Ind. Ant., Nov., 1933, 201 ff.; JBORS, XVIII, 1, 1982, 17 ff.). The simple story, narrated in the Harsha-Charita, that Chandra Gupta, disguised as a female, destroyed a Śaka (not Khaśa) king, who coveted the wife of another, in the very city of the enemy, was doubtless emblazoned by later poets and dramatists, and (as is clear from certain data, to which Mr. V. V. Mirashi draws attention in IHQ, March, 1934, 48 ff.) details, such as fratricide, and association with ghouls, not found in the earlier account, continued to be added in the days of Amoghavarsha I (A. D. 815-888) and Govinda IV (A.D. c. 927-955). The Devī Chandraguptom and similar works are as much unsuited to form bases of the chronicles of Chandra Gupta II as
of the new monarch disclosed by certain Vākāṭaka inscriptions, several types of coins and the Sāñchī inscription of A. D. 412-3 was Deva Gupta, Deva-śrī or Deva-rāja.¹

For the reign of Chandra Gupta II, we possess a number of dated inscriptions so that its limits may be defined with more accuracy than those of his predecessors. His accession should be placed before A.D. 381, and his death in or about A.D. 413-14.

The most important external events of the reign were the emperor's matrimonial alliance with the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II, son of Prithivisheṇa I, and the war with the Śaka Satraps which added Western Mālwa and Surāśṭra (Kāṭhiāwār) to the Gupta dominions.

Matrimonial alliances occupy a prominent place in the foreign policy of the Guptas. The Lichchhavī connection had strengthened their position in Bihār. After the conquest of the upper provinces they sought alliances with other ruling families whose help was needed to consolidate the Gupta power in the newly acquired territory and prepare the ground for fresh conquests. Thus Samudra Gupta received presents of girls (kanyopāyana) from Śaka-Kushān chiefs and other foreign potentates. Chandra Gupta II married Kubera- nāgā, a princess of Nāga lineage,² and had by her a daughter named Prabhāvatī, whom he gave in marriage to Rudrasena II, the Vākāṭaka king of Berar and the

the Mudrārākshasam and the Aśokāvadāna are in regard to the doings of the great Mauryas. The subject has been fully discussed by the present writer in an article entitled "Vikramādiṭya in History and legend" contributed to the Vikramādiṭya-volume, Scindia Oriental Institute (1948), pp. 488-511. The story of Chandra Gupta's adventure in its developed form has absorbed a good deal of folklore, such as tales about ghouls, Piśācha. The motif of the wife leaving a mean-spirited husband is found in Penzer, Kathā S. S., III. xx. 90.


² Nāga-kulotpāṇī cf. JASB, 1944, p. 58. It is possible as urged by many writers, that Chandra Gupta Vikramādiṭya also entered into marriage alliances with the Kadambas of Vaijyanāṭi or Banavasi in Kuntala, or the Kanarese, country. The sending of an embassy to Kuntala by Vikramādiṭya, is vouched for by Bhoja and Kshemendra. (Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, p. 6.). Kākusthavarman of the Kadamba dynasty gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings in or about the fifth century (Talagunda Inscription, Ep. Ind., VIII, 93 ff.; IHQ, 1933, 197 ff.).
adjoining districts. According to Dr. Smith, “the Vākāṭaka Mahārāja occupied a geographical position in which he could be of much service or disservice to the northern invader of the dominions of the Śaka satraps of Gujṛat and Surāshṭra. Chandra Gupta adopted a prudent precaution in giving his daughter to the Vākāṭaka prince and so securing his subordinate alliance.”

The campaign against the Western Satraps is apparently alluded to in the Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Vīrasena-Sāba in the following passage “he (Śābd) came here (to Eastern Mālwa), accompanied by the king (Chandra Gupta) in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world.” Śāba was an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra. He held the position, acquired by hereditary descent, of a Sāchīva or minister of Chandra Gupta II, and was placed by his sovereign in charge of the Department of Peace and War. He naturally accompanied his master when the great western expedition was undertaken. Eastern Mālwa, which had already felt the might of Samudra Gupta, became the base of operations against the Śakas. Inscriptions at Udayagiri and Sāñchī suggest that the emperor Chandra Gupta II assembled at or near Vidiśa in East Mālwa many of his ministers, generals and feudatories, some of whom are mentioned in records dating from A.D. 402 to 413. The campaign against the Śakas was eminently successful. The fall of the Śaka Satrap is alluded to by Bāṇa. The annexation of his territory is proved by coins.¹

Chief Cities of the Empire.—The first important Gupta metropolis seems to have been at Pāṭaliputra—“the city named Pushpa” where Samudra Gupta is said to have

¹ JRAS, 1914, p. 324.
² Silver coins of the Garuḍa type bearing the legend Parama-Bhāgavata, probably struck in Surāshṭra (Allan, p. xciv). Some of the coins bear the date 90 (=A.D. 409. EHI, 4th ed., p. 345). It has been suggested that, like his father, Chandra Gupta, too, performed a horse sacrifice (IHQ, 1927, p. 725) and that a stone horse lying in a village named Nagawa near Benares, and bearing an inscription containing the letters Chamdragu, commemorates the event. But there is no clear reference to such a sacrifice in the inscriptions or coins hitherto published.
“rested on his laurels” after one of his victorious campaigns, and from which a Gupta Minister for Peace and War went to East Mālwa in the company of his sovereign. From A.D. 402 Chandra Gupta seems to have had a residence in Mālwa, at first possibly at Vidiśa and later on, after his western conquests, at Ujjain. Certain chiefs of the Kanarese districts, who claimed descent from Chandra Gupta (Vikramādiya), referred to their great ancestor as Ujjayini-puravar-ādhiśvara, ‘lord of Ujjain, the best of cities,’ as well as Pātalipuravar-ādhiśvara, ‘lord of Pātali (putra), the best of cities.’ Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies Chandra Gupta II with the traditional Vikramādiya Sakārī, “the sun of valour, the destroyer of the Sakas,” of Ujjain.1 The titles Śrī Vikramah, Sinha-Vikramah, Ajita-Vikramah, Vikramānka and Vikramādiya actually occur on Chandra Gupta’s coins.2

1 In literature Vikramādiya is represented as ruling at Pātaliputra (Kathā-varst-sagara, VII. 4. 9:—Vikramādiya stvāsiḍrāja Pātaliputrkha) as well as Ujjayini and other cities. Śahasāṇka of Ujjain is said to have ordered the exclusive use of Sanskrit in his harem (Kārava Mimamsā, 3rd ed., p. 90). He thus reversed the policy of Ṛṣbhavarṇa (p. 187) or Śitavāhana of Kuntala. Cf. the verse in Sarasvati Kāṇṭhābharaṇa II. 15.

Ke’bhum Aḍhyarajyaṁ rājye prakṛita-bhāṣīnāṁ
hāle śrī Śahasāṅkasya ke na Sanskrīttavādīnāṁ.

Among the Kārva-kāras tested in Ujjain mention is made of a Chandra Gupta along with Kālidāsa, Amara, Bāhavi and others (Kārava M., p. 55). Paramārtha, the biographer of Vasubandhu, refers to Ayodhyā as the capital of a Vikramādiya while Hiuen Tsang represents Śrāvasti as the seat of the famous king (EHII, 3rd Ed., pp. 332-33). Subandhu refers to the fame of Vikramādiya, but not to his capital city, “like a lake Vikramādiya hath left the earth, save indeed in fame” (Keith, Hist. Sans. Lit., p. 312). Cf. Hāla, v. 64.

2 Name, title or epithet. Type of coin.

Śrī Vikrama  ...  ...  {  ...  Archer type (gold).
Vikramādiya  ...  ...  {  ...  Couch type (gold).
Rūpaṅkīṭī  ...  ...  ...  Chhattara (Parasol) type (gold).
\begin{align*}
\text{Sinha-Vikrama, Narendra Chandra}, \\
\text{Narendra Sinha, Sinha Chandra}
\end{align*}
\{  ...  ...  Couch type (gold).
Ajita-Vikrama  ...  ...  ...  Lion-Slayer (gold).
Paramabhāgavata  \}  ...  ...  Horseman type (gold).
\begin{align*}
\text{Paramabhāgavata}, \\
\text{Vikramādiya}, \\
\text{Vikramānka}
\end{align*}
\}  ...  ...  Silver coins of the Garuda type.
Vikramādiya, Mahārāja, Chandra  ...  ...  Copper coins (Garuda, Chhattara and Vase type).
We have no detailed contemporary notice of Ujjayini (also called Viśālā, Padmāvatī, Bhogavatī, Hiranyakavatī) in the days of Chandra Gupta. But Fa-hien who visited Mid India during the period A.D. 405 to 411, has left an interesting account of Pātaliputra. The pilgrim refers to the royal palace of Aśoka and the halls in the midst of the city, "which exist now as of old," and were according to him "all made by spirits which Aśoka employed, and which piled up the stones, reared the walls and gates, and executed the elegant carving and inlaid sculpture-work,—in a way which no human hands of this world could accomplish." "The inhabitants are rich and prosperous, and vie with one another in the practice of benevolence and righteousness. Every year on the eighth day of the second month they celebrate a procession of images... The Heads of the Vaiśya families establish houses for dispensing charity and medicines." The principal port of the empire on the east coast was Tāmralipti or Tamluk in West Bengal from which ships set sail for Ceylon, Java (then a centre of Brāhmaṇism), and China.

Much light is thrown on the character of Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya's administration by the narrative of Fa-hien and the inscriptions that have hitherto been discovered. Speaking of the Middle Kingdom, the dominions of Chandra Gupta in the upper Ganges Valley, the Chinese pilgrim says: "the people are numerous and happy; they have not to register their households, or attend to any magistrates and their rules; only those who cultivate the royal land have to pay a portion of the gain from it. If they want to go, they go: if they want to stay on, they stay. The king governs without decapitation or other corporal punishments. Criminals are simply fined, lightly or heavily, according to the circumstances of each case. Even in cases of repeated attempts

1 Meghadūta (I. 31) and Kathā-sarit-sāgara, Tawney's translation, Vol. II. p. 275. For an account of Ujjayini in the seventh century A.D., see Beal, H. Tsang, II, p. 270; and Ridding, Kādambari, pp. 210 ff.
at wicked rebellion they only have their right hands cut off. The king's bodyguards and attendants all have salaries. Throughout the whole country the people do not kill any living creature, nor drink intoxicating liquor, nor eat onions or garlic. The only exception is that of the Chāndālas. In buying and selling commodities they use cowries. The last statement evidently refers to such small transactions as Fa-hien had occasion to make. The pilgrim does not seem to have met with the gold coins which would only be required for large transactions. That they were actually in currency, we know from the references to "dīnāras" and "suvarṇas" in inscriptions.

That Chandra Gupta II was a good monarch may be inferred also from the inscriptions. Himself a devout Vaishnava (Parama-bhāgavata), he appointed men of other sects to high offices. His general Āmrakārīddava, the hero of a hundred fights, anēkasamar-āvāpta-vijaya-yaśas-patākah, appears to have been a Buddhist or at least a pro-Buddhist, while his Minister of Peace and War, Śāba-Vīrasena, and perhaps also his Mantran or High Counsellor, Śikharasvāmin, were Śaivas.

Regarding the machinery of Government we have no detailed information. But the following facts may be gleaned from the inscriptions. As in Maurya times, the head of the state was the Rājā who was at times nominated by his predecessor. The king is now regarded as a divinity—Achintya Purusha, 'the Incomprehensible Being,' Dhanada-Varunendrāntaka-sama, the equal of Kuveṣa, Varuṇa, Indra and Yama, loka dhāma deva, 'a god dwelling on earth,' Paramadaivata, 'the supreme

---

1 Legge.
2 Allan.
3 Chandra Gupta II also issued silver and copper coins. The silver coins were mainly intended for the western provinces conquered from the Śaka satraps but they are also mentioned in the time of his son in inscriptions of Northern Bengal. The Baigrama inscription of the year 128 (448 A.D.) for instance refers to rūpakas along with dīnāras (cf. Allan, p. cxxvii). The copper coins issued by Chandra Gupta II are commonly found around Ayodhya (Allan, p. cxxxi).
deity.’ He was assisted by a body of High Ministers whose office was very often hereditary as is suggested by the phrase “anvaya-prāpta sāchivya” ‘acquirer of the post of minister by hereditary descent’, of the Udayagiri Inscription of Śāba.¹ The most important among the High Ministers were the Mantrin, ‘High Counsellor,’ the Sāṃdhi-vigrahika, ‘Minister for Peace and War,’ and the Akshapatāl-ādhyakṣa, ‘the Lord Keeper of State Documents.’ Like the Kauṭilyan Mantrin, the Gupta Sāṃdhi-vigrahika accompanied the sovereign to the battlefield. As in the case of most of the Pradhānas of Śivāji there was no clear-cut division between civil and military officials. The same person could be Sāṃdhi-vigrahika, Kumārāmātya (cadet-minister), and Mahāđandā-nāyaka, ‘great commandant of the army,’ and a Mantrin could become a Mahā-bal-ādhyakṣa, ‘chief commander of forces.’

It is not clear whether the Guptas had a central council of ministers (Mantri-parishad).² But the existence of local parishads (e.g., the Parishad of Udānakūpa) is proved by a Basār seal discovered by Bloch.

The empire was divided into a number of provinces styled Desas, Bhiktis, etc., sub-divided into districts called Pradeśas or Vishayas.³ Among Desas the Gupta inscriptions mention Šukuli-desa. Surāṣṭra (Kāṭhiāwād), Dabhālā (the Jubbulpore region, Dāhala or Chedi of later times) and “Kālindī Narmadayor Madhya,” the territory lying between the Jumna and the Nerbudda, and embracing, no doubt, Eastern Mālwa, are also perhaps to be placed under this category.

¹ The Mahā-danda-nāyaka Harisheṇa was the son of the Mahādanda-nāyaka Dhuva-bhūti. The Mantrin Prathivisheṇa was the son of the Mantrin Sikkhatvasvāmin. Cf. also the hereditary governors (goṣṭri), of Mandasor, Surāṣṭra, etc. Things were somewhat different in the Maurya Period. Pushya Gupta, Rāṣṭrīya of Surāṣṭra in the time of Chandra Gupta Maurya, was quite unconnected by blood with Tushāsptha, governor or feudatory in the time of Asoka.

² The Bilsad Ins. (CII, 44) refers to a [Par]shad. But there is nothing to show that it was a central political assembly. The Sabhyas mentioned in connection with the nomination scene in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription may, however, have been members of a Central Curia Regis or Council.

³ A territorial unit styled Vithi is also known.
Among BHUKTIS (lit. allotments) we have reference in inscriptions of the Gupta and early Post-Gupta Age to Pundra-vardhana BHUKTI (North Bengal), Vardhamana BHUKTI (West Bengal), Tirra BHUKTI (North Bihār), Nagara BHUKTI (South Bihār), śrāvasti BHUKTI (Oudh), and Ahichchhatra BHUKTI (Rohilkhand), all situated in the Ganges valley. Among Pradeśas or Vishayas mention is made of Lāṭa-vishaya (in continental Gujārāt), Tripurī-vishaya (in the Jubbulpure region), Airikīna in Eastern Mālwa (called Pradeśa in Samudra Gupta’s Erāṇ inscription, and Vishaya in that of Toramāṇa), Antarvedī (the Gangetic Doāb), Vālavī (?), Gayā, Koṭivarsha (the Dinājpur region in North Bengal), Mahākhushāpāra (?), Khāḍātāpāra (?), and Kuṇḍadhāṇi.¹

The Deśas were governed by officers called Gopūris, or Wardens of the Marches, as is suggested by the passage Sarveshu Deśeshu vidhāya Gopūrin ‘having appointed Gopūris in all the Deśas.’ The Bhukte were usually governed by Uparikas or Uparika Mahārājas who were sometimes apparently princes of the Imperial family, e.g., Rājaputra-deva-bhaṭṭāraka, Governor of Pundravardhana BHUKTI mentioned in a Dāmodarpur plate, Govinda Gupta, Governor of Tirabhukti mentioned in the Basārh seals² and possibly Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of Tumain in Central India. The office of Vishaya-pati or District Officer was held by Imperial officials like the Kumār-āmātyas and Ayuktakas,² as well as by feudatory Mahārājas like Mātrivishṇu of Erāṇ. Some of the Vishayapatis, e.g., Sarvanāga of Antarvedī,³ were possibly directly under the Emperor, while others, e.g., those of Koṭivarsha, Airikīna and Tri-

² Govinda Gupta is known also from the newly discovered Mandasor Ins. of the Mālava—Vikrama year 524 (noticed by Garde, ASI, Annual Report, 1922-23, p. 187; Cal. Rev.; 1946, July, 155; Ep. Ind., xix, App. No. 7; xxvii, 12 ff.) which mentions his Senādhipa or captain Vāyurakshita, and Vāyu’s son Dattabhāṣa, Commander-in-chief of the forces of king Prabhākara (467-68 A.D.).
³ They are also known as officers apparently in charge of vīṭha or smaller units.
⁴ And Kulavriddhi of Pañaḥchanagari (in North Bengal), Ep. Ind., xxi, 81.
purī, were usually under provincial Governors. The Governors and District Officers were no doubt helped by officials and dignitaries like the Dāṇḍika, Chaur-oddharanīka and Dāṇḍapāśika¹ (apparently judicial and police officials), Nagara Sreshṭhī (President or Alderman of a city-guild), Sārthavāha (lit. caravan-leader or merchant), Prathama-Kulika (foreman of artisans), Prathama-Kāyastha (the chief scribe), Pusta-pāla (record-keeper) and others. Every Vishaya consisted of a number of “grāmas” or villages which were administered by headmen and other functionaries styled Grānikas, Mahattaras and Bhojakas.²

Outside the limits of the Imperial provinces lay the vassal kingdoms and republics, mentioned in the Allahabad prāsvāti and other documents.

The Basārh seals throw some interesting sidelight on the provincial and municipal government as well as the economic organisation of the province of Tirabhukti (Tirhut) in North Bihār. The province was apparently governed by prince Govinda Gupta, a son of the Emperor by the Mahādevī Śri Dhruva-svāmini, who had his capital at Vaiśāli. The seals mention several officials like the Uparīka (governor), the Kumār-āmātya (cadet-minister).³

² In the Myṛcchhukaṭīka (Act IX), which may be a composition of the period between Bāṇa (who knew a king Śūdraka, but no poet of the same name) and Vāmana (8th century) the judge (adhikarāṇīka) in a court of law is accompanied by a Sreshṭhī and a Kāyastha. Reference is also made to the Adhikarāṇa-Bhojakas and a Mahattarāka in connection with the arrangement of benches in the Vaiśāhāra-māṇḍapa (the hall of justice) and the detection of people “wanted” by the city Police (nagara-rakṣh-ādhiṅśita). The Mudrā-rākṣasā of Visākhadatta which is probably to be assigned to a period anterior to Rājaśekhara, the Dasaṇḍapaka and Bhoja, perhaps also to Vāmana but not to Avantivarman (of the Maukharī or Utpala dynasty) or Dantivarman (Rāṣṭrakūṭa or Pallava) whose name or names occur in the Bharata Vākyas, makes mention of Kāyastha, Dāṇḍapāśika, etc. Village functionaries were ordinarily placed under officials of the Vishaya or district. But in exceptional cases they had direct dealings with the Uparīka or governor of a Bhūkta (Ep. Ind., XV, 196).
³ It has been taken to mean (1) minister of a prince as distinguished from that of the King (rājāmātya), (2) minister in charge of Princes, C. V. Vajdya, Med. Hind. Ind., I, 198, (3) a junior minister whose father is an igne, or (4) one who has been a minister since the days of his youth. But cf. Ep. Ind., X, 49; XV, 302 f. It will be seen that the Kumārāmātyas were, as stated by a previous
the *Mahā-pratihāra* (the great chamberlain), *Talavara* (general or local chief), the *Mahā-danḍanāyaka* (the great commandant), the *Vinayasthiti* sthāpaka, the censor [?], and the *Bhaṭāśvapati* (lord of the army and cavalry), and the following offices, e.g., *Yuvarāja-pādiya Kumār-āmātya-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the Minister of His Highness the Crown Prince, according to Vogel), *Raṇabhāṇḍāgārādhikaraṇa* (office of the chief treasurer of the war department), *Balādhikaraṇa* (war office), *Danḍapāś-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the chief of Police), *Tīra-bhukty-Upārikādhiṣṭhāna* (office of the Governor of Tirhut), *Tīrabhuktau Vinayasthiti-sthāpakādhiṣṭhāna* (office of the censor [?] of Tirhut), *Vaisāly-ādhishtānādhiṣṭhāna* (office of the government of the city of Vaisāli), *Śrī-paraṇa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādiya Kumār-āmātya-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the cadet minister waiting on His Majesty).

The reference to the *Parishad* (Council or Committee) of Udānakūpa shows that the *Parishad* still formed an important element of the machinery of local government. The mention of the ‘mote-hall of aldermen of guilds, caravan-leaders and foremen of artisans’ (*Śresṭhī-writer, divided into two classes, viz., (i) *Yuvarāja-pādiya*, those serving the Crown Prince, and (ii) *Paraṇa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādiya*, those serving the Emperor himself. This perhaps makes the interpretation ‘counsellor of, or in charge of the Prince’ untenable. See, however, Fenzel. I. 32; III. 156. The most probable view is that the term *Kumāra* in the expression *Kumārāmātya* corresponds to *Pīna, Chikka, Immadī, Ilaya*, of the south, and is the opposite of *Peda* (*Prauḍha*), *Pirīya*. In the Gupta Age the *Kumārāmātyas* often served as district officers. The office was also combined with that of a general, counsellor and foreign secretary.

 Cf. *talāra* of the Chirwā Inscription of Samara Sinhā.

Dr. Basak takes *Vinaya-sthiti* in the sense of law and order (The History of North-Eastern India, p. 312).

3 In the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Sthāpaka* is the designation of the introducer of a play (Keith, Sanskrit Drama, p. 340). Here a different functionary may be meant.

5 The mention of *Raṇa-bhāṇḍāgāra* suggests that the finance department had its military as distinguished from the civil side.

6 A distinction is drawn between imperial officials and those connected with viceroyal administration and amongst the latter officers of the province of *Tīrabhukti* are clearly distinguished from the public servants in charge of the subordinate administration of the *ādhishṭhāna* of Vaisāli.
sārthavāha-kulika-nigama) is of interest to students of economics.

Chandra Gupta II had at least two queens, Dhruvadevi and Kubera-nāgā. The first queen was the mother of Govinda Gupta and Kumāra Gupta I. The second queen had a daughter named Prabhāvatī who became queen of the Vākāṭakas. The latter was the mother of the Princes Divākarasena, Dāmodarasena and Pravarasena II (or III). Certain mediaeval chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta. The origin of these chiefs is probably to be traced to some unrecorded adventures of Vikramāditya in the Deccan.

1 A son of Chandra Gupta styled bhūpati (king) Chandraprakāśa is mentioned in a verse quoted by Vāmana in his Kāvyālakāra-Sūtra-mūrti (JASB, Vol. I, No. 10, [N.S.], 1905, 255 ff.). But the identity of this Chandra Gupta is uncertain. His identification with Vikramāditya (i.e., Chandra Gupta II) rests on the vexed problem of the date of Vasubandhu (or Subandhu?) alleged to be mentioned by Vāmana, and the question as to whether the personage mentioned may be identified with the Buddhist scholar whose biographer was Paramārtha (A.D. 500-69). Paramārtha was a Brāhmaṇa of the Bhāradvāja family of Ujjainī who stayed for a time in Magadha and then went to China (A.D. 546-69). According to his account Vasubandhu was born at Purushapura or Peshāwar of the Brāhmaṇa family of Kauśika. He went to Ayodhya at the invitation of Bāladiya, son of Vikramāditya (JRAS, 1905, 33 ff.). For some recent views about the date of Vasubandhu, see Indian Studies in Honour of C. R. Lanman, 79 ff.

2 Rājaśekhara in his Kāvyamimāṃsā and Bhoja in his śrīgāra Prakāśikā mention that Kālidāsa was sent on an embassy to a Kuntala king by Vikramāditya. "Kṣemendra, in the Aucitya Vicāra Carcā, refers to Kālidāsa's Kunteśvara Dautya" (Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, 1924, p. 6). That the Guptas actually established contact with Kuntala appears clear from the Tālagund Inscription which states that a Kadamba ruler of the Kanarese country gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings. An important indication of Gupta influence in the South Western Deccan is possibly afforded by the coins of Kumāra Gupta I found in the Satara District (Allan, p. cxxx). The rōle assigned to Kālidāsa by Rājaśekhara, Bhoja and Kshemendra is not unworthy of credence as tradition points to a date for him in the early Gupta Age. For traditions about his synchronism with Mahārājādhirāja Vikramāditya (Sakārāti) and Dignāga and with king Pravarasena who is held to be the author of the poem Setubandha written in Mahārāṣṭri Prakrit and is, therefore, presumably identical with one of the kings bearing the same name in the Vākāṭaka family, (recorded in Abhinanda's Rāmacharita, ch. 32, Hāla, Gāthāsaptasāti, Bhūmikā, p. 8 and other works) see Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference, 99 ff.; Mallinātha's comment on Meghadūta, I. 14; Ind. Ant., 1912, 367, JRAS, 1918, 118 ff. It has recently been pointed out by Mr. Mirashi that the Pattana plates of Pravarasena II (year 27) refer to a Kālidāsa as the writer of the charter, Ep. Ind., xxiii (1955), pp. 81 ff.

But the identity of the scribe with the great poet remains doubtful.
GENEALOGY OF THE VĀKĀTAKAS OF VISHNUVĪRIDDHA GORTA

GENEALOGY OF THE VĀKĀTAKAS

Vindhyāśakti I (twice-born)
Mahārāja Pravarasena I. 1 Bhavanāga, King of the Bhāra-
śivas (Padmāvati) 2
Sarvasena* Gautamiputra—daughter
Vindhyāśakti II Samudra Gupta Mahārāja Rudrasena I (Dcoṭek)
Dharma-Mahārāja Mahārājādhirāja
(Vatsagulma or Basim Chandra Gupta II Mahārāja Prithivishēṇa I
in S. Berar) Prabhāvati—Mahārāja Rudrasena II
Pravarasena II? Agra-Mahishī
son
Pravarasena II? (or III) 3
Yuvarāja Divākarasena Dāmodarasena
Devasena. Nandivaridhana 4 Rāmagiri
Supratīshthāhāra Ajjhitabhattārikā—Narendrasena 5
Harishena? Princess of Kuntala
his minister Hasthibhoja Prithivishēṇa II
(Vembāra)
"raised his sunken family" from Nala

* It must not be understood that Sarvasena was necessarily the elder of the two brothers. The matter may be settled when further evidence is available.
1 He performed four Asvamedhas, and is styled a Mahārāja, and Samrāj. His traditional capital Kāñchanaṅkāpura recalls Hiranyapura (Hirapur? SSE of Sāgar) of the Dudia plates (Ep. Ind. III. 2586). The splitting up of the name into Purikā and Chanakā seems hardly justifiable.
3 A dharma-vijayī whose "kosa-dāṇḍa-sādhana" is said to have accumulating for a hundred years.
4 Identified by some with Nagardhan near Ramtek (Hiralal Ins. No. 4; Tenth Or. Conf. p. 458) and by others with Nandapur, near Ghughusgarh, north-east of Ramtek (Wellsted Notes on the Vākātakas), JASB, 1933, 160f.
5 Ruler of pravarapura, Charmmāṅka and of following rājya, viz.,
Bhojakata (N. Berar), Ārammī (east of Berar) and of the Wardhā region. Pravarapura has been identified by some with Pavnār in Wardhā District
(JASB, 1933, 159).
6 His commands were honoured by rulers of Kosalā, Mekalā (at the source of the Nerbudda) and Mālava.
7 Credited with the conquest of Kuntala, Avanti, Kalinga, Kosala, Andhra, Trikūṭa, Lāta.
SECTION II. KUMĀRA GUPTA I MAHENDRADITYA.

Chandra Gupta II's successor was Kumāra Gupta I, surnamed Mahendraditya whose certain dates range from A.D. 415 to A.D. 455. His extensive coinage, and the wide distribution of his inscriptions show that he was able to retain his father's empire including the central and western provinces. One of his viceroys, Chirātadatta, governed Pundravardhana Bhukti or roughly North Bengal, another viceroy, prince Ghaṭotkacha "Gupta,

1 The Mandsor inscription of the Mālava year 524 suggests that Kumāra may have had a rival in his brother prince Govinda Gupta. In the record Indra (viuvadha śāhīpa, Kumāra, who is styled Śri Mahendra and Mahendrakarmā on coins) represented as being suspicious of Govinda's power. Ep. Ind., XIX, App. No. 7 and n. 5; Ep. xxvii. 15.

2 Also called Śri Mahendra (on coins of the 6Archet type), Aśvamedha Mahendra (on coins of the Aśvamedha type), Mahendrakarmā, Ajīta Mahendra (on coins of the horseman type and sometimes on the lion-slayer type), Śiniha Mahendra (on coins of the lion-slayer type), Śri Mahendra Śiniha (also on coins of the lion-slayer type), Mahendra Kumāra (on coins of the peacock type) Mahendra-kalpa (Tumain Ins.), Śiniha Vikrama (on coins of the lion-slayer type; Allan, Gupta Coins, p. 80), Vyāghra bala-parākrama (on coins of the tiger-slayer type) and Śri Pratāpa. On the swordsman type of gold coins and on copper coins of the Garuda and possibly śiniha-vāhini types the emperor is simply called Śri Kumāra Gupta. The title Mahendrāditya with the epithet Parama bhāgavata, 'devoted worshipper of the Bhagavat (Vishṇu-Kṛṣṇa),' is found on silver coins, apparently struck in Surāshṭra.

3 The date 56 (=A.D. 451) is found in the Bilsar inscription and the date 136 (=A.D. 455) on silver coins (EHI, 4th ed., pp. 345-46). The Eraṇ inscription of Samudra Gupta refers to his 'virtuous and faithful wife' and many sons and son's sons of the royal pair. From this it seems probable that Kumāra Gupta and his brothers were already born during the reign of their grandfather, and that Kumāra had seen not less than some thirty five summers before his accession. As he reigned for at least forty years, he could not have died before the age of 75 (approximately).

4 The possession of the central districts in the Ganges valley is, according to Allan, confirmed by the silver coins of the peacock type (cf. the Ayodhya coins of Aryamitra, CHI, I. 538 and Meghadūta I. 45.) and the inclusion of the western province by those of the Garuda type. Silverplaited coins with a copper core were intended for circulation in the Valabhi area, and coins of small thick fabric resembling the Traikūṭaka coinage were apparently struck in South Gujarāṭ (Allan, pp. xxiii ff.).

held office in the province of Eran (in Eastern Mālwa) which included Tumbavana; a third viceroy or feudatory, Bandhuvaram, ruled at Daśapura in western Mālwa. The Karamadānde inscription of A.D. 436 mentions Prithvisheṇa who was a Mantrin and Kumārāmātya, and afterwards Mahā-balādhikrita or general under Kumāra Gupta, probably stationed in Oudh. The panegyrist of a Mālwa viceroy claims that the suzerainty of Kumāra Gupta extended over “the whole earth which is decked with the rolling seas as with a rocking girdle, which holds in its breast-like mountain altitudes the founts of the vivifying liquid, and smiles with the flowers of its forest glens.”

Like his father, Kumāra was a tolerant king. During his rule the worship of Svāmī Mahāsena (Kārttikeya), of Buddha, of Śiva in the liṅga form and of the sun, as well as that of Vishṇu, flourished peacefully side by side.

and Bhādra; IHQ, XIX. 15) of the year 120 = A. D. 439 in the Bogra district, makes mention of another officer, the Āyukta, Achyuradāsa of Purpakausikā in Śrīnagaveravīthī. The Natore Inscription of A. D. 432 (JPASB, 1911) is another record of Kumāra’s reign found in N. Bengal.

1 Tumain in the Guna district of the Gwalior state, about 50 miles to the north-west of Eran. M. B. Garde, Ind. Ant., xlix 1920, p. 114, Ep. Ind. xxvi (1941), pp. 115 ff; Tumain Inscription of the year 116, i.e., A. D. 435. The identity of the prince mentioned in the record, with Śrī Chāhotakacha Gupta of seals and Ghaṭa Kramāditya of coins is uncertain (Allan, xvi, xl, liv) Hema Chandra (in the Pariśīṣṭha paraṇa, xii, 2-3) places Tumbavana in the Avantideśa, ‘the ornament of the western half of Bhārata’ in Jambūdvipa.

Ihaiva Jambūdviṇe ‘pāg Bharatārdhā vibhūṣaṇam
Avantirīti deśo ‘sti svargadeśiṣya riddhibhīh
tat rat Tumbavanamiti viḍyate sanniveśanam

2 Mandasor Inscription of A. D. 437-48. Bhide suggests (JBORS, VII, March, 1921, pp. 93 ff) that Viśva-varman of Gupta Ins. No. 17 is an independent king, who flourished a century before his namesake of ins. No. 18, who is a governor (Gaṭpīṛi) of the Guptas. S. Majumdar points out that even Viśva-varman of Ins. No. 17 must be later than Naravarman of V. S. 461 (= A. D. 404-05) in the Bilhar Kotra (Rāgadh state, Mālwa) Ins. (Ep. Ind. xxvi. 190 ff) of Mahārāja Naravarman of the year 474 (i.e., A. D. 417-18) the king is styled ‘aulikara’, thus establishing his connection with Viṣṇuvardhana of the Mālava Era 589 (A. D. 532-33).

3 Cf. the Bilsad, Mankuwār, Karamadānde and Mandasor inscriptions. Śiva appears to have been the favourite deity of many high ministers, Viṣṇu of the most powerful ruling race and the sun of traders and artisans in the early Gupta period. The expression Jitam Bhagavatā appears to have been popularised by the king. His example seems to have been followed by Mādhava
The two notable events of Kumāra’s reign are the celebration of the horse sacrifice, evidenced by the rare Aśvamedha type of his gold coinage, and the temporary eclipse of the Gupta power by the Pushyamitrās. The reading Pushyamitra in the Bhātari inscription is, however, not accepted by some scholars because the second syllable of this name is damaged. Mr. H. R. Divekar in his article — “Pusyanitras in the Gupta Period” — makes the plausible emendation Yudhy = amītrāmś = ca for Dr. Fleet’s reading Pusyanitramś = ca in the Bhātari Pillar Inscription. It is admitted on all hands that during the concluding years of Kumāra’s reign the Gupta empire “had been made to totter.” Whether the reference in the inscription is simply to amitras (enemies), or to Pushyamitrās, cannot be satisfactorily determined. We should, however, remember in this connection that a people called Pushyamitra is actually referred to in the Vishnu Purāṇa and a Pushyamitika-Kula in the Jain Kalpasūtra. The Purāṇa text associates the Pushyamitrās, Paṭumitrās, Durmitras and others with the region of Mekala near the source of the Nerbudda. References to the warlike activities of Mekala and the neighbouring realm of Kosala

Gaṅga of Penukondā plates (Ep. Ind. XIV. 334), Vishnuvarman I Kadamba of Hebbata grant (Mys. A. S., A. R., 1925. 98), Nandivarman Pallava of Udanyendiram (Ep. Ind. III. 145) and other kings of the south. The popularity of the cult of Kārttikeya is well illustrated not only by the sanctuaries erected in his honour, but also by the names Kumāra and Skanda assumed by members of the imperial family, and the issue of the peacock type of coins by the emperor Kumāra Gupta I. The Gupta empire reached the zenith of its splendour before its final decline in the time of the originator of the ‘peacock’ coins, as a later empire did in the days of the builder of the peacock-throne.

1 Cf. Fleet, CII, p. 55 n.

2 Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1919-20, 99 f.

3 CII, iii, p. 55.

4 SBE, XXII, 292. Cf. the legend Pusamitasa found on Bhīša seals in characters of the Kushān period or a somewhat earlier date (JRAS, 1911, 198).

5 Vish., IV, 24. 17; Wilson, IX, 213. “Pushyamitra, and Paṭumitras and others to the number of 15 will rule over Mekalā.” The commentary, however, distinguishes the 15 Pushyamitra-Paṭumitrās from the 7 Mekalas. But from the context it is apparent that the position of the Pushyamitrās was between the Māhishyas (people of Māhishmati?) and the Mekalas in the Nerbudda-Son valleys if not in a part of the country of the Mekalas themselves. Cf. Fleet, JRAS, 1889, 228, cf. also Bhīśa seals. For Mekalā see also Ep. Ind. xxvii 158 f.
that had once been overrun by Kumāra's grandfather, are found in inscriptions of the Vākāṭaka relations of Kumāra Gupta. Bāṇa relates the tragic story of a ruler of Magadha who was carried off by the ministers of the lord of Mekala. A passage in the Mankuwar stone image inscription of the year 129 (A.D. 449) where the emperor Kumāra Gupta I is styled simply Mahārāja Śrī instead of Mahārājādhirāja Śrī has been interpreted by some scholars to mean that he was possibly deprived by his enemies of his status as paramount sovereign. But the theory is rendered improbable by the Dāmodarpur plate of about the same date where Kumāra is given full imperial titles. It may be noted in this connection that in several inscriptions, and on certain coins, his immediate predecessors, too, are simply called Rājā or Mahārāja.

The assumption of the title Vyāghra-bala-parākrama "displaying the strength and prowess of a tiger", on coins of the tiger-slayer type, by Kumāra may possibly indicate that he attempted to repeat the southern venture of his grandfather and penetrate into the tiger-infested forest territory beyond the Nerbudda. Expansion towards the south is also indicated by a find of 1,395 coins in the Satara District. But the imperial troops must have met with disaster. The fallen fortunes of the Gupta family were restored by prince Skanda Gupta who may have been appointed his father's warden in the Ghāzipur region, the Aṭavī or Forest Country of ancient times.

The only queen of Kumāra I named in the genealogical portion of extant inscriptions is Anantadevi. He had at least two sons, viz., Puru Gupta, son of Anantadevi, and Skanda Gupta the name of whose mother is, in the opinion of some scholars, not given in the inscriptions. Sewell, however, suggests that it was Devakī. This is not an unlikely assumption as otherwise the comparison of the

---

1 Allan p. cxxx. Cf. also the Kadamba inscription referring to social relations between the Kadambas of the fifth century and the Guptas.
2 Cf. the Bhilari Inscription.
3 Historical Inscriptions of Southern India, p. 349.
widowed Gupta empress with Kṛṣṇa’s mother in verse 6 of the Bhitārī Pillar Inscription will be less explicable. Hiuen Tsang calls Buddha Gupta (Fo-to-kio-to) or Budha Gupta,¹ a son (or descendant?) of Śakraditya.² The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had a synonymous title was Kumāra Gupta I who is called Mahendrāditya on coins. Mahendra is the same as Śakra. The use of terms conveying the same meaning as titles and epithets was not unknown in the Gupta period. Vikramāditya was also called Vikramāṅka. Skanda Gupta is called both Vikramāditya and Kramāditya, both the words meaning “puissant like the sun” or “striding like the sun.” If Śakraditya of Hiuen Tsang be identical with Mahendrāditya or Kumāra I, Budha Gupta³ was closely related to Kumāra. Another member of Kumāra’s family was possibly Ghaṭotkacha Gupta.⁴

SECTION III. SKANDA GUPTA VIKRAMĀDITYA.

According to the evidence of the Ārva-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa, confirmed by epigraphic testimony, the immediate successor of Mahendra, i.e., Kumāra Gupta I, was Skanda Gupta. In an interesting paper read at a meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Dr. R. C. Majumdar’s sugges-

¹ The name Fo-to-kio-to has been restored as Buddhā Gupta. But we have no independent evidence regarding the existence of a king named Buddha Gupta about this period. The synchronism of his successor’s successor Bālāditya with Mihirakula indicates that the king meant was Budha Gupta, cf. also Ind. Ant., 1886, 251 n.

² That Śakraditya was a reality is proved by a Nālandā seal (H. Sastri, MASI, No. 66, p. 98). To him is ascribed an establishment at Nālandā, the far-famed place, which grew into a great university in the seventh century A.D. The pilgrim was not indulging in mere fancy as suggested by Śrī N. Śastri in a treatise on Nālandā.

³ Recent discoveries show that Budha Gupta was really a grandson (not a son) of Kumāra Gupta I. The Chinese pilgrim may have failed to distinguish between a son and a grandson. Cf. The Kopparam plates where Pulakesin II is represented as a grandson of Kṛtivarman I. But he was really the son of the latter. It is also possible that Śakraditya was an epithet of Purugupta, the father of Budha.

⁴ The Tumain Inscription referred to by Mr. Garde; cf. also the Basākh seal mentioning Śrī Ghaṭotkacha Gupta. The exact relationship with Kumāra is, however, not stated in the inscription.
ted that after Kumāra's death, which apparently took place while the struggle with the Pushyamitras was still undecided, there was a fratricidal war in which Skanda Gupta came off victorious after defeating his brothers including Puru Gupta, the rightful claimant, and rescued his mother just as Kṛiṣhṇa rescued Devakī. Dr. Majumdar observed that the omission of the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta in the genealogy given in the Bihār and Bhitarī Stone Pillar Inscriptions indicated that she was not the chief queen and Skanda 'had no natural claim to the throne'. The rightful heir of Kumāra was Puru Gupta, the son of the Mahādevī Anantadevī.

We should, however, remember that there was no rule prohibiting the mention of ordinary queens in inscriptions. The mother of Princess Prabhāvatī, Kuberaṇāgā, was not the chief queen of Chandra Gupta II. No doubt the title Mahādevī is once given to her in the Poona plates of her daughter in the year 13, but it is not repeated in the Riddhapur plates of the year 19, where she is called simply Kuberaṇāgā devī without the prefix Mahādevī, whereas Kumāra-devī, Datta-devī and even her own daughter, Prabhā vatī-guptā are styled Mahādevīs. The contrast is full of significance and we know as a matter of fact that the real Mahādevī (chief queen) of Chandra Gupta II was Dhrūva-devī or Dhrūva-Svāminī. Though Kuberaṇāgā was not the principal consort (agramaḥiṣī) of her husband, she is mentioned in the inscriptions of her daughter. On the other hand the names of queens, the mothers of kings, are sometimes omitted. In the genealogical portion of the Bānskhera and Madhuban plates the name of Yaśomati as Harsha's mother is not mentioned, but in the Sonpat

---

1 Cf. the Bhitarī Inscription, JASB, 1921 (N. S. XVII), 253 ff. In IC. 1944, 171, Dr. Majumdar modified his views regarding the omission of the name of the queen mother in the Bihar ins. and found the names of Mahādevī Anantadevī and her son Purugupta in the inscription.

2 JASB, 1924, 58.

3 The name of the father of a reigning king is also sometimes omitted (cf. Kielhorn's N. Ins. Nos. 454, 468).
and the Nālandā seals\(^1\) she is mentioned both as the mother of Rājya-vardhana and as the mother of Harsha. Therefore it is not safe to draw conclusions from a comparison of genealogies given on seals and those given in ordinary praśastis. From a comparative study of the seals and plaques referred to above on the one hand and ordinary panegyrical epigraphs on the other, two facts emerge, viz., (a) genealogies given by the records of the former class are fuller than those given in the others, and (b) names of mothers of reigning kings that are invariably given \(\textit{even though this meant repetition}\) in documents of the first group are sometimes omitted by the writers of praśastis, even though they be the names of the chief queens. There is no real analogy between the genealogy on the Bhitarī seal and that in the Pillar Inscriptions. \(A\) seal should be compared to another seal and an ordinary praśasti with another document of the same class.\(^2\)

As to the question of rightful claim to the succession, we should remember that the cases of Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II suggest that the ablest among the

---


\(^2\) We have already seen that in the opinion of Sewell the name of Skanda’s mother is actually mentioned in one epigraph. According to that scholar her name was Devakī. The comparison with Kṛishṇa’s mother (who, with all her misfortunes, did not experience the pangs of widowhood) in the Bhitarī Inscription would be less explicable, if not altogether pointless, if Devakī was not the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta as well as that of Kṛishṇa. Why were Kṛishṇa and Devakī thought of in connection with the victory over hostile powers, instead of, say, Skanda (Kārttikeya) and Pārvatī, Indra or Viṣṇu and Aditi, by the panegyrist of Skanda Gupta who is compared to Śakra (Śakro-pama, Kahaum Inscription) and Viṣṇu (śṛṇapikṣhīpavakṣhā, Junāgadh epigraph)? A possible explanation is that the name of his mother coupled with her miserable plight suggested to the court-poet comparison with Kṛishṇa and Devakī. \textit{Cf.} \textit{Ep. Ind.} I. 964; xiii. 126, 131 (Hampe and Conjeeveram ins. of Kṛishnadeva Rāya) where we have a similar play on the name Devakī:

\begin{quote}
tadvāhie Devakijñiriddīśe Timma bhūpatiḥ
yalasā Tuluvandreshu Yadoḥ Kṛishṇa ivānaye... sarasādubhūtusmāṃ Narasāśvaniśpālakah
Devakinānandat (var. *nandanaḥ) Kāmo Devakī nandanaḥdiya.
\end{quote}

The problem, however, is not free from difficulties and its final solution must await fresh discoveries.
princes was chosen irrespective of any claim arising out of birth.

There is nothing to show that the struggle at the end of Kumāra’s reign, referred to in the Bhūtari Pillar Inscription, was a fratricidal conflict. The relevant text of the inscription runs thus:

Ptāri divam upeṭē viplutāṁ vaṁśa-lakṣhmīṁ
bhūja-bala-vijit-ārir-yyaḥ pratishtāpya bhūyaḥ
jitam-iti āravītāṁ mātarams āsra-netrāṁ
hūta-ṛipur-iva Krīṣṇa Devakīṁ-abhyupetāh.

“Who, when (his) father had attained heaven (i.e., died), vanquished (his) enemies by the strength of (his) arm, and steadied once more the drifting fortunes of his family; and then exclaiming ‘the victory has been won’ betook himself, like Krīṣṇa, when his enemies had been slain, to his weeping mother, Devakī.”

The hostile powers (ari), who made the Vaṁśa-lakṣhmī, goddess of family fortune, of Skanda Gupta “vīpūta,” ‘convulsed,’ after the death of his father, were apparently enemies of the Gupta family, i.e., outsiders not belonging to the Gupta line. As a matter of fact the antagonists expressly mentioned in the Bhūtari Pillar Inscription were outsiders, e.g., the Pushyamitrās and the Hūnas. There is not the slightest reference to a fratricidal war. There is no doubt a passage in the Junāgaḍḥ Inscription of Skanda which says ānat “the goddess of fortune and splendour (Lakṣhmī) of her own accord selected (Skanda) as her husband (svayam varaṁ-chakāra)...having discarded all the other sons of kings (mamṭjendra-putra).” But “Svayameva śriyā grihitā” “ac-

1 For the reference to Devakī, see Viśṇu Purāṇa, V, 79.
2 Even if the reference be merely to “amitras” (see ante, p. 568), these amitras could not have included an elder brother, as the passage “kṣitipa-charaṇa-pīṭhe sthāpaṇa vāma-pādaḥ,” “placed (his) left foot on a foot-stool which was the king (of that hostile power himself)” clearly shows. The expression samudita bala kosha (“whose power and wealth had risen”) would be singularly inappropriate in the case of the rightful heir to the imperial throne of the Guptas with its enormous resources existing for several generations, and can only point to a parvēnu power that had suddenly leaped to fame.
cepted by Śrī or Lakshmī of her own accord” is an epithet which is applied by Prabhākara-vardhana, shortly before his death, to Harsha whose devotion to his elder brother is well-known. That Skanda Gupta like Harsha was considered to be the favourite of the Goddess of Luck is well-known. Attention may be invited to the Lakshmī type of his coins¹ and the epithet Śrī-parikshiptavakshāḥ (“whose breast is embraced by Śrī, i.e., Lakshmī”), occurring in the Junāgaḍh Inscription. The panegyrist of the emperor refers to a svayambara in the conventional style.² A svayambara naturally presupposes an assemblage of princes, not necessarily of one particular family, in which all the suitors are discarded excepting one. But there is no inseparable connection between a svayambara and a fight, and, even when it is followed by a fight, the combatants are hardly ever princes who are sons of the same king. The epigraphic passage referring to Lakshmī’s svayambara, therefore, does not necessarily imply that there was a struggle between the sons of Kumāra in which Skanda came off victorious. It only means that among the princes he was specially fortunate and was considered to be the best fitted to rule because of the valiant fight he had put up against the enemies of the family and empire. In the Allahabad praśasti we have a similar passage:—“who (Samudra Gupta) being looked at with envy by the faces, melancholy through the rejection of themselves, of others of equal birth... was bidden by his father,—who exclaiming ‘verily he is worthy’ embraced him—to govern of a surety the whole world.” It may be argued that there is no proof that Skanda was selected by Kumāra. On the contrary he is said to have been selected by Lakshmī of her own accord. But such was also the case with Harsha. Skanda like Harsha was called upon to save the empire of

¹ Allan, p. xcix.

Gurijatreṣvara-rāja-Śrīr
yasya jajñe svayambarā

The Svayambara of Lakshmī forms the subject of the drama which Urvāṣī acts before Indra with her sister nymphs (JASB, 59, 34).
his forbears at a time when the fortunes of the imperial family were at a low ebb, and both these eminent men owed their success to their own prowess. The important thing to remember is that the avowed enemies of Skanda Gupta mentioned in his inscriptions were outsiders like the Pushyamitras, Hūnas, and Mlechchhas. The manujendra-putras of the Junāgaḍh Inscription are mentioned only as disappointed suitors, not as defeated enemies, comparable to the brothers of Samudra Gupta who were discarded by Chandra Gupta I. We are, therefore, inclined to think that as the tottering Gupta empire was saved from its enemies (e.g., the Pushyamitras) by Skanda Gupta it was he who was considered to be the best fitted to rule. There is no evidence that his brothers disputed his claim and actually fought for the crown. There is nothing to show that Skanda shed his brothers’ blood and that the epithets “amalātmā,” ‘pure-souled,’ and “parahitakārī,” ‘the benefactor of others,’ applied to him in the Bhitarī Inscription and coin legends were unjustified.

The view that Skanda Gupta was the immediate successor of Kumāra Gupta I seems to be confirmed by a verse in the Ārya-Maṅjuśrī-māla-kalpa which runs thus:

Samudrākhyya nyipāsaḥchaiva
Vikramaścaiḥ kirtitaḥ
Mahendranripavaro mukhyah
Sakārādyam atah param
Devarājākhyya nāmāsau yugādham</p>

It is impossible not to recognise in the kings (nyipa) Samudra, Vikrama, Mahendra and “Sākārādyā” mentioned in the verse, the great Gupta emperors Samudra Gupta, Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, Kumāra Gupta I, Mahendrāditya and Skanda Gupta.

1 Bhitarī Ins.
2 Junāgaḍh Ins.
3 Allan, Gupta Coins, cxxi.
4 Vol. I, ed. Ganapati Sāstri, p. 648. Cf. the Rewa Ins. of 141 = A.D. 460/61. Attention was drawn to this record by Mr. B. C. Chhabra at the Oriental Conference, Twelfth (Benares) Session, Summaries of Papers, part II, p. 39 and later by Drs. Majumdar and Sircar.
5 IHQ, 1932, p. 352.
Skanda Gupta assumed the titles of *Kramāditya* and *Vikramāditya*. The passage from the *Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa* quoted above refers to his appellation *Devarāja*. The titles Vikramāditya and Devarāja were apparently assumed in imitation of his grandfather. The latter epithet reminds one further of the name Mahendra given to his father. It is also to be noted that in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription Samudra Gupta is extolled as the equal of Indra and other gods and in the Kahāum record Skanda Gupta is called *Sakropama*.

From the evidence of coins and inscriptions we know that Skanda ruled from A.D. 455 to c. 467. The first achievement of the monarch was the resuscitation of the Gupta Empire and the recovery of lost provinces. From an inscriptive passage we learn that, while preparing to restore the fallen fortunes of his family he was reduced to such straits that he had to spend a whole night sleeping on the bare earth. Line twelve of the Bhitarī Inscription tells us that when Kumāra Gupta I had attained heaven, Skanda conquered his enemies by the strength of his arms. From the context it seems that these enemies were the Pushyamitras "whose power and wealth had (suddenly) gone up."

The struggle with the Pushyamitras was followed by conflicts with the Hūṇas and probably also with the Vākāṭakas in which the emperor was presumably victorious in the end. The invasion of the Hūṇas took place not later than A.D. 458 if we identify them with the *Mlechchhas* or barbarian uitlanders of the Junāgaḍh Inscription. The

---

1 Allan, *Catalogue*, pp. 117, 122; cf. Fleet, CII, p. 53:

"*Vinaya-bala-sunitair* vikramena kramena
pratidinam-abhiyogād īpsitam, yena labdhvā."

The epithet Kramāditya is found on certain gold coins of the heavy Archer type as well as on silver issues of the Garuḍa, Bull and Altar types. The more famous title of Vikramāditya is met with on silver coins of the Altar type.

2 The Hūṇas are mentioned not only in inscriptions, but in the *Mahābhārata*, the *Purāṇas*, the *Raghuvansha* and later in the *Harsha-charita* and the *Nitisākyāṃśa* of Somadeva. The *Lalita Vistara* (translated by Dharmanaraka, d. A. D. 515) mentions the Hūṇalipi (Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 266). See also W. M. McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, 399ff., 455ff., 485f.
memory of the victory over the Mlechchhas is preserved in the story of king Vikramāditya, son of Mahendrāditya of Ujjain, in Somadeva’s Kathā-sarit-sāgara.\(^1\) Central India and Surāśṭra seem to have been the vulnerable parts of the Gupta Empire. The Bālāghāt plates\(^2\) refer to Narendrasena Vākāṭaka, son of Skanda Gupta’s cousin Pravarasena II (III?) as “Kosalā-Mekalā-Mālav-ādhipatyabhycarchitasāana” ‘whose commands were treated with respect by the lords of Kosalā (Upper Mahānādi Valley), Mekalā (Upper Valley of the Nerbudda and the Son), and Mālava (probably Eastern Mālwa). The Junāgadh Inscription tells us that Skanda “deliberated for days and nights before making up his mind who could be trusted with the important task of guarding the lands of the Surāśṭras.” Allan deduces from this and from the words “sarveshu deseshu vidhāya goptram” ‘appointing protectors in all the provinces’ that the emperor was at particular pains to appoint a series of Wardens of the Marches to protect his dominions from future invasion. One of these Wardens was Parṇadatta,\(^3\) governor of Surāśṭra. In spite of all his efforts Skanda Gupta could not, however, save the westernmost part of his empire from future troubles. During his lifetime he no doubt, retained his hold over Surāśṭra, the Cambay coast and the adjoining portions of continental Gujarāt and Mālwa.\(^4\) But his successors do not appear to have been so fortunate. Not a single inscription or coin has yet

---

1 Allan, Gupta Coins, Introduction, p. xlix.
2 Ep. Ind., IX, p. 271.
3 Persian Farnā-dāta seems, according to Jarl Charpentier, to be the form underlying the name Parṇadatta (JRAS, 1931, 140; Aiyangar Com. Vol., 15).
4 The inclusion of Surāśṭra within his empire is proved by the Junāgadh Inscription and that of the Cambay coast by silver coins of the ‘Bull type’. The type was imitated by Krishṇarāja (Allan, ci), who is to be identified with the king of that name belonging to the Kāṭachchuri family. Krishṇa’s son and successor, sāṅkaragana appropriates the epithets of the great Samudra Gupta. His son Buddhārala effected the conquest of Eastern Mālwa early in the seventh century A. D. (c. 608 A. D.; Vañner plates, Ep. Ind., xii, 51 ff.; see also Marshall, A Guide to Sāñchī, p. 211). The dynasty was overthrown by the early Chalukyas and it is interesting to note that three of the characteristic epithets of Samudra Gupta are applied to the Chalukya Vijaya-rāja in the Kaira grant; Fleet, CII, 14.
been discovered which shows that Surāṣṭra and Western Mālwa formed parts of the Gupta empire after the death of Skanda Gupta. On the contrary Harisheṇa Vākāṭaka, cousin of Narendrasena, claims victories over Lāṭa (South Gujarāt) and Avanti (district around Ujjain) besides Trikūṭa in the Kanark, Kuntala (the Kanarese country), Andhra (the Telugu country), Kaliṅga (South Orissa and some adjoining tracts), and Kosala (Upper Mahānadi Valley), while the Maitrakas of Valabhi (Wala in the peninsular portion of Gujarāt) gradually assume independence.

The later years of Skanda seem to have been tranquil.¹ The emperor was helped in the work of administration by a number of able governors like Pariṇadatta, viceroy of the west, Sarvanāga, District Officer (Vishayapati) of Antarvedi or the Gangetic Doāb and Bhīmavarman, the ruler of the Kosam region.² Chakrapālita, son of Pariṇadatta, restored in A.D. 457–58 the embankment of the lake Sudarśana at Girnar which had burst two years previously.

The emperor continued the tolerant policy of his forefathers. Himself a Bhāgavata or worshipper of Kṛishṇa-Viṣṇu, he and his officers did not discourage followers of other sects, e.g., Jainas and devotees of the Sun. The people were also tolerant. The Kāhāum Inscription commemorates the erection of Jaina images by a person “full of affection for Brāhmaṇas.”³ The Indore plate records a deed by a Brāhmaṇa endowing a lamp in a temple of the Sun.

¹ Cf. the Kāhāum Ins. of 141 = A.D. 460-1.
² The inclusion within Skanda’s empire of provinces lying still further to the east is proved by the Bhitārī and Bihār Pillar Inscriptions and possibly by gold coins of the Archer type struck on a standard of 144.6 grains of metal. Allan, p. xcvi, 118.
³ Cf. The Pāḥḍpur epigraph of the year 159 (A.D. 479) which records a donation made by a Brāhmaṇa couple for the worship of the Divine Arhats, i.e., the Jinas.
CHAPTER XII. THE GUPTA EMPIRE (continued):
THE LATER GUPTAS

Vasvaukasārāmatibhuṣya sahaṁ
saurājya vaddhotsavaya bibhūtyā
samagraśaktau tvayi Sūryavaiśīye
sati praṇanna karuṇāmavastham

—Raghuvarṇam.

SECTION I. SURVIVAL OF THE GUPTA POWER AFTER
SKANDA GUPTA

It is now admitted on all hands that the reign of
Skanda Gupta ended about A.D. 467.1 When he passed
away the empire declined,2 especially in the west, but did
not wholly perish. We have epigraphic as well as literary
evidence of the continuance of the Gupta Empire in parts
of Central and Eastern India in the latter half of the fifth
as well as the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. The
Dāmodarpur plates, the Sārnāth Inscriptions3 and the
Eraṇ epigraph of Budha Gupta prove that from A.D. 477
to 496 the Gupta Empire extended from Bengal to Eastern
Mālwa.4 The Betul plates of the Parivrājaka Mahāraja
Saṁkshobha, dated in the year 199 G. E., i.e., 518 A.D.,
‘during the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta King,”
testify to the fact that the Gupta sway at this period was
acknowledged in Ṯabhālā, which included the Tripuri
Vishaya (Jabalpur region).5 Another inscription of
Saṁkshobha found in the valley near the village of Khoh

1 Smith, The Oxford History of India, additions and corrections, p. 171.
2 For the probable causes of decline, see Calcutta Review, April, 1930,
p. 36 ff; also post. 666 ff.
4 Śrīmati pravardhamāna vijaya-rājye saṁvatsara-sate nava-navaty-
uttare Gupta-nripa-rājya bhuktu. “In the glorious, augmenting and victorious
reign, in a century of years increased by ninety-nine, in the enjoyment of
sovereignty by the Gupta King.”
in Baghēlkhand, dated in A.D. 528, proves that the Gupta Empire included some of the central districts even in A.D. 528.¹ Fifteen years later the grant of a village in the Koṭivarsha Vishaya (Dinājpur District) of Puṇḍravar-dhana-bhūkti (roughly North Bengal) ‘during the reign of Paramadaivata (the Supreme Divinity) Parama-bhaṭṭāraka (the Supreme Lord) Mahārājādhirāja (King of Kings) Srī……………Gupta,’² shows that the Gupta dominions at this period included the eastern as well as the central provinces. Towards the close of the sixth century a Gupta king, a contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushyabhūti³ family of Śrīkaṇṭha (Thānēsar), was ruling in “Mālava.”⁴ Two sons of this king, Kumāra Gupta and

¹ Fleet, CII, III, pp. 113-16, Hoernle in JASB, 1889, p. 95
³ This seems to be the correct spelling and not Pushpabhūti (Ep. Ind., I. 68).
⁴ “Mālava” was graced by the presence of the Guptas as early as the fifth century. This is proved by the Udayagiri inscriptions of Chandragupta II and the Tumain inscription of Ghatoṭkacha Gupta. In the latter part of the sixth and the commencement of the seventh century, it seems to have been under the direct rule of a line of Guptas whose precise connection with the Great Guptas is not clear. Magadha was probably administered by local rulers like Kumārāditya Mahārāja Nandana (A. D. 551-2?) of the Aumaṇa plate, Gayā Dist., Ep. Ind., X, 49, and the Varmanas (cf. Nāgārjuni Hill Cave Ins., CII, 226; also Pūrṇavarman mentioned by Hiuen Tsang and Devavarmā, IA, X, 110). For a detailed discussion see Ray Chaudhuri, JBRS, XV, parts iii and iv (1929, pp. 651 f.). The precise location and extent of the “Mālava” of the “later Guptas” cannot be determined. In Ep. Ind., V, 229, the Daṇḍanāyaka Anantapāla, a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI, is said to have subdued the Saptā Mālava countries up to the Himālaya Mountains. This suggests that there were as many as seven countries called Mālava (cf., also rice, Mysore and Coorg, 46). These were probably: (1) The country of the ‘Mālavas’ in the Western Ghats (Kanarese Districts, p. 569), (2) Mo-la-po Mālavaka āhāra of Valabhi grants on the Mahi governed by the Maitrakas, (3) Avanti in the wider sense of the term ruled by the Kaṭacchhuris or Kalachuris of the Abhona plates (sixth century) and by a Brāhmaṇa family in the time of Hiuen Tsang Chinese pilgrim, (4) Pūrva Mālava (round Bhilsa), (5) District round Prayāga, Kauśāmbī and Fatehpur in U. P. (Smith, EHI, 4th ed., p. 350n.; IHQ. 1931, 150f.; cf. JRAS, 1908, 561), (6) part of eastern Rājputāna, (7) Cis-Sutlej districts of the Pafilāb together with some Himālayan territory. The later Guptas probably held (4) and (5) and at times, Magadha as well. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (xii, 1. 96) whose date is not probably far removed from that of the later Guptas, associates Malava with Arbuda (Abu) and distinguishes it from Avanti. The rulers of Mālava and Avanti are also distinguished from each other by Rājaśekhara in his Viḍḍhaṭṭāla bhaṭṭāki, Act IV (p. 121 of Jīvānanda Vidyāśāgara’s edition). Early, in the seventh
Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon the princes Rājya-vardhana and Harsha of Thānesar. From the Aphsaḍ Inscription of Ādityasena we learn that the fame of the father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, marked with honour of victory in war over Śusūhitavarman, doubtless a king of Kāmarūpa, was constantly sung on the bank of the river Lohitya or Brahmaputra. This indicates that even in or about A.D. 600 (the time of Prabhākara-vardhana) the sway of kings bearing the name Gupta extended from “Mālava” to the Brahmaputra.²

In the sixth century Gupta suzerainty was no doubt successively challenged by the Huns and their conquerors belonging to the Mandasor and Maukhari families. In the first half of the seventh century the Guptas lost Vidiśā to the Kaṭachchuris and their power in the Ganges Valley was overshadowed by that of Harsha. But, after the death of the great Kanauj monarch, the “Gupta” empire was sought to be revived by Ādityasena, son of Mādhava Gupta, who “ruled the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans,” performed the Aśvamedha and other great sacrifices and assumed the titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja.

In the seventh century the Guptas seem to have lost Eastern Mālwa to the Kaṭachchuris. In the Vaiṣṇava plates issued from Vidiśā (Besnagar) in or about A.D. 608, a Kaṭachchuri king, Saṅkaragānaṇa received epithets that are palpably borrowed from the Allahabad Praṣasti of Samudra Gupta. The overthrow of the Kaṭachchuris was effected by the early Chalukyas of Badami and South Gujarāt. Fleet points out (CII, 14) that three of the epithets of Samudra Gupta are applied to the Chalukya chieftain Vijayarāja in the Kaira grant of the year 594 (IA. VII 248). Ādityasena of the later Gupta family, who ruled in the second half of the seventh century A.D., seems to be referred to in Nepalese inscriptions as ‘King of Magadha’. Magadha, now replaced Eastern Mālwa as the chief centre of Gupta power.

¹ Cf. Hoernle in JRAS, 1903, 561.

² An allusion to the later Guptas seems to occur in the Kādambari, Verse 10, of Bāna which says that the lotus feet of Kubera, the poet’s great-grandfather, were worshipped by many a Gupta:—

Bābhūva Vaiṣṇava vanha samhāva
dvija jagadgītāgravgraṅh satām
aneka Guptaśrīkṣiptā paṁkhaṇaḥ
Kubera nāmāṁśa ivu Svayambhuvaḥ.
We shall now proceed to give an account of Skandā Gupta’s successors. The immediate successor of the great emperor seems to have been his brother Puru Gupta. The existence of this king was unknown till the discovery of the Bhitarī seal of Kumāra Gupta II in 1889, and its publication by Smith and Hoernle. The seal describes Puru Gupta as the son of Kumāra I by the queen Anantadevi, and does not mention Skanda Gupta. The mention of Puru Gupta immediately after Kumāra with the prefix tat-pād-ānudhyāta “meditating on, or attached to, the feet of” (Kumāra), does not necessarily prove that Puru Gupta was the immediate successor of his father, and a contemporary and rival of his brother or half-brother Skanda Gupta. In the Manahali grant Madanapāla is described as Śrī-Rāmapāla-Deva-pādānu-dhyāta, although he was preceded by his elder brother Kumārapāla. In Kielhorn’s Northern Inscription No. 39, Vijayapāla is described as the successor of Kshitipāla, although he was preceded by his brother Devapāla. Smith and Allan have shown that Skanda ruled over the whole empire including the eastern and the central as well as many of the western provinces. He may have lost some of his districts in the Far West. But the coin-

1 JASB, 1889, pp. 84-105.
2 The omission of Skanda’s name in the Bhitarī seal of his brother’s grandson does not necessarily imply that the relations between him and Puru’s family were unfriendly as suggested by Mr. R. D. Banerji (cf. Annals of the Bhand. Ins., 1918-19, pp. 74-75). The name of Pulakesin II is omitted in an inscription of his brother and Yuvrāja Vishṇuvardhana (Sātāri grant, Ind. Ant., 1890, pp. 227f). The name of Bhoja II of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty is not mentioned in the Pātālgarh inscription of his nephew Mahendrapāla II, but it is mentioned in an inscription of his brother Vinayakapāla, the father of Mahendrapāla. Besides, there was no custom prohibiting the mention of the name of a rival uncle or brother. Maṅgalaśa and Govinda II are mentioned in the inscriptions of the rivals and their descendants. On the other hand even an ancestor of a reigning king was sometimes omitted, e.g., Dharapāṭha is omitted in his son’s inscription (Kielhorn, N. Ins., No. 464).
3 Kielhorn, Ins. No. 31.
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types of the successors of Kumāra Gupta, with the exception of Skanda Gupta and Budha Gupta, show that none of them could have held sway in the lost territories of Western India. Epigraphic and numismatic evidence clearly indicates that there was no room for a rival Mahārajādhirāja in Northern India including Bihār and Bengal during the reign of Skanda Gupta. He was a man of mature years at the time of his death cir. A.D. 467.1 His brother and successor Puru Gupta, too, must have been an old man at that time. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that he had a very short reign and died some time before A.D. 473 when his grandson Kumāra Gupta II was ruling. The name of Puru Gupta's queen has been read by various scholars as Śrī Vatsadevī, Vainyadevī or Śrī Chandradevī.2 She was the mother of Narasiṁha Gupta Bālāditya.

The coins of Puru Gupta are of the heavy Archer type apparently belonging to the eastern provinces of the empire of his predecessors.3 Some of the coins hitherto attributed to him have the reverse legend Śrī Vikramaḥ' and possible traces of the fuller title of Vikramāditya. Allan identifies him with king Vikramāditya of Ayodhyā, father of Bālāditya, who was a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu. The importance of this identification lies in the fact that it proves that the immediate successors of Skanda Gupta had a capital at Ayodhyā probably till the rise of the Maukharis. If the spurious Gayā plate is to be believed Ayodhyā was the

1 When sons succeed a father or mother after a prolonged reign they are usually well advanced in years. In the case of Skanda Gupta we know that already in A.D. 455 he was old enough to lead the struggle against all the enemies of his house and empire in succession. Cf. 566 n. 3 ante.

2 Ep. Ind., XXI. 77; ASI, AR, 1934-35, 63.

3 Allan, pp. Lxxx, xcvi.

4 Mr. S. K. Sarasvati attributes these coins to Budha Gupta (Indian Culture, I, 69a). This view, however, is not accepted by Prof. Jagan Nath (Summaries of papers submitted to the 12th All India Oriental Conference, Nagpur, 1946, Sec. IX, p. 11). According to Mr. Jagan Nath the reading is definitely Puru and not Budha. As to the title Vikramāditya, see Allan, p. cxxii. Dr. R. C. Majumdar (ASB, 4:4-49) adduces evidence in support of the view of Mr. Sarasvati,
seat of a Gupta *jaya-skandhāvāra*, or 'camp of victory,' as early as the time of Samudra Gupta. The principal capital of Bālāditya and his successors appears to have been Kāśī.¹

The identification proposed by Allan also suggests that Puru Gupta could not have flourished much later than 472 A.D., for a Chinese history of the Indian patriarchs belonging to that year mentions "Ba-su-ban-da."²

The evidence of the Bharsar hoard seems to show that a king styled Prakāśāditya came shortly after 'Skanda Gupta. Prakāśāditya may be regarded as possibly a biruda or secondary epithet of Puru Gupta or of one of his immediate successors. Even if we think with Allan that Puru had the title Vikramāditya there is no inherent improbability in his having an additional Āditya title. That the same king might have two "Āditya" names is proved by the cases of Skanda Gupta (Vikramāditya and Kramāditya) and Śilāditya Dharmāditya of Valabhi. But the identification of Prakāśāditya still remains sub judice. His coins are of the combined horseman and lion-slayer type. The "horseman type" was associated with the southern provinces of the empire of the Guptas³ and the lion-slayer type with the north.⁴

Puru Gupta seems to have been succeeded by his son **Narasiṃha Gupta Bālāditya.** This king has been identified with king Bālāditya whose troops are represented by Hiuen Tsang as having imprisoned the tyrant Mihirakula. It has been overlooked that Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya was the immediate successor of Tathāgata Gupta⁵ who was himself the immediate successor of Bud(d)ha Gupta.⁶

---

¹ CII, 285.
² JRAS, 1906, 40. This is now confirmed by the seal which represents Puru as the father of Budha (476-95).
³ Allan, p. lxxxvi.
⁴ Ibid., xcii.
⁶ *Fo-to-kio-to*. Beal, *Fleet and Watters* render the term by *Buddha Gupta*, a name unknown to imperial Gupta epigraphy. The synchronism of his second successor Bālāditya with Mihirakula proves that Budha Gupta is meant. We have other instances of corruption of names, e.g. Skanda is
COINS OF NARASIMHA

whereas Narasimha Gupta Bāładitya was the son and successor of Puru Gupta who in his turn was the son of Kumāra Gupta I and the successor of Skanda Gupta. The son and successor of Hiuen Tsang’s Bāładitya was Vajra¹ while the son and successor of Narasimha was Kumāra Gupta II. It is obvious that the conqueror of Mihirakula was not the son of Puru Gupta but an altogether different individual.² The existence of several kings of the eastern part of the Madhyadēśa having the biruda*Bāładitya is proved by the Sārnāth Inscription of Prakaṭāditya.³ Narasimha Gupta must have died in or about the year A.D. 473. He was succeeded by his son Kumāra Gupta II Kramāditya by queen Mitradevi.⁴

The coins of Narasimha and his successor belong to two varieties of the Archer type. One class of these coins was, according to Allan, apparently intended for circulation in the lower Ganges valley, and the other may have been issued in the upper provinces. The inclusion of Eastern India within the dominions of Bāładitya (Bālākhya) and Kumāra (II) is vouched for by the Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kalpa.⁵

transformed into Skandha in several Purānic lists of the so-called Andhra dynasty.

¹ Yuan Chwang II, p. 165.
² Drs. Bhaṭṭasālī and Basāk, who uphold the identification of Hiuen Tsang’s Bāładitya with the son of Puru Gupta, do not apparently attach due weight to the evidence of the Life of Hiuen Tsang, p. 111, which, as we shall see later on, is corroborated by the combined testimony of the Sārnāth inscription of Prakaṭāditya and the Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kalpa. The evidence of these documents suggests that Hiuen Tsang’s Bāładitya was identical with Bhānu Gupta and was the father of Prakaṭāditya and Vajra.
³ CII, p. 285. A Bāładitya is mentioned in the Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yaśōvarman (Ep. Ind., 1929, Jan., 98) and also a seal (Śrī Nālandāyām Śrī Bāładitya Gandhakudi, MASI, 66, 38).
⁴ It is suggested in Ep. Ind., xxi, 77 (clay seals of Nālandā) and ASI, AR, 1934-35, 65, that the name of Kumāra Gupta’s mother has to be read as Mitradevi and not Śrīmatī devī or Lakshmīdevī.

Bālākhya nāmasau nṛpatir bhuvita Pūrva-deśakaḥ
tasyāparyeta nṛpatiḥ Gauḍāṇām prabhasishnavah
Kumārākhya nāmaṁ ābhikhaḥ so'pir atyanta dharmaṇvān.
SECTION III. KUMARA GUPTA II AND VISHNUGUPTA

Kumāra Gupta II of the Bhitarī seal, son of Narasimha Gupta, has been identified with Kramāditya of certain coins of the Archer type that are closely connected with the issues of Narasimha Bālāditya. He is also identified with king Kumāra Gupta mentioned in the Sārnāth Buddhist Image Inscription of the year 154 G. E., i.e., A.D. 473-74.

Drs. Bhaṭṭasālī, Basāk and some other scholars think that the Kumāra Guptas of the Bhitarī seal and the Sārnāth epigraph were distinct individuals. The former places Kumāra, son of Narasimha, long after A.D. 500. But his theory is based upon the doubtful identification of Narasimha, with the conqueror of Mihirakula. According to Dr. Basāk Kumāra of the Sārnāth Inscription was the immediate successor of Skanda. In his opinion there were two rival Gupta lines ruling simultaneously, one consisting of Skanda, Kumāra of Sārnāth and Budha, the other comprising Puru, Narasimha and his son Kumāra of the Bhitarī seal. But there is not the slightest evidence of a partition of the Gupta Empire in the latter half of the fifth century A.D.

On the contrary inscriptions and coins prove that both Skanda and Budha ruled over the whole empire from Bengal to the West. We have already seen that according to the traditional account of the Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-mūla-kalpa the kingdom of Bālākhyā, i.e., Bālāditya and his successor Kumāra embraced the Purva-deśa (Eastern India) including Gauḍa (Western and part of Northern Bengal). How can we reconcile the rule of these kings with the contemporary sovereignty of a rival line represented by Skanda and Budha?


2 Dacca Review, May and June, 1920, pp. 54-57.


4 The seal of Budha Gupta (MASB, No. 66, p. 64) proves conclusively that Budha, far from belonging to a rival line, was actually a son of Puru Gupta. It also negatives the late date for Puru Gupta suggested by Dr. Bhaṭṭasālī.
IDENTITY OF KUMĀRA GUPTA OF SĀRNĀTH

is no cogent reason for doubting the identity of Kumāra of the Bhitarī seal with his namesake of the Sārnāth Inscription.

Kumāra II’s reign must have terminated in or about the year A.D. 476-77, the first known date of Budha Gupta¹. The reigns of Puru, Narasimha and Kumāra II appear to be abnormally short, amounting together to only ten years (A.D. 467-77). This is by no means a unique case. In Vengi three Eastern Chālukya monarchs, viz., Vijayāditya IV, his son Ammarāja I, and Ammarāja’s son, another Vijayāditya, ruled only for seven years and six and a half months.² In Kaśmira six kings, Śūravarman I, Pārtha, Sambhuvardhana, Chakravarman, Unmattāvanti and Śūravarman II, ruled within six years (A.D. 933-39); and three generations, of kings, viz., Yaśaskara, his uncle Varnata, and his son Saṅgrāmadeva ruled for ten years (A.D. 939-49). A fragmentary seal discovered at Nālandā

¹ One of the successors of Kumāra (II), son of Bālāditya, is according to the Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa, a prince styled Ukārākhyya. That appellation may according to Jayaswal apply to Prakāśāditya, for Allan finds the letters ru or u on his coins. But the identification of a prince whose designation was u, (Ukārākhyya), with Budha Gupta (Jayaswal, An Imperial History of India, 38), does not seem to be plausible. The passage in the Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa suggests a name like Upagupta, Upendra. Though there is no direct epigraphic evidence for the name Upagupta, the existence of such a prince does not seem to be improbable in view of the fact that an Upagupta is mentioned in Maukhari records as the mother of Iśānavarman [Āsirvadh (Fleet, CII, p. 220) and Nālandā (Ep. Ind., xxvi, p. 74) seals]. Cf. Bhānu Gupta and Bhānu Guptā, Harsha Gupta and Harsha Guptā, Mahāsena Gupta and Mahāsena Guptā. On the analogy of these cases it is possible that there was a prince named Upagupta, apparently the brother of Upaguptā. If this surmise be correct Upagupta may have to be placed in the same period as the mother of Iśānavarman, i.e., in the first half of the sixth century A.D., sometime after Budha Gupta. If u is the initial of Upendra (Vishṇu or Kṛiṣṇa) and not of Upagupta, it may refer to Vishṇu Gupta or to Kṛiṣṇa Gupta, just as Somākhyya has reference to the Gauda king Sāśānaka. The existence of a son of Kumāra Gupta II named Mahārājādhirāja Śrī Vīṣṇu Gupta has recently been disclosed by a fragmentary seal at Nālandā (Ep. Ind., xxvi. 135; IHQ, XIX. 19). It is difficult in the present state of our knowledge to say whether he was the immediate successor of his father, or had to wait till the death of his great uncle Budha Gupta. Those who place him and his father after Budha Gupta, have to dissociate Kumāra of the Bhitarī and Nālandā seals from the homonymous prince of Sārnāth. This is not improbable but must await future discoveries for confirmation.

refers to Kumāra's son Vishnu Gupta who is probably to be identified with Chandrāditya of the coins.

**Section IV. Budha Gupta**

For Budha Gupta, now known to have been a son of Puru Gupta¹ we have a number of dated inscriptions and coins which prove that he ruled for about twenty years (A.D. 477-c. 495).

Two copper-plate inscriptions discovered in the village of Dāmodarpur in the district of Dinājpur, testify to the fact that Budha Gupta's empire included Puṇḍravardhana bhukti (roughly North Bengal) which was governed by his viceroys (Uparika Mahārāja) Brahmadatta and Jayadatta.² The Sārnāth Inscription of A.D. 476-77 together with the Benares Stone Pillar Inscription of 159 (= A.D. 478-79) noted by Dr. D. C. Sircar (ASB, 6-12-48) (TRASB, 1949, 5 ff.) and Benares Inscription³ of 479 prove his possession of the Kāśī country. In A.D. 484-85 the erection of a dhvaja-stambha or flag staff in honour of Janārdana, i.e., Vishṇu, by the Mahārāja Mātrivishṇu, ruler of Eran, and his brother Dhanyavishṇu, while the Bhūpati (King) Budha Gupta, was reigning, and Mahārāja Suraśmichandra was governing the land between the Kālindī (Jumna) and the Narmadā (Nerbudda), indicates that Budha Gupta’s dominions included part of Central India as well as Kāśī and North Bengal.

The coins of this emperor are dated in the year A.D. c. 495. They continue the peacock-type of the Gupta silver coinage that was meant, according to Allār, for circulation in the central part of the empire.⁴ Their

¹ Seal of Budha Gupta (MAB, No. 66, p. 64).
² To the reign of this Gupta king belongs also probably the Pahādpur (ancient Somapura) (Rājshāhi District) plate of A.D. 478-79 (Mod. Rev., 1931, 150; Prabā 1398, 671; Ep. Ind., XX, 59 ff) and also a copper-plate of A.D. 488-9 (Ep. Ind., xxi, 52), originally found at Nandapura (Monghir District). For a possible reference to Budha Gupta in Purānic literature, see Pro. of the Seventh Or. Conf., 576.
³ JRASB, 1949, 5 ff.
⁴ Cf. also Mahābhārata, ii. 32. 4; Kālidāsa, Meghadūta, i. 45.
legend is the claim to be lord of the earth and to have won heaven,—found on the coins of Kumāra Gupta I and Skanda Gupta.

SECTION V. SUCCESSORS OF BUDHA GUPTA

According to the Life of Huien Tsang Budha Gupta was succeeded by Tathāgata Gupta, after whom Bālāditya succeeded to the empire.1 At this period the supremacy of the Guptas in Central India was challenged by the Hun king Toramāna. We have seen that in A.D. 484-85 a Mahārāja named Mātrivishṇu ruled in the Airikina Vishaya (Eraṇ in Eastern Mālwa, now in the Saugor District of the Central Provinces) as a vassal of the emperor Budha Gupta. But after his death his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu transferred his allegiance to Toramāna. The success of the Huns in Central India was, however, short-lived. In 510-11 we find a general named Goparāja fighting by the side of a Gupta king at Eraṇ and king Hastin of the neighbouring province of Ṭabhālā to the south-east of Eraṇ acknowledging the sovereignty of the Guptas. In A.D. 518-9 the suzerainty of the Guptas is acknowledged in the Tripūrī vishaya (Jubbulpore District). In the year 528-29 the Gupta sway was still acknowledged by the Parivrajaka-Mahārāja of Ṭabhālā. The Parivrajakas Hastin and Samshobha seem to have been the bulwarks of the Gupta Empire in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradeśa. The Harsha-charita of Bāṇa recognises the possession of Mālava, possibly Eastern Mālwa, by the Guptas as late as the time of Prabhākara-vardhana (cfr. A.D. 600). There can be no doubt that the expulsion of the Huns from parts of Central India was final.2 The recovery of the Central Provinces was probably effected in the time of Bālāditya whose troops are repre-

---

1 Beal, Si-yu-ki, II, p. 168; the Life, p. 111.
2 For the survival of the Huns in the Mālwa region, Sec Ep. Ind., xxiii., 108.
resented by Hiuen Tsang as having imprisoned Mihirakula, the son and successor of Toramâna, and set him at liberty at the request of the Queen Mother. The Hun king had to be content with a small kingdom in the north. It is not improbable that Bâlāditya was a biruda of the "glorious Bhanu Gupta, the bravest man on the earth, a mighty king, equal to Pârtha" along with whom Goparâja went to Eran and having fought a "very famous battle" died shortly before A.D. 510-11.2

Mihirakula was finally subjugated by the Janendra3 Yasodharman of Mandašor some time before A.D. 533.

1 Beal Si-yu-ki, I, p. 171.

2 In a Nâlandâ Stone Inscription (Ep. Ind., XX, 43-45) Bâlāditya is described as a king of irresistible valour and vanquisher of all foes. The last of the Bâlādityas mentioned in a Sârnâth Inscription (Fleet, CII, 285 ff.) had a son named Prakaṣâditya by his wife Dhavalâ. In the Aśā-Mañjusti-mūla-kalpa (ed. G. Sâstri, p. 637 ff.) Pakârâkhya (Prakaṣâditya) is represented as the son of Bhakârâkhya (Bhanu Gupta). Buddhist tradition thus corroborates the identification, first proposed in these pages, of Bâlâditya with Bhanu Gupta. Cf. now Jayawal, An Imperial History of India, pp. 47, 53. An inscription found at Guṇâighara near Comilla and certain seals at Nâlandâ disclose the existence of a king named (Yai)nâ Gu(pta) who ruled in or about A.D. 507 and must have been also a contemporary of Mihirakula or of his father (Prabâsi, 138, 675; IHQ, 1930, 53, 561). The seals give him the style Maharâjâdhirâja (ASI, AR, 1930-31, Pt. I, 230, 249; MASI, 66, 67; IHQ, XIX, 275) and suggest relationship with the imperial Guptas Dr. D. C. Ganguly identifies him with the Dvâdâsâditya of coins (IHQ, 1933, 784, 989). But owing to damaged condition of the Nâlandâ seal his parentage cannot be ascertained.

3 The ascription of the title of Vikramâditya to Yasodharman of Mandašor, and the representation of this chief as a ruler of Ujjain, the father of Śilâditya of Mo-la-po and the father-in-law of Prabhâkara-vardhana are absolutely unwarrented. According to Father Heras (JBO, 1927, March, 8-9) the defeat of Mihirakula at the hands of Bâlâditya took place after the Hun king's conflict with Yasodharman. It should, however, be remembered that at the time of the war with Bâlâditya Mihirakula was a paramount sovereign to whom the king of Magadha had been tributary, and with whom he dared not fight, being only anxious to conceal his poor person (Beal, Si-yu-ki, Vol. I, p. 168). This is hardly possible after the Janendra of Mandašor had compelled the Hun "to pay respect to his two feet". The victory of Bâlâditya over Mihirakula was certainly not decisive. The "loss of the royal estate" was only temporary, and the tyrant soon placed himself on the throne of Kaśmîra and conquered Gandhâra (Beal, Si-yu-ki, I, p. 171). To the court-poet of Yasodharman Mihirakula was pre-eminently a king of the Himâlayan region. This is clear from the following passage which was misunderstood by Fleet whose interpretation has been followed by Father Heras (p. 8 n):—

"He (Yasodharman) to whose feet respect was paid—by even that (famous)
Line 6 of the Mandaśor Stone Pillar Inscription leaves the impression that in the time of Yaśodharman Mihirakula was the king of a Himalayan country ("small kingdom in the north"), i.e., Kaśmīra and that neighbourhood, who was compelled "to pay respect to the two feet" of the victorious Janendra probably when the latter carried his arms to "the mountain of snow the tablelands of which are embraced by the Gaṅgā."

Yaśodharman claims to have extended his sway as far as the Lauhitya or Brahmaputra in the east. It is not improbable that he defeated and killed Vajra the son of Bālāditya, and extinguished the viceregal family of the Dattas of Puṇḍra-vardhana. Hiuen Tsang mentions a king of Central India as the successor of Vajra. The Dattas, who governed Puṇḍra-vardhana from the time of Kumāra Gupta I, disappear about this time. But Yaśodharman's success must have been short-lived, because in A.D. 543-44, ten years after the Mandaśor inscription which mentions the Janendra Yaśodharman as victorious, the son (?) and viceroy of a Gupta paramabhāṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja prithivipati, 'supreme sovereign, king of kings, lord of the earth', and not any official of the Central Indian Janendra, was governing the Puṇḍra-vardhana-bhukti, a province which lay between the Indian interior and the Lauhitya.

king Mihirakula, whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save (the god) Śhānu and embraced by whose arms the mountain of snow falsely prides itself as being styled an inaccessible fortress" (Kielhorn in Ind. Ant., 1885, p. 219). Kielhorn's interpretation was accepted by Fleet. [The statement that Mihirakula's head "had never been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save (the god) Śhānu" shows that he refused to do homage to Bālāditya, and probably accounts for the order, given for his execution by that king.]

1 CII, pp. 146-147; Jayaswal, The Historical Position of Kalki, p. 9.
2 If the identification of Bālāditya with Bhānu Gupta first proposed in these pages is correct, his son Vajra may be identified with Vahārākhya, the younger brother (ānuj) of the Prakṛāditya of the Sārnāth Inscription (Fleet, CII, 284 ff.)—the Pāhārākhya of the Ārya-Maṇjuśrī-māla-kalpa who is represented as the son of Bhāhrākhya, i.e., Bhānu Gupta (ed. G. Śastri, pp. 687-44). Prakṛāditya is represented in the inscription named above as the son of Bālāditya by Dхavallī. Cf. now Jayaswal, An Imperial History of India, pp. 47, 53, 56, 63.
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THE LINE OF KRISHNA GUPTA

SECTION VI. THE LINE OF KRISHNA GUPTA

The name of the Gupta emperor in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 543-44 is unfortunately lost. The Apḫsaḵ Inscription, however, discloses the names of a number of “Gupta” kings,¹ the fourth of whom, Kumāra Gupta (III), was a contemporary of Iṣānavarman Maukhari who is known from the Harāhā Inscription to have been ruling in A.D. 554.² Kumāra Gupta III, and his three predecessors, viz., Krīṣṇa, Harsha and Jīvita, should probably be placed in the period between A.D. 510, the date of Bhanu Gupta, and 554, the date of Iṣānavarman. It is possible, but by no means certain, that one of these kings is identical with the Gupta emperor mentioned in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 543-44.³ The absence of high-sounding titles like Mahārājādhirāja or Parama-bhaṭṭāraka

¹ Although the rulers, the names of most of whom ended in—gupta, mentioned in the Apḫsaḵ and connected contemporary epigraphs, who ruled over the provinces in the heart of the early Gupta empire, are called “Guptas” for the sake of convenience, their relationship with the early Guptakula or Guptavahsa is not known. It is, however, to be noted that some of them (e.g., Kumāra Gupta and Deva Gupta), bore names that are found in the earlier family, and Krīṣṇa Gupta, the founder of the line, has been identified by some with Govinda Gupta, son of Chandra Gupta II. But the last suggestion is hardly acceptable, because Govinda must have flourished more than half a century before Krīṣṇa Gupta. And it is surprising that the panegyrists of Krīṣṇa Gupta’s descendants should have omitted all references to the early Guptas if their patrons could really lay claim to such an illustrious ancestry. In the Apḫsaḵ inscription the dynasty is described simply as Sad-vahsa ‘of good lineage’. The designation Gupta, albeit not “Early Imperial Gupta”, is possibly justified by the evidence of Bāṇa. The Guptas and the Gupta Kulaṇḍutra mentioned in Bāṇa’s Kādambari and Harsha-charita may refer to the family of Krīṣṇa, if not to some hitherto unknown descen- dants of the early imperial line. One of the princes of the early Gupta line, Ghatotkacha Gupta of the Tumain inscription is known to have ruled over Eastern Mālwa and it is not impossible that Krīṣṇa Gupta was, in some way, connected with him. We must, however, await future discoveries to clear up the point.

³ Mr. Y. R. Gupke (Ind. Hist. Journal) reads the name of Kumāra in the inscription of A.D. 543-44, but he identifies him with the son of Narasimha Gupta. The ruler whose name is missing may represent one or other of the “Gupta” lines already known to scholars or some new line. Cf. the cases of Vainya Gupta and the princes mentioned on pp. 814-15 of Ep. Ind., xx, Appendix.
in the Ślokas or verses of the Apśaḍa Inscription does not necessarily prove that the kings mentioned there were petty chiefs. No such titles are attached to the name of Kumāra I in the Mandaśor Inscription, or to the name of Budha in the Eraṇ Inscription. On the other hand the queen of Mādhava Gupta, one of the least powerful kings mentioned in the Apśaḍa Inscription, is called Parama-bhaṭṭārikā and Mahādevī in the Déo Baraṇārk epigraph.

Regarding Krishna Gupta we know very little. The Apśaḍa Inscription describes him as a hero whose arm played the part of a lion, in bruising the foreheads of the array of the rutting elephants of (his) haughty enemy (dṛiptārāti), (and) in being victorious by (its) prowess over countless foes. The dṛiptārāti against whom he had to fight may have been Yaśodharman. The next king Deva Śrī Harsha Gupta had to engage in terrible contests with those who were “averse to the abode of the goddess of fortune being with (him, her) own lord.” There were wounds from many weapons on his chest. The name of the enemies, who tried to deprive him of his rightful possessions, are not given. Harsha’s son Jivita Gupta I probably succeeded in re-establishing the power of his family in the territory lying between the Himālayas and the sea, apparently in Eastern India. “The very terrible scorching fever (of fear) left not (his) haughty foes, even though they stood on seaside shores that were cool with the flowing and ebbing currents of water, (and) were covered with the branches of plantain trees severed by the trunks of elephants roaming through the lofty groves of palmyra palms; (or) even though they stood on (that) mountain (Himālaya) which is cold with the water of the rushing and waving torrents full of snow.” The “haughty foes” on seaside shores were probably the Gauḍas who had already launched into a career of conquest about this time and who are described as living on the sea shore (samudr-āśraya) in the Harāhā Inscription of A.D. 554.¹ The other ene-

¹ Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 110 et seq.
emies may have included ambitious Kumārāmalīyas like Nandana of the Amauna plate.

The next king, Kumāra Gupta III had to encounter a sea of troubles. The Gauḍas were issuing from their “proper realm” which was in Western Bengal as it bordered on the sea and included Karṇasuvargā and Rāḍhāpuri. The lord of the Andhras who had thousands of three-fold rutting elephants, and the Śūlikas who had an army of countless galloping horses, were powers to be reckoned with. The Andhra king was probably Mādhavavarman (I. Janāśraya) of the Polamuru plates belonging to the Vishnukundin family who “crossed the river Godāvari with the desire to conquer the eastern region” and performed eleven horse-sacrifices. The Śūlikas were probably the Chalukyas. In the Mahākūta pillar inscription the name appears as Chalikya. In the Gujarāt records we find the forms Solaki and Solāṇki. Śūlika may have been another dialectic variant. The Mahākūta pillar inscription tells us that in the sixth century A.D., Kīrtivarman I of the “Chalikya” dynasty gained victories over the kings of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Magadha, etc. His father is known to have performed the Aśvamedhā sacrifice, “the super-eminent touch-stone to test the might of warriors conquering the world and an indication of the conquest of all the warriors.” Prince Kīrtivarmā may have been entrusted with the guardianship of the sacrificial steed that had to roam about for a year in the territories of the rulers to whom a challenge was thrown by the performer of the sacrifice.

A new power was rising in the Upper Ganges Valley

1 M. Chakravarti, JASB, 1908, p. 274.
2 Prabodha-chandrodaya, Act II.
3 Dubreuil, AHD, p. 92 and D. C. Sircar, IHQ, 1933, 276 ff.
4 In the Brihat-Saṁhitā, IX. 15; XIV. 8, the Śūlikas and Saṅvikas are associated with Aparānta (N. Koṅkan), Vanavāsī (Kanara) and Vidarbha (Berar). In Brih. Saṁ., IX. 21, X. 7, XVI. 33, however, they are associated with Gandhāra and Vokkāṇa (Wakhan). A branch of the people may have dwelt in the north-west. In JRAS, 1912, 128, we have a reference to Kulastambha of the Śulki family. Tārāntāha (Ind. Ant., IV, 384) places the kingdom of “Śulik” beyond “Togara” (Ter in the Deccan ?).
which was destined to engage in a death grapple with the Guptas for the mastery of Northern India. This was the Mukhara or Maukhari power. The Maukhari claimed descent from the hundred sons whom king Āśvapati got from Vaivasvata, i.e., Yama (not Manu). The family consisted of several distinct groups. The stone inscriptions of one group have been discovered in the Jaunpur and Bārā Bankī districts of the Uttar Pradesh, while lithic records of another group have been discovered in the Gaya district of Bihar. A third family has left inscription at Badvā in the Kotah state in Rājputāna. The Maukhari of Gaya, namely, Yajñavarman, Sārdulavarman and Anantavarman were a feudatory family. Sārdula is expressly called sāṃanta chūdāna, ‘crest-jewel of vassal chiefs’ in the Barābar Hill Cave Inscription of his son.

The Badvā Maukhari held the office of general or military governor under some Prince of Western India in the third century A.D. The Maukharis of the Uttar Pradesh probably also held a subordinate rank at first. The earliest princes of this family, viz., Harivarman, Ādityavarman,

---


2 Mbh., III, 296, 98 ff. The reference is undoubtedly to the hundred sons that Āśvapati obtained as a boon from Yama on the intercession of his daughter Savitri. It is surprising that some writers still identify the Vaivasvata of the Maukharī record with Manu.

3 CII, p. 223. The connection of the Maukharis with Gaya is very old. This is proved by the clay seal with the inscription Mokhalisā, or Mokhaliṣām (Fleet, CII, 141), to which attention has already been drawn above. A reference to the Mokharis seems also to occur in the Chandravalli Stone Inscription of the Kadamba king Mayūrasrman (Arch. Survey of Mysore, A. R. 1929, pp. 59 ff). Dr. Tripathi finds a possible reference in the Mahābhāshya (JBORS, 1934, March). For the Badvā ins., see Ep. Ind., XXIII, 42 ff. (Altekar).

4 In literature the Maukharī line of U. P. is associated with the city of Kanauj which may have been the capital at one time. Cf. C. V. Vaidya, Mediaeval Hindu India, I, pp. 9, 33: Aravamuthan, the Kaveri, the Maukharīs and the Sangam Age, p. 101. Hiuen Tsang, however, declares Kanauj to have been included within the realm of the House of Pushyabhūti even before Harsha. A Gupta noble was in possession of Kusāthala (Kanauj) for some time after the death of Rājyavardhana and before the rise of Harsha. (Harsha-Charita, Parab's ed., pp. 228, 249).
and Iśvaravarman, were simply Mahārājas. Ādityavarman's wife was Harsha Guptā, probably a sister of king Harsha Gupta. The wife of his son and successor Iśvaravarman was also probably a Gupta princess named Upa-Guptā. In the Harāhā inscription Iśānavarman, son of Iśvaravarman and Upa-Guptā,¹ claims victories over the Andhras,² the Śūlikas and the Gaudas and is the first to assume the Imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja. It was this which probably brought him into conflict with king Kumāra Gupta III.³ Thus began a duel between the Maukharis and the Guptas which ended only when the latter with the help of the Gaudās wiped out the Maukhari power in the time of Graha varman, brother-in-law of Harshavardhana.⁴

We have seen that Iśānavarman’s mother and grandmother were probably Gupta princesses. The mother of Prabhākara vardhanā, the other empire-builder of the second half of the sixth century, appears also to have been a Gupta princess. It seems that the Gupta marriages in this period were as efficacious in stimulating imperial ambition⁵ as the Lichchhavī marriages of more ancient times.

Kumāra Gupta III claims to have "churned that formidable milk-ocean, the cause of the attainment of fortune, which was the army of the glorious Iśānavarman, a very moon among kings."⁶ This is not an empty boast, for the Maukhari records do not claim any victory over

¹ Fleet, CII, 230.
² The victory over the Andhras is also alluded to in the Jaunpur stone inscription (CII. p. 239) which, according to Fleet, also seems to refer to a conflict with Dhārā, the capital of Western Mālava (?). Dr. Basāk thinks that Dhārā in this passage refers to the edge of the sword (Hist. N. E. Ind., 109).
³ Any one acquainted with the history of Europe knows that enumeration as I, II, III etc. need not imply that the kings in question belonged to the same dynasty.
⁴ The successors of Graha varman may have survived as petty nobles. With them a "Later Gupta" king contracted a matrimonial alliance in the seventh century A.D.
⁵ Cf. Hoernle, JRAS, 1905, p. 567.
⁶ Aphisād Ins.
the Guptas. Kumār Gupta III's funeral rites took place at Prayāga which probably formed a part of his dominions.

The son and successor of this king was Dāmodara Gupta. He continued the struggle with the Maukhari and fell fighting against them. "Breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūnas (in order to trample them to death), he became unconscious (and expired in the fight)."

Dāmodara Gupta was succeeded by his son Mahāsena Gupta. He is probably the king of Mālava, possibly Eastern Mālwa, mentioned in the Harsha-charita, whose sons Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon Rājya-vardhana and Harsha-vardhana by their father, king Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushyabhūti family of Śrīkaṇṭha (Thānesar). The intimate relation between the family of Mahāsena Gupta and that of Prabhākara-vardhana is proved by the Madhuban grant and the Sonpat copper seal inscription of Harsha which represents Mahāsena Guptā Devī as the mother of Prabhākara, and the Apsara inscription of Ādityasena which alludes to the association of Mādhava Gupta, son of Mahāsena Gupta, with Harsha.

1 The Maukhari opponent of Dāmodara Gupta was either Sūryavarman of Sarvavarman (both being sons of Iśānavarman), it not Iśānavarman himself. A Sūryavarman is described in the Sṛṣṭi stone inscription of Mahāśiva Guptā as 'born in the unblemished family of the Varmans, great on account of their ādhipatya (supremacy) over Magadha.' If this Sūryavarman be identical with, or a descendant of, Sūryavarman, the son of Iśānavarman, then it is certain that for a time the supremacy of Magadha passed from the hands of the Guptas to that of the Maukhars. The Deo-Bāraṇārk inscription (Bālaābad District) of Juvala Gupta II also suggests (CII, pp. 216-218) that the Maukhari Sarvavarman and Avantivarman held a considerable part of Magadha some time after Bālāditya-deva. After the loss of Magadha the later Guptas were apparently confined to "Mālava," till Mahāsena Gupta once more pushed his conquests as far as the Bāhūtya.

2 Reference to Mahābhārata XII. 98, 46-47; Raghuvamś, VII. 58; Kāvyādarsa, II, 119; Rājatavaāgini, I. 68, shows that the objections raised against the interpretation of Fleet are invalid. The significance of the touch of Sūrabadhū as distinct from a human being, is entirely missed by a writer in Bhand. Com. Vol. 181, and a reviewer of Dr. Tripathi's History of Ancient India.
The Pushyabhūti alliance of Mahāsena Gupta was probably due to his fear of the rising power of the Maukharis. The policy was eminently successful, and during his reign we do not hear of any struggle with that family. But a new danger threatened from the east. A strong monarchy was at this time established in Kāmarūpa by a line of princes who claimed descent from Bhagadatta. King Susthitavaran of this family came into conflict with Mahāsena Gupta and was defeated. “The mighty fame of Mahāsena Gupta,” says the Apsaḍ inscription, “marked with honour of victory in war over the illustrious Susthitavaran......is still constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohitya.”

Between Mahāsena Gupta, the contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana, and his younger or youngest son Mādhava Gupta, the contemporary of Harsha, we have to place a king named Deva Gupta II who is mentioned by name in the Madhuban and Banskhera inscriptions of Harsha as the most prominent among the kings “who resembled wicked horses,” who were all punished and restrained in their evil career by Rājya-vardhana. As the Gupta princes are uniformly connected with Mālava in the Harsha-charita there can be no doubt that the wicked Deva Gupta is identical with the wicked lord of Mālava who cut off Graharvan Gupta Maukhari, and who was himself defeated “with ridiculous ease” by Rājya-vardhana. It is difficult

1 And perhaps of other aggressive states mentioned in the beginning of the fourth Uchchhāsā of the Harsha-charita. The Lāta of that passage may have reference to the Katachhuri who finally ousted the Gupta from Vidiśa in or about A.D. 608. The Katachhuri (Kalachuri) dominions included the Lāta country in the latter part of the sixith and the first decade of the seventh century A.D. (Dubreuil, AHG, 8a).

2 See the Nadhanapur plates. A writer in the JRAS (1948) revives the theory that Susthitavaran was a Maukhari and not a king of Kāmarūpa. But no Maukhari king of that name is known. The association of Susthitavarman with the river Lohitya or Brahmaputra clearly shows that the king of that name mentioned in the Nadhanapur plates is meant.

3 The Emperor Chandra Gupta II was Deva Gupta I.

4 It is difficult to believe, as does one writer, that the Mālava antagonist of Graharvan Gupta and Rājya-vardhana was Buddharāja of the Kalachuri (Katachhuri) family. Had that been the case then it is rather surprising that a shadowy figure like Devagupta, and not Buddha-rāja, would be specially
to determine the position of Deva Gupta in the dynastic list of the Guptas. He may have been the eldest son of Mahāsena Gupta, and an elder brother of Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta. His name is omitted in the Aphaśaḥ list of kings, just as the name of Skanda Gupta is omitted in the Bhitarī list.

Shortly before his death, king Prabhākara-vardhana had given his daughter Rājyaśrī in marriage to Grahavarman, the eldest son of the Maukhari king Avantivarman. The alliance of the Pushyabhūtis with the sworn enemies of his family must have alienated Deva Gupta, who formed a counter-alliance with the Gauḍas whose hostility towards the Maukharis dated from the reign of Iśānavarman. As soon as Prabhākara died the Gupta king and the Gauḍa king, Śaśāṅka, seem to have made a joint attack on the Maukhari kingdom. "Graha-varman was by the wicked rājā of Mālava cut off from the living along with his noble deeds. Rājyaśrī also, the princess, was confined like a brigand’s wife with a pair of iron fetters kissing her feet and cast into prison at Kanyākubja." "The villain,

selected in the epigraphic records of the time of Harsha, for prominent notice among "the kings who resembled wicked horses," who received punishment at the hands of Rājyavardhana. It is the 'Guptas' who are associated with Mālava in the Harsha-charita which deals mainly with events till the rescue of Rājyaśrī. The rulers mentioned in connection with the tragic fate of the last of the Maukharis, the vicissitudes through which Rājyaśrī passed, and the struggles in which Rājyavardhana engaged, include Gupṭas and Gauḍas but no Kāṭachchuri king.

1 Hoernle. JRAS. 1905. P. 562. The suggestion, however, cannot be regarded as a well-established fact. Devagupta may have represented a collateral line of the Mālava family who continued to pursue a policy hostile to the Pushyabhūtis and the Maukharis, while Kumāra, Mādhava, the Gupṭa Kulaśūdra who conpired at the escape of Rājyaśrī from Kuśasthala (Kanaunj), and Ādityasena, son of Mādhava, who gave his daughter in marriage to a Maukhari, may have belonged to a friendly branch.

2 There is no reason to believe that Śaśāṅka belonged to the Gupta family (pace Allan, Gupta Coins, lxix). Even if it be proved that he had a secondary name, Narendra Gupta, that by itself cannot establish a connection with the Gupta line in view of (a) the absence of any reference to his supposed Gupta ancestry in his own seal matrix ins. or in the record of his feudatories, (b) the use of the Nandīdhūja to the exclusion of the Garuḍadhvaja, (c) his Gauḍa connection. The epithet 'Samudrāṭraya' applied to the Gauḍas of the sixth century A.D., can hardly be regarded as an apposite characterisation of the Guptas of Magadha, Prayāga or Mālwa.
deeming the army leaderless purposes to invade and seize this country (Thânesar) as well." Rājya-vardhana, though he routed the Mālava army "with ridiculous ease," was "allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the overlord of Gauḍa, and then weaponless, confiding and alone despatched in his own quarters."

To meet the formidable league between the Guptas and the Gauḍas, Harsha, the successor of Rājya-vardhana, concluded an alliance with Bhāskara-varman, king of Kāmarûpa, whose father Susthita-varman Mrigâṅka had fought against Mahâsena Gupta. This alliance was disastrous for the Gauḍas as we know from the Nidhanapur plates of Bhāskara. At the time of the issuing of the plates Bhāskara-varman was in possession of the city of Karṇasuvarṇâ that had once been the capital of the Gauḍa king, Saśāṅka, whose death took place some time between A.D. 619 and 637. The king overthrown by Bhāskara-varman may have been Jayanâga (nâgarajasamâhuayo Gauḍârâja, the king of Gauḍa named Nâga, successor of Somâkhya or Saśāṅka), whose name is disclosed by the Vappaghoshavâta inscription.¹ The Gauḍa people, however, did not tamely acquiesce in the loss of their independence. They became a thorn in the side of Kanauj and Kâmarûpa, and their hostility towards those two powers was inherited by the Pâla and Sêna successors of Saśāṅka.

In or about A.D. 608 the Guptas seem to have lost Vidiśâ to the Kaṭâchchuris. Magadha was held a little before A.D. 637 by Pûrṇavarman. Mâdhava Gupta the younger or youngest son of Mahâsena Gupta, remained a subordinate ally of Harsha of Thânesar and Kanauj and apparently resided at his court. In the period 618-27, Harsha "punished the kings of four parts of India" and in 641 assumed the title of King of Magadha.² After his

¹ Harsha-charita, Uchchhvâsa 6, p. 185.
² Ep. Ind., XVIII, pp. 60 ff; Ârya-Mañjuśrî-mûla-kalpa, ed. G. Śātri, p. 636. The name Jaya is also given in the Buddhist work.
³ Ind. Ant., IX. 19.
death the Gupta sovereignty in Magadha was revived by Ādityasena, a prince of remarkable vigour and ability, who found his opportunity in the commotion which followed the usurpation of Harsha’s throne by Arjuna (?). For this “Later Gupta” king we have a number of inscriptions which prove that he ruled over a wide territory extending to the shores of the oceans. The Aphsād, Shāhpur and Mandāra inscriptions recognise his undisputed possession of south and part of east Bihār. A Deoghar inscription, noticed by Fleet, describes him as the ruler of the whole earth up to the shores of the seas, and the performer of the Āsvamedha and the other great sacrifices. He renewed contact with the Gauḍās as well as the Maukharis and received a Gauḍa named Sūksham-śiva in his service. A Maukhari chief, Bhogavarman, accepted the hands of his daughter7 and presumably became his subordinate ally. The Dēo-Baraṇārāk inscription refers to the Jayaskandhāvāra of his great-grandson Jīvita Gupta II at Gomatīkoṭtaka. This clearly suggests that the so-called Later Guptas, and not the Maukharis, dominated about this time the Gomati valley in the Madhya-desa. The Mandāra inscription applies to Ādityasena the imperial titles of Parama-bhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja. We learn from the Shāhpur stone image inscription that he was ruling in the year A.D. 672-73. It is not improbable that he or his son Deva Gupta (III) is the Sakalottarā-patha-nātha, lord of the whole of North India, who was defeated by the Chalukya kings Vinayāditya (A.D. 680-96) and Vijayāditya.3

We learn from the Dēo-Baraṇārāk inscription that Ādityasena was succeeded by his son Deva Gupta’ (III), who in his turn was succeeded by his son Vishnu Gupta (II).4 The last king was Jīvita Gupta II, son of Vishṇu.

1 CII, p. 215 n. Āditya is said to have performed three Āsvamedha sacrifices.
2 Kielhorn, INI, 541.
4 This king seems also to be mentioned in an inscription discovered at Mangraon in the Buxar subdivision.
All these kings continued to assume imperial titles. That these were not empty forms appears from the records of the Western Chalukyas of Vātāpi which testify to the existence of a Pan-North Indian empire in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D. The only North Indian sovereigns, Uttarāpatha-nātha, who laid claim to the imperial dignity during this period, and actually dominated Magadha and the Madhya-deśa as is proved by the Apsāḥ and Dēo-Baranārk inscriptions, were Ādityasena and his successors.¹

The Gupta empire was probably finally destroyed by the Gauḍas who could never forgive Mādhava Gupta’s desertion of their cause and who may have grown powerful in the service of Ādityasena. In the time of Yasovarman of Kanauj, i.e., in the first half of the eighth century A.D., a Gauḍa king occupied the throne of Magadha.²

Petty Gupta Princes, apparently connected with the imperial line, ruled in the Kanarese districts during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries A.D. and are frequently mentioned in inscriptions. Evidence of an earlier connection of the Guptas with the Kanarese country is furnished by the Tālagund inscription which says that Kākustha-varman of the Kādamba dynasty gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings. In

¹ For a curious reference to the Chalukyas and king Jih-kwan ('Sun army' i.e., Ādityasena), see IA, X, p. 110.
² Cf. the Gauḍavya-ho by Vākpatirāja. Banerji confounds the Gauḍas with the later Guptas. In the Harāhā inscription the Gauḍas are associated with the sea-coast, Samudrāśraya, while the later Guptas, as is well-known, hail their centres in the hinterland including Magadha and Mālwa. The people on the seashore were, according to the evidence of the Apsāḥ inscription, hostile to Jivita Gupta I. The Praśastikāra of the Apsāḥ record is expressly mentioned as a Gauḍa, a designation that is never applied to his patrons. The family of Krishna Gupta is simply characterised as Satavāna and there is not the slightest hint that the kings of the line and their penegyrist belonged to the same nationality. The fact that Gauḍa is the designation of the lord of Magadha in the days of Yasovarman early in the eighth century cannot be taken to prove that Gauḍa and later Gupta are interchangeable terms. In this period lordship of Magadha is not inseparably connected only with later Gupta lineage. Cf. the passage Magadhahiti-patymahanāham jāta kuśe varmāṇām, which proves the existence of non-Gupta lines among rulers of Magadha in this age.
the fifth or sixth century A.D. the Vākāṭaka king Narendrasena, a descendant of Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya through his daughter Prabhāvatī Gupta, is said to have married a princess of Kuntala, i.e., of the Kanarese region. Curiously enough, the Gutta or Gupta chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya, lord of Ujjayini.¹

¹ Jouveau-Dubreuil, AHD, p. 76.
³ The account of the Later Guptas was first published in the *JASB*, 1920, No. 7.
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1 A. Ghosh, Two Maukharī seals from Nalanda, Ep. xxiv, 285. We have reference to another son of Avantivarman named Suva or Such. ............ who seems to have succeeded his father. Grahavarman too, has royal epithets in the Harsha-charita (pp. 149, 183). The order of succession is not, however, clear from available evidence.
APPENDIX A

The Results of Aśoka's Propaganda in Western Asia

The vast region beyond the western frontiers of India came within the geographical horizon of Buddhist writers as early as the Rāveru Jātaka, and possibly the Sussondi Jātaka, and its princes figure not inconspicuously in Buddhist inscriptions of the third century B.C. The records of Aśoka show that the eyes of the imperial missionary of Magadha were turned more to the West than to the East; and even the traditional account of early Buddhist proselytising efforts given in the chronicles of Ceylon, does not omit to mention the country of the Yonas where Mahārakkhita “delivered in the midst of the people the Kālakārīma suttanta,” in consequence of which a hundred and seventy thousand living beings attained to the reward of the path (of salvation) and ten thousand received the pāthajīva.” It will perhaps be argued that the Yona country mentioned in the chronicles is to be identified with some district in the Kābul valley, and is not to be taken to refer to the realm of “Antiochos, the Yona king, and the kings, the neighbours of that Antiochos, namely, Ptolemy, Antigonos, Magas and Alexander,” mentioned in the second and the thirteenth rock edicts of Aśoka. Rhys Davids, in fact, is inclined to regard the declaration in these edicts about the success of Aśoka’s missionary propaganda in the realms of Yona princes as mere “royal rhodomontade”. “It is quite likely,” says he, “that the Greek kings are only thrown in by way of make (weight, as it were); and that no emissaries had been actually sent there at all.” Sir Flinders Petrie is, however;

1 Mainly an extract from an article published in the Buddhist Studies (ed. B. C. Law).
2 Mahāvīra, Ch. XII.
3 Dr. J. J. Charpentier has contributed a paper to A Volume of Indian Studies presented to Professor E. J. Rapson in which he revives the suggestion of Prinsep (Hultzsch, Aśoka, xxxi) that “Amitavaka” referred to by Aśoka is Antiochos Soter (c. 281-61), and not his son Antiochos Theos (261-46). But his theory requires that Chandra Gupta ascended the throne in 327-25 B.C., that he was identical with Xandrames and that the story of his visit to Alexander (recorded by Justin and Plutarch) is a myth. The theory is opposed not only to the evidence of Justin and Plutarch, but to the known facts about the ancestry of Chandra Gupta. Unlike Xandrames, Chandra Gupta is nowhere represented as of barbar origin. His paternal ancestors are described as rulers by Brahmanical and Buddhist writers alike.
4 Buddhist Indiā, p. 298.
of opinion that in the Ptolemaic Period Buddhism and Buddhist festivals had already reached the shores of Egypt. He infers this from Indian figures found at Memphis. An epigraph from the Thebaid mentions as the dedicator “Sophon the Indian”.¹

Alberuni,² writing in the eleventh century A. D. says, “In former times Khurāsān, Persis, Irāk, Mosul, the country up to the frontier of Syria, was Buddhistic, but then Zarathustra went forth from Ādharbajjān and preached Magism in Balkh (Baktra). His doctrine came into favour with king Gushtasp, and his son Isfendiyād spread the new faith both in East and West, both by force and by treaties. He founded fire-temples through his whole Empire, from the frontiers of China to those of the Greek Empire. The succeeding kings made their religion (i.e., Zoroastrianism) the obligatory state-religion for Persis and Irāk. In consequence the Buddhists were banished from those countries, and had to emigrate to the countries east of Balkh ... Then came Islam.” The above account may not be correct in all its particulars. The statement that Buddhism flourished in the countries of Western Asia before Zoroaster is clearly wrong. But the prevalence of the religion of Sākyamuni in parts of Western Asia in a period considerably anterior to Alberuni and its suppression by Zoroastrianism and Islam may well be based upon fact. The antagonism of Buddhism to the fire-cult is hinted at in the Bhūridatta Jātaka.¹ It has even been suggested that Zoroastrian scriptures allude to disputes with the Buddhists.⁴

Four centuries before Alberuni, Hicuen Tsang bore witness to the fact that Lang kie(k)a-lo, a country subject to Persia, contained above 100 monasteries and more than 6,000 Brethren who applied themselves to the study of the Great and Little “Vehicles”. Persia (Po-la-sce) itself contained two or three Saṅghārāmas, with several hundred priests, who principally studied the teaching of the Little Vehicle according to the Saravāstivādin school. The pātra of sākya Buddha was in this country, in the King’s palace.⁵

The Chinese pilgrim did not probably personally visit Persia. But no doubt need be entertained regarding the existence of Buddhist communities and Saṅghārāmas or monasteries in Irān,

---

¹ Mahañy, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, 1531.
³ No. 548.
⁴ Sir Charles Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, III, 430.
Stein discovered a Buddhist monastery in “the terminal marshes of the Helmund” in Seistan.¹ Mānî, the founder of the Manichaean religion, who was born in A.D. 215-16, at Ctesiphon in Babylonia and began to preach his gospel probably in A.D. 242, shows unmistakable traces of Buddhist influence.² In his book Shābūrqān (Shapurakhan) he speaks of the Buddha as a messenger of God. Legge and Eliot refer to a Manichaean treatise which has the form of a Buddhist Sūtra. It speaks of Mānî as the Tathāgata and mentions Buddhas and the Bodhisattva. In Bunyiu Nanjo’s Catalogue of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka, App., II, No. 4, we have reference to a Parthian prince who became a Buddhist śramaṇa or monk before A.D. 148. In his History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon,³ Dr. Vincent Smith refers to a picture of a four-armed Buddhist saint or Bodhisattva in the guise of a Persian with black beard and whiskers, holding a thunderbolt (vajra) in his left hand, which has been found at a place called Dandān-Uliiq in Turkistan. Such figures are undoubtedly the products of a type of Buddhism which must have developed in Irān, and enjoyed considerable popularity as late as the eighth century A.D. which is the date assigned by Dr. Smith to the fresco or distemper paintings on wood and plaster discovered at Dandān-Uliiq.

It is difficult to say to what extent Buddhist literature made its influence felt in Western Asia. Sir Charles Eliot points out the close resemblance between certain Manichaean works and the Buddhist Suttas and the Pātimokkha, and says that according to Cyril of Jerusalem, the Manichaean scriptures were written by one Scythianus and revised by his disciple Terebinthus who, changed his name to Boddas.⁴ He finds in this “jumble” allusions to Buddha Sākyamuni and the Bo-tree. It may further be pointed out that some Jātaka tales show a surprising similarity to some of the stories in the Arabian Nights. The Samudra Jātaka,⁵ for instance, tells the story of the demon who put his beautiful wife in a box and guarded her in this manner in order that she might not go astray.

¹ Sir Charles Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, III, 3.
³ P. 310.
⁴ Cf. McCunnle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 185.
⁵ Terebinthus proclaimed himself learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians and gave out that his name was no longer Terebinthus but that he was a new Buddha (Buddhas) and that he was born of a virgin. Terebinthus was the disciple of Scythianus, who was a Saracen born in Palestine and who traded with India.”
⁶ No. 496.
But this did not prevent her from taking pleasure with others. The tale in all its essential recurs in the *Arabian Nights.*¹

The *Jātaka* verse,

"He his true bliss in solitude will find,
Afar from woman and her treachery"

is comparable to the statement of the poet in the *Arabian Nights*:

"Never trust in women; nor rely upon their vows;
For their pleasure and displeasure depend upon their passions.
They offer a false affection;
For perfidy lurks within their clothing."

Whatever may be the case at the present day, in times gone by Western Asia was clearly not altogether outside the sphere of the intellectual and spiritual conquests of Buddhism.

¹ Burton, *The Book of the Thousand Nights,* I. 12ff; Olcott, *Stories from the Arabian Nights,* p. 3; Lane's *Arabian Nights,* pp. 8-9. A similar story is found in Lambaka X, taraṅga 8 of the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*; Penzer, *The Ocean of Story,* Vol. V. pp. 151-52. "So attachment to women, the result of infatuation produces misery to all men. But indifference to them produces in the discerning emancipation from the bonds of existence."
APPENDIX B

A NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGICAL RELATION OF KANISHKA •
AND RUDRADĀMAN I

Some years ago² Mr. Haricharan Ghosh and Professor Jayachandra Vidyalankar contributed two very interesting notes on the date of Kanishka. The latter upholds the theory of Dr. Sten Konow, fortified by the calculations of Dr. Van Wijk, that the great Kushān Emperor began his rule in A.D. 128-29, and criticises the view put forward in this work that Kanishka I’s rule in the “Lower Indus Valley” (this and not “Sind,” is the expression actually used) could not have synchronised with that of Rudradāman I, who, “did not owe his position as Mahākṣatrapa to anybody else.” The conclusions of Professor Konow and Dr. Van Wijk are admittedly hypothetical, and little more need be said about them after the illuminating observations of Professor Rapson in JRAS, 1930, January, pp. 186-202. In the present note we shall confine ourselves to an examination of the criticism of Professor Jayachandra Vidyalankar and Mr. Haricharan Ghosh of the views expressed in the preceding pages.

The Professor has not a word to say about the contention that Kanishka’s dates 1-23, Vāsishka’s dates 24-28, Huvishka’s dates 31¹-60, and Vāsudeva’s dates 67-98 suggest a continuous reckoning. In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an era. But we know of no era current in North-West India which commenced in the second century A.D. He only takes considerable pains to prove that Rudradāman’s sway over Sindhuvārī (which he identifies with modern Sind) between 130 and 150 A.D. does not imply control over Sui Vihār and Mūltān, and consequently Kanishka’s sovereignty over Sui Vihār in the year 11 of an era starting from 128-29 A.D., i.e., in or about 140 A.D., is not irreconcilable with the rule of the Great Satrap in Sindhuvārī at about the same time. He is not oblivious of the difficulty of harmonising this limitation of Rudradāman’s power with the known fact of the Great Satrap’s campaign against the Yaudheyas in the course of which he claims to have uprooted that powerful tribe “in their country

¹ IHQ, March, 1930, pp. 149ff.
³ The earliest recorded date of Huvishka is now known to be the year 28
proper which was to the north of Suē Vihār" and, according to
the theory advocated by the Professor, "formed part of Kanishka's
dominions" at that time. He meets the difficulty by saying that
"the pressure of the Kausāna armies from the North had driven
the Yaudheyas to the desert of Marwar". Such surmises to explain
away inconvenient details, are, to say the least, not convincing,
especially in view of the fact that Maru finds separate mention in
the inscription of Rudradāman as a territory under the rule of the
mighty Satrap.

But is the contention of the Professor that Sindhu-Sauvīra did
not include the country up to Multān correct? Alberuni, who based
his assertions on the geographical data of the Purāṇas and the
Bṛihatsamhitā, made the clear statement that Sauvīra was equivalent
to Multān and Jahrāvār.1 Against this Professor Vidyalankar
quotes the evidence of Yuan Chwang who says that in his days
"Mou-lo-san-pu-lu," i.e., Mūla-sthāna-pura or Multān was a
dependency of the "Che-ka" or Takka country in the C. Pañjāb.
It should be noted, however, that the Chinese pilgrim is referring
to political dependence, and not geographical inclusion. India was
a dependency of Great Britain. But geographically it was not a
part of the British Isles. On the other hand, Alberuni does not
give the slightest hint that what he actually means by the equation
"Sauvīra, i.e., Multān and Jahrāvār" is political subjection of Multān
to Sind. His account here is purely geographical, and he is merely
giving the names of the countries, as taken from the Samhitā of
Varāhamihira with his own comments. Far from making Multān
a political dependency of Sind he carefully distinguishes "Sauvīra,
i.e., Multān and Jahrāvār" from "Sindhu" which is mentioned
separately.

The view that ancient Sauvīra was confined to Southern
Sind and that Sindhu and Sauvīra together correspond to modern
Sind, and nothing but Sind, is unsupported by any early evidence.
Yuan Chwang went east from Sin-tu above 900 li and, crossing to
the east bank of the Indus, came to the Mou-lo-san-pu-lu country.2
This proves that Sin-tu lay to the west of Mou-lo-san-pu-lu
(Multān), and was situated on the west side of the Indus. The
commentator of the Kāmasūtras of Vātsyāyana makes the clear
statement3 संथनानामिति | सिंचनामा नरवस्य परिवचनेऽन सिंचवेदवस्त्र सवानाम।
The major part of modern Sind was clearly outside the geogra-
phical (as opposed to the political) limits of ancient "Sin-tu" or

1 I. 308.
2 Watters, II. 254.
Sindhu and was, in the days of Yuan Chwang, included in the countries of A-tien-p’o-chih-lo, Pi-to-shih-lo, and A-fan-tu. Part of the modern territory of Sind may have been included in Sauvīra whose southern limits undoubtedly reached the sea, because the Milinda-Pañho mentions it in a list of countries where “ships do congregate”. We are informed by the author of the Periplus that “ships lie at anchor at Barbaricum” (at the mouth of the Indus). But the evidence of Alberuni leaves no room for doubt that the northern limits of Sauvīra reached Multān. A scholar like Alberuni thoroughly conversant with Purānic lore, is not likely to make an unwarranted statement. In fact, the inclusion of Multān within Sauvīra receives striking confirmation from some of the Purāṇas. The Skandapurāṇa, for instance, referring to the famous temple of the Sun at Mūla-sthāna or Multān, says that stood on the banks of the river Devikā (Devikāta):—

ततो मध्यमहिमाविषय मूलस्थानमिति भूतस्।
वैदिकायापत्ते रघु भार्स्कर वारितस्वरस्।।

In the Agnipurāṇa the Devikā is brought into special relations with the realm of Sauvīra:—

सोवीरराजस्य पुरा संबंधास्वत्तु पुणोहित:।
तेन चायतन विष्णोऽकारस्ते वैदिकायानः।।

According to Yuan Chwang, Sin-tu and Multān were neighbouring countries lying on opposite sides of the Indus. This is quite in accordance with the close association of Sindhu and Sauvīra in early literature.

पति: सोवीरसिन्धूं न्युन नुद्वायो जयस्व:।
काव्यवेदः दिबोनासाधयम् सोवीरस्तु सह सिन्धूभि:।
सिद्धविनोदिनिहने विचारादस्यायणं।।

Rudrādāman’s mastery over Sindhu and Sauvīra (in the sense in which these terms were understood by the Purāṇas, the commentator on the Kāmasūtras of Vātsyayana, Yuan Chwang and Alberuni) is clearly irreconcilable with the simultaneous sovereignty of Kanishka over Sui Vihār.

Apart from the identification of Sauvīra with Multān and Jahrain, is it unreasonable to hold that a power which exercised sway over ancient Sindhu and Maru, and fought with the Yaudheyas of Johiyawār, had the Sui Vihār region under its control?

Mr. H. C. Ghosh asserts that it cannot be proved that Ru-
dradāman held Sindhu and Sauvīra some time from 136 A.D. at least. He also thinks that the argument that Kanishka started an era “involves a petitio principii.” Now, we know that by 150 A.D. Rudradāman was “the lord of the whole of eastern and western Ākārāvanti, Anupānīvrīd, Ānartta, Sūrāśṭrā, Svabhra, Maru, Kachchha, Sindhu, Sauvīra, Kukura, Aparānta, Nīshāda, and other territories gained by his own valour.” The conquest of so many countries must have taken a long time, and the Andhau inscriptions show that one of the countries, at any rate, namely, Kachchha, had come under the sway of the Great Satrap as early as 130 A.D. On p. 277 of the Political History of Ancient India (second edition) it has been pointed out that “the name of the capital of Scythia (i.e., the Lower Indus Valley) in the time of the periplus was Minnagara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Sakasthāna mentioned by Isidore. Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the name of the western Kṣatrapas of Cashtana’s line, viz., ‘Dāman’ (-dama) is found also in the name of a prince of the Drangianian house of Vonones. Lastly, the Kārddamaka family, from which the daughter of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Karddama river in Persia.”

The facts noted above indicate that the Śaka sept to which Chashtana and Rudradāman belonged came from Sakasthāna in Irān through the Lower Indus Valley to Cutch and other places in Western India. In view of this and the contiguity of Cutch to the Lower Indus Valley, it is permissible to think that the date of the conquest of Sindhu and Sauvīra could not have been far removed from, and may have even preceded, that of Cutch (Kachchha). As the great Satrap retained his hold on these provinces till 150 A.D. it stands to reason that he was their ruler from c. 136 A.D.

As to the second contention of Mr. Ghosh, it may be pointed out that Kanishka’s dates 1-23, Vāsishka’s dates 24-28, Huvishka’s dates 28-60, and Vāsudeva’s dates 67-98, do suggest a continuous reckoning. To deny that Kanishka started an era is tantamount to saying that the dates of its successors, Vāsishka, Huvishka, and Vāsudeva are regnal years. But no serious student will contend that Vāsudeva’s dates 67-98 are to be taken as regnal years.
APPENDIX C

A NOTE ON THE LATER GUPTAS

It was recently urged by Professor R. D. Banerji that Mahāsena Gupta of the Apsaḍ inscription, father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, could not have been a king of East Mālava, and secondly, that Susthitavarman whose defeat at the hands of Mahāsena Gupta, in the Lohita or Lauhitya region, is mentioned in the Apsaḍ inscription, was not a Maukhari, but a king of Kāmarūpa.

The second proposition will be readily accepted by all careful students of the Apsaad epigraph and the Nidhanapur plate inscription, though some western scholars are still, I know not why, of a contrary opinion. As to the first point, viz., whether Mahāsena Gupta was a direct ruler of East Mālava or of Magadha, a student will have to take note of the following facts:—

(i) In the Deō-Barañārk Inscription of Jīvita Gupta II, which records the continuance of the grant of a village in south Bihar, we have reference to Bālāditya-deva, and after him, to the Maukharis Śravavarman and Avantivarman. Not a word is said about their later Gupta contemporaries in connection with the previous grants of the village. The inscription is no doubt damaged, but the sovereignty of Śravavarman and Avantivarman undoubtedly precludes the possibility of the direct rule of their contemporaries of the later Gupta line.

(ii) Inscriptions discovered in the Barābar and Nāgārjuni hill caves disclose the existence of another line of Maukhari "Varmans" who were feudatory (sāmanta) chiefs of the Gayā district in the time of the later Guptas.

(iii) Yuan Chwang who visited Magadha in the time of Harsha mentions Pūrṇavarman as the occupant of the throne of

---

1 Mainly an extract from an article published in JBORS, Sept.-Dec., 1929, pp. 561ff.
2 JRAS, 1928, July, pp. 681f.
3 Dr. R. C. Majumdar’s suggestion that the village in question may have been situated in U.P. has been commented upon by Dr. Sircar who points out that Fleet’s reading of the name of the village (on which Dr. Majumdar bases his conclusions) is tentative and unacceptable.
Magadha.\textsuperscript{1} He does not say a word about Mādhava Gupta or his father in connection with Magadha.

(iv) Bāna indeed, refers to Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, but he expressly mentions his father as the king of Mālava, and not of Magadha. The existence of two associates of Harsha, each bearing the name of Mādhava Gupta, one of whom was the son of a king of Magadha, is not known to the biographer of the great emperor.

From the evidence adduced above two facts emerge, \textit{viz.}, that the father of the only Mādhava Gupta whom the biographer of Harsha knew to be the associate of his royal patron, was a king of Mālava, and that before Harsha's conquest of the province in A.D. 641,\textsuperscript{2} direct control over Magadha was exercised, not by the Guptas, but by the "Varmans". The memory of "Varman" ādhipatya (supremacy) over Magadha had not died away even in the time of the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāsiva Gupta.

The only relevant argument that Professor Banerji urged against the view that Mahāsena Gupta, the father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, was "probably" a king of Mālava, is that "it was impossible for a king of Mālava to reach the banks of the Lauhitya without strenuous opposition from the kings" who governed the intervening region. But how did Professor Banerji solve the problem? By making Mahāsena Gupta king of Magadha, and assuming that "Assam very probably lay on his frontier and Rādhā and Vanga or Mithilā and Varendra were included in his kingdom." Anything in the nature of a proof he failed to give, but we were asked to accept his surmise because "in this case only is it possible for Mahāsena Gupta to have fought with Sus titavarman of Assam."

Regarding the possibility of a king of Mālava carrying his arms to the banks of the Lauhitya, attention may be invited to the Mandaśor inscription of Yaśodharman. In the case of Mahāsena Gupta a careful student of the Aphsaq inscription cannot fail to note that the way before him had been prepared by his immediate predecessors. Kumāra Gupta, his grandfather, had pushed to Prayāga, while Dāmodara Gupta, father of Mahāsena Gupta, claims to have "broken up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari"—the same power which we have already seen, held control of Magadha a little before Harsha's conquest of the Province. The Gauḍa expansion had

\textsuperscript{1} Watters, III, 115.
\textsuperscript{2} Ind. Ant., IX, 19.
\textsuperscript{3} Political History of Ancient India, Second Edition, p. 373.
already been stopped for a time by the victories of Isānavarman Maukhari. What was there to prevent the son of Dāmodara Gupta (who must have assumed command after the death of his father on the battle-field)\(^1\) from pushing on the Lauhitya?

\(^1\) Cf. Fleet Corpus III. pp. 203, 206. Cf. also Viṣṇu-viṣṇavāja motif ante. 606 n 1.
APPENDIX D

THE DECLINE OF THE EARLY GUPTA EMPIRE

Towards the close of the fifth century A.D. the empire built up by the genius of Samudra Gupta and Vikramāditya was fast hastening towards dissolution. Skanda Gupta (A.D. 455-467) was the last king of the Early Gupta line who is known to have controlled the westernmost provinces. After A.D. 467 there is no evidence that the Imperial Guptas had anything to do with Surāśṭra or the major part of Western Mālwa. Budha Gupta (A.D. 476-77 to c. 495) was probably the last prince of the family to be implicitly obeyed on the banks of the Lower Ganges as well as the Narmadā. The rulers who came after him retained a precarious hold for some time on Eastern Mālwa and North Bengal. But they had to fight with enemies on all sides, and, if a tradition recorded by Jinasena is to be believed, their power collapsed in A.D. 551 (320 + 231):

\[\text{Guptānām cha śata-dvayam}\\ \text{eka-trīṃśachcha varshāni}\\ \text{kāla-vidbhir udāhritam.}^4\]

1 First published in the Calcutta Review, April, 1930.
2 The identity of the supreme lord (Parama-vāmin) mentioned in connection with the consecration of the early Valabhī king Dronasiriha, is unknown. The surmise that he was a Gupta, though plausible lacks convincing proof. Some scholars lay stress on the fact that the era used is the Gupta era (IC, V. 409). But the use of an era instituted by a dynasty does not always indicate political subordination to that line. It may simply have a geographical significance, a continuation of a custom prevailing in a particular locality. Even undoubted Gupta vassals used the Mālava-Vikrama Samvat in Mandaśor. Conversely the Gupta era is found used in regions, e.g., Shorkot and Ganjam, beyond the proper limits of the Gupta empire. Tejpur, too, should possibly come under the category, as we are not sure as to whether it formed a part of the state of Kāmarūpa in the fourth century A.D. Equally conjectural is the identification of the ruler in question with a Hun or a sovereign of Mandaśor. Theories and speculations in the absence of clear data are at best unprofitable. Some connection of the later kings of the Gupta line with the Mandaśor region in W. Mālwa in the first quarter of the sixth century A.D. may possibly be hinted at by the expression Guptanāthaih ‘by the Gupta lords’ used in the Mandaśor prāfasti or panegyric of Yasodharman. The term nātha may have reference to the fact that the Guptas were once overlords of Mandaśor. But the analogy of Hūṃdāhipa occurring in the same record may suggest that nātha simply means ‘lord’ or ‘king’ without reference to any special relations subsisting between Mandaśor and the Guptas in or about 533 A.D.

3 Harivansa, Ch. 60.
4 Ind. Ant., 1886, 143; Bhand Com., Vol., 195.
The supremacy over Āryāvarta then passed to the houses of Mukhara (cir. A.D. 554) and Pushyabhūti (family of Harsha, A.D. 606-47) under whom the centre of political gravity shifted from Magadha to Kanauj and that neighbourhood. Attempts were no doubt made by a line of so-called later Guptas to restore the fallen fortunes of their family, but these were not crowned with success till after the death of Harsha.

The causes of the decline of the early Gupta Empire are not far to seek, though a detailed presentation of facts is impossible in view of the paucity of contemporary records. The broad outline of the story is, however, perfectly clear. The same causes were at work which proved so disastrous to the Turki, Sultanate of Delhi in the fourteenth century, and to the so-called Mughul Empire in the eighteenth, viz., outbreak of rebellions within, devastating invasions from without, the growth of a class of hereditary governors and other officials who commanded enormous influence in local centres, and assumed the titles of Mahārāja and Mahārājādhirāja, and dissensions in the imperial family itself.

Already in the time of Kumāra Gupta I, the stability of the empire was seriously threatened by a turbulent people whose name is commonly read as Pushya-mitra. The danger was averted by the crown prince Skanda Gupta. But a more formidable enemy appeared from the steppes of Central Asia. Inscriptions discovered at Bhitarī, Kura, Gwalior and Erān, as well as the records of several Chinese pilgrims, prove that shortly after the death of Kumāra Gupta I, the fierce Huns swooped down upon the north-western provinces of the empire and eventually made themselves masters of the Pañjāb and Eastern Mālwa.

The newcomers were long known to the people of India as a race of Uitlanders closely associated with the Chinese. The Mahāvastu mentions them along with the Chinas, while the Sabhāparva of the Mahābhārata includes them in a list of foreign tribes amongst whom the Chinas occupy the first place:—

Chinān Sakaṁs tathā ch Odṛān(?) Varvarān Vanavāsināḥ
Varṣheyeṇā (? Hāra-Hūnāṁścha Krishnān Haimavatānīṣṭhāḥ.

1 Ep. Ind., XIV, pp. 110-20; JRAS, 1906, 84ff. About this time (A.D. 554 or A.D. 564) as pointed out by Drs. Bhattachari and Sircar, king Bhūtivarman of Assam is found arrogating to himself imperial titles by the performance of an Asūmedha sacrifice. Cf. Bhāratavarsha, Kshātha, 1348, p. 83, etc. Ep. Ind., xxvii. 18f. Subsequently Sircar opines that he finds no Gupta year in the record.

2 I. 185.

4 The mention of the Odras in this connection is odd. It is tempting to read in the epic verse Chaḍotāmicha (instead of tathāchodrān). Chaḍota is the name of a territory in Central Asia near Khotan.
A verse in the Bhīṣmaparva brings the Huns into relations with the Pārasikas or Persians:

Yavanās Chīna-Kāmbojā dārunā Mlechchhajātayaḥ
Saktidrahaḥ Kulathāscha Hūniḥ Pārasikaiḥ saha.

This verse is reminiscent of the period when the Huns came into contact with the Sassanian dynasty of Persia. Kālidāsa, too, places the Huns close to Persia—in the saffron-producing country watered by the river Varṣkshu, the modern Oxus. Early in the reign of the Emperor Skanda Gupta they poured into the Gupta Empire, but were at first beaten back. The repulse of the Huns is mentioned in the Bhītarī Inscription and is also probably alluded to by the grammarian Chandragomin as a contemporary even. With the passing away of Skanda Gupta, however, all impediments to the steady advance of the invaders seem to have been removed and, if Somadeva, a Jain contemporary of Krishna III, Rāshtrakūta, is to be believed, they penetrated into Indian interior as far as Chitragūta. They certainly conquered the Eran district (Airikīna pradeśa) in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradesh. The principal centres of their power in India, in the time of their kings Toramāna and Mihirakula, were Pavvaiya on the Chināb and Śākala, modern Siālkot, between the Chenāb and the Deh, in the Upper Pañjāb.

Next to the Hun inroads must be mentioned the ambition of generals and feudatories. In the time of the Emperor Skanda Gupta, Surāśthra was governed by a Goptri or Margrave named Parṇadatta, who was appointed by the emperor himself to the Viceroyalty of the Far West. Shortly afterwards, Bhaṭārka, a chief of the Maitraka clan, established himself in this province as general or military governor, with his capital probably at Valabhi. He, as well as his immediate successor, Dharasena I, was satisfied with the title of Senāpate or general, but the next chief Dronasimha, the second son of Bhaṭārka (A.D. 502-03) had to be installed as Mahārāja by his suzerain. A branch of the dynasty established itself in Mo-la-po

5 Ind. Ant., 1912, 165f.
6 Ind. Ant., 1896, 105.
7 Bhand., Com. Pol., 216. Chitrakūta may be Chitor in Rājaputāna, or more probably the equally famous Chitrakūta on the Mandākinī in Central India, where Rama lived for a short time during his banishment. A Hūna-manḍala is mentioned in an inscription as being situated in the Mālwa region (Ep. Ind. XXIII. 109).
8 JBORS. 1948, March, p. 33; C. J. Shah, Jainism in Northern India, 210, quoting Kuvalayamālā (7th century A.D.).
(Mālavaka) or the westernmost part of Mālwa in the latter half of the sixth century, and made extensive conquests in the direction of the Sahya and Vindhyā Hills. Another, and a junior, branch continued to rule at Valabhī. In the seventh century Dhruvasena II of Valabhī married the daughter of Harsha. His son Dharasena IV (A.D. 645-49) assumed the imperial titles of Paramabhatṭārdaṇḍa Paramēśvara Chakravartin.

But the Maitrakas of Mo-la-po and Valabhī were not the only feudatories who gradually assumed an independent position. The rulers of Mandaśor pursued the same course, and their example was followed by the Maukharis of the Madhyadeśa and the kings of Navyāvakaśikā-Vardhamāna and Kanyasuvarna in Bengal.

Mandaśor, the ancient Daśapura was one of the most important Viceregal seats of the Early Gupta Empire. It was the Capital of a long line of margraves belonging to the Aulikara family who governed part of Western Malwa on behalf of the Emperor Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya and his son Kumāra Gupta I Mahendāditya. With the sixth century A.D. however, a new scene opened. Yaśodharman, ruler of Mandaśor about A.D. 533, emboldened no doubt by his success over the Huns, defied the power of the Gupta lords (Guptanātha), and set up pillars of victory commemorating his conquests, which, in the words of his court panegyrist, embraced the whole of Hindusthān from the river Lauhitya, or the Brahmaputra, to the Western Ocean, and from the Himālayas to the mountain Mahendra or the Eastern Ghāts. After his death the Guptas figure

4 Dharasena II, king of Valabhī, left two sons, viz., Śilāditya II-Dharmāditya and Kharagraha I. The account of Hiuen Tsang seems to suggest that in his time (i.e., shortly after Śilāditya) the Maitraka dominions split up into two parts, one part including Mo-la-po and its dependencies probably obeying the line of Śilāditya-Dharmāditya, the other part, including Valabhī, obeying Kharagraha and his sons, one of whom was Dhruvasena II, Bālāditya or Dhruvabhāra, who married the daughter of Harsha of Kanauj. The account of the Chinese pilgrim seems to receive confirmation from the Alina plate of Śilāditya VII (Fleet, CII, 171f. esp. 182f.) which associates Derabhāja, the son of Śilāditya I Dharmāditya, with the region of the Sahya and Vindhyā mountains, while the descendants of Kharagraha I are connected with Valabhī. The Naivalakhi and Nogāwā plates, however, suggest that occasionally the same ruler governed both Mālavaka and Valabhī. In the latter half of the seventh century A.D. the line of Kharagraha I became extinct, and the Maitraka dominions were once more united. For an alleged connection of the Valabhī dynasty with the Kanarese country, see Moraes, Kadamba-kula, 64f. The recently discovered Virdi copperplate grant of Kharagraha I of the year 907 (=A.D. 616-17) shows that for a time that ruler held Ujjain (Pro of the 7th Or. Conf. 65ff.). It is from the camp at Ujjain that the grant was issued.
1 Ep. Ind. XXVI. 130 ff; Fleet, CII, 153.
again as lords of Mālava (Eastern Mālwa) in literature and possibly in inscriptions of the time of Harsha. But Western Mālwa could not be recovered by the family. Part of it was, as we have already seen, included within the dominions of the Maitrakas. Another part, viz., Avanti or the district round Ujjain, the proud capital of Vikramāditya and Mahendrāditya in the fifth century A.D., is found in the next centuries in the possession of Śaṅkaragana of the Katakchhuri or Kalachuri dynasty and Kharagraha I of the Maitraka line which gave way to a Brāhmaṇa family in the days of Hiuen Tsang, which in its turn, was replaced by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Gurjara Pratihāras and other families.

Another family which came to the forefront in the sixth century A.D., was the line of the Mukharas or Maukharis. The stone inscriptions of the princes of this dynasty prove their control over the Bārā Bankī, Jaunpur and Gayā districts of the Uttar Pradeśa and Bihār. All these territories formed integral parts of the Gupta Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. In the next century they must have passed into the hands of the Maukharis. The feudatory titles of the earlier princes of the Mukhara line leave no room for doubt that they occupied a subordinate position in the first few decades of the sixth century A.D. In or about the year A.D. 554, however, Iśānavarman Maukharī ventured to measure swords with the Guptas, and probably also with Huns, and assumed the Imperial title of Mahārājaśādhīrāja. For a period of about a quarter of a century (A.D. 554-cir. A.D. 580) the Maukharis were beyond

---


1 G. Jouveau Dubreuil, Ancient History of the Deccan, 82.

2 Watters, Yuan Chwang, ii. 250. This family may have been connected with the viceroyal line of Naigamas mentioned in the Mandaśor Inscription of the Mālava year 589, of the time of Yaśodharman and Vīṣṇuvardhana. Abhayadatta of this family was the viceroy (Rājasthānīya, Sachiva) of a district bounded by the Vindhya, the Pāriyātra (Western Vindhya including the Aravalli range) and the Sindhu (the sea or a Central Indian stream bearing the same name). His nephew is called a nṛpati (king). Daksha, the young brother of the ruler, excavated a well in the year 589 (= A.D. 553-54).

3 Ind. Ant., 1886, 125; Ep. Ind., XVIII, 1926, 219 (verse 9 of Saṅjājā grant); cf. Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 177 (reference to a governor of Ujjain under the Pratihāra King Mahendrapāla II). In the Saṅjājā inscription it is claimed that at Ujjain an early Rāṣṭrakūṭa king made the Gurjara and other lords his door-keepers (Pratihāra). It is not improbable that, like the Paramāras, the Gurjara lords brought to Ujjain were for a long time feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the name Pratihāra had reference to their status under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, before the theory of descent from Lakṣmaṇa was adumbrated. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the home territory (Swaśīhaya) of Nāgabhata’s line was in Marwar as is clear from the Jaina Kuvalayamāla and the Buchkala inscription.
question the strongest political powers in the Upper Ganges Valley. They anticipated to some extent the glorious achievements of Harsha, the brother-in-law, and, apparently, the successor (on the throne of Kanauj?) of their last notable king Grahavarman.

Like the Maukharis, the rulers of Bengal too, seem to have thrown off the Gupta yoke in the second half of the sixth century A.D. In the fourth and fifth centuries Bengal undoubtedly acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gupta Empire. The reference to Samatā in Eastern Bengal as a prayanta or border state in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of the emperor Samudra Gupta proves that the Imperial dominions must have embraced the whole of western and central Bengal, while the inclusion of northern Bengal (Paundravardhana bhukti) within the empire from the days of Kumāra Gupta I (A.D. 443-44) to A.D. 543-44 is sufficiently attested by the Dāmodarpur plates. Samatā, though originally outside the limits of the Imperial provinces, had nevertheless, been forced to feel the irresistible might of the Gupta arms. The Harāhā Inscription of Iśānavarman, however, shows that the political situation had changed completely about the middle of the sixth century A.D. A new power, viz., that of the Gauḍas, was fast rising to importance in the valley of the Lower Ganges. Gauḍa was already known to Pāṇini⁴ and the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra. The grammarian seems to associate it with the East. A passage occurring in the Matsya, Kūrma and Linga Purāṇas has, however, been taken to mean that the Śrāvasti region was the cradle of the Gauḍa people. But the passage in question does not occur in the corresponding text of the Vāyu and Brahma Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata. In early literature the people of the Śrāvasti region are always referred to as the Kosalas. Vāsyāyana, the author of the Kāmasūtra, writing probably in the third or fourth century of the Christian era, refers to Gauḍa and Kosala as names of distinct countries. Gauḍa in the Matsya-Kūrma-Liṅga MSS. may have been inserted as a Sanskritised form of Gauḍa in the same way as the term Madra-mandala is

---

¹ For the date, see Ep. Ind., XVII, Oct., 1924, p. 345.
² VI. ii. 100.
³ II. 13.
⁴ Cf. VI. ii, 99.
⁵ Nirmitā yena śrāvastī Gauḍa-deśe dvijottamāh.
Matsya, XII, 30, cf. Liṅga, I. 65.
Nirmitā yena śrāvastī Gauḍadeśe mahāpurī (Kūrma, I. 20. 19).
⁶ Yujñe śrāvastikho tājā śrāvasti yena nirmitā (Vāyu, 88. 27; Brahma, VII, 53).
Tasya śrāvastikhe śreyah śrāvastī yena nirmitā (Mbh., III. 261. 4).
⁷ For Kosala, see dasanachchhedya-prakaraṇam; for Gauḍa, see nakhachchhedya-prakaraṇam and dāravakhi-prakaraṇam.
employed to denote the Madras Presidency, by some modern pandīts of the Southern Presidency, as well as other scholars and journalists who are unacquainted with the topography of Ancient India. In the Central Provinces the name “Gond” is very often Sanskritised into Gauḍa Varāhamihira, writing in the sixth century A.D., places Gauḍaka in the Eastern division of India. He does not include Gauḍa in the list of countries situated in the Madhyadeśa. Mention is no doubt made of a place called Guaḍa. But, if Alberuni ⁴ is to be believed, Gauḍa is Thanesar and not Oudh. The use of the term Pañcha Gauḍa as the designation of a territory embracing Northern India as far as Kanauj and the river Sarasvatī, is distinctly late and dates only from the twelfth century A.D. The term is possibly reminiscent of the Gauḍa empire of Dharmapāla and Devapāla, and cannot be equated with the ancient realm of the Gauḍas in the early centuries of the Christian era. The distinct statement in the Harāhā Inscription that the Gauḍas were on the seashore clearly suggests that the Bengal littoral and not Oudh, was the seat of the people in the sixth century A.D. In the next century, their king Śaśāṅka is ⁵ found in possession of Karṇasuvarnā near Murshidābad. In the century that follows a Gauḍa appears, in the Gauḍa-vahō of Vākpati-rāja, as the occupant of the throne of Magadha. The zenith of Gauḍa power is reached in the ninth century when the Gauḍa dominion extends over the Gangetic Doāb and Kanauj. About the early kings of the Gauḍas our information is meagre. Certain copper-plate inscriptions, discovered in the Faridpur Burdwan ⁶ Districts, disclose the existence of three kings—Dharmāḍitya, Gopachandra ⁷ and Śamāchāradeva, who are described as overlords of Navayāvakāśikā, Vāraka maṇḍala, and in one case, of Vardhāmāna-bhukti (Burdwan Division). The Vappaghoshavāṭa inscription introduces to us a fourth king, viz., Jayanāgā, who ruled at Karṇasuvarnā. These kings are, however, not expressly referred to as Gauḍas. The earliest king, to whom that epithet is applied is the famous Śaśāṅka, the great rival of Rājyavardhana of Thanesar.

⁴ Cf Gieger’s translation of Mahāvamsa, p. 62n.
⁵ Cf. Imperial Gazetteer of India. Provincial Series. Central Provinces, p. 188.
⁶ i. 300.
⁷ Mallasārula Plate (S. P. Patrikā, 1344, 17).
⁸ Gopachandra may be the Gopākhyā nṛpāti who was apparently a contemporary and rival of Prakaṭāḍitya, son of Bhānu Gupta (Arya-Maṭhjīri-mūlaakalpa. ed., G. Sāstrī, p. 647). It is not altogether improbable that Dha-kāḷākhyā (ibid., p. 644) is identical with Dharmāḍitya. Was he a younger brother (anuṣa) of Vākaraṅghya (Vajra) and Pakāḷkhyā (Prakaṭāḍitya)? If this surmise turns out to be correct he may have belonged to the Gupta line.
and his brother Harsha. The title Mahārājādhirāja assumed by the Bengal kings mentioned above, leaves no room for doubt that they no longer acknowledged the suzerainty of the Guptas and set themselves up as independent sovereigns.

The uprising of the Pushyamitras, the invasions of the Huns and the intransigentism of provincial governors and feudatories, were not the only sources of trouble to the Guptas in the last days of their sovereignty. Along with foreign inroads and provincial insubordination we should not fail to take note of the dissensions in the Imperial family itself. The theory of a struggle amongst the sons of Kumāra Gupta I may or may not be true, but there is evidence to show that the descendants of Chandra Gupta II did not pull on well together, and the later kings who bore the Gupta name sometimes took opposite sides in the struggles and convulsions of the period. The later Imperial Guptas do not seem to have been on friendly terms with their Vakāṭaka cousins. Narendrasena Vākāṭaka, a great-grandson of Chandra Gupta II through his daughter Prabhāvatī, seems to have come into hostile contact with the lord of Mālava. Narendrasena’s cousin Harisheṇa claims victories over Avantī. Inasmuch as the Guptas are associated with parts of Mālava as late as the time of Harsha, some of the victories gained by the Vākāṭakas must have been won over their Gupta cousins. In the seventh century A.D., Deva Gupta appears as an enemy of Harsha’s family, while Mādhava Gupta was a friend.

Lastly, it is interesting to note that while the earlier Guptas were staunch Brāhmaṇists, some of whom did not scruple to engage in sacrifices involving the slaughter of living beings, the later kings, or at least some of them, e.g., Budha (Buddha) Gupta, Tathāgata Gupta and Bālāditya had Buddhist leanings. As in the case of Aśoka after the Kaliṅga war and Harsha after his intimate relation with the Chinese Master of the Law, the change of religion probably had its repercussions on the military and political activities of the Empire. In this connection it is interesting to recall a story recorded by Hiuen Tsang. When “Mahirakula,” the Hun tyrant ruling at Śākala, proceeded to invade the territory of Bālāditya, the latter said to his ministers, “I hear that these thieves are coming, and I cannot fight with them (their troops); by the permission of my ministers I will conceal my poor person among the bushes of the morass.” Having said this he withdrew to an island with many of his subjects. Mihirakula came in pursuit but was taken alive as a captive. He was, however, set free and allowed to go away on the intercession of the Queen Mother.\(^1\) We do not know how far

Beal, Si-yu-ki, I, 166f.; Watters, I. 288-89.
the story is authentic. But it seems that Indians of the seventh century A.D. from whom the Chinese pilgrim must have derived his information, did not credit the later Buddhist rulers of the Gupta dynasty with the possession of much courage or military vigour, though they bear testimony to their kindness and piety. The misplaced clemency of Bālāditya and his mother helped to prolong the tyrannical rule of Mihirakula and gave Yaśodharman and the succeeding aspirants for imperial dominion, viz., Iśānavarman and Prabhākara-vardhana, an opportunity of which they were not slow to take advantage and thereby seal the doom not only of the Huns (Yetha), but also of the Gupta domination in Northern India.