

FOREIGN
DISSERTATION
39672

B 2632989

UC-NRLF



B 2 632 989

THE GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

OF THE

RAGHUVAMŚA AND DAŚAKUMĀRARĀRITA

CONSIDERED MORE ESPECIALLY
IN THEIR BEARING UPON THE DATE
OF THESE WORKS.

INAUGURAL DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE

PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY

OF LEIPZIG FOR THE ACQUISITION

OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

MARK COLLINS.



LEIPZIG

PRINTED BY G. KREYSING

1907.

Angenommen von der philologischen Sektion auf Grund der Gutachten der Herren Windisch und Brugmann.

Leipzig, den 31. Juli 1907.

Der Procancellar,
Des Condres.

Abbreviations.

- A. S. W. I. = Archaeological Survey of Western India.
Beal (S.), Buddhist Records. = Buddhist Records of the Western World.
2 vols. Boston 1885.
Bib. Ind. = Bibliotheca Indica.
Br. S. = The Bṛhat Saṃhitā of Varāha-Mihira. Edited by H. Kern.
Bib. Ind., Calcutta 1865.
C. I. I. = Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.
Cunningham (A.), Anc. Geog. = The Ancient Geography of India. Vol. I,
The Buddhist Period. London 1871.
Daśak. = The Daśakumāracharita of Daṇḍin with three Commentaries.
Edited by Nārayaṇa Bālkrishṇa Godabole and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang
Parab. 4th ed. Bombay 1898.
Daśak., ed. Bühler and Peterson. = The Daśakumāracharita of Daṇḍin,
edited with critical and explanatory notes. Part I, by Georg Bühler
(Bomb. Skt. Series No. 10) 1873. Part II, by Peter Peterson (Bomb.
Skt. Series No. 42) 1891.
Daśak., tr. Meyer. = Daṇḍins Daçakumāracaritam, die Abenteuer der
zehn Prinzen. Ein altindischer Schelmenroman. Zum ersten Male
aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt von Johann Jakob Meyer.
Lotos-Verlag, Leipzig.
Ep. Ind. = Epigraphia Indica.
Fleet (J. F.), Dyn. of Kan. Dist. = The Dynasties of the Kanarese
Districts. Bombay Gazetteer (1896) vol. I, part II, p. 277 ff.
Harṣac., tr. Cowell and Thomas. = The Harṣa-carita of Bāṇa, translated
by E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas. London 1897.
Ind. Ant. = Indian Antiquary.
J. A. O. S. = Journal of the American Oriental Society.
J. A. S. B. = Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J. R. A. S. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Lassen (Chr.), Ind. Alt. = Indische Altertumskunde. Bd. I, Geographie,
Ethnographie und älteste Geschichte. 2. Aufl. Leipzig 1867.
MBh. = The Mahābhārata, an epic poem, written by the celebrated
Veda Vyāsa Rishi. Edited by the learned pandits attached to the
establishment of the education committee. 4 vols. Calcutta 1834—39.

- Raghuv. = The Raghuvāṅśa of Kālidāsa with the Commentary of Mallinātha. Edited by Gopal Raghunāth Nandargikar. 3rd ed. Bombay 1897.
- Rām. Gorr. = Ramayana, poema indico di Valmiki. Testo sanscrito secondo i codici manoscritti della scuola gaudiana per Gaspare Gorresio. 5 vols. Paris 1845—50.
- S. B. E. = Sacred Books of the East.
- Smith (V. A.), Early Hist. = The Early History of India from 600 B. C. to the Muhammadan conquest, including the invasion of Alexander the Great. Oxford 1904.
- Viṣ. Pur., tr. Wilson. = The Viṣṇu Purāṇa: a System of Hindu Mythology and Tradition, translated from the original Sanskrit and illustrated by notes derived chiefly from other Purāṇas by H. H. Wilson. Edited by Fitzedward Hall. 5 vols. London 1864—70.
- Weber (A.), Ind. Str. = Indische Streifen. Bd. I. 1868.
-

The uncertain and conventional nature of Indian Geography.

The early geography of India shares much of the obscurity of the early history of that country. Of names there is no lack, but the uncertain chronology of Sanskrit literature makes it generally impossible to assign the geographical data of any work to a particular period. Neither of the great epics — the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa — was the product of one generation, and the geographical material with which they abound belongs probably to many periods. The Mahābhārata more than once makes mention of the Hūṇas,¹ and this epic at least must have been subject to additions as late as the fifth century A. D.²; and in later literature, even when the date of an author can be approximately determined, it is far from certain whether we have in his writings a faithful mirror of the geographical conditions of his time, or a

Geographical
uncertainty al-
lied to historical
uncertainty.

¹ MBh., ed. Calcutta 1834—39, I. 6685 (Hūṇa); III. 1991 (Hūṇa); VI. 373 (Hūṇa). The St. Petersburg Dictionary, from which these references are taken, records only one occurrence of this name in the Rāmāyaṇa, viz. as a *varia lectio* in the Bengal recension (ed. Gorresio, Paris 1845—50, IV. 40. 25). Here, instead of दण्डकूलाञ्च, one manuscript has पृहृणाञ्च, the first part of which is unintelligible.

² The Hūṇas appear to have made their first incursion into India about 455 A. D., when they were defeated by Skandagupta as recorded in this emperor's Bhitari inscription (Fleet, Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, No. 13; Vincent A. Smith, Early History of India, Oxford 1904, p. 208: see also *ibid.* p. 272 ff., and M. A. Stein, White Huns and kindred Tribes, Ind. Ant. XXXIV, p. 80 ff.). The name Hūṇa occurs frequently in literature after this date, and is even found in inscriptions of the tenth or eleventh century. M. Sylvain Lévi has pointed out that a certain Sindhurāja about 1000 A. D. boasts of having defeated a Hūṇa king, and that the Kaḷacuri Karṇadeva about 1100 A. D. married a Hūṇa princess (La date de Candragomin, Bull. de l'École française d'Extrême-orient, 1903, p. 52). In this latter case, as Bühler (following Fitzedw. Hall) has shown, Hūṇa is the name of a Rājput tribe. But these Rājputs, he suggests, may have been, wholly or partially, of Hūṇa extraction. (The Udaipur praśasti of the kings of Mālva, Ep. Ind. I, p. 225).

collection of more or less imaginary names, reminiscences of bygone days or echoes from the epic lore with which even a paṇḍit of to-day is often more familiar than with the actualities which surround him.

The same names found in various parts of the country.

This main cause of obscurity, which seems closely related to that national characteristic which banishes all unadulterated history from the field of Sanskrit literature, is increased by several minor ones, not wholly unconnected therewith. Conspicuous among these is the frequent occurrence of the same name in different parts of the country. We find Aśmakas in the north-west in the Bṛhat Saṃhitā,¹ and in the south in the Rāmāyaṇa (Bengal recension, ed. Gorresio, IV. 41. 17) and elsewhere.² The Puṇḍras, usually reckoned among eastern nations (Br. S. XIV. 6; MBh. II. 1096), are enumerated in the Rāmāyaṇa (IV. 41. 18, Gorr.) along with the Drāviḍas, Colas and Ceralas as a southern people.³ And the same epic places Oḍras and Ṛṣikas both in the north (IV. 44. 13 Gorr.) and in the south (IV. 41. 18, 16, Gorr.). It is not always clear, owing to uncertainty of date and the possibility of interpolation and borrowing, whether these names represent earlier and later settlements of one and the same tribe, or contemporary settlements of different branches of the tribe. The context sometimes decides. Kosala in the Buddhist Suttas is the northern country; in the Daśakumāracarita it is the southern. Sometimes distinctive epithets are employed, but this is exceptional.⁴ The Raghuvamśa, for example, usually styles the northern nation Uttarakośala; Kośala, however, occurs both for Uttarakośala and (once only)⁵ as the name of some other country, the home of Kauśalyā, the wife of Daśaratha. Some of the tribes whose names are found in connexion with the most various parts of India may have been more or less nomadic in their habits. The Nāgas, for instance, seem to have had in the fourth century several settlements in northern India and

¹ Ed. Kern, Bib. Ind., Calcutta 1865, XIV. 22.

² Daśakumāracarita, ed. Godabole and Parab, Bombay 1898⁴, p. 198: Sutta Nipāta, ed. Fausböll, Pali Text Soc. 1885—94, v. 977.

³ In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (tr. Wilson, ed. Hall, London 1864—70, vol II, p. 132) the chief nations lying south of the Kuru-Pāñcālas are given as Puṇḍras, Kalīṅgas and Magadhas. Here the Puṇḍras are probably to be placed in southern Bengal: in the Daśakumāracarita (p. 125) they are neighbours of Videha and apparently occupy northern Bengal.

⁴ Except, perhaps, in enumerations like that of the Digvijaya of MBh. II, adhys. 25—31. Here we find:

Prāgjyotiṣa	II. 1002.	Uttarajyotiṣa	II. 1193.
Kosala	" 1075.	Uttarakośalas	" 1077.
Mallas	" 1077.	Dakṣiṇamallas	" 1086.
Matsyas	" 1082.	Aparamatsyas	" 1108.
Suhmas	" 1090.	Prasuhmas	" 1090.
Sekas	" 1113.	Aparasekas	" 1113.
Kosala	" 1117.	Prākkośalas	" 1117.

⁵ Raghuv., ed. Nandargikar, Poona 1897³, IX. 22.

the Panjāb;¹ the town and district of Nāgpur testify to their presence at one time in the Central Provinces; and still further south we hear of a Nāgarakhaṇḍa, or territorial section of the Nāgas which in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries formed one of the divisions of the Vanavāsī province in North Kanarā.² Many names of physical features doubtless wandered with the migrations of the encroaching Aryans, who seem rarely to have adopted the aboriginal nomenclature. So it is that we find an Irāvati (MBh. II. 372: mod. Rāvī) among the tributaries of the Indus, and another further east (Pālī, Aciravati: mod. Rāptī) on which the town of Śrāvastī stood. Gomati, too, was the name of one of the streams of Sapta-Sindhava, the Gomāl,³ before it was used to denote the Guntī, a northern affluent of the Ganges. The numerous Sindhs⁴ (Sindhu) may owe their name to a similar cause; but in this case the word had come to be a general term for river. Some of these names, like Sarasvatī (Av. Harahvaiti, Gk. Ἀράχωρος), seem, indeed, to have been brought from the original home of the Indo-Iranians. It is curious that Varana, the ancient name of Bulandshahr in the United Provinces, corresponds very closely with Varena one of the sixteen regions enumerated in Vendidad I: possibly, like Harahvaiti and Ranhā (= Rasā) in the same list, the name belongs also to this primitive period.

Not only do we find the same name in different places, an intelligible though confusing phenomenon, but not infrequently different names are used for the same place, tribe or natural feature, a phenomenon not so intelligible and more confusing. This is often due to the Hindu love for synonyms, as when we meet with Kusumapura by the side of Puṣpapura, Śakraprastha by the side of Indraprastha.⁵ Sometimes it seems to be the result of divergent sanskritization of the Prākṛt original; Aśmaka and Aśvaka, for instance, may both represent the Prākṛt Assaka.⁶ Sometimes it is doubtless due to a want of knowledge, as when Sāketā is

Different names employed for the same place or people.

¹ Nāgadatta, Gaṇapatīnāga and Nāgasena, evidently Nāga-chiefs, were among the nine rulers of Āryāvarta exterminated by Samudragupta (C. I. I. III. No. I, l. 21); and the Maheśvaranāga, son of Nāgabhatta, whose name appears on a seal of probably the fourth century purchased by Cunningham at Lahore (ibid. No. 77) and presumably belonging to this region, must also have been a member of this race.

² Fleet, *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, Bomb. Gaz. 1896, I, part II, p. 281 note.

³ Rgveda X. 75. 6: Max Müller, *India, what can it teach us?*, Collected Works, Longman 1899, p. 166.

⁴ Three rivers bearing this name are found in Mālwa alone: (1) a large stream that joins the Chambal (Carmanvatī) near its confluence with the Jumna, (2) the Chhotī (little) Sindh and (3) the Kālī (black) Sindh, both tributaries of the Chambal (Lassen, *Ind. Altertumskunde*, 2nd ed., vol. I, pp. 145—46.)

⁵ MBh. II. 1057, 1104.

⁶ Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, London 1903, p. 28.

used for Ayodhyā.¹ In the case of non-aryan tribes and foreign nations the laxity of nomenclature is very conspicuous. Names of the various indigenous races are practically treated as synonyms: in the Daśakumāracarita members of the same forest horde are called Śabarās, Kirātas and Bhillas.² And similar confusion exists in connexion with the foreign settlers, Yavanas, Hūnas, etc. in the north-west and other parts of India. Even when these names appear side by side,³ it is scarcely to be understood that any clear distinction was present in the mind of the writer.

The traditional element in geography.

Tradition is a further disturbing element. Names appear to be handed down from author to author and used without any regard to the existence of the places and peoples concerned; and the geographical fancies of an early age are similarly propagated from generation to generation and sometimes find their way centuries later into the sober pages of technical literature. The nine-fold division of Bhāratavarṣa (India), for instance, given in the third book of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa is repeated as late as the twelfth century by the astronomer Bhāskarācārya (born 1114 A. D.) in his Siddhānta-Śiromaṇi;⁴ and the geographical section of Varāha Mihira's Brhat Saṃhitā (book XIV),⁵ containing an important list of peoples and places arranged under the traditional nine heads (Central, E., N-E. etc.), is taken, according to Kern, from an earlier work of unknown date ascribed to Parāśara; the form only has been changed, the matter being left almost intact.⁶ Similarly

¹ In the Raghuvamśa they seem clearly to be considered identical, and the commentator Mallinātha (e. g. on V. 31) ratifies this identification. But the fact that both names are found in Buddhist literature points to a distinction. Śaketā was one of the six great cities of Buddha's time (S. B. E. XI, pp. 99 and 247) and is frequently mentioned. Ayodhyā (Ayojjhā) is met with but rarely: it occurs in the Saṃyutta-Nikāya (ed. L. Feer, Pali Text Soc. 1884—1904, vol. III, p. 140.) where the town is said to be on the banks of the Gangā. Prof. Rhys Davids thinks they may have been adjacent cities like London and Westminster (Buddhist India p. 39). But if the modern Ajudhyā near Faizābād stands on the site of the ancient town, this suggestion is at variance (1) with the opinion of Fergusson, followed by Vincent. A. Smith (J. R. A. S. 1897, p. 860 note I), that the site must be looked for at or near Lucknow, and (2) with that of Führer given by Rhys Davids himself (loc. cit.) that it may be represented by the ruins at Sujān Kot on the Sai river, a tributary of the Gumti. Major Vost (J. R. A. S. 1905, p. 437) would locate Saketa at Tusāran Bihār, a village about 24 miles northwest of Allahābād.

² Daśak. pp. 15, 16, 107. They are also called simply hunters (लुब्धकाः) and foresters (वनचराः) (p. 107). Similarly the names Kirāta and Pulinda are used interchangeably p. 25.

³ E. g. MBh. II. 1199: पृह्वान् वर्वरांश्चैव किरातान् यवनान् शकान्.

⁴ III. 41; tr. L. Wilkinson, Bib. Ind., Calcutta 1861, p. 120.

⁵ Dr. Fleet has given a useful alphabetical arrangement of the names occurring in this list, together with brief remarks, in Ind. Ant. XXII (Topographical list of the Brhat Saṃhitā, p. 169 ff.).

⁶ Brhat Saṃhitā, ed. Kern, Introd., p. 32.

stories from the Jātakas and other old store-houses of ancient fable are frequently introduced into more recent narratives with no change of setting—and no suggestion of their earlier origin. The names Avanti, Śūrasena, Trigarta, occurring in the secondary stories of the sixth book of the Daśakumāracarita, appear to represent the geographical conditions of a time considerably previous to that of the main story; and it is possible that in the main story itself the geographical stratification is broken by similar embedded borrowings from earlier formations.

Of a somewhat different though allied nature is the employment of ancient for modern names by a kind of literary licence for which it is difficult to find an appropriate name, but which may be called conventional. When, for instance, Bāṇa in the Harṣacarita calls Bhāskaravarman ruler of Prāgijyotiṣa,¹ there can be little doubt that he was expressing himself in a way perfectly intelligible to his contemporaries, but he can hardly have adopted the then accepted designation of the country which is now called Assam: for this was known as Kāmarūpa (Kia-mo-lu-po) to Bāṇa's contemporary Hiuen-Thsang² in the seventh century, and is mentioned under that name in an inscription of the fourth.³ The use of the name Videha in the Daśakumāracarita is probably quite similar. If Daṇḍin wrote this work, as its style indicates, about the sixth century A. D.,⁴ Videha would presumably represent the land of the Licchavis, one of the clans of the Vṛji federation to which the Videhas also belonged.⁵ It was through the influence of this powerful tribe that the early Guptas were able to lay the foundation of their empire,⁶ and the allusion to the marriage of Candragupta I with the Licchavi princess Kumāradevī, the occurrence of the expression "Licchavi-dauhitra" (daughtēr's son of the Licchavi, i. e. Samudragupta) on so many of the Gupta monuments in various parts of northern India,⁷ must have made this name widely known.

Conventional
geography.

¹ Harṣac., tr. Cowell and Thomas, London 1897, p. 218.

² Bcal, Buddhist Records of the Western World, Boston 1885, vol. II, p. 195.

³ That of Sumadragunta C. I. I. III, No. I, l. 22.

⁴ Weber, Ind. Str. I, p. 312: Pischel, Śrīgāratilaka, Kiel 1886, Introd. p. 13.

⁵ Cunningham, Anc. Geog., pp. 447—8: Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, p. 22

⁶ Smith, Early Hist., p. 244.

⁷ The *vaṃśāvalī* of the Guptas containing the name Licchavi is found in five of the inscriptions in Dr. Fleet's third volume of the Corp. Inscr. Ind. These are:

No. 1 (Samudragupta) on pillar orig. at Kosam. Allahābād Distr. U. Prov. circ. 341 A. D.

No. 4 (Candragupta 2) on stone orig. at Mathurā. Mathurā Distr. U. Prov.

No. 10 (Kumārāgupta I) on pillar at Bilsad. Eṭā Distr. U. Prov. 415/6.

No. 12 (Skandāgupta) on pillar at Bihār. Patna Distr. Bengal Pres.

The extreme friendliness which the Daśakumāracarita represents as existing between the kings of Magadha and Videha would well bear out such an interpretation.¹ In this case Mithilā,² the capital of Videha in the same work, if it is more than a mere name, would stand conventionally for Vaiśālī, the chief town of the Licchavis. It should, however, be observed that even in Buddhist and Jaina literature, where the geographical data seem to be usually more reliable, the name Videha or Mahāvīdeha is sometimes used in a vaguer or broader sense, so as to include the Licchavi country, or even the whole of the territory which the Vṛjī clans occupied. In the Nirayāvaliya-sutta,³ for instance, Vesālī is spoken of as a city of Videha. It is therefore possible that the name of one of the more influential Vṛjī clans had as a matter of fact become extended at an early period to denote the whole community, much as the name of the Alemanni, one of the ancient Germanic tribes, has come to be applied in France to the whole German nation. No such explanation, however, can be given for Daṇḍin's employment of Śrāvastī as the name of a royal city situated somewhere in

No. 13 (Skandagupta) on pillar at Bhitari. Ghāzīpur Distr. U. Prov. circ. 455.

The first part of inscription No. 2 (Samudragupta), found at Eraṇ in the Sāgar Distr. C. Prov., may also have contained the family list and the name Licchavi, but it has unfortunately been broken away and lost.

¹ We are told, for instance, on p. 14 how the king of Videha visits his intimate friend (निजसुहृत्), the king of Magadha, at Puṣpapura; and again on p. 106 we not only find mention of the deep friendship (परं मित्रम्) of these kings, but it is added that their queens also (to quote Meyer's translation) "hegten und pflegten eine unvergleichliche gegenseitige Zuneigung wie die Gattinnen Balas und Sambaras."

² The name Mithilā is not mentioned either by Fa-Hien or Hiuen-Tsang. Local tradition claims Janakpur, a small town in the Mihtari district of Nepāl, as the site of the ancient capital of Janaka, and Gen. Cunningham considered the situation of this place to correspond exactly with that of Chen-shu-na, which Hiuen-Tsang calls the capital of the Vṛjīs (Anc. Geog., p. 445). But this writer describes Chen-shu-na as mostly in ruins, although he tells us that in the old royal precinct there were still some 3000 houses (Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. II, p. 78). So that, granting Cunningham's identification and local tradition to be both correct, there seems little probability of Chen-shu-na, or Janakapura, or Mithilā having been the centre of a flourishing kingdom in the first half of the seventh century; and the probability that it held this position in the sixth, when Daṇḍin presumably wrote, is not much greater.

³ Ed. Warren, Verh. der koninkl. Akademie van Wetenschappen, vol. XII, section 24 (Amsterdam 1879). In the Mahāparinibhāsanutta (ed. Childers, London 1878, p. 1) Ajātasātru, the son of Bimbisāra, who married a daughter of Ceṭaka, ruler of Vaiśālī (Jacobi, S. B. E. XXII, Introd., pp. xiii and xv) is called Vedehiputto, i. e. son of the Videha lady. Similarly in the Jaina Sutras, Trīśāla, a sister of this same Ceṭaka and mother of Mahāvira, the founder of the Jaina religion, is called Videhadattā (ibid. Introd., pp. xii and xv).

the north. Fa-Hien, who visited the ruins of the ancient Śrāvastī during his travels in India between the years 399 and 414 A. D., reports that "the inhabitants were few and far between amounting in all to a few more than two hundred families".¹ Hiuen-Tsang, two hundred years later (629—645 or 646), found the city in a similar condition, though he speaks of a large kingdom of Śrāvastī (Shi-lo-fu-shi-ti) of which it had once been the capital. "The chief town", he says, "is desert and ruined. There is no record as to its limits. The ruins of the walls compassing the royal precinct give a circuit of about twenty lis (about three and a third miles). Though mostly in ruins, still there are a few inhabitants".² If Daṇḍin wrote, as he almost certainly did, between 400 and 600 A. D., it is clear that his Śrāvastī is either wholly imaginary (borrowed it may be with the story in which it occurs)³ or, if we are to assume a basis of reality for his geography, a conventional name for some other northern town. He speaks of a great festival or religious assembly (उत्सवसमाजः) held at Śrāvastī in honour of Śiva, to which pilgrims gathered from all parts of India.⁴ Such religious gatherings are held even to-day at Thāneśar (the ancient Sthāṇvīśvara) in the Ambāla District of the Panjāb. According to the Imperial Gazetteer the great festival held here was formerly⁵ attended by as many as 500,000 pilgrims. The name of this town, moreover, shows that it was especially connected with the worship of Śiva. I venture therefore to make the suggestion — a suggestion which, however bold it may appear, seems to me to lie quite within the bounds of possibility — that when Daṇḍin wrote of Śrāvastī and its Śiva-festival, he had in mind this distinctly Śaiva town of Sthāṇvīśvara. Śrāvastī was a name traditionally accredited and, above all, classic; Sthāṇvīśvara shared little of its classical prestige: but both were northern, and it is as representative of a northern power that Śrāvastī finds a place in Daṇḍin's romance. There is perhaps a further hint in the same direction to be found in the name which Daṇḍin has given to the ruler of his Śrāvastī, viz. Dharmavardhana. Sthāṇvīśvara was during the sixth century the seat of a kingdom over which the ancestors of the great Harṣa-

¹ Fa-Hien, Record of Buddhist kingdoms, tr. Legge, Oxford 1886, p. 55; Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. I, p. xlv.

² Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. II, pp. 1—2.

³ The story of Pramati (ucchvāsa V, p. 143 ff.). Both the motives of this story are found elsewhere in Sanskrit literature (Daśak. tr. J. J. Meyer, Lotus-Verlag, Leipzig 1905, Introd., pp. 75—87) and there may have been some common source to which Daṇḍin was directly or indirectly indebted. Weber (Ind. Str. I, p. 309) doubted its originality.

⁴ Daśak. p. 148.

⁵ That is, before 1872 when the number had fallen to 30,000 owing to the introduction of sanitary arrangements by the British Government. (Hunter, Imperial Gazetteer, under Thanesvar).

vardhana reigned.¹ All of these bore names terminating with *-vardhana*,² and this termination would therefore be almost as characteristic of these kings as *-gupta* was of the imperial family at Puṣpapura. If this is so, if we may see in Daṇḍin's Śrāvastī a literary equivalent for Sthānvīśvara, we have an extreme example of the ways of conventional geography.³

Possible sources of this conventionalism.

It is evident that the traditional element enters largely into this literary phenomenon. I would, however, distinguish it from the mere importation of geographical names from previous literature, though it must be granted it would not always be an easy task to decide where tradition ends and convention sets in. This conventional use of names had, I conceive, little in the nature of fixity, and arose mainly from a general agreement among writers in a preference for what was classical and traditional. It becomes more intelligible when we consider (1) that the system of education in India tended to make the Hindu more familiar with the literary past than with the living present, (2) that when he wrote, it was for a limited public trained in the same schools and equally familiar with their traditional lore, and (3) that the language in which he wrote was the language of this ancient learning and culture, and its employment could not but foster a conservativeness of thought and form, and assist in severing him still further from the present and the actual.

Distinction between real and mythical or fabulous geography sometimes disregarded.

Sometimes the border-line between real and mythical or fabulous geography is wholly disregarded, as when Durgasāra in the Daśakumāracarita is said to retire to the mountain of Kubera,⁴

¹ Mabel C. Duff, Chronology of India, Westminster 1899, p. 306: V. A. Smith, Early Hist., pp. 282—83: Harṣac., tr. Cowell and Thomas, p. 81 ff. and p. 100 ff.

² Their names are given in table II.

³ The name Śrāvastī occurs in the Madhuban copper-plate of Harṣavardhana (ed. Bühler, Ep. Ind. I, p. 67 ff.) which records the grant of a village in the district (bhukti) of Śrāvastī to two Brahmans. Such a gift, implying special interest in the locality on the part of the donor, would seem to indicate that this region formed part of the dominion of the rulers of Thāneśar. And the Harṣacarita distinctly lends support to this view, for Baṇa tells us that he visited Harṣa in his camp on the Ajiravati, a river which the translators of this work would identify with the Raptī (cf. Palī, Aciravati) on which the town of Śrāvastī stood (Harṣac., transl. Cowell and Thomas, p. 146, and Preface, p. xi). If this were the case, Daṇḍin's selection of the name would be more intelligible. [It seems, indeed, possible, in the presence of these facts, that these kings were known as rulers of Śrāvastī. The resemblance between Śrāvastī and Śārasvata — one of the names of their country, the land of the Sarasvati — may have helped to bring this about, and I would venture the suggestion that the form Śāravatī of Raghuv. XV. 97 actually points to such a confusion — here between Śrāvastī and Śārasvati. But even if this is so, the fact nevertheless remains, that, when Daṇḍin writes of a royal city called Śrāvastī, he is using this name conventionally.]

⁴ राजराजगिरिः (pp. 39 and 59.), एकपिङ्गलाचलः (p. 60).

i. e. Kailāsa, in order to practise austerities. No doubt the Himālayas are meant, but the name is nevertheless purely mythical. In this particular case we find ourselves once again in contact with that far-reaching traditional bias of the Hindu mind. In other instances the fabulous element is more marked. For example, the geographical list of the Bṛhat Saṃhitā already referred to names, side by side with actual places, the city of Brahma,¹ the city of ghosts,² the kingdom of the dead,³ etc., and among the races there enumerated we find Aśvavadanas (people with horses' heads) Vyāghramukhas (people with tigers' heads), Ekapadas (people with one leg), Trinetras (people with three eyes) and similar physiological curiosities. Such beings, of course, often find a place in the folklore and travellers' tales of other nations; but then they are usually located in some distant and unknown land. This is not the case here. Although Varāha Mihira sets as title to this section "the division of the globe" (कूर्मविभागः), it deals nevertheless almost exclusively with India. And we meet with some of these strange folk on Indian soil elsewhere in Sanskrit literature. The Ekapadas, for instance, placed in the Bṛhat Saṃhitā in the east (as well as Ekacaraṇas in the north-west) are mentioned (as Ekapādas) as a southern people along with the Keralas and Vanavāsis in the Mahābhārata.⁴ The Puruṣādas, or Cannibals, occur likewise both in the Mahābhārata (in the west, II. 1170) and in the Bṛhat Saṃhitā (in the east). And the "Timiṅgalanṛpaḥ" of the same epic (II. 1172), a southern king defeated by Sahadeva, is clearly to be connected with the Timiṅgilāśanas or Whale-eaters, one of the southern tribes of Varāha Mihira.⁵

¹ ब्रह्मपुरम्, situated on the summit of Mt. Meru according to the Viṣ. Pur. (tr. Wilson, vol. II, p. 118).

² भूतपुरम् (in the north).

³ नद्यराज्यम् (in the north-east).

⁴ MBh. II. 1173.

⁵ Other curious tribes mentioned in the Digvijaya of the Mahābhārata are उलूकाः, the Owls (II. 1020); मयूरसदृशाः, peafowl-like people (II. 1036); तित्तिरिक्ल्वाषाः, people spotted like the partridge, and मण्डूकाः, the Frogs (II. 1043); कालमुखाः नाम नरराक्षसयोनेयः, the Blackfaces, half men, half Rākṣasas (II. 1171); and the उष्ट्रकर्णिकाः camel-eared people? (II. 1175). Some of these names, like मत्स्य possibly owe their origin to tribal emblems: others may be nick-names, terms of contempt for indigenous tribes or even foreign races. Alberūnī explains Varāha Mihira's नारिमुखाः, "men with women's faces" to mean "Turks" (Sachau, Alberūnī's India, London 1888, vol. I, p. 302); but many, like त्रिनेत्र (three-eyed) and एकविलोचन (one-eyed) of Br. S. XIV, seem to be purely mythical.

Names employ-
ed with little or
no meaning.

Lastly, as the preceding paragraph might lead us to expect, it seems possible that at times bare names are used void of any particular denotation. Such is, at least, the inference to be drawn from Varāha Mihira's list, where we meet occasionally with two names for one and the same place, or one and the same people. Sindhala for instance is here set down by the side of Laṅkā;¹ Utkala (Orissa) by the side of Uḍra (cf. Uriya, the present name of the natives of Orissa).² Mathurā was the chief town of the Śūrasenas; yet we find both the Śūrasenas and the people of Mathurā (माथुरकाः) mentioned. And similarly, when this author names both the Suhmas and Tāmaliptikā (cf. Dāmaliptā,³ the capital of the Suhmas in the Daśakumāracarita), I am afraid we cannot regard this as a careful distinction between the name of a country (or its chief town) and that of its inhabitants — a distinction which would not be in keeping with the nature of the list⁴ — but rather

¹ Prof. Jacobi (Das Rāmāyaṇam, Bonn 1893, p. 90 ff.) considers the occurrence of both these names in this list to bear out his contention that these two places were originally distinct. Laṅkā, he maintains, in the earlier portion of the Rāmāyaṇa belongs to "Fabelland." He suggests that the term "dvīpa" there applied to it (IV. 58. 20; 111. 54, Bomb. 1888) may mean continent as in Jambudvīpa, and that its identification with Ceylon was of later origin. Prof. Jacobi assigns the original Rāmāyaṇa to the sixth or even the eighth century B. C. (ibid. p. 111), and for this early period his view possesses every probability. But for the time at which Varāha Mihira's (or Parāśara's) list was drawn up I hardly think we can assume that Laṅkā still preserved this early nebulous character. Kālidāsa seems clearly to have known it as an island lying south of India (Raghuv. XII. 66; XIII. 2), and Prof. Jacobi points out that it is spoken of as such in the later portions of the Rāmāyaṇa (e. g. IV. 41. 23 ff; VII. 45. 10, Bomb. 1888). It seems to me that in the Brhat Samhitā Laṅkā may be regarded as the literary name of Ceylon (whenever the identification may have taken place), while Sindhala is the actual name of the same island introduced by means of commercial intercourse or otherwise — the compiler of this list having been unaware that these two names denoted one and the same place.

² Wilson gives Orissa as the equivalent of Utkala in his translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (ed. Hall, vol. II, p. 160 note 5); and Dr. Fleet tells us that "Utkala is always explained as denoting Orissa" (Ind. Ant. XXII. p. 193). V. A. Smith, however, suggests Ganjam (Early Hist., p. 10). Uḍra is identified with Orissa by Cunningham (Anc. Geog., p. 510).

³ Daśak. p. 155. The name seems to have been used for the country as well as its chief town, for Hiuen Tshang mentions Tan-mo-li-ti (cf. Pālī Tāmaliptā) amongst the countries in this part of India. [Tāmaliptā and the Suhmas are, however, mentioned in consecutive verses of the Mahābhārata (II. 1098—99), and it is possible that Daṇḍin's geography of the far east is at fault.]

⁴ The list enumerates the countries etc. of the nine regions under the respective influence of the nine planets, and it is clearly unnecessary to name both a country and its inhabitants. Even if Tāmaliptikā is here the name of the Suhma capital, its mention is equally unnecessary, and neither in the case of Magadha nor of Avanti is any mention of the chief town made.

evidence that what he is giving us is very largely a collection of words.¹ It seems probable that in the Raghuvamśa, when Kālidāsa makes Raghu conquers first the Prāgjyotiṣas and then the king of Kāmarūpa,² we have a classical instance of this independent treatment of synonymous names.

The geographical data of the Raghuvamśa and the Daśakumāracarita: a comparison.

As a consequence more especially of the conventional use of names, which gives rise to a kind of literary geography, the map of India as made known to us by ancient inscriptions has a very different appearance from that which more or less contemporary writings present. The probable date of Kālidāsa, placed by Huth between 400 and 600 A. D. as extreme dates,³ would lead us to expect at least some similarity in the geographical nomenclature of his epic, the Raghuvamśa, and the numerous names recorded in the Allahābād inscription of Samudragupta which, according to Vincent A. Smith, belongs to about 360 A. D.⁴ But if we compare the conquests of Raghu in this poem (IV. 26—88) with those of Samudragupta in the inscription, which are very nearly co-extensive, we find only one certain coincidence of name, viz. Kāmarūpa (Assam), and one probable one, viz. Mahendra, the name of a hill in Ganjām, a part of the ancient country of Kāliṅga⁵ Kaurālaka in line 19 of this inscription, which Dr. Fleet considered to be an error for Kairālaka,⁶ i. e. of the Keralas — this would have made a third

Difference of nomenclature in the Raghuv. and Samudragupta's inscription.

¹ It might be added that this list of Varāha Mihira includes also doublets of mythological beings. We have already noticed the Ekapadas and Ekacarānas. There are also, beside the Aśvavadanas in the east, Turagananas in the north, both names meaning "horse-faced". Further we have inhabitants of the sky both in the north-west (Khassthas) and in the north (Khacaras); and to the same category are doubtless to be assigned the Diviṣṭhas or inhabitants of heaven, placed in the north-east. Alberūnī describes these Khassthas as "people who are born from trees, hanging on them by the navel-strings" (Sachau, Alberūnī's India, vol. I. p. 303).

² Raghuv. IV. 81 and 83. Prāgjyotiṣa alone is mentioned in the catalogue of the Bṛhat Saṃhitā.

³ Die Zeit des Kālidāsa, Leipziger Dissertation 1890, p. 50. Kalidasa most probably wrote during the latter half of the fifth century: see p. 48.

⁴ Early Hist., p. 247. The conquests of Samudragupta were terminated according to this writer about 340 A. D. (p. 249). We may, I think, take it for granted that the names occurring in inscriptions preserve as a rule the actual nomenclature of the time.

⁵ A list of the countries named (1) in the fourth canto of the Raghuvamśa and (2) in Samudragupta's inscription is given in table I.

⁶ C. I. I. III, p. 7 note 1.

coincidence —, more probably represents lake Kolleru or Colair, the *jalām Kunāḷam* of the Aihōle inscription of Pulikesin II.¹ The list of the fourth canto, it is true, is by no means so exhaustive as that of the inscription, but nevertheless the remarkable dissimilarity between these two records points I think conclusively to the fact that in this epic we have to deal very largely with conventional or traditional geography.

Geography of
the Raghuv. not
entirely derived
from the Rāmā-
yaṇa.

It might be supposed that Kālidāsa was unduly influenced in his selection of geographical detail by the Rāmāyaṇa. The identity of the main subject in both — the story of Rāma — naturally necessitated that some of the names of places and races occurring in the earlier poem should reappear in the later. This is, of course, the case with Uttarakośala; Videha and Mithilā (only in connexion with the house of Janaka); Kośala² and Kekaya³ (the homes of Daśaratha's wives Kauśalyā and Kaikeyī). But that Kālidāsa has not blindly followed his predecessor in this respect is evident from the entire absence in his work of certain names occupying a position of some prominence in the earlier epic. Among the states friendly or feudatory to Daśaratha the Rāmāyaṇa names the Matsyas, the Sindhu-Sauviras, the Saurāṣṭras and Kāśi (also Kāśikosālas).⁴ None of these is to be found in the Raghuvamśa.⁵ This can hardly be fortuitous, and the explanation is doubtless to be looked for in the altered geographical conditions of the time at which Kālidāsa lived. The country of the Matsyas had possibly become absorbed at an early period (they are not mentioned in Samudragupta's inscription) in the territory of the Mālavas and other neighbouring races.⁶ Sauvīra and Surāṣṭra formed part of the dominion of the Western Satraps in the second century A. D.,⁷ and we may assume were incorporated in the Gupta empire by Candra-

¹ Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. VI, p. 3 note 3.

² Raghuv. IX. 22.

³ Ibid. IX. 22 and X. 55.

⁴ Rām. I. 12. 18 ff. Gorr.; I. 13. 21 ff. and II. 10. 36—37, Bomb. 1859.

⁵ Sindhu is one mentioned, viz. XV. 87, where we are told that

Rāma gave this country (देशः सिन्धुनामकः) to his brother Bharata. This detail seems to be derived from the traditional Rāma-story. Bharata conquers the Gandharvas after being installed in the kingdom of Sindhu (XV. 88); and in the Rāmāyaṇa Sindhu is the name of one of the Gandharva princes overthrown by Bharata (IV. 41. 61, Gorr.).

⁶ Gen. Cunningham identified Virāt, the ancient capital of the Matsyas, with the town of Bairāt, 41 miles north of Jaipur (Anc. Geog., p. 340 ff.). Coins of the Malavas have been found as far north as Nāgar in the Jaipur State, about 45 miles north of Kota (Fleet in Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. II, p. 311; V. A. Smith in J. R. A. S. 1897, p. 884), and it seems probable that their territory at one time bordered on that of the Matsyas.

⁷ According to an inscription of the Satrap Rudradāman (Bhagvānlāl Indrajī in Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. I, p. 36). The inscription, which belongs to the year 150 A. D., is given in Dr. Burgess' second volume of the Archæol. Survey of W. India, p. 128 ff.

gupta II when he overthrew this power about 395 A. D.¹ Certainly Surāṣṭra was under Guptan suzerainty in the time of Skandagupta,² during whose reign Manmohan Chakravarti has plausibly suggested Kālidāsa wrote.³ These countries were probably included in the great western province of Mālava, in whose capital, Ujjayinī, it is possible sons of the imperial house held their court in the capacity of Yuvarājas, as in the days of the Mauryas.⁴ The consequent loss of identity and importance may account for their omission in the poem. The absence of the name of Kāśi admits of a similar explanation. So important a state, situated on the confines of Magadha, must certainly have been one of the nine kingdoms of Āryāvarta which Samudragupta forcibly annexed after putting their rulers to death;⁵ its feudatory chiefs, creatures of the emperor, could have held but an insignificant position so long as the Gupta supremacy continued to flourish.

It seems, indeed, possible that, so largely unhistoric as Kālidāsa's nomenclature appears to be, the Raghuvamṣa nevertheless in the main, and where the exigencies of the story did not compel divergence, preserves the general geographical conditions of his time and was more or less intelligible as such to his initiated readers. It is at least remarkable that in the sixth canto the countries introduced in connexion with the svayaṃvara of Indumatī, princess of Vidarbha, present a striking parallel to those which are given a prominent position in the Daśakumāracarita, a work which, as we have seen, was assigned by Weber to the sixth century, that is to say, within the period fixed by Huth for Kālidāsa. These countries are Vidarbha, Magadha, Aṅga, Avanti, Anūpa (capital Māhiṣmatī, VI. 43), Śūrasena, Kaliṅga, Pāṇḍya and Uttarakośala. The number, nine, is that of the traditional divisions of Bhārata-varṣa, and I believe we may see in this list a reflex of the principal kingdoms of India in the time of Kālidāsa, subject of course to this traditional limitation. No fewer than six of these countries

General
geographical
agreement be-
tween the
Raghuv. and the
Daśak.

¹ V. A. Smith, *Early Hist.*, p. 255.

² There is an inscription of this emperor (C. I. I. III, No. 14) and one of the Satrap Rudradāman on the same rock at Junāgaḍh in Kāthiāwād, a rock which also bears the fourteen edicts of Aśoka. All three inscriptions are to be found in A. S. W. I. II, p. 98 ff.

³ See p. 48.

⁴ It is difficult to interpret otherwise the occurrence of the name Kumāragupta as "ruler of the earth" (Kumāra gupte prthivim praśāsati) on an inscription at Mandasor (C. I. I. III, No. 18) of the year 473/4, if at this time Skandagupta was still reigning (Smith, *Early Hist.* p. 270). For the inscription at Junāgaḍh (456 A. D.), mentioned in a previous note, shows that his sway extended much further west than Mandasor. The only alternative, it seems to me, would be to assume that the western provinces were lost to the empire before the end of his reign. That Aśoka held the position of Yuvarāja at Ujjayinī before he became emperor is seen from Mahāvamśa V (tr. Turnour and Wijesinha, Colombo 1889, p. 17).

⁵ C. I. I. III, No. I, l. 21.

find a place in the Daśakumāracarita, viz. Vidarbha, Magadha, Aṅga, Mālava (= Avanti) Māhiṣmatī and Kaliṅga.¹ Śrāvastī, in earlier times one of the chief cities of Northern Kośala,² also figures prominently in Daṇḍin's romance, but it can hardly be looked upon as an analogue of Kālidāsa's Uttarakośala. This country possibly represents the home-province of the northern empire³ (in which case it would have to be regarded as forming with Magadha the kingdom to which Daṇḍin applies this latter name), or it may owe its place in the list merely to the nature of the narrative. Śrāvastī, on the other hand, whether we connect it with Sthāṇviśvara or not, seems to stand in the Daśakumāracarita as literary equivalent for some distinctly northern power, much as Śūrasena appears to be used in the Raghuvamśa (though not necessarily as indicating the same country). This divergence in the north is paralleled by a similar divergence in the south. Here in the Raghuvamśa we have the Pāṇḍyas; in the Daśakumāracarita, the state of Vanavāsī. These differences might point to a change in the political importance of the countries in these parts between the dates at which these works were composed. Other explanations are of course conceivable, such as (1) difference of personal estimate dependent on the writer's knowledge of the districts in question, or the rumours which have reached him concerning them, (2) partiality or prejudice, whether due to local, racial or religious causes, and (3) ignorance. In the case of a large country like India, an imperfect acquaintance with distant provinces, e. g. those in the far south, is at least intelligible, and it seems likely that Kālidāsa relied purely on classical reminiscence when he selected the Pāṇḍyas⁴ to represent the chief power in this region. But to whatever causes they may be due, it is worthy of emphasis that these differences affect only remote parts of the country, the general resemblance of the India mapped out in Kālidāsa's sixth canto and that of the Daśakumāracarita remains unmistakable.

That this resemblance is scarcely to be regarded as accidental may be seen by a comparison of Kālidāsa's list with the nine chief

The nine chief kingdoms of the Raghuv. and Bṛhat Saṃhitā.

¹ The Śūrasenas are mentioned in one of the secondary stories of the sixth ucvāsa (the story of Nitambavati, p. 173). These stories, however, are generally considered to be taken from earlier sources (Weber, Ind. Str. I, p. 309) and their data cannot therefore be accepted with certainty for the time of Daṇḍin.

² Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, p. 40.

³ Assuming actual conditions are reflected, it may be remarked that this could not be the case if the early Guptas had their capital at Pātaliputra, but would be possible if their seat of government was either at Ayodhyā (Smith, Early Hist., p. 257) or at Kanyakubja, i. e. Kānanj (Fleet, C. I. I. III, p. 5).

⁴ This name is certainly historical and is found as late as Śaka 1175 (= 1253 A. D.): see V. Venkayya in Ind. Ant. XXII, p. 59 ff. But I doubt whether Kālidāsa used it otherwise than as a typical name for a southern power, that is conventionally.

kingdoms enumerated in the *Bṛhat Saṃhitā* and taken by its author, *Varāha Mihira*, from the earlier *Parāśaratantra*. They are here given as *Pañcāla* (central), *Magadha* (E.), *Kaliṅga* (S-E.), *Avantī* (S.), *Ānarta* (S-W.), the *Sindhu-Sauvīras* (W.), the *Hārahauras* (N-W.), the *Madras* (N.) and the *Kauṇindas* (N-E).¹ Only three of these, *Magadha*, *Kaliṅga* and *Avantī*, are common to both; the remaining six are met with nowhere in the *Raghuvamśa*, (and, it may be added, nowhere in the *Daśakumāracarita*). *Śūrasena* and *Vidarbha*, it is true, have a place in the long catalogue of this fourteenth chapter, the former among the countries of the central division, the latter among those of the south-east. But the fact that *Pañcāla* is chosen in preference to *Śūrasena* to represent the central region shows that the *Śūrasenas* held a relatively unimportant position at the time when this list was composed, or at least were inferior in importance to the *Pañcālas*. And the position of *Varāha Mihira's* central region itself points to an entirely different political horizon from that which is presented in the *Raghuvamśa*.

The remaining names of this epic not directly connected with the *Rāma* story, viz. those which occur in the *Digvijaya* of *Raghu* (canto IV), are *Suhma* (v. 35), *Vaṅga* (36—37), *Utkala* (38), *Kerala* (54), *Kamboja* (69), *Utsavasamketā* (78), *Prāgjyotiṣa* (81), *Kāmarūpa* (83), and those of the distinctly foreign races, the *Pārasikas*, or *Yavanas* (60, 61), and the *Hūṇas* (68).² Of these *Suhma* and *Kāmarūpa* (for which *Prāgjyotiṣa* would seem to be a mere doublet) are found in the main text of the *Daśakumāracarita*; *Utkala*, in the *Uttarapīṭhikā*.³ The *Yavanas* are also mentioned, but only as a trading people visiting the eastern coast.⁴ The rest — *Vaṅga*, *Kerala*,⁵ *Kamboja*, the *Utsavasamketas* and the *Hūṇas* — are wanting.

Other geographical names of the *Raghuv.*: in part absent in the *Daśak.*

¹ Br. S. XIV. 32—33. These divisions are given by *Alberūnī*, according to *Sachau's* translation (vol. I, p. 298), as *Pāncāla*, *Magadha*, *Kaliṅga*, *Avantī*, *Anantā*, *Sindhu* and *Sauvira*, *Madura*, and *Kulīnda*. He adds that these names were not those by which these countries were then generally known. *Alberūnī* (or *Abu-l-Raiḥān*) was born A. D. 973 (*ibid.*, Preface, p. viii). It should be observed that the three names printed in italics are given correctly as *Ānarta*, *Madra* and *Kauṇinda* in *Alberūnī's* detailed list (vol. I, p. 300 ff.).

² The name *Kirāta* applied in the *Raghuvamśa* (IV. 76) to inhabitants of the *Himālayas*, and in the *Daśakumāracarita* (e. g. p. 25) to inhabitants of the *Vindhya* region, can only be regarded as one of the general terms for non-aryan aborigines: see p. 8.

³ *Daśak.* p. 214. But the *Uttarapīṭhikā* (ascribed to *Padmanābha* in *Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum*) is certainly late, as it is not noticed by any of the three commentaries published in *Godabole* and *Parab's* edition of the *Daśakumāracarita*. It is, however, just possible that the completion of the romance which it supplies is traditional.

⁴ p. 161.

⁵ The *Keralas* may possibly be the same as the *Muralas*, one of the tribes subject to *Vidarbha*: see p. 43 f.

Names occurring in the Daśak, and absent in the Raghuv.

There are, on the other hand, some names in the Daśakumāracarita which appear neither in the fourth nor in the sixth canto of the Raghuvamśa. We may omit those occurring in the secondary stories of the sixth ucchvāsa as possibly of earlier origin, and those of the dependent states of Vidarbha as being of minor importance. There remain Videha, Kośala (i. e. Southern Kośala, alluded to incidentally p. 204 and p. 210), Kāśī, Puṇḍra (mentioned incidentally p. 125), Andhra, Lāṭa and Pāṭalī.¹ Videha and Kośala (if this was regarded as the country of Kauśalyā) would naturally be excluded from the account of Raghu's conquests; their omission from the sixth canto, as also that of Kāśī, might be due to the numerical limitation prescribed by tradition. The western kingdoms of Lāṭa (Surat) and Pāṭalī (not identified) it is at least possible to connect with Kālidāsa's western power or powers² in the neighbourhood of Trikūṭa.³ Kāśī, Puṇḍra and Andhra, whatever may be the cause, are neither named nor alluded to anywhere in this epic.

At least eight countries common to these two works.

These differences are, I think, not greater than might be expected. They are partly due to the fact that the Raghuvamśa deals (viz. in canto IV) with a larger extent of country than the Daśakumāracarita. The territory of the Pārasikas (extreme west), the Hūṇas (further to the north), the Kambojas (extreme north-west) and the Utsavasamketas (in the Himālayas), as also possibly that of the Pāṇḍyas in the extreme south, lay outside the area within which the adventures of the princes are confined. Partly, again, they are a result of the greater amount of geographical detail with which Daṇḍin supplies this restricted area. Within these limits, leaving aside Videha, Kośala and other doubtful instances, eight kingdoms or provinces are certainly common to these two works.

This and other coincidences support the assumption of proximate dates.

Some of the names employed (e. g. Magadha and Kaliṅga) were those in actual use, others (e. g. Aṅga and Vidarbha) are almost certainly conventional. But the general geographical resemblance

¹ The name Pāṭalī occurs but once, viz. in the third Purvapāṭhikā. In Godbole and Parab's edition it is consigned to a foot note (p. 31), but appears in the text of Bühler and Peterson's edition (Bombay 1873—91, part I, p. 19).

² Raghuv. IV. 58:

अवकाशं किलोदन्वानामायाभर्थितो ददौ
अपरान्तमहीपालव्याजेन रघवे करम् ॥

³ IV. 59. Paṇḍit Bhagavānlal Indrajī considered that Trikūṭa was on the site of the present town of Junnar in the Poona District, Bombay Presidency, and suggested that in the three ranges that encircle Junnar we have the origin of the term Trikūṭa, or "Three-peaked" (Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. I, p. 57). But as Jackson points out in his note (ibid. p. 59), Trikūṭa is a mountain, not a town, as Paṇḍit Bhagavānlal seems to have thought. Raghu does not found a town to commemorate his victory, but turns the mountain Trikūṭa itself into a "jayastambha", or pillar of victory.

is in no way affected by the real or conventional nature of the names which these works share. And this resemblance, it should be observed, adds credibility to the assumption with which we set out, viz. that Kālidāsa and Daṇḍin are separated by no great interval of time. Two coincidences of detail which favour the same conclusion may here be noticed. Both these authors mention the Mahākāla temple at Ujjayinī,¹ and both speak of the rulers of Vidarbha as belonging to the Bhoja race.² Allusions to the Mahākāla temple are by no means infrequent in Sanskrit literature, and this coincidence must be regarded as but of minor importance. The second however seems significant. Not only do these writers agree in assigning their Vidarbha princes to the same family, but both give special prominence to Vidarbha itself. In the Raghuvamśa more than three cantos are devoted to the story of Indumatī³ — her svayamvara, her marriage with Aja, her mysterious death —, and in the Daśakumāracarita this country is represented as a paramount power to whose ruler, Anantavarman, no fewer than six southern kingdoms owe allegiance.⁴

This brings out a further point of agreement between these two works, viz. in the general political aspect of India which they present. We find in both a large empire in the north — that of Dilīpa and his successors in the Raghuvamśa; that of Rājahamśa in the Daśakumāracarita —, and in the south an important power to which both give the name Vidarbha. Here again, it seems to me, we have a reflex of the actual conditions of the time at which these authors lived — and therefore additional evidence, however slight, favouring the view of their proximity of date.

Resemblance of the political aspect in both: favourable to the same view.

The Northern Empire.

A comparison of the frontier countries in the time of Samudragupta, as given in his Allahābād inscription, with those in the fourth canto of the Raghuvamśa shows clearly that the northern empire known to Kālidāsa included a somewhat greater area than that over which this early Guptan emperor ruled. In the west the territories of the Mālavas and Ābhīras, and perhaps those of some of the tribes situated further north, seem to have been added, for we are probably to place the Hūnas, whom Rāghu encountered

Kālidāsa's northern empire more extensive than that of Samudragupta.

¹ Raghuv. VI. 34: Daśak. pp. 7, 34 and 43 (all in the Pūrvapīṭhikā).

² Raghuv. VII. 26: Daśak. pp. 190 and 209.

³ Raghuv. V. 39 to the end of canto VIII.

⁴ Daśak. p. 203.

on the Sindhu¹ (Indus), well to the north of the Panjāb,² or possibly in Kaśmīr. In the east Vaṅga takes the place of Samataṭa as a frontier state; and in the south we have nothing to correspond to the petty kingdoms of the Kākas, Sanakānīkas and others enumerated on the Allahābād pillar. This is quite in keeping with the conclusion arrived at by Huth, that Kālidāsa must have lived after 400 A. D. Guptan supremacy appears to have been first extended eastward as far as the territory of the Vaṅgas by Candragupta II (circ. 375—412 A. D.), and it was under this emperor that the dominion of the Satraps in the west — Mālava, Surāṣṭra and probably adjacent states — was also added to the empire.³ We know further from inscriptional evidence⁴ that in the same reign a Sanikānika prince ruling in the neighbourhood of Udayagiri,⁵ that is, in one of the southern frontier states of the time of Samudragupta, acknowledged the Gupta sovereign as his overlord.

As in the Raghuvamśa, so in the Daśakumāracarita Mālava is treated as a recognized part of the northern empire. This fact, taken together with the evidence of literary style according to which, as we have seen, this latter work must be assigned approximately to the sixth century, makes it probable that Daṇḍin, as well as Kālidāsa, lived under the later members of the Imperial Gupta dynasty, whose sway (certainly in the case of Skandagupta) extended as far west as Surāṣṭra. That Surāṣṭra is mentioned in neither of these works⁶ may be due to accident or, as already suggested, to the fact that its importance was absorbed and possibly its identity largely lost by its forming part of the great western province at whose capital Ujjayinī, it seems to me probable, younger members of the imperial family held their court.⁷ The Gupta dominions do not seem to have included Kāmarūpa. In the

¹ Raghuv. IV. 67. Mallinātha calls this Sindhu a river of Kaśmīr. There are other readings (Vamṅśū-, Maṅṅśū- etc.); but, in any case, the allusion in this verse to the saffron-plant (कुङ्कुम) seems to point to the neighbourhood of Kaśmīr: see M. Cakravarti's remarks in J. R. A. S. 1904, pp. 159—60. The Hūṇas (if Mihirakula was a Hūṇa) were certainly at one time in possession of this country (Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. I, p. 171: Smith, Early Hist., p. 276).

² An inscription of a Toramāna-śaha-jauvla, possibly the same as the Toramāna, father of Mihirakula, of the Eraṇ inscription (C. I. I. III, No. 36) who is generally regarded as a Hūṇa, has been found at Kura in the Salt Range, in the north of the Panjāb (Bühler, Ep. Ind. I, p. 238 ff.).

³ Smith, Early Hist., pp. 254—55.

⁴ C. I. I. III, No. 3.

⁵ Udayagiri is the name of a hill and village about two miles to the north-west of Bhelsā (or Bhilsā) in the dominion of Sindia in Central India. There can be no doubt that Sanikānika and Sanakānika are but two forms of the same name.

⁶ The Saurāṣṭras are, however, mentioned in one of the secondary stories of the sixth ucchvāsa, the story of Nimbavati (p. 170).

⁷ See p. 17 note 4.

Mālava included in northern empire of the Raghuv. and Daśak., as in that of later Imperial Guptas: Kāmarūpa excluded.

Raghuvamśa this country also lies outside the limits of Raghu's empire; and in the Daśakumāracarita, as Kāmarūpa plays no direct part in the romance,¹ we are probably likewise to infer that it formed no part of the northern empire in the time of Daṇḍin. Of the interior political conditions of this vast empire, which, according to the Raghuvamśa, would seem to have stretched from the delta of the Ganges on the east to the Indus on the west, and to have reached as far north as the Himālayas, but little definite information is to be elicited from the two works under consideration. I would, however, venture to notice briefly one of the countries included within this area, viz. Aṅga — a country which forms the scene of the longest² of the adventures in the Daśakumāracarita, and with regard to which Daṇḍin has preserved what seems to be an important historical fact.

The capital of Aṅga in the Daśakumāracarita is Campā. This town was situated in the immediate neighbourhood of Bhagalpur on the right bank of the lower Ganges, where the present villages of Champanagar and Champapur still preserve the ancient name and in all probability indicate the exact site.³ As depicted by Daṇḍin it was not wanting in religious activity. Before the town stood both the hermitage of a Brahman ascetic⁴ and the house of a Jaina brotherhood,⁵ and in the town itself we read of a Buddhist nun,⁶ the chief agent of a famous courtesan of the city. It appears

Aṅga and its
chieftown Campā.

¹ Kāmarūpa is not the scene of any of the adventures of the ten princes. It is represented as on friendly terms with Videha (pp. 112—13), and the royal houses of these two countries are connected by marriage (pp. 113 and 125—26).

² The adventures of Apahāravarmaṇ, ucchvāsa II, p. 67 ff.

³ Lassen, Ind. Alt. vol. I, p. 175 note 1; Cunningham, Anc. Geog., p. 477.

⁴ Daśak. p. 67.

⁵ चपणकविहारः p. 76, but जैनायतनम् p. 77. The Padacan-drikā commentary renders the first of these words by सौगतावासः "a Buddhist house", and the second by चपणकदेवतागारः "a shrine belonging to the mendicant order." The fact that Vasupāla in the story, on entering this religious house, discards every vestige of clothing would seem to indicate that Daṇḍin was thinking of the Digambara sect of the Jains (Daśak., tr. Meyer, p. 213 note 3). But probably neither Daṇḍin nor the commentator cared to distinguish between these two non-brahmanical religions.

⁶ शाक्यभिक्षुकी (p. 58). This is the only clear allusion to Buddhism to be found in the Daśakumāracarita. The nurse of Upahāravarmaṇ, prince of Videha, adopts in her later years a life of religious mendicancy (मन्नञ्जा, p. 108; she is called तापसी p. 106), but as an old servant of one of the good Hindu heroes of the romance, we are probably to understand that she joined a Hindu order. [Women belonging to religious orders are introduced into two of the borrowed stories of the sixth book, that of Nimbavatī (p. 170 ff.), and that of Nitambavatī (p. 173 ff.). In the former, the scene of which is laid in Surāṣṭra, a female

further to have been largely devoted to commerce, for we learn that the merchant class, evidently an important part of the community, possessed at least one special privilege — a privilege granted them, we are told, by the Mauryas. They were exempted from capital punishment for theft.¹

The Mauryas of
Campā.

This allusion to the Mauryas² is suggestive. Their regulations are represented by Daṇḍin as still in force. This is not likely to have been the case with the laws and regulations of that particular Maurya dynasty to which the great Aśoka belonged and which came to an end about 184 B. C.³ But it is conceivable that there was a later dynasty, that when Puṣyamitra slew the last direct representative of this line and seized the government at Pāṭaliputra,⁴ the Mauryas still maintained their hold on Campā and continued to exercise their power within the narrower limits of the Aṅga territory. The expression employed in the text — Mauryadatta eṣa varo vanijām, “this is a Maurya-given privilege of the merchants”, — might, indeed, be taken to indicate that Mauryas were actually ruling in Campā at the time of the story, and therefore presumably in the time of Daṇḍin. And it is more reasonable to suppose that when Dhanamitra in the story reminds the king of this Maurya-given boon, he is referring to a ruling of the king’s ancestors rather than to a regulation introduced by a preceding dynasty.

Kings of Campā
and the Maukharis.

These rulers of Campā, I venture to suggest, are intimately connected with the Maukharis. Kings of Aṅga find no place in inscriptions of the Gupta period, whereas the Maukharis, at least during the sixth century, occupy an important position. The Daśakumāracarita mentions Aṅgas but not Maukharis; the Harṣacarita, written in the first half of the seventh century, mentions the Maukharis, but not the Aṅgas. The fact that certain inscrip-

ascetic (प्रब्राजिका, तापसी), possibly Hindu, takes the place of mother (she is मातृस्थानीया) to Nimbavati. In the latter a mendicant nun (अमणिका, निर्यन्त्रिका), probably to be regarded as Buddhist, is employed to seduce Nitambavati, the wife of a merchant of Ujjayini (not Mathura or Madhura (as Weber, Ind. Str. I, p. 309) which is the home of Kalahakanṭhaka who employs the nun].

¹ Daśak. p. 91.

² A second allusion to the Mauryas is found on p. 194, where we are told that Viṣṇugupta had recently condensed the whole science of politics into a work of six thousand ślokas for the benefit of the Mauryas, or for some member of this race. (इयम् [i. e. दण्डनीतिः] इदानीमाचार्यविष्णुगुप्तेन मौर्यार्यै षड्विंशोक्तसहस्रैः संचिन्ना).

³ Smith, Early Hist., p. 171.

⁴ Viṣ. Pur., tr. Wilson, vol. IV, pp. 190—91: Harsac., tr. Cowell and Thomas, p. 193.

tions of the Maukharis¹ exist in the cave-temples of Barābar and Nāgarjunī hill in the Gayā district of the Bengal Presidency is quite in agreement with the assumption that their head-quarters lay at one time south of the lower Ganges and in the neighbourhood of the ancient Campā. These inscriptions bear the names of Yajñavarman, Śārdūlavarman and Anantavarman, and as the second of these is called "the best among chieftains" (*sāmanta-cūḍāmaṇi*, lit. the crest-jewel of border-kings),² it seems very probable that they belong to a time before the rise of the Maukharis to power, when, as feudatories of the Guptas, their possessions were confined to the narrower limits of a territory certainly in the neighbourhood of, and, as it seems to me, identical with, that of the Aṅgas.³ Afterwards — doubtless as the Gupta power declined — they appear to have extended their dominion. Īśānavarman assumes the same device and legend on his coins as are found on those of the Imperial Guptas,⁴ and he evidently claimed the position of lord-paramount of northern India. From the Harṣacarita we learn that the Maukharis were in possession of Kānyakubja⁵ in the first half of the seventh century, and it seems probable that at this time, and indeed since the time of Īśānavarman, the so-called later Guptas of Magadha held a more or less subordinate position, and that Magadha was under the suzerainty, if not actually in the hands, of the Maukharis.⁶ It is true that Hiuen-Thsang calls Kānyakubja, or Kanyākubja, the capital of Harṣavardhana.⁷ This need not, however,

¹ C. I. I. III, Nos. 48, 49, 50.

² Ibid. No. 48, l. 4, and Dr Fleet's note thereon (note 3 on p. 223.)

³ The Aṅga-king in the Daśakumāracarita is clearly a vassal of the king of Magadha (cf. p. 143 **अङ्गराजः सिंहवर्मा देवपादानां भक्तिमान् कृतकर्मा च**). And on the otherhand, it may be here remarked, the paramount position of the king of Magadha is not only indicated by his name, Rājahaṃsa, but also by the title of Rājadhīrāja applied to him on p. 177.

⁴ V. A. Smith, The Coinage of the Early or Imperial Gupta Dynasty of Northern India, J. R. A. S. 1889, pp. 136—37. His coins are of the fan-tail peacock type and imitate, both in this particular and in the legend (in which the same title "vijitāvaniravanipati" is adopted), coins of Kumāra- and Skandaguptā. He appears also to have been the first of his line to assume the title Maharājadhīrāja (C. I. I. III, No. 47, l. 6).

⁵ Harṣac., tr. Cowell and Thomas, pp. 173 and 224.

⁶ The first of the later Guptas to adopt the supreme title is Ādi-tyasena about the middle of the seventh century: he styles himself both Maharājadhīrāja and Paramabhaṭṭāraka (C. I. I. III, No. 44—45). It seems, however, probable that the foundation of the greatness of the later Guptas was laid by Mahāsenagupta, their power receiving a temporary check during the reign of Harṣavardhana. See appendix A.

⁷ Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. I, pp. 209—10. Hiuen-Thsang says that the old capital of Kanyākubja was called Kusumapura. Are we to see in this statement a hint that in former times (under the Maukharis?) Pāṭaliputra- and Kānyakubja were under one government? Or was Kusumapura an older name for Kānauj? Kusumapura appears to have been

conflict with the evidence of the Harṣacarita. The Maukhari Grahavarman, who was married to Harṣa's sister Rājyaśrī, met with an early death at the hands of the king of Mālava,¹ and we may assume that the kingdom thus apparently left without direct heir was temporarily taken over by this powerful ruler.

Rulers of Campā in Further India and the Maukharis.

Campā, as we have seen, was in all probability largely a mercantile city. This would harmonize well with what seems a very reasonable assumption, viz. that the Campā of further India was originally a trading station or colony from the like-named capital of Aṅga. If we admit a connexion between the Aṅga rulers of literature and the Maukharis of history, the peculiar similarity between the names of these kings and those recorded in the inscriptions of this far-eastern province becomes at once intelligible. Both series show a marked preference for epithets of Śiva in the distinctive portion of the name, and both have the kṣatriya termination-*varman*. Amongst the Maukharis we find the names Harivarman, Iśānavarman, Śarvarman;² in Further India, Harivarman (5 times), Rudravarman (4 times), Bhadravarman (4 times).³ The earliest inscription from eastern Campā, that of Bhadravarman I., belongs to the fourth century A. D. and an ultimate connexion between these dynasties is therefore chronologically quite possible. The Maukharis and the rulers of eastern Campā may both have been descended from the same royal family, the early kings of Aṅga.⁴

The Mauryas and the Maukharis.

These early kings may have been the Mauryas: it is even possible, as already pointed out, that Campā was still under Mauryan rule when the Daśakumaracarita was written. If we could thus connect these Mauryas, the rulers of Aṅga, with the Maukharis, who later held possession of Kānyakubja and possibly of Magadha, we should be better able to understand Hiuen-Tsang's allusion to

the name of the royal precinct at Pāṭaliputra (ibid. vol. II, p. 83 note 4.), and it is possible that if the Guptas established a more central capital for their dominions, the new palace and royal precinct should preserve the name of the old, and this name (as in the case of the capital of Magadha) be used to denote the town itself.

¹ Harṣac., tr. Cowell and Thomas, pp. 123 and 173.

² C. I. I. III, No. 47 and 51.

³ Finot, Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-orient 1904, pp. 908—10.

⁴ Kālidāsa speaks of the well-trained elephants of the Aṅga-king, of whom he says (Raghuv. VI. 27):

विनोतनागः किल सूत्रकारिर्
ऐन्द्रं पदं भूमिगतोपि भुङ्के ॥

It is tempting to compare this with the allusions to the "ponderous and mighty rutting elephants", the "proudly-stepping array of mighty elephants" of the Maukharis — allusions showing undisguised admiration — in the inscription of a hostile king, viz. the Later Gupta Ādtyasena (C. I. I. III, p. 206).

a king of Magadha who was (1) a Buddhist, (2) the last of the race of Aśoka and at the same time (3) a contemporary of Śaśāṅkaraja, whom he makes the murderer of Harsa's brother Rājyavardhana.¹ Hiuen-Tsang calls this king Pūrṇavarman (Pu-lana-fa-mo). Except for the name — and this even shows the Maukhari termination *-varman* — all these details could well apply to the Maukhari Grahavarman. If this king was not the last direct representative of this dynasty of Maukharis,² the rule of these kings seems at least to have been suspended during the reign of Harṣavardhana. That he was a Buddhist the Harṣacarita affords us the clearest indications. He was a friend ("second heart") of the Buddhist ascetic whom Harṣa meets in his search of Rājyaśrī (who had escaped from the confinement to which she had been subjected by the king of Mālava, and was wandering with her attendants in the forests of the Vindhya), and Rājyaśrī herself, after her husband's death, resolves to enter a Buddhist order.³ And, as brother-in-law of Harṣa, he was certainly the contemporary of Rājyavardhana and his murderer Śaśāṅkadeva. Have we here one of the numerous instances of the employment of secondary names, or are we to ascribe these coincidences to accident?

The Southern Dominion: Vidarbha and the Bhojas.

We have seen that the data of the Daśakumāracarita point to the existence of a large southern power called by Daṇḍin Vidarbha, a country which also figures prominently in the Raghuvamśa. And we have further seen that both Daṇḍin and Kālidāsa speak of the ruler of this country as a Bhoja, or a member of the Bhoja family. These facts, it has been suggested, intimate that these authors were not separated by a very long interval of time — they both seem to have written during the more prosperous period of this southern power. If we turn to the evidence of inscriptions we find, it is true, no mention of Bhojas in the records of either the fifth or

The Vākātakas
of "Bhojakata-
rājyam".

¹ Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. II, pp. 118 and 174.

² A. Maukhari Bhogavarman is mentioned in an inscription of the Nepalese king Jayadeva bearing the date 153 of the Harsa era = 759 A. D. (Ind. Ant. IX, p. 181). Grahavarman was therefore certainly not the last to bear this title.

³ Harṣac., tr. Cowell and Thomas, pp. 250 and 258. Compare also the lamentations of Rājyaśrī's attendants: "O lord of the Mukhara family (i. e. Grahavarman), why dost thou not restore to consciousness this widowed wife, distracted with her various griefs? O Holy *Sugata*, thou art asleep to thy distracted worshippers" (p. 246).

the sixth century, but we do nevertheless find a powerful race of kings who ruled probably during the Gupta period (their inscriptions unfortunately leave their precise date uncertain) in the western part of the Dakhan, viz. that of the Vākātakas. The grants of these kings¹ record the gift of land or villages situated in what is now the province of Eastern Berar, that is to say, in a district whose present designation is in all probability but a modification of the ancient name Vidarbha: and one of these villages, Carmanka (the modern Chammak, about four miles southwest of Ilichpur), is, moreover, said to be in the kingdom of Bhojakaṭa.² A city bearing this name, we learn from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa,³ was founded by Rukmin, the father of Kṛṣṇa's wife Rukminī and son of Bhīṣmaka, king of Vidarbha. This Bhojakaṭa, as well as its king Rukmin, is also mentioned in the second parvan of the Mahābhārata, viz. in the Digvijaya of Sahadeva, and it is here placed in the neighbourhood of the Narmadā and Avanti.⁴ I think, therefore, there can be little doubt that this town is to be identified with the Bhojakaṭa of our inscription. It was doubtless the head-quarters of that district, or *viṣaya*, of the Vākātika dominions which the inscription calls Bhojakaṭarājyam.⁵ The fact that other names of cities or strongholds are met with ending in *-kaṭa* (e. g. Tālākaṭa, MBh. II. 1169: **दिव्यकटं पुरम्**, II. 1193) shows this to be a termination. It probably had the same force as *-kaṭaka*, for we find in inscriptions Dhanakaṭa⁶ by the side of the more usual Dhanakaṭaka as the name of the capital of Andhra. According to the St. Petersburg Dictionary *kaṭaka* meant "ring, army, royal residence". The last signification would probably arise from the circle of walls or fortifications surrounding the palace, and it seems to me that *kaṭaka* must have denoted, like the word *town* (cf. Germ. *Zaun*, a hedge), a fortified place in general, before it came to be used in the narrower sense of royal residence. I think, therefore, we are justified in assigning to Bhojakaṭa some such meaning as "fort or fortified city of the Bhoja, or the Bhojas". And this interpretation is rendered more probable by the fact that Rukmin, the mythical founder of this city, is called in the Harivaṃśa lord of the Bhojas.⁷ A tribe bearing this name certainly occupied the western Vindhya in the

¹ The Chammak and Siwanī grants (ed. Fleet, C. I. I. III, Nos. 55 and 56), and the Dudia grant (ed. Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. III, No. 35, p. 258 ff.).

² Bhojakaṭa-rājye (C. I. I. III, No. 55, l. 18).

³ Viṣ. Pur., tr. Wilson, vol. V, pp. 69 and 71.

⁴ MBh. II. 1115 and 1166. Cf. Harivaṃśa, ed. Calcutta 1839, v. 5016.

⁵ The termination *-rājyam* is found again in the Dudia grant (Ārammi-rājye: Ep. Ind. III, No. 35, l. 13) and has probably the same meaning as the more usual *rāṣṭram*, a term synonymous with *viṣaya* (Fleet, C. I. I. III, note 7 on pp. 32—33).

⁶ E. g. in a Pālī inscription of Puḷumāyi, A. S. W. I. IV, p. 110.

⁷ Harivaṃśa v. 5016.

time of Aśoka,¹ and other evidence of the presence of Bhojas in this part of India will be noticed later on. Bhojakaṭa may have been one of the strongholds of this race or, quite possibly, was the citadel in which their chief — *the* Bhoja — resided. In any case, it remains clear that the territory of the Vākāṭakas not only occupied a country the present designation of which connects it with the ancient Vidarbha, but that it also included a district associated with the name of Bhoja.

Beside these grants there exists an inscription of these kings in one of the caves at Ajaṅṭā, near Aurangābād.² Both these sources supply a genealogical list.³ In the grants the dynasty begins with Pravarasena I and ends with Pravarasena II: in the inscription an earlier king named Vindhyaśakti is mentioned, and three kings are added after Pravarasena II; but Rudrasena II, the precursor of this sovereign, is omitted, and no mention is made of Gautamīputra, the son of Pravarasena I. This prince has no title and in all probability did not reign. Pravarasena I is said in the grants to have performed, among many other important sacrifices, four aśvamedhas (ll. 1—2) — an indication that he claimed for himself the position of universal ruler. He seems, too, to have given his name to Pravara-pura, the apparent capital of the Vākāṭaka dominions, from which two of the grants⁴ are dated. These considerations coupled with the fact that these grants (which, of course, are earlier than the inscription) omit the name of Vindhyaśakti, make it probable that Pravarasena I was the actual founder of the dynasty. The occurrence of the termination *-sena* in every name of the series except the first points in the same direction.

The queens of the Vākāṭakas are as a rule not mentioned. In the grants, however, the marriage of Gautamīputra and that of Rudrasena II find special notice. Gautamīputra married the daughter of Bhavanāga, Mahārāja of the Bhāraśivas, who (i. e. the Bhāraśivas, the royal family to which Bhavanāga, belonged) had performed, we are told, no fewer than ten aśvamedha sacrifices. Rudrasena II was married to Prabhāvatiguptā, the daughter of Mahārājadhīrāja Śrī Devagupta (or possibly Śrīdeva Gupta). These alliances were evidently regarded as of special importance. Nothing is known of Bhavanāga, though Bühler suggested that the Bhāraśivas might be the same as the Bhār Rājputs.⁵ But there can be little reasonable doubt that the Gupta mentioned in connexion with the

Their genealogy.

The record of an important Vākāṭaka marriage preserves the name of a Mahārājadhīrāja Śrī Devagupta.

¹ They are mentioned in the thirteenth rock edict (Smith, Early Hist., p. 164).

² Burgess, A. S. W. I. IV, pp. 124—127.

³ See table II.

⁴ The Chamnak grant (C. I. I. III, No. 55) and the Dudia grant (Ep. Ind. III, No. 35). Pravara-pura may have been the name of the royal palace: see p. 37 f.

⁵ Ind. Ant. XII, p. 241.

second marriage, who bore the supreme title of Mahārājādhirāja, belonged either to, the family of the Early (Imperial), or to that of the Later Guptas.

The identifica-
tion of this prin-
ce with the La-
ter Guptan De-
vaguṇḁa histo-
rically impro-
bable: the Vā-
kāṭakas rather
contemporaries
of the Early
Guptas.

As a matter of fact the name Devaguṇḁa, or Devaguṇḁadeva, actually occurs in an inscription of Jvituṇḁa II,¹ the last known number of the Later Gupta dynasty.² This inscription is not dated; but as the name of Śrī Harṣa (i. e. Harṣavardhana of Sthānviśvara, 606—648 A. D.) is introduced in an earlier record³ of these kings in connexion with Mādhavaguṇḁa, the grandfather of Devaguṇḁa, it is clear that this prince could not have reigned earlier than the second half of the seventh century. In all probability he did not commence to reign till some time after 672 A. D.; for the date 66 occurring in an inscription of his predecessor Ādityasena⁴ is doubtless to be referred to the Harṣa epoch of 606—607. At this time the Calukyan dynasty predominated in the south. We know from the Aihole inscription⁵ that even before the middle of the seventh century the greater part of India south of the Narmadā was in their hands. Pulikeśin II, who caused this monument to be set up, appears, indeed, to have attempted to extend his conquests beyond this river, and to have met in battle the great Harṣavardhana himself (l. 23). The immediate successors of this monarch — Vikramāditya I, Ādityavarman, Vinayāditya, Vijayāditya, Vikramāditya II — all assume the paramount titles Mahārājādhirāja and Parameśvara, the last two adding that of Bhaṭṭāraka or Paramabhaṭṭāraka.⁶ The supremacy of the first of these rulers certainly extended as far as Nausārī in the Baroda state,⁷ which, of course, implies that it included part at least of the intervening Western Dakhan. And the same district acknowledged the authority of the last of them. An inscription of the year 739 A. D. tells us how the Arabs (Tājikas), wishing to conquer all the southern kings, entered the Navasārikā country (i. e. Nausārī) and were there overthrown by Avanijanāśraya-Pulikeśin, a feudatory of the Calukyas.⁸ It is far from likely that the Vākāṭaka dynasty in its prime, when its princes were in a position to enter into matrimonial alliance with a powerful, if not paramount, family of northern India, could

¹ C. I. I. III, No. 46, l. 4.

² See table III.

³ Ibid., No. 42, l. 15.

⁴ Ibid., No. 43.

⁵ Ed. Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. VI, p. 1 ff. See also Fleet, Dyn. of Kan. Dist., Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. II, pp. 350—51. The Calukyan power suffered an eclipse at the end of Pulikeśin's reign, when the Pahlavas seem to have become for a time paramount. The supremacy of the Calukyas was, however, restored by this king's son Vikramāditya I after an interval of about thirteen years (ibid. pp. 358 ff.).

⁶ Fleet, Dyn. of Kan. Dist., Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. II, pp. 361 ff.

⁷ Ibid., p. 363.

⁸ Ibid., p. 375.

have been contemporary with this warlike and dominant race. Nevertheless Dr. Fleet, whose authority I hesitate to oppose, is induced by the identity of name to assert a connexion between these two Devaguptas,¹ thereby tacitly assigning the Vākātakas to the period between the middle of the sixth and the middle of the eighth century. This view seems to me to be untenable. In addition to the above considerations, the evidence of palæography not only does not require so late a date, but seems indeed to point to a considerably earlier period. As Dr. Fleet has pointed out, the "box-headed" type of character employed in the Vākātika grants was certainly used as early as the reigns of Samudragupta and his successor Candragupta II,² and Bühler in his remarks on the Chammak grant, which he edited in *Indian Antiquary*, vol. XII, placed these documents either in the first half (p. 239) or the middle (p. 240) of the fifth century.³ It is evident that this would make these kings the contemporaries of the Early Guptas. And I believe it is possible, quite apart from this evidence, not only to show that such was the case — that, at least, these Early Guptas were ruling at the time when the marriage between Rudrasena II and Prabhāvatiguptā took place —, but to give very plausible reasons for assigning this event to a particular (Guptan) reign.

The Vākātakas, as we have seen, almost certainly preceded the Calukyias. We know of no other power in these parts of India more likely to have brought about their downfall than these same Calukyias. If they were not directly overthrown,⁴ their greatness must at least have been seriously affected by the rising power of this warlike race, whose capital Vātāpi (Bādāmī) was situated at no great distance from Vākātika territory. Dependencies would probably have fallen away as the prestige of their overlords began to be eclipsed, or have been gradually wrested from them by these powerful rivals. It seems probable that the name of the Vākātakas as a southern power had vanished when Pulikesin II led his armies northward to the Narmadā and sought to extend his dominions beyond the Vindhya. This ruler, under whom we may look upon the Calukyan supremacy in the south as permanently established, began his reign about 610 A. D. We may provisionally regard this date — or in round numbers 600 A. D. — as supplying

The rise of the Vākātakas probably connected with the fall of the Western Satraps about 400 A. D.

¹ C. I. I. III, *Introd.*, p. 15. So also Dr. Hoernle in the table appended to his remarks on the Bhitārī seal (*J. A. S. B. LVIII*, pt. I, opp. p. 84). This writer, however, in a more recent article (*J. R. A. S. 1903*, p. 563), identifies him with the Śrīdevagupta of the Madhuban inscription of Harṣavardhana and regards him as a son of the Later Gupta Mahāsena.

² C. I. I. III, pp. 18–19.

³ Dr. Burgess reproduces these remarks of Bühler in the fourth volume of the *Archæological Survey of W. India* (p. 116 ff.) and therefore presumably shares this opinion.

⁴ See appendix B.

the *terminus ad quem* of the Vākāṭaka dynasty. The eight kings from Pravarasena I to Hariṣeṇa, allowing an average of twenty-five years for each reign, would have occupied a period of about two centuries.¹ This would give approximately 400 A. D. as the *terminus a quo* of the dynasty. Now the last known date of the Western Satraps is 388 A. D.,² and according to Vincent A. Smith, their power was overthrown by Candragupta II about 395 A. D.³ It is certain that in the time of Skandagupta part at least of their territory was in the possession of the Guptas.⁴ These kings ruled over a wide extent of country which stretched south beyond the Narmadā — on the seacoast certainly as far as Supārā, near Bassein⁵ —, and probably in later times included Berar; and it is but in accordance with the usual course of Indian history, that when the central power fell, some subordinate ruler should have taken advantage of the situation and made for himself a new dominion from the fragments of the old. These considerations supply us at least with a possible and intelligible starting-point for the Vākāṭakas, viz. the fall of the Satraps about 400 A. D. A comparison of the names occurring in these two dynasties raises this possibility to a probability; for the suggestion that some connexion exists between these two houses is unmistakable. One of the coins of these Satraps dated S. E. 144 (= 222 A. D.) bears the name of a Pṛthiviṣeṇa, the son of Rudrasena (Rājño Mahākṣatrapasa Rudrasenasa putrasa Rājñaḥ Kṣatrapasa Pṛthivīsenasa).⁶

¹ There would seem, however, to have been nine generations (including Gautamīputra), and the period may have been a little greater. C. M. Duff in her *Chronology of India*, p. 308 (following *Ind. Ant.* XIII, p. 242) adds a Rudrasena III between Pravarasena II and his unnamed son. There is, however, no inscriptional warrant for this king.

² Bhagvānlāl Indrajī, *The Western Kshatrapas*, J. R. A. S. 1890, p. 662.

³ *Early Hist.*, p. 255.

⁴ The Junāgadh inscription of Skandagupta (C. I. I. III, No. 14) records the repairing of the embankment of the artificial lake Sudarśana in the Kāṭhiāwāḍ peninsula — an embankment originally constructed in the time of the Maurya Candragupta, and which had been rebuilt by the Satrap Rudradāman in 150 A. D. (*The Sāh or Rudra Dāmā Inscription*, A. S. W. I. II, p. 128 ff.)

⁵ Bhandarkar, *Early History of the Dekkan*, 2nd ed. Bomb. 1895, p. 16. How far the dominion of these rulers extended inland is uncertain. The greater part of the central Dakhan was during the time of the earlier Satraps in the hands of the Andhrabhṛtyas, but it may well be, that when this dynasty fell (according to Vincent A. Smith (*Early Hist.*, p. 190) about 236 A. D.), the Satraps seized some of the territory bordering on their possessions in the Konkan. Certain it is that coins of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudrasena II (256—272 A. D.), the son of Dāmājaḍaśri, have been found at Amrāvati in Berar, and a second hoard of coins, belonging to Satraps whose dates range from 238 to 300 A. D., still further south at Karād on the Kṛṣṇā, 31 miles south of Sātāra (Bhagvāntal Indrajī, *Early History of Gujārāt*, Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. I, pp. 48—49).

⁶ Bhagvānlāl Indrajī, *The Western Kshatrapas*, J. R. A. S. 1890, p. 653, and *Bomb. Gaz. I*, pt. I, p. 43.

The same names in the same order are found in the list of Vākāṭaka kings, who, however, never call themselves kṣatrapas. Such a two fold coincidence can hardly be due to accident. When we remember that coins of these western rulers have been found in what would appear to be the heart of the Vākāṭaka dominion,¹ we may, I think, accept it as strong presumptive evidence in favour of a direct family relationship. It would be intelligible, for instance, if the founder of the Vākāṭaka dynasty had been a younger member of the family of the last Satrap ruler in charge of a frontier province (like Aśoka in the time of Bindusāra,² Agnimitra in the time of Puṣyamitra)³ which was not directly affected by the attack of Candragupta II.⁴ Such an origin from a Śaka (or Pahlava)⁵ race might further account for the curious title, Vākāṭaka, which these kings assumed.

And this assumption of (approximately) 400 A. D. as the date at which this dynasty commenced is made still more probable by a consideration of certain records to be found in Dr. Fleet's volume of Gupta inscriptions. There were in the fifth century two small kingdoms in Central India occupying roughly the districts now known as Bundelkhaṇḍ and Baghelkhaṇḍ. Their territories were contiguous, and a boundary pillar discovered at the village of Bhumarā, in the native state of Nāgaudh,⁶ marks one point at which they touched. The rulers of the more western of these kingdoms (in Bundelkhaṇḍ) claimed descent from a saintly and royal ancestor (nṛpatiparivrājaka) named Suśarman, and this dynasty has therefore been styled by Dr. Fleet the Parivrājaka. They employed regularly in their grants the Gupta era and were probably minor feudatories of this empire. The rulers of the more eastern kingdom, with whom we are more particularly concerned, had their capital at Uccakalpa (not identified), and we may again follow Dr. Fleet in giving this name to the dynasty. These Uccakalpa kings, differing from the Parivrājakas, do not make mention of the Guptas in dating their grants, and it has been held that they used the Cedi or Kaḷacuri era.⁷ Their dates, however, if calculated

Further evidence in favour of this date: the Uccakalpan Vyāghra and Vyāghradeva of the Jaso inscription.

¹ See note 5 above and p. 37. Amrāvati (Amraoti) lies about 22 miles south-east of Ilichpur.

² Mahāvansha, tr. Turnour and Wijesinha, p. 17.

³ Malavikāgnimitra, Poona 1896, p. 12; tr. Weber, Berlin 1856, p. 10.

⁴ The province of Surāṣṭra seems certainly to have been under the administration of a son of the ruling Satrap (Bhagvānlal Indr., J.R.A.S. 1890, p. 641).

⁵ Fleet, Dyn. of Kan. Dist., Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. II, p. 317. In Rudradāman's inscription (I 19) at Junāgaḍh a Pahlava minister, Suviśakha, is mentioned as administering the districts of Anarta and Surāṣṭra (A. S. W. I. II, p. 130).

⁶ Bhumarā is about nine miles to the north-west of Uchaharā, in the Nāgaudh State, in the Baghelkhaṇḍ division of Central India.

⁷ Dr. Fleet, who expressed this view in his Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts (Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. II, p. 293) and elsewhere, definitely renounces it J. R. A. S. 1905, p. 567.

from the Gupta epoch, seem to me to fit in better with the known synchronism of the two kings Hastin (Parivrājaka) and Śarvanātha (Uccakalpa) whose names appear on the boundary pillar mentioned above. These grants have been found at Kārītalāi, in the Jabalpur district of the Central Provinces,¹ and at or near Khoh, in the native state of Nāgaudh, in the Bhagelkhaṇḍ division of Central India.² In the genealogical table which they preserve we find the name of a Mahārāja Vyāghra (see table I). Now a Vyāghradeva, in a short inscription on a slab found in the native state of Jaso in Bundelkhaṇḍ, calls himself a feudatory of the Mahārāja of the Vākātakas, the illustrious Pṛthiviṣeṇa.³ Jaso, the chief town of this state, and Uchaharā, the chief town of the Nāgaudh state, are situated about twenty-five miles apart; the inscribed stone, therefore, lies close to or within the territory over which the kings of Uccakalpa ruled. There is, therefore, at least a *prima-facie* likelihood that the names belong to one and the same dynasty of kings.

The dates of the Uccakalpan grants probably Guptan.

The known dates of the Parivrājaka Hastin lie between 475—76 and 510—11 A. D., a period of thirty-five years. It is not probable that his reign could have fallen much beyond these limits. The dates of his contemporary Śarvanātha, if calculated from the Kaḷacuri epoch, fall between 441—2 and 462—3 A. D.; if calculated from the Gupta epoch, between 512—13 and 533—34 A. D. In the former case there is a difference of thirteen years between the known periods of these kings; in the latter case, a difference of two. Considering the length of time during which Hastin is known to have reigned, the Gupta reckoning seems to offer the more reasonable result. It is not uncommon for rulers to use dates in their inscriptions without specifying the era to which they belong. Ādityasena, for instance, one of the Later Gupta line, employs the era of Harṣavardhana, but does not name it.⁴ And if the Uccakalpas were subject, as I think, to the Vākātakas, the omission of the name of Gupta is intelligible — the Vākātakas appear to have had no era of their own, their grants giving simply the year of the reign. It is further likely that they would be influenced in

¹ C. I. I. III, No. 26. Kārītalāi is a village about twenty-three miles north east of Muḍwārā, the chief town of the Muḍwārā subdivision of the Jabalpur district of the Central Provinces.

² Ibid. Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31. Khoh is a village about three miles south-west of Uchaharā, the capital of the native state of Nāgaudh, or Nāgaudh, in the Baghelkhaṇḍ division of Central India.

³ Vākātakānām mahārāja-śrī-Pṛthiviṣeṇa-pādānuddbyāto Vyāghradevo mātapitroh punyarttham kṛtāmīti (C. I. I. III, Nos. 53—4). The slab was found near Nachne-ki-Talāi, a small village about seven miles south-west of Jaso.

⁴ Dr. Fleet, at least, considers the date on Ādityasena's Shahpur inscription to belong to this era (C. I. I. III, p. 210).

their way of dating by the method in general use throughout the wide empire on whose borders their state was situated.

The Uccakalpan Śarvanātha was preceded by Jayanātha, Jayanātha by Vyāghra. The grants of Jayanātha belong to the years 174 and 177, and if we regard these as Guptan we have as the last known date of this sovereign (319—20 and 177) 496—7 A. D., and as the earliest (319—20 and 174) 493—4 A. D. Vyāghra would then have ruled some time before 493 A. D., and would in all probability have been ruling between the years 468 and 471 A. D. (allowing twenty-five years as the average duration of a reign). Now assuming 400 A. D. as the starting point of the Vākātakas dynasty, and allowing thirty years (it would be possible to allow more) to each of the first two kings on account of the omission of Gautamīputra, the approximate dates of Pṛthivīseṇa, the contemporary of the Vyāghradeva of the Jaso inscription, would be 460—485.¹ That is to say, on this assumption the reigns of these two Vyāghras would fall together. This conclusion, harmonizing as it does with the already established probability that these two rulers belonged to the same dynasty, seems to me strongly to favour the adoption of (approximately) 400 A. D. as the initial date of the Vākātakas, and to add very great probability to the assumption that the rise of this dynasty is closely associated with the fall of the Western Satraps.

Coincidence of the probable dates of the two Vyāghras on the assumption of 400 A. D. as term. a quo of the Vākātakas, a confirmation of the probability of this assumption.

It is true the period which Bühler assigned to the Vākātakas on palæographical grounds is somewhat earlier than that which I have assumed. According to his estimate, Pṛthivīseṇa ruled from about 350 to 400 A. D.² And it is clear that this ruler would then probably, though with less likelihood, have been a contemporary of the Uccakalpan king Vyāghra if the dates of this dynasty were calculated from the Kaḷacuri epoch of 248—9 A. D.³ But the connexion of the Uccakalpan dates with this era is now denied by no less an authority than Dr. Fleet,⁴ and all that can be claimed for Bühler's view is that it offers the unprejudiced testimony of palæography to the early date of the Vākātakas and thus, in that it accentuates the probability that Pṛthivīseṇa lived during the time of the Uccakalpas, contributes very essentially towards establishing the conclusions at which we have arrived.

Bühler's dates for the Vākātakas, though earlier, in reality afford further confirmation.

¹ As Rudrasena II, the successor of this king, is not mentioned in the Ajanṭā inscription, it is possible that his reign was a short one: in this case Pṛthivīseṇa may have ruled for more than the average number of years.

² Ind. Ant. XII, p. 241. Dr. Burgess gives his dates as 360—410 A. D. (A. S. W. I. IV, p. 128).

³ Kielhorn, Ind. Ant. XVII, p. 215. With this era Vyāghra would have reigned some time before 422 A. D., and would probably have been reigning between 397 and 400 A. D.

⁴ J. R. A. S. 1905, p. 567.

The name "Śrī-devagupta" a serious difficulty.

If these conclusions are correct, Pṛthivīṣeṇa would have been living during the reign of Skandagupta (circ. 455—480). We are here confronted with a serious difficulty. Rudrasena II, who married Prabhāvatiguptā, was the son of this Pṛthivīṣeṇa, and therefore (as it is natural to suppose that the marriage took place during his father's reign), on the authority of the Vākāṭaka grants, the contemporary of Pṛthivīṣeṇa was the Mahārājādhirāja Śrī Devagupta. This name appears nowhere in the list of the Imperial Guptas. Three explanations of this discrepancy suggest themselves. Devagupta may have been an alternate name. Or this prince may have been a younger brother of the ruling sovereign, in which case we should have to assume that the style *Mahārājādhirāja* was allowed by courtesy to younger members of the royal house, the higher title *Paramabhāṭāraka* being possibly reserved for the supreme ruler himself. Or "Śrīdeva" may be an honorific prefix, and the name "Gupta" used as the generic title of this family of kings, as in the inscription of Yaśodharman¹ and in the date-formula of the Parivrājaka grants (Gupta-nṛpa-rājya-bhuktāu).² As favouring this view, it may be noticed that in the Madhuban grant of Harṣavardhana the Later Guptan contemporary of Rājyavardhana II is spoken of as Śrīdevagupta,³ though there can be little doubt that at this time the reigning Gupta was Mahāsenā.⁴

Summary of results of the preceding investigation.

The evidence at our disposal, it may be admitted, does not in all points furnish us with such definite results as could be desired: it nevertheless supplies one or two valuable suggestions as to the relations between the Vākāṭakas and the Imperial Guptas. It may, in the first place, be taken for granted that these two dynasties were contemporary. It is further certain that the suzerainty of the Vākāṭakas extended as far north as the native state of Jaso in Bundelkhaṇḍ, which lay on the very borders of the Gupta dominions, and in the immediate neighbourhood of which the kings of Uccakalpa are known to have ruled. There is, therefore, very great probability (1) that the Devagupta (or Śrīdeva Gupta), whose daughter was married to the Vākāṭaka Rudrasena II, belonged to the Imperial line, and (2) that the Uccakalpa kings were feudatories of the Vākāṭakas. In which latter case it would further follow that this marriage took place most probably during the reign of Skandagupta.

Vidarbha of the Raghuv. and Daśak. = the kingdom of the Vākāṭakas.

I venture to think that the Vidarbha of Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa and of Daṇḍin's Daśakumāracarita represents this kingdom of the

¹ C. I. I. III, No. 33, l. 4.

² Ibid., No. 21, 22, 23, 25.

³ Ed. Bühler, Ep. Ind. I, (p. 67 ff.), l. 6.

⁴ Dr. Hoernle, however, would regard this Śrīdevagupta as an elder brother of the Mādava who in the Apsad inscription (C. I. I. III, No. 42) immediately follows Mahāsenagupta (Some Problems of Ancient Indian History, J. R. A. S. 1903, p. 562).

Vākātakas; and I believe that the use of the name Bhoja, which both these authors apply to the rulers of this country, finds an explanation if we assume that they wrote at a time when this dynasty was predominant in the south.

The Vākāṭaka grants enable us to fix with tolerable certainty three points within the territory over which these kings ruled. Carmaṅka of the Chammak grant is the village of Chammak, where this grant was found, situated about four miles south-west of Ilichpur.¹ Kollapūraka of the Siwanī grant is probably represented by the present village of Kolapur, about twenty-one miles south of the same town.² Candrapura mentioned in the Dudia grant may be the modern Chandpur, a village lying south of Siwanī (Seoni) and to the west of the Waingangā.³ The first two villages are both situated within the district of Ilichpur in Berar; the last lies a little to the south-west of this province, in the adjacent territory of Haidarābād. The Ilichpur district was considered by Bühler to mark the extent of the Bhojakaṭarājyam mentioned in the Chammak grant,⁴ and this Bhojakaṭarājyam, that preserves the name of the city founded by Rukmin, a prince of Vidarbha, doubtless occupied a part of the territory of Vidarbha. The ancient capital of this country was Kuṇḍinapura, and if this city is rightly identified with the present village of Kundapur, about 40 miles east of Amarāvātī (Amraotī), also in Berar, there can remain no doubt that this province, as indeed its name suggests, represents part at least of the classic Vidarbha. Two of these Vākāṭaka villages at least must, therefore, be regarded as lying within the limits of this country.

The fact that two of the three known grants of this dynasty have reference to the restricted area of the Ilichpur district — the locality of Bhojakaṭarājyam — makes it probable that here lay the political centre of the Vākāṭaka dominion. The Siwanī and Dudia grants (both recording gifts of Pravarasena II) are dated from Pravarapura. A southern affluent of the Godāvarī, that joins this river south of the Ajaṅṭā hills, bears the name Pravara, and it is possible that Pravarapura was a city situated on this stream. But it seems far more probable that Pravarapura preserves the name of the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena I, the apparent founder of this dynasty. In this case it may be the name, not of a city, but of the royal palace and precinct of some city situated in or near Bhojakaṭarājyam, and not improbably at Bhojakaṭa itself. Of the importance of this town in early days Indian literature leaves no doubt: and that it was in existence at this time the Chammak

The political centre of the Vākāṭakas probably in or near the district of Ilichpur (E. Berar).

Pravarapura the royal precinct of Bhojakaṭa?

¹ Fleet, C. I. I. III, p. 235.

² Ibid., p. 244.

³ Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. III, p. 260.

⁴ Ind. Ant. XII, p. 240.

grant renders highly probable. The name Bhojakaṭa, as has been pointed out, probably indicates that it at first denoted such a fortified royal residence. That it should be eventually applied to the whole city of which the royal citadel (puram) formed the nucleus or centre is but natural. It is exactly what seems to have happened in the case of Puṣpa- or Kusuma-pura. Hiuen-Thsang tells us that this place was so called "because the palace of the king had many flowers", and he further explains Kusumapura (Ku-su-mo-pu-lo) to mean "the city or royal precinct of the scented flower".¹ It seems clear that Kusumapura, or Puṣpapura, (Flower-citadel, or-city) was originally the name of the royal palace or of that part of the city in which the palace stood,² and which, according to Hiuen-Thsang's account of Indian cities,³ was separated by a wall from the rest of the city. This explanation at least makes the use of the two names Puṣpapura and Pāṭaliputra⁴ side by side in Indian literature far more intelligible. I would suggest that Pravara-pura, the citadel of Pravara, was either the name of the palace and royal precinct of a new dynasty erected in the old capital, not improbably Bhojakaṭa, or a new name for the palace and precinct of a former dynasty.

Bhojas in the south: the Mahābhojas of cave-inscriptions and the Viṣ. Pur.

As we have seen, there can be little doubt that Bhojakaṭa was in some way connected with a race of Bhojas; and it has been suggested that it was the head-quarters of such a race, the seat of a line of Bhoja kings. Bhojas seem to have reigned in the south even in the remote times at which the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa was compiled, for this name was even then regarded as a characteristic designation for a southern ruler.⁵ But in this case the south (dakṣiṇā dik) most probably means, not the Dakhan, but the region of the Vindhya. The presence of a Bhoja race in the Dakhan at an early period is, however, conclusively shown by certain Buddhist inscriptions that have been found in this part of India. In the caves at Kuḍā⁶ mention is frequently made of kings having the title Mahābhoja, and this name occurs again in one of the caves

¹ Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. II, p. 83 and note 4.

² Cf. the line quoted from the commentator Jagaddhara by Fitzedw. Hall in the Introduction (p. 35) to his edition of the Vāsavadattā (Calcutta 1859): कुसुमं पुरमित्वाङ्गः पुरं पाटलिपुत्रकम्.

³ E. g. in the case of Rājagṛha (Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. II, p. 165).

⁴ Both these names, for instance, are used for the capital of Aśoka in the Mahāvāṇsa (ed. Sumangala and de Silva, Colombo 1883, Paṭaliputta V, 22; Puppapura V, 41).

⁵ Ait Br. VIII, 14; tr. Haug, Bombay 1863, p. 517. "Then the Rudras inaugurated Indra in the southern region during 31 days with the three Ṛk verses, the Yajus and the great words (just mentioned) for obtaining enjoyment (of pleasure). Hence all kings of living creatures in the southern region are inaugurated for the enjoyment (of pleasure) and called 'bhoja' i. e. 'enjoyer'."

⁶ A. S. W. I. IV, Kuḍā Inscr., No. 6, 15, 17, 20, pp. 85—87.

at Beḍṣā.¹ Both Kuḍā and Beḍṣā, it is true, lie considerably remote² from the neighbourhood of Bhojakaṭa, but the title of these rulers, the Great Bhojas, indicates that they were a powerful race, and it is by no means impossible that this town, which shares the name of this dynasty, was situated within their territory. The Bhojas who are spoken of in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa also seem to have belonged to the Dakhan. Mahābhoja, we are told, was the great-grandson of Vidarbha: "he was a pious prince, and his descendants were the Bhojas, the princes of Mṛttikāvati."³ Here we find the names of Bhoja and Mahābhoja immediately connected with that of Vidarbha. The latter points clearly to the Dakhan: Mahābhoja is the very name found in the Kuḍā caves. But for the town with which these Bhojas are connected, it would seem as if this Purāṇa — that records the names of the Andhrabṛṛtya kings⁴ and mentions the Guptas of Magadha⁵ — had here preserved an allusion to these southern rulers. The mention of Mṛttikāvati is, however, a disturbing element.

The position of this city is uncertain. According to the Mahābhārata⁶, it lay between Vatsabhūmi (capital Kauśāmbī, probably the modern Kosam, about 28 miles west by south from Allahābād) and Tripurā, the modern Tevur on the Narmadā, near Jabalpur: and a verse of the Harivaṃśa⁷ points similarly to the neighbourhood of this river. According to the Brahma Purāṇa,⁸ it was situated on the Parṇāśa, another form of which name, Varṇāśa, would be represented in modern times by Baṇṇās or Baṇās.⁹ A river bearing this name, one of the southern tributaries of the Son, flows through Baghelkhand, and it is evident that a position on this river would fully satisfy the requirements of the epic. But a Mṛttikāvati north of the Narmadā would not be in Vidarbha, and it is here that we should expect to find a race to whom, in this half-poetic account, a progenitor of this name is given. The introduction of the name Vidarbha may be due to a recognition on the part of the compiler of this purāṇa, or of those who framed the tradition which he incorporates, that the Bhojas of Mṛttikāvati were related to the Bhojas of the Dakhan. But another explanation is possible, viz. that there were two Mṛttikāvatis, the capitals respectively of an earlier and more northern settlement — that of the Mahābhārata —

Mṛttikāvati
and Bhojakaṭa.

¹ Ibid., Beḍṣā Inscr. No. 3, p. 90.

² Kuḍā is situated about 45 miles south of Bombay; Beḍṣā is in the Māwal sub-division of the Poona district, Bombay Presidency.

³ Viṣ. Pur., tr. Wilson, vol. IV, p. 73.

⁴ Ibid., vol. IV, p. 194 ff.

⁵ Ibid., vol. IV, p. 218.

⁶ MBh. III. 791—92.

⁷ Harvaṃśa v. 1983.

⁸ Viṣ. Pur., vol. IV, p. 73 (Wilson's note 1).

⁹ Ibid., vol. II, p. 152 (Wilson's note 2, Hall's note §).

and a later and more southern settlement — that of the Purāṇas. A Parnāsā, or Varṇāsā, (Pāli, Baṇāsā) is certainly mentioned in an early Satrap inscription at Karle,¹ and this stream is more likely to belong to this neighbourhood than to be represented by the river Baṇās which empties itself into the Rann of Kacch, though this was doubtless also in Satrap territory. Karle is in the Poona district, and therefore in the vicinity of the Kuḍā caves where so many Mahābhoja inscriptions have been found. It is at least strange that the names Parṇāsā and Mahābhoja, associated in these purāṇas with that of Vidarbha, should be thus found so close together in the Dakhan, at no great distance from Berar. There may have been several Bhoja settlements in this part of India. To such a settlement the rulers named in an Ajaṇṭā inscription² of the time of the Vākāṭaka Hariṣeṇa would seem to have belonged. This is at least the conclusion to which the allusions to Pradyumna (if this reading is correct) and Śāmba in this inscription (v. 9), and the occurrence of the termination -sāmba (= -śāmba) in the names of this dynasty (Hariśāmba, Sauriśāmba, Raviśāmba) would lead us. And the centre of such a settlement was undoubtedly Bhojakaṭa: indeed, it seems to me not improbable that this city, founded according to tradition by a prince of Vidarbha, is the city referred to in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa as the seat of the descendants of Vidarbha, the name there employed, Mṛttikāvati, being but a secondary name derived from the earlier home of these Bhojas. The chiefs of these various communities, if such they were, may have been under the supremacy of a paramount Bhoja, the Mahābhoja. In any case, no city seems so likely to have been the head-quarters of these Vidarbha Bhojas, both from its position in Berar and from its place in ancient Indian tradition, as the city which bears the name of this tribe, Bhojakaṭa.³

The Vākātakas
prob. known
(conventional-
ly) as Bhojas.

The evidence of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa leaves no room for doubt that the district in which Bhojakaṭa stood — Bhojakaṭarājyam — formed a part of the ancient country of Vidarbha. That the Vākātakas were in possession of this district is certain: that their capital was in the same district is probable, and in this case, I have tried to show, it is quite possible that it was at Bhojakaṭa itself. If I am right in connecting this city and region with a race of Bhoja kings, the predecessors of the Vākātakas, whether, indeed, these occupied the Bhoja capital or not, it would be natural for the tradition-loving Hindu to continue to use in his writings the older and classic name and to call these rulers Bhojas or Bhojavamśas. There are indeed expressions in the Ajaṇṭā inscription already referred to which seem to indicate that the Vākātakas

¹ A. S. W. I. IV, p. 101.

² Ibid., pp. 128—132.

³ See appendix B.

were in the mind of the writer in some way connected with the Bhojas. In the fragmentary eleventh verse we have the “lovely enjoyments” (upabhogāḥ lalitāḥ) of Devasena recorded, and in the sixteenth we read how this king, “being at ease and having installed [Hastibhoja as minister] there, attached himself to enjoyments (bhogēṣu) according to his heart’s desire.”¹ Such expressions are not usual in inscriptions. It would seem as if the writer were thinking of that passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which we have already had occasion to notice, in which we are told that “all kings of living creatures in the southern region are inaugurated for the enjoyment of pleasures (bhujyāiva) and called ‘Bhoja’, or enjoyer”. This would give us strong reasons for assuming that in his time the Vākātakas were generally or, perhaps, conventionally known as Bhojas. The writer of the inscription was the son of Hastibhoja, the minister of Devasena who is spoken of in the verse quoted above, and in the name of this minister we may perhaps find further confirmation of such an assumption. Seven ancestors of this Hastibhoja are enumerated in an inscription found in a Buddhist vihāra at Ghaṭotkaca, about eleven miles west of Ajaṅṭā.² All of these have single names:³ Hastibhoja, who is the first member of the family to become minister to a Vākāṭaka king, is also the first whose name shows a double element, — and the second element is *-bhoja*. Is it possible that this termination was adopted on his appointment to the service of a king with whose dynasty the name Bhoja was usually associated?

Gen. Cunningham proposed as the boundaries of the Vākāṭaka kingdom the Mahādeva hills on the north, the Godāvārī on the south, the Ajaṅṭā hills on the west, and the sources of the Mahānadi on the east.⁴ But the supremacy of the Vākātakas, that reached at one time, as we have seen, northward to the neighbourhood of Baghelkhaṇḍ, must have covered in the days of its prosperity a much greater area. The Daśakumāracarita names six dependencies of Vidarbha, but the position of most of them is so uncertain that we learn from this bare enumeration but little as to the territorial extent of the southern dominion with which Daṇḍin seems to have been acquainted, and over which he sets a prince of the Bhoja race. It is, however, important to notice that this dominion does not include Kaliṅga on the east, nor Lāṭa (Surat) on the west, both of which countries are represented as independent.⁵ Further,

The territory of the Vākātakas and of Daṇḍin’s Vidarbha.

¹ Burgess, A. S. W. I. IV, pp. 126 and 127.

² Ibid. p. 60, and pp. 136—140.

³ Yajña, Deva, Soma, Ravi, Pravara, Śrī-Rāma, Kīrti.

⁴ Bühler, Ind. Ant. XII, p. 240 (= Burgess, A. S. W. I. IV, p. 118): he refers to Cunningham, Archæol. Reports, vol. IX, p. 123.

⁵ A war between Lāṭa and Paṭālī is a leading feature in the 3rd Pūrva-pīṭhikā (Somadatta’s Adventure); and a war between Kaliṅga and Andhra, in the seventh ucchvāsa of the Daśakumāracarita proper (Mantragupta’s Adventure).

as we find Vidarbha at war with Vanavāsī, we may probably regard this kingdom as marking its southern limit at least on this side of India. The town of Vanavāsī, in the sixth and seventh centuries one of the seats of the Kādamba kings,¹ is the modern Banavāsī in North Kanarā.² We may, therefore, perhaps place the southern boundary of Daṇḍin's empire either along the Kṛṣṇā (Kistnā), or along the Varadā³ (Wardā) and Tungabhadra rivers. On the east it was bounded partly by Kalinga and possibly Kosala,⁴ and partly by Andhra, under which name we must understand the eastern territory between the Kṛṣṇā and the Godāvārī. Within this area, then, must be assigned the six feudatory kingdoms of Vidarbha.

The dependen-
cies of Vidar-
bha in the Da-
śak.

These kingdoms are Aśmaka, Kuntala, Murala, R̥cīka, Koṅkaṇa, and Sāsikya or Nāsikya.⁵ Several of these names are found in inscriptions of the Gupta period, and it seems likely that we have in this list less conventionality than is present in some other parts of Daṇḍin's geography: and, indeed, the nomenclature of the Daśakumāracarita seems on the whole to be distinctly less conventional than that of the Raghuvamśa. A tribe of Aśmakas, or Assakas, was settled, at the time when the Sutta-Nipāta was composed, on the banks of the Godāvārī.⁶ This is, no doubt, the same tribe whose name appears in inscriptions at Ajaṅṭā of about the sixth century A. D.,⁷ and they therefore probably occupied land near the sources of this river in the western Dakhan, south of Berar. Kuntala-deśa, according to Dr. Burgess, stretched "from the Narmadā in the north to somewhere about the Tungabhadra (or further) in the south, having the Arabian Sea for its border on the west, while it reached the Godāvārī and the Eastern Ghats on the north-east and south-east".⁸ This estimate, including as it does Vidarbha, is manifestly larger than the Daśakumāracarita warrants. An

¹ Fleet, Dyn. of Kan. Dist., Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. II, pp. 285 and 291.

² Ibid. note 1 on pp. 278—79.

³ Anantavarman, the king of Vidarbha, is said to have assembled the forces of his feudatories on the Narmadā (p. 203): it would be more in accordance with the position of Vanavāsī to read, with the *varia lectio* (Daśak., ed. Bühler and Peterson, pt. II, p. 59), Vaṭadā (= Varadā, i. e. the Wardā).

⁴ This country is only referred to incidentally, viz. pp. 204 and 210.

⁵ Daśak. p. 203.

⁶ Sutta-Nipāta, ed. Fausböll, v. 977:

So Assakassa visaye Alakassa samāsane

Vasī Godhāvarīkūle uñchena ca phalena ca.

These Aśmakas were probably a branch of the Aśmakas of the north-west mentioned in the Bṛhat Saṃhitā and elsewhere: cf. Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, pp. 27—8.

⁷ A. S. W. I. IV, Ajaṅṭā inscriptions No. 4, v. 10 (p. 131); No. 5, v. 9 (p. 135).

⁸ A. S. W. I. III, p. 23.

inscription of the twelfth century¹ shows that their capital at that time was at Kurugode, about fourteen miles north of Ballārī, in the Madras Presidency. Ballārī is considerably south of the Tungabhadra: but Kuragode, as the inscription clearly indicates,² was a new capital, and its foundation may point to a recent expansion of the Kuntala territory in a southern direction. The position of the Muralas is quite uncertain. The name occurs in an inscription found at Bhera Ghat on the Narmadā,³ but among others either equally unknown or of such divergent parts that we derive no hint as to the actual location of this tribe. In the Raghuvamśa⁴ a river Muralā or Marulā is mentioned in connexion with the country of the Keralas, and it is possible that the Keralas of this passage are the same as Daṇḍin's Muralas. But to identify these with the Keralas of the extreme south⁵ is hardly warranted by the data of his romance. It would seem to bring the influence of Vidarbha much too far south, and it would not be in keeping with the known site of Vanavāsī, the seat of a power hostile to Vidarbha and therefore presumably close to the frontier of its dominion. The country of these Keralas, or, as they were also called, Ceras,⁶ lay along the Malabar coast, south of the territory of Vanavāsī, and it is evident that such a position for an ally of Vidarbha would be almost impossible. The Muralas must have been situated further to the north. That they were the same as the Keralas of the Murala river is just possible, but all that can be urged in favour of such an identification is a verse of the Bṛhat Saṃhitā⁷ in which the Āsmakas, Koṅkaṇas, Kuntalas, Keralas

¹ Colebrooke, *Miscell. Essays*, London 1873, vol. II, p. 242.

² "This Kurugode was established as the capital of his dominions by the king of Kuntala" (*loc. cit.*), i. e. Rakṣāmala of the inscription, which bears the date 1095 and 1103 of the Śaka era, equivalent to A. D. 1173 and 1181.

³ Ed. Fitzedw. Hall, *J. A. O. S.* VI, p. 499 ff.

⁴ *Raghuv.* IV, 55.

⁵ As apparently Fitzedw. Hall in his remarks on the above inscription *J. A. O. S.* VI, p. 527. It must be admitted, however, that the association of the Muralas with the Colas (with whom the Ceras, or Keralas, are usually associated) and the Kāverī river in the Kathāsaritsāgara (XIX, 95—96) is in favour of such an identification. Possibly the Kerala country covered a very large area and included parts both of the Dakhan and the extreme south of India.

⁶ These names are considered to be etymologically connected (*Smith, Early Hist.*, p. 341: *Ind. Ant.* XXXIV, p. 248—49).

⁷ *Br. S.*, ed. Kern, XVI, 11:

द्रविडविदेहान्धारमकभासापुरकौङ्कणाः समन्त्रिषिकाः ।

कुन्तलकेरलदण्डककान्तिपुरस्त्रेच्छसङ्करजाः ॥

समन्त्रिषिकाः makes no sense. Kern suggested in his translation (*Publications of the Roy. As. Soc.* 1869—73) सहाय्यषिकाः as an emendation. The meaning would then be "with Atri's hermitage and the

and possibly the R̥ṣikas are mentioned together along with Daṇḍaka, and from which we may perhaps infer that they were all neighbouring tribes occupying the western Dakhan. For R̥ṣika the MSS. have also R̥ṣika and R̥ṣika,¹ and there can be no doubt that under R̥ṣikas we are to understand the R̥ṣikas who are named together with Vidarbha and Māhiṣikī (= Māhiṣmatī) in the Rāmāyaṇa.² Their country may have lain between Vidarbha (Berar) and Māhiṣmatī, an ancient capital of Avanti according to Buddhist accounts,³ and which, we learn from the Raghuvamśa, was situated on the Narmadā (Revā).⁴ In this case it is possible that their name (which appears also as R̥ṣṭika)² is to be connected with that of the Raṭṭis, Raṭṭhis, Raṭṭhas or Rāṣṭrikas, the early inhabitants of Mahārāṣṭra, the land of the Mahārāṭhas.⁵ Koṅkaṇa is probably that country whose Maurya rulers were defeated in the latter half of the sixth century by the Calukya Kirtivarman, and in the early part of the seventh by his successor Pulikesin II.⁶ These Mauryas appear to have occupied the territory known in the ninth and following centuries as the Koṅkaṇa fourteen-hundred. This was, next to Lāṭa, the present district of Surat, the most northern of the seven Koṅkaṇas into which the coast-country between the Western Ghats and the sea was divided: it "began about Chaul or Chemval in the Kolāba District, thirty miles north of Bombay, and appears to have extended over the whole of Kolāba and Thāna."⁷ The name of the last tribe is again uncertain. Sāsikyā, the reading of Godabole and Parab's edition of the Daśakumāracarita, has little to recommend it. A tribe of Sāsikas or Śāsikas is mentioned in the long geographical list of the Bhiṣma parvan of the Mahābhārata,⁸ but even if these were identical with the Sāsikyās, we learn nothing whatever about them from the mere presence of their name in this bare list. Other readings⁹ are

R̥ṣikas'. We should expect the southern Vidarbha in place of Videha in the first half of the verse.

¹ Daśak., ed. Bühler and Peterson, pt. II, p. 59.

² विद्भानृष्टिकांश्चैवरम्यान्माहिषिकीमपि । IV. 41. 16, Gorresio.

विद्भानृष्टिकांश्चैवरम्यान्माहिषिकानपि । IV. 41. 10, Bomb. 1859.

As in the case of the Aśmakas, there seems to have been also a northern tribe of R̥ṣikas Arjuna in the Mahābhārata defeats a combination of the Lohas, Kāmbojas and northern R̥ṣikas (II, 1032): and they are also mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa (IV. 44. 13, Gorr).

³ Rhys Davids, Buddh. Ind., p. 40: he refers to Dīgha-Nikāya XIX, 36.

⁴ Raghuv. VI. 43. So also Daśak. p. 11.

⁵ Bhandarkar, Early History of the Dekkan, p. 2.

⁶ Aihole Inscription of Pulikeśin II, ed. Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. VI, No. 1, vv. 9 and 22: Fleet, Dyn. of Kan. Dist., Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. II, pp. 282—83.

⁷ Fleet, *ibid.*, pp. 283—84, and note on p. 283.

⁸ MBh. VI. 354.

⁹ Daśak., ed. Bühler and Peterson, pt. II, p. 59.

Sāśikya, Sāhasikya, Āsikya¹ and Nāsikya. The last is adopted in Peterson's text and, though it is apparently only warranted by one manuscript, seems by far the most satisfactory. Nāsikya is the modern Nāsik situated at the source of the Godāvarī, and the Nāsikyās would therefore have been close neighbours of the Aśmakas. Their territories may have been separated by the Ajañṭā hills.

Only one of these names is found in the Vākāṭaka inscription at Ajañṭā. The Kuntalas are there said to have been overthrown by Pṛthiviṣeṇa and again, together with other peoples, by Hariṣeṇa.² The mention of the Kuntalas in this inscription is, of course, no proof that they were feudatory. But as an evidently neighbouring state it seems probable that this was at times the case. And it seems further probable that the Aśmakas, whose name, as we have seen, occurs in other inscriptions at Ajañṭā — in the same district, that is, as the Vākāṭaka inscription — were among the states subject to these kings. That the Vākāṭakas certainly held the position of over-lords is shown (1) by the inscription of Vyāghradeva noticed previously, and (2) by an allusion to that "moon among princes, Hariṣeṇa" in another of the Ajañṭā cave-records,³ — the one already mentioned (p. 40) as probably belonging to a Bhoja tribe. These inscriptions, it is clear, provide very little direct help towards determining the actual extent of country over which the Vākāṭakas exercised suzerainty; but we may nevertheless obtain from one of the verses of the Vākāṭaka inscription very important negative evidence. The eighteenth verse tells us that Hariṣeṇa conquered Kuntala, Avanti, Kālīṅga, Kosala, Trikūṭa, Lāṭa, Andhra and possibly one or two more countries whose names are not legible. Trikūṭa was probably some part of the northern Konkan,⁴ that is, the coast-land between the Western Ghats and the sea. As both Lāṭa and Trikūṭa stand side by side with Kuntala in this list, we have, in the first place, decisive evidence that the latter country was certainly not always bounded at all points on the west by the Arabian Sea as Dr. Burgess defines it. At this time it was evidently independent. But if we consider the territory held by the Vākāṭakas and the Kuntalas together, we are able, further, from the data of this inscription to lay down the following boundaries for the combined countries. On the east we have Kosala and Kālīṅga, on the west Lāṭa and Trikūṭa, on the south

Evidence of the Ajañṭā inscriptions as to the territorial extent of the Vākāṭaka dominion.

¹ Asikas are mentioned by the side of Asakas (or Aśmakas) in the Nāsik inscription of Puḷumayi (A. S. W. I. IV, p. 108).

² Vv. 8 and 18 (A. S. W. I. IV, pp. 126 and 127).

³ Ibid. p. 132. "Pandit Bhagvānlāl is probably right in assuming that the Hariṣeṇa mentioned in l. 21 is the Vākāṭaka prince whose name occurs in Ajañṭā No. 3, and that the Vākāṭakas were the lords-paramount whom these rulers obeyed" (Dr. Burgess' remark on p. 128).

⁴ See p. 20. Bhagvānlāl Indrajī considered the Traikūṭakas to be a branch of the Ābhīras, and connected them further with the later Haihayas (Bomb. Gaz. I, pt. I, pp. 57—58).

Andhra, and on the north Avanti. It will be seen that the area thus enclosed corresponds very closely indeed with that of the dominions of Vidarbha (which, of course, included Kuntala) in the Daśakumāracarita, where the bounding kingdoms are Kosala and Kalinga on the east, Lāṭa (and Pāṭali) on the west, Andhra and Vanavāsī on the south, and the Magadhan empire (including Mālava i. e. Avanti) on the north.

Summary of evidence in favour of the identification of Vidarbha with the kingdom of the Vākātakas.

This close resemblance between these two areas is explained if Daṇḍin's Vidarbha represents the kingdom of the Vākātakas. And that such is the case the whole course of our argument would lead us to expect. This argument may be here briefly recapitulated. Adopting the period fixed by Huth for Kālidāsa, viz. 400—600 A. D., as a period including also the generally accepted date of Daṇḍin, we have shown that this proximity of date between these two authors is borne out by the geographical data of their works, the Raghuvamśa and the Daśakumāracarita. And we have pointed out that in both of these works special emphasis is laid on a southern kingdom called Vidarbha over which in both a Bhoja prince is represented as ruling. Turning to history, we have found a line of kings, the Vākātakas, ruling in Berar — a province which undoubtedly represents at least a part of the ancient Vidarbha —, whose territory included a district named Bhojakaṭarājyam, and therefore probably Bhojakaṭa itself — a city founded according to tradition by a prince of Vidarbha who is also spoken of as lord of the Bhojas. It has been suggested that, as successors of Bhoja kings, the name Bhoja may have been, and probably was, applied to these rulers. Finally, I have tried to show that there are reasonable grounds for assuming that these Vākātakas, possibly a branch of the Western Satraps, flourished between 400 and 600 A. D., and therefore were ruling in the time both of Kālidāsa and of Daṇḍin.

Date of the Daśakumāracarita.

If this assumption is correct, the appearance of the Kuntalas in this romance as vassals of Vidarbha would indicate that Daṇḍin did not write (at least that he did not write the eighth ucchvāsa in which Vidarbha and its dependencies are introduced) during the reign of Hariṣeṇa, when the Kuntalas held an independent position. If this king was the last of his line — as he is certainly the last recorded —, it would further follow that he wrote some time before his reign, that is, according to my estimate, before 585 A. D. We may perhaps venture a step further. It seems to me probable that we have in the bare narrative — I mean the romance divested of the adventures of the princes, the quasi-historical background of the piece —, at least here and there, scraps of actual history. It is, in the first place, natural that events of his time or of a time not very remote and well remembered should have had some influence upon Daṇḍin in determining the form of this part of his story. And further, since we have seen in the case of the south

that the geographical setting appears to reflect with surprising accuracy actual historical conditions, it seems not unreasonable to expect that the historical element may have entered to some extent also into his facts. There are two leading quasi-historical events in the *Daśakumāracarita*: one of these appertains to the south, the other to the north. In the south Anantavarman of Vidarbha, a profligate prince, is overthrown by the artifices of Vasantabhānu, king of Aśmaka, who seizes the whole of his dominion. Anantavarman's queen, with her daughter, a girl of thirteen, and her still younger¹ son Bhāskaravarman, flees to the friendly court of Mitravarman (her husband's half-brother)¹ at Māhiṣmatī. Here one of the ten princes appears. Mitravarman is killed, and the prince becomes Bhāskaravarman's guardian. At this point the story breaks off abruptly leaving the prince meditating vengeance on the Aśmakan usurper.² In the north the king of Magadha, Rājahaṃsa, is ousted from his possessions by Mānasāra, king of Mālava, and is forced to take refuge in the Vindhya. Here Rājahaṃsa's son Rājāvāhana and nine other princes grow up. They eventually seek adventures. Most of them obtain influential positions in various countries and with the armies thus at their disposal join in overthrowing the power of Mālava.³ Now in the *Vākāṭaka* inscription we are told that the son of Pravarasena II succeeded his father at the age of eight; and from the *Dudia* inscription we know that Pravarasena II reigned for at least twenty-three years. These facts would harmonize very well with the character of Anantavarman (a second Agnivarṇa)⁴ as described in the *Daśakumāracarita*, and certainly do not preclude the possibility of some such political catastrophe as that which befell this prince. That no such adverse event is mentioned need not be regarded as an obstacle to this view, the inscription records little but the genealogy of these princes and the virtues and good deeds of the minister who composed it. If, further, my suggestion as to the date of the *Vākāṭakas* in correct, Pravarasena II would have begun his reign about 510 A. D., and would thus have been a contemporary of that Mihirakula who ruled in Mālava and who,

¹ These little touches certainly do not lessen the probability of an historical foundation.

² The story is found in the 8th (last) *ucchvāsa* of the *Daśakumāracarita* proper (p. 190 ff.). Its conclusion is supplied in the *Uttarapīṭhikā*: the prince (*Visruta*) drives out the Aśmakas and establishes Bhāskaravarman on the throne of Vidarbha, and, as a reward for his services, is presented with the province of Utkala (p. 214).

³ In the *Daśakumāracarita* itself we are only told that the army of the deputy ruler of Mālava (*Caṇḍavarman*) was defeated in the neighbourhood of Campā. The *Uttarapīṭhikā* adds that the combined forces marched against Mānasāra and overthrew him at Ujjayinī, that Rājahaṃsa adopted the life of an ascetic and was succeeded by his son Rājāvāhana as ruler of both *Puṣparājyam* and *Mālavarājyam* (pp. 216—17).

⁴ *Raghuv.* canto XIX.

according to Hiuen-Tsang's account, caused the ruler of Magadha, like Rājahansa, to conceal himself "among the bushes of the morass".¹

Date of the
Raghuvamśa.

The date of Kālidāsa has been reduced in recent years with great probability to within far narrower limits than those assigned by Huṭh in 1890. It has been suggested by Manmohan Chakravarti² that this author wrote the Raghuvamśa in the capacity of court-poet to one of the later emperors of the Early Gupta dynasty, probably Skandagupta. The imperial favour, he thinks, may have been won by the Kumārasambhava, a work intended by its title to attract the attention of the reigning sovereign — the *kula-devatā* of these later emperors having been the war-god Skanda, or Kumāra, as indicated (1) by their names (Kumāragupta, Skandagupta) and (2) by the peacock (the *vāhana* of this god) on their coins. M. Chakravarti supposes that the capital of these Guptas was Ayodhyā, and that Kālidāsa chose his subject for a court-poem, the history of Rāma and the famous epic kings who ruled in this city, in order to flatter his patron, apparently by an implied comparison with these ancient heroes. The suggestion is plausible, and I am not sure that a rough parallel could not be drawn between the first five rulers of the Raghuvamśa³ (upon each of whom Kālidāsa dwells at length) and the first five Gupta emperors beginning with Candragupta I, the practical founder of the dynasty. It is at least curious that in each case the second in the list (Raghu, Samudragupta) makes wide conquests over almost identical areas. The fifth emperor was Skandagupta (who contended with the fierce Hūnas of the north as Rāma with the fierce Rākṣasas of the south), and such a parallel would therefore be quite in keeping with the view put forward by M. Chakravarti and supported by Prof. Liebich,⁴ that Kālidāsa wrote his epic during the reign of this sovereign.⁵ Further, if I am right, it was precisely at this time that a matrimonial alliance brought about nearer relations between the Guptas and the Vākātakas — a fact which would help to account for the prominence given in this poem to the Bhojas and their country Vidarbha.

¹ Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. I, p. 168.

² J. R. A. S. 1903, p. 183 ff.; 1904, p. 158 ff.

³ Dilipa, Raghu, Aja, Daśaratha, Rāma. The list is different in the Purānas, as also in the Rāmāyaṇa (Vis. Pur., tr. Wilson, vol. III, p. 314): the number and the names may therefore have been specially chosen.

⁴ Das Datum des Candragomin und Kālidāsa's, Jahres Bericht der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur 1903, Abt. IV, p. 28.

⁵ M. Chakravarti (J. R. A. S. 1904, p. 160) restricts the composition of the fourth canto to the period 480—490 A. D.

Appendix A.

The Later Guptas.

That the earlier members of the Later Guptan dynasty ruled in Magadha is rendered improbable by the fact that their dates overlap those of the Early or Imperial Guptas whose names appear on the Bhitari seal.¹ This country, the traditional headquarters of imperial power, was doubtless in the hands of Išānavarman when he assumed the supreme title (he may have wrested it from the last of the Imperial Guptas). And similarly it is intelligible that the Later Guptan Ādityasena, likewise the first of his line to lay claim to the title of overlord, should be called lord of Magadha (viz. in an inscription of the Nepālese king Jayadeva, Ind. Ant. XIX, p. 181), the possession of the imperial title implying that he was powerful enough to seize Magadha.

I think there can be no reasonable doubt that Mādhavagupta, the friend of Harṣavardhana in the Harṣacarita who accompanies him in his search for Rājyaśrī, is the same person as the Mādhavagupta who in the Aphaṣa inscription of Ādityasena is expressly said to have been Harṣa's intimate companion.² The Mādhavagupta of the Harṣacarita is a son of the king of Mālava,³ and it seems therefore indisputable that the Later Guptas were rulers of some country bearing this name. The location of their inscriptions points to the east. The composer or engraver of one of these — the Aphaṣa inscription mentioned above, — calls himself a native of Gauḍa,⁴ and we have, I think, every right to infer either that this eastern Mālava included Gauḍa at the time when this inscription was written, that is, in the time of Ādityasena, or that its eastern boundary lay at no great distance from this town, the modern Gauṛ on the lower Ganges. In the latter case the evident inter-

¹ Smith and Hoernle, J. A. S. B. 1889, p. 84 ff.: Fleet, Ind. Ant. XIX, p. 244 ff.

² Sri-Harṣadeva-nija-saṅgama- (C. I. I. III, No. 42, l. 14).

³ Harṣac., tr. Cowell and Thomas, p. 119.

⁴ C. I. I. III, No. 42, l. 47.

course between Mālava and Gauḍa would indicate that the ruler of Gauḍa was a friendly and probably — at this time — a feudatory chief. It is possible that the territory of these Guptas extended westward (south of the Maukhari territory) as far as the district of Mālwa in the neighbourhood of Fatehpur.¹ The marriage of Ādityavardhana of Sthānviśvara with Mahāsenaguptā,² possibly a younger sister of the Later Guptan Mahāsenā, at least suggests that the confines of these two countries were not very widely separated. The position, however, of the earlier records — the three inscriptions of Ādityasena³ — seems clearly to show that, up till the time of this king at any rate, their chief seat lay in country immediately east of Gauḍa. During this period these kings were constantly at war with the Maukharis, and the territories of these two nations must have been adjacent. This would be intelligible and in perfect agreement with the evidence of the Later Guptan inscriptions, if the Maukharis, as their assumption of the supreme title would lead us to suppose, were at this time the suzerains of Magadhā. I believe, further, that it can be shown to be more than probable that one of these earlier kings, viz. Mahāsenagupta, waged war with Kāmarūpa (Assam). This would similarly suggest the adjacency of their territory to this country and point again to the vicinity of Gauḍa. The Aphaṣṭ inscription tells us that Mahāsenagupta defeated the illustrious Susthitavarman and adds that his fame was still constantly sung on the banks of the Lohityā by the Siddhas in pairs.⁴ The mention of the Lohityā, i. e. the Brahmaputra, makes it almost certain that Susthitavarman was king of Kāmarūpa, and I would identify him with Suṣṭhiravarman the father of that Bhāskaravarman, king of Prāggyotiṣa (i. e. Kāmarūpa) who in the Harṣacarita comes to seek Harṣa's alliance.⁵ Mahāsenagupta, according to the same inscription, was the father of Harṣa's companion Mādhava, and he would therefore have been the contemporary of Suṣṭhiravarman.

This identification, it seems to me, throws new light on Bāṇa's narrative. The events there recorded are briefly the following. The king of Mālava attacks and slays the Maukhari Grahavarman and imprisons his queen Rājyaśrī (the sister of Harṣavardhana) at

¹ Harṣac., Preface, p. xii, note 1.

² Ibid., p. 232.

³ C. I. I. III, Nos. 42—45. Aphaṣṭ (No. 42) is about 15 miles north-east of Nawāda, in the Gayā district; Shāhpur (No. 43), about 9 miles south-east of Bihār, in the Patnā district; Mandār Hill (Nos. 44—45), about 7 miles south-east of Bāṅkā, in the Bhāgalpur district of the Bengal Presidency.

⁴ C. I. I. III, p. 206.

⁵ Harṣac., p. 217. Dr. Hoernlé (J. A. S. B. LVIII, pt. I, p. 102) would identify him with Avantivarman, the father of Grahavarman, mentioned in the Harṣacarita (ibid., p. 122).

Kānyakubja. Rājyavardhana II (who has recently succeeded his father Prabhākaravardhana at Sthānvīśvara), accompanied by his kinsman Bhaṇḍi, leads an army against the Mālavan ruler and defeats him. He is, however, himself treacherously slain by the king of Gauḍa, and Kānyakubja is seized by the "man named Gupta". Bhaṇḍi returns with the booty taken from the Mālavan army to Sthānvīśvara, and is then commissioned by Harṣa to chastise the ruler of Gauḍa.

This episode has been discussed by Dr. Hoernle in an article published in the Royal Asiatic Society's Journal for 1903.¹ He there distinguishes between the king of Mālava, the father of Mādhavagupta, and the king of Mālava who leads his army against the Maukharī Grahavarman and is defeated by Rājyavardhana. The former he recognizes as the Later Gupta Mahāsena (p. 561). The latter he would identify with Hiuen-Thang's Śīlāditya (p. 555), whom he considers to have been the son of the Yaśodharman [= Yasovarman of coins (p. 551), and Vikramāditya of the Rājatarāṅginī (p. 553)] who defeated Mihirakula, and who, according to Dr. Hoernle, established the imperial dynasty of Western Mālava (p. 553). This distinction, I venture to think, is not only unnecessary but incorrect. We know from the Madhuban inscription of Harṣavardhana² that the king whom Rājyavardhana defeated was a Gupta. The actual expression there found — Śrīdevagupt-ādayaḥ³ — leads Dr. Hoernle to the conclusion that the king of Mālava, Śīlāditya, was accompanied on this expedition by a son of the Later Gupta Mahāsena named Devagupta, an elder brother of the Kumāra- and Mādhavagupta mentioned in the Harṣacarita (p. 564). This prince he thinks is the "man named Gupta" of Baṇa's account (p. 561). But, apart from the difficulty of accounting for his connexion with the wars of a western king and the omission of his name from the dynastic list of the Aphaṣṭ inscription, there seems no reason why Devagupta, the companion or ally of this western king — the man who, in reality, seriously impaired the effect of Rājyavardhan's victory by seizing Kānyakubja immediately after — should be specially mentioned in this inscription, while Śīlāditya himself, whom, according to Dr. Hoernle, Rājyavardhana actually defeated, is either completely ignored or merely included among the "others" (ādayaḥ) who took part in this campaign. I have elsewhere⁴ suggested that "Śrīdeva-Gupta" (His Majesty the Gupta) may be employed as a general designation of these rulers, just as the simple "Gupta" is employed in Yaśodharman's inscription and elsewhere. Śrīdevagupta may, of course, have been

¹ Some Problems of Ancient Indian History, p. 545 ff.

² Ep. Ind. I, p. 67 ff.

³ Ibid., p. 72, l. 6—7.

⁴ See p. 36.

a second name of Mahāsenagupta; but whether a second name or a general title, the concurrent evidence of the Harṣacarita and the Aphaṣaḍ inscription requires us to assume that the king denoted in the Madhuban grant is none other than the Later Gupta Mahāsenā.

And with this assumption the account given in the Harṣacarita becomes clearer. That Mahāsenā should wage war with the Maukharī his contemporary might almost have been anticipated from the previous course of history: it is what both his father Dāmodara and his grandfather Kumāra had done before him.¹ The territory of these Guptas, as we have seen, bordered in all probability on that of Gauḍa, and it is therefore not surprising to find a king of Gauḍa taking part — probably as an ally² — in the campaign of one of these kings. And the presence of a noble³ named Gupta in the train of a Guptan king is equally intelligible. He was possibly a kinsman of Mahāsenā, occupying in his army a position of trust such as Bhaṇḍī appears to have held in the army of Rājyavardhana.

I conceive that the defeat of Mahāsenā's army was due to the death of this monarch in the contest. The re-capture of Kānyakubja so soon after the fall of Rājyavardhana indicates that his victory was by no means so decisive as Bāṇa, in the interests of his patron Harṣa, would have us believe. And the return of Bhaṇḍī with the army of his fallen sovereign to Śthānviśvara, though he was able to carry with him what spoils of war the short-lived victory had furnished, can only be regarded as an honourable retreat. I would suggest that after the conflict the "man named Gupta", now in supreme command, (acting on the advice of some subtle Cāṇakya) despatched the king of Gauḍa to the quarters of

¹ C. I. I. III, No. 42, l. 7—9. Dāmodara had indeed been slain by "the Maukharī".

² This king of Gauḍa, according to the commentator of the Harṣacarita, was named Śaśāṅka (Harṣac., Preface, p. x); and this is the name given by Hiuen-Tsang to the murderer of Rājyavardhana, though he calls him a king of Kāmasuvarṇa (Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. I, p. 210). This Śaśāṅka is doubtless the same as the king of this name mentioned in certain plates published by Prof. Hultzsch (Ep. Ind. VI, p. 143 ff.) and bearing the date Gupta-saṃvat 300 (= A. D. 619—20). He was at this time an independent sovereign, for not only does he bear the title *Mahārādhirāja*, but the Maharāja Mādhavarāja who issued this grant calls himself a *Mahāsāmanta*, and was evidently a feudatory of Śaśāṅka. It is not very likely that he held an inferior position at the time of this campaign (circ. 606 A. D.), in which case he could not have been other than an ally of the king of Mālava. Mahāsenā, however, seems to have been a particularly powerful ruler, and it is just possible that he was able to compel this neighbouring king to acknowledge his supremacy.

³ कुलपुत्र (Harṣac., Bombay 1897, p. 249).

the victorious Rājyavardhana, ostensibly to offer his submission or to negotiate terms of peace, but with the secret charge to surprise and slay his rival. The unsuspecting nature of Rājyavardhana favoured the bold enterprise, and this prince fell a victim to the ambitious designs — and possibly religious antipathy — of the Mālavan.¹ However this may be, certain it is that by some means or other this Guptan noble obtained possession of Kānyakubja. The moment was auspicious. He was now at the head of the royal forces. The resources of the Maukhari capital were at his disposal. The rightful heir to the throne of Mālava was absent at the court of Sthānviśvara.² It would have been an easy matter for him to have made himself master of the kingdom of the Guptas and, indeed, in possession as he was of the Maukhari territory, to have established a temporary supremacy in this part of India. And this, it seems to me, is what happened. His reign would doubtless have been a short one. It is natural to suppose that the expedition sent by Harṣa to chastise the neighbouring state of Gauḍa would also have been commissioned to install Mādhava on the throne of his father. The “man named Gupta” would have been rightly regarded by Mādhava and his successor as a usurper, and the omission of his name from the Aphaḍ inscription finds, therefore, a natural explanation.

Finally, Bāṇa tells us that when Bhāskara-varman came to Harṣa to crave his alliance, his father Suṣṭhira-varman had been dead “only a few days”.³ We cannot be sure when this visit took place, but, if I am right in identifying this Suṣṭhira-varman, king of Kāmarūpa, with the Susthitavarman whose kingdom lay in the neighbourhood of the Lohityā and who was defeated by Mahāsena-

¹ Rājyavardhana was “allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the king of Gauḍa, and then weaponless, confiding and alone, despatched in his own quarters” (Harṣac., p. 178). Hiuen-Tsang’s account emphasizes the religious side. “At this time the king of Karnasuvarna — a kingdom of Eastern India — whose name was Saśāṅka (She-shang-kia), frequently addressed his ministers in these words: If a frontier country has a virtuous [and therefore a Buddhist?] ruler, this is the unhappiness of the (mother) kingdom. On this they asked the king to a conference and murdered him.” (Beal, Buddhist Records, vol. I, p. 210).

² Kumāra disappears from Bāṇa’s narrative after his first introduction: he may have met an early death. Mādhava, however, is there represented as attending Harṣa in his search for Rājyaśri (Harṣac., p. 235), and there can be little doubt that he was still attached to the court of Sthānviśvara when these events took place at Kānyakubja. It is conceivable that these two princes, Kumāra and Mādhava, were sent to the court of Prabhākaravardhana in the first place as hostages for the good behaviour of their father. According to Bāṇa this Prabhākaravardhan was “an axe to the creeper of Malwa’s glory” (ibid., p. 101), and it is not unreasonable to suppose that Mālava is here used in the same sense as in the other instances.

³ Harṣac., p. 223.

gupta, it is not difficult to suggest a reason for his seeking in person the support of a powerful ally. Suṣṭhiravarman had possibly fallen in the same campaign (a *digvijaya*) in which Grahavarman had met his death, and we may well imagine that his kingdom lay at the mercy of the Mālavas — or, at least, that the young king sought to secure his country against future molestation at the hands of these warlike neighbours. Mahāsena's career had been terminated by Rājyavardhana, and it is natural that Bhāskara-varman should fly for assistance to the successor of this king, whose arms had been victorious against his father's foe, and who, in a sense, was the avenger of his father's death.

Appendix B.

The Vākāṭakas and the Kātaçuris.

It has been pointed out that the Viṣṇu Purāṇa speaks of Bhojas who were the descendants of a remote ancestor named Vidarbha.¹ This Vidarbha is there also represented as the ancestor of the Cedis. He had three sons: Kratha, Kaiśika and Lompada. Kratha was the ancestor of the Bhojas; Kaiśika, the father of Cedi, the progenitor of the Caidya kings.² In the Harivaṃśa Vidarbha is similarly made the father of Kratha, Kaiśika and Lompada; but here Cedi is the son of a second Kaiśika, the great-grandson of Lompada.³ Again, in the assault on Mathurā in this epic we find the following kings closely associated: Bhīsmaka, Rukmin, Krātha, Kaiśika, the king of Cedi (Śiśupāla), and Dantavakra.⁴ All of these seem to have been either Bhojas or Cedis. Bhīsmaka, king of Kuṇḍina, and Rukmin, king of Bhojakaṭa, were both Bhojas of the south.⁵ Krātha and Kaiśika bear names which

¹ See p. 40.

² Vis. Pur., tr. Wilson, vol. iv, p. 67 ff.

³ Harivaṃśa, tr. Langlois, Paris 1834—35, vol. i, p. 165 f. The allusion to Lomapāda and his descendants is, however, bracketed by Langlois, as being found only in one MS. and probably introduced from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa: it is omitted in the Calcutta edition of the text published in 1839. For Kaiśika (Langlois, Kēśika) the Calcutta text has Kauśika (v. 1988). The Harivaṃśa also assigns to Vidarbha a son named Bhīma.

⁴ Langlois, vol. i, p. 393. The Calcutta text reads Kauśika (v. 5090) and Dantavakra (v. 5091).

⁵ Bhīsmaka is said to have been descended from Vidarbha's son Kaiśika (Langlois, vol. i, p. 493), who in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa is the ancestor of the Cedi kings. He is distinctly referred to as a Bhoja (ibid., vol. i, p. 439), and his son Rukmin is spoken of as *Bhojādhipati* (v. 5016; rendered by Langlois (vol. i, p. 388) as "roi de Bhodja").

indicate affinity with the Bhojas and Cedis respectively. Dantavakra, king of the Karuṣas, was a cousin of Śiśupāla, king of Cedi, both being grandsons of Śūra (a descendant of Yadu) and his wife Bhojī.¹ The Bhojas and Cedis would seem clearly to have been closely related or allied races, and there is nothing improbable in the assumption that (possibly even in the time of the Harivaṃśa) they were the principal members of a tribal community similar to that of the Mālavas or of the Vṛjīs — a southern offshoot, it may be, of the Vṛṣṇi community to which the Bhojas and Yādavas of Mathurā and its neighbourhood belonged.² The existence of such a community in the Dakhan in the time of Kālidāsa might explain his employment of the double name “Kra-thakaiśika” (= Bhoja-Cedi?) for the subjects of his Bhoja prince of Vidarbha.³ We have seen how in the case of the Vṛjīs the name of one of the constituent tribes, viz. Videha, came to be applied to the whole federation;⁴ and it is similarly possible that the name “Cedi”, as well as “Bhoja”, was used to denote the whole of this southern community. Indeed, we may perhaps find an explanation of the Cedi era if we assume that, like that of the Mālavas, it dates from the union of these clans under such a definitely constituted federal association. This would then have taken place in the year 248—49 A. D.,⁵ shortly after the fall of the Andhrabhṛtyas,⁶ under whose suzerainty Vidarbha in the second century certainly stood.⁷ This sequence of dates at least makes for the probability of this suggestion.

There can be no doubt that Bhojakaṭa lay in Bhoja territory. Over this territory, and possibly over that of adjacent Cedi tribes also, as I conceive, the Vākāṭaka Pravaraṣena I — in the first instance probably the deputy of the Western Satrap in this district — made himself supreme; and this country became the nucleus

¹ Langlois, vol. i, p. 160 f.

² The name “Vṛṣṇi” is applied to Kṛṣṇa (a Yadava), Ugrasena (the Bhoja king of Mathurā) and the other allied chiefs who join in single combat with the six kings mentioned above in the text (Langlois, vol. i, p. 393). This name, it should be remarked, is employed in the Harivaṃśa in more than one sense. It is given (1) as a general designation for the three families descended from the three sons of Kroṣṭu (ibid., vol. i, p. 159); (2) as the name of the descendants of Vṛṣṇa, a Yādava (vol. i, p. 157); and (3) as the name of a race of kings descended from Bhīma, the son of Vidarbha (vol. i, p. 493).

³ Raghuv. V. 39, 61; VII. 29. At VIII. 81, however, it is used as equivalent to Bhoja.

⁴ See p. 10.

⁵ Kielhorn in Ind. Ant. XVII, p. 215.

⁶ This happened, according to V. A. Smith, about 236 A. D. (Early Hist., p. 190).

⁷ In the reign of Śātakarni Gotamīputra (A. S. W. I. IV, p. 109) who, according to V. A. Smith (Early Hist., opp. p. 190), acceded about 113 A. D.

of the Vākāṭaka dominion. As the successors of Bhojan princes (possibly at Bhojakata) these rulers, according to my suggestion, seem to have inherited the name "Bhoja" as a conventional or literary designation. Their subjects, however, — the Krathakaisikas of the Raghuvamśa — may well have been known historically as Cedis.

Another name for the Cedis is Kaṭaccuri or Kaṭacuri. Now the Aihole inscription of Pulikeśin II tells us that this monarch's predecessor Mangaleśa "took in marriage the Fortune of the Kaṭacuris."¹ This ruler reigned from 591 to 610 A. D. According to my estimate Harisena, the last known member of the Vākāṭaka dynasty — and therefore probably the last important one — ascended the throne about 585 A. D. It seems difficult to resist the conclusion that this was the king whom Mangaleśa overthrew.

¹ Aihole Inscription of Pulikeśin II, ed. Kielhorn, Ed. Ind. VI, p. 8.

Table I.
Conquests of Raghu and of Samudragupta.

Northern India.			
Extreme West and North-West.			
Pārasikas, or Ya- vanas	IV. 60—65.	Śakas	Territory of Western Sa- traps. ²
Hūnas	IV. 68. North of the Pa- rasikas (v. 66); in the vicinity of the Sindhu (v. 67). ¹	Śāhis ³	Territory of Kidāra Ku- sān princes, in neigh- bourhood of Kandahar.
Kambojas	IV. 69—70. Encountered after battle with the Hūnas and before ascending the Himā- layas.	Daivapu- tras ⁶	Territory of Great Ku- sān kings of Gāndhāra (Kābul and Peshāwar).
		Śāhānuṣā- his ³	Persia or the Kuṣān territory on the Oxus.
West			
		Ābhīras	Ahīrwāra, between the Parbatī and Betwā rivers and stretching south as far as Sironj.
		Malavas	Country north of the Narmadā, including part of Rajputāna and probably bounded on the east by the Jun- na and Betwā.
		Ārjunāya- nas	Probably country be- tween the Malava and Yaudheya territory.
		Yaudheyas	Territory south of the Mādrakas, including the present sites of Lāhor and Delhi.
		Mādrakas	Mādradeś, the Rechnā Duab between the Cha- nāb and Rāvī: their territory probably ex- tended to the Bīās.

¹ According to the commentator Mallinātha the Sindhu is here a river of Kāśmīr.

² The locations here given are taken from an article by Vincent A. Smith in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1897 (The Conquests of Samudra Gupta, p. 859 ff.), supplemented by the more recent, though briefer, account of Samudragupta's campaigns in his Early History of India (pp. 247—250).

³ So Dr. Fleet (Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, p. 14): V. A. Smith (J. R. A. S. 1897, p. 902 f.) takes these names as titles.

Table I. (cont.).

Northern India (continued).			
North			
Utsava-samketas	IV.78. In the Himālayas. Kirātas (v. 76) and "hill-tribes" (v. 77) are also mentioned.	Kartṭpura Nepāla	Lower ranges of the western Himālayas, including probably Kāngra, Garhwal, Almora and Kumāon. ¹ The modern Nepal.
East			
Prāgjyotiṣas ²	IV.81. Encountered after descending from the Himālayas and crossing the Lauhitya (Brahmaputra).		
Kāmarūpa	IV. 83—84.	Kāmarūpa Davāka	Assam. Possibly the country between the Ganges and Brahmaputra comprising the present districts of Bogrā, Dinājpur and Rājshāhī.
Suhmas	IV. 35. The first nation defeated by Raghu on his eastward march from Ayodhyā.		
Vaṅgas	IV. 36—37. Defeated in the neighbourhood of the Ganges.	Samatata	Delta of the Ganges and Brahmaputra.
South			
		Muruṅḍas Kharāparikas Kākas Sanakānikas Prārjunas	} Situation quite uncertain. ³

¹ V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 250 and note.

² Prāgjyotiṣa is elsewhere identical with Kāmarūpa: see p. 9.

³ A Muruṅḍadevi, or Muruṅḍasvāminī, is mentioned in the grants of the Uccakalpa king Sarvanātha (Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, Nos. 28, 29, 31) who reigned in the neighbourhood of Nāgaudh in Baghelkhand, and the Muruṅḍas may therefore have been located somewhere in this part of India. There is an inscription of a Sanikānika prince, a feudatory of Candragupta II, at Udayagiri, about two miles north-west of Bhelsā, in the dominions of Sindia (Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, No. 3); and as Kakanāda is the ancient name of Sañci (5½ miles south-west of Bhelsā), V. A. Smith would place both these tribes, the Sanakānikas and the Kākas, in this region. For the location of the Prārjunas he suggests the Narsimhpur district of the Central Provinces, and for the Kharaparikas, the Seoni or Mandlā district of the same province (J. R. A. S. 1897, pp. 892—96: a map of the conquests of Samudragupta is given in this author's *Early History of India*, opp. p. 250).

Table I. (cont.)

Southern India.			
Utkala	IV. 38. Entered from Vaṅga after crossing the Kapiśā (or Karabhā, Mallinātha).	Kosala	The southern and eastern districts of the Central Provinces of which the capital is Nāgpur.
		Mahākāntāra	Probably the modern districts of Baitūl, Chindwāra, etc. in the wilder parts of the Central Provinces [= Mahāṭavi of Br. Sam. XIV. ?].
Kalinga	IV. 38—43. The mountain Mahendra is mentioned in v. 39.	Piṣṭapura	The modern Pithāpuram in the Godāvārī district of the Madras Presidency.
		Mahendragiri Koṭṭūra Kaurāḷa	Hill-forts in Ganjām. ²
			In the neighbourhood of the Kolleru (Colair) lake, ³ which is situated between the deltas of the Godāvārī and Kṛṣṇā.
		Veṅgī	The Godāvārī and Rājmahendri districts, between the Godāvārī and Kṛṣṇā.
Pāṇḍya	IV. 49—50. After passing the Kāvārī (v. 45); in the neighbourhood of the Tamraparṇī river (v. 50).	Kāñci Avamukta	Conjeeveram. Situation unknown.
		Pālakka	Pālgatcherry, chieftown of the division of Pālgḥat (Palakkāḍu), situated in a gap of the Western Ghāts between the Tāptī river and Cape Comorin.
Kerala	IV. 54. After passing the mountains Malaya, Durdura (v. 51) and Sahya (v. 52).		
Aparānta ¹	IV. 58. In the vicinity of the mountain Tri-kūṭa (v. 59).	Devarāṣṭra	The modern Mahratta country. Cf. Deogiri near Aurargābād, in Haidarābād.
		Kusthalapura	Evāṇḍapalla, or Khāndesh. ⁴

¹ The expression अपरान्तमहीपालव्याजेन possibly means merely "in the guise of the *western* king or kings".

² V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 248.

³ *Ibid.* Prof. Kielhorn suggests that a fortified island in this lake is meant (*Ep. Ind.* VI, p. 3).

⁴ V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 249.

Table II.

Approx. Date of Accession.	Yakatakas	Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, No. 56, 56; Archæol. Survey of W. India, p. 124 ff.	Maharâjas of Uccaakalpa	Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, Nos. 26, 27, 28, 30, 31.	Parivarjakas	Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, Nos. 21, 22, 23, 25.
400	Vindhyaśakti Pravarasena I [Gautamiputra m. d. of Bhava- nâga, Mah. of Bhâ- rasîvas.]		Oghadeva m. Kumaradevi Kumâradeva m. Jayasvâmini			
430	Rudrasena I		Jayasvâmin m. Râmadevi		Devâhya	
460	Prithivîsena		Vyâghra m. Ajñitadevi		Prabhâñjana	
485	Rudrasena II m. Prabhâvati- gupta, d. of Maha- râjadîrâja, Sri Devagupta.	498—4 ¹ 496—7 492—3 425—6	Jayanâtha m. Murgudadevi	= Vyâghradeva of C. I., III, Nos. 53—4, a feuda- tory of the Va- katâka Prithivi- sena?	Dâmodara	
510	Pravarasena II	512—13 583—4	Śarvanâtha	Contemporary of Hastin. (C. I. I. III, No. 24)	Hastin	
535	Unnamed son	441—2 462—3			Samkṣobha	
560	Devasena					
585	Harisena					

¹ The upper numbers give the extreme dates calculated from the Gupta epoch 319—20 A. D.; the lower ones, the same dates calculated from the Kalacuri epoch 248—49 A. D.

Table III.

Later Guptas	Corp. Inscr. Ind. III. Nos. 43-46.	Maukharis.	Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, Nos. 47 and 51.	Dynasty of Harṣa- vardhana	Corp. Inscr. Ind. III, No. 53: Ep. Ind., p. 67 ff.
Kṛṣṇagupta		Hārivarman m. Jayavāmini		Naravardhana	
Harsagupta		Ādityavarman m. Harsagupta		m. Vajrint-devi Rājyavardhana I	
Jvitagupta I		Īśvararman m. Upagupta		m. Apsaro-devi Ādityavardhana	
Kumārāgupta	Defeats Īśā- navarman.	Īśānavarman m. Lakṣmivati		m. Mahāsenagupta	Mahāsena-
Dāmodaragupta	Killed in bat- tle with the Maukhari.	Śarvarman	"TheMaukhari" (C.I.I. III, No. 47, 1. 8).	Prabhākaravar- dhana	gupta prob. elder sister of
Mahāsenagupta		Avantivarman		m. Yaśomati	Mahāsena-
Madhāvāgupta	Friend of Har- savardhana.	[Grahavarman]	Married Harṣa's sister Rājyasri (Harsacarita, tr. Cowell and Tho- mas, p. 123).	Rājyavardhana II	gupta.
m. Srimatī					
Ādityasena					
m. Koṇadevi					
Devagupta					
m. Kamaladevi					
Viṣṇugupta					
m. Ījjadevi					
Jvitagupta II					

Lebenslauf.

Ich bin geboren zu Brighton (England) 1866 den 28. Dezember und gehöre der englischen Kirche an, besuchte Privatschulen in dieser Stadt und zum Abschluss die „Brighton Grammar School“, womit ich meine Schuljahre 1881 beendete. Danach betätigte ich mich bis 1886 kaufmännisch, trat dann als Lehrer in eine Privatschule ein und bereitete mich zu gleicher Zeit für die öffentlichen Examina der Universität London vor. Ich bestand das „Matriculation“-Examen dieser Universität 1888, das „Intermediate“ 1889, und das „Bachelor of Arts“ 1891. Zu dieser Zeit hatte ich eine Stelle als Lehrer in der „Brighton Grammar School“, die ich 1892 verließ. Vom Anfang des Jahres 1893 bis April 1904 war ich in Indien; zunächst als Lehrer in der „East Indian Railway Hill School“ zu Mussoorie (1893—97), dann als Oberlehrer in dem „Armenian College“ zu Calcutta (1898—1900), und während der letzten Jahre als Professor des Englischen in dem „Central Hindu College“ zu Benares, wo ich die Gelegenheit hatte bei den Panditen Samskrt studieren zu können. 1904 kehrte ich nach Europa zurück und 1905 immatrikulierte ich mich an der Universität zu Leipzig, wo ich meine Studien fortsetzte, in Samskrt unter Herrn Prof. Windisch, im Avestischen unter Herrn Prof. Lindner, in vergleichender Sprachwissenschaft unter Herrn Prof. Brugmann, und in Philosophie unter Herrn Prof. Wundt. Allen diesen Professoren drücke ich hiermit meinen ergebensten Dank aus.

Leipzig, den 12. Juli 1907.
Ferdinand-Rhodestr. 7.

Mark Collins.

