V

SOME PROBLEMS IN ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY

By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, PH.D., C.I.E.

IV.—THE IDENTITY OF YASODHARMAN AND VIKRAMĀDITYA, AND SOME COROLLARIES¹

THE Journal for 1903, pp. 545 ff., contained an essay of mine discussing the problem of Yaśodharman-Vishnuvardhana. In the meantime, 1908, Mr. Vincent A. Smith's valuable *Early History of India* has appeared in a second edition. As it offers an entirely different solution of the problem, it appears to me desirable to reconsider the evidences bearing on its solution. And here

¹ For Nos. I-III see this Journal for 1903, p. 545; 1904, p. 639; and 1905, p. 1. The following works are quoted in this article: Bull. = Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient; C.K. = Cowell's edition of Kusumāñjali; Cat. IM. = Mr. Smith's Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, 1906; EI. = *Epigraphia Indica*; F.G.I. = Dr. Fleet's Gupta Inscription in the *Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, vol. iii; F.E. = Dr. Fleet's Epigraphy in the *Indian Empire*, vol. ii, in the Imperial Gazetteer of India; GN. = Nachrichten d. k. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen; H.V. = F. Hall's edition of Vāsavadatta; IA. = *Indian Antiquary*; JBTS. = Journal of the Buddhist Text Society, and similarly JRAS., etc.; L.AR. = Professor Liebich's Annual Report of the Schlesische Ges. für Vaterländische Kultur (Breslau, 1903); N.RV. = Mr. Nandargikar's edition of Raghuvamśa; P.M. = Professor Pathak's edition of Meghadūta; R.IC. = Professor Rapson's Indian Coins in the Encyclopædia of Indo-Aryan Research; R.IE. = Sir Herbert Risley's Ethnology and Caste, in the *Indian Empire*, vol. ii in the Imperial Gazetteer of India; R.PI. = Sir Herbert Risley's *The People of India*, 1908; S.AI. = Professor Sachau's Translation of Alberuni's India; S.EH. = Mr. Smith's *Early History of India*, 2nd ed., 1908; S.GC. = Mr. Smith's Gupta Coinage in JRAS., 1889; S.R.T. = Dr. Stein's Translation of the Rājatarāṅginī; T.I. = Dr. Takakusu's Translation of Itsing; T.KS. = Mr. Tawney's Translation of Kathā Sarit Sāgara; W.B. = Wassilyew's *Buddhismus*, 1860; W.HL. = Weber's History of Indian Literature; W.HN. = Wright's History of Nepal; W.YC. = Watters' *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, 1904.

let me say at once that my object is not controversy, but friendly discussion of an admittedly difficult problem.

The supreme importance of the Hunic invasion of India is increasingly becoming realized. As Mr. Kennedy says (JRAS., 1908, p. 879), "it changed the face of North-western India." The change, indeed, has been very considerable; but what it might have been, if the domination of the Huns had not been broken in India, as it was also broken in Europe, who can say? It is surely a matter of great interest to determine, if possible, to whom the credit belongs of having broken that domination.

In the essay above referred to I attempted to establish, in the main, the following three propositions:—

1. That Yaśodharman–Vishnuvardhana was the agent who broke the Hunic domination.

2. That the memory of this great achievement survives in the Indian tradition which changed the name of the Mālava era into that of the Vikrama era.

3. That the empire founded by Vishnuvardhana–Vikramāditya, the conqueror of the Huns, was wrecked in consequence of the reversal of his anti-Hunic policy by his successor.

I am willing to admit that my working out of the three propositions may not have been sufficiently lucid, and that, particularly with respect to the third proposition, it may not now be sustainable in all minor details; but I demur to the assumption that any weakness in the last item suffices to upset the whole argument. With regard to the first proposition, in any case, I still feel confident that the evidence at present available is absolutely conclusive. That, after all, is the main point; if that is conceded, the rest will have to be construed, perhaps not exactly in the same, but in some such way as I have suggested. My construction is no more than a working hypothesis, and, like any other scientific hypothesis, it is

subject to the test that it co-ordinates and explains, in the best way, all the (at present) known facts and indications of facts. This test, I submit, it does satisfy.

1. I will take the three propositions *seriatim*. My first proposition is that it was Yaśodharman, and he alone, that broke the domination of the Huns. The alternative proposition, adopted in Mr. Smith's *Early History*, is that Yaśodharman played only a subordinate part in the transaction, and that the credit of it is due to Narasimhagupta, called Bālāditya. This theory was originally (1889) put forward by myself in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (vol. lviii, pp. 88 ff.), but I had not at that time fully realized the significance of the epigraphic evidence. I now see that that evidence is conclusive in Yaśodharman's favour, and that it is further corroborated by some other epigraphic, numismatic, and literary evidence, which, though more or less obscure, is very suggestive of the same conclusion.

The epigraphic evidence, which I take to be conclusive, is that of the so-called Mandasor inscriptions, published by Dr. Fleet in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol. ii, pp. 142–58 (Nos. 33–5). One of them, in duplicate (Nos. 33, 34), is engraved on two “Columns of Victory” erected by Yaśodharman himself. That portion which concerns us here, runs as follows:¹—

“He who . . . enjoys those countries . . . which were not enjoyed (*even*) by the lords of the Guptas, whose prowess was displayed by invading the whole (*remainder of the*) earth, (*and*) which the command of the chiefs of the Hūṇas, that established itself on the tiaras of (*many*) kings, failed to penetrate: he before whose feet chieftains, having (*their*) arrogance removed by the strength of (*his*) arm, bow down, from the neighbourhood of the (river) Lauhitya up to (the mountain) Mahendra, the lands at the foot of which are impenetrable through the groves of Tala-trees, (*and*) from (*Himālaya*) the mountain of snow, the tablelands of which are embraced by the (*river*) Gaṅgā, up to

¹ I quote Dr. Fleet's translation of No. 33, pp. 147–8.

the Western Ocean . . . he through the embraces of whose arms the (*Himālaya*) mountain of snow carries no longer the pride of the title of being a place that is difficult of access : he to whose two feet respect was paid with complimentary presents of the flowers from the lock of hair on the top of (*his*) head by even that (*famous*) king Mihirakula, whose forehead was pained through being bent low down by the strength of (*his*) arm in (*the art of compelling*) obeisance."

This record positively affirms three facts—

(1) That Yaśodharman compelled King Mihirakula to make abject obeisance to himself.

(2) That he acquired an empire which extended from the River Lauhitya (or Brahmaputra) in the north-east to the ocean in the south-west, and from the heights of the Himālayas in the north-west to the Mahendra Range in the south-east.

(3) That this empire embraced countries which were not included either in the dominions of the Guptas or in those of the Hūnas.

The record further, by entirely ignoring Narasimhagupta (Bālāditya), excludes the supposition that that person was concerned in any part of the transaction.

The testimony which we have here is direct and contemporary. It is, in fact, the testimony of the actor in the transaction himself. For historical purposes no better testimony can be required. If it is to be set aside, very strong grounds for doing so must be shown. In the *Early History of India*, p. 301, the grounds for discrediting the testimony are stated as follows :—

"Yaśodharman, the Central Asian Rāja, . . . is known from three inscriptions only, and is not mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, who gives the sole credit for the victory over the Huns to Bālāditya, king of Magadha. Yaśodharman took the honour to himself and erected two columns of victory inscribed with boasting words to commemorate the defeat of the foreign invaders. In these records he claims to have brought under his sway lands which even the Guptas and Huns could not subdue, and to have been master of Northern India from the

Brahmaputra to the Western Ocean, and from the Himālaya to Mount Mahendra in Ganjam. But the indefinite expression of the boasts and the silence of Hiuen Tsang suggest that Yaśodharman made the most of his achievements and that his court poet gave him something more than his due of praise. Nothing whatever is known about his ancestry or his successors. His name stands absolutely alone and unrelated. The belief, therefore, is warranted that his reign was short, and of much less importance than that claimed for it by his magniloquent inscriptions."

Practically, the objections in this indictment reduce themselves to three—

(1) The meagreness of our information about Yaśodharman. We have only the three Mandasor inscriptions. Neither from these nor from any other source do we know anything about his ancestry or his successors.

(2) The indefinite expression of his boasts.

(3) The silence of Hiuen Tsang, who gives the sole credit of the great victory to Bālāditya of Magadha.

As to the first objection, the meagreness of our information is explained by the circumstances of the case. The Mandasor Stone inscription (No. 35 in F.G.I., pp. 155–6) expressly states (in l. 4) that Yaśodharman, at starting, was a mere "tribal ruler" (*janendra*); and the same fact is implied in the statement (l. 9) that "Shashtidatta was the servant (*bhṛtya*) of the rulers (*nṛpa*) who founded the family of that lord (*prabhu*) Yaśodharman". All these particulars show that Yaśodharman originally was only the chief, or one of the chiefs, of a tribe settled in Western India. On the identity of this tribe, see below, p. 142. That he was a man of some position, though in a small way, is shown by the fact of his having had the *aulikara* crest (F.G.I., p. 151), whatever that may have been. He was the first who rose to fame and power. He had no ancestry worth mentioning. In all probability he had also no successors worth mentioning, though we shall see presently (p. 124) what indications we have on this

point. In the Mandasor inscriptions, being contemporary with Yaśodharman, of course, no successors could be mentioned. Harshavardhana's empire commenced about 606 A.D.; it lasted many years, and then utterly collapsed. Yaśodharman's empire, as will be shown below (p. 122 ff.), commenced about 525 A.D.; it probably lasted many years, and then as suddenly collapsed as Harshavardhana's. Of neither's successors do we know anything, at least for the present. Both empires rose and vanished like brilliant meteors in the sky of Indian history, overcast by the storm-clouds of foreign invasions. No one, for that reason, questions Harshavardhana's achievements. Why should one question those of Yaśodharman? ¹ Harshavardhana was lucky in having a court poet, Bāṇa, who directly commemorated him in his *Harṣa-carita*. Yaśodharman was not so lucky in his court poet, who, as we shall see in the sequel, probably was Kālidāsa. But, I suspect, allusions to Yaśodharman will be discovered in Kālidāsa's writings, e.g. in the *Raghuvamśa*, when once they are carefully scrutinized with that object in view. Yaśodharman left no coins to commemorate his reign, as the Guptas had done; but neither has Harshavardhana left us any coins. At least, such is the general opinion, though I believe that opinion is not fully sustainable (see below, p. 133 ff.). In any case, both great emperors are exactly alike in this respect.

India's memory has been apt to deal strangely with some of its greatest heroes. Take the case of Samudragupta. I quote the *Early History of India*, p. 274, where it is stated better than I could do—

“By a strange irony of fate this great king [Samudragupta]—warrior, poet, musician—who conquered nearly all India, and whose alliances extended from the Oxus to Ceylon, is unknown even by name to the historians of India. His lost fame has

¹ On such grounds one might as well question the achievements of Napoleon, or of Alexander.

been slowly recovered by the minute and laborious study of inscriptions and coins during the last seventy years; and the fact that it is now possible to write a long narrative of the events of his memorable reign is perhaps the most conspicuous illustration of the success gained by patient archæological research in piecing together the fragments from which alone the chart of the authentic early history of India can be constructed."

Why not extend the same measure of restitution to that other of India's lost heroes, Yaśodharman, by means of similar "minute and laborious study" of contemporary inscriptions, coins, and literature? Our information of Samudragupta's achievements is founded on a single inscription. In the case of Yaśodharman we have at least three inscriptions; and who will say that more may not yet be discovered?

I turn to the second objection, that Yaśodharman's boasts are expressed in indefinite language. It is really difficult to understand where the indefiniteness comes in. If the record had said, in the not unusual Indian fashion, that Yaśodharman conquered "the three worlds", or conquered India from end to end and sea to sea, the complaint of an indefinite boast would be intelligible. But when it states in precise and simple language the exact boundaries of the empire, and adds that it included countries which had never belonged to the Guptas or Hūnas, can anything more definite be required? As a matter of fact, the latter part of the "boast" is correct, for the Hūnic dominions never included the eastern provinces of Bihar and Bengal, nor did the Gupta dominions ever include a Himalayan province, the reference here being (see below, p. 104 ff.) to Kashmir.

I come to the third objection, the silence of Hiuen Tsang; and I cannot help believing that here we have the real gravamen. But for it, the other two objections, which are too unsubstantial, probably would never have been thought of. The gravamen is that Yaśodharman

claims the sole credit of a victory, which Hiuen Tsang gives to Bālāditya of Magadha, without, in fact, mentioning Yaśodharman at all. Mr. Smith's view of the events in question is thus stated in the *Early History of India*, p. 300 :—

“The cruelty, practised by Mihiragula, became so unbearable that the native princes, under the leadership of Bālāditya, king of Magadha (the same as Narasimhagupta), and Yaśodharman, a Rāja of Central India, formed a confederacy against the foreign tyrant. About the year 528 A.D. they accomplished the delivery of their country from oppression by inflicting a decisive defeat on Mihiragula, who was taken prisoner, and would have forfeited his life deservedly but for the magnanimity of Bālāditya, who spared the captive and sent him to his home in the north with all honour.”

Let us observe here, in the first place, that there is no longer any mention of any “sole credit”, but the credit for the victory is given to a “confederacy” led jointly by Bālāditya and Yaśodharman. The idea of a confederacy is not supported, nor even suggested, by either of the two rival witnesses. Yaśodharman, in his inscriptions, takes the sole credit to himself, and Hiuen Tsang, in his account, gives the sole credit to Bālāditya. The suggestion of the “confederacy” is simply an unfounded attempt at harmonizing two contradictory statements. Further, while Yaśodharman, in his inscriptions, expressly claims the honour of having captured Mihiragula, the view adopted in the *Early History* ascribes that capture, on the authority of Hiuen Tsang, to the Magadha king Bālāditya. It pits, therefore, the late hearsay account of a foreigner against the direct statement of a contemporary Indian, the very actor in the transaction! But let us see what Hiuen Tsang's account is. I quote it from Watters' *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, vol. i, pp. 288–9.¹

“On his way to the capital of this country . . . Yuan Chwang came to the old capital called Śākala. Some centuries

¹ It may be read in further detail in Beal's *Buddhist Records of the Western World* (Siyuki), vol. i, pp. 167–72.

previously a king named Mo-hi-lo-ku-lo (Mihirakula), who had his seat of government at this city, ruled over the Indians. He was a bold, intrepid man, of great ability, and all the neighbouring states were his vassals. Wishing to apply his leisure to the study of Buddhism, he ordered the clergy of his country to recommend a Brother of eminent merit to be his teacher. But the clergy found difficulty in obeying the command, the apathetic among them not seeking notoriety, and those of great learning and high intelligence fearing stern majesty. Now at this time there was an old servant of the king's household who had been a monk for a long time. Being clear and elegant in discourse and glib in talking, this man was selected by the congregation of Brethren to comply with the royal summons. This insulting procedure enraged the king, who forthwith ordered the utter extermination of the Buddhist church throughout all his dominions. Now the king of Magadha, at this time Bālāditya by name, was a just and benevolent ruler and a zealous Buddhist, and he rebelled against the order for the persecution of the Buddhists. When Mikirakula proceeded to invade the territory of Bālāditya to reduce him to obedience, the latter, accompanied by several myriads of his subjects, withdrew to an island. Mihirakula came in pursuit, but he was taken prisoner. On the petition of Bālāditya's mother the prisoner was set free and allowed to go away. His younger brother having taken possession of the throne, he took refuge in Kashmir, and here repaid hospitality by treachery, and having murdered the king he made himself ruler. Then he renewed his project of exterminating Buddhism, and with this view he caused the demolition of 1,600 topes and monasteries, and put to death nine kotis of lay adherents of Buddhism. His career was cut short by his sudden death, and the air was darkened, and the earth quaked, and fierce winds rushed forth as he went down to the Hell of unceasing torment."

Watters' comment on this passage is that it "reads like a romance founded on a basis of truth". I have quoted the passage in full to enable the reader to judge for himself of the justice of Watters' remark. If he will read the more detailed account in Beal's *Siyuki*, he will be still more impressed with the romance character of it. What are we to think of its historical trustworthiness when

Hiuen Tsang places Mihirakula, and by implication his supposed conqueror Bālāditya, "some centuries previous" to his own time, and when he represents Bālāditya as holding a position subject to the orders of Mihirakula! Can we seriously be asked to pit such a romance, for purposes of historical construction, against a sober contemporary document? Anyhow, one thing is clear, that it affords no foundation for the theory of a "confederacy" of Bālāditya with Yaśodharman. Rather, the whole drift of it excludes the idea of a confederacy. Either Bālāditya was the sole conqueror and captor of Mihirakula, or it was Yaśodharman. We must make our choice of the alternatives. For my part, I take my stand with the Indian contemporary record against the later foreign-reported romance.

2. I now proceed to the reconsideration of my second proposition that the memory of Yaśodharman's great achievement survives in the Indian tradition of "Rāja Bikram of Ujain", and in the change of the name of the Mālava era into the Vikrama era. This proposition is of a very different character from the preceding. It does not deal with facts established by contemporary documentary evidence, but with speculations based on scattered, more or less obscure indications, which we must piece together as best we can into a consistent theory. To begin with, a preliminary point may be cleared away. It is now generally acknowledged that there existed no king Vikramāditya in 57 B.C., the epoch of what is now known as the Vikrama era, but which at first and for many centuries was known as the Mālava era. With the circumstances of the origin of the era in 57 B.C. I am not concerned. My concern at present is solely with the reason of the change of the name from Mālava to Vikrama; or to quote Kielhorn's words in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xx, p. 407, with "the reason why the [Mālava] era in later times was

joined with the name of a king Vikrama". Kielhorn's explanation, as very well summed up by Dr. Fleet, *ibid.*, vol. xxx, p. 4,¹ is that

"The word *vikrama*, from which the idea of the king Vikrama or Vikramāditya was evolved, most probably came to be connected with the era by the poets, because the years of reckoning originally began in the autumn, and the autumn was the season of commencing campaigns, and was, in short, the *vikrama-kāla* or 'war-time'."

One is naturally very reluctant to differ from an opinion backed by the deservedly high authority of such scholars as Kielhorn and Dr. Fleet, but I believe that the basis of the whole theory, viz. that *vikrama-kāla* means "war-time" and hence is a designation of the season of autumn, is a mistake. Kielhorn (*loc. cit.*, p. 409) says, "the poets were accustomed to speak of *śarad* [autumn] as *vikrama-kāla*," and again (p. 407), "autumn was pre-eminently the *vikrama-kāla*." The poets, indeed, constantly speak of *śarad*, or autumn, as the time when kings go to war, but they never apply to *śarad* the term *vikrama-kāla*; and this for the simple reason that *vikrama* does not mean war, but prowess, or valour, or vigour. Kielhorn (*loc. cit.*, p. 408, n. 16) refers only to a single passage in the *Harṣacarita* (6th *ucchvāsa*, Calcutta ed., p. 156), where, it is alleged, *vikrama-kāla* occurs in the sense of "war-time". The text of the passage is uncertain, and the simile expressed in it is rather far-fetched, but such as it is the passage is only intelligible if the word *vikrama-kāla* means (not "war-time", but as it should naturally) "time of vigour". The idea in the mind of the poet seems to be that what the old warrior has drunk in his time of vigour (youth), he ejects in his declining years (autumn) in the form of his grey beard. In reality, that particular passage shows that *vikrama-kāla* is not the autumn, but rather

¹ Also in the *Indian Empire* of the Imperial Gazetteer, vol. ii, p. 4, n. 2.

the spring.¹ The whole argument, therefore, which bases the origin of the Vikrama era on the meaning "war-time" for *vikrama-kāla*, falls to the ground. But further, even if *vikrama-kāla* did mean "war-time", or autumn, it could not well be the foundation of the Vikrama era. To my mind the idea appears quite incongruous that an era should be called after a royal or social custom. The Vikrama era would be quite singular in that respect. So far as I can call to mind, there is no other Indian era, or indeed any era anywhere, which is not called after a person, or people, or event, or the like, either actual, or believed to be actual. That being so, the only question awaiting solution is, who was the person named Vikrama, or Vikramāditya,² that caused the name of the Mālava era to be changed into Vikrama era.

Dealing with this question, we may set aside at once all kings of Southern India that bear the name of Vikramāditya. Both tradition and epigraphy (see Dr. Fleet, in *IA.*, xxx, p. 4) agree in pointing to Northern India, and more specifically to Malwa, as the country where that person is to be looked for. In that part of India, during the later times of the Gupta empire and the period immediately after its downfall, the use of the title Vikramāditya came

¹ The meaning of *vikrama-kāla* is rediscussed by Kielhorn in *GN.*, 1900, p. 353 ff., where the passage in question, together with its translation by Cowell and Mr. Thomas, is quoted. I am disposed to accept Kielhorn's emendation *vikrama-kāla-pitam akāle'pi*, but the reading as it stands, *vikrama-kālam akāle'pi*, after all, yields precisely the same meaning: "the terrible visage (of the old warrior), brightened by a thick white mustache which hid his cheeks, seemed to pour forth his *vikrama-kāla*, or time of (youthful) vigour, even out of season, in the shape of the commencing autumn, white with blooming *kuśa* grass." That is to say, the exhibition of youthful vigour in old age was out of season, i.e. was not what one could normally expect. However, even if *vikrama-kāla*, which properly means "vigour-time", be, for the purpose of this particular passage, made to mean "war-time", the latter constructive meaning, restricted to a particular passage, could not reasonably be supposed to have resulted in the naming of a widely current era.

² This name or title occurs in both forms, e.g. on coins of Chandragupta II; see Mr. Smith, *Gupta Coinage*, in *JRAS.*, 1889.

much into fashion. It was a turbulent time, a period of wars, conquests, and invasions, internal as well as external; and the title "sun of prowess" naturally appeared appropriate to rulers and princes who distinguished themselves in those warlike performances. It was similar with the alternative title Śilāditya, "sun of goodness," which was borne by rulers who distinguished themselves by works of peace. And, of course, both titles might be borne by the very same ruler, if he was distinguished in both peace and war. They may have been assumed by the holders themselves, or they might be given to them by their admiring subjects. To take a conspicuous example of the latter case, Hiuen Tsang mentions Harshavardhana of Kanauj only once under that name (*Siyuki*, i, 210), and adds that as king "his title was Śilāditya" (*ibid.*, p. 213, W.YC., i, 343). Under that title he refers to him elsewhere throughout his work. But Harshavardhana himself never assumes that title in any of his extant copperplate grants, nor in any of the literary works ascribed to him (though one of them, *Nāgānanda*, is of a distinctly Buddhist character), nor on the single coin which (as I believe) can be ascribed to him with some probability (JRAS., 1903, pp. 547-9). Nor is that title given to him in other extant inscriptions (e.g., Aphsad, F.G.I., p. 207; Nausāri, IA., xiii, 79; Aihole, EI., vi, 10, etc.); nor by his court poet Bāṇa in the *Harṣa-carita*. If it were not for the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims (Hiuen Tsang, Itsing), we should know nothing of his having had the title Śilāditya. In a matter of this kind, of course, where Hiuen Tsang speaks from personal knowledge, he can be absolutely trusted; but it seems probable that it was not an official title of Harshavardhana, but one given to him only by the admiring Buddhist monks of India, among whom the Chinese pilgrims heard it used.

Another example, concerning the title Vikramāditya,

is the following. I summarize the facts as given by Mr. Takakusu in JRAS., 1905, pp. 35, 41, 44, 47. The Indian Buddhist monk Paramārtha relates that King Vikramāditya of Ayodhyā sent his crown prince, Bālāditya, with the queen-mother to Vasubandhu (apparently during the latter's first stay in Ayodhyā) to be instructed in Buddhism. After Vikramāditya's death his successor, King Bālāditya, and the queen-mother, invited Vasubandhu (who in the meantime had gone to Puruṣapura) to return to Ayodhyā. Paramārtha does not say who King Vikramāditya was, but Mr. Takakusu identifies him with Skandagupta on the ground of the latter calling himself by that title on certain of his silver coins (loc. cit., p. 44; also S.EH., p. 292). But, as the Bhitari Seal (JASB., lviii, 89) proves, Bālāditya, whose proper name was Narasimhagupta, was not the son and successor of Skandagupta, but of Puragupta. It appears, therefore, that the king Vikramāditya of Paramārtha's narrative, is Puragupta; and this again seems to show that the title Vikramāditya was popularly given to all the occupants of the imperial Gupta throne. There is nothing to show that Puragupta either deserved or assumed that title; but having once been borne by his illustrious predecessors, Chandragupta II and Skandagupta, the title seems to have popularly been conceded also to him. Unless, indeed, it be assumed that Skandagupta and Puragupta are identical, on which see below, p. 128 ff.

The most conspicuous example of the alternative case of a king himself assuming the title Vikrama or Vikramāditya is Chandragupta II. This is amply proved by his bearing that title on certain of his gold, silver, and copper coins (S.GC., pp. 76 ff., 121 ff., 140).¹ Next to Samudragupta, Chandragupta was undoubtedly the most powerful member of the imperial Gupta family.

¹ Perhaps there is an allusion to the title in the phrase *vikram-āva-kṛaya-kṛita* in the Udayagiri cave inscription, F.G.I., p. 35.

By reason of his brilliant conquests and excellent administration, which are lucidly described by Mr. Smith (S.EH., pp. 275 ff.), he fully deserved the title of "Sun of Prowess" which he assumed. And this brings us to the only two persons who can rightly claim to be identified with the Vikrama after whom the era is named. They are Chandragupta II and Yaśodharman. The choice seems to me to lie only between these two. Mr. Smith elects the former (S.EH., pp. 275, 291). Dr. Fleet (F.GL., p. 37, n. 2) appears to have entertained a similar preference; whether he does so still, I do not know. It is with some diffidence that I venture to differ from such authorities, but to my mind the balance of probability is in favour of Yaśodharman being the right claimant.¹ Of course, I fully admit that the case is to a great extent a matter of argument, and not of definite proof. It is based on the co-ordination of a number of statements, or indications, scattered up and down in the Indian tradition, with the object of determining to which of the two claimants, Chandragupta II or Yaśodharman, the co-ordinated result applies. With regard to the Indian tradition, the early tendency was to accept it at its full "face-value". Then came the natural reaction, which I fear has not yet fully spent its force, of rejecting it practically *in toto*. My own position is this: to sift out of a tradition its main points (irrespective, of course, of the miraculous or fantastic elements), and bring them to the test of facts known by definite proof from (so far as possible) contemporary records. Traditional facts which satisfy this test I see no rational grounds to reject. Also, a tradition which comes to us not direct from an Indian source, but through the report of a foreigner, demands additional caution, because it is doubly open to distortion.

¹ This, in fact, is essentially the theory, proposed long ago (1870), though on insufficient and partly misunderstood evidence, by Fergusson, in *JRAS.*, n.s., iv, p. 131 ff.

With these preliminary remarks I will now review some of the best known Indian traditions. To begin with, there is the tradition of the *Rājataranginī*. It comes from Kalhana, in 1048–9 A.D. (S.R.T., Introd., p. 15), who claims to have his information from records accessible to him. His account occurs in the third book (loc. cit., i, p. 83 ff.). The substance of it is as follows :—

“At Ujjainī there reigned King Vikramāditya, called Harsha, as the sole sovereign of the world. At his court there lived a dependant, a poet, called *Mātrigupta* (i.e., protected by the mother), who cunningly ingratiated himself with the king, so much so that the king appointed him tributary king of Kashmir. Hearing of this appointment, Pravarasena, who had previously been dispossessed of his throne, prepared to contest it. But Vikramāditya dying at this time, *Mātrigupta*, having lost his patron, came to an arrangement with Pravarasena, by which he retired to Benares, vacating the throne in favour of his rival. Subsequently, Pravarasena assisted Pratāpaśīla, also called Śīlāditya, the son of Vikramāditya, to recover the kingdom of his father, of which he had been deprived by his enemies.”

Whom does this story about Vikramāditya of Ujjain fit, Chandragupta II or Yaśodharman? It describes Vikramāditya as “the sole sovereign of the world”. This is truly an “indefinite expression of boast”; but, of course, it means only that Vikramāditya ruled an extensive empire in Northern India. So far the description is equally true of Chandragupta II and Yaśodharman, except for the qualification “of Ujjain”, for that town would hardly be selected by the story as the capital of Chandragupta. But what is more decisive is that the story includes Kashmir in the empire of Vikramāditya, for it makes him the overlord of that country. Now, as we know, Kashmir never formed a part of Chandragupta II's empire, nor indeed of the Gupta empire at any time. But the Mandasor inscription shows that it was included in Yaśodharman's empire; for it is there stated (*ante*, p. 91) that the empire extended to

“the tablelands of the Himālaya”, and that Yaśodharman overthrew and captured Mihirakula, who, as we know from the numismatic records of Kashmir (R.IC., 39; F.IA., xv, 245; PASB., 1885, p. 4), held sway over that country. On this point, therefore—one of the main points of the story—the trustworthiness of Kalhana’s tradition is guaranteed by the contemporary Mandasor record.

But the tradition of Vikramāditya’s (Yaśodharman’s) overlordship over Kashmir has in its favour some additional numismatic and literary testimony, though, it is true, of a more speculative kind. By the former I refer to the well-known coins of Yaśovarman. I have briefly discussed their attribution in this Journal for 1903, pp. 551–2. The question has been re-examined recently by Mr. V. Smith in this Journal for 1908, pp. 783–5. He is constrained to admit that they “belong unquestionably to the Kashmir series”; that they were not minted at Kanauj, and, in fact, never “occur in the Kanauj country, or, indeed, anywhere to the south of the Panjab”; and that there is no record of King Yaśovarman of Kanauj ever having held Kashmir. While making all these admissions, and adding that “the puzzle remains unsolved”, Mr. Smith nevertheless inclines to accept the old attribution to Yaśovarman of Kanauj; or, failing this, he suggests that the coins may possibly be attributable to Lalitāditya, who “may have been for a time the subordinate ally of the King of Kanauj, and constrained to strike coins in his name”. This is really turning the tables on poor Lalitāditya! The *Rājataranginī* records his overthrow of Yaśovarman of Kanauj, but of his ever having been a subordinate of Yaśovarman, there is no vestige of evidence of any sort. The only basis for the suggestion is that “no coins assignable on the face of them to any period of Lalitāditya’s long reign have been discovered”. But in

this respect Lalitāditya is not singular. It is usually believed (though not by me) that there are no coins known to exist even of the famous Harshavardhana. But it would indeed be singular if Lalitāditya had struck coins in the name of his overlord Yaśovarman, and had struck no coins in his own name after the latter's overthrow, or continued even then to strike coins witnessing to his subordinate position! That suggestion of the attribution to Lalitāditya, I am afraid, is not tenable. The suggested subordinate position of Lalitāditya to Yaśovarman of Kanauj is further supported by the statement that Vākpatirāja "affirms that his hero [Yaśovarman] marched triumphantly defeating all enemies between the Narmadā and the Himālaya". If Vākpatirāja had really made an assertion of such an indefinite boast, it would, on Mr. V. Smith's own principles, not deserve any credit. But he makes no such assertion. He soberly traces the *digvijaya* of Yaśovarman from place to place. In the direction of Kashmir he takes the king no further than Thānesar. From here he makes the king return to Ayodhyā, and thence visit the Mandara mountain and the northern abode of the Yaksha princes (*Gaṇḍavaḥo*, Intro., p. xxix). This last move sounds very much as if it described poetically the king's going to *svarga*, that is, his demise after the *digvijaya*. But even if it was meant to describe an actual mundane conquest, it does not refer to Kashmir, but to the mountains to the north of Ayodhyā, that is, to Nepal.

Of more importance is Mr. Smith's argument from his constructive date of the Yaśovarman coins (loc. cit., pp. 783-4). Comparing their barbarous execution with that of the coin of Pratāpāditya II (*circa* A.D. 700) and Vinayāditya (*c.* A.D. 772), he places them intermediately between 728 and 745, the latter being the date of Yaśovarman of Kanauj. My readers are asked to refer to plate iii in Sir A. Cunningham's *Coins of Mediæval India*.

All the coins on that plate from No. 5 to No. 14 are of extraordinary crudity, with the exception of No. 9, which shows a rather better executed female figure on the obverse (left hand). It is this coin to which Mr. Smith refers as the coin of Durlabha-Pratāpāditya II.¹ But it is hardly fair to select this particular coin for comparison. Nos. 5 and 6, of Narendrāditya and Gokarṇa, which belong to the sixth century, are quite as barbarous as Yaśovarman's coin; indeed, No. 6 is rather more barbarous. We know too little about the circumstances of the period to account for the better execution of the exceptional No. 9. Pratāpāditya II by some chance may have had a better die-cutter working with a better model. The whole series is of an equally barbarous make, and extends over a period from the sixth to the eighth centuries, and there is nothing against assuming that the Yaśovarman coins started the series. His coins, as Mr. Smith rightly points out (*loc. cit.*, p. 784), are so common that they must have been struck in large numbers by a prince of considerable power. Yaśodharman, as his Mandasor inscription proves, was such a prince of considerable power; and if we assume that he started the series, the fact accounts for the long persistence of the type of his coinage.

There is another objection which has been sometimes urged against my identification of the Yaśovarman coins, viz. the spelling of the name with *va* instead of *dha*. In inscriptions of the period in question the forms of the two *akṣaras* resemble each other very closely; even now they are not always quite easy for the decipherer to distinguish. The Yaśovarman coins admittedly are very crude, and it is quite possible that the apparent *va* was really meant by the die-cutter to be *dha*, or the manuscript copy *dharman* which was given him to

¹ Cunningham calls him Pratāpāditya I. See Dr. Stein's remark in *RT.*, i, 8.

incise may have been misunderstood by him as *varman*. There are so many possibilities of accounting for the *va* that really the point does not seem to be of any consequence.

The history of India in the period including the sixth to eighth centuries is not yet so thoroughly known that some new discovery might not be made, but it could only be in some matter of detail. It is sufficiently well known to leave no room for the discovery (between Yaśodharman of Ujain and Yaśovarman of Kanauj) of any new empire and its founder, to whom the Yaśovarman coins might be attributed. As they cannot be ascribed to Yaśovarman of Kanauj, I suppose we shall have to make up our minds, however reluctantly, to let Yaśodharman have his due. When in 1889 I published my discovery of Puragupta (on the Bhitari seal) it was decried on every side; Dr. Fleet alone stood by me (JASB., 1894, lxiii, p. 211), and his approval was a great comfort. Now Puragupta is quietly accepted by everybody as if there never had been any opposition (see S.EH., p. 293).¹ May it be a good omen for Yaśodharman!

I said above (p. 105) that there was also some literary evidence of Yaśodharman's conquest and overlordship of Kashmir. It is found in Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa*, and the credit of this discovery belongs to Professor Pathak, of the Deccan College (JBBRAS., xix, 35-43, and P.M., pp. 2-8), and Mr. Monmohan Chakravarti, who drew attention to it in this Journal (for 1903, pp. 183-6, and for 1904, pp. 158-61). The most fruitful point in their examination of Kālidāsa's poem is the suggestion that for his description of Raghu's *digvijaya* in ch. iv, vv. 28-85,

¹ In JRAS., 1893, p. 127, n. 1, I am sternly admonished that "the reading *Pura* is certainly untenable, and must be given up". The last reference (known to me) to the *Sthiragupta* myth occurs in 1902, in JBBRAS., xx, 2. The propagators of this myth can hardly have taken the precaution to consult the original of the seal or any of its many facsimiles.

the poet drew on the round of conquests made by a contemporary emperor at whose court he lived. Examining the north-western portion of the *digvijaya* (vv. 58–71) from this point of view, Mr. Chakravarti came to the conclusion that the emperor must have been Skandagupta (JRAS., 1903, p. 185), while Professor Pathak (RM., p. 5) concluded that it must have been Yaśodharman who commemorated his *digvijaya* in his well-known Mandasor inscription on the “column of victory”. That Professor Pathak’s view is the correct one is obvious from the fact, brought out by Mr. Chakravarti himself (JRAS., 1904, p. 159), that the mention of saffron (*kunkuma*) points to Kashmir. Skandagupta’s conquests did not include Kashmir. Indeed, his achievement was limited to steadying the fortunes of the Gupta empire, which, to quote Mr. Smith (S.EH., p. 289), “was tottering to its fall,” by a decisive victory over the Pushyamitras and their allies somewhere in modern Sindh or Gujerat (see below, p. 126). Of any *digvijaya* of Skandagupta there is not the shadow of evidence. In fact, even that achievement was a temporary stroke of good fortune, for (to quote again Mr. Smith, p. 291) “he was unable to continue the successful resistance which he had offered in the earlier days of his rule, and was forced at last to succumb to the repeated attacks of the foreigners”. With much more plausibility Chandragupta II might be suggested. For if the inscription on the iron pillar at Delhi is rightly ascribed to him (S.JRAS., 1897, p. 1 ff.), he did make a *digvijaya*, extending from Bengal to Sindh. He certainly added the territories of the so-called Western Satraps to the Gupta empire. But (irrespective of chronological difficulties) there is absolutely no evidence, so far as I am aware, of Kashmir ever having been included within the Gupta empire, either in the time of Chandragupta II, or, indeed, of any of the Gupta emperors. On the other hand, Yaśodharman refers to Kashmir as one of the

extreme points of his *digvijaya*, when, in his Mandasor inscription, he speaks of "the snowy range (*tuhina-sikharin*, i.e. the Himālaya), the ridges (*sānu*) of which are embraced by the river Gaṅgā", that is, by the Sindhu affluent of the Vitastā.¹ But what is particularly worth noting is that Kālidāsa in his description follows and names exactly the landmarks given in the Mandasor inscription. Neither Professor Pathak nor Mr. Chakravarti appear to have noticed this point. The inscription gives the following four landmarks: (1) the River Lauhitya in the north-east; (2) the mountain Mahendra in the south-east; (3) the Snowy Range (i.e. Kashmir) in the north-west; (4) the Western Ocean in the south-west. Similarly, Kālidāsa's *digvijaya* runs as follows: (1) by way of Vanga and Utkala to the mountain Mahendra in the south-east (vv. 32-43); (2) by way of the Malaya Range, the Kaveri and Tāmraparnī Rivers, and across the Sahya Range to the Western Ocean in the south-west (vv. 43-59); (3) by land route (i.e. skirting the Gulfs of Cambay and Kacch) to the western border, where the Pārasika and other western tribes were defeated, and thence into the land of Kuvera,² where the Sindhu (affluent of the Vitastā) flows and saffron grows (i.e. Kashmir), in the north-west (vv. 60-79); (4) descending from the Himālaya into Kāmarūpa (Assam), across the Lauhitya River in the north-east (vv. 80-5).

The preceding theory, as has been stated, implicates that Kālidāsa was Yaśodharman's contemporary in the earlier half of the sixth century. In the Meghadūta of Kālidāsa³ there is a well-known verse which names Diṇnāga as his adversary. The way in which Diṇnāga

¹ On Gaṅgā = Sindhu, see Dr. Stein's *Ancient Geography of Kashmir*, pp. 91, 107 (in JASB., lxviii, Extra No. ii, 1899), also RT., ii, 335.

² In S.R.T., i, 10 (v. 43), Kashmir is called "the region of Kubera".

³ Probably one of his earliest compositions; see Mr. Chakravarti in JRAS., 1903, p. 186, and 1904, p. 161; also Professor Liebich in L.A.R., pp. 3-6.

is referred to indicates that he had long since established his reputation as a powerful dialectician, and it thus points to the later years of his life, which, as will be explained in the sequel (p. 139), probably extended to about 520 A.D. Hence Kālidāsa's time may be set down as about 490–550 A.D. As is well known, Kielhorn made an attempt to fix Kālidāsa's date before 473 A.D. (GN., 1890, pp. 251 ff.; also IA., xix, 285); and he is supported therein by Professor Liebhich (L.A.R., pp. 6–7). Kielhorn relied for this purpose on an apparent identity of ideas in a passage (l. 17) of the Mandasor inscription of 473–4 A.D. (F.G.I., pp. 79 ff.), and of Kālidāsa's *Rtusamhāra* (v, 2. 3).¹ This pair of passages may be said to contain four ideas. Two of these ideas, which occur in both compositions, are, however, so commonplace as to negative the suggestion of borrowing, while the other two ideas, as Kielhorn himself admits, occur only in the inscription, but are not found in the *Rtusamhāra*.² Nor, as pointed out by Professor Liebhich (L.A.R., p. 6), do the two poets employ the same phraseology. When the idea is commonplace there should be identity of phrase. When there is no such identity the idea should be so uncommon as to make its occurring spontaneously to two different writers improbable. Seeing that neither alternative exists in the present case, it does not seem reasonable to suggest either writer having borrowed from the other. Moreover, if Mr. B. C. Mazumdar's suggestion (JRAS., 1904,

¹ Some other coincidences are also adduced by Kielhorn in EI., vi, 3. 4. But the dates of these, even if true, do not militate against my determination of Kālidāsa's date.

² The four ideas are : (1) that the winter is agreeable to men because it confines them to warmed rooms in the company of lovely women ; (2) it is a season in which one does not wish for cool places or cooling appliances. These two are common to the two poets. The other two are : (3) in the winter the fishes lie low down in the water, and (4) the water-lilies are bitten by frost. How the matter of borrowing by Indian poets strikes an Indian mind may be seen from Mr. Chakravarti's remarks in this Journal, 1904, p. 161.

pp. 395 ff.) should prove true that Vatsabhaṭṭi, the author of the inscription, is also the author of the famous *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, the case would be exactly reversed, and Kālidāsa, about 530 A.D., would be the borrower from Vatsabhaṭṭi, about 473.¹ Nor would there be anything extraordinary in even a great poet like Kālidāsa borrowing from an equally great poet such as the author of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. As Professor Jacobi rightly says (VOJ., iii, 127), "even the greatest poets were occasionally forced to take over thoughts from other writers. But if they did so, they always modified them, improving or expanding them, so that such borrowings were not exposed to the charge of plagiarism." In this case Kālidāsa certainly expanded the two ideas which he has in common with Vatsabhaṭṭi, if he borrowed them at all, which, seeing that the ideas are commonplace, we need not suppose that he did.

To my mind the accord of Kālidāsa's *divyajāyā* with Yaśodharman's inscription is striking. It seems to leave no room for doubt that it was Yaśodharman's round of conquests which served Kālidāsa for his model. If so he was Yaśodharman's contemporary, say 490–550 A.D., and lived at Yaśodharman's court when the latter ruled his wide empire in Northern India. And this brings us to another point of the Vikramāditya tradition, which speaks of "the nine gems" (*nava-ratna*), or learned men, who adorned Vikramāditya's court. This particular point may or may not be true; with our present want of information on the minuter details of the tradition it would be rash to pass judgment on it. With regard to another name, that of Varāha Mihira, the tradition in all probability is correct.

¹ Regarding Bhartrihari see Kielhorn's remarks in IA., 1883, xii, 218 ff. No more than three grammatical works are ascribed to him: (1) the commentary on *Mahābhāṣya*; (2) the *Vākyapadīya*, and (3) the *Prakīrṇaka*. These are precisely the three works which alone are ascribed to him by Itsing (TI., pp. 178–80), who visited India forty years after Bhartrihari's death (TI., p. xxv; L.A.R., p. 7). There is, therefore, no good reason for attributing the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* to Bhartrihari.

That learned man, who lived from 504 to 581 A.D. (W.H.L., p. 261), and was a native of Avanti (Eastern Malwa, Ujain), certainly was a contemporary of Yaśodharman and might very well have lived at his court, and it would probably be from him that Kālidāsa obtained the astronomical information which he casually exhibits in his works (P.M., p. 9).

Another argument of Mr. Chakravarti in favour of his identification of the conqueror with Skandagupta is based on a misunderstanding of the history of Persia. Mr. Chakravarti argues (JRAS., 1903, pp. 184-5) that as the Persian king Firūz was totally defeated by the Huns in 484 A.D., and in consequence thereof lost his life and the eastern provinces of Persia, the defeat of the Persians on the frontiers of India, mentioned in Kālidāsa's *digvijaya*, must have occurred before 484 A.D., in which year "the eastern portion of Persia passed on to the White Huns", and when Skandagupta was on the throne. But it was only Gandhāra which "passed on to the White Huns" as a result of the disaster in 484 A.D., but not the Persian provinces (modern Baluchistan, etc.) to the south of Gandhāra. According to the Chronicle of Tabari, in Professor Nöldeke's *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden* (pp. 119 ff.), what happened was this: Peroz (Firūz) had twice to make peace with the Huns; once he was captured by them, and was released only on paying a heavy ransom and leaving his son Kawādh as hostage in their hands for two years, but he broke faith and lost his life in a sanguinary battle in 484 A.D., and his daughter, who was captured, was married by the Hunic king. The Huns now broke into Persia, but order was restored by a Persian chief, who bought off the Huns by a yearly tribute and placed Peroz's brother Balash on the throne. In 488 A.D. Balash was deposed and blinded. His nephew Kawādh succeeded him (loc. cit., p. 135 ff.) and ruled at first

unopposed, but in 496 A.D. he was imprisoned by his rebellious nobles and priests, who placed his brother Jāmāsp on the throne. But Kawādh managed to escape to his brother-in-law, the Hunic king, and married his daughter. With the help of the Huns he expelled his brother Jāmāsp in 499 A.D., and recovered his kingdom. He died in 531 A.D. Accordingly Kawādh was the contemporary of Yaśodharman,¹ and he would naturally act as the ally of the Huns in their war with Yaśodharman about 525–8 A.D. His encounter with Yaśodharman would, of course, have taken place in the province of Sindh, and as a result of his defeat he would lose that province, or a portion of it, to Yaśodharman. As a matter of fact, Tabari (*loc. cit.*, p. 156) mentions Sindh as one of the provinces which were lost to the Persian kingdom by Kawādh, and recovered by his successor Khusrau Anūsharwān (531–78 A.D.). That province appears to have belonged to the Sassanide kingdom since the time of Shāpur II (309–79 A.D.), and Bahram Gor (420–38 A.D.) is said to have received Debal, Makran, and neighbouring tracts of Sindh as dowry of an Indian king's daughter, whom he married (*loc. cit.*, p. 108).

The identity of Vikramāditya of Kalhaṇa's tradition with Yaśodharman is, thus, guaranteed by the latter's Mandasor inscription as well as by more or less definite numismatic and literary evidence. But we have obviously the same tradition which Kalhaṇa reports to us from Kashmir in 1048 A.D., also reported to us some centuries earlier, in 633 A.D., by Hiuen Tsang, as told him in Śākala (Siālkoṭ?), the capital of the neighbouring country Cheh-ka (Ṭakka?, W.Y.C., i, 286). I have already quoted the tradition on p. 96, and have shown that it is entirely wrong as regards the attribution of the Hunic defeat to Bālāditya instead of Yaśodharman.

¹ In T.KS., ii, p. 586, the Persian king is called Nirmūka. See below p. 120.

On this point the Kashmir tradition has preserved the truth in ascribing it, in effect, to Vikramāditya (Yaśodharman) of Ujain. In the case of Hiuen Tsang we are dealing with a tradition which demands double caution (*ante*, p. 103), for it is an Indian tradition reported by a foreigner. Hiuen Tsang is a transparently honest reporter; but he is not, nor would he claim to be, a guarantee for what did not come within his personal knowledge. His tradition and that of Kalhana differ also with reference to the identity of Mātrigupta, or "the mother's protégé". While the Kashmir tradition makes him a poet-dependant at the king's court, the Śākala tradition resolves the name into a story about Mihirakula, the captive protégé of the king's mother. Both traditions have an air of romance. They may have a basis of truth, but in default of more information neither deserves to be treated as sober history. The fact that the Śākala tradition is so much nearer in time to the events which it professes to narrate might suggest that it merits more credit. But on the point of the credibility of a tradition the mere time-factor is really of small account. It is a well-observed fact, how quickly after a stirring event the myth-making faculty of a people comes into operation. Of this fact, indeed, in the present case, we seem to have an actual proof. For when Hiuen Tsang about three years earlier, in 630 A.D., passed through the adjacent country of Gandhāra, he was told what is evidently the same tradition in a rather different form. It is given in W.Y.C., i, pp. 211-12, and *Siyuki*, i, pp. 105-8. The main facts of it are as follows: King Vikramāditya of Srāvasti, on the day when he reduced all India to submission, distributed an enormous largess among the poor. Later on, taking offence at the bounty of the great Buddhist teacher Manoratha, he disgraced him publicly, and thereby caused his death. In consequence Vikramāditya lost his kingdom, and was succeeded by

a king who showed respect to men of eminence, and at the instance of Vasubandhu, a pupil of Manoratha, rehabilitated the latter's memory. Mr. Smith, in his *Early History* (p. 292), identifies this king of Śrāvasti with Skandagupta. This may be so; but the remark, in the tradition, that the king had subdued all India, would not fit Skandagupta, while it fits quite well Yaśodharman, whose wide conquests are guaranteed by his Mandasor column inscription. "Vikramāditya, who subdued all India," recalls to one's mind the "Vikramāditya, the sole sovereign of the world", of the Kashmir tradition. The Mandasor stone inscription (in F.G.I., p. 150 ff.), which is dated in 533-4 A.D., shows that at that time the western portion of Yaśodharman's (or Vishnuvardhana's) empire had been placed by him under the administration of a viceroy (*rāja-sthānīya*). The natural conclusion is that personally Yaśodharman administered the eastern portion of his empire, which had Pāṭaliputra and Ayodhyā for its capitals, and which enjoyed the prestige of the old Gupta empire. It must (as Mr. Smith rightly observes in EH., p. 192) have included the famous ancient town of Śrāvasti, which may have served also as an occasional residence. But it is hardly worth while to trouble about a rational explanation of the king's residence when the tradition shows itself so strangely "mixed" about the personality of the king himself. For it clearly confuses Vikramāditya (i.e. Yaśodharman) with his antagonist Mihirakula. What it says about the relation of Vikramāditya to the Buddhist teacher is curiously reminiscent of what is related of Mihirakula in the Śākala tradition (*ante*, p. 97; see also the tradition of Tārānātha below, p. 118). And Vikramāditya's successor, who is said to have "shown respect to men of eminence", is clearly Yaśodharman, who overthrew and thus succeeded Mihirakula. How this confused tradition arose, and who is responsible for the confusion, whether Hiuen Tsang himself (who

had just then arrived as a perfect stranger to the country) or his informants, it would be difficult to say and idle to speculate upon. But we must remember that the tradition was not current in Śrāvastī itself. Hiuen Tsang did not hear it when he was staying in that town, but while on his arrival in India he was passing through Gandhāra, which is close to Śākala and Kashmir, the localities of the two other versions of the same tradition. Also, the title Vikramāditya might, in a popular story, under varying circumstances, be given to any conqueror, to Mihirakula no less than to Yaśodharman.

Nearly contemporary with Kalhaṇa was Alberuni. The tradition reported by him, about 1031 A.D., is equally confused. According to him (S.A.I., ii, 6),

“ a Śaka [i.e. Hunic] king tyrannised over the country between the river Sindh [i.e. the river of that name in Central India] and the [western] ocean . . . Some maintained that he was a Sūdra or low-caste Hindu from the city of Almansūra (in Sindh), while others maintained that he was not a Hindu at all, but had come to India from the West. The Hindus had much to suffer from him, till at last they received help from the East, when Vikramāditya marched against him, put him to flight, and killed him¹ in the region of Karūr between Multan and the castle of Lonī. Now this date became famous as people rejoiced in the news of the death of the tyrant, and was used as the epoch of an era, especially by the astronomers. They honour the conqueror by adding *śrī* to his name, so as to say Śrī-Vikramāditya. Since there is a long interval between the era which is called the era of Vikramāditya and the killing of Śaka, we think that that Vikramāditya from whom the era has got its name is not identical with that one who killed Śaka, but only a namesake of his.”

This tradition clearly refers to Mihirakula, and describes fairly enough the extent of his Indian dominions and his overthrow by Yaśodharman-Vikramāditya. It also, and this is particularly noteworthy, distinctly explains

¹ This tradition ignores the story of Mihirakula's liberation and instalment as king of Kashmir.

the origin of the name of the Vikrama era, namely, that it was so called in memory of Yaśodharman's overthrow of the Huns. Wherein the tradition went wrong—a thing very natural for a tradition—is that it confused two events, the change of name of the era and the origin of the era; and that it thus transferred the date of Yaśodharman-Vikramāditya and his victory to 57 B.C., when the Mālava era originated. To this confusion sometimes¹ another was added which connected the Vikramāditya tradition with the Śaka era, because, as we know, the term Śaka was used, in a loose way, of all foreigners (*mlecchas*), including the Huns.

The Vikramāditya tradition, reported by Tārānātha (about 1608 A.D.; IA., iv, pp. 364–5), is equally confused, but also worth noting. According to this tradition,

“King Gambhīrapaksha was the protector of the great Buddhist teacher Asanga [the brother of Vasubandhu] in Sāgara [i.e. Śākala=Siālkot?] in the Yavana [i.e. Hunic] kingdom, not far from the west [i.e. in the Panjab]. After the death of Gambhīrapaksha the powerful king Śrī-Harsha [i.e. Vikramāditya], who was born in the kingdom of Maru [Rājputānā? *infra*, p. 142], appeared in the west [coming, of course, from the east] . . . He abolished the teaching of the Mlecchas [Yavanas, as above, or Huns] by massacring them at Multān [Karūr in Alberuni's tradition], and laid the foundations of great Buddhist temples . . . He was succeeded by his son Śīla.”

This agrees with Kalhaṇa's tradition, quoted above, p. 104, according to which Vikramāditya bore also the name of Harsha, and was succeeded by his son Śīlāditya. The story of King Gambhīrapaksha and his protégé Asanga involves a double confusion. It is a distorted

¹ “Especially by astronomers,” as Alberuni says. The reference here is to Bhaṭṭotpala, who, as Bhau Dāji explains (JRAS., 1865, i, 407) in his commentary on the *Brhat Samhitā*, quotes a verse from a Tantra (*Pañcasiddhāntikā*?) which refers Vārāha Mihira to 427 of the Śaka-kāla (=505 A.D.), and explains that term to mean “the time when the Śaka kings were conquered by Vikramāditya”.

version of the patronage of the Buddhists, on the one hand, by Mihirakula (in his earlier years), and, on the other hand, by the last Guptas, Narasimha and Kumāra II. Vikramāditya (Yaśodharman), being the conqueror and successor of both Mihirakula in the West and the last Guptas in the East, is represented as the son of Gambhīrapaksha, who confusedly impersonates both the Hūṇas and Guptas.

With the Buddhist tradition of Tārānātha may be compared the Jain tradition in the *Therāvalī* of Merutunga (c. 1300 A.D.; JBBRAS., ix, 148; Bhau Dāji's Lit. Rem., pp. 123 ff.).¹ According to this tradition (N.R.V., Introd., p. 7),

“King Gardabhilla reigned at Ujjainī for 13 years, when Śrī Kālikācharya uprooted him, and established Śaka (i.e. Hunic) kings in Ujjainī. They ruled for 4 years. Gardabhilla's son Vikramāditya regained the kingdom of Ujjainī, and having relieved the debt of the world by means of gold, commenced the Vikrama era. His reign extended over 60 years, and he was succeeded by his son Dharmāditya.”

This contains a most curious jumble of facts. Gardabhilla would seem to represent the emperor Skandagupta, who was deprived of his western dominions by the Hūṇas. Down to that event his reign would have comprised about thirteen years (p. 127). Vikramāditya, who overthrew the Hūṇas and succeeded to the Gupta empire, is represented as the son of Gardabhilla, just as in the tradition of Tārānātha (p. 118), where Gambhīrapaksha corresponds to Gardabhilla. It may be noted that the son of Vikramāditya is called Dharmāditya, which practically is a synonym of Śīlāditya. Another point may also be noted that Vikramāditya is said to have reigned for sixty years. The *paṭṭāvalis* of the Digambara Jains, on the authority of the *Vikrama Prabandha*, give him fifty-six

¹ Also Professor Jacobi in JGOS., xxxiv, 278 ff. and 253 ff., where some other chronological speculations are given.

years (IA., xx, 350 ; xxi, 71).¹ This agrees with the tradition, reported many centuries earlier by Hiuen Tsang (see below, p. 122), that Vikramāditya (there called Śilāditya) reigned "fifty years and more".

Nearly contemporary with Kalhaṇa's tradition in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (p. 104) is that of Somadeva (about 1070 A.D. in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (T.K.S., ii, 563 ff.). Here, as may be expected in a collection of folk-tales, the Vikramāditya tradition is much mixed up with fantastic elements. Still, there are some points which are worth noting. Thus—

"Vikramāditya is said to have been a son of King Mahendrāditya of Ujain in Avanti, and to have succeeded his father on the throne at a time when India was overrun by the Mlecchas [i.e. Hūṇas]. He is said to have had also the name of *Viśamaśīla* [a synonym of Śilāditya, given by Hiuen Tsang ; below, p. 122]. He made a *digvijaya* (loc. cit., p. 567), in which he conquered the Dekkan (S.E.) and the Western Border (S.W.), Maddhyadeśa, and Saurāshtra ; also all the eastern region of the Ganges (N.E.) and the northern region and Kashmir (N.W.). In the latter country he slew hosts of Mlecchas (i.e. Hūṇas). His vassal kings (loc. cit., p. 586) include Nirmūka, king of the Persians."

Here we have another example of the tendency of tradition (already noticed in the case of the Buddhist and Jain traditions) to represent the conqueror and successor of a king or of a dynasty as the son of his predecessor, to whom he may have been not related at all. Mahendrāditya, as we know from his coins (S.G.C., p. 123 ; F.G.I., Introd., p. 16), was a title assumed by Kumāragupta I ; and thus Vikramāditya, i.e. Yaśodharman, who superseded the Gupta dynasty (and who overthrew the Huns and extended his empire as far as Kashmir), is represented as a son of

¹ In IA., xx, 347, the emendation *paṇa-rasa* for *rasa-paṇa* is wrong. The latter is the correct reading, as in IA., xxi, 67, for *rasa* is 6, and *paṇa* is 50. On the other hand, *rajjam* (or *gajjam*) in IA., xx, 347, should be *rajjam*.

Mahendrāditya.¹ Further, the description of Vikramāditya's *digvijaya* closely agrees with that given by Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvamśa*.²

In connection with the *digvijaya* of Vikramāditya, the tradition of the Nepal *Vamśāvalī* is worth noticing. Immediately before the accession of Amśuvarman (about 630 A.D.) it indicates a period of trouble, and then proceeds as follows (W.N.V., pp. 131-2):—

“At this time Vikramājī, a very powerful monarch of Hindustan, became famous by giving a new era to the world, which he effected by liquidating every debt existing at that time in his country. He came to Nepal to introduce his era there . . . and after clearing off all the debts of the country he introduced his era . . . The Rāja, having received the permission of the gods and the people, went back to Ujjain . . . After this the Rāja Vikramājī obtained salvation. Being a stranger, he left no son in Nepal, so that Amśuvarma . . . now became king.”

It is generally admitted that the author of the *Vamśāvalī* is here confusing the well-known Vikrama era with some other era current in Nepal at the time of Amśuvarman. Regarding the identity of this era there is a difference of opinion. Bhagwanlal Indraji (IA., xiii, 421) suggested that it was the Harsha era, and this suggestion was supported by Bühler (IA., xix, 40; see also F.G.I., Introd., p. 184).³ On the other hand, Professor S. Lévi (*Le Nepal*, ii, 144 ff.) explains it as a special era of Amśuvarman

¹ Chandragupta II, who calls himself Vikramāditya on his coins, is here out of the question, for he was the father of Mahendrāditya Kumāragupta II.

² Curiously enough, Kālidāsa's description is followed by Somadeva even more closely (T.K.S., i, 52, 150 ff.) in another *digvijaya*, ascribed to a king of Vatsa, a country with the capital Kauśambhī. The agreement here is so striking as to suggest Somadeva imitating Kālidāsa.

³ The reference to Cunningham (ASR., i, 280) by Bhagwanlal Indraji, I think, is wrong. Cunningham says nothing about any conquest of Nepal by Harsha Vardhana. Professor S. Lévi's ingenious explanation of the term *tukhāra* (Turk), against Bühler's reading *tuśāra* (snowy), has been adopted by Mr. Ettinghausen (*Harsha Vardhana*, pp. 46, 47) without acknowledgment.

himself. However, it is not this difference which concerns us here, but the fact that the *Vaṃśāvalī* notices the Vikramāditya tradition. That its notice really refers to the well-known Indian tradition about Vikramāditya is shown by the curious particular that that emperor is said to have effected the introduction of his era by liquidating every debt existing at that time in his own country, as well as in Nepal. Precisely the same particular is stated in the above-quoted (p. 119) tradition of Merutunga's Jain Therāvali.

There is still another tradition about Vikramāditya, reported by Hiuen Tsang (*Siyuki*, ii, 261 ; W.YC., ii, 242). He says that according to local records, sixty years before his own time, there had flourished a most beneficent king, Śīlāditya by name, whose reign lasted "50 years and more". It was in the Mālava (Mo-la-po) country, apparently in 641 A.D., that Hiuen Tsang recorded the above tradition.¹ The statement "60 years before" brings us to about 581 A.D., and "50 years and more" to about 525-8 A.D. The latter, as we shall see (pp. 130 ff.), is in all probability the time of Yaśodharman's *digvijaya* and the establishment of his empire. It may be noted that King Śīlāditya is not said to have been "king of Mālava", but only to have "flourished" at the specified time; nor does the tradition say anything about any relationship of his to any other king.² That Mālava was included in his dominions may be concluded from the fact that Hiuen Tsang heard of the tradition in Mālava, but the vague term "flourished" suggests that his dominions may have included much more. And, in fact, his identification with Śīlāditya I of Valabhī, made by Professor Sylvain

¹ The question of the exact identity of Mo-la-po has no real bearing on that of the identity of Śīlāditya. There is nothing to show, nor does Hiuen Tsang say so, that he inspected the local records himself. He only reports what the people told him that they contained.

² The statement on this subject in S.E.H., p. 306, is somewhat misleading. See preceding note.

Lévi (*Journal des Savants*, 1905, p. 547) and accepted by Mr. Smith (S.E.H., p. 306), assumes that suggestion. But if the Śīlāditya of the tradition was not only king of Mālava, but also of Valabhī, he may have been king of yet a great deal more. In my opinion that identification is rather improbable. It is based on the statement of Hiuen Tsang (W.Y.C., ii, 246; *Siyuki*, ii, 267) that Dhruvabhāṭa, the reigning king of Valabhī, was "a nephew of Śīlāditya, formerly king of Mālava". Hiuen Tsang himself does not identify the two Śīlādityas, that is, Śīlāditya, the uncle of Dhruvabhāṭa, and Śīlāditya, who "flourished" sixty years before. The identification is imposed on him by his modern commentators. It may have been in his mind, but that is by no means certain, for the dates do not agree—a circumstance of which we have no good reason to suppose that Hiuen Tsang was unaware. Śīlāditya, Dhruvabhāṭa's uncle, appears to have reigned only about twenty years (c. 595–615 A.D.), while Śīlāditya, who "flourished" sixty years before, is said to have reigned "50 years and more". Hiuen Tsang, no doubt, referred to Śīlāditya I (Dharmāditya) when he spoke of him as being Dhruvabhāṭa's uncle; and when he said that Śīlāditya was formerly king of Mālava, that would show that Śīlāditya I, at some time between 595 and 615 A.D., had ruled also over Mālava (i.e. western Mālava, or Mo-la-po), possibly by conquest. Such a rule over Mālava, though we have no definite information on the subject, may very possibly have occurred in that very disturbed period. Anyhow, there is no sufficient reason to charge Hiuen Tsang with making an identification which is not consistent with his own chronological statement. On the other hand, the Śīlāditya of the Mālava "local records", who "flourished 60 years before" Hiuen Tsang, agrees, both in point of length of reign and in point of administrative character, exactly with the king "Vikramāditya of Ujain" (Mālava in the wider sense)

of the general Indian tradition. And so far as Hiuen Tsang's report is concerned, there is nothing to show that the "local records" did not really refer to the well-known traditional Vikramāditya. That Hiuen Tsang calls him Śilāditya may (as I suggested in my article in JRAS., 1903, pp. 565-6) be due to a confusion on his own part with Vikramāditya's traditional son Śilāditya; but, after all, it is also quite possible that the "local records" may really have spoken about Yaśodharman under the title of Śilāditya. That title was not at all uncommon in that period of the history of India. Yaśodharman might very well have borne both titles: Vikramāditya on account of his warlike exploits, and Śilāditya by reason of the subsequent wise and beneficent administration of his empire. Of the latter title, *viśamaśīla* and *dharmāditya* were synonyms: the former, as we have seen (p. 120), is actually given to him in Somadeva's tradition, and the latter may have been borne on his coins (see below, p. 135). According to the traditions of Kalhaṇa (*ante*, p. 104) and Tārānātha (p. 118) Śilāditya was the title of his son and successor, who must have reigned after about 580 A.D.; but there is no reason why both might not have borne that title: in the Valabhī dynasty we find that it was the title of five kings in succession. Moreover, when the tradition speaks of a son, the person referred to may very possibly have been no relation at all, but merely the successor in the same kingdom, or the ruler of an immediately succeeding kingdom (*ante*, p. 120). We must always remember that we are dealing with mere traditions, which are liable to confusions. Hiuen Tsang's reports on Indian history, unless when dealing with events in which he himself bore some part, also belong to that category. He had no means of testing the exact truth of the stories which were told him, but naturally accepted them as true and accurate. But as for ourselves, his statements must be

brought to the test of definitely established facts, but not conversely such facts tested by his hearsay statements.

For our present purpose the foregoing examples of the Indian tradition about Vikramāditya will suffice. They have not been brought forward for the purpose of basing on them a construction of the history of the period in question, but with the object of testing the credibility of their essential elements by reference to facts established by definite contemporary evidence. The main points (for my present purpose) in which they agree are: (1) that there was a person who overthrew the Hunic domination and founded an empire over the whole of Northern India; (2) that this person is known by the title of Vikramāditya; (3) that the Vikrama era was founded in memory of his achievements. Of these three points, the first, which is the basis of the other two, is fully borne out by the definite contemporary evidence of Yaśodharman's inscription. Yaśodharman, therefore, is the person whom the Indian tradition remembers as the famous Vikramāditya, the founder of the Vikrama era. The third point, of course, we must take *cum grano salis*. The so-called foundation, as we now know, was merely a change in the nomenclature of the era. That the Indian tradition came to understand it in its strict sense of "founding" the Mālava era in 57 B.C. need cause no surprise. It is precisely what would naturally happen in a popular tradition. No more need we be surprised to find that the change in nomenclature took considerable time before it established itself in the general usage. It is quite premature to lay particular stress on the first instance of its use (whether 842, or 993, or 1198 A.D., in F.I.E., p. 4) within our present knowledge. That knowledge is notoriously exceedingly imperfect. Any day may bring forth the discovery of an earlier instance. In the meantime, it does not seem wise to reject offhand the Indian tradition which ascribes the change to Vikramāditya

(Yaśodharman), the conqueror of the Huns and founder of an empire, and to place it to the credit of a king (Chandragupta II) of whom, despite all *we* may know, the Indian tradition knows nothing whatsoever.

3. There remains the reconsideration of the third of my propositions, that the empire founded by the Hunic conqueror Yaśodharman, known also as Vikramāditya, was wrecked in consequence of a reversal of his anti-Hunic policy by his successor. I will admit at once that this proposition involves a more or less speculative construction of the history of the period. But I submit that no rival theory can claim to be more, and this simply because, in the present state of our knowledge, no other than a speculative presentation of the history is possible. I claim for the theory no more than that it is a working hypothesis, which, however, deserves to be fairly tested—whether for confirmation or rejection—by facts which may be already known, or which hereafter may become known. I still stand, in the main lines, by the theory which I put forward in this *Journal* for 1903 (pp. 543 ff.); in minor points (such as the erroneous *Laelih*) it may have to be modified. The construction of the history of the period which I would now submit is as follows:—

“The death of Kumāragupta I, early in 455 A.D., marks the beginning of the decline and fall of the Gupta empire” (S.E.H., p. 289).¹ Shortly before his death the empire had become involved in serious distress by the revolt of the powerful clan of Pushyamitras. I take these Pushyamitras to be the same as the Maitrakas, who some years later (c. 495 A.D.), under their leader (*senapati*) Bhaṭārka, established themselves in Valabhī, probably with the help of the Hūṇas under Toramāṇa. They were a foreign tribe, because the Jūnāgarh rock-inscription (dated 456–8 A.D.) appears to describe them as Mlecchas, who, however, had

¹ I adopt here and elsewhere the words of Mr. Smith to mark the points of agreement.

been settled for some time on the western border, and had become partially indianized, as shown by their names. Their movement under Bhaṭārka was their second attempt at revolt, which this time proved successful. In their first attempt, at the very close of Kumāragupta's reign, they were signally defeated by the crown prince Skandagupta, in 455 A.D., who by his victory restored the fortunes of his family. He had in the meantime succeeded his father, who had died during the progress of the campaign. For about thirteen years, as shown by the Kuhaun and Indore inscriptions, of 460 and 465 A.D. respectively, he enjoyed the rule of his empire in peace and prosperity (S.EH., p. 291). About the latter year the Huns, coming from the north, occupied Gandhāra, and a little later, perhaps about 468 A.D., advanced into the interior of India. Skandagupta attempted to resist the invasion. At first he appears to have met with some success, as indicated in the Bhitari inscription (F.GI., l. 15, p. 56). But the Huns "being constantly recruited by fresh hordes eager for the plunder of India" (S.EH., p. 291), Skandagupta was gradually forced back, farther and farther, by their repeated attacks, till finally he lost the whole of the western portion of his empire. This portion passed under the domination of the Hunic king Toramāṇa, and, as shown by the Eran and Gwalior inscriptions (F.GI., pp. 158, 161), it included Eastern Malwa and extended, at least, as far as Gwalior.

The course of events above sketched is quite fairly indicated in the Bhitari pillar inscription of Skandagupta (F.GI., pp. 52 ff.). That inscription is not dated, but as it mentions the temporary success of Skandagupta over the Hūṇas, its date must be about 468 A.D. It first describes (ll. 10-12) Skandagupta's wholly successful campaign against the Pushyamitras, which he conducted for his father, in the progress of which his father died and he himself succeeded to the throne, and at the end of which

he returned, crowned with victory, to his mother (at Pāṭali-putra or Ayodhyā?). In ll. 14 and 15, which unfortunately are much mutilated, the inscription goes on to describe the later campaign against the Hūṇas, in the earlier part of which Skandagupta was able to hold his ground. As the occupation of Gandhāra by the Huns took place only about 465 A.D., before which they could not advance into the interior of India, it follows that the Bhitari inscription cannot be placed earlier than 465 A.D. There is no evidence nor probability of any weak body of Huns having arrived early (i.e. about 455 A.D.) and having failed to effect a lodgment in the interior (as suggested in S.EH., p. 297).

From about 468 A.D., then, Skandagupta's dominions were limited to the eastern portion of the old Gupta empire. It may have been from this time that the Gupta capital was transferred to Ayodhyā, as being perhaps less accessible to the Huns, and therefore offering more protection. Skandagupta is generally supposed to have died about 480 A.D., and to have been succeeded by his half-brother Puragupta (S.EH., p. 293). But this depends on the solution of the difficult problem of the relation to each other of those two personages. My original tentative suggestion (JASB., lviii, 92 ff.) that they were not identical, but half-brothers, appears to be now generally accepted. But I am no longer quite satisfied that it is really the correct solution. The Buddhist writer Paramārtha, who was practically a contemporary of the events he relates (499–569 A.D.; JRAS., 1905, p. 34) in his life of Vasubandhu, apparently makes Bālāditya (i.e. Narasimhagupta) to be the immediate successor of Vikramāditya (i.e. Skandagupta), and ignores altogether the existence of Puragupta. The only conclusion which one can draw from that circumstance is that the two names Skandagupta and Puragupta, neither of which occur in Paramārtha's work, belong to the same person whom Paramārtha

mentions only by the title of Vikramāditya, and that Narasimhagupta, whom Paramārtha likewise mentions only by his title of Bālāditya, was the son and successor of Skandagupta, *alias* Puragupta. If that be so, the question arises how to account for the two names of the same person. I am unable to offer a quite satisfactory reply; but it may be suggested that the change of name may possibly be connected with the decline in the fortunes of Skandagupta. While he was the victorious and prosperous sovereign of the undiminished Gupta empire he was Skandagupta, the "Wargod-protected", but when he was reduced to the modest sovereignty of its eastern portion, he became Puragupta, the "town-protected", i.e., protected by the fortifications of his residence, which withstood the attacks of the Huns. *Pura*, or town, might refer to Ayodhyā, or to Pāṭaliputra, the latter of which, indeed, is said by lexicographers to be the *pura* κατ' ἐξοχήν (M. Williams' Dict., s.v.). One naturally asks what may have prevented Toramāṇa from extending his conquests farther east than Gwalior: that he desisted voluntarily is not probable; the reason was probably his failure to capture the strongly fortified towns of Skandagupta.

Puragupta is generally assumed to have reigned down to about 485 A.D. (S.E.H., p. 293), and if he be identical with Skandagupta, that year, of course, would be the approximate date of the latter's demise. Narasimhagupta (Bālāditya) now succeeded, and after him came Kumāragupta II, the dominions of neither including more than the eastern portion of the old Gupta empire.¹ The western portion was in possession of the Hunic king Toramāṇa, who ruled it down to about 510 A.D. "The Indian dominion which he had acquired was consolidated sufficiently to pass

¹ In the Deo-Baraṇār inscription Narasimha is mentioned as the ruler only of *madhyadeśa*, or the central portion of Northern India (JASB., lviii, 15).

to his son Mihiragula, whose capital was in Śākala, in the Panjab" (S.E.H., p. 298), but whose territory extended certainly as far as Gwalior (F.G.I., p. 161). "All Indian traditions agree in representing Mihiragula as a blood-thirsty tyrant, the Attila of India. The cruelty practised by him became so unbearable" (S.E.H., pp. 299, 300) that it roused his Indian subjects to a revolt against the foreign tyrant. This revolt broke out in 525 A.D. It was headed by a tribal chief named Yaśodharman, and resulted not only in the capture of Mihiragula and the overthrow of his kingdom, but in the establishment of an empire which was ruled by Yaśodharman, under the style of Vishnuvardhana, and which embraced the whole of Northern India, including both the Hunic and the Gupta kingdoms. For the last two particulars, the overthrow of the Huns and the foundation of the new empire, we have the explicit contemporary evidence of the Mandasor inscriptions (F.G.I., pp. 142 ff. and 150 ff.). For the first particular, the date 525 A.D., we have also definite though indirect contemporary evidence. In a Valabhi inscription of the year 571-2 (F.G.I., p. 168, l. 4) we are told that Droṇasimha was installed as Mahārāja "by the paramount master in person, the sole lord of the circumference of the territory of the whole earth". Droṇasimha was the third of the Valabhi line and the younger son of Bhaṭārka, the founder of the line. Both his predecessors, the father Bhaṭārka and the elder brother Dharasena I, bore the minor title *senapati*. The elevation to the Mahārājaship points to some great service done by Droṇasimha to "the paramount master", his overlord. Droṇasimha was succeeded by his younger brother, Dhruvasena I. The latter's grants embrace the years 526-40 A.D. (*Ep. Ind.*, viii, Suppl. i, p. 11), that is fifteen years. As he was the last of three brothers reigning in succession, it is not very probable that his reign began much before 526 A.D. Droṇasimha may well have reigned on to 525 A.D.

Mihiragula was still in power in 520 A.D., when the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Sungyun visited the Hunic king in Gandhāra (S.E.H., p. 299). A Parivrājaka inscription of 528–9 A.D. informs us that in that year the Gupta emperors still enjoyed their sovereignty in the eastern portion of the old Gupta empire, which included at that time the modern Nāgaudh State in Baghel Khand (F.G.I., Introd., p. 8, also p. 112; JASB., lviii, p. 95). The Mandasor stone inscription of 533–4 A.D. (F.G.I., p. 152) and Yaśodharman's column inscription having been incised by the same person (F.G.I., p. 146), the date of the latter inscription cannot be far removed from the date of the former. It follows from all these considerations that Yaśodharman's campaign, which is recorded in the column inscription, and which refers to the overthrow of the Hunic and Gupta kingdoms, must have begun before 526 A.D. and ended after 528–9 A.D. And the suggestion is that the revolution in Mihiragula's dominions, which was headed by Yaśodharman, commenced in 524–5 A.D. In that year, with the assistance of the Valabhī *senapati*, Droṇasiṃha, Yaśodharman inflicted his famous decisive defeat on Mihiragula, somewhere in the Panjab. The Indian tradition, which places it at Karūr, may very possibly be correct, and the capture of Mihiragula may have been the result of the capture of his capital at Śākala (Siālkot?). Anyhow, as a reward for his valuable assistance, Droṇasiṃha was raised by Yaśodharman to the rank of *Mahārāja*, probably in 525 A.D., the last year of Droṇasiṃha's reign.¹ Yaśodharman followed up his victory

¹ This explanation was first suggested by Dr. Fleet in JA., xv, 187, n. 3. Droṇasiṃha is described as *Mahārāja* already in his grant of 502 A.D. (JBBRAS., xx, p. 4). That year falls within the period of Toramāṇa's Hunic domination, and it may be that Droṇasiṃha attempted to profit by the disturbance of that time to assume the higher title; but it received its formal sanction only in 525 A.D. from Yaśodharman as emperor. The genuineness of the grant, however, is doubted by Kielhorn in EI., viii, App. i, p. 2, n. 2. The treatment meted out to the captive Mihiragula is graphically described in Yaśodharman's column inscription

over Mihiragula by invading and taking possession of Kashmir, in commemoration of which success he struck the so-called *Yaśovarman* coins after the fashion of Kashmir. From the description of Yaśodharman's campaign by Kālidāsa (also by Somadeva, T.K.S., i, 155) it would appear that the Huns had the assistance of the Persians, whose king, Kawādh, was both son-in-law and brother-in-law to the Hunic king. Yaśodharman, in order to protect his rear, before he advanced into Kashmir, appears to have marched across the lower Indus against the Persians, and defeated them somewhere in Makran (*ante*, p. 114). Having subverted Mihiragula's rule, and established his own over the western portion of the old Gupta empire, Yaśodharman now turned his attention to the eastern portion of that empire, which was still in the possession of the Gupta family. At this time Kumāragupta II had succeeded his father Narasiṃhagupta (Bālāditya). What provocation, if any, Kumāragupta may have given Yaśodharman we do not know. Perhaps the latter only acted on the proverb that the appetite grows with the eating. But that, as a fact, he attacked the Guptas and subverted their rule, establishing his own in its place, is guaranteed by Yaśodharman's column inscription, and it is confirmed (so far as that may be taken as a confirmation) by the account, given by Kālidāsa and Somadeva, of Yaśodharman's (Vikramāditya's) *digvijaya*. The result of Yaśodharman's campaigns in the west and east was the establishment of a new empire, which reached from the Brahmaputra to the Indus, and from the Kashmirian

(F.G.I., p. 148, l. 6). He was compelled to fall down, and touch with his head, the hair-lock of which was adorned with flowers, the feet of the victor. He was apparently forced to pay the same humble obeisance to Yaśodharman's ally, Droṇasiṃha, as implied in l. 4 (cf. with l. 3) of the Valabhi inscription (F.G.I., p. 168). From this it is difficult to say how much, if any, credit is to be given to the story of Mihiragula's liberation and restoration to Kashmir, which was related to Hiuen Tsang, and reported to us by him; especially in the face of the very different story of the same events in the Kashmir Chronicle, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

Himālayas to the Mahendra Range in the south, where (according to the accounts of Kālidāsa, N.R.V., iv, 49, p. 109, and Somadeva, T.KS., i, p. 150) he had a victorious encounter with the Cholas and Pandyas. If the Nepal *Varaṃśavalī* can be trusted, the empire included Nepal (*ante*, p. 121). Yaśodharman's campaigns must have occupied about four years, for in 528 A.D., as we have seen, the Guptas still exercised their sovereignty. It was probably not before 529 or 530 A.D. that Yaśodharman found himself in the peaceful enjoyment of his vast empire. It was probably at that time that, to mark the final accomplishment of his ambition, he erected the two columns of victory, the broken remains of which survive to the present day in the neighbourhood of Mandasor (F.G.I., pp. 142, 149). Having once obtained unchallenged possession of the empire, Yaśodharman ruled it for a long term of years (fifty-six according to the tradition) in peace, with a wisdom and beneficence, the memory of which still survives in all Indian traditions. In order to enable him to do so, he placed the western portion of the empire, or at least a part of it, in the charge of a faithful servant of his family as viceroy, retaining for himself the immediate administration of the eastern portion. This arrangement is commemorated in the contemporary Mandasor stone inscription of 533-4 A.D. (F.G.I., pp. 150 ff.). That inscription explicitly gives to Yaśodharman the title of Vishnuvardhana. That was the style which Yaśodharman adopted as emperor, and which, in the abbreviated form of Vishnu, he placed on his imperial coinage. In that coinage, to mark himself as the successor of the Gupta emperors, he continued the type of the Gupta coins.

Among the coins of the Gupta period there are two varieties of which hitherto no satisfactory attribution has been found. These are the coins of Vishnu and of Prakāśāditya. With regard to the former, I have already (in this Journal for 1903, p. 552) suggested their

attribution to Yaśodharman as emperor and successor of the Guptas, and explained my reason for doing so. I do not remember to have seen any serious objection to my suggestion,¹ and I may now add that the abbreviation of the imperial title *viṣṇu* from *viṣṇu-vardhana* is exactly on a par with the abbreviation *nara* from *narasimha* on the coins of Yaśodharman's predecessor, Narasimhagupta (R.IC., p. 26; S.GC., pp. 117, 128).² Further, the reverse legend, *Candr-āditya*, as originally read by Cunningham (C.M.I., pp. 12, 19), and since generally accepted (e.g., R.IC., p. 26; JASB., lxiii, p. 176; Cat. IM., p. 121), is in truth an impossible Sanskrit compound. Taken analogous to *vikram-āditya*, *dharm-āditya*, etc., it would mean "sun of the moon", which is absurd; taken as a *dvandva*, "sun and moon," it is equally absurd; taken to mean simply "moon-god" (*āditya* = divine being), it would be unidiomatic. No Indian would think of forming such a compound; least of all, to serve as the title of a sovereign. The coin which is figured by Cunningham (loc. cit., pl. ii, fig. 4) is the only one which permits any, even tentative, reading; it is now in the British Museum, where I have examined it; all other specimens in the British Museum are simply illegible. The only *akṣara* which is plainly legible on the coin in question is *śrī*; all others can only be guessed. The first *akṣara* of the name may be *ca* or *va* or *dha*. The second is certainly a conjunct, but it may be *rma* or *mma* (with *r* formed on the line or above it) just as likely as *ndr*. In short,

¹ In Cat. IM., p. 121, n. 1, it is rejected, without assigning any reasons.

² Regarding the common Indian practice of shortening (made *bhīmavat*) compounds, see the discussion in JGOS., xxxix, 707; xl, 145; xlv, 481 ff.; VOJ., viii, 240 ff. I owe these references to the kindness of Mr. A. B. Keith. Thus, explaining the name of a medical formula, Aruṇadatta in his commentary on *Aṣṭāṅga Hṛdaya*, iv, 14, v. 36, says: *tathā śārdūla-śabdena śārdūla-vikriḍitam vṛttam upalakṣyate, yathā bhīma-śabdena bhīmasena iti*, i.e. the *śārdūla-vikriḍita* metre is indicated by the word *śārdūla*, just as *bhīmasena* by the word *bhīma*.

I suggest that the legend is *dharmāditya*. That reading, at least, conforms to Sanskrit idiom, and the historical analogy of similar titles ; it satisfies also the visible traces on the coin.

With respect to the *Prakāśāditya* coins, now that the obverse reading [*vijitya*] *vasudhām devam jayati*, i.e., "[having subdued] the earth, His Majesty is victorious," has been established by Professor Rapson (Cat. IM., pp. 98, 119), their attribution to Puragupta is no more tenable, for the reason that Puragupta¹ certainly never was in the position of "having subdued the whole earth". But that legend exactly fits Yaśodharman and his *digvijaya*. I would suggest, therefore, that the *Prakāśāditya* coins be allotted to Yaśodharman, after he had established his new empire, say after 530 A.D. At the bottom of their obverse they, as well as the Vishnu coins, show the single letter *u* (S.G.C., 116; Cat. IM., p. 119). This I take to be a mint-mark, and to be the initial letter of Ujain, the original capital of Yaśodharman as emperor.

We have thus three varieties of coins, all attributable to Yaśodharman. The first is the so-called Yaśovarman variety, commemorative of Yaśodharman's victory over the Huns in the West. The second is the *Prakāśāditya* variety, commemorative of his victory over the Guptas in the East. The third is the Vishnu(-vardhana) variety, commemorating him as a ruler of the whole empire under his proper imperial style. The title *prakāśāditya*, or "Sun of Splendour", is obviously appropriate to Yaśodharman as the great conqueror. Equally appropriate is the title *dharmāditya*, which, like *śīlāditya* (given to him in the Malwa tradition of Hiuen Tsang, p. 122), means

¹ Nor Skandagupta, if he be really identical with Puragupta. As Puragupta, i.e. having lost half his dominions (*ante*, p. 129), Skandagupta surely would not have committed the sarcasm against himself of claiming to have subdued the whole earth.

“Sun of Goodness”, and commemorates Yaśodharman as the wise and good administrator of the empire.¹ As yet no coins showing the title Vikramāditya have been discovered; and though there occur indications of its use in contemporary Sanskrit literature (*infra*, p. 138), still in the main it is found, for the present, only in the Indian traditions, in which it is the common and almost exclusive designation of Yaśodharman. As I have suggested already in this Journal for 1903, p. 553, it may not have been an official title of Yaśodharman at all, but one bestowed on him by his grateful and admiring subjects, just as the title Śīlāditya was bestowed on Harshavardhana by his Buddhist subjects (*ante*, p. 101).²

In addition to continuing the type of the Gupta coinage, Yaśodharman appears to have also adopted the later Gupta practice of making Ayodhyā his principal capital. There the well-known Buddhist writer Paramārtha lived at his court, and thence, soon after 539 A.D., he left for China (JRAS., 1905, p. 40). There, at Yaśodharman's court, lived also the famous Kālidāsa, who must have written his *Raghuvamśa* in or soon after 530 A.D., when Yaśodharman had completed his *digvijaya*, which Kālidāsa *ex hypothesi* describes. Yaśodharman's traditionally long rule of fifty-six years, counting from some date between 525 and 530 A.D., ended somewhere between 581 and 586 A.D. His death was followed by one of the most disturbed, and hence obscure, periods of the history of India, which came to an end only with the establishment of the new empire of Harshavardhana in 606–12 A.D.

¹ The copperplate grants of Dharmāditya, which in *Ind. Ant.*, 1892, xxi, 45, I suggested to be referable to Samūdragupta, I would now prefer to attribute to Yaśodharman. This attribution removes the difficulty of the Lakshmī seal (see JASB., lxiii, 166). There are now two of these Dharmāditya plates, which Mr. Pargiter is at present engaged in preparing for publication.

² See an instructive observation of Dr. Fleet on the curious usages of titles, or *birudas*, in *Ep. Ind.*, vi, 193. Thus Govinda III, Rashtrakūṭa, was remembered only as Jagattunga.

We know at present too little about this period to do more than form a conjecture; and for myself, I still adhere to the historical construction suggested in this Journal for 1903, pp. 553 ff. Though in minor details it may be open to correction, in its main lines, I believe, it will turn out to be correct. The pivot round which the history of the period, from about 586 to 606, turns is the reversal of the anti-Hunic policy of Yaśodharman by his son and successor, whom the Indian tradition (rightly or wrongly) calls Śīlāditya (p. 124). His pro-Hunic policy roused the patriotic reaction which was headed by the Chiefs of Thanesar, and in 606 A.D. caused his final overthrow. To this chain of events it now seems possible to add another link. In the Gwalior inscription of the time of Bhoja I (*c.* 840–85 A.D.), reported on by Kielhorn in his Epigraphic Note, No. 17 (in GN., 1905, Heft ii), it is stated that the Gūrjara king Vatsarāja “in battle by force took away the universal sovereignty from the famous family of Bhaṇḍi”. From this statement it may be inferred that, after the overthrow of Śīlāditya, Harshavardhana conferred the rule of Mālava on Bhaṇḍi, who was his cousin and Śīlāditya’s son; and that after the break-up, in 648 A.D., of Harshavardhana’s empire, Bhaṇḍi laid claim to the succession in the “universal sovereignty”, that is, in the empire; and further, that this claim (in the main, probably a nominal one) was maintained by Bhaṇḍi’s family down to about 780 A.D., when Mālava (Avanti) was conquered by the rising power of the Parihāra-Gūrjaras under Vatsarāja (JRAS., 1904, pp. 644 ff.). As Bhaṇḍi was a grandson of the celebrated Vikramāditya (Yaśodharman), the inscription is justified in applying to his family the term “famous”.

The foregoing construction of the history of the period, to repeat once more, is for the present only a working hypothesis. Like every scientific hypothesis, it stands to be confirmed or rejected on further evidence

that may be forthcoming. In the meantime I may refer to two pieces of contemporary evidence from Sanskrit literature.

The first is the well-known 10th verse of Subandhu's introduction to his *Vāsavadattā*, which guarantees the existence of a king Vikramāditya as a contemporary of the poet. In H.V., p. 7, it runs as follows :—

*Sā rasavattā vihitā, navakā vilasanti, carati no
kaṁkaḥ |*

saras = īva kīrti-śeṣam gataṃ bhuvi Vikramāditye ||

i.e., Vikramāditya, like a lake, having (recently) passed away, all save his renown, such prowess (as was his) has departed; paltry new (kings) start up; does not a heron(-like king) prowl about (for prey).

The last clause may also be translated "do they not prey on one another". There is, as Mr. B. C. Mazumdar has pointed out (JRAS., 1907, p. 406), a pun on the word *kaṁkaḥ*, crane, or *kaṁ kaḥ*, "whom who," i.e. one another. The clauses of the verse, *more poetæ*, are turned so as to admit of several interpretations, but, by the general consensus of the commentators, ancient and modern,¹ the primary reference is to the political condition of the country prevailing at the time of the poet himself.

That Subandhu is anterior to Bāṇa, the contemporary of Harshavardhana, is now generally admitted (VOJ., i, 115). In his *Vāsavadattā*, Subandhu names Uddyotakara, and mentions the *Alaṅkāra*, a work of Dharmakīrti (H.V., 9, 10; C.K., Introd., pp. vi, vii). The latter was a pupil of Dinnāga (JRAS., 1902, p. 366; ib., 1905, p. 361; JBBRAS., 1894). The former was the (younger) contemporary and opponent of the great logician Dinnāga (JRAS., 1902, p. 366), and Dinnāga himself was an (older) contemporary

¹ See Śivarāma Tripāṭhin's remarks on H.V., p. 7; also Professor Jacobi in Voj., iii, 143, 144; also F. Hall himself in the Introduction, p. 6. The ridicule, as unmeasured as it is unmerited, poured by the latter on his dissentients, needs no notice; it only marks the era of the then prevailing rampant scepticism regarding traditions.

of Kālidāsa, who names him in his Meghadūta, and a pupil of Vasubandhu (W.B., p. 78; JBTS., 1896, iv, 1 ff.). Vasubandhu's date, as shown by Dr. Takakusu (JRAS., 1906, pp. 43, 52), is about 420–500 A.D.¹ Accordingly, that of his pupil Dinnāga and of the latter's contemporary opponent Uddyotakara is about 450–520. That of Dinnāga's pupil and commentator, Dharmakīrti (W.B., p. 208), is about 480–560; and finally, that of Subandhu is about 550–600 A.D. Now Subandhu's verse indicates that the Vikramāditya whom he names exercised paramount rule, but that his death, which had then only recently occurred, was followed by a period of political disturbance. The only ruler who satisfies these indications in the period of Subandhu's life (550–600 A.D.) is Yaśodharman. It follows, therefore, that Subandhu, in the verse in question, is referring to Yaśodharman; and that Yaśodharman was well known to his contemporaries by the title of Vikramāditya soon after his death, and probably during his lifetime. As the disturbed political condition of Northern India was terminated by the establishment of Harshavardhana's rule, it follows that the *Vāsavadattā* must have been written before 606–12 A.D., in which latter year Harshavardhana was formally crowned. Subandhu's verse, therefore, affords us a fairly clear determination, not only of the date and identity of Vikramāditya, but also of the approximate date and duration of Subandhu's life. To recapitulate briefly: a reference to the dates of certain well-known personages (Vasubandhu, etc.) places Subandhu in the latter half of the sixth century A.D. In that space of time falls Yaśodharman's rule, as proved by the Mandasor inscription of 533–4. That rule and its surrounding circumstances

¹ Professor S. Lévi makes it 500–50 (Bull. 1903, p. 49; JRAS., 1904, p. 44). This suits my argument even better; but I prefer to base it on the more extreme (though, indeed to my mind, more probable) date of Dr. Takakusu.

exactly fit the indications in Subandhu's verse 10 of the *Vāsavadattā*. Those circumstances show that Subandhu must have lived before 606–12 A.D.

Regarding the last clause of Subandhu's verse *carati no kaṁkaḥ*, Mr. Mazumdar, as already stated, has pointed out the pun inherent in *kaṁkaḥ*. He suggests that the word may refer to the Kanka dynasty of petty kings (*bhūpati*) mentioned in the *Bhāgavat Purāṇa* (xii, 1, 27). But even more significant are two other passages, occurring in the *Mahābhārata*, where the Kankas are enumerated in a list of peoples, "sandwiched" between the Śakas and Tukhāras on one side and the Pahlavas and Madrakas on the other (*Śānti P.*, lxv, 2429), or between the Śakas and Tukhāras on one side and the Romaśa(-*nara*) and Śṛṅgi(-*nara*) on the other (*Sabhā P.*, 1, 1850).¹ This position marks out the Kankas as a foreign tribe, living on the north-western borders of India, between the Scythians, Turks, Parthians, and Madrakas (the last in the Panjab). The Romaśa-*nara*, or shaggy men, and the Śṛṅgi-*nara*, or horned men, would indicate a people dressed in shaggy or hairy clothes, and such as wear a horned or peaked headdress. Thus the Kankas might indicate a Hunic tribe or clan. But there need be no reference to an actual Kanka king. *Vikramāditya* is not a name, but a title indicative of prowess; so also *kaṁka* is meant only as an epithet indicative of greed (*atīlōlupa*). Anyhow, whether *kaṁkaḥ* mean simply a heron or be a proper name, I would suggest that it contains a reference to Vikramāditya's unpatriotic and pro-Hunic son and successor, Śīlāditya.

The second contemporary evidence from the Sanskrit literature is the well-known verse to which Professor Liebhich has drawn attention (*VOJ.*, xiii, pp. 308 ff., and *LAR.*, 1903). It occurs in Chandragomin's commentary

¹ I owe these references to the kindness of Mr. Pargiter.

(*vr̥tti*) on *sūtra* i, 2, 81, in his Grammar (*Camdram-vyākaraṇa*), and runs (with Kielhorn's correction in GN., 1903, p. 305) as follows:—

ajayaḥ = *Jarto Hunān*,
i.e. the Jarta defeated the Huns.

The verb *ajayat*, he defeated, is in the imperfect tense; and this tense, according to the Sanskrit grammarians, implies that the event referred to is one which is universally known, and which occurred in the past, but within the lifetime of the writer, though not necessarily under his own eye. Now the only defeat of the Huns of such magnitude as to cause a general sensation is that which was achieved by Yaśodharman, and which is recorded by him on the Mandasor column of victory. It took place about 525–8 A.D. There is no record of any previous defeat of any importance. In fact, the Huns did not invade India before about 468 (*ante*, p. 127). The initial success of Skandagupta's reign was not obtained over the Huns, but over the Pushyamitras and their allies (*ante*, p. 127). In his subsequent war with the Huns, after 468 A.D., he only secured a small temporary advantage; for soon afterwards he was driven out by the Huns from the western portion of his empire. It is obvious, therefore, that Skandagupta and his campaign cannot be referred to in the grammatical example above quoted; and moreover he, being a Gupta, could not be described as a Jarta. After Skandagupta's reverse the Huns firmly established themselves in their western Indian possessions, till the great and eminently successful revolt under Yaśodharman in 525–8 A.D. occurred. It follows, therefore, that Chandragomin wrote his example after 526–8 A.D. Moreover, it must have been written almost immediately after that date, say in 529 A.D., while Yaśodharman's great victory and its sensation was still fresh in the memory of the people, and before Yaśodharman had also set aside the Gupta dynasty, and

himself assumed the imperial crown as Vishnuvardhana and Vikramāditya. Otherwise Chandragomin would hardly have referred to him simply as "the Jarta". Kielhorn (GN., 1903, pp. 306, 307) has explained that that term signifies "a particular people and their king", and has suggested its identity "with the well-known tribal names *Jatta* or *Jāt* of the Indian vernaculars". This identification seems undoubtedly to be correct. The Jāts appear to constitute a foreign element in the population of India, similar to the Rājputs. But they are distinct from the latter (R.PI., pp. 92, 185, 186; R.IE., i, 300, 322), who are the resultants of the foreign invasions about the Hunic period. The Jāts belong to an older (Indo-Aryan) stratum of immigrants (R.PI., pp. 36, 58, 123; R.IE., i, 293, 299), who, however, had early become indianized. They are now found settled in the eastern Panjab and in Rajputana (see the Maps of Castes in R.PI., p. li). It will be remembered that the tradition reported by Tārānātha (*ante*, p. 118) makes Yaśodharman (there called Śrī Harsha) to be a native of Maru (i.e. Mārwāra, or western Rajputana). As the Mandasor stone inscription of 533-4 A.D. is dated in the era of the Mālava tribes,¹ that fact may show, though not necessarily, that the Jāt tribe was included in their number. Of the Jāt tribe Yaśodharman would seem to have been the Chief; and, as his name, Yaśodharman, shows, he was, to all intents and purposes, an Indian, and he would naturally have felt himself an Indian as against the new foreign (Hunic) masters of his country.

Though not immediately connected with my present subject, I cannot resist the temptation to point out the means we now have to approximately determine the dates of Chandragomin's life. Dr. Takakusu (JRAS., 1905,

¹ See F.G.I., p. 154, l. 21, *Mālava-gaṇa-sthiti-vaśāt*, i.e. since the first constitution of the Mālava tribes. *Vaśa* means here birth, origin; see M. Williams' Dictionary.

p. 41) has informed us that according to Paramārtha, a contemporary, there was a Brahmanist grammarian, Vasurāta, who attacked the Buddhist theologian Vasubandhu. The latter, as Dr. Takakusu calculates (to my mind, rightly), lived from about 420 to 500 A.D. The controversy with Vasubandhu, in which Vasurāta appears to have had the assistance of another Brahmanist scholar, Sanghabhadra (ibid., p. 36), took place when Vasubandhu was already an old man (ibid., p. 40), and after Bālāditya (i.e. Narasimhagupta) had ascended the throne (ibid., p. 49) about 485 A.D. (*ante*, p. 129). It may therefore be referred to (about) 490 A.D. Vasurāta, clearly, was much younger than the old Vasubandhu, whom he challenged in his youthful aggressiveness. Accordingly we may allot to him approximately the years 470–530 A.D., which would make him about 20 years old at the time of the controversy. Now Bhartrihari in his *Vākyapadīya* (v. 489) tells us that the nearly forgotten study of Sanskrit grammar was resuscitated by a band of scholars, among whom Chandragomin was chief. And Puṇyarāja, in his commentary on the *Vākyapadīya*, informs us that among the other members of that band the next important after Chandragomin was Vasurāta. In fact, it may be suggested that it was the sense of power inspired by the newly acquired knowledge of Sanskrit grammar which caused the eager, youthful Vasurāta to challenge Vasubandhu. From Puṇyarāja's explanation the obvious conclusion is that Vasurāta and Chandragomin were contemporaries,¹ and that therefore Chandragomin must

¹ Verse 489 of the *Vākyapadīya* (in the Benares Sanskrit Series) runs as follows : (*vyākaraṇ-āgamaḥ* |) *sa nīto bahu-śākatvaṃ Candracāryādibhiḥ punaḥ* ||, i.e., the study of grammar was again brought to a high state of flourish by Candracārya and others. Puṇyarāja explains *Candracāryādi* by *Candracārya-Vasurāta-guru-prabhṛti*, i.e. Candracārya, Vasurāta, and other teachers. I do not think that Puṇyarāja's explanation necessarily implies that Vasurāta was a younger pupil of Chandragomin, as Professor Liebich (L.A.R., p. 9) and Dr. Takakusu (JRAS., 1905, p. 45) assume : both may very well have been of the same age,

also be placed about 470–530 A.D. He cannot be placed earlier, because, as we have seen, his grammatical example must have been written after 525–8 A.D. Nor can he be placed later, because he takes the first place in the group of resuscitators of the study of Sanskrit grammar. He it was who appears to have started the movement, and whose example, and perhaps instruction, won Vasurāta for it. The date, implied in his grammatical illustration drawn from the Jarta's victory over the Huns, shows that his grammar, the *Candravyākaraṇa*, received its final touches only after 525–8 A.D.

and Vasurāta may have been only inspired by Chandragomin to pursue the same line of study. But there is a curious chronological difficulty in the matter. Bhartrihari's language in verse 489 certainly seems to suggest, as Professor Liebich takes it, that he himself was a direct pupil of Vasurāta. But as, according to Itsing (T.I., p. 150), Bhartrihari died about 650 A.D., and as the date of Vasurāta is about 470–530, or at latest 520–600 (calculating from Dr. Takakusu's or Professor S. Lévi's data respectively), it seems quite impossible that Bhartrihari could have been a direct pupil of Vasurāta. It seems necessary, therefore, to assume (with Dr. Takakusu, JRAS., 1905, p. 45) that Bhartrihari was really a *prasiṣya*, or pupil of a pupil, of Vasurāta.