ART. XXI.—*Some Problems of Ancient Indian History.*

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

It has long been a puzzle to me that no coins of the two great emperors Vikramāditya and Harsha Vardhana should have survived, when we have, in comparatively large numbers, coins of most minor kings before and after them. I believe, however, that coins of these two emperors do exist, though they have not been recognized hitherto. My attention was drawn to them recently, while writing a sketch of the ancient history of India.

The late Sir Alexander Cunningham in his *Coins of Medieval India* gives three plates of Kashmir coins. Two of these, plates iv and v, contain those of the strictly native Kashmir kingdom, beginning with Avanti Varman. All these latter coins, from beginning to end, exhibit mere varieties of precisely the same type: obverse, standing figure of king; reverse, sitting figure of goddess. But there is one striking exception. The three coins forming the third line in plate v present an entirely different type. The type, indeed, is so different that one wonders how they ever got into the series of Kashmir coins. Strictly speaking, the three coins show two types, though both entirely different from the prevailing Kashmirian one. No. 21, in plate v, has on the obverse a horseman, and on the reverse a sitting goddess, while Nos. 22 and 23 show on the obverse the king's name in large letters, and on the reverse the figure of the South Indian elephant.

Another point may also be noted, which, though not decisive in itself, tends to emphasize the difference. All true Kashmir coins, in plates iv and v, are of copper. The

only exception are these three coins, which are either of gold (Nos. 21, 22) or of silver (No. 23).

I will first dispose of Nos. 22 and 23, of which the former is of gold, the latter of silver, and both of which, I believe, are unique. They are the issues of a king *Śrī Harṣa Deva*, whose name fills the whole obverse side of the coin. The reverse is occupied by the characteristic elephant of the coins of the South Indian Kangudeṇa. Cunningham ascribes the coins to Harsha Deva of Kashmir, who reigned from 1089 to 1101 A.D., and he is followed therein by Mr. Rapson in his *Indian Coins*, §§ 112 and 125 (1). The only ground for this attribution appears to be a passage in the *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī* (vii, 926), which used to be wrongly translated as stating that Harsha "introduced coins like those current in Kārṇāṭa" (J. C. Dutt's translation, 1879). The passage really only says that "as (Harsha) was fond, in his amusements, of the Dekhan fashion, he introduced a *ṭanka* copied from that of the Kārṇāṭa (country)." As Dr. Stein (Transl., vol. i, p. 340) has rightly pointed out, *ṭanka* here does not mean 'a coin' but a 'die' or 'stamp.' The whole context of eleven verses (921-931) speaks of fashions of personal dress and adornment; and the particular passage above quoted clearly refers to a certain Kārṇāṭa fashion of stamping, probably clothes, or perhaps jewels. The word *ṭanka* simply means a 'die,' which may be of any kind or for any use. In the verse in question the context negatives the idea that Kalhana was speaking of a 'coin-die.' In a subsequent verse (vii, 950), and in a different connection, Kalhana does, indeed, speak of gold and silver coins (*dinnāra*) of Harsha. But apart from other improbabilities of that statement which have been already pointed out by Dr. Stein (Transl., vol. ii, p. 317, also footnote on p. 342 of vol. i), the point to be noted is that Harsha's abundant copper coins are of the common Kashmir type (see plate v, No. 24), and if his gold and silver coins had been imitated from those of South India, this subsequent verse (vii, 950) would have been the place for Kalhana to record the fact, but not when he was speaking about fashions of personal adornment.

As he has not done so, it must be concluded that Harsha's gold and silver coins (if there were any¹) were of the same type as his copper coins. To me it appears far more probable that both Nos. 22 and 23 are issues of Harsha Deva of Malwa, who reigned from about 950 to 974 A.D. About him the Udepur Praśasti says (*Epigraphia Indica*, vol. i, p. 225) that "he took in battle the wealth of king Kottiga," the Rāshtrakūṭa king of Malkhed (Mānyakhēṭa). His Southern Indian conquest was confirmed by his son Vākpati II, who, according to the same Praśasti, subdued the Karṇāṭas, Keraḷas, and Colas (*ibid.*, p. 227). Harsha's conquest of Malkhed is corroborated by Dhanapāla in his Pāiyalacchī (*ibid.*, p. 226). There can be no doubt, then, that Kangudeṇa, for a time, was in the power of Harsha of Malwa; and it cannot surprise to find that he struck coins with the South Indian emblem of the elephant to commemorate his conquest. The practice of striking imitative coins to mark a conquest is not at all uncommon, while the adoption of a new coinage (as the Kashmir theory assumes) from mere "love of amusement" in imitation of that of a distant and quite unrelated country, would be an extraordinary occurrence, and one which, so far as I know, is otherwise quite unheard of.

I will now turn to the other coin, No. 21 of plate v. It is a gold coin, and, I believe, also unique. Unfortunately its find-place is not known. It shows on the obverse the figure of a horseman, with the legend *Harṣa Deva*, and on the reverse that of an enthroned goddess. Cunningham attributes it also to Harsha of Kashmir. He does not give

¹ I doubt that in vii, 950, Kalhana must necessarily mean 'gold and silver coins.' The passage might very well mean no more than that "at that time the use of gold and silver things (*rukmaś-ca rājataś-ca*) was plentiful, while that of copper money (*dinnāraś-ca tāmrajañ*) was rare." He simply wanted to emphasize (no doubt exaggeratedly) the profusion of gold and silver during Harsha's reign as compared with his copper currency, which itself was very large. This interpretation is supported by the fact that no gold or silver coins of Harsha have ever been found, with the exception of the three specimens in question, the identity of which is more than doubtful. If Harsha's gold and silver currency had really been so plentiful, as the usual translation assumes, the total absence of any survival would be very strange.

his reasons. It cannot have been that passage of the *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī*; for the type of the coin is certainly not Karnatic. There is no reason either to connect the coin with Harsha of Malwa, still less with Harsha the Chandel, who reigned about 900–925 A.D. The type of our coin seems to me too early and too western for either attribution. There only remains the famous Harsha of Thanesar, commonly known as Harsha Vardhana of Kanauj, who reigned from 606 to 648 A.D. Not unfrequently he is simply called Harsha Deva, e.g., in the Harṣa Carita, the Nausarī Grant, and the Aṃśad Stone Inscription (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, p. 207; *Ind. Antiquary*, xiii, 73, 79). I believe the coin must belong to him. Its type is peculiar in its composition. The reverse type is the goddess seated on a throne (not cross-legged on a lotus) with the cornucopiæ in her left hand. The back-frame of the throne is recognizable by the two thick bands which run right and left from the waist of the goddess. This type, varied from a preceding “Zeus Enthroned with Sceptre,” was commonly adopted by the Great Kushans and their successors the Little Kushans, who together ruled Gandhara and the Panjab from the third to the seventh century A.D. The type was adopted by the Early Guptas, but changed by them later on, about 410 A.D., into the “Goddess Seated Cross-legged on a Lotus and Holding a Lotus-flower.” With the Little Kushans, from about 430 A.D., the type gradually degenerated, but it always remained the “Enthroned Goddess with Cornucopiæ,” the throne being indicated by a cross-band, as in the coin of Yaśovarman, which will be noticed presently. But neither the Guptas nor the Kushanas join with the reverse goddess the obverse type of the horseman. Instead of it they always have the standing figure of the king. The horseman seen on the obverse of our coin is the peculiar western type of the “Horseman with Lance upright, or at rest, in his right hand.” It is seen very distinctly in the coins of the Brahman Shāhis of Kabul, who reigned from about 880 A.D. It is evidently a variation of the preceding type of the “Horseman with Lance levelled, or at charge,” seen, e.g., on

coins of Hermæus about 45–60 A.D.¹ For the intermediate time, the only evidence of the use of the “Horseman with Lance at rest,” so far as I know, is our gold coin, and a few obscure copper coins (see Cunningham’s *Coins of Mediæval India*, pl. vi, Nos. 11, 22, 23). The Brahman Shāhis use for the reverse a recumbent humped bull. Being Hindus, they may have introduced this reverse type; and it is possible that their predecessors, the Turki Shāhis, may have used the enthroned goddess of the Kushans with the obverse horseman. Anyhow, it is this peculiar combination of the “Horseman with Lance at rest” on the obverse, and the “Enthroned Goddess with Cornucopiæ” on the reverse, which we have on our gold coin of Harsha Deva. For myself, I am disposed to believe that the emblem of the “Horseman with Lance at rest” is the mark of the early Rajputs, i.e. the Hinduized Kushans, Huns, and other invaders. The chiefs of Thanesar were Rajputs (*Epigraphia Indica*, i, p. 68). On the whole, it appears to me that Harsha Vardhana has the best claim to the gold coin in question.

I now turn to a class of coins which I believe must be attributed to the celebrated Vikramāditya. I mean the coins of the Little Kushan type which bear the name of Yaśovarman. A specimen is shown in Cunningham’s *Coins of Mediæval India*, pl. iii, No. 11, among the Kashmir coins (also in Mr. Rapson’s *Indian Coins*, pl. iv, No. 22). They are not uncommon: fifty-seven were found in 1885 in the Sialkot District of the Panjab (*Proceedings As. Soc. Beng.*, 1888, p. 180). Another was discovered in the Manikyala Stūpa (*Indian Antiquities*, vol. i, pl. v, No. 9, and pl. xxxi, No. 3). It is usual to place these coins among those of Kashmir, and to ascribe them to a certain Yaśovarman of Kanauj (Cunningham, *l.c.*, p. 44, n. 20; Rapson, *l.c.*, p. 32; Stein, Translation of the *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī*, p. 89 of Introd., and p. 132). Nothing appears to me more improbable. In the first place, there is no Yaśovarman among the kings of

¹ I follow the chronology as arranged by Mr. Vincent A. Smith in the J.R.A.S., January, 1903.

Kashmir. There was a Yaśovarman who belonged to the royal family, but he was never on the throne (*Rāja Tar.*, transl., i, 184), and besides, his date, about 850 A.D., is too late. Next, as to Yaśovarman of Kanauj, there is nothing to show that he ever advanced so far as Kashmir, still less that he ever was in possession of it. According to the *Gaṇḍavāha* (Sh. P. Pandit's ed., p. xxviii) he got no further than Thanesar. That work, written in praise of Yaśovarman's exploits by his court poet Vākpati, would not have failed to record his advance to Kashmir, if that had been a fact. From the account of the same occurrences, given in the Kashmirian Chronicle, *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī* (ch. iv, vv. 132–146; Stein's transl., vol. i, pp. 131–134), it is doubtful whether he got even so far as Thanesar. Yaśovarman's army and that of the Kashmirian king apparently met in the Doab ("the land between the Gaṅgā and Yamunā," *l.c.*, v. 132). There, as Kalhana sardonically relates, "the thoughtful ruler of Kanauj showed his back to the fiercely shining Lalitāditya (of Kashmir), and offered his submission" (*l.c.*, v. 135). But the offer was not accepted, and soon afterwards "Yaśovarman was uprooted entirely" (*l.c.*, v. 140). In these circumstances how should Yaśovarman strike coins of the Kashmir type? Even an Indian king is not in the habit of adopting a coin-type of a country by the king of which he is "entirely uprooted"!

Regarding Yaśodharman we gain much information from his own inscriptions (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 142–158; *Journal A.S.B.*, lviii, 95, 96). His personal name was Viṣṇu Vardhana,¹ and he was originally only one, probably the most important, of the chiefs of the Mālava clans, and a feudatory of the Early Gupta empire. As such he had distinguished himself by his martial character, or as his surname Yaśodharman expresses it, "by making the attainment of glory his rule of life." About 533 A.D. he inflicted

¹ Both names are given to him in the Mandasor Inscription. *Pace* Dr. Fleet (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 155, note 5), the identity is explicitly affirmed by the Sanskrit phrase *sa eva narādhipati*, 'this very same sovereign.' The words *janendra* and *narādhipati* are not exactly 'titles' (like *mahārāja*), but synonymic descriptions of sovereignty or chiefship.

a crushing defeat on Mihiragula, by which he delivered the Gupta empire from a threatening Hunic domination. It was this victory, and the great political changes consequent on it, which procured for him the title of Vikramāditya, and for the Mālava era its new name, by which it was henceforth known, of the Vikrama era. For his "ruling passion," stimulated by that great victory, led Yaśodharman on to set aside the last of the Early Gupta emperors, the weak Kumāra Gupta II, and to assume himself the imperial titles *rājādhirāja* and *paramēśvara* (Mandasōr Inscr., l. 5; see Dr. Fleet's notes in *Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 156), thus founding the Mālava imperial dynasty. In his Mandasōr Pillar inscription (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 148) he boasts that he not only conquered the Huns, but that he ruled an empire vaster than that of the Guptas ever had been. This boast shows that his empire extended to the Indus, if not beyond it, and that it also included Kashmir, which had never formed part of the Gupta empire. From the somewhat confused account of the *Rāja Taraṅgiṇī* (ii, 7; iii, 125, with Dr. Stein's notes, and *Introd.*, pp. 81, 83), one fact, at least, comes out clearly, that Vikramāditya, also called Harsha of Ujjain (Mālava), had conquered Kashmir. In view of these conquests, one might also expect Vikramāditya, or Yaśodharman, to strike coins of the Kashmir and Little Kushan type. That, as a fact, he did so appears to me to be proved by the coins now under discussion, which bear the name of Yaśovarman. The two forms *dharman* and *varman* are easily interchangeable, and the fact that the form *varman* was so frequently used just at this period (Fleet, in *Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 145, note 2), may well explain its occurrence on the coins in question. The circumstance that one of these Yaśovarman coins was found in the Manikyāla Stūpa is specially worth noting. Seeing that the Yaśovarman of Kanauj never got as far as the Indus, but was defeated in the Doab by the king of Kashmir, proves that he could not have deposited a coin of his in that stūpa. On the other hand, it is natural that Yaśodharman (Vikramāditya), who carried his victorious arms as far as

the Indus, should deposit a coin of his, struck in memory of his western conquests, as a votive offering, in that celebrated frontier stūpa.

It will perhaps be now admitted that I have shown sufficient reason¹ to believe that, while for this class of coins Yaśovarman of Kanauj is altogether out of the question, the celebrated Vikramāditya has the best claim to them,—at least, until a still better claimant can be produced. But there is another class of coins which, I believe, may also be ascribed to Vikramāditya. I mean the coins of the well-known Gupta type with the legend *Viṣṇu* on the obverse. There are, as Mr. Rapson informs me, 14 of them in the British Museum, and about 12 in the Hunterian Museum in Glasgow. One specimen is shown by Cunningham in his *Coins of Mediaeval India*, plate ii, No. 4. He attributes it to Vishnu Gupta (c. 680 A.D.), of the Later Gupta dynasty (*ibid.*, pp. 12, 19). Herein he is followed, though doubtfully, by Mr. Rapson (*Indian Coins*, p. 26) and by Mr. V. Smith (*Gupta Coinage*, p. 116). The name *Gupta*, however, does not appear on any of them.² On the other hand, as Mr. Rapson truly observes, they “bear a great resemblance to those of Nara(gupta) Bālāditya and Kumāragupta II Kramāditya.” These two points show that they belong to a king who bore the name Vishnu and was a contemporary of the Gupta emperors Narasimha and Kumāra II. The only Vishnu known in that period is the well-known Vishnu Vardhana, king of Mālava, who is the same as Yaśodharman, the conqueror of the Huns, afterwards called Vikramāditya (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 151, 155). To him I would attribute the coins in question. The mysterious letter *u*, seen between the legs of the king on the obverse, which has never been explained, I would suggest to be the initial of Ujjain, the capital of Vikramāditya. The reverse of these coins shows the title *Candrāditya*. This would seem

¹ I had already done so in 1888; see *Proceedings As. Soc. Beng.*, 1888, pp. 180–183.

² Mr. Rapson, who, at my request, has kindly re-examined them, writes me (27-iv-03), “so far as I know, there is no trace of *-gupta*.”

to be the title which Yaśodharman—Vishnu Vardhana at one time assumed. It is not impossible, indeed, that he never himself assumed the title Vikramāditya, but that it was given to him by his people and by posterity, just as the titles ‘great,’ etc., among ourselves.

The period of Indian history to which Vikramāditya belongs is still very obscure.¹ There is, however, not a little of contemporary evidence to be gathered from inscriptions and literature which I will try to put together, and indicate what conclusions, I believe, can be drawn from them. Yaśodharman’s inscriptions show that, as a result of his victory, *circa* 533 A.D., he founded an empire which exceeded that of the Guptas, and therefore, of course, must have taken its place. This empire, which I may call the Mālava empire (or that of Ujjain, after its capital town), did not last very long: it came to an end in 606 A.D., when Harsha Vardhana established his empire of Kanauj. The period in question, therefore, lies between 533 and 606 A.D. To this period belongs that Śilāditya of whom Hiuen Tsiang says (*Siyuki*, i, 261) that he ruled Mālava about 60 years before his own time, that is, about 580 A.D. (640–60). The *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī* further tells us that this Śilāditya² was the son of Vikramāditya, who is described (*R.T.* iii, 125) as being “the sole sovereign of the world.” The only sovereign to whom that description can apply in the period immediately preceding 580 A.D. is Yaśodharman, the Mālava emperor, with his empire vaster than that of the Guptas. Therefore, Yaśodharman must be Vikramāditya.

There are contemporary indications which corroborate this identification. The *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī* (iii, 330) not only tells

¹ The view set forth in the sequel is substantially the same as that suggested by me, in 1889, in the *Journal A.S.B.*, lviii, pp. 95 ff. It is now explained and supported more in detail, and especially relieved of the erroneous identification of Yaśodharman with Śilāditya, which vitiated the theory in its original form.

² The identity of the Śilāditya of the *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī* with the Śilāditya of Hiuen Tsiang has always been assumed (Dr. Stein in note to *R.T.*, iii, 330, and *Introd.*, p. 66); with what amount of truth, will be seen from the sequel. I may here note that for the *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī* (*R.T.*) I always refer to Dr. Stein’s edition and translation.

us that Śīlāditya was the son of Vikramāditya, but also that he "had been dethroned by his enemies," but afterwards "replaced in the kingdom of his father" by Pravarasena II of Kashmir. About this Pravarasena it tells us that he was a son of Toramāṇa (*R.T.* iii, 104–109), and that he belonged to the "great race of Mihiragula" (*R.T.* iii, 57, 58), or, in other words, that he was a Hunic king. Seeing that Śīlāditya was "replaced in the kingdom of his father" Vikramāditya, who had founded the Mālava empire, he must have been a Mālava emperor; and since he was "dethroned by his enemies," the latter must have been rival emperors; and whereas he was assisted in his restoration by a Hunic king, the Huns must have been involved in the contest of the rival emperors. Let us see how far there is contemporary evidence to corroborate these three points.

In Harsha Vardhana's inscriptions (e.g., the Madhuban copper-plate, *Epigraphia Indica*, i, 72) his father Prabhākara, the chief of Thanesar, is described with the imperial titles (*paramabhaṭṭāraka* and *mahārājādhirāja*). This necessarily means that Prabhākara, whose date is about 580–606 A.D., had set up as a rival emperor, and this he could not have done without coming into warlike collision with the contemporary Mālava emperor Śīlāditya. Further, in Śarva Varman's Asirgaḍh seal (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 220) we find his father Isāna Varman, the Maukharī chief of Kanauj, bearing one of the imperial titles (*mahārājādhirāja*). Here we have an indication of another rival of the contemporary Mālava emperor. Isāna's date, as shown by his coin, is 565 A.D.,¹ which is corroborated by the fact that, as shown by a comparison of their genealogies, he must have been a contemporary of Prabhākara's father Āditya Vardhana. Accordingly he must have set up as a rival of the Mālava emperor Vikramāditya, and the Maukharī chiefs must have come into warlike collision with the Mālava emperors.

¹ The possible dates, as shown by Dr. Fleet (*Indian Antiquary*, xiv, 68), are G.S. 245 or 265 or 275 = A.D. 565 or 585 or 595. But as the genealogies show, 565 is the only admissible date. See the chart in *Journal A.S.B.*, vol. lviii. Cunningham read G.S. 257 = A.D. 577, which would not affect my argument.

There are some more confirmatory indications in the *Harṣa Carita*, which is a contemporary work of the Thanesar court poet Bāṇa. For he relates at length that the ruler of Mālava waged deadly war against both the chiefs of Thanesar and Kanauj. These chiefs, then, are the enemies who, as the *Rāja Tarāṅginī* says, dethroned Śīlāditya. According to the *Harṣa Carita*¹ the course of events was briefly as follows:—Prabhākara of Thanesar waged war with the lord of Mālava as well as with the Hūnas (*H.C.* 101); he was not altogether successful, for later on, just before his death, he had to send his son Rājya once more against the Hūnas (*H.C.* 132), and the lord of Mālava conquered Kanauj and slew Prabhākara's son-in-law, the Maukharī chief Grahavarman (*H.C.* 173); finally, the lord of Mālava is utterly defeated by Rājya (*H.C.* 176). The lord of Mālava is never named, but it can have been none other than Śīlāditya; there existed no other Mālava rival emperor at that time.²

The *Harṣa Carita*, moreover, affords indications for calculating fairly precise dates. Prabhākara had two sons, Rājya and Harsha, and a daughter Rājyaśrī. In the year of Rājyaśrī's conception, the elder son, Rājya, was "nearing his sixth year" (*H.C.* 115), and the younger brother, Harsha, was in his second year, for he could "just manage five or six paces with the support of his nurse's fingers" (*H.C.* 115), and "tiny teeth were beginning to adorn his mouth" (*H.C.* 116). The next year Rājyaśrī was born. Accordingly there were about four years between the two brothers and about three years between Harsha and his sister. Again, we are told that Prabhākara called to his court two Gupta princes,³ Kumāra and Mādhava, to be companions to his

¹ In all the references to the *Harṣa Carita* (*H.C.*), I quote Cowell and Thomas' translation, by pages.

² It is worth noting that the Gauda king who murdered Rājya Vardhana is also never named, though it was the celebrated Śaśāṅka. The claims of Devagupta to be the lord of Mālava will be discussed in the sequel.

³ The Gupta princes were sons of the king of Eastern Malwa (*H.C.* 119). They were kinsmen of Prabhākara; they were, in fact, his first cousins, though of course considerably younger than himself, for Prabhākara's mother, Mahāsenaguptā, was the sister of the two princes' father, Mahāsenagupta. The princes were the constant companions of Prabhākara's sons, and accompanied them on all their

own sons. The older, Kumāra, was "in age about 18 years" (*H.C.* 120); his companion, Rājya, must have been of about the same age. Harsha and his friend Mādhava, accordingly, would be about 14, and the sister Rājyaśrī about 11 years old. This exactly agrees with the statement (*H.C.* 121) that at this time Rājyaśrī had come to maturity "in a comparatively limited time." It cannot have been long afterwards that Rājya was sent by his father on an expedition against the Hūnas (*H.C.* 132), for on his return, only a few months, or possibly weeks, afterwards, it is said (*H.C.* 166) that his beard showed but "faint growth." He may have been about 20 at that time. Harsha, accordingly, can only have been about 16 in that year, which was the year of his own accession to the throne, because Rājya lost his life a few months afterwards. That this is correct is shown by the fact that Harsha is twice (*H.C.* 175, 239) said to have been a mere "boy" at this time. Now Harsha came to the throne in the Autumn (October) of 606 A.D. He must, therefore, have been born in 590 A.D., his brother Rājya in 586 A.D., and his sister Rājyaśrī in 593 A.D. Accordingly Prabhākara cannot have married Yaśovati later than 585 A.D., and as he appears to have married soon after his accession to the throne, the latter event cannot be placed much earlier than 583 A.D. Prabhākara's marriage to Yaśovati throws a sidelight on the cause of his setting up as a rival emperor. As her name shows, she must have been a daughter of the Mālava emperor Yaśodharman – Vikramāditya. When the latter died, Prabhākara probably put forward his claim to the imperial crown, for Vikramāditya's son, Śilāditya (as will be shown in the sequel), was a 'pro-Hun,' and was not popular. It must be also remembered that Vikramāditya was really an usurper, for he had supplanted the old imperial Gupta family. But he was the deliverer from the Huns, and

expeditions (cf. *H.C.* 235). Mādhava, though the younger brother, eventually succeeded to the throne of Eastern Malwa, because his elder brother Kumāra must have been massacred with his companion Rājya by the Gauda king (*H.C.* 178).

a masterful ruler; and as long as he lived his empire was secure. But the usurpation was not altogether acquiesced in. A branch of the old imperial Gupta house was ruling in Eastern Malwa. The Maukharī chiefs of Kanauj were connected with it by marriage; so were the Rajput chiefs of Thanesar. It cannot surprise, therefore, that these chiefs espoused the cause of the Guptas, and disputed the pretensions of the Mālava emperors. The Maukharī Āditya Varman had married a Gupta princess Harshā (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, Introd., 14). Her son Isāna, as we have seen, assumed one of the imperial titles: this was in 565 A.D., during Vikramāditya's lifetime. The Thanesar chief, Āditya Vardhana, had also married a Gupta princess, Mahāsenaguptā (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, Introd., 15). Her son Prabhākara assumed the full imperial titles; that is, he set up openly as a rival emperor. That, as we have seen, must have been about 583 A.D., and his doing so makes it probable that just at that time a change took place in the occupant of the Mālava throne. Vikramāditya must have died about 583 A.D. Accordingly his reign embraced about fifty years (533–583 A.D.). We shall presently see that there is some evidence to confirm this length of his reign. There was another reason for Prabhākara to persevere in disputing the succession of Śīlāditya, Vikramāditya's son. He had married his daughter Rājyaśrī to the Maukharī prince Grahavarman (*H.C.* 122), who in his person represented the Maukharī claims to empire.¹ This explains the attack of the Mālava emperor Śīlāditya on Kanauj in 606 A.D., when he killed Grahavarman and threw his consort Rājyaśrī into a dungeon, "confining her like a brigand's wife with a pair of iron fetters" (*H.C.* 173). This savage treatment of the princess throws an informing light on Śīlāditya's character, especially when we remember that Rājyaśrī was a young girl, not more than about 13 years of age.

¹ Grahavarman was the eldest son of the ruling Maukharī chief Avantivarman. He may have been about 18 years of age, his bride, as above shown, being about 11 years old. The wedding would have been in 604 A.D., and between that year and 606, when he was killed, Grahavarman must have succeeded his father.

We can now fairly follow the course of events. Yaśodharman Vikramāditya founded his Mālava empire about 533 A.D., and reigned up to about 583 A.D. He was respected as the deliverer from the Huns, as a strong and wise ruler, and as a patron of learning. On the whole his rule was not disputed, though the Maukharī chiefs of Kanauj (Iśāna Varman, etc.) were restive, and (as we shall see in the sequel) the Gupta chiefs of Eastern Malwa (Devagupta, etc.) as well. His son Śīlāditya was a man of a very different character, ferocious and unpatriotic (witness his relations to the Huns); and therefore, on his accession, about 583 A.D., the general discontent broke out openly. The Thanesar chief Prabhākara became the leader. He was marked out for the rôle he assumed; for he combined in his person the claims of his own house (through Yaśovatī) with those of his connections (by marriage), the Maukharīs of Kanauj and the Guptas of Eastern Malwa. So he set up as rival emperor, and with his confederates made war on the Mālava emperor Śīlāditya: these are "the enemies" of the *Rāja Taraṅgiṇī* (iii, 330). At first he was successful: Śīlāditya and his Hunic allies were defeated (*H.C.* 101). The result was that, as the *Rāja Taraṅgiṇī* (iii, 330) says, he was "dethroned," and had to take refuge in the Panjab or Kashmir with the Huns. Thence, later on, with the assistance of the Hunic king of Kashmir, Pravarasena II, he returned, and regained his possessions in Malwa, or, as the *Rāja Taraṅgiṇī* (iii, 330) says, was "replaced in the kingdom of his father" Vikramāditya. He now determined to pursue his success and re-subject the Maukharī and Thanesar chiefs (*H.C.* 173). In his attempt on Kanauj he was successful; he captured that capital, killed the king Grahavarman, and imprisoned his queen Rājyaśrī (*H.C.* 173). In the meantime Prabhākara had sent his son Rājya to attack Śīlāditya's allies, the Hūnas, in the north (*H.C.* 132), in their own country of Kashmir. But owing to his father's sudden death from fever a few months later, Rājya had to return immediately without effecting his object. On hearing of Śīlāditya's capture of Kanauj, and of his determination to

capture Thanesar also (*H.C.* 173), Rājya set out at once from the latter place, with a hurriedly gathered cavalry force (*H.C.* 175), to meet Śīlāditya, who was advancing from Kanauj. The opposing forces met, apparently, not very far from the latter town, and Śīlāditya was completely surprised and totally defeated (*H.C.* 178). The surprise, indeed, and the rout were so complete that it resulted in the capture of Śīlāditya's whole camp, including his personal equipage and the women of his court (*H.C.* 225).¹ The defeated emperor's cause had been espoused by Śāsānka, the king of Gauḍa. This king was holding Kanauj, while Śīlāditya had marched from there for the re-conquest of Thanesar. He now, while ostensibly surrendering the town to Rājya, treacherously murdered him, when he came "weaponless and confiding" (*H.C.* 178) to receive the submission. In the general confusion attending the deed, Rājyaśrī succeeded in effecting her escape from her prison (*H.C.* 224, 250). She fled into the southern wilds of the Vindhya (*H.C.* 224), whence she was ultimately rescued by Harsha (*H.C.* 258).

The date of the signal defeat of Śīlāditya is well known. It took place some time in the Summer of 606 A.D. It marks the end of the second Mālava war, and the destruction of the Mālava empire. The question is whether it is possible to fix the date of the end of the first Mālava war which marked the temporary "dethronement" of Śīlāditya. I believe Bāṇa's narrative affords us a clue. He tells us (*H.C.* 116) that, about the time of Rājyaśrī's birth, "Yaśovati's brother presented his son Bhaṇḍi, a boy of about 8 years of age, to serve the young princes" Rājya and Harsha. As we have seen, Rājyaśrī was born in 593 A.D., and Yaśovati must have been a daughter of Yaśodharman-Vikramāditya. Her brother would be Śīlāditya, and Bhaṇḍi, therefore, would be Śīlāditya's son. Why should Śīlāditya, the emperor, give up (orig. *arpitavān*) his son to his rival Prabhākara? The

¹ Bāṇa does not say what became of Śīlāditya himself, whether he escaped or was killed. It has generally been assumed that he was slain in the battle (F. E. Hall in *Vāsavadattā*, pref., 52; M. Müller in *Ind. Ant.*, xiv, 233; Bühler in *Epigr. Ind.*, i, 70), but I do not know on what ground. But whether slain or not, it is certain that the battle finally disposed of him as an emperor.

reason that suggests itself is that Śīlāditya was under compulsion. He had been defeated and “dethroned” by Prabhākara, and could not avoid, or was forced by treaty into, surrendering his son to his rival and brother-in-law. If this surmise is correct, we obtain the year 593 A.D. for Śīlāditya’s temporary dethronement. The indignity of the forced surrender of the son serves to explain the bitterness with which the second Mālava war was prosecuted between the two rivals, after Śīlāditya had been restored to the throne with the help of his Hunic friends. As to Bhaṇḍi, the name under which he is mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang is Po-ni (*Siyuki*, i, 210). It has generally been assumed that the latter is the Chinese misspelling or adaptation of Bhaṇḍi. But Bhaṇḍi itself is a strange name for a prince. It is neither a Sanskrit nor a Hindu name; and no other person has ever been found bearing it. Though it has a Sanskrit look, it is not really a Sanskrit word. It might be suggested to be a variety of the word *bhaṇḍa*, but that word means ‘a buffoon,’ and *bhaṇḍi* or ‘buffoon’ would surely be a strange name for an imperial prince. I would suggest that it was really a Hunic name, of which Po-ni and Bhaṇḍi are Chinese and Sanskrit adaptations respectively. That Śīlāditya should have given his son a Hunic name would be only another indication of his pro-Hun proclivities. It may seem strange to find Bhaṇḍi fighting against his own father (*H.C.* 175, 224, 225). But it must be remembered that he was only 8 years old when he was surrendered to Prabhākara (*H.C.* 116) in 593 A.D., and that at the latter’s court he was treated by the king as a “third son,” and by his children as a “fourth brother” (*H.C.* 117). It cannot surprise, therefore, that when Bhaṇḍi’s father returned about eleven or twelve years later an utter estrangement had grown up between father and son, so that when Rājya Vardhana set out to meet his father in battle in 606 A.D. Bhaṇḍi preferred the cause of his friend Rājya to that of his father, to love whom he may never have had any cause.

There is another piece of contemporary evidence touching this period, which it is worth while considering. Harsha’s

inscriptions (e.g. the Madhuban copper-plate in *Epigr. Ind.*, i, 72) mention a certain Devagupta as one of the kings (*rājāno*) who were "subdued in battle" by Rājya Vardhana. It has rightly been held that the passage can only refer to the great battle in which Rājya broke the power of the Mālava emperor, who, as we have seen, was Śilāditya, the son of Vikramāditya. The inscription does not say of which country Devagupta was king (*rāja*), but it suggests itself to connect him with the two princes Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta, who, as Bāṇa tells us, were brought to Prabhākara's court and were "sons of the Malwa king" (*mālava-rāja*, *H.C.* 119). In that case, Devagupta being a king of Malwa,¹ the question further suggests itself: was he the father of those two princes? Now, in the Apsad inscription of Ādityasena (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 200) we have the genealogical tree of the Later Gupta kings. This tree gives us Mādhavagupta as the son of Mahāsenagupta; and as we know that the latter was the maternal uncle of Prabhākara, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the Mādhavagupta of the Apsad inscription with the prince Mādhavagupta who was sent to Prabhākara's court. It is evident, therefore, that Devagupta cannot have been the father of Mādhavagupta. But if he was not the father, in what other relation can he have stood to him? Here it is to be observed that Mahāsenagupta belonged to the generation of Āditya Varman (Prabhākara's father), who married his sister Mahāsenaguptā, while Mādhavagupta belonged to the generation of Harsha (Prabhākara's son), whose associate he was, according to the Apsad inscription (line 15), as well as according to the *Harṣa Carita* (*H.C.* 120, 235). There is clearly here a gap: some member is wanted between

¹ Bühler, who also holds that Devagupta was a king of Malwa, suggests (*Epigr. Ind.*, i, 70) that this country might be a "Mālwa in the Panjab, much nearer to Thanesar." This is an error. There is no Malwa in the Panjab at all, so far as I know. There is, however, a Malwa in the North-West Provinces, in the Fatehpur District, on the Ganges; and probably Bühler had this Malwa in his mind. (Cowell and Thomas, in the Preface to their translation, p. xii, state it as a fact.) But it is distant no less than about 350 miles from Thanesar. Moreover, it is a small place, and there is no evidence that it ever was the capital of a state.

Mahāsena and Mādhava to correspond to the generation of Prabhākara. Devagupta would just fill that gap; and, curiously enough, the wording of the Apsad inscription points not only to the existence of a gap, but also indicates how it is to be filled up. Every member of the royal line, except one, is expressly stated to be the son (*suta* or *tanaya*) of his predecessor. That exception is Mādhava. Of him it is not said that he was the "son" of his predecessor Mahāsena, but only that he "came from him" (*tasmād abhūt*). But further, this phrase is explained by saying (l. 11) that Mādhava came from Mahāsena just as the god Mādhava (i.e. Krishna) came from Vasudeva. The latter had eight sons out of Devakī, and Krishna was the youngest. The phrase, therefore, indicates that Mahāsena had a number of sons, of whom Mādhava was the youngest; and I suggest that Devagupta was the oldest of them, or, at least, older than either of the two brothers Kumāra and Mādhava. Thus there would certainly have been three sons of Mahāsenagupta, and, of course, there may have been more. But in any case there would be an appreciable interval in age between Deva and Mādhava, probably eight or ten years, for Kumāra was four years older than Mādhava. This interval would explain the gap in the genealogical list in point of generation: Devagupta would correspond to Prabhākara.

I conclude, then, that Mahāsena was followed, on the throne of Eastern Malwa, by his eldest son Deva; and Deva was followed by Mādhava. Kumāra did not reign, because, in all probability, he accompanied Rājya Vardhana in his campaign against Śīlāditya, and, like him, fell a victim to the treachery of the king of Gauda. Now, though the Apsad inscription is silent regarding the reign of Devagupta, there is evidence that, as a fact, he did reign: we have it in the inscriptions of the Vākāṭaka chief Pravarasena II (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 235). In these inscriptions Pravarasena is described as the maternal grandson of the Mahārājādhirāja Devagupta. The title *mahārājādhirāja* not only proves that he was a reigning sovereign at one time, but that he put

forward some claim to the imperial dignity, similar to that of the Maukharī chief Isāna Varman, who (as we have seen) also assumed the imperial title *mahārājādhirāja*. Of course, it remains to be proved that the two Devaguptas are identical. Bühler, who noticed the antique character of the letters of the Vākātaka inscriptions, suggested as their date "the middle of the fifth century" (*Indian Antiquary*, xii, 240), but did not attempt to identify Devagupta. Dr. Fleet, though he felt the palæographic difficulty, nevertheless identified Devagupta with the Devagupta of the Later Gupta list, who was "the son Ādityasena, and belongs to the period of about A.D. 680-700" (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, Introd., 15). Professor Kielhorn, in *Epigraphia Indica*, iii, 260, simply accepted Dr. Fleet's identification. For myself, I have no hesitation in identifying the Devagupta of the Vākātaka inscriptions with the Devagupta of the Harsha inscription. This identification satisfies sufficiently the palæographic demands; and I feel certain that if Dr. Fleet had known the Madhuban inscription of Harsha at the time he wrote about the Vākātaka inscriptions, he would have anticipated me in suggesting it.

Devagupta's position, however, in the rival contest of that period is not quite clear. For while, on the one hand, his title of *mahārājādhirāja* proves him to have been a claimant of the imperial dignity, he appears, on the other hand, in the battle of Rājya Vardhana against Śilāditya in 606 A.D. on the side of the latter. What probably happened was this: we have seen that the two brothers Kumāra and Mādhava were sent to Prabhākara's court (*H.C.* 119). They are not likely to have been sent by their elder brother, who laid claim to the imperial dignity, but by their father Mahāsenagupta. The latter, accordingly, must have been still reigning at that time. As Kumāra was then 18 years of age (*H.C.* 120), the same as his friend Rājya, who was born in 586 A.D., the year of his being sent to Prabhākara's court must have been 604 A.D. Accordingly Mahāsenaga was still alive and reigning in 604 A.D. He probably died, however, in the same year; the sending of

his two sons may have been his dying arrangement. He was succeeded by Deva, who at once assumed the imperial title. By this assumption he would naturally come into collision with Prabhākara, who since the dethronement of Śīlāditya in 593 A.D. had been the head of the empire. This explains two things: (1) how it came to pass that on Śīlāditya's restoration and march to the re-conquest of Kanauj and Thanesar, Devagupta is found on the side of Śīlāditya fighting against Rājya Vardhana, by whom he was defeated in 606 A.D., as mentioned in Harsha's inscriptions; (2) how it was that he is omitted from the Later Gupta genealogical list; the Guptas evidently looked upon him as a renegade of whom they had no reason to be proud.

There may, however, have been a more cogent reason for Devagupta's exclusion from the genealogical list. From Bāṇa's account of the occurrences it appears that, while Rājya lost his life through the treachery of "the king of Gaṇḍa" (*H.C.* 178), "a man named Gupta," as Bāṇa contemptuously calls him (*H.C.* 224), was also implicated in the deed. In another place (*H.C.* 251) Bāṇa calls him "a noble called Gupta." In both cases he disdains to call the accomplice by his proper name. I suggest that this accomplice was Devagupta. He had joined Śīlāditya in his capture of Kanauj, had shared his defeat at the hand of Rājavarḍhana, had afterwards escaped back to Kanauj, and finally assisted the king of Gaṇḍa,¹ who was holding

¹ According to Hiuen Tsiang (*Siyuki*, i, 210) the king of Gaṇḍa's name was Śāsāṅka, and his country was Kārṇa-suvarṇa. The latter has been rightly identified by Mr. Beveridge with Rangmaṭi, near Berhampur in Bengal (*Journal A.S.B.*, lxii, 315). The name Narendragupta has also been attributed to Śāsāṅka, but on quite insufficient grounds. Cunningham (*Survey Reports*, ix, 157) says (in 1879) that he "learned from Dr. Bühler that in the Jain Books Sasāṅka is called Narendra Gupta." But Bühler (*Epigr. Ind.*, i, 70), in 1888, bases his information only on "one MS. of the *Śriharsha-charita*." That manuscript information cannot have been of much value, for it is entirely ignored by the translators Cowell and Thomas. Beal, in n. 16 to his *Siyuki*, i, 210, states the name as a fact; but it does not appear that he had any other basis for his statement than Cunningham's apparently misunderstood information of Bühler. Practically, therefore, Narendragupta as a name of Śāsāṅka is a delusion. The latter's real identity and relation to contemporary dynasties still requires elucidation. I may return to this some day; the present paper is already too long for it.

the town, in the treacherous murder of Rājya. If we remember that, as I have pointed out, in all probability Kumāragupta was with Rājya at the time, and shared his miserable fate, it sufficiently explains the detestation in which Devagupta must have been held by his family, and his total exclusion from mention in the family list.

The leading events of the period may now be chronologically tabulated thus:—

- A.D.
- c. 533. Vikramāditya (Yaśodharman-Vishnuvardhana) defeats the Huns, founds the Mālava empire, and reigns c. fifty years.
 - c. 583. Prabhākara succeeds to the chiefship of Thanesar, and sets up a rival claim to empire. A ten years war ensues with Mālava.
 - c. 593. Śilāditya, son of Vikramāditya, is dethroned, and retires to the Huns of the Panjab and Kashmir.
 - c. 604. Devagupta, chief of Eastern Malwa, also sets up a rival claim, but submits to Śilāditya, who has returned and regained Malwa with the help of Pravarasena II of Kashmir.
 - 606. Decisive battle between Śilāditya and Rājya Vardhana, resulting in the final destruction of the Mālava empire.

In addition to the contemporary evidence, above discussed, we have two traditional accounts of the period in question: one by *Hiuen Tsiang*, the other in the *Rāja Tarangīṇī*. Hiuen Tsiang's account has the advantage of being nearly contemporary. As he was in India between 629 and 645 A.D., he was separated from the period under discussion only by about thirty years. On the other hand, being a foreigner, it cannot be expected that he always grasped correctly all the details of the historical information which he gathered, and which for him, the Buddhist monk, could not have the paramount interest necessary for an accurate presentment in his report. The events connected both with Vikramāditya and Śilāditya were so recent that they must still have been prominent in people's minds at the time of Hiuen Tsiang's visit. As a fact, he mentions both these monarchs by name, and recites the stories he heard about them. But, what can hardly surprise in his case, he confounds the two

men, and ascribes to Vikramāditya what really refers to Śīlāditya, and *vice versa*. The failure to notice this confusion of Hiuen Tsiang's has led to much misunderstanding of his reports. Thus, in *Siyuki*, i, 106, he relates about Vikramāditya that he was king of Śrāvastī and a man of wide renown; but he is given a very unpleasant character. He is an ill-conditioned person, who, out of jealousy of the saint Manorhita, played a mean trick on him, in consequence of which Manorhita predicted evil on him. This prediction came true; for (*ibid.*, 108) a little afterwards Vikramāditya lost his kingdom, and was succeeded by a monarch who widely patronized men of literary merit. It has generally been supposed that the successor of Vikramāditya here referred to is Śīlāditya of Ujjain. But this is impossible; Śīlāditya of Ujjain is not known for any literary patronage. The fact is that Hiuen Tsiang has been confounding the two men; what he says about Vikramāditya refers to Śīlāditya, and the successor, of course, is Harsha Vardhana. Vikramāditya did not lose his kingdom, but Śīlāditya did. Also Vikramāditya's character was very different from that described in the passage above referred to. His true character is described by Hiuen Tsiang in another passage (*Siyuki*, i, 261; see also his *Life*, p. 148), where, however, he wrongly gives it to Śīlāditya. He says about Śīlāditya (*recte* Vikramāditya) that he was a man of eminent wisdom and great learning, that he respected the "three treasures" of Buddhism, that he was never angry nor injured anyone, that he endeared himself to his people, and that his memory was still (in Hiuen Tsiang's time) revered. He further says of him that he ruled "for fifty years and more," and that he flourished about sixty years before his own time. Now Vikramāditya (= Yaśodharman) became emperor c. 533 A.D., and if he ruled "fifty years or more," he reigned down to c. 583, which is quite correctly "sixty years before" Hiuen Tsiang. All Indian tradition is unanimous in ascribing to him wisdom and literary patronage. And if he was "endeared to his people" and "his memory was revered," it is not likely that he would "lose his kingdom."

Nor is there any evidence of his ever having lost it. The fact of the matter is: Hiuen Tsiang simply confounds two names, while he reports the facts correctly. With the true key to his reports, all his statements fall into their proper places.¹

Let us now turn to the account in the *Rāja Tarāṅgiṇī*. It is, as has been recognized long since and by everyone, much confused. But I am not sure that the true cause of the confusion has been quite realized. The fact is that Kalhana, who lived upwards of five centuries (1148 A.D.) after the period in question, had before him several different legendary accounts of it. They, no doubt, were contained in one or the other of those eleven early chronicles to which he refers as his sources (i, 14, and Dr. Stein's *Introd.*, p. 24). Some of them were so contradictory that, as he himself says (ii, 6), he refused to accept them as accounts of the same events, but treated them as relating to successive events. The result naturally was that grotesque chronology which "places the father [Toramāṇa] 700 years after the son [Mihiragula]," the latter himself being placed 1200 years too early (Dr. Stein's *Introd.*, pp. 65, 66, and his note to *R.T.* i, 103; Dr. Hultzsch in *Indian Antiquary*, xix, 262). There were, more especially, two contradictory traditions. One, related in chapter ii, centred round Pratāpāditya; the other, in chapter iii, round Pravarasena II. According to the former, (1) Pratāpa's predecessor (not father) Yuddhiṣṭhira, who belonged to the race of Mihiragula, was in prison (ii, 4); (2) he himself, a relative of Vikramāditya, was placed on the throne by the ministers (ii, 5); (3) at that time Harsha was over-lord of Kashmir (ii, 7); (4) Pratāpa's grandson was Tuṅjina (ii, 11); (5) later on, one Sandhimat, not of the

¹ In the passage (*Siyuki*, i, 267) where he says that Dhruvabhāta was the nephew of Śilāditya, the latter name may or may not be correct. I have not investigated the point as it in no way affects the history of the period I am considering. If Hiuen Tsiang's report is correct that Dhruvabhāta was both the nephew of Śilāditya and grandson-in-law of Harsha Vardhana, of course, he cannot in this case be confounded with Vikramāditya, but must be the real man of that name. But is the report necessarily correct?

royal line, was king (ii, 117). According to the other tradition, (1) Pravarasena's father, Toramāṇa, who belonged to the race of Mihiragula (iii, 57, 58), was in prison (iii, 104, 121); (2) he himself was called to the throne by the ministers (iii, 281); (3) at that time Harsha (=Vikramāditya) was over-lord of Kashmir (iii, 125, 186, 187); (4) Pravarasena's grandson was Tuñjina (=Raṇāditya, iii, 386); (5) intermediately, one Mātṛigupta, not of the royal line, was king (iii, 239). Obviously these two traditions refer to the same events: Pratāpa corresponds to Pravarasena, and Sandhimat to Mātṛigupta. But the second tradition is much nearer the truth: Vikramāditya (Harsha), having deprived the Hunic king (Toramāṇa) of his throne, placed on it a creature of his own (Mātṛigupta), who, later on, was displaced by a son of the former Hunic king (Pravarasena). The first tradition is altogether confused. Tuñjina is a Hunic name; yet he is represented as the grandson of Pratāpa, who is said to be a "relative" of Vikramāditya! The second tradition goes on to relate that Pravarasena assisted Vikramāditya's son, Pratāpaśīla or Śīlāditya, to recover his parental kingdom (iii, 330). It may be that here we have the root of the story of the first tradition about Pratāpāditya being a "relative" of Vikramāditya, who gave him the throne of Kashmir. For Pratāpāditya has some features in common with Pratāpaśīla as well as with Mātṛigupta. A curious point about the otherwise fairly accurate second tradition is that it entirely ignores Mihiragula. He is prominently mentioned, however, in a third tradition which Kalhana had also before him, and which he has worked into his first chapter. According to this tradition, Mihiragula was the son of Vasukula, and grandson of Hiranyakula (i, 288, 289). From Mihiragula's own Gwaliyor inscription (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, 163) we know that he was a son of Toramāṇa. It follows, then, that Vasukula is another name of Toramāṇa; and as the second tradition makes Pravarasena to be a son of Toramāṇa, it would further follow that Toramāṇa had two sons, Mihiragula and Pravarasena, or that Mihiragula had a brother

Pravarasena. Now here comes in a fourth tradition, which is reported by Hiuen Tsiang. According to him (*Siyuki*, i, 165 ff.), after Mihiragula had set out for the conquest of the Gupta empire, a younger brother of his, whom he had left behind, usurped the throne in his home dominions (the Panjab, Gandhāra), and when he tried to return after his defeat, finding his brother in possession, he took refuge in Kashmir, the king of which country put him in charge of a small territory. The really important point in this relation is that Mihiragula had a younger brother, and that, therefore, Toramāṇa had two sons. The name of that younger brother may have been Pravarasena. At the same time, it is to be noticed that Hiuen Tsiang's tradition distinguishes between the (unnamed) king of Kashmir, who gave an asylum to the defeated Mihiragula, and the (unnamed) younger brother of Mihiragula, and that, while the third tradition of the *Rāja Taraṅgiṇī* makes Hiranya(kula) to be the father of Vasukula-Toramāṇa and grandfather of Mihiragula (i, 288, 289), the second tradition represents Hiranya as being the brother of Toramāṇa (iii, 102), and therefore uncle of Mihiragula.

I do not profess, with the information at present available, to explain all the obscurities of the four traditions, or to harmonize them. But one point is certain. If the *Rāja Taraṅgiṇī* is correct in asserting that Pravarasena assisted in the restoration of Śīlāditya, his father Toramāṇa cannot have been the same as the Toramāṇa who was the father of Mihiragula. For, as we have seen, Śīlāditya's restoration must be placed in 605 A.D., while Mihiragula's father must have died before 515 A.D. (*Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, *Intro.*, p. 12). It follows that Pravarasena II himself cannot have been the younger brother of Mihiragula. That brother might have been, however, Pravarasena I, also called Tuṅjina and Śreṣṭhasena, who, according to the *Rāja Taraṅgiṇī* (second tradition, iii, 97, 102-109), was the grandfather of Pravarasena II. If so, Pravarasena I's father, Meghavāhana, who is said (*R.T.* iii, 2) to have been brought from Gandhāra to be king of Kashmir, would be the

well-known Toramāṇa I, the father of Mihiragula. We should then have also two Hiranyas: one, the grandfather of Mihiragula; the other, the nephew of Mihiragula and brother of Toramāṇa II.¹ All this would suit the known dates well enough. It may be exhibited in the following table:—

Pravarasena II espoused the cause of Vikramāditya's son Śīlāditya, and assisted in his restoration. He must have had some good cause to go to the assistance of a man whose father had dethroned his own granduncle, Mihiragula, and was detested by him (*R.T.* iii, 265, 266, 282). I would suggest that Śīlāditya had reversed his father's policy and favoured the Hunic chiefs, and it was this policy that led to his general unpopularity, to the rise of the Thanesar chiefs as rival emperors, and the destruction of the Mālava empire.

¹ In the light of this information it seems desirable to re-examine the coins of Hiranya, Toramāṇa, and Mihiragula. See *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 245, and *Proceedings A.S.B.*, 1885.

² Mātrigupta is said to have reigned only about 5 years (*R.T.* iii, 264), but Sandhimat is given 47 years (*R.T.* ii, 142). Deducting 47 from 583, we obtain 536 as the year of Vikramāditya's conquest of Kashmir.