

ART. XXIII.—*Notes on Indian Coins and Seals. Part III.*  
*The Kulūtas, a people of Northern India.* By E. J.  
 RAPSON, M.A., M.R.A.S.

THE identification of the kingdom of Kulūta, which Hiouen Thsang visited, with the present valley of Kullu seems to be quite beyond dispute;<sup>1</sup> and the lapse of more than twelve centuries and a half has effected so little change in the conditions, that Hiouen Thsang's description and the account in Hunter's Gazetteer are curiously similar. Like its neighbour the kingdom of Chamba (Skt. *Caṇpakā*), it belongs to the eastern or Jālandhar group of Hill States in the Panjab.<sup>2</sup> At present this group consists of twelve states, but, according to Cunningham, there were formerly only four—Jālandhar, Chamba, Kullu, and Mandi. Of the first and third we have a detailed description by Hiouen Thsang,<sup>3</sup> and, as will be seen (*inf.*, p. 541), it is possible that he mentions the second under another name. In our attempts to unravel the tangle of ancient Indian geography, the untying of one knot fortunately often leads to the untying of others. The identification of the Kulūtas may enable us to identify, with a greater or less amount of certainty, other peoples who occur with them in the geographical lists. It may, therefore, serve a useful purpose, if we examine in detail all the known occurrences of the Kulūtas in literature and on inscriptions and coins.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cunningham: *Ancient Geography of India*, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, pp. 130 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, p. 136.

<sup>4</sup> For these references, I am indebted to Fleet's *Topographical Index to the Brhat-samhitā*; Cunningham's *Ancient Geography of India*; Wilson's *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* (ed. Hall); Telang's *Mudrārākhaṣa* (Bomb. Skt. Ser.); and the P.W.

## HI O U E N T H S A N G : (in India A.D. 629-645.)

Hiouen Tshang's visit to the kingdom of Kulūta is described in the fourth book of his travels.<sup>1</sup> From *Chi-no-po-ti* (*Cinapati* = the modern *Patti*, according to Cunningham<sup>2</sup>), he had proceeded to *She-lan-t'o-lo* (*Jālandhara*, called also *Trigartta*), thence to *K'iu-lu-to* (*Kulūta*), and thence to *She-to-t'u-lu* (*Śatadru*, the kingdom of the *Satlay*). About the identification of these places, broadly speaking, there can be little doubt. In his account of *Kulūta*, Hiouen Tshang also gives the directions and distances of two other places, *Lo-u-lo* and *Mo-lo-so* (possibly to be read *Mo-lo-po*),<sup>3</sup> though it appears that he did not visit them, but obtained his information about them from hearsay. The former has been identified with *Lāhul*<sup>4</sup>; but with regard to the position of the latter there is a difference of opinion. Cunningham<sup>5</sup> identified it with "*Mar-po*, the actual name of the province of Ladāk"; but Vivien de St. Martin,<sup>6</sup> on the strength of a note inserted by the Chinese editor to the effect that another name for the place was *San-po-ho*, has no hesitation in identifying it with *Caṇpakā*. It must be admitted that neither the direction nor the distance given by Hiouen Tshang suits the position of Chamba in relation to Kullu; but he may have been misinformed, or a mistake may have crept in from some other source. *San-po-ho* must surely be intended to represent *Caṇpakā*, but the Chinese editor may have been mistaken in supposing it to be another name for *Mo-lo-so* (*Mo-lo-po*). We shall have occasion to continue the discussion of this point hereafter (*inf.*, p. 541).

<sup>1</sup> *Si-yu-ki*; Beal, i, p. 177; Julien, ii, p. 203. Also *Life of Hiouen Tshang*: Beal, p. 77; Julien, i, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> p. 200.

<sup>3</sup> Vivien de St. Martin, in Julien, iii, p. 331 (but in his *Errata alphabétique*, p. 570, he says, *Effacez ce mot*); Cunningham, p. 143; Beal, i, p. 178, note 33.

<sup>4</sup> Cunningham, p. 143.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Mémoire analytique sur la carte, etc.*, in Julien, iii, 334.

## MAHĀBHĀRATA.

The Kulūtas are mentioned in the topographical lists contained in the Bhīṣma-parvan of the Mahābhārata under the guise of a description of the country of Bhārata given by Sañjaya in answer to a question of the blind king Dhṛtarāṣṭra. These lists are included in Wilson's translation of the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*. They are, no doubt, late additions to the epic,<sup>1</sup> and, like other similar catalogues of names of persons and places given in the Purāṇas, are now, owing to the ignorance and carelessness of successive transcribers of the MSS., in many cases almost hopelessly corrupt. The only hope for the restoration of these corrupt passages lies in the positive evidence afforded by inscriptions and coins. The śloka in which the reading *Kulūta* is to be restored appears thus in the Bombay (1862) edition of the Mahābhārata, Bhīṣma-parvan, Adhyāya 8, 52 :—

*Kāśmīrāḥ Sindhusauvīrā Gāndhārā Darśakās tathā |*  
*Abhīsārā \*Ulūtāśca, Saivalā Bāhlikās tathā || 52 ||*

Wilson (*Viṣṇupurāṇa*, ed. Hall, ii, p. 174) reads *Utūla*, and notes also the variants *Ulūṭa* and *Kulūta*. He adds : "the Rāmāyaṇa has Kolūkas or Kaulūtas among the Western tribes." The identification thus suggested will be discussed below in our examination of the passage of the Rāmāyaṇa to which Wilson refers. The credit of first seeing that the variants in the passage just quoted from the Mahābhārata were mistakes for the name *Kulūta* is due to Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall, who, in his note to Wilson, says : "The Kulūtas—not Kulūtas—are a real people : see Wilson's *Hindu Theatre*, vol. ii, p. 165 ;<sup>2</sup> M. V. de Saint Martin's *Mémoire Analytique sur la carte de l'Asie Centrale*, pp. 81–84, and his *Étude sur la Géographie Grecque*, etc., pp. 300–303." It will be seen that this emendation is abundantly supported

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the mention of Hūṇas in the second śloka quoted from this passage of the Mbh. There is no reason to believe that there were Hūṇas in India before the reign of Skandagupta, c. 452–480 A.D.

<sup>2</sup> The first passage quoted from the *Mudrārāksasa* (*inf.* p. 535).

by the fact that the peoples mentioned together with the Kulūtas in this śloka also occur with them in other passages of Sanskrit literature.

Farther on in the same passage (śloka 64) we find the mention of a people called *Kulatthas*, of whom nothing else seems to be known :

*Yavanās Cīna-Kāambojā dāruṇā Mlecchajātayah |*  
*Sakṛdgrāhāḥ Kulatthāśca Hūṇāḥ Pārsikaiḥ saha || 64 ||*

These lists are so thoroughly corrupt that it is doubtful whether scholarship will ever succeed in restoring them to their original state. Conjectural emendation is often very tempting, but it will be safer not to make any corrections except such as are supported by some positive evidence. In the present case, it need only be pointed out how liable two forms such as *Kulattha* and *Kulūta* would be to confusion. The possibility of such confusion should be borne in mind when we find the *Kulūtas* in the *Mudrā-rākṣasa* (*v. inf.*, p. 535) called *Mlecchas*, and mentioned in association with much the same peoples—*Cīnas*, *Hūṇas*, and *Pārsikas* (or *Pārsikas*)—as in this passage. It also suggests a possible explanation of the fact that there are two tribes called *Kulūta* in the *Br̥hat-saṃhitā* (*v. inf.*, p. 533).

#### RĀMĀYAṆA.

The passage of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, to which Wilson refers, occurs in the *Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa*, xliii, 8 (Bengal recension, ed. Gorresio) :

*Marīcipattanaṃ caiva ramyaṃ ca Jatilasthalaṃ |*  
*Suvīram Aṅgalokaṃ ca tathā \*Kolūkam eva ca || 8 ||*

Wilson's conjecture that *Kulūta* should be restored here is probably founded on the variant *Kaulūta* which he notices. Apart from this, there would seem to be nothing in its favour. The places included in this list are distinctly stated to be in the West. *Aṅga* is undoubtedly the country around *Bhagalpur*, in Bengal. *Jatilasthala* cannot be

identified with certainty; but it is not improbably a variant of *Jaṭhara*, the name of a people who are mentioned together with the Aṅgas in the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā*.<sup>1</sup> Of the position of Marīci-pattana nothing seems to be known. It is evident, therefore, that the place, the name of which is disguised under the variant forms *Kolūka* and *Kaulūta* in this passage of the Rāmāyaṇa, must be sought for in Bengal rather than in the Panjab.

BRĤAT-SAMHITĀ: (Varāha-mihira, *ob.* 587 A.D.)

Varāha-mihira places peoples of this name in two divisions of his astrological chart—(1) the north-west division and (2) the north-east division. In order to distinguish clearly between these two peoples, it will be well to compare the different passages in which they are mentioned.<sup>2</sup>

(1) KULŪTAS OF THE NORTH-WEST DIVISION.

- XIV. *Diśi paścimottarasyaṃ*  
*Māṇḍavya-Tukhāra-Tāla-Hala-Madrāḥ* |  
*Aśmaka-Kulūta-Lahaḍa-*  
*Strirājya-Nṛsiṃha-Vana-Khasthāḥ* || 22 ||  
*Veṇumatī Phalgulukā*  
*Guruhā Marukucca-Carmaraṅgākhyāḥ* |  
*Ekavilocana-Śūlika-*  
*Dirghagrīvāsyaśeśa.* || 23 ||

(2) KULŪTAS OF THE NORTH-EAST DIVISION.

- XIV. *Aiśānyāṃ Meruka-Naṣṭarājya-*  
*Paśupāla-Kīra-Kāśmīrāḥ* |  
*Abhisāra-Darada-Taṅgaṇa-*  
*Kulūta-Sairindha-Vanarāṣṭrāḥ* || 29 ||  
*Brahmapura-Dārva-Dāmara-*  
*Vanarājya-Kirāta-Cīna-Kauṇḍāḥ* |  
*Bhallāpalola-Jaṭāsura-*  
*Kunāṭha-Khaṣa-Ghoṣa-Kucikākhyāḥ* || 30 ||

<sup>1</sup> Fleet, *Topographical List*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ed. Kern.*

It must constantly be borne in mind that there is no certainty as to the reading of many of the names in these lists. A glance at Dr. Kern's various readings will show to what extent the existing MSS. differ from one another. No variants, however, are given of the name Kulūta in either passage. We must suppose, then, either that the readings are correct, or that, if there is a mistake in either case, it is one which goes back to a period before the date of the existing MSS. The two passages are quoted by Alberuni<sup>1</sup> (A.D. 973–1048) with variants in the case of many of the names; but here, again, our word Kulūta appears substantially unaltered. It is, of course, sometimes a matter of opinion how words should be divided. In the first passage *Kulūtalahaḍa* is regarded by the Sanskrit editor, Kern, as two words, and by the Arabic editor, Sachau, as one.

Whether there were really two peoples bearing the name Kulūta, or whether, in one case, this form is a wrong reading for some other name, cannot, perhaps, be determined. In glancing through Fleet's *Topographical List*, one cannot fail to notice that, in several cases, e.g. *Abhira*, *Ambaṣṭha*, *Bhadra*, *Ghoṣa*, *Kirāta*, peoples having the same name are placed in two or more divisions. The question is whether this represents an actual state of things, or whether, in some cases, other and perhaps less known names have been altered into these by the copyists. In any case, the Kulūtas of the Kullu valley are certainly those of the north-east division mentioned in our second passage.

These Kulūtas must surely, also, be those referred to in x, 11, where they are mentioned together with the Trigarttas and Cīnas, and in the next śloka, x, 12, where they are mentioned with Taṅgaṇas, Khasas (*i.e.* Khaṣas), and Kāsmīras. The Kulūtas of iv, 22, and xvii, 18, occurring in lists including the Madras, are probably those of the north-west division.

<sup>1</sup> *Trans.* Sachau (ed. 1888), vol. i, pp. 302, 303.

MUDRĀRĀKṢASA : (VĪŚĀKHADATTA, probably c. 600 A.D.)

This play was formerly held to be not earlier than the eleventh or twelfth century of our era, chiefly on the authority of Wilson, who identified the Mlecchas, who play an important part in the story, with the Muhammadans, and supposed the period of its composition to be that during which Muhammadan power was gaining the ascendancy in India. This is, however, an assumption which cannot be sustained. The word *Mleccha* has various applications. It is used to denote different foreign tribes, such as the Hūnas, who invaded India and settled in the northern districts of the Panjab; and it occurs in the Junāgaḍh Inscription of Skandagupta, which is dated in the 138th year of the Gupta era = A.D. 457-8.<sup>1</sup> The period of the plot of the *Mudrārākṣasa* is, of course, that of the Maurya Candragupta in the third century B.C.; but there is not the slightest attempt to draw an historical picture, and the conditions of the drama are doubtless those of a period not long anterior to the date of its composition. As Telang has shown, in the excellent Introduction to his edition of the play, a considerable number of indications point rather to the seventh century A.D. as its most probable date. Indeed, if the name *Avantivarman* which, in some MSS., is substituted for *Candragupta* in the concluding śloka, refers, as is by no means unlikely, to the Maukhari prince of that name, the date of the play must be within a few years of 600 A.D.<sup>2</sup>

The Kulūtas are mentioned in two passages:—

Act i, p. 48 (ed. Telang):

Cāṇakya. *Āḥ jñātam | Upalabdharvān asmi prañidhibhyo yathā tasya Mleccharājyalokasya madhyāt pradhānatamāḥ pañca rājānaḥ parayā suhr̥tṭayā Rākṣasaṁ anuvarttante | Te yathā |*

<sup>1</sup> Fleet: *Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, iii, p. 62; *Topographical List of the Brhat-samhitā*, Ind. Ant., 1893, p. 185, s.v. *Mleccha*; cf. also the reff. given by Telang, *Mudrārākṣasa* (Bomb. Skt. Ser.), p. xxviii.

<sup>2</sup> That the Maukharis were great patrons of literature may be inferred from other sources, e.g. from the introductory stanzas to the *Kādambarī*.

*Kaulūtaś Citravarmā Malayānarapatih Śiṃhanādo nṛsiṃhaḥ  
Kāśmīraḥ Puṣparākṣaḥ kṣataripumahimā Saindhavaḥ Sindhu-  
ṣenaḥ |*

*Meghākhyāḥ pañcamo'smin prthuturagabalaḥ Pārsikādhiraḥ  
Nāmāny eṣāṃ likhāmi dhruvam aham. Adhunā Citraguptaḥ  
pramārṣtu || 20 ||*

Act v, p. 207 :

Rākṣasa . . .

*Pāścāt tiṣṭhantu vīrāḥ Śakanarapatayaḥ sambhṛtās Cīna-  
Hūnaiḥ*

*Kaulūtādyaśca siṣṭaḥ pathi pathi vṛṇuyād rājaloḥ Ku-  
māram || 11 ||*

In the first line of the latter passage, the Calcutta edition has *Kīrāḥ* instead of *Vīrāḥ*. This reading is probably to be preferred. The *Kīras*, as will be seen from other passages, are constantly mentioned together with the *Kulūtas*. Its reading *parivṛṇuyād* in the second line is also an improvement. On the other hand *Cedi-* instead of *Cīna-* is an excellent instance of the way in which an unintelligent copyist will constantly substitute a known for an unknown name quite regardless of sense.

The geographical positions of the tribes mentioned in these two passages are discussed by Telang in his Introduction, pp. xxx ff.

KĀDAMBARĪ: (Bāṇa, c. 600 A.D.)

Probably no historical importance whatever is to be attached to this passage. It occurs in Jābālī's story of the previous life of the parrot Vaiśampāyana, and refers to a damsel named Patralekhā, a daughter of the King of Kulūta, who was taken captive when Kulūta was conquered by the great king (i.e. Tārāpīḍa of Ujjayinī), and was sent by the Queen, Vilāsavatī, to Prince Candrāpīḍa to be his

betel-bearer.



*Iyam khalu kanyakā mahārājena pūrvam Kulūtarājadhānim  
avajītya Kulūtesvaraduhitā Patralekhābhīdhānā bālikā satī  
bandījanena sahnāyāntahpuraparicārikāmadhyam upanītā †*

p. 101 (ed. Peterson) : trans. Miss Ridding, p. 75.

# CHAMBA COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF SOMAVARMADEVA AND ĀSAṬADEVA : (c. 1050 A.D.)

The following historical facts bearing on our subject are to be noted from Professor Kielhorn's edition of this inscription in the *Indian Antiquary*, 1888, p. 7.

The identification of princes of Chamba (Caṇpakā) mentioned both in this inscription and in the Rājatarāgiṇī makes it certain that its date is about the middle of the eleventh century A.D. At this period the dynasties of Caṇpakā and Kulūta were related. Sālavāhana, the predecessor of Somavarmadeva and Āsaṭadeva—the Sāla of the Rājatarāgiṇī who was conquered by Ananta of Kashmir—is described as one “who was asked the favour of bestowing royalty, in return for services rendered, or to be rendered, by his kinsman, the lord of Kulūta, anxious to render him homage.”<sup>1</sup> Neighbouring peoples such as the Trigarttas (Jālandhara) and Kīras, who are elsewhere found in association with the Kulūtas, are also mentioned together with them in this inscription, which is thus of the greatest importance as confirming the testimony of the literary documents.

## COIN OF THE KULŪTA KING VĪRAYAŚA.

The characters of the Brāhmī inscription on the obverse of this coin are those of columns vii, viii, ix of Bühler's Tafel III, i.e. of the first or second century A.D. Another fact leads us to a similar conclusion. On the reverse we find simply the title *ra-ña* in Kharoṣṭhī characters. It has been

<sup>1</sup> p. 8: *sevā - vidhi - vyagra - svakulya - Kulūtesva(sva)ra - karma-vyatihāra-  
prārthamāna-rājyātpa(rpa)na-prasādasya.*

noticed before (J.R.A.S., 1899, p. 372) that on coins bearing inscriptions in the two alphabets the importance of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet tends to diminish as time goes on. On the earliest known coins of this class (probably first century B.C.)—e.g. the small silver coins of the Kuniṇḍas and Audumbaras—the Kharoṣṭhī inscription is quite as full as the Brāhmī. At later periods it is first curtailed and then abolished altogether. This process can also, as we have seen, be traced on the coinage of the Western Kṣatrapas. We shall probably, therefore, not be far wrong if we attribute this coin to the first or second century A.D.—perhaps rather to the second than the first.

#### THE KULŪTAS AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS.

We, therefore, find traces of the Kulūtas from about the first or second century A.D. to the middle of the eleventh. They are called Mlecchas in the *Mudrārākṣasa*, where they are found in the company of the same tribes as in the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* (*v. sup.* Kulūtas of the N.E. Division, p. 533). The term *Mleccha* meant 'foreigner' generally,<sup>1</sup> and was particularly applied to those foreign invaders who had settled on the northern frontiers.<sup>2</sup> But, whatever may have been the nationality of the Kulūtas, they had, as their coin shows, adopted Indian names by the first or second century A.D. So far as we are able to trace the history of foreign invaders in early days, this seems to have been the case regularly. The Kṣatrapas of Surāṣṭra and Mālava begin with foreign (perhaps Persian) names,<sup>3</sup> but rapidly become Hinduized; and the occurrence of the name Vāsudeva in the Kuṣana dynasty and of such names as Udayāditya among the Hūnas points to the same fact. The question whether there were two tribes called Kulūta, as indicated by Varāhamihira, cannot be determined at present. The Kulūtas of the Chamba Copper-Plate (*v. sup.*, p. 537), of

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Chinese in *Life of Hiouen T'sang*, Julien, i, p. 230; Beal, p. 167.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, Julien, i, p. 75. "Au nord de Lan-po (Lamghan) les pays frontières portent généralement le nom de Mie-li-tch'e (Mlêch-tcha's)."

<sup>3</sup> J.R.A.S., 1899, p. 374.

Hiouen Tshang, of Varāhamihira's N.E. Division, and of the Mudrārākṣasa are almost certainly, as is shown by the common association of names, the ancient inhabitants of the Kullu Valley. There is no reason to doubt that the coin belongs to the same tribe. Its *provenance* (Cunningham, *Coins of Anc. Ind.*, p. 67) and the fact that coins of the Kuṇindas, who are mentioned with these Kulūtas by Varāhamihira, are found in the same district (*ibid.*), alike point to this conclusion. As we have seen, the supposed mention of Kulūtas in the Rāmāyaṇa cannot be maintained. With regard to the Mahābhārata, a comparison of the first śloka quoted with the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* makes us think that the Kulūtas here named must be those of Varāhamihira's N.E. Division. On the other hand, the second śloka, in which we have supposed a possible mistake of *Kulathās* for *Kulūtās*, has so many names in common with the passages from the *Mudrārākṣasa*—Cīna, Hūṇa, Pārsika and 'Mleccha peoples'—that we should feel inclined to come to the same conclusion in this case also. Altogether, we have here a puzzle of which the solution is not yet apparent.

The constant association of the same names together with the Kulūtas may enable us, perhaps, to identify some of these :—

*Cīnas* (*Cīṇas*). This name has often been translated 'Chinese,' and there has been a considerable difference of opinion among scholars whether or not such a translation was admissible.<sup>1</sup> It would seem more reasonable to suppose that the word simply denoted the inhabitants of *Cīnapati* (*Chi-na-po-ti*), which Hiouen Tshang visited shortly before Kulūta.<sup>2</sup> He derives the name from the fact that king Kaniṣka had formerly kept some Chinese hostages there (*l.c.*). As to the present site of Cīnapati, Cunningham's identification with Patti seems most probable.<sup>3</sup> In any case, it was certainly not far from Kulūta.

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* the references given by Telang, p. xxxi.

<sup>2</sup> *Sī-yu-ki*, Beal, i, p. 173; Julien, ii, p. 199.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide*, however, Beal, *l.c.*; Vivien de St. Martin, in Julien, iii, p. 332, identifies it with Katoch, which seems rather to be Jālandhara.

*Jālandhara.* From Cīnapati, Hiouen Thsang proceeded to Jālandhara and thence to Kulūta. With regard to the general identification of Jālandhara, or Trigartta as it is also called, with the modern Kāngra or Katoch, there seems to be little doubt,<sup>1</sup> though, of course, it must be borne in mind that the extent of these kingdoms probably varied from time to time, and that a name which was at one period applied only to a part may at another period have denoted the whole. The proximity of Jālandhara to Kulūta and to other places habitually mentioned in the same lists enables us to suggest another identification.

*Kīras.* In an inscription<sup>2</sup> dated Śaka 7[26], which mentions two rulers of Jālandhara, we have a dynastic list of the Rājānakas of Kīragrāma. Surely this must be the capital of the Kīra people, who are so often mentioned together with the Kulūtas. As we have seen, the three peoples, Trigarttas, Kīras, and Kulūtas, occur together in the Chamba Copper-Plate Inscription (*v. sup.*, p. 537). It is noticeable, moreover, that the Kīras, who, according to the reading of the Calcutta edition, which is probably correct, are mentioned together with the Hūṇas in the second passage quoted from the *Mudrārākṣasa* (*sup.*, p. 536), are also found with them elsewhere.<sup>3</sup>

*Udumbaras.* From considerations of *provenance*, Cunningham had classed the coin, which is now proved to have been struck by the Kulūta king Vīrayaśa, among those of the Udumbaras. The fact is interesting as tending to show that the territories of the two peoples were not widely separated. Whether his identification of the name Udumbara with the later Damari, or Dahmari, can be sustained is not so certain. One is tempted to see some connection with this latter name in the form Dāmara, which occurs with Kulūta and the rest among the places comprised in Varāhamihira's N.E. Division (*sup.*, p. 533).

<sup>1</sup> Cunningham, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

<sup>2</sup> Kielhorn: *List of Inscr. of North. Ind.*, No. 351; *Ep. Ind.*, i, p. 112.

<sup>3</sup> Kielhorn, *Ep. Ind.*, ii, p. 11. Bhera-ghāt Inscr. of Alhaṇa-devī (Cedi-saṃ. 907), l. 11, "*Kīrah kīravat āsa pañjaragrhe Hūṇah praharṣam jahau.*"

*Caṇpakā*. As has been stated above (p. 530), the Chinese editor of the *Si-yu-ki* gives *San-po-ho* as another name for *Moloso* (possibly *Mo-lo-po*), and Vivien de St. Martin has no hesitation in identifying it with *Caṇpakā*, in spite of the difficulties which have been indicated above. The correspondence in form between the two words is indeed striking; but it must be borne in mind that the Chinese editor, while perfectly right in his intention to transliterate *Caṇpakā* by *San-po-ho*, may have been wrong in his identification of *San-po-ho* with *Mo-lo-so*. As usual in these cases, the possibilities of error are numerous, and any special pleading in favour of one or other probability is apt to do more harm than good to the cause which we have at heart—the ascertainment of *fact*. It must be clearly understood, then, that the following attempt to solve this difficulty is founded on assumptions which remain to be proved or disproved by subsequent discovery—viz., that Hiouen Tshang was wrong as to the information which he gives from hearsay about the locality of *Mo-lo-so* (*Mo-lo-po*), that his Chinese editor was right in supposing *San-po-ho* to be another name for *Mo-lo-so* (*Mo-lo-po*), and that *San-po-ho* is to be identified with *Caṇpakā*.

It is, at any rate, curious that Chamba, by its name *Caṇpakā*, is known neither to Varāhamihira nor to Hiouen Tshang. Is it possible that it may have been known to them by another name? The Chinese editor's equation *Mo-lo-so* (*Mo-lo-po*) = *San-po-ho* suggests that the *Malaya* of our first extract from the *Mudrārākṣasa* may be intended to represent this *Mo-lo-so* (*Mo-lo-po*) = *San-po-ho*. Both Wilson and Telang have been puzzled<sup>1</sup> to find this place-name from distant south-western India thrown in among 'Mleccha' tribes of the extreme northern frontier. Telang hints that *Malaya* in this passage may be a misreading. This is quite possible. It is simply suggested here that it may be intended to represent—correctly or incorrectly—the Chinese *Mo-lo-so* (*Mo-lo-po*) = *San-po-ho* = *Caṇpakā*.

<sup>1</sup> Wilson, *Theatre of the Hindus*, vol. ii, p. 165; Telang, *Mudrārākṣasa*,

Perhaps we may venture to go one step farther, although we feel that we are now on very uncertain ground. The exact determination of the territory of the Mālavas is a well-known puzzle in Indian topography. The evidence of coins, associating them with the Yaudheyas and Ārjunāyanas, tends to place them somewhere in the north of the Panjab. They are placed by Varāhamihira in the northern division, and in every case but one in which they are mentioned in the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* they are associated with northern peoples.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Fleet solves this difficulty boldly by saying,<sup>2</sup> "Varāhamihira places them too much to the north; as they are undoubtedly the people of Mālwa, from whom (see *Ind. Ant.*, vol. xx, p. 404) the Vikrama era derived its original appellation." But is it not just possible that there may really have been two peoples—(1) the Mālava of the north represented the *Μαλλοὶ* of the Greek writers, by the coins having the inscription *Mālavānām jaya[h]*,<sup>3</sup> by the Malaya of the *Mudrārākṣasa*, and by the *Mo-lo-so* (*Mo-lo-po*) of Hiouen Tshang; and (2) the better-known Mālava of the south called *Mo-lo-po* by Hiouen Tshang?

---

#### ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

I was unfortunately unable to see a revise of my first instalment of *Notes on Indian Coins and Seals* (p. 97), and, in consequence, some misprints and wrong references remain uncorrected.

p. 99, lines 12, 25 : *for* opposition *read* apposition.

p. 100, line 1 : *for* *Dajaka* *read* *Dojaka*.

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* reff. in Fleet, *Topographical List*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *J.R.A.S.*, 1900, p. 107.

p. 105, note 1: The reference to the publication of an ancient inscription of Ceylon is wrong in two particulars. The author is Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids, and not Dr. Hoernlé, and the page on which the observation quoted from him occurs is 140 and not 170. It should be added, too, that with reference to the substitution of *śa* for *sa* in another word occurring in the inscription—*śagasa* for *saṅghassa*—he goes on to say “these two characters are, therefore, interchangeable and do not represent श and स.”

p. 119, line 22: *for Bengal read Bombay.*