Yueh-ti. We may therefore suggest that the tribal name gradually became the title of the ruler, whether the family belonged to the Gušhan clan of the Tochari or not, and that it was conferred on the governors of provinces and on such of the conquered race as had submitted, but were allowed to retain their possessions.

Hima Kadphises or Yen-kiao-chang enlarged and consolidated the conquests of his father and extended his influence as far as the valley of the Ganges to a distance of 3,000 it from the Indus and there reduced the country of Tim-li and its capital Chao-ki-tching, neither of which has as yet been identified. The coins which according to numismatic evidence follow those of Kadphises and which are known as the Kadphises and which are known as the Kanerki-group bring us to a series of kings who are known to us by their coins and inscriptions and are also mentioned in contemporary records. Their names occur in a number of inscriptions in the Indian-Pali alphabet and dated in an unknown era which were discovered at Mathura (Muthra).

Kanishka—Mahārāja Kanishka, S. 9, 28.

Huvishka—Mahārāja Rājatirāja devaputra Huvishka, S. 33, 39, 47, 48.

Vāsudeva—Mahārāja Rājatirāja devaputra Vāru, S. 44; and Mahārāja Rājatirāja Shāhī Vāsudeva, S. 87, also with dates 44 and 98.

Many others with varying dates, but without mentioning the name of any king, were found in the same locality. We have named inscriptions in the Baktrian-Pali character of Kanishka (Bahawalpur) dated in San. 11, and again as 'Mahārāja Kanishka Gushanavasa samvardhaka,' dated in San. 18, at Mānikiyalā, and one of Huvishka as 'Mahārāja Rājatirāja Huvishka,' dated in San. 51, on the Wardak vase: in the first and third the Greek names of the months are used. Besides these we have the inscriptions found by Mr. Löwenthal at Zeda in the Yusufzai district in which occurs the words 'Kanishkasa itāja tiandharya' of Kanishka Rāja of Gandhāra. There is also a Taxila record.
which the Satrap Liako-Kusuluko speaks of the "78th year of the great king, the great Moga, on the fifth day of the month Panemus." The Takht-i-Bahi inscription of the Parthian king Gondophares is translated\(^1\) by General Cunningham:—"In the 26th year of the great king Gudupharā in the samvat year three and one hundred \((160 + 3)\), in the month Vaisākh, on the 4th day." Mr. Thomas would apply the Seleukidān era to the dates given in the Mathura inscriptions of Kanishka and Huvishka.\(^2\) This era commenced in the year B.C. 312, and the difference is provided for by "assuming the use of a cycle of 100 years, or as appears to be the custom in the north-west Himalaya, the suppression of hundreds in the dates in common use. Thus in Kashmir,\(^3\) the year 24 is given as the date of the composition of the Rāja Tarangini by Kalhana, but this really stands for 4,224 of the Kashmir era which began in B.C. 3,076. According to this scheme San. 9 of Kanishka’s Mathura inscription represents B.C. 2-3. General Cunningham\(^4\) and Professor Dowson\(^5\) apply the Vikramaditya era to these dates, which brings out B.C. 48 for the same date, and Mr. Ferguson\(^6\) assigns these dates to the Saka era, which would give us 87 A.D., and for reasons given hereafter we accept this as most in accordance with facts. The Huvishka of the inscriptions has been identified with the Oerki of coins and the Kanishka of the inscriptions with the Kanerki of the coins; and in place of the Gushka or Jushka of the Kashmir chronicles we have Bazdeo or Devaputra Vāsudeva, the Śāhi Vāsudeva, a title reproduced in the Sahānu-Śahi of the Kālaka legend noticed hereafter and in the Sahānu-Śahi of the Gupta inscription on the Allahabad pillar. The legend on the obverse of the coins of these Turushkas is the same throughout, ‘Rau nano rae ——— kovano,’ merely differing in the name and the legend on the reverse. The indications derived from a study of the coins further show us that Buddhism was the favoured religion under Kanishka. The coins of Huvishka exhibit traces of the popularity of the Saiva forms, the worship of the sun-god and Iranian beliefs; but Bazdeo’s coins are almost

\(^1\) Arch. Rep. II. 59; V. 59; Ind. Ant. IX. 256.  
\(^2\) Sakkariā coins and Indian art, J. H. A. S. IX., 1.  
\(^3\) Dr. Bühler on Kashmir era, J. R. A. R. A. S., XII., (1877).  
\(^4\) Arch. Rep. III., 29; V., 60.  
\(^5\) J. R. A. S. V.  
\(^6\) J. R. A. S. IV. 3.; XII., 185, which contains a valuable summary of the facts regarding the Saka and Vikrama eras: see also his Hist. Ind. Architecture, App. A.
entirely confined to the Okro (ugra) or terrible form of Siva clothed in Indian fashion with trident and noose (pasu) and attended by the bull Nandi. As Pasupati, Siva is still supreme in the hills from Garhwal to Nepál. The general result shows that, contrary to tradition, those princes were not synchronous.¹ Huvishka’s date overlaps the earliest date of Vásudeva by a few years, if the latter has been correctly read; but we cannot reconcile Kanishka’s dates with those of Vásudeva if they were brothers and contemporaries. We may reasonably hold that all that this legend intends is that they all belonged to the same race or family.

The ‘Chronicles of Kashmir’ give us the names of Asoka, Jaloka and Damodara and, proceeds⁸ with the narrative thus:—


And again⁹ in the time of Lalitâditya we read:—

“Pour montrer manifestement l’empreinte de leurs chaînes, les Turushkas tiennent par ses ordres les bras en arrière et ont la moitié de leur tête rasée.”

There is no doubt that the ‘Chronicles’ are in error in assigning only 150 years to the interval between the death of Buddha and the accession of the Turushka princes. Hwen Thang makes the interval 400 years,⁴ but in this he commits the same mistake that he made in the case of Asoka, who is placed⁵ by him only 100 years after the death of Buddha. Though the initial point of Hwen Thang’s chronology is wrong as might be expected from the history of the early Buddhist church in China, his relative

¹ Mr. Rhys Davids (Buddhism, p. 228) gives the order Huvishka, Hashka, Kanishka, but for this arrangement evidence is wanting. ⁵ Trousset, 11, 19.
chronology may be generally accepted and according to this Kanishka will have lived three hundred years after Asoka. Now we know that Asoka reigned about B.C. 252-217, and therefore Kanishka may, according to Hwen Thsang, be placed about 53-89 A.D. If we refer Kanishka’s dates to the Saka era his svatuv 9 in the Mathura inscription will fall in 87 A.D. Both the Chinese and Tibetan annals contain a full account of the great Buddhist council held by Kanishka under the presidency of Vasubandhu and at the instigation of the sage Parshvika at which five hundred monks were present and certain commentaries were composed which are mentioned by both Fah Hian and Hwen Thsang. The latter furnishes us with still further indications of Kanishka’s power in the following statement. When Kanishka ascended the throne:—

“Faisait sentir sa force redoutable aux royaumes voisins, et l’influence de ses lois se répandait dans les pays lointains. Il organisa sa armée et étendit ses domaines jusqu’à l’est des monts Tsung-ling (near the Pamir plateau). Les prêtres dépendants qui habitaient à l’ouest du fleuve ces grantaient la puissance de ses armes lui envoyaient des otages.” At this time,—“Il ne cravait ni au châtiment du crime, ni à la rémunération de la vertu; il méprisait et colonnialisait la loi du Buddha.” Whilst hunting one day Kanishka heard of the prophecy of Sākya that a king by name Kanishka would arise and build a stupa over his relics: “Ce fut d’autant plus désigné par l’ancienne prédiction du grand saint, il ouvrit son cœur à la foi et montra un profond respect pour la loi de Buddha.”

On the spot he erected a great stupa, and this can be no other than the great stupa or tope at Mūnīya already referred to. The latest Roman coins found with those of Kanishka in this tope bear the date B.C., 43 and these were worn and old. In a second tope opened during the Afghan war near Jalālabad coins of Kadphises, Kanishka, Huvishka and the Empress Sabina, the wife of Hadrian, were found, and the last could not have been minted before 120 A.D. In many of the earlier Buddhist works Nāgarjuna is made a contemporary of Kanishka though he was apparently

1 This question is, however, by no means settled; Kern makes Asoka to reign 270-232 B.C. 1 inc. Ant. III. 78. The date of Buddha’s Nirvana is also still unsettled; the Christian Buddhist place it in B.C. 543; the Chinese in B.C. 1500; others in B.C. 300; and again others in B.C. 360. 2 E. I. 172 (Chinese); M. 82, 89, etc. Beq. XX. 2 (Tibetan); Schmidt, Gesch. der Ost. 315 (Mongolian); La Cama’s Vasudive, p. 87, 88; who shows how Buddhism extended from Kashmir to the Kālal valley. Turkistán and Tibet. 4 M. 79, p. 107. 5 Adso. p. 405 and Thomas’ Princely L., 29, 139. 6 ibid., p. 144. 7 Princ. A. S. Beq. 1979, p. 287.
earlier, and it is said that it was through his labours that the Buddhist religion spread through Kashmir and thence throughout the Himálaya. He is the Nágasena of the Ceylonese books and it was with him that the Yona king Milinda held his celebrated disputation.\(^1\) The Dīpavansa,\(^2\) written in the the fourth century, however, has the statement:—“The Thera who originated from the Kassapa tribe, Majjhima Durabhisāra, Sahadeva, Mūlakadeva, converted the multitude of Yakkhas (Yakshas, Khasas) in the Himavat and the Thera Mahārakkhiita converted the Yavana region.” It is probable, however, that by the last name Nágasena is intended as he was born of a Brahman family and received his initiation\(^3\) at the hands of the Buddhist fraternity of the rock Rakkhita and converted “Milinda king of Ságal, in the country called Yon.” In the vernacular Tibetan\(^4\) Nágasena is called Lugrub and according to Westergaard’s calculations lived in the first century A.D. He was the founder of the great Mādhyaamika school of the Mahāyāna or ‘Great-vehicle’ which has exercised such influence in northern countries. In the Chaturvinsati-prabandha of Raja Sekhara,\(^5\) Nágájuna is stated to have been a contemporary of Sátaváhana, a synonym for the founder of the Saka era. In Buddhist records the name of Kanishka is placed with that of Asoka as one of the great protectors of Buddhism, and on his death, or rather the fall of his dynasty, Brahmanising influences became supreme in Kashmir: so that when Hwen Thsang visited that country, he found there a king who was attached to Brahmanical views and who is identified by some with Pravarasena II. The summary\(^6\) of Ma-twanlin informs us that Shin-tu extended from the south west of the Yueh-ti and the kingdom of Kábul (Kaofu) to the western sea and on the east to Pan-khi, and that the Yueh-ti slew the kings of those kingdoms and filled their places with generals to whom they gave the governorship. Having become rich and powerful by these conquests, they remained in power till the time of the later Hans who began to reign 223 A.D. Above we have seen that about this time they were ousted from Kashmir by the Kritiyas and in the plains they were supplanted by the Guptas.

\(^{1}\) Awes, p. 394. \(^{2}\) Oldenberg’s translation, p. 159. \(^{3}\) Hardy’s Manual of Buddhism, p. 584. \(^{4}\) Schlagentweit, Buddhism in Tibet, p. 50. \(^{5}\) J.B.R.A.S., No 21, p 222. \(^{6}\) Mém. II., 197.
Connected closely with the debased form of the coins of Basdeo and his imitators come those of the Kshatravata or satrap dynasty of Gujrát, amongst whom the name of Raja Kesaharāta Mahākshatrāpa Nahapāna is the first. The Nāsik inscriptions show that his son-in-law Ushavadāta Dinkaputra was a Saka, and the coins, whilst giving clear legends in the Deva-nāgari alphabet, imitate in their devices the forms of the Indo-Skythian coins and also bear rude imitations of Greek letters. These letters appear to be an attempt to copy the corrupt form of the legend ‘Raon nanon raon’ as seen on the later Turushka coins. Following and closely imitating the better class of ‘Sinha’ or so-called ‘Sah’ coins come those of the Guptas and then those of the Vallabhis, each of which on numismatic evidence alone is shown to have followed the other, and all that we know from inscriptions confirms this fact. Dr. Bhau Dājī would make this Nahapāna a Parthian monarch and descendant of Phrahatātes and founder of the Saka era. But there is nothing to lead us to suppose that his influence was other than local, and the evidence inclines to show that he was not an ardent Buddhist. He was a Saka it may be presumed like his son-in-law and obeyed the same paramount authority that then held India, and that this was the Turushka ruler of Kasmīr cannot be doubted.

We may therefore fairly conclude that the Saka era originated with Kanishka and that its initial date is to be referred to his consecration on the 4th March, 78 A.D. We cannot, however, ignore the current traditions on the subject that it was dated from the destruction of the Sakas by Śālivāhan. The Saka era is, however, so closely connected with that known as the Vikrama era commencing with

1 Ind. Ant., IX, 16. 2 J. B. B. R. A. S., VIII, 236. 3 Ibid. p. 239: the name Sakasena occurs in an inscription in the Kanheri caves: see also Oldenberg Ind. Ant., X, 223, for an interesting note on the Kshatravata series of coins. There is evidence both from the coins and the inscriptions to show that Naḍapāna was the head of one line of Kshatravata and Chastana was the head of another. As observed (J. B. B. R. A. S., IX, 1; XIII, 361) the coins of Naḍapāna are formed on an Indo-Skythian model showing the national weapons whilst the head has a Greek rīgh: the coins of Chastana introduce the ‘chaitra’ symbol instead like those of other South-Indian dynasties. On the connection between Saka and Pārtihātes, see Cunn. Arch. Rep., II, 47. A coin of Zebiones has the legend ‘Māniyāna Kshatravataḥ pratapav Chastraṇa Aho aśva’ of Jihonī the satrap, son of the satrap Manigala; and Cunningham makes him an officer of Kujula kara Kadphises. Arch. Rep., II, 168.
the new moon of March, B.C. 57, that the two must be considered together. We shall first take the local traditions. Both these eras are current in Kumaon; the first occurs in the earlier historical documents and is used by the Khasiya population and the second appears in the later literary and religious compositions. According to the received Kumaon version of the Rájávali twenty-nine princes ruled in Indraprastha, beginning with Parikshit and ending with Lachhmi Chand. The last prince of this line was murdered by Mantri Mitrasena, who was succeeded by nine members of his family, ending with Muthimal Sena. He in turn was slain by his minister Birbahu (or Dhírbahu), whose descendants ruled in Indraprastha for fifteen generations ending with Udai Sena. The names of the fourth dynasty are taken from my copy, Tod, Ward and Cunningham:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saina</td>
<td>41 10 5</td>
<td>Manakatak.</td>
<td>Mahagunga.</td>
<td>Mahiliganga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rákshapála</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td>Kaja-pala.</td>
<td>Rajpala.</td>
<td>Rákshapála.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My copy of the Rájávali states that Rákshapála (Rájapála) was slain by Sakadatta, who after a reign of 95 years was expelled by Bhrí Vikramáditya, that the latter reigned for 93 years and was slain by his successor Samantapála. Ward¹ writes:—"This last monarch (Rájapála) giving himself up to effeminate amusements, his country was invaded by Shakáditya, a king from the Kumaon mountains, who proved victorious and ascended the throne after Rájapála had reigned twenty-five years. The famous Vikramáditya in the fourteenth year of the reign of Shakáditya, pretending to espouse the cause of Rájapála, attacked and destroyed Shakáditya and ascended the throne of Dehli, but afterwards lost his life in a war with Sháliváhana, king of Pratishthana, a country to

¹ Ward's authority is a Brahman named Mrityunjaya, whose work was published in 1806 A.D. Coudt we have trusted these statements our work would have been much lightened, but in seeking for corroborative evidence, we have discovered their worthlessness and have by a series of negative conclusions arrived at some positive inductions as to the origin of the Khass of Kumaon.
the south of the river Narmada. Vikramasena, the infant son of Vikramaditya, was raised to the throne, but was supplanted by Samudrapala, a yogi. Vikramaditya and his son reigned ninety-three years." Tod writes of Rajpala that "he carried his arms into Kumaon, but was killed by Sukwanti, the prince of that region under the Himalaya, who seized on Indraprastha or Dehli, whence he was expelled by Sakaditya or Vikramaditya." Tod again quotes from his authority: "Sukwanta, a prince from the northern mountains of Kumaon, ruled fourteen years, when he was slain by Vikramaditya, and from the Bharat to this period 2,915 years have elapsed." General Cunningham writes that Indraprastha was taken by Sakaditya or Sukwanti in B.C. 57, and was retaken by Vikramaditya Sakari. According to all modern tradition the author of the Vikrama era bears the title 'Sakari' from having destroyed the Sakas, whilst Salivahana, who established the Saka era 135 years later, is held to be one with a second Vikramaditya who also triumphed over the Sakas. Mrityunjaya makes Salivahan the conqueror of the Vikramaditya, who slew Sukwanta; so that we are in this dilemma that some Hindu legends refer to only one defeat of the Sakas, whilst in others the two eras are explained as commemorating two defeats. For the numerous references to Vikramadityas in the later Indian records from the inscriptions of Chandragupta onwards we must refer the reader to Wilford's celebrated essay in which he identifies some nine Vikramas and almost as many Salivahanas and endeavours to deduce order from chaos with the result that one feels more bewildered than enlightened at the end of the argument.

We shall now examine the evidence as to the age of Vikramaditya which may be reduced to three heads: (a) legends; (b) express statements in authorities and (c) actual use in inscriptions. It would be unprofitable to state the legends at greater length than we have done, but some deserve some further notice as much conjecture has been built on it by many writers. It is found in the oft-quoted memorial verses containing the names of the nine gems of Vikramaditya's court. They appear to occur for the first time in a work called the

1 Cunningham, Arch. Report, I., 189. 2 As. Res., IX., 117.
Jyotirviddharana, which Hall\(^1\) believes to be not only pseudonymous, but also of recent composition. The passage runs:—"Now has this treatise been composed by me in the reign of the august Vikramárka, Lord of Málava and most eminent king of kings; in the assembly of which same king Vikramárka are, as assessors, Sanku, the eloquent Vararuchi, Mani, Ansudatta, Jishnu, Trilochana, Harn, and Ghatakarpaii, and also other literary men, amongst whom Amara Sinha is first and these also belong to King Vikramárka’s court: Satya, Varáha-mihira, Sruta Sena, Bátaráyana, Manitha, Kumára Sinha, and other astronomers, such as myself. Dhanvantari, Kshapanaka, Amara Sinha, Sanku, Vetála Bhatta, Ghatakarpaii, Kálidása, the celebrated Varáha Mihira and Vararuchi are the nine gems in the court of King Vikramá." A description of the government is then given and the number of the soldiers of Vikramá, and that after destroying 555 millions of Sakas, he established the Saka era. Mention is next made of his conquest of "the Lord of the country of Rúm, the king of the Sakas," whom he brought to Ujjayini to adorn his triumphal entry. The author dates his work in Káli-yuga 3068 or B.C. 33, but the style and language is comparatively modern, and though he calls himself Kálidása and one with the author of the Rághuvansá, there are reasons for doubting the statement and Weber places him as late as the sixteenth century.\(^2\) No argument for or against the existence of the Vikramáditya can therefore be derived from the occurrence of this tradition beyond this, that the writers named are known not to be earlier than the sixth century, and therefore cannot be referred to the first century B.C.

We shall now quote the Musalmán writer\(^3\) Al Birúni, who is after all the principal authority on Indian eras. He wrote in the early part of the eleventh century and gathered his information at first hand in India, and is trustworthy, careful and accurate in his remarks. After describing the eras in use amongst the Indians Al Birúni tells us that they ordinarily employed the eras of Sri Harsha, Vikramaditya, Saka, Ballabha and Gupta. The

\(^1\) Memlces Magazines, VII, 275 (1855); see also Wilson, VI., VIII., and Bahú Dhl, J. B. B. A. S., 1842, 96.
\(^2\) Hist. Ind. Lit., p. 281.
first was dated 400 years before that of Vikramäditya, but he adds:—

"J'ai vu dans l'almanach de Cachemire cette ère reculée après celle de Vikramäditya de 64 ans. Il m'est donc venu des doutes que j'ai pas trouvé moyen de résoudre." This would give the year 607 A.D. for the initial year of the era of Sri Harsha. The era of Vikramäditya himself was calculated by taking 342, which was multiplied by 3 and made 1026, to which was added the years of the Jovian cycle of 60 years that had passed. This might lead us to suppose that the era was not known until after 1026 and indeed Reinaud in a note on this passage states that it commenced in 959 A.D., but we have an inscription of this century expressly dating from the Vikramäditya era. Al Birûnî then proceeds to discuss the Sêka era:—"L'ère de Saka, nommée par les Indiens Sâcâkâla, est postérieure à celle de Vikramäditya de 135 ans. Saka est le nom d'un prince qui a régné sur les contrées situées entre l'Indus et la mer. Sa résidence était placée au centre de l'empire dans la contrée nommée Aryavartha. Les Indiens le fond naitrent dans une classe autre que celle des Sakya: quelques uns prétendent qu'il était un Soutra et originaire de la ville de Mansoura. Il y en a même qui disent qu'il n'était pas de race indienne et qu'il tirait son origine des régions occidentales. Les peuples eurent beaucoup à souffrir de son despoticisme, jusqu'à ce qu'il leur vint le secours de l'orient. Vikramäditya marcha contre lui, mit son armée en déroute et le tua sur le territoire de Korour, situé entre Moultan e la château de Louny. Cette époque devint célèbre, à cause de la joie que les peuples ressentirent de la mort de Saka et on la choisit pour ère, principalement chez les astronomes."

Here the Saka era is clearly assigned to the destruction of the Saka by Vikramäditya. Al Birûnî however adds:—

D'un autre côté, Vikramäditya reçut le titre de 'Sri' à cause de l'honneur qu'il s'était acquis. De restâ l'intervalle qui s'est écoulé entre l'ère de Vikramäditya et la mort de Saka prouve que le valaque n'était pas le célèbre Vikramäditya mais un autre prince du même nom." It is somewhat satisfactory to see that the difficulties regarding the assignment of this era are as old as the eleventh century.

Al Birûnî then explains the Ballabha and Gupta eras:—

"Ballabha, qui a donné aussi son nom à un ère était prince de la ville de Ballabha, au midi de Anhalwara, à environ trente yojanas de distance. L'ère de Ballabha est postérieure à celle de Saka de 241 ans. Pour s'en servir, on pose l'ère de Saka et l'on en ôte à la fois le cube de 6 (216) et le carré de 5 (25). Ce qui reste est l'ère de Ballabha. Quant au Gupta Kâla (l'ère des Guptas) on entend par le mot gupta des gens qui, dit-on, étaient méchants et puissants et l'ère qui porte leur nom est l'époque de leur extermination. Apparemment, Ballabha suivit immédiatement les Guptas; car l'ère des Guptas commence aussi l'an 242 de l'ère de Saka. L'ère des astronomes commence l'an 537 de l'ère de Saka. C'est à cette ère qu'ont été rapportées les tables Kanda Khâta de Brahmagupta. D'après cela on s'en tenant à l'an 600 de l'ère de Yesterdjod, on se trouve sous l'année 1438 de l'ère de Sri Harsha, l'an 1083 de l'ère de Vikramäditya, l'an
953 de l'ére de Saca, l'an 712 de l'ére de Ballaba et de celle des Guptas. D'un autre côté, les tables Kanda-Khátaka comptent 366 ans, le Pancha Siddhántaka de Varásha Mihira 326 ans, la Karana Sára 132 ans et la Karana Tiaka, 19 ans. Les années que j'assigne aux tables astronomiques sont les années adoptées par les Indiens eux-mêmes afin de donner plus d'exactitude à leurs calculs.

Déjà je me suis excusé sur l'imperfection de ce qui est dit ici et j'ai averti que les résultats que je présente offraient quelque incertitude, vu les nombres qui excédaient celui de cent. Je ferai remarquer de plus que j'ai vu les Indiens, lorsqu'ils veulent marquer l'année de la prise de Somnath (par Mahmud) évidemment qui eut lieu l'an 416 de l'hégire et l'an 947 de l'ére de Saca je les ai vus écrire 242 puis au-dessous 606 puis encore au-dessous 99 enfin additionner le tout ensemble ; le qui donne l'ére de Saca. On peut induire de là que le nombre 242 indique les années qui précèdent l'époque où les Indiens commencèrent à se servir d'un cycle de cent et que cet usage commence avec l'ére des Guptas. D'après cela, le nombre 606 indiqueraient les samavatasaaras de cent complets, ce qui porterait chaque samavatasaarà à 101. Quant au nombre 99, ce seraient les années qui se sont écoulées du samavatasaar non encore révolu, c'est ce qui est en effet : j'ai trouvé la confirmation et l'éclaircissement de cela dans les tables astronomiques de Durlab, le Mouníén ; on y lit :— “cris 848 et ajoute le Loka-kâla, c'est-à-dire, le compt du vulgaire ; le produit marquera l'année de l'ére de Saca.” En effet, si nous écrivons l'année de l'ére de Saca qui correspond à l'année actuelle et qui est l'année 953 et que nous retranchions de ce nombre la quantité 848 il restera 105 pour le Loka-kâla, et l'année de la ruine de Somnath tombera sur la année 98.”

This extract gives us the only notice from Arabian sources that can be relied upon regarding the chronology of the Hindus at this early period. There

1 This shows that the chapter was written by Al Birúni in 1050 A.D.
2 Chait, March-April.
3 Bhādon, August-September.
4 Kártik, October-November.
can be no doubt but that Al Biruni correctly represents the opinions current in his time, and he shows conclusively that even then contradictions were rife that could not be explained. His description of the mode in which he saw the people calculate the Saka era is interesting. The person using the era first put down the number 242 and then added to it the cycles of 101 years that had elapsed and then the number of years in the current cycle. Thus the year 947 Saka was obtained by putting together 242 + 606 + 99; and Al Biruni gives as his opinion that 242 Saka was the year of that era in which it was introduced into use in the country in which he then was. This would give us 319-20 A. D., or the initial date of the local era adopted by the Brahmanising Vallabhis as distinguished from that of the foreign Indo-Skythian Buddhists. This date marks the decline of the Turushka dynasty in Kashmir, and all indications lead us to suppose that early in the fourth century there was a great Indian revival in the countries to the south-east of the Indus. For some reason unknown to us the Arabian writer styles the Guptas ‘a wicked and powerful race,’ but this may simply mean that they were opposed to the people of the country in which Al Biruni was at the time and from whom he received his information and cannot be considered as an expression of critical opinion on his part regarding their conduct. There is no doubt that Al Biruni is wrong in assigning, in accordance with the popular tradition when he wrote, the initial date of the Saka era to the destruction of the Sakas, for as we have seen that race was a power in India long subsequent to the year 78 A. D. It is not our intention to discuss here the initial date of the Gupta era or to explain the second error of Al Biruni in assigning the initial date of the Gupta era to that of their extermination. The Vallabhi inscriptions are dated from 311 to 348 in an era beginning in 319 A.D., but it does not follow that the Gupta dates can be referred to the same initial date. Indeed General Cunningham gives good grounds for believing that the initial date of the Guptas is 167 A.D., and this we shall consider hereafter. However, Al Biruni’s errors are clearly those of his informants, and had he stated anything else, we should

1 On the Guptas, see Mr. Ferguson, J. R. A. S., IV., 51; XII., 259; Mr. Thomas’ Gupta Dynasty, London, 1876; Dr. Oldenburg, In. Ant. X., 218; and General Cunningham, Arch. Rep., IX., 10, and X., 112, where the subject is fully discussed in detail.
have good grounds for doubting his veracity, for as we have seen the popular legend regarding the origin of the Vikrama era was current in his time.

Before proceeding further we shall quote the passages in the Chronicles of Kashmir. "Chronicles of Kashmir" bearing on the question of Vikrama and his date and for this purpose will quote from Troyer's translation:

"Dans le même temps (the death of Hiranay) l'heureux Vikramādīya appelé d'un autre nom Harsha, réunit comme empereur à Ujayini l'empire de l'Inde sous un seul patron. La déesse Sri servit ce roi qui était combié d'un bonheur merveilleux, en s'attachant à lui avec plaisir, ayant abandonnée pour lui les bras de Hari et les quatre océans. Employant la fortune comme moyen d'utilité, il fit fleurir des talents c'est ainsi qu'encore aujourd'hui les hommes des talents se trouvent la tête haute au milieu des riches. Ayant d'abord détruit les Sakas il rendit léger le fardeau de l'œuvre de Hari, qui doit descendre sur la terre pour exterminer les Miechchhas."

Vikramādīya placed the poet Matrign Gupta on the throne of Kashmir. In an earlier passage it is stated:

"Ayant fuit venir ensuite, d'un autre pays, Pratapādīya, parent du roi Vikramādīya, il se sacrèrent souverain de l'empire. D'autres induits en erreur, ont écrit que ce Vikramādīya fut le même qui combattit les Sakas ; mais cette version est rejetée."

Here we have distinct mention of two Vikramādīyas belonging to Kashmir, the earlier one at a distance of twenty-two reigns after the Turushkas and the later one after Toramāna and Hiranya and clearly to be identified with the great Chakravartti Raja Vikramādīya. Toramāna and Hiranya were brothers and the name of the former is known to us from inscriptions and coins. The inscriptions occur at Erān and Gwalior and the Erān inscription appears to be connected with that of Budhagupta dated in 165 of the Gupta era. Mr. Thomas reads 180 on a coin of Toramāna and Dr. Mitra read 180 plus some other figure on the Erān inscription.

We have evidence of the very early use of the Saka era not only

Early use of the Saka era in India but in other Buddhist countries. According to Alwes, "the era most familiar to the Ceylonese is the 'Saka Warasa;' which is the year of some king of the continent of Asia whose name is Saka and who

was said to be the head of the royal house of Yavana.” According to Sir S. Raffles, the Javan era is called that of Aji-Saka, on whose arrival in Java it is supposed to have commenced; it begins in 75 A.D. In Bali, the Saka era (Saka Warsa Chandra) is also in use and starts from 78 A.D., and the difference between the initial era in Java and Bali is supposed to be due to the use of the lunar year by the Javans on their conversion to Islam and of the solar year by the people of Bali. One of the earliest Javan traditions makes Tri-tresta, the husband of Bramani Kuli of Kamboja, the first Indian immigrant in Java, and he was slain by another Indian adventurer, Watu Gunung of Desa Sangala (Panjab). In Siam, the word for era is ‘Sa-ka-rat,’ but there the sacred era commences with the Nirvana of Buddha and the popular era with the introduction of Buddhism in 638 A.D. In both Tibet, China and Siam, the cycles of 60 years and of 12 years are also in use and, as we have seen, the cycle of 60 years was in common use in India at an early period.

In the Badami inscription of the Chalukya Mangalîswara occurs the following statement:—“Sri Mangalîswara who victorious in battle—in the twelfth year of his reign—five hundred years having elapsed since the coronation (or anointment, abhisheka) of the king of the Sakas.” Here we have a very clear and distinct statement that, as might naturally be supposed, the era takes its name from its founder. The ordinary expression in the grants of the Chalukyas in recording a date is in the same terms as the preceding;

Saka era in inscriptions,

thus in the Aihole grant, ‘five hundred and six years of the Saka king having elapsed,’ ‘six hundred and sixteen years of the Saka king having elapsed’ and in an old Coorg document when the eight hundred and ninth year of the time past since the Saka king was current.’ None of these inscriptions give out an uncertain sound and in some hundreds of grants of the first eight centuries the Saka era is called the Saka nîâla kâla, Saka kâla, Sakendra kâla, Saka bhûpa kâla, and the like, without any allusion

1 History of Java, II., 66; Crawford’s Hist. Ind. Arch., I., 800. Buddhism appears to have been introduced into Ceylon in the third century before Christ; into Burma in the fifth century after Christ; into Siam in the seventh century, and into Java, Bali and Sumatra in the sixth century. 6 Crawford’s Embassy to Siam, p. 280. 2 Schlagentheut, Buddhism in Tibet, p. 278. 3 Ind. Ant., III., 305; VI., 363; X., 57; Arch. Soc. West India, II., 287; III., 118. 4 Ind. Ant., V., 68; J. B. H. A. A., IX., 915. 5 Ind. Ant., VI., 21. 6 Ibid., p. 108.
to the destruction of the Sakas and clearly showing that the era
was named from the accession of a Saka king. In a Jaina legend
published by the late Dr. Bhau Déji, a story is brought in to
explain the origin of the Saka era which is in many ways very
instructive for our purpose. Gardhabhilla, Rája of Ujain, is there
said to have offended the sister of the sage Kálaka and paid no
heed to the saint's remonstrances. Kálaka on this proceeded to
the west bank of the Indus, where the kings were called Sáhi and
the supreme king had the title Sáhánu-Sáhi. He induced a Sáhi
and a number of nobles to return with him to Hindukadesa (India)
and proceeding by Gujrát they reached Ujain and de-throned
Gardhabhilla. The Sáhi became Rája of Ujain and the nobles
who accompanied him became feudal chiefs. Because they came
from Saka-kúla, they were called Sakas and thus originated the
'Saka vaisa.' Vikramáditya, son of Gardhabilla, overthrew this
Sáhi, but one hundred and thirty-five years afterwards a Saka
again became king and introduced his era. Whilst corroborating
the inscriptions as to the origin of the Saka era this legend intro-
duces the modern explanation of the origin of the Vikrama era,
which apparently first appears in the writings of the astronomers.
Aryabhata, the oldest of the Indian astronomers, does not mention
either the Vikrama or Saka era. Varáha Mihira, who is supposed
to have written towards the close of the sixth century, informs us
that the Sakendra-kúla commenced in the year 3179 of the Káli-
yuga and again calls it as usual Saka-bhúpa-
kúla. Brahmagupta, who wrote in the
seventh century, speaks of so many years having elapsed at
the 'end of Sáka.' Bhattotpála, writing in the middle of the
tenth century, explains the phrase 'Sakendra-kúla' thus:—
'Saka means king of the Mlechchha tribe and the time when they
were destroyed by Vikramáditya deva is properly known as Saka.'
Again Bhaskaráchárya, writing in the twelfth century, gives the
years of the Káli-yuga "to the end of the Saka king," 'Saka
nripánta.' Even amongst the astronomers it was not until the
seventh century that we find the slightest hint of the Saka era

---

1 J. B. B. A. S., IX., 133, 164, and Wilford in Ant. Res., IX., 150, 8vo. In
an old Jaina work it is stated that 185 years after Vikrama having passed again
the Sakas expelled Vikramadiputra and conquered the kingdom. J. B. B. A. S.,
IX., 161.

being considered as commemorating the destruction of the Sakas, and not even then was the Vikrama era in use.

Dr. Bhau Daji states that we do not meet with the assertion that the Saka era commenced with the destruction of the Sakas until the eighth century, and again that not a single inscription or copper-plate grant is dated in the Vikramaditya Sanvat before the eleventh century, and this era was introduced on the revival of Jainism in Gujrát.\(^1\) Even then there is much confusion in its use, for the Svetambaras make their great teacher Mahāvīra live 470 years before Vikramaditya, whilst the Digambaras make him live 605 years before Vikramaditya, the difference of 135 years being the exact time between the Vikrama and Saka eras. General Cunningham in one of his reports\(^2\) writes:—"My impression is that Kanishka was the real founder of the era which is now known by the name of Vikramaditya. The Vikramaditya to whom tradition assigns the establishment of the era is now known to have lived in the first half of the sixth century A.D. I think it probable, therefore, that he only adopted the old era of the Indo-Skythians by giving it his own name. The earliest inscription that I am aware of dated in the Vikrama era is San. 811 or 754 A.D." Subsequently\(^3\) he refers to an inscription at Jhalra Patan dated in San. 748 and alters Tod's assignment of it to the Vikrama era on the grounds that:—"As the Sanvat of Vikramaditya does not appear to have been in use at this early period the true date of the inscription, referred to the Saka era, will be 135 years later or 826 A.D." No better authority could be quoted for the inscriptions in the Bengal Presidency. Dr. Burnell states that the Vikrama-Sanvat is all but unknown in southern India except in the Dakhin.\(^4\) Mr. Fleet shows that the date of Dantidurga (eighth century) is erroneously\(^5\) supposed to have been recorded in both the Saka and Vikrama eras, and he adds\(^6\):—"As far as my experience goes it

---

\(^2\) Arch. Rep., II., 68.  
\(^3\) ibid., p. 266.  
\(^4\) Elements South Indian Palaeography, p. 78.  
\(^5\) Ind. Ant., VII., 151.  
\(^6\) ibid., p. 187. This Vikramaditya is reported in his inscription to have said:—"Why should the glory of the king Vikramaditya and Nanda be a hindrance any longer? He, with a loudly-uttered command, abolished that era, which has the name Saka and made that (era) which has the Chaukyas figure," alluding to the foundation of the Chaukya Vikrama era which Mr. Fleet has shown to start from February 10, 1078. The mention of Vikramaditya here undoubtedly shows that the Vikrama era was known, but was not in use.
OF THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES.

(the Vikrama era) was never used either before or after the
time of Vikramáditya VI. (1075 A.D.) by the western Cha-
lukyas and Cháluukyas nor by the Ráshtrakútas, who tempo-
arily supplanted them in western India; nor by the feudatories
of those dynasties; nor by the eastern Chalukyas of Vengi." Dr. Bühler, however, quotes two early inscriptions assumed to
be dated in the Vikrama era: (1) the Gúrjara grant1 of Jayabh-
hata of "the year 486, which seems to be dated in the Vikrama
era"; and (2) the Páthan inscription2 of Sanvat 802 recording
the accession of Vanarája which "can be referred to no other
era." But in both these instances there is room for very
much doubt. From all that we have gathered concerning the use
of this era these apparent exceptions will, hereafter, be explained.
With regard to the latter we have a note of the editor to say :
"Having examined this letter (Vanarája’s inscription at Páthan) I
am in doubt of its genuineness; possibly, however, it may be a
copy of an older one; but if a copy may the mode of dating not
possibly be an interpolation?" With regard to Jayabhata’s grant
the argument rests on certain assumptions that he must have been
the son of Dadda I. and father of Dadda II. and that as his date is
San. 486 and the records of Dadda II. are dated in Saka 380-417,
the former date must refer to some other era and presumably to
that of Vikramáditya. Now the genealogical portion of this date
of Jayabhata has been lost and all the arguments advanced are so
open to correction that we must decline to accept this solitary
instance as evidence of the use of the Vikramáditya era at this
eyear period. There is nothing to show why Jayabhata should
depart from the practices of his predecessors and successors
without expressly naming the new era. The third instance quoted
by Dr. Bühler has been shown to be due to an error of the
translator.3 The name Sáliváhana so often connected in modern
times with the Saka era does not occur in this relation in any
ancient records or manuscript.4 A Sátapáhana family reigned at
Páthan on the Godávari when the Sinha dynasty ruled in Gujrát,
and Gotamiputra or Sátaíñari of this race is styled in an inscrip-
tion as the ‘establisher of the glory of the family of Sátapáhana’

---

1 Ind. Ant. V., 110
2 "Ibid. p. 112.
3 Ind. Ant. VIII., 141.
4 J. B. B. E. A B., VIII., 237: Hemachandra makes Sátapáhana have the
synonyms Hála, Sáliváhana, Sálakána.
by reason of his conquests over the Sakas, Yavanas, Palhavas and
his being the destroyer of the descendants of Kahaharáta. This
power was of short duration, for Rudra Dáma in an inscription
records his success against Sáatakarni or Gotamiputra and the sub-
mission to him of the same countries that Gotamiputra, lord of
dakshinapatha, gives in his list of conquests. In the country
where this Sátaváhana dynasty lived and ruled there is no attempt
to assign to it any connection with the Saka era. We have now
shown—

(a) that the Saka era was instituted by the Buddhist king
Kanishka; that it spread though his influence to all Buddhist
countries:

(b) that there is no early mention of its being intended to mark
other than the anointment or consecration of the Saka king until
the seventh or eighth century:

(c) that the Vikramá era was not used until at least the eighth
century, and consequently that the popular traditions assigning both
eras to victories over the Sakas are incorrect, and that there is no
real connection between the name of the founder of either era and
Kumón.

We shall now inquire how these traditions arose.

There are three different reasons given for the founding of the
Vikramáditya era:—

(a) that it was an invention of the astronomers:

(b) that it was to commemorate the
freeing of the people from debt:

(c) that it was to commemorate a great victory over the
Sakas.

In the Jaina Rájávali-kathá, a work written in ancient Kana-
rese, it is recorded that:—“Then was born in Ujjayini, Vikramá-
ditya, and he by his knowledge of astronomy having made an
almanac established his own era from the year Rúdírodgári, the
605th year after the death of Varddhámána.” Now Varddhámána is
the Jaina teacher Mahávira, who died in B.C. 681, and consequently
the Vikramáditya referred to lived in B.C. 56 and is one with
the author of the Vikrama era. The accurate Al Birûni notes that in his time the Vikrama era was used principally by astronomers and that the same class had another era used solely by them and which commenced in 665 A. D.

The Nepál annals tell us that:—"At this time¹ Vikramâjit, a very powerful monarch of Hindustán, became famous by giving a new Sambatásara, or era, to the world, which he effected by liquidating every debt existing at that time in his country. He came to Nepál to introduce his era here ⋆ ⋆ and after clearing off the debts of this country introduced his Sambat." Hwen Thsang mentions² a Vikramáditya of Sravasti or eastern Oudi in whose reign lived a learned Buddhist named Manoratha, "au milieu des mille ans qui ont suivi le Nirvâna du Bouddha" or "dans l'une des mille années qui ont suivi le Nirvâna du Bouddha," neither of which expressions is unfortunately intelligible. This Vikramáditya is said to have paid off the debts of his subjects and also to have oppressed the Buddhists and favoured the Brahmans and shortly afterwards lost his kingdom. Manoratha was evidently put to death by the Brahmans and Vasubandhu avenged him during the reign of Vikramáditya's successor. Tárúnâtha states that Vasubandhu lived 900 years after Buddha and he was a pupil of Manórátha according to Hwen Thsang: so that the two authorities differ about the date. In Merutunga's Therâcali it is stated³ that:—"Gardhabilla's son Vikramáditya having regained the kingdom of Ujjayini and having relieved the debt of the world by means of gold, commenced the Vikrama Sambat era." And accounts are not wanting of petty rulers desirous of imitating Vikramáditya and starting an era of their own by paying off the debts of their people. We have two notable instances in the annals of Nepál and Kumaon. Of the third reason given for the establishment of the Vikrama era we have given sufficient examples. That there was a great Vikramáditya in the sixth century there can be no doubt, but that he had anything to do with the era which bears his name requires further proof. This Vikramáditya reigned shortly after Toramána, Raja of Kashmir, and in the Kashmir chronicles is specially praised for his liberality.

1 Wright's Nepál, p. 131: the time will be discussed hereafter: it was about the end of the sixth century ² Mém., I., 115. ³ J. B. S. H. A. S., IX., 147, 148.
From Tārānātha we learn that on the death of the Buddhist king Gambhirapaksha, Sri Harsha, born in Maru, abolished the teaching of the Mlechchhas by massacring them at Multán (but a weaver of Khorasân spread it anew) and laid the foundations of great Buddhist temples in the kingdoms of Maru, Málwa, Mewára, &c. This Sri Harsha was succeeded by his son Sila, who reigned about 100 years. The contemporary of Sila in the west was Vyúkula, King of Ma-nha, who raised himself by force over Sila and reigned thirty-six years. This account calls to mind Hwen Thsang’s description of Siláditya of Kanauj. From him we learn that Siláditya ascended the throne in 610 A.D. His father was Prabhákara-Vardhana and his eldest brother Rája Varádhana preceded him on the throne, but being slain by Sasángka, Raja of Karna-Suvarna, the minister Bání and the people placed the younger brother Harsha-Vardhana on the throne with the title Siláditya. He suffered reverses at the hands of Satyásráya or Pulakesi II., the western Chalukya Raj of Badámi, as recorded by Hwen Thsang, Ma-twan-lin and in several inscriptions of Pulakesi himself and his successors. We know that Siláditya was a zealous Buddhist himself, but was very tolerant towards Brahmanas: of his father we know but little. His grandfather appears to have been a Siláditya of Málwa and to have succeeded the great Vikramáditya there. Tārānátha tells us that the Sri Harsha Vikramáditya, the exterminator of the Mlechchhas, was succeeded by a Sila, and Hwen Thsang shows that the successor of Vikramáditya was a favourer of the Buddhists. Sri Harsha lost his kingdom probably through the enemies that he gained by his victory at Multán. Over a hundred years later the Buddhists lost everything with Siláditia of Kanauj. It is his death that marks the true era of Brahmanical ascendancy. With it came the preponderance of Hindu revivalistic ideas in religion and missionaries poured forth from southern and western India and gave the last touches to the complete restoration of Brahmanism. In Magadha, Nepál and Kumaon, the rulers for some time remained faithful to Buddhism, but the advocates of Siváism and especially the apostles of Tantric beliefs were numerous and powerful, and it would appear that the great mass of the people followed them.

1 La Comtesse Vasiliéff, p. 59: Ind. Ant., IV., 364.
2 Mémo., I., 247.
3 Ibid.
4 Ind. Ant., IX., 19.
5 Ind. Ant., V., 72; VI., 78, 87, amongst others.
Al Birúni has, as we have seen, mentioned the great battle at Kohurú between the city of Multán and the fort of Lúni, which can be no other than that noticed by Táránáth. The Aphasar inscription referring to Dámodara Gupta states that:—"While gloriously dispersing at the battle of Maushari the roaring line of elephants of the fierce army of the western Hunas, he fainted and selected the nymphs of heaven." In other words Dámodara perished in the battle of Maushari. Thus we have confirmation of the statement that the Guptas on one side and Vikramáditya on the other were determined opponents of the Sakas. Mr. Fergusson has arrived at the same opinion and states:—"What appears to have happened is this: about or before the year 1000 A.D., the struggle with the Buddhists was over and a new era was opening for the Hindu religion and a revival among the Hindu dynasties, and it was then determined to reform the calendar in a sense favourable to the new state of affairs. * * * In consequence of this, in looking back through their history for some name worthy to dignify the era and some event of sufficient importance to mark its commencement, they hit on the name of Vikramáditya as the most illustrious known and the battle of Kohurú as the most important in his reign." They then established the era by adding ten cycles of 60 years each to the date 544 A.D., and thus arrived at B.C. 56. This is a possible explanation, but there is no absolute necessity for connecting the great Vikramáditya's victory at Kohurú with the era that bears his name. It is more probable that it was introduced for astronomical purposes like another similar era quoted by Al Birúni and that this was done when Ujain was made the meridian of India. It did not come into general use even amongst astronomers before 1000 A.D. On this question Holtzmann pertinently remarks that:—"To assign him (Vikramáditya) to the first year of his era might be quite as great a mistake as we should commit in placing Pope Gregory XIII. in the year one of the Gregorian calendar, or even Julius Caesar in the first year of the Julian period to which his name has been given, that is in the year B.C. 4713." There is absolutely nothing on record regarding the first century before Christ, not even excepting the

---

Yueh-ti conquest of the Sakas in Kipin, that would indicate a victory in Brahmanical interests, and this Yueh-ti success is not likely to have been the cause of the Brahmans fixing on 57 B.C. as the initial year of the era. The great Vikramaditya may have displaced a Buddhist family in Malwa and he himself was succeeded by the philo-Buddhist Silådityas, and Silåditya's namesake and descendant was again followed by Brahmanical rulers, and the facts concerning the troubles of this period were moved back to adorn the legendary but obligatory explanation of the origin of the two eras. Another suggestion is derived from a passage in Strabo, in which he states: — "The Sakae occupied Baktriana and got possession of the most fertile tract in Armenia which was called after their own name Sakasene." This colony was exterminated by the Persians, who in remembrance of their victory instituted an unusual festival called Sakae. Many of the Indian legends concerning the great Vikramaditya contain facts connected with the history of the Kings of Persia, such as the surrender of the Roman Emperor and his being brought in chains to Ujain, which can only allude to the capture of Valerian by Shápùr in 260 A.D. The institution of the Sakae is attributed to Cyrus by some, but in any case must be referred to a period not later than the second century before Christ.

Returning from this long digression we take up again the Saka history after the Turushka princes of Kashmîr. The title 'Sháh' found on the coins of Basdeo is none other than the 'Sháhan-Sháhi' of the Gupta inscription on the Allahabad pillar and the 'Sáhânu-Sáhi' of the Jaina legend already quoted. It is also the 'Sháh' of the Katur kings of Kábul and the 'Shah-Katur' of the present chiefs of Kashkára. Basdeo is the last of the rulers whose name is found preserved in Greek letters. Returning to the Chinese writers, we find that about 98 A.D., the chief of the Yueh-ti had so far established his power as to aspire to the hand of the daughter of the emperor of China in marriage. Ambassadors were sent to China on his behalf, but were stopped by the Chinese governor of Kashgar, who refused to allow them to proceed. — The Yueh-ti king then sent a force of

70,000 men to compel the passage of his envoys, but these returned discomfited and ever afterwards he remained tributary to them. There is little doubt that the vigorous proselytising set on foot by Kanishka and his successors led to much division and dissension amongst his followers and subjects, and their treatment of the local princes and distribution of the government amongst military officials did not tend to make their rule more acceptable. Taking advantage of these disorders the Kritiyas expelled the Turushkas from Kashmir and were in turn driven out by the Tukharas king of Himatara about 260 A.D., but again succeeded in recovering the throne of Kashmir.

Up to the early part of the fifth century the Indo-Skythian tribes were known as Skuthae to the Greeks and Romans and as Turks to the Persians and Arabians, but about 420 A.D., these names give place to the term Haiataliotes or Haiateleh amongst the Arabs, Hepthalites amongst the Byzantine historians and Hepthals amongst the Armenians. Other variations are Euthalites, Ephthalites, Naphthalites, Atelites, Abtelites, who are one with the Cidariotes of Priscus or the 'White Huns.' They were, according to DeGuignes, a race of Huns called Tele and first came into notice in their wars with the Sassanides, and eventually were conquered and absorbed by the Tu-khiu chief Tu-men, the founder of the eastern Turks, in the middle of the sixth century. The Chinese annals also record that at the end of the second century after Christ, the eastern capital of the Yueh-ti lay to the west of the sandy desert of Foo-ty at Lou-kiang-chi, which Klaproth places near Khiva. To the north, the Yueh-ti country was bounded by the territory of the Ju-ju, who appear to be one with the branch of the White Huns, who were subsequently conquered by the Tu-khiu, once their servants and iron-workers. The Yueh-ti had brought a large tract of country under their sway and Po-lo (Bolor or Chitrál) some two hundred and ten leagues from the sands of Foo-ty became their western capital. Some time after their king called Kitolo (Katur) crossed the Hindu Kush (420 A.D.) and invaded Sind and subdued five kingdoms to the north of Kan-to-lo (Gandhara). At this time the Yueh-ti used chariots drawn by two or

2 Julien, J. A. S. Paris, 6th Ser., III., 324.  
four pair of oxen. During the time of the Gooi dynasty (424-451 A.D.) a merchant came from the country of the great Yueh-ti to China and taught the Chinese the art of making coloured glass. The Yueh-ti or Yue-tchi were now called Ye-tha or Yi-ta, and their power extended from Khoten to the Oxus and their principal town was Bamian. Their country was called Ta-kone or the 'great kingdom' by the Chinese. Kitolo left his son at Peshawar, who established there a separate kingdom of the little Yueh-ti, whilst the great Yueh-ti still occupied Kábul. Still there are not wanting traces of the presence of the Huns in this part of the world. Cosmas in 525 A.D. gives the name Hunnie to the country lying between China and the borders of Persia and the Roman Empire. He calls the king of this country Gollas, who had at his disposal two thousand elephants and a numerous cavalry, which show that Gollas must have had possession in some flat country and connections with India. Damodara Gupta records his victory over the fierce army of western Hunas at Maushari in the previously quoted Aphsar inscription, and from DeGuignes we learn that Soupharai or Sukha Rai, the Soucran (Sukha Ram) of Tillemont and Sukha of the Arabs, who was governor of Zabulistan, Ghazni and Bost under the Sassanidan princes Balas and Kobad, defeated the White Huns at Bikand about 490 A.D. Still we cannot accept the conclusion of Reinaud and others that the Ephthalites were one with the Yueh-ti. We acknowledge the proximity of the Ephthalites in the countries west of the Kábul valley, where, according to Procopius, they had been settled for a long time and some of them sought service as mercenaries in the Persian army, and their chief may have become suzerain of the countries as far as the Indus. But as remarked by Reinaud:—

"On ne mieux comparer les vastes contrées de la Tartarie à cette époque qu’à une mer presque constamment en furie, et où les vagues ne font que changer de place suivant le vent qui souffle."

The Huns had no long lease of power, for by the middle of the sixth century, or twenty-five years after Cosmas’ relation, the White Huns fell before the Tukhiu or eastern Turks.

---

3 J. A. S. Paris, 6th Ser., I., 439: Gollas must be the same as Anowal, who ascended the throne in 420 A.D. and perished at the hands of Tuman.

6 Ante. p. 435: this battle will fall in 480-490 A.D. if we take 319 A.D. as the initial date of the era, and in 360-450 A.D. if we take 107 A.D. as the initial date, and all indications show that the latter is the more probable date.
The Chinese pilgrims of whom accounts have come down to us in some detail afford us valuable aid in ascertaining who were the occupants of the trans-Indus country at this time. There are, however, certain difficulties connected with the topography of the region traversed by them which throw some doubt on the conclusions arrived at. Fortunately all of them—Fah Hian, Sung Yun, and Hwen Thsang—visited the kingdom of Khie-pan-to bordering on Yarkand. Fah Hian calls it Kie-cha and Sung Yun calls it Han-pan-to. Hwen Thsang on his return journey to China after crossing a mountain range to the south of the valley of Po-mi-lo (Pamir) entered the kingdom of Po-lo-lo celebrated for its gold washings, and after a difficult journey of 500 li arrived at Khie-pan-to on the Sita river, where lived a king of the Chine Suryadeva gotra, descended from an ancestor born of the sun-god and a Chinese princess: hence the family name. M. de St. Martin identifies the chief city of Khie-pan-to with Kartchu on the Yarkand river. Fah Hian left Kartchu, "in the midst of the Tsung-ling mountains," on his journey from China, and proceeding westwards for a month crossed those mountains into northern India. He adhered to the incline of the same mountains for fifteen days in a south-westerly direction and reached the Indus (Sin-to), which he crossed and entered the country of Ou-chang or Swat. Here the river of Gilgit is clearly intended by the name "Sinto," for otherwise his statement is unintelligible. Sung Yun left Han-pan-to also on his outward journey from China and going west six days entered on the Tsung-ling mountains and after three days reached the city of Kiueh-yu and after three days more the Puh-ho-i mountains and then the kingdom of Poh-ho, to the south of which lay the great snowy mountains. Thence in the first decade of the 10th month (or two months after leaving Han-pan-to) he arrived in the country of the Ye-tha in 519 A.D. "They receive tribute from all surrounding nations on the south as far as Tieh-lo (To-li of Fah Hian and Tha-li-lo of Hwen Thsang, the modern Darel); on the north, the entire country of La-ia (La-la, or it may be read Chih-ia): eastward to Khoten and west to Persia, more than forty countries in all." He then alludes to the curious custom of the females wearing horns on their heads from

which drapery descended, and adds "these people are of all the 
four tribes of barbarians the most powerful. The majority of 
them are unbelievers. Most of them worship false gods." Of 
the country of Gandhára (Peshawar) he writes:—

"It was formerly called Ye-po-lo. This is the country which the Ye-tha 
destroyed and afterwards set up Lae-lih to be king over the country; since 
which events two generations have passed. The disposition of this king was 
cruel and vindictive and he practised the most barbarous atrocities. He did 
not believe the law of Buddha, but loved to worship demons. The people of 
the country belonged entirely to the Brahman caste; they had a great respect 
for the law of Buddha and loved to read the sacred books, when suddenly this 
king came into power who was strongly opposed to anything of the sort and 
entirely self-reliant. Trusting to his own strength he had entered on a war 
with the country of Kl-pin respecting the boundaries of their kingdom and his 
troops had already been engaged in it for three years."

Sung-yun attended the royal camp to present his credentials and was 
very roughly received and when remonstrating with the king 
said:—"The sovereign of the Ye-tha and also of Ou-chang when 
they received our credentials did so respectfully." This would 
clearly show that the king of Gandhára did not belong to the long 
established section of the Ye-tha, and the Chinese traveller also styles 
the subjects of the Gandhára king Si-khiang or ‘western foreigners.’ 
According to Sung-Yun their conquest of Gandhára took place 
only two generations previously, or say 470 A.D., and they were 
in 520 A.D. at war with Kábul. Fah Hian¹ refers to the 
Yueh-ti conquest of Gandhára as having occurred ‘in former 
times,’ and he wrote in 402 A.D., so that this clearly was 
a different conquest from that mentioned by Sung Yun. Again, 
the conquest by Kitolo must be considered a third, and the 
reigning prince of Gandhára in Sung-Yun's time probably belonged 
to some other division of the little Yueh-ti, who were then at 
war with the great Yueh-ti at Kábul.² Chitrál is moreover said 
to have belonged to Akeon-khiang in the time of the Goei dynasty 
(424-451 A.D.), so that we may consider the kingdom of Gandhára

¹ Beal, f. e., p. 37. ² General Cunningham suggests that the Gójaras 
in Yaghistán are the representatives of the Kushan or Great 
Yueh-ti. Yaghistán is the name given to the country inhabited by tribes 
having independent institutions on our north-west frontier. Captain Trotter 
notes of these Gójaras that they are said to be of Jat descent, though now Musal-
máns. They are termed by the Patháns Hinoki, and are frequently met with in 
the pastoral districts where they tend the flocks of the Patháns, who are lords of 
the soil. "They are said to be descendants of the aboriginal inhabitants of the 
in 520 A.D., as an independent offshoot of the little Yueh-ti, whose principal seat was in Chitrál. The name Si-khiang is usually given to the Tibetans, and we know that the little Yueh-ti fled to Tibet in the first century before Christ.

Hwen Thsang on his journey from China visited Tukhara and then Bamiyan, where the people were zealous Buddhists. Further east in Kapisa in the Kabul valley there was a Kabatriya king (630 A.D.). Lamghán and Nagarahāra were subject to Kapisa as well as Purushapura (Peshawar), the capital of Gandhāra. This dynasty, however, could not have lasted long, for Al Birūnī, as we have seen, distinctly states that the dynasty which preceded the Hindu rulers of Kabul was a Turkish one, and this can be no other than the ruling family of the great Yueh-ti. Buddhism prevailed throughout the whole valley of the Kabul river and in Swat, where the spoken language, though somewhat different, resembled that of India. The remains of numerous buildings existed which had been destroyed by Mihirakula, Raja of Kashmir, about 500 A.D., were seen by the Chinese traveller. Hwen Thsang then advanced as far as the sources of the Swat river and afterwards passed along the Indus into the country of Tha-li-lo (Darel), the former capital of Udāna or Swat. Thence he visited Pol-u-lo, the modern Iskardo, where the people spoke a different language. All these indications corroborate the result of our previous investigations and show that an Indian people speaking an Indian language formed during the first seven centuries of the Christian era the main part of the population along the whole length of the Kabul valley and along the Indus up to Gilgit, where they were bounded by the Baltis on the east. We shall now examine the few notices that occur in Arabian and Persian writers.

The writings of the earliest Musalmán geographers show that Kabul was divided between the dominant Turks and subject Hindus. Istakhri in

---

1 There is some difficulty about this name and there are apparently two places that can answer to the name Bulor. According to Klaproth (Mag. Az., I., 96), Chitrál was known as Bolor to the Chinese, and he notes that under the Han it belonged to Ou-tehka (Udāna or Swat) and under the Gogd (414-461 A.D.), it was the kingdom of Akson-khiang, clearly a Tibetan dynasty and perhaps connected with the little Yueh-ti: Comm. Arc Gogd., 89, and Progr. A. G. B., III. The Rou-lo of Sung-Yun (Beul., p. 182) would more nearly approach Chitrál, and this will also be the Rou-lo of Klaproth’s authorities quoted at p. 477.

2 This paragraph is based upon Elliot, II., 413-447.
A.D. writes:—"Kábul has a castle celebrated for its strength, accessible only by one road. In it there are Musalmáns and it has a town in which are infidels from Hind." In this statement he is followed by Ibn Hankul (942 A.D.), and his successors. Ibn Khallikán states that in the time of Yakúb-bin-Luís Kábul was inhabited by a Turkish tribe called Durán, on which Elliot remarks:—"It is possible that the term Durán may have a connection with *dará*, a hill-pass (valley), and that allusion may be made to the country north of Kábul, just in the same way as in modern times, the inhabitants of these same tracts are styled in Kábul, 'Kohistání' or hill-men." The first invasion recorded was in the time of Abdullah, Governor of Irák, on the part of the Khalíf Us món (644 A.D.) He invaded Zaranj and Kish then considered part of Indian territory and the tract between Ar-rukhaj (Arachosia) and Dáwar and in the latter country attacked the idolators in the mountain Zúr. Abdurrahmán subsequently advanced to Kábul about the year 661 A.D. and took prisoner Kábul Sháh, the ruler, who became a convert to Islám; but we learn "that the king of Kábul made an appeal to the warriors of India and the Musalmáns were driven out of Kábul. He recovered all the other conquered countries and advanced as far as Bust, but on the approach of another Musalmán army, he submitted and engaged to pay an annual tribute." In 683-4 the Kábulís refused to pay the annual tribute and their king was taken and killed. The war was continued by the king's successor, who was again compelled to yield submission to the Musalmáns, but "whenever opportunity offered, renewed efforts were made by the Kábulís to recover their lost independence." In 697-8 Ranbil was chief of Kábul and reduced the leader of a Musalmán army who had invaded his territory to such straits that he was compelled to purchase his release. In 700-01 A.D. an avenging expedition under Abdurrahmán was sent by the celebrated Hajjáj against Kábul and was completely successful. The victor on his return was, however, coldly received by his master because he did not remain and take permanent occupation of the country. Exasperated at this, Abdurrahmán made a treaty with the infidels and promised them freedom from tribute should he succeed in overthrowing his master, and on

---

*This name is very variously given by different writers, Zenti, Zambil, Rathyl, Rategli, and Wilson makes the name Atohagdle.*
the other hand the Kábul king agreed to afford him a refuge in
the event of failure. Hajjáj was victorious and Abdurrahmán
committed suicide when his host was about to deliver him up to
the conqueror. Masúdí and other writers make the name Ranbal a
dynastic royal title for the prince of Kábul and the territories be-
tween Hirát and Kábul. When Al Mamún was made governor
of Khurásán he captured Kábul and obliged the king to become a
Muhammadan. In 869-70 A.D., Yakúb-bin-Lais took Kábul and
made its prince a prisoner. The king of Ar-Rukhaj was put to
death and its inhabitants were forced to embrace Islám. This con-
quest appears to have been more durable than any of the preceding
ones, for we find the coins of Yakúb struck at Panjshír, to the
north-east of Kábul in the years 874-75 A.D.

Indians of Kábul.

All the authorities quoted by Elliot,
except Al Birúní, makes Kanak the last
of the Katormán kings.

Al Birúní writes: —

"Le Kaboul était autrefois gouverné par des princes de race turque;
on dit qu'ils étaient originaux du Tibet. Le premier d'entre eux, qui se nom-
mait Barhtigín. le trône resta au pouvoir de ses enfants pendant à peu près
soixante générations. l'ordre de ces règnes était écrit sur une étoffe
de soie qui fut trouvée dans la forteresse de Nagarkot; j'aurais vivemment
désiré pouvoir lire cet écrit: mais différentes circonstances m'ont empêché.
Au nombre de ces rois fut Kanç; c'est celui qui a fondé le vihàra de Peychaver
et dont le vihàra porte le nom. le dernier roi de cette dynastie fut Laktouso-
man. Le prince avait pour visir un brahman nommé Kalar. il s'empara
donc du trône et est pour successeur le brahme Sáma. Celui-ci fut remplacé
par Kamalavâ; puis vinrent successivement Bhima, Jayapâla, Anandapâla et
Nardakarpâla. Celui-ci monta, dit-on, sur le trône l'an 412 de l'hégire (1021
A. D.). Son fils Bhimapâla lui succéda au bout de cinq ans,"

Kanç can be no other than the Kanishka of the Turushka
dynasty of Kashmír. Elliot identifies Kalar with the Syálpati of
the bull-and-horseman type of coins found in the Kábul valley and
which bear Brahmanical emblems as those of their predecessors,
bore the elephant and lion, considered Buddhistic signs. The latter
in turn differed from the earlier Indo-Skythian coins. We cannot
further allude to the interesting results derivable from a study of
these coins beyond that they show that the Turkish dynasty had

1 Fragments Arabes, p. 147; Dowson's Elliot, II., 10.
2 See Thomas' Principes, I., 330, and references.
become thoroughly Indianised. In 961 A.D. Alptegin established the Musalmán dynasty of Ghazni and henceforth the Hindus were the objects of bitter persecution, so that many became Musalmáns and others fled to the hills or to India. In the histories mention is made of the services rendered to Mahmúd of Ghazni by the Hindu renegade Tilak, who is also said1 to have brought "all the Hindu Kators and many outsiders" under the rule of Sultán Masúd (1082 A.D.) At the time of Timúr's expedition2 against these Kators (1408 A.D.) their country extended from the frontiers of Kashmir to the mountains of Kábul and they possessed many towns and villages. One of their large cities was called Shckal and another Jorkal, which latter was the residence of the ruler. Timúr approached the Kator country by the Kháwak pass from Indaráb; to his right lay the Kators and to the left the pagan Siyáh-Poshes. He describes the former as a people who drink wine and eat swine's flesh and who speak a language distinct from Turki, Persian, Hindi and Kashmiri, and their chiefs were called Uda and Udáshu or Adáshu. Timúr further adds that most of the inhabitants were idolaters; they were men of a powerful frame and light complexion and were armed with arrows, swords and slings. In the time of Baber the country of Kábul was occupied by many and various tribes. He writes3:

"Its valleys and plains are inhabited by Türk, Aymaks and Arabs. In the city, and the greater part of the villages, the population consists of Tijiks. Many others of the villages and districts are occupied by Pasháis, Paráchiis, Tijiks, Berekis and Afgáns. In the hill-country to the west reside the Hasáras and Nukderis. Among the Hasára and Nukderi tribes are some who speak the Mughal language. In the hills to the north-east lies Kaziristán and such countries as Kator and Gebrek. To the south is Afgánistán. There are eleven or twelve different languages spoken in Kábul; Arabic, Persian, Türkí, Mughall, Hindi, Afgání, Pashá, Paráchi, Gobri, Berekí and Lamghání."

The Parácha Musalmáns of the Indus valley appear to represent the Baniyas of the plains and have a dialect of their own. Pashu is spoken in the valley of the Kunar river and Hindi will probably represent the language of the Kards and people of Kashkára. In the reign of Jahángír (1619) the Sarbár of Paklí is described as bounded on the north by the Kator country, on the south by the Ghakkar country, on the east by the Kashmir mountains

1. Dowson's Elliot, II, 132-33. 2. Ibid., III, 490. 3. Ebrahime's Baber, I, 231.
and on the west by Attak-Banáras. Pakli was traversed by Jahángír on his way to Kashmir and lay between the Indus and the Kishanganga. At this time, the country to the north was known as Kátor comprising Gilgit, Darel and Chitrál.

From the preceding extracts we gather that Katúra or Kátor was the name given to the reigning family in Kábul for many generations, and that they were so Indianised as to be regarded as Hindus. They, moreover, ruled over an Indian race inhabiting the country throughout the highlands from Lamghán to Baltí. We shall now turn to the people inhabiting this region at the present day. We find three great groups of tribes in this tract, the Kho division between the Indus and the Hindu-kush, the Shins on the upper Indus and surrounding all, Muhammadans of different races speaking Pashtu or Persian or Túrki. The Khos comprise the mass of the Chitrál population, the Siyáh-Posh of Káfíristán and the people of Lamghán and represent the Khasas or Khasas of whom we have heard so much. The upper part of the Kasakhara valley is called Túrī-kho, the middle is known as Múl-kho and the lower as Lud-kho and the language spoken is called Khawár, the Arniya of Dr. Leitner. These Khos are the oldest inhabitants and are styled "Faktir-mushkin" by the ruling class. The latter are descended from the common ancestor of the governing family and are generally spoken of as Sáh Sangullie, next to whom come the Zundre or Ronos and then the Ashimadek or food-givers. As already mentioned the Khushwaktiya branch of the Katúra reigned in Yassan and the Sáh or Sháh Katúra branch in Chitrál. It would appear that the native rulers of Gilgit, Iskando and Kashmir were supplanted by Musalmán adventurers in the fourteenth century and those of Kasakhara by others in the sixteenth century. The local tradition in Chitrál is that it was governed by 'a Rais who is said to have been of the same family as the rulers of Gilgit before the introduction of Muhammadanism.' The last local ruler of Gilgit was the Ra Sri Buddhadatta, of the Sáh-rais family and the old name of that valley was Sargín. There is no doubt that in the name Sáhrais we have the Sáh or Sháh of Sáh Katúra and a continuation to our own day of the 'Sháh' in the inscriptions of Vásudeva and the Sáhánas-Sáh of inscriptions and legends. The members of the present ruling family
are intruders and it is to the Ronos we must look for the representative of the old princes. Major Biddulph\textsuperscript{1} tells us that:—

"The Ronos rank next to the ruling family in every country in which they are found. The Wazirs are generally though not always chosen from amongst the Rono families. They exist in small numbers in Nagar, Gilgit and Yunyâl, gradually increasing in numbers as one travels westwards through Yassan, Mastój and Chithrâl, in which places they are said to be altogether over 300 families. In Nagar and Yassan they call themselves Harâ and Haraiyo and in Chithrâl, Zundra, but they all claim to be of the same stock. Some exist in Wakhan and Sirikol, where they are called Khalbar-khatar, and in Shighman, where they are called Gaibalik-khatar."

The Sâh Sangallie class in Chitral give their daughters to the Ronos, 'who being descended from a former dynasty of rulers of the country are regarded as of royal blood.' Surely in these we have the representatives of the Yueh-ti rulers of Kashmir who called themselves 'Korano' on their coins, and of the Kator kings of Kâbul, the last of whom was displaced by his Brahman minister; whilst the actual de-facto ruler of Kash-kâra retains the ancient title of 'Sâh Katâre.'

From Major Biddulph\textsuperscript{2} we learn that 'the name 'Dârul' is not acknowledged by any section of the tribes to whom it has been so sweepingly applied. In a single instance the term is applied by one tribe to some of their neighbour.' The correct name for the principal tribe inhabiting Gilgit, Astor and the Indus valley is Shin or Shing, possibly the Chinas of the Parânas. They have pleasing features, hair usually black, but sometimes brown, complexion moderately fair: the shade being sometimes light enough, but not always, to allow the red to shine through; eyes brown or hazel and voice rough and harsh. Mr. Drew gives the divisions which exist at the present day and which he says 'may be called castes, since they are kept up by rules more or less stringent against the intermarriage of those who belong to different divisions.' With both Kho and Shin are found Gujarâs, Kremins and Doms. The last is a servile caste corresponding to the Khâsiya Doms in Kumaon and performing similar duties. The habits and customs of both Khoos and Shins and the language spoken by them all show their Indian origin, though they have been

\textsuperscript{1} "Tribes of the Hindu-kush," p. 34, 66.  
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 2, 166.
for some centuries converts to Islám. There is still one other considerable section of the inhabitants of this region to be mentioned. Their language betrays a Turanian origin and they call themselves Búrisho or Wúrshik and are known to their neighbours as Yesh-kun. They form the entire population of Hanza, Nagar and Punnyál, and nearly all the population of Yassan besides being numerically superior in Gilgit, Sai, Darel and Astor, and their language is called by themselves Búrishki and by others Khajúna. Major Biddulph\(^1\) rightly, we think, connects the name 'Búrisa' with 'Purusha-pura,' the name of the capital of the Little Yuez-ti in the fifth century of our era.\(^3\)

The Moollah who visited Chitrál in 1874 saw three several pagan Káfirs from various parts of Káfirstan and describes their appearance as so like the Chitrális both in features and dress and in the way of arranging the hair of their faces that it would be impossible to distinguish them apart were it not for the fact that the Káfirs all wear a tuft of hair on the crown of the head like the Hindús, and this, too, is only visible when they remove their head-dress.\(^4\) In 1841, Dr. Griffiths saw some of the Káfir inhabitants of Kattar and describes them as a fine-bodied people and very active and not very fair. The chiefs were much fairer than their followers and in the expression of face and eyes, Aryan. According to Major Biddulph, the Siyáh-Posh are separable into three tribes conformable to the natural divisions of the country, the Rum, Wai and Bush. The Rum-galis or Lum-galis border on Laghmán and Kábul and may probably be referred to the Romakas of the Puránas. The Wai-galis inhabit the valleys extending south-east to the Kunar river at Chaghán Sarái, and the Bush-galis occupy the valleys to the north. They speak a language having an Indian basis; their principal deities are Imbra (Indra) and Mani (Manu), and the men shave their heads in Indian fashion, merely leaving the ordinary top-knot. The women of the Bash-galis wear a curious head-dress consisting of a sort of black cap with lappets and two horns about a foot long made of wood wrapped round with cloth and fixed to the cap. This custom is noticed by Hwui Seng\(^4\) when writing of the Ye-tha country which was met

---

\(^1\) *J. C. p. 20, 160.*  
\(^2\) *Astra, p. 488.*  
\(^3\) *Trotter's Report, 1874-75, p. 25.*  
\(^4\) *Beal's Yab-Hian, p. 185 : about 530 A.D.*
with on leaving Poh-ho: there the royal ladies wore 'on their heads a horn in length eight feet and more, three feet of its length being red coral. As for the rest of the great ladies they all, in like manner, cover their heads, using horns, from which hang down veils all round like precious canopies. * * The majority of them are unbelievers and most of them worship false gods.' Hwen Thsang has a similar notice regarding the Tukhára country of Himatula, the ruler of which was so friendly to the Yueh-ti Turushkas of Kashmir as to avenge their downfall. 3

Taking into consideration the very different influences to which the Khos of Kashtára and the Khasiyas of Kumaon have been subjected for many centuries, it is not curious that their habits and customs at the present day should widely differ. The fortunes, too, of their rulers have varied. Syálkot in the Panjáb is supposed to have been founded by Sáliváhan, whose son Rásálu was succeeded by Raja Hudi, chief of the Syálas. 4 The chiefs of Nagarkot or Kangra were also closely connected with the Yueh-tis and Al Birúni mentions that they possessed a genealogical tree of the Turkish rulers of Kábúl written on silk. 5 The chiefs of Lohara or Sáhi, a petty hill

1 Mém. II., 191. 2 Antecd. p. 427. The following references will furnish all the information known about these so-called 'Káfrs':—

Mascon, C.—Narrative of various journeys in Balochistán, Afghanistan and the Panjáb, I., 131 : London, 1842.
Mohan Lal.—Siah-posh tribe. J. A. S. Ben., II., 305.
Trump, Dr.—Language of so-called Káfrs, J. R. A. S., XIX., 1.
Biddulph, Major.—Tribes of the Hindi Koosh, p. 186 : Calcutta, 1851.
Princap, J., 314, Thomas' edition
Eratine, W.—History of Baber, I., 231.
Néronat, A.—Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques, I., 293.

Out of all these writers only Elphinstone, Mascon, Bunne, Trump and Biddulph have seen Káfrs and no European has as yet entered their country. 6

state of the Gilgit or Sârgin valley, who succeeded Didda on the throne of Kashmir in the eleventh century, also claimed descent from Salivâhana, but were none the less Sâhîs of the Turushka stock.\footnote{1 Troyer’s R. T., Vi., 367: VII., 1888.} In A.D. 700, both the king of the Turks and the king of Kâbul are said to have borne the same name, which was also common to the kings of Kashmir.\footnote{2 Cunn. Arch. Rep., II., 76.} Unfortunately this name comes to us in many guises, but if we accept the form Râbbil as standing for Ratnapâla we have another link in the chain. Again the existence of a Surya-déva Râja, sprung from the sun-god, and therefore of the solar-race, in the hill state\footnote{3 Mém. L.} of Khypán-to (Sirikol) in the seventh century, shows the influence of Indian ideas far beyond the limits assigned ordinarily to the Indians themselves. We may now conclude that we have carefully and fairly made out a connection between the dynasty ruling west of the Indus known as Kâtúres and the Kumaon Katyûras and between the people of Rumaon and the Kunets of Kunaor and the Khos of Kashkâra. We find, wherever the Khasas occur, the Doms live with them as their servitors and recognize in these Doms the descendants of the Dásan of the Védás, inhabitants of Upper India even before either Nágas or Khasas appeared. The time has passed for attributing to the small immigration of the Aryans that has given us the Védás, the origin of all the races who are to-day assumed to be of Aryan blood and even for holding that all so-called Rajpúts are of Aryan descent. Many of our Rajpút clans can be traced back to Báktrians, Parthians and Skythians when the facts now fast accumulating are closely examined. We have seen already how the Aryan writers themselves acknowledge that in many cases all the castes have a common origin. Many of the purer race did not accept the advanced ideas of their priest-led brethren and are accordingly contemptuously classed amongst the outcasts because ‘they knew no Brahmans.’ The Aryan immigrants themselves found on their arrival in India that other members of their race had preceded them. These from admixture with the so-called aborigines had degenerated from the primitive type in customs and perhaps also in features. Their religion also was affected by this union for, as we shall see hereafter, the Pâsupati cult had its origin amongst the non-Brahmanical tribes, and from this sprang the
terrible forms of Siva which have taken such hold in comparatively modern times of the popular religious thought of India. The influence of the Vaidik Aryans is better shown in the language and literature of modern India and the modifications of the physical characteristics of the various tribes with which they have come in contact. Professor Huxley, as quoted by a recent writer, says, "the Indo-Aryans have been in the main absorbed into the pre-existing population, leaving as evidence of their immigration an extensive modification of the physical characters of the population, a language and a literature."

We may, therefore, assume for the Khasiyas an Aryan descent in the widest sense of that term much modified by local influences, but whether they are to be attributed to the Vaidik immigration itself or to an earlier or later movement of tribes having a similar origin, there is little to show. It is probable, however, that they belong to a nation which has left its name in various parts of the Himálaya, and that they are one in origin with the tribes of the western Himálaya whom we have noticed. This nation in course of time and chiefly from political causes and the intrusion of other tribes was broken up into a number of separate peoples, some of whom have become Muhammedans, others Buddhists and others again, as in these hills where the facility of communication with the plains and the existence of the sacred shrines in their midst rendered the people peculiarly open to Brahmánícal influence, became Hindús in religion, customs and speech. As we approach the Aryan ethnical frontier in the Himálaya to the west, Turks, Tátars, Iranians, and Aryans professing the three great religions meet and as we near the ethnical frontier in the east, Tibetans and Hindús are found together in the debateable ground, as we may call Nepál. Further east Tibetans alone prevail until we get to the shading off between them and the monosyllable-tongued Indo-Chinese tribes in farthest Asám. Whatever may have been their origin, the Khasiyas have forgotten it and influenced by modern fashion have sought to identify themselves with the dominant Hindu races as the Hindu converted to Islám and called Shaikh seeks to be known as a Sayyid when he becomes well-to-do in the world. In this respect the Khasiyas do not differ from any other hill tribe brought
under Brahmanical influence. All see that honour, wealth and power are the hereditary dues of the castes officially established by the authors of the Mānava Dharma-sāstras and seek to connect themselves with some higher than their own. Even at the present day, the close observer may see the working of those laws which have in the course of centuries transmuted a so-called aboriginal hill-race into good Hindus. A prosperous Kumāon Dom stone-mason can command a wife from the lower Rajpūt Khāsiyas, and a successful Khasiya can buy a wife from a descendant of a family of pure plains' pedigree. Year by year the people are becoming more orthodox in their religious observances and the names of the dī miniōres are becoming somewhat neglected. What little historical records exist show us great waves of invasion and conquest over all Upper India from the earliest times and bitter dynastic and religious struggles. The many different tribes who joined in these wars have not been superimposed without disturbance one on the other like deposits of inorganic matter, so as to enable us like the geologist at once to declare the order of their coming from their ascertained position, but rather they are in the position of a range of mountains full of faults, inversions and folds. Following out this simile the earliest inhabitants had to receive conqueror after conqueror, and accommodate themselves to the deposit left behind, by being crumpled up so as to occupy less space or by being cracked across so as to allow some parts to be pushed above others. We find that this is what must have taken place. In some cases the intruding power was strong enough to absorb or to enslave the conquered race, in other cases these have been pushed onwards from their original seats, and again in other cases they have been divided into two. From Tibet on the north and the plains on the south intruders have wedged themselves in or been superimposed on the Khasiya race, chemically assimilating as it were the subject race in places by intermarriage and in others showing a purely mechanical admixture. For these reasons it is impossible to trace any unbroken direct connection between the Kātūres and Khos of Kashikāra and the Katyūras and Khasas of Kumāon, but the affinity is none the less established on as good grounds as any other question connected with early Indian history and may be accepted until other and better evidence comes to light.