CHAPTER I
TRADITION OF ĀDIŚŪRA

There is a tradition in the kulapanjikās that a
king of Bengal named Ādiśūra brought five Brāhmaṇas
of five different gotras from Kolāṅca¹ or from
Kānyakubja² to his country as there was dearth³ of
learned Brāhmaṇas there. According to the same tradition,
five Kāyasthas belonging to five different gotras also
came to Bengal along with the said Brāhmaṇas as their
attendants. The kulīna Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas of
Bengal often claim their descent respectively from the

1. Āyātā Vipravaryyāḥ Śucitatarahṛdayāḥ Paṅca Kolāṅcadesāt
is also called Krocāṅca, Kolaṅca, Krocāṅci and Krocāṅja

2. According to some version,
Āyātān paṅca Vipraśca Kānykubja Pradeśatah
(Cf. Kularāma, cited in N.N. Vasu's Viśvakosa, Vol.III, p.593, note 1); Kānyakubja, Mahodaya, Kānyakubja,
Gāḍhipura, Kauśa and Kuṣasthala are different names of Kānyakubja in Sanskrit literature (Cf. Viśvakosa,
Vol.III, p.77); Kānyakubja was located in Antarvedi
country i.e. the land between the Ganges and the Jumna
(Cf. Sircar, op.cit., p.29).

3. The notion that there was dearth of learned Brāhmaṇas
in Bengal may be adduced to a statement in the
Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra (I.I. 25-31) of about the
above-mentioned immigrant Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas.¹

sixth-fifth century B.C., which regards the people of Puṇḍra (North Bengal) and Vaṅga (South and South-West Bengal) outside the pale of Vedic culture, so that it prescribes expiatory rites for the purification of Aryans visiting those countries (Cf. Sircar, op.cit., p.3). The Mahābhārata (II. 16-23, 29) also points to the semi-Aryanised condition of Puṇḍra (Cf. Sircar, op.cit., p.1, note 4). According to F.J. Monahan (Beng. Past Pre., Vol. XXI, pp. 7-10), the fact that the Buddhist predominance lasted much longer and the Vedic reform was later delayed in Bengal than in other parts of India, probably accounts for a tradition that Bengal was an 'impure' country where the Vedic Brāhmaṇas were forbidden to reside. D.C. Sircar (op.cit. p.2), however, points out that the progress of Aryanism in Bengal seems to have been accelerated from the beginning of the fourth century B.C. Sircar (ibid., p.10), further, suggests that from about the sixth century A.D. Rāḍha (upper South-West Bengal) became one of the greatest centres of Aryan culture in Bengal and in the whole of India.

IDENTIFICATION OF ĀDIŚŪRA

Scholars generally take Ādiśūra as a man of history, although there is some dispute as regards his identity and, as we shall see below, the historicity of the tradition of bringing of the Brāhmaṇas, referred to in the first paragraph, has been doubted. That a Śūra family existed in Bengal has been established on the basis of epigraphic and literary sources. Thus, the Tirumalai rock inscription (1025 A.D.) of Rājendra Cola 1 mentions the name of Raṇasūra and in the Rāmacaritā of Sandhyākaranandāṇī there is mention of Lakṣmīsūra, the ruler of Apara-Mandāra (West Bengal), who is described as one of the chief feudatories of Rāmapāla (first half of the 12th century A.D.). Further, the Barrackpur inscription of Vijayasena (1097-1159 A.D.)

records that Vilāsadevi, the queen of Vijayasena and the mother of Ballālasena belonged to a Śūra family.

N.N.Ray\(^1\) believes that Raṇaśūra of the Tirumalai rock inscription belonged to the family of Ādiśūra. H.P. Sastri\(^2\) is also of the same opinion. B.C.Sen\(^3\) appears to support Ray's view when he suggests that the said Raṇaśūra may be taken to be the same as that of the table supplied by M.Chakravarti given below. Referring to the generations of the Varendra Brāhmaṇas, as pointed out by M.C. Majumdar, R.P.Chanda\(^4\) suggests that Ādiśūra may be considered to have been the son or grandson of the same Raṇaśūra. N.N.Vasu\(^5\) holds Lakṣmīśūra of the Rāmacarita to have been a member of the same line of Śūra chiefs, who ruled in Southern Raḍha\(^6\) and places him third in succession from Raṇaśūra of the Tirumalai rock inscription as known from his table given below. F.J. Monahan\(^7\) points out that the same Raṇaśūra is not mentioned in any of kulapaśnjikās.

5. Rajanyakanda, p. 146.
6. For discussion on the location of Raḍha, see Hist. Beng., Vol.1, pp.20-22; see also Chapter III below.
7. Beng. past Pre., Vol. XXI, p.8
According to him \(^1\) 'we are not sure that Ranaśūra and Lakṣmīśūra belonged to the same family or dynasty.'

H.C. Ray \(^2\) suggests that the same Lakṣmīśūra may have belonged to a branch of the Śūras of Cola and Sena inscriptions and of kulapañjikās. P.Raya \(^3\) takes the same Lakṣmīśūra to be the grandson of the said Ranaśūra. P.C. Sen \(^4\) is also of the same opinion and adds that Ādiśūra may be taken as the grandfather of the same Ranaśūra. D.C. Ganguly \(^5\) suggests that the Śūra family mentioned in the Barrackpur inscription, mentioned above \(^6\), may be identified with the Śūra dynasty which ruled in Apara Mandāra under its king Lakṣmīśūra.

Besides, J.Takakusu \(^7\) refers to Āryaśūra who was a Buddhist author. Owing to the paucity of definite evidence whether the Śūra family of Bengal was

---

1. Ibid., p. 10.
3. A Historical Review of Hindu India, p. 129.
4. Prabarttak, 1363 B.S., p. 163.
6. See above, p.3
7. I-tsing, p. .1vi.
associated with Aryasūra is difficult to say. Further, N.N. Vasu makes reference to a Copper-plate grant of a chief named Lalitasūra apparently of the tenth century A.D. found in the former Himalayan state of Badrinath and also to a stone-inscription of one Raṇasūra found in Nepal and adds that as they bore the Sūra title they were relations of Ādiśūra. But, according to F.J. Monahan, 'nothing can be inferred from them with regard to a Sūra dynasty in Bengal.' He argues that the name or title 'Sūra' meaning 'hero' or 'warrior' was borne or assumed by chiefs of different dynasties of different parts of India, like the names or titles 'Pāla' 'Sena' and 'Varman'. In this connection, we may draw attention to the names Sūrasena (8th century A.D.), a Maukhari Prince ruling at Kanauj after Harṣavarṇaḥ's death, 'Sūra', a minister of

1. Rajevakanda, p. 121.
2. Proceeding, Asiatic Society of Bengal, p. 72
5. Loc. cit.
Avantivarman (856-83 A.D.) of the Utpala dynasty of Kashmir, and Śūraditya\(^1\) of the Śravaṇabhadrā dynasty, a devotee of the Paramāra king of Bhojadeva (first part of the eleventh century), of Mālava. But whether Ādiśūra belonged to the same Sūra family to which Raṇaśūra and Lakṣmīśūra belonged or not has been a matter of controversy among scholars. Thus, R.L. Mitra\(^2\) refers to some people who believe that Vatsarāja (8th century A.D.) of Gurjara, dethroned the Buddhist king of Gauḍa. The latter was replaced by the former's soldier in-chief to be known as Ādiśūtra. The Uttara Rādhiya Kāvastha Kulapanṭikā, as pointed out by N.N. Vasu\(^3\), mentions the king Bhoja (C. 836-885 A.D.) of Gurjara - Pratihāra dynasty of Kānyakubja as Ādiśūra. According to P.C. Sen,\(^4\) a soldier in-chief of the said Mihirebhoja (c.836-885 A.D.) or son Mahendrapāla (c. 893-908 A.D.), and not of Vatsarāja as stated above, came to Bengal, while conquering certain localities of the country, and eventually flourished as a feudal lord of Gaḍmandāśāra (in the Hooghly District) in South Rādha (South-West Bengal). The said

3. Rajanyakandā, p. 129; R.D. Banerji (Bang. Iti., Reprint, p.271) is of the opinion that Ādiśūtra (732 A.D.) can never be regarded as Bhoja (836-885 A.D.)
feudal lord was, according to Sen\(^1\), probably a certain ancestor of Ādiśūra who, during the course of political disorder in Bengal, emerged as an independent ruler in South Rādha. K.C. Sinha\(^2\) is of the opinion that Ādiśūra may be identified with the lord of Gauḍa belonging to the Kāmbojā\(^3\) (South-West Kashmir and parts of Kafiristan) family or regarded as one of the descendants of the King mentioned in an inscription on the wall of a Śiva temple in the Dinajpur District (Bangladesh). There is a tradition, mentioned in Dhruvānanda Misra's Kārikā, as pointed out by N.N. Vasu\(^4\), that Ādiśūra came from the Dārada (Dardistān, according to Vasu\(^5\)) country (to the North of Kashmir) to Bengal. P.C. Bandyopadhyay\(^5\) also supports the same tradition and adds that the Śūras came to Bengal when the Kāmbojā family came to the country and also suggests

---

1. **Loc. cit.**
2. **Nabâyabharata**, p.46.
5. **Loc. cit.**
that the Śūras as feudal lords of the Kāmboja kings ruled in Kāpasuvarṇa in the Murshidabad District of West Bengal. M.M. Chatterji\(^1\) appears to be of the same view when he says that Ādiśūra was a "non-Bengalee king of Bengal." N.R. Ray\(^2\) is also of the same opinion when he suggests that the Śūras of Bengal were probably non-Bengalees, the possibility being dictated by the fact that the Senas and the Varmans of Bengal came from outside.

Further, according to Mitra\(^3\), Ādiśūra is identical with Vīrasena, the founder of the Sena dynasty of Bengal. Mitra\(^4\) argues that 'the word Śūra is a synonym of Vīra a hero, and ādi is indicative of the initial position which Vīrasena occupies in the genealogy of the dynasty.' Cunningham\(^5\) appears to endorse Mitra's suggestion when he says that "Vīrasena may have been also known as Śūrasena". R.C. Dutt\(^6\) also appears to support Mitra's identification when he mentions it in his work. H.P. Sastri\(^7\) suggests that Ādiśūra must have been a great

4. Loc. cit.
7. History of India, p. 34.
feudatory of the Gupta Emperors. Referring to the Sadvaidya-Kulacandrika of Jayasena Biswas, U.C. Gupta\(^1\) points out that a king named Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa of Sālbana in Daksīṇa Rāḍha assumed the title of 'Ādiśūra', as he brought Brāhmaṇas from outside Bengal for a Yajña (sacrifice). N.N. Vasu\(^2\) contends that the Śūra king may be taken to be the same as Jayanta of Kalhaṇa's Rājatarangini (the 12th century A.D.), and, according to him\(^3\), the Āin-i-Akbari\(^4\) has shown Jayanta and Ādiśūra as belonging to the two different dynasties because the two names, viz., Jayanta and Ādiśūra, have not been found mentioned in one and the same kulapaṇḍikā. Vasu\(^5\) also thinks that Jayanta having been elevated to the position of a king of Pañca-Gauḍa, assumed the title of 'Ādiśūra'. Vasu's suggestion has been supported by B.Mustafi\(^6\), N.N. Ray\(^7\) and P.C.Bandyopadhyay\(^8\).

But the existence of Jayanta as a king in Bengal has been doubted by scholars. Thus, M.A. Stein is not inclined to regard as a fact the romantic adventures of Jayāpīḍa of the Kārkotā dynasty of Kashmir which has led to the belief of the existence of Jayanta as a king of Pauḍravardhana (North Bengal). V.A. Smith supports Stein's view and adds that Jayanta is not known to 'sober history'. R.P. Chanda also observes that it is difficult to regard Jayanta as a historical personage in the absence of contemporary inscriptions and literary works revealing him and then rejects the identification of Ādiśūra with Jayanta, as made by Vasu, stated above, by referring to Kalhana and kulapanjikās. Chanda argues that the title Pañca-Gaudādhipa applied to Ādiśūra is not met with in inscriptions and literary works being given to any other king of Bengal and that Kalhana appears not to have described Jayanta as a king of five Gauḍa countries (Pañca-Gauḍa), but seems to have referred to five kings of Gauḍa (Pañca-Gaudādhipān).

3. Gaudarajamala, 1st ed., p. 18, note; H.C. Roy (Dy. Hist. North. Ind., Vol. I, p. 278) observes that "though it is not impossible that there may be some grain of historical fact in the stories of the adventures of Jayāpīḍa, all attempts to identify Jayanta must remain problematical".
4. Loc. cit.
According to Chanda\textsuperscript{1}, it would be wrong to accept the passages\textsuperscript{2}, as cited by Vasu\textsuperscript{3}, from the \textit{kulapanjikās} of Vamsivadāna Vidyāratna, (a \textit{ghataka}), a man of the 19th century A.D., for the identification, mentioned above\textsuperscript{4}, without judging the original source from which the said Vidyāratna collected the stanzas for his \textit{kulapanjikās}. Chanda\textsuperscript{5}, further, points out that the \textit{kulapanjī} and the \textit{Kuladosa} found in the house of the same Vidyāratna bear no such passages as stated above, nor any evidence that may help us in identifying \textit{Adisūra} with Jayanta. According to Monahan\textsuperscript{6}, "the whole of this theory is without historical foundation" as 'there is some doubt whether Jayanta ever existed'.

2. \textit{Bhusūreṇa Ca Rājnāpi Śrī Jayanta Sutena Ca} and \textit{Adisūra Sutena Ca}
4. See above, p. 10.
Further, according to Vasu\(^1\), a certain king of the Sūra family was probably described as Adisūra, as he was the first to assume the position of a king of Pañca-Gauḍa. In support of his contention he points out\(^2\) that the first ruler of the Bhanja dynasty of Orissa is called 'Adibhanja',\(^3\) the first ruler of the Varāha dynasty of Varāhabhūm\(^4\) in the Purulia District in West Bengal is known as 'Adivarāha',\(^5\) the first ruler of the Malla dynasty of Viṣṇupur in West Bengal is described as 'Adimalla'.\(^6\)

F.J. Monahan\(^7\) appears to support Vasu's view when he remarks that since mention of a chief named Raṇaśūra is found in the Tirumalai rock inscription of Rājendra Cola I, 'it is not at all improbable that there may have been a chief of that dynasty called Adisūra'. R.C. Majumdar\(^8\) has gone so far as to opine that the first ruler of the Sūra dynasty referred to in the Tirumalai rock inscription must have been called Adisūra. He also points out that the first ruler in the Ambaśṭha family

---

1. Rajanyakanda, p.98.
2. Loc.cit.
5. Rajanyakanda, p.98; on the evidence of Equmisra's Kārika (13th century A.D.) P.C. Sen points out that Adisūra has been compared with Adivarāha who was Mihirabhoja of the Fratihāra dynasty of Kānyakubja (op.cit., p.160).
is called 'Adisūra' because he was endowed with valour and heroism. Monahan points out that Vijayasena is referred to in some kulapaññikās "as an Adisūra" as he invited Brāhmaṇas from 'Meru' as known from the 25th verse of the Deopādā inscription of the said Sena king. P.Raya notices that Vigrahapāla II (tenth century A.D.) was driven out of Gauḍa and had to seek shelter with the Mahāsāṃanta (Great feudal lord) in South Rāḍha (South-West Bengal). According to him, the above Mahāsāṃanta may be taken to be Adisūra. P.L. Paul suggests the identification of the said Sura King with the Magadhādirāja Adisūra of the Dudhpani rock inscription (8th century A.D.) of Udayana. A Thakur suggests that Adisūra of the Maithil Vācaspatimisrā's Nyāyakāṇikā (841 A.D.) may be taken to be the same as that of kulajī works. P.C.Sen also supports Thakur's

1. Loc. cit.
5. Loc. cit.
view. Thakur's suggestion has been further developed by D.C. Sircar\textsuperscript{1} who suggests that Ādīśūra of the Nyāyakanikā was possibly connected with the Sūra family of Bengal and was probably a vassal of the Pāla rulers of Bengal and Bihar and was given a paramount influence in the tradition for some unknown activities of his. On the other hand, D.C. Bhattacharyya\textsuperscript{2} suggests that the same Ādīśūra was an honorific title assumed by king Nṛga, belonging to the Sāra dynasty of Mithilā, although, as U. Thakur\textsuperscript{3} observes, such a dynasty is not known to Mithilā, Bengal or Orissa either in ancient or medieval times.

Regarding the caste to which Ādīśūra belonged, the Āin-i-Akbarī\textsuperscript{4} (16th century A.D.) states that he was a Kāyastha. The same description is also mentioned in Dhruvānandamisra's Kārikā, as pointed out by N.N. Vasu\textsuperscript{5}. But in the Sadväidyakulapēṭikā\textsuperscript{6} of Kavikanṭahāra the said Sūra king is described as a Vaidya by caste. The same account is also found in the Viprakulakalpalata\textsuperscript{7}. In the Sanskrit Rājēvalī, as pointed out by R.C. Majumdar\textsuperscript{8},

\begin{itemize}
\item[2.] History of Nyāya-Nyāya in Mithilā, pp. 24-25.
\item[3.] The Indian Historical Review, Vol. III, No. II, pp. 443-444.
\item[5.] Visvakosa, Vol. III, p. 597.
\item[7.] Cf. Ballāla-Mohamudgara, p. 318.
\end{itemize}
the same Śūra king is, however, stated to have been the
first ruler in the Ambaṣṭha family. The same description
is also given in the Kulapradīpa of Dhanañjaya.
According to R.P.Chanda, the Kuladosa records that he
was born in a Kṣatriya family.

In the Rājāvalī, mentioned above, Ādiśūra is said
to have belonged to the Paṅca-Pravara and the Maudgalya-
gotra and has been described as proficient in the Vedas.

He is also described in the same work as the king
of countries including Bengal (Vaṅg-ādi-dese). In the
Kulatattvārvāvav he is specifically stated to have been
the conqueror of Āṅga, Kалиnga, Karṇaṭa, Kērala, Kēmarūpa,
Saurāṣṭra, Magadha, Mālava and Gurjara. It is narrated
in the Kulapradīpa mentioned above, as pointed out by
L.M.Bhattacharyya, that he defeated the Buddhists and
ousted them from the soil of Bengal. Both the
Bhadugī-Vamsāvāli and the Lāghubharata add that he
vanquished the Buddhist Pālas. According to R.D.Banerji,

4. Loc.cit.
it was not possible for Ādiśūra to annex Kānyakubja
in the time of Yaśovarman (c. 728-753 A.D.), the king
of that country, as held by N.N. Vasu.\(^1\) Supporting
Banerji’s view, P. Raya\(^2\) argues that Yaśovarman killed
Jibita Gupta, king of Gauḍa-Magadha and forced the
king of Bengal to swear allegiance to him and was defeated
by Lalitāditya, the king of Kashmir. Afterwards,
Kānyakubja passed into the hands of the Gurjara-
Pratihāras in about 780 A.D. Raya\(^3\) therefore, holds
that there is no case for assuming that Ādiśūra
became a king of Pañca-Gauḍa including Kānyakubja.

HISTORICITY OF THE TRADITION

The historicity of the tradition that Ādisūra brought five Brāhmaṇas from Kolānc̣a to Bengal, as stated above, has been doubted. The grounds for such doubt rest on the difference of accounts as regards -

(A) the genealogical position of Ādisūra,
(B) the reasons for bringing the Brāhmaṇas,
(C) the date of the advent of the Brāhmaṇas and
(D) their (i) names and (ii) gotras,
(E) the place from which they were brought,
(F) the place in which they were received by Ādisūra first,
(G) the condition in which they were seen at the time of reception by Ādisūra and
(H) their settlement in Bengal.

A GENEALOGICAL POSITION OF ĀDISŪRA

As regards the genealogical position of Ādisūra, there are, at least, six conflicting dynastic tables. P.S. Raichaudhuri has given an exhaustive genealogy. The same genealogy in the form of contraction is also preserved in the Ain-i-Akbari. The above work mentions

1. Ādisūra O Ballālasena, p. 27.
3. Loc.cit.
eleven kings headed by Udśūr, but the rest of the names do not end with the Ṣūra title. The relation among them is also not clear.

**TABLE I**

The table, as given by Raichaudhuri, runs as follows:

1. According to J.N.Sarkar, possibly the contraction of Ṭāisūr (Loc. cit.).
TABLE II

The genealogy, given by M.C.Majumdar\textsuperscript{1}, runs as follows:

(1) Kavisūra,
(2) his son Mādhavasūra,
(3) his son Ādisūra,
(4) his son Bhūsūra,
(5) his son Kṣitisūra,
(6) his son Dharāsūra,
(7) Pradyumnasūra,
(8) Varendrasūra and
(9) Anusūra.

The relation among the last three kings is not clear and even their relationship with the former kings is not clear.

TABLE III

Referring to the Gaude Brāhmaṇa, M.Chakravarti\textsuperscript{2}, has given a list of the genealogy which runs as follows:

(1) Ādisūra,
(2) Bhūsūra,
(3) Kṣitisūra,
(4) Avanīsūra,
(5) Dharanīsūra,
(6) Raṇasūra.

The relation among the kings is not clear.

\textsuperscript{1} Gau.Brah., p. 28, note.
**TABLE IV**

R.P. Chanda points out that the *Kuladose* contains names of seven kings belonging to the Sūra dynasty. They are:

1. Ādiśūra,
2. his son Bhūsūra,
3. his son Kṣitiśūra,
4. his son Avanīśūra,
5. his son Dharaṇīśūra,
6. his son Dharāśūra and
7. his son Anuśūra.

**TABLE V**

The *Kulatattvārṇava*, edited by Sarvānanda Miśra, preserves in it the following genealogy:

1. Mādhavaśūra,
2. his son Ādiśūra,
3. his son Bhūsūra,
4. his son Kṣitiśūra,
5. his son Mahīśūra,
6. his son Pṛthvīśūra,
7. his son Dharāśūra,
8. his son Candrasūra and
9. his son Somaśūra.

N.N.Vasu has compiled another table of the Śūra dynasty of Bengal. It runs as follows:

1. Kaviṣūra,
2. his son Mādhavaśūra,
3. his son Ādiśūra alias Jayanta,
4. his son Bhūṣūra,
5. his son Kṣitisūra,
6. his son Avanīśūra,
7. his son Dharanīśūra,
8. his son Yāminīśūra,
9. his son Raṇasūra,
10. his son Varendraśūra,
11. his son Pradyumnasūra and
12. his son Lakṣmīśūra.

It may be seen that the name Ādīśūra occurs in all the tables. The names from Ādīśūra to Kṣitisūra in the same order are common to all the tables except Table I, which contains Yāminībhānu and Anirudra after Ādīśūra who is listed after Mādhavaśūra in Table II, Table V and Table VI. The names from Mādhavaśūra, headed by Kaviṣūra except in

1. Rajanyakanda, p. 146.
Table V, to Kṣitiṣūra in the same order appear in Table II, Table V and Table VI. The names from Ādiṣūra to Dharaṇīṣūra in the same order are mentioned in Table III, Table IV and Table VI. The name of Dharāsūra is met with in Table II after Kṣitiṣūra, in Table IV after Dharaṇīṣūra and in Table V after Pṛthvīṣūra. The mention of Pradyumnaśūra after Dharāsūra is made in Table II and after Varendraśūra in Table VI. Varendraśūra is given after Pradyumnaśūra in Table II and after Raṇasūra in Table VI. Anuṣūra is placed after Varendraśūra in Table II and after Dharāsūra in Table IV. The name of Raṇasūra occurs in Table III after Dharaṇīṣūra and in Table VI after Yāminīṣūra.

The names from Yāminībhānu to Jayadhara of Table I are not common to any other table. Yāminīṣūra and Lakṣmīṣūra are new to Table VI and Mahīṣūra, Pṛthvīṣūra, Candrasūra and Somasūra are new to Table V.

According to the evidence of the Vipreklakalpalatā, as pointed out by U.C.Gupta, a king named Šālvāna, belonging to the Vaidya clan, was ruling over Bengal. Pratāpacandra was born in his family. Tejaḥśekhara descended from the latter. Ādiṣūra belonged to Tejaḥśekhara's

family. The Laghubhārata of Govindakānta Vidyābhūṣaṇa probably supports the evidence of the Viprakulakalpalatā when it appears to represent Tejaḥśekhara as the father of Adiśūra.

According to H.F. Sastri, Adiśūra was the eighth in the ascending line from king Śaśāṅka (first half of the 7th century A.D.). In the Rādhīya Kulaśajāka, as pointed out by P.C. Bandyopadhyay, Adiśūra is mentioned to have belonged to the Suddhaśicandra family. P. Raya, is of the opinion that the Ṣūras were the direct descendants of the Imperial Guptas.

Since the aforesaid genealogies are divergent and mutually conflicting, it is hardly possible to compile a reliable genealogy on the basis of them.

THE REASONS FOR BRINGING THE BRAHMANAS

The Kulajī texts differ in their accounts of the purpose for which the Brāhmaṇas were brought to Bengal. In different Kulajī texts at least six different religious ceremonies are referred to for the performance of which Adiśūra

imported Brāhmaṇas. For instance, as M.C. Majumdar\textsuperscript{1} points out, according to the Varendra Kulapāñjīka, Candramukhī, the queen of Ādiśūra, once observed the Cāndrāyaṇavṛata. She invited regional Brāhmaṇas and asked them to kindle fire to be produced from their mouths to perform the rites of the said Vrata. The Brāhmaṇas then declared their inability to do so. Infuriated at their words she said, "Notwithstanding the wishes of my father, how can I reside in a place where there are no Brāhmaṇas". The Śūra king assuaged her anger by inviting learned Brāhmaṇas from Kolāṇcā.

On the basis of Vamsivadan Vidyāratna, Majumdar\textsuperscript{2} refers to the Agnihotriya Yajña for their advent in Bengal and further alludes to the sacrificial feast, which was held in order to avert the threatened consequences of a long and oppressive drought, for their immigration.

The Kulatattvārṇava\textsuperscript{3} records that the Brāhmaṇas were brought to perform the Putresthi Yajña.

On the basis of the Kāvasthakuladīpikā, L.M. Bhattacharyya\textsuperscript{4} suggests that the performance of a rite to propitiate the wishes of God was the cause of their importation.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Loc. cit.
\item Op. cit., pp. 3-5.
\item Op.cit., p. 368.
\end{enumerate}
The *Kāṭiśaśvamaśavalīcarita* records that they were invited to officiate at the performance of a ceremony for obviating the evil effects of the fall of a vulture on the roof of the palace of the Śūra king.

Vācaspatimiśrā's *Kularāma*, however, states that the king of Kāśī (not Kānyakubja as in the other texts) being asked by Ādiśūra to pay tribute refused to do so, and in reply tauntingly referred to Ādiśūra's dominions as bereft of Brāhmaṇas and Vedic sacrifices whereupon the latter defeated the king of Kāśī in battle and brought down five Brāhmaṇas.

Scholars have referred to a few other ceremonies and circumstances. Thus, S.N. Tagore says that Ādiśūra having observed the triumph of vice among his people brought the learned Brāhmaṇas to conduct a ceremony for the purpose of arresting the progress of wickedness and obviating its evil effects.

R.M. Martin suggests that Ādiśūra's family being descended from a Brāhmaṇa and Sudra woman, he probably had reverence for the sacred order and accordingly he introduced five Brāhmaṇa families from Kānyakubja.

---

According to J.N. Bhattacharyya, the performance of one of the Vedic sacrifices is the cause of bringing them.

H.P. Sastri notices that the bringing of Brāhmaṇas by Ādiśūra was due to one of the results of the Pan-Indian Brāhmaṇa movement set on foot by Kumārila (7th century A.D.).

F.J. Monahan suggests that 'the Mohammedan invasion of North-Western India would furnish a very good reason for the migration of Brāhmaṇas from Kanauj (Kāanyakubja) to Bengal.'

M.M. Chatterji observes that the position of Brāhmaṇism in Kāanyakubja explains the importation from it into Bengal of five Brāhmaṇas by Ādiśūra.

S.C. Chakravartty opines that it was not unlikely that there might be want of Brāhmaṇas well-versed in Veda and Vedic sacrifices in Bengal. He says that sometime before or after the Imperial Guptas, there had been little or no prevalence of Vedic sacrifices.

5. Ind.Cult., Vol. XIV, p. 175.
or performances of such nature and if any king or noble desired to have them, a Brāhmaṇa would have to be imported from the North or Central India for the purpose.

On the evidence of Edumisra's Kārika (13th century A.D.), D.C. Bhattacharyya\(^1\) says that the five Brāhmaṇas were brought to adorn the palace of king Ādiśūra.

Besides the difference in the accounts of the purpose for which the Brāhmaṇas were brought, it is to be noted that many scholars do not believe that there was really any scarcity of the learned Brāhmaṇas in Bengal. Thus, R.G. Basak\(^2\) making reference to the five Dāmodarpur copperplate inscriptions observes that in the 5th and 6th centuries A.D. there was no such absence of Brāhmaṇas in Bengal. Basak\(^3\) also refers to the Faridpur copperplate inscription\(^4\) of king Dharmāditya (6th century A.D.) in which there is mention of Candra-svāmin of the Bharadvāja gotra, who was a Vājasaneyin and studied six Āṅgas. Besides, referring to the king Lokanātha's (7th century A.D.) Tippera Copperplate grant\(^5\) which makes mention of the sacred fires, pauranic deities, Brāhmaṇas versed in the four Vedas, etc., Basak\(^6\)

---

tries to justify the prevalence of Brähmanical influence in Eastern India in the 7th century A.D. On the basis of the Silimpur inscription of Jayapāla (9th century A.D.), Basak also observes that some of the old orthodox families of highly learned Brāhmaṇas had been residing in the village Śiyamba in North Bengal. Basak further refers to the description of Varendra (brahmakulodbhava) in Sandhyākaranandīn's Rāmacarita and opines that Bengal was always a home of learned Brāhmaṇas.

In support of Basak's contention, M.Chakravarti draws attention to the evidence supplied by the Bhuivaneswar Prasasti of Bhaṭṭabhaveśvara (the 11th century A.D.), which bears ample testimony to the practice of Vedic culture in Bengal. On the basis of the same inscription, Chakravarti also observes that scholars like Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa was the product of an age when and of a tract where general learning had been raised to a fairly high level. R.P. Chanda also holds the same opinion when he refers to the inscriptions of the 5th and 6th centuries A.D. as mentioned above. Further,

1. Ibid., Vol. XIII, pp.283ff.
2. Ibid., p. 288.
3. Loc. cit.
7. Loc.cit.
Chanda observes that the inclusion of the Karatoya, the Lauhitya (Brahmaputra) and places where the Ganges falls into the sea among the tirthas or holy places in the Mahābhārata (III.85.2-4) indicates that Bengal was recognised as a seat of Brāhmaṇism, for there could not have been Brāhmaṇical tirthas without a Brāhmaṇa population in the neighbourhood. R.C. Majumdar also endorses Basak's view when he says that in view of the evidence of the Pāla inscriptions it is difficult to believe that there was dearth of learned Brāhmaṇas in the time of Ādiśūra.

C

THE DATE OF THE ADVENT OF THE BRĀHMAṆAS

The date of the advent of the five Brāhmaṇas is variously put by different genealogical texts as is to be noted from the following passages:

1. Vedacandrāṇka (914) Saṁkta Gauḍe Vipraḥ Samāgatah
2. Vedabāṇāṇka-Saṁkta (954) ................
3. Ańke Ańke Vāmāgata Vedajukta tadā ....(994)

1. Loc. cit.
4. Navanavatya dhika-Navesati Śakābde ...(999)
5. Vedabārhima Sāke ....(854)^
6. Sāke Vedakalamba Śataka Vimite rājā-Adiśūraḥ sa Ca(654)^
7. Vedabāṅgā—Śake (654) ..^
8. Sāke Sarābchi -rtume (675 or 645) ...
9. Vedāyateśa - abdake (804) .....^
10. Vedabāṅgānavamāna - Śakābde (954) .....^
11. Ye anker nānyagati, trirāyṛti, tāramāgha māse
    (999 Samvat = 864 Sāke),
12. Vikrama era Uñavarga daśa Śata abda (999 Samvat = 864 Sāke)^

The above passages show that the migration of the
Brāhmaṇas is ascribed to so many dates as Śaka 654 (A.D.
732), 675(A.D.753), 804(A.D.882), 854(A.D.932), 864(A.D.
942), 914(A.D.992), 954(A.D.1032), 994(A.D. 1072) and
999(A.D. 1077).

It would thus appear that there is even a difference of more than three hundred years between the time of one source and that of the other for the same event. This being not very likely, the historicity of the event becomes doubtful. It may also be pointed out that, besides the discrepancy in mentioning the date of the advent of the Brāhmaṇas, the texts quoting the passages are all of much later date and hardly dependable.

The problem of determining the date of the advent of the Brāhmaṇas would have been much easier if the date of Ādiśūra who was responsible for bringing the Brāhmaṇas was known to us. But while N.N. Vasu has placed the Śūra King in 732 A.D. and H.P. Sastri support him, R.P. Chanda and B.C. Sen suggest different dates for the same king. Chanda argues that the genealogical trees of the present day Rādhiya and Varendra Brāhmaṇas, in some cases, cannot be carried back as early as the date suggested by Vasu. Chanda, however, suggests that Ādiśūra probably flourished in Rādha by the middle of the tenth century A.D. Chanda, in support of his suggestion, argues that the influence of

7. Loc. cit.
the Pāla rulers was still then prevailing in the early part of the eleventh century A.D. and the rise of the Varman and the Sena dynasty was caused by the revolt of the peasants in Varendra (North Bengal) in the latter half of the same century. Sen\(^1\) observes that it is difficult to accept the date offered by Vasu. He places Ādiśūra at the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. or near it, since no trace of the Śūras in Bengal is to be found before the date of Tirumalai inscription (1025 A.D.), mentioned above\(^2\). He argues that traditional and historical evidence appear to agree in pointing to their association with Rāḍha\(^3\) and that it is probable that shortly after the invasion of Aṅga and Rāḍha by the Chandella king Dhaṅgadeva, the state of affairs in the latter territory proved favourable for the foundation of a new dynasty by the Śūras, who shared it with the Kāmbojas\(^4\).

2. See page 3.
3. For discussion on the location of Rāḍha, See Chapter I, p. 2, note 3; p. 4, note 6 above and also see Chapter III below.
4. Loc.cit.
NAMES AND GOTRAS OF THE IMMIGRANT BRAHMANAS

No difference in the accounts of the number and names of the gotras of the five Brahmanas brought to Bengal is to be noticed in different Kulajī texts which, however, differ in mentioning the names of the Brahmanas.

According to the Rādhīya genealogist Vācaspatimiśra, the names are as follows:

(i) Bhaṭṭanārāyana of the Śāndilya gotra,
(ii) Śrīharṣa of the Kāśyapa gotra,
(iii) Dakṣa of the Bharadvaja gotra,
(iv) Chhāndāda of the Vātsya gotra and
(v) Vedagarbha of the Sāvarna gotra.

The names of the Brahmanas, as mentioned by Devivarā Vandypāḍhyā, are:

(i) Kṣitīśa of the Śāndilya gotra,
(ii) Medhātithi or Tithimēdhē of the Bharadvāja gotra,
(iii) Vītarāga of the Kāśyapa gotra,
(iv) Sudhāniḍhī of the Vātsya gotra and
(v) Saubhari of the Sāvarna gotra.

The *Varendra Kulapāṇijīka* has the following names:

(i) Nārāyaṇa of the Śaṇḍilya gotra,
(ii) Dharadhrāra of the Vātsya gotra,
(iii) Śuṣeṇa of the Kāśyapa gotra,
(iv) Gautama of the Bharadvāja gotra and
(v) Parāśāra of the Śāvarga gotra.

In view of the difference in the names of the Brāhmaṇas, the historicity of the tradition seems doubtful. Moreover, there is evidence of the existence of Brāhmaṇas of the five above mentioned *gotras* in Bengal before the time of the alleged advent of five Kolāṇca Brāhmaṇas. Thus, we find the mention of a Brāhmaṇa named Jayānandadevaśārman of the Bharadvāja gotra in the Belwa inscription² of Vigrahapaśa III (1055-1090 A.D.), and by assigning twenty five years to a generation we reach the middle of the tenth century A.D. for Mitrakaradeva, the fourth in ascent from Jayānandadevaśārman. Besides, a Brāhmaṇa named Prahasa of the said gotra is mentioned in the Siimapur inscription³ of Jayapāla (810-850 A.D.), and by applying the same process we go back to the seventh century A.D. for Pasupati, the seventh in

ascent from Prahasa. Moreover, the Midnapur inscription\(^1\) of Śāśānka (7th century A.D.) mentions a Brāhmaṇa named Dāmyasvāmin of the same gotra. Of the same century the Nidhanpur inscription\(^2\) of Bhāskaravarman makes reference to Brāhmaṇas of the said gotra, e.g., Arkadattasvāmin, Tuṣṭidattasvāmin, Varuṇasvāmin, Viṣṇupālitasvāmin, Śucipālitasvāmin, Mitrapālita, Arθapālita, Prajāpatipālitasvāmin, Vasudattasvāmin, Rudraghoṣasvāmin, Nāγadattasvāmin, Rūpūḍhyasvāmin, Viduṣasvāmin, Gaurisvāmin, Sucaritasvāmin, Bappasvāmin, Udayanasvāmin, Śivagaṇasvāmin, Viṣṇudattasvāmin, Janārdanasvāmin and Śukrabhavasvāmin. Furthermore, the Faridpur inscription\(^3\) of king Dharmāditya (sixth century A.D.) mentions a Brāhmaṇa named Candrasvāmin of the Bharadvāja gotra.

The Rāmapāla inscription\(^4\) of Śricandra of the tenth century A.D. mentions a Brāhmaṇa named Pitavāsagupta of the Sāṇḍilya gotra, and by applying the same process of assigning twentyfive years to a generation, mentioned above, we arrive at the ninth century for Makkadagupta, the fourth in ascent from Pitavāsagupta. Besides, the name of a Brāhmaṇa called Guravamisra of the said gotra appears in the Badal pillar inscription\(^5\) of Nārāyaṇapāla

---

(854-890 A.D.), and with the application of the same process we reach the seventh century A.D. for Vīradeva, the seventh in ascent from Guravamśra. Moreover, the Nidhanpur inscription\(^1\) of the seventh century, referred to above, mentions the names of some Brāhmaṇas of the Śaṅḍilya gotra, e.g., Anantasvāmin, Rāvisvāmin, Madhusvāmin and Mahīcharasvāmin.

The Samantasar inscription\(^2\) of Harivarman of eleventh century A.D. mentions a Brāhmaṇa donee (name damaged) of the Vātsya gotra, and with the application of the same process we find that Vedāgarbha, the grandfather of the Brāhmaṇa donee, belonged to the eleventh century A.D.

Besides, the Chhāndogyaparīṣṭaprakāśa\(^3\) of Nārāyaṇa of the said gotra narrates that his distant ancestor Dharma received the grant of a village from king Dharmapāla (eighth century A.D.). Moreover, the Nidhanpur inscription\(^4\) of seventh century A.D., mentioned above, contains the names of Brāhmaṇas such as Kuśmāṇḍpatrasvāmin and Śāsvatadāmasvāmin of the Vātsya gotra.

R.P. Chanda has admitted much later migration of a Brahmana named Ratnakaradevasarman of the Vatsya gotra from Madhyadeśa, of which Kanyakubja was the capital as known from the Barrackpur inscription of Vijayasena (1097-1159 A.D.). In view of the migration of the Brahmanas of the Vatsya gotra mentioned above, and Sāvarna gotra, mentioned below, Chanda believes that Adisūra might have imported Brahmanas from Kanyakubja for certain Vedic rites.

Caturbhujā, the author of the Haricaritakāvya (1493 A.D.), belonging to the Kāśyapa gotra, states that Svarṇarekha, the earliest man of his family, received the grant of the village Karanja from king Dharmapāla (8th century A.D.). Besides, the Midnapur inscription of seventh century A.D., mentioned above, mentions a Brahmapa named Bhaṭṭesvara of the said gotra. Of the seventh century the Nidhanpur inscription referred to above, makes reference to Brahmanas named Rṣidāmasvāmin, Śubhadāmasvāmin, Prakāśavarasvāmin, Ugradattasvāmin, Supratīghitasvāmin, Managhoṣasvāmin and Keśavasvāmin of the same gotra. Besides, the Vappoghoṣavāṭa

1. Manasi, 1321 B.S., Magha issue, p. 683.
inscription\textsuperscript{1} of Jayanāga (6th century A.D.) mentions a Brāhmaṇa named Bhaṭṭa Brahmavirāsvāmin of the same gotra.

The mention of a Brāhmaṇa named Bhaṭṭabhavadeva II of the Sāvarṇa gotra is made in the Bhuvaneswar Prāṣasti\textsuperscript{2} (11th century A.D.), and by following the same method of assigning twenty five years to a generation, we reach the ninth century A.D. for Bhavadeva I, the seventh in ascent from Bhaṭṭabhavadeva II.

The Nidhanpur inscription\textsuperscript{3} of seventh century, mentioned above, also refers to a Brāhmaṇa named Gomināgasvāmin of the said gotra. R.G. Basak\textsuperscript{4}, however, admits the migration of a Brāhmaṇa named Pitāmbaradevaśarman of the Sāvarṇa gotra from Madhyadesa into Bengal as known from the Velāva grant\textsuperscript{5} of Bhojovarman (12th century A.D.), although it is of much later date.

It is interesting to note that none of these Brāhmaṇas has been described as descendant of the Brāhmaṇas brought by Ādiśūra, nor even have they been described as immigrants to Bengal. All this goes a long way to take the story of the advent of the Brāhmaṇas as a fanciful one.

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., Vol. XVIII, pp. 60-64.
\textsuperscript{2} Ins.Beng., Vol.III, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{3} Ep. Ind., Vol.XII, pp. 64-76.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., Vol.XIII, p. 288.
\textsuperscript{5} Ins.Beng. Vol.III, p. 16.
According to the Radhiyakulapāṇi jīka, the aforesaid five Brāhmaṇas migrated from Kolāṅca, while the Vārendrakulapāṇi jīka states that they migrated from different places, viz., the Brāhmaṇa of the Śāṇḍilya gotra from Jambucatvara, the Brāhmaṇa of the Vātsya gotra from Tāmidt, the Brāhmaṇa of the Bharadvāja gotra from Audumbara, the Brāhmaṇa of the Śāvarṇa gotra from Madra and the Brāhmaṇa of the Kāśyapa gotra from Kolāṅca, the location of which is, however, disputed. According to Monier Williams, Kolāṅca is a "name of Kaliṅga (the Coromandel coast from Kuttack to Madras; but, according to some, this place is in Hindustān, with Kanauj for its Capital)". V.S. Apte suggests, Kolāṅca is the "name of the country of Kaliṅga."

N.N. Vasu says that the above-mentioned place, according to popular belief, is identical with Kānyakubja. But there is no evidence that can corroborate the view. Referring to the Sabdaratnavali, Vasu

2. For the different forms in which it is mentioned, see above, P.I.
6. Rajanyakanda, p. 130.
7. Loc.cit.
points out that the said locality is mentioned in the above work as some country; while there is a reference to Kānyakubja in the same work, it makes no mention of Kolāṅca. Hence the latter locality does not appear to be identical with the former place. Vasu, therefore, suggests that the name Kolāṅcal or Kolācāla has appeared in the form of Kolāṅca in the early kulapāñjikās. The territory where Kolas lived came to be known as Kolāṅcalā. It was situated in the Karnāṭa region in the Southern part of India. The Brāhmaṇas migrating from Karnāṭa to Bengal in the time of Rāṣṭrapūtās or Cālukyas described themselves as immigrants from Kolāṅcalā (Kolāṅca according to the version of kulapāñjīs). Vasu further suggests that the Brāhmaṇas of Kānyakubja migrated to Bengal at the invitation of King Ādiśūra, while some of the Brāhmaṇas who accompanied Kṛṣṇa Akālavāra, the Rāṣṭrapūta king, to Northern India, however, settled in Bengal and probably came to be described as migrating from Kolāṅca.

N.G. Majumdar locates the place in the ancient Śrāvasti country, i.e. the district round modern Set-Mahet on the borders of the Gonda and Bahraich Districts.

1. Loc. cit.;
of U.P., while N.K. Dikshit$^1$ is inclined to locate it in North Bengal (Bengladesh). Dikshit$^2$ has identified Kulāṇca (identical with Kolāṇca) mentioned in the Gaonri inscription$^3$ of the Paramāra king of Mālave with Kulāṇch in the Bogra District (Bengladesh). Although D.C. Sircar$^4$ considers the suggestion of N.G. Majumdar to be more reasonable, he believes$^5$ in the growth of Kolāṇca in North Bengal. According to him$^6$, Kroḍāṇchi and Kroḍāṇja mentioned respectively in the Amgachi inscription$^7$ of Vigrahapāla III and the Šubhaṅkara inscription$^8$ of king Dharmapāla of Kāmarūpa respectively are probably the same as Kolāṇca. Kroḍāṇja is stated to have been situated in Śrāvesti in the Šubhaṅkara inscription$^9$, mentioned above.

---

In his opinion the Hili-Balurghat region is called Sravasti in the Silimpur inscription of Jayapala and the Guakuchi inscription of king Indrapāla of Prāgjyotiṣa and Pahuniyojana in the Kudatini inscription. He appears to say that Sravasti was the new name of what was originally called Pahuniyojana. He, however, observes that a large number of Brāhmaṇas of Sravasti in the ancient Kosala country in Madhyadeśa (i.e. the Set-Mahet region in the Gonda and Bahraich Districts of U.P.), especially of Tarkārī in that region, were settled in the Hili-Balurghat area in North Bengal and that these Brāhmaṇas named their new settlements after their old habitation in U.P. He cites an instance of a similar settlement by referring to Pātaliputtiram in the South Arcot District, which was apparently so named by some people settling there from Pātaliputra (Near Patna).

2. Ep.Ind., Vol.XIII, p. 290
3. P.N.Bhattacharya, op.cit., p. 137.
The name of the capital of king Ādisūra where he received the five Brāhmaṇas is variously recorded in the Kulapaṇjikās. Thus, Vācaspatimisra's Kularēma and the Vārendrakulapaṇjikā record that the capital was at Gouḍa in North-West Bengal. The Kullatattvārṇava mentions Paundravardhana (which became the capital of Varendra) as the capital.

On the other hand, the Laghubhārata mentions Rāmapāla as the capital. The Rājāvalī also contains that Rāmapali or Rāmapalyā in Vikramapura (Bangladesh) was the capital.

2. Cf. Ibid., p. 41.
3. In the 7th century Karnasuvarna became the capital of Gouḍa country.
The condition in which the Brāhmaṇas met Ādiśūrā is known from the Vārendrakulapañjikā which records that they came on horse-back, wore stockings, had their sacred thread made of leather and allowed their whiskers and beards to grow, were in leather shoes and needle-sewed garments with lips betel-stained. The Śūra king was mortified to see them in such a position and pretended to be asleep and they could not see him. They on this, by incantations, made a wrestler's stick to send forth buds. The Śūra king, next day, hearing of this, and fastening his clothes round his neck, went to deprecate the wrath of the Brāhmaṇas who forgave him. The sacrifice was then performed with great pomp and in accordance with the ordinances laid down in the sacred books.

\* Cf. Gau.Brāh., p. 39, note.\*
PLACES OF SETTLEMENT OF THE BRAHMAÑAS IN BENGAL

According to L.M. Bhattacharyya,¹ the five villages, viz. Pañcakoṭi, Kāmakoti, Harikoṭi, Kankagrama and Baṭagama, were made over to five Brāhmañas to settle in. Bhattacharyya² suggests that the said villages were situated in the districts of Manbhum, Birbhum, Midnapur, Murshidabad and Burdwan respectively. N.N. Vasu³ has placed them in the Malda District, while on the evidence of the local tradition, K.P. Ghosh⁴ locates them in Vikramapur (Bangladesh). Ghosh⁵ argues that the existence of pācgān (Pañcagrama) and the settlement of a large number of Brāhmañas there probably supports the location.

2. Loc.cit.
5. Loc.cit.
There is difference in the accounts of the Kulajī texts as to whether the incident of bringing the Brāhmaṇas was peaceful or not. Thus, the Vārendrakulapañjikā records that they were sent to Bengal at the instance of Ādisūra, since the latter had married Candramukhī, the daughter of Candraketu, the king of Kānyakubja. N.N.Vasu says that it was not peaceful. Referring to Dhruvānandamiśra, Vasu states that Viśrṣimha, the king of Kānyakubja, did not concede to send Brāhmaṇas, as supplicated by Ādisūra, to Bengal except on pilgrimage whereupon the latter declared war against the former’s army. The same version appears in the Kulatattvārvāna. The Kularāma states that Ādisūra led a second expedition by which he won a decisive victory by a ruse. He made seven hundred local Brāhmaṇas ride on bulls and placed them in front of the army. The orthodox king of Kānyakubja being in fear of killing any Brāhmaṇa or bull agreed to send the Brāhmaṇas.

3. Loc.cit.
Scholars have attempted to explain the circumstances leading to the origin of the Adisūra story. Thus, according to N.N. Vasu, the name Adisūra meaning the first or the chief Sūra may have been given by the genealogists to one or more kings or chiefs. They, in furtherance of the orthodox movement of the reformation of Hinduism, may have introduced Vedic Brāhmaṇas and also Kāyasthas who were the followers of the reformed Vedic doctrines and practices, from Northern or Southern India into Bengal. It was, however, one of the results of the Pan-Indian Brāhmaṇical movement started by Kumārila (7th century A.D.). The first king, who brought the five Brāhmaṇas, assumed the title of Adisūra.

In continuation of Vasu's view R.C. Majumdar states that the story of the migration of the Brāhmaṇas (which was a common feature of the social life of early Bengal) from Madhyadesa to Bengal was the basis of the Adisūra story. Majumdar says that, as in early days the latter country was held in contempt by the Aryans, the migrants treated regional Brāhmaṇas with scorn and remained separated from them for maintaining their purity of descent. All other Brāhmaṇas, later, began to declare

3. Loc.cit.
themselves as the descendants of the Kolānca (U.P.) Brahmanas in order to prove themselves equal with the Brahmanas hailing from Madhyadesa. The majority of the Brahmanas, thus, with the passage of time, mixed up with the Brahmanas from Kolānca, and this accounted for the appearance of the legend about the import of the five learned Brahmanas in the kulapañjīs. Majumdar\(^1\), in this connection, refers to other stories of the same type. Thus, the Kulaṭattvārṇavā\(^2\) records that a king named Śūdraka, belonging to the Andhra dynasty in Varṣa, imported the Sārasvata Brahmanas. King Śaśānka (first half of the 7th century A.D.) of Kṛṇasuvanva invited the Śākadvīpi Brahmanas\(^3\), later known as Grahavipra, and the Vedic Brahmanas were brought to the country by king Śyāmalvarman\(^4\) or Harivarman\(^5\) as claimed by the Pāścatya Vaidikas. Of the above-mentioned kings all unlike Ādiśūra are known from the history of Bengal. In view of the above facts, Majumdar\(^6\) believes that the story of Ādiśūra must have been fabricated by the Brahmana authors of the kulapañjikās to establish their claim of pure descent.

1. Loc.cit.
5. Cf. Ibid., p. 469.
N.K. Dutt¹ seems to accept Majumdar's views when he states that the memories of the Radhiya and Varendra Brāhmaṇas of their foreign origin, their superiority complex and their attempt to keep themselves separate from the local Brāhmaṇas have given rise to such a legend. The following arguments have been given by Dutt² in support of his suggestion. The Anglo-Indians under British rule, who had not more than a small percentage of 'white' blood in their veins, looked down upon the 'native' of the soil and called England their 'home'. Very few of the Mussalmans of India would like to own their descent from native converts but would claim their origin from Arabia, Persia and Turkestan. Though the Aryan theory originated among European scholars less than two centuries ago and was unknown in India, it has spread such fascination in India during the short period of a century or so that the educated people of the northern part of India and also portion of her southern part would feel hurt if they are not mentioned as Aryans in descent.

2. Loc. cit.
D.C. Sircar has also attempted to show that the story was a late fabrication. According to him, the story in all its essential points was imported from South India. He has compared the account of the kulapañjis regarding the settlement of U.P. Brāhmaṇas in Bengal with similar traditions current in South India. According to the Kargudari inscription of the Hangal Kadambas, the mythical Mayūravarman (the progenitor of the family and sometimes also called Trilocana Kadamba) came to the south from the Himalayan regions and brought from Ahicchatra (modern Ramnagar in the Bereilly District) 18 Brāhmaṇas whom he settled in the Kuntala country. It may be noted that later Pallava inscriptions mention similar accounts of a mythical Trilocana Pallava who is said to have invited some Brāhmaṇas from Ahicchatra and settled them to the East of Śrīparvata, where he founded 70 agrahāras.

An inscription\(^1\) of the reign of the Cola King Kulottuiga III (1178-1216 A.D.) states how the ancestors of the Idaŋgai (left hand) communities settled in the Tamil country during the rule of the mythical king Arindama who imported a large number of learned and pious Brāhmaṇas from Antarvedi, i.e. land between the Ganges and Jumna. It is stated that the ancestors of the Idaŋgai classes (98 in number according to a later record) accompanied the said Antarvedi Brāhmaṇas as the bearers of their slippers and umbrellas and received five villages\(^2\) which now lie in the Tiruchirapalli District.

Sircar\(^3\), in this connection, observes: "No student of the social history of Bengal can fail to notice the close resemblance of the above tradition (i.e. the tradition of the mythical king Arindama) with the well-known

---

3. The five villages are Tiruvellarai, Pachchil, Truvāśi, Tiruppiḏavūr, Urrattūr and Kāraikkādu of Šennivala - Kurram - all of which are places now situated in the Trichinopolli District of Tamilnadu (*Loc.cit.*).
kulapanjī account of the importation of the ancestors of the kulīnas from Kānyakubja (in the same Antarvedī country), together with their Kāyastha servants by King Ādiśūra. This may of course damp the enthusiasm of those who even now believe in the historicity of the Ādiśūra story, though it is difficult to determine the contribution of South Indians, patronised by the Pāla and Sena kings, in the fabrication of the kulapanjī account.

In this connection, Sircar also draws our attention to the fact that the Pāla dynasty was matrimonially related with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Karnāṭa. It is well known that Rannādevī, the queen of Dharmapāla himself, was the daughter of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief named Pravala. Similarly, Bhāgyadevī, the daughter of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief named Tūṅga, was the queen of king Rājyapāla (c. 911–35 A.D.).

1. "The Trikāṇḍaṇeṣa regards Antarvedī and Kuśasthālī as synonyms whereas Kuśasthala is another name of Kānyakubja even according to the same work" (D.C. Sircar’s Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind., p. 29, note 2.).
2. Ibid., pp. 29–30.
while one of the queens of king Vīgrahapāla III (c. 1055-81 A.D.) was the sister of Rastrakūṭa Mathana or Mahana who ruled over Aṅga or East Bihar as a viceroy of the Pālas\(^1\). Moreover, there is reference to the Karnāṭakas as mercenary soldiers in the armies of the Pāla kings of Bengal and Bihar. Thus, the Monghyr plate\(^2\) of Devapāla (c. 810-54 A.D.) mentions the Karnāṭakas in the list of peoples serving the Pāla monarch. The Manahali plate\(^3\) of Madanapāla (c. 1144-61 A.D.) further expands the list of mercenaries by adding the Coḍas i.e. Colas, to it. Thus, the Karnāṭa soldiers continuously served in the Pāla army for more than three centuries. The entry of the tradition of Arindama into Bengal during the rule of the Pālas and Senas is considered by Sircar\(^4\) very probable. The Senas of Bengal actually hailed from Karnāṭa and must have patronised South Indians in the same way as the Māslim rulers of India entertained Musalmans of other countries at their courts. It may be noted that the Ādiśūra story in the kulapaṇjikās cannot be traced earlier than the late medieval period, while the very similar Arindama legend is at least as early.

as the twelfth century A.D. It is, therefore, very probable, as Sircar\textsuperscript{1} thinks, that the latter story regarding the import of U.P. Brāhmaṇas to the South was carried to Bengal by some Tamilian settlers migrating to Bengal during the age of the Pālas and Senas and it later appeared in the kulapaṇījīs as the Ādiśūra tradition about the import of Brāhmaṇas from the same region to Bengal. This is also supported by the use of the Śaka era (which was imported from the South where it was popular) in the Ādiśūra tradition of Bengal. Thus, there is, according to Sircar,\textsuperscript{2} probably no historicity in the story of the import of Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas.

\textsuperscript{1} Loc.cit.
\textsuperscript{2} Loc.cit.