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THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE HŪNAS

The invasion of the Hūnas on India has left deep impressions on its history and culture and the Indian society experienced a series of changes in the political, economic and social spheres after their appearance on the political scene of the country. Until now the history of the Hūnas in India remain confined to Toramāṇa and Mihirakula and even lacking a composite presentation of the facts related to the above Hūna rulers. Moreover, the history of political developments in the north-western region in which the Hūnas actively participated has remained obscure. The history of the Hūnas before coming to (or invading) India had prepared the necessary ground that determined the future course of Hūna activities in India. So, before discussing the Hūna activities in India, it is essential for us to make a survey of the Hūna activities in the north-western region and beyond the frontiers of India where they came in confrontation with the Sassanians, the Kushāṇashāhs, the later Kushāṇas and other tribes of their own ethnic stocks.

The Hūnas are first found to appear in Bactria where they replaced the Kushāṇashāhas, the governors of the Sassanians. After the end of the rule of Varhrān II Kushāṇashāh we find the
coins of Kidāra being issued in the Bactria region. The identification of Kidāra relents upon two divergent views— one identifying him with the Kushāṇas and the other with the Hūṇas. The Kidāra being a Kushāṇa chief is advocated by Cunningham, Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya, and others. Cunningham, on the basis of title 'Kidāra Kushāṇa Šāh' on Kidāra coins, designate him as 'Kidāra—the King of the Kushāṇas'. Cunningham further identifies Kidāra with 'Ki-To-Lo' of the Chinese writers, who conquered Gândhāra, and placed his son in the government of Peshawar, while he returned to the westward to repel an inroad of the White Hūṇas. Cunningham, on numismatic grounds calculates the date of Kidāra as A.D.417. He places the retirement of 'Ki-To-Lo' before the advance of the White Hūṇas earlier than A.D.428 or, say, about A.D.425, or perhaps even earlier. The important information concerning this problem is supplied to us by the Chinese work 'Wei-shu' or the 'Annals of the Wei Dynasty' which is quoted by Martin. The information runs as follows, "The kingdom of the Ta-Yueh-chi has for its capital the town of Lou-kien-chi (Balkh) to the west of Fo-ti-cha (Bamian) at a distance of 14,500 li from Tai (the Wei capital). The Ta-Yueh-chi found themselves threatened on the north by the Juan-Jaun, and were exposed on several occasions to their raids. They, therefore, migrated to the west and established themselves in the town of Po-lo (Balkan), 2100 li from Fo-ti-cha. Their king Ki-to-lo (Kidāra), a brave and warlike prince, raised an army, crossed to the south of the Great Mountains
(the Hindukush), and invaded Northern India, where the five kingdoms to the north of Kan-tho-lo (Gandhāra) submitted to him⁴. This piece of information of the Chinese sources associate Kidāra with the family of Ta-Yueh-chi or the Great Kushāṇas. Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya⁵ maintains the similar view following the Chinese sources.

The other view that Kidāra was a Hūṇa is sponsored by Gobl, Bivar and others, particularly on the basis of the coins. The scholars of this line believes that the Hūṇas entered on the political scene in two waves. In the first wave came the Kiārites, sometimes identified with the Chionites and in the second wave came the Hephthalites. Bivar observes, "shortly after A.D.360, when the reign of Varahrān II Kushāṇashāh came to an end, the next ruler to issue coins of the Kushāṇo-Sassanian fabric was the enigmatic figure of Kidāra. This personage was no doubt a Hun, to judge by the phrase 'Kidārite Huns' used by the historian Priscus in a later context"⁶. Kidāra after capturing Bactria from the Kushāṇashāhs, issued coins in gold and copper which are the close copy of his predecessor i.e. the Sassanian governor Varahrān II Kushāṇashāh. The first gold issues were still in the name of Varahrān but subsequently his own name and titles were added 'Bago Kidarо (ozorkо) Koshono (Shaho)⁷. The appearance of the title 'Kidāra Kushāṇa Shāh' on certain coins of Kidāra enables these scholars to propound that bearing the title of Kushāṇashāh
by Kidāra is the continuation of the earlier practice maintained by the Sassanian governors who bore the title 'Kushānashāh'. Bivar believes that, "The earlier Kushānashāhs (prior to Kidāra) were members of the Sassanian royal family. Their titles signifies, not that they were 'Kushāna' kings (as were their predecessors of the house of Kanishka), but they were 'kings over Kushānas'. The same would have been no less true of Kidāra. His adoption of the title of Kushānashāh would only have signified that he succeeded the control of the Sassanian Kushāna province, and adopted the title traditionally employed by his Sassanian predecessors". The similar view is expressed by Robert Gobi.

If we follow the theory of Cunningham, Chattopadhyaya and others, based on the Chinese sources, then it can be held that the area from Peshawar to Gandhara including Kabul valley, were under the occupation of Kidāra. But it seems doubtful in light of other sources. The account of Annianus Merceilinus records that Shāpur II (A.D.309-79) spent the winter of A.D.356-57 in Kabul where he was on the borders of Kushānas. The fact that Shapur II spent the winter on the eastern frontiers is confirmed by an inscription at Persepolis, dated in the year 48 of Shāpur II (i.e.A.D.356). Here emerges two possibilities. First, Kidāra was ruling over that area as a governor of feudatory of the Sassanian emperor and secondly that the area of Kabul valley had slipped away from the hands of Kidāra to the Sassanians. But the
reference of 'Kushāṇa border' by Ammianus Marcellinus testifies the separate existence of the Kushāṇa kingdom thus rejecting the first possibility. The view that the Kushāṇa kingdom existed in the east of the Kabul valley is strengthened by the Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta which mentions the term 'Daiva-Putra Shāhī-Šāhmūshāhī'. It is almost agreed that the term 'Daivaputra Shāhī-Šāhānushānī' represents the Kushāṇa family on the western border of India. If the Kushāṇa kingdom existed in the west of India and Kabul valley under the Sassanians then the possibility of Kidāra, whose coins are found to be issued in the Bactria region on the pattern of the Kushāṇashāh governors of the Sassanians, being a non-Kushāṇa ruler cannot be ruled out. Moreover, the existence of a powerful Kushāṇa kingdom in the second half of the fourth century is doubtful. Further, the numismatic evidences suggest eastward advance of Kidāra and not that first he moved to west from east and then from west to east. To add more the characteristic features of the Kushāṇa coinage found from the Bactria region are absent on the coins of Kidāra. On the other hand his coins carries the features which were characteristic of the Kushāṇashāh governors of the Sassanians.

Both the views that Kidāra as Kushāṇa and Kidāra as Hūṇa mainly rely upon two sources i.e. Wei-shu (Annals of the Wei Dynasty) and of Priscus respectively. Cunningham and others quote 'Wei-shu' to describe Kidāra as Kushāṇa Whereas Bivar and other,
asis of Priscus’s information, designate Kidāra as Hūṇa. Should be taken into consideration that Priscus was rary to the Hūṇas, who was in the camp of Attila, the conqueror whereas the ‘Wei-shu’ text was compiled from -554 which describes the history of contemporary ‘Wei’.

It seems natural that information of Priscus, who lived as is more reliable and authoritative.

Supposition that Kidāra was not a Kushāṇa ruler is further d by the coins which contain the title ‘Kidāra Kushāṇa’ the obverse and ‘Alakhāṇa’ on the reverse. According h the Bactrian legend ‘Alxonno’ (=Alxon) corresponds rāhmi legend ‘Alakhāṇa’. The tribal name ‘Alxon’ is ed in relation to the Chionites who, under their king s, assisted the Sassanian emperor Shāpur II during his Amida in A.D.360. Regarding the connection of ‘alxon’ Chionite Mitchiner observes, “The tribal name ‘Alxon’ sliterated OHIONO by Ghirshman and ALXONO by Gobl. Whatever he correct rendering, and Gobl’s appear more likely, it ally recognized that this is a tribal name written in Greek (as on coin no.1) script synonymous with the d version ‘Chionite’ given by the Roman soldier Ammianus nus when describing this people. Biswas refers a coin, discovered at Hidda Top during excavations legend in Greek. Regarding the legend, Biswas observes
that "The first half can be read as 'Khionoth' perhaps intended for Chionite. The latter half of the inscription seems to be 'OIONO' perhaps intended as Hiono or Hūna"\(^{18}\). The Chionites can be identified with 'Xiyon' ( = Chion), the Persian word for Huns. Thus, it will not wrong to suggest that the Chionites represented a group of Huns. In other words, it can be held, in light of the above discussion, that 'Alakhānē' on the Kidāra coins is synonymous with Greek word 'Alkon' which is further associated with the Chionites, the Huns.

It is almost agreed, as discussed in the preceding chapter, that the Hephthalites are identified with the Hūnas. Now, two distinct group of Huns appear, the first represented by the Chionites and the other by the Hephthalites. The fact that the Chionites and the Hephthalites represented two distinct Hunnic groups is supported by the accounts of Ammianus Mercellinus and Procopius. Describing the custom of disposal of deads, Ammianus Mercellinus informs that son of Grumbate, the Chionite king who assisted the Sassanian emperor against the Romans during later's siege of Amida in A.D.360, died in the battle and that he was cremated\(^{19}\). Procopius claims that the Hephthalites practised inhumation of their dead, up to twenty of his boon companions being buried with each of their chiefs\(^{20}\). Thus, in respect of their funeral rites, the Hephthalites contrast with those of the Chionites. In light of this, it can be suggested that the Huns
entered on the political scene on two times or in other words in two waves - one represented by the Chionites and the other by the Hepthalites. The Kidāra, perhaps belonging to the first wave, occupied the Bactria region in around A.D.360 ousting the Kushāṇašāh governors of the Sassanians from that region. It is believed that the Chionites may indeed have been substantially identical with the Kidārites and probably Kidāra was a successor of Grumbates as ruler over Chionites, who because of his leadership would have come to be known by his name. Kidāra, after capturing Bactria from the Kushāṇašāhs issued coins in gold and copper which are close imitations of his predecessor i.e. the Sassanian governor Varahrān II Kushāṇašāh. The first gold issues were still in the name of Varahrān but subsequently his own name and titles were added.

The Kidārites could not maintain their hold over Bactria for long. According to the Chinese sources followed by McGovern, a new wave of Hunnish invaders known as the Hepthalites fell upon Bactria towards the end of the fourth century A.D. and drove the Kidārites into Gandhāra. It might be possible that the Kidārites, after driven away from the Bactria region by the Hepthalites, came to occupy the area of Kabul valley which was ruled over by the Kushāṇašāhs - the Sassanian governors up to the last quarter of the fourth century. In the east of the Kabul valley existed the kingdom of the Kushāṇas. The Kushāṇa king had
invaded the Kushānāshāhs territories in the west which is testified by numismatic evidences. Burns, who has discussed the coins of Later Kushāna ruler Vasu, describing the king’s ‘ruler on throne’ copper coins, observes that “We may learn more from these later ‘ruler on throne’ copper coins as we find specimens showing overstriking on Kushāno-Sassanian coins minted in the mountains to the northwest (present day Afghanistan). This tells us that the south-eastern Kushānas under Vāsu defeated the Kushānas-Sassanian and captured one of their mints and returned with a great hoard of Kushāno-Sassanian copper coins”24.

When the Kidārites were drowven away from Bactria, they came to occupy the area of Kabul valley, the fact which is supported by the numismatic evidences. A coin (coin no. 1) which is struck from altered dies of the Sassanian Shapur II (A.D.309-79), carries, on the obverse, the bust of Shapur II with the pelvic legend in his name and a Greek legend ‘Alchono’. It is important to mention here that the portrait of the Kushānāshāhs disappeared from the coins and were replaced by portrait of their sovereign — the Sassanian emperor at about the time of Shapur’s sojourn in Kabul in A.D.356-57 and subsequently their name was also replaced by the Sassanaian emperor’s name25. The identification of the word ‘Alchono = Alxonof = Alxon’ is already discussed in relation to Kidāra plus Chionites.
When the Kidarites occupied the Kabul valley, the region in the east of it was divided into different kingdoms or principalities. According to 'We-shu' when Kidāra invaded India, the North-Western Frontier Province region was divided into five kingdoms. The numismatic evidences suggest the existence of the kingdom of the Shakas in the east of Kabul valley. Chattopadhyaya states, "The coins of the Shakas resemble so closely the issues of Knishka III and Vāsudeva II that we may safely assign them after the period of the last name monarch (i.e. Vāsudeva II)." The Shaka coins bear the names like Vai, Mi, Pu, Pa, Vi, Aya, Bhr, Sita, Bhu, and Saya which may be representing the name of the mints and the princes. Burns believes that the Kushāna and the Shakas both existed on the borderlands of the Gupta ruler, Samudragupta at least up to A.D. 375. He further states that the Kidarites might have been the cause of the extinction of the Shakas. About the kingdoms in further east, Chattopadhyaya observes, "In the Punjab plains two dynasties, the Shiladās and the Gaḍaharas, founded two independent principalities. As the name Samudra = Samudragupta, the Gupta emperor = is found on a coin of Gaḍahara chief, it is believed that these dynasties survived till at least the time of the Guptas. Though the date of Kidāra's invasion or occupation of north-western territories is not known but Cunningham places flourishing of Kidāra in this area in C.A.D. 425.
After conquering the areas in the east of the Kabul valley, Kidāra advanced further in the east where he came in confrontation with the Gadaharas. It is not yet certain whether the name Gadahara represented a king or a tribe. But the existence of Kushāna kingdom in the west or north west of India is upheld by scholars and which is also supported by Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudrapupta. Moreover, the Gadahara coins are found closely resembling the coins of Kushāna king Vāsudeva. Therefore, it can be held, though tentatively, that Gadahara might be belonging to the Kushānas. Here we shall be considering Gaḍaharas as a king for our convenience.

The numismatic evidences suggest a possible conquest of the Kidārites over the Gaḍaharas and the occupation of the later's territory by the former. The coins of the king Gaḍahara/Gaḍakhra are indicative of the conquest of the Kidārites. The earlier specimen of king Gaḍahra/Gaḍakhra are characterized by the vertically engraved name variant 'Gaḍahara' in the right field of the obverse. On some of these coins, the likewise vertically engraved Brahmi legend 'Kidāra' appear under the king's raised left arm. Mitterwallner observes that "the late Kushāna king Gaḍahra/Gaḍakhra, when striking these coins nominally recognized the authority of the Hun king Kidāra". After conquering the Gaḍahara territories, the Kidārites issued coins which are imitations of the king Gaḍahra/Gaḍakhra. On the gold coins of
Kidāra, the name of the king is vertically written in Brāhmi as on later Kushāṇa coins, from Vaiśu(Vaiśudeva III) onwards but instead of appearing in the right obverse field, it is now placed under the king's left arm, which was a characteristic feature on the gold coins of Samudragupta, the Gupta ruler.

Before recognizing the authority of the Kidāra, the later Kushāṇa king Gaḍahra/Gaḍakhra had acknowledged the overlordship of the Gupta emperor Samudragupta (c.A.D. 330-70). This is testified by the gold coins of king Gaḍahra/Gaḍakhra which portray the name Gaḍahra/Gaḍakhra engraved in the right obverse field besides the name 'Samudra' (for Samudragupta) under the left arm of the Kushāṇa king (coin no. 6). This relationship between the Kushāṇa king and Samudragupta is further strengthened and testified by the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta which states "---whose tranquil fame, pervading the whole world, was generated by establishing (again) many royal families, fallen and deprived of sovereignty, - whose binding together the whole world, by means of amplitude of the vigor of (his) arm, was affected by respectful sacrifices, bringing presents of maidens, (giving) Garuda tokens, surrendering the enjoyment of their own territories, soliciting (his) commands, (rendered) by the Daivaputra Shahis, Shāhanushāhis, Sakas, and Mūrūṇdas and by the peoples of Simhla and all other dwellers in islands ----". The subject of concern in the above description is the expression
'Daivaputra - Shahi - Shahanushahi'. There is considerable difference of opinions amongst the scholars, as to whether this expression represents one or different ruling powers. Allan prefers to take Daivaputra, Shahi and Shahanushahi as three different powers each representing one separate state. Alternatively, he was prepared to regard Shahi-Shahanushahi as one single unit stating "The Shahanushahi (or perhaps the Shahi Shahanushahi) is to be identified with the king of the Kushanas whose kingdom stretched from the Indian borders to the Oxus".

D.R. Bhandarkar argued long ago that it is one single compound designating some later Kushana king, as 'Daivaputra' being a 'tadhita' form means 'a descendent of Devaputra, and it cannot stand by itself. Moreover, it never occurs alone without the addition of Shahi or Shahanushahi or their Indian equivalents - 'Maharaja' or 'Rajatiraja', both in the inscriptions and on the coins. Smith holds that this compound title refers to the Chiar/t'i king Srumbates who fought with the Romans in association with the Sassanid emperor Shapuhr II below the walls of Amida in 359 AD. Raychoudhary sees in this honorific a reverence to the sassanids themselves besides the Kushanas who had accepted their superaracy. Mazumadar thinks that a Kushana ruler exercising sway over Kabul and a part of the Punjab and possibly other territories further to the west is intended here. Buddha Prakash, after examining the contemporary political situation, concludes that "It relates to a later Kushana king who was at
war with the sassanid emperor Shāhpūr II between AD. 350-356 and was in need of some aid to contend with this menace. Therefore, keeping in view the circumstantial evidences and the views of the scholars it can be held that the title 'Daivaputra Shāhī-Šāhānushāhī' must be representing the Kushāṇa ruler to the west of the Gupta kingdom. Perhaps the Gupta-Kushāṇa alliance came to an end when Kidāras subjugated certain parts of the Gaḍahāra territory, if not the whole and that was most probably materialized after the departure of Samudragupta from the Indian politics in c.A.D. 370. The expansion of the Kidārite rule in Kashmir, as suggested by their coins, perhaps took place after c.A.D. 370 and continued to exist till its occupation by the Hephthalites sometime around A.D. 460.

The kidārites were followed by the Hepthalites, the Huns of second wave, in Bactria towards the end of the fourth century A.D. From the foundation of their kingdom in Bactria until their conquest of northern Pakistan about A.D. 460 was the main period of their expansion. Khiṅgila, Toramāṇa and Mihirakula are ranked among the chief rulers of the Hephthalites. During the first half century, the Hephthalites consolidated their power over Bactria and repulsed the Sassanian attempts at re-conquest.

They did not crosse the Hindukush to the south but it was probably during this period that they extended their control northwards over Sogdiana where they introduced a currency of
silver drachms based on the Sassanian coinage of Bahram IV but legends in Sogdian script*. During the early fifth century, the Hephthalites extended their sway over the Kabul valley which remained earlier under the Kushānashāhs and then under the direct rule of the Sassanian emperors succeeded by the Kidārites around A.D. 420. After conquering the area of Kabul valley, the Hephthalites then conquered northern Pakistan from the Kidārites around A.D. 460 which is also the time of invasion of India by the Hephthalites. The conquest of northern Pakistan around A.D. 460 is testified by various contemporary texts and inscriptions*. For the following seventy or eighty years i.e. from c.A.D. 460 to c.A.D. 530/40, the Hephthalites were engaged in settling the scores with their Indian counterparts. During this period they conquered large portions of northern and Central India under the leadership of Toramana and Mihirakiula. During the period A.D. 530/40 - 560, there was little change in the situation of the Hephthalites. But in c.A.D. 560, their empire was threatened by the attacks from north-west. In about this year, the Sassanian emperor Khusru I (A.D. 531-79) inflicted a major defeat on the Hephthalites in Bactria giving Turkish tribes to the north the opportunity to invade and settle the northern Hephthalite provinces. The final and fatal blow to the Hephthalite power came after the complete annexation of Bactria in A.D. 710 by the Arabs.
The third group of the Hunic people is known by the name Napk-Shah or Napk-Malk (Napki Malik) as suggested by Gobl*7. Broadly their rule ranged from A.D. 475 to 560 over the areas of Pakistan, Kabul valley and Bactria as is known by their coins. On the basis of the analytical study of the coinage of Napki Malik, Mitchiner concludes that "The Napki coinage was inaugurated in the Kabul valley about A.D. 475 and subsequently modified slightly and adopted in Bactria and Pakistan in about A.D. 530 becoming a general Hephthalite (Hun) currency that endured for about three decades until the Turkish migration of c.A.D. 560"**.

Conclusively, it was around A.D. 460 that the Hephtalites made inroads into the Indian territory, the event which is recorded in the Bhitari inscription of Skandagupta. On the basis of Gobl’s assertions which suggest Khingila as the Huna ruler ruling from A.D. 430/40 to 490***, it can be held that the first invasion of India by the Hunas during the time of Skandagupta took place under the leadership of khingila. Khingila is also known to have issued coins which are discussed in the chapter on Huna coinage. Sung-yun gives the name of the Hephthalite king as 'Laelih' while describing the Ephthalite conquest of Gandhāra. The date of Laelih is placed by Sung-yun at two generations prior to the accession of the king who was reigning in A.D. 520, or some forty or fifty years before A.D. 515; or ranging from A.D. 465 to 475**. The Hephthalite king Laelih of Sung-yun can be identified with Khingila.
and the clue regarding the date of the Ephthalite ruler, as supplied by Sung-yun, more or less matches the present date of Hùṇa invasion on India i.e. around A.D. 460.

The Indian invasion of Hùṇas has the earliest recording in the Bhitari pillar inscription of Skandagupta\(^\text{31}\) (c.A.D. 454-67). Before entering into the Hùne-Gupta imbroglio, it would be necessary for us to make a brief survey of political condition of India before the Hùṇa invasion, which would facilitate us explain the facts more objectively and convincingly. Broadly speaking, the Gupta rulers exercised their influence over a considerable part of north and central India specifically upto the time of Kumaragupta I (c.A.D. 415-54). But the last days of Kumaragupta I rule witness some sort of crisis as noticed by scholars. The use of simple title Maharāja for Kumaragupta in the Mankuwar image inscription dated 129 G.E.\(^\text{32}\) has been interpreted by some scholars in terms that the last days of his rule were troublesome and there was definitely a deterioration in the status and prestige of Kumaragupta I. Fleet takes it as a case of carelessness and ignorance on the part of the drafter of the inscription\(^\text{33}\). Buddhaparkash finds this deterioration due to the combined invasion of Gupta empire by the Persian and Kāṅkas sometime between AD. 451 and 455\(^\text{34}\). But his contention is dismissed for lack of proper evidences. Aiyangar states that Kumaragupta suffered a defeat at the hands of the Huns and it was enough to
shake the foundations of the Gupta empire. J.P. Singh views silver plated coins of Kumāragupta I in large numbers from the neighborhood of Valabhi in Kathiawar, as a symptom of the threat to the Gupta dominions of a more serious politico-military nature than generally believed. He further explains the causes: "We are inclined to suggest that this jolt was given to the Guptas either by Sarvva or Sasa (Bhaṭṭāraka). Both Sarvva and Sasa are known only from their silver coins from parts of Western India. They were feudatories as known from their title Mahākṣatrapa but certainly not of Guptas. As the invasion of the feudatory kṣatrapas was directed towards the western provinces, its economy collapsed and thus a silver plated currency was issued, probably from the Gupta mint at Valabhi. J.P. Singh's assertions confirms some serious trouble that took place towards the close of Kumāragupta's reign and that Mūnas were not related to this problem. This problem did not end up with Kumāragupta's death but continued to be a source of constant trouble to Skandagupta as well.

Skandagupta's problems began from the time of his accession to the throne. His succession to the throne was not smooth and natural. The later inscriptions of the Guptas (after Skandagupta) does not mention the name of Skandagupta in the Gupta genealogy after Kumāragupta, rather we find Purugupta succeeding Kumāragupta. Skandagupta is known mainly from his Bhitari inscription which refers to him as the son and successor of Kumāragupta I but it
does not mention the name of his mother. The non-mention of his mother's name by Skandagupta inspired the scholars to doubt the legitimacy of Skandagupta's claim to the throne. R.C. Majumdar suggests that "his mother was not the chief Queen and hence he had no natural claim to the throne. Purugupta, the son of Mahādevī Anantadevī, was the rightful successor of Kumāragupta I." J.P. Singh holds that "Skandagupta's silence about his mother is strange and perhaps a definite indication of her doubtful social status."

Another important point often discussed in this connection is the non-mention of the expression 'tatpādānudhyāta' for Skandagupta in his Bhitari inscription. B.P. Sinha held that "the phrase 'tatpādānudhyāta' is a technical expression and denotes 'a legal or legitimate right to the throne', and because Skandagupta had no such right so it is avoided in his own inscription." Skandagupta's own Bhitari record uses these expressions to indicate the relationship of Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I to indicate their relationship with their respective fathers. Similarly in the Karmadaṇḍa stone inscription, Kumāragupta used the expression 'tatpādānudhyāta' to indicate his relationship with his father-Chandragupta II and according to Vākāṭaka inscription Chandragupta II used the similar expression to indicate his relationship with his father Samudragupta.
But the same practice is not followed by Skandagupta to indicate his relationship with his father. J.P. Singh observes, "The use of the term 'tatpādānudhyāta' to indicate the nature of relationship between a Gupta king and his father on one hand and a governor or feudatory in relation to his overlord on the other, shows that the expressions had assumed some special significance well before the Bhitari pillar was inscribed". In the light of the above discussion, the non-use of this expression by Skandagupta, leads to the possibility that he was not a natural heir to the throne as several other Gupta Kings before and after him. There is consensus among scholars that Skandagupta's succession was contested. This reconquest of the King followed by his accession to the throne, was followed by the appointment of governors in all provinces, possibly as a measure of strengthening and consolidating his kingship. If, however, the possibility of war of succession is ruled out, it will become difficult to infer about the special circumstances that necessitated the appointment of governors on such a scale, that too, after deep deliberations. Even if we accept 'malechha' as the correct word then it can be related to Sarvva, who as described earlier, was entitled Mahāksatrapa and representing his Saka overlords, though not ruling at that time. The concerned verse in the Junagarh inscription, revealing Skandagupta's achievements, informs that "----even (his) enemies in the countries of malechhas ---- having (their) pride broken down to
the very root-----It clearly means that his enemies were living in the country of malechhas. The country of malechhas can be the country occupied by Sakas earlier and 'enemies' denotes 'Sarvva' who were feudatory, certainly not of the Guptas, and bore the title 'Mahākṣatrapa' and who from the time of Kumārgupta I were creating troubles. So, it appears that most serious threat to Skandagupta's throne came from the Saurashtra province and it might be possible some persons connected to the royal house were involved in it, the hint of this kind bring provided in the Junagarh inscription which informs that the king spent days and nights to choose an able person for governorship® who could be loyal to him. The sort of crisis mentioned in the Junagarh inscription no where refers to the Hūṇas rather it was a serious revolt coming out of domestic or internal politics. The Junagarh inscription can hardly be believed to carry a hint of any foreign invasion.

The crushing defeat of Hūṇas by Skandagupta is mentioned in the Bhitari inscription. After making a comparative study of the Junagarh and Bhitari inscriptions, it appears that Bhitari inscription follows the Junagarh inscription in terms of chronology. The Junagarh inscription is dated from 456 to 458 AD and doesn't mention the Hūṇas at all. The term 'malechha' in the Junagarh inscription does not appear to be related to Hūṇas. J.P. Singh observes, "Towards the end of the verse 4th of the Junagarh
inscription, Fleet had conjecturally read 'malechha-deseshu and
the same reading has been accepted by all subsequent epigraphists
and historians alike. But the reading is not supported by the
plate of the inscription supplied by Fleet**. He further states,
"The third verse of the inscription refers to his conquered
enemies whose pride was broken to root. The verse 7th of the
Junagarh record probably also refers to these very enemies and
repeats the breaking up of their pride. And as the latter verse
refers to 'Sarveshu deseshu' in the verse 3rd of the epigraph it
should be preceded by 'Sarva'. If the reading 'Sarva' be accepted
instead of 'malechha', the connotation of the verse 4-7 of this
record becomes crystal clear and can be early explained. These
countries or rather provinces whose pride was broken by Skanagupta
and which were all provided with new 'Guptas' or governors connot
be any other regions but those that formed part of the Gupta
empire. It was this politico-military trouble that made the family
fortune to totter after the death of Kumaunagupta**. He concludes
"Thus, it seems to be well established now that there is no
reference to the Hūnas or for that matter any foreign power in
the Junagarh inscription. Therefore, the views expressed with
regard to the successive invasion of the Hūnas and the dates of
the invasion in the early years of Skandagupta fall to the
ground"**.
Even if we accept the righteousness of the word malechha, then it cannot be accepted to be related to Huṇas on the following grounds:

1. The identification of ‘malechhas’ with Huṇas cannot be established with certainty as the term itself has a broader definition which includes speakers of an alien language, social groups ranked as mixed castes, technologically backward tribes and the people along the frontiers. Even the indigenous people who were not practising the scared brahmanical rites were branded as ‘malechhas’.

2. There had been a fierce fighting between Skandagupta and the ‘Huṇas—to too fierce that the earth was shaken (Dharā-Kampitā). His ‘victory over Huṇa had brought him a heroic glory. Then, it is very surprising that such a prized conquest was simply termed as a conquest over enemies in ‘malechha desa’. Atleast Skandagupta might not have been allowing to pass off this heroic deed in such a casual way.

3. The term does not refer to Skandagupta’s conquests over ‘malechnas’ but ‘conquest over his enemies living in the ‘malechha-desa’ and ‘malechha desa’ did not represent the country of Huṇas specially at that time.

4. Varāhmihira’s account also rejects such supposition. Varāhmihira” in his Brihatsaṁhitā tells the influence of
planets on different tribes. In this context, he says that 'Ketu' presides over the 'Pahlavas', 'Sveta Hūnas', Cholas', 'Avaṅgas', 'Maru chinas; and the land of Malecchas. Here he separately mentions the Hūnas and the land of Malecchas.

Thus, on the basis of the above discussion it is clear that Hūnas cannot be identified with the Malechhas referred to in the Junagarh inscription. The Junagarh inscription is dated from AD. 455 to 457 which means that Hūna invasion happened sometime after AD: 457. The peaceful reign of Skandagupta is mentioned in the Kahaum record dated 141 G.E. (AD.460) on the basis of which some scholars believe that the Hūna invasion can be fixed only after AD. 460. J.P. Singh opines "This, event of Skandagupta's reign may have possibly taken place around A.D. 464". We donot find any specific grounds not to disbelieve this assumption except with a possibility of one or two years plus-minus.

Similarly the problem of the identification of battle field where Hūnas & Guptas fought, is quite ticklish. Agrawal has suggested "The fighting took place in Saurashtra or some where very close to it is most likely, as the province of Saurashtra seems to have given Skandagupta some very anxious moments". He further states, "there seems to be no justification for the view that the Hūnas had overrun the Gangetic plain upto Bhitari in Ghazipur district of eastern U.P. In the middle of the fifth
century the Hūṇas were carrying on a see-saw struggle against the Sassanians in Persia and their hands were not free for a full scale invasion into the very heart of India."7 As stated earlier, the Hūṇas emerged as a mighty political power and after settling their scores with the Sassanians and Kidāraites, they were free enough to concentrate on their Indian exploits and barring their initial invasion, they proved to be a formidable political power. Moreover, Agrawal's assertion that Saurashtra was the place of battle is based on the identification of Hūṇas with the 'malechha' of the Junagarh inscription and that has been placed wrong in the light of the careful examination of the contents of the Junagarh and Bhitari inscriptions. Lack of proper evidences bars us to reach to a particular conclusion.

It has already been suggested by Gobi and other scholars that Khingila, father of Toramāṇa, was the Hūṇa chief who ruled approximately from A.D. 430/40 to 490.8 Thus it was during his time that the Hūṇas were knocking at the Indian door around A.D. 460. Thus it can be placed that the first invasion of the Hūṇas on India during the reign of Skandagupta, was led by Khingila. Now the problem that arises is regarding the route of the invasion. Here we can take help of the archaeological evidences. R.S. Sharma, while explaining the urban decay in north India in Gupta and post-Gupta periods, on the basis of excavations, states, "The Hūṇa invasion may have destroyed some towns in the fifth century
A.D. Three such cases may be mentioned: Ajram, which is situated about 12 km. south-east of Hoshiarpur, Sanghol and Kausāmbhi. We are doubtful that the Hūṇas might have reached Kausambi in the wake of first invasion. But it seems certain that they had overrun and gained control of the Punjab which is testified by further explorations and excavations conducted at Sanghol in particular. Sanghol has yielded a number of antiquities particularly related to the Hūṇas. These included coins of Toramāna, Mihirakula and later Hūṇas, a sealing of Mihirakula along with evidences of Hūṇa onslaughts on Buddhism, besides some Kidārite coins. The entire chronology of Hūṇas in India is evidenced only on this site. The site of Sanghol witnesses the burian of 117 sculptures of the Kushāṇa period which according to G.B. Sharma, were dumped due to the fear of Hūṇa invasion. It appears from these discoveries that this site of Sanghol was their Indian headquarters from where they operated in the Indian affairs. The credit to enlight the richness of the site with special reference to the Hunas goes to G.B. Sharma who has been in constant touch with this site till today. From Sanghol, the Hūṇas directed their operation to invade the Gupta empire. It appears that the Hūṇas confronted with Skandagupta some where in western U.P. near the Banks of the river Gaṅgā. In this context we are supported by Fleet’s reading of the Bhitari inscription which gives the description of the battle like this, "-----just as if it were the roaring of (the river) Gaṅgā, making itself
noticed in (their) ears ----"?? Sometimes Fleet's reading of 'Gāṅga-dhvani' in line 15 of the Bhitari inscription is challenged and read as 'Shāraṅga-dhvani'?? But Fleet's reading appears to be correct. The river Gaṅgā, from its origin flows from north to south and in the western U.P., it takes a turn and flows from west to the east. The scope of crossing Gaṅgā from the western side appears in the western U.P. only. In this context, the importance of Sanghol in relation to the Hūṇas can not be ignored. Although, Bhitari itself, from where was found the inscription which records the defeat of Hūṇas by Skandagupta, is situated on the banks of the river Ganga but it is difficult to believe that the Hūṇas, in the very first attempt, reached the heart of the Gupta empire. Secondly, the Hūṇas, from the west, could reach Bhitari without crossing the river Gaṅgā. Thus, this all is indicative of the western U.P. as the venue of the battle. It is equally important to remember that in ancient times the rivers formed the boundaries of the kingdoms and every measure was adopted to check the enemy before it could cross the river. And perhaps the same happened this time. Skandagupta made the successful attempt to check the Hūṇas before they could cross the river Gaṅgā somewhere in the western U.P. Bhitari can not be the venue because we notice the discovery of the evidences of Skandagupta's successors from the area falling beyond Bhitari in the west. It indicates that Bhitari and the area in the west remained under the occupation of Skandagupta and his successors. Moreover, we donot find any
evidence of Hūṇas' presence between Sanghol and Bhitari. Kaūśāmbī has yielded a seal of Toramāṇa but as we know that during their first invasion the leader of the Hūṇas was Khiṅgila and not Toramāṇa and the discovery of Toramāṇa's seal from Kaūśāmbī can not be connected with the first invasion of the Hūṇas.

The result of the battle was the victory of Skandagupta who inflicted a crushing defeat on the Hūṇas. The defeat left very deep wounds on the Hūṇas and it jeopardized their future plans to invade the Gupta empire specially through this route. Even after this defeat the area of Punjab remained under the occupation of the Hūṇas. The second invasion of the Hūṇas comes nearly after thirty years when Toramāṇa began his political career approximately in A.D. 490. It seems possible that this period of thirty years was utilized by the Hūṇas to extend and establish their power in Kashmir. Because as we see that Toramāṇa, after entering into the western and central Indian politics was, in any condition, not able to spare time for the conquest of Kashmir. The Kura inscription of the time of Toramāṇa Shāh, which to our belief appears to be belonging to Toramāṇa, the Hūṇa ruler, was issued perhaps around A.D. 490.

During the second course of invasion, it appears that the route selected was through Rājputānā to Saurashtra i.e. southwards. In a span of thirty years many significant changes had taken place in the politics of India especially in western
and central India which later on became Hūṇas' area of operation. The significant change was the partial eclipse of the power and prestige of the Guptas which now shrunk to Bihar, Bengal and eastern parts of M.P. And U.P. The Gupta chronology after Skandagupta is found to be disturbed and confused which itself is a sign of decaying power of the Guptas. Out of this atmosphere of political turmoil and confusion, new kingdoms emerged who, earlier, had been owing allegiance to the Guptas. The western India completely slipped out of the Gupta's hands. In central India, the Aulikaras emerged as the powerful suzerains. The successors of Skandagupta were struggling hard to assert their status of 'Mahārājādhirāja who were facing the challenge of internal dissension. As a whole, the political scenario of the country was not encouraging and this state of affairs proved quite advantageous to the Hūṇas who had experienced earlier an imperial show of strength under Skandagupta.

As suggested above, the second invasion of the Hūṇas under Toramāṇa followed the southward route passing through Rājputāṇa. The fact that the Hūṇas, under Toramāṇa, followed the route passing through Rajasthan, to conquer the areas of Central India, is tackled by certain scholars. Dasaratha Sharma observes, "The Gupta control over Rajasthan must have increased during the next one hundred years of so and remained unimpaired upto c.A.D. 500 when the White Hūṇas raided India and passing whirlwind like
through the Punjab and intervening lands laid low the pride of
the Guptas in the battle of Evam. It is not unlikely that they
might have marched through Rajasthan to their objective; or it
might be that they turned to this land, after they had conquered
some other fair parts of India. The havoc at Bairata in which
Buddhist monuments were destroyed ruthlessly has made D.R. Sahni to
suggest such a possibility. A Similar suggestion comes from
Dr. Goetz regarding the destruction of the ancient shrines in
the area of Rangmahal, Badopal, Pir Sultan ki Dheri. And the
positive proof of their incursion can be had from the Bhimachunri
inscription of Kota area in which one Dhruvasvami, whose name
is written in the Gupta script, is said to have fallen fighting
against the Huna army.

We donot hear of any powerful kingdom in Rajaputana at this
time barring the presence of the Malava rulers in south Rajasthan.
It has been argued by some scholars, on the basis of the Mandasor
stone inscription dated in Malava year 493 and 529 (=A.D. 436
and 472) that the Gupta emperors continued to maintain their hold
over Rajputana till A.D. 472. But the arguments appears to be
unconvincing in the light of the contemporary political situation.
But, undoubtedly, the existence of the Malava kingdom in this
area as a political power cannot be denied. To understand the
Malava power in this area, a brief history of this kingdom requires
attention.
We find the Mālava referred to in context of the Alexander's campaign and in the Allahabad Praśasti of Samudragupta. According to S.B. Chaudhry, "a people of the name of the Mālava appear to have occupied the country round Nagar [Jaipur] in Rājputānā, 45 miles north of Kota, 25 miles to the E-SE of Tonk, where large number of coins bearing the legend 'Mālavāṇām Jayāḥ' are found." D.R. Bhandarkar says that in the Gupta period they migrated still farther southward as is indicated by the findspot of the inscriptions of the period and appear to have occupied Mewar and Kota of S-E Rājputānā and other parts of central India. The above quoted Mandasor stone inscription of Kumāragupta I and Bandhuvarman is dated in Mālava years i.e. 493 and 529, which is a clear indication of Mālava's occupation of Mandasor upto A.D. 472. The discovery of an inscription, of a chief of a dynasty of rulers known as 'Mālava Vamsa' at Nandsa in the Sahara district of Udaipur state in Rajasthan, has enriched our knowledge on the history of the Mālava kingdom. Venkatramayya, after making a careful examination of the record has suggested the following genealogy of the rulers mentioned in this inscription:

| Jayatsena     |
| Bhriguvardhana|
| Jayasoma      |
| Nandisoma     |
On this line, we are further guided by the discovery of two inscriptions of Mahārāja Gauri. The first inscription of Mahārāja Gauri was found at Chhoti Sadari near Neemuch station on the Ajmer-Khandwa railway line and is dated in the year 547 (=A.D. 490). King Gauri, belonging to the Mānvāyani family, gives the following genealogy:

Punyasoma
| Rājyavardhana
| Raṣṭra (called Raṣṭravaradhana in the second inscription)
| Yaśogupta
| Mahārāja Gauri

The second inscription which is fragmentary and undated was found at Mandasor (ancient Daśapur). It gives the following genealogy of king Gauri:

Raṣṭravaradhana
| Yaśogupta
| Mahārāja Gauri

Both the inscriptions appear to be representing the same ruling family. Mahārāja Gauri belonged to the Mānvāyani family (of Kṣatriyas) which seems to be derived from the Mālavas giving the meaning as belonging to the family of the Mālavas. The Nandsa inscription is dated in Vikrama year 289 (=A.D. 226) and engraved
during the time of Nandsoma. The inscription of Mahārāja Gauri is dated in Mālava year 547 (= A.D. 490). There lies a gap of nearly more than 250 years between Nandsoma and Mahārāja Gauri, we can assign a ruling span of about forty years to each king which appears to be convincing. Thus it will not be unnatural to suggest that Mahārāja Gauri belonged to the Mālava tribe. The Mandasor inscription of Mahārāja Gauri mentions the name of a king Ādityavaradhana whose identity is untraceable in the fragmented record. D.C. Sircar observes: "It will be seen from the contents of the inscription that Mahārāja Gauri excavated a tank in the suburbs of Daśapur for the merit of his diseased mother, when Narender Ādityavaradhana had his headquarters there. This would suggest that the latter was the overlord of the former who excavated the tank at his overlord's capital at a considerable distance from his own residence." Mirashi also considers Ādityavaradhana as the overlord of Mahārāja Gauri. Sircar gives the indication that Mandasor was the capital of Ādityavaradhana, which, to our belief seems to be correct. Mahārāja Gauri may be feudatory of king Ādityavaradhana ruling over in the south Rājputānā. The inscription itself gives the impression that it was issued by king Ādityavaradhana and not by king Gauri. The line 5 of the inscription states: "Śrī mahārāja Gaurina! Yasya mātāmahāḥ ——divam gate "meaning "Śrī māhārāja Gaurina whose mother ——passed away" (line 8). Here it seems that Mahārāja Gauri is being introduced and which cannot be applied
to the issuer of the inscription. Thus Adityavaradhana is the person who introduces Maharaja Gauri. So it can be assumed that Mandasor was the capital of Adityavaradhana and not of Maharaja Gauri. This assumption is further strengthened by the Mandasor inscription of Malava years 493 and 529 (=A.D.436 and 472) which tells that within thirty-six years at least three kings ruled at Dasapur. It is indicative of the turmoiled state that happened to be there in that period.

We know that there was the ruling family of the Aulikaras with 'avarman' ending names ruling at Dasapur (Mandasor). The king of this family were Jayavarman, Simhavarman, Naravarman (known dates A.D. 404 and 417), Visvavarman (A.D. 423) and Bandhvarman (A.D. 436). Some times, the name of a king Prabhakara is also added to the list of the above Aulikara kings5. The identification of king Prabhakara as the Aulikara king is nowhere reasonable and convincing. The Mandasor inscription dated M.S. 524 informs us that king Prabhakar, who was a destroyer of the enemies of the Gupta house was ruling at Dasapur in A.D. 467. The other inscription from Mandasor dated M.S. 493 and 529, informs us that 'other kings' were ruling at Dasapur between A.D. 436 and 472. The king Prabhakara can be placed in the list of the 'other kings' and his conquest over the enemies of the Gupta house strongly implies that he was the feudatory of the Gupta emperors probably of Skandagupta. It has been stated earlier that
Skandagupta appointed new governors in most of the provinces specially those who had created problems for Skandagupta by siding with his enemies. Perhaps, the 'varaman' line of Aulikaras belonged to that category which supported the enemies of the Skandagupta. And these 'varaman' (Aulikaras) were replaced, through this or that mean, by appointing Prabhākara as the governor of Daśapur who is credited with destroying the enemies of the Gupta house in the Mandasor inscription dated M.S. 524. These enemies of the Guptas house can be none other than the Aulikaras.

It appears that the Aulikaras retained the control of Daśapur after the death of Skandagupta defeating king Prabhākara – the feudatory of the Guptas. About king Prabhākara, M.G. Gardiner, who first published the Mandasor inscription dated M.S. 524, observes that: "He may have been appointed to the kingship of Daśapur by the paramount power (the Guptas), after the extinction of the 'varaman' dynasty to which Naravaraman of the Mandasor inscription of M.E. 461, Viśwavarmana of the Gaṇghāra inscription of M.E. 480 and Bandhuvaraman of the Mandasor inscription of M.E. 493 belonged. That Prabhākara was not a scion of the '-----varaman' dynasty is also corroborated by his name which, unlike those of all known members of that dynasty, does not end in 'varman'".

Thus on the basis of the above discussion it can be held that Mahārāja Gauri was the feudatory of the Aulikara king
Adityavaradhana who was ruling at Mandasor in A.D. 490. The Aulikaras under Adityavaradhana regained the control of Dasapur from the king Prabhākara, who was the feudatory of the Guptas, some time after the death of Skanda Gupta.

Before coming into conflict with the Aulikaras, Toramāṇa accomplished the task of Eran conquest. The Eran stone pillar inscription of the time of Buddhagapta dated G.S. 165\textsuperscript{2/5} confirms the occupation of Eran by the Guptas upto A.D. 484. The inscription records the erection of the pillar (dhvaja stambha) by Dhanyavishṇu with the grace and permission of his elder brother Mātrivishṇu in order to increase the religious merit of his deceased parents. The same purpose is cited in another undated inscription of Dhanyavishṇu of the time of Toramāṇa from Eran\textsuperscript{2}. But two significant political events took place between the time period of these two inscriptions from Eran. The first marks the change of overlord of Dhanyavishṇu who is now described as Mahārajādhirāja Toramāṇa. The second event recorded in the undated inscription is the death of Mātrivishṇu — the elder brother of Dhanyavishṇu. Both these events i.e. change in the overlord and death of Mātrivishṇu, took place sometime after A.D. 484. If we take A.D. 490 as the date of the beginning of Toramāṇa’s career as a king then the conquest of Eran by Toramāṇa can be placed in A.D. 491 as suggested by the undated inscription which states that “in the first year when Mahārajādhirāja, the glorious Toramāṇa, is
governing the earth**. The 'first year' is considered to be the regnal year of Toramâna. Hence Toramâna's Eran conquest can be safely placed in the A.D. 491. It is not certain that whether Mâtrivshnu died in this battle or not. But Toramâna's occupation of Eran appears to be continued up to around A.D. 510. It seems likely that Bhãnu Gupta, whose inscription has been discovered at Eran dated G.E. 191 (=A.D. 510)**, assisted Toramâna in his battle against the Aulikara ruler Prakãshdharman and the latter defeated the former. According to the Eran posthumous inscription of Bhãnu Gupta, in this famous battle, Goparaja, the able commander of the forces of Bhãnu Gupta, passed away and in turn Goparaja's wife committed sati. It becomes clear from this inscription that in A.D. 510 Eran was under the control of Bhãnu Gupta. And it is also certain that Toramâna, who conquered Eran in A.D. 491, had not lost it to Bhãnu Gupta in A.D. 510. Perhaps Bhãnu Gupta relation with Toramâna annoyed the Aulikaras and they adopted or followed the anti-Gupta attitude. The fact that Bhãnu Gupta assisted the Hûnas against the Aulikaras can be viewed in light of the fact that the Gupta ruler Narasimha Gupta Bãladitya was paying tribute to the Hûna ruler Mihirakula**.

We do not have any direct evidence of Toramâna's occupation of Mandasor. But there are reasons to believe that Mandasor was under the control of Toramâna, on the basis of the discovery of three copper plates of Maharaja Bhûta from Sanjeli in the
Panchmahal district of Gujarat which is not at a much distance from Mandasor. Mandasor falls between Eran and Sanjeli in a straight line and in light of the occupation of Eran and Sanjeli by Toramāṇa, it is quite possible that Mandasor also constituted as a part of his empire. Further more, the Aulikara kings before Prakāśhddharman mentioned in the Risthal inscription, bore simply the title of 'Senāpatī' which is, perhaps, not indicative of their independent political status. In the said inscription, Prakāśhddharman is entitled as 'Mahārājājādhirāja' which clearly establishes the independent status of the Aulikara king. In light of this, it may be possible that the Aulikara kings before Prakāśhddhaman were the feudatories of the Hūna ruler Toramana, who, by that time, had assumed the title of 'Parmabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājājādhirāja, as known from sanjeli copper-plate inscriptions. It appears possible that Prakāśhddharman retained the control of Mandasor after defeating Toramāṇa sometime before A.D. 515.

The Sanjali copper plates, which describe Mahārāja Bhuta as meditating on the feet of 'Parmabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājājādhirāja Toramāṇa', are dated in the years 3, 6, and 19101. The dates involve a score of controversies whether they represent the regnal years of Mahāhrāja Bhūta or Toramāṇa. These plates have been edited by R.N. Mehta and A.M. Thakkar with fascimile plates102. They refer all the three dates viz. 3, 6, and 19 to the reign of
Toramāṇa. On this basis, they have fixed the dates of that Hūṇa king and his son and successor Mihirakula. Their argument is as follows: "The total of the reign periods of Toramāṇa (19 years mentioned in plate III) and of Mihirakula (15 years mentioned in his Gwalior inscription) comes to thirty four years. The latter Hūṇa king was overthrown by Yaśodharman in circa A.D. 530 vide Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman of M.S. 589 (=A.D. 532). So, (A.D. 530 minus 34 =) A.D. 496 is the first regnal year of Toramāṇa's reign. The Maitraka king Droṇasiṁha (G.S. 183 = A.D. 503) and others who describe themselves in their grants as meditating on the feet of the Paramabhaṭṭāraka and who were ruling in the beginning of the sixth century A.D. in Saurashtra, were feudatories not of the Guptas as is generally supposed, but of the Hūṇas." V.V. Mirashi finds it difficult to accept these conclusions. Mirashi states that, "There should be no doubt that the dates 6 and 19 of plates II and III being the regnal years of Mahārāja Bhūta and Mahārāja Mātridāsa II respectively. The year 3 of plate I must similarly be regarded as the regnal year of Mahārāja Bhūta, though the name of his 'Paramabhaṭṭāraka' Maharājādhirāja illustrious Toramāṇa' being mentioned immediately after it causes suspicion in this matter". Explaining further, he states in ancient times when any feudatories dated their records, they mentioned in them their own dates, not those of their suzerain, though they described themselves as meditating on their feet. In anticipation to the objection 'How does
Dhanyavishnu date his Eran inscription in the first regnal year of his suzerain Toramāṇa?", he says, "if we read the inscription carefully, we shall notice that Dhanyavishnu is not mentioned there in as a feudatory of Toramāṇa, but only as a comm. ...".

The problem of dating can be partially resolved in light of similar copper plate grants of Mahārāja Svāmīdāsa, Mahārāja Bhulūnda and Mahārāja Rudradāsa. The Sanjeli copper plates of maharaja Bhuta gives the following genealogy:

Mahārāja Mātridāsa I
(Son)
Mahārāja Bhūta
(Son)
Mahārāja Mātridāsa II

The first two plates dated year 3 and 6 were issued by Mahārāja Bhūta while the third plate dated year 19 was issued by Maharaja Matridasa. The copper plate grants of Mahārāja Svāmīdāsa, Mahārāja Bhulūnda and Mahārāja Rudradāsa, which are closely related in nature, contents and findspot to that of Mahārāja Bhūta, are dated in years 67, 107 and 117 respectively. R.C. Majumdar, who has published the plates of Mahārāja Svāmīdāsa and Mahārāja Bhulūnda, refers the years to the Gupta era. V.V. Mirashi refers these dates to the Kalachuri-Chedi era supposed to have been founded by the Ābhira king Isvarasena in A.D. 248-49.
and therefore corresponds to A.D. 316-17, and 366-67 respectively. D.C. Sircar, on logical grounds, rejects Mirashi's conclusions. He held that the imperial titles 'Paramabhaṭṭaraka' and 'Maharajadhiraja' mentioned in the plates, were founded and popularised only by the Gupta emperor Chandragupta II and can hardly be expected in a record of A.D. 316 before the rise of the imperial Guptas. Finally, Sircar acknowledge the dates in the Gupta era.

Therefore, keeping in view the close proximity or similarity of above copper plate grants of Maharaja Bhūta, with the grants of Maharaja Svāmīdāsa, Bhulunda and Rudradāsa, it can be held that the dates in the Sanjeli copper plated does not represent the regnal year of Maharaja Bhūta and must be following some popular era. But as we know that the popular Gupta era was brought to an end by the Hūṇas under Toramāṇa. It is also known, presently, that the date represent the regnal years of Toramāṇa. If we go with A.D. 490 as the beginning of Toramāṇa's rule, then the dates 3, 6, and 19 of the Sanjeli copper plates must represent the dates A.D. 493, 496, and 509 respectively. If there existed any connection between Maharaja Svāmīdāsa, Bhulunda, Rudradāsa, and Maharaja Mātridāsa I, Bhūta and Mātridāsa II, the following genealogy can be established:

Maharaja Svāmīdāsa --- year 67 (+319=A.D. 386)
Mahārāja Bhulunda --- year 107 (+319=A.D. 426)

Mahārāja Rudradasa --- year 117 (+319=A.D. 436)

(relation not established)

Mahārāja Mātridāsa I --- year ?

(Son)

Mahārāja Bhūta --- years 3 and 6 (+490=A.D. 493 and 496)

Mahārāja Mātridāsa II --- year 19 (+490=A.D. 509)

The Gupta era i.e. A.D. 319 has been used in case of the first three rulers as Gupta era is found to be only popular era in their times. Whereas the last three of the Sanjeli copper plates found to be living in Toramāṇa's time and hence their dates are related to Toramāṇa's accession of throne i.e. in A.D. 490. Thus the whole discussion brings in focus that Toramāṇa beginning his career in A.D. 490, conquered Eran in A.D. 491 and the area surrounding Sanjeli i.e. Saurashtra in A.D. 493. Mandasor also passed into Toramāṇa's hands, sometime between A.D. 491 and 493. Toramāṇa continued to exercise his control over Eran, Saurashtra and adjoining areas upto A.D. 510. During this period he issued coins closely resembling to that of Kumāragupta's central Indian type. Two such coins are now preserved in the British Museum. On the obverse of the coin is the head of the
king on the left and Brāhmi numerals in front of the head. On the reverse is peacock standing, facing, with wings and tail outspread, circular marginal legend in Brāhmi: 'Vijitavaniravanipati Śrī Toramāṇa diva jayata' (i.e. Vijitavaniravanipatiḥ Shri Toramāṇa divam jayati), meaning ‘King Toramāṇa, who has conquered the earth, wins the heaven’ (coin no. 42). The figures for the dates or rather year on each of the British Museum pieces were read as ‘82’ or rather ‘182’ by E.J. Thomas, and as 52 by A. Cunningham, J.F. Fleet and V.A. Smith. The year concerned was considered by Fleet as the regnal year of Toramāṇa. Cunningham favoured the attribution of the year either to the Śaka era, with the hundred omitted, or to a white Hūṇa era of A.D. 456 or 457. His alternative suggestion was accepted by Smith. B.N. Mukherji gives more convincing explanation to the years concerned. He observes, ‘There can hardly be any doubt that these figures should be deciphered as ‘80 sa’ and interpreted to denote ‘sa(mavatāsara) or year 80.’ The numerals on coin no. 2 should be read as ‘87’. And since there is no evidence of his inclination to use any other specific era, the years ‘80’ and ‘87’ on his coins may be attributed to the same Gupta era which was used on their prototypes (i.e. on the Gupta silver coins). It should, however, be noted that Buddhagupta’s silver coins of central Indian type or fabric, the earliest of which at least must be placed before the beginning of Toramāṇa’s coinage, are dated to the year 175 and perhaps even to the year 180 of
the Gupta era. Hence if the year 80 and 87 of Toramāṇa's coins are to be assigned to the same reckoning, we must concede that the Hūṇa king used the 'Gupta saṃvata' with the figures for hundred omitted. If this hypothesis is correct, year '80' and '87' of Toramāṇa's coins correspond to the year 180 and 187 respectively of the Gupta era of A.D. 319-20. Thus, Toramāṇa's silver coinage started in 180 + 319-20 = A.D. 499-500 and for year 187, it is A.D. 506-07. This period (from A.D. 499 to 507) represents the zenith of Toramāṇa's reign particularly in central India, enjoying the title of 'Parmābhāṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja'.

The conquest of Kauśāmbī also constitutes one of remarkable achievement of king Toramana. A seal of Toramāṇa was discovered in the Ghoshitarāma monastery during the excavations of Kauśāmbī. It has been opined by Sudhakara Chattophadyaya that it was Mihirakula and not Toramāṇa who conquered the Gangetic valley and that the Kauśāmbī sealing bearing the legend 'Toramāṇa' was carried to Kauśāmbī from somewhere else and, therefore, should not be taken as the evidence of Toramāṇa's conquest of that region. Thapalyal, on the other hand, confirms Toramāṇa's conquest of Kauśāmbī and observes "Seal and sealings, no doubt, can be carried to long distances, but the present sealing is different from the normal type. The legend, 'Toramāṇa', is impressed on the same lump on which is also impressed the seal
of the 'Ghoshtirāma' monastery. In fact, the first impression was struck over the second. Both the impression on the lump were evidently made at the same time or within a very short period when the clay was still moist. The seal of the Ghoshitarāma monastery was undoubtedly struck at Kauśāmbī where the said monastery was located, and hence the second seal should also have been struck at the same place and before the clay lump (on which the impressions have been made) dried. The sealing, therefore, did not come from outside, but originated at Kauśāmbī itself, which lends support to the view that the region of Kauśāmbī was under the rule of Toramāṇa".

Thus Toramāṇa had his control over Saurashtra, Mandasor (?), Eran, Kauśāmbī including Rajasthan, Punjab, Kashmir and western U.P. from A.D. 490 to A.D. 510. But after A.D. 510, his fortunes, particularly in central India appears to be sealed by the Aulikaras. The Risthal stone inscription11 records the crushing defeat of Toramāṇa by the Aulikara king Prakāśhdmharman - the defeat which went unnoticed before the discovery of this inscription. The inscription has been edited with a plate by K.V. Ramesh and S.P. Tiwari120. It was further discussed and explained by V.V. Mirashi121 and Ashvini Agrawal122. Verse 16 of the inscription (Mirashi version) refers to the victory of Prakāśhdmharman on Toramāṇa as follows: "By his victory he has falsified the imperial title of the Hūṇa which, up to the time of
king Toramāṇa, had become established on the earth through his footstool being variegated by the clusters of the rays of the crestjewels of princes (bowing to his feet)". Mirashi\textsuperscript{123} believes that the defeat of Toramāṇa by Prakāshadharman was followed by the earlier defeats of Toramāṇa's predecessors by the said Aulikara ruler. But this assumption does not seem correct in light of the above discussion. The inscription is dated in the M.S. 572 (=A.D. 515) and on this basis Ramesh and Tiwari\textsuperscript{124} had presumed that Toramāṇa's career as a successful adventurer had ended by A.D. 515. It can be presumed that defeat of Toramāṇa by Prakāshadharman occurred sometime before A.D. 515. As we had discussed earlier that the Sanjeli copper plates and his central Indian type coinage indicates the closure of his reign in A.D. 509 or 510. It may be possible that Prakāshadharman defeated Toramāṇa around A.D. 510.

So, after this defeat, Toramāṇa's power and prestige in central India was shattered and Mandasor once again became part of the Aulikara territories. The fate of Saurashtra remains obscure due to lack of evidences. But the Hūṇas' occupation of the areas of north and western India continued uninterrupted under Mihirakula. The Hūṇa's occupation of Eraṇ perhaps continued even after Toramāṇa. Possibly, Toramāṇa delegated the supervisory powers and administration of Eraṇ to Bhānugupta. So, the reference of a famous battle in Eraṇ posthumous inscription of Bhānugupta dated A.D. 510 should not be considered as a fight against the
Hūnas. Probably, Bhānugupta in this battle, participated against the enemies of the Hūnas who, most probably were the Aulikaras. In this battle Bhānugupta’s military commander Goparāja passed away in memory whose a pillar at Eran was installed. Over this was engraved the said inscription dated A.D. 510. Perhaps, the acceptance of Hūna’s sovereignty by the Guptas angered the Aulikaras who, under Yasodharman, were prepared to settle the scores with the Hūna-Gupta combine. The reference of a statement in the undated Mandasor stone inscription of Yashodharman that he (Yashodharman) possessed the countries which not even the Guptas and the Hūnas could subdue, perhaps represent the Hūna-Gupta combine.

Conclusively, Toramāṇa’s reign can be termed as partially a reign of peace, barring a single defeat by the Aulikara king Prakashadharman and expansion of the Hūna rule in India. His reign does not mark the cruel oppression of the Buddhists in India as evidenced by the Kura inscription of the time of Toramāṇa Shāhār which records the construction of a Buddhist monastery by Roṭa-Siddhavridhi. This fact is tackled in detail in the next chapter.

Mihirakula: (c.A.D. 510/15-540.)

Toramāṇa was succeeded by his son Mihirakula who ascended the throne sometime after A.D. 510. The history of Mihirakula’s character, conquests and defeats is known through a variety of
sources, viz., literary, epigraphical and numismatics. But they do not present a composite picture of Mihirakula's reign. The account of Hiuen-Tsang, Sung-yun and Tārānath, Kalahana, Gwalior inscription of Mihirakula, Mandasor inscription of Yashodharman etc., although carry information about Mihirakula yet in terms of chronology of the events and the dubious character of the sources, it is very difficult to give a final shape to Mihirakula's rule with the help of these scattered references. But despite these limitations, these various sources help us to trace a detailed account of Mihirakula's reign.

At the time Mihirakula's accession the throne, certain political developments occurred in Central and Eastern India which led to the formation of new political equations. The Aulikaras had by now established themselves as a powerful and prestigious force in Central India. The internal politics of the Gupta kings is manifested through their assertive efforts to regain the old glory. However, three major political forces i.e. the Hūṇas, the Aulikaras and the Guptas dominated or shared the political affairs of northern, central and eastern parts of the country respectively. The Gupta kings, among three, had the lowest weight and it is evident from the accounts of Hiuen-tsang that the Gupta king Narasimhagupta Bālāditya was paying tribute to Mihirakula which is indicative of the fact that the Guptas were still continuing to accept the overlordship of the Hūṇas. Before
we discuss the Hūṇa-Gupta relationship, the Hūṇa-Aulikara relationship require prior attention, which also involves the much controversial issue of the final defeat of Mihirakula.

We have two inscriptions of Aulikara king Yashodharman from Mandasor – one dated in M.S. 589127 (=A.D. 532) and the second undated128. The Gwalior stone inscription of Mihirakula records the 15th regnal year of Mihirakula’s reign127. If we take Mihirakula’s accession to the throne around A.D. 510, then the date of this inscription can be placed around A.D. 525. Our contention, here, is to clear the fact that the undated Mandasor inscription of Yashodharman, which carries the information of Mihirakula’s defeat by Yashodharman, was issued later than the Mandasor inscription of Yashodharman dated M.S. 589 (=A.D. 532). It can be argued on the following grounds:

1. The defeat of Mihirakula, as is generally believed, broadly falls around A.D. 530. If we take this defeat around A.D. 530, then how is it possible that it remained unreflected in the Mandasor inscription issued just after one or two years, i.e., in M.S. 589 =A.D. 532.

2. It is equally surprising and doubtful that the name Hūṇa does not appear even for a single time in the inscription dated M.S. 589 =A.D. 532 whereas it is boldly mentioned in the undated inscription.
3. Thirdly, the dated inscription has the description only of administrative officers of Yashodharman.

So, in light of these considerations is clear that the undated Mandasor inscription of Yashodharman was issued later than his dated inscription dated in M.S. 589 = A.D. 532. Hence it can also be assumed that defeat to Mihirakula by Yashodharman was inflicted after A.D. 532. Keeping in view the fact that the engraver of both the dated and undated inscriptions is the same person named Govinda, we can convincingly place a gap of around five to ten years between the issuance of these two inscriptions. Thus the date of Mihirakula's defeat by Yashodharman can be placed around A.D. 540.

The Hūṇa-Gupta relationship requires to be dealt in light of the political developments in the Gupta empire, though filled with confusion. The Gupta ruler still followed the legacy of Bhānugupta of paying obesince to their Hūṇa masters. The account of Hiuen-tsang testifies that the Gupta emperor Narasimagupta Bālāditya was paying tribute to Mihirakula. So, the Hūṇa-Gupta relationship in terms of master and subordinate still existed. The position of the Guptas in relation to the Hūṇas and the Aulikaras had been reduced to the status of the poor third. The Mihirakula's character was creating doubts and insecurity in the Guptas whereas they were equally fearful and worried of the growing power of the Aulikaras. In these circumstances, it is
not expected that the Gupta ruler Narasimhagupta Bālāditya can alone inflict a decisive defeat to Mihirakula. Moreover, the political interests of the Aulikaras were expected to come in direct clash with the Hūnas and not with the Guptas. For political reasons, it might be possible that the Guptas sided with the Aulikaras and possibly that enraged Mihirakula and he opted to attack the Gupta frontiers. The Aulikaras, this time, might be coming in support of the Guptas and they unitedly by fought and inflicted a defeat to Mihirakula. The possibility of reasons other than this that incited Mihirakula to attack the Gupta ruler, cannot be ruled out.

Hiuen-tsang's account of Mihirakula provide a wide information regarding his character and his relations with the Guptas. Hiuen-tsang's information, in brief, runs as follows:

"Some centuries before the period (A.D. 629-45) when he was on his Indian travels, there was a king named Mihirakula (Mo-hi-lo-kiu-lo) who established his authority in the town of Sakala, and ruled over India. He desired, in his leisure time to study the Law of Buddha. But becoming enraged with the Buddhist priests, because they appointed, instead of themselves, a mere household servant to enlighten him, he issued an edict to destroy all the priests through out the five Indies, to overthrow the law
of Buddha, and to leave nothing connected with it remaining. At this time there was a king of Magadha named Bāladitya, who profoundly honoured the law of Buddha. Hearing of the cruel persecution and atrocities of Mihirakula, he strictly guarded the frontiers of his kingdom, and refused to pay tribute Mihirakula raised army to punish his rebellion. And then Bāladitya, knowing his renown, said to his ministers: 'I hear that these thieves are coming and I cannot fight with them, by the permission of my ministers I will conceal my poor person among the bushes of the morass'. Having said this, he departed from his palace and wandered through the mountains and deserts. Being very much beloved in his kingdom, his followers amounted to many myriads, who fled with him and hid themselves in the islands of the sea. Mihirakula committing the army to his younger brother, himself embarked on the sea to go to attack Bāladitya. The King guarding the narrow passes whilst the light cavalry were out to provoke the enemy to fight, sounded the golden drum, and his soldiers suddenly rose on every side and took Mihirakula alive as captive and brought his into the presence (of Bāladitya). Bāladitya ordered that your crimes admit of no extenuation and you must die. Hearing this,
mother of Bālāditya, interfered in the matter and
finally secured his release. After that Mihirakula
left the island. Mihirakula's brother having gone
back, established himself in the kingdom. Mihirakula
having lost his royal estate concealed himself in
the isles and deserts, and going northwards to
Kashmir, he sought there an asylum. The king of
Kashmir received him with honour and in pity, gave
him a small territory and a town to govern. But after
some years, Mihirakula stirred up the people to
rebellion, and placed himself on the throne. After
this Mihirakula made an expedition to the west,
against the kingdom of Gāndhāra. He took the king
in ambush and killed him, exterminated the royal
family and the chief minister, overthrew the stupas
and destroyed the samgharamas, and slew large number
of the people by the side of the river Sindhu. Then
he took the wealth of the country that he had
destroyed, assembled his troops and returned. But
before the year was out, he died.\textsuperscript{131}

The above account of Hiuen-tsang gives detail picture of
Mihirakula's activities and his character. But this is not free
from certain inaccuracies and flaws particularly the description
of geographical features like mountains, deserts, sea, islands
and narrow passe. Similarly, the description of certain political events, like movement of Mihirakula in despair and frustration for some years which is a clear indication of break up or gap in Mihirakula’s rule and which is not supported by any other evidence, raises the doubts regarding the authenticity of the document. It seems logical that the anti-Buddhist policies of Mihirakula, perhaps, motivated Hiuen-tsang to present Mihirakula in such a humiliating way that a powerful king of north India is described as begging for his life from his feudatory. The intentions of the author becomes more clear in the light of the limitations of the character of Narasimhagupta Baladitya who is described as fleeing away from his palace for some safer place due to the fear of Mihirakula’s attack. The author does not give a convincing detail of how such a weak ruler could defeat such a powerful ruler like Mihirakula. Moreover, the geographical features mentioned in the account of Hiuen-tsang are not in consonance with the physical features of north India specially the Gangetic area which would have been the only area for the Huna-Gupta conflict.

Hiuen-tsang visited India a hundred years later than the time of Mihirakula and it would have been possible that Hiuen-tsang was not supplied the true information regarding the Huna-Gupta conflict. Neither the Gupta victory over Mihirakula is preserved in any contemporary record. Had there been a Gupta victory over
Mihirakula then, certainly, it would have been finding a special coverage in the Gupta records. In the above description, Narasimhagupta Bālāditya is described fighting alone against Mihirakula without the assistance and support from any other contemporary king. As we know that Narasimhagupta alone was no match to the Hūna power and if he really defeated Mihirakula then support from any other contemporary king was imminent. But we donot find such reference of a supporting king in Hiuen-tsang's story. The non-mention of Yashodharman in Hiuen-tsang's story, who was a key figure in the Huna - Gupta - Aulikara struggle, indicates towards the possibility that Hiuen-tsang was unaware or not well equipped with the information of the contemporary political events and personalities. If we believe that Narasimhagupta defeated Mihirakula, then it would have led to the final departure of Mihirakula from the Indian political scene, as appears from the story. It means that Mihirakula's defeat by Yashodharman would have come earlier to the former's defeat by the Gupta King. Then how it alluded from the Hiuen-tsang's accounts?

It is known that the purpose of the visit of Hiuen-tsang was to collect maximum information regarding Buddhism in India. For this he came into contact with Indian Buddhist scholars, monks and heads of the Buddhist monasteries. It is quite obvious and natural that these Buddhist scholars and monks must be
cultivating a feeling of hatred against Mihirakula who can be branded as the biggest persecutor and destructor of Buddhism in Indian history. In this way, Hiuen-tsang was supplied one way information and that modelled the contents of the story with the help of the historical characters and he felt consoled and satisfied in awarding a literary punishment to the greatest persecutor of Buddhism i.e. Mihirakula.

We have other literary accounts of Sung-yun, Kosmos and Taranath at our disposal which throw some light on the history of Mihirakula. Taranath’s account of history of Buddhism in India records the information about Mihirakula, which, in brief, is as follows: "In the time of ‘Dharmachandra’, king of Magadha, a Turushaka ruled in Kashmir and Hunnimanta, king of Persia, ruled over Lahore and Multan. One day seeing on his queen’s dress the footprint mark of the king of Magadha, he was affronted and invaded the country of Magadha, where he demolished the temples of Buddha. Then Buddaparkash, Raja of Benaras, with the princes of west and south India attacked Hunnimanta and killed him, and re-established the religion of Buddha." The account of Taranath bears a close resemblance with that of Hiuen-tsang and it is believed that while describing Mihirakula (i.e. Hunnimanta of Taranath), Taranath is influenced by the record of Hiuen-tsang. But despite this limitation of the account of Taranath, it provides a different reason for invading the emperor in the east from that
given by Hsiien-tsang, although both are related to Buddhism. It is also believed that Tārānath, in his story of the dress of the queen of Hunnimanta, imprinted with the footprints of a certain king, is simply following Kalahaṇa. Thus Tārānath’s source of information for his work was based on Hsiien-tsang and Kalahaṇa. Kalahaṇa’s account relates the story as follows: “One day the king perceived the marks of the footprints on the breast of his queen. He was told that the queen wore a jacket made of cloth from Simhala, which was marked with the golden footprints of the Simhalese king. The king flamed with anger, and with his large army of elephants marched towards Simhala to give a lesson to the king. He subdued the country, deposed the reigning king and enthroned a new chief. While returning from Lanka, Mihirakula conquered the Chola, Karnāṭa, Lāṭa and other kingdoms.”

A Persian writer of 13th century, Muhammad Vali in his ‘Majmu’ al Tawarikh’ gives the same story, but in his version the footprints were of a Sindh king named Hala.

The information of Kosmos Indico-pleustos (A.D. 522-530) runs as follows: “In India further up the country, i.e. further north, are the White Hūṇas. The king named Gollas, it is said, goes forth to war with not less than 1000 elephants, besides a great force of cavalry. This ruler tyrannizes over India. Once when he laid the siege to a certain inland city of India, protected all round by water . . . his army drank up all the water, and he
took the city. Gollas of the Kosmos is identified with Mihirakula for he has some coins inscribed with the name 'Mihiragula' and so it is quite possible that Kosmos has abbreviated the full name in to the last half.

Sung-yun, a Chinese pilgrimage, who visited India in A.D. 520, entered Gāndhāra, where he found that the reigning king was an Ephthalite (Ye-tha-i-li-to) who didnot believe in Buddha. He was warlike, and kept 700 war-elephants. Peshawar was on his frontier, and he had been at war with Kipin for three years regarding his boundary. The pilgrim adds that "It was formerly called the country of Yepolo", and that since the conquest by the Ye-thas, who set up 'Lae-lih' to be the king, two generations had passed away.

We shall utilise this information to explore the problem of Mihirakula's defeat by the Gupta ruler Narasimhagupta Bālāditya as held by Hiuen-tsang. On the basis of the information supplied to us by Hiuen-tsang, Tārānath, Kalahaṇa, Sung-yun and Kosmos, the following observations, keeping aside their limitations, can be made:

1. Militarily and individually Mihirakula was a very powerful and strong emperor and consequently he, unlike Toramāna, was referred and the works of the above authors.
2. The defeat of Mihirakula is recorded only in the account of Hiuen-tsang and Tārānāth and it is also held that Tārānāth received this information from Hiuen-tsang. Hence it can be said that Hiuen-tsang’s account is the sole source of Mihirakula’s defeat by the Gupta ruler.

3. The accounts of Hiuen-tsang and Tārānāth differ in explaining the reasons that incited Mihirakula to attack the Gupta king.

4. All the above accounts present Mihirakula as a declared anti-Buddhist.

5. It can be held that only the accounts of Buddhist authors i.e. Hiuen-tsang’s and Tārānāth’s, record the defeat of Mihirakula, while the works of Kosomos, and Sung-yun, who were contemporary of Mihirakula, and that of Kalahaṇa a later writer do not record the defeat of Mihirakula.

It gives support to the supposition, as stated earlier, that Buddhists were cultivating a feeling of hatredness towards Mihirakula and that inspired and modelled the contents of the story of Mihirakula’s defeat, thus giving them a sense of consolation and satisfaction by awarding a literary punishment in their writings by showing Mihirakula defeated.
Thus, in light of the above discussion, it is difficult to accept that Narasimhagupta Bālāditya, the Gupta ruler, had ever inflicted a defeat on Mihirakula, as claimed by Hiuen-tsang. This problem can further be discussed in the light of the Gupta politics. The Nālandā seal of Vishnugupta gives the name of last three Gupta rulers as Narasimhagupta II, Kumāragupta III and Vishnugupta. On the basis of fifth Damodarpur copper plate dated G.S. 224, the date of Vishnugupta has been placed at A.D. 543. If we assign an average rule of ten years each to Kumāragupta III, father of Vishnugupta, and Narasimhagupta II, grand father of Vishnugupta, then the dates of the last three Gupta rulers will be following:

Mahārājādhirāja Narasimhagupta II = A.D. 523

Mahārājādhirāja Kumāragupta III = A.D. 533

Mahārājādhirāja Vishnugupta II = A.D. 543

So, all these three Gupta rulers appear to be the contemporary of the Mūṇa king Mihirakula. The story of Hiuen-tsang, which states the defeat of Mihirakula by Narasimhagupta Bālāditya, projects the final departure of Mihirakula from the Indian politics. But as stated earlier that Yashodharman defeated Mihirakula around A.D. 540 which means that upto around A.D. 540 Mihirakula was still ruling north and central parts of India.
Therefore, the defeat of Mihirakula by the Gupta ruler Narasimhagupta Baladitya, as claimed by Hiuen-tsang, is shrouded in mystery and confusion and puts a question mark on the said defeat.

So, apart from this controversial conflict of Mihirakula with the Guptas, it appears from other sources that his rule was not a peaceful one and marked a troubled period of Hūṇa rule. Mihirakula's main troubling zone was the north-west region which, according to Kosmos, challenged the authority of Mihirakula in Gāndhāra and Kashmir. It may be possible that Mihirakula, after the departure of Toramāṇa, did not inherit the portions of central India. Hiuen-tsang records Sakala (modern Sialkot in Pakistan) as the capital of Mihirakula and in this light. It can be observed that the area around Sakala constituted the main area of Mihirakula's activities. This is testified by the accounts of above discussed authors. His conquests of central parts of India came sometime after his accession to throne and again he was left confined to the north-western affairs after facing a defeat at the hands of Aulikara king Yashodharman around A.D. 540. Probably, Mihirakula, met with an end while dealing with his north-western affairs.

In the north-west, according to Gobi, Kapiśā which belonged to the Alxon during the reign of Khiṅgila and Tormāṇa. Probably fell to the NSPK at the death of Toramāṇa, The King of Kipin,
who, according to Sung-yun in A.D. 520, had been at war with Mihirakula for more than three years because their border was in dispute. After the retreat of the Alxon from India, Kapisa as well as Gandhāra, probably fell into the hands of the Nspk. This is all the more probable since numismatic evidences attest to the Alxon movement from India in the direction of Zabulistan. The Nspk is considered another Hūna group by Gobl. Kapisa is recognised as a kingdom and not as a capital by Gobl. Thus it can be held that due to challenges to his authority in the north-west, Mihirakula could not pay much attention to consolidate his power in Central India particularly after his defeat by Yashodharman.

Evaluating the career of Mihirakula, it can be held that Mihirakula, probably began his career as a king around A.D. 510 and met with an end around A.D. 540. In the ruling span of about thirty years, he faced defeat in the north-west by the Nspk, another Hunnic group and in central India by Yashodharman. He observed anti-Buddhist attitude which brought him in the books of contemporary and later writers.

Later Hūnas: After the departure of Mihirakula from the Indian politics, the Hūna legacy was maintained in pockets i.e. in Rajasthan, Punjab and Kashmir. In Rajasthan, they lost their independent identity after merging into the Rajput fold. In Punjab, they continued to rule where they came in confrontation
with the Maukharis and the Pushpabhūtis. Kashmir formed the part of the later Hūṇa rulers belonging to the central line of the Hūṇas, with their headquarter in Zabulistan. In India, the Hūṇas remained politically alive up to the time of Kalachuri king Karṇa who is known for marrying a Hūṇa princess.

In the post-Mihirakula period, the Indian politics took a new turn. The Guptas, the Hūṇas and the Aulikaras as dominant forces were replaced by the later Guptas, the Pushpabhūtis and the Maukharis. The rise of new political powers marked the beginning of new political equations in which the Pushpabhūtis or the Varadhanas emerged as the most dominant group. The period representing these developments is characterised by the exit of the imperialistic forces from the political scene of the country except Harshvardhan's, shift of central seat of power from Pāṭliputra to Kannauj etc. In the changed environment, the Hūṇas, the Maukharis, the Vardhanas and the later Guptas were involved in the mutual conflicts. Although the political prestige and the influence of the Hūṇas, which they enjoyed under Toramāṇa and Mihirakula, could not be protected and preserved by their successors but still they were not completely wiped out of the political scene of the country. The Hūṇa factor was noticed and felt in the camps of the Maukharis and the Vardhanas.

In the Maukhrai inscriptions, the Hūṇas are not directly referred to in conflict with them. The Jaunpur inscription of
Isvaravarman gives a distant reference of the Hūnas. The inscription states, "Of him, whose spotless fame spread far and wide over the regions, the son (was) king Isvaravarman, ... with virtues which means of compassion and affection allayed the troubles (caused) by the approach of cruel people, and which affected the happiness of the mankind ...." The inference rules out the possibility of Maukhari-Hūna conflict or confrontation particularly in the time of Isvaravarman. But the cruel people and their causing unhappiness the populace might be a distant reference to Hūnas who are generally believed to be cruel and inflicting injuries on the mankind by their barbaric actions. Isvaravarman (c.A.D. 520-40) does not claim that he allayed the troubles of the populace by defeating the cruel people. But he allayed the troubles of the people by means of compassion and affection only. Recently, a scholar has opined that Yashodharman with his allies - the Maukhari and the later Guptas - persuaded Mihirakula, who fled away from central India due to the possible attack of Yashodharman and his allies, up to the land of snow i.e. Kashmir and defeated him. It is untenable to believe that Yashodharman defeated Mihirakula in Kashmir. Moreover, the Maukhari inscriptions do not speak of any Maukhari involvement in causing a defeat to Mihirakula either individually or in alliance. Maukhari king Isanavarman is sometimes credited with defeating the Hūnas but his date (c.A.D. 540-60) does not match with the date of Yashodharman.
Sometimes, the Sulikas, mentioned in the Harhā inscription of Isinavarman, whom he defeated, are identified with the Hūṇas. Thakur observes, "the Sulikas of the Harhā record were really the Hūṇas of the Aḥṣad inscription, the only difference being that while they have been referred to by their tribal name in the latter, they have been mentioned as a linguistic stock belonging to the special branch of the Paisāchī Prākrit, i.e. the Sulikas, in the former." Chattopadhyaya states, "The Hūṇas occupied in the second half of the 6th century A.D. the region where the Paisāchī Prākrit had been in vogue, and thus therefore they may be identified with the Sulikas of the Harhā record". Sinha has rightly rejected this theory. He observes, "It is rather surprising that in the Aḥṣad inscription, the Hunas are referred to in association with Isinavarman. Why should the Harha inscription refer to the Hūṇas as Sulikas? The Hūṇas are well known in the Indian inscriptions and literature and there is no reason why in the Harhā inscription alone they should be referred to as Sulikas."".

The information regarding the defeat of the Hūṇas by the Maukhari king, who is sometimes identified with Isinavarman, is revealed by the Aḥṣad inscription of Ādityasena. The inscription which describes the merits of the later Gupta kings, gives the honour to Damodaragupta for causing defeat to the unnamed Maukhari king who (the Maukhari king) is credited with
inflicting a defeat on the Hūṇas. There prevails a difference of opinion regarding the identification of the Maukhari king who defeated Hūṇas. Some scholars identify it with Īśānavarman and some others identify the king with Sarvavarman, the son and successor of Īśānavarman. The scholars arguing in favour of Sarvavarman opine that since Dāmodaragupta's father Kumāragupta had fought against Īśānavaramana, father and predecessor of Sarvavarman, the Maukhari king whom Dāmodragupta fought should be identified with Sarvavarman. Hence Sarvavarman should be the Maukhari king who caused a severe defeat to the Hūṇas by these scholars. On the other hand, the scholars accepting Īśānavarman as the Maukhari king opine that apparently Īśānavarman, who is mentioned by name in verse 8 of the Apsad inscription, has been referred to by his dynastic appellation 'Maukharī' in verse 11 of the same epigraph. It can not be said for certain whether this battle between the Hūṇas and the Maukharīs took place in the reign of Īśānavarman or Sarvavarman. As the territories of the Pushpabhūtis lay in between the kingdoms of the Maukharīs and the Hūṇas, some scholars held that the Pushpabhūti and the Maukhari forces unitedly fought against the Hūṇas, their common enemies. Another suggestion is that Adityavardhana, the Pushpabhūti ruler was relatively a minor ruler and allowed Sarvavarman to pass through his territories in his fight against the Hūṇas, who because of their close proximity posed a greater danger to the Pushpabhūtis than to the Maukharīs.
The problem of the overlord of the Pushpabhūtis has not attracted the adequate attention of the scholars. The Pushpabhūti rulers upto the time of Prabhākaravardhana bore the title 'Mahārāja' only which shows their feudatory status. Thapalyal suggests of them being the feudatories of the Imperial Guptas but gives no proper evidence in support of his theory. Majumdar includes the possibility of these rulers being the feudatories of the Hūnas or even of the Maukharis. If the Pushpabhūtis were the feudatories of the Hūnas then why and how did the Pushpabhūtis allow the Maukharis to use their territories against the Hūnas, their overlords. The other hitch in accepting Majumdar's theory is that the territories of the Pushpabhūtis were falling between the territories of the Hūnas and the Maukharis. Then what factors inspired the Maukharis to attack the Hūnas who were not even sharing a common boundary. A more convincing explanation though hypothetical to this problem can be sought by closely examining the Hūna-Maukhari - later Gupta-Pushpabhuti relationship.

Vishnugupta was the last imperial Gupta ruler of Magadha whose reign ended in c.A.D. 551-52. The Pushpabhūtis, the Maukharis and the later Guptas were probably the feudatories of the imperial Guptas. The Maukharis rulers before Īśānavarman i.e. Harivarman, Ādityavarman, Īśvaravarman assumed the title simply of a 'Mahārāja' ample to show their feudatory status. The Harāhā inscription of Īśānavarman dated A.D. 554 records him as
Maharajadhiraja - the first among Maukhari rulers to assume such title. After the death of the imperial Gupta ruler Vishnugupta in c.A.D. 551-52, Isanavarman attained the independent status as known from his Harha inscription dated A.D. 554. After the death of Vishnugupta, throne of Magadha was left to be contested by two strong claimants i.e. the Maukharis and the later Guptas. The Apsad stone inscription of Adityasena records the battle between Kumragupta and Isanavarman and the victory of the former. This battle perhaps took place after A.D. 554. Finding no chance to capture the throne of Magadha, Isanavarman planned to extend his empire in the west. Probably the Pushpabhūtis, who were earlier feudatories of the imperial Guptas, now, had to accept the overlordship of the Maukhari ruler Isanavarman. There are two reasons behind this acceptance. The first is that the Pushpabhūtis were not capable enough militarily, to resist the continuous threat of the Hūṇas on western border. Neither the Pushpabhūtis were fully equipped to face the challenge of the increasing power of the Maukharis. Moreover, with the help of the Maukharis, they could check or resist the possible Hūṇa onslaughts. So, it was a compulsion as well as a timely adjustment for the Pushpabhūtis to accept the overlordship of the Maukharis. The Apsad inscription of Adityasena mentions the victory of Dāmodargupta over the unnamed Maukhari king. Perhaps this Maukhari king was Isanavarman who can be credited with causing a severe defeat to the Hūṇas. It was essential for Isanavarman to protect
his feudatory the Pushpabhūtis, from the onsloughts of the Hūṇas, the failure of which may even threaten the independence of his own kingdom. So, the Maukharis and the Pushpabhūtis fought against the Hūṇas unitedly and defeated them. With his conquest over the Hūṇas in the west, Isanavarman again tried his fortune to caputures the throne of Magadha and attacked Dāmodargupta. Isanavarman this time, was successful in defeating the later Gupta king Dāmodargupta who after this defeat accepted the overlordship of the Maukharis. Isanavarman was succeeded by his son Sarvavarman.

Although, the Maukhari victory over the Hūṇas is credited to Sarvavarman by some scholars. But the possibility of Isanavarman being the Maukhari king gains ground in light of the information supplied to us by his Harhā inscription which explains his conquests and extension of empire whereas the Asirgarh copper seal of Sarvavarman remains confined to the simple description of the Maukhari genealogy without making any mention of his conquests or empire extension. The find of a clay seal of Sarvavarman from Nalanda, which contains the similar information supplied to us by the Asirgarh seal, testifies the occupation of Nalanda by the Maukharis. It is indicative of the fact that the later Guptas might be the feudatory of the Maukharis. The later Guptas had accepted the overlordship of the Maukharis during the time of Isanavarman. The approximate date of Sarvavarman is placed at c.A.D. 560-80 and Mahāsenagupta, the later Gupta king, contemporary of Sarvavarman, has been assigned the date
The continuous pressure and threat of the Maukharis compelled the later Guptas to accept the Maukharis' sovereignty. The later Guptas could get rid of Maukharis if the Pushpabhūtis apply the same pressure tactics upon the Maukharis on their eastern border. Moreover, the Pushpabhūtis were in the process of accumulating power and consolidating their empire. This objective was facilitated by the incompetency of the successors of Iśānavarmana who proved weak to check the growing power of the Pushpabhūtis. So, keeping in view these developments, the later Guptas had no other alternative but to seek the cooperation of the Pushpabhūtis to get rid of the Maukharis. Besides, the Pushpabhūtis were also worried and conscious of the dangers of the Maukharis' presence on their eastern border. So, the Pushpabhūtis were also in need of a friend in the eastern side who could ensure cooperation to protect their eastern boundaries from the Maukharis. This sort of political necessity enabled the Pushpabhūtis to reach to an agreement of mutual cooperation and understanding with later Guptas against the Maukharis.

To make this cooperation obligatory, the later Guptas established matrimonial relations with the Pushpabhūtis. Mahāsenagupta, the later Gupta king married his sister Mahāsenagupta to Ādityavardhana (c.A.D. 560-80), the son of Rājyavardhana I. Perhaps, it was after this alliance that the
Pushpabhūtis felt confident and as a result, they declared themselves independent. Prabhākaravardhana, the son and successor of Adityavardhana assumed the titles of Parambhaftāraka and Mahārājadhiraja as known from the Banskhera copper plate inscription of Harsha. But the alignment between the Pushpabhūtis and the later Guptas changed in the time of Rājayavardhana II (c.A.D 605-06) who established matrimonial relations with the Maukharis by marrying his sister Rājayashri to the Maukhari king Grahavarman (c.A.D. 600-605) and they unitedly formed a front against the later Guptas and the Gaudas of Bengal.

After Mihirakula, the first encounter of the Hūnas is noticed in relation to the Maukharis and the second encounter appeared in relation to the Pushpabhūti king Prabhākaravardhana. Although, the Banskhera and Madhuban copper plates do not mention his conquests and achievements but Bānabhaṭṭa, in his Harsh-charita gives a wide description of his conquests and achievements. The Harsh-charita speaks of Prabhākaravardhan as follows: "a lion to the Hūna deer, a burning fever to the king of Sindhu, a troubler of the sleep of the Gurjara king, a bilious fever to that scent-elephant, the lord of Gāndhāra, destroyer of the skill of the Lāṭās, an axe to the creeper of the Mālava's glory". The account of Harsh-charita testifies the defeat of the Hūnas by Prabhākaravardhan. Hoernle and R.K. Mookerji propounded
a theory according to which, the Hūṇas and Śilāditya, king of Mālwa, formed a confederacy against the confederacy of the Maukharis, the later Guptas and the Pushpabhūtis with the aim to uproot and destroy their power. The later confederacy was led by Prabhākaravardhana. In this conflict, Prabhākaravardhan inflicted a defeat on Śilāditya, king of Mālwa who also happened to be the brother of Yashomati, the wife of Prabhākaravardhan. The authors take Yasomati as the daughter of the Aulikara king Yashodharman who defeated Mihirakula. Mookerji further adds that despite his alliance with the Hūṇas, Śilāditya had to surrender his son Bhanḍi to the Pushpabhūti ruler. Thapalyal places the following objections to this theory:

1. Had Yasomati been the daughter of Yashodharman, an illustrious ruler, this fact had naturally been highlighted in the Harsha-charita.

2. Besides, names of brother and sister in some cases could be similar but hardly those of the father and the daughter.

3. Moreover, Bāṇa’s account shows that yasomati’s parents were alive when she immolated herself (in A.D. 606).
Vaidya too rejects this theory on the chronological grounds. Since we are not equipped with adequate evidences regarding this episode about. Which the further research & discoveries may throw light.

Whatever may be the political & military equations against the Hūnas who ever after their defeat by Prabhākaravardhan, continued to create problems on the western borders of the Pushpabhūtis. Prabhākaravardhan in his last days, probably in A.D.605, sent his son Rājayavardhan to beat back the Hūnas who were again creating troubles on the northern border of the Thanesar kingdom. The Harsh-charita states that Rājayavardhan marched towards Uttrāpatha and entered the Himalayas near Kailāsha to defeat the Hūnas. The 'Kāvyamīmāṃsā' of Rajshekhar places Uttrāpatha to the north of Prithudaka (mod. Pehowa in Kurukshetra dist., Haryana). The Brihat Samhitā includes Gāndhāra, Takṣasāḷā and Pushkalāvati within the region. Devahuti is of the view that they had a principality on the banks of the Sutlej, where it flows in the hilly tract of the Gangetic region. Vaidya held the view that the Hūnas were a powerful people in the Punjab even after their defeat at the hands of Prabhākaravardhan and had their kingdom at Gāndhāra and Sakala. Since we do not hear of any Hūṇa attack during the reign of Harsha who exercised influence as far as Kashmir in the north, it seems that Rājayavardhan was successful in repulsing them back.
The accounts of Harsh-charita and the Maukhari rulers testify the control of the Punjab region by the Hūnas. The presence of the Hūna rule in Punjab is also proved by their coins and seals found from Sanghol, Ropar and other sites. Smith has published same coins found from Hoshipur district. Cunningham has also found some coins from western Punjab (now in Pakistan). The coins are discussed in detail in the chapter on Hūna coinage. Here we shall confine ourselves to the political aspect only. After the end of Mihirakula's reign, the coins discovered in the Hūna area of Punjab, do not provide the absolute chronology of the later Hūna rulers but sufficient to provide the clues to establish a tentative chronology. Sanghol, in Ludhiana district of Punjab, has yielded a good number of coins which include that of Toramāna, Mihirakula, Śrī Bala, Bhīmasena, Śrī Balarāma, Śrī Vayarasa and Chandragupta. The coins bearing the name of Vīdisagupta, discovered from Ropar, are attributed to the Hūnas. The coins of Śrī Vayarasa discovered from Sanghol, have been attributed by G.B. Sharma to the Hūnas who considers Śrī Vayarasa as another Hūna ruler. Sanghol also yielded a coin of certain Chandragupta which carry the conventional Hūna features. The discovery of this coin along with other Hūna coins and resemblance of its features with those of Hūna coins give weight to the supposition that king Chandragupta may have some sort of relations, may it be the family relations, with the Hūnas. The discovery of the coins of Vīdisagupta from Ropar can be
discussed in the light of the coin of Chandragupta discovered from Sanghol. In the post-Mihirakula period, we have only two kings with the 'gupta' ending name ruling in Punjab and its adjoining areas.*1. S.C. Ray who considers Vidishagupta as a Gupta monarch, assign these issues on the palaeographical grounds to the period of the Guptas.*2. It is difficult to accept Ray's assertions because we donot find any reference of Vidishagupta in any record of the Gupta dynasty or supported by other sources. Handa suggests Vidishagupta being a Huna ruler and places the coins of Vidishagupta between A.D. 530 and 580.*3. The close resemblance of the features of the coins of Chandragupta and Vidishagupta ultimately with the Huna coins enables us to place them in the same category and in the light of above discussion the possibility of these two rulers being Hunas cannot be ruled out. On the similar basis, G.B. Sharma identifies Bhimasena of the coins as another Huna ruler.

There is another interesting variety of coins popularly known as 'Kpa' coins, which follows the Huna coins in succession. Scholars have divergent views about the issueing of these coins. Lallanji Gopal has classified these coins with Indo-Sassanian coins, possibly on the identification of symbol with crude fire alter.*4. Smith also considers the possibility of these marks as an echo of the Sassanian devices.*5. G.B. Sharma observes, "These coins bear the devices on obverse and reverse which are
very close copy of the Huna coins. The Hunas had a principality at Sanghol and its neighbourhood and ruled for a considerable period even until the rise of the Pushpabhūtis of Thanesar and we find so many varieties of Huna coins giving names of some unknown kings such as Bhima sena, Śrī Bala, Śrī Balarāma apart from the coins of Toramāna and Mihirakula. As the name suggests the Hunas were thoroughly Indianised by this time like the Kushāṇas as we find the name of Vāsudeva. These coins, which were issued after the Hūṇa seem to be a variety of the later Hūṇa coins which were issued by some king or feudatory, giving this short name as 'kpa' or 'ksa'. These coins remained in circulation up to the advent of the early medieval currency. The discovery of these coins from Sanghol, which seems to be the Indian headquarters of Hūṇas' operation in India and correspondence of their data, palaeographically, with the Pushpabhūtis, the sources of which record the defeat of the Hūṇas, gives an indication towards the possibility of these coins as belonging to the later Hūṇas.

In the post-Harṣa era, we find the references of the Hūṇas in the contemporary inscriptions which prove the existence of the Hūṇas as a political force though not of stature of Toramāna and Mihirakula. The Hūṇas are referred in the inscriptions of the Pratihāras, the Pālas, the Paramāras, the Kalachuris and the Guhils. The Una1 plates of Avanivarman II dated V.Ś. 956 (=A.D.899) of the time of the Pratihāra king Mahenderpāla mentions
the name of two Hūṇa chiefs ~ Vishāda and Jajjapa. The inscription informs that Balavarman, a feudatory of the Pratihāra king of Kannauj and father of Avanivarman II, the issuer of the inscription, defeated a certain Vishāda (verse 16) from whom he took away a pair of big drums, and by slaying Jajjapa and other kings, freed the earth from the Hūṇa race (verse 17). About the identification of these two chiefs, Kielhorn observes, "who Vishāda was, it is impossible to say. Wars with the Hūṇa kings are frequently mentioned in Indian inscriptions of the Middle Ages, and we know of a Hūṇa princess, Avalladevi who was married by the kālachuri Karna in the 11th century; but in recording the name of Jajjapa, for the first time discloses the name of an individual Hūṇa king, who must be placed in about the last quarter of the 9th century". Regarding the locality of the Hūṇas, Thakur observes that "In the 9th century there was a 'Hūṇa-Maṇḍala' situated to the north-east of Mālwa which was probably ruled over by Jajjapa, a Hūṇa chief or king whose successors were defeated and crushed by the Paramāra king Siyāka II and his successors Vākapatī and Sindhorāja.

The fact that the Hūṇas continued to exist as a political force, contrary to the reference of extinction of Hūṇa race in the Una plate, is evident from the Karda plate found at Kurda or Kardala in the Talod taluk of the than Khandesh district. The plate is dated in the Saka year 892 (≈A.D.972-73) of the time of
Kakka or Kākka III and credits him with having conquered the Gurjara, Hūna, Chola, and Pāndya kings. The information in the inscription is very limited and does not throw light on the name of the Hūnas king, their geographical position and other aspects related to the Hūnas.

The Hūnas are mentioned in the epigraphical records of the Pāla dynasty. The Nālandā plate of Dharmapāla mentions 'Gauḍa-Mālava-khasa-kulika-Hūna', as being his 'sevakādin' (attendants) and 'padmopājivinah'. The Khalimpur grant of Dharmapāla mentions the rulers of the Bhojas, Matsyas, Mātras, Kurus, Yadus, Yavanas, of Avanti, Gāndhāra, and Kīra only and not the Hūnas. Thakur believes that "The term 'yavana' of the rulers of Gāndhāra' may indicate indirectly the Hūnas who are mentioned directly in the Nālandā plate. The nature of the inscriptions, however, tends to suggest that there was no violent armed clash between the Pāla monarch and the aforesaid kings who, in order to avoid indiscriminate bloodshed and consequent humiliation, seem to have voluntarily accepted his suzerainty and paid their homage which is clear from the terms 'sevakādin' and 'padapadmopājivinah' used in the Nālandā records in the context of Dharmapāla's victories. But it is doubtful that the rulers at such a great distance like Gāndhāra had accepted the suzerainty of the king of Bengal. Dharmapāla's successor Devapāla is also referred to have confronted with the Hūnas. The
Badal inscription states that Devapāla inflicted a crushing defeat upon the Utkalas, the Hūnas, the Drāvidas and the Gurjaras. Who were these Hūnas and where they were residing is not indicated in any Pāla record. R.C. Majumdar suggests that they were the inhabitants of the outskirts of the Pāla empire. But it is difficult to believe keeping in view the existence of the powerful Pratihāra kingdom lying between the territories of the Pālas and the Hūnas. Similarly, the Bangarh grant of Mahipāla refers to the Gaudas, the Mālavas, the Khasas, the Hūnas, the Kulikas, the Karnāṭakas etc. as the servants of the king (sevakādin).

The conflicts between the Paramāras and the Hūnas are evidenced in the literary and epigraphic records. Regarding this, Thakur observes that "It was not a temporary phase; on the other hand it was a protracted bloody affair resulting in indiscriminate deaths and devastation." The story of this warfare between the Paramāras and the Hūnas begins with the invasion of the Hūna territory by Siyaka II who is said to have launched a military campaign against them, slaughtered the princes and turned their harems into the dwelling-places for the consecration of widowhood. Regarding the Hūna prince and his territory, D.C. Ganguly suggests that the ‘Hūna-mandala’ mentioned in the ‘Navasahasānka-charita’; was situated to the north-west of Mālwā and the Hūna chief defeated by Siyaka II was a successor of Jajjapa who was defeated and killed by Balavarman. The Hūnas
were, once again, involved in violent conflict with the Paramāras during the time of Vākapati II (A.D. 974-97), the son and successor of Siyaka II. Thakur observes, "It appears that despite their crushing defeat during the previous regime, the Hūnas could not be subdued for long and Vākapati had to wage war against them." The Ganor inscription of Vākapati refers to the grant of a village, Vanika in 'Hūna-mandala' to a Brahmana, which shows that Vākapati was successful in annexing the Hūna territory into his kingdom. But it appears that Vākapati's conquest of Hūna-mandala was not decisive as Sindhurāja (A.D. 997-1010), younger brother of Vākapati, had to lunch fresh campaigns against the Hūnas. The Udaipur Prasasti and the 'Navasahasāṅka-charita', giving a graphic description of the battle between Sindhurāja and the Hūnas, record his decisive victory over the Hūnas. After the reign of Sindhurāja, we donot hear of Paramāra-Hūna conflict. In the same way, the epigraphical evidences of the Rāṣṭrakūtas and the Chālukyas mentions the defeat of the Hūnas but these evidences are unable to throw significant light on the history of the Hūnas in that period.

The relations of the Hūnas with the Kalachuris appear to be somewhat less enimical. In atleast three epigraphic records their political and marital relations are graphically described which shows that their attachment was much deeper. The Bheraghat-Jubbulpur inscription of the Kalachuri queen
A1 hanadevi represents king Karna as having subdued and held in check the Pandyas, the Muralas, the Kungas, the Vañgas, the Kalingas and the Hūnas. The Karnabela inscription says that Karna was waited upon by the rulers of Hūna, Gurjara and Kīra territories. The expression or tone of the inscriptions do not suggest of battle between the Kalachuris and the Hūnas but it can be said, undoubtedly, that the Hūnas were less powerful than the Kalachuris and it will not be an exaggeration to assume that the Hūnas might have acknowledged the superiority of the Kalachuris. Probably the cordiality between the relations of the two was made possible by the establishment of matrimonial relations, a fact testified by the other two Kalachuri records. The Khairh (Rewa) plates of king Yasakarna, dated in the Kalachuri year 823 (=A.D. 1072) state that king Lakshamikarna, father of Yashakarna, was married to the Hūna princess Avalladevi. The establishment of the matrimonial relations between the two is further corroborated by the Jubbulpur plate of the same ruler dated in the Kalachuri year 829 (A.D. 1078). Thakur opines that "These martial relations gave the Hūnas a prominent place in the society which had so long treated them as barbarous foreigners with no cultural standing."

Thus we notice the existence of the Hūnas as a political force in the post-Harṣa era, the fact which is recorded in the inscriptions of the contemporary ruling dynasties. Sometimes it
is doubted that the Hūṇas of the post-Harṣa era were the similar Hūṇas who invaded India during the time of Skandagupta. Buhler, while editing the Udapur Prasasti of the Kings of Mālva\textsuperscript{214}, opines that "With respect to the Hūṇas, it may be noted that those mentioned here and in other medieval inscriptions are not Hunas, but a Kṣatriya race. For the bards and Jaina 'Prabandhas' regularly enumerate the Hunas among the thirty-six 'Kṣatriyakula', and their matrimonial alliance in the eleventh century with the Kalachuris precludes the possibility of their having been then considered foreigners". Here it should be taken into consideration that the Hūṇas, because of their skill or specialization in warring pursuits enabled them to be considered as the Kṣatriyas and thus securing a seat in the Rajput fold. This problem is tackled in detail in the fourth chapter. The Hūṇas, after their references in the Kalachuri records, are not found mentioned as such in the subsequent records and their history or historical identity comes to an end after that period.
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