CHAPTER IV
Indian society, from the time of Aryan invasion has experienced several foreigners' aggressions with successful political establishments but at the same time showed its high assimilative capacity by absorbing most of them in its broader social framework. The process of assimilation of the foreigners was achieved, largely, due to the voluminous size and depth of Indian culture, its high assimilative capacity and the absence of any major cultural confrontation which is witnessed only when the Muslims invaded the country. The pre-Muslim invasions were largely political in nature and could never pose a challenge to the superiority of the Indian culture. But the assimilation of the foreigners into Indian society cannot be termed as smooth and easy. The process involved non-acceptance of the foreigners in the Brāhmaṇical writings belonging to different periods thus denying them entry into Indian social fold. The foreigners were designated as 'mallechhas' for whom were prescribed special laws to restrict their entry into Indian fold or more precisely into the Brāhmaṇical fold. But despite these literary restrictions and denials the foreigners were assimilated into Indian society though in different capacities. The present chapter discusses
the problems like difference in the outlook of the rulers at Pāṭliputra and the peripheral areas, effects of Hūṇas on Indian society in light of the Hūṇas' impact on Indian economy, the nature and character of Hūṇas and their invasion, the religious faith of Toramāṇa and Mihirakula, Mihirakula and Buddhism, assimilation of the Hūṇas and lastly the Hūṇas and the origin of Rajputs.

The social approachment of Hūṇas with India yielded two folded results. The first influencing or disturbing the traditional social order which had fixed particular social responsibilities and functions of each varṇa. That can be considered as indirect or distant impact the impact introduced mainly by the economic changes caused by the Hūṇas as discussed in the earlier chapter. The second category of results belong to the Hūṇas area of operation where socialization finally led to their absorption and assimilation into India culture.

The Hūṇas may not have a direct relationship with the social changes occurring particularly in the areas surrounding Pāṭliputra - the central seat of power at that time, i.e. eastern U.P. Bihar, Bengal and eastern parts of M.P. It is important here to mention that these areas were under direct control of the Gupta rulers and all kind of political, social and economic activities or programmes starting from Pāṭliputra had direct bearings on these areas. Whereas the outlying areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat, western
U.P., Punjab, Haryana and western portions of Central India etc., who were marginally tagged with the Gupta empire were not strictly bound to oblige their overlords by showing equal eagerness and zeal to follow and pursue the things while dealing with the political, social and economic affairs of their respective kingdoms. In other words, the Gupta rulers had no interference in the affairs of the Kingdoms not falling under their direct rule. This difference in the outlook of two categories of rulers is reflected in dealing with the problem of the Hūṇas. The Gupta rulers were more worried and conscious about the consequences of the invasion of the Hūṇas whereas the rulers in the peripheral areas were somewhat apathetic and less concerned. The rulers in the peripheral areas did not appear to have supported the Guptas whole-heartedly to oust or repulse the Hūṇas from India, rather taking advantage of the situation, they preferred to declare their independent status or to accept the suzerainty of the Hūṇas in achieving the final goal of independence by throwing the yoke of the Gupta empire. These rulers, perhaps, were under the impression that the Hūṇas, after sometime, would leave India and then they will be able to enjoy their independent status. The Junagarh inscription of Skandagupta hints towards this possibility where Skandagupta is referred to as spending days and nights to choose an able and strong governor for Saurashtra on whom he would believe that he would not act against the wishes of the Gupta emperor. So, such sort of distrust upon his distant
subordinates clearly exhibits the difference in the outlook of the rulers ruling in Pāṭliputra and distant areas in dealing with the problems.

So far as the social aspect is concerned it is difficult to apply a general yardstick to measure the extent - horizontal and vertical and soundness of the Brāhmaṇical social order in all parts of the country in equal volume and intensity. It may not be possible without the help of the state. The dominating and monopolized role of the Brāhmaṇas was possible only with help of the state and the kind of state which Guptas provided to the Brāhmaṇas to assist them achieve the role of a monopolizer, was absent in the border areas where state was or could not be always favourable to them. It had mainly two reasons. The first is that the border areas specially north & west covering Gujarat, Punjab and Rajasthan, were prone to the invasions and perhaps a stable state of the imperial status like that of the Mauryas and the Guptas could not be established. Moreover, the invasions, brought in contact the different cultures, which caused growth of a class of people of mixed religious and social identities that paved way for the development of more broader and sort of secular outlook rejecting the symptoms of closed society or a highly introverted society. The closed societies present the most favourite ground where religion can grow to the extant of influencing and dominating over all other forces - productive
and non-productive. This is what we notice in the Gupta heartland. Thus, two main currents emerge from the above discussion. First, that there was difference in the outlook of the rulers ruling in Pāṭliputra and the peripheral areas and second that social order was firmly established and nurtured in areas of Bihar, Bengal, eastern parts of U.P. and M.P. The Brāhmaṇical order could not make deep inroads into the social order of the peripheral areas.

As we have discussed in the preceding chapter that the Hūṇas sealed the fate of India's external trade through western border which ultimately ruined the prosperity of urban centres and the scope of further economic growth of India; that the Gupta empire had to face a financial crisis for spending more amount on army to check the Hūṇa menace; that the peasantry had to bear the burden of this extra expenditure on army and administration, that the pressure on the agricultural land increased; that the state economy became more dependent on agriculture; that the land was donated or granted to religious persons or institutions by the state and the individuals; that the need and importance of coins decreased considerably, etc. All these economic changes created a vertical social distance among the Four varṇas adversely affecting the economic relation between their, which instead of satisfying the social needs and functions, disturbed the inter-varṇa relationship and the institutional pattern that had been traditionally expounded, protected and established by the
Dharmashāstras. As a result of it the ritual status of the Brāhmaṇas became insufficient to provide them adequate and respectable means of livelihood. The Smritis² speak of Brāhmaṇas following non-Brāhmaṇical callings, and inscriptions testify to the existence of the Brāhmaṇas who were agriculturist householders, traders, architects and government servants³. The Vaiśyas too, were left to live below the earlier standards as their traditional occupations were no more in better condition to bring a respectable living. A section of the silk weavers of the Lāta country in Gujarat, after settling at Daśapur in West Mālwa, adopted such professions as that of an archer, a story teller, an exponent of religious problems, an astrologer, a warrior and an ascetic⁴. The Śūdras were benefitted in this turmoil and they could now choose a profession which could bring them more economic gains and social respectability. Yājñavalkya⁵ permit the Śūdras to become traders and agriculturists. The Mahābhārata⁶ allows the Śūdras to perform the 'Pākayajña' with the authority to offer a nominal sacrificial fee i.e. 'Pūrṇapatra dakshiṇā'. The Sudras had to right to perform the 'Nāmakarṇa Saṁskāra' i.e. the name giving ceremony⁷, the funeral rites and srāddha⁸, and to bestow gifts⁹.

With the loss of state patronage, the Brāhmaṇical religion, after the Gupta period was not able to retain the monopoly over the society which it enjoyed earlier. In the new and changed
circumstances, we find a deviation in the functions of the Brāhmaṇas as assigned to them by the Dharmashāstras, specially in the means of earning livelihood. The Mahābhārata makes the specific mention of some serious deviations which reduced them to a very low status. It is said that those Brāhmaṇas who are not well born and do not follow the duties of their order, and are addicted to evil practices are like Śūdras\textsuperscript{10}. Those who are employed in the law courts for summoning the people, those who perform worship for others to gain money, those who perform the sacrifices of Vaiśyas and Śūdras, those who officiate in sacrifice on behalf of a whole village and those who make voyages on the ocean - these five are regarded as Chāndālas among Brāhmaṇas\textsuperscript{11}. Other varṇas too could not remain aloof from such deviations which are discussed at large in context of the Kālī Age. Restoration from such deviations seem to be the important task to the state and the law-givers. Upadhyaya\textsuperscript{12} observes, "Curbing of such deviations seems to be of paramount importance to them. In the Brāhmanic attempt to standardize the class behaviour, only the assertion of the traditional social order was not enough, although it was the primary need of the time. They made certain special provisions, quite in accordance with the traditional rules, either to curb deviations or, if necessary, to accord them the legal sanction and support occupational digressions under abnormal situations." And thus 'Āpaddharma' was formulated to meet the new challenges and the occupations like learning, mechanical
arts, work for wages, service, rearing cattle, trade, agriculture, fortitude, alms, receiving interest on money, cart (on hire), mountain (collecting grass and fuel on hills for sale), getting subsistence from a country full of water, trees and shrubs, and king's support, were accorded the legal sanction by the law-givers.

Thus we find that the Brāhmaṇas moved to agriculture to earn their livelihood though under 'Āpaddharma'. To ensure their livelihood in agriculture, the Brāhmaṇas were provided agricultural land. The inscriptions of the Gupta and post-Gupta period clearly show the changed status of the Brāhmaṇas where they are found to be granted and donated land by the state and the individuals for agricultural purposes. It is important to add here that service to the Brāhmaṇas, either in the form of donation of land by the individuals or grant of land by the state - both were made obligatory to the individual and the king to the extent that non-service to the Brāhmaṇas would lead to their ruins. It is said that drought and epidemic destroy the realm of that king in whose reign a 'śrotṛīya' dies of starvation. And alternatively, that king attains heavenly bliss who bestows landed property upon the Brāhmaṇa, nay, he earns greater rewards in case he is slain in an attempt to rescue the lost property of a Brāhmaṇa. The significant feature of the information recorded in the inscriptions is that the individuals purchased the land
from the state and then the purchased land was donated to the Brahmans by the individuals in order to seek the religious benefits or merits.

The Dhanaidaha copper plate inscription\textsuperscript{17} of the time of Kumaragupta I dated A.D.432 records the purchase of one 'kulyavāpa' land under the viśaya 'Khadapāra' by a person with 'Vishnu' ending name and the donation of that land to a Brahmana named Varāhaswāmi. Another inscription of the time of Kumaragupta I from Kalaikuri-Sultanpur\textsuperscript{18} (in Rajshahi dist. of Bangla Desh) dated A.D.439 records the purchase of nine 'Kulyavāpa' land from the state by a 'kulika' named Bhīma and others and then donation of it to some Brahmans of Pundhravaradhana. The Dāmodarpur copper plate inscription of the time of Buddhagupta\textsuperscript{19} dated A.D.482 records the purchase of one 'kulyavāpa' land and then donating it to some Brahmans in order to attain spiritual welfare of his deceased fore-fathers. The Nandapur (Bihar) copper plate inscription\textsuperscript{20} dated A.D.486 records the purchase of four 'kulyavāpa' land by some one from the state and then donating it to a Brahmana. A similar information is recorded in the Dāmodarapur copper plate inscription\textsuperscript{21} dated A.D.543.

There are three characteristic features of this practice of donating land. First, it was taken into consideration that the state should not bear the financial loss in allotting land to the Brahmans. The price was paid by the individuals. Who generally
belonged to the Vaiśya community. Secondly, only non-cultivable land was donated keeping in view the fact that the cultivable land may not be harmed. Such considerations led to the expansion of agriculture. Thirdly, donation was always officially sanctioned and the donation was made a permanent landed property of the Brāhmaṇas. In order to prevent any future disturbance by any one to the donated land, a passage from Mahābhārata was quoted in each inscription stating "The giver of land abides in heaven for sixty thousand years, but the confiscator (of a grant), and he who assents (to an act of confiscation), shall dwell for the same number of years in hell".

The mode of economic security provided to the Brāhmaṇas in central India was different from that prevailed in the areas of Bihar, Bengal and eastern U.P. In Central India, the feudatories of the Gupta emperors particularly the Priyrajakas and the Uchchakalpa were more enthusiastic and concerned in rescuing the Brāhmaṇas. In this region it is not the donations but the grants and not by the individuals but by the state and not the land alone but the whole village as well is a characteristic feature. The Khoh copper plate inscription of Mahāraja Hastin, the feudatory of the Guptas, dated A.D.476 records the grant of the village of Vasuntarāśaṇḍika to Gopāsvāmin and other Brāhmaṇas by Mahāraja Hastin. Another inscription of Mahāraja Hastin from Khoh dated (=A.D.482-83) records the grant, by Mahāraja Hastin,
of the agrahāra of Koraparika to certain Brāhmaṇas. The Shankarapura copper plate inscription of the time of Buddhagupta dated (=A.D.486) records the grant of a village Chitrapalya to a Brāhmaṇa Gosvāmin. Similarly, the Majhgawam inscription of Mahārāja Hastin dated (=A.D.510-11); Khoh inscription of Mahārāja Saṃkṣhoba dated (=A.D.528-29); the Karitalai inscription and Khoh inscription of Mahārāja Jāyanātha of the Uchchakalpa dynasty dated (=A.D.493-94 and 496-97 respectively); the Khoh inscription of Mahārāja Sarvanātha dated (= A.D. 512-13) and two undated inscription of Mahārāja Jayarāja and Mahārāja Sudevarāja all record the grant of a village or villages to a Brāhmaṇa or to certain Brāhmaṇas. The attention seeking feature of these grants is that the Brāhmaṇas are also extended certain economic rights and political privileges which are found to be absent in the land donations of Bihar and Bengal. The economic rights were preserved in the form that most of the taxes collected from the granted village would go in the pocket of the grantee. The political privilege was granted in the form that the granted land or the village to the brahman will not be entered by the regular or irregular troops. The state's control over the granted areas was left only in the form of right to impose fines on the thieves. In order to avoid any future confiscation of the granted villages, it was stated that 'preservation of the grant is greater than what arises from making a grant'. In the area of Saurashstra the grant of the land or the
villages to the Brāhmaṇas appears somewhat later.

The king who was formally regarded as the upholder of the varṇāśrama-dharma, helped the Brāhmaṇas to establish as the administrators with certain economic rights and political privileges in order to compensate or rehabilitate than as discussed above. These rescuing measures put the brahmanas in more commandable position. Now they had acquired two fold monopoly over the society. First as a sole proprietor of the existing social system and secondly as the administrative head of certain areas with certain political and economic power. This newly acquired status of the Brāhmaṇas put their saviours in trouble but at a later stage when the practice of granting land acquired greater importance in terms of the size and area.

II

Whatever the studies has been done on the Hūṇas specially in India, though very scanty, majority of them designate the Hūṇas as barbarous, nomad, savage and uncivilized persons or people who caused destruction to the cultured societies. It is difficult to state that it is simply a misconception. To understand the nature and character of the Hūṇas, a careful examination of the facts available requires more attention. Perhaps, no kingdom or tribe in history had invaded other kingdoms or the tribes with a white flag during the course of the military adventure. Even
the religious massages of fraternity and humanity had been popularized through the sword. In this way, the invasion of the Hūṇas was not different from other invasions which occurred innumerable times in history. Their invasion too, possessed all the natural characteristics of an invasion which always involve brutality, loot, plunder, deaths etc., though the causes of the invasion may differ. The Hsiung-nu, tribal people in the north of Chinese empire, are treated or designated in the Chinese literature as barbarous, nomadic, savage and uncivilized people. Similarly the Hūṇas of the western sources, who are identified with the Hsiung-nu of the Chinese sources are designated as the barbarous, savage, nomadic and uncivilized people. The Hūṇas in India are represented by two important rulers named Toramāna and Mihirakula. The picture of Toramāna that emerges is free from barbarism, cruelty and brutality, whereas the cruelty of Mihirakula is recorded in the works of Hiuen-tsang, Kalhana And Tārānāth as discussed in chapter II. The historical authenticity of the works of the above authors appears to be filled with inaccuracies and flaws due to this or that reason as has been discussed in chapter II. No contemporary record or evidence points towards the inhuman personality traits of Mihirakula. Only the Buddhist works mention Mihirakula as a tyrant and cruel man. The possibility of Mihirakula paying less respect to the human values cannot be denied. But it is not enough to keep him separate from the other rulers who adopted similar policies while dealing with
Thus, it will not be an exaggeration to believe that the invasion of the Hūṇas was simply an invasion that possessed all the qualities of an invasion. And it is to be equally accepted that they inherited the qualities of a good warrior, war skills, valourness and gallant any which were described as a sign of barbarism, brutalism and savageness in the records. The White Hūṇas, before invading India, were ruling in the region of the Oxus valley and its lower areas where they confronted with the Sassanians, later Kushāṇas and other tribal kingdoms of their own ethnic stock. Their well defined political strategies, policies, calculations and equations were the source of their strength. Their invasion on India should not be viewed in terms of want of new pasture lands or simply to loot and plunder India. The invasion of the Hūṇas appears to be a part of a conscious effort to extend their kingdom in India and to exploit the Indian resources to strengthen their empire and power. Their invasion can not be termed as merely an accident or incident. Neither it can be said that they were pushed into India like the Sakas and the Kushāṇas.

The Hūṇas, after their invasion and subsequent establishment of their political power in India, experienced no significant resistance - either politically with Skandagupta as an exception or socially from their Indian counterparts. The reactions and
the ramifications of the political activities has been discussed in the second chapter. The establishment of political power of the Hūṇas did not bring any changes in the administrative and economic system of the country. Perhaps it was convenient for the Hūṇas to adopt the Indian system in toto in view of the political and administrative compulsions and limitations. The social system, though remained unchanged, experienced a disturbance in the functions of the four varnas.

Despite the Indian restrictions and resistance to the foreigners, the Hūṇas showed keenness to go along with it by adopting the Indian names for its rulers and professing Indian religion and religious ethos. The first Indian impression on the Hūṇas can be noticed on the coins of Khiṅgila placed roughly between c. A.D. 430-490. Although the Hūṇa invasion under Khiṅgila was confined to a simple military adventure having no significant cultural impressions or influence. But this invasion brought the Hūṇas more closer to India or Indian culture, the impressions of which, though vaguely, are noticed on his coins Issued from the north-west region on which were find the use of Brāhmi script. But this cannot be considered as a sign of cultural interaction between the Hūṇas and India. After Khiṅgila, the Hūṇas were led by Torāmāṇa in India.

The solar wheel on the copper coins of Toramāṇa not only reflects his personal religious outlook i.e. a sun worshipper,
but also associates the Hūṇas with the sun cult having foreign origin which later on contributed to the assimilation of the Hūṇas into the Indian fold. The importance of the sun cult with reference to the Hūṇas lies in the process of migration of sun priests of foreign origin in India. The foreign sun priests, first entered in India in the fifth century B.C. in the wake of Achaemenid invasion, then they entered in the 1st - 2nd century A.D. in the wake of Śaka - Kushāṇa invasion and lastly they entered in the wake of the Hūṇa invasion in the 5th - 6th century A.D. Now attention will be paid to the point that how these sun-priests contributed to the assimilation of the Hūṇas in Indian culture. The prominence given to the solar wheel is indicative of the official recognition of the sun cult by Toramāṇa. Toramāṇa's preference for solar worship is shown by his building a temple to the sun in Multan. Toramāṇa named his son 'Mihira' (Sun, of 'Mithra') which points to his association with the sun god. Mihirakula, the son and successor of Toramāṇa, was a declared Śaivite. Mihirakula's non-continuation of Toramāṇa's sun cult should not be considered as a difference in their religious outlook. The literary and epigraphical evidences points to the association of the sun god with Śiva". The Nirmand (Dist. Kangra, H.P.) copper plate of Mahāsāmanata Mahārāja Samudrasena dated c. A.D.612-13 records the allotment of Śulisāgrāma by Samudrasena to a body of the Brāhmaṇas, who studied the Atharvaveda, at the agrahāra of Nirmanda for the purpose of god Tripurāntaka or Śiva,
who under the name Mihireshwara, had been installed by the queen mother. Fleet pointed out that, "The occurrence of that word as the first compound of the god's name in this inscription, would indicate that in this particular case, some form or other of the solar worship was combined with the Saiva rites. It is therefore a clear case of association and identification of the Sun with Siva. In the Puranic literature, we have evidences of identifying the Sun with Siva, particularly in the 'Saura - Purana', an 'upa-Purana' of Brahma-Purana, is named after the Sun. Concerning this, Winternitz noticed that its main purpose was to glorify the god Siva. He significantly remarked, "In many places, however, Siva is identified with the Sun god, who reveals the Purana, or else the Sun god recommends Siva - worship. Thus option for the sun cult and Saivism by Toramâna and Mihirakula respectively shows two different religious outlooks but standing not at too great distance.

Toramana's religious outlook or aptitude was a symbol of religious tolerance where he showed equal respect to other religious sects specially the Buddhism. The Kura inscription of Toramâna Shah records the construction of a Buddhist monastery by Rojta-Siddhavridhi, son of Rojta-Jayavridhi, for the teachers of the Mahisasaka school. The inscription was incised during the reign of the king of kings, the great king Toramâna Shah, to whom and to whose family the donor wishes to make over a share of the
merit gained by his pious gift. The discovery of a seal of Toramana from Ghoshitrama monastery in Kausambhī reveals about occupation of Kaushāmbī by Toramāṇa. The conquest of Kaushāmbī by Toramāṇa should not be viewed in terms of the destruction of the monastery by him as suggested by G.R. Sharma Mihirakula's anti-Buddhist approach might be held responsible for the destruction of this monastery. Moreover into the account of Hiuen-tsang and I-tsing and epigraphic records, Valabhi and its neighbouring areas were known as flourishing Buddhist centres in the 6th, 7th and 8th centuries. Mahārāja Guhasena of Valabhi (whose known date is A.D.,567) records in his copper plate that he arranged water facilities for the Sākya bhikshus belonging to 18 sects. The regions mentioned in these records was Toramāṇa's area of operation. If Toramāṇa had been practising or following anti-Buddhist policy it would have certainly found a place in the writings of the Chinese pilgrims in the same manner as we notice Mihirakula's name in their works. Even the Buddhist establishments are found intact and flourishing by the Chinese pilgrims whereas at the same time, at other places, they are referred to be desolated, deserted and destroyed. So all this clearly points towards the fact that Toramāṇa never followed a anti-Buddhist policy and whatever the destruction had been done to Buddhism by the Hūnas at least Toramāṇa can not be held responsible for that. Similarly, whatever epithets, titles or
adjectives had been used for Hūṇas grading them as barbarous, savage and uncivilized the same can not be applied in the case of Toramāṇa.

It is sometimes opined that Toramāṇa was a follower of Jainism. In this context the Jain text 'Kuvalayamālākāhā' of Udyotana Suri written in A.D.778 is referred. There are two manuscripts of 'Kuvalayamālā', though differing in some important particulars. One of them is the Jaisalmer Ms. on palm leaf and written on Sunday, Phalgun, vadi I samvat 1139 and is preserved in the local bhanḍār. The other is the paper manuscript of about the 15th century in the Govt. library at Poona. According to Udyotana, a king Torarāya or Torarāja was ruling over Parvatikā city situated on the banks of the river Chandrabhūga whose religious teacher was Harigupta, probably belonging to the royal Gupta dynasty. Muni Jina Vijaya takes this king as Toramāṇa, the Hūṇa king. N.C. Mehta, whose observations are based on the thesis of Muni Jina Vijaya has drawn the following conclusions:

(a) - "Torarāya is the celebrated Hūṇa monarch Toramāṇa who shook the Gupta empire to its very foundation and extended his sway as far as Mālwa (c. A.D.499-510)".

(b) - "Toramāṇa, or Toramāṇa had a Guru by the name Harigupta who was himself a scion of the family of the Imperial Guptas. The writer of Kuvalayamālā has particularly noted
the family as a mark of distinction, and though he doesn't specifically states it, the inference from the verses that follow is that Harigupta was a Jain".

Dashrath Sharma on the basis of the conclusion of Muni Jina Vijaya opines that probably, the Huna, after coming into contact with the Jain Muni, accepted or adopted Jainism.

N.C. Mehta's identification of Torarāya with Toramāṇa, the Huna king is rejected by K.P. Mitra on the following grounds:

(a) Udyotana Suri completed his work about A.D. 778 and lived about three centuries (278 years) after Toramāṇa (provided Torarāya was Toramāṇa) when the memory about him had become dim.

(b) Udyotana was a man of Deccan or south as his 'āṅka' suggests and which Mehta believes. In those days there was no means of communication by which legend about Toramāṇa could easily reach the Deccan, say, by having been carried by some bard or minstrel.

(c) And what did Toramāṇa do to merit Prasasti or eulogy or to be gratefully remembered by a Jaina writer like Udyotana Suri, or for that matter, the people of India?

(d) Udyotana Suri was writing a romance and not a history and he had no reason to remember Toramāṇa who had no claim to remembrance.
Hence] Torarāya is merely a nondescript rājā. There is an interval of about four centuries between the writing of Kuvalayamāḷī and the Jaisalmer Ms. Which is earlier and perhaps more reliable than the Poona Ms. of the 15th century. The Jaisalmer Ms has 'Śrī Tora-rāyeṇa' whereas the Poona Ms. has 'Toramāṇena', which, not unlikely may be a misreading or the copist's emendation.

To our belief Mitra’s objections to the identification of Toraraya of Kuvalayamāḷī, with Toramāṇa, the Hūnas king, carries more weight than the arguments given in its favour. Moreover, Jainism was not much popular and prevalent religious faith in that area by the time of Toramāṇa. Neither we get any contemporary evidence in support of it from that area. So, in light of these objections, it is very difficult to believe that the Hūnas, specially Toramāṇa ever professed Jaina religion.

Mihirakula was a devout follower of Saivism is evident from his coins with the depiction of Nandibull, trident and having the legends like 'Jayatu Vrishdhvaja' or 'Jayatu Vrisha'. The Gwalior inscription refers Mihirakula as bowing his head only before the Pāsupati on this earth. It is quite evident from the historical facts that Saivism attracted the foreigners more in comparison to other sects of Brāhmanism and Mihirakula’s option for Saivism was no mere an exception. H.C. Ray Chaudhary suggests the reasons for adopting non-Brāhmanical sects like Buddhism,
and Śaivism by the foreigners, as follows, "the Śaka and Kushāṇa sovereigns of north India were generally hostile towards the religion of the Vāsudeva and it was this anti-Bhagwat attitude which probably brought the foreign Kings into conflict with the Vaishnava monarchs Chandra and the imperial Guptas". But confrontations between the foreigners and the imperial Guptas due to religion, can be considered only if the foreigners sought to expand and popularise their own religion and that was not the reality. The preference to adopt Śaivism by the foreigners lies in its nature and principles which kept its door open for all irrespective of their cast, creed and race. Whereas the Bhāgvatism was not free from Brāhmaṇical hold or monopoly and it treated the foreigners like untouchables. Though under pressure or compulsion, necessary arrangements were made to absorb the foreigners, though ranked as Śūdras. Manu, makes an improvement in describing the foreigners as Kṣatriyas fallen to the status of Śūdras on account of negligence of the sacred rites and not consulting the Brāhmaṇas. Like wise, the Ābhīras, Śakas, Kambojas, Gāndhāras, Cinas, Kirātas, Paḥālavas etc. are treated as the peoples who were reduced from the Kṣatriyahood to the position of Śūdras. Moreover, Bhāgavatism was bestowed with royal patronage while Śaivism was still in need of royal patronage which it could find under the foreigner kings. So, Śaivism and foreigners were complimentary to each other in which Śaivism found a royal patron and the foreigners found an easy way to
enter into the Brahmanical fold.

The other important feature of Mihirakula's religious aptitude was the adoption of repressive measures against Buddhism. Mihirakula is known or regarded as the greatest of royal persecutor of Buddhism in India. His sacrilegious acts against Buddhism are recorded in the accounts of Hiuen-tsang and corroborated by Kalhana and Manjusrimulakalpa. The Kashmir historian compares Mihirakula with Yama, the god of death, for the former's atrocities\(^*\). At one place Kalhana remarks, "One's tongue would become polluted if one attempted to record his cruelties and evil deeds in detail\(^{30}\). The Manjusrimulakalpa also records the anti-Buddhist acts of a king who was marked with the appellation of a planer (sun), he patronized the Brāhmanas\(^{31}\). Now what provoked Mihirkula to adopt anti-Buddhist attitude? Joshi finds two reasons for it. He States, "Thus from literary as well as archaeological sources Mihirakula seems to have been a follower of Brāhmanism and a fanatic Saiva. Besides, he had one more reason to persecute the Buddhists - he had been enraged by the Buddhist monks who had sent to him a monk of low rank to teach him the doctrines of Buddhism\(^{32}\). There upon says Hiuen-tsang, the king ordered the utter extermination of the Buddhist church throughout all his dominions. He overthrew the stupas, destroyed the Saṅgharamas, altogether one thousand six hundred foundations. Besides, he put to death nine hundred koṭis of lay adherents of Buddhism\(^{33}\).
So there appears a difference of approach in the policies of Toramāṇa and Mihirakula in dealing with Buddhism. The former’s tolerant policy was replaced by later’s hatredness towards Buddhism. Let’s examine the first possibility that Mihirakula was a fanatic Saivite that motivated him to adopt the anti-Buddhist policy. The option for Saivism by Mihirakula can be based upon two reasons. First, the merits of Saivism as a religion attracted Mihirakula to adopt Saivism. Second, that the Saivism was a popular faith of the Indian population and to win over the confidence of the local population, Mihirakula preferred the adoption of Saivism. It is difficult to believe that a person of Mihirakula’s stature might be extending a courtesy and consideration to the merits of a religion. The second possibility that Saivism was a popular faith and was accepted by many foreign rulers in the past seems to be more logical. If Mihirakula adopted Saivism to win over the confidence of the local population, then he can not be a fanatic. His actions to persecute Buddhists were not aimed to spread the message of Śiva or Saivism in India. Neither Saivism was Mūṇa’s own religion for they which could forcibly cause conversion of people of other sects to Saivism as we notice sometimes in the case of the Muslim rulers in India. So, to attribute Mihirakula’s fanaticism as one of the main reasons to destroy the Buddhist stupas and monasteries and persecution of the Buddhist monks, is difficult to accept. So far as the second possibility is concerned it is not an unexpected
move keeping in view the personality of Mihirakula.

Mihirakula's anti-Buddhist attitude is largely covered by the account of Huien-tsang. But his account has been subjected to severe criticism by scholars. Watters points out that other Chinese authorities also place Mihirkula long before that date. Pannalal totally rejects the contention of the Chinese pilgrim about the Hūnas but Fleet and following him, Smith and others, believe that there is some error in the Chinese text itself. Thakur states, "There is no doubt that Yuan-chwang's story is not above board for he does not say any thing about Yashodharman and the crushing victory of Mihirakula by him. The simple fact is that the Buddhist bias of the pilgrim, like all sectarian preachers greatly affected and distorted his general view of man and affairs, making such accounts sometimes exaggerated and often wholly untenable". Even if we believe the contents of Huien-tsang's story, then sending a low ranked monk to teach Buddhism to Mihirakula merely cannot form a sound reason specially when the king was interested or prepared to learn Buddhism. The real reasons lie somewhere else. It may be possible that certain political considerations played a vital role in the enforcement of anti-Buddhist policy. It is well known that Mihirakula restruck a good number of Toramāṇa's coins at his name. This is very rare phenomenon that a son had to restruck the coins of his father. Economic compulsions can not be held responsible for that. Perhaps
loss of cordiality or understanding between Toramāṇa and Mihirakula was behind this phenomenon. It may be possible that there must have been some serious cause of confrontation between Toramāṇa and Mihirakula and due to that Mihirakula reversed Toramāṇa's tolerant policy towards Buddhism.

Thakur has tried to explore the reasons that provoked Mihirakula against the Buddhists, in the light of the accounts of Kosmos and Yuan-chwang. It is stated by Thakur that "It was after his (Mihirakula) ignominious defeat (after A.D. 530) at the hands of Narasiṃha Gupta Bālāditya and Yashodharman that he returned to his capital but, to his utter bewilderment and anguish, he found both Gāndhāra and Kashmir lost to his empire the former having been usurped by his younger brother during his long absence and the later having asserted independence, adding insult to his injuries. Reduced to a wandering existence he sought and obtained asylum in Kashmir and later by intrigues and machination succeeded in killing the king of Kashmir and placing himself on the throne. It was after this successful coup that he wanted to wreak vengeance on his unobliging and treacherous brother and consequently he marched against Gāndhāra, killed the king and placed himself securely in the region". He further states, "The massacre of the Buddhist as well as the Jainas (as we learn from the Jaina sources) in those regions may well be explained by the fact that the followers of these religions had secret intrigues leading to
his overthrow because of his pronounced Brāhmanical leanings, for from no other regions have we any evidence or proof of his ferocious and violent behaviour towards the followers of these two sects. Thakur's conclusions appear to be more convincing.

So far as the impact of the Huna invasion on the religious affairs of the country is concerned, Buddhism experienced the greater loss, for the Huna rulers particularly Mihirakula practised the anti-Buddhist policy, according to the Buddhist sources. Hiuen-tsang gives the description of Mihirakula's atrocities on Buddhist monks and institutions and also gives a detailed account of the state and condition of the Buddhist monasteries and saṅghas, which he found in the ruins. Buddhism which attained the heights of progress under the Kushānas and a satisfactory survival under the Guptas, showed signs of decay in the post-Gupta period. Despite the responsibility of certain internal factors for its decline, the contribution of external factors can be adjudged as of equal importance. The most important of these external factors was the invasion of the Hūnas and their subsequent cultivation of anti-Buddhist policy specially under Mihirakula. The Hūna rulers before Mihirakula are not evidenced to be following the anti-Buddhist policy as has been discussed earlier. The destruction of the Buddhist monasteries and the stupas is archaeologically proved by the excavation and exploration of various sites. We have already discussed that the
sites of Takshāśilā, Ajram, Sanghol and Kaushāmbī are found to be deserted and destroyed as a result of the Hūṇa invasion. These places were closely associated with Buddhism. During the excavation at Sanghol, a site in district Ludhiana in Punjab, we find a hoard of as many as 117 images, panels etc. dumped in a stupa to the eastern side of the site and it is, perhaps, indicative of the fact that due to the fear of the Hūṇa invasion, the images were dumped to protect them from the Hūgas onslaughts. G.B. Sharma disclosed that the earlier habitation was on the western side of the mound or site. But the Hūṇas possibly destroyed this habitation on the western side and they themselves settled on the eastern side from where are found a large number of Hūṇa coins and other antiquities. According to him this site came under the attack of the Hūṇas and their invasion brought misfortunes to the growth of Buddhism on this site following the similar fate of Buddhism on other sites. Buddhism, which experienced a state patronage under the Kushāṇas and a more tolerant treatment under the Guptas, now experienced a heavy loss of monks and monasteries under the Hūṇas. The repressive policy of the Hūṇas particularly of Mihirakula not only checked the further growth of Buddhism in India but led to its decline.

IV

The problem of assimilation of the Hūṇas in Indian society can be discussed in light of Indian reaction to the foreigners
as revealed by the contemporary literature. They are described as fierce barbarians and vultures. Generally, the foreigners have been designated as 'malechchha' in Indian literature which includes speakers of an alien language; social groups ranked as mixed castes; technologically backward tribes; not observing the laws of Varna; ritually impure and the people along the frontiers. This shows that the term 'malechchha' is not confined to the foreigners only, but also included the indigenous tribes or people living in the areas where the 'śrāddha' ceremony (offering to ancestors on stipulated occasions) was not carried out, and where people did not observe the laws of the Varna. So the term 'malechchha' has variable meanings which kept on changing with the changing situations. Sometimes, the process of assimilation of the Hūṇas in Indian society is explained in consonance with the assimilation of the Indo-Aryans. But here it should be given attention that the Indo-Aryans were assimilators who assimilated the aboriginal population in its fold. Similarly, the standards and the treatment accorded to the foreigners like Saka, Pahlava, Greeks, Kushāṇas and the Hūṇas in the process of their subsequent assimilation into Indian society, should not be applied to the Muslims because of their cultural limitations and considerations. The Muslims represented a separate religion and culture and they confronted the Indian culture whereas the Hūṇas invasion and their subsequent settlement did not lead to any cultural confrontations because of lack of formal culture.
process of assimilation passes through three stages of confrontation, confusion and compromise. The confrontation can be studied under non-acceptance of the foreigners by the Indians and the second stage, i.e. confusion can be identified as a period of practice to assert for social and political survival against various odd forces and the final stage paves way for the mutual acceptance of the social and political necessities and the realities.

By the time of the Hūnas, northern India was now familiar with the foreign invasions and the governments under the 'malechchha' dynasties. So, the Hūnas were treated in the traditional framework and were awarded the same treatment as to their foreign predecessors. The assimilation of the Hūnas could be achieved at various levels. The obvious forms are noticeable in external habits such as names, dress, eating habits and amusements. We donot find any significant cultural exchange between Hūnas and Indians during the course of first invasions except the use of Brāhmī script on the coins of Khiṅgila. The sanskritization of names was a common feature among both indigenous and foreign malechchas has who slowly tried to move away from their status of malechchha⁷. Very often in the case of the ruling families it took one or two generations to make the transition. Mihirakula can be cited here as illustration. The Indian culture or society was prepared to accept the malechchhas in its fold
but with certain conditions. As we have seen that the major difference between theĀrya and the malechchha was that the latter did not conform to the law of Varna. On one occasion the god Indra is asked how the Yavanas, Sakas, Cinas, Kambojas, Pulindas etc. can be brought within the social pale, and he replies that if they follow the 'dharma' of the Sastras (essentially the law of Varna), they can be admitted. But it appears that generally the malechchhas specially the foreigners did not concede to it and rather they preferred to side away with Buddhism, which at least did not put such pre-conditions or restrictions. The other more subtle form of assimilation was through the incorporation of cults and cult-priests into the religious beliefs and rituals of the established religions of the Āryas. In the case of the Buddhism the assimilation was easier since there was no such stress on ritual ranking as in the Brāhmaṇical relation. But in the case of Hūṇas, Buddhism could not lure them and they, initially under Toramana, professed the Sun cult and later Saivism under Mihirakula. Henceforth the doors of the Brāhmaṇical religion were not closed and Brāhmaṇism was made more flexible and more adjustable for them as discussed earlier. Thapar opines that, "Perhaps the Sun and fire cults of the Hūṇas acted as bridge towards their acceptance of and by Hinduism".

Now how the Sun or fire cult helped the Hūṇas in providing them the easy assimilation in the Hindu or Indian fold, is a
matter to be dealt with in light of the origin and development of the Sun cult in India. The Indian Sun cult occupied a unique position among the religious systems of India in the sense that it was the only sect which came to be formally associated with a foreign priesthood and developed under its influence in ancient times. Indian Sun-priests came to be known by various designations or names such as Māga, Bhojaka, Vāchaka, Yājaka, Pujaka, Sevak, Sākadvipa Brāhmaṇa, Sūrya-dvīja in the late Purānic records like the Sāmba, Bhavishya and Brahma Purāṇas which are confirmed by the Brihateśa - saṃhitā, Alberuni and the inscriptions of Hunda and Govindapur in the main and there is a sizeable number of these Sun priests under the popular name of Sākadvipa Brāhmaṇas or Māga Brāhmaṇas still present in the north Indian population. The late Puranic records particularly the Sāmba and Bhavishya Purāṇas, contain the story of the advent of the Māgas from the Sākadvipa in order to accept the priesthood of a Sun temple at Multan in connection with the Samba legend. Sākadvipa is identified with South-West Afghanistan i.e. east Iran of ancient times. The Māgas of the Purāṇas have been identified with the Sun-worshipping Māgi Priests of Iran. Alberuni confirms that the Māgas were no other than the Māgi priests of Persia. The chief feature of Māgi cult were their worship of the Sun god and the Fire god under the name of Mithra. They were famous for magic and occult power. Srivastva states that the Māgas who came to India were originally the magic expert,
indigenous (non-Aryan) fire and sun worshipping priests of Medea. The Sun priests of foreign origin first entered in India in the 5th century B.C. in the wake of the Achaemenid invasion, then they entered in the first-second century A.D. in the wake of the Saka-Kushāṇa invasions and lastly they entered in the wake of the Mūṇa invasion in the 5th-6th centuries A.D.®. The Māγian form of Sun worship became popular during the Kushāṇa period as we find the portrait of Mithra on the coins of the Kanishka, absence of sun icons with Iranian features before the Kushāṇa period and silence of the Indian literature about them before the second century A.D. On the copper coins of Kaniska and the gold coins of Huvisuka, Mihira is represented and the figure is identical with that of great god Helious. In the Mihira Yasht of the Avesta is bestowed on, and invocation offered to, the angel presiding over and directing the course of the sun®©. Mihira is the sanskritized form of the Persian Mihr which is a corruption of Mithra, the Avestic form of the Vedic Mitra®®. In the words of Srivastva, the evidence of Mithra worship on the coins of Kanishka is simply indicative of official recognition of the cult®®. Several Gupta and Kushāṇa sun-icons contain the Iranian features introduced by the Māγas which show that the Māγas were present in the society during this period. The seals from Basarh, Bhita, Sunet and Rajghat (Gupta period) show Māγian influence®®. Srivasta concludes that the Māγa influence was negligible so far as the mythology, theology and philosophy of the Sun cult were
concerned. It appears that the tradition of the Sun image and sun temple in particular was introduced by the Magas as is clear from the following statement of the Sāmba Purāṇa, "Na purā pratiṃśa byasit pujayate maṇḍale raviḥ (29.2)" (There was no image in the past as the sun was worshipped in disc form). The existence of a large number of sun temples in the western part of India where the Magas first established a sun temple at Mūlasthāna (modern Multan) is again a pointer in the direction that the Maga priests were responsible for this new tradition. It is important to mention here that Toramāṇa also constructed a sun temple at Multan. So far the absorption of these sun priests, in the words of Srivastva "It appears that the orthodox sections of the Hindu society had to accept them by the 4th-5th centuries A.D. on account of their immense popularity in the pre-Gupta society. By the middle of the 6th century A.D. they were absorbed in the orthodox Hindu society as evidenced by the prescription of Magianised Sun worship in the Sāmba and Bhavishya Purāṇas whose lower limits go to the 6th century A.D., though the material of the Sāmba Purāṇa was re-written in the Bhavishya Purāṇa by the 10th century. That they attained the status equal to that of the Brāhmaṇas at this time can be seen from a manuscript dated A.D. 550, found in Nepal in which the Brāhmaṇas and the Magas are given equal status."
The Magas were not the alone priestly group that entered India in different periods. As discussed above, various other groups of Sun priests immigrated into India in the course of the invasions. Bhandarkar refers one of these groups. He states, "In the Jodhpur state there is a class of the Brāhmaṇas known as the Sevaka and also Bhojaka, most of whom are religious dependents of the Oswal Śrāvakas. They call themselves Śākadvīpi Brāhmaṇas and keep images of Sūrya in their houses, which they worship on Sundays when they eat once only." The Prāsari Brāhmaṇas of Pushkar were also originally known as Sevakas and the Śākadvīpi Brāhmaṇas. The Sevakas say that their caste people are called Śākadvīpi in the east, Sitāpurī in the South, and Pānde round about Delhi and Agra. The Pujārīs of the temple of Jagadisb and Jvalamukhi in north India are, it is said, Śākadvīpi Brāhmaṇas.

So, on the basis of the above discussion it appears that the foreigners adopted Sun-cult which was maintained by the Sun priests of foreign origin. Similarly, the sun priests were bound to favour the foreign rulers as they were the only ruling class which patronised and protected the Sun-cult and sun priests. Thus, in terms of requirement and necessity, both were complimentary to each other. That can be considered as the first stage towards assimilation into Indian society. The second and final stage began with the Indianization of the Sun priests as discussed earlier and acquired the status equal to the Brāhmaṇas. Now the
Sun priests had their weight in the Brāhmanical fold and thus they also facilitated the absorption and the assimilation and acceptance of the foreigners into the Brāhmanical fold. The second stage of assimilation is marked by the adoption of Śaivism by the foreigners specially the Hūṇas. Thus, the acceptance of the Sun-cult by Toramāṇa and Śaivism by Mihirakula marks the different stages in achieving the final goal. The connection of the foreigners with the Sun-cult is convincingly testified by making a comparison of the Sun images with the Kushāṇa kings. The statues of the Kushāṇa kings and the earlier images of Sūrya have a striking resemblance in dress and as regards the boots, the sword and the club held in their hands and the squatting attitude. The high boots worn by the god are similar to those seen in the well-known statues of Kanishka, Vamatakasuma and Chaṣṭana and the two unknown royal figures in a sculpture (No. 1559 of the Mathura register) found in the Sadar Bazar, Mathura. The figure (Mathura Museum No. 269) probably represents Kanishka or Kadphises II and is very similar in dress, attributes and the sitting attitude, to the Sun images of the Mathura Museum No. 7, 930 and 522 and the image in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Pandey states that "It is interesting to mention here that the development of the sun images of the Kushāṇa period represents a religious renaissance when the foreign spirit was slowly merging into the Hindu view of life. In the course of time supremacy of the Hindu
mythology was felt and thus there came to be a representation of
the deity, which though purely Hinduised, always retains a
patronizing allusion to the foreign form."\(^5\).

The legacy of the Sun-cult was maintained by the various
Rajput dynasties ruling over Rajasthan, Haryana, Himachal Pardesh,
Gujarat and Madhya Pardesh etc. The foreigners' area of operation
was similar to that of the Rajputs where sun worship was
uninterruptedly carried out by the Rajput dynasties like
Pratihāras, the Chāhmānas, the Gāhaḍavālas, the Parmāras etc.
Whether the continuance of Sun-cult by the Rajputs has any
relations with the foreigners patronizing Sun-cult in this area
earlier, is a problem to be viewed in light of the origin of the
Rajputs. Besides, the relation between the Rajputs and the last
foreigners can be established on numismatic grounds where the
Indo-Sassanian coinage of the foreigners was carried with or
continued by the Rajputs in the form of Gadhīa coins.

At the time of Hūna invasion, Rajasthan was dominated by
the presence of various republics who had earlier accepted the
suzerainty of the Gupta rulers but after its decline, flourished
independently.\(^6\) The socio-cultural fabric of these republics
was not guided by the Brāhmaṇical social order and they were
maintaining a separate or distinctive social, political and
cultural traits or ethos different from that of the centrally controlled areas of Pāṭiliputra. So the response and the treatment extended to the foreigners by the Brāhmaṇical scriptures was of little importance or in a sense meaningless so far as the problem of assimilation of the foreigners into Indian society is concerned. This area, falling in isolation from the Pāṭiliputra point of view developed its own distinct social and cultural framework where the tribal instincts—sometimes offered by the foreigners, played dominant role in terms of the political organization with separate social and cultural framings. This area basically comprised of the various warrior groups where the priests or the Brāhmaṇas had a less dominant role to play in comparison to the role played by them in Pāṭiliputra and its adjoining areas. Thus, socially, such kind of environment could produce only the Kṣatriyas which is illustrated by the presence of various warrior groups in this area commonly known as the Rajputs. Here the Kṣatriyas dominated the political and social affairs instead of the Brāhmaṇas. The cultural factors like movements, migrations or displacement played an important role in the growth and rise of many Rajputs tribes as a major political power. The craze for the Kṣatriyahood in this area was so high that certain Brāhmaṇical groups felt a matter of pride in leaving their Brāhmaṇahood and opting for Kṣatriyahood. This is also indicative of the less importance of the Brāhmaṇas in this area. So, theoretically, the foreigners specially the Hūṇas had to bear a stiff resistance from the
protector or champions of Brāhmaṇism but practically the assimilation process exhibited patience, tolerance and flexibility making it convenient to settle and practise the secluded Hindu practices.

The republics of this area put no hindrance or resistance to the political conquests or occupation of these areas by the Hūnas. A simple reason may be put forward that these republics were less powerful as compared to the Hūnas. But this can be only one side of the coin. The other side involves the basic nature of these republics. Culturally, these republics were not associated with the typical Brāhmaṇical culture being preserved and observed by the Gupta emperors ruling at Pāṭliputra. So, the republics saw no threat to their cultural edifice from the Hūnas. Moreover, the people of these areas had a larger population of having foreign connection in this or that way and were not fundamentally blooded with the Brāhmaṇical spirit as much as the Guptas and their allies. These factors prevented the possible conflict between the republics and the Hūnas. Thus, to accept the suzerainty either of the Hūnas or of the Guptas had no significant meaning for these republics. So the political developments or necessities or the compulsions forced these republics to go along the interests of the Hūnas instead of fighting against the Hūnas for the Guptas.
The important tribes in this area, according to the Allahabad Prasasti of Samudragupta were the Malavas of the Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar region, the Arjunayanas of Jaipur-Delhi-Agra division, the Yaudheyas of the northern Rajasthan and the adjoining areas of Haryana and the Abhiras of Abiria in southern Rajasthan. Another tribe i.e. Varikā tribe of the Bharatpur area is known from a stone pillar inscription found at Bijayagarh near Bayana, dated, according to Fleet, c.A.D.371-72. A Maukhri principality of Badva (in the former Koṭā state) also existed in A.D.238 as revealed by the Badava stone pillar inscription. D.C. Shukla believes that this branch of the Maukharis had disappeared from the political scene of Rajasthan by the middle of the fourth century or had become subordinate to some neighbouring power which rendered its separate mention in the Prayāga Prasasti unnecessary. How much distance existed between the relation of these republics and the Guptas is testified by the Prayāga Prasasti itself. In the Prayāga Prasasti of Samudragupta, the Malavas, the Arjunāyanas, the Yaudheyas and the Abhiras of Rajasthan and some other tribes of Punjab and Madhya Pardesh have been grouped with the 'pratyanta' (exterior) states whose kings were compelled to pay all kind of taxes, carry out the imperial commands and pay personal homage to the emperor. The rulers of these tribal republics were also expected to attend the royal court personally. Such kind of imposition of terms and conditions could not help the Guptas to win the hearts of these tribal
republics and that too to the extent of assisting them against the Hūṇas. The existence of these republics in the post-Samudragupta period is discussed differently. A.S. Altekar\textsuperscript{103} opines that "The tribal republics mentioned in the Prayāg Praśasti continued to flourish even after Samudragupta. It is important to note in this connection that we have no evidence whatsoever to show that the homelands of these republics were ever annexed to the Gupta empire. The fact that no monuments of the Gupta rule have been found in Rajputana or beyond Mathura shows that the Guptas could hardly exercise any effective control over these republics. They may well have continued their semi-independent existence down to the middle of the 5th century A.D. when they appear to have been engulfed in the Hūṇa avalanche". Thakur\textsuperscript{104} states that "The invasion of the Hūṇas further dealt a death blow to the none-too-prosperous Indian republicanism which till then survived like an oasis in the vast imperial desert". Some scholars give different version or opinions regarding the Gupta rule in Rajasthan and accept its existence before the time of coming of the Hūṇas. But here we need not to fall in this controversy. It is apparent that certain tribal republics existed in this area in the Gupta and post-Gupta period and their affiliation with their masters was some sort of compulsion from which they got rid of at the time of Hūṇa invasion.
Thus, the Hūṇas, settled in this area which was free from strict Brāhmaṇical control, did not face assimilation problem on the pretext of being a malechchha in the Brāhmaṇical literature. After their settlement in this area, the Hūṇas attained Kṣatriyahood. The political power acquired by the each Rajput group — be it foreigner or the indigenous, brought them the status of a Kṣatriya. There are instances of some Rajput tribes owing their foundation from a Brāhmaṇa. They attained the status of Brahma-Kṣatriya in the initial stages of the political mileage and were considered, later on, purely Kṣatriyas when their political power groomed to the best.

The origin of the Rajputs is sometimes considered in light of the Hūṇas. It should be taken into consideration that the assimilation of the Hūṇas into the Indian society took place in different circumstances in different areas. First of all, their settlement and subsequent assimilation in the area of Rajasthan needs to be examined where their name was included in the list of thirty-six Rajput clans — a clear hint of attainment of Kṣatriyahood. It is not that all Rajput tribes originated from the Hūṇas, that all the Hūṇas were absorbed as Kṣatriyas, that all the Rajput tribes had Kṣatriya origin and foreign origin, and that all the Hūṇas were assimilated in Rajasthan only.

The studies on the Rajputs history rests upon two extremes — one favouring their origin from the hoards of the foreigners
of the post-Gupta period while the other end stipulates their origin from the Āryan Kṣatriyas. Both kinds of studies have their own limitations. The studies propounding indigenous origin of Rajputs assumed symbolic overtones in the heyday of nationalist historiography, and in the historical and purely literary writings of various genres, the military and chivalrous qualities of the Rajputs were repeatedly projected. The other group of studies, who insist on the foreign origin of Rajputs, is found to be satisfied on the drafted and fabricated genealogy of different Rajput dynasties in the inscriptions. Both groups ignored the study of political, social and economic aspects which combinedly contributed in the growth of new political powers then termed as Rajputs. B.D. Chattopadhyaya has very ably made an effort to trace the origin of the Rajputs in terms of political, economic and social processes. His hypothesis, concerned to the origin of the Pratiharas, the Guhilās and the Chāhamānas, rests on the following conclusions:

1. The term Rājputra represented a mixed caste and constituted a fairly large section of petty chiefs holding estates.
2. These 'Rājputras' were included in the Rajput clan by the contemporary status of a clan at least in the early stages of crystallization of Rajput power.
3. One of the important pointers to the process of emergence of Rajputs was a spate of colonization of new areas causing significant expansion of the number of settlements furthering expansion of agrarian economy.

4. The territorial expansion of what came to be known as Rajput power, was achieved at least in certain areas, at the expense of erstwhile tribal settlements.

5. The mobility to the Kṣatriya status was in operation in the same period (in which the indigenous and foreign tribes competed at equal length).

6. A definite correlation existed between the political eminence and a movement towards a corresponding social status e.g. movement from Brahma-Kṣatriya status to pure Kṣatriya status representing the feudal status and the independent status respectively.

The above assertion of Chattopadhyaya clears certain apprehensions and after closely examining the date available regarding origin of the Rajputs the following conclusions can be made:

1. All the Rajputs did not derive their origin solely from the foreign or indigenous stock.

2. The term Rajput represented a group of people consisting of foreign as well as indigenous people.
3. The Rajputs of foreign origin like Hūnas were Indianised by the cultural interaction with the Rajputs of indigenous origin who carried with them the characteristics of Indian culture. The interaction involved inter-marriage and interdining etc.

4. The entrance into the Rajput fold, by the foreigners as well as indigenous, largely depended upon their political status. The political power attained by the foreign and indigenous tribes placed them at a common platform of Rajputhood.

5. The Rajput fold or platform was open to all having no social restrictions to foreign and indigenous people in joining the said platform. The loss to the foreigners of not being an Indian were compensated by the political power they exercised.

6. The Hūnas were not confined to the Rajasthan area only.

In the light of the above assertions, we can discuss the problem of assimilation of the Hūnas into Indian society with special reference to their entry into the Rajput fold. It can be assumed safely that the political developments in this area were paving way for the emergence of new kingdoms who, in the beginning, are found to be settling scores with the local tribes. At this stage the social and political status was not clearly defined and we witness the upward mobility among these newly emerging kingdoms to achieve a well defined social and political
status. In this struggle certain clans like the Pratiharas, the Guhilas, the Chāhamāṇas etc. rose to prominence and become a dominant power. Here, we shall confine ourselves to the Hūṇas whose name we find mentioned in the list of thirty six clans of Rajputs. The inclusion of the Hūṇas in the list of Rajput clans, accorded them the status of the Kṣatriyas and epigraphical sources shows that they had established matrimonial relations with other Rajput clans. The Atpur inscription of Saktikumara\textsuperscript{108} refers to a prince of Guhila family (who were originally the Brāhmanas) as marrying a Hūṇa princess, Hariyadevi. The three Kalachuri inscriptions - the Totawali plate of king Jaisimhadeva dated Kalachuri era 918\textsuperscript{107} the Jabalpur copper plate inscription of Yāṣakarṇadeva (A.D.1122)\textsuperscript{108} and the Bheraghata inscription of queen Alhaṇadevī dated Kalachuri era 907\textsuperscript{109} states that the Kalachuri king Karnadeva married the Hūṇa princess Avalladevi. These records provide a clue to their upward social mobility where their identity of being a foreigner had been given no consideration and were accepted as a part of the Rajput confederacy. Defining the social status of the Hūṇas in light of these records Biswas\textsuperscript{110} states, "The natural assumption is that, even though they were thoroughly Indianised and considered themselves the Kṣatriyas, they were forced to bear the designation of the Hūṇas. It is further remarkable that the Kṣatriya houses, who made matrimonial alliances with the Hūṇa family, mostly took the daughters of the Hūṇas. This suggests that even though the
mediaeval Huna families were marrying with the Kṣatriyas, they were still looked on as lower in status. It is to be believed that the term 'Rajput' is a designation applied for various tribes, either foreign or indigenous, keeping in view their political status. The Kanabela stone inscription of Jayasimhadeva (composed between A.D. 1160-1180) mentions that the Kalachuri King Karna (A.D. 1041-1073) had conquered the Hūnas. It shows that the Hūnas continued or maintained their political weight even up to the time of Kalachuri King Karna. The Hūnas politically, may have a lower status in comparison to the Guhilas and the Kalachuris.

Biswas's assertion that they enjoyed a lower social status only because they gave their daughters in marriage to the royal houses of the Guhilas and the Kalachuris, is an argument not based upon the proper understanding of the facts. The royal houses of the Guhilas and the Kalachuris were under no compulsion to accept a girl of low social status in marriage. Moreover, for the determination of social status the Brāhmānical scale was not applied. It largely depended upon the occupation or profession being practised by the concerned tribe. The Hūnas because of their warrior qualities fulfilled the eligibility conditions or qualified to be called as the Kṣatriyas. It does not necessarily mean that all the Hūnas became Kṣatriyas. Some of them might be opting for other occupations which were assigned to the people of having lower social status. Tod, in his monumental work, observes that "The only singular circumstance is, by what means
they (Hūnas) came to be recognised as Hindus, even though of the lowest class. Sūdra we cannot term them, for although the 'Kāṭhi' and the 'Bala' cannot be regarded as, or classed, with the Rajputs, they would scorn the rank of the Sūdra". this observation possibly includes the second category of the Hūnas who moved to the lower occupations. If we judge the case of the Hūnas in the contemporary situation from the Brāhmaṇical point of view where vertical social scale consisted of the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas, the Vaiśyas and the Sūdras, then we will find that only two groups i.e. the Kṣatriyas and the Sūdras were eligible or fittest groups to include or adjust the Hūnas in their fold. The Hūnas could not be included into the Brāhmaṇical fold due to the non-Brāhmaṇical pursuits of the Hūnas. In Rajasthan, agriculture and trade were not encouraging due to the adverse climatic or geographical conditions and that restricted the growth of the Vaiśya profession, hence no scope or possibility for the Hūnas to be adjusted in the Vaiśya group. Neither it matched to their inherited or traditional profession. So, the only option before the Hūnas to adjust themselves was in the Kṣatriya and the Sūdra groups. They could make their entry in these two groups only and which they did.

Thakur's conclusions regarding the connection of the Hūnas with the Rajputs, who believes the Hūnas as the non-Rajput tribe, requires further examination of the problem. Thakur states,
"The confusion regarding the acceptance of the Hūṇas as one of the numerous clans of the Kṣatriyas in later times arose, it seems, due to the misreading of the verse in question in the Rāsa (Prithvīrājarāsop of Chanda Bārdāi) by Mohan Lai who wrongly interpreted the Hula as the Hūṇa". Tod has given four lists of the royal clans of Rajasthan which includes Ancient Manuscripts, Chanda Bārdāi, Kumārapālacharita (in Sanskrit and Gujarati separately) and Khichi bard. Finally, he has given a corrected list prepared on the basis of the above four lists. The word 'Hul' appears in the list of Chanda Bārdai and Khichi bard while in the list of Ancient Manuscript and in one of the two lists of Kumārapālacharita, there is a direct mention of word 'Hun'. Moreover, in the final corrected list prepared by Tod himself, the word 'Hul' and 'Hun' are mentioned separately. Tod has discussed the Hūṇas with great length in his work on the Rajputs but does not mention the Huls. So, Thakur's assertion that the Hūṇas are included in the list of 36 Rajput clans merely on the philological grounds appears to be illogical and contrary to the reality.

Thakur regarding the social status of the Hūṇas, states,"The Hūṇas, inspite of their marital relations (with the Kṣatriya clans), were never accorded the rightful place in the Kṣatriya order". This points towards the inferior status of the Hūṇas in the Kṣatriya order. But Thakur has not explained the
cause of this inferior status of the Hunas. But certainly the cause is not related to the Hunas being the foreigners. It may be, as discussed earlier, due to the lower political status of the Hunas and not concerned to their social inferiority or low ranking. Thakur has vehemently rejected the foreign origin of the Rajputs. We have discussed earlier that the title Rajput was assigned to the tribes of both, foreign and indigenous origin. Thus it will be fruitless to state that the Rajputs had solely foreign origin or indigenous origin rather it represented the mixed stock of foreign and indigenous people. Here it is important to mention that the most important factor which completely Indianised the foreign tribes was their constant touch or association with the Rajput tribes of indigenous origin who brought in contact the foreign people with the Indian culture. The maintenance or observance of social relation between the two bridged the cultural gap between them.

The connection of the Hunas with the origin of the Rajputs depend upon the theory of foreign origin of the Rajputs which has been challenged by some scholars who favours the indigenous origin of the Rajputs. We have stated earlier that the Rajputs comprised of both the foreign and the indigenous elements. In this way, the possibility of the Hunas being one of foreign tribes from whom certain Rajput tribes derived their origin, can not ruled out. But as we find the Hunas are independently mentioned
in the annals of the contemporary writers and who are not attached with the origin of other Rajput tribes, it is very difficult to conclude that which other Rajput tribes derived their origin from the Hūṇas.

The assimilation process of the Hūṇas was not confined to the area of Rajputana only. It is also evidenced that Punjab remained a stronghold of the later Hūṇas. But it is not yet established, due to lack of proper evidences, that which particular group of the population in this area derived their origin from the Hūṇas. Sometimes the Jāts, the dominant peasantry class in northern Rajasthan, western Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana and Pakistan's Punjab becomes the focus of controversy when the question of their origin arises. The Europeans historians insists that the Jāts are the descendents of the Indo-Scythian stock which is also the source of origin of the Rajputs. While the other group sees the jāts of the Ṛṣy lineage, the fact which is also supported by the earlier anthropologists. It would serve no purpose to us to investigate this problem in light of the dirth of evidences.
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