CHAPTER - VIII.

THE MLECCHAS IN FOREIGN ACCOUNTS,
SECULAR LITERATURE AND
INDIAN EPIGRAPHS.

The texts belonging to secular literature, foreign accounts and the epigraphic documents bearing references to the Mlecchas, cover a wide range in point of time. They have one common factor, evidently negative in character. They do not lay down any injunction with regard to connubium and commensality, nor do they safeguard the interest of any particular community against contamination with the Mlecchas.

According to the Life, China in the eyes of the Indian monks was "a country of the Mlecchas, men of no importance, and shallow as to religion and so the Buddhas are never born there." The Indian monks, therefore, requested the Master of the Law to stay on in Jambudvīpa which, according to the testimony of Hiuen-Tsang, was conterminous with the Indian sub-continent in the seventh century A.D. Thus, the countries where the Buddha had not been born and where the people did not follow a superior religion, were branded as Mleccha. According to Hiuen-Tsang's own version, however, all the countries to the north of Lan-Po (i.e., Lamghan) were called Mi-li-ku (cf. Milakkhu or Milikkhu of the Buddhist texts). The Lamghan or Leghman region in southern Afghanistan has been included in India by the Chinese pilgrim. To the Indians, however, it was outside India proper.
In Visākhadatta's Mudrārāksasa, reference has been made to the conspiracy engineered by Malayaketu to dethrone Candragupta. The Mlecchas were drawn into the plot. The five Mlechat kings par excellence, who had joined the intrigue, were Citra-varman of Kuluta, Siṁhanāda of Malaya, Puṣkarākṣa of Kaśmīra, Sindhuṣeṇa of Sindhudeśa and Megha of Pārasya. Thus, large areas, included by Huien Tsang within India, had been regarded as Mleccha lands by the Indian writers. The exact date of Visākhadatta, however, is not known to us. There is every reason to believe that he belonged to the older group of dramatists who succeeded Kālidāsa, and, as such, could not have been removed far from the Chinese pilgrim in point of time. The possible source of the drama is the Brhatkathā of Guṇaṇḍya, who lived in or before the third century A.D. It is, therefore, difficult to determine whether the Mleccha kingdoms, mentioned in the Mudrārāksasa, refer to the foreign principalities of north-western India which were in existence even on the eve of the rise of the Imperial Guptas in the fourth century A.D. According to the most reserved opinion Visākhadatta lived in the ninth century A.D. The Arabs then had their principalities in Sindh. Leaving aside the controversies, we are in a position to assert that Visākhadatta had the knowledge of Mleccha ruling families in Kulu valley, Kashmir and over large tracts lying to the west of the Indus and stretching over Persia. They are
called Mlecchas either because of their foreign origin or that of their non-adherence to Brahmanism or both.

We may refer in this connection to the Junagarh inscription of the reign of Skandagupta, dated 457 A.D. It is the earliest epigraphic document of India bearing reference to the term Mleccha. It is interesting to note that the Bhitari pillar inscription alludes to Skandagupta's victory over the Hūnas while the Junagarh epigraph refers to his enemies in the Mleccha countries. The relevant verse of this record has been translated in the following way "Whose (i.e., Skandagupta's) fame, moreover, even (his) enemies in the countries of the Mlecchas..... having their pride broken down to the very root, announce with the words 'verily the victory has been achieved by him". The Junagarh inscription indicates that the encounter had taken place in or before G.E. 136, i.e., immediately after or before Skandagupta's accession to the throne. It is doubtful whether Skandagupta could have faced the Hūnas as early as or before A.D. 455. The Mleccha enemies, therefore, might have been different from the Hūnas. Reference may be made in this connection to the "fire altar" device on the silver coins of Skandagupta. They betray the die-cutter's knowledge of the Sassanian coins. There are thus reasons to believe that the Mleccha contenders were the Sassanids who are known to have had a proclivity towards the east from earlier times.
The Kathāsaritasāgara of Somadeva records the tradition that Vikramāditya, son of Mahendrāditya, ascended the throne on the abdication of his father and utterly defeated the Mlecchas. As Mahendrāditya was the well-known title of Kumārāgupta I, Vikramāditya may be regarded as the title of Skandagupta. It is of great interest to note that Skandagupta bore the title Kramāditya. On the 'Altar Type' of his silver coins, however, he is given the epithet Vikramāditya. The Kathāsaritasāgara does not in any way indicate the identification of the Mlecchas with the Hūṇas.

In the Gwalior Prasasti of the reign of the Pratihāra king Bhoja (c. A.D. 835-85), Nāgabhāţa (I) has been credited with the victory over the Mlecha king. Nāgabhāţa (I) ruled in the first half of the eighth century A.D. The Mlecchas defeated by him, possibly, denote the Arabs. We know of one Junaid who was the governor of Sind under Khalif Hishārī (A.D. 724-43) and conquered Al Bilāman in Jurz. Al Biladuri mentions the different regions overrun by the Arabs in India in the eighth century A.D. According to him, they made incursions against Ujjain and burnt the suburbs of Baharimod. The term Mlecha thus acquired a new dimension from the eighth century A.D. largely due to the growing Arab menace.

The Dholpur inscription, dated V.S. 898 (= A.D. 841),
states that the powerful Mleccha rulers on the river Čarmanvati (i.e., Chambal) made obeisance to the Čāhamāna king Čanda-mahāsena of Dhavalapuri (Dholpur). These Mleccha kings cannot be identified. We have to assume either the temporary progress of the Arabs up to a region as far east as the banks of the Chambal about the middle of the ninth century A.D. or the presence of the Arabs in that region from the eighth century A.D., who had earlier been defeated by Nāgabhaṭa I. The Arabs could not, however, make any headway into India due to the alertness of the Indian chiefs.

According to the Chroniclers of Western India, the Ābhīras had established their sway over southern and western Saurashtra in the second half of the tenth century A.D. under Grāharipu, described as a Mleccha chief. He ate beef and carried on anti-Brahmanical activities.

The Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva, while narrating the story of Niścayadatta, refers to the Tājikas in the land of the Mlecchas. King Udayana of the Vatsa country defeated in the north the lord of the Sindhu country and the Mlecchas. The merchant Niścayadatta decided to leave the northern direction, inhabited by the Mlecchas, in favour of Daksināpatha. Somadeva thus places the Tājikas, i.e., the Arabs, in the land of
the Mlecchas and at the same time designate the north as the
land of the Mlecchas. The Kathāsārītāgāra was written down
between A.D. 1063 and A.D. 1081, in Kashmir. The Mleccha
countries of the north, therefore, should be taken to denote
areas lying to the north of Kashmir. By the middle of the
eleventh century A.D., the Turks under the leadership of Chagri
Beg and Tughril Beg had crossed over the Oxus, conquered Merv
and Nishapur from the Gazmavids and had brought under their
hegemony the entire regions of Khurasan and northern Persia.27
The Gazmavids under Sultan Mahmud in the beginning of the
eleventh century A.D. carried on depredations in the north-west
while the Arabs had been holding precariously their principalities in Sind. Thus, the entire region lying in the north-west
under the foreigners came to be known as Mleccha land.28

It may be noted that the Kathāsārītāgāra has been
regarded as one of the versified versions of the Brahatkathā of
Gunādhya, the other being the Brahatkathāmañjarī of Kāsemendra.
In fact, Somadeva does not claim to have invented the stories.
He observes that he has only abridged together the big volume
of the work (i.e., Brahatkathā) and that "the language is
different."29 The north-western frontiers of the Indian sub-
continent were under the rule of the foreigners in the couple
of centuries before and after the commencement of the Christian
era. The foreign principalities existed in that region even after the downfall of the Kushāṇas. The Sakas, Yavanas and the Pahlavas, who ruled there, are all enumerated as Mlecchas in Indian texts. It is thus difficult to say whether Somadeva refers to an early state of things or the happenings which were contemporaneous with the time of the composition of his work. The growing knowledge of the countries beyond India in the north and north-west in the centuries following the commencement of the Christian era bespeaks brisk activities in trade. The countries lying in the north-west and in (Soviet) Central Asia are enumerated as those of the Mlecchas in a few Jaina texts.

On the other hand, Al Beruni in the first half of the eleventh century refers to the ego and conceit of the Hindus with regard to their country, language and culture. Their ignorance of the aliens developed out of their reluctance to travel in foreign countries and 'mix with other nations'.

Nīcāsayadatta's decision to retire to the south with the view to carrying on trade, as related in the Kathāsaritsāgara, therefore, may imply the condition prevailing in the eleventh century A.D. The Mlecchas of this text, hence, may be taken as denoting the Muslims who were in possession of the territories to the west of the Indus in the middle of the eleventh century A.D.

The Indian concept of the term Mleccha in the eleventh century A.D. has been clearly expounded by Al Beruni (A.D. 973-
The Mlecchas of the west mentioned in the Purānas have been identified by him with the Arabs. The fanaticism of the Hindus, according to Al Beruni, "is directed against those who do not belong to them — against all foreigners. They call them Mlecchas, i.e., impure, and forbid having any connection with them, be it by inter-marriage or any other kind of relationship or by sitting, eating and drinking with them, because thereby, they think they would be polluted." On enumerating the rites and ceremonies of the members of castes, besides the Brahmans, Al Beruni states that "all other men except the Cāndāla, as far as they are not Hindus, are called Mleccha, i.e., unclean, all those who kill men and slaughter animals and eat the flesh of cows".

Al Beruni's statement indicates that foreigners in general, irrespective of their religion, country and race, were looked down upon by the 'Hindus' as Mlecchas at least in the first half of the eleventh century A.D. The term Mleccha, according to him, means 'impure' or 'unclean'. The prescriptions laid down in the Smṛti texts of early medieval India against all contamination, effected by a Mleccha, have their parallels in the observations of Al Beruni. It may be noted that the Mlecchas are not included in the list of antya-jas mentioned in the legal texts. The inroads of the Muslims
into India have been accounted for the growing hatred towards the foreigners. Al Beruni also takes notice of the difference between the Hindus and the Muslims in manners and usages, dress, ways and customs. It indicates that though Mleccha, according to Al Beruni, was a generic term for the foreigners, the bulk of them comprised the Muslims. The denotation of the term, however, widens when the cannibals, hunters of animals and beef-eaters are enumerated as Mlecchas. It may be mentioned that many of the indigenous tribes are described as Mlecchas in early Indian texts who lived on hunting and feasted on cattle. Al Beruni probably took into account the reference to the term Mleccha in indigenous texts as well as the concept of the term concerned current during his stay in India.

The Rājatarangini of Kalhana (Kalhana), who flourished in the middle of the twelfth century, refers to the Mlecchas in various contexts. By the time of the composition of this chronicle of the kings of Kashmir, Islam had become a settled fact in Indian history. The bearers of the religion were being described as Mlecchas. Nevertheless, Kalhana, while using the term concerned, did not always aim at the followers of Islam.

In connection with the early history of Kashmir Kalhana records that "when the country had been overrun by the Mlecchas, that meritorious king obtained from Bhūtēsa, who had been
propitiated by him by penance, a son. The meritorious kin here refers to Asoka (described as the great grandson of Sakuni), and the son to Jalauka. The Mlecchas, therefore, may be taken for the Greeks of Bactria who within fifty years after the death of Asoka had poured into the north-west. It may be mentioned that the earliest indigenous texts, bearing reference to this invasion, like the Mahabhasya of Patanjali, (second century B.C.) do not refer to the Greeks as Mlecchas, but as Yavanas. Still earlier, Katyayana uses the expression Yavanāl lipyām and not Mlecchāl lipyām. The categorization of the Yavanas along with the Sakas, Pahlavas, etc., as Mlecchas took place at a comparatively later date, and before the completion of the Great Epic. Thus if Kalhana had meant the Greeks by the term Mleccha in connection with the reigns of Asoka and Jalauka, he must have used the tradition recorded in the Epics and the Purāṇas.

Jalauka inflicted a crushing defeat on the invading Mlecchas and the place, where the battle took place, had been known during the time of Kalhana as Ujjhitaqimba. The Rāja-tarangini further states that after the reign of Hiranyakula and his son Vasukula, the land of Kashmir was overrun by the Mlecchas and that Mihirakula of violent deeds became the king. His kingdom included Gandhāra. The Hūna chief Mihirakula is
known to us from epigraphs as well as from the account of Hiuen Tsang. The Mlecchas of the Rajatarangini may, therefore, be identified with the Hūṇas.

It may be mentioned that in contemporary inscriptions of the indigenous rulers the Hūṇas are always mentioned by their name. It is only in comparatively later texts that they are branded as Mlecchas. According to the account of Hiuen Tsang, Mihirakula "issued an edict to destroy all the Buddhist priests and overthrew the law of Buddha throughout India". The coins ascribed to Mihirakula, however, bear the legend 'Jayatu Vṛṣṇ'. It indicates his adherence to Saivism which is also referred to in the Mandasore inscription of Yasodharman dated 589 of the Mālava Era. Thus Mihirakula, inspite of his being a Hūṇa by race, was not anti-Brahmanical, though, according to Hiuen-Tsang's testimony, anti-Buddhistic in religious faith. The fact remains that by the time when Kalhaṇa had completed the Rajatarangini, foreigners in general, irrespective of their religious creed and race, had become known as Mlecchas.

Kalhaṇa records the tradition that Mihirakula "after killing the inhabitants of Āryadesa ..... re-established pious observances in this land which, overrun by impure Dāradas, Bhauṭṭas and Mlecchas, had fallen off from the sacred law". According to another tradition, recorded by Kalhaṇa, the above
acts were intended for the destruction of the Khāsas.\textsuperscript{54}

The Mieochas has thus been distinguished from the Dāradas, Bhauṭtas and the Khāsas. The Dāradas may be identified with the modern Dards who lived in the region "extending from Chitral and Yasim, across the Indus regions of Gilgit, Chilas and Būnji to the Kishanganga Valley in the immediate north of Kashmir". The Dāradas or the Daradas, mentioned in the Rejiatarangini, occupied the Kishanganga valley.\textsuperscript{55} The term Bhauṭta or Bhutta has been used by Kalhaṇa to denote the "population of Tibetan descent generally inhabiting the regions immediately to the east and north-east of Kashmir, \textit{i.e.}, the regions of "Dras, Ladakh and perhaps also Skardo".\textsuperscript{56} The Khāsas, frequently mentioned in the Rejiatarangini, probably belonged to the region "comprising the valleys lying immediately to the south and west of the Pir Panjūl range". The rulers of Rājapūrī (modern Rauari) are described as 'lords of Khāsas'. From VIII. 177, 1074, it appears that the entire valley from Banhal to the Chandrabhaga was inhabited by the Khāsas. There were also Khās settlements in the Beas valley below Barmula.\textsuperscript{57} The Khāsas still survive in the Khakha tribe. Most of the hill-chiefs in the Beas valley below Kashmir belong to the Khaṃka tribe.\textsuperscript{58}

While referring to the story of Vikramaditya and the
poet Mātrigupta, Kalhana states that by exterminating the Sakas, Vikramāditya had made the task easier for the Avatāra of Viṣṇu (or Śiva, according to Stein) who was to descend upon the earth for the destruction of the Mlecchas. The Sakas are thus grouped under the Mlecchas.

According to the Rājaratnagīrī, Vajrāditya Bappiyaka, the second son of Lalitāditya, sold away "many men to the Mlecchas" and thus introduced into his realm the practice of the Mlecchas. Vajrāditya began to rule from c. 762 A.D. Hisham ibn 'Amrat-Taghlibī, the governor of Sindh who ruled from A.D. 768 to A.D. 772, is known to have invaded Kashmir and captured slaves and prisoners. The Mleccha contemporaries of Vajrāditya, therefore, may be identified with the Arabs of Sindh. The relevant passage of the Rājaratnagīrī also brings out that the Arabs practised slave trade which had been introduced into Kashmir in the reign of Vajrāditya.

In the eleventh century Ananta, who belonged to the first Lohara dynasty, killed the Darada king and imprisoned the Mleccha kings. The Mleccha chiefs perhaps bear reference to the tribal chiefs on the frontiers of Kashmir who had partly become Muhammadans. The Lavanyas of Mañavarājya (Maraz), being tormented by the governor Ananda during the reign of Harṣa (A.D. 1089-1101), fled away to the lands of the Mlecchas.
and turned into beef-eaters. The \textit{Rajatarangini} in describing the intrigues engineered by Bhikṣāśaṅga, refers to the Turuṣkas under Sullāra Vismaya and to the support rendered by Somapāla of Rājapūrī. The statement that follows is that the combination of Kashmiri, Khaśa and Mleccha warriors were competent to uproot the whole world (\textit{visvotpātana-pātavah}). It implies that the Khaśas possibly referring to the force of Somapāla, were distinguished from the Mlecchas denoting the Turuṣkas, who constituted the cavalry and used lasso. That the Mlecchas were characterized by their horses seems to be indicated in the \textit{Vikramāṇa-devacāritā}, which refers to Utkarṣa, the younger brother of Kṣitipati, i.e., Kṣitirāja of Kalhana, as making the earth devoid of the marks of pounding caused by the horses of the Mleccha kings. The equestrian chiefs of the Mlecchas came from the borders of the Himalayas and reached the camp of, Darads in a round-about way. The Turuṣkas here possibly refer either to the Ghuzz Turks, who had driven out Sultan Khusraw Shab from Ghazni shortly after 1157 A.D., or to the Ghaznavids, who being dispossessed of Ghazni, had established themselves in the Punjab.

From the contexts in which the term Mleccha has been used in the \textit{Rajatarangini}, it appears that during the time of Kalhana had gained currency as a nomenclature for the foreigners.
in general, and the Arabs and Turks or rather the bearers of Islam, in particular.

The Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuḍga, a Jaina text of the thirteenth century A.D., bears reference to the Mlecchas in different contexts. It mentions Māngu who destroyed the invading Mleccha army and was finally killed in the battle-field during the reign of Siddharāja Jayasimha (A.D. 1092-1132) of the Gālukya dynasty of Guzrat. Jayasimha was undoubtedly the greatest ruler of the house. But the inscriptions of his reign do not allude to his encounter with the Mlecchas. On the other hand, he is known to have put down the revolt of the non-Aryan Barbaras who had been harassing the ascetics of Siddhapura. Reference has been made to the arrival of the ministers of a Mleccha king at the court of Jayasimha. These ministers ultimately gave up their insolent attitude and left with rich presents. The Mleccha king, however, has not been mentioned by name. We can only surmise that he might have been a governor of the Punjab under the Yaminis or a minor Arab chief of Sind. During the reign of the minor king Mūladeva (i.e., Mūlarāja II), the regent queen Nāikidevi, the daughter of king Paramārdi (the Kadamba ruler of Goa), led the Gālukya army against the Mlecchas and defeated them at Gaḍārāraghaṭṭa. The Mleccha invasion
possibly refers to that of Mu'izz-ud-din Muhammad Ghori who attacked the kingdom of Guzrat in A.D. 1178. In the account of the Muslim historians the name of the adversary of Muhammad Ghori is recorded as Bhīma (II) who succeeded Mūlarāja II. From the Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, however, it appears that the battle took place during the short reign of Bāla-Mūladeva, i.e., Mūladeva, the Minor or Mūlarāja II (1176-78 A.D.).

We know that Mu'izz-ud-din Muhammad Ghori following his conquests of Delhi and Ajmer, marched with his huge army against Jayacandra, the Gāhaḍavāla king in 1193 A.D. Jayacandra was killed in the battle field while fighting on an elephant and the Gāhaḍavāla army met with a disaster. The same incident has been narrated in the Prabandha-cintāmaṇi. Reference has been made to the Mleccha invasion and conquest of Vārānasī when king Jayacandra and his queen Suhavē riding on an elephant plunged into the Ganges.

The above references to the Mlecchas in the Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, thus, bear allusion to the Turkish invaders of Northern India. Bereft of the statement that the deity of the Mlecchas encouraged people with false speech, there is no other complain against their cruelty, dreadful appearance and incontinence. The Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, however, quotes the dictum of the later legal texts that a hermit should take "food
collected as bees collect honey, even if given by a Mleccha".79

The Rajatarangini of Jonarāja (1389-1459 A.D.) mentions that a Mleccha king sacked Dhili (i.e., Delhi) and on his way back presented two elephants to the king of Kashmir out of fear.80 The Mleccha king appears to be Amir Timur, the Turkish conqueror, who invaded India in A.D. 1398 and was engaged in a bloody battle at Delhi. He distributed elephants as a token of his success in India, which fact has been twisted by Jonarāja. The Mlecchas, however, have been distinguished in one passage of a supplement folio from the Turuṣkas and Tājikas (i.e., Arabs)82 and in another from the Khasas and Daradas.83

The epigraphic documents of northern India of medieval period often bear reference to the Mlecchas. An inscription, dated V.S. 1220 (= A.D. 1162) and engraved on the Aśokan pillar at Kotla Firoz Shah, describes the Sākambhari king Visāladeva as the exterminator of the Mlecchas.84 The verse furnishing this information, recurs in the Sarangadharapaddhati of Visāladeva, alias Vyāghrarāja (A.D. 1153-63), who is known to have fought a number of battles against the Muslims.85 He claims to have "made Āryāvarta what its name signifies by repeatedly exterminating the Mlecchas." The term Mleccha here, thus, denotes the Muslims who were trying to push their conquests towards the east. According to the Kuretha Plates, dated V.S.
1277 (= A.D. 1220), Vigraha killed a leader or leaders of the armies of the Mleccha king. This Vigraha was the Pratihara chief who had established the supremacy of his family at Gwalior by ousting the Muslims during the effete rule of Aram Shah (A.D. 1210-11), son and successor of Qutb-ud-din Aibak.

The Chirava inscription, dated V.S. 1330 (= A.D. 1272) of the time of Samarasimha of Mewar states that neither the kings of Malwa, Gurjara, Mârava and Jângela nor the Mlecchas could humble the pride of Jaitrisimha, the grandfather of Samarasimha. The Mlecchas of this record possibly refer to the Muslims' under Iltutmish, the Mamluk Sultan, who overran Mewar and destroyed the capital of the Guhilas. The Muslim army, however, retreated on receipt of the news of the advance of the Vâghela army, who rendered assistance to Jaitrisimha. The Mandhata inscription of Paramâra Jayasimha, dated 1331 V.S. states that Devapâla killed a Mleccha king at Bhaillasvâmin (i.e., Bhilsa). The Mleccha invasion in this context also refers to the Muslim inroads under Iltutmish of Delhi.

In the inscriptions' records of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the term Mleccha has been used regularly in the sense of the Muslim conquerors. Epigraphs of the Gâha-devâlas of Kanauj, however, refer to a tax called Turuska-danda. It has been interpreted by V.A. Smith to imply the tax levied to meet
the expenditure incurred towards resisting the Turkish invaders.

Leaving aside the interpretations offered by different scholars, we may note the categorical use of the term Turuṣka — instead of the generic one, viz., Mleccha.

The most important information is given in the Delhi Museum (now the National Museum) Inscription of the time of Mahammada Sahi, dated (Vikrama) Saṃvat 1384. It mentions Mleccha Sahāvatina as the first Turuṣka who seized Dhili (i.e., Delhi). “Thenceforward that city has been in the possession of the Turuṣkas to this day; at present prince Śrī MahammäŚahi rules over it.” Sahāvatina may be identified with Shihabud-din Ghuri alias Mu‘izz-ud-din Muhammad Bin Sam (A.D. 1156-1205) and Mahammad Sāhi with Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq who ruled between A.D. 1325 and 1351. The Mlecchas has been unambiguously identified with the Turuṣkas or the Turkish invaders. It is in this sense that the term Mleccha has been used in most of the inscriptions of northern India of the eleventh-twelfth centuries A.D. and onwards. The Jaisaimer Jaina temple inscription of the time of Laksmana, dated V.S. 1459 (= A.D. 1402) refers to Ghaṭasimha, who had wrested Vapradārī from the Mlecchas.

In Eastern India, the rulers of Prāgjyotisa, who ruled from about the last quarter of the seventh century A.D., are
described as Mleaoha Lords or Lords of the Mlechas. According to the Bargaon Grant of Ratnapāla, after the rule of several generations of rulers of the Naraka family, "a great chief of the Mlechas, owing to a turn of fate, took possession of the kingdom". The chief was Sālastambha. The Hayunthel Copper Plate inscription of the line of Harjaravarman refers to the future rulers known as the Mlechas. In the Mainamati Plate (No. 1) of the reign of Laqhabacandra (year 6), Kalyāṇacandra has been described as causing sorrow to the Mlecha and Gauḍa women. According to the Mainamati copper plate inscription of the reign of Govindacandra, the Lauhitya, i.e., Brahmaputra, swelled up by the tears rolling off from the eyes of the Mlecha women. The husbands of these women met their doom at the hands of Kalyāṇacandra. It may be mentioned that the Mainamati record (No. 1) as well as the Paschimbhag Copper Plate of the year 5 refers to Śrīcandra's victory over Kāmarūpa. The association of the Mlechas with Lauhitya (i.e., the Brahmaputra) leaves no room for doubt that they refer to the ruling house of Kāmarūpa, who had been known as Mlechas. There is, however, no evidence to prove that the rulers of Kāmarūpa, styled Mlechas, did not follow Brahmanism. On the other hand, the opening verses of the relevant inscriptions, bearing adoration to Śiva and the large scale grant of land in favour of the Brāhmanaṣas hint at their adherence to a Brahmanical cult.
In all probability the term **Mleccha**, appearing as an appellation of a ruling house of Kāmarūpa, is a Sanskritised form of the tribal name **Meh**, who still survive in the erstwhile state of Assam. In fact, the line of Puṣyavarman, to which Bhāskara-varman belonged, and that of Śālastambha appear to be two separate Mongolian or Tibeto Burman groups. The rulers of both the families became proselytes to Brahmanism and tried to uplift their status by tracing their descent from the eponymous hero Bhagadatta who enjoyed the position of the Primeval Being in Assam. The names Prālambha and Harjara of the Mleccha dynasty sound non-Aryan. Even in the Tezpur inscription the name Prālambha is described as a strange one. There is thus a possibility that because of their Tibeto-Burman or Mongoloid origin, the ruling family of Assam of the early medieval period is styled Mleccha. Such a position would indicate that the Mlecchas could sometimes adopt Brahmanism and were absorbed into the fold of Brahmanical culture. On the other hand, the Mechs also belong to the Mongoloid or the Tibeto-Burman group who were probably known by such names as Cīnas, Kirātas, etc., in early Indian texts. The Sanskritisation of the term **Meh** into **Mleccha** would also point to the fact that they were no longer shunned as impure barbarians, but were absorbed into the Brahmanical society. They contracted matrimonial alliances with other ruling dynasties. A princess
of the line of Sēlastambha was married to a Licchavi King of Nepal who belonged to the Solar race.

The above survey tends to show that the term Mleccha has been used in the epigraphs of early medieval and medieval periods in two senses. In the inscriptions of northern and western India it has been used to denote the Arabs and the Turkish invaders of northern India. In the inscriptions from Assam and those from south-eastern Bangladesh the term concerned denotes a ruling family of Assam, the rulers of which were racially affiliated to the Mongoloid stock but were gradually absorbed into the Brahmanical fold. The Turkish invaders are called Turuṣkas in the Kansaibariśa (near Guwahati) inscription dated Saka 1127 (= A.D. 1205/6), and are thus distinguished from the Mleccha rulers of Assam of earlier days. In the inscriptions of the Senas reference has been made to the Garga-yavanas who probably denote the Turkish invaders of eastern India. In a verse ascribed to Śaraṇa, a certain king has been credited with the conquest of Gauḍa, Kaliṅga, Kāmarūpa, Kāsi and Magadha and victory against the Cedi and Mleccha rulers. As Śaraṇa lived in the court of Lakṣaṃnasena, the king may be identified with the Sena ruler. The victory over the Mlecchas may, therefore, bear an allusion to the advent of the Muslims. Thus both the terms (Garga-) Yavana
and Mleccha were used in the thirteenth century to mean the Turkish invaders or the bearers of Islam to eastern India.

In none of the inscriptions of the early medieval and medieval periods, the Mlecchas have been mentioned with opprobrium. The authors of the inscriptions seem to have exonerated them from all the allegations brought against them in the later Purāṇas and Dharmāṣṭras concerning sexual indulgence and cruelty.
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