

But the zoology of the "five Rivers" furnishes a clinching proof. These now contain cetacean mammal, a highly aquatic reptile and a Cyprinoid fish, which belong to the Gangetic fauna, and not to that of any river that seeks the sea in the Peninsular Provinces of Bombay. They are the Gangetic porpoise (*Platahista*), the long-snouted fish-eating crocodile (*Gairalis*), and the Rohu fish (*Labeo Rohita*). And this fact, when added to Dr. Oldham's historical and geographical evidence, renders it almost impossible to doubt that the Saraswatī did really once communicate with the Gangetic system; and that it was the river's desertion of its old bed, and invasion of the Indus region, that brought into the waters of the latter three essentially Gangetic animals.

W. F. SINCLAIR, Bombay C.S.

To the Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society.

2. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE LATER ANDHRABHRITYAS.

By C. MABEL DUFF.

SIR,—In an article in the "Indian Antiquary," vol. xxi. p. 204, M. Senart has reconstructed the chronology of five of the later Andhra kings, on the strength of data drawn from the numismatic discoveries of Paṇḍit Bhagwānlāl Indrajī.

It is known from Rudradāman's inscription at Girnar that he was contemporary with one of the Śātakarṇi, and M. Senart, following Dr. Bühler (*Ind. Ant.* xii. p. 272) and Paṇḍit Bhagwānlāl (*Antiquarian Remains at Sopârâ and Padaṇa*), identifies this Śātakarṇi with Chaturapana Vāsishṭī-putra II., or his son Śrī Yajña Gautamīputra II., but the arguments for this identification rest on somewhat slender evidence.

One point brought forward in favour of it is the fact that an inscription at Kanheri of Vāsishṭīputra II. states that his wife was the daughter of a Mahākshatrapa, whose name apparently began with "Ru." The identification of this "Ru" with Rudradāman becomes the more plausible since an interpretation of the passage in the Girnar inscription referring to Śātakarṇi represents Rudradāman as having spared the Andhra king on account of his relationship to himself. If these points could be established, they would certainly go far towards determining the chronological relations of the Andhras and the Western Kshatrapas. Unfortunately all we can say of them at present is that they are probable; we have no proof of their certainty.

In the first place, as Dr. Bühler remarks (Ind. Ant. xii. 272 ff.), the "Ru" referred to in the Kanheri inscriptions need not necessarily be Rudradāman, as there may have been other Kshatrapas of that name. The fact of his being a Mahākshatrapa is perhaps a point in favour of the identification, but, on the other hand, there is no proof that the name *Kārdḍamakārāja*, also borne by the individual in the inscription, was one of Rudradāman's.

Further, the interpretation of the passage in the Girnar inscription, which gives so much likelihood to the inferences drawn from that at Kanheri, must be accepted with reservation. Professor Bhandarkar ("Early History of the Dekkan") puts an entirely different construction upon it, so that if we accept his translation the identification of the "Ru" of the Kanheri Cave with Rudradāman loses some of its plausibility.

Perhaps the strongest evidence for establishing the synchronism between Rudradāman and one or other of the above-named Andhrabhṛityas, is drawn from numismatic and palæographic sources, for the letters in the Girnar inscriptions are, as Dr. Bühler says, the exact counterpart of those in Vāsishṭīputra's inscription at Kanheri; while coins of Gautamīputra II. found at Sopârâ, so closely resemble those of Rudradāman, as to suggest the inference that they were copied from them. This

evidence, however, scarcely proves more than the close proximity of these kings in point of time; it does not preclude the possibility of one of their predecessors being the Śâtakarṇi alluded to by the Kshatrapa king.

Even if, with M. Senart, we consider the agreement of these data sufficiently strong to justify us in drawing chronological conclusions from them, there is a point he has lost sight of in the argument by which he proves Chaturapana to be the Śâtakarṇi of the Girnar inscription.

His list of the Andhras, beginning with Gautamîputra I., the contemporary of Nahapâna, is as follows:

Gautamîputra I. reigned 24 years.	A.D. 113-137
Vâsishṭîputra I. Pulumâyi 24 years.	137-161
Mâdharîputra 8 years	161-169
Chaturapana Vâsishṭîputra II. 13 years.	169-182
Yajña Śrî Gautamîputra II.	182

It is true that these dates would allow of our making Chaturapana and Rudradâman contemporaries if we were sure of three things: 1st, that Rudradâman reigned until A.D. 175; 2nd, that he conquered the Andhra king between A.D. 169 and 175; and 3rd, that he cut the inscription at Girnar at the very end of his reign. I think it can be shown, however, that we are very far from being able to prove these points satisfactorily.

The date formerly assigned to Rudradâman by Paṇḍit Bhagwânâlâl was A.D. 148-178. As long as Rudrasîmha was his only known successor, with the date A.D. 181, this as an approximate attempt at fixing the limits of his reign answered well enough. But the case is altered now that we know from the Paṇḍit's numismatic discoveries with regard to the Kshatrapas (J.R.A.S. 1890, p. 639), that two rulers intervened between him and Rudrasîmha, the second having the known date A.D. 178. Even with the knowledge that both reigns were short, it is necessary, in order to make room for them, to cut down that of Rudradâman by at least three years, and it is more than

probable that its later limit was nearer A.D. 170 than A.D. 175.

Even if, for argument's sake, we accept the later date to prove our point, we must suppose that the Girnar inscription was cut about that year and just after Rudradâman's conquest of the Andhra king, yet there is no evidence in the inscription—our only source of information on the subject—to warrant such an assumption. On the other hand, if Rudradâman's reign ended, as seems probable, about A.D. 170, it is hardly possible that he could have twice conquered the Andhra king in the brief space of one year, which he must have done if M. Senart's dates (A.D. 169–182) for Chaturapana are accepted.

But there is another way in which the synchronism between Chaturapana and Rudradâman might be established without throwing too much weight on arguments founded on insufficient evidence. Paṇḍit Bhagwānlâl's list of these Andhra kings, based on his own numismatic discoveries, helps us out of the difficulty involved by the acceptance of M. Senart's list. He places Chaturapana after Pulumâyi, and he infers, from his bearing the name Vâsishtîputra, that he was Pulumâyi's brother and successor. Next, he places Mâdharîputra, and last Gautamîputra, II., the son of Chaturapana.

Dr. Bühler (*Ind. Ant.* xii. p. 272), commenting on this list, changes the order, and referring to a former paper of the Paṇḍit's (*J. Bo. Br. R.A.S.*, vol. xiv. 303 ff.) on the subject, points out that Mâdharîputra's position in the group was proved by numismatic evidence, as he is known to have re-struck coins of Pulumâyi's, while coins of his own were in turn re-struck by Gautamîputra II. But while these facts may well be used as an argument for placing him after Pulumâyi, it is difficult to see how they determine his position as regards Chaturapana. We know nothing of his relationship to the other Andhras. He may just as easily have succeeded Chaturapana as preceded him. In either case it would not interfere with the relationship of the latter to Śrî Yajña. In fact, for

all we know to the contrary, Māḍharīputra may have been the son of Chaturapana by a different wife, and elder brother of Gautamīputra II.

Accepting the Paṇḍit's conclusions, the list of the Andhras stands accordingly :

Gautamīputra I. reigned 24 years at least	A.D. 113-137
Vāsishṭīputra I. Pulumāyi, 24 years	137-161
Chaturapana Vāsishṭīputra II., 13 years	161-174
Māḍharīputra Sirisena ? 8 years	174-182
Gautamīputra II.	182

By this arrangement, which, considering the scanty nature of the evidence, is quite as reasonable as the other, either Pulumāyi or Chaturapana may have been the Śātakarṇi defeated by the Kshatrapa king. On the one hand Pulumāyi, like the others, bore the name of Śātakarṇi, and in identifying him with the Andhra king mentioned by Rudradāman, we are not forced to make any arbitrary assumption in support of our view, as to the date of the inscription at Girnar. On the other, there is the evidence of the Kanheri inscription, which, while it points pretty strongly to Vāsishṭīputra II. as the king in question, cannot, for the reasons stated above, be looked upon in the light of positive proof of the fact.

Dr. Bühler, in the above-named article (*Ind. Ant.* xii. 272), remarks that we have no evidence that these five kings directly succeeded each other, but I think, as the list now stands, it is more than likely that they did so. This assumption is strengthened by the testimony of the W. Kshatrapa dates, and by the fact, now proved beyond doubt, that they reckoned by the Śāka era. This was denied by Dr. Bühler when he wrote, and he was consequently unable to make use of the synchronism between Gautamīputra I. and Nahapāna, though, at the same time, he admitted that the relation between Rudradāman and Chaturapana or Śrī Yajña must be made the basis of any attempt to reconstruct the Andhra chronology. But a

reconstructed Andhra chronology, starting from the date supplied by Gautamīputra's conquest of Nahapāna, which, I suppose, Dr. Bühler would now accept, renders it impossible, as we have seen, by his list of the kings, to make even Chaturapana contemporary with Rudradāman. Matters would not, therefore, be much improved by the insertion of one or two other kings.

Reviewing the evidence on all sides, and accepting Paṇḍit Bhagwānlāl's arrangement of the group, it seems reasonable, until we have authoritative proof to the contrary, to conclude that these five kings succeeded each other in the order given, and that the length of reign, which their inscriptions allot to each, is on the whole fairly correct.

I have ventured to raise this question in the hope that one or other of the distinguished scholars to whom I have referred may be able to settle the point, which is of considerable importance for Indian chronology. If the suggestions I have ventured to put forward should be accepted, then the following table compiled from the sources mentioned above would give the dates of the five Andhrabhṛityas and their Kshatrapa contemporaries.

ANDHRABHṚITYAS.	WESTERN KSHATRAPAS.
<p>Gautamīputra I. Śātakarṇi Gautamīputra I. destroys Nahapāna Pulumāyi Vāsishṭīputra I.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">A.D. cir. 110-126</p> <p>Nahapāna</p> <p>Chasṭāna, contemporary and apparently successor of Nahapāna in A.D. 126. Ptolemy mentions him under the name of Tiasenes as contemporary with Pulumāyi</p> <p style="text-align: right;">" 110-140</p> <p>Jayadāman succeeded his father Chasṭāna</p> <p style="text-align: right;">" 140-145</p> <p>Rudradāman (son) succeeded Jayadāman</p> <p style="text-align: right;">" 145-170 (?)</p>
<p>Chaturapana Vāsishṭīputra II. Śātakarṇi Māḍharīputra Sirisena ? Gautamīputra II. Śrī Yajña</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">A.D. 161-174 174-182 182-211</p> <p>Dāmazada</p> <p>Jīvadāman</p> <p>Rudrasīmha</p> <p style="text-align: right;">" 170-175 " 175-180 " 186-196</p>