

*The Early History of the Huns  
and  
Their Inroads in India and Persia.*

(Read on 28th August 1916.)

I.

During the present war, we have been often hearing of the ancient Huns, because some of the ways of fighting of our enemies have been compared to those of these people. Again, the German Emperor himself had once referred to them in his speech before his troops when he sent them under the command of his brother to China to fight against the Boxers. He had thus addressed them :—"When you meet the foe you will defeat him. No quarter will be given, no prisoners will be taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at your mercy. Just as Huns, a thousand years ago, under the leadership of Attila, gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historic tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again dare even to look askance at a German."

Well-nigh all the countries, where war is being waged at present, were, at one time or another, the fields of the war-like activities of the Huns. Not only that, but the history of almost all the nations, engaged in the present war, have, at one time or another, been affected by the history of the Huns. The early ancestors of almost all of them had fought with the Huns.

The writer of the article on Huns in the Encyclopædia Britannica<sup>1</sup> says, that "the authentic history of the Huns in Europe practically begins about the year 372 A.D., when under a leader named Balamir (or Balamber) they began a westward movement from their settlements in the steppes lying to the north of the Caspian." Though their strictly authentic history may be said to begin with the Christian era, or two or three centuries later, their semi-authentic history began a very long time before that. They had powerful monarchies and extensive empires, and illustrious conquerors and rulers. They had a glorious as well as an unglorious past during a period of nearly 2,000 years. According to the Avesta and Pahlavi books of the Parsees, they had fought with the ancient Persians of the times

<sup>1</sup> 9th edition, Vol. 12, p. 381.

of Zoroaster and even with those of times anterior to him. The History of the Huns, is the history, as said by M. Deguignes, "of a nation almost ignored, which established, at different times, powerful monarchies in Asia, Europe and Africa. The Huns, who, later on, bore the name of 'Turks,' natives of a country situated on the North of China, between the rivers Irtish and Amur, made themselves, by degrees, masters of the whole of the great Tartary. Since 200 B. C., several royal families have successively reigned in these vast countries. They had empires more extensive than that of Rome, illustrious emperors, legislators and conquerors who have given rise to considerable revolutions."<sup>1</sup> It is the history of a nation, who has, through its one branch or another, "contributed to the destruction of the Roman Empire, ravaged France, Italy, Germany and all the countries North of Europe, ruined the empire of the Khalifs, and possessed the Holy land."<sup>2</sup> Their Empire, which, at one time, extended to Western Europe in the West, and to China in the East, has left, as it were, its marks in the names of places like *Hungary* in Europe and *Hunza*<sup>3</sup> in Asia. In the name of Hungary, we see its old Chinese name, *vis.*, Heungnoo or Huingnu. They were "a people who lived with glory during more than 2,000 years."<sup>4</sup> Gibbon<sup>5</sup> speaks of them as "the terror of the world." It was more than once, that they had shown themselves to be the terror of the world. It was during, what may be called, their second period of terror in Europe, that their name was associated with Attila.

At different times and at different places, they were the subjects, the allies and the enemies of Rome. Gaul was at different times open "to incursions of Vandals, Germans, Suevi, and savage eastern Allani." Of these, the Allani were "perhaps pressed into the Empire by the advance of the Huns from their Scythian steppes."<sup>6</sup> Britain was long ruled by Rome. But it was the pressure of various eastern tribes, and, among them, that of the Huns, which compelled Rome to look after its own home in Italy and to withdraw its army and its protection from Britain. In about 406 A.D., Rome withdrew its legions from

<sup>1</sup> I translate from "Histoire Générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mogols, et des autres Tartares occidentaux, &c., avant et depuis Jesus Christ jusqu' a present," par M. Deguignes (1756) Tome premier, partie première, Preface p. V.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. VI.

<sup>3</sup> Lit. Place (Jâ) of the Huns. It is also known as Kanjud. It is a State on the Upper Indus, forming a part of the country of Gilgit.

<sup>4</sup> Histoire des Huns, &c., by M. Deguignes, p. XXV.

<sup>5</sup> Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (1745), Vol. II, p. 342.

<sup>6</sup> "Leaders and Landmarks in European History," by A. H. R. Moncrieff and H. J. Chaytor, Vol. I, p. 149.



Britain.<sup>1</sup> They had long wars with the ancient Romans, the ancient Germans and with other nations of Europe. During these wars, they had advanced up to the further West of Europe. Their wars and their inroads had even forced some of the people of the West to cross over the sea and to go to Africa. Again, they had frequent wars with the ancient Persians from very early times to the later times of the Sassanians. Coming to India, they had made more than one inroad into the country. Not only had they made inroads, but had made a long stay and ruled for a number of years over various parts of the country, extending from Kathiawar<sup>2</sup> to Pataliputra. They had their capital at Sialkote. They are even said to have imported into India alien Brahmins from the West.

History has recorded inter-marriages of the princes and princesses of some of the nations of the West and the East with the princesses and princes of the Huns. The fact of these royal marriages suggests, that there must have been inter-marriages among their respective subjects also. From all these facts and considerations, which we will examine in this Paper, one may say, that the blood of many of the branches of the above nations, both of the West and the East, has been mixed with that of the Huns. In connection with this subject, one may read with great interest, Mr. R. Bhandarkar's very interesting article in the *Indian Antiquary*,<sup>3</sup> entitled "Foreign elements in Hindu population," wherein, the learned author points to the Huns also, as forming a foreign element in the Indian population. It is in the company of these Huns, that the tribe of the Gujars is said to have come from without to India—the tribe that gave its name to our Gujarat in the West of India, and to Gujarat and Gujaranwala in the Punjab.

## II.

It is such a people that forms the subject of my Paper. I propose to speak of them, not only from the Western point of view, but also from the Iranian and Indian points of view. The object of this Paper is, not so much to give any running history of this people, as to refer to some events in their history which had some far-reaching results. The subject was suggested to me during my study for a paper on "The Hunas of the Indian books in the Avesta and Pahlavi books of the Parsees," contributed for the coming memorial volume in honour of our vener-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> For their relations with Kathiawar, *vide* the recent (1916) interesting book on "The History of Kathiawar," by Captain H. Wilberforce Bell, pp. 32, 37, 40.

<sup>3</sup> *Indian Antiquary* of January 1911.



able and esteemed Sanskrit scholar, Dr. Sir Ramcrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. This Paper is based on collateral notes collected during the study for that paper. It contains only a passing reference to the special subject of that paper.

In the few centuries before and after Christ, there existed the following great kingdoms :—

- 1 China in the East, 2 Rome in the West, 3 Persia under the Parthian rule and 4 India. The last two stood between the first two, as connecting links.

The Huns, under different names, had relations with the nations of all these four great kingdoms, and lived, at times, now and then, here and there, on the frontiers of these four great kingdoms, harassed their people and had long wars with them. Again, at times, they lived as subjects of these kingdoms and at times, as their allies. We will speak of the relations of the Huns with these four great powers at or about the commencement of the Christian era.

Our sources of information on the History of the Huns are various.

Sources of information. 1. Firstly, as to their relation with China, we have to look to the Chinese annals, which give us also a glimpse into their origin and very early history. We find a good account based on these annals, in the "*Histoire Générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mogols, et des autres Tartares occidentaux, &c.*", by M. Deguignes. In this connection, we must bear in mind, that the Huns were known in different countries and in different ages by various names, such as, Turcs, Mongols, Tartares, Haetalites, &c.

2. For their relations with Rome, in whose decline and fall, they had a strong hand, we have to look to various classical writers, whose accounts have been presented to us by various recent writers. Gibbon has spoken of them in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

3. As to Persia, we have references to them in the Avesta and Pahlavi books of the Parsees, where they are spoken of as Hînus. I will not speak of these references here, as I have referred to them, as said above, in a separate paper in the Bhandarkar Memorial Volume. Several Mahomedan writers on the history of Persia, such as Firdousi, Maçoudi, and Tabari, have spoken of them. But they have not spoken of them under their original name of Huns but as Haetalites, Turcs, &c. I will refer to them, when I speak of the inroads of the Huns in the Sassanian times.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We get a very good account of them in the late M. E. Drouin's "*Mémoire sur les Eptnalites dans leurs Rapports avec les Rois Perses Sassanides*" (1895).



4. Coming to our own country, India, they are referred to in Indian books and in Indian inscriptions. Just as they had, following the inroads of the German and Gothic tribes, a strong hand in bringing about the downfall of the Roman Empire, and just as they had, followed by the Arabs, a hand in the downfall of the Sassanian Empire of Persia, they had a hand in the downfall of the Indian Empire of the Gupta dynasty. Again, their inroads into India should not be taken as a separate event in their history. Just as in times before Christ, the check, which they had received in their inroad into China by the construction of the Great China Wall, had forced them to turn to the West, towards the countries of the Roman Empire, so the check, which some of their tribes received in Europe, partially in, and mostly after, Atilla's time, drove them back towards the East, towards Persia and India. Though their inroads into Persia had weakened the Persian Empire, they had a substantial check there and it was this check again that drove them strongly towards India.

### III.

Origin and early history. Their movements guided by the want of Bread and Butter.

Before coming to the subject proper of this Paper, *viz.*, their inroads into the countries of the above four great kingdoms in the first century before Christ, we will say a few words on their origin and earlier history, for which subject the Chinese annals, as studied and described by

M. Deguignes, are our main authority.

The writer of the article on Huns in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*<sup>1</sup> says: "We have no adequate philological data for conclusively determining the ethnological position of the ancient Huns.....The Huns, in all probability, belonged to the Turkish branch of the great Turanian race." The Avesta and Pahlavi books of the Parsees support this view.

Tartary has been the name by which a very extensive part of Asia, north of India, has been known. It has been divided into Eastern Tartary and the Western Tartary. Their people, the Tartars, and especially the Western Tartars, are known as Huns. The Eastern Tartars have played an important part in the history of Asia, forming powerful empires here and there, but it was very rarely that they marched towards Europe. The Avars, who latterly played some important part in the history of Western Asia and Eastern Europe, are the only branch of the Eastern Tartars who went to the East. But, though they themselves did not go to the West, it is they, who, as it were,

<sup>1</sup> 9th Edition, Vol. XII, p. 382.



forced the Western Tartars, the Huns, to go to the West. They invaded the country of the Western Tartars and made them fly to the West. It is the Western Tartars who marched towards the West, towards India and Persia in Asia, and towards Rome, France, Germany, etc., in Europe, that are known as Huns. They are called *Hûnus* by Iranian writers, *Hunas* by Indian writers and *Huns* by Roman writers. In Tartary itself they bore the name of *Hiengnou*.<sup>1</sup> M. Deguignes identifies them with the *Heungnoo* or *Hiungnu*, who, according to Chinese writers, owned a great empire from the Caspian to the frontiers of China. This empire then fell into a state of anarchy and lost all its influence at the end of the first century A.D. One section of this fallen race went to the West, settled in the country near the river Ural and became the ancestors of the Huns, who, 300 years after, re-asserted their power and influence under Balamir and came into contact with the Romans.

Thus, what we see is this : The Huns leave their Asiatic country and advance towards the West as well as towards the East. In the West, they drive tribes after tribes from their countries. These tribes, being driven from their countries, enter, at times peacefully, but generally, fighting into other regions and drive away the people thereof. The people, thus driven in their turn, force others to leave their places. It is something like what would happen in a crowd. Those behind push those in their front. These in their turn, push those before them and so on. Thus, the slightest push or rush behind produces a rush all along the line and even in the distant front. This was what happened in the case of the inroads of these people towards the West—in Europe as well as in Asia.

Now, what is at the bottom of these grand national or tribal pushes, is the demand for Bread and Butter. Dr. Ellesworth Huttington has very well illustrated this fact in his "Pulse of Asia. A Journey in Central Asia, illustrating the Geographical basis of History." He dwells upon, and illustrates, what is called "the Geographic Theory of History." Applying this to the History of Europe, what we find is this : The Huns who lived in Asia, were, owing to a change in the physical condition of their country, obliged to leave their country in search of bread. They gradually dispersed in large numbers. Some went to the East and some to the West. In their search for bread, they drove away by force the people of the country where they found bread. The people thus displaced, proceeded further and drove away the people of the country they occupied. Thus, it was that the Huns had driven

---

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire Générale des Huns* " by M. Deguignes, Tome I, Partie I, p. 213.



away some of the German tribes, who, in their turn, went to other countries.

M. Deguignes begins their history, on the authority of Chinese accounts, at about 1200 B. C.<sup>1</sup> Though it is since 209 B. C., that we get some proper materials for their history, they flourished long before that time. Their first empire was destroyed by the Chinese and it was restored by Teon-man-tanjou, who was their first Emperor, known in history. He died in 209 B. C. M. Deguignes gives a long list of his successors from B. C. 209 to A. C. 93.<sup>2</sup> During the reign of one of these successors, Pou-nou-tanjou, who came to the throne in 46 A.D., a great famine devastated their country and weakened their empire. During the time of weakness and difficulty, they were driven to the North by the Eastern Tartars. The Chinese also attacked them and compelled them to leave their country. Some of them went towards Kashgar and Aksou. Thus, their empire in Tartary, in the north of China known as the country of Turkestan, was destroyed.

It was a branch of these early Huns, that latterly went to Europe at the time when Emperor Valens was ruling at Rome. They were then ruled by their chiefs, of whom Balamir was the principal (A.D. 376). M. Deguignes<sup>3</sup> gives a list of the dates of his reign, and of his successors' or contemporaries' reigns as follows :—

Balamir...	...	...	...	A. D. 376.
Uldes ...	...	...	...	„ 400. A prince named Donat was his contemporary.
Aspar ...	...	...	...	„ 424.
Roilas ...	...	...	...	„ 425.
Roua or Rugula	...	...	...	„ 433.
Attila and Bleda (the nephews of Roua) ...	...	...	...	Bleda died in 444. Then Attila ruled alone and died in 454.

Some of these may be contemporaries ruling over different tribes.

Ellac, DENGHISIC, HERNACK, the three sons of Attila, divided the countries of Attila among themselves and among their two other relatives, EMNEDZAR and UZINDAR. These princes were defeated by the Romans and the power of the Huns in Europe was destroyed in 468 A.D. Some Huns preserved their power round about Georgia. Some

<sup>1</sup> "C'est aux environs de l'an 1,200 avant J. C. que nous devons placer le commencement de l'Empire des Huns," "Histoire des Huns," Tome I., P. I., p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 218.



others ruled in the country near the Danube and continued there up to the time of their chief Zambergam who became Christian in 618 A. D. Since that time, the Huns have been mixed up with the Avars above referred to, who were an offshoot of the Eastern Tartars.

The above named Pou-nou-tanjou (46 A. D.) had, in order to secure the succession to the throne, to his son, got murdered another rival prince. Another prince of the family of Pe, King of Gesui, closely related to the murdered prince had raised a revolt. He ruled in the south in the countries close to China. His country formed the Empire of the Huns of the South. He declared himself the Tanjou or Emperor of that kingdom. He made an alliance with the Chinese and took an active part in weakening the Huns of the North. But, in return, they were much weakened by many of their tribes joining with the Huns of the North. So, in the North, at about 48 A. D., another powerful dynasty was formed. Deguignes gives us a list of these rulers from 48 to 216 A. D. <sup>1</sup>

#### IV.

Now, we will speak, one after another, of their relations with, or inroads into, the territories of the Chinese, Persian, Roman, and Indian Empires.

##### I.—THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE CHINESE EMPIRE.

According to the Chinese writers, in the third century B. C., their rule extended from the Caspian Sea to China. One of the Chinese Emperors, named Cheng, built in the 3rd century B. C., a great wall to prevent their frequent inroads into his territories. This emperor had come to the throne in 246 B. C. at the age of 13. He drove away the Huns in 215 B. C. and then built the Great Wall. By an irony of fate, China was up to late, ruled by the princes of the Manchou Tartars who were the descendants of the very race against whom the Chinese wall was built. It is said of this Great Wall that about 30 lacs of men were engaged in building it. An army of 3 lacs of men was engaged to defend the labourers. It was more than 1,500 miles long. It was 10 to 40 feet in height and 15 feet in breadth. One of the reasons for the Fall and Decline of Rome (and also of the check of the rising power of the then Germans to a certain extent) was this Great Chinese Wall. Of course, the inroads into Italy of the Teutonic tribes, which formed the German nation in the 5th century, formed, one of the reasons—one of the principal reasons, perhaps the principal reason—of the downfall of the Roman Empire. But, we will see later

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid*, p. 219.



on, that these German hordes were dispersed and driven towards Italy by these Huns, the barbarian hordes of Central Asia.

The Pyramids, the Great Wall of China, and the Himalays are spoken of by some to be the three greatest Wonders of the World. Of these three, one—the Himalays—is the work of Nature. It is the Great Wall of India, built by the hand of no Emperor, but by God, that Emperor of Emperors, that Grand Architect of Architects. Had it not been so placed or built, imagine what would have been the trouble of our rulers to protect the country from Northern invaders. This wall of Nature gives one an idea of the importance of the Chinese Wall to the great Chinese Empire. The Pyramids form a grand work of man. But they are mere mausoleums, and had and have no practical use, proportional to the great expense of money and trouble spent over them. But the Great Wall of China had the practical purpose of defending the country, thus saving enormous military expenditure. The Romans under Julius Cæsar built a wall on the Rhine, about 200 years after the Great Chinese Wall. It was on a smaller scale and it was to protect the frontiers of the Roman Empire against some barbarian German tribes. Perhaps, the idea of this wall was suggested to Rome by the Chinese Wall. This Roman Wall on the Rhine was broad enough on the top to serve as a military road. But it did not serve its purpose as a practical work. The German hordes were too strong for it. But the Chinese Wall served its purpose against the Huns. The Chinese Emperor, who began building it, died in 210 B. C., while the Wall was being built.

Being stopped in their frequent inroads into China in the East, the Huns turned their attention to the West. They gradually advanced to the West. It was not a sudden march from the East to the West, but was a work of years, nay of centuries. Those were not the times of regulated Transport or Commissariat departments in the East, especially in the case of wandering tribes like those of the Huns. What they did was this : When they were stopped in their advances at one place, they turned to another. They stopped there and continued to live there as long as they comfortably could. Feeling some kind of pinch, they advanced further. In these advances, at times, the tribes or the people whose country they occupied, advanced further in search of fresh fields for food.

The Great Chinese Wall, having prevented the Huns from making frequent encroachments on the Chinese territories, forced them to turn towards the West in the direction of Asiatic and Greek Kingdoms, and towards the south-west where lived the Yue-chi. These Eastern Huns, at



first attacked the U-sui tribes, who in their turn attacked the Yue-chi. These Yue-chi, being thus pushed by the Huns, turned towards the West and attacked the Su living on Lake Balkash. The Su tribe, which was thus attacked, consisted of the different Turanian tribes, such as the Messagatæ, Tochari and Dahæ, who lived on the frontiers of Persia on the shores of the Upper Jaxartes. The Dahæ seems to be the Dahi of the Dâhinâm Dakhyunâm of the Farvardin Yasht<sup>1</sup> of the Parsees, which speaks of the five known countries of the then world. The Su tribe, being attacked by the Huns, advanced to the Caspian from the Oxus. The Su tribes, who included the Dahæ and the Messagatæ then attacked the Greeco-Asiatic Kingdom of Bactria and the Asiatic state of Parthia. All this began to happen from about 50 years after the erection of the Great Chinese Wall. The Parthians opposed the above tribes. Thereupon, they turned back. The Scyths, Su and Yue-chi invaded India and made their settlements in Punjab. These inroads of the Huns on the Asiatic tribes postponed their inroads for a time in Europe.

## V.

### II.—THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Claudius Ptolemy, the well-known Egyptian Geographer, who lived at Alexandria in the early part of the second century A. D., refers to the Xoâvoi Chuni (Choënoi) a tribe of the Huns, as living between the tribes of the Basternæ and the Roxalani on the Dneiper?<sup>2</sup>

Dionysius Periegetes, who lived at some time about 200 A. D., is said to have referred to Huns living on the borders of the Caspian. But doubts are entertained about these references to the earlier presence of the Huns in Europe, and the authentic history of their progress in the West begins in the 4th century after Christ. Their settlements were known to exist in the north of the Caspian. They advanced westwards in 372 A. D. Under the leadership of the above referred to Balamir, they defeated the Alani who occupied the district between the Volga and the Don. They then enlisted these Alani into their own service. They, afterwards, invaded the country of the Ostrogoths (Eastern Goths), ruled over by Ermanaric or Hermanric, in 374 and subjugated them in the time of Hunimand, the son of Hermanric. They advanced further and defeated the Visigoths (or Tirvingi). For 50 years, they thus conquered the various tribes in the north of Italy, which was then not only free from their attack, but, at times

<sup>1</sup> Yasht XIII, 144.

Prof. Nobbe's Text (1843), p. 172, Bk. III, Chap. V, 25.



received their help in its war with others, *e.g.*, the Ostrogoths. In 404-5, the Huns under a chief, named Uldin, helped the Roman general Honorius in his fight with the Ostrogoths under Radagaisus or Ratigar. They spread in Dæcia, which is now called Hungary after their name. In 409, they invaded Bulgaria. In 432 or 433, their King Ruas or Rugulus received from Theodosius II an annual tribute of £350 of gold, *i.e.*, 14,000 £ sterling and the rank of a Roman general.

Aetius, a promising young Roman, was one of the hostages, given to this Hunnic King, Ruas or Rugulus. Having acquired some influence with the Huns, he led an army of 60,000 Huns to Italy to advance his own interests in his country. Differences soon arose again between Theodosius and Ruas. Ruas objected (*a*) to the Romans making alliances with some tribes on the river Danube, which tribes, he said, were his subjects, and (*b*) to their allowing refuge to some of his unruly Huns. These differences would have renewed hostilities, but Ruas died soon after. On his death, his nephews, Attila and Bleda or Belda, succeeded him.

Let us cast a glance at the history of England at this time, and see,

A glance into the History of England which formed a part of the Roman Empire at this time.

how it was affected by that of the Huns. Britain formed a part of the Roman Empire, and, as such, had a Roman army for its protection. Some German legions also formed a part of this army. The Zoroastrian Mithraism of ancient Persia, several monuments of which have been found in

London, York, Gloucestershire, New Castle and other places, is said to have been introduced into England by, among others, these German legions of the Roman army of occupation.<sup>1</sup> Rome, when it began to be invaded by eastern tribes, had to look to the safety of its own home than to that of distant dominions like Britain. It had its difficulties first with the Goths and then with the Huns. So, Britain was much neglected. The Scots and the Picts often invaded England in the 4th century A. D. In 368 A. D., they had penetrated as far as London. Rome, owing to its own home difficulties, could not attend to the appeal of Britain to send troops for its protection. Rome withdrew the last of its regular army from England, in about 406 A. D. But, at the earnest demand of the people, it sent its legions again in 418 A. D. to protect the country against the inroads of the Scots and the Picts. The legions drove away the invaders, repaired British fortresses and instructed native Britons how to defend themselves and returned to Rome.

<sup>1</sup> Cumont's Mithraism. Vide Legge's Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity.



The Scots and the Picts again invaded England. The people, under their Gaulish Bishop, St. Germaine of Auxaine, defeated them in 429 A.D. The victory at this battle is known as, "the Halleluja Victory" on account of the well-known cry of Hallelujah<sup>1</sup> being raised at it by the soldiers. In 446 A.D., the Britons again asked for help from Rome against the invading Scots. But Rome itself was then rapidly falling on account of its wars with the Huns. The letter to Rome asking for help is known as "the groans of the Britons." Actius, the Roman General, commanded the army of the tottering empire of Rome, which was threatened by Attila. The Romans having refused the required help, the Britons called for help the Saxons who lived on the North-Western coast of Germany. They were to a certain extent as bad barbarians at that time as the Picts and the Scots, but, in times of difficulty, were looked to as saviours. The Saxons themselves were feeling the pressure of the advancing Huns on the continent; so, perhaps, they eagerly grasped this opportunity to save themselves as well as the Britons.

As said by Mr. Moncrieff, "it has been surmised with some probability, that it was the pressure of Attila's conquest that drove our Saxon forefathers to make settlements in Britain. He is said to have formed an alliance as far east as China, and thus to have neutralized another Tartar host that would have pressed him from that side as he pressed upon the western tribes. Not for the first nor the last time now did Asian hordes overflow from their steppes into Europe."<sup>2</sup>

Attila or Etzel, born in 406 A.D., became the king of Huns in 434 A.D. He was the son of Mundzuk, the brother of the last Hunnic king, Ruas or Rugulus, whom the Roman King Theodosius paid the annual tribute of £14,000. Before he came to the throne, the Romans and the Huns were on the point of war, which, however, was avoided by the death of his uncle King Ruas or Rugulus. Attila, on coming to the throne, made a treaty, the treaty of Margus, near modern Belgrade, said to have been made by both sides on horseback. By this treaty, the Romans of the Eastern Empire under Theodosius consented to pay double the original tribute, *i.e.*, £28,000 sterling. Certain other terms acknowledging the power of the Huns were accepted. Among these terms were the following :—(a) The Romans were to return to the Huns some of their subjects who had taken refuge in Roman country; (b) a fine of £8 to be paid by the Romans

<sup>1</sup> Hallelujah is Hebrew Alleluiah, *i.e.* 'Praise (you) Jehovah' ('halal' to praise and 'yah', an abbreviation of Yehovah).

<sup>2</sup> Leaders and Landmarks in European History from early to modern times (1914), by A. R. H. Moncrieff and Rev. H. J. Chaytor, Vol. I, p. 151.



for every fugitive not to be traced ; (c) several markets were to be open both to the Huns and the Romans ; (d) Rome was to make no alliance with any tribe that may be at war with Attila. After this temporary peace with Rome which lasted for 8 years, the Huns reduced Scythia to subjugation and then thought of attacking Persia again. They had at one time already ravaged Media, a part of Persia. They also advanced westwards to the Rhine and fought with the Burgundians. The Roman Empire was at the time divided into two Empires, the Eastern and the Western. They invaded both (A. D. 441). They attacked Constantinople, but peace was soon made, whereby Attila was offered thrice the previous annual tribute, *viz.*, £84,000 and a large sum as indemnity. Bleda died in 445 A. D. So Attila ruled alone. During the above negotiations, Theodosius had plotted for his assassination. Attila censured him for want of honour and courage, but, before he could do anything, Theodosius died and was succeeded by Marcian, who refused to pay any tribute. Attila did not mind this refusal, because his attention in the meantime was drawn towards the Western Empire where Princess Honoria, the sister of Valentinian, who was once confined at Constantinople for her frailties, tired of unmarried life, sent to him her ring and an offer of marriage. He accepted that offer and then began to claim half the Roman Empire as her dowry. The Visigoths were then hostile to the Romans. The Vandals offered to join him against these Visigoths under Theodoric. So, in 451, he led an army of 700,000 men through central Germany, and crossed the Rhine. He defeated the Burgundians and passed through Gaul, and was checked jointly by the Visigoths under Theodoric and the Romans under General Actius at Chalons<sup>1</sup> on the Marne. In the great battle that was fought, Theodoric was killed. His son Thorismund retrieved the fortune of the day and drove Attila back to his camp. Attila is said to have lost from 160,000 to 300,000 men. But this is believed to be some exaggeration, as this defeat was not a crushing defeat for the Huns, who withdrew for the time to their headquarters at somewhere near modern Budapest. Next year, Attila invaded the country on the Adriatic. Venice owes its foundation to this inroad of the Huns. The fugitives from his ravages went and founded this city in the lagoons of the Adriatic Coast. Attila then marched against Rome, which would have fallen, had it not been saved by the embassy of Pope Leo. It is said that Pope Leo boldly came to him and threateningly warned him saying : " Thus far and no further." It is believed that St. Peter and St. Paul also appeared miraculously before Attila and threatened him. Attila at once withdrew from any further attack on Rome. The motive of the withdrawal is not known. He

---

<sup>1</sup> Some writers say that the place of his defeat was Mory and not Chalons.



was moved more by superstition at the serious words of a priest than by mercy, and abstained from entering into Rome. This event saved the Roman civilization from the hands of the Huns. Shortly after, he died (453 A.D.) from the bursting of a blood vessel on the very night of his marriage with Ildiko or Hilda, a beautiful Gothic maiden. Under the banner of Attila's Huns, there fought, at one time, some of the German tribes—the Ostrogoths, Gepidæ, Alani, Heruli and many other Teutonic tribes. His Huns ruled over countries extending from the Rhine to the frontiers of Chalon. His men looked at him with a superstitious awe as a god possessing the iron-sword of the god of war. He is said to have assumed the name of the "Scourge of God" or "the Fear of the World." He was buried in a golden coffin, covered over by a silver coffin, which, in its turn, was put in an iron coffin. His Huns got his grave dug by war-prisoners, who then were killed immediately, so that the place of his tomb may not be known to others.<sup>1</sup>

The great German national epic, known as Nibelungenlied, refers to Attila. According to this epic, Kriemhild was the widow of one Siegfried, who was murdered out of jealousy by Gunther, her brother, the King of Burgundy. On her husband's death, she married Attila and thought of avenging the death of her first husband. She asked Attila to invite her brother and his nobles to dinner at Buda Pesth. She then asked her friends to attack them. They all were killed by sword or fire. She also then died.

It was the invasion of Europe by Attila preceded by that of Allaric, that gave a strong blow to Mithraism that had spread in Europe from the Persian towns of Asia Minor, &c., the disseminating medium being the Roman legions, the Syrian and other merchants and slaves, the imperial officers, &c.<sup>2</sup> The Invasion of Attila giving a blow to Persian Mithraism in Europe. Mithraism had spread even in Britain, where several Mithræa have been excavated.<sup>3</sup> It had spread in Germany<sup>4</sup>, and it is said, that it were the German legions who formed a part of the Roman army of occupation in Britain that had a great hand in its spread there, in various places like York, Gloucester, Chester and even as far in the

<sup>1</sup> For some further particulars about Attila, *vide* "Leaders and Landmarks in European History" by Mr. Moncrieff and Rev. Chaytor, pp. 151 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> "The Mysteries of Mithra" by Prof. Franz Cumont, translated from the second revised French edition by Thomas J. McCormack (1903), pp. 40 *et seq.*, 61 *et seq.*, 74 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 50 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> "Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, being Studies in Religious History from 330 B. C. to 330 A. D." by F. Legge (1915), Vol. II, p. 230, n. 3.



north as Carlisle and New Castle.<sup>1</sup> Like many other legions of the army of the great Roman Empire, these German legions also seem to have kindly taken to Mithraism, when they came into contact with the Persian soldiers in the frequent wars of the Romans with the Persians. The Cult of Mithra, in one form or another, is said to be very old. The recent discovery of some inscriptions leads to show, that Mithra "was one of the most exalted deities of the presumably Aryan Hittites or Mitannians at a date not later than 1272 B.C."<sup>2</sup> One scholar carries the date of one of the inscriptions to 1900 B. C.<sup>3</sup>

The outline, in which Mr. Legge sums up M. Cumont's account of the spread of Mithraism, enables one to see properly the part that Alaric and Attila and their Huns played in giving a blow to this Mithraism, and in preparing Europe for the further spread of Christianity of which it was a principal rival.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 50 et seq.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, Introduction, p. LXII.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Legge's outline runs as follows :—

"As usual, the official form of religion in the Roman Empire had for some time given indications of the coming change in the form of Government. The sun had always been the principal natural object worshipped by the Persians, and a high-priest of the Sun-God had sat upon the Imperial throne of Rome in the form of the miserable Heliogabalus. Only 33 years before Diocletian, Aurelian, son of another Sun-God's priestess and as virile and rugged as his predecessor was soft and effeminate, had also made the Sun-God the object of his special devotion and of an official worship. Hence Diocletian and his colleague Galerius were assured in advance of the approval of a large part of their subjects when they took the final plunge in 307 A. D., and proclaimed Mithras, "the unconquered Sun-God," the Protector of their Empire.

"In spite of this, however, it is very difficult to say how Mithras originally became known to the Romans. Plutarch says indeed that his cult was first introduced by the Cilician pirates who were put down by Pompey! This is not likely to be literally true; for the summary methods adopted by these sea-robbers towards their Roman prisoners hardly gave much time for proselytism, while most of the pirates whom Pompey spared at the close of his successful operations he deported to Achæa, which was one of the few places within the Empire where the Mithraic faith did not afterwards shew itself. What Plutarch's story probably means is that the worship of Mithras first came to Rome from Asia Minor and there are many facts which go to confirm this. M. Cumont, the historian of Mithraism, has shown, that long before the Romans set foot in Asia, there were many colonies of emigrants from Persia who with their magi or priests had settled in Asia Minor, including in that phrase Galatia, Phrygia, Lydia, and probably Cilicia. When Rome began to absorb these provinces, slaves, prisoners, and merchants from them would naturally find their way to Rome, and in time would no doubt draw together for the worship of their national deities in the way that we have seen pursued by the worshippers of the Alexandrian Isis and the Jewish exiles. The *magi* of Asia Minor were great supporters of Mithridates, and the Mithridatic wars were no doubt responsible for a large number of these immigrants.

"Once introduced, however, the worship of Mithras spread like wild-fire. The legions from the first took kindly to it, and this is the less surprising when we find that many of them were recruited under the earliest emperors in Anatolian states like Commagene, where the cult



It is pointed out that "the strictly monarchical doctrine" of Mithraism had appealed greatly to the Roman emperors who saw that "in a quasi-Oriental despotism lay the only chance of salvation for the Roman Empire."<sup>1</sup> In passing to the West and in spreading there, it had undergone such a change from its original form, that, according to Mr. Legge, "Western Mithraism was looked upon by the Sassanian reformers as a dangerous heresy."<sup>2</sup> This rather gave to the Roman emperors "an additional reason for supporting it."<sup>3</sup> Dacia, the country of modern Hungary and Roumania, had become the centre of many Mithræa in the time of Trajan who favoured Mithraism "as an universal and syncretic religion."<sup>4</sup> So, a short time after, with the desolation of Dacia at the hand of the Goths and the Vandals, Mithraism, which had its principal seat there, centred in the midst of a number of Mithræa, received a great blow. When Aurelian abandoned Dacia in 255 A. D. to the Goths and the Vandals, Mithraism suffered a great blow, which paved the way for Christianity, because, with the fall of Dacia, people began to look more towards the Christian Constantinople than the Pagan Rome as the seat of the Roman empire. The Mithræa or the temples of Mithras began to be wrecked and plundered. The masses began to turn from Mithraism to Christianity. The adherents of Mithra, popularly known as the "Capped One" from the fact of their priest putting on a particular cap (the mitre) grew less and less. Thus, the invasions of Attila, which gave a great

---

was, if not indigenous, yet of very early growth. Moreover the wars of the Romans against the Persians kept them constantly in the border provinces of the two empires, where the native populations not infrequently changed masters. The enemy's town that the legions besieged one year might therefore give them a friendly reception the next; and there was thus abundant opportunity for the acquaintance of both sides with each other's customs. When the Roman troops marched back to Europe, as was constantly the case during the civil wars which broke out on the downfall of the Julian house, they took back with them the worship of the new god whom they had adopted, and he thus became known through almost the whole of the Roman Empire. 'From the shores of the Euxine to the north of Brittany and to the fringe of the Sahara,' as M. Cumont says, its monuments abound, and, he might have added, they have been met with also in the Egyptian Delta, in Babylon, and on the northern frontiers of India. In our own barbarous country we have found them not only in London and York, but as far west as Gloucester and Chester and as far north as Carlisle and Newcastle. The Balkan countries, like Italy, Germany, Southern France, and Spain, are full of them; but there was one part of the Roman Empire into which they did not penetrate freely. This was Greece, where the memories of the Persian Wars long survived the independence of the country, and where the descendants of those who fought at Salamis, Marathon and Thermopylæ would have nothing to do with a god coming from the invaders' fatherland. It is only very lately that the remains of Mithras-worship have been discovered at the Piræus and at Patras, in circumstances which show pretty clearly that it was there practised only by foreigners." (Fore-runners and Rivals of Christianity, being Studies in Religious History from 330 B. C. to 330 A. D., by F. Legge (1915, pp. 228-30).

<sup>1</sup>*Ibid.* Vol. II, p. 270.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 271.



blow to the power of Rome, also gave a great blow to Mithraism and a great impetus to Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

In connection with this subject of the spread of Zoroastrian Mithraism in Europe, it may be said that Sir George Birdwood seems to think that some Zoroastrians even served in the Roman army. They had entered in the service of the Roman empire in Western Asia where Rome had many possessions. With the advent of the Roman army into England as the army of occupation, these Zoroastrian soldiers had gone to England, and when there, they may have had a direct hand in the spread of Mithraism. Zoroastrian Mithraism paved the way for Christianity, in so far, as it first shook and then broke to a certain extent the ancient paganism.<sup>2</sup>

(a) The food of the ordinary Huns in the very early period of their history was of roots of some trees and half-raw flesh of all animals. (b) Horses were their inseparable companions. They lived as it were, on the back of horses, because in marches they ate on their back and even slept over them. (c) They were a wandering tribe and as such did not live in houses. (d) Their clothing was made partly of linen and partly of the skin of field mice. (e) Their implements of war for fighting from a little distance were javelins pointed with bones, and for fighting from close quarters swords and lassos. (f) In attacks, they did not advance in lines or ranks but rather in loose array.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid*, Vol. II, p. 273. For a succinct account of the spread of Mithraism, *vide* also "The Religious Life of Ancient Rome" by Jesse Benedict Carter (1912), pp. 87-94.

<sup>2</sup> Sir George Birdwood thus speaks on the subject: "Europe owes the establishment and endowment of Christianity as a State religion to the fact that Constantine the great was attracted to it by the religion of the Zoroastrians, who had served in the Roman legions under his command. Zoroastrians, with the neo-Platonists and Christians were the three principal spiritualizing influences closely inter-related, and equally free from dogmatic theology that at last broke down the whole structure of paganism west of the Indus right on to Great Britain; and on the ruins of the temples of Greece and Rome appeared the domes and towers and spires of the Catholic Roman Schismatic Greek Churches. In Great Britain, there are, I believe, 40 contemporary monuments of ancient Persians, Zoroastrians of the Roman army of occupation in these islands; and the remains of several of them are to be found along the wall of Hadrian within a cycle sweep of Edinburgh. At St. Ives in Huntingdonshire, the abbot of Ramsay in the 11th century, dedicated a chapel to Ivo, a Zoroastrian, who came to England and died here in the 7th century—possibly as a refugee from Iran when first invaded by the Arabs. Our Western code of social etiquette reaches us from the ancient Persian Court, through the Court of the Cæsars of Constantinople and thence through the courts of the Mediæval Christendom that sprang up out of the dust of fallen Rome. It was this 'Persian apparatus' of social etiquette that taught the barbarians who overthrew Rome good manners and made us 'gentlemen' gentlemen." (Sir George Birdwood's letter to the Edinburgh Parsee Union—The Parsi of 30th August 1908.)



Priscus, one of the ambassadors from the Roman Empire to the Court of Attila, has left us some account of the manners and customs of the later Huns, based on what he saw during his stay in Attila's Camp. From this, we learn the following<sup>1</sup> :—

(b) The manners and customs of the Huns in Attila's time.

1. Attila's quarters in his camp were in a "palace of logs and planks, enclosed by palisades and dignified by turrets."
2. His many wives had separate lodges, where they worked at preparing showy dresses for the soldiers.
3. Some of the Romans, who were taken prisoners, married Hunnic women in Attila's Camp.
4. Their dinner time was at three in the afternoon, which they called "the 9th hour," counting the hours from six in the morning.
5. The first thing offered before dinner was a cup of wine, which the guests drank in honour and for the health of their host. It was after drinking this health that they took their seats for dinner.
6. At dinner, the king sat on a coach, his eldest son sitting by his side in reverential awe for his father.
7. The king had a simple clean dress but the nobles had their arms, bridles, and even the shoes of their horses decorated with jewels. The king drank and ate in wooden cups and plates, but the nobles ate in silver and gold ones.
8. They ate at separate tables in parties of three or four.
9. The king's fare was mostly flesh, while the others had meat, bread, relishes and wine.
10. The king sent his cup to an honoured guest who stood up and drank it standing. Each guest had a separate cupbearer.
11. In the evening, minstrels sang at the Court. This singing was accompanied by or followed by some musical performances. In connection with this matter, Mr. Moncrieff adds: "This is the type of a Tartar, and the description of his rude Court is not unlike what may be seen to-day in a Mongol Chief's *Yurt*; nor indeed were his revels more barbarous than those of the Germans and Gothic kings he turned into vassals. In quite modern days we read of Hungarian feasts as graced by the like rude minstrelsy."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Leaders and Landmarks in European History, by Moncrieff, Vol. I, pp. 151 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 152.



12. They took special care to hide the tombs of their kings. They buried them in much sequestered places and then killed the diggers of the graves, so that they may not tell anybody where the king was buried, lest somebody may remove his body. At times, they diverted waters of rivers from their natural beds, and then, burying their kings in those beds, let the water flow in again.

Claudian on the  
Huns of the 5th  
century A. D.

Claudian the poet, who has written on the  
Fall of the Roman Empire, has thus given a  
picture of the Huns of the 5th century:

“ There is a race on Scythia’s verge extreme  
Eastward beyond the Taurs’ chilly stream.  
The Northern Bear looks on no uglier crew ;  
Bare is their garb, their bodies foul to view.  
Their souls are ne’er subdued to steady toil,  
Or Cere’s webs. Their sustenance is spoil.  
With horried wounds they gash their brutal brows  
And o’er their murdered parents bind their vows.”

On the death of Attila in 453, his Hunnic empire fell into pieces.

The Huns after  
the death of Attila.

His sons quarrelled among themselves. Ardaric,  
the King of the Gapidæ, rose in revolt against  
Attila’s sons. In a battle near the river Netad in

Pannonia, 30,000 Huns and their confederates were killed, among whom also was Ellak, the eldest son of Attila. The Huns were broken as a nation and they dispersed. Some of their hordes began to live under the Romans in modern Servia and Bulgaria. The main part of the Huns returned to, and lived in, the plains of the river Ural, which were their home till about a century ago. About thirty years after this, their two tribes—the Kulurguri and Utarguri, reappeared under the name of Bulgari. They again invaded the Eastern Empire of the Romans and continued harassing it for 72 years (485-557). The Avars, who were, up to now, a tribe under them, got ascendancy over them for some time. But the Huns under Krobat or Kubrat again regained their independence in 630, made a treaty with Emperor Heraclius. On the death of Krobat, his dominions were divided among his five sons. The Huns under the first son, Batbaias, remained in their own country, but those under the third son, Asperuch, crossed the Danube. The Huns under Batbaias afterwards came into contact with the Khazars on the river Volga. Their dominion was then known as the Great Bulgaria, whose people were spoken of as the Danubian or White Bulgarians. Thus, according to this account, the Bulgarians were the descendants of the Western Huns.



In or about the 5th century after Christ, the Huns began to lose or lost their original name of Hiong-nou or Huns.

Huns began to be known as Turks, and, later on, as Mongols or Moguls.

One of their hordes or tribes, which was known as the Turks becoming very powerful, gave its name to the whole Hun nation. So, the Huns began then to be known among the neighbouring nations by the name of Turks. Later on, when Chengiz Khan, the chief of the horde or tribe of the Mongols or Moguls became very powerful, his tribe gave its name to the whole nation. The whole Tartar nation then began to be spoken of as the Mongols or Moguls. Just as one and the same river receives different names in the different parts of the country, through which it runs from its source to its mouth, so, the one and the same nation, the Hiong-nou or Huns received different names during its progress from the time of its origin up to now, and from its original home to different countries. The horde or the tribe of the Turks who gave its name to the Huns later on, was called Tou-Kioue by the Chinese and Turks by the other adjoining nations.

The German confederation of groups before the invasion of the Huns, and the effect of the invasion upon the confederation.

Their wars with the Romans had taught the Germans, that it was to their advantage, that the different tribes should unite into groups. So, before Attila's invasion, the numerous German tribes had united into the following four :—

1. The Allemanni, meaning *all men*. They were so called, because their custom was to hold land in common among *all men*. This tribe had given its French name Allmagne to Germany. They lived in the south of Germany, in German Switzerland, the Black Forest and near the lake Constance.
2. The Franks, who gave their name to France, and who have given us the name Firangi for all Europeans, because the Franks, the French, were the first Europeans to come into contact with the Mahomedans (Saracens, Arabs) in the Crusades. The Portuguese were the first Europeans to come to India. So, the Indian Mogul (Mahomedan) rulers, taking them to be like the Franks, called them Firangis. After the Moguls and following them, other Mahomedans, and following them, all the Indians called all Europeans, Firangis.
3. The Saxons, who lived in North Germany and who gave to the ancient Englishmen the name of Anglo-Saxons.
4. The Goths, who were divided into the Eastern Goths (Ostrogoths) and the Western Goths (Visigoths). They were the



most cultured of all the Germans and were first converted to Christianity by Ulphilas who translated the Bible for them into Gothic. They lived on the banks of the Dneiper. They had formed a great Kingdom in the 4th century A.D. extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea. They included the Vandals and the Burgundians.

The invasion of the Huns dispersed these Germans. According to Mr. Gould<sup>1</sup>, the invasion was like that of a wasp in a beehive when all the bees immediately disperse. After the invasion of the Huns, the German groups or confederacies left their countries and began to disperse. The Huns, crossing the Volga for the first time in 375, invaded that part of Germany where lived the Goths. The Ostrogoths, being unable to stand against them, crossed the Danube and entered into the dominions of the Roman Empire, asking for protection. They stayed there, and, after a time, led by their King Theodoric conquered Italy. The Visigoths or Western Goths, not being able to stand against the Huns, ran towards Southern Gaul and made Toulouse their centre. They, under their King Alaric, at one time, took Rome. The Vandals and the Suevi ran towards Spain and from thence went to Africa, forming Carthage as their centre. The Suevi being driven by the Huns, also occupied modern Portugal. The Angles and the Saxons crossed over to Britain in 449 and conquered it. The Lengobards or Lombards descended into North Italy. The Burgundians descended into the country between the Rhone and the Saone and founded the Burgundian Kingdom. The cold German soil of North Germany being deserted by the Germans, it was latterly occupied by the Sclavs who came from the North-East and who occupied Ponerina and Molenburg.

The whole of the dispersion of the German tribes was not bad in itself. Some tribes or groups became very powerful. Among such were the Franks, who, at times, fought on behalf of the Romans against the German tribe of Allemanni and against the Western Goths. They established a good strong kingdom and their kings established their authority in a better way.

The final result of the dispersion of the Germans was this: Some of them, escaping into adjoining countries more civilized than theirs, took up their habits and customs. They gradually disappeared as German tribes and were absorbed among the people among whom they lived. Thus, the old German tribes of the Vandals, Burgundians, Goths and Lombards disappeared. The Franks going into Gaul gave

The final result.  
Some German  
tribes disappeared.

<sup>1</sup> The story of the Nations. Germany, p. 29.



it the name of France and ceased to be Germans. The Franks were the most important of the groups. Thus the final result of the invasion and depredations of the Huns was this : Those German tribes, which left the country on being driven away by the Huns, were, later on, gradually absorbed into the people of the other countries where they went. They gradually acquired new languages and even new customs. They gradually disappeared as German tribes.

We will conclude our account of the wars of the Huns with the Romans with accounts given by two well-known Arab writers, Maçoudi and Tabari, who refer to the Romans.

According to Maçoudi, near the territories of the Khazars and the Alans near the Caucasus, in the direction of the west, there inhabited in about 932 A.D., four Turkish tribes which had come down from the same stock. Some led the life of nomads, and some led a sedantary life. Each of these tribes was powerful, was ruled by a chief, and had its country at the distance of several days' march from that of another. The country of one of them extended up to the Black Sea (la mer Nitas). They carried their excursions up to the country of the Romans and even up to Spain.<sup>1</sup> These four tribes were the following :—

1. The Yadjni (یجنى)
2. The Bedjgards. (بجگرد)
3. The Bedjnâks. (بجناک)
4. The Nowkardehs. (نوکرده)

In about Hijri 320 (932 A.D.), or a little after, they fought with the Romans. There was a Greek city named Walendar (ولندر), which, being on a site between the mountains and the sea, was very difficult of access. It came in the way of their excursions upon the territories of the Romans. When the four tribes were quarrelling among themselves about a certain Mahomedan merchant, a native of Ardebil, who, belonging to one of the tribes, was maltreated by another tribe, the Greek garrison of Walendar, taking advantage of the internal quarrels, attacked their country, and carried away their women and cattle. The Turks, thereupon, united, and with an army of 60,000 horsemen invaded the country of their common enemies, the Romans (Hijri 332 A. D. 944). Armanus was then the King of Rome (ارمنوس ملك الروم) (Romanus I. the Emperor of the East,

<sup>1</sup> Macoudi, traduit par Barbier de Meynard, Vol. II., p. 38, *et seq.* Chapter XVII.



919-944 A. D.). He sent to the help of his subjects of Walendar, an army made up of 12,000 cavalry-men, raised from the newly converted Christians of the district and 50,000 Romans. After a long and heavy fight, the Turks were successful and they marched against Constantinople. They then marched successfully towards France and Spain. The route followed by the armies of these Turks served, later on, as roads of communication with Constantinople.

According to Maçoudi, "they have pliant articulation, curved legs and a bony frame-work, so soft, that they can draw the bow above their shoulders by turning themselves; and

Maçoudi on the physical constitution of the Huns known as the Turks. thanks to the softness of the vertebra of their back, their body appears to be entirely turned back. . . . Under the action of rigorous cold, the heat carries itself and concentrates in the

superior part of their body—this is what gives a strongly coloured taint".<sup>1</sup> "The Turks are fat and soft. Their character offers much analogy to that of women. Thanks to their cold temperament and to the humid principles which prevail in them, they show little aptitude for cohabitation and have consequently a small number of children. Again, continuous horse-exercise weakens amorous desires among them. Among the women, plumpness and humidity prevent the absorption of the seed from the organs of generation. It is the cold which gives to their race a reddish taint . . . because the effect of persistent cold is to colour red what is white."

According to Tabari, in the time of the Roman Emperor Eliânus

Tabari. (Julien), some tribes of the Huns, known as

Khazars, and their territories were under the sway of the Romans. When this Emperor invaded Persia, ruled over by Shapour Zulaktâf, the Khazars, together with the Arabs, formed a part of his army. After some desultory fight, Julien was killed by an arrow from the Persian army and was succeeded by Jovianus who soon concluded peace.

## VI.

### III. THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.

We saw above, that the Huns had, at first, their home in the steppes of Central Asia. They moved eastward towards

Their Inroads in Asia. China. They moved westward and divided themselves into two branches, one towards the valley of the Oxus and the other to that of the Volga. The

<sup>1</sup> I give my translation, *Ibid*, Vol. IV, p. 9.



division, which went towards the valley of the Volga, invaded, in about 375 A.D., Eastern Europe and drove before them the Goths (who also were an offshoot of some early Hun stock), who thus driven, invaded the dominions of the Roman emperors, fighting with them, in what is known as the Gothic War, in which Emperor Valens lost his life in 378 A.D. The Huns, with Attila at their head, harassed the Roman Empire, both, the Western at Ravenna and the Eastern at Constantinople. Attila died in 453 A.D. His Hunnic Empire was broken by another branch of their original stock in the North. The invasion and ravages of this Hunnic division in Europe were quick in their result, and did not continue long; but in the case of the inroads of the other division, that in Asia itself, they were slow and lasted long.

The branches or offshoots of the division which had moved to the valley of the Oxus were known under different names. Those, who invaded Persia, were known as Ephthalites or White Huns. Firoz, the grandfather of Noshirwan, was killed in fighting with them (484 A.D.). The frontier kingdoms of India like Kabul and the adjoining territories were then governed by the Kushans. The Huns attacked them and occupied these territories. They then invaded India proper. This was at the time when the Gupta King Skandagupta was reigning. We now come to this part of their history. We will first speak of their relations with Persia.

Among the above-named four great kingdoms, Persia was one, with whom the Huns had frequent quarrels and fights. Under their different names of Huns, Turks, Haetalites, Khazars, &c., they were in frequent wars, one may say in continuous wars, with the Persians. The reason is simple, *viz.*, their co-terminous boundaries. In a certain way, the war between these two countries may be said to be, not only boundary-wars, but also blood-wars. I have spoken, at some length, elsewhere on their relations with the very early Persians on the authority of the Avesta and Pahlavi books.<sup>1</sup> According to the ancient Iranian tradition, the founders of both, the Iranian and the Turanian kingdoms, were brothers. Jealousy and rivalry led to fight and murder, which now and then continued. The history of Persia of the very early dynasties, the Peshâdâdians and the Kayânians—of times preceding those of what may be termed authentic history,—was the history of the war of Iran with Turan, the latter being the cradle of the early Huns. The history of the Achæmenian times was mostly the history of Iran's war with the Greeks. But the Achæmenians had also to fight with the Huns. The Massagetæ, against whom Cyrus fought, and the Sakas or

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Sir Ramcrishna G. Bhandarkar's Memorial Volume.



Scythians, against whom Darius fought, were Hunnic tribes. The history of the Parthians and the Sassanians was the history of Iran's wars with the Romans. But, these last two periods also were interspersed with frequent wars with the Huns or Turks.

Maçoudi, with some difference, derives the origin of the Turks from the same source as the Pahlavi Bundelesh. He says, that one Turk was the ancestor of all the Turks (Ce Turk, qui est le pere de tous les Turks).<sup>1</sup> He gives as follows the genealogy of Firasiâb, the Frâsiâv of the Pahlavi Bundelesh, the Afrâsiâb of Firdousi: Firasiab-Bouchenk (the Pashang of the Bundelesh)—Nabet-Nachmir (the Zaeshm of the Bundelesh)—Turk-Yaceb (the Spaenyash of the Bundelesh)—Tour (the Tuj or Tur of the Bundelesh.)—Aferidoun (the Fredun of the Bundelesh.) Maçoudi places the country of the Turks together with that of the Khazars, Dilemians and the Slavs in the sixth clime between Syria, Asia Minor and Mesopotamia on the one hand, and China on the other<sup>2</sup>. One of the tribes of the Turks being the Khazars, who lived on the shores of the Caspian, the Caspian sea was called Behr-al Khazer, i.e., the sea of the Khazars<sup>3</sup>.

The Tagazgez (طغزغز) with whom Zadsparam, the brother of Manuscheher, the author of the Pahlavi Nâmakihâ-i-Mânuschihar<sup>4</sup> seems to have come into contact, and from whom he had taken some heretical views,<sup>5</sup> formed the bravest, most powerful and the best governed tribe, (la plus valeureuse, la plus puissante et la mieux gouvernée) of the Turks.<sup>6</sup> These Tagazgez latterly adopted Manichæism<sup>7</sup>.

The chief ruler of these Turks was known as the Khakân of the Khakâns (خاقان الخوqان)<sup>8</sup>. They formed an empire and ruled over all smaller kings of the various tribes or divisions. Afrasiab

<sup>1</sup> Maçoudi, Tradit par Barbier de Meynard, Vol. 11, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, Chapter VIII, Vol. I., p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*, p. 263.

<sup>4</sup> *Vide* Ervad Bomanji N. Dhabhar's edition of the Text (1912).

<sup>5</sup> *Vide* my Paper on "References to China in the ancient books of the Parsees," read before the International Congress held at Hanoi in December 1902.—(*Journal*, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXI, pp. 525-536). *Vide* my Asiatic Papers, Pt. I, pp. 251-252.

<sup>6</sup> Maçoudi par B. de Meynard, Vol. I, p. 288

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 299-300.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, p. 288.



himself, the above referred to inveterate enemy of the Irânians, has been considered to be one of such Khâkâns.

An account of the relations of the Huns with the Sassanian Persians is somewhat important from the point of view of the history of India. The Hunnic invasion of India, had, as we will see later on, some connection with the relations and wars of the Huns with the Sassanian Persians. These Hunnic-Persian, or to speak more particularly Hætalite-Sassanian wars lasted for about 100 years.<sup>1</sup>

We have, as it were, a labyrinth of various versions or accounts of the wars of the Sassanians with the Huns. On the one hand, we have Eastern writers like Firdousi, Maçoudi, Tabari, and Aboulfeda, who differ among themselves. On the other hand, we have a number of Byzantine writers, who also differ among themselves in the matter of the details of these wars. We find excellent epitomes of the versions of these Western writers in the History of M. Deguignes and in the recent *Mémoire* of M. Drouin. Among the Sassanian kings, Kobad is one, for whose wars with the Huns we have the most different versions. As M. Deguignes says, the Huns had very long wars with Kobad of which the details are not known<sup>2</sup>.

The second stock of the ancient Huns, when stopped in China, had remained temporarily settled in Central Asia at places like Aksu, Kashgar, &c. The ancient Huns, who had knocked at the gates of China, had also knocked at the gates of Persia. The history of Persia of the Peshdadian and Kianian times was, as said above, the history of the wars of the Iranians with the Turanians, the ancestors of the early Huns. The Avesta and the Pahlavi books of the Parsees speak of them. I will not speak of these here. In later times also, in the times of the Achænenians and the Parthians, they had frequent wars with the Persians. I will not speak here of these wars also. But I will speak of their wars during the Sassanian times, because it was at this time that the Huns came into more prominence both in Asia and in Europe. It was during these times that they made their presence and their force felt to the Roman, Persian and Indian Empires. They were the descendants of the above second branch who had temporarily settled in Central Asia.

<sup>1</sup> The late M. E. Drouin speaks of them as Ephthalites, and gives us an excellent paper on the subject, under the title of "Mémoire Sur les Huns Ephthalites dans leur Rapports avec les Rois Perse Sassanides." (Extrait du *Museon*, 1893).

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire des Huns*, T. I., P. II, p. 332.



At the time when the black or sun-burnt Huns of the North were devastating the countries of Europe, the Huns of

The origin of the different names under which they came into contact with the Persians.

the above other Hunnic branch, known generally as the white Huns, were committing inroads into Persia. They were known under different names, such as Euthalites, Ephthalites, Haitalites, Nephthalites, Atelites, Abtelites, Cidarites.

Oriental writers speak of them generally as Turcs. The Huns, who, as said above, had settled at Kashgar and Aksu, and had, thence, spread towards the Caspian and the frontiers of Persia, were called Te-le or Til-le. As they lived on the waters (آب بِل) *i.e.*, the shores of the Oxus, they were called Ab-tele. The name Abtelite in the above list of their names comes from this origin. It is the corruption of this name 'Abtelites,' that has given the people their other names such as Euthalites and Nephthalites.<sup>1</sup> It is this last corrupted name Nephthalite, that has led some to believe that they were the descendants of the Jews of the Nephthali tribe. According to Tabari, the word Haitalite comes from the word 'Haital,' which in the Bokharian language, means "a strong man."<sup>2</sup>

The different Sassanian monarchs with whom the Huns came into contact. Behramgour, 420-438.

The Persians fought with the Huns during the reigns of the following Sassanian monarchs :—

1. Behramgour (Behram V) 420-438 A. D.
2. Yazdagard II, 438-457.
3. Hormuzd (Hormazd III), 457.
4. Pirouze, 457-484.
5. Balâsh, 484-488.
6. Kobâd, 488-497 (Kobad dethroned).
7. Jâmâsp, 497-499.
8. Kobâd (restored to throne), 499-531.
9. Naushirwan the just (Chosrœ I), 531-579.

We will speak of the relations and wars of the Huns with these Sassanian kings.

According to Firdousi, Behramgour was a very brave king, but he was of a 'jolly good fellow' type. Reports having spread round about, that he was an easy going man, the Khakân of Chin thought of

<sup>1</sup> Histoire des Huns, by M. Deguignes, Tome I, Partie II, pp. 325-26.

<sup>2</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II., p. 128.



taking the opportunity of the Persian king's easy going life to invade his dominions. The people, whose leader is spoken of as the Khakān of Chin, were Hætalites or, Epthalites, otherwise known as the White Huns. Behram's courtiers grew restless over the news, but he assured them to depend upon God for the safety of the country. He apparently seemed to take the matter lightly, but really was anxious about it. He appointed his brother Narsi to rule for him and to remain at the capital, and marched with a large army to a direction other than that from which the enemy was coming. His people thought, that he shirked the coming war, but it seems, that his object was to entice the enemy to advance further and then to fall upon him in an unexpected way. Behramgour first went to the great Iranian Fire-temple of Adargoushp in Azarābādgan and prayed for victory. The king could not disclose all his plans; so, the courtiers in spite of the remonstrances of Narsi, sent one Homai (همای) as an envoy to the camp of the coming invader and offering a tribute sued for peace. The Khakan accepted their offer and promised not to advance further than Merv. He asked the envoy to meet him at Merv with the offered presents and tribute. He then advanced upto Merv where he waited for the offered presents and tribute. Behramgour was all along kept informed by his spies of what was happening and of the movements of the Khakan. By an unfrequented road, he secretly marched towards Merv and fell upon the Khakan and his army. A great battle was fought at Kashmihan (کشمین) near Merv. The Khakan was defeated and fell a prisoner in the hand of Khazra-vān (خزروان), a general of Behram. Behram then invaded the territories of the Turcs (Haitalites), who all submitted to him and offered to give tributes. He then ordered a stone column to be built on the frontiers to mark the spot<sup>1</sup> which no Turk or Khalaj<sup>2</sup> may cross and enter into the land of Irān<sup>3</sup>. The Jehun or the Oxus was fixed as

<sup>1</sup> M. Deguignes names the place as Pherbar, but does not give his authority (*Histoire des Huns*, T. I. P. II, p. 327).

<sup>2</sup> The modern Khiljis of Afghanistan are believed to be these Khalaj.

<sup>3</sup>

بر آورد میلی ز سنگی و ز گچ  
 که کس را ز ایران ز ترک و خلیج  
 نبودی گزر جز بفرمان شاه  
 هما نیز جیهون میانجی بر او



the boundary between these countries. He appointed one Shohreh<sup>1</sup>, in command of the frontier district. It appears that the long circuitous way which Behramgour had taken was purposely intended by him as a ruse to take the Huns by surprise and to give them a crushing blow.<sup>2</sup>

The religion of the Huns, at least in early times, was, Mazdayaṣṇian and if not purely Zoroastrian, somewhat akin to Zoroastrian. At least, there lived many Zoroastrians in their country. A statement of Firdousi, in connection with this victory of Behramgour over the Haetalites, seems to show this. He says, that in the Haetalite centres like Chagan, Khatal, Balakh, Bokhara and Gurzastân<sup>3</sup>, there lived Mobads who went to fire-temples and prayed there with Bâz and Barsam.<sup>4</sup>

Behramgour then went to the great fire-temple of Âdargushasp in Âzarâbâdgân and offered thanks to the Almighty for his victory. He presented to the temple, for its decoration, the jewels of the crown of the Khakan which he had taken with him. According to Tabari,<sup>5</sup> in his war with the Huns, Behram had also taken prisoner the wife of the Khakan, the great Khatun. He took her as a state prisoner to the above great fire-temple and made her serve the temple.<sup>6</sup> This fact of sending a Hun lady to serve in a Fire-temple also shows that some Huns were Mazdayaṣṇans. This great victory in the battle of Kashmihan had far-reaching effects in Central Asia. The various chiefs and rulers sought the friendship of the king of Iran, and the spread of Sassanian coins in Central Asia is believed to be the result. Behramgour's coins seem to have served as a type for the coinage of some surrounding people, even of India. That also seems to be the result of this great victory.

According to Firdousi, Behram, some time after this, came to India and married Sepinud, the daughter of the king of Kanouj. The

<sup>1</sup> شهره Some MSS. give the name as Shamr.

<sup>2</sup> M. Deguignes, *Histoire des Huns*, T. I. P. II, p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> Some MSS. have the name as Gharchakân,

<sup>4</sup> Mecan's Ed. Vol. III, p. 1548. چغانی و ختلی و بلخی ردان

بخاری و از غرچکان موبدان  
برفتند با باژ و برسم بدست  
نیاش کنان پیش آتش پرست

<sup>5</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg, Vol. II, p. 121.

آن خاتون که زن خاقان بود بخد مت تشکده کردن فرستاد  
(Munshi Naval Kishore's Text of 1874, p. 301.)



name of the Indian king, as given by Firdousi, is Shāngal (شنگول)<sup>1</sup> and as given by Maçoudi is Shabarmeh<sup>2</sup> (شبرمه). M. Drouin thinks that they do not sound as Hindu names.<sup>3</sup> I think, the first name is a Hindu name corresponding to the modern name Shankar, a form of which we see in Shankarâchârya. It is more the name of a family than of an individual king. According to Firdousi, Behram on his return to Persia took his Indian queen to the great fire-temple of Adargushasp<sup>4</sup> and got her admitted into the fold of Zoroastrianism. M. Drouin thinks that these events, *vis.*, Behram's visit to India, and his marriage with the Indian Princess Sepihnoud, are no poetical fancies of Firdousi, but real facts. The Persian kings had, ere this, commenced to have closer relations with India. Hormuzd II (A.D. 305) had come to Kaboul and had married a daughter of its Kushan (Yuetchi) king. A copper coin of this king bears the figure of Siva with the Nandi symbols. This coin then illustrates Persia's closer relations with India.

According to Firdousi, Behramgour sent for 10,000 singers, male and female, of the class of Luri (لوریان)<sup>5</sup> and distributed them in Persia to provide Indian music to his people who asked for it. It is these Luris, who seem to have given to Persia, Western Asia and Europe, the various classes of singing gypsies. It is said, that the use of Pahlavi alphabet for writing purposes in the country of the Haetalites began after this time of the victory of Behramgour. The Armenian alphabet had gone in there before this time, in the times of the Parthians.

Behramgour was succeeded by his son Yazdagard, known familiarly as the Sipah-dost, *i.e.*, the friend of the soldiers. He was also spoken of as Kadi, *i.e.*, the great. On his coins, he is spoken of as Kadi Yazdagardi or Mazdayaçna Kadi Yazdagardi. Firdousi, Tabari and Maçoudi, while speaking of this king's reign, do not refer to his wars with the Haetalites. It is the Armenian writers, who give us a glimpse of these wars.<sup>6</sup> He carried invasions over the country of the Ephthalite or Haetalite Huns, spoken of as the country of the Kushans, every year from 442 to 450. The king issues a proclamation and appeals to his subjects.—Ariks and Anariks (*i.e.*, Iranian and un-Iranian)—to

<sup>1</sup> Mecan's Ed. III, p. 1558.

<sup>2</sup> Maçoudi, traduit par B. de Meynard II, p. 191.

<sup>3</sup> Aucun de ces noms n'a une tournure Sanscrite. Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites (1895), p. 28, n. 2.

Adar Gushasp is one of the great Fire-temples, which are still mentioned by the Parsees in their Atash nyaish. For its History, *vide* my Iranian Essays, Part I.

<sup>5</sup> Mecan's Text, Vol III, p. 1585.

<sup>6</sup> M. Drouin's Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites (1895), p. 30.



unite and help him against the Huns. Even his Christian subjects in Armenia helped him in these wars against the Huns or Kushans. He carried his invasions over their country for seven successive years but without effect. He succeeded a little in 450 A. D., and taking a part of their territories, founded therein a city and named it Shehrastân-i-Yazdagard, *i.e.*, the city of Yazdagard. Yazdagard, flushed at this victory, aimed at Zoroastrianising Armenia. But, it is said that Kushan, the country of the Haetalite Huns, once being opened to other people, opened also to Christianity.

The Haetalite Huns were off and on carrying on their depredations in Persia. So, Yazdagard carried another invasion in 454 A. D., but, falling in an ambushade had to beat a sudden retreat. He died in 457 A.D., leaving two sons, Hormuz and Phirouz, by his queen Dinaki. The name of this queen has recently come into light by means of an intaglio or a cut gem discovered in 1868 by a Russian savant M. Boutkowski. M. Dorn, in 1881, discovered the name from a Pahlavi inscription on it.<sup>1</sup>

Firouz was, according to Firdousi, the elder son of Yazdagard. But Hormuzd III 457 A. D. and the Huns. Yazdagard, had, from his dying bed, declared his son Hormuzd as his successor. Firouz was at the time of his father's death at Seistan. So, Hormuzd, being on the spot, easily occupied the throne. This brought in a civil war. Firouz asked for help from the Haetalite king, whom Firdousi calls Shah Haital (شاه هیتال)<sup>2</sup> Firdousi calls him Chagâni Shahi (چغانی شاهی)<sup>3</sup> and gives his name as Faganish (فغانیش)<sup>4</sup>. I think, that, as we will see later on, it was this Hunnic king or a prince of his clan or tribe, who is known in Indian inscriptions as Toramana the Shahi.

This Haetalite king offered to help Firouz to gain his father's throne, on condition, that he (Firouz) surrendered to him the countries of Tarmud (ترمذ) and Visehga (ویسه گرد).<sup>5</sup> Firouz accepted that condition, and with the help of this Hunnic king Faganish, defeated his brother Hormuzd and won the throne of Persia. According to

<sup>1</sup> M. Drouin's *Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites*, p. 32, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Mecan's *Calcutta ed.*, Vol III, p. 1589. M. Mohl's small ed. Translation, Vol. VI, p. 68.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> The name of this town seems to have some connection with the Vaêsaka clan of the Huns (Hûnavo Vasaekaya), who according to the Âbân Yasht (Yt. V. 54) were, as it were, the hereditary Hunnic foes of the Iranians (*Vide* my paper on the Iranian Huns in the Bhandarkar Memorial Volume.)

Firdousi<sup>1</sup> and Mirkhond,<sup>2</sup> Firouz pardoned his brother, but, according to Aboulfeda<sup>3</sup> he was imprisoned, and according to Tabari,<sup>4</sup> he was killed. According to this last author, the Hunnic king, at first, kept Firouz at his Court, giving him the command over the country of Talekan, and sent him to Persia later on, when the people there appealed to Firouz to relieve them from the oppression of Hormuzd.

M. Deguignes<sup>5</sup> and M. Drouin<sup>6</sup> name this Hunnic king as Khushnawâz. They seem to follow Tabari, but, I think Tabari<sup>7</sup> is wrong and Firdousi's version is correct. Firdousi, later on, speaks of a Hunnic king Khushnawâz as fighting with Firouz, and says, that he was the son of Khâkân<sup>8</sup> (فرزند خاکان).<sup>9</sup> By 'Khakan:' perhaps, he meant, as said by Drouin,<sup>10</sup> the Khakan previously referred to, *vis.*, Faghanish. I think Faghanish the Khakan, who first aided Firouz, and of whom he specially speaks as the Shâhi and Chaghani, must have gone to India to make an inroad there. I think, he is the Toramana of the Indian inscription. But more of this later on.

In the matter of the wars of the Huns with the Sassanian kings, we find a great difference, not only in the statements of Western and Eastern writers, but also between the statements of different Oriental writers like Firdousi, Tabari, Maçoudi, &c. This difference is especially very great in the case of the reign of Firouz. One cannot even say with certainty, whether this Sassanian king had only one war with the Hunnic king or more than one; and, if the latter, whether it was with the same Hunnic tribe or different tribes. However, we will try to string up the various statements.

His Famine policy. A year after Firouz's accession to the throne, Persia was visited by a great famine which lasted for seven years. Firouz helped his people with grain and did his best to prevent mortality, both among men and cattle. He threatened with loss of life, those, who thought of

<sup>1</sup> Mecan's Text III, p. 1589.

<sup>2</sup> M. Drouin's Memoire sur les Huns, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 128.

<sup>5</sup> Histoire des Huns, T. I., P. II, p. 328.

<sup>6</sup> Memoire sur les Huns, p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 127.

<sup>8</sup> Mohl, Vol. VI, p. 74.

<sup>9</sup> Mecan's Text III, p. 1591.

<sup>10</sup> Memoire sur les Huns, p. 33.



taking an undue advantage over the poor. He wrote to the heads of all villages : " Give food to the poor. Do not remove them from one village to another. If in any village any single poor man will die for want of food I will put to death one rich man for that."<sup>1</sup> Firouz remitted all land collections. He sent for grain from the countries of the Roman Empire, India, Turkestan and Abyssinia. Tabari says, that owing to an extraordinary care on the part of the king, only one person died of hunger during all the seven years of the famine, and the king, in order to atone as it were for this one death, distributed 100,000 dinars among the poor. He appointed a day for general public prayers to the Almighty for the relief of the distress. When the famine ended and plenty began to return, he commemorated that event by founding a new city which he named Firouzarâm. Firouz's famine administration, as described by Firdousi and Tabari, would do credit to any modern king.

According to Prîsus, a Roman writer, Firouz, after defeating his brother Hormuzd and winning the Persian throne with the help of the Hunnic king (Faganish, according to Firdousi), seems to have made a treaty with the Hunnic king. Therein, he agreed to give his sister in marriage to a Hunnic prince, who is named Coucha<sup>2</sup> (or Koukhas),<sup>3</sup> and whom M. Drouin identifies with Khoushnâvâz.<sup>4</sup> But Firouz did not act according to the agreement, because, perhaps, as said by M. Deguignes, he was ashamed, that his royal sister should marry a Hunnic king. It is said, that Firouz got another Persian lady dressed as a royal queen and passed her off as his sister before the Hunnic king. But this pretended princess, afraid lest the fraud may be known and she be put to death, gently divulged the secret to the Hunnic king, who, though displeased with the fraudulent ruse of Firouz, was pleased with the loyalty and sincerity of the Persian lady, and so, in recognition of that, married her and made her his queen. The Hunnic king then thought of revenging himself upon the Persian king. He asked him to send him 300 of his best Persian soldiers to train his Hunnic army. Firouz sent them. The Hunnic king killed some and mutilated others. The latter were then sent to the Persian king. It is worth noting in this connection, that the Huns of this Hunnic king are spoken of as Kidarites<sup>5</sup>. These events brought about a breach of peace, and war was declared in which the Persians were successful. According to some writers, the

<sup>1</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> Histoire des Huns by M. Deguignes T. I., Partie II, p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> Mémoire sur les Huns, by M. Drouin, p. 34.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Drouin, Mémoire sur les Huns, p. 34. M. Drouin thinks that these Kidarites were a Hunnic tribe, different from the Ephthalites (*Ibid.*, p. 35, n. 2.)



Hunnic king had asked the hand of a daughter of Firouz in marriage. This being refused, the refusal served as a cause of war.

It is said, that in this war, Firouz asked the help of Emperor Leon I, but was refused. Leon only sent an ambassador, named Constantius, to the court of Firouz. In the war that ensued, Firouz was entrapped in a defile from which there was no escape and he had to surrender. It is said, that the Hunnic king offered to set him free on condition that he prostrated before him, and swore, that he would not invade his territories again. Firouz's Zoroastrian Mobads being consulted, said, that a Zoroastrian king could prostrate before none but the sun. To meet the difficulty, it was arranged, that the Hunnic king may be asked to receive the prostration, the next morning with the rise of the sun. Accordingly, the next morning, when the sun rose, Firouz prostrated before the king, but giving the prostration, at least in his mind and in the mind of his Persians, a look of a prostration before the sun.

There is another version, which is based on that of Joshu the Sliglite, a Syrian monk-historian, who lived in the beginning of the 6th Century, and who is known as a good historian of the war between the Sassanian king Kobad and the Byzantine Emperor Anastalius (502-506). According to this version, the Hunnic king made peace on condition that Firouz paid 10 mule loads of ecus.<sup>1</sup> Firouz could pay then only two-thirds, and so, his son Kobad was kept as a hostage.<sup>2</sup> Firouz, later on, paid the balance and Kobad was set free.

According to Tabari, a Hunnic officer had once to resort to a ruse<sup>3</sup> to secure victory for his master. It is not clear in which of the several wars that Firouz fought with the Huns this patriotic ruse was resorted to.

The ruse described by Tabari was this : When Khushnavâz had to retire before the large Persian army, then a devoted patriotic chief officer of his court came to his help and saved him by means of a stratagem. Taking Khoushnavâz into his confidence, he got some of his limbs cut off. Thus mutilated, he got himself placed in a position, where he could be seen by the Persians. Some Persians, passing by the place saw him, had compassion upon him, and took him to Firouz who inquired after his case. The Haetalite chief said, that as he had remonstrated with Khoushnavâz for his tyrannical government and for his war against the Persians, he was thus mutilated for his liberty of speech and freedom of views. He then offered to lead

<sup>1</sup> An ecus about half a crown.

<sup>2</sup> Drouin's *Mémoire sur les Huns*, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> We read in Herodotus of a similar ruse during the siege of Babylon by Darius (Bk. III, 150-160).



the Persian army by a particular route against the Haetalites, whereby he could be sure of victory. Firouz was deceived and was led into a trap, where he was surrounded and defeated by the Hunnic army.

According to Tabari, the Hunnic king got a great stone column erected to mark the boundary of his country.

**A Boundary column.** So grand was the structure that it took six months to erect it. It was made out of one

stone. It was then covered over with metal. Firouz was made to swear before it that he would never cross it and invade Hunnic territories. Tabari, after describing the erection of this column at some length, says, that according to some, it was built by Behramgour. I think this latter version is correct and Tabari's previous version does not seem to be probable. The very life-history of the Huns makes it improbable, that they should bind themselves to a particular boundary. Firouz was burning with revenge for the humiliation, he was put to by then Hunnic king in the previous war, and he sought for an opportunity to invade the Hunnic country again. It is said that the Hunnic king became a little oppressive and his oppression drove some of his people to seek the protection and help of Firouz. He accorded these. Firouz ordered an invasion of the Hunnic country ruled over by Khoushnavâz. His son Kobad accompanied him in the invasion. His other son Palâs was left at the capital to rule as a regent. According to Tabari, the cause of the war was the oppression of Khoushnavâz over his people. He was a man of unnatural lust.

As said above, Behramgour had raised a column on the frontiers to mark the boundary between his country and that of the Turanian Hunnic king. According to some, it was the Hunnic king who had raised it. The latter protested against Firouz crossing the boundary. Firouz, according to Tabari, retorted<sup>1</sup>: "I have obligation towards thee, but I have greater obligations towards God." He said: "a number of your Haetalites, tired of your oppression, have entered into my Persian territories and have appealed to me for help." It is said, that, to avoid the apparent guilt of crossing the above boundary stone, Firouz resorted to a ruse. He ordered the column to be brought down and placed it on a large chariot drawn by a number of elephants. He then let the chariot always proceed in the front and he marched behind it with his army.

In the war that ensued, the Hunnic king Khoushnavaz prepared extensive deep trenches and covered them with grass and dry rubbish, and then, under the pretext of retreat, drew the Persian army over the

<sup>1</sup> Tabari par Zotenberg II, p. 131.

trenches. Firouz and a number of his army fell in them. In the battle that ensued, Firouz was completely defeated and killed. His daughter Firouzdokht was taken prisoner. According to some, even his son Kobad was taken prisoner. Some say that the Hunnic king married Firouzdokht. Others say, that the Hunnic king sent her away to Persia with all due honours. Thus ended the war or wars of Firouz with the Haetalite or Eupthalite Huns.

On the death of Firouz, the Persian nobles wanted to give the throne to his minister Sufrai, but he refused, and Balâsh, the Valens of the Western writers, a son of Firouz, was given the throne. Sufrai was a Persian minister in whose charge Firouz had left the country when he went to fight against the Haetalites. When he heard of the death of his Royal master being killed in the war with the Haetalites, he declared war with them and gave them a partial defeat, but soon concluded peace, on condition that Khushnavaz was to set at liberty Kobad, the son of Firouz, and Ardeshir, a minister of Firouz, who were taken prisoners in the final war when Firouz was killed. Khousnawaz set Kobâd and Ardeshir free. According to a Western writer, Lazarus of Pharbia, Zareh, a brother of Balâsh, had raised a revolt to gain the throne, but it was suppressed and he was put to death<sup>1</sup>. But this is doubtful. Some writers do not speak of Kobâd having been a prisoner in the hands of the Hunnic king.

Kobâd sought the aid of the Hunnic king to depose Balâsh and gain the Persian throne for himself. Khushnavaz promised him help but did not soon fulfil the promise. When help was actually given and he marched with the help of the Hunnic army to Ctesiphon,<sup>2</sup> the capital of the Persian empire, he heard on the way, that Balâsh was dethroned by the Persian Mobads. The reason for this dethronement, as given by Josua, the Slylite,<sup>3</sup> was, that he introduced into Persia, the customs and manners of the Byzantine emperors. Among these, one was that of the institution of public baths. It seems, that these public baths were places where large reservoirs or tanks were built in which all people dipped. This was held to be insanitary, and so, sinful from the point of view of the Iranians, who held water in reverence and enjoined, that it should not be so spoilt as to do harm to those who used it. If an unhealthy or infected man dipped into the reservoir of a public bath, the water, that was spoilt and contaminated, was likely to do harm

<sup>1</sup> Drouin's Memoire, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> According to Hamazah, this town was, at first, named طوسفون, I think, it was named after Tug of Siskâna. *Vide* my text and translation of the Pahlavi Shatroihai-i-Airân, pp. 72-73.

<sup>3</sup> Drouin's Mémoire sur les Huns, p. 41, n. 2.



to subsequent bathers or swimmers. According to the Pahlavi *Ardâi Viraf Nameh*<sup>1</sup>, this was sinful.

There are different versions about the relations between Balâsh and Kobâd. Some writers say, that Balâsh voluntarily resigned in favour of Kobâd. Others say that Balâsh's natural death paved Kobâd's way to the throne. Others related, as said above, that he was dethroned and that the dethronement made matters easy for Kobâd, who then seized the throne of Persia. According to Firdousi, Kobâd was only 16 years of age when he came to the throne, and it was Sufrai who asked Balâsh to retire and set Kobâd on the throne. Anyhow, it seems, that for some time, Sufrai was the real ruler and Kobâd a nominal king. Some time after Kobad came to the throne, some of his courtiers prejudiced him against Sufrai, who was his father's confidential minister and who had released him from the hands of the Haetalite king Khoushnawaz. He was told, that Sufrai was ambitious and looked for royal power, etc. He, thereupon, got Sufrai murdered. The Persians therefore rose in rebellion against him for this unjust conduct, and handed him over as a prisoner to Zarmehar, the son of Sufrai. They then placed his brother Jamasp on the throne. Zarmehar however treated Kobâd well and set him free. Kobâd, in company with Zarmehar, fled to the country of the Haetalites. On his way there, he fell in love with the beautiful daughter of a village headman, who traced his descent from Feridun and married her. Noshirwan was born of this wife who was named Baboudokht.<sup>2</sup>

Both western and eastern writers differ on the subject of Kobâd's marriage or marriages. Some say, that he went to the court of Khoushnawaz, the Hunnic king, for the second time to seek help against his brother Jamasp, who was placed on the throne of Persia by his people when they dethroned him for his Mazdakaism or such other fault. When there, he married a daughter of the Hunnic king, and that it was from this Hunnic wife that Noshirwan was born. Some say this queen was not the daughter of Khoushnawaz himself, but was a royal lady of the court of Firouz, who, having fallen a prisoner in the hands of the Hunnic king, was adopted by him as his daughter.

As to his deposition also, there are differences. Some say that his inclination towards the socialistic views of Mazdak was the cause of

<sup>1</sup> The Book of Arda Viraf by Hoshang-Haug-West. Chap. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Drouin's Mémoire, p. 44.

dethronement. Others place the fact of his relation with Mazdak<sup>1</sup> a little later on. Some say, that anticipating what was going to take place, he himself retired. Anyhow, this much was certain, that Kobâd had made himself unpopular and was therefore dethroned by his people or had to leave the throne.

Jamasp had a short reign of about 3 years (497-499 A. D.). Kobâd soon sought the help of the Hunnic king and regained his throne. According to Tabari<sup>2</sup>, he had the help of 30,000 soldiers from the Hunnic king.

Kobad promised a tribute to the Hunnic king in return of the assistance he received from him. He had a number of Huns in his Persian army serving as auxiliaries. The tribute not being paid regularly, the Hunnic king pressed for it. So, Kobad turned to the Roman Emperor Anastasius and asked for help of money from him. This help being refused, he besieged Theodosopolis, the modern Erzeroum, which formed a part of Roman Armenia. When he was in Mesopotamia, busy with the Romans, the Huns invaded his dominions and so he had to return. He then had long wars with these Ephthalite Huns, commencing from 503 A.D. According to the Byzantine writers, Kobad soon made peace with his enemies in the West and concentrated all his efforts for the war with the Huns which lasted for about 10 years (503 to 513 A. D.). During these years, he had also to fight against a famine in his country. Again, besides the Ephthalite Huns, there arose against him the Huns of the Caucasus and the Kidarite Huns. According to Tabari<sup>3</sup>, he fought also with the Khazars who also were a Hunnic tribe.

According to Tabari<sup>4</sup>, it was during the reign of this sovereign, that Shamar, a son of Tobba, the king of the Arabs, founded the city of Samarkand which, upto then, forming a part of the Empire of China, was known as Shin or Chin. Shamar took the city by a ruse in concert with a princess of the city who was duped by the invader.

Again, according to the same author<sup>5</sup>, it was during this reign that the Persian kings turned from payment

Kobad and the introduction of the payment of land revenue in coins.

in kind to payment in coin in the matter of the land revenue. It is said, that at one time, when Kobad was in a village, he heard the wife of a villager rebuking her child for plucking a grape from a vine-plant. Kobad inquired, why she would

<sup>1</sup> For particulars about his teachings, *vide* my paper on "Mazdak, the Iranian socialist" in Dastur Hoshang Memorial Volume.

<sup>2</sup> Zotenburg II, p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> Zotenburg II, p. 148.

<sup>4</sup> Zotenburg II, p. 156.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, p. 152, Chap. XXX.



not let her own child eat a grape. This honest woman said, that until the officers of the king took an inspection of the crop, she was not justified in letting the grapes to be eaten by the child, because the king was to be paid a share of the crop. The king was touched by the honesty of the woman and saw the harshness of the system, whereby a farmer could not make any use of his crop till the State officers measured the crop; so, consulting with his officers, Kobad introduced the system of levying some fixed revenue from land, whereby the farmers could be at liberty to make any use they liked of their produce.

The ancient Persians under the Sassanides had come into contact with the Chinese<sup>1</sup>. Moses of Chorene, a known Armenian writer of the 5th century, who wrote in about 440 A.D., speaks of China as Jenasdan (*i.e.*, Chinistân) and of its emperor as Jenpagur (*i.e.*, Chin Phagfur). He refers to some relations between the emperor of China and Ardeshir Bebegan, the founder of the Sassanian dynasty.<sup>2</sup> But the first notice of Persia in the Chinese Annals is that of about 461 A.D. Col. Yule, thus speaks of the subject: "Their first notice of Persia is the record of an embassy to the Court of the Wei in 461; succeeded by a second in 466. In the year 518-519, an ambassador came from Kinhoto (Kobad), king of that country, with presents and a letter to the emperor. The Chinese annalists profess to give the literal terms of the letter which uses a tone of improbable humility."

Kobad was in war with Justin, the king of Rome. The latter sent ambassadors to the king of the Huns, asking for help against Kobad. These Huns are spoken of as Hongres and their country as Hungrie, by the writer whom M. Deguigne<sup>3</sup> follows. Herein, we see the origin of the name of modern Hungary. The king, whose help Justin sought, was named Zilidges. He is also spoken of as Zeliobes, Zilgbi, and Ziaigbir.<sup>4</sup> His capital was on the North of Derbend.<sup>5</sup> He

<sup>1</sup> For references to China in Parsee books, *vide* my Paper before the B. B. R. A. Society entitled "References to China in the Ancient books of the Parsees," Journal of the B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXI, pp. 525-36. *Vide* my Asiatic Papers, Pt. I, pp. 241-54.

<sup>2</sup> "Cathay and the Way thither," being a Collection of Mediaeval Notices of China by Col. Yule. New edition, revised by Dr. Henri Cordier (1915), Vol. I, Preliminary Essay, pp. 93 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Histoire des Huns*, &c., Vol. I, Part II, p. 319, noted.

<sup>4</sup> *Idid*, note e.

<sup>5</sup> Derbend is situated in the state of Hissar in Central Asia. Between it and Khuzur lie the celebrated defile of Kohlugu (a Mongolian word, meaning a barrier) and the iron-gate, and now known as Buzghal Khana, *i.e.*, Goat's House. It is said to be very narrow, in some places only about 5 ft. wide, and affords the only outlet from the valley.

was paid for the promised help. He entered at the same time into a treaty with Kobâd, binding himself to help him against Justin. Kobâd, learning this fact from Justin, was enraged at this treachery and put to death the Hunnic king, who had joined his army with about 80,000 men. This was in about 521 A. D.

At one time in the reign of Kobâd, two different tribes or branches of the Huns took two different sides. A division of the Huns known as the Salai Huns, under the leadership of their queen Barez, who had succeeded to the leadership on the death of her husband Malak, helped Justinian, the Roman Emperor, against the Persians. Another tribe of the same Huns, led by Styrax and Gloves, helped Kobâd with 20,000 men. In the subsequent fight that took place between these rival parties of the Huns, the adherents of Kobâd were defeated.

According to Firdousi, Naoshirwan succeeded his father Kobâd.

One of his first acts was to sign the treaty of Ctesiphon in 533 A.D. whereby the long war between the Persians and Romans in Mesopotamia was ended. One of his great works was to build large fortified walls across those parts of his frontiers, from which some Turkish tribes of the Hunnic stock now and then committed inroads into his territories. He then went against the Alans who soon surrendered. He then subdued the Baluchis and received homage from Indian princes on the banks of the Indus. He then crushed the power of the Ephthalites. Once upon a time, the Khakân of China thought it advisable to seek the friendship of Naoshirwan. So, he sent an embassy to him with many rich presents. The embassy had to pass through the country of the Haetalites or Ephthalites who were then ruled over by Gatcre (غاتقر). The Haetalian king did not like any closer alliance between the Khakan of China and the Shah of Persia. So, he impeded the way of the Embassy. The Khakan, whose people, according to Firdousi, were the descendents of the tribes of Afrâsiab and Arjâsp, thereupon declared war against the Haetalites of Gatcre. His army, under a general named Fanj, marched towards the river Gulzaryun (گلزریون). His army consisted of the Kachârbashis (کاچارباشی) and the people of Chach (چاچ).

The army of the Haetalian king Gatcre collected war materials from the countries of Balkh, Shignan, Amur, and Zam. The soldiers were from the country of Khallan, Tarmud and Viseh. Bokhara was the principal seat of the Haetalian army. The Haetalians were in the end defeated completely. The people thereupon met in an



assembly and elected Fagâni (فغانی) of the tribe of Chagâni (چغانی) as their leader and king, and thought it advisable to seek, under the circumstances, an alliance with Naoshirwan.

On the other hand, Naoshirwan, when he heard of the war between the Haetalian king Gatre and the Khakan of China, the tribes of both of whom belonged to the same original stock, was well inclined towards the fallen Haetalites, because he found, that one day, the victorious Khakan may get overpowerful and overbearing. He made preparations to march against the Khakan. The latter, hearing of this, sent ambassadors offering friendship and submission, and returned to his country, no longer molesting the Haetalites. The alliance was further completed by Naoshirwan, marrying a daughter of the Khakan. Naoshirwan's successor Hormuzd was the fruit of this marriage.

A year after the marriage, Naoshirwan arranged with the Khakan to invade the territories of the Haetalites with a view to completely avenge the death of his grandfather Firouz who was killed in a war with them. The Haetalites under their king Faghani were completely defeated and their empire was divided between Naoshirwan and the Khakan. This event took place in about 557 A.D. This was a great crushing defeat which the Haetalites or Ephthalites received at the hands of Naoshirwan. They then retired to other countries. Thus ended the long war, the one-hundred years' war of the Haetalites with the Persians. M. Drouin gives the following dates about the principal events of this hundred years' war :—

Arrival of the Haetalites or Ephthalites in Transoxania ...	420-25
The First War of the Persians under Behramgour: ...	427
The Second War... Yazdagard II ... ..	442-49
The Third War ... ..	450-51
The Fourth War .. ..	454
Firouz seeks the aid of the Haetalites against his brother Hormuzd III ... ..	458
Firouz's First War with the Haetalites ... ..	474-76
Firouz's Second War ... ..	482-84
The War of Safrai with the Haetalites ... ..	484-85
Kobâd at the Court of the Haetalites to ask for help ...	486
Kobâd at their Court for the second time ... ..	497-99
Kobâd's War with them ... ..	503-13
Naoshirwan's War with them when they were finally destroyed and driven away ... ..	556-57

## VII.

## IV.—THE INDIAN EMPIRE. THE HUNNIC INROADS INTO IT.

We find a mention of the Hunas in two places in the Vishnu Purana, both, in the third chapter of the 2nd book<sup>1</sup>.  
 The Hunas mentioned in the Vishnu Purana. (a) In the first mention the writer gives a description of the Bharata-Varsha (India). After a mention of its extent, its mountains, divisions, and rivers, its principal nations are mentioned, and among these, in the list of those living "in the extreme west," we find the Hunas. Wilson, while speaking of these people in his Vishnu Purana says: "By the Hunas we are to understand the white Huns or Indo-Scythians, who were established in the Punjab and along the Indus at the commencement of our era, as we know from Arrian, Strabo, and Ptolemy, confirmed by recent discoveries of their coins.

(b) The second mention is in the detailed list of the different people. In this list, among what are called "ferocious and uncivilized races," are included "Sakridgrahas, Kulatthas, Hunas, and Pârsikas."<sup>2</sup> As to the last people, the Pârsikas (the Parsees), Wilson says that they are known both as Pârsikas or Pârtakas. "The first is not a common form in the Pûranas, although it is in poetical writings, denoting, no doubt, the Persians or people of Pars or Fars: the latter, also read Pâradas, may imply the same as beyond (Pâra) the Indus."<sup>3</sup> It may be noted in this connection, that the Pahlavas, or Pallavas or Pahnavas<sup>4</sup> (the Parthians) are spoken of separately in the Vishnu Purana.<sup>5</sup> Wilson speaks of them as "a northern or north-western nation, often mentioned in Hindu writings, in Manu, the Râmâyana, the Purânas, &c. They were not a Hindu people and may have been some of the tribes between India and Persia<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The Vishnu Purana, a system of Hindu Mythology and Tradition, translated from the original Sanscrit, by H. H. Wilson (1840), pp. 177 and 194.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, p. 177, n. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*, p. 194.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, n. 149.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 189 and 195.

<sup>6</sup> According to Wilson, this form 'Pahnavas' is more usual in the text. *Ibid*, p. 195, n. 158.

*Ibid*, p. 189, n. 61.



The Hunas are also referred to in the *Raghuvanṣa* (Canto IV, 68)<sup>1</sup> of Kalidas. The date of this celebrated poet

The Hunas in the of India is not certain. But "the balance of evidence is in favour of the view that the poet flourished in the sixth century A. D."<sup>2</sup>

We read the reference to the Huns in the following lines of his poem :—

"His mighty acts,  
Wrought on their husbands, Hūna dames proclaimed,  
Recorded on their cheeks in angry scars."<sup>3</sup>

Professor P. B. Pathak, thus translates the three couplets referring to Raghu's march towards the country of the Hunas :

"Thence Raghu marched against the regions of Kubera, subjugating the northern kings with arrows as the sun drinks up the water with his rays.

"His horses relieved of the fatigue of the journey by rolling on the banks of the Indus shook their bodies which had saffron flowers clinging to their manes.

"There the redness on the cheeks of the Hūna queens testified to Raghu's achievements in which his prowess was displayed against their husbands".<sup>4</sup>

According to Mallinātha, the commentator of the *Raghuvanṣa*, Kālidāsa, meant, that Raghu marched against the countries of the Hūnas, and that the Hūna princes being killed, their wives mourned over the loss of their husbands.<sup>5</sup>

It seems that the Huns had some relations with India from early times, just as the Persians had. But, just as their relations with Persia in the Sassanian times above referred to, may be said to have been more authentic, so, their relations with the later Guptas may be said to be more authentic.

<sup>1</sup> The *Raghuvamśa* of Kalidasa with the commentary of Mallinātha by Kashinath Pandurang Parab, 2nd edition (1882), p. 89.

<sup>2</sup> "The date of Kalidasa" by Mr. K. B. Pathak (*Journal, B. B. R. A. S.*, Vol. XIX, p. 35).

<sup>3</sup> The *Raghuvanṣa*, translated by P. De Lacy Johnstone (1902) p. 34, ll. 179-81.

<sup>4</sup> Paper on "The Date of Kalidasa," *Journal, B. B. R. A. Society*, Vol. XIX, p. 36.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

A. D. 330 to 455, a period of about a century and a half, was the golden age of the Guptas.<sup>1</sup> The death of Kumaragupta in 455 brought that age to an end. Skandagupta<sup>2</sup> came to the throne after him. An irruption of the Huns from the steppes of Central Asia through the North-Western passes was one of the causes that brought about the end of this golden age. Skandagupta saved India for a time by defeating these Huns. To commemorate that event, he erected at Bhitari "a pillar of victory" with a statue of Vishnu at the top.

Bhitari is a village about five miles from Sayidpur in the Ghazipur district of the North-Western provinces. The inscription<sup>3</sup> is on a red sand-stone column, and in the Sanskrit language. The object of the inscription is "to record the installation of an image of the god Vishnu . . . . and the allotment to the idol, of the village . . . . in which the column stands."<sup>4</sup> In this inscription, Skandagupta speaks of himself as one "by whose two arms the earth was shaken, when, he, the creator (of a disturbance like that) of a terrible whirlpool joined in close contact with the Hûnas."<sup>5</sup> This inscription, as said by Dr. Fleet, is not dated. But as pointed out by Dr. Smith, "this great victory over the Huns must have been gained at the very beginning of the new reign"<sup>6</sup> (about 455 A.D.). This is inferred from another inscription of Skandagupta at Junâgadh. The inscription is on a large granite boulder at the foot of Mount Girnar. The boulder has three inscriptions on it of three different periods. (a) The first is that containing 14 edicts of Asoka. (b) The second, which is later, is that of the Satrap Mahâkshatra Rudradâman<sup>7</sup> who had built the lake Sudarshana. (c) The third inscription, much latterly added, is the inscription in question of Skandagupta.

Skandagupta's inscription on the boulder is dated 138th year<sup>8</sup> of the Guptas, *i.e.*, A.D. 457-58. It takes a note of his work of repairing the

<sup>1</sup> These Guptas were known as the "Early Guptas" and were distinguished from the "Later Guptas of Magadha."

<sup>2</sup> Kumaragupta I was succeeded by Skandagupta (455-80), who, in turn, was succeeded by his brother Puragupta (480-485). Puragupta was succeeded by his son Narsimhagupta Baladitya, who was succeeded by his son Kumargupta II.

<sup>3</sup> For this inscription, *vide* "Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum Vol. III. Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their successors," by Dr. J. F. Fleet (1888), pp. 52-56.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, p. 56.

<sup>6</sup> The Early History of India, 3rd edition, 1914, p. 309.

<sup>7</sup> Rudradaman's inscription speaks of the city as "Girinagara," *i.e.*, the City of the hill. This name seems to have given to the mountain, on the side of which it is supposed to have stood at first, its modern name Girnar, its old name being Urjayat.

<sup>8</sup> Dr. Fleet's Inscriptions of the Early Guptas, p. 58.



embankment of the above lake<sup>1</sup>. Now, in this inscription, Skandagupta's victory over the Huns mentioned in the previous inscription, is referred to, in words of allusion, but not in name. The words used in this second description, *viz.* "verily the victory has been achieved by him" (Skandagupta),<sup>2</sup> in reference to his victory over the Mlechchas (foreigners of alien religion) are a repetition of similar words in the previous inscription<sup>3</sup> used in connection with the king's victory over the Huns. This fact shows that it is the victory over the Huns that is referred to in this second inscription, bearing the date of about 458. So, the victory of Skandagupta over the Huns must have taken place before this time.

In or about 465 A.D., there was another great inroad of the Huns into India. We have the authority of the Chinese traveller Sung-yun or Sing-yun to say so. He travelled in India in 520 A.D. He thus speaks of the Ye-thas, who were a tribe of the Huns: "This is the country which the Ye-thas destroyed, and afterwards set up Laelih to be king over the country; since which event two generations have passed. The disposition of this king (or dynasty) was cruel and vindictive, and he practised the most barbarous atrocities. He did not believe the law of Budha, but loved to worship demons . . . . The king continuously abode with his troops on the frontier, and never returned to his kingdom in consequence of which the old men had to labour and the common people were oppressed."<sup>4</sup>

We learn from this statement of the Chinese traveller, that the Huns occupied the country of Gandhâra (near Peshâwar) or the North-Western Punjab, which was then ruled over by the Kushans. The Chinese traveller speaks harshly of their atrocities.

Of the tribe of Ye-tha (Ephthalites), Mr. Beal says:<sup>5</sup> "The Ye-tha were a rude horde of Turks who had followed in the steps of the Huing-nu; they were in fact the Ephthalites or Huns of the Byzantine writers." According to the above Chinese writer, these Ye-tha Huns set up a king of their own named Lae-lih. Cunningham thinks that the Hunnic King Lae-lih was the father of Toramâna. They settled there and advanced further into the interior of India in 470 A.D., and invaded Skandagupta's territories in the heart of his country. Owing to the repeated attacks of these Huns, whose hordes seem to have followed one after another into India, Skandagupta was in the end

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid* p. 63.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid* p. 62.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid* p. 55.<sup>4</sup> "Si-Yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World," by Samuel Beal, Vol I, (1884) Introduction, pp. 99—100.<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, Introduction, p. XVI.

defeated. The Hunnic war brought great financial distress to Skandagupta's reign. Consequently, coinage degraded both, in the purity of its gold and "in the design and execution of the dies."<sup>1</sup> Skandagupta died in or about 480 A. D.

The Huns, before they invaded India this time, had tried their luck elsewhere. When checked there, they came to India. We saw above, that they were now and then driven to extensive inroads and migrations by want of food in the country where they settled, whether provisionally or permanently. Their inroads were, as said above, in accordance with the Bread and Butter Theory of Huttington.<sup>2</sup> They were driven towards the West, towards Europe from their steppes in Asia by want of food. We saw, that in the 4th century A.D. they went to Eastern Europe and invaded the country of the Goths, who themselves were the descendants of some of their own previous Turkish tribes, similarly driven to the West in some earlier times. The Goths thus driven invaded the countries of the Romans whose Gothic War cost them the life of their Emperor Valens in 378. The Huns then spread into other parts of Europe, but, being divided into a number of groups or tribes which fought against one another, they could not unite. At last, some of the powerful tribes united under Attila, who caused terror among the people of the Roman Empire. He died in 453 and his Hunnic Empire broke for a time. During this period, some of their tribes had been trying their strength with the Persians who kept them under certain check. We saw above, that they had long continuous wars with the Persians even in the Peshdadian and Kyanian times. In the Sassanian times, Behramgour had a long war with them. His son Firouz had to continue that war and in the end he lost his life falling into a concealed trench dug by them (484 A. D.). Kobâd, Naoshirwan, Hormuzd, Khushru Purviz all had to fight, with more or less success, against their different tribes, the Haetalites, Khazars and others, known generally as the Turcs of the Khâkân.

On the defeat and death of the Persian king Firouz, the Huns must have grown stronger. About 500 A.D., they, led by Toramâna, brought stronger attacks on India. Toramâna settled himself in Malwa in Central India, at some time before 500. He assumed the Indian title of Maharajadhiraja, *i.e.*, the Raja of the Maharajas. He established his power so strongly, that besides taking this Indian title, he struck coins in his name and engraved inscriptions.

<sup>1</sup> Smith's Early History of India, 3rd edition (1914), p. 311.

<sup>2</sup> The Pulse of Asia.



Three inscriptions are known, wherein his name occurs. (a) The first is an inscription of his own reign and is that at Eran in the Khurâ sub-division of the Sâgar district in the Central Provinces. It is inscribed on "the chest of a colossal red sand-stone statue of a Boar, about 11 feet high representing the God Vishnu in his incarnation as such<sup>1</sup>." The object of the inscription "is to record the building of a temple in which the Boar stands, by Dhanyuvishnu, the younger brother of the deceased Mahârâja Mâtrivishnu<sup>2</sup>." In this inscription, engraved in the first year of Toramâna's reign, he (Toramâna) is spoken of as "the glorious Torâmana of great fame (and) of great lustre<sup>3</sup>." It gives no era, but its reference to Matriviṣṇu helps scholars to determine its approximate date. This Mâtrivishnu is referred to as a feudatory of the king Budhagupta in an inscription of the latter's reign,<sup>4</sup> which is dated completely in words in the year 165, *i.e.*, 484-85<sup>5</sup>. This date in Budhagupta's inscription leads us to say, that the date of this inscription and the date of Toramâna referred to therein must be some date about 484-85 A. D.

(b) The second inscription of Toramâna is that at Kura in the Salt Range. The inscription is, at present, in the Lahore Museum. We find the following account of this inscription in the *Epigraphia Indica*<sup>6</sup>, from the pen of the late Dr. E. Bühler<sup>7</sup>:—"The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a Buddhist monastery by one Siddhaviddhi, the son of Roṭṭa-Jayaviddhi, for the teachers of the Mahîśasaka school. . . . The inscription was incised during the reign of the king of kings, the great king Toramâna Shâha or Shâhi, Jaüvla, to whom and to whose family the donor wishes to make over a share of the merit gained by his pious gift. The date is unfortunately not readable. On palæographical grounds, it may be assigned to the fourth or the fifth century."

The inscription refers to Toramâna in the following words: "In the prosperous reign of the king of kings, the great king Toramâni Shâhi Jaü. . . . (राजा—राजमहाराज तोरमानी पाहि जऊ)."

(c) The third inscription is that of the time of Toramâna's son Mihircula inscribed in his (Mihircula's) 15th year of reign. It was "found

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fleet's *Inscriptions of the Early Guptas*, p. 158.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Fleet's *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings*, No. 36, p. 160.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 19, Plate XIII., pp. 88-9.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 89.

<sup>6</sup> *Epigraphia Indica*, a Collection of Inscriptions supplementary to the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, edited by Dr. J. Burgess (1892), p. 239.

<sup>7</sup> The article is entitled "The new Inscription of Toramana Shaha."

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 239-40.



built into the wall in the porch of a temple of the sun in the fortress at Gwalior in Central India." It is now in the Imperial Museum at Calcutta. The inscription<sup>1</sup> refers to solar worship and records the building of a temple dedicated to the Sun, and built by one Mâtrichêta in the reign of Mihircula "for the purpose of increasing the religious merit of (his) parents and of himself."<sup>2</sup> Mihircula is referred to in this inscription as being the son of Toramâna who is spoken of as "a ruler of great merit<sup>3</sup>." The inscription begins with the praise of the sun. Mihircula himself is spoken of as a person "of unequalled prowess, the lord of the earth."<sup>4</sup>

From an account of the relations of the Hunnic kings with the Sassanians, as given by Firdousi, and as referred to by us above, we find that there was a Hunnic or Haetalite king, who had helped Firouz or Pirouze. This Persian king reigned from 457 to 484 A.D. He was the son of Yazdagard II (438-457). Yazdagard had, on his death bed, directed that the throne may be given to his son Hormuzd (Hormazd or Hormrisdas III, 457 A.D.). The throne having thus passed to his brother Hormazd, Pirouz disputed it and with the help of the Hunnic king, invaded Persia and won the throne which was occupied by Hormuzd for hardly a year. Now this Hunnic or Haetalite king, who helped Pirouz, was, according to Firdousi, Faghânish (فغانیش).<sup>5</sup> He is spoken of as the Shâh of Haital (شاه هیتال) <sup>6</sup> and also as Chagâni Shahi (چغانی شاهی).<sup>7</sup>

I think the title "Shâhi" of the Indian inscription of Toramâna is the same as the above Shâhi of Firdousi. I also think, that the title "Jaû..." in the Indian inscription of Toramâna is the same as that of Chagani in Firdousi's Shah-Nameh. In the Indian inscription, the portion of the title which is quite legible is "Jaû...". The other letters are, says Dr. Buhler, very faint and partly doubtful."<sup>8</sup> On the suggestion of Dr. Fleet, he reads them as 'vla' and thus takes the whole word to be Jaûla. I think the faint and doubtful letters are 'gan' and so the whole word is Jaugan or Jaugani, which is another form of Firdousi's Chagani. 'Ch' and 'J' being letters of the same class, the words Chagani and Jaugani are the same.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fleet's Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings, p. 163. No. 3

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Mecan's Calcutta Edition, Vol. III, p. 1589. <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Epigraphia Indica, edited by Dr. Burgess, p. 239, n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> According to M. E. Drouin, Chagan was also written "Djagan" (Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites, p. 21).



This Hunnic king was called Chagani from the fact of his Huns being specially connected with Chagan. Chagān seems to have been their favourite place. They were very eager to retain Chagan in their hands. Later on, when Kobād sought the aid of the Hunnic king Khoushnāz, the latter asked the Persian king to agree, that he would never claim Chagan, and the Persian king agreed.<sup>1</sup>

The identification of the above two words Shâhi and Jau (gani) of the Indian inscription of the Hunnic king Toramâna with the titular words Shâhi and Chagani of Firdousi's Hunnic king Faghana brings us to, or helps us in, the identification of the name of the king himself. I think, that the Hunnic king Toramâna of the Indian inscription may be the same as the Hunnic Fagâna of Firdousi's Shahnameh. The identification of the titles is pretty certain. So, anyhow, this Toramâna, known as the Shahi and Jau (la) or Jaugani was, if not the same king as Firdousi's Hunnic king known as the Shahi and Chaghani, at least a member of the same family or stock.

These identifications lead us to say, that the time of the Hunnic king Toramâna of the Indian inscription is some time during the reign (457 to 484 A. D.) of king Firouz of Persia. So, I think, it was after this event, *viz.*, the accession of Firouz to the throne of Persia with the help of the Hunnic king (A. D. 457), that the Huns may have turned towards India for the second invasion and made an inroad into it. Firouz had further wars with the Haetalite Huns, but they were with another king, *viz.*, Khoushnāz. I think, Tabari is wrong in naming the Hunnic king who helped Firouz to gain the throne of Persia as Khoushnāz, and that Firdousi is right in naming one as Fagani, and the other as Khoushnāz.

اگر باز یابی تو گنج و کلاه  
چغانی مرا باشد و گنج و گاه  
مرا باشد آن مرز و فرمان من  
نگهداری این عهد و پیمان من  
زبردست را گفت خندان قباد  
کز آن بوم هرگز نگیرم یاد  
چو خواهی فرست مت بی مر سپاه  
چغانی چه باشد که دارم نگاه

In 510 A. D., Mihiragula (Mihirkula) succeeded, Toramāna. Sakala  
 (Siālkot) in Punjab was his capital. He had  
 Mihircula. struck his coins also. The Hunnic rule was in  
 the ascendancy in India in his time. It had spread far and wide be-  
 yond India. Bāmyān near Herat and Balkh were two of the princi-  
 pal centres of these Huns ruled over by Hun kings. One of the two  
 kings of these two centres was so powerful, that he levied tribute  
 from forty countries, between the frontiers of Persia in the West, to  
 Khotan on the frontiers of China in the east.<sup>1</sup> A Chinese pilgrim-  
 envoy, Sung-Yun, from the king of China, visited his Court in about  
 519 or 520 A. D.<sup>2</sup> It is believed that Mihirkula ruled also over the  
 country of Gandhara. It is the same Mihirkula who is referred to in  
 the Rajatarangini, the History of Kashmir, by Kalhana, as a wicked  
 king who was opposed to the local Brahmins and who imported  
 Gandhara Brahmins into Kashmir and India. The practices and  
 customs attributed to him and to his Brahmins show that these im-  
 ported Brahmins were Zoroastrian in their belief to some extent.

I suspect that the Mātrichata, the builder of the sun-temple, re-  
 ferred to in the above inscription, wherein Mihircula, the Hunnic king  
 is mentioned, was himself a foreigner, one of the same stock of Huns to  
 which Mihircula belonged. He was an Iranian Hun, who, it is very  
 likely, believed in some forms of Zoroastrianism. His special refer-  
 ence to the true religion (Sad-Dharma,<sup>3</sup> Cf. Behdin) and to the  
 classes of the twice-born (Dvija-gana<sup>4</sup>) leads us to that inference.

Cosmas Indicopleustes, the monk-writer, who wrote in 547 A. D.,  
 refers to a king of the White Huns, named Gollas, as ruling oppres-  
 sively in India and drawing large tributes. This *Gollas* is thought  
 to be the same as this Mihira *gula*, "the Attila of India."<sup>5</sup>

In the end, Mihircula was defeated in about 528 A. D. by an Indian  
 king. He was taken prisoner and was sent away with all honour,  
 due to a captive king, to his capital at Sakala (Sialkot). Taking  
 advantage of the defeat of Mihircula in the south, his brother usurped  
 his throne. So Mihircula went to Kashmir whose king extended to

<sup>1</sup> Vide S. Beal's Si-Yu-ki, Buddhist records of the Western World (1884), Vol. I, Intro-  
 duction pp. LXXXIV *et seq.* for the Mission of this traveller.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the court customs of the Hunnic king of the country of Yētha (Ephthalites),  
 remind us of our present court customs. For example, (a) on entering the assembly, one man  
 announces your name and title; then each stranger advances and retires..... (b) The  
 royal ladies of the Ye-tha country also wear state robes, which trail on the ground three feet  
 and more; they have special train-bearers for carrying these lengthy robes." (*Ibid*  
 p. XCD).

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Fleet's inscriptions of the Early Gupta kings, No. 37, p. 162.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Smith's "History of India," 3rd edition, p. 307.



him his hospitality, which he abused by raising a revolt against him and seizing his throne. Mihirçula died in or about 548 A. D.

The invasion of India by the Huns is said to have "changed the face of Northern India."<sup>1</sup> Had their power not been broken, they would have still further changed the face of the country.

## VIII.

### WHO BROKE THE POWER OF THE HUNS IN INDIA.

Now, the question among Indian scholars is: Who broke the power of the Huns in India? Mr. Vincent Smith and Bâlâditya. gives the credit to Bâlâditya (Narasimhagupta), the King of Magadha. He associates with him Yashodharman, a Raja of Central India,<sup>2</sup> as one playing the second fiddle. He says that both these Rajas "appear to have formed a confederacy against the foreign tyrant." He takes the Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsang for his authority. Hiuen Tsang says as follows: "We came to the old Town of Shâkala (She-kie-lo)..... Some centuries ago, there was a king called Mo-hi-lo-kin-lo (Mihiracula) who established his authority in this town and ruled over India. He was of quick talent, and naturally brave. He subdued all the neighbouring provinces without exception. In his intervals of leisure he desired to examine the law of Buddha, and he commanded that one among the priests of superior talent should wait on him. Now it happened that none of the priests dared to attend to his command."<sup>3</sup> Hiuen Tsang then says, that as no good respectable priest offered his services, to explain to the king the law of Buddha, an old servant in King's household who had long worn the religious garment was put forward for the purpose. Mihiracula resented this want of respect towards him and ordered a general massacre of the Buddhist priests. "Bâlâditya-*raya*, King of Magadha, profoundly honoured the law of Buddha and tenderly nourished his people. When he heard of the cruel persecution and atrocities of Mihiracula, he strictly guarded the frontiers of his kingdom and refused to pay tribute. Then Mihiracula raised an army to punish his rebellion." In the war that issued, Bâlâditya retired at first on some "islands of the sea," but subsequently defeated Mihiracula and took him a captive. Bâlâditya ordered Mihiracula to be killed, but his mother interceded and persuaded her son to forgive him. Mihiracula's

<sup>1</sup> Kennedy, *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, 1908, p. 879.

<sup>2</sup> Smith's *History of India*, 3rd edition (1914), p. 318.

<sup>3</sup> *Buddhist Records of the Western World* (Bk. IV), translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsang (A.D. 629) by Samuel Beal, Vol. I, p. 167.



brother ascended his brother's throne at Shakala (Sialkot), and Mihiracula retired to Kashmir, where he was welcomed by the king of the country. But he proved ungrateful and after a short time usurped the throne of Kashmir.<sup>1</sup>

According to Hiuen Tsang, who travelled from 629 to 645 A.D., the Mihiracula mentioned by him lived some centuries before his time. Mr. Vincent Smith says: "It is not easy to explain why the pilgrim alleges (p. 167, *Beal Records*, Vol. I) that Mihiracula lived 'some centuries' before his time."<sup>2</sup> According to Mr. Smith, "Watters is inclined to think that the tale told by Hiuen Tsang refers to a Mihiracula of much earlier date. Dr. Fleet suggests that there may be an error in the Chinese text."<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Rundolph Hoernle differs from Mr. Vincent Smith and gives the sole credit of the Indian victory over the Huns to Yashodharman (Vishnuvardhan), a Raja of Central India. He admits no confederacy and rests the claim of his hero on three inscriptions of Yashodharman, which Mr. Smith sets aside as a piece of false boasting on the part of the king. As to this epigraphical evidence, Dr. Hoernle particularly refers to two inscriptions of Yashodharman at Mandasor, known as *rana-stambhas*, *i.e.*, "Columns of Victory in War."<sup>4</sup> There are two columns at short distances, but the inscription on both is the same. One may be said to be, as it were, the duplicate of the other, built, perhaps with a view, that if one was destroyed, another may continue to proclaim the work and the victory of the king. The inscription on one (No. 33) is well-nigh entire, but much of that on the other (No. 34) is destroyed. Yashodharman thus speaks in column 33 of his victory over the Huns of Mihiracula. "He who, spurning (the confinement of) the boundaries of his own house, enjoys those countries—thickly covered over with deserts and mountains and trees and thickets and rivers and strong-armed heroes (and) having (their) kings assaulted by (his) prowess—which were not enjoyed (even) by the lords of the Guptas whose prowess was displayed by invading the whole (remainder of the) earth (and) which the command of the chiefs of the Hunas, that established itself on the tiaras of (many) kings failed to penetrate.....he to whose two feet respect was paid with

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 168-171

<sup>2</sup> *History of India*, 3rd edition, p. 319, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, 1903, p. 549, *et seq.* Vide also *Ibid* of 1909, p. 89, *et seq.*



complimentary presents of the flowers from the lock of hair on the top of (his) head by even that (famous) King Mihiracula."<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Vincent Smith<sup>2</sup> says, that Yashodharman, in this inscription of his, took to himself false credit and that Hiuen Tsang, the great Chinese traveller very properly gave the credit to Baladitya. Dr. Hoernle doubts the authority of Hiuen Tsang in this matter, saying that his account is romantic, though based on some truth. He says, that the authority of a contemporary inscription of King Yashodharman is far greater than that of Hiuen Tsang, who came to India much later, and who bases his version on what he had heard. That being the case, Yashodharman was properly the person who broke the power of the Huns.

The Vikrama era began in 57 B. C. It is now generally believed, that there existed no King Vikramaditya at that time, and that the era latterly known by his name, was then, in those early times, known as the Malwa era. Dr. Fleet thus sums up the explanation of the change of the name: "The word *vikrama*, from which the idea of the King Vikrama or Vikramaditya was evolved, most properly came to be connected with the era by the poets, because the year of reckoning originally began in the autumn, and the autumn was the season of commencing campaigns, and was, in short, the *vikrama-kala* or war-time."<sup>3</sup> Dr. Hoernle differs from this explanation, and thinks, that there did exist a king of the name of Vikrama. Who was that King? Dr. Hoernle says, that Vikramaditya (*i.e.*, the Sun of prowess) seemed to be the popular title of the kings of Malwa during the later times of the Gupta Emperors, who lived and ruled in turbulent times, requiring great power in war matters, just as Sâlâditya (*i.e.*, the Sun of goodness or peace) was the title of Harshavardhana of Kanouj. He thinks, that it was the above King Yashodharma of Malwa, that was known by the popular title of Vikramaditya.

The Rajatarangini of Kashmir by Kalhana says (Bk. III), that there reigned "at Ujaina, King Vikramaditya called Hersha as the sole sovereign of the world". It includes Kashmir in the territories of that king. It also speaks of a foreign King Mihiracula being defeated.

<sup>1</sup> Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III. Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their successors by John Faithfull Fleet (1888) pp. 147-48. Inscription No. 33. Stone pillar inscription of Yashodharman at Mandasor in the Mandasor district of Scindia's dominions in the Western Malwa division of Central India.

<sup>2</sup> Early History of India end. Edition p. 301.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of 1909, p. 99.



The Mandasor inscription, above referred to, of Yashodharma also refers to Kashmir as one of his dominions, under the words "the tablelands of the Himalaya," and it also refers to the overthrow of Mihiracula by Yashodharma. So, it appears, that the Vikramaditya referred to by the Kashmir history as ruling in Ujjain and defeating Mihiracula, is King Yashodharma who is associated by his inscription with Kashmir and Mihiracula.

Dr. Hoernle further adduces (a) numismatic and (b) literary evidence to support Yashodharma's (Vikramaditya's) connection with Kashmir and his claim to be the successful opponent of the Huns.

(a) There are some coins known as the coins of Yashovarman, and they are believed to belong to the series of Kashmir coins. But, there has been no king of Kanauj of the name of Yashovarman who held Kashmir. So, Dr. Hoernle says, that this Yashovarman of the coins belonging to the Kashmir series, is the same as the Yashodharma of the Mandasor inscription and of the Kashmir History, the Rajatarangini of Kalhana.

(b) Tradition says, that there were "nine gems" *nava-ratna*, i.e., nine learned men in the Court of Vikramaditya. Kalidasa is believed to be one of these best learned men of the time, who lived in the Court of Yashodharman. Another learned man was Varaha Mihira. This fact of some learned men (*ratna*) living in the Court of Yashodharma and also in the Court of Vikramaditya according to the tradition, points to the probability of Vikramaditya and Yashodharman being the same sovereign.

The literary evidence of Yashodharman's connection with the conquest of Kashmir is further supplied by Professor Pathak's Evidence. Professor Pathak who discovers it in Kalidas's *Raghuvamsa*. Kalidasa seems to have drawn his picture of the description of the conquest of his hero Raghu from an account of the conquest of a contemporary king in whose court he lived. Professor Pathak<sup>1</sup> concludes, that this contemporary King was Yashodharman, who took a note of his *digvijaya* in his Mandasor inscription on the "Column of Victory". The Kunkuma mentioned in Kalidas's poem is the well-known saffron of Kashmir.

Dr. Hoernle adds to Professor Pathak's evidence, a further evidence supplied by the landmarks given in the Mandasor inscription and in Kalidas's *Raghuvamsa*<sup>2</sup> to show, that the above referred to king, the contemporary of Kalidas, was Yashodharma (about 499-550 A. D.).

<sup>1</sup> Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XIX, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> One of the landmarks in Kalidas's *Raghuvamsa* is the Western Country where ruled the Pārasika and other tribes from the West. This refers to the rule of the Persians over the Western part of India, over Gujarat, Kathiawad, Cutch, Sind, &c.



Mr. Monmohan Chakravati differs from Professor Pathak, and thinks, that the contemporary king from whose series of conquests Kalidas drew his picture of the *digvijaya* of his hero Raghu, was Skandagupta and Yashodharma. One of his arguments for his conclusion thus refers to an event in the history of Persia: Kalidas, in his *Raghuvamsa*, refers to the defeat of the Persians (Parasika) on the frontiers of India. Mr. Chakravati identifies this event with an event in the reign of the Persian King Piruz (Firuz) (457-484), the son of Yazdagird II. As we saw above, Firuz had come into great contact with the Ephthalites who are otherwise spoken as the White Huns, Khazars, &c. These Ephthalites had helped him against his brother in securing the throne of Persia, but latterly he fell out with them. He alternately won and lost, but was at last killed in a battle with them in 484 A. D. The Ephthalites or the White Huns overran Persia. Their further fight was brought off by an annual subsidy by Persia. In this war, the Persians are believed to have lost a portion of their eastern territories on the frontiers of India.

Mr. Chakravati thinks, that Kalidas in his *Raghuvamsa* refers to this defeat of the Persians and to their loss of their eastern dominions. As this happened in about 484 A. D., when Skandagupta was ruling, he thinks that the contemporary of Kalidasa was Skandagupta and not Yashodharman. But Dr. Hoernle says, that it is not this event that is alluded to in the *Raghuvamsa*, because Piruz had lost in this war only Gandhara, and not the country on the direct frontiers. So, it is a later event. It is the event of Kavâdh (Kobâd) fighting on the side of his brother-in-law, the Hunnic King. With the help of the Huns, he removed his brother Jamasp from the throne (499 A. D.). He died in 531 A. D. Thus the Persian Kavâdh (488 or 489-531) was a contemporary of the Indian Yashodharman (490-550). The Huns had warred against Yashodharman, and in this war, they may have been helped by Kavâdh who had married a daughter of the Hunnic king. In this war, wherein he fought on the side of the Huns as their ally, he lost some of his eastern provinces, especially the province of Sindh. It is this loss that Kalidas refers to as the defeat of the Persians (Parasikas).

We do not learn from Firdousi's *Shahnamah* anything about the loss of any territories on the frontiers of India either by Firouz or by Kobâd. Tabari and Maçoudi also do not speak directly of any loss of Persian territories on the frontiers of India. Tabari indirectly refers to such a loss. While speaking of the conquests of Naoshirwan, he says: "Then

Naoshirwan desired to possess equally a certain portion of Hindustan. He made a large army, with a distinguished general at its head march against Hindustan (and) against Serandib where lived its king. . . . This (Indian) king surrendered to him all the countries in the neighbourhood of Oman which had already been ceded to Persia in the time of Behramgour<sup>1</sup>. ”

What we learn from this passage is this : A part of India on its frontiers belonged at one time to Persia under Behramgour. Between the time of that monarch and that of Naoshirwan, it had passed back from the hands of the Persians into the hands of the Indian king. We do not know in whose reign it so passed. But, looking to the history of the reigns of two of the several intervening kings, we find that it may be either in the reign of Firouz who was killed in the war with the Hætalite Huns, or in that of Kobâd, who also had friendly and unfriendly relations with them. Of these two, the reign of Kobâd was much weaker. He had to meet the brunt, both, of a kind of civil war and a foreign war. So, possibly it was during his reign, that a part of India which belonged to Persia in the reign of Behramgour, passed into the hands of the Indian king. Maçoudi also does not throw any light on the question. What we learn from him is simply this : “ The kings of Hind and of Sind and of all the countries on the north and south concluded peace with the king of Persia (Naoshirwan).” The Indian king writes a letter “ to his brother, the king of Persia, master of the crown and the banner, Kesr Anaoushirawan.”

(الي اخيه ملك پارس صاحب التاج والرايت  
كسري آنوشيروان)<sup>2</sup>

On weighing the arguments on both sides, including the appeals to the relations of the Huns to the Sassanide Persians, I am inclined to say, that the credit of crushing the power of the Huns in India belongs to Yashodharman. The authority of the Chinese traveller is a later authority and a second-hand authority. Again, there is one statement of this traveller, which leads us to pause before taking his statements as authentic. He places the Hunnic king Mihircula some centuries ago.<sup>3</sup> If that be true, the date of Baladitya and also that of Yashodharma are carried some centuries ago. This is contrary to facts.

<sup>1</sup> Translated from Zotenberg's French Translation, Vol. II, p. 221, Chap. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Maçoudi par B. DeMeynard, Vol. II, p. 201.

<sup>3</sup> Beal's Buddhist Records, Vol. I, p. 169.



Now, as opposed to this doubtful authority of the Chinese pilgrim-traveller, who speaks (*a*) some time after the event, and (*b*) that on second-hand information, and (*c*) upsetting the chronological order of time, we have (*a*) the contemporary authority and (*b*) that the first hand authority, (*c*) supported by a proper chronological order of dates of Yashodharma's own inscriptions.

It is suggested that the court-poet of Yashodharman may have given false credit to his royal patron on his inscriptions. But we must bear in mind, that kings have some reputation to uphold. If Yashodharman had not been the real victor, he would not have dared to get a wrong inscription put up. He ran the risk of being taken for a braggart or boaster by his contemporaries, by both, the princes and the peasants. The court-poet may be allowed to praise his royal master and even to deify him, if he liked; but he would not be allowed to subject his master to public ridicule by attributing to him a feat or exploit which he did not do. To exaggerate in praise is one thing, but to state an untruth and to attribute a feat to the king which he did not do is another thing. The latter, instead of raising the king in the estimation of his contemporaries, his own subjects, would lower him. From all these considerations, I think that the real credit of breaking the power of the Huns belonged to king Yashodharman.

As said above, the History of the Sassanian kings of Persia has been appealed to, in determining the question of destroying the power of the Huns in India. In this connection, there is one point which seems to me to be important. If Kalidas refers to a defeat of the Persians, it is more likely that he refers to a defeat at the hands of his own people, the Indians, and at the hands of a king of his own country, and not to a defeat at the hand of others,—the Huns—who were also hostile to his people and his country. So, it is more likely that the event referred to the later event of Kavadh's reign as pointed out by Dr. Hoernle. From all this rather long review of events, we find that it was king Yashodharma, who broke the power of the Huns and it was he who was known as Vikramaditya.