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It is already well-known—but apparently needs to be reiterated—that written sources from about the eighth century do not use terms which are today used as generic terms to refer to the Muslims. It is not altogether true, as seems to be suggested by some, that sources reveal lack of familiarity with specifics as regards terms and concepts connected with Islam. At least in the middle of the thirteenth century, there is clear evidence of familiarity with the term Musalāmāna (literally, ‘one who submits to Allah’), and of concepts which relate to the practice of Islam. But such evidence is extremely rare, whereas generic terms which were in use in earlier times to denote outsiders or others to the society, were grafted on to newcomers, without even partial modifications. The general absence of a term in written sources cannot by itself be a proof that it was unfamiliar. On the other hand, it may be interesting to speculate why, if a term was known, as Musalāmāna was known in the thirteenth century, it was not used commonly. The use as well as non-use of particular words, in addition of course to ways they were used, may indeed be indicative of attitudes.

What were then the terms used commonly? And, do appropriate references, arranged in a chronological order, suggest any evolutionary pattern? The chart that will appear as an appendix in the end will provide a bird’s eye-view of the pattern; for the present, a general point may be made. It can be noticed, when one wades through a substantial series of comparable epigraphic records, that terms found in these records (and literary texts as well) may be broadly grouped into four categories, the classification being based on how these terms were derived. I would consider the category of ethnic names as most important, as the majority of terms used—and most regularly—derive from tribal/community names. Ethnic names are, in general, specific references, not liable to inappropriate attribution, and included in this category, we shall find the following terms, in their specific contexts:

2Shashi Joshi and B.S. Josh, op. cit., p. 190.
4See Appendix I.
Tajika, Turushka, Gauri, Mudgala, Turutti (Turhati), Pathana.

Terms derived from country of origin are Pàrasika and Garjana/ Garjanaka. As we shall presently see, Pàrasika was originally distinctly pre-Islamic, and changed its connotation to move over to the category of generic terms, qualified to be used interchangeably with other generic terms. Garjana/Garjanaka was derived from the placename Gazni, and referred to the ruler of Delhi. Hammira, another term in common use, was derived from amir and, unlike Suratrana, which, having been derived from Sultan remained an honorific, could be a generic term, as suggested by the title of the play Hammirmadamadurana and many references in the inscriptions. The other generic terms were: Yavana, Mleccha and Saka. All these terms were in use in early historical times, but although Yavana and Mleccha were already generic terms with reference to 'outsiders' in the early historical context, the ethnic term Saka came to acquire, or so it appears, a generic connotation only in early medieval times, perhaps through its continued association with the Saka era. Another instance of an ethnic term changing into a generic term in the early medieval period is Turushka; its use was too frequent to have been restricted to a single ethnic connotation alone.

This, admittedly, is a brief introduction to the range of terms used and to what they seem to have conveyed; what is required now is to make more detailed reference to their contextual occurrences.

II

Two terms in early use were Pàrasika and Tajika. Pàrasika was definitely connected with pre-Islamic Persia, and for its early use, D.R. Bhandarkar's comments appear to be still pertinent: 'a Pàrasika is distinguished from a Pahlava in ancient Indian works and records.

The latter is identical with Iranian Pahlav and is taken to denote a Parthian. Pàrasika, on the other hand, is the Pahlavi Parsik, denoting an inhabitant of Pars, the ancient Persis or modern Fars. It should further be remembered that the meaning which attaches to the word depends upon the period to which any particular reference to it belongs. Bhandarkar's precise identification of Pàrasikas of AD 300-700 with 'Iranians of the time of or connected with the Sassanian dynasty', and of a later period, with the 'Muhammadan inhabitants of Persia' may not apply uniformly to all Pàrasika references so neatly, but a shift in the connotation did definitely take place, making it a generic term interchangeable with Saka, Mleccha or Yavana, rather than with a fixed connotation in relation to 'Muhammadan inhabitants of Persia'. Pàrasika, in fact, can be used to question fixed relation between ethnicity and the connotation of term. In the Raghuvamśam (iv) of Kàlidàsa, king Raghuv encountered the Pàrasikas, who were westerners (pàscātāya), in his divyajaya undertaken on the land route. Kàlidàsa tells us that Raghuv 'could not bear the flush caused by wine in the lotus faces of the Yavana women; that a fierce battle took place between him and the westerners who had cavalry for their army; that he covered the earth with their bearded heads, severed by his arrows, that the survivors put off their helmets and sought his protection, and that his soldiers beguiled the fatigue of conquest with wine in vineyards covered with choicest skins'. Other practices associated with the Pàrasikas are condemned in Dharmasàstra texts and other genres of literature, Vṛddha Yājñavalkya duly dictating that on 'touching Càndalas, Mlecchas, Bhilas, Pàrasikas and others that were guilty of the mortal sins, one should bathe together with the clothes worn'. However,
the references to the Pārasi̇kas in epigraphs and literature from the close of the seventh century were in all likelihood to Persian settlements on the western coast and such references are devoid of any ethnic attributes. It is not at all clear when Pārasi̇ka came to denote a Muslim; possibly, by the close of the eleventh century; when Kulottunga Cola claimed to have ‘scattered (his) enemies (and) whose fame is spontaneously sung on the further shore of the ocean by the young women of the Persians (Pārasi̇s)’, the term had acquired a new connotation.

The earliest occurrence of the term Tājika is in the Kavi plate from Broach (Bharoch) district, Gujarat. Dated 22 June 736, the plate11 which records a gift of land to God Āśramadeva, mentions the Tājikās in order to highlight the military achievements of Jayabhāta IV, Gurjara feudatory of the contemporary Maitraka ruler of Valabhi, the actual raid having been undertaken at the city of the lord of Valabhi from Sind. The context of the grant is not military, but it is intended to convey the impression that by forcibly vanquishing the Tājikās, Jayabhāta was able, ‘even as a cloud extinguishes with its showers the fire that troubles all people’, to put an end to the unending misery of the people (āṣeṣa-loka-satāpa).

The term Tājika, it has been suggested,12 was derived from Pahlavi Tāzīg, in turn derived from the name of the Arab tribe Ṭayyi. However, a recent intensive probe into the various possibilities regarding the derivation of the term shows that it derived from Arabic tribal or tribal confederation of the Ṭayyi, and, further, that ‘an old Parthian formation of the name which by the third century must have been Tāzīg may be envisaged’.13 In any case the term in use in India was thus of West Asian origin, but it was indigenized, as were other terms of the categories listed above. The term, in a similar context, occurs in another near contemporary record from Navasari, also in Gujarat.14 The feudatory who this time inflicted what is represented as a major defeat on the advancing Tājika army was Čāluḍya Pulekṣaṅglāra. His overlord, the illustrious king Vallabha, rewarded the unique display of the feudatory’s valour with such titles as Daksināpata-sādhaṅga (the pillar of Daksināpatha), Gālukkā-śaṅkā (ornament of the family of the Čaluḍkās), Pṛthivī-Vallabha (beloved of the earth) and Anivartaka-nivartayitr (repeller of the unrepellable). Dated 21 October 739, the Navasari plates of Pulekṣaṅglāra provide a graphic description of the devastations caused by the Tājika army which had set out to cause more devastations:

When the army of the Tājikās,—which poured forth arrows, javelins and iron-headed clubs; which destroyed, with its rapidly brandished and glittering swords, the prosperous Saindhava, Kacchella, Saurāṭha, Cāvotaka, Maurya, Gurjara and other kings; which, desiring to enter Daksīnāpata... with a view to vanquish all Southern kings, came, in the very first place, to conquer the viṣaya of Navasārika, which rendered the regions between the quarters dusky with the dust of the ground raised by the hard and noisy hoofs of its galloping horses; the bodies (of warriors) in which appeared dreadful as their armours, were reddened by very large streams of blood (gushing) from the intestines which came out of the cavi of their big bellies, as they impeciously rushed forth and were completely pierced by spear-heads; which had previously not been vanquished even by numerous eminent chiefs among hosts of kings, who offered their heads in return for high honour and gifts they had received from their lord; who opposed it, biting mercilessly both their lips with the...
tips of their teeth; who, though they were great warriors and had their sharp swords reddened by the mass of blood that flowed when the sides of their loins and trunks of hostile elephants were rent on several extensive battlefields, could not attain success; who cut off the necks of their enemies' heads, as if they were plucking the stalks of lotuses, hitting them with their horse-shoe-shaped sharp arrows which were quickly discharged for the destruction of their adversaries; whose bodies were covered with a coat of bristling hair on account of their martial spirit and excitement, was defeated in the forefront of the battle in which headless trunks began a circular dance to the accompaniment of the loud noise of drums beaten continuously in joy caused, as it were, by the thought: 'Today at least we have, by laying down our heads, paid off the debt we owed to our lord in (this) one life.'

This extensive, involved passage, offering a gory description of the battle between Avanijanāśraya Pulakesirāja and his loyal retainers on one side and the Tājikas on the other, is cited here as an appropriate text for the study of representation. The passage represents an actual battle fought, but uses various literary conventions to take the description beyond ordinary portrayal in order to project the loyal achievements of a feudatory, the loyalty of whose own subordinates contributes in making the imagery of the battle and the battlefield so vividly splashed with colour. The evidence of the Navasari plates is commonly cited to highlight the battle and the battlefield so vividly splashed with colour. The order to project the loyal achievements of a feudatory, the loyalty of whose own subordinates contributes in making the imagery of the battle and the battlefield so vividly splashed with colour.

The point may perhaps be effectively stated by analysing another early, seventh century inscription, referring to the Tājikas. The inscription of Pratihāra Vatsarāja, dated Ab 795, and of uncertain provenance, was intended to record the construction of a temple and attributes sovereign kingship (sārvabhauma-nṛpatih) to Vatsarāja achieved through victories over Kāñcana and Lāṭā in the south, which took his armies down to the southern ocean, his victory over Jayaśīla, which took his army to the Himalayan heights, his victory over the Lord of Gauḍa, as also by virtue of his victories over Mleccha and Kīra kings, respectively of the western and northern quarters. Vatsarāja's subordinate Śrivarmaka too claimed several victories, including one on the Tājika ruler who was taken captive (baddhalākha-sakala-jagajjāgaras-Tājikēś). Others defeated by him were: Kesāri, who was forced to pay tribute; the ruler of hill tribes who were punished, and Vyaṅghra, the powerful Tomara king. Victories over enemies of Kāñcana and Gauḍa are claimed by feudatory Śrivarmaka's son Gallaka as well in the record.

See, for example, the following comments on the Arab raids of the period: 'Either Shīrka or his successor was on the throne when the Arabs swept over the whole Rājputāṇa and Gujārāt, and advanced as far as Ujjayinī. The Gurjara kingdom of Jodhpur was overrun, but the Pratihāra king Naṅgaḥaṭa of Avanī without this terrible shock and hurled back the invaders. The credit of saving western India from the hordes of the Arab invaders belongs to him, and he shares the glory with the Chāka king Avanijanāśraya Pulakesirāja who stopped their advance into southern India.

'The Arab invasion must have brought about great changes in the political condition in western India by destroying or weakening numerous small states.' R.C. Majumdar, The Classical Age (Vol. 3 of The History and Culture of the Indian People) (Bombay, 4th edn., 1988), p. 155.

As can be seen from another record, also mentioning the Tājikas and belonging to the Raṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan, the terms of representation of victories achieved over enemies are in accordance with the convention which seeks to place the ruler, sometimes through the mediation of his subordinates, in a position of universal sovereignty. The convention underlines the need for multiplicity of enemies who are vanquished: further, acknowledgement of defeat is opposed to the concerns of sovereignty. If at all defeat has to be acknowledged, it has to be couched in terms acceptable to the convention. The Raṣṭrakūṭa grant, that of Kṛṣṇa III (939-67) from Chinchani in Thane and datable to the middle of the tenth century, credits the ruler with victories over Pāṇḍya, Odra, Simhala, Cola, Pārāśikā, Andhra, Dravida, Barbara, Tājika, Vaṇkina, Hūṇa, Khasa, Guriyara and Mālavīyaka. The list is impressive, as was the projected status of the Raṣṭrakūṭas in their records, and the fact that the Tājikas and the Pārāśikās should be mentioned among those who were subdued by Kṛṣṇa III is additionally significant. The Pārāśikās were in all probability an important community of western India located within Raṣṭrakūṭa territories: some representatives of the Tājikas were political subordinates of the Raṣṭrakūṭas in western India. In fact, another Chinchani grant of an earlier date, of AD 926, belonging to the period of Raṣṭrakūṭa Indra III, refers to Madhumati of the Tājika community who had received the entire maṇḍala of Samyāna, on western coast, from Kṛṣṇarāja II (878-915). Madhumati, obviously a Sanskritized form of Muhammad, was the son of Sāhiyaratāra (or Yararāra), and he had another name Sugatipa. As a feudatory ruler of Samyāna-maṇḍala, appointed by the Raṣṭrakūṭas, Sugatipa was involved in projects of a religious nature, to be referred to in the next chapter, but as a governor, his position was similar to that of a member of the family of Tājikas who were closely associated with the Kadambas of Candrapura and Goa. G.M. Moraes, on the basis of inscriptive evidence preserved in a later Portuguese version, suggests that this association dates to the time of Guhallaideva II (980-1005?). When Guhallaideva’s pilgrimage to Somnath was interrupted, he had to make his way to Goa. ‘A native of this city named Madummod, of Tāj origin, the wealthiest among all sea-faring traders, a person of great wisdom, rendered a great and public service to the above-mentioned king Guhallaidev.’ The city of Goa which was made the capital of his kingdom by Kadamba Jayakesi I (1050-80) ‘owed a substantial part of its prosperity to the wise administration of SaḍANO, a grandson of the merchant Muhammad who . . . had rendered valuable service to Guhallaideva. Jayakesi appointed him governor of the Konkan. Prudent, just and liberal, he was well-versed in mathematics and “the fourteen arts, the four resources, and the seven solicitudes”’. According to sources used by Moraes, in 1053 SaḍANO established in the capital a charitable institution which arranged food for the poor and the helpless and lodgings for the pilgrims; the resources for running the institution came from trading vessels and merchants from foreign countries.

SaḍANO, the competent administrator, is obviously identical with Sadhana mentioned in the Panjim plates of Jayakesi I, dated AD 1059. The inscription has the following details about the family, described as of Tājika descent:

There was one Āliyama, the peaceful, who was born in the city of Śrīvainyula. He was of Tājīya descent. He was intelligent and derived his wealth from the possession of ships. His son Madhumada was, like full moon, delight to the eyes of the people. To Madhumada was born Sadhana who was strong; he became equal of Kesiraja (Jayakesi) in the matter of protecting the realm. His munificence removed the misery of the distressed and his strength put an end to his enemies. The good conduct of that wise man attracted the minds of the honest persons.

17 Apart from other qualities, the hero of a mahākāvyya was to possess the urge for conquest. See David Smith, Ramākara’s Haravijaya: An Introduction to the Sanskrit Court Epic (Delhi, 1983), pp. 29-30.
19 Ibid.
21 Ibid., pp. 185-6.
22 Panaji Copperplates of Jayakesi I of AD 1059 in G.M. Moraes, ibid., Appendix 3, no. 2.
The Tajik presence in western India was on a scale which may be considered not too insignificant for the formation of images about them; they would be considered as Mlecchas, despite the deliberate Sanskritization of their ethnic and personal names, and the reference to the Mlecchas and the Tajikas in the inscription of 795, of Pratihara Vatsaraja, need not be taken to relate to two separate communities. In fact, both Yavana and Mleccha were terms which, after having acquired a generic connotation suitable for application to outsiders, continued in use. The mention of the Yavanas in the Kharepatan (Ratnagiri district, Maharashtra) inscription of 1095 of the time of Silahara ruler Anantadeva and of the Mlecchas in the Vadavali grant (Thane, Maharashtra) of 1127 of the time of Silahara Aparajita I would have related to the Tajikas who, as already pointed out, had a significant political presence in western India in early medieval times, to the extent of being listed among adversaries even when they could be appointed as governors and could be seen as contributors to the promotion of an ideal socio-religious order.

To return to the question of representation in terms of literary convention, it may be instructive to study the images which are projected about the Tajikas in the specific context of western India of early medieval times. Tajika raiders of the Navasari record of AD 739 were obviously considered capable of causing political devastations; the Yavanas of the Kharepatan plate, who overran the Konkan country as a result of a civil war after Murnmuni, harassed the Gods and brāhmaṇas (devadvijāti-pramatha-vidhi) and were 'violent and vile' (agra, pāparāsī). These are traits which may be seen as conforming to what the Yavanas or Mlecchas would generally be associated with. However, the general is not necessarily universal, and what the Chinchani plates tell us about the activities of the Arab governor Sugatipa will, again, have to be understood, and in a specific context, of what is associative with the Tajikas/Yavanas/Mlecchas. The point about the general and the specific may also be explored by trying to see the relationship between the Tajikas/Mlecchas and the norms of the existing social order. Note, for example, the case of Chittukka, who according to the Vadavali plates (Thane, Maharashtra) of Silahara Aparajita I (AD 1127), was an asura—a demon—born to devastate the world (jagad-dalayitum). All the feudatories gathered round him... the wealth of religious merit was destroyed, the elders perished, refugees were harassed, all townsmen and their servants were ruined and all prosperity of the kingdom came to an end. The calamity to the Silahara kingdom, seen in general terms of devastation to the world, was caused by an individual who, when Aparajita fought him single-handed, with only one horse, ran away and sought refuge with the Mlecchas. The inscription does associate, in the end, the Mlecchas with calamity, but not as its originator in this specific context. At the same time, as will be mentioned later, the Mlecchas are generators of calamity in other situations in which Mleccha domination causes total ruin of existing political and social order. The general tenor of how the Tajikas as Mlecchas or as Yavanas would be perceived and represented, which would sometimes accord with representations of individuals from other social groups, would pose a contradiction with other types of representation. It will have to be seen whether contemporary conventions can in any way illuminate and resolve this contradiction.

References to Tajikas in inscriptions appear to discontinue after the tenth century, although, judging from the history of commercial and other contacts with the Arab world, it is rather surprising that...
the term does not continue to figure with any importance in the epigraphic and other records of western India. The term which assumes increasing importance is Turuṣka, although this preliminary statement requires several qualifications. First, it is not that the term Turuṣka is of later usage than Tājika and replaces it. Second, it is not Turuṣka alone which comes to be in use. For example, the term Śaka can be seen to be in use where one could expect Turuṣka. Similarly, as can be seen from the Viśāla grant of Prolaya Nāyaka, of the first half of the fourteenth century from Andhra Pradesh, Turuṣka could be substituted not only by such terms as Yavana, but by another term initially of a different ethnic origin, Pārasīka, as well.

Probably mentioned as Tu-Kiše in the Chinese annals of Tang and other dynasties, the term Turuṣka is mentioned in early Indian literary sources from about the seventh century onward: in the Harsa-Carita of Bana who distinguished them from the Pārasīkas; in the Garuda, Vīmana and Bhāgavata Purāṇas; in Amarakośa; in the Kāvya Jānakiharana of Kumārādāsa and other texts. The

**P. Prasad, 'The Turushka or Turks in late Ancient Indian Documents', Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 55th Session, Allahabad, 1994 (Delhi, 1995), pp. 170-5. Andre Wink summarizes views on the nomenclature and origin of the Turks thus: 'The very word "Turk" or "Türk" appears as the name of a Central-Asian nomad people only from the 6th century onwards, when in 552 the "Turk" Qaghanate was founded on the Orkhon river in Mongolia. The Chinese name for the Turks was Tu-Kišh, which was apparently derived from Türkli, the Mongol plural of Türk. The Greeks called them Tourkoi, the Arabs Ātrak (sg. Turk), while in new Persian they became known as Turkan (sg. Turk). Originally, Turk was an ethnonym which was associated with a small tribe headed by the Ashima clan; it meant "the strong one" and within the semantic range of a whole series of tribal names which connoted "force", "violence", "ferociousness", and so on'; Andre Wink, 'India and Central Asia: The Coming of the Turks in the Eleventh Century', in A.W. Van Den Boek, D.H.A. Kolf and M.S. Oort, eds., Ritual, State and History in South Asia: Essays in Honour of J.C. Heesterman (Leiden, New York, Köln, 1992), p. 755. It is possible that some of the Sanskrit appellations such as aitihyla used with reference to the Turuṣkas were literal translations of tribal connotations mentioned by Wink.


Rājatarāṅgini reference to Kaniśka and his successors as Turuṣka is perhaps to be explained in terms of the manner in which the term Turuṣka was being used with reference to Shahiyas of Kabul, to even the Tibetans, and to the rulers of the north in general in the Kumārapāla-carita which specifies Caulukya Kumārapāla's conquests by relating them to the cardinal directions in which they were undertaken: Gaṅgā on the east, Vindhya on the south, Sindhu on the west, and Turuṣka country on the north. Before, however, the actual establishment of the Turkish Sultanate in Delhi, the Turuṣkas start figuring on the political horizons of rulers located in different parts of the subcontinent. Perhaps the earliest epigraphic document to refer to the Turuṣkas as political adversaries is a fragmentary Sarada inscription from Hund (Attock, Pakistan), assigned, on palaeographic grounds, to the second half of the eighth century. K.V. Ramesh finds in this document reference to the routing of a Muslim army in the Sindhu country by the local ruler Anantadeva, but with reference to the evidence of Al-Beiruni and Kalhana regarding the Turuṣkas, it has alternatively been suggested that it was the ethnic Turks before conversion, who are mentioned in documents of this period.

Whatever be the religious affiliation of the ethnic Turks of the Hund record, the Sagar Tal (Gwalior) inscription of Pratihāra king Vatsarāja of the ninth century refers to the Turuṣkas in a manner which is similar to how they figure in other early medieval records before the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate: that is, by listing them among other enemies of the ruler. The extensive achievements of Pratihāra Nagabhata II, which included victories over the countries


**P. Prasad, 'Turuṣkas'.


The Yavana king, of the Khalimpur plate of Pala ruler Dharmapila, a formidable adversary of the Prabhars, approved, along with kings of Bhoja, Madra, Kuru, Yadu, Avanti, Gandhara and Kira, the installation of the king of Kanyakubja by Dharmapala; perhaps he too was a Turuska, and his inclusion, among a number of rulers of northern and central India, suggests a pattern which is similar to the inclusion of the Turuska among a number of political adversaries.

References to Turuskas in a similar vein occur in many inscriptions of the period, and it is not necessary to cite them all. I select below translations of two verses occurring in the inscriptions of the Kalacuris of Madhya Pradesh to illustrate further the point made above. The following occurs in the Amoda plates (Bilaspur district, Madhya Pradesh) of Prthvideva, dated AD 1079:

By that king was erected on the earth a pillar of victory after forcibly dispossessing the kings of Kosala and Vanga, ruler of Konkan, the lord of Sakambhari, the Turuska, the descendant of Raghu, of their treasure, horses and elephants.

Another verse, occurring in the Jabalpur inscription of 1167 of Kalacuri Jayasimha, and repeated in the Kumbhi plates (1180-1) and the Umariya plates (1192-3) of his son Vijayasimha, refers to the military might of Jayasimha in the following terms:

On hearing of his coronation, the Gurjara king disappeared, the Turuska lost the strength of his arms, the lord of Kuntala renounced all love sports, and other kings also, leaving the earth through apprehension, crossed the ocean.

Sanskrit texts, which style themselves as Mahakavyas, often refer to the Yavanas, Mlecchas, Turuskas interchangeably, and they too do not carry the impression of the emergence of a single foe, as a literary motif, posing threat to the military might of the central character of the Mahakavya. One can assume that from the point of view of the literary idiom this would not have been desirable and in consonance with the intended status of the hero. A detailed examination of the texts from this perspective cannot be a part of the present study, but the point can be made by using one general study on Sanskrit ‘Historical’ Mahakavyas and by referring to at least one medieval Mahakavya in some detail.

Prthviraja-vijaya of Jayana, one of the early texts of the genre of historical Mahakavya, centres around Cahasana Prthviraja who, as a hero, is characterized as dhirdatta, and who, inexplicably,
continues to be designated by modern historians as ‘the last Hindu emperor of India’. Written possibly between 1191 and 1193, *Prthvirāja-viṣaya* begins with an account of the ancestry of Prthvīrāja, tracing his lineage to the Sun, and the narrative moves through generations of Cāhāmāna rulers till it reaches Prthvīrāja. Among Prthvīrāja’s predecessors, Ajayarāja and Amorāja are shown as having encountered and defeated the Muslims, and, of course, *Prthvīrāja-viṣaya* is about Prthvīrāja’s own victory over the Muslims. But in terms of his priority, when Prthvīrāja attained maturity to rule the kingdom, first was his campaign against Nāgārjuna, who had taken possession of Gaṇḍapura. Prthvīrāja also resolved to vanquish beef-eating Mleccha Gauri (i.e. Gauri), and bestowed gifts on a messenger who brought news from Gujarī of the routing of Gaurī (Gaurī) army, but then the narrative, in the penultimate canto of the text, moves off in a different direction: Prthvīrāja retires to a picture gallery and becomes absorbed in a painting portraying the beauty of Tilottamī.

*Prthvīrāja-viṣaya*, in the form in which it is available now, is an incomplete text, and one is thus deprived of the text’s detail of Prthvīrāja’s victory over and representation of Gaurī in the last canto of the text. However, another text, *Hammīra-mahākāvya*, written perhaps in the second half of the fifteenth century, around another Cāhāmāna ruler Hammīra of Raṇastambhapura also has many references to conflicts with the Turuṇkas, interspersed with references to conflicts and intrigues with other kings. To Simharaṇa, a predecessor of Hammīra, is attributed a victory over Hetima, a Mleccha general; but Simharaṇa’s *dīgviṣaya* (conquest of all quarters) is directed against Kannāga, Lāṭa, Cola, Gaṇḍara and Aṅga. In *Hammīra-mahākāvya*’s continuous narration of events, of the period between the death of Prthvīrāja IV and Hammīra, conflict with the Mlecchas is a recurrent theme, but here too references to such conflicts are combined with references to conflicts with other kingdoms, court intrigues, and religious benefactions and other activities. The motif of *dīgviṣaya* is also used for Hammīra (whose name as that of his brother Suratṛāṇa are derived respectively from *āmir* and *sultaṇ*) and covered, as mentioned in the text, Bhimarasapura, Gadhawandala, Dhāra, Ujjaini, Medapata and Acalēśvara. Hammīra’s relation with Alauddin, Sultan of Delhi, is represented as one of high intrigues. Hammīra insulpts his own official; the official seeks refuge at the court of Delhi; to avenge his insult, Alauddin enlists support from Aṅga, Telānā, Magadha, Mahīśūra and other regions. In the final encounter with Alauddin, Hammīra, frustrated by the treachery of his subordinates, kills himself; one of the few trusted subordinates who fight for Hammīra in his last encounter is Mahīmasāḥi, a Yavana.

Encounters with Turuṇka or Yavana rulers of the south figure prominently in some texts written in that region. *Madhurā-viṣaya*, which was written by Gaṅgādevī, in the second half of the fourteenth century, in celebration of Vijayanagara prince Kampana’s victory over the Madura Sultans, uses motifs found in other texts as well. One of several descriptions of Bukka, father of Kampana and one of the founders of Vijayanagara, is that he was born to free the world of the Mlecchas. However, when Bukka advised Kampana on his plan of campaign, Kampana’s adversaries were to be Camparāya, ruler of Taṇḍiramāṇḍala and of the city of Kaṇḍi; and several forest kings, before he was to proceed against the Sultan of Madura. Kampana’s success in the south led to the establishment of Marataka as the capital of the new province, and, the text asserts, kings from Magadha, Maḷava, Sevunā, Sinhala, Dāmila, Kerāla and Gaṇḍa waited at the gates for their turn to pay Kampana homage. Kampana, in the end, achieved success against the Yavanas of Madura through divine intervention.

*Sālavābhityudaya*, written around 1480 by Rājanātha Diṇḍima, is about another Vijayanagara figure Sālava Narasimha. Sālava Mangi, an ancestor of Narasimha, had, in his time, set out to defeat Mleccha *suratṛāṇa* of the south and had, it is stated, removed fears of Kerāla, Cola and Pāṇḍya kings. Cantos 3-13 of the text focus on the *Caṇkravartī* aspirations of Narasimha who fought against Kalīṅga,

44Ibid., Chap. 9.
46Ibid., Chap. 10.
47Ibid., Chap. 11.
Cola and Pandyas; marched down to the seat of Rama, and then on to Ananta-Sayanam; achieved victory over Turuska; and then proceeded through Dasarna to the Himalayas. Kings of Anga, Konkana, Kalinaga, Khala, Tila, Kaira, Gurjara, Lata and so on acknowledged his suzerainty, and even after his appointment as a Cakravarthi in front of God Visvevara of Kashi, he went on to defeat Vanga, Kalinaga, Gauda, Pragyotoisa and a host of other countries. He also defeated the Turuskas, who are stated to have been endowed with various weapons and who tortured the earth.

Another interesting text, from the point of view of representation of historical events, as also that of relation with the Yavanas is Rashtraushavanamahakavyam, written by Rudrakavi, a poet from the south (daksinadig-bhava-kavi), at the instance of his patron king Narayana Saha, Bagula ruler of Mayuragiri, in 1596. The original seat of the Rashtrausha family is traced in the text to Kanyakubja, and it is given both solar and lunar descent through divine intervention. The narrative moves through thirty-eight generations of the family, till it reaches the time of Narayana Saha's son Pratapa Saha. Gaumalladeva, twenty-sixth in descent from the earliest member of the lineage, is stated to have defeated the Gurjaras and the Mavas, and after having killed Alaundin (Alavadinam Yavanadhinatham), to have taken his kingdom. His son Mahugi is stated to have captured Rama-raja of Devaguri, but at the humble request of Ramarajas minister Hemadri, released him, after making him a feudatory (sambhramana-punar-mumoca). Nandadeva, twenty-eighth in descent, was a casualty at the hands of crores of Turuska soldiers of Dilli (Koti-Turuska-sainyak), who had conquered Kanita, Lata, Utaka, Cola, Gauda, Kalinaga, Vanga and other countries. However, Khadgasena, Nandadeva's grandson, is stated to have defeated eight thousand Mughal warriors along with their leader Mallika (Sa Mallikakhyam Yavanadhitham jiv-astasaahasra-Mugala-virat). Successes against the Yavanas, as also other rulers marked the times of Rama, Nandadeva II and Bhairavasena. In fact, Bhairavasena, while he offered protection to the ruler of Manapappavata (Mandu) by defeating one Sulema Saha, at the same time extended help to Bakhada Saha, the Sultan of Gujarat (Gurjaradeva-pitrisesa Sulatana Bakhada) who was a Turuska- narendra and who was protecting his subjects with 'respectful adherence to the dharma appropriate to his own descent' (nirvamsocita-dharma-sambhramena). Bhairavasena's help extended to campaigns in the south, against Citrakuta and against the Mughal ruler Humayun (Humayu Mugiladhirajah). Bhairavasena was regarded as a friend (mitra) by the Sultan of Gujarat and was generously rewarded by the latter for his friendship.

Amicable contact with the Mughal monarchy and court began with Akbar, a kshatriya and avamipurandara, when Virasena, Bhairavasena's son, spent some time at the Mughal court. Although Narayana Saha, son of Bhairavasena and patron of the author of this mahakavya, lent initial support to the Ahmednagar ruler Burahana Saha, the arrival of Akbar's son Murada Saha in Broach, with orders for Nariya Saha to extend support to Murada, made both Nariya and his son Pratapa to switch allegiance to the representative from Delhi.

Pratapa Saha, depicted in the text as a great plunderer, was on the forefront of the assault on the capital of Nijama Saha of Ahmednagar, and in the concluding part of the mahakavya, it is claimed that Pratapa was loved by (pranayi) Saha Murdaraja-srivighnakahanakshipta.

Obviously, this selective gist of the text leaves out other details of claimed military achievements, against Yavanas, and non-Yavanas, religious benefactions which interspersed with campaigns of victory, and of conventional romance and intrigue. What emerges from the text is a narrative that is an attempt to document the triumphs of the Bagulas, and to establish their claim to sovereignty over the south, as also that of relation with the Yavanas.
even from this selective gist—and from the mahākavyas cited above—is that war against Tūrūka/Yavana (even when Yavanas may be depicted as allies) had by the medieval period become a part of the "dīgviṣaya" lore, and the narrative world of the authors of the mahākavyas had to be characterized by contestation for political authority by contestants of heterogeneous origin. In the Rāstrādhwarmśa-mahākavya, the undisputed authority of course lay with Śāhā Śrīmad-Akabbara (Akbar), but that was not irreconcilable, till the end, with the ‘sovereign’ status of Mahārājirāja-Srī-maharajadhirāja-Srī Nārāyaṇa Śāhā.

V

I have been trying to show, by citing epigraphic and literary sources, that as raiders and contestants for political power, the Tājikas and the Tūrūkas were depicted by contemporary authors as among many claimants in a situation of intense and constant competition. Whatever the political history of the period, even of the time of Akbar, this was what informed, through the use of literary convention, the narrative structure of the texts. The question to proceed to from this would be: How is Turūka rule perceived? What kind of break, if any, in the genealogy of rule, is perceived in the available documents, once the Sultanate came to be established in Delhi?

There is a cluster of interesting epigraphs of the thirteenth century from the Delhi region, which originated mostly from the merchant families of the area and to which we may turn for an initial answer to this query.

I start with the quite well-known Palam Baoli inscription of AD 1276, almost the whole of which is in Sanskrit, written by Pandita Yogisvara. One notices that the inscription contains three genealogies. The genealogy of Ṣhakkura Uḍadhara, a purapati in Śrīyoginipurā (Delhi), who had constructed numerous extensive dharmasālas and was now constructing a well, to the east of Pālamba-grāma (Palam) and west of Kumumbapura, for religious merit, derived from a recorded vamśavāt which incorporated the separate genealogies of his parents. The other genealogy was that of the recent and current rulers of Delhi, starting with Śhahavāda (Ṣhahabuddin) and coming up to Śrī Hammīra Gayāsīndīna (Ghiyasuddin Balban). These rulers are listed as a part of a genealogy of rule. The sāmārijya (sovereign state corresponding to the universe) is represented as belonging to its emperor Śrīkara (Ṣiva) whose abhiṣeka was performed by the celestial river Gaṅgā.

According to the Palam Baoli inscription, it was Lord Śrīkara who was thus the emperor of the Universe, but in the kingdom of Hariyāṇaka, in which Śrīyoginipurā or Dhillī was located, it was a succession of royal families who enjoyed the earth: first the Tomaras, followed in succession by the Cauhīlas and then, currently, by the Śrāvakas.

Similar genealogy is present in the Sarban stone inscription of AD 1378, found in the Raisina area of Delhi. The object of this Sanskrit inscription too, is to record the construction of a well in the vicinity of the village Saravala (Sarban) in the pratigāna of Indraprastha in the country of Hariyāṇa, for attainment of heaven by deceased ancestors, by two merchant brothers. The record contains a short genealogy of this merchant family from Agrataka (Vamśām-Agratakā-nivāsinī). The second genealogy, of succession of rule, also relates to the country (deśa) of Hariyāṇa which is comparable to heaven on earth. The city of Dhillī in that country, says the record, was built by the Tomaras: the Tomaras

56 The Palam Baoli inscription gives the following genealogy of the Delhi rulers: Śhahavāda (Ṣhahabuddin), Sūdudvāda (Ṣubuddin Ṭībak), Samaśadīna (Ṣhamsuddin Ilutmīsh), Pherūjādī (Ṣuknuddin Fīlīz), Jāṭīdīna (Jalāluddin Rāzī), Māṭjādīna (Maṭuddin Bāhrām), A体系建设 (A’lauuddin Masud), Naradīna (Nasiruddin Mahmūd), Śrī Hammīra Gayāsīndīna (Ghiyasuddin Balban).

were succeeded by the Cāhāmānas who were conscientious in looking after their subjects; ‘then, Mleccha Sāhavādana, whose scorching might burnt the garden which was the family of his enemy, took the city by force. Since then the city has been enjoyed by the Turuṣkas, the current lord of the land being Śrī Mahamadāsāhī. 58 The city was taken by force which the Naraina stone inscription, written a year earlier (1327); but also falling in the reign of Muhammad bin Tughlaq,59 describes as niṣaṇbāhavīrīya, i.e. ‘might of his own arms’. The purpose of this epigraph too is to record the construction of a well, for the satisfaction of the ancestors, by a merchant of—as the record describes it—Rohitaka-viṣṇa,60 at the village of Nāḍāyana, located in the western direction of Indraprastha. This is in the great and virtuous province of Hariyānaka where Kṛṣṇa along with Pārtha wandered for the suppression of sin; in its city of Dhili, sin is expelled through the chanting of the Vedas. And in this country, ‘there is the famous king Mahamadāsāhī, the crest jewel of all the rulers of the earth, who by the strength of his own arms, has crushed (his) enemies, and is the powerful Śaka Lord’. 61

The representation of the succession of rule,62 in the country of Hariyānā and in the city of Indraprastha or Dhiliṅkā63 uses symbols, similes and motifs which are common in other Sanskrit inscriptions, including prastāśita, of earlier and of the same period; the ruler of the Śaka, Turuṣka or Mleccha descent may be seen to fit into the same convention, and if there is a new element or trait associated with his rule, it has so modified as to conform to this convention. One evidence of this is seen in the way the royalty of the Śaka/Turuṣka/ Mleccha ruler is expressed: as nṛpa, nṛpati, nṛpati-vara, nāyaka, samrāj, prthvindra, 64 bhūmipati, bhūpati, 65 mahāraja-dhārīja 66 and paramabhaṭṭāraka,67 ruling over his viṣaya-rāja. 68 Secondly, the fourteenth century: ‘Pattana was established by Vanarāja, the pearl of the Caukkada [Cāpottakādī, Cāvadī] dynasty in Vikrama 802 in Lākṣaśāma in the region under the rule of king Anāhīta. Seven kings of the Cāvadī dynasty reigned: Vanarāja, Yogariṣṭa, Keśarāja, Bhuvagada, Vairasimha, Ratnādiya, and Sāmāntasimha. Then eleven kings of the Chalukya dynasty reigned in that town: Mularāja, Cāmanḍurāja, Vallaḥarāja, Durlabharāja, Bhīmadeva, Karṇa, Jayasimha-deva, Kumārapalīlādeva, Ayajadeva, the younger Mularāja, and Bhīmadeva. Then reigned the kings in the Vāydhīya years: Lavanprāśī, Viradhavāla, Visaladeva, Arjunā, Sāṅgadeva, and Kapadeva. Then in Gujarāt came the rule of the Śalā: Alau-ud-dina, etc. But Arjunaṃsi Śāṃstī is worshipped in the same way today.’ John E. Cort, tr., ‘Twelve Chapters from the Guidebook to various Pilgrimage Places, the Vividhātīrtha-kalpa of Jinaprabhasīrī, in Phyllis Granoff, ed., The Clever Adulteress and Other Stories: A Treasury of Jain Literature (Oakville, New York and London, 1990), p. 246.

64These titles all appear in the Palam Baoli inscription.
66Palam Baoli and Sarban Inscriptions.
67Paramasūkha, an epithet of the sovereign ruler, is used for Shāmauddin Iltūmish (1210-1236) in Mahāba fort copperplate inscriptions from Uttar Pradesh: the dates on the inscriptions are AD 1227 on one side and 1234-50 on the other. P. Prasad, op. cit., p. 80.

68Note, in this context, the interesting passage in a fifteenth century sale deed of a girl and her son from Tirhut in north Bihar: ‘In Tirbhukti, which is protected by Mahārājādhirāja, the prosperous Bhaīravasimha-deva, a Nīrāyana against enemy kings like Nīrāyana against Kaṃsa, who is engaged in devotion to Śiva and is shining with all the insignia received through the favour and boon of the Sultan, the prosperous Aḻavādīna Śaha, the Paramasūkha, Paramava, supreme lord, aṉeṇapati: the lord of horses, Gaḻapattī, the lord of elephants, narpattī: the lord of men and rājatrayādhipati: supreme lord of a triad of kings and the guardian of the
ruler’s sovereignty extends over the earth having the ocean as its girdle, and his conquests extend to all directions. Note, for example, how the kingdom of Śrī Hanumā Gayāsāmadīna is described in Palān Baoli inscription of 1276.86

In his kingdom, abounding in benign rule, extending from Gauda to Gajjana, from the Dravida region and from the Subandha (to the north) where the entire region was filled with inner content, the earth bore vernal floral charms produced by the rays of the innumerable precious stones and corals which dropped on it from the crowns of the bent heads of the rulers who came from every direction for his service.

He, whose legions daily traversed for a bath the earth both eastward to the confluence of the Ganges with the (Gangāsāgara) and westward to the confluence of the Indus with the sea... When he went forth on a military expedition, the Gaudas abdicated their glory: the Andhras through fear sought the shelter of holes; the Keralas forsook their pleasures; the Karnātas hid themselves in caves; the Mahārāstras gave up their places, the Gurjharas resigned their vigour and the Lātas turned into Kirātas.

The earth being now supported by this sovereign, Śesā, altogether forsaking his duty of supporting the weight of the globe, has betaken himself to the great bed of Viṣṇu; and Viṣṇu himself, for the sake of protection, taking Lakṣmī on his breast, and relinquishing all worries, sleeps in peace on the ocean of milk.

Established metaphors are invoked to represent military exploits as well as the stability of the kingdom of the Sāka/Turūṣka ruler, much in the same way as they would be described in the records of the other ruling dynasties of the period. The point about this is that the inscriptions were not necessarily representing only empirical reality or concrete events; what is to be noted in this is the selection of terms for representation of what the rulers were seen as upholding. Thus, the wealth which was acquired, was seen, in an inscription of the time of Sikandar Shah Lodi, as having been acquired by adhering to the correct principle (nyāyopāravṛti); the ruler was thus one ‘who was beloved of his subjects (prājā) and giver of joy to them’.70 The representation of Turūṣka/Sāka/Yavana rulers as adhering to norms which had been in existence earlier included other traits which they came to be endowed with. There was, apart from the usual Sanskritization of individual names and names of lineages,71 the modification of the title Sultan to Sūratrāṇa, which gave it the literal meaning ‘Saviour of Gods’.72 This pattern of representation also makes intelligible the search for a lunar, Pāñjāva lineage for a medieval Muslim ruler of Kashmir, or the projection of Śāh Śrīmad-Akabbara (Akbar), in the sixteenth century text Bhūmacandra-carita, as Rāma.73

If these representations are seen as relevant for understanding one dimension of the culture and politics of the early medieval period, then reference may be made to some additional material, bearing on the process of internalization. The Sultan of...
Delhi, as we have seen, could be a mahārajadhirāja and paramabhaṭṭāraka; the Chandella rulers Paramārīdeva, Traiṣokya varmadēva and Viśvaravamanvēda were called paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārajadhirāja, paramēvara, paramāmāheśvara Śahī-mahārajā in the Chakhrī (Charkhrī tāhil, Hamirpur district, Uttar Pradesh) copperplate inscription of 1289.24 The Arabic term āmir, modified to Hammīra or Hamvīra, could both denote the ‘alien’ who was an adversary, as also a local ruler, who could subdue the alien Hammīra.51 Sultan, transformed into Surātrāṇa could thus be appropriated by rulers claiming to be sovereign among Hindu kings (Hindurāyasyāsurātrāṇa), the term deriving its connotation not from its literal meaning, but from what its original (Sultan) signified. The term Hindurāyasyāsurātrāṇa is of Vijayanagara origin, used, along with numerous other titles, it was intended to project the Vijayanagar rulers as chiefs among Hindu rāyas or kings;52 the selection of the particular suffix ‘surātrāṇa’ to Hindurāyasyā makes it represent exactly what it is intended to oppose: the political might of the political power such as Śaha,77 was thus not essentialized but could remain open for use among royalty in general.

The earth submerged by the Turuṣkās/Sākas/Mlecchas, depicted as shouldering the great burden of the earth (mahābhāra),78 to the extent of relieving Viṣṇu of his worries,79 is one kind of representation. In another kind, they themselves become the great burden of the earth, and the ruler who subdues them becomes comparable to Viṣṇu: this is a complete reversal of the former representation. Note, for example, the following reference to Candella Traiṣokya varman, father of Viṣvaravaman, in Ajaigarh Fort Rock inscription of 1261 of the time of Viṣvaravaman:

Then Traiṣokya varman, protector of the earth, who knew well how to provide for forts, ruled; like Viṣṇu he was, in lifting up the earth, immersed in the ocean formed by the streams of Turuṣkās.80

The earth submerged by the Turuṣkās/Mlecchas is a regular motif, which is used to underline the significance of its rescue. The motif related to the perception of a changed order, of departure from what is familiar and held valuable, and, at times, of surrender to current reality, and, at other times, of positive action. The attitude of surrender to what is perceived as a changed order is expressed, with great pathos and faith in miracle, in an inscription written towards the close of the twelfth century and found at Etawah fort in Uttar Pradesh.81 The inscription is of mahārāja Ajayasimha who, the record claims, was a nephew of the Gāhadāvāla ruler Jayaccandra. The inscription states that mahārāja Ajayasimha and his ācārya and priest performed a mahāyoga of Candikā. It also refers to the installation, made earlier, of an image of Durgā, but ‘now, with great sorrow, touching her with my head, I place this Durgā, the dweller of the fort and destroyer of bad luck into this pit, till the God Skanda turns their (of the Mlecchas) glory (sun) to dust. When ill
fate meets Yavanas, she might reappear, or manifest herself again amidst uproar.\[^{32}\]

It has been mentioned before that the perception of the violation of an existing order, by ‘violent and vile’ Yavanas who harassed Gods and Brähmanas, the most important symbols of that order, is present in the Khaarpata plate of 1095 of the Śilāharas of Konkan. The perception, more vividly expressed, and sometimes using the motif of the submergence of the earth, because of Mleccha domination, is present in records from thirteenth-fourteenth centuries. I shall give below excerpts from literary and epigraphic records of the period, both to illustrate how several images were made to converge in the literary idiom, and to make the point about counter-representation clearer.

The first reference I make is to Madhurā-vijaya, which, as mentioned earlier, was a Mahākāvyava written by Gangādevi, in the second half of the fourteenth century, in celebration of the victory of her husband Kampana over the Turuskas of Madurai. The narration,\[^{33}\] providing an elaborate commentary on the nature of Turuṣka rule in Madurai, is done by a mysterious lady, the gift of a sword by whom enables Kampana in the end to kill the Turuṣka ruler:

Vyāghrapuri had truly become the habitation of tigers where men lived formerly; the dome of the central shrine had become so dilapidated that it was only the hood of Ādiseśa that protected the image of Raṅganātha from falling. The Lord of Gajāranya, who is said to have killed an elephant to obtain its skin for a garment, was reduced to a similar condition because of its being deprived of clothes.\[^{34}\]

\[^{32}\]Ibid. Inscriptions also refer to installation of new images to replace broken images. One can cite in this context the evidence of a Kiradu (west Rajasthan) inscription of 1178-9 which records the installation of an image by the wife of a subordinate official Tejapāla working under Mahārājaputra Madanabrahma, ruler of Kirāṭa-kopa (Kiradu), during the time of Cautukya Bhīrnadeva, to replace an image broken by the Turuṣkās, D.R. Bhāndarkar, ‘A List of Inscriptions’, p. 56, no. 381.

\[^{33}\]The citations made here are not extracts from the translation of the text; they are paraphrases, taken from publications cited below.

\[^{34}\]Chandra Prabha, op. cit., p. 339.

The continuation of the narrative is in a similar vein:

The temples in the land have fallen into neglect as worship in them has been stopped. Within their walls the frightful howls of jackals have taken the place of the sweet reverberations of the mridanga. Like the Turuṣkās who know no limits, the Kaveri has forgotten her ancient boundaries and brings frequent destruction with her floods. The sweet odour of the sacrificial smoke and the chant of the Vedas have deserted the villages (agrāharas) which are now filled with the foul smell of roasted flesh and the fierce noises of the ruffianly Turuṣkās. The suburban gardens of Madura present a most painful sight; many of their beautiful coconut palms have been cut down; and on every side are seen rows of stakes from which swing strings of human skulls strung together. The Tamraparni is flowing red with the blood of the slaughtered cows. The Veda is forgotten and justice has gone into hiding; there is not left any trace of virtue or nobility in the land and despair is writ large on the faces of the unfortunate Drāviḍas.\[^{35}\]

The calamity, of which man and nature are both perceived to be agents, is made to be of cosmic proportions, and this is what links it up with the image of the recovery of the earth which became submerged in the ocean as a result of Mleccha rule, entitling its rescuer identity with the Primeval Boar (Mahā-Varāhā). The Annavarappadu plates of 1385 and 1401, from the West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh, refer to king Vema of the Reddi family as having been ‘praised as the Primeval Boar (Mahā-Varāhā) by all the learned for his act of lifting up the country that was submerged under the Mleccha... ocean; the land of the Andhra shone brilliantly, and while this king was lawfully ruling (the earth), there flourished all the sāstras and Vedas and hundreds of sacrifices were performed’.\[^{36}\]

‘Blinding blackness, to which the earth passed’ afflicted by the Turuṣkās, is another metaphor to underscore the calamity of Mleccha rule. It is used in another inscription from Andhra, the Vilasa Grant of Prolaya Nāyaka, discovered near Pithapuram in East Godavari


disturb the to abandon their religious practices; the cultivators were despoiled anekair-bahudhå-vibhakte.)

Many of their victims died of terror to that time kept under check, flourished under them, as enveloped in the Turuska Jiimadagnya (ParaSurama).

People of the earth ... when the Sun, viz., Yayati, Nabhaga the people were overturned and broken; the were impoverished and ruined. None dared to lay claim to anything, were completely forgotten. While king Prataparudra was ruling the kingdom, bitter hostility arose between him and Ahammada suratrii:za, who was the Yama (Death) to the kings, stamped out the remnants of the royal families left destroyed by Jåmadagnya (ParaSuråma). Although Prataparudra vanquished that suratrii:za who had an army of 9,000 horses seven times, he had to submit to the Turuska at last ... owing to the decrease of the good fortunes of the people of the earth ... when the Sun, viz., Prataparudra set, the world was enveloped in the Turuska darkness. The evil (adharma), which he had up to that time kept under check, flourished under them, as the conditions were very favourable for its growth. The cruel wretches subjected the rich to torture for the sake of their wealth. Many of their victims died of terror at the very sight of their vicious countenances; the Bråhimanas were compelled to abandon their religious practices; the images of the Gods were overturned and broken; the agrohåras of the learned confiscated; the cultivators were despoiled of the fruits of their labour, and their families were impoverished and ruined. None dared to lay claim to anything, whether it was a piece of property or one's own life. To those despicable wretches wine was the ordinary drink, beef the staple food and the slaying of the Yavanas the favourite pastime. The land of Tilüga, left without a protector, suffered destruction from the Yavanas, like a forest subjected to devastating wild fire.

King Prola of the Musunûri family of the fourth or the Śudra varna, the grant goes on to state, destroyed the power of these Yavanas and re-established order in society:

The very people who suffered at the hands of the Yavanas sought protection under him, and turned against them and put them to death. Having overcome the Yavanas in this fashion, he restored to Bråhinanas their ancient agrohåras confiscated by them, and revived the performance of the sacrifices, the smoke issuing from the firepits of which spreading over the countryside cleared it of the pollution caused by the movements of those evil-doers. The agriculturists surrendered willingly a sixth of the produce of the soil to the king; and he set his hand to the task of repairing the damages caused by the Pàrasikas.

The Madhurå-vijaya and the epigraphic records from Andhra that I have cited all talk about calamity; in addition to other traits of disorder, the calamity takes the form of an end to the recitation of the Vedas, destruction and neglect of temples, decline of the settlements of the Bråhinanas and so on. The Vilasa grant describes the collapse of an ideal social order in comprehensive terms, and the above traits are the chief traits of the order which is restored: this is a feat comparable to the lifting of the earth submerged in the ocean. It is a feat highlighted by portraying the magnitude of the calamity, of the total destruction of what is perceived as valuable in society, brought about by the rule of the Yavanas.

The description of the devastation, whether portrayed in the Madhurå-vijaya or the Vilasa grant will be, and has been, commonly taken to represent the one and exclusive reality of Yavana rule; the return to the old order, similarly, is taken to represent the reality of a liberation. It needs to be seen, however, that the image of the Turuska/Yavana suratråna and of his community as the destroyer of the existing social order is what may be called counter-representation of the suratråna as the perpetuator of that social

57 N. Venkataramanayya and M. Somasekhara Sharma, 'Vilasa Grant'.