

APPENDIX—I

A NOTE ON THE KING CANDRA OF THE MEHARAUĪ
IRON PILLAR INSCRIPTION

This iron pillar bearing the inscription of Candra was originally erected on a hill called Viṣṇupada near the Beas, but was brought to Meharaulī (Delhi) and was installed near the well-known Kutub Minar.¹ We also know of the transfer of the Aśokan pillars from Topra and Meerut to Delhi.²

Though many scholars³ have tried to identify Candra of this inscription, it remains a baffling problem. The generally accepted view is to identify him with Candragupta II.⁴

Goyal⁵ has identified Candra with Samudragupta. His argument is that the original name of the king was not Candra and in his support he quotes Fleet⁶ and Allan. His second contention is that whereas there is no evidence to prove that Candragupta II had any military success in Bengal, we have a positive reference in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription to Samataṭa, Ḍavāka and Kāmarūpa as the bordering (pratyanta) states of Samudragupta's empire. Goyal further argues that Candragupta II had suzerainty over Daivaputraṣāhiṣhānuṣāhis who ruled in that region. He also points out that Samudragupta had advanced victoriously to the south as far as Kāñcī while Candragupta II can at best be credited with matrimonial alliances or diplomatic activities alone in the South. Following Majumdar, Mookerji and Agrawala he holds that Candraprakāśa, son of Candragupta mentioned by the rhetorician Vāmana was no other than Samudragupta and thus concludes that Candra was another name of Samudragupta.

We cannot accept Goyal's view since his arguments stand on a weak edifice. We shall refute them one by one.

Fleet⁷ was misled by the reading 'Dhāvena' in line 6 which seems to be 'Bhāvena' as suggested by some scholars.