
ANCIENT SINDHU AND SAUVĪRA

Author(s): B. D. Mirchandani

Source: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 1976, Vol. 57, No. 1/4 (1976), pp. 81-93

Published by: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41692236>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*

JSTOR

ANCIENT SINDHU AND SAUVĪRA

By

B. D. MIRCHANDANI

Sindhu and Sauvīra are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* and elsewhere in Sanskrit literature as two of the countries of Bhāratavarṣa, but with regard to their locations there is no agreement among scholars. Where exactly lay these two territorial divisions of ancient India? On the evidence available, there seems to me little doubt that both Sindhu and Sauvīra were parts of the area which formed the Punjab province of undivided India.

Sindhu and Sauvīra are usually mentioned together or conjointly as Sindhu-Sauvīra. Their peoples—the Sindhus and Sauvīras¹—are also often mentioned in association or linked together as the Sindhu-Sauvīras. From this it is clear that Sindhu and Sauvīra were adjacent territories and their peoples near neighbours.

The *Mahābhārata* (III. 267. 8 ; VIII. 75. 11) refers to Jayadratha as king of the Sindhu-Sauvīras, and mentions that the Sindhus and Sauvīras fought on the side of the Kauravas at the Kurukṣetra battle.² The site of this famous battle lies in the Punjab, about 40 miles to the north-west of Panipat. PARGITER places the Sindhus and Sauvīras in the north-west of the *Madhyadeśa*, 'the Middle Country', denoting the whole of the Ganges basin from the Punjab as far east as the confines of Bihar.³

Baudhāyana Dharma-Sūtra, a work of high antiquity, refers to the Sauvīras as "of mixed origin and prescribes a sacrifice of expiation for travel amidst them" (*Sacred Books of the East*, XIV, p. 148). In a note MAX MÜLLER adds that "the Sauvīras probably dwelt in the south-west of the Punjab, near Multan." The country of the

¹ "The *Sibarae* of Pliny," says MC CRINDLE, "are undoubtedly the Sauvīras of the *Mahābhārata*" — *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*, p. 153 n.

² PARGITER, (*Ancient Indian Historical Tradition (A. I. H. T.)* p. 182) assigns the battle to about 950 B. C., while MORTON SMITH (*Dates and Dynasties in Earliest India*, pp. 6-7) fixed it "close to the year 975 B. C."

³ "The Nations of India at the battle of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas," *JRAS*, 1892, pp. 313, 333.

11 [*Annals*, B. O. R. I,]

Sauvīras, however, seems to have included Multan. For we read in the *Skanda Purāṇa* that the famous Narasimha shrine at Mūlsthāna or Multan stood on the banks of the river Devikā.⁴ From the *Agni Purāṇa*, again, we learn that the Devikā flowed through the realm of the Sauvīras.⁵ PARGITER has identified the Devikā with the present day Deeg, a tributary of the Rāvī.⁶

The term "Sindhu" is significant, and suggests that it designated a country which either lay along the river Indus or through which that river flowed. Sauvīra, on the other hand, is said to have been named after king Suvīra of the Anu tribe⁷ "The Ānavas", says PARGITER (*A. I. H. T.*, p. 264), "divided into two branches. One branch headed by Uśīnara established separate kingdoms on the eastern borders of the Panjab, namely, those of the Yaudheyas, Ambaśthas, Navarāṣṭra and the city Kṛmila; and his famous son Śīvi Auśīnara originated the Śivis in Śivapura and, extending his conquests westwards, founded through his four sons, the kingdoms of the Vṛṣadarbhas, Madras (or Madrakas), Kekayas (or Kaikeyas) and Suvīras (or Sauvīras), thus occupying the whole of the Punjab, except the north-west corner.⁸ The Druhyus ruled in the Punjab at that time, so that Śīvi and his sons must have driven them back into that corner, which became known as Gāndhāra after the Druhyu king Gāndhāra." In another passage (at p. 137) he says: "It has been a universal practice to name countries, towns, mountains and rivers, especially in newly developed regions, after discoverers, conquerors, founders and celebrated men, and the same method must have been adopted by the Aryans who conquered North India and founded new kingdoms and towns there."

Alberuni, in his work on India which he completed in 1030 A. D. , observes that the names in Sanskrit topographical lists are mostly obsolete, not those by which the countries are now known, and twice he equates Sauvīra with "Multan and Jahrāvar" (SACHAU, *Alberuni's India*, pp. 298, 300, 302). The latter is presumably Jhārawār, which

⁴ *Prabhāsakṣetra-Māhātmya*, ch. 278.

⁵ *Agni Purāṇa*, translated by M. N. DUTTA, II, p. 271.

⁶ *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, translated by F. E. PARGITER, p. 292 n.

⁷ *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 99, 23-4; *Matsya Purāṇa*, 48, 19-20; *Harivamśa*, 31, 1680-1.

⁸ According to MORTON SMITH (*op. cit.*, p. 425) prince Vṛṣadarbha and his brothers lived about the year 1320 B. C.

according to another passage from Alberuni as interpreted by RAVERTY⁹ lies at the junction of the Jhelum and the Chenab, nearly 50 miles above Multan. Alberuni's equation ("Sauvira, i. e. Multan and Jahra'var") is of importance as showing exactly where Indian tradition placed the Sauviras, and it is in general agreement with the rest of the evidence. It may then fairly be presumed that the Sauvira comprised the district around and above Multan, lying to the east of the Indus in the Punjab.¹⁰

The Sindhu country, as has already been mentioned, also lay in the Punjab. PARGITER (*A. I. H. T.*, p. 271) observes that "in the *Rāmāyana* the Punjab kingdom of Kekaya, Sindhu and Sauvira...are specially named among the invitations sent out for Daśaratha's sacrifice." In *Raghuvamśa* (XV. 87-9), Kālidāsa makes Rāma give Bharata the Sindhudeśa; the latter then conquers Gāndhāra which he presents to his sons, who proceed to found the cities of Puṣkalāvati and Takṣaśilā (Taxila). Sindhudeśa here can stand only for Sindhu country in the Punjab. So also in Pāṇini's *Śloka* (IV. 3.93) which mentions the name of Takṣaśilā with that of the Sindhudeśa. The *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* list of the North-western peoples mentions the Sindhus with the Sauviras, Madrakas, Śatadruja (dwellers of the Sutlej valley), who all belonged to the Punjab, and with the Gabalas and Gāndhāras.¹¹ "The Sindhu-Deśa", says Anandoram BAROOAH in his *Ancient Geography of India* (pp. 12-13), "meant the country of the upper Indus."

The celebrated Chinese pilgrim, Hiuen Tsiang, or, as the name is rendered in modern Pekinese, Yuan Chwang, visited in 641 A. D. a kingdom to the west of the Indus, which he calls *Sin-tu* and which apparently lay in the Punjab.¹² He travelled there from Gurjjara (*Ku-che-lo*), by which name the present district of Mārwar in

⁹ "The Mihrān of Sind and its Tributaries," *JASB*, LXI, 1892, p. 219. At the present day the Jhelum and Chenab unite some 80 miles to the north-west of Multan.

¹⁰ RAYACHAUDHURI (*Political History of Ancient India*, pp. 619-20) is assuredly mistaken in his assertion that "the evidence of Alberuni leaves no room for doubt that the northern limits of Sauvira reached Multan."

¹¹ See PARGITER's translation, pp. 314-17. *Vāyu* and *Matsya* also group the Sindhus with these peoples, but read Yavanas for Gabalas, which word, says PARGITER, "denoted the Greeks originally."

¹² BEAL, *Si-yu-ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World*, II, pp. 271-75; WATERS, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, II, pp. 252-54.

S. W. Rajputana was then known.¹³ From Gurjjara, that is its capital, *Pi-lo-mo-lo* (= Bhillamāla, now Bhinmāl or Śrīmāla, 50 miles to the north-west of Mt. Abu),¹⁴ he says, "proceeding northward through wild deserts and dangerous defiles about 1900 *li*,¹⁵ crossing the great river *Sin-tu* we come to the kingdom of *Sin-tu*." And again: "Going from this eastward 900 *li* or so, crossing the Sindhu river and proceeding along the eastern bank we come to the kingdom of *Mu-lo-san-p'u-lu*", i. e. Mūlasthānapura (Multan).¹⁶ It appears then that Sindhu and Multan were neighbouring kingdoms in the Punjab, lying respectively to the west and the east of the Indus. It is interesting to note that Yaśodhara, the 13th century commentator of Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, also says that the Sindhudeśa lay to the west of the Indus (*Sindhunāmā nadah paścimena Sindhu-deśah*).¹⁷

Hiuen Tsiang thus describes *Sin-tu*: "This country is about 7000 *li* in circuit; the capital city, called *P'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo*, is about 30 *li* round. The soil is favourable for the growth of cereals and produces abundance of wheat and millet. It also abounds in gold and silver and native copper. It is suitable for the breeding of oxen, sheep, camels, mules, and other kinds of beasts ... They find here a great quantity of salt, which is red like cinnabar; also white salt, black salt and *rock salt*. In different places, both far and near, this salt is used for medicine ... There are several hundred *saṅghārāmas*, occupied by about 10,000 priests ... There are about thirty Deva temples, in which sectaries of various kinds congregate. The king is of the Śūdra (*Shu-t'o-lo*) caste. He is by nature, honest and sincere, and he reverences

¹³ DEX, *Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India*, p. 272.

¹⁴ *Rajputana Gazetteer*, I, pp. 193-94; *Indian Antiquary*, 1888, XVII, p. 192.

¹⁵ PÉRE GAUBIL (*Histoire de l'Astronomie Chinoise*, I, p. 77) has shown that the Chinese *li*, shortly after the time of Hiuen Tsiang, was equal to 329 metres or 1079.12 English feet, that is 4.88 *li* to the mile — or say in round numbers 5.

¹⁰ WATTERS (II, p. 254) merely mentions that the pilgrim "went east about 900 *li* and crossing the Sindh river to the east bank came to *Mu-lo-san-p'u-lu* country.

¹⁷ *Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra with the commentary of Yaśodhara* (Benares edition), p. 295. Hwui Li, the biographer of Hiuen Tsiang, also places *Sin-tu* to the west of the Indus, though he makes him travel to that country from 'O-fan-ch'a and not, as the pilgrim himself relates, from Gurjjara. The country of 'O-fan-ch'a or *A-fan-t'u* (= Avāṇḍa) corresponds, as I have shown elsewhere (*J. I. H.*, 1967, XLV, pp. 343-49), with the Baluch province of Kacchi or Kachh Gandāva bordering on the north-west of Sindh and the west of the Punjab. — See BEAL, *The Life of Hiuen - Tsiang by Hwui Li*, p. 151.

the law of Buddha. When Tathāgata was in the world, he frequently passed through this country, therefore Aśoka-rāja has founded several tens of *stūpas* where the sacred traces of his presence were found By the side of the river Sindh, along the flat marshy lowlands for some thousands *li*, there are several hundreds of thousands (*a very great many*) of families settled. They are of an unfeeling and hasty temper, and are given to bloodshed only. They give themselves exclusively to tending cattle, and from this derive their livelihood"¹⁸

Hiuen Tsiang's mention of rock-salt shows that the *Sin-tu* kingdom included the Salt Range or rather a portion of it. The Salt Range, with its enormous deposits of rock salt, from which the range derives its name, extends for about 152 miles from the Jhelum valley on the east to the Indus on the west, and crops up again beyond that river. It lies entirely in the Punjab. Nor anywhere else lower down the Indus could rock-salt be found.

"Sindhu" was evidently the name of the tract which the *Sin-tu* kingdom embraced, and it derived this name no doubt from the river Indus on which it bordered "for some thousand *li*" as attested by our pilgrim. Tribes in India, it is true, gave their names to districts, but Sindhu was not one of those districts. Nor was Sindhu an ethnic term of a distinct race or tribe as is often supposed. Hiuen Tsiang's *Sin-tu* kingdom seems to have occupied the tract of country now known as Derajāt,¹⁹ together with some area to the south of it. Derajāt comprises the long, narrow strip of territory bounded on the west by the Sulaiman range (which divides the Punjab from Baluchistan) and on the east by the river Indus, below the Salt Range to the point where that river is joined by the united waters of the Punjab. It is worth noting that the term for rock-salt in Indian languages is *Sindhu* in various modifications (e. g. *Sindhu lavana* in Sanskrit; *Saindhava* in Bengali, Gujarati and Marathi; *saindav* in Hindi; *sindhā* in Punjabi and *sendho lūṇ* in Sindhi), which it possibly owes to its association with this ancient Sindhu country.

¹⁸ BEAL, II, pp. 272-73.

¹⁹ It is so designated from the three principal towns in the tract, namely, Dera Futh Khan, Dera Ismail Khan and Dera Ghazi Khan; the term Derajāt being Arabic plural of Dera. Herbert EDWARDS (*A Year on the Punjab Frontier*, I, p. 31) applies the epithet Derajāt to the whole of this tract extending as far south as the northern boundary of modern Sindh.

Scholars, misled by similarity of the names *Sindhu* and *Sindh*, have generally supposed that Hiuen Tsiang's account of *Sindhu* (*Sin-tu* in Chinese transcription) relates to the lower Indus valley kingdom of *Sindhu* with its capital at Alor, and ruled then by Brahman Chach who usurped the throne in 622 A. D. when the last Rai king died. No wonder that they find the pilgrim's account perplexing. HAIG (*The Indus Delta Country*, pp. 34-5), for instance, remarks: "Hiuen Tsiang's *Sindh*, in fact, is not the *Sindh* of any period known to history, and his description of it is wholly irreconcilable with the facts which we gather from the contemporary history embodied in the *Tārīkh-i-Hind wa Sind*.²⁰ He places the capital to the west of the Indus, whereas we know that it was on the east bank, its ruins and the long dried-up channel of the river being still to be seen in attestation of the fact. He calls it *P'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo*, which Chinese scholars take to represent such names as Vichavapur or Vismapur, or Balmapur; and General Cunningham, taking rather an unwarrantable liberty with the Chinese syllables, turns into Abhijānwapur.²¹ All these names, unknown in *Sindh* and unmentioned in its histories, serve only to mystify us, and the case becomes worse when Hiuen Tsiang says that Multan was only 900 *li* or so — that is, some 150 miles — distant from the capital of *Sindh*, and to the east of it, the fact being that Multan was 250 miles from it and north-east of it. To all of this must be added his statement that the king was a Shudra (*Shu-t'o-lo*), while from the sources above-mentioned we gather that at this time (about 641 A. D.) a Brahman ruled *Sindh*."

²⁰ This work, more commonly known as the *Chach-Nāma*, is a Persian version made in 1216 A. D., of an original Arabic chronicle, now lost, which ELLIOT thinks was composed not very long after Muhammad bin Kasim's conquest of *Sindh* in 712 A. D. Though mainly a record of the course of events during the Arab General's invasion, the work in its earlier portion treats of *Sindh* when it was ruled by Hindu kings of the Rai dynasty and their Brahman successors and takes us back to the closing years of the fifth century A. D. This Hindu kingdom of *Sindh* that was subverted by Islam comprised not only the modern province of *Sindh* but also Baluchistan and a considerable part of the Punjab. Selected extracts from the *Chach-Nāma* translated into English by ELLIOT appear in his *History of India as told by its own Historians* (1, pp. 133 ff.), while Kalichbeg's *Chuchnamah* is a complete English translation of the work.

²¹ In a footnote HAIG adds: "There is a village named Abhijāno, a little to the south of the old capital, which suggested this restoration to General Cunningham. He says Abhijan is Sanskrit for 'fame,' 'and is not improbably connected with Hwen Thsang's *F'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo*'. (*Anc. Geog.*, p. 259). The connection seems to leave something to be desired in the way of explanation."

It seems, therefore, certain that Hiuen Tsiang's *Sin-tu* could not have been Sindh.

However, various attempts have been made to make the pilgrim's account of *Sin-tu* fit the kingdom of Sindh somehow. To that end, HAIG (*op. cit.*, p. 35) supposed that Chach by his conquests must have extended his dominion as far north as the Salt Range and that the pilgrim probably made a mistake in his bearing when he said that the capital was to the west of Multan.²² He, however, left unexplained the pilgrim's statement that the king was a Śūdra. CUNNINGHAM (*Ancient Geography of India*, pp. 286-87) turned *P'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo* into Abhijāuwapur and assumed that in 641 A. D. the last Rai king of Sindh was still reigning. "What may be surmised", wrote VAIDYA (*History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, I, p. 19), "is that Sāhāsi was still on the throne of Sind when Hiuen Tsiang visited the country in 641 A. D."²³ Vincent SMITH (*Early History of India* p. 369) insists that "the Buddhist king of the Śūdra caste must be Sihras Rāi," that "*P'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo* was Aror or Alor" and that the usurpation of the Brahman Chach was an event which took place in 616 A. D. LAMBRICK (*Sind*, p. 148), a recent inquirer into the geography of Sindh, who takes Hiuen Tsiang's *Sin-tu* to be the "modern Upper Sind", suggests that "apart from the possibility that Alor had some other name, . . . the Indus is not likely to have been flowing east of Alor at that time." All these conjectures and suppositions were entirely unwarranted, for the pilgrim distinctly states that *Sin-tu* was a country to the west of the Indus and opposite to Multan, that is to say in the Punjab.

The distinction between the Sindhudeśa in the Punjab and the lower Indus country of Sindh appears clearly from Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsamhitā* (XIV, verses 32-33), where that sixth century Indian

²² WATFER (II, p. 254), on the other hand, denounced as impossible the restoration of the Chinese transcription *Mu-lo-san-p'u-lo* as *Mūlasthāna-pura*, i. e. modern Multan. But Hiuen Tsiang's description of the famous temple of the Sun accords with what we are told of Multan in the *Chach-Nāma* and by the Arab geographers.

²³ The *Chach-Nāma* makes no allusion to the caste of the Rai king of the Sindh, but mentions that the last Rai was a brother of the ruler of Chitor. From this VAIDYA infers that the Rais were Śūdras. The then ruling family of Chitor, according to him, was of Mauryan origin and the Mauryas, he states, "were of course Śūdras."

astronomer mentions Sindhu-Sauvira as well as Siddhu in the list of countries. The distinction is repeated by Alberuni (I, pp. 300, 302), though SACHAU fails to join Sindhu-Sauvira and Sindhu occurs twice in the list.²⁴

P'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo, the Chinese pilgrim's name for the capital of *Sin-tu*, has puzzled all scholars. In 1861, JULIEN transcribed it as *Vijambha-pura*.²⁵ D. C. SIRCAR identified *Sin-tu* with "parts of modern Sind to the west of the Indus" and offers *Vīśrambha-pura* as the Indian original of the name of the capital,²⁶ however, very probable that *P'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo* is a transcription of the Sanskrit *Vṛṣadarbha-pura* or a contracted (Prākṛit or Pāli) form of that name in general use. If my surmise be correct, there can be no doubt that the city here indicated by the pilgrim was the same place which was anciently the capital of the kingdom of the Vṛṣadarbhas,²⁷ and which appears to have been called Vṛṣadarbhapura after the founder of the kingdom. Although the descendants of the Anu Prince Vṛṣadarbha were probably no longer reigning over this part of the country when Hiuen Tsiang visited it, its metropolis had, however, preserved its ancient name of Vṛṣadarbha-pura.²⁸

²⁴ It is curious that KERN in his translation of the *Bṛhatsamhitā* renders the second Sindhu as "the Indus" — *JRAS*, 1871, V, p. 84.

²⁵ "In 1853, M. Stanislaus Julien in his translation of the life of Hwen-Tsang wrote the word as *Vijanava-pura*. He translated it in 1858 in his translation of the travels of Hwen-Tsang as *Vighava-pura*. Finally, in his *Methode pour dechiffrer et transcrire Les noms sanscrits qui se rencontrent dans les livres chinois*, he writes *Vijambha-pura*. In 1853 and 1858 M. Julien accompanied his transcriptions with a note of interrogation; in his later publication he gives the new transcription as definitive". — *Ind. Ant.*, VIII, 1879, p. 336.

²⁶ *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, p. 153.

²⁷ An alternative or popular designation of his ancient kingdom of the Vṛṣadarbhas seems to have been Sindhu, and it occupied probably much the same area as did the *Sin-tu* kingdom visited and described by Hiuen Tsiang, namely, the tract presently known as Derajāt. Having failed to conjecture this, PARGITER in his article "Earliest Indian Traditional History" (*JRAS*, 1914, pp. 267 ff.) remarked that the position of the Vṛṣadarbha kingdom was "uncertain." CUNNINGHAM, quoting LASSEN (*Pentapotamia Indica*, p. 13), in the *Archaeological Survey Report*, 1862-65, II, p. 13, however, writes: "The name of Vṛṣadarbha is perhaps preserved in the *Brisbarita* or *Brisambritae* of Pliny, who being coupled with the *Taxillae* must have been near neighbours of the *Sauviras*."

²⁸ Traces of this name may be recognized in *Vitabhaya* or *Vibhaya*, which according to the Jainas designated the capital of the ancient kingdom of Sindhu-Sauvira. See *Ind. Ant.* 1878, VII, p. 275; J. C. JAIN, *Life in Ancient Indian as depicted in the Jain Canons*, p. 251.

It remains to settle the position of Vṛṣadarbha-pura (*P'i-shen-p'o-pu-lo* in Chinese transcription). That ancient city has disappeared and the pilgrim's description of the routes (i) from *Sin-tu* to Gurjjara and (ii) from *Sin-tu* to Multan is the only data to guide us in attempting to fix its site. Distance and direction given by the pilgrim as from country to country are, in the opinion of scholars, almost always the distance and direction from one capital to the next capital; and I propose to treat them as such. Let me take up route (ii) first. From *Sin-tu*, that is its capital, Hiuen Tsiang tells us that he departed eastward, crossed the Indus, and then proceeding along its eastern bank—presumably in a *northerly* direction—reached Multan.²⁹ It follows, therefore, that Vṛṣadarbha-pura lay to the south-west of Multan, and the distance, 900 *li*, which the pilgrim mentions, represents probably the length of his journey in the two directions—first east and then north. The abbreviated account in WATTERS'S *Yuan Chwang* (II, p. 254) is misleading in that it suggests that the capital of *Sin-tu* was 900 *li*, or some 180 miles, to the west of Multan. If it had been, we should have to look for it on the other side of the Sulaiman range, in the dry and almost barren highlands of Baluchistan—a location unthinkable for the capital of a kingdom lying on the Indus. It seems to me far more likely that Vṛṣadarbha-pura stood on the west bank of the Indus, a little to the south of its junction with the Panjuad,³⁰ in the present Dera Ghazi Khan District. From there the pilgrim's journey to Multan could have been 180 miles long, considering the many detours which he probably had to make in this marshy, riverine tract. I now turn to the pilgrim's route from Gurjjara to Multan. From Gurjjara, that is its capital, Bhinmāl, a place distant about 50 miles north-west from Mt. Abu, Hiuen Tsiang says he travelled 1900 *li*, or some 380 miles northward “through wild deserts and dangerous defiles”, and then crossing the river Indus to the west reached the *Sin-tu* kingdom or, as he

²⁹ The Indus of the present day flows 30 miles to the west of Multan. In the time of Hiuen Tsiang, it followed probably to the east of its present course. As CUNNINGHAM (*Anc Geog.* p. 288) has pointed out “the gradual *westing* of all the Punjab river which flows from north to south is only the natural result of the earth's continued revolution from west to east, which gives their waters a permanent bias towards the western bank.”

³⁰ The five great rivers from which the Punjab takes its name are the Jhelum, the Chenab, the Ravi, the Beas and the Sutlej. After various junctions these unite to form the *Panjuad*, literally ‘the five streams’. It unites with the Indus near Mithankot. — See *Punjab Gazetteer*, I, p. 197,

probably meant, its capital. This bearing and distance from Bhinmāl take us to the southern section of D. G. K. District. Mithankot town in D. G. K. District, situated close to the west bank of the Indus, not many miles to the south of its confluence with the Panjnad, is about 300 miles as the crow flies from Bhinmāl. The actual marching distance across the sandy Marwar desert would, however, be considerably more. It seems to me that the capital of Hiuen Tsiang's *Sin-tu* occupied a position on the Indus, more or less similar to that of Mithankot, it being fairly certain that the river then flowed a good deal to the east of its present course. That, I think, is a fair inference from the two statements of the pilgrim. This view as to the position of Vṛṣadarbha-pura derives some support from the statement of the pilgrim's biographer, Hwui Li, namely, that *Sin-tu* lay 700 *li*, or some 140 miles, to the east of 'O-fan-ch'a. The country of 'O-fan-ch'a, as already stated, corresponds to the province of Kachhi in Baluchistan, while its unnamed capital is identifiable with modern Gandāva.³¹ This bearing and distance from Gandāva also lead us to the southern part of D. G. K. District, in which I have located the metropolis of *Sin-tu*. Thirteen centuries have effaced all traces of Vṛṣadarbha-pura. Like many other places on the Indus, it has probably been swallowed up by that insatiable river. Its precise position, therefore, cannot be assigned.

Some writers, relying on certain Buddhist texts, suggest that Sauvīra extended to the south of Multan and included some part or other of modern Sindh. According to these texts the capital of Sauvīra was *Roruka* or *Roruva*,³² which LÜDERS identified with Alor in Sindh. JOHNSTON has convincingly shown that this identification is wrong. "Rauruka, unknown outside Buddhist texts", he says, "is identified by Lüders (*SBPAW*, 1930, p. 57) with the old site of Aror near Rohri in Sind; the only positive evidence, such as it is, of its real existence is its mention in the *Māhāmāyuri*'s list of Yakṣas, verse 34 (Levi, *J. A.*, 1915, 1, p. 39) which suggests a more northerly location. For all the places mentioned immediately before or after it, which can be identified, are in Gāndhāra or the neighbourhood."³³ Then again, the *Milinda Pañho*, in enumerating a few ports and countries

³¹ See the present writer's article "On Hiuen Tsiang's Travels in Baluchistan", *J. I. H.*, 1967, XLV, pp. 343-49.

³² *Dialogues of the Buddha*, tr. by T. W. & C. A. F. RAYS DAVIDS, II, p. 269-70; *Jātaka*, tr. by C. B. COWELL, III, p. 280.

³³ "Demetrias in Sind?", *JRAS*, 1939, pp. 225-26.

in all parts of Asia calls one of them *Sovira*, which could be understood as a port and town in the *Sauvira* country.³⁴ RAYACHAUDHURI (*P. H. A. I.*, I, p. 620), for instance, says: "Part of the modern territory of Sind may have been included in *Sauvira* whose southern limits undoubtedly reached the sea because *Milinda Pañho* mentions it in a list of countries where ships do congregate." *Sauvira*, however, was a country far too inland to boast a seaport. Separate mention of *Sindhu-Sauvira* and *Sindhu* by *Varāhamihira* also precludes the assumption that *Sauvira* included a part of *Sindh*. Further, as JOHNSTON in the article already cited remarks: "This portion of the work is a late addition made in Ceylon and its evidentiary value is small; it can hardly be held to establish anything without corroboration to place the meaning beyond doubt," *Sopāra* (ancient *Sūrparaka*), 37 miles north of Bombay, from where, according to *Bāveru Jātaka*, ships used to sail to *Bāveru* (*Bābiru* or *Babylon*) can with reason perhaps be identified as the *Sovira* of the Buddhist text.

TARN (*The Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 142), in connection with his theory that the Graeco-Bactrian king *Demetrius* (c. 184–167 B. C.) founded in *Sindh* a city and port called *Demetrias* after him, affirmed that the "*Sauvira-Sindhus* . . . at this time were on the *Indus* and occupied the *Delta*."³⁵ That suggestion has been ably refuted by JOHNSTON. On carefully examining all the evidence in Indian literature bearing on the *Sauviras* he came to two conclusions:

³⁴ RHYS DAVIDS, *The Questions of King Milinda*, II, p. 269. The relevant passage reads: "Just O King as a shipowner, who has become wealthy by constantly levying freight in some seaport town, will be able to traverse the high seas, and go to Vanga, or Takkola, or China, or *Sovira*, or *Surat*, or the *Koromandal* coast, or *Surat*, or *Further India*, or any other place where ships do congregate — Just so, O King ...".

³⁵ In *JRAS*, 1940, pp. 179–80, TARN argues thus: "The two names *Sauviras* and *Sindhus*, are generally conjoined, sometimes forming one word; *Lüders* said they were always found together ... Certainly the *Mahābhārata* appears to connect the *Sauviras* with peoples of the north, which means that there was a tradition that at some period they had been in the north; but the repetition of this tradition in the epic and later literature does not necessarily mean that the *Sauviras* were on the upper *Indus* in the time of each several writer; it may, and probably does, mean that some Indian writers did exactly what Hellenistic writers were so found of doing — quoting their predecessors without regard to the circumstances of their own day." Evidence is, however, completely lacking to support the suggestion that the *Sauviras* were nomadic and by the second century B. C. had worked their way from the upper *Indus* to the *Delta*.

“ firstly that at quite an early date the Sauvīras ceased to be recognizable as a tribe, their name being applied to a country, and secondly that at the earliest period the name may have indicated the part of the Indus valley immediately below Gandhāra, and later certainly meant the area around and above Multan.”⁸⁶ And he adds (at page 239) that “ there is no evidence to show that Sauvīra was ever identified with any other area than that lying along the Indus north of Multan.” Nor were the Sindhus the people of the lower Indus valley, their habitat being the tract along the upper course of the Indus, now known as Derajāt.

The only Indian epigraph which mentions Sindhu-Sauvīra is the inscription of Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman, engraved about the year 150 A. D. on the famous rock at Girnar.⁸⁷ The inscription, which was executed by Rudradāman’s deputy who held authority over Saurāṣṭra, records the construction of a new dam on the Sudarśana lake in place of the old one built in the time of Candragupta Maurya (300 B. C.), which had burst. JACKSON, in the *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency* (Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 36), writes : “ The poetic eulogies of Rudradāman appear to contain a share of fact . . . Another portion of the inscription claims for him the overlordship of Ākrāvanti, Anūpa, Ānarta, Saurāṣṭra, Śvabhara, Maru, Kachha *Sindhu-Sauvīra*, Kukura, Aparānta and Nishāda ; that is roughly the country from Bhilsa in the east to Sindh in the west and from about Ābu in the north to the Konkan in the south including the peninsula of Cutch and Kāthiāvāḍa.” Further, he explained that “ Sindhu-Sauvīra are two names usually found together. Sindhu is the modern Sind and Sauvīra may have been part of Upper Sind.” Pandit BHAGVANLAL INDRAJI and Dr. BÜHLER referring to this inscription in the *Indian Antiquary* (VIII, p. 338), state that “ Sindhu-Sauvīra probably comprised modern Sindh and a portion of the Multan districts.” Speaking of the same inscription D. C. SIRCAR (*Ancient Malwa and Vikramaditya Tradition*, p. 89) says that “ Sindhu denotes the western part of the lower Indus valley,” while Sauvīra “ represents the eastern part of the lower Indus valley.” The expression Sindhu-Sauvīra, however, denoted, as I have shown, a region in the Punjab lying on both sides of the upper Indus. It seems, therefore, extremely improbable that Rudradāman exercised suzerainty over any part of the lower Indus valley.

⁸⁶ *Art. cit.*, p. 231.

⁸⁷ *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VIII, p. 36.

From the evidence adduced above it seems reasonable to conclude that Sindhu and Sauvira were neighbouring countries in the Punjab, lying respectively to the west and east of the river Indus. Sindhu comprised roughly the tract of country at present known as Darajāt, while Sauvira embraced the district around and above Multan. Scholars generally take Sindhu to be the lower Indus country of Sindh, but there is nothing beyond similarity of the two names to recommend that view. Nor did Sauvira extend southwards of Multan, or include some part or other of Sindh, as suggested by some writers.