

M.R. Singh¹⁶ and U.N. Roy,¹⁷ however, identify the Vāhlika in the Panjab and U.N. Roy goes further to identify the Vāhlikas with "Daivaputraśāhi-śāhānuśāhi" i.e. the Kidāra Kuśānas. But this seems contrary to the statement in the inscription that king Chandra had conquered the Vāhlikas in warfare, after having crossed the seven mouths of the river Indus.¹⁸

So far as the conquests of king Candra in the South are concerned we submit that it is an eulogy (praśasti) which may be of the conventional type and may not be entirely historical. The conventional claim is repeated by some later kings.¹⁹ In Line 5 of the Mandasor Stone Pillar Inscription we find that Yaśodharman (A.D. 525-35) boasts to have conquered the whole country to the west of the Paścima-payodhi and to the north of the Mahendra (cf. Mahendrācala in the Tirunelveli district).²⁰ We know that Candragupta II wielded a great influence in the south. His daughter Prabhāvatīguptā was married to the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II. There is some evidence to show that during the regency of Prabhāvatīguptā, Gupta officers exercised some control over the Vākāṭaka administration.²¹ Further Candragupta II arranged a marriage between his son and the daughter of Kākutsthavarman, the most powerful ruler of the Kadamba family in the Kanarese country of the Bombay Presidency.²²

Goyal's assumption that Candra was another name of Samudragupta is incorrect. We have criticised it earlier on linguistic and palaeographic considerations. Moreover, it looks funny that the name of Candragupta I, his son and his grandson alike should be the same. Utilising the evidence of Vāmana that Vasubandhu was the minister of Candraprakāśa, the son of Candragupta, Goyal quotes Majumdar²³ and takes Candragupta to be Candragupta I and regards Candraprakāśa as another name of Samudragupta. But Majumdar himself strikes a note of caution when he says that "It is not altogether impossible that Vasubandhu's patron belonged to this²⁴ or a similar local dynasty of Ayodhyā".²⁵ We cannot associate Vasubandhu with the Imperial Guptas unless we find any strong evidence of a positive nature.

Thus we see that the arguments raised by Goyal do not support his view that Samudragupta is to be identified with