

XXIV.

SOME PROBLEMS OF ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY.

No. II: THE GURJARA EMPIRE.¹

BY A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, PH.D., C.I.E.

THE object of this essay is not so much to propound a new theory of my own, as to draw more prominent attention to one put forth by Mr. Devadatta Ramkrishna Bhandarkar in two papers contributed by him to the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1903. They are entitled *Gūrjaras and Epigraphic Notes and Questions, No. III*. Stated quite briefly, the theory is that the well-known 'Kings of Mahodaya' were Gūrjaras. Mr. Bhandarkar does not claim the whole credit of it for himself. Much of his material, as he himself admits, has been drawn by him from the *Bombay Gazetteer*. But he has added to it new material and fresh points of view, and worked up the whole into a consistent theory. To me it appears that, in the main, the theory is sound, and throws unexpected light on a period of Indian history until now very dark. I will first briefly explain the main positions of the theory, as I gather them from the two papers above referred to: the evidence, in detail, must be read in the papers themselves. Next, I shall set out, in detail, such further particulars as a closer examination of the contemporary records of that period appears to me to yield, partly in corroboration, partly in modification of Mr. Bhandarkar's theory.

I.

Up to the middle of the tenth century the country now known as Gujarat was called by the name of Laṭa.

¹ For No. I see *ante*, vol. for 1903, p. 545.

About that time the northern portion of the Laṭa country came under the domination of a people called Gūrjara.¹ From them it derived its new name Gurjaratrā, whence comes the modern form of the name Gujarat. At a much later date the name Gurjaratrā was extended to that portion of Laṭa which lay south of the Mahī river; and thus arose the modern acceptance of the name Gujarat as applicable to all the country lying to the north and the south of the Mahī.

The earliest date at which we hear anything about the Gūrjara people is about 585 A.D., when Prabhākara Vardhana, the father of Harsha Vardhana, is said to have defeated them. About fifty years later, 640 A.D., their country is described by Hiuen Tsiang under the name of Kiu-che-lo, and corresponds to Central and Northern Rajputana. About this time, 634 A.D., they submitted voluntarily (*E.I.* vi, 2) to the rising Chalukya power under Pulikeśin II.²

These circumstances point to a new arrival. The Gūrjaras were new immigrants, probably a Turki tribe, who in the middle of the sixth century took possession of what is now called Rajputana, and were attempting to expand eastward and southward. In the south they were, for a long time, restrained by the powerful empire of the Rāshtrakūṭas. But at last, towards the end of the tenth century, they succeeded, under the name of Chaulukyās, to force themselves into Northern Laṭa, to which they gave the name of Gujarat.

In the east they were checked by the equally powerful empire of Prabhākara and his son Harsha Vardhana. That empire collapsed in 646 A.D. For nearly a century and a half we hear nothing more about the eastward advance of the Gūrjaras. At the end of that quiescent period, about 783 A.D., a fresh effort was made by them under their chief Vatsarāja. He penetrated victoriously as far as Gauḍa and Vaṅga (Bihar and Bengal). But in the course of his

¹ In the records this name is spelt varyingly with *ñ* or with *u*.

² The Aihole inscription here refers to the three adjoining countries, Laṭa, Rajputana, and Malwa, as submitting to Pulikeśin II.

conquests he came into collision with the southern emperor, the Rāshtrakūṭa Dhruva, who defeated him and drove him back into his ancestral kingdom in Rajputana (Marwar). After this failure we hear again nothing more about the movements of the Gūrjaras; but they must have renewed the eastward advance, and must have been successful in it; for from 843 A.D. onwards we find their chiefs ruling a great northern empire from their capital at Mahodaya (Kanauj), and carrying on an intermittent warfare with the Rāshtrakūṭa rulers of the southern empire. The existence of these two great empires is testified to in Muhammadan records (about 916 A.D. by Abu Zaid, and 943 A.D. by Al Masūdi) as those of the *Juzr* (Gūrjara) and *Balhāra* (Vallabharāja, i.e. Rāshtrakūṭa). Of the Gūrjara emperors of Mahodaya, reigning during that period, Bhoja I, Mahendrapāla, and Vināyakapāla (or Mahipāla) are known from their dated land-grants and stone inscriptions.

These are the main outlines of Mr. Bhandarkar's theory. The crucial point of it is the correct reading of the dates occurring in the land-grants. Hitherto these dates have been read as 100, 155, and 188, referable to the Harsha era, and therefore equivalent to 706, 761, and 794 A.D.¹ Mr. Bhandarkar proposes to read them 900, 955, and 988, referable to the Vikrama era, and hence equivalent to 843, 899, and 931 A.D. I am convinced that Mr. Bhandarkar's readings are correct. Inspecting the facsimiles given in Bühler's Table IX, in his *Indian Palæography*, it will be seen that the multiples of 100 are formed by placing the unit figure on the right side of the hundred figure, either on the same level or a little below it. Now in the facsimile of the date of the Daulatpurā grant (*E.I.* v, 209), it will be noticed that the figure which has been read as 100 stands very considerably below the level of the rest of the writing. This proves that the figure cannot be read as a numeral standing by itself, but that it is intended to be a multiplicative figure qualifying some other numeral, which should

¹ For the sake of simplicity I give here, and throughout, only *single* equivalent years of the Christian era, which for the purpose in hand is quite sufficient.

stand on its left. Moreover, the figure itself has not much resemblance to any hitherto known figure for 100, while it exactly resembles some of the forms of the figure for 9, as shown in Bühler's table (see his Nos. 6, 11, 13 in his row for 9). It is evident, therefore, that the figure in question is that for 9, used as a multiplicator of another numeral figure; and this other figure, in fact, is clearly seen in the formula standing on the left of the figure for 9. It has been read as *srā* or *sro*. It is, however, really the figure for 100.¹ The two figures together, therefore, express the numeral 900 (i.e. 100×9).

In the facsimiles of the other two grants (*Ind. Ant.*, xv, 112 and 140) we can now clearly recognize the same figure 900, made up of the figure for 9 standing on the right side of, and on a level with, the figure for 100. The latter has been read as *tsrā* (Dr. Fleet) or *tsro* (Professor Kielhorn); but the element *t* of the conjunct does not belong to the numeral. The dates must be read

Samvat 900 (or 955, or 988).

The scribe who, in his fanciful way, treated the numeral figure for 900 as a 'numeral letter,' and thus had in his mind the group of aksharas *samvat srā o*, naturally wrote the whole in ligatures *samvatsrāo*. There is, therefore, no need of explaining the supposed word *samvatsrā* as an abbreviation of the genitive plural *samvatsarāṇām* (*Ind. Ant.*, xv, p. 13, note 57, and p. 141, note 27)—an explanation

¹ It has become usual to call such figures 'numeral letters,' because of their curious resemblance to letter-forms. I believe the practice of calling them so originated with the late Pandit Bhagvānlāl Indrajī (*Ind. Ant.*, vi, 42 ff.). But the resemblance does not really become noticeable before the eighth and following centuries (especially in Jain, Nepalese, and Buddhist manuscripts), and the farther back one traces the symbols the more the resemblance disappears. Whatever the origin of the numeral figures may be, I do not believe that they have any connection with the letters (simple or compound) of the Brāhmī alphabet, in the sense in which this connection has been ordinarily understood. I hold, therefore, that it is misleading to distinguish between numeral figures and numeral letters. There really exists only one set of symbols—numeral figures; and their growing resemblance to letters is due merely to the growing whimsicality of scribes who exaggerated a fancied resemblance.

which assumes both an anomalous spelling and an anomalous construction.¹

There is one point in Mr. Bhandarkar's Gūrjara theory which appears to me of questionable correctness. It does not form, however, any necessary link in his argument, and, if proved incorrect, does not invalidate his general theory.

At the end of his first paragraph (p. 2 of his article on the Gūrjaras) Mr. Bhandarkar says, "before the middle of the tenth century . . . Gujarāt was known as Lāṭa, and hence was not ruled over by Gūrjara princes." As a fact, however, there was a dynasty of Bharoch, which, as we know from their (genuine) Kaira grants, dated 629 and 634 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xiii, 81, 88; see also the Sāṅkheḍa charter of 595 A.D. in *E.I.* ii, 19), had established itself in the Lāṭa country, certainly in the middle of the seventh, and probably as early as the end of the sixth century, and which, as they state themselves, belonged to the Gūrjara ruling race (*Gurjara-nṛipa-vamśa*). But the members of this dynasty did not hold the position of sovereigns, but only of ruling Prime-ministers. They call themselves only *Sāmānta*, and claim to combine in their person the *pañca-mahāśabda* or five great offices of state. Their nominal sovereigns appear to have belonged to the Nāga tribe (*nāga-kula*), whom they claim to have subjected. It seems clear from all this that the Gūrjaras can have come into the Lāṭa country only in small numbers, and, though *de facto* governors of the country, were not important enough to impose on it a new name (*Gurjaratrā*) derived from their own. This change of name, as Mr. Bhandarkar shows, happened only in the latter part of the tenth century, when the country must have been occupied by the Gūrjaras in

¹ The same anomalous form *sām̐vatsro* is supposed to occur in a Khajurāho inscription (*Ind. Ant.*, xxvi, 30, 31). But the word really reads correctly *sām̐vatsare*. The akshara *re* is somewhat indistinct, but the down-stroke shows, in the middle, a slight indentation (cf. *ri* at the end of line 3 in Sir A. Cunningham's *Survey Reports*, vol. xxi, pl. xvi A; the mark is very obvious in vol. x, pl. ix, i), and it is therefore not the down-stroke of the vowel *o*, but the indented body-stroke of the consonant *r*. In any case, even if it were *o*, the akshara would have to be read *tso*, not *tsro*; there is no underwritten *r* in it.

much larger numbers, and when their chiefs (Mūlarāja, etc.) acquired the actual as well as the nominal sovereignty of it.

II.

I now proceed to the examination of the contemporary records that bear on the history of the Gūrjaras.

In the Introduction to Jinasena's *Harivaṃśa Purāṇa* (Peterson's 4th *Report*, pp. xli and 176; also *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 142), which was written in 783 A.D., it is stated that in that year there lived the following rulers:—(1) Vatsarāja, the lord of Avantī, in the east; (2) Śrī-Vallabha, the son of Krishna, in the south; (3) a king called Indrāyudha, in the north. A fourth ruler is also mentioned, but he does not concern us in the present enquiry. Dr. Fleet has shown (*E.I.* vi, 197) that Śrī-Vallabha refers to Dhruva, who reigned from about 783 to 793 A.D., over the great southern empire of the Rāshtrakūṭas. Vatsarāja, too, must have ruled a very wide empire. Malwa can have been only its chief province, with Avantī, or Ujjain, as its capital. That it also included all the country lying directly east of Malwa may be concluded from a statement in the Baroda grant of 812 A.D., which implies (*Ind. Ant.*, xii, 160, 164, line 39) that his conquests eastwards extended over Gauda and Vaṅga, that is, Bihar and Bengal. Further north lay the kingdom of Indrāyudha. This can only have been the country which, in the main, corresponds to the present United Provinces, and must have had Kanauj for its capital.

Regarding Vatsarāja, we read in the Rādhanpur grant of 808 A.D. (*E.I.* vi, 248, verse 8) that he suffered a great defeat at the hands of Dhruva, who deprived him not only of the two state-umbrellas (i.e. of the sovereignty) of Gauda [and of Vaṅga, as shown by the Baroda grant just referred to], but drove him away into the desert (*maru* = Marwar) of Rajputana. Nor did Vatsarāja recover from this crushing defeat; for in the Baroda grant of 812 A.D. we are told that he, who had once conquered Gauda and Vaṅga, was now kept out even of his chief province of Malwa by Karka, at the command of the latter's suzerain,

Govinda III, the son and successor of Dhruva. The same events, it is clear, are alluded to in the Nilgund inscription of 866 A.D., which relates (*E.I.* vi, pp. 105, 106, verse 5) of Govinda III that he "fettered," or held in subjection, the people of Malwa and Gauda as well as the Gūrjaras of the hill-fort of Chitor.

The course of events which these detached statements suggest is that Vatsarāja, advancing from Rajputana eastward, first conquered Malwa, making Ujjain (Avanti) his capital. Then, continuing his advance eastward, he subjected Gauda and Vaṅga (Bihar and Bengal). The empire thus acquired he ruled indisputably in 783 A.D. Later on he came into collision with his southern neighbour, the Rāshtrakūṭa emperor Dhruva, in consequence of which—let us say in 790 A.D.—he lost his empire, and was forced back into his home-province in the wilds of Rajputana. There he was for some time—let us say up to 810 A.D.—compelled to stop by Karka under Govinda III, who held against him the frontier hill-fort of Chitor (Nilgund, *E.I.* vi, 106; Sirūr, *E.I.* vii, 207; *Ind. Ant.*, xii, 25), once a Gūrjara stronghold.

According to the genealogies (Daulatpurā grant of 862 A.D. in *E.I.* v, 208; Dighwa-Dabauli grant of 898 A.D. in *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 110; As. Soc. Beng. grant of 931 A.D. in *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 140), Vatsarāja's successor was his son Nāgabhaṭa. Mr. Bhandarkar informs us that there exists an (unpublished) grant of Amoghavarsha I, according to which Nāgabhaṭa was vanquished by Govinda III. This must have happened after 810 A.D. and before 814 A.D., when Govinda III ceased to reign. The notice of Nāgabhaṭa's defeat suggests that, after the death of his father Vatsarāja, he made an attempt to recover the paternal empire, but failed to do so, and that, therefore, he continued to be limited to his ancestral principality in Rajputana. This circumstance is quite sufficient to account for the fact that there is next to nothing known about him.

The next in the genealogical list is Nāgabhaṭa's son Rāmabhadra. Of him, so far, no records have come to

light; but there is one significant fact known about him: he is the first, in the records of his successors, who bears the imperial titles (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*, etc., *E.I.* i, 186, line 1). Further, in the Gwaliyōr inscription of 876 A.D. (*E.I.* i, 154 ff.) mention is made of two persons, Vāṇḍabhaṭṭa and his son Alla, contemporaries of Rāmabhadra and his son Bhoja I (here called Rāmadeva and Ādivarāha) respectively. The former had been appointed to the office of 'chief of the boundaries,' or margrave, by Rāmabhadra; and his son Alla was confirmed in that office, and, in addition, made commandant of the fort of Gwaliyōr, by Rāmabhadra's successor Bhoja I, when the latter determined to set out to "conquer the three worlds" (*ibid.*, p. 158, verse 22). Moreover, the inscription also states that Vāṇḍabhaṭṭa's father, Nāgarabhaṭṭa, had emigrated from Ānandapura in the Laṭa country, i.e. from Vaḍnagar in what is now called Gujārāt.

The course of events suggested by these statements may be described as follows. Rāmabhadra set out—say, about 815 or 820 A.D.—from Rajputana to recover the empire of his grandfather Vatsarāja. In his train migrated Nāgarabhaṭṭa, together with his son Vāṇḍabhaṭṭa. The latter was, by his tribal chief, Rāmabhadra, put in charge of the eastern frontier of his empire, which at this time must have been pushed forward as far as Gwaliyōr. As the Gwaliyōr inscription only says that Vāṇḍabhaṭṭa was in the service of Rāmabhadra (Rāmadeva, *ibid.*, p. 157, verse 7), but does not mention Bhoja I as his master, it would follow that he must have died before Bhoja I's accession. On his death his son Alla succeeded to the vacant office; and later on, when Rāmabhadra's successor, Bhoja I, resolved to resume his father's ambition, and (as the inscription expresses it in verse 22) to "conquer the three worlds," Alla was put in command of the fortress of Gwaliyōr. Seeing that the earliest (known) grant of Bhoja I is already dated from Kanauj in 843 A.D., it is clear that he cannot have succeeded to the throne very much earlier. We can hardly put his accession earlier than 840 A.D. At that date, it is evident, the Gūrjara empire extended no further east than Gwaliyōr,

and while it included Rajputana and Malwa, it did not yet include the northern kingdom of Kanauj. The conquest of that kingdom happened only under Bhoja I. It was the first achievement in his "conquest of the three worlds." That, of course, is a poetical and proverbial expression; nevertheless, it fairly represents the facts of the case. For the Gūrjaras came from the west, and their line of advance was in three directions, north, east, and south. Bhoja I, in the first instance, turned his arms northwards, and conquered the whole of the neighbouring kingdom of the north, which in the time of his great-grandfather Vatsarāja, 783 A.D., had been ruled by Indrāyudha. As early as 843 A.D. he had possessed himself of the northern capital Mahodaya, or Kanauj; for his Daulatpurā grant is dated in that year (Śaṁvat 900, *E.I.* v, 208) and from that town. How many years it took him to complete the conquest of the whole northern kingdom is not known; but it was certainly completed by the year 882 A.D. For an inscription, extant in Pehewa, in the Karnal District of the Panjab, names him as the ruler of the country (*E.I.* i, 184). That Bhoja I's empire still included the kingdom of Malwa is shown by his Gwaliyōr inscriptions of 875 and 876 A.D. (*E.I.* i, 155), and by the inscription of Deogaṛh in Central India of the year 862 A.D. (*E.I.* iv, 310). That it also included the Gūrjara ancestral province of Rajputana is proved by the Daulatpurā charter (above referred to), which records Bhoja I's grant of the village of Sivā (Sewa) in the Dindwan District (*E.I.* v, 210). This inscription, moreover, has an interest of its own, as it professes to be the renewal of a grant which was originally made by Vatsarāja and afterwards confirmed by Nāgabhaṭa, both of whom, as we have seen, had once been reigning in Rajputana. The Deogaṛh inscription suggests that in 862 A.D. Bhoja I was still in peaceful possession of Central India, and had not yet come into collision with the southern empire of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. This conclusion is confirmed by the records of the latter empire. Amoghavarsha I reigned from 814 to 877 A.D.; but none of the Rāshṭrakūṭa records ascribes

to him any conflict with the Gūrjaras. As late as 866 A.D. Amoghavarsha's own Nīlgund and Sirūr inscriptions (*E.I.* vi, 98, and *Ind. Ant.*, xii, 215) know of no such conflict. It would seem that, at least, up to that date Bhoja I was fully occupied with the complete reduction of the northern kingdom, and was not able to turn his attention to the conquest of the south.

As to the east, the uniform tradition of Bandelkhand tells us that before the domination of the Chandels, that country, with the capital Mahoba and the stronghold Kalanjar, was in the possession of the Parihars (*Journal A.S.B.*, I, 3, 6; lxxi, 102). The Parihars (Pratihāras), as Mr. Bhandarkar rightly points out, were one of the divisions of the Gūrjara tribe. The Chandels took possession of Bandelkhand, about 950 A.D., under their king Yaśovarman, who, in a Khajurāho inscription of the year 954 A.D., is said to have been "a scorching fire to the Gūrjaras," and to have "easily conquered the Kālāñjara mountain" (*E.I.* i, 132, 133, verses 23 and 31, see below, p. 653). The traditional date of the Chandel occupation is 677 (*Journal A.S.B.*, I, 3), which, taken in terms of the Chedi era, is equivalent to 946 A.D. As the Parihars are said to have occupied Bandelkhand for many generations before the Chandels, there is no difficulty in assuming its conquest by the Gūrjara-Parihars to have taken place during the reign of Bhoja I.¹ The latter's farther advance eastward appears to have been barred by the powerful Pāla kingdom of Bihar and Bengal (Gauḍa) under Dharmapāla (about 840–875 A.D.).

Bhoja I's reign must have been very long. It includes the two dates 843 and 882 A.D. It may have lasted, let us say, from 840 to 885 A.D., when Bhoja I was succeeded by his son Mahendrapāla (*alias* Mahiṣapala, *Ind. Ant.*, xvi, 174). Under him the Gūrjara empire attained its widest extent. He was the first who rightly claimed to exercise imperial rule (*adhirājya*), and who, in his grants, assumed the full

¹ The *beginning* of the Parihar-Gūrjara occupation might be traced back even to the earliest conquest by Vatsarāja.

imperial titles, though by courtesy he allowed them already to his father, Rāmabhadra. But under the latter the Gūrjara rule extended only as far as Gwaliyor; and under Bhoja I's successors, as we shall see, the imperial power of the Gūrjaras already began to decline, and the empire was in full process of disintegration under Bhoja I's great-grandson Vijayapāla. To the fact that Bhoja I was the first real claimant of imperial rule there is a curious testimony in the *Rājataranginī* in a passage (Book v, 151) which in the original runs as follows:—

*Hṛtañ Bhojādhirājena sa sāmrajyam adāpayat |
pratihāratayā bhṛtyā-bhūte Thakkiyak-ānvaye ||*

That is—"The sovereign power which the emperor Bhoja had seized, he caused to be given in the Thakkiya family which had taken service as Pratihāra." This is said with reference to the Kashmirian king Śankara Varman, who reigned from 883 to 902 A.D. The passage, no doubt, as already observed by previous translators, is obscure, but two facts come out clearly enough: first, that Bhoja I had seized the imperial power, which seizure had occurred in the time preceding Śankara Varman; secondly, that the latter was instrumental in the transfer of that power into the Thakkiya family of Parihars, for the term *pratihāratā* seems obviously to refer to the clan name of the Parihars. What exactly the circumstances of the transfer were it is impossible to say with our present knowledge, but the transaction must have occurred during the time of Bhoja I's successor Mahendrapāla (885-910 A.D.).

Of this sovereign we know that he ruled the Gūrjara empire as it was left to him by his father Bhoja I. The capital of the empire was now Mahodaya, or Kanauj. From here was issued Mahendrapāla's charter of 899 A.D. (the so-called Dighwa-Dubauli plate, of Samvat 955, *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 105). It granted a village which lay so far north as the district of Śrāvasti in the present Nepalese Terai. The inscription of Siyadoni, in the Lalitpur District of the Central Provinces, mentions Mahendrapāla as the reigning

emperor in 903 and 907 A.D. (*E.I.* i, 170); and the inscription at Pehoa (Pehewa) of his time shows his empire as still including the Karnal District in the Panjab (*E.I.* i, 242). It would seem that he took up his father's ambitious schemes of conquest, and attempted to extend his empire in the east and south. In both directions, however, he met with an effective check. At this time there were three monarchs reigning, all three claiming the well-known imperial titles. These were the Gauda emperor Devapāla in the east, the Rāshtrakūṭa emperor Krishna II in the south, and the Kalachuri emperor Kokkalla I, whose Chedi dominions bordered on those of the Gūrjara emperor, in the south-east. All three were allied by marriage. Devapāla was a son of Raṇṇādevī, the daughter of the Rāshtrakūṭa emperor, (probably) Amoghavarsha I (Mungir grant, *Ind. Ant.*, xxi, 254, here called Śrī-Paravala), and sister of Krishna II, whose nephew, therefore, he was. This relationship to Krishna II is referred to in the Deolī (940 A.D.) and Karhād (959 A.D.) grants of Krishna III, in which it is said that Krishna II was "the preceptor entrusted with the duty of the education of the Gauḍas" (*Gauḍānām vinaya-vrat-ārppana-guruḥ*, *E.I.* iv, 283, verse 15, and v, 193, v. 13), i.e., apparently the children of his brother-in-law, the Gauda emperor Dharmapāla.¹ Krishna II, therefore, appears to have been not only the uncle but also the tutor of his nephew Devapāla. Moreover, he was himself the son-in-law of Kokkalla I (*E.I.* i, 253; ii, 300, 304; iv, 280; vii, 29).

The three sovereigns, Kokkalla I, Krishna II, and Devapāla, would seem to have combined to oppose Mahendrapāla's schemes of conquest; or Krishna II and Devapāla may have done so, each in his own turn. In any case, regarding the latter it is recorded in the Badal pillar inscription, of about 925 A.D., that "he brought low the

¹ Professor R. G. Bhandarkar translates (*E.I.* iv, 287) "the preceptor charging the Gauḍas with the vow of humility," which conveys no very intelligible meaning. The notice seems to indicate either that Krishna, before his accession, lived at Dharmapāla's court and superintended the education of Devapāla, or that the latter, before his own accession, lived at Krishna II's court, where he received his education.

arrogance of the lord of the Gūrjaras" (*kurvikṛta-Gūrjara-nātha-darṣam*, *E.I.* ii, 160, v. 13) in attempting the conquest of the Pāla empire. As to Krishna II, the Bagumrā (Nausārī) grant of his grandson and successor, Indra III, dated 914 A.D., compares "his battles with the Gūrjara ruler to a storm of the rainy season" (Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar's paper, p. 4, *J.B.B.R.A.S.* xviii, p. 258), and the Deoli grant of Krishna III, dated 940 A.D., says of him that "he terrified the Gūrjaras" (*E.I.* v, 193, verse 13; also the Karhād grant of 959 A.D., *E.I.* iv, 283, verse 13). As to the exact share which Kokkalla I had in the war, we have no clear information. But in the Bilharī inscription, the earlier portion of which falls in the reign of Kokkalla I's grandson Keyūrarvarsha, about 925 A.D. (*E.I.* i, 252), we are told that "having conquered the whole earth, Kokkalla I set up two unprecedented pillars of fame, namely, Krishna II in the south and Bhoja II in the north"¹ (*E.I.* i, 264, verse 17). Similarly, the Benares grant of Karṇadeva, dated 1042 A.D., informs us that Kokkalla I held "a protecting hand" (*abhaya-daḥ pāṇiḥ*) over Krishna II, as well as over Harsha the Chandel and Bhoja II. These statements certainly suggest that Kokkalla I took an important as well as an active part in the repression of Mahendrapāla.

At this time the Chandels had only recently come to settle in Bandelkhand. Their chief, Harsha, had married a Chohan (Chāhamāna) princess, Kañcukā—so we are informed in a Khajurāho inscription set up in 954 A.D., apparently the closing year of the reign of Harsha's son Yaśovarman (*E.I.* i, 126, verse 21; see also *ibid.*, 143, v. 29). By that marriage Harsha had contracted an alliance with the dominant race of the Gūrjaras, of whom the Chohans were a prominent clan. But he was not contented therewith, but aspired to independence of the Gūrjara power. From the Benares grant of Karṇadeva, of 1042 A.D., we learn that Kokkalla I had married a Chandel royal princess,

¹ The reference cannot be to Bhoja I (as suggested in *E.I.* i, 253), for under that monarch the Gūrjara power was at its zenith, and it is out of the question that he could have been a *protégé* of Kokkalla I.

Natṭādevī (*E.I.* ii, 301, 306, verse 8). That lady can only have been a daughter of Harsha; and it suggests itself that, in furtherance of his scheme of independence, the latter not only married his daughter to Kokkalla I, but gave him active assistance in the prosecution of his war with Mahendrapāla. In return for this assistance, after Mahendrapāla's defeat (or, as the grandiloquent Bilhari inscription has it, "after having conquered the whole earth," *E.I.* i, 264, verse 17), Harsha was made an independent ruler under the protection, or suzerainty, of Kokkalla I. Further, Mahipāla, in his grant (the so-called Bengal Asiatic Society's plate, *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 138) of the year 931 A.D., tells us that his father Mahendrapāla had two wives, of whom one, called Dehanāgā, was the mother of his half-brother Bhoja II, while the other, Mahidevī, was his own mother. We also learn from the same grant that the two half-brothers succeeded their father, one after the other. Bhoja II came first, and it was he who held his throne under the protection of Kokkalla I. As we shall see presently, he reigned but a short time, being turned out apparently by his half-brother Mahipāla, who had the support of the powerful Chandel chief, Yaśovarman. All this suggests that the cause, or at least one of the causes, of the war between Kokkalla I and Mahendrapāla may have been a family quarrel. Dehanāgā, I would suggest, was a daughter of Kokkalla I, or at least a Kalachuri princess, while Mahidevī was probably a Chandel princess. Their sons, the half-brothers, were rival claimants to the succession. Kokkalla I naturally took the side of Bhoja II, and after his victory over Mahendrapāla seated his protégé on the throne, under his own protection or suzerainty. It appears, indeed, probable that the war ended not only with Mahendrapāla's overthrow, but his death. As, according to the Siyadoni inscription (*E.I.* i, 170), he was still alive in 907 A.D., we may perhaps place his death shortly afterwards, say in 910 A.D., in which year accordingly Bhoja II would have succeeded.

Bhoja II reigned as the protégé of his suzerain, the

Chedi emperor Kokkalla I. Besides the statements already quoted referring to this relation of his to Kokkalla I, there is very little known about him. In the charter, dated 931 A.D., of his half-brother and successor, Vināyakapāla (*alias* Mahīpāla, *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 138), he is duly recorded in his proper place in the dynastic succession. On the other hand, in the earlier Asni inscription, dated in the year 917 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xvi, 173), of the same half-brother Mahīpāla, all mention of him is omitted. The conclusion suggested by the difference is that early in his reign, when Mahīpāla had just turned out Bhoja II, he disdained to mention his half-brother as ever having reigned at all, while, at a much later date, when the memory of Bhoja II's reign had lost its sting, it was no longer ignored. In any case, all the surrounding circumstances point to the conclusion that Bhoja II's reign can have been but a very short one, so that it might easily be ignored in a dynastic list. As a fact, his successor is found reigning already in 914 A.D.

Mahīpāla, who succeeded his brother Bhoja II, is also known under a variety of other names, Vināyakapāla, Kshitipāla, and Herambapāla (see *E.I.* i, 124; iii, 265). His fortunes are closely connected with those of the Chandel prince Yaśovarman. With regard to the latter a Khajurāho inscription, which was engraved in 954 A.D. under his son Dhānga, informs us that he was "a scorching fire" to the Gūrjaras (*E.I.* i, 132, verse 23), and especially that he captured their stronghold Kalanjar (*ibid.*, verse 31). The result of these operations was that Yaśovarman conquered for himself a large dominion which extended from Kalanjar in the east to Gwaliyor in the west, and from the borders of Chedi in the south to the Jamna in the north (*ibid.*, verse 45). This was, in fact, the whole of the eastern province of the Gūrjara empire, which thus was reduced to its old limits under Rāmabhadra, when it reached no farther east than the frontier fort of Gwaliyor. Of this territory Yaśovarman made himself the independent sovereign with imperial titles. He was, in fact, the real founder of the Chandel power, though a beginning had already been

made under his father, Harsha. Yaśovarman's opportunity for aggrandisement was the war which at this time was being waged by Mahendrapāla with the Chedi ruler Kokkalla I and his Rāshtrakūṭa ally. It is not clear whether he was involved in it while it was in actual progress. He was certainly not in league with Kokkalla I, for the Khajurāho inscription above referred to says that "he brought distress on the shameful Chedis" (*E.I.* i, 132, verse 23). But when the war ended with the defeat of Mahendrapāla and the enthronement of Bhoja II under the protection of Kokkalla I, Yaśovarman espoused the cause of Bhoja II's half-brother Mahīpāla. For in another contemporary Khajurāho inscription we are told that "Kshitipāla (i.e. Mahīpāla) was placed on the throne" by him (*E.I.* i, 122, line 10).¹ We may conclude, therefore, that Yaśovarman disputed the settlement made by Kokkalla I, and, after a successful war with Bhoja II and his suzerain Kokkalla I, enthroned Mahīpāla. The reward which he secured for himself was, of course, the acknowledgment of his independent sovereignty over Bandelkhand with the frontiers above stated. Kokkalla I's defeat by Yaśovarman seems to me clearly enough stated in the Khajurāho inscription of 954 A.D. In verse 28 (*E.I.* i, 127) it records the defeat of a Chedi king who, it is true, is not named; but his identity is disclosed by the statement that "he made himself notorious by putting down his lotus-foot on (i.e. preventing) the coronation of Kshitipāla." The original passage runs as follows :—

vikhyāta-Kṣhitipāla-mauli-racanā-vinyasta-pādāmbujam.

This has been translated (*ibid.*, p. 132) "who had put down his lotus-foot on rows of diadems of famous princes." But I submit that *kṣhitipāla* should not be taken as a common noun ('prince'), but refers to the well-known king

¹ The attribution of this inscription to Harsha is clearly wrong. Unfortunately it is badly mutilated, but its general purport is unmistakeable. The reference to Harsha is finished in line 7, and the sovereign referred to in line 10 must be his successor, Yaśovarman.

Kshitipāla, otherwise known as Mahipāla or Vināyakapāla; that *vikhyāta* does not qualify *kṣitipāla*, but *pādāmbuja*, and that *racanā* has its ordinary meaning of arranging or putting on (of the *mauli* or crown). The passage, it appears to me, is not intended to make a vague general statement, but to record a definite fact.

The year of Mahipāla's accession is approximately fixed by the date, 914 A.D., of the Haddāla grant (*Ind. Ant.*, xii, 195; xviii, 91), which mentions him as the then reigning emperor. His grant, issued from Mahodaya (Kanauj) in 931 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xv, 138), shows him still reigning in that year. According to the Siyadoni inscription (*E.I.* i, 170), his son Devapāla was reigning in 948 A.D. At some time, therefore, between these two dates, 931 and 948 A.D., Mahipāla must have ceased to reign. As there are grounds (to be mentioned further on) for believing that Devapāla had but a very short reign, we may take it that Mahipāla probably reigned until about 945 A.D. At the beginning of his reign his empire, with one exception, appears to have included all its old provinces. The Haddāla grant of 914 A.D. above mentioned, having been issued in Kathiawad, indicates its south-western extent. The Asni inscription of 917 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xvi, 174) shows Mahipāla reigning in the large northern province of Kanauj. The Siyadoni inscription of 948 A.D., near Lalitpur in Central India, includes that province in Mahipāla's empire. The Rajor inscription of 960 A.D. (*E.I.* iii, 265), not far from Alwar in Rajputana, indicates its north-western extent. The two last-mentioned records refer to a somewhat later time, but there is no probability (rather the reverse) that Mahipāla's empire included in later times more territory than it did at the beginning. The only exception, above referred to, is the province of Bandelkhand, of which, as we have seen, Yaśovarman made himself the independent sovereign, probably as the price of assistance in securing to Mahipāla the succession to the Gūrjara crown. But it was only for a few years that Mahipāla was permitted to rule his extensive empire in peace. He soon became

involved in a disastrous war with the Rāshtrakūṭa emperor Indra III. The cause is not exactly known, but it was probably connected with the fact that Mahīpāla owed his enthronement to the revolution, effected with the help of Yaśovarman, against the political settlement made by the Kalachuri Kokkalla I and his Rāshtrakūṭa ally, Krishna II. Indra III was Krishna II's successor, and had married Vijambā, a great-granddaughter of Kokkalla I (*E.I.* iv, 280; vii, 43, 44). As shown by his Bagumrā (or Nausāri) grant (*J.B.B.R.A.S.* xviii, 257), he came to the throne in 915 A.D., and he can have reigned for only about three years, for the Daṇḍāpur inscription of his successor, Govinda IV (*Ind. Ant.*, xii, 223), is already dated in 918 A.D. (see Dr. Fleet in *E.I.* vi, 176, 177). Within this short period falls his punitive expedition against Mahīpāla. The Cambay grant of his successor, Govinda IV, dated 930 A.D. (*E.I.* vii, 26), permits us to trace the course of Indra's campaign. He first marched to Ujjain in Malwa, then crossed the Jamna, and, marching across the Doab to the banks of the Ganges, captured and "completely devastated" Mahīpāla's capital, Mahodaya, or Kanauj (*ibid.*, verse 19). Having done so, he appears to have retired to his own country. Whether Mahīpāla fought any battles and was defeated, or whether he simply retired as his enemy advanced, is not quite clear from the statements of the Cambay charter, but they rather seem to support the second alternative. In any case, no sooner had Indra III withdrawn than Mahīpāla resumed the government of his dominions. This is shown by his issuing a charter from Mahodaya in 931 A.D., granting a village near Allahabad (or Benares, *Ind. Ant.*, xv, 138). The Asni inscription, which mentions him as reigning in 917 A.D., must have been set up either immediately before or, more probably, immediately after Indra III's great northern raid. At the same time, Mahīpāla did not, after that raid, return to the rule of an undiminished empire. The great province of Malwa no longer formed any part of it. The chief of the Parmar (Paramāra) clan of Gūrjaras, who held it as a fief,

appears to have profited by the disturbance attendant on Indra III's raid to assume independence. The earliest (known) Parmar charters are the grants of Vākpati of 974 and 979 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, vi, 52, and xix, 161). They name three immediate predecessors of his, Siyaka, Vairisimha, and Kriṣṇarāja, and describe them by the usual imperial titles which signify independent sovereignty.¹ Allowing the usual average term of twenty years for a reign, or a period of sixty years for the three reigns, we obtain the year 915 A.D. as the approximate date when the Parmars of Malwa secured their independence from the Gūrjara empire. The conclusion, therefore, seems justified that it was the Parmar Kriṣṇarāja who at the time of Indra III's raid, between 915 and 918 A.D., made himself independent of Mahīpāla. It also becomes probable that the actual date of Indra's raid was the year 915 A.D.

In the Deoli grant of Krishna III, dated 940 A.D., there is a remark which throws another curious light on the insecurity felt by Mahīpāla with respect to his imperial rule. The grant says (*E.I.* v, 194, v. 25) that, "hearing of the conquest of all the strongholds in the southern region simply by means of his (Krishna III's) angry glance, the hope (for security, set by them) on (the strongholds of) Kālāñjara and Chitrakūṭa (Chitor) vanished from the heart of the Gūrjaras."² The reference is to Krishna III's victorious

¹ The Udepur *prastāvi* of about 1080 A.D. (*E.I.* i, 223) gives a much longer but, on the face of it, mythical ancestry.

² The original text runs as follows: *galitā Gūrjara-hṛdayāt Kālāñjara-Chitrakūṭ-āśā*. Mr. Bhandarkar translates this, "the hope of conquering Kālāñjara and Chitrakūṭa dropped away from the heart of the Gūrjara prince" (see p. 5 of his paper on the *Gūrjaras*). This apparently reflects an earlier translation, even more strongly expressed, in Professor R. G. Bhandarkar's *Early History of the Dekkan* (2nd ed., p. 75): "The Gūrjara prince *who was preparing to take the fortresses of Kālāñjara and Chitrakūṭa in the north had to give up the enterprise*." The compound is translated much more soberly and correctly by the same Professor in *E.I.* iv, 289: "the hope about Kālāñjara and Chitrakūṭa." (The italics throughout are mine.) The idea of "conquering" or "preparing to take" is not suggested by anything in the compound, and it is wrongly imported into it. For Kālāñjar and Chitor did not require conquering; they had already belonged to the Gūrjara empire for a very long time. At this time, it is true, one of them, Kālāñjar, had passed into the power of the Chandel Yaśovarman, but that prince had placed Mahīpāla on the throne and was on his side. Naturally Mahīpāla trusted for security to

campaigns in Southern India which he prosecuted while he held the position of *Kumāra* or crown prince. Now it appears that the year 940 A.D. of the Deolī grant was the first of Krishna III's reign, and that his father, Amoghavarsha III (Baddiga), reigned from about 934 to 940 A.D. Accordingly, the southern campaigns must have taken place in that period, 934-940 A.D., and the Gūrjara apprehension of insecurity must refer to Mahīpāla's reign in that period. Mahīpāla feared that Krishna III, after his successful campaigns in the south, would now turn his attention to his (Mahīpāla's) dominions in the north.

There is still another remark which is worth noticing. It occurs in the Cambay grant of Govinda IV, dated 930 A.D., and represents the rivers Ganges and Jamna as doing service at Govinda IV's palace (*E.I.* vii, 44, verse 28). Mr. Bhandarkar rightly explains this remark to indicate "either that, after an expedition of conquest against northern India, he (Govinda IV) added the signs of these rivers to his *insignia*, or that he inherited these signs from some one of his predecessors, perhaps his own father, Indra III, who had overrun northern India" (*ibid.*, p. 35). Considering that Govinda IV, as we know from contemporary charters (*ibid.*, p. 33), led a life entirely given up to sensuality, it is not probable that he would have undertaken an arduous campaign; nor, indeed, is there the smallest evidence of his ever having done so. Therefore, there remains only the second of Mr. Bhandarkar's alternatives, that Govinda IV had inherited the signs of the Ganges and Jamna from his father, Indra III, who, as a fact, had crossed the Jamna and marched to the Ganges in his victorious expedition against Kanauj.

Mahīpāla may be taken to have reigned from about 913 to 945 A.D. About the latter year he was succeeded by his son Devapāla. As the Siyadoni inscription shows, Devapāla was certainly on the throne in 948 A.D. (*E.I.* i, 170, 177).

the stronghold of the Chandel. In any case, considering the relation in which these two monarchs stood to each other, one cannot suppose that Mahīpāla could have contemplated "conquering" from him the stronghold of Kalanjār.

But his reign must have been a very short one; for in the Rajor inscription of the year 960 A.D. (*E.I.* iii, 263, 265) Vijayapāla is described as the immediate successor of Kshiti-pāla (i.e. Mahīpāla). The case is very similar to that of the two half-brothers Mahīpāla and Bhoja II, who are both described as immediate successors of Mahendrapāla, and of whom the earlier, Bhoja II, reigned only for a very short term. It suggests, not only that Vijayapāla was a half-brother of Devapāla, whom he supplanted, for some reason at present unknown, but also that Devapāla can have reigned only for a very few years, say down to 950 A.D.

Devapāla was succeeded by Vijayapāla, who probably was his half-brother, and who, according to the Rajor inscription (*E.I.* iii, 263), was reigning in 960 A.D. At this time the Gūrjara empire had already become greatly reduced through the secession of Bandelkhand and Malwa. But over a great portion of even this reduced dominion, the Gūrjara emperor's rule was only nominal. For Mathanadeva, the issuer of the Rajor edict, who belonged to the Parihar clan of Gūrjaras, though acknowledging the suzerainty of Vijayapāla, adopts almost imperial titles,¹ indicating that he was practically the independent ruler of his Rajputana fief.

Vijayapāla may have reigned down to about 975 A.D. After him there is a gap in the history, on which we have as yet no information whatever. In 1027 A.D., as we know from his grant of that date (*Ind. Ant.*, xviii, 33), Trilochanapāla was reigning. His father and predecessor, Rājyapāla, had been slain by his feudatory, the Kachhwāha chief Arjuna (*E.I.* ii, 234), who acted in alliance with the Chandel emperor Vidyādhara (*E.I.* i, 219; ii, 235). This Rājyapāla must be the king of Kanauj, whom Maḥmūd of Ghazni, on his arrival at that town in 1022 A.D., is said to have found already attacked and killed by an alliance of Hindu princes (Sir A. Cunningham, *A.S. Reports*, i, 147).

¹ Vijayapāla receives the full imperial titles *Paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *Mahārājādhirāja*, *Paramēśvara*. For himself Mathanadeva only claims *Mahārājādhirāja* and *Paramēśvara*, while to his father Sāvaṭa he gives only the title *Mahārājādhirāja*.

As we have the two dates 1088 and 1048 A.D. for the two Kachhwāha chiefs, Vikramasimha and his father Vijayapāla (*E.I.* ii, 234, 235 ; *J.A.S.B.* xxxi, 393), the latter's grandfather Arjuna, who killed Rājyapāla, must have reigned about 1020 A.D. According to Trilochanapāla's grant, above referred to, Rājyapāla's predecessor was his father, Vijayapāla. The chronological calculation above given would fix his reign as falling about 1000–1020 A.D. It seems to me, therefore, impossible to identify him with the Vijayapāla of the Rajor grant of 960 A.D. (Professor Kielhorn's proposal, *E.I.* iii, 265). He might, however, very well have been the grandson of that Vijayapāla. There remains, then, only a gap of about twenty-five years, 975–1000 A.D., to be filled up by the reign of one king between the two Vijayapālas. He would be the son of Vijayapāla I, and father of Vijayapāla II. This latter sovereign I would suggest to be identical with the Jayapāla of the traditional list of the (Tomara) kings of Kanauj (Sir A. Cunningham's *A.S. Reports*, i, 149), who is said to have been defeated by Maḥmūd of Ghazni in 1018 A.D.

The history of the Gūrjara empire after Trilochanapāla is still very obscure. For myself, I am disposed to adopt Sir A. Cunningham's theory that the Kanauj imperial family retired to Delhi (*A.S. Reports*, i, 132 ff.). Kanauj, as we know from the Gahaṛwār charters (*Ind. Ant.*, xviii, 13), was captured about 1050 A.D. by Chandradeva, the founder of the Gahaṛwār dynasty. As a result of the Gahaṛwār conquest, the reigning emperor appears to have retired to his north-western frontier province, to which henceforth the rule of his family, now known as the Tomara, was limited. This emperor was Anangapāla, apparently a son of Trilochanapāla. He may have reigned from 1040 to 1060 A.D. He seems to have retired to his stronghold on the Jamna, called Lālkoṭ or the Red Fort. This happened, as recorded on the Iron Pillar (*ibid.*, pp. 151, 174 ; *Journ. R.A.S.*, 1897, p. 13) in 1052 A.D. Around Lālkoṭ there sprang up the new royal residence of Delhi, about 1060 A.D. In their greatly reduced dominions the royal family continued to

reign for about a century longer, till at last in 1170 A.D. the succession passed to the Chohan chief Prithirāj, the son-in-law of the last Tomara king, Anangapāla II, who had no male issue. Prithirāj, of course, considered himself as succeeding to the old imperial claims of his wife's family, claims which apparently had never been formally renounced. This fact explains Prithirāj's violent feuds with the Chandels of Bandelkhand (Paramardideva or Parmāl) and the Gaharwārs of Kanauj. It also explains how it came to pass that when in 1191-2 A.D. Muhammad Ghori attacked India he met with no united resistance on the part of the Indian princes.

The subjoined synchronistic table may illustrate the history of the Gūrjara power, as traced out in the preceding remarks :—

APPROXIMATE DATES.	GŪJRARA.	RĀSHṬRĀKŪṬA.	PĀLA.	CHEDI.	CHANDEL.	PARMAR.	CHOHAN.	PARIHAR.
(1) 770-780 ...	Devasākti.							
(2) 780-810 ...	Vatsarāja.	Dhruva, 783-794.						
(3) 810-815 ...	Nagabhatta.	Govinda III, 794-814.						
(4) 815-840 ...	Rāmbhadra.							
(5) 840-885 ...	Bhoja I.	Amoghavarsha I, 814-877.	Dharmapāla, 840-875.					
(6) 885-910 ...	Mahendrapāla.	Krishna II, 877-915.	Devapāla, 875-910.	Kokkalla I, 875-910.	Harsha, 890-910. Yaśovarman, 910-950.			
(7) 910-913 ...	Bhoja II					
(8) 913-945 ...	Mahipāla	Indra III, 914-918, & Govinda IV, 918-934.		...		Krishnarāja, 915-935.	Chandana & Vakpati.	
(9) 945-950 ...	Devapāla			...		Vairisinha, 935-955.	Sinhārāja.	Lakshmana.
(10) 950-975 ...	Vijayapāla I	Krishna III, 940-971.		...	Dhānga, 950-975.	Siyaka, 955-970.	Vijrahārāja, 973.	Vajradāman, 977.
(11) 975-1000 ...	(Unknown.)	Ganda, 975-1000.	Vakpati, 970-990.		
(12) 1000-1020 ...	Vijayapāla II.							
(13) 1020-1022 ...	Rājyapāla.				
(14) 1022-1040 ...	Trilochanapāla.			...	Vidhyādhara, 1000-1025.			
(15) 1040-1060 ...	Anangapāla.							

(To be continued.)