JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
1909

VI
THE GURJARAS OF RAJPUTANA AND KANAUJ

By VINCENT A. SMITH

(Continued from p. 76.)

I NOW proceed to discuss in detail the ascertained facts of each reign, inscriptions, of course, being the principal source of information, and in doing so shall permit myself a certain amount of latitude in digressions upon cognate topics. The inscriptions of the greatest value for establishing the genealogy of the royal family are Nos. 3, 8, and 19–22 of my List.

- I. NĀGABHATA I, *circa* 725–40 A.D.; and
- II. KAKUSTHA OR KAKKUKA, *circa* 740–55 A.D.

These two princes are known only from inscription No. 8. They are described as having been members of the Pratihāra race and of solar descent, the “fire-pit” legend being unknown apparently to the author of the document.¹ Nāgabhata I is credited with having defeated the barbarian (Mleccha) armies, which must be understood to mean the Arabs, who had occupied Sind in 712 A.D. under the leadership of Muḥammad, the son of

¹ The “fire-pit” legend first appears in the *Prithvīrāj-rāisā* of Cand (Chand), which claims to be contemporary with the hero of the poem, but may be considerably later in date. Prithvīrāja was killed in 1193 A.D.

Kāsim. Kakustha was the son of an unnamed brother of Nāgabhaṭa I, but beyond this fact nothing is known concerning him.

III. DEVAŚAKTI OR DEVARĀJA, *circa* 755–70 A.D.

The third king, who is named Devarāja in inscription No. 8 and is called Devaśakti in No. 2, was the younger brother of Kakustha. Until the recent publication of No. 8 he was believed to have been the first of the dynasty. His queen, the mother of his successor, was named Bhūyikādevī. He is described as being “a most devout worshipper of Viṣṇu” (*paramavaiṣṇava*). Professor Kielhorn observes that the manner in which the genealogy of the *mahārājas* of Kanauj (Mahodaya or Mahodayā) is given in their grants, and more “especially the way in which each of them is described as the devotee of a particular deity, remind one of, and apparently are imitated from, the corresponding parts” of the grants of Harṣa, who was king of Thānēsar and Kanauj from 606 to 648 A.D., and became paramount sovereign of Northern India in 612 (*Ep. Ind.*, v, 211). The earliest known genealogy of the dynasty was recorded during the reign of Mihira Bhoja (*circa* 840–90 A.D.), when the Parihārs were firmly seated upon the throne of Harsa at Kanauj, and it is natural that they should have made use of a formula sanctioned by their great forerunner, and familiar to the secretariat officials. The use of the simple title *mahārāja* in certain inscriptions as the official designation of Devaśakti and other kings, must not be understood to imply that those princes necessarily occupied a position inferior to that of rulers who preferred more pompous titles. In the genealogies Mihira Bhoja himself, the greatest king of the dynasty, is designated as *mahārāja*, while in inscription No. 3 he is honoured with the full so-called “imperial” *protocole*, *paramabhaṭṭāraka-maharājādhirāja-parameśvara*. Similarly, in the fourth

century, Samudragupta, the most brilliant prince of his distinguished line, was content to be called a mere *Rājā* in the legends of his "Tiger" coins, although most records bestow on both him and his father the complete formula of the "imperial titles". Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar justly remarks that "it is wrong to suppose that *mahārāja* necessarily denotes a subordinate feudatory rank", while, on the other hand, it is true that "the high-sounding titles borne by kings are often found to be empty".¹ Some authors lay too much stress on the variations in titular formulas, which, in reality, are of extremely slight significance.

No definite events in the reign of Devaśakti are on record, nor is it possible to define with precision the extent or situation of his dominions. The dates assigned to him and his two predecessors, although hypothetical, cannot be very far wrong. Kakustha and Devaśakti having been brothers, the period of thirty years assigned to the two reigns combined appears to be ample; and inasmuch as the reign of the thirteenth king certainly ended in 1019 A.D., while Vatsarāja, the fourth king, is known to have been reigning in 783, it is not likely that the first king came to the throne earlier than 725. The thirteen reigns and ten generations between 725 and 1019 give an average of 22·6 years per reign and 29·4 years per generation, which is higher than the ordinary. While the dates assumed above may be slightly too early, they are certainly not too late, and the possible margin for error is very small.

IV. VATSARĀJA, *circa* 770–800 A.D.

The fourth king of the dynasty, Vatsarāja, is something more than a mere name. Good evidence proves that he

¹ "Epigraphic Notes and Questions," p. 18 of reprint from J. Bo. Br. R.A.S., vol. xx.

was reigning in 783–4; an unpublished inscription from Osia, to the north of Jodhpur, No. 1 of my List, describes him as a Pratihāra; and a considerable body of testimony, which records his wars with the surrounding powers, defines his relations with the contemporary sovereigns of Northern and Western India. He is stated to have been a worshipper of Maheśvara or Śiva. His queen, the mother of his successor, Nāgabhaṭa II, was named Sundarī devī.

The Sāgar Tāl inscription (No. 8) asserts that he “seized by main force (*hathād agrahīt*) the imperial sway (*sāmrajyam*) from the famous house of Bhaṇḍi”. The meaning of this statement is not apparent. The only Bhaṇḍi known to history is the prince who was brought up with Harṣa as a companion, and was a son of the brother of Harṣa’s mother, Yaśomatī or Yaśovati.¹ Unfortunately, Bāṇa gives no indication of the family to which Yaśomatī and Bhaṇḍi belonged, nor has any record been found which mentions Bhaṇḍi as the ruler of a kingdom. Harṣa’s cousin, therefore, may or may not be the Bhaṇḍi alluded to in the inscription, and the identity of the once “famous house of Bhaṇḍi” remains unknown.

Our definite knowledge of the ambitious character of Vatsarāja and the wide extent of territory covered by his campaigns is derived from the records of the rival Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Mānyakheṭa and Nāsik, which for several generations maintained an unceasing conflict with the Gurjara chiefs. Three grants of the time of Govinda III, ranging in date from 806 to 812 A.D., recite the fact that Vatsarāja, lord of the Gurjaras, had conquered Gauḍa (Gauṛa) and Vaṅga, and in his turn had been humbled by Dhruva (Dhora, Nirupama) Rāṣṭrakūṭa, the father of Govinda III. Dhruva is alleged to have

¹ Bāṇa, *Harṣa-carita*, transl. Cowell & Thomas, p. 116. See Hoernle, *ante*, p. 137.

driven Vatsarāja into the deserts of Mārṇār. Kakkarāja II, the subordinate Rāṣṭrakūṭa Rāja of Gujarāt, took part in the war by protecting Mālava against the Gurjaras.¹ Gauḍa means Western and Central Bengal, probably including Magadha or South Bihār, and Vaṅga means Eastern Bengal. We need not necessarily suppose that Vatsarāja actually penetrated the latter province; it is more probable that the Rāja of Vaṅga, as an ally of the king of Gauḍa, shared his defeat in a battle fought on the western frontier of the Bengal king's dominions. It is sufficiently surprising that the Gurjara king of Rājputāna should have made his way so far east even as Magadha. The dominions of Bhaṇḍi, whose descendant he defeated according to the Sāgar Tāl inscription, must have occupied some of the intermediate territory.

The chronology of the Pāla dynasty of Gauḍa is too imperfectly determined to allow of absolute certainty as to the name of the king defeated by Vatsarāja, but there can be little doubt that he was Gopāla, the first of that

¹ The three grants are (1) the Waṇi grant dated, according to Dr. Fleet, in "Śaka 730 for 728 (A.D. 806-7, the *Vyaya saṁvatsara*" (*Ind. Ant.*, xi, 156, 160); (2) the Rādhapur grant, dated 730 Śaka, 808 A.D. (Kielhorn, *Ep. Ind.*, vi, 240); and (3) the Barodā grant of Kakkarāja II, dated Śaka 734, 812-13 A.D. (Fleet, *Ind. Ant.*, xii, 164). The text of the Waṇi grant, repeated in the Rādhapur document, is as follows:—"Having with his armies, which no other army could withstand, quickly caused Vatsarāja, intoxicated with the goddess of the fortune of (*the country of*) Gauḍa, that he had acquired with ease, to enter upon the path of misfortune in the centre of (*the deserts of*) Maru, he took away from him not only the two (*regal*) umbrellas of Gauḍa, that were as radiantly white as the rays of the autumn moon, but also, at the same moment, his fame that had reached to the extremities of the regions." Kakkarāja's grant explains that the entrance to Mālava was barred against the lord of the Gurjaras, who had been "evilily inflamed by conquering the lord of Gauḍa and the lord of Vaṅga". The Rāṣṭrakūṭas being the enemies of the Gurjaras, the testimony of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa grants to the success gained by Vatsarāja in his war against Gauḍa may be accepted without reserve. The mention of both Gauḍa and Vaṅga in Kakkarāja's grant explains the reference to *two* state umbrellas in the Waṇi and Rādhapur documents.

dynasty, who, according to Tāranāth, ruled for forty-five years, and annexed Magadha late in his reign. If Gopāla be assumed to have come to the throne in or about 732 A.D. his reign would have terminated in 777, when he was succeeded by Dharmapāla, who is said to have reigned for sixty-four years, and is known to have reigned at least thirty-two. Dharmapāla, as we shall see presently, was a monarch of great power, and it is unlikely that he should have succumbed to the Gurjara attack. It is, therefore, all but certain that the King of Gauḍa defeated by Vatsarāja was Gopāla, and the event may be dated between 770 and 777, somewhere about 775. It cannot be well assigned to a later date, because it is now established that Govinda II, elder brother of Dhruva, occupied the throne for some years, and that Dhruva's reign was not a long one. His successor certainly was in power in Śaka 716 = 794–5 A.D. Roughly speaking, Dhruva's reign must be assigned to the decade between 780 and 790. Consequently, his defeat of Vatsarāja must fall within the same limits, and Vatsarāja's raid on Bengal must be dated earlier.

The Barodā inscription of Kakkarāja shows that, even in the time of Dhruva's successor, Govinda III, Vatsarāja still continued to be puffed up by the remembrance of his victory over the armies of Bengal, and needed to be restrained from aggressions against his southern neighbour in Mālava. Dhruva's victory, therefore, would not seem to have inflicted permanent injury on the growing Gurjara power, which made an immense advance a few years later under the leadership of Nāgabhaṭa II, the successor of Vatsarāja.

In addition to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions, a literary document gives important information concerning Vatsarāja and his contemporaries. The passage alluded to is stanza 51 in the colophon to the Jain *Harivamśa*, the text of which is given by Professor R. G. Bhandarkar as follows:—

शकैष्वब्दशतेषु सप्तसु दिशं पञ्चोत्तरेषूत्तरां
 पातीन्द्रायुधनाम्नि कृष्णनृपजे श्रीवल्लभे दक्षिणाम ।
 पूर्वा श्रीमदवन्तिभूभृति नृपे वत्सादि(ध)राजेऽपरां
 सौर्या(रा) नामधिमण्डले(लं) जययुते वीरे वराहेऽवति ॥

“*Śākeṣvabdasateṣu saptasu diśaṁ pañchottareṣūttarāṁ
 Pātīndrāyudhanāmnī Kṛṣṇanṛipaje Śrīvallabhe
 dakṣiṇām ;
 Pūrvāṁ Śrīmad-Avanti-bhūbhṛiti nṛipe Vatsādi-
 (dhi)rāje 'parāṁ
 Soryā(rā) ṇāmadhimaṇḍale(laṁ) jayayute vīre
 varāhe 'vati.*”¹

The translation has been the subject of dispute, but, when the text is interpreted in the light of the inscriptions, the following free version, mainly in accordance with Professor Bhandarkar's opinion, may be accepted as correct :—

“In the Śaka year 705, when the person named Indrāyudha was ruling the northern, and King Kṛṣṇa's son, Śrī Vallabha, was ruling the southern region ; while the East was under the rule of the illustrious lord of Avanti, and the West under that of the sovereign lord Vatsarāja, and the territory of the Sauryas under that of the heroic Jayavarāha.”

The year 705 Śaka corresponds, according to Cunningham's tables, to the period beginning March 9, 783 A.D., and ending on February 26, 784. The text informs us that in that year the North was governed by Indrāyudha, the South by Śrī Vallabha, son of King Kṛṣṇa, the East by the lord of Avanti, and the West by the sovereign lord Vatsarāja, while the territory of the Sauryas was under the rule of the heroic Jayavarāha (or “the heroic and victorious Varāha”).

¹ *Bom. Gaz.*, 1896, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 197 n.

Avanti, as is well known, is another name for that section of Mālava, or Mālwā, of which Ujjain was the capital, but no materials seem to exist for the identification of the particular Ujjain chief referred to. The "territory of the Sauryas" most likely means the peninsula of Saurāṣṭra, or Surāṣṭra, the modern Kāthiāwār, or, at least, the southern part of that peninsula. The ruler alluded to cannot be identified at present.

My immediate concern is only with the three named kings, Indrāyudha in the North, Kṛṣṇa's son, Śrī Vallabha, in the South, and Vatsarāja in the West. Indrāyudha undoubtedly was king of Pañcāla, with his capital at Kanauj. His history will be examined fully in connexion with the reign of Nāgabhaṭa II. Here it will suffice to note that the Jain author's mention of his name is of high value as fixing for him a definite date, and also as conclusive proof that the Gurjara conquest of Kanauj occurred later than 783 A.D. The title Śrī Vallabha permits no doubt that the king of the South (as regarded from the writer's point of view) was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa, and the explanation that he was the son of King Kṛṣṇa can mean, as applied to the year 783 A.D., only that he was one of the two sons of Kṛṣṇa I, that is to say, either Govinda II or his brother and antagonist, Dhruva. Although it is now certain that Govinda II actually reigned for some years, various reasons indicate that the Śrī Vallabha alluded to must be Dhruva.¹ Vatsarāja, king of the West, obviously must be interpreted to mean the king who is known to have suffered defeat at the hands of Dhruva. Thus the Jain author establishes the synchronism of Indrāyudha, king of Kanauj, Dhruva, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of the Deccan, and Vatsarāja, the Gurjara king of Bhinmāl, in the year 783 A.D. The date so fixed, being in perfect accord with the epigraphic and other evidence, may be accepted without demur. Clearly

¹ *Ep. Ind.*, vi, 195.

proved synchronisms of an exact kind so rarely occur in the records of early Indian history that the firm chronological standpoint afforded by this passage in the Jain *Harivaṃśa* is of exceptional value. As will further appear in the discussion of the next reign, it is also of material help in settling the chronology of the Pāla kings of Bengal.¹

The epigraphic and literary authorities cited enable the historian to construct an outline of the reign of Vatsarāja as follows :—

Vatsarāja, the fourth known prince of the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty of Rājputāna, was the son of Devarāja, or Devaśakti, the third king, by Bhūyikā devī, and came to the throne about 770 A.D. His queen was Sundari devī, mother of his successor, Nāgabhaṭa II. In religion Vatsarāja was a Brahmanical Hindu, with a special devotion to Śiva. He was an ambitious, aggressive prince, and carried his arms across the Gangetic plains, attacking with success the Buddhist king of Gauda, or Western and Central Bengal, who, almost certainly, must have been Gopāla, the first of the Pāla dynasty. The ruler of Vaṅga, or Eastern Bengal, who probably was subordinate to Gopāla, shared in his neighbour's defeat. Some years later Vatsarāja encountered Dhruva, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, with disastrous results, being defeated, and compelled to flee for a time into the desert parts of Mārwar. The subordinate Rāṣṭrakūṭa Rāja of Gujarāt protected Mālwa against an incursion attempted by Vatsarāja. A statement that Vatsarāja wrested the

¹ It is unnecessary to discuss the early tentative interpretations of the passage, according to which Vatsarāja was supposed to mean "King of the Vatsas", and so forth. It seems to me quite clear that the epithet *Kṛṣṇanripaje* was intended to define the application of the indeterminate title *Śrī Vallabha*. Dr. Fleet long maintained that Govinda II never actually reigned, but the correctness of the contrary opinion has been demonstrated successfully by Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar in his paper on the Cambay plates of Govinda IV (*Ep. Ind.*, vii, 28).

sovereignty from the "famous house of Bhaṇḍi" is not fully intelligible in the present state of knowledge. In the year 783-4 A.D. Vatsarāja was the contemporary of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch, Dhruva, of Indrāyudha, king of Kanauj, of an unnamed king in Avanti, and of Jayavarāha Surāṣṭra. About 800 A.D. he was succeeded by his son, Nāgabhaṭa II.

V. NĀGABHAṬA (NĀGABHAṬṬA) II (*circa* 800-25 A.D.).

Nāgabhaṭa, the fifth king of the dynasty, son and successor of Vatsarāja, is known to have been reigning in 815 A.D.,¹ and may be assumed with confidence to have come to the throne about 800 A.D. Like all the members of his family, he was a Brahmanical Hindu, his special devotion being given to the goddess Bhagavati, who appears to have been the family deity. The prominence of Śakti worship in the devotions of the Parihārs of Kanauj is indicated not only by the fact that three of the kings, namely, Nāgabhaṭa, his grandson Mihira Bhoja, and his great-grandson Mahendrapāla, are described specifically in the genealogies as "worshippers of Bhagavati", but also by the circumstance that the seal of Mahipāla, the tenth king, bears the image of Bhagavati, although the genealogy describes him as a "worshipper of the Sun". Hirānanda, the editor of the Sāgar Tāl inscription, points out that Hindus frequently combine personal devotion to the Śakti goddesses with outward conformity to the ritual of more respectable sects, and cites appositely the pithy Sanskrit saying, **अन्तः शाक्ताः बहिः शैवाः सभामध्ये च वैष्णवाः**—"Inwardly Śāktas, outwardly Śaivas, and in public Vaiṣṇavas."²

Nāgabhaṭa's queen, the mother of his successor, Rāma-bhadra or Rāmadeva, was Īsatādevī. The principal events

¹ Unpublished inscription from Buckalā in Jodhpur State, No. 2 of my List. (Now ed. by D. R. Bhandarkar, *Ep. Ind.*, ix, 198.)

² *Annual Report, Archaeol. Survey*, 1903-4, p. 279.

in the remarkable career of Nāgabhaṭa and his relations with contemporary sovereigns are ascertained chiefly from the Sāgar Tāl inscription (No. 8 of my List), the grants of Dharmapāla, the Pāla king of Bengal, and an unpublished Rāṣṭrakūṭa record. Welcome confirmation of these documents is afforded by a passage in the work of the Buddhist historian, Tāranāth. The only document which professes to give a list of Nāgabhaṭa's conquests is the Sāgar Tāl inscription, which, in the customary rhetorical language, credits him with having inflicted defeats on the kings of Andhra, Saindava, Vidarbha, Kalinga, and Vaṅga, with having vanquished Cakrāyudha, and captured hill-forts belonging to the rulers of Ānarta, Mālava, Kirāta, Turuṣka, Vatsa, and Matsya. The overthrow of Cakrāyudha involved the annexation of the Gangetic kingdom of Pañcāla, with its capital Kanauj, which now became the headquarters of the Gurjara empire. It also implied defiance of the great Pāla monarch, Dharmapāla, who had set Cakrāyudha on the throne. The alleged defeat of the lord of Vaṅga must be interpreted as meaning that Nāgabhaṭa successfully encountered the power of Dharmapāla, whose dominions included the whole of Bengal. It is impossible to say how far the boasts of victories in the Andhra country, between the Godāvari and the Kṛṣṇā, in Saindava, or Sind, in Vidarbha, or Berār, and in Kalinga, or Orissa, were in accordance with the facts. It is not difficult to believe that the prince who was capable of effecting the permanent annexation of distant Kanauj, should also have been strong enough to capture hill-forts in Ānarta, or North Kāthiāwār, in Mālava, and in Matsya, or Eastern Rājputāna. The Turuṣkas referred to probably should be interpreted as meaning the Arabs, who were then settled firmly in Sind, and had some hold on Gujarāt and Kāthiāwār. The Kirātas may be interpreted as meaning wild hill tribes of either the Himalayan or other

ranges. The exact position of Vatsa is not known, but the allusion may be to the territory of Kauśāmbī, in or near the Rewā country, which is associated with the name of Vatsa.¹

We learn from the Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla and the Khālimpur grant of Dharmapāla, kings of Bengal, that prior to the thirty-second or thirty-third year ("year 32") of Dharmapāla's reign he had defeated and dethroned Indrāyudha, or Indrarāja, king of Kanauj and Pañcāla, and had substituted in the place of the vanquished monarch a prince named Cakrāyudha, probably his younger brother. The enthronement of the new king was effected with the submissive assent of the surrounding powers, enumerated as being the Bhoja, Matsya, Madra, Kuru, Yadu, Yavana, Avantī, Gandhāra, and Kīra kings. Although the position of all the kingdoms alluded to cannot be precisely defined, the list evidently is equivalent to a catalogue of the principal states in Northern and

¹ "Ānarta is known from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. It corresponds to northern Kāthiāvāḍ. Its capital was Kuśasthali, the modern Dvārakā" (Bhagwān Lal Indraji and Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, vii, 259). Benfey refers to *Mbh.*, 2, 614.

According to Cunningham, "Matsya then included the whole of the present Alwar territory, with portions of Jaypur and Bharatpur. Bairāt and Māchāri were both in Matsya-deśa; while Kāman, Mathurā, and Bayāna were all in Surasena" (*Reports*, xx, 2; *Anc. Geogr.*, pp. 340-5).

"De l'ensemble des témoignages, il apparaît qu'aux temps anciens, les Hindous désignaient sous le nom de Kirātas toutes les populations de famille tibéto-birmane qui s'échelonnaient entre les hauts plateaux de l'Himalaya, les bouches du Gange et le littoral voisin. Refoulés ou absorbés par la poussée hindoue, les Kirātas n'ont subsisté que dans les montagnes, à l'Est du Népal" (Sylvain Lévi, *Le Népal*, vol. ii, p. 77). But the term is also used in a less definite sense. The names Kirāta and Pulinda are employed interchangeably in the *Dasakumāracarita* (Bomb. ed., p. 25). Dr. Collins holds, and apparently with reason, that the name Kirāta "can only be regarded as one of the general terms for non-Aryan aborigines" (*Geographical Data of the Raghuvamśa and Dasakumāracarita*, Leipzig, 1907, pp. 8, 18).

Vatsa is said to have been in the south-eastern division of the middle country (*Brhat Samhitā* transl. in *Ind. Ant.*, xxii, 193). For discussion of the position of Kauśāmbī, see JRAS., 1898, p. 503; 1900, p. 1; 1903, p. 583; 1904, pp. 249, 544.

North-Western India, including the Panjāb, at the beginning of the ninth century. Cakrāyudha having been installed with so great solemnity by the most powerful monarch of the day, acting in concert with nine other considerable kings, Nāgabhaṭa displayed much audacity in attacking and dethroning him, and so defying the authority of Dharmapāla and all his allies. The success obtained by the Gurjara chief in this arduous enterprise must have raised him at once to the rank of paramount sovereign of Upper India, previously held by Dharmapāla. The approximate date of this momentous change in political conditions probably was a little later than 800, say about 810 A.D. Inasmuch as Nāgabhaṭa's successors for eight reigns are known to have held their court at Mahodaya, or Kanauj, there can be no doubt that Nāgabhaṭa transferred his capital to that city from Bhilmāl, the ancient headquarters of his race and family. The only other definite event recorded as having occurred during his reign is a defeat which the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, Govinda III (784–815 A.D.), claims to have inflicted on him. Even if the defeat really occurred, it had no serious significance, for the Gurjara power continued its growth unchecked.¹

¹ The Bhāgalpur copper-plate records a grant made by Nārāyaṇa-pāla, great-grandson of Vākpāla, brother of Dharmapāla. Verse 3 recites that Dharmapāla gave the sovereignty over Mahodaya or Kanauj, which he had acquired by the defeat of Indrarāja (= Indrāyudha) and others, to the suppliant Cakrāyudha (*Ind. Ant.*, xv, 304; xx, 188).

The Khālimpur copper-plate, dated in the year 32 of the reign of Dharmapāla, recites (v. 12) that he had "installed the illustrious king of Kanyakubja, who readily was accepted by the Bhoja, Matsya, Madra, Kuru, Yadu, Yavana, Avanti, Gandhāra, and Kira kings, bowing down respectfully with their diadems trembling, and for whom his own golden coronation jar was lifted up by the delighted elders of Pañcāla" (*Ep. Ind.*, iv, 252). Although this contemporary record does not name the king of Kanauj, it is obvious that the event described is the installation of Cakrāyudha in succession to Indrarāja (= Indrāyudha), as recorded in the later Bhāgalpur grant.

The position of the Bhoja kingdom has been discussed recently with much learning by Dr. Mark Collins, who has shown good reason for

The Buddhist historian Tāranāth gives valuable information about King Dharmapāla, which offers important confirmation of the records quoted above.

“After him [scil. Devapāla], Dharmapāla, the son of this king, was chosen as sovereign. He exercised sovereignty for 64 years, and since he had also brought under his rule Kāmarūpa, Tirahuti, Gauḍa, etc., his

believing that the Vidarbha of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* and Dandin's *Daśakumāracarita* should be identified with the kingdom of the Vākāṭaka dynasty, the members of which were feudatories of the later kings of the imperial Gupta line. The rulers of this kingdom were known as Bhojas, and the political centre of their dominion was Bhojakaṭarājyam, corresponding roughly with the Illicpur District in Berār, to the north of the Tapti (Tāpi) River. The authority of the Vākāṭakas in the sixth century had extended certainly as far north as the native state of Jaso in the Bundelkhaṇḍ group of Central Indian States (*circa* lat. 24° 24', long. 80° 30'), on the northern side of the Narmadā, and it is quite possible that Bhojas from Vidarbha may have attended the installation of Cakrāyudha. When that event took place the Vākāṭaka dynasty had long become extinct, but the tribal name Bhoja survived, and the Bhojas who came into touch with Dharmapāla most likely lived near the Narmadā.

The Matsya country, as already noted, is supposed to be equivalent to Eastern Rājputāna. The Madra nation certainly occupied the central parts of the Panjāb. The Kurus may be associated with the Kurukshetra of Thānēsar, and the Yadus, or Yādavas, may be the people of the Mathurā territory. The name Yavana, as is well known, was used in an indefinite way to designate various races of foreign origin in the north-west of India, and it is impossible to identify precisely the meaning attached to the term by Dharmapāla's historiographer. Avanti, of course, means Eastern Mālwā, or the Ujjain territory. Gandhāra, presumably, has its usual meaning, and designates the Peshāwar District, with certain adjoining regions. The Kīras occupied territory in the Kāngrā Valley, where their name is preserved at Kīragrāma, the village in which the famous temple of Vaidyanāth or Baijnāth stands, or stood until the earthquake of 1905. One of the inscriptions there shows that in the eleventh century (926 Śaka, corrected date) Kīragrāma was a fief of the kingdom of Trigarta or Jālandhara. In literature the Kīras are often mentioned in connexion with the Hūnas, and also with the Kulūtas, or inhabitants of Kulu (*Ep. Ind.*, i, pp. 97 ff.; JRAS., 1900, p. 540; Cunningham, *Reports*, v, 178; *Archæol. Surv. Annual Rep.*, 1902-3, p. 268).

The defeat of Nāgabhaṭa by the Rāṣtrakūṭa king, Govinda III, is mentioned in an unpublished inscription of Amoghavarṣa belonging to Professor R. G. Bhandarkar (Bhandarkar, “The Gurjaras,” p. 4 of reprint).

dominions were very extensive, reaching on the east as far as the ocean, on the west inland to Delhi (Dili), on the north to a point below Jālandhar, and on the south over the inner valleys from the skirts of the Vindhya mountains (*im Süden von dem Schooss des Vindhja-Gebirges einwärts über die Thäler*) . . . Contemporary with this king in Western India was Cakrāyudha, as clearly appears from the inscription on the pillar (obelisk) of the younger Sitā of Jayasena.¹ Roughly speaking, it appears that he was a contemporary of the Tibetan king Khri srong lde btsan." (Schiefner, pp. 218–19.)

Although Tāranāth errs in representing Dharmapāla as being the son and successor of Devapāla, who, as a matter of fact, was the son and successor of Dharmapāla, the historian was sufficiently well acquainted with the chronological position of Dharmapāla. The Tibetan king, Khri srong lde btsan, with whom Tāranāth makes Dharmapāla to have been approximately contemporary, was born in 730, and reigned for forty-six years, from 743 to 789 A.D.² The latter years of his reign, therefore, coincided with the earlier years of Dharmapāla, who came to the throne about 777 or 780 A.D.

Tāranāth is also right in stating that Dharmapāla was contemporary with Cakrāyudha. At the time, about 800 A.D., when Dharmapāla was strong enough to depose Indrāyudha from the throne of Kanauj and to replace him by Cakrāyudha, with the humble assent of nine

¹ Schiefner could not explain this phrase. The pillar has not been discovered. The mention of Delhi is an anachronism, as the city was not founded until 993–4 A.D. (*E. Hist. India*, 2nd ed., p. 355), but the historian intends only to mark the western limit of Dharmapāla's rule by naming a well-known place.

² Khri srong lde btsan was the patron of Guru Padma-sambhava, a native of Udyāna, trained at Nālanda, who came to Tibet in 747 A.D. and introduced Lamaism (Waddell, *The Buddhism of Tibet*, 1895, p. 24). The dates given in the text for the birth and reign of Khri srong lde btsan rest on the authority of Sarat Candra Dās ("Contributions on Tibet," JASB., 1881, vol. iv, pt. i, p. 224).

northern powers, the extent of his sovereignty cannot have been much less than that attributed to him by Tāranāth, whose statement that his dominions extended on the east to the ocean implies that Vaṅga, or Eastern Bengal, was subject to his control. The permanent occupation of Kanauj and the kingdom of Pañcāla by Nāgabhaṭa Parihār greatly restricted the authority and influence of Dharmapāla, and proportionately exalted the position of the new rulers of Kanauj, who now became the dominant power in Northern India.

VI. RĀMA, RĀMABHADRA, OR RĀMADEVA (*circa* 825–40 A.D.).

Nāgabhaṭa was succeeded by his son Rāmabhadra, or Rāmadeva, whose mother was Īśatādevī. No contemporary records of Rāmabhadra's reign having been discovered, it is impossible to fix the date of his accession with precision, but 825 A.D. may be accepted as a close approximation to the truth. He is described as being a worshipper of the Sun. Inscription No. 5, which gives him the name of Rāmadeva, proves that his dominions included Gwālior. Kanauj, no doubt, was his capital. Inasmuch as the next king, Mihira Bhoja, was reigning in 843, Rāmabhadra's reign may be assumed to have ended in or about 840 A.D.

VII. MIHIRA, OR BHOJA I (*circa* 840–90 A.D.).

Mihira, surnamed Bhoja, son of Rāmabhadra by Appādevī, is known to have been on the throne from 843 to 882 A.D., and consequently must have reigned at least forty years. If his reign be assumed to have lasted half a century, from 840 to 890, the possible error is small. The Sāgar Tāl inscription (No. 8 of my List) proves that his personal name was Mihira, and he is mentioned by that name in a grant dated June 6, 867 A.D., issued by Dhruva Dhāravarṣa, a Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler of Bharōc (Broach), who claimed the honour of having

defeated Mihira, the conqueror of the world.¹ But the Parihār king was more generally known by his secondary name or title (*biruda*) of Bhoja, which occurs in many inscriptions. Another title assumed by him was that of Ādi-varāha, the Primæval Boar, indicating that he wished to identify himself with the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu. This title is found in the Caturbhuja inscription from Gwālior (No. 5 of my list), and on certain coins of base silver, which are extremely common in Northern India. These coins, mentioned in the Siyaḍonī inscription as “Ādi-Varāha drammas”, are descended from the Greek drachma through Sassanian types. The obverse exhibits the legend *Śrīmad-ādivarāha* in bold letters, accompanied by certain marks indicative of the Sassanian prototype. The reverse displays an image of the Boar incarnation and the solar wheel. The type probably continued to be issued by Bhoja’s successors.² Notwithstanding this evidence of devotion to a special manifestation of Viṣṇu, Bhoja is described in the genealogies as a worshipper of the goddess Bhagavati. A third title, Prabhāsa, assumed by Bhoja, which occurs in the Daulatpurā inscription (No. 3 of my List), means “splendour” or “beauty”, and seems to refer to his personal name, Mihira, “the Sun.”

Bhoja was contemporary with Amoghavarṣa I and Kṛṣṇarāja II of the main Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, with Kokkalla I of Cedi, and with Rāhila and Harṣa of the Candēl dynasty of Jejākabhukti. All these princes were connected one with another by marriage. Kokkalla I (*circa* 860–900 A.D.) claims to have enjoyed the support of his son-in-law, Kṛṣṇa II (888–912 A.D.), in the south and of Bhoja in the north (Bilhari and Benares inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.*, i, 252 ; ii, 300). The queen of Kokkalla I was

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, xii, 189 ; No. 77 of Kielhorn’s “Southern List” (*Ep. Ind.*, vii, App.).

² Cunningham, *Coins of Med. India*, p. 49, pl. vi, 20, 21 ; *Catal. Coins*, I.M., vol. i, pp. 233, 241, pl. xxv, 18.

a Candēl princess named Naṭṭā, presumably a near relation of Harṣa (*circa* 925–50 A.D.), who is described as the ruler of Cītrakūṭa, where he may have been governor in the time of his father Rāhila.

The epigraphic evidence proves that Bhoja's dominions included places so far apart as Daulatpurā in the Jodhpur State, Rājputāna; Deogarh in the Lalitpur subdivision of the Jhānsi District; Gwālior; Pehewā in the Karnāl District, Panjāb; and, of course, Kanauj the capital. His successors being known to have held Saurāṣṭra and Oudh, those countries also may be fairly assumed to have been within the limits of Bhoja's empire. Those limits may be defined as, on the north, the foot of the mountains; on the north-west, the Sutlaj; on the west, the Hakra, or "lost river", which formed the boundary of Sind, the Mihrān, and the Indian Ocean; on the south, the Jumna, forming the boundary of Jejākabhukti; on the south-west, the lower course of the Narmadā; and on the east, the boundary of the Pāla kingdom of Magadha. It is possible that on the south the rival kingdoms of Cedi and Jejākabhukti may have recognized more or less the suzerainty of Kanauj. The complete independence of the Candēl power seems to date from the reign of Bhoja's grandson Mahipāla. An attempt made by Bhoja late in his reign to extend his territory in the Panjāb was checked by Śaṅkaravarman, king of Kaśmīr, who reigned from 883 to 902 A.D. (*Rājat.*, bk. v, v. 151).

The government of Bhoja, referred to by the Arab traveller Sulaimān in 851 A.D. as that of the king of Juzr (i.e. Gūjara), was hostile to the Arabs of Sind, who continually threatened his western frontier. The great Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom on the south, the enemy of the Gurjara empire, on the other hand, cultivated the friendship of the Muslim foreigners, and used their aid against the neighbouring inland powers.¹ The king of Juzr, we

¹ *Bom. Gaz.*, 1896, vol. i, pt. i, pp. 468, 526.

are told, maintained a powerful army, with the best cavalry in India, and plenty of camels. He was extremely rich, and there was "no country in India more safe from robbers".¹ This brief remark is all the information that we possess concerning the internal administration of Bhoja. It suffices to prove that he understood the art of government, and was capable of keeping the peace within his borders, as well as of repelling external foes.

VIII. MAHENDRAPĀLA (*circa* 890–908 A.D.).

About 890 A.D. Mihira Bhoja was succeeded by his son Mahendrapāla, whose mother was Candrabhaṭṭārikā-devī. Mahendrapāla, which is used in inscriptions Nos. 10–16, may be regarded as the standard form of this king's name. Variants are Mahindrapāla (No. 18), Mahendrāyudha (No. 9), and Nirbhayarāja, with Prākṛit equivalents, in the plays of Rājaśekhara. The dramatist held office as the *guru*, or teacher, of his sovereign, and was so proud of the honour that he mentions the fact in each of his four extant plays. Like his father, Mahendrapāla was specially devoted to the worship of Bhagavati.

The epigraphic evidence establishes beyond doubt that Mahendrapāla's wide dominions, of which Kanauj was the capital, included Saurāṣṭra, Oudh, Gwālior, and the Karnāl District of the Panjāb. There is no reason to suppose that during his reign the empire inherited from his father suffered any diminution. The exact date of his death cannot be determined, but the event occurred certainly between the years 907 and 914. The reign of Bhoja II being comprised within this short interval, there is little room for error if 908 A.D. be assumed as the date of the death of Mahendrapāla and the accession of his son Bhoja II. Although the materials available do not permit the preparation of a consecutive narrative of the events

¹ Elliot, i, 4.

of Mahendrapāla's reign, the fragmentary records present certain items of interest which deserve notice.

Inscriptions Nos. 9 and 11 of my list are grants made by certain chiefs in Saurāṣṭra, feudatories of the king of Kanauj. The genealogy of these chiefs is given as—

[Vāhuka]dhavala

Avanivarman I

Balavarman

Avanivarman II, Yoga.

Both Balavarman and Avanivarman II were feudatories of Mahendrapāla. The grant made by Balavarman is noticeable as being dated in the year 574 of the Valabhi era, the earliest known mention of that era under that name. We also learn that Balavarman defeated and slew a Hūṇa chief named Jajjapa, the only Hun chief of the period whose name has been preserved. This statement seems to refer to a war in Rājputāna. Balavarman's grandfather is recorded to have gained successes in battle against a Kaṇṇāṭa or Rāṣṭrakūṭa army, and also against King Dharma, that is to say, Dharmapāla, king of Gauḍa or Bengal. The grandfather of Balavarman must have been a feudatory of Bhoja, whom, presumably, he attended in an otherwise unrecorded war with the sovereign of the East. Dharaṇivarāha, who is mentioned as one of the opponents of Avanivarman II, must be the Cāpa prince who is again mentioned in an inscription dated 914 A.D. in the reign of Mahipāla.¹

Inscription No. 10, a grant issued at Kanauj the capital, is of special interest because the village bestowed is

¹ Kielhorn, *Ep. Ind.*, ix, pp. 1-4. While revising the draft of this essay I have heard with the deepest regret the news of the sudden death of Professor Kielhorn, whose labours have made it possible for me to give a detailed history of the Gurjara-Pratihāra empire.

described as being situated in the Vālayikā *viṣaya* (pargana) of the Śrāvastī *maṇḍala* (District), in the *bhukti* (province) of the same name. The famous city of Śrāvastī, although its exact site has not yet been visited, undoubtedly was situated on the upper course of the Rāptī, to the north of Oudh, in territory now Nepalese. The grant, therefore, implies that Northern Oudh was included in the dominions of Mahendrapāla.

When Hiuen Tsang visited Śrāvastī, although most of the ancient Buddhist buildings were in ruins, the site was still inhabited (Watters, i, 377). About the same time, in the year 25 of his reign, equivalent to 631 A.D., Harṣa granted a village in the Kuṇḍadhāni *viṣaya* of the Śrāvastī *bhukti* (*Ep. Ind.*, vii, 157). The latest mention of Śrāvastī which has come to my knowledge is in a grant from the Gorakhpur District, made by a local Rājā named Kīrtipāla in 1111 A.D. One of the villages donated is described as situated in the *viṣaya* of Śrāvastī (*Ep. Ind.*, vii, 94). A Katak inscription of the tenth century alludes to the *maṇḍala* of Śrāvastī (*Ep. Ind.*, iii, 359). The records cited are sufficient to show that throughout the ages, up to the twelfth century, the old city continued to give its name to a *viṣaya* (pargana) and a *maṇḍala* (district). The *bhukti* (province) of Śrāvastī known to Harṣa in 631 was still recognized by Mahendrapāla in 898 A.D.¹ We may, therefore, safely conclude that Śrāvastī continued to be inhabited, though probably by only a small population, at least up to the twelfth

¹ In Kaśmīr the term *viṣaya* = pargana = the later term *rāṣṭra* (Stein, transl. *Rajatar.*, vol. ii, p. 437). This meaning of *viṣaya* certainly suits many inscriptions. The pargana is a wonderfully stable unit of high antiquity. *Maṇḍala* means a larger area, more or less equivalent to the modern district, or perhaps division. *Bhukti* denotes an extensive province or kingdom, as Jejakabhukti = Bundelkhaṇḍ; Tirabhukti = Tirhūt. The reader will observe that the ancient names of three *viṣayas*, viz., Vālayikā, Kuṇḍadhāni, and Śrāvastī, included in the Śrāvastī province, are recorded. Probably they are still traceable. (Now see, for a different view, Vogel, *ante*, 1908, p. 971.)

century, for it is not reasonable to suppose that a wholly vanished city should have continued to give its name to a pargana, district, and province. I shall not be surprised if we hear that the name still survives on the spot.

Inscriptions Nos. 12 and 13, being parts of the huge Siyaḍoṇī record, establish the fact that the Gwālīor territory was included in the dominions of Mahendrapāla, as it had been in those of his predecessor Bhoja, and continued to be in those of his successors Mahipāla and Devapāla. The chieftain or nobleman named Undabhāṭa, mentioned in inscription No. 13 as one of the donors of the gifts recorded, is also known from the Terahi inscriptions, which are epitaphs on the tombstones of two officers killed in 903 A.D. in a fight between the forces of Undabhāṭa and those of a rival chief named Guṇarāja (*Ind. Ant.*, xvii, 201). Terahi lies about twenty-seven miles to the north-west of Siyaḍoṇī (Siron).

Inscription No. 14 (see No. 7 from the same place) proves that the Karnāl District in the Panjāb continued subject to Mahendrapāla, as it had been to his father. This document is chiefly concerned with the eulogy of a noble Tomara family, three members of which had built a temple to Viṣṇu. The name of their ancestor Jāula recalls the title or epithet Jāuvla applied to Toramāṇa Śāhi in the Kura (Salt Range) inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, i, 238). As the Tomaras probably were a clan of the Gurjaras, who were closely associated with the Hūṇas, or White Huns, it is not surprising that a Hun name, in a slightly modified form, should occur in a Tomara family.

IX. BHOJA II (*circa* 908-10 A.D.).

The existence of this king is known from inscription No. 19 only. Nothing is recorded about him, except that he was a Vaiṣṇava in religion and that his mother's name was Devanāgā-devī. Evidently he left no competent heir, and consequently, after a brief reign, was

succeeded by his half-brother, Mahipāla, whose mother was Mahidevi-devī.

X. MAHĪPĀLA (*circa* 910–40 A.D.).

This king, who came to the throne about 910 A.D., or a little later, and was a worshipper of the Sun, like his great-grandfather, Rāmabhadra, is known by a variety of names. One of these, Kṣitipāla, is an exact synonym of Mahipāla. Two others, Herāmbapāla and Vināyakapāla, are titles of the minor deity, Gaṇapati or Gaṇeśa, and another, Harṣa, is an alternative name for Śiva (*Ep. Ind.*, ii, 117). The choice of these mythological names proves that Mahipāla, while professing special devotion to the Sun, the favourite deity of his Scythic ancestors and all Rājput clans,¹ was not insensible to the claims of other members of the Hindu pantheon upon his veneration.

Inasmuch as the known dates for Mahipāla extend from 914 to 931, and his successor was reigning in 948 A.D., the limits of his reign may be determined as extending from 910 to 940 A.D. in round numbers.

We learn from the Cambay plates of Govinda IV, Rāṣṭrakūṭa, that early in the reign of Mahipāla, Indra III, father of Govinda IV (Feb. 915–*circa* 917 A.D.), captured Kanauj (*Ep. Ind.*, vii, pp. 30, 43). The same event seems to be that alluded to by the Kanarese poet Pampa, who affirms that Narasiṃha defeated the Gurjara king Mahipāla, and bathed his horses at the junction of the Ganges, that is to say, advanced as far as Prayāga, or Allāhābād. Narasiṃha, a Calukya chief, was the father of the poet's patron, Arikēśarin Karnāta, and apparently must have been a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king.²

¹ In Rājputāna, in Malcolm's time, every male Rājput infant received, as the first present from his father, an embossed figure of a horse and the sun, made of either gold or silver, which he continued to wear suspended from his neck, worshipping it daily as his personal deity (Malcolm, *Central India*, 1832, 3rd ed., vol. ii, p. 144).

² JRAS., N.S., vol. xiv, p. 319, quoted by Fleet in *Kanarese*

The Rāṣṭrakūṭa does not seem to have attempted to hold Kanauj or to annex the kingdom of Pañcāla, which continued to be governed by the Gurjara dynasty for more than a century after the successful raid of Indra III. But the capture of the capital, even temporarily, must have been a severe blow to the power of Mahipāla, and his reign may be considered to mark the beginning of the decline and fall of his house. Nevertheless, he continued to be recognized as one of the greatest sovereigns of India. The dramatist Rājasēkhara, who resided at his court, does not hesitate to call him "sovereign of Āryāvarta", or Northern India. The latest play composed by Rājasēkhara, the *Bāla-bhārata* or *Pracāṇḍa-pāṇḍava*, was performed at Kanauj in the presence of Mahipāla (Konow and Lanman, *Karpūra-Mañjarī*, p. 188).

The province of Saurāṣṭra or Kāthiāwār certainly was still subject to the suzerainty of Mahipāla in December, 914 A.D., when his feudatory Dharaṇivarāha Cāpa, governor of Vardhamāna (Vaḍhvān), made the grant of a village (Inscr. No. 17). This chieftain has been mentioned already as a feudatory of Mahēndrapāla (Inscr. No. 11). The dependence of Saurāṣṭra on the Gurjara kingdom of Bhilmāl and Kanauj possibly may have continued as late as 961, in the reign of Vijayapāla Gurjara, when Mūlarāja Caulukya (Solanki) overthrew the subordinate Cāpa dynasty of Anhilvād (Anahilapattana, etc.) and overran Saurāṣṭra. The Caulukya dynasty founded by Mūlarāja certainly was quite independent of Kanauj, and it is not unlikely that the province of Saurāṣṭra was lost to the Kanauj kingdom

Dynasties (Bom. Gaz., vol. i, pt. ii, p. 380), and by Jackson, *ibid.*, pt. i, pp. 466, 469. The passage runs, as given by Fleet :—"His son Narasiṃha . . . plucked the goddess of victory from the arms of Ghūrjararāja (*sic*), defeated a king named Mahipāla, and bathed his horses at the junction of the Ganges." This seems to mean, as interpreted by Mr. Jackson, that Mahipāla is described as "the king of the Gurjaras".

a good many years before 961 A.D. Kṛṣṇa III, Rāṣṭra-kūṭa (940–56 A.D.), claims to have inflicted a defeat on the Gurjaras of the north (*Bom. Gaz.*, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 420, with ref. to inser.). Perhaps Mahipāla may have been obliged to relinquish his hold on the distant western provinces when his capital was captured by Indra III about 916 A.D.

The other inscriptions of Mahipāla, No. 18 of 917 A.D. and No. 19 of 931 A.D., prove that his dominions included both the Fathpur District in the Gangetic Doāb and Benares, but this information is of little value, as these districts, not being very far from Kanauj, probably continued to form part of the Kanauj kingdom until the Gurjara dynasty came to an end in the eleventh century. Mahipāla's dominions must have also included the Gwālior territory, which was still under the sovereignty of his successor Dēvapāla (Inser. No. 20). Gwālior achieved its independence before 977 A.D., during the reign of Vijayapāla (*I.A.*, xv, 35; *Ep. Ind.*, ii, 235). We learn from inscription No. 21 that the Alwar State was governed by a Gurjara-Pratihāra feudatory of Vijayapāla, and that consequently it too must have been included in Mahipāla's kingdom; but it may be doubted if his territory extended any further westward. At the beginning of his reign the traveller Al-Masūdī, who visited India in 915 A.D. and wrote the account of his travels about 950, describes the king of Juzr (Gūjara) as the possessor of many horses and camels, and says that he considered himself as the equal of any king on earth, save only the king of Babylon (Bābal).¹ The capture of Kanauj by Indra III, which occurred probably in 916 A.D., must have abated Mahipāla's pride, and, as observed above, presumably resulted in the loss of Saurāṣṭra and other western provinces. A fragmentary inscription from Khajurāho states that Kṣitipāla

¹ Elliot, *Hist. of India*, vol. i, p. 25; *Bom. Gaz.*, 1896 vol. i, pt. i, pp. 469, 506, 525.

(= Mahipāla) was placed on the throne by a Candēl king, who certainly must have been either Harṣadeva or Yaśovarman, his son. Dr. Hoernle supposes the reference to be to the latter, but I am inclined to agree with Professor Kielhorn that the king indicated was Harṣa, who may have assisted Mahipāla in regaining his throne after the capture of Kanauj by Indra III about 916 A.D.¹ Yaśovarman was contemporary with Devapāla, the son of Mahipāla (Herambapāla), as stated in another Khajurāho inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, i, 134).

XI. DEVAPĀLA (*circa* 940–55 A.D.).

Mahipāla was succeeded by his son Devapāla at some date not far removed from 940. In 948 A.D. inscription No. 20, being part of the Siyaḍoṇī record, mentions Devapāla as the ruling sovereign, and so proves that the Gwālīor territory still formed part of the Kanauj kingdom. Gwālīor was lost during the next reign prior to 977 A.D. The only other epigraphic record of Devapāla is found in a Khajurāho inscription of Yaśovarman Candēlla, dated 1011 Vikrama = 954 A.D., which states that the image of Vaikuṇṭha or Viṣṇu set up in the temple built by Yaśovarman was received by him from Devapāla, the son of Herambapāla (= Mahipāla), who had purchased it, in exchange for a force of elephants and horses, from Sāhi, king of Kira,² who in his turn had received it as a token of friendship from the king of Bhōṭa (? = Tibet), who had obtained it from the Kailāsa Mountain (*Ep. Ind.*, i, 134). The surrender of this much prized and historical image to Yaśovarman is good evidence that about 950 A.D. the power of the Gurjara

¹ *Ep. Ind.*, i, 122. The fragments of lines 7 and 8 describe Harṣa as a conqueror, and what is left of line 10 consists of the words *punaryena Śrī Kṣitipālādēvaṇripatiḥ simhāsane sthā[pitah]*. The difficulty consists in determining the antecedent of the relative pronoun *yena*, “by whom.”

² Probably the Kāngrā Valley.

king was inferior to that of his Candēl rival. The superiority of the arms of the southern kingdom had also, as already noticed, been experienced by Mahipāla, who was indebted for the recovery of his throne to the good offices of the Candēl king Harṣa. Devapāla seems to have left no competent issue, and was consequently succeeded, in or about 955 A.D., by his brother, or half-brother, Vijayapāla.

XII. VIJAYAPĀLA (*circa* 955–90 A.D.).

Comparison of the genealogical statements in the Siyaḍoṇī inscription No. 20 and the Rājaur inscription No. 21, supplemented by the Candēlla document from Khajurāho which describes Devapāla as the son of Mahipāla (Kṣitipāla, Herāmbapāla), establishes the fact that both Devapāla, known to have been reigning in 948 A.D., and Vijayapāla, known to have been reigning in 960 A.D., were sons of Mahipāla. The omission of Devapāla's name from the Rājaur inscription is satisfactorily explained by the assumption that that prince left no issue, and consequently was omitted from the genealogy. Such omissions are common. The further inference necessarily follows that Vijayapāla was the brother, or half-brother, of Devapāla.

The exact limits of Vijayapāla's reign cannot be determined, but we know that his accession must have occurred between 948 A.D., when his predecessor was on the throne, and 960 A.D., when he was in power himself, and also that his successor, Rājyapāla, was killed in 1019 A.D. The death of Vijayapāla, therefore, falls between 960 and 1019. His reign may be assumed, without the possibility of large error, to cover the period extending from 955 to 990 A.D. This assumption assigns thirty-five years to Vijayapāla and twenty-nine to Rājyapāla, but the figures, of course, are merely approximations to the truth.

The gradual diminution of the Kanauj empire, begun in the time of Mahīpāla, was continued during the reign of Vijayapāla. The foundation of the Solanki (Caulukya) dynasty of Anhilvāda about 961 A.D. by Mūlarāja proves that Gujarāt had completely slipped from the grasp of the sovereign of Kanauj by that date. The Jains have recorded a tradition that some years earlier, about the year 953 A.D., 18,000 inhabitants migrated from Bhilmāl (Bhinamāla), the ancient Gurjara capital in Rājputāna; and it is stated that about 990 A.D. the local chief of Bhilmāl was content to serve as a subordinate ally of Mūlarāja.¹ The Paramāra (Pawār) kingdom of Mālava, too, had become fully independent, and between 974 and 995 was governed by a famous king named Munja, *alias* Vākpati II. These facts prove that the western provinces, which had been subject to Mihira Bhoja and his son, no longer formed part of the dominions of Vināyakapāla.

Meanwhile, the rival Candēl kingdom of Jejākabhukti continued to grow in strength, and attained its maximum of power in the days of King Dhaṅga (*circa* 950–1000 A.D.), who apparently claimed the lordship even of Gwālior (Gopādri), the ancient possession of the Parihārs of Kanauj.² The fortress was wrested from Vināyakapāla at some date prior to 977 A.D. by a Kacchwāha (Kacchapaghāta) chief named Vajradāman, who seems to have held it as a feudatory of the Candēl king Dhaṅga.³ The Kacchwāhas retained

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, xix, 233; Jackson, in *Bom. Gaz.*, 1896, vol. i, pt. i, pp. 451, 469. By a clerical error the date of Mūlarāja is given as 740 in the note on p. 451.

² Khajurāho inscription No. 2, vv. 44, 45:—“Dhaṅga . . . who rules the earth . . . even as far as that mountain called Gopa (Gopādri)” (*Ep. Ind.*, i, 134). For limits of Dhaṅga’s dominions see *ibid.*, p. 124. The Jumna was the frontier between them and the Kanauj kingdom of Pañcāla.

³ The relation of feudatory is an inference from the Khajurāho inscription. The only inscription of Vajradāman is dated in 977 A.D. (No. 47 of Kielhorn’s “Northern List”; *JASB.*, vol. xxxi, p. 393). The conquest by Vajradāman is recited in a much later Gwālior inscription

Gwālior until 1128 A.D., when they were succeeded by a local Parihār dynasty. The Parihārs were overthrown by the Sultan Iltitmish (Altamsh) in 1232. The fortress remained in Musalman hands for about a century, and then passed into the hands of a Tomara chief who declared his independence. The connexion between Kanauj and Gwālior never was renewed after its rupture by Vajradāman. There is no proof of any close relationship between the Parihār rulers of Gwālior between 1128 and 1232 and the ancient Parihār royal family of Kanauj.

The Rājaur inscription (No. 21) mentioned above is of special interest as affording clear evidence that the Parihār Rājput̃s originally were a clan of the Gurjara horde. The donor of the grant recorded in the inscription is expressly described as a Gurjara-Pratihāra, that is to say, a member of the Parihār clan of the Gūjar caste. By the tenth century the Gurjaras, no doubt, had become a caste. The record also mentions that the village granted was cultivated by Gurjaras. We can, by means of such hints, justly infer that in the course of centuries the rank and file of the Hinduized descendants of the ancient Gurjara nomad immigrants developed into the pastoral and agricultural castes known as Gūjars, or by other names, while one aristocratic section, that of the Parihārs, which produced ruling families, took rank in Hindu society as Kṣatriyas or Rājput̃s.

In 990, or possibly 991 A.D., the precise date not being ascertainable, Jaipāl, king of the Panjāb (Baṭhindah), formed a confederacy of Hindu princes, including the Rājās of Delhi, Ajmēr, Kālañjar, and Kanauj, to oppose the Amīr Sabuktigin.

The great battle which ensued, fought somewhere between Bannū and Ghaznī, probably in the Kurram

dated 1150 v.e. = approximately 1093 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xv, 35, 41 ; Kielhorn's "Northern List", No. 73).

(Kurmah) Valley, resulted in the total defeat of the allies and the occupation of Peshāwar by the Muhammadans.¹ Among the four allied Rājās mentioned, the ruler of Kālāñjar (Jeḷākabhukti) at that date undoubtedly was Dhaṅga Candēl. The identity of the other three is not certain. Until the date of the accession of Rājyapāla is settled it is impossible to decide whether he or his father was the ally of Jaipāl at the time referred to. Nothing more is known concerning the reign of Vijayapāla.

XIII. RĀJYAPĀLA (*circa* 990–1019 A.D.).

On the assumption that Vijayapāla's reign ended and Rājyapāla's began about 990 A.D., or a little later, the sovereign on the throne of Kanauj in 1008–9 A.D. (399 H.) can have been none other than Rājyapāla. Jaipāl (Jayapāla), king of the Panjāb (Baṭhindah), who, as already mentioned, had suffered a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Amīr Sabuktigīn about 990 A.D., was crushed finally by Sultan Maḥmūd on November 27, 1001. Being allowed, after an interval of captivity, to return to his own land, he committed suicide by fire in 1002 A.D., and was succeeded by his son Ānandapāla. That prince having given trouble to the Sultan at the time of the invasion of Multān, Maḥmūd determined to punish him, and set out on the march to the Indian frontier in the autumn of 1008 A.D. (399 H.). Ānandapāla, being advised of the danger impending over all the Hindu States of Upper India, followed the precedent set by his father and summoned aid from the Rājās of Ujjain, Gwālior, Kālāñjar, Kanauj, Delhi, and Ajmēr. The allies assembled a huge army, surpassing in numbers any which had confronted the Amīr Sabuktigīn. The opposing hosts faced each other for forty days on the plain of Peshāwar, during which interval the Indian army was strongly reinforced

¹ Raverty, *Notes on Afghānistān*, p. 320. That author shows good reason for holding that the battle took place in or near the Kurram Valley.

by fresh contingents, and notably by the accession of 30,000 Khōkhars, a warlike tribe of the Panjāb.

These tribesmen, having succeeded by a bold rush in penetrating the Sultan's entrenchments, slaughtered three or four thousand Musalmans in the course of a few minutes. Victory seemed to be in the grasp of the Indians, but a trivial accident more than neutralized the effect of a brilliant feat of arms and turned their gain into loss. The elephant ridden by Ānandapāla, the commander-in-chief, becoming frightened, bolted in terror and caused a panic among the Hindu host. The moment the Indians gave way they never got another chance. Five or six thousand Arab horsemen, supported by about ten thousand Turks, Afghans, and *Khaljis*, swooped down upon them, pursued the fugitives for two days and two nights, and slew eight thousand. Enormous quantities of booty, including thirty elephants, fell into the hands of the Sultan, who returned to *Ghazni* in 1009 A.D.

The king of Kanauj who shared in this rout and slaughter undoubtedly was Rājyapāla. The king of Kālāñjar was Gaṇḍa, son of Dhaṅga Candel, the Rājā of Jejākabhukti. The personal identity of the remaining allied monarchs cannot be ascertained exactly, but it is probable that the Gwālīor chief was Kīrtirāja Kacchwāha. Delhi, which had been founded only a few years before the disaster, was then ruled by a Tomara prince, a member of a clan of foreign descent, more or less closely connected with the Gūjar-Parihārs. The Rājā of Ajmēr must have been one of the Cauhān (Cahumāna) rulers of Sāmbhar (Śākambharī), on which Ajmēr was dependent.

The Sultan's attack on Kanauj itself was postponed for some years, and nothing is known concerning the history of the city during the interval. In the autumn of 1018 A.D. Maḥmūd quitted *Ghazni* as usual, and passing through Baran or Bulandshahr, reached Mathurā on the Jumna in December. The holy city of Kṛṣṇa was sacked

and burnt. Late in December (8th of Sh'abān) the Sultan arrived before Kanauj, which occupied a strong position on the bank of the Ganges and was defended by seven distinct "forts", a word which perhaps may be taken to mean "concentric lines of circumvallation". The city was reputed to contain ten thousand temples. Rājyapāla, lacking courage to defend his capital, made little or no resistance, and presently tendered his submission. Maḥmūd, having become master of all the seven forts in a single day, gave his soldiers license to plunder the city and take as many prisoners as they desired. Those inhabitants who had not either escaped or been reduced to slavery were put to the sword, and the temples were destroyed, but the city as a whole was not razed. In the spring the Sultan in his wonted fashion returned to Ghaznī with his spoil and captives.

Gaṇḍa, the Candēl Rājā of Jejākabhukti and Kālañjar, was indignant at the want of spirit shown by Rājyapāla, who had submitted tamely to the foreigner, withdrawn from Kanauj, and moved his court to Bārī on the other side of the Ganges.

The rulers of several other Hindu states sharing the dissatisfaction felt by Gaṇḍa, formed an alliance with him for the purpose of punishing the recreant Rājyapāla. The allies, who included Arjuna, the Kacchwāha Rājā of Gwālīor, placed themselves under the command of Vidhyādhara, the Candēl Crown Prince, son of Gaṇḍa, captured Kanauj, and slew Rājyapāla. These events must have taken place in the hot weather of 1019 A.D., after the departure of the Sultan and before the break of the rains. The dishonoured throne of Kanauj and Bārī was then occupied by Rājyapāla's son Trilocanapāla, who continued to reside at Bārī.

Maḥmūd was furious when he heard at Ghaznī of the punishment inflicted upon the prince whom he regarded as a feudatory, and resolved to take speedy vengeance on

the audacious confederates. In October, 1019 A.D., he again started from his capital, and, after a march of three months, attacked and captured Bārī, the new Parihār capital. No effective resistance being offered, the town was plundered and the temples levelled. This event may be dated in January, 1020 A.D.

Maḥmūd then advanced southwards into the Candēl territory, expecting to encounter vigorous resistance. But Gaṇḍa, who had punished with death the pusillanimity of Rājyapāla, was himself equally deficient in courage, and could not harden his heart to face the fierce warriors of Islam.

The Sultan, seeing the vast numbers of the enemy, feared that he had advanced too rashly into the midst of a hostile country, and ascended an eminence to reconnoitre the dangerous position. But his anxiety was needless, for "when night came on, great fear and alarm entered the mind of Gaṇḍa, who fled with some of his personal attendants, leaving all his baggage and equipment". Thus shamefully was the Hindu cause lost. Maḥmūd obtained vast quantities of booty, including 580 elephants, and so, "loaded with victory and success, returned to Ghaznī."¹

¹ The narrative in the text is based on a combination of the testimony of the inscriptions with that of the Muhammadan historians. Al-'Utbi, author of the *Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī*, was Secretary to the Sultan Maḥmūd, and is, therefore, entitled to credit as a contemporary authority. With one exception, his narrative does not deal with events subsequent to 1020 A.D. (410 H.). He records briefly the hardly won victory gained by Maḥmūd over Ānandapāla, king of the Panjāb, late in 1008 A.D., and states that the allies were led by Brāhmanapāla, son of Ānandapāla (Elliot, ii, 33). A fuller account is given by the late compiler, Firishṭa, who presumably based his narrative on earlier authorities (Elliot, ii, 446).

Al-'Utbi's history of the Kanauj expedition is the best that we possess (Elliot, ii, 41, 42, 44-6, 457). The Sultan, having crossed the Jumna (Jūn) on the 20th Rajab, 409 H. = December 2, 1018 A.D., then captured various strongholds, sacked Mathurā, and advanced on Kanauj. "He left the greater part of his army behind, and took only a small body of troops with him against Rāi Jaipāl [*v.l.* Rājāpāl, Rajaipāl, etc., slight corruptions of Rājyapāla], who had also but a few men with him, and was preparing to flee for safety to some of his dependent vassals."

When Elliot, Reinaud, and other authors commented on Al-'Utbi's

XIV. TRILOCANAPĀLA (1019 – ? 1030 A.D.).

Trilocanapāla, the successor and presumably the son of the unlucky Rājyapāla, was no more successful in war narrative the Parihār and Candēl inscriptions were not known, and “Rāi Jaipāl” was an insoluble puzzle. He was confounded with Jaipāl, the king of the Panjāb, who had opposed Sabuktigīn, and was also mixed up with the princes of the Śāhiya dynasty of Ohind (Kābul). Now that it is certain that Rājyapāla was the Rājā of Kanauj in 1018 A.D., it is easy to make the slight correction required in Al-’Utbi’s text, and the whole story becomes fully intelligible.

Nizām-ud-dīn, the author of the *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Akbarī*, seems to be in error in representing the sack of Mathurā as subsequent to that of Kanauj (Elliot, ii, 460). The testimony of the contemporary Al-’Utbi is to be preferred. The explanations that Rājyapāla’s death was a punishment inflicted by his allies for his failure to resist the invader and that Maḥmūd returned to India with the special purpose of punishing the Hindu allies in his turn are due to Nizām-ud-dīn. By the accidental omission of a stroke the name of Gaṇḍa, گنڈا, is transformed into Nandā, نندا, in the Persian texts. The true form of the name is known from the Mau Candēl inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, i, 295–307). The Dūbkund inscription near Gwālior (*Ep. Ind.*, ii, 235) records the slaying of Rājyapāla, king of Kanauj, by Arjuna, the Kacchwāha chief of Gwālior, under the command of Vidhyādhara Candēl, who must have been then Crown Prince, as his father Gaṇḍa was still alive when attacked later by Maḥmūd. Another inscription found at Mahobā refers to the same event by describing Vidhyādhara as “a master of warfare, who had caused the destruction of the king of Kanyākubja” (*Ep. Ind.*, i, 219).

Inscription No. 22 in the list in this paper, dated January 26, 1027 A.D., establishes the fact that in the Parihār dynasty of Kanauj Trilocanapāla was the successor of Rājyapāla, the successor of Vijayapāla of the same dynasty, who was reigning in 960 A.D. The name of Trilocanapāla also occurs in Nizām-ud-dīn’s narrative, where it has not been recognized hitherto. Describing the invasion of 410 H. = 1019–20 A.D., the historian says that when Maḥmūd “reached the banks of the Jumna, Tarū Jaibāl [reading of Elliot’s MS.], who had so often fled before his troops, and who had now come to assist Nandā, encamped in face of the Sultan”, etc. It is now obvious that the reading “Tarū Jaibāl” is merely a slight error for Trilocanapāla, the dropping of the upright stroke of the *l* (*lām*) making all the difference (*Tarū Jaibāl* = تروحيماال ; *Trilocanapāla* = ترلوچنپال). As everybody knows, the dots in Persian writing often go astray (see Elliot, ii, 463). Elliot’s commentary, for want of the key supplied by the inscriptions, is a bewildering mass of confusion. The statement of Nizām-ud-dīn that Trilocanapāla had often fled before the Sultan is sufficiently accurate when we remember that the son must have shared his father’s flight in the year preceding. The transfer of the Parihār capital from Kanauj to Bārī is deposited to by Alberūnī (Elliot, i, 54; ii, 464; and Sachau’s transl.).

than his father had been. When Maḥmūd, bent on vengeance against the Hindu confederate princes, reached the Jumna in December, 1019 A.D., Trilocanapāla made a show of defending the passage of the river, but was easily defeated with heavy loss. He was not strong enough to make any attempt to hold his new capital Bārī, which was left undefended, and fell a prey to the invader's troops, who, as usual, destroyed the temples. We are not told where Trilocanapāla found refuge, but inscription No. 22, obtained at Jhūsī opposite Allāhābād, proves that in 1027 A.D., seven years after the sack of Bārī, he was residing at Prayāga (Allāhābād), and was in a position to make the grant of a village to Brahmans of Jhūsī (Pratiṣṭhāna). The length of Trilocanapāla's reign is not known.¹ A Rājā named Yasahpāla, who is mentioned in a fragmentary record dated 1036 A.D. (1093 v.E.) found at Karā (Colebrooke, *Essays*, ii, 246), probably was his successor. The names of the later Parihār Rājās, if any, are not known. About 1090 A.D. Kanauj passed into the hands of Candradeva Gaharwār (Gahadavāla), and remained under the rule of his dynasty until the city was destroyed by Shihāb-ud-din in 1193 A.D. Even after that event Rājās of Kanauj continued to exist, as shown in detail in my essay on the history of that city (*ante*, 1908, pp. 791-3).

¹ Cunningham (*Coins Med. India*, p. 60) confounds Trilocanapāla of Kanauj (1019-? 1030 A.D.) with the king of the same name belonging to the Śāhiya dynasty of Ohind (Kābul), who was defeated decisively by Maḥmūd on the bank of the Tosi River about 1013 A.D., and died in 1021-2 A.D. = 412 H. Trilocana ("three-eyed") is a name or epithet of Śiva.