JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

I.

SOME PROBLEMS OF ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY.

NO. III: THE GURJARA CLANS.

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

(Concluded from p. 662, October, 1904.)

[I HAVE already expressed my agreement with General Sir A. Cunningham's theory that the emperors of Kanauj were Tomaras. For the evidence, such as it is, I must refer to his *Arch. Surv. Reports*, vol. i, p. 132 ff. From his theory, in combination with that of Mr. Bhandarkar, it follows, of course, that the Tomaras were a clan of the Gūrjara tribe. It is curious that the Tomaras are hardly ever mentioned in older records. There are, so far as I am aware, only two old inscriptions that name them. One is the Pehewa inscription (*E.I.* i, 244) of the time of Mahendrapāla (c. 885–910 A.D.), and the other is the Harsha inscription (*E.I.* ii, 116) of the Chohan Vighraharāja, dated 773 A.D., which would fall into the reign of Vijayapāla c. 950 – 975 A.D.). Vighraharāja's great-grandfather Bhandana is said to have defeated or slain (*hatvā*) a Tomara

lord (*iśa* and *bhūpa*) named Rudrena, and to have been a cause of terror (*bhaya-da*) to the sovereign (*Kṣitipati*). Seeing that Chandana's date would coincide with that of Kshitipāla (*alias* Mahipāla, c. 913-945 A.D.), it suggests itself that the term *Kṣitipati* may have been chosen on purpose in allusion to Kshitipāla's name, and that the Chohan Chandana may have been one of the chiefs who gave assistance to the Rāshtrakūṭa Indra III in his great war with Mahipāla. Chandana's grandson Simharāja is also said to have had an (apparently unsuccessful) encounter with a Tomara leader (*nāyaka*). Both this "leader" and the "lord" Rudrena must have been chiefs of minor divisions of the imperial Tomara clan of Gūrjaras.

Another minor division of the same clan is recorded in the Pehewa inscription (*E.I.* i, 244). This inscription mentions three generations of a Tomara family, resident apparently in or near Pehewa, in the Karnal District. Its chief interest, however, lies in a remark concerning the descent of the family. It states that the family originally sprang from a king (*rāja*) named Jāula, who, as is clearly implied, lived ages ago. The name Jāula is peculiar: it reminds one of the well-known coins of the Shāhi Javūvla or Jabula (Mr. Rapson's *Indian Coins*, p. 29), and of the Kura inscription (*E.I.* i, 239) of the "great king" (*mahārāja*) Toramāṇa Shāhi Jaūvla. Now there is an old Bandelkhand tradition (*J.A.S.B.* lxxi, 102) that "Toraman, the general of Rāja Gopāl, who was a Kachhwaha by race, invaded Eran in 243, and conquered all countries from Bhopal to Eran. Toraman's son (Sūr Sen) subdued Gwaliyor at the same time, and also built the famous fort of Gwaliyor in 285 [A.D.]. The descendants of Sūr Sen [i.e. the Kachhwahas] ruled over Central India for a long time," down to about 933 A.D., when the Parihar dynasty is said to have "invaded and conquered Gwaliyor." In passing, it may be noted that, according to this tradition, Toramāṇa was a Kachhwaha; also, that what it calls the Kachhwahas are evidently identical with the Gūrjaras. What makes the tradition interesting, however, is that, as a fact, there exists an Eran

inscription of Toramāṇa (*F.G.I.*, p. 158),¹ as well as one of Goparāja, dated in the year 510 (*F.G.I.*, p. 191). The Pehewa inscription shows that at the end of the ninth century there still survived a recollection of the descent of the Tomaras from a Jāvula king Toramāṇa; and the Bandelkhand tradition proves that even as late as the earlier part of the seventeenth century (Bard Kharg Rai, in Shah Jehan's reign, Sir A. Cunningham's *A.S. Reports*, ii, 370) there still lived a reminiscence of Toramāṇa's rule in Eran. The presumption is that the Toramāṇa of Eran and the Jāvula Toramāṇa were the same person. It has been said that "there is no evidence to show that the Toramāṇa of the Kura inscription [i.e. Jaūvla] is in any way connected with the Toramāṇa of the Eran inscription" (*E.I.* v, 72, note 1). But, as the case stands, it would be more correct to say that there is no evidence to show that the two Toramāṇas are not connected with each other. This is practically also the opinion of Bühler² (*E.I.* i, 239), Mr. Vincent Smith (*J.A.S.B.* lxiii, 186, 189), and Mr. Rapson (*Indian Coins*, p. 29). I do not mean to say that all these things are assured historical facts, but they do seem to me to offer the elements of a fairly sound working hypothesis. The Tomaras were Gūrjaras; so were the Kachhwahas and the Parihars; they all descend from the Jāvula king Toramāṇa, or rather were clans or divisions of a Jāvula tribe; in which case the Jāvulas would be Gūrjaras.

It has been accepted as an undoubted fact that Toramāṇa was the king of the Hūnas (White Huns or Ephthalites). The Hūnas are, no doubt, mentioned in numerous old Indian inscriptions, but the only Indian evidence connecting Toramāṇa with the Hūnas is the Mandasor inscription of 535 A.D. (*F.G.I.*, p. 148). This inscription, though it does

¹ I adopt Dr. Fleet's practical suggestion regarding the method of citing the volume on the Gupta Inscriptions, in *J.R.A.S.*, 1904, p. 7, footnote.

² Bühler has been represented as denying the identity of the two Toramāṇas. This probably goes too far. What he says is "I am not able to assert that" the two are identical (*E.I.* i, 239); which may only mean that the identity seemed to him possible, though, for the reasons stated by him, he did not like to state it as a fact.

not say so, certainly suggests that Mihirakula, the son of Toramāṇa, whom Yaśodharman defeated, was the king, or leader, of the Hūnas. Dr. Fleet has suggested that "the Maitrakas, i.e. the Mihiras [the modern Mers], were the particular family or clan among the Hūnas to which Toramāṇa and Mihirakula belonged" (*F.G.I.*, Introd., p. 12). But if Dr. Hultzsch's interpretation of the passage on which the suggestion rests should be correct (*E.I.* iii, 319; I express no opinion on this point), the latter could not be any longer sustained. Moreover, the Mihiras (Mers or Mehars) were "attached from time immemorial to the Jethwā Rajputs" (*Ind. Ant.*, xv, 362), who are only the "Senior" (*Jethwā*) or *rājakula* (royal clan) of the Mehars. It seems more probable that Toramāṇa would belong to the royal clan; and this royal (or *jethwā*) clan may have been that of the Jāvulas, or (as they came to be called in later times) Tomaras. In fact, might not Tomara, a comparatively late Indian word, be an Indian corruption of Toramāṇa, signifying the descendants, or family, of Toramāṇa? A transposition of syllables (*aksharas*) is a by no means uncommon Indian habit. In the manuscripts of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, the reading *Tomarāṇa* is found alternating with *Toramāṇa* (see Dr. Stein's edition, v, 233). Several good examples of ancient date are noted by Professor Kielhorn in the *Epigraphia Indica* (vi, 3), and the habit is well-known to all acquainted with modern India. The Hunic connection of Toramāṇa and Mihirakula is certainly supported by extra-Indian evidence: thus Gollas, whom Kosmas Indikopleustes (c. 525 A.D.) calls the king of the Indian White Huns, is probably Mihirakula. But the Huns were evidently divided into several clans: a royal clan and several subordinate clans. The Gūrjaras may have been one of these clans. The exact ethnic relation of the Gūrjaras to the Hūnas is still very obscure. These may be generic names of the same people; or they may be specific names of subdivisions of the same people; or they may be names of two peoples, differing ethnically, but driven by connected causes to settle in India. It may be doubted whether even the contemporary Indians had an exact

knowledge of the inter-relation of these foreign peoples. Bāṇa, when enumerating the campaigns of Prabhākara Vardhana (c. 600 A.D.), distinguishes the Hūnas and Gūrjaras. He was undoubtedly referring to foreign peoples who, under differing names, were at that time overrunning the Panjab and Rajputana respectively, but his manner of using the names is no sufficient proof respecting the ethnic inter-relation of their bearers, or respecting the exact delimitation and denotation of the two names.¹

Mr. Bhandarkar has shown (p. 15 ff. of his paper on the Gūrjaras) that there is good reason to believe that the Solankis (Chaulukyas), Parihars (Pratihāras), Parmars (Paramāras), and Chohans (Chāhumānas or Chāhuvānas), the four so-called Agnikula clans of Rajputs, are really, or were originally, divisions of the Gūrjaras. To these, the Tomaras may now be added as another Gūrjara division; and there is still another clan which may also be added to the list. This is the Kachhwahas (*Kacchapaghātas*). Regarding them there is an interesting Bandelkhand tradition, which is related by Diwān Bighe Bahādur Mazbūt Singh in his *History of Bandelkhand* (translated by Mr. Silberrad in *J.A.S.B.* lxxi (1902), pp. 100 ff.). It says that "about 933 [A.D.] the Parihar dynasty rose into importance and invaded and conquered Gwalior. The first king of the Parihar dynasty was Vajradaman, who subdued Central India. He was followed successively by Rajakīrat, Raja Bhuvanpāl I, and Raja Padhpāl. In 1093 succeeded Mahipāl,² but even before his accession the Chandels had got possession of the whole kingdom except Gwalior." Now there is a Sasbāhu inscription of Mahīpāla, of the year 1093 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xv, 35). It mentions a line of eight Kachhwaha (*Kacchapaghāta*) princes, who are clearly identical with the Parihar princes of the Diwān. The

¹ Similarly, in the Badal Pillar inscription, of c. 925 A.D. (*E.I.* ii, 161, 165), the Hūnas and Gūrjaras are distinguished. But here it may be mere poetical license.

² I have slightly revised this remark, which, as printed in *J.A.S.B.*, makes no sense.

latter's list is short by three names, but the five names it mentions are not only the same as in the Sasbāhu inscription,¹ but also follow one another in the same order. For Vajradāman we have the date 977 A.D. (*J.A.S.B.* xxxi, 393; *E.I.* ii, 235). The Diwān calls him the first of the dynasty, but as he himself refers the rise of the dynasty to 933 A.D., his Vajradāman must clearly have had a predecessor, who, as the inscription shows, was Lakshmaṇa. In the inscription Vajradāman is said to have "defeated the ruler of Gādhi-nagara (or Kanauj) and conquered the fort of Gopādri (or Gwaliyor)." The Kanauj ruler here referred to must be either Vijayapāla, for whom we have the date 960 A.D. in the Rajor inscription, or his successor of the (at present) unknown name. As to Lakshmaṇa, the traditional date 933 A.D. suits fairly well, seeing that his son Vajradāman reigned in 977 A.D. In the *Journal A.S.B.*, vol. I, p. 46 (1881), it is stated that the Lakshmaṇa Sāgar at Bilhari is traditionally attributed to Lakshman Parihar, who is said to have reigned about 900 years, or 30 generations, ago. This gives us for him the approximate date 950 A.D. (i.e. 1880—930). The point, however, to which I wish to draw attention is that the tradition reported by Mr. V. Smith and that related by the Diwān agree in representing Lakshmaṇa and Vajradāman and their dynasty to have been Parihars, while in their own inscription they call themselves Kachhwahas. This would make for an identity of the Parihars and Kachhwahas; but, at any rate, it points to a close connection of them with the Gūrjaras, of whom, no doubt, they were subdivisions. Another indication of identity, or intimate connection, of the Kachhwahas and Gūrjaras has already been mentioned in connection with Toramāṇa. The rise of the Kachhwaha-Parihars under Lakshmaṇa, about 933 A.D., falls within the period of the reign of the Gūrjara emperor Mahīpāla. Under him, with the decline of the power of the imperial (Tomara) clan, the chiefs of the subordinate clans began to assert their independence: the Parmars of

¹ The Diwān's Padhpāl is the Padmapāl of the inscription. Is it a misprint?

Malwa, under Krishnarāja, about 915 A.D.; the Chohans of Ajmīr, under Chandana, about the same date; and the Kachhwahas of Gwaliyōr, under Lakshmana, about 933 A.D. About the latter date, also, the Parihars of Alwar must have become independent under Sāvata, for his son Mathanadeva describes himself as an independent ruler in his Rajor grant of 960 A.D. (*E.I.* iii, 263).

As to the Chandels, who were the earliest to assert their independence, under Yaśovarman, and perhaps already under Harsha, about 910 A.D., it is not impossible that they also were really a subordinate Gūrjara clan. But I know of no clear evidence on this point.

With regard to the Chaulukya clan of Gūrjaras, it has already been stated (*J.R.A.S.*, 1904, p. 640) that they conquered for themselves an independent kingdom in Laṭa, in the latter part of the tenth century, and that from them that country received its modern name of Gujarat. It appears, however, that there were two distinct migrations of Chaulukyas into Laṭa, which took place at two distinct dates, though not separated by any great interval of time. On the first immigration we receive information from the Sūrat grant of the Chaulukya Kīrtirāja, dated in 1018 A.D. (*Vienna Or. Journ.*, vii, 88; *E.I.* v, App., No. 940). It tells us that Kīrtirāja's grandfather Bārāpa obtained (*adhiḡamya*) the country of Laṭa. This vague remark is explained by the tradition (see details in *Ind. Ant.*, xii, 199; vi, 183, 184) that Bārāpa took military service as a "general" under Tailapa, the restorer of the southern Chālukya empire. As a reward for his services, he would seem to have obtained a grant of land in Laṭa; and it would further seem that in this position of a great Laṭa landowner he came into collision with Mūlarāja, under whom the second, and more important, Chaulukya settlement in Laṭa took place. Mūlarāja's two earliest (known) grants are dated in 974 (*Vienna Or. Journ.*, v, 300) and 987 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, vi, 191; also Nos. 45 and 50, in *E.I.* v, App., pp. 7, 8). In these grants Mūlarāja claims to be no more than a *Mahārājādhirāja*. In his subsequent grant of 995 A.D. (*Vienna Or. Journ.*, v, 300;

E.I. v, App., p. 8, No. 52) he already claims the full imperial titles. It appears probable, therefore, that Mūlarāja's encounter with his kinsman Bārāpa took place between 974 and 987 A.D. This also agrees with Bārāpa's date as deducible from his grandson Kirtirāja's grant of 1018 A.D., according to which he should have reigned from about 960 to 980 A.D. There is nothing to show that Bārāpa was ever anything more than a Laṭa landholder. It was his grandson Kirtirāja who first held some kind of dependent regal position in Laṭa. In the Sūrat grant of Kirtirāja's grandson, Trilochanapāla, dated in the year 1051 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xii, 201; *E.I.* v, App., p. 51, No. 356) he is said to have "attained the rank of a lord of Laṭa" (*Laṭa-bhūpa-padaviṃ adhiḡamya*, verse 12). In his own grant, dated 1018 A.D., he only claims the title of "Governor-General" (*mahāmaṇḍaleśvara*). Even his grandson, Trilochanapāla, in his charter of 1051 A.D., still claims to be no more than a chief (*nṛpa*) and ruler (*bhoktā*) of the Laṭa country. At that time Mūlarāja's dynasty had already held the supreme power in Laṭa for several generations. It is quite clear that Bārāpa's dynasty never held any but a subordinate position in Laṭa; and it is not from them that the country is likely to have acquired its new name of Gujarat. This it can only have done through the powerful position obtained by the Chaulukyas of Mūlarāja's dynasty. The latter conquered for himself the independent sovereignty of Laṭa, with the imperial title, about 995 A.D., as shown by his Baroda grant of that year. This assertion of independence, however, had probably as much reference to the imperial claims of the southern Chālukya Tailapa (973-997 A.D.) as to those of the northern Gūrjara monarch, Vijayapāla's successor of the unknown name (about 975-1000 A.D.).

Both Chaulukya branches, that of Bārāpa as well as that of Mūlarāja, must have migrated into Laṭa from the country lying immediately in the north, that is, from Rajputana, the old home province of the Gūrjara race. Regarding this home, Bühler (*Ind. Ant.*, vi, 81) refers to a tradition of "most Jain chroniclers of Gujarāt," according to which

Rāji, the father of Mūlarāja, and his ancestors "held the throne of Kalyāna in Kanauj." I cannot quite make out the grounds for this statement. At least, those chronicles which are accessible to me do not seem to bear it out. The earliest of them, the *Dvyāśraya Mahākāvya* of Hemachandra, written about 1150 A.D., says of Mūlarāja that he was "born of the Chālukya (*sic*) race," and just mentions his father Rāji, but it has not one word about his ancestors or the place where they lived (*Ind. Ant.*, iv, 72, 74). Contemporary with Hemachandra's chronicle is the *Vaṇnagar Prasasti*, of 1151 A.D. (*E.I.* i, 293). It just mentions the myth of the miraculous birth of Chulukya, the *heros eponymos* of the Chaulukya race, but again says not one word about Mūlarāja's father, or his ancestors and their original home. Nor is there any more information to be found in the *Sukṛta Saṅkīrtana* of Arisinha, or in the *Kīrtikaumudī* of Someśvara, both of about 1230 A.D.¹ On the other hand, a still later chronicle, the *Kumārapāla Carita* of Jayasinha, begun about 1365 and completed about 1435 A.D., while it duly relates the story of the miraculous birth of Chulukya, makes him live, not at Kanauj, but in Madhūpaghna, which is supposed to be the same as Mathurā (*Ind. Ant.*, xii, 197). Further, the very much earlier chronicle, *Vikramāṅkadeva Carita* of Bilhana, of about 1085 A.D., while relating the miraculous birth-story of Chulukya (in connection, it is true, not with the Chaulukyas, but with the southern Chālukyas), represents him and his early descendants as living in Ayodhyā (*Ind. Ant.*, v, 317; cf. vii, 17, and xiv, 49). Again, the Hindi bard Chand, about 1190 A.D., according to Tod (*Rajasthan*, i, 88, Madras ed.), "makes the Solankhis [Chaulukyas] important as princes of Sooru on the Ganges, ere the Rahtores obtained Kanauj." I have no doubt that there may be Gujarat chroniclers who give the story as related by Bühler, but I suspect that they are of very late date, and deserving of little credence. In any case, it is clear that the chroniclers

¹ See Kāthvate's edition of the latter, and Bühler's paper on the former in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the K. Akademie d. Wiss., vol. cxix, No. vii.

are by no means in agreement with one another. They offer the choice of Kanauj, Mathurā, Ayodhyā, and "Sooru" (Soron?). It seems pretty evident that they are drawing on their imagination for their facts.

The only mention of Kanauj that I can find in the chronicles accessible to me occurs in Arisimha's *Sukṛta Sankārtana*, sarga ii, verse 5 (quoted by Bühler, *l.c.*, p. 41, compare p. 11; also *Ind. Ant.*, xii, 199), which describes Bārapa as the "general of the king of Kanyākubja." Its date is about 1230 A.D. A still earlier reference, however, to Kanauj, in connection with the Chaulukyas, exists in the Sūrat grant of Trilochanapāla, of 1151 A.D. It appears to me to afford a clue to the origin of the tradition concerning Kanauj. Having related the story of the miraculous birth of Chulukya, it goes on to say of him that he married a Rāshtrakūṭa lady, and lived with her in Kanauj. The original of the passage runs as follows (*Ind. Ant.*, xii, 201, verse 6):—

*Kanyākubje Mahārāja Rāshtrakūṭasya kanyakām |
labdhvā sukhāya tasyām tvaṁ Cauluky=āpnuhi santatim ||*

This has been translated to mean (*ibid.*, p. 203), "O thou Chaulukya, king of kings, marrying the princess of the Rāshtrakūṭas in Kanyākubja, bless thou (*the world*) with offspring obtained from her"; and thence the conclusion has been drawn (*ibid.*, p. 199; also *E.I.* v, App., p. 51, No. 356) that the grant referred to a "Rāshtrakūṭa Mahārāja of Kanyākubja." But there is no ground for believing that Rāshtrakūṭa (Rahtor) kings of Kanauj ever existed; nor does the passage really say so. For *Kanyākubje* must be constructed with *āpnuhi*, and what the passage really means is "O Mahārāja Chaulukya, having married the daughter of the Rāshtrakūṭa, do thou, for the sake of the welfare (*of thy people*), beget offspring on her in Kanyākubja." Accordingly it is Chaulukya who is represented as the Mahārāja of Kanauj, not the Rāshtrakūṭa. If we now remember that Kanauj was the capital of the great Gūjjara empire, and think of the prestige it must have

enjoyed as the seat of the imperial Gūrjara clan, it does not appear wonderful that the writer of Trilochana's grant should have chosen that town as the residence of the eponymous hero of the collateral Chaulukya clan. But, clearly, the writer's statement is of no historical value. What may have suggested to him the idea of Chaulukya marrying a Rāshtrakūṭa lady is at present impossible to say. That the Chaulukyas, on migrating to Laṭa, may have formed matrimonial connections with the Rāshtrakūṭa chiefs of that country is probable enough. It is to be noted that the grant does not describe the Rāshtrakūṭa whose daughter Chaulukya is said to have married by any regal title,—indeed, by any title whatsoever: she is simply a Rāshtrakūṭa lady. From Kirtirāja's grant of 1018 A.D. it is clear that there were Rāshtrakūṭa chiefs subordinate to the Chaulukya "Governors-General" (*mahāmaṇḍaleśvara*) of Laṭa; and matrimonial alliances with them on the part of the Chaulukyas would be only natural. But further, as Kirtirāja's grant is said¹ (*Vienna Or. Journ.*, vii, 89) to agree with that of Trilochanapāla in respect of "the origin of the name and race of the Chaulukyas," it may be concluded that the passage above referred to can be traced back to 1018 A.D. In all probability the tradition embodied in it goes back to the time of the founder of the dynasty, Bārapa, i.e. to about 975 A.D. That dynasty, no doubt, claimed from the beginning an ancestral connection with the royal clan of the Gūrjaras, whose capital was at Kanauj. The court-poets and bards converted this claim into an actual rule of the Chaulukya ancestors in Kanauj, but there is no good reason to believe that either Bārapa or Rāji or their immediate predecessors ever lived anywhere else than somewhere in Rajputana (see pp. 23, 24).

Both Chaulukya migrations into Laṭa took place about 975 A.D. This was the time of the reign of the Gūrjara emperor Vijayapāla (or possibly of his successor of the unknown name). What the cause of the migrations may

¹ It does not seem to have ever been textually published.

have been is not known. None of the inscriptions as yet discovered throws any light on this point. But as tradition makes Bārāpa a "general" of Tailapa, the heir of the Earlier Chālukya dynasty, I would suggest that the Chaulukyas may have been called in by that prince, who was about that time (from 973 A.D.) engaged in re-establishing the Chālukya rule over the southern empire, with the object of assisting him in his undertaking. For there seems good reason to believe that the Chālukyas were kinsmen of the Chaulukyas—that, in fact, they represent a very early immigration into Southern India of that portion of the Gūrjara stock which called itself Chālukya or Chaulukya. The very fact of the identity of the names goes to prove the original unity of the Chaulukyas and Chālukyas.¹ I am disposed to agree with Bühler (*Ind. Ant.*, vi, 182) that the two words are "only dialectic forms of the same name." But, despite the attempted Sanskrit derivation of the genealogists, I would suggest that the name is not a Sanskritic word at all, but of foreign (Gūrjara or Hunic) origin.²

The migration of the Chālukyas from the north into the south appears to be generally admitted. As Dr. Fleet says, they themselves "always represent themselves as having come originally from the north" (*Ind. Ant.*, vii, 247); and he holds that "it is an undoubted fact that the Chālukyas did come originally from the north" (*ibid.*, vii, 246; xiv, 49). His theory, which I am disposed to accept, is that their southward migration took place under Pulikeśin I, about 550 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, vii, 247; viii, 12, 239). Before that Chālukya chief acquired his new capital Vātāpi (Badami) in the south, he had a capital in the north, where his grandfather Jayasimha ruled as the "chief" of the Chālukyas (or Chalukiyas). In the Mahākūṭa inscription of Pulikeśin's son Mangaleśa, dated in the year 602 A.D., Jayasimha is

¹ The spelling of the latter form *Cālukya* varies with *Calukya* and *Calikya*. The form *Calukya* is used by the earlier, and *Cālukya* by the later dynasty of the Southern Empire.

² Might it be connected with the Turkī root *chāp*, gallop, *chāpāul*, a plundering raid, a charge of cavalry? See *J.A.S.B.*, extra number for 1878. Perhaps Turkī scholars would tell us.

described simply as a chief (*nṛpa*, *Ind. Ant.*, xix, 16, line 2), while in the Aihole inscription of his grandson, Pulikeśin II, of the year 634 A.D., he is said to have been a king (*rājā*, *E.I.* vi, 4, verse 5). There is practically little difference between the two terms: they both indicate a mere chief or ruler. With reference to the cause of the Chālukya migration to the south, Dr. Fleet suggests (*Ind. Ant.*, vii, 247) that the Chālukyās may have been “originally feudatories of the Gūrjara kings, but, in the person of Pulikeśin I, threw off that yoke, and, migrating to the south, established an independent sovereignty of their own.” That they were feudatories of the paramount Gūrjara king I agree; but seeing that the date of Jayasimha must be somewhere very near the date, about 533 A.D., of the great defeat inflicted on the Hūnas by Yaśodharman (i.e. Vikramāditya), and that the Gūrjaras were closely connected with the Hūnas, I would suggest that, when the combined Hūna-Gūrjara invasion was stemmed by the Mālava emperor Vikramāditya, the component parts of the invading hosts were dispersed, some (the main portion) settling for the time in Rajputana, others in the Panjab (Gujarat District), while a third portion, the Chālukya, moved southwards. This third portion, apparently after leaving a small detachment in Laṭa, where it founded the *Sāmanta* dynasty of Bharoj (see *J.R.A.S.*, 1904, p. 643), penetrated into the country south of the Narmadā, and there established the Chālukya empire of Badami (*Vātāpi*). Even then it was only a division of the Chālukya clan which proceeded south. Another division remained in Rajputana, whence, at a much later date, it followed the earlier emigrants southwards into Laṭa in the latter part of the tenth century, under Bārapa and Mūlarāja. The difference in the names of the two divisions of the clan—Chālukya (Chalukya, Chalikya) and Chaulukya—may well be explained by the fact that they separated at such a very early period, and for several centuries lived in localities so widely separated as the Dekhan and Rajputana. In the Aihole inscription of Pulikeśin II, above referred to, there is a remark which is worth noting in the present connection.

According to Professor Kielhorn, the inscription (*E.I.* vi, 2, verse 22) indicates that the "Gūrjaras submitted to Pulikeśin of their own accord." This is no more than one would expect on the theory that the Chālukyas themselves were members of the Gūrjara race. In that remark, it may be further noted, the Laṭas and Mālavas are joined with the Gūrjaras in the policy of voluntary submission. Here 'Laṭas' must refer to the Gūrjara (Chālukya) chiefs who settled in Laṭa as its *Sāmanta* rulers, while 'Mālavas' refers to the Gūrjara (Paramāra) chiefs who appear to have remained behind in Malwa, after the retirement of the main body of the Gūrjaras into Rajputana. Laṭas, Mālavas, and Gūrjaras, therefore, in that remark refer to the Gūrjaras in Laṭa (modern Gujarat), Malwa, and Rajputana respectively.

There is one point in connection with the Gūrjara theory (explained in No. II of my *Problems*, *J.R.A.S.*, 1904, p. 639) which it may be well to notice. In pursuance of that theory, and in support of it, Mr. Bhandarkar proposes a correction of the date of Dharmapāla, and consequently of the whole chronology of the so-called Pāla dynasty of Bengal. This correction I hold to be untenable; but that does not upset the Gūrjara theory, into which the usually accepted date of Dharmapāla fits perfectly well. In his paper on the Cambay Plates of Govinda IV (*E.I.* vii, p. 31 ff.), Mr. Bhandarkar says that "we have positive evidence that Dharmapāla lived in the earlier part of the tenth century, i.e. at least half a century later than he has hitherto been placed." His "positive evidence" is as follows: (1) the Bhagulpur and Khalimpur grants tell us that Dharmapāla, having defeated Indrarāja, and thus obtained the sovereignty of Kanauj, gave it over to Candrāyudha; (2) Kshitipāla was placed on the throne by the Chandel Harsha (see, however, p. 15); (3) the Rāshṭrakūṭa Indra III attacked Kanauj, whose ruler at that time was Kshitipāla (or Mahīpāla). On these premises Professor Bhandarkar founds the following argument: (1) Indra III not only attacked Kanauj, but he must have ousted its ruler Kshitipāla; for, unless he had done so, Kshitipāla could

not have been *replaced* by Harsha; (2) Kshitipāla could not have been *replaced* on the throne of Kanauj, unless previously Indra III had been defeated; (3) that previous defeat of Indra III was effected by Dharmapāla, because he is said to have defeated Indrarāja; (4) Indrarāja's (i.e. Indra III's) defeat was followed by Chandrāyudha's enthronement in Kanauj, which shows that Chandrāyudha and Kshitipāla are identical. Now No. 3 of the argument implicates the assumption that Indrarāja and Indra III are the same person, which is precisely the point to be proved. Nos. 1 and 2 of the argument make the assumption that Kshitipāla was *replaced* on the throne of Kanauj; but the Khajurāho inscription (*E.I.* i, 121) says only that he was *placed*, not that he was *replaced*, on the throne, by the Chandel king. No. 4 of the argument necessitates the implication that the enthronement of Kshitipāla was the joint work of Harsha and Dharmapāla. This implication Mr. Bhandarkar expressly admits, and considers such a joint action as "what in all likelihood must have come to pass." But there is no "positive evidence" for it whatsoever; and the probability of it will, to most people, appear infinitesimal. What, in all probability, did occur has been explained in No. II of my *Problems* (*J.R.A.S.*, 1904, p. 656). Kshitipāla (i.e. Mahipāla) was originally placed on the throne, in succession to his brother Bhoja II, by the Chandel king (not Harsha, but) Yaśovarman; and Indra III in all probability was not defeated, either by Dharmapāla or anyone else, but returned to his own country after his successful raid on Kanauj. If it is supposed that Indra III returned in consequence of a defeat, that defeat could only have been inflicted on him by Yaśovarman, the friend of Mahipāla. But in that case the probability is that such a signal success over the powerful Rāshtrakūṭa emperor would have been enumerated in the list of Yaśovarman's successes in the practically contemporaneous Khajurāho inscription of 954 A.D. Verse 23 of that inscription (*E.I.* i, 132) gives a list of successes in war over a number of peoples, but the Rāshtrakūṭas are not among them. This being so, it is

not probable that Yaśovarman came into collision with Indra III.

As to Dharmapāla's date, there exists as yet only one positive piece of evidence, and that appears to me to be distinctly in favour of the date assigned to him by Professor Kielhorn (*E.I.* iv, 246). This is the date 1026 A.D. for the Bengal Mahīpāla, and it admits no other date for Dharmapāla than the middle of the ninth century, say about 840 A.D. In two instances the Pālas are recorded in marriage connection with the Rāshtrakūṭas, but neither instance affords any help. Dharmapāla himself is said to have married a daughter of the Rāshtrakūṭa Parabala (*Ind. Ant.*, xxi, 254); but the *biruda* Parabala is otherwise unknown. Again, Rājyapāla married a daughter of the Rāshtrakūṭa Tunga (*Ind. Ant.*, xxi, 99). But the *biruda* Tunga is too vague to support any conclusions. It has been referred to Jagattunga II, but that prince never reigned (*E.I.* iv, 288, verse 16; also *E.I.* vi, 176); and though that may not be an absolute objection, the *biruda* Tunga was a speciality of the whole Rāshtrakūṭa family (*E.I.* vi, 189), and occurs in various combinations in connection with several of the Rāshtrakūṭa emperors. Admitting the middle of the ninth century for Dharmapāla, the bearer of the *biruda* Parabala might be Amoghavarsha I, and Tunga might refer to Govinda IV, called Nripatunga.

With Dharmapāla's date about 840 A.D. both identifications are incompatible, that of Chakrāyudha with Mahīpāla (or Kshitipāla), and that of Indrarāja with Indra III. The probability undoubtedly is that, as suggested by Professor Kielhorn (*Ind. Ant.*, xx, 188¹), Chakrāyudha was Indrarāja's younger brother; and seeing that by defeating Indrarāja, Dharmapāla was enabled to give the kingdom of Kanauj to Chakrāyudha, it seems necessarily to follow that Indrarāja was the then (c. 840 A.D.) ruling king of Kanauj. As there was an Indrāyudha reigning in the north, i.e. in the

¹ Chandrāyudha cannot, however, be identified with Bhoja I (Ādivarāha), for though the latter's date would suit well enough, he was the most powerful member of the Gūjjara imperial house, and never required Dharmapāla's aid.

kingdom of Kanauj, in the year 783 A.D., it suggests itself (especially as Indrarāja may very well have borne also the name Indrāyudha, and as the same name is apt to recur in the same family) that Indrarāja and Chakrāyudha of Dharmapāla's time were descendants of the earlier Indrāyudha. This line of thought only follows out a suggestion, already thrown out by Professor Kielhorn (*E.I.* iv, 246, footnote 1) and Dr. Fleet (*E.I.* vi, 197). Further, seeing that, in all probability, Bhoja I was a contemporary of Dharmapāla, it further suggests itself that Bhoja I's conquest of the northern kingdom was the direct consequence of the disastrous war of that kingdom with Dharmapāla, which rendered it so weak as to finally perish under Bhoja I's attack.

The history of the northern kingdom of Kanauj is still almost a blank for the two centuries following immediately after the emperor Harsha Vardhana's death. That event was followed by a palace revolution (*Journal Asiatique*, 1900, p. 300), and a general anarchy and disruption of the empire. Between it and the conquest of Kanauj by Bhoja I, only three, or perhaps four, facts are known. First, there is the reign of Yaśovarman, to which belong the years 731-745 A.D. (see Dr. Stein's translation of the *Rājataranginī*, p. 132, footnote 134, for particulars). Secondly, there is the reign of Indrāyudha in 783 A.D. Thirdly, there is the defeat and deprivation of Indrarāja and the restoration of (his brother) Chakrāyudha by Dharmapāla, about 840 A.D. Fourthly, there is the mention of an unnamed king of Kanauj, who is said, in the *Rājataranginī*, to have been defeated by Jayapīḍa, a grandson of Lalitāditya (Muktāpīḍa), the conqueror of Yaśovarman. He was, therefore, probably also a grandson of Yaśovarman. Jayapīḍa reigned thirty-one years, about 772-803 A.D. The *Rājataranginī* says (iv, 471, Dr. Stein's transl., p. 103) that "after defeating the king of Kanyākubja in battle that king of surpassing valour (Jayapīḍa) carried off his throne, the ensign of royal power." This seems to indicate not only the defeat of the king of Kanauj, but a termination of his dynasty. If this surmise is correct, the subsequently mentioned kings Indrāyudha,

Indrarāja, and Chakrāyudha would have belonged to a new dynasty. But the name of neither dynasty—if there were two dynasties—is known at present.

Incidentally it may be noted here that an advance of Kashmirian troops so far into the centre of North India, as is implied by the relation of the *Rājataranginī*, is supported by a remark in the Khajurāho inscription of 954 A.D. That record describes (*E.I.* i, 132, verse 23) the Chandel king Yaśovarman as one “before whom perished the Kashmīrī warriors.”

The traditional genealogy of the Gūrjara emperors of Mahodaya–Kanauj commences with a prince named Devaśakti. The earliest occurrence of this genealogy is in the Daulatpurā grant of Bhoja I, dated in 843 A.D. (*E.I.* v, 208). Devaśakti's date, at the usual rate of twenty years for a reign, would be only about sixty years earlier, say about 770 to 780 A.D.; for he is the fourth predecessor of Bhoja I. In the genealogy he is clearly treated as a real person, and a queen is assigned to him, named Bhūyikā, who is said to be the mother of Vatsarāja. After an interval of only about sixty years one would suppose a correct knowledge of Bhoja's ancestry to have survived; and, of course, *devaśakti*, taken as a *bahuvrihi* compound, is not an impossible name of a real person. Still, it is a curious name, and outside fable-literature it is unique, so far as I know. Might it not be a mere legendary name? It means literally ‘the power of Deva,’ and it is as if one of our royal houses who claim to reign by “the grace of God” were to make that “grace of God” the ancestor of their house. Might not this name *devaśakti* give us the earliest indication of the rise of the later legend of the miraculous birth of the ancestors of the Rajput clans?

A well-known form of this legend is related by Tod (Rajasthan, i, 86, 87, Madras ed.); also in the Rāsmālā (ii, 234), and by Sir Alexander Cunningham (*Arch. Survey Reports*, ii, 253 ff.). According to it Vasiṣṭha had once convened all the other sages on Mount Abū to perform a sacrifice before the assembled gods. In this they were

disturbed by the Asuras. Thereupon Vasishṭa caused to come forth from the sacrificial fire-pit successively the four eponymous ancestors of the so-called Agnikula or 'fire-clans' of Rajputs, the Parihars, Chālukyas (or Solankīs), Parmars, and Chohans. This form of the legend which makes all the four clans to have sprung equally from the sacred fire is given on the authority of the Rajput bards, especially of the Hindi bard Chand Bardāi. But Sir A. Cunningham suggests (*i.e.*, p. 254) that in the original legend the fire-birth must have been limited to the Chohans. Herein, I think, he is right. Chand lived about 1190 A.D., and he is, so far as I know, the earliest witness to the existence of the legend in the form above given. He certainly seems to limit the fire-birth to the Chohans. The legend is related by him in stanzas 124 ff. of the first book (*prastāva*) of his *Prithirāj Rāsau*.¹ The following are its essential portions:—

Taba su-rikkhhi Bāciṣṭa kuṇḍa rocana raci tāmahi |
Dhāriya dhyāna jāi homa madhya vedī sura sāmaha |
Taba pragatīyau Pratihāra, rāha tini thaurā su-dhāriya |
Phuni pragatīyau Cālukka, Brahma tini cālu su-sāriya |
Pāvāra pragatīyau bīra vara, kahyau rikkhhi para-māra
dhana |
Traya purukha juddha kīnau atula, naha Rakkhhasa
khuddanta tana || 124 ||

Taba citīya Bāciṣṭa, eha Āsura avicāriya || 127 ||

Anala-kuṇḍa kiya anala sajji upagāra sāra sura |

Upajiyau anala Cāhuvāna taba cava su-bāhu asi bāha dhari ||

¹ So in the MSS. and in the *Bibliotheca Indica* ed., p. 67; but in M. V. Pandia's ed., p. 49, verses 127 ff. The text varies slightly; the only important difference is in Pandia's ed., line 4, *brahmacāri vrata dhāriya*, "he kept the brahmacāri vow," for *Brahma tini cālu su-sāriya*. That reading can hardly be correct, because it is incongruent with the tenour of the stanza, which intends to describe warriors, not ascetics. *Cālu* is also spelt *cullū*, *calū*, *calu*, *caluka*, *Skr. caluka* or *cūluka*.

That is—

“Then the sage Vasishṭa carefully prepared a pit; performing meditation, he offered a *homa* in the midst of the altar in the presence of the Suras. Then there appeared the Pratihāra: him he placed on the road to the palace. Next there appeared the Chālukka: him Brahma brought forth from his hollowed palm. The Pāvāra (Parmar) (now) appeared, the excellent hero: (him) the sage called blessed as the ‘Slayer of the enemy’ (*para-māra*). The three men made a fight unequalled; (but) the Rakshasas did not draw back a whit . . . Vasishṭa thought to himself, ‘These Asuras are very impudent’ . . . So he made a fire in the fire-pit, preparing a thorough protection for the Suras . . . Then there arose from the fire the Chāhuvān, four-armed, holding a sword in each arm.”

Here the fire-birth is distinctly ascribed to the Chohans, but to them only. Of the others it is not said that they came out of the fire. With regard to the Parmars and Chaulukyas, indeed, Chand’s words seem to contain a distinct allusion to peculiar legends of theirs concerning the miraculous birth of their eponymous ancestors. It is certain from their inscriptions that these two clans possessed such legends at a date considerably anterior to Chand, while, for the present at least, there is no evidence to prove this either concerning the Parihars or the Chohans. It would seem that in Chand’s time the leading rival clans among the Rajputs were the Parihars, Chaulukyas, Parmars, and Chohans. It is not impossible that the legend in the form in which it is quoted above is an invention of Chand Bardāi himself, for the purpose of extolling his particular clan, the Chohan, at the expense of the three others. For this purpose he appears to have appropriated to the Chohans a peculiar claim of the Parmars. For, so far as we know, the Parmars are the only clan who, anteriorly to Chand, laid claim to the fire-birth. The existing evidence is meagre, but such as it is the inscriptions of the Chohans themselves give no countenance to the belief that they claimed to be a ‘fire-race.’

Their earliest (known) record is a *prāśasti*, dated 842 A.D.

(*J.G.O.S.* xl, 39; *E.I.* v, App., No. 12), of a branch line of Chohans ruling in Dholpur in Eastern Rajputana. It simply states that the line belongs to "the goodly race of the eminent 'land-lord' Chāhavāna" (*Cāhavāna varābhūpati-cāru-vamśa*) without the least suggestion of anything miraculous. The next is a *praśasti*, dated 973 A.D., of the main line of Chohans. It similarly speaks only of the *Cāhamānāvaya* (*E.I.* ii, 121, verse 13) or Chāhamāna line. So also the *praśasti*, dated 1170 A.D. (*J.A.S.B.* lv, 41, verse 10), of the main line; and the charter, dated 1161 A.D. (*J.B.B.R.A.S.* xix, 26; *E.I.* v, App., No. 141), of the Nadol branch of Chohans. The latter two records are practically contemporaneous with Chand Bardāi. It seems clear, therefore, that the whole of the Chohan clan, in the main as well as the side lines, laid no claim to being a 'fire-race.'

The only Rajput clan which, so far as I know, puts forth in its records a claim to be a 'fire-race' is that of the Parmars. Their claim can be traced back to about a century earlier than Chand Bardāi, that is, to the year 1060 A.D., the date of the Arthuna (*Ind. Ant.*, xxii, 80) and (approximately) of the Udepur *praśastis* (*E.I.* i, 224), which belong to the junior and senior branches respectively of the royal line of Parmars of Malwa. It is in these inscriptions that we first meet with the legend of the miraculous birth of the eponymous hero from the sacrificial fire-pit. As told here it runs as follows (*E.I.* i, 234, 236, verses 5, 6): At one time on Mount Abū, Viśvāmitra forcibly took away the cow of Vasishṭa; thereupon the latter caused a hero to arise from the fire-pit (*agni-kunḍa*); that hero slew the enemies, and recovered the cow; in reward thereof the sage gave him the name *Para-māra* or slayer of the enemies. This is substantially the same story as given by Chand Bardāi, though in his version the enemies are Rakshasas, and no mention is made of any abduction of the cow.¹ The

¹ Chand also knows the story of Vasishṭa's cow, but according to him the cow was not abducted, but fell into a bottomless cleft of the mount (*athāva bīla*, stanza 81); also, the loss of the cow has no immediate connection with the creation of the fire-races.

term 'fire-race,' though implied in the legend of these two *praśastis*, does not actually occur in them. The first actual use of it we find in the slightly later Nagpur *praśasti* of the year 1104 A.D. It occurs there (*E.I.* ii, 182, verse 4) in the form *vahni-vamśa*, not *agni-kula*.

It may be worth noting that the legend is not found introduced in the nearly contemporaneous Bhinmal inscription, dated 1060 A.D. (*Bombay Gazetteer*, vol. i, pt. 1, p. 472; *E.I.* v, App., No. 689), of the Rajputana line of Parmars. This inscription (like those of the Chohans) speaks simply of the "Paramāra race" without the least suggestion of any miraculous occurrence. It would seem, therefore, that the legend of the 'fire-birth' was limited to the royal Parmar line of Malwa. What is curious, however, is the fact that there exist several Parmar inscriptions of earlier date than 1080 A.D. which make no mention whatever of that legend. This circumstance might be thought to prove that the legend was not known before 1080 A.D., or the latter half of the eleventh century, if it were not that we have also inscriptions later than 1080 A.D. which do not mention the legend. Such are the charters (land-grants) of Lakshmī Varma Deva, dated 1143 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xix, 353; *E.I.* v, App., No. 121), and of Arjuna Varma Deva, dated 1211 A.D. (*J.A.S.B.* v, 378; *E.I.* v, App., No. 195). The evidence of the charters, therefore, does not necessarily disprove an existence of the legend earlier than the latter half of the eleventh century, but it does prove that no credence, or at least no importance, was attached to it officially. It might be introduced into private, or semi-private, eulogies (*praśasti*), but not into official charters (*śāsana*).

The case is similar with the Chaulukyas (Solankīs). At least it is so with the more important (imperial) line of Mūlarāja. In the official charters of this line the legend of the miraculous birth of their eponymous hero is never admitted. As a rule, indeed (just as in the Parmar charters), there is not even any mention of his name, nor of the descent from him. Mūlarāja's charter, of 987 A.D., appears to be the

solitary exception in describing that sovereign as belonging to the "Chaulukya line" (*Caulukikānvaya*, *Ind. Ant.*, vi, 191, line 5). The legend appears in Chaulukya *prāśastis*, and it is found so for the first time, in the year 1151 A.D., in the *Vaṇnagar prāśasti* (*E.I.* i, 301, verse 2). As here given, the legend says that at the request of the gods, to protect them from the *Dānavas*, *Brahmā*, when performing the *sandhyā* ceremony, produced the hero Chulukya from the Ganges water in his hollowed palm (*culuka*). It is this form of the legend, evidently, which is referred to in the verses of Chand Bardāi above quoted.

With the less important Chaulukya line of Bārapa, the legend is not only met with at a considerably earlier date, but is also admitted into their official charters. It is, for the first time, found in Kīrtirāja's grant of 1018 A.D. (*Vienna Or. Journ.*, vii, 88; *E.I.* v, App., No. 354), and is repeated in Trilochanapāla's grant of 1051 A.D. (*Ind. Ant.*, xii, 201, verses 4-7; *E.I.* v, App., No. 356). Here it is given in a somewhat different form. The passage runs as follows:—

Kadācid Daitya-khed-ottha-cintā-Mandara-manthanāt |
Viriñceś culuk-āmbodhe rāja-ratnam pumān ābhūt ||
"Deva kiṁ karavāṇ" = iti nattivā prāha tam eva saḥ |
Samādiṣṭārtha-saṁsiddhau tuṣṭaḥ sraṣṭ-ābravīc ca ||
"Kanyākubje, Mahārāja, Rāṣṭrakūṭasya kanyakām |
labdhvā sukhāya tasyām teaṁ Cauluky-āpnuhi santatim ||
Ittham atra bhavet kṣatra-santatir vitatā kila |
Caulukyāt prathitā nadyāḥ srotāṁs = iva mahādharaṭ " ||

That is—

"Once on a time, through the churning with the Mandara (mount) of anxiety roused by the oppression of the Daityas (called *Dānavas* in verse 1), out of the ocean in the hollowed palm (*culuka*) of Brahma there arose a man, a jewel of a king. 'O Deva, what shall I do,' so respectfully he addressed Brahma; and the pleased Creator, for the attainment of the indicated object, spoke to him: 'In Kanyākubja (Kanauj), O great King Chaulukya, after having taken (in marriage) the daughter of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa, do thou, for the sake of the

welfare (of the people), raise progeny on her. Thus there may here arise from a Chaulukya (i.e. from a palm-born being) a truly extensive race of Kshatriyas, far-spreading like river streams (coming) from a mountain.'”

The point in this version of the legend which is particularly to be observed is that it has much less of a mythological complexion. There is here no suggestion of a quarrel between the Devas and Daityas. We have evidently before us no myth, but a semi-historical account of an early occurrence, expressed in poetical and figurative language. And perhaps it is this semi-historical character of the occurrence which accounts for its being mentioned in the official charters. “At some time,” not exactly known, but still remembered, the natives of the country and their brahmanical institutions were being harassed by non-brahmanical foreigners (poetically called Daityas or Dānavas). One of the foreign chiefs, a Chaulukya, married the daughter of one of the native Rāshtrakūṭa chiefs and pursued a pro-Hindu policy. The Brahmins, relieved of their mountain-load of anxiety, gladly regularised the transaction by declaring the Chaulukyas a Kshatriya caste. This appears to be the meaning of the semi-historical legend. Its earliest known date is 1018 A.D., but, as already remarked on p. 11, it probably existed as early as the middle of the tenth century, and there is no reason why it should not have existed among the Chaulukyas even earlier, at a time when they still lived in their original home in Rajputana. There is nothing strange in the occurrence itself: the assimilating power of Hinduism is well known in India. If the Moghul emperors, when they formed matrimonial alliances with daughters of Rajput princes, had at the same time adopted Brahmanic Hinduism, we should now have a Moghul caste of Hindu Kshatriyas. But even the loose Muhammadanism of the early Moghuls possessed more power of persistence than the Shamanism of the Huns or Gūrjaras.

A curious point about the semi-historical tradition of the Chaulukyas is that Bilhana, about 1085 A.D., in his *Vikramāṅkadeva Carita*, transfers it to the southern Chālukyas.

He also gives it a more strictly mythological character. According to him, "Brahmā was once engaged in his *sandhyā* devotions, when Indra came to him to complain of the growing godlessness on earth. On hearing this request the Creator directed his looks towards his *culuka*, and from it sprung a handsome warrior fit to protect the three worlds. From him descended the Chālukyas, among whom Hārīta is reckoned as first progenitor, as well as Mānavya who humbled the pride of the enemies" (*Ind. Ant.*, v, 317; xii, 198, 199). Bilhana here combines the legend of the *culuka*-birth, which is peculiar to the later northern Chaulukyas, with the tradition of a descent from Mānavya and Hārīta, which is the property of the earlier southern Chālukyas; and, so far as I know, the combination is limited to him. It cannot be traced elsewhere in the records of the southern Chālukyas. As to their own proper tradition of the Mānavya and Hārīta descent, it can be traced back to a very early age. We meet with it for the first time, as early as 601 A.D., in the Mahākūṭa inscription of Maṅgaleśa (*Ind. Ant.*, xix, 17; *E.I.* vii, App., No. 5); and it can be followed down to 1009 A.D. in the Kanṭhem grant (*Ind. Ant.*, xvi, 17), and even to 1077 A.D. in the Yeūr inscription (*Ind. Ant.*, viii, 11; *E.I.* vii, App., No. 185), among the records of the Later Western Chālukya dynasty. The last-mentioned date is the very time of Bilhana and his combination, just referred to. About the same time another combination of the original tradition was effected with a Puranic genealogy (quite different from the *culuka*-birth legend) in the records of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty. This combination is first met with in the Raṇastipunḍī grant of 1011 A.D. (*E.I.* vi, 347).

With reference to the original and simple Chālukya tradition of their descent from Mānavya and Hārīta, it is worth noting what Maṅgaleśa's Mahākūṭa inscription, of 601 A.D., says regarding Pulikeśin I (*Ind. Ant.*, xix, 17, 18, line 4), that his "body was purified by the religious merit of oblations performed after celebrating *agniṣṭoma* (and other) sacrifices; that he was descended from the (god)

Hiranyagarbha (Brahman), accepted the admonitions of the elders, and was good to the Brāhmins." We have here (so it seems to me) a fairly plain statement of the adoption of Brahmanism by Maṅgaleśa's grandfather, the foreign invader or immigrant, Pulikeśin I, and of his admission, with solemn ceremonial, by the Brāhman "elders" into the Brahmanic social system, in confirmation whereof he was assigned membership of the Mānavya *gotra* and descent from an original ancestress of the Hārīta *gotra* (*Ind. Ant.*, xix, 13). The same characteristic incidents are described in even plainer language in the Raṇastipuṇḍī grant (*E.I.* vi, 352, lines 17-20; see also *South Indian Inscriptions*, i, No. 39, p. 58, and *Ind. Ant.*, vii, 243-245; xiv, 49, 51): "During this battle his (Vijayāditya's) great queen, who was pregnant, reached, together with the family priest and the old ministers, an *agrahāra*, called Muḍirema, and being protected like a daughter by Viṣṇubhaṭṭa Somayājīn, a great ascetic, who dwelt there, she gave birth to a son, Viṣṇu Vardhana. She brought him up, having caused to be performed for this prince the rites which were suitable to his two-sided Kshatriya descent from the Mānavya *gotra* and the sons of Hārītī." Though the date of this grant, 1011 A.D., is much too late to inspire any confidence in the historical truth of the minuter details of its tradition, the general drift of the latter is fully confirmed by the Mahākūṭa inscription, which, being dated in 601 A.D., is nearly contemporary with, that is, only about fifty years after, the date of the incidents in Pulikeśin I's life which it records.¹ Moreover, both records agree in one important item of the tradition, namely, that the Brahmanic naturalization of the Chālukyas took

¹ There is another point of detail in the later record of 1011 A.D., which, even with the late authority for it, is perhaps not altogether without significance. It is said that Viṣṇu Vardhana, after his naturalization, went to the "Chālukya mountain," and there paid worship to a number of Brahmanical deities (*E.I.* vi, 352, line 4; *Ind. Ant.*, xiv, 49). This story seems to reflect a variant of Chand Bardāi's legend, which places the origin of the Chālukyas, and of their kindred clans, on Mount Abū, in connection with a solemn Brahmanical ceremony. "The Chālukya mountain" I take to mean the mount which was the ancestral stronghold of the Chālukyas, and the reference may well be to this very Mount Abū.

place, not in the lifetime of their reputed founder, Jayasimha (called Vijayāditya in the later record), but in that of one of his immediate successors. According to the later record (of 1011 A.D.) it was Jayasimha's son, Vishṇu Vardhana (the Raṇarāga of the earlier record?), while, according to the earlier and more trustworthy record (of 601 A.D.), the naturalized person was his grandson, Pulikeśin I, who was, no doubt, the actual invader of Southern India and the founder there of the Chālukya sovereignty.

The later record has preserved another significant incident. It records that the "great queen" (*mahādevī*) of the above-mentioned Vishṇu Vardhana, who received Brahmanic naturalization, was a Pallava princess (*E.I.* vi, 353, line 24). The Pallavas were an intensely Brahmanical dynasty; and the adoption of Brahmanism by the Chālukya chief would be the natural corollary of his matrimonial alliance with a Pallava princess. We have here a tradition parallel to that of the Chaulukyas mentioned above, p. 24. The authority for it, no doubt, is of a very late date; the early record, of 601 A.D., does not mention it; but the incident itself possesses the greatest intrinsic probability, with this modification only, that the Chālukya chief who concluded the Pallava matrimonial alliance was, not the problematic Vishṇu Vardhana, but the real founder of the southern Chālukya sovereignty, Pulikeśin I. In any case, the tradition recorded in the Raṇastipunḍī grant shows what at that date, 1011 A.D., was believed to be the natural concomitant of the Brahmanic naturalization of a foreign invader.

As regards the Parihars, we have, as yet, very few records. But there are two very early ones of nearly the same date, 861 A.D., the Ghaṭayāl and Jodhpur *prāśastis* (*Journal R.A.S.*, 1894, p. 1, and 1895, p. 513; *E.I.* v, App., Nos. 13, 330), of the two half-brothers Kakkuka and Bāuka. They appear to have held a considerable tract of country in western and northern Rajputana, and their date would show that they must have done so under the sovereignty of the Gūrjara emperor Bhoja I (c. 840-845 A.D.). Their *prāśastis* give

them no territorial titles whatsoever, not even *rāja*, though it is specially noted in the Jodhpur inscription that one of Kakka's (their father's) two wives, the mother of Bāuka, was a *mahārājñī*, that is, an imperial princess. This shows that the princes of this dynasty were only small chiefs, who in course of time grew sufficiently powerful to form, in the person of Kakka, a matrimonial alliance with the imperial Gūrjara house of Bhoja I. This is confirmed by the notice in the Jodhpur inscription (*l.c.*, l. 14) that Kakka, whose date must be about 830–850 A.D., "gained renown in a fight with the Gaudas at Mudgagiri (Mungir)." As the son-in-law of Bhoja I he would naturally have assisted him in his attempted "conquest of the three worlds" (see *J.R.A.S.*, 1904, pp. 646, 647). The two half-brothers Kakkuka and Bāuka formed the twelfth generation of their Parihar dynasty. This fact, at the usual rate of twenty years for a reign, will place Harichandra, the founder of the dynasty, at about 640 A.D.

The particular point of interest, however, of the two *prasaṣtis* is that apparently they profess to give an account of how the Parihar clan of Rajputs really arose. According to them, Harichandra was a Brahman who, as the Jodhpur *prasaṣti* tells us, married two wives, one of Brahman, the other of Kshatriya caste. The Brahman wife is not named, and she was probably an ordinary woman of her own caste. The Kshatriya wife, on the other hand, is described as a lady of noble birth (*mahākulaguṇānvitā*, verse 7) and a princess (*rājñī*, verse 8), and her name is given as Bhadrā. The descendants of the Brahman wife are expressly stated to have taken rank as Brahmans, while those of the Kshatriya lady are not specifically classed, though of course the implication is that they enjoyed their mother's rank. But the implication is expressed in a very curious way. The text runs as follows:—

Viprah śrī-Haricandr-ākhyah patnī Bhadrā ca kṣattriya |
Tābhyān tu ye sūtā jātāḥ Pratihārām=ś=ca tān viduḥ || 5 ||
Pratihārā dvija bhūtā brāhmaṇyām ye 'bhavaṁ=t=sutāḥ |
Rājñī Bhadrā ca yām=t=sūte te bhūtā madhu-payinaḥ || 8 ||

That is—

“There was a Brahman named Harichandra, and his wife was Bhadrā, a Kshatriya lady. Now the sons that were born from this pair have become known as the Parihars. The sons that were born to the Brahmanī woman became Parihar Brahmans, and those whom the princess Bhadrā bore they became liquor-drinkers.”

Let us note, first, all the sons of the “Brahman” Harichandra were Parihars, his sons of the Brahman woman as well as those of the Kshatriya lady. Secondly, what differentiates them is not so much the fact that they were born of mothers of two different castes, but the fact that some of the sons were addicted to the habit of drinking liquor. The drinking of liquor is a well-known distinctive trait of the Rajputs. There is another curious remark in the Jodhpur *praśasti* (verse 6). Harichandra, who is described as a “Brahman” (*dvija* or *vipra*) and a “Vedic scholar” (*vedaśāstrārtha-pārāga*), is nevertheless said to have been a Rohilla (or Rohilladdhi).¹ Though the meaning of the latter designation is not exactly known, it is at least certain that it is not any Indian brahmanic term: it seems to point to Harichandra having been of foreign extraction.

The facts which the statements of the *praśastis* seem to me to suggest are these. Harichandra by race belonged to the Rohillas, a clan or sept of the foreign invaders. Among them he held the position of a priest or wizard, or what corresponded to that of the Brahman among the natives of India. As such he not only claimed to be a Brahman, but adopted Brahman practices and married a real Brahman woman. In addition, being an influential Rohilla, he also married a noble lady of the country, a real Kshatriya princess. The sons of the latter lady naturally adhered to the noble ‘passions’ of their class, especially in the matter

¹ The word in the original is either *Rohilla-dvy-aṅka* or *Rohilladdhy-aṅka*, pointing to a clan Rohilla or Rohilladdhi. *Dvy-aṅka*, ‘having two marks,’ might indicate that Harichandra belonged by birth to the Rohillas, but by profession, or class, to the ‘Brahmans.’ Compare the term *dvi-pakṣa* as applied to the southern Chālukyas, *Ind. Ant.*, xiv, 51, line 24.

of drinking liquor ; and, as an indication of their noble birth, as sons of a *rājñī* or princess, they were called *rāja-putra* or Rajputs, that is, princely sons. The sons of the Brahman woman also followed the practices of their mother's class, and abstained from drink, and consequently they took rank as a species of Brahmans. Thus there arose Parihar Brahmans and Parihar Rajputs. Here we have an actual example of the mergence of a foreign people into the Hindu population, to which Mr. Bhandarkar refers in the concluding paragraph of his paper on the *Gūṛjaras* (pp. 20, 21). With his remarks I fully agree. But what is interesting is that we have in the two Parihar *prāśastis* such an early testimony to the actuality of the process of fusion. It goes back to the middle of the ninth century ; and though the beginning of the fusion, according to the *prāśastis* themselves, must be placed about 200 years earlier, in the middle of the seventh century, there is no good reason to doubt the soundness of the tradition. It is a further illustration of the general conclusion to which all the traditions we have been examining point. The Rajput clans are the result of intermarriages of foreign (*Gūṛjara* and other) invaders with women of the native Indian ruling classes. The period of the non-brahmanical foreign invasion was one of great trouble and oppression for the Brahmanism of the country. Those foreigners who intermarried with natives were naturally disposed to favour and even adopt Brahmanism ; and in return the Brahmans naturalized them by providing them with a respectable place in their caste system. The earliest instances of such naturalization would appear to have been those of the southern *Chālukyas* of the Dekhan and the northern Parihars of Rajputana, occurring about the sixth and seventh centuries respectively. The imperial *Gūṛjaras* appear to have come later in the middle of the eighth century (*Devaśakti*) ; and the Parmars and Chohans probably arose about the same time. The rise of the *Chalukyas* (*Solankīs*) would seem to fall into the middle of the tenth century. No doubt there must have been great differences in the times and conditions of these several

growths. On all points of detail we are still very much in the dark : what we seem clearly to see is only the general trend of the events.

In conclusion, I will venture to sketch, as a working hypothesis, the outlines of the course of the history of this period as it presents itself to my mind. In the earlier part of the sixth century a great invasion took place into India of Central Asiatic peoples, Huns, Gūrjaras, and probably others, whose exact interrelation we do not know. Their first onset carried them as far east as Gwāliyor. For a time their advance was stemmed by the signal defeat inflicted on them about 533 A.D. by the Mālava emperor Yaśodharman-Vikramāditya, and later by the efforts of the Kanauj emperor, Harsha Vardhana. The foreign hordes, thus checked in their eastward advance, divided. One (probably the main) portion settled in Rajputana and the Panjab, stragglers also in Southern Malwa. Another portion, known as the Chālukyas, turned southward across the Narmadā, and about 550 A.D., under Pulikeśin I, won for themselves a kingdom with its capital at Badami, and, by the inter-marriage of their chief with the old Brahmanic royal house of the Pallavas, became naturalized in the Brahmanically constituted Indian community. A period of about 200 years now followed, in the south, of the steady growth of the Chālukya empire. In the north, it was a period of quiescence of the northern settlers. During this period a gradual fusion took place with the natives of the country, as evidenced by the upgrowth of the Parihars in the middle of the seventh century, and of the Parmars, Chohans, and imperial Gūrjaras in the middle of the eighth century. This was the period of the nascence of the Rajput clans. It was at last terminated by a fresh outbreak of the ethnic volcano. About 780 A.D. the eastward movement was resumed by the imperial Gūrjaras of Rajputana, under Vatsarāja. Their new onset led them as far as the borders of Bengal. It was again temporarily checked by the Rāshtrakūṭa emperors, who, in the meanwhile, had subverted the empire of the southern Chālukyas, and who represented

a recrudescence of the native opposition to the foreign invaders, enacted 200 years earlier under the Mālava and Kanauj emperors. The check was not permanently effective; Vatsarāja's successors succeeded in making good their advance, and about 840 A.D., under Bhoja I, the Gūrjara empire, with its capital at Kanauj, embraced nearly the whole of northern India, up to the borders of Bihar and Bengal (Gauda). After Bhoja I, the Gūrjara empire began to decline, owing partly to the internal rivalry of the constituent clans (Parmars, Chohans, Chandels, Parihars, Kachhwahas, etc.), partly to external wars with the Chedis and Rāshtrakūṭas. About 950 A.D. the empire had shed a number of independent sovereignties, Malwa, Bandelkhand, and several smaller ones in Rajputana. At the same time, however—by way of compensation, as it were—a fresh activity manifested itself in a southerly direction. About 975 A.D. the Rāshtrakūṭa empire was subverted by a renaissance of the Chālukya power, and Laṭa was conquered by the Chaulukyas. The latter, who were kinsmen of the Chālukyas, but had remained behind in Rajputana, thus reverted to the original southward movement of their kindred. In the meantime the stump of the Gūrjara empire, consisting of the small kingdom of Kanauj, continued to exist for about a century longer, till, about 1050 A.D., it was finally extinguished by the Gaharwār Chandra Deva. This brings us near to the next great foreign invasion of India by the Turki hordes, which, about a century and a half later, from 1191 A.D. onwards, once more changed the face of northern India.

P.S. to p. 2.—In Mr. Sibberrad's paper on the *History of Western Bundelkhand*, the era of the dates is not mentioned. It would seem that they are intended to be taken in terms of the Christian era. In that case, 243 and 285 as dates A.D. are obviously much too early. But if referred to the Gupta era, they are much nearer the truth: $243 = 563$ G.E., and $285 = 605$ G.E.