CHAPTER VI

DYNASTIC HISTORY OF BENGALE AND BIHAR

The connection of the peoples of the alluvial plains of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra, with those living lower down in the deltaic regions, which form the greater part of modern Bengal and Bihar, has always been of a more or less intimate character. As early as the later Vedic literature we find the Prācyas, 'the dwellers in the east' differentiated from the westerners, who lived in the upper valley of the Ganges and the Jumna. It is not known exactly which tribes were included in this term. It is likely that the Kāsīs, Kosalas, Videhas, Magadhas and other eastern tribes known at that time to the Aryans are meant. But the fact that the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa refers to their mode of making tombs and disapproves of that custom makes it possible that there were cultural, if not also ethnic, differences between the peoples of the upper and lower Ganges valley. The epic story which makes Āṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Pūṇḍra, and Sumba the kṣetraja sons of the asura Bali by his wife Sudeṣṇā through the agency of the Brahman sage Dirghatamas, seems to indicate at least the popular belief that these peoples formed a compact ethnic group. The physical measurements of the peoples of a large portion of Bengal and Bihar convinced Risley that they were mainly Dravidio-Mongolian, with a strain of Indo-Aryan blood, which is more prominent in the west and in the higher groups. In the western half of Bihar the Aryo-Dravidian features predominated, while in the east of Bengal the Mongolian type was more common. This theory has been criticised. But the opponents admit that 'the people of the lower Ganges valley belong to a different Aryan stock from those who composed the Vedic hymns.' Whatever may be the ethnic and cultural
affinity of the peoples of Bengal and Bihar, it is certain that
the political relationship between them was sufficiently intimate.
Thus when we enquire into the history of the different political
and geographical divisions of this region, such as Magadha,
Videha, Aṅga, Vaṅga, Samataṭa, Puṇḍra, Gauḍa, Rādhā
Sumha, etc., we find that from the beginning of imperialism
in the 5th and 4th centuries B.C., excepting periods of political
disintegration, they have been generally under the administra-
tion of one government. The absorption of Aṅga by Magadha
in the reign of Bimbisāra was the first important step in the
development which culminated in the establishment of the
Nandas as rulers of the Prasii and the Ganganidæ. Perhaps
earlier still is the epic tradition of the unification of these tracts
under Jarāsandha of Magadha and Karna of Aṅga. The
Mauryas certainly ruled over these regions; and the recent dis-
coveries of the Damodarpur plates makes it clear that the Guptas
did the same up to the beginning of the 6th century A.D.
Again the Pālas of our period, though known to their contem-
poraries as kings of Vaṅga (Vaṅgapatī), issued most of their
earlier inscriptions from Bihar. It will thus be not improper to
group together in one chapter the accounts of the dynasties that
ruled over the lower valleys of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra.¹

It is now generally agreed that the Gupta empire survived
the shock of the Hūṇa invasions and continued up to the begin-
ning of the 6th century A.D. There is evidence to show that
at least in the east its disintegration began soon after that time.
Thus the absence of the word Gupta, in Mahārāja-Rājaputra-Deva
Bhaṭṭāraka, the name of the governor in the fifth Damodarpur
plate may indicate that he was the son of a local rājā of North-
ern Bengal who in 543 A.D. perhaps acknowledged only a

¹ See Vedic Index, Vol II, p. 46; Mahābhārata, I, 101; Risley, Peoples of India; Cen-
sus Report for 1901 by the same; IGI, 1937, pp. 272 ff.; Ohanda, Indo-Aryans, CHI,
Vol. 1, pp. 40 ff.; Carmichael Lectures, Calcutta University, 1918, pp. 49 ff.; JASB, 1928,
nominal suzerainty of the Gupta sovereigns.\textsuperscript{1} The discovery of the Faridpur plates, which are referred to the 6th century A.D. reveals the presence of a line of independent rulers in Southern Bengal,\textsuperscript{2} while the Vappaghośavāṭa inscription of Jayanāga\textsuperscript{3} seems to indicate the presence of another line of independent rulers in Kānasuvāraṇaka in the latter half of the 6th century A.D. Whether they had any connection with the Gupta governors of Northern Bengal referred to above is a question that cannot be answered in the present state of our knowledge. But that there grew up an independent power in Bengal side by side with the decadent Gupta power in Magadha is shown by the references to the clash of the Maukharis and the ‘Gauḍas living on the seashore’ in the Harāhā inscription of Iśānavarman (554 A.D.).\textsuperscript{4} It remained for Saśāṅka to extend the power of the Gauḍas from Kanauj in the west to Ganjam in the south.\textsuperscript{5} But his empire was short-lived. Attacked on both flanks by Harṣa and Bhāskaravarman, he appears to have retreated into the hill-tracts of Orissa. The former annexed Magadha, while the latter to judge from the position of his victorious camp at Kānasuvāraṇa, overran North and West Bengal.\textsuperscript{6} During the reign of Harṣa, the rest of Bengal and Bihar appears to have been divided into a number of independent and semi-independent states. These were (1) I-lan-na-po-ja-to (Hiranyaparvata?, country round the hill of Monghyr), (2) Chan-p’ō (Campā, Bhagalpur District), (3) Ka-chu-wēn (?) k‘i-lo (Kajāṅgala, area round Rajmahal), (4) Pun-na-fa-tan-na (Punḍra-vardhana, North Bengal to the west of

\textsuperscript{1} EI, Vol. XV, p. 142; The Early History of Bengal, by Prof. R. C. Majumdar, Dacca University, 1924, pp. 14-15.

\textsuperscript{2} IA, 1910, Vol. 39, pp. 193-216; JASB, August 1910, pp. 439-36; 1911, pp. 289, 308 and 475-502. I think Pargiter has successfully proved that these grants are genuine.

\textsuperscript{3} EI, Vol. XVIII, pp. 60-64.

\textsuperscript{4} EI, Vol. XIV, p. 117, verse 18.


the Karatoya), (5) San-mo-ta-t'na (Samata, Bengal delta between the Hugli and Hill Tippera), (6) Tan-mo-lih-ti (Tamralipi, portions of Midnapore and the 24-Parganas) and (7) Kic (k'a)-lo-na-su-ja-la-na (Karhasuvarna, probably portions of Nadia, Burdwan, Birbhum and Murshidabad districts). A critical study of Yuan Chwang's account seems to indicate that though Harsha sometimes passed through these tracts in the course of his invasions, they did not form a part of his empire. After the death of Harsha, the troubled state of the Ganges valley appears to have helped the extension of Tibetan power in the south. The Chinese and Tibetan documents however never tell us whether Tibet actually held Bengal and Bihar; and it seems likely that whatever influence Tibet had over these tracts, came to an end about the year 703 A.D., when, according to the T'ang annals, Nepal and India threw off the suzerainty of Tibet. During the second half of the 7th century, we have the records of two important lines of princes ruling in Bengal and Bihar. These were the Guptas of Magadha and the Khadgas of Samatata. As the Shahpur inscription of Adityasena gives for him the date A.D. 672-73, and as a Deoghar epigraph preserves the memory of his performing 'Asvamedha and other great sacrifices' and of having ruled 'the whole earth up to the oceans,' it is not unlikely that it was this Gupta sovereign who was instrumental in throwing off the yoke of Tibet in 703 A.D. The extent of the rule of these later Guptas is not exactly known. All their inscriptions have been so far discovered in the districts of Gaya, Patna, Bhagalpur and Shahabad of Bihar. But their conflict with the Maukharis

---

1 BR, Vol. II, pp. 186-204; YC, Vol. II, pp. 178-98. Watters restores J-lan-na, the first part of the name in no. (1), as IRAIa 'which denotes a piece of wild or barren land.'

2 JBORS, September-December, 1933, pp. 3 ff.

3 Journal of the Manchester Oriental Society, 1911, p. 139.

4 PI, pp. 300-18.

of the U. P., their wars on the banks of the Lauhitya, and the possible identification of Madhavagupta of the Aphsad stone inscription with the Malwa prince Madhavagupta of Bana's Harṣacarita, would indicate a wider extent of power than the distribution of their inscriptions suggests.\(^1\) In this connection it is interesting to note that the Kumārāṃśya Lokanātha of the recently discovered Tippera grant dated in year 44 (Harṣa era? = A.D. 650) has been referred to by some scholars as a feudatory of this Gupta prince Ādityasena.\(^2\) But he was more probably a vassal of the Khadgas. The inscriptions of the Khadgas have been so far found in the Dacca and Comilla districts in Bengal. The possible identification of Rājabhaṭa,\(^3\) king of Samataṭa at the time of Seng-Chi's visit to India (c. 650–700 A.D.) with Rājarāja of the Ashrafpur plate (B) and the suggested reading of the date in the same plate as 73 or 79 (= 679 or 685 A.D.), which has now been found to be not inconsistent with the palaeographic data of the records, would tend to place these rulers in the periods c. 650-700 A.D.\(^4\) Karmanta, the place of residence of these princes has been identified with modern Kamta near Comilla.

Neither of these dynasties however appears to have succeeded in establishing a united and strong government in Bengal and Bihar. The result was that these rich tracts remained for about


\(^2\) EI, Vol. XV, p. 304.

\(^3\) Life, pp. xxx-xxxii; but Chavannes seems to give the name as Ho-loou-che-po-teh's (Harṣabhaṭa), see his Religieux Éminents, p. 128.

\(^4\) The editor of the Ashrafpur plates placed them "in the 8th or 9th centuries A.D." This view is still held by some scholars, see Baṭgalār Itihās, by K. D. Banerji, 2nd Ed., pp. 164 ff., 333 ff. But see JASB, 1923, pp. 376 ff. The date proposed above is also supported by the suggested identification of "roi de l'Inde Orientale qui s’appelle T'i-p'ou-po-mo (Devavarman)," the contemporary of king Ādityasena (je-Kium=l'armée du soleil) mentioned by Hsei-luen (c. 650-700 A.D.) with Devakhadga of the Ashrafpur plates and Ādityasena of the Shabpur image inscription; See Chavannes, Les Religieux Éminents, pp. 81 and 88; Life, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii.
50 years (c. 700—750 A.D.) a constant prey to foreign invaders. The first invasion so far recorded appears to have been that of the princes of the Sāila family. The Rāghi (Balaghat district, C.P.) plates of Jayavardhana II inform us that his grandfather took Kāśi after killing its ‘self-conceited and cruel king,’ while the elder brother of this grandfather took the whole country of Pundra after destroying its ruler. As the script of the inscription ‘very much resembles those of the Paithan plates of Govinda III, dated in the year 794 A.D.,’ it is probably not unreasonable to refer the events recorded above to c. 725 A.D. It is not improbable that the prince referred to as a Pundra king in this inscription was Jīvitagupta or one of the successors of Ādityasena. The invasion of the Sāilas was followed by that of Yaśovarman, who is described in the Rājarāṇgini of Kalhana, as lord of ‘the land of Kanyakubja from the bank of the Yamunā to the Kālikā.’ Stein has identified this prince with ‘the king of Central India, I-chao-fon-mo, who in A.D. 731 sent an embassy to the Chinese Court.’ It appears from the Chinese annals that he was on his throne at least between 731 and 736 A.D., and it was probably during these years that he undertook a triumphal procession of digvijaya for the conquest of the countries all round his dominions, which is recorded in the Gaubavaho of Vākpatirāja. In the course of his eastern expedition he seems to have met the king of Gaugā, who is also called Magadhādhipa, not far from the ‘Vindhyā region,’ and defeated him in a fierce battle, in which the vassals and nobles of the eastern king appeared ‘like sparks of light issuing from a shooting-star.’ After the battle the Magadhādhipa was pursued and slain by

---

1 *EI*, Vol. IX, pp. 41-47. I have accepted a comparatively earlier date for the events, as the conquests apparently took place during the reign of the great-grandfather of the donor. The conquerors having died during the lifetime of their father, the next king mentioned in the inscription is the father of the donor.

2 IV, 182-46.


Yaśovarman, who then proceeded eastwards and compelled the Vaṅga king though ‘powerful in the possession of a large number of warlike elephants’ to acknowledge him as his suzerain.\(^1\) It is not certain who this ruler of Magadha-Gauḍa was; but that he was a powerful sovereign is clear from the fact that his dominions extended from the borders of Vaṅga (Eastern Bengal) to the Vindhyas. Possibly he was one of the Saila rulers referred to above who conquered Kāsi and Puṇḍra in about the first quarter of the 7th century A.D. It is significant that the Saila prince Śrīvardhana, who is probably not far removed from the 2nd quarter of the 8th century, is called ‘the lord of the Vindhya’ (Vindhyaśvara), the very mountain not far from which the two armies met for the first time. It is not improbable that the Vaṅga (Samataṭa) king defeated by Yaśovarman was one of the Khaḍga rulers referred to above. The success of Yaśovarman was however short-lived, and not long after 736 A.D., he fell a victim to the ambition of the Kārkota king Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa, probably known to the Chinese as Mu-to-pi.\(^2\) We are told by Kalhana that after annexing the dominions of the Kanauj king, Lalitāditya ‘proceeded with ease to the eastern ocean’ and reached the ‘Gauḍa land.’\(^3\) Another invasion of Bengal-Bihar was probably undertaken by the Kāmarūpa king Śrī-Harṣa (Hariśa?), who is referred to in the Paśupati inscription of his son-in-law Jayadeva of Nepal (153 = 153 + 595 = 748 A.D?) as the ruler of Gauḍa, Oṭra, Kaliṅga, Kosala and other lands.\(^4\) This appears to have been followed by the invasion of the Kashmirian king Jayāpīḍa, who is reported by Kalhana to have visited the lands east of Prayāga in the course of his adventures in the early part of his reign (c. 762-63 A.D.). We are told that Jayāpīḍa

\(^1\) Ibid, verses 354, 414-20.

\(^2\) Rājatarāṅgini, Stein’s Trans., Vol. I, pp. 88-89.

\(^3\) Ibid, IV, 145 43. Specially note the verses 333 30 which describe the treacherous murder of the Gauḍa king by Lalitāditya and the bravery of the ‘dark-coloured’ servants of the Gauḍa prince, which when contrasted with the conventional details of the niṣṇjaṇa, have an historical appearance.

\(^4\) IA, Vol. IX, p. 179, line 15. See also supra, pp. 192 and 241.
reached 'the city of Paundravardhana, subject to the king of Gaula and at that time protected by a prince called Jayanta.' The Kashmirian monarch married Kalyānadevi, the daughter of Jayanta, and after conquering 'the chiefs of the five Gaudas' (Pañca-Gauḍādhipān), made his father-in-law their sovereign. Though it is not impossible that there may be some grain of historical fact in the stories of the adventures of Jayāpiḍa, all attempts to identify Jayanta must remain problematical. As a result of all these invasions the lower Ganges valley must have been reduced to a chaotic condition. The Lama Taranātha, referring to the condition of this region just before the election of Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty, says: "There was no longer any member of it (the royal family of the Cūndras) a king; in Odiviṣa, in Bengal and the other five provinces to the east, each Kṣatriya, Brāhman, and merchant (Vaiśya ?) constituted himself king of his surroundings, but there was no king ruling the country." The anarchic condition is more vividly expressed by the expression Mātsyanyāya which is applied by the Khalimpur inscription of Dharmapāla to describe the condition of North-eastern India before the election of Gopāla. In the last paragraph I have indirectly placed Gopāla in the beginning of the second half of the 8th century. There has been recently much discussion on the chronology of the Pālas. We do not propose here to enter into a detailed examination of this question. It will be sufficient if we remember the foundation stāsa on which all schemes of Pāla chronology must inevitably rest. In the case of the nine kings from Gopāla to Mahīpāla,

1 Rājatarāṅgiṇi, IV, 421-63; Kalhaṇa places the reign of Jayāpiḍa in 751-762 A.D. As the adventures in Gauḍa-Pundra are placed by Kalhaṇa in the beginning of his reign, and as Stein has shown that we must correct these dates of the local historian by adding a period of about 12 years, I have placed Jayāpiḍa's possible visit to the lower Ganges valley in c. 763-65 A.D. As to the identification of Jayanta, I would point out that in my chronology he is placed sufficiently near Gopāla to raise the suspicion of their identity.

2 IA, Vol. IV, 1875, pp. 365-366.

these are: (1) The date Saka 705 expired (783-84 A.D.) supplied by the *Jaina Harivamśa* for Indrāyudha, who must be identified with the Mahodaya ruler Indrarāja of the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla, who was dethroned by Dharmapāla.

(2) The synchronism of Dharmapāla with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III (793-814 A.D.) established by the identification of Dharma and Cakrāyudha, mentioned in the Sanjan plates of Amoghabarṣa as surrendering themselves to Govinda III, with the Dharmapāla and Cakrāyudha of the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla. (3) The *Vikrama* year 1083 (A.D. 1026) given in the Sarnath inscription for Mahīpāla (I). (4) The synchronism of Rājendra Cola and Mahīpāla established by the former’s Tiru-malai inscription, which records an attack made by the Cola king upon the lower Ganges valley in about 1021-25 A.D. (5) And the synchronism of Nāgabhaṭa (c. 807-33 A.D.) and Cakrāyudha established by the Sagartal (Gwalior) inscription of Bhoja (v. 9). The year 1026 A.D. for Mahīpāla is usually taken by scholars to mark the end of his reign. Accepting that hypothesis for the time being, and counting backwards from that date, we arrive at the date 769 A.D., for Dharmapāla (1026-257 = 769 A.D.). In this calculation we have two uncertain factors, viz., the year 1026 A.D. may not have been the last year of Mahīpāla, and the period of 257 years which is the total of the reign-period so far known of the rulers from Dharmapāla to Mahīpāla does not take into account the unknown reign-period of Vigrahapāla (II). Again it is not certain that the reign-periods so far known were the last years of the reign of the respective sovereigns. Within these limitations, the dates of the rulers from Gopāla to Mahīpāla may be shown as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Dharmapāla</td>
<td>c. 769-801 A.D., (reign-period so far known 82 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Devapāla</td>
<td>c. 801-840 A.D., (39 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vigrahapāla (I) or Sūrapāla</td>
<td>c. 840-843 A.D., (8 years).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Nārāyaṇapāla ... c. 843-897 A.D. (reign-period so far known 54 years).
6. Rājyapāla ... c. 897-921 (24 years).
7. Gopāla (II) ... c. 921-978 (57 years).
8. Vigrahapāla (II) ... c. 978- ? (not known).
9. Mahīpāla (I) ... c. 978-1026 (48 years).

The chronology proposed above is open to the obvious criticism which I have already pointed out. But the fact that any considerable increase in the reign-periods would push Dharmapāla into the period 700-50 A.D., seems to indicate that the possible total excess of reign-periods cannot be large. A little elasticity in the chronological scheme may however be introduced if we place the date 1026 A.D. in the middle of Mahīpāla’s reign. The arguments so far advanced to prove that Mahīpāla was dead before 1026 A.D. do not appear to me to be at all conclusive. Even assuming that Mahīpāla died before 1026 A.D., his reign can only be moved back from that date by a few years, for any big gap would place Dharmapāla in the period 750-60 A.D. The division of Gauḍa into five divisions in c. 762-63 at the time of Jayāpīḍa, is not consistent with what we know of Dharmapāla’s reign. But in view of the synchronism of Dharmapāla with Govinda III (c. 794-814 A.D.) and Nāgabhaṭa II (c. 815-33 A.D.) it would, I think, be safer if we push forward the period of Dharmapāla’s reign by another 14 years and place the last date of Mahīpāla in c. 1040 A.D. This would give Dharmapāla a reign of 46 years (769-815 A.D.), which is not at all impossible in view of the fact that Tāranātha assigns him a period of 64 years. The reign-periods assigned by this historian sometimes, as in the case of Mahīpāla (I) and Rāmapāla, have been found to be approximately in agreement with the known dates of those princes. Thus unless there is some mistake in the ascription of the dates found on inscriptions or colophons of MSS. the above table with this correction should serve as the nearest approximations of the reign-periods of the first nine Pālas. As to
the eight later Pālas who followed Mahīpāla I, we have to take into consideration the known reign-periods of these princes, which is 106 years. This however does not include the unknown reign-periods of three princes, and includes 4 years for Kumārapāla, which, as we shall see is an uncertain quantity. In this connection we must bear in mind the synchronisms between Nayapāla and Vighrahapāla (III) and the Tripuri Kalacuri Lakṣmī-Karṇadeva (c. 1041-70 A.D.) and that between Rāmapāla, and Nānyadeva (c. 1097-1150 A.D.). The argument that since in a MS. dated in 1120 A.D. the Nepal king Sadāśivadeva is styled Rājādhīrāja-Paramēvāra, the supremacy of Nānyadeva over the Bagmati valley must have been over by that date, cannot be accepted as conclusive, for we have already shown elsewhere that Nepal rulers appear to have continued to assume imperial titles in spite of their subservient position.¹ Thus the theory based on this supposition that Vijayasena must have conquered North-Bengal and Tīrhut in about 1120 A.D. from Madanapāla and Nānyadeva loses its force. I have elsewhere shown reason to suppose that Nānyā's reign may have continued even up to about the middle of the 12th century A.D.² Again, in view of the fact that the Pālas appear to have lingered on in Magadha till the middle of the 12th century there is nothing impossible in supposing that Madanapāla may have continued to rule for some time in Bihar even after he lost North-Bengal. Within the limitations which we have already pointed out, we can then propose the following table for the last eight Pāla kings:

12. Mahīpāla (II), c. 1082-? (, , , not known).
13. Sūrapāla (II), c. 1083-? (, , , not known).

² See supra, pp. 204-205'and fn. 1 on p. 205.
15. Kumārapāla, c. 1126-1180 , , ( , , , 4 years?).
16. Gopāla (III), c. 1180-? , , ( , , , not known).
17. Madanapāla, c. 1180-1150 , , ( , , , 19 years).
? Govindapāla, c. 1150-1162 , ,
? Palapāla, c. 1162-? , ,

We can introduce a little more elasticity in the chronological frame by placing Madanapāla a few years later, for we do not know how long Govindapāla ruled. A Gayā inscription gives the date V. E. 1232 as the 14th year, counting from the end of his reign. (Śrī Govindapāladeva-gata-rājye-caturdasa-samvatsare.) His reign thus ended in c. 1162 A.D. But he may have ascended the throne of Magadha a few years after 1150 A.D.1 Palapāla of the Jaynagar image inscription may have reigned for a few years after Govindapāla.

Turning now to the details of Pāla history, we are first confronted with the question of their origin. In their inscriptions the Pālas never claim any descent from any mythical or epic hero, which is such a common feature in the genealogical tables of many other dynasties of India. In the earliest grant of the dynasty, the Khalimpur plate of Dharmapāla, we are simply told that the family sprang from Dayitaviṣṇu, who is called Sarva-vidyāvadāta (sanctified by all sorts of knowledge). His son Vapyāṭa (Bappaṭa ?) is described as Khanditārāti; and the latter’s son Gopāla was forced to accept the hands of the Goddess of Fortune in order to put an end to the condition of anarchy (mātsyanyāya) then prevailing in North-eastern India. In the commentary of the Rāmacarita the Pālas are said to have sprung from the sea, while in the Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva they are said to have been born in the family of the sun

(vamśe Mihirasya). In the commentary of a Nepal MS. of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā written by Haribhadra in the reign of Dharmapāla the latter is described as Rājabhatādi-vamśa-patita. In the Āʾin-i-Akbarī the Pālas are described as a 'Kāyeth family.' These are the facts on which must depend any discussion on the origin of the Pālas. Of these we may reject the testimony of the Āʾin-i-Akbarī as very late. The statements of the Rāmacarita and the Kamauli grant are also separated from Gopāla by more than three hundred years. From the Khalimpur grant it appears that Dayitavīśnu belonged to an educated plebeian family, which was probably neither Brahman nor Kṣatriya. In the troublesome days that then prevailed in North-eastern India during the first half of the 8th century, the family must have soon found the sword to be more profitable than the pen. This transformation may have led to the foundation of the fortunes of the family. Vapyaṭa and then Gopāla appear to have met with considerable success in their new profession, to be deemed able to save the country from the grip of anarchy. Attempts have been made to show that the statement of Haribhadra means that Dharmapāla was a descendant of Rājabhata, the son of Devakhaḍga of the Ashrafpur plates. Though the fact that the Pālas and the Khāḍgas were both Baudhā families, may be considered favourable to such an identification, and there is no inherent difficulty about the chronological position of the two families, yet I think it is better not to push this theory too far. For it is doubtful whether Rājabhataḥdi-vamśa-patita can really mean scion of Rājabhata. Paṇḍit H. P. Śāstri took it to mean 'the


"Rājya Rājabhataḥdi-casthu-patita-śri-Dharmapālaśya vai
Tatrābhūk-vidhāyini viracitā Sat-pañjik-eṣām mayā."

See also Bengal grant of Mahāpāla, V. 2, EI, Vol. XIV, pp. 324 ff. and p. 339 fn. 1.

descendant of a military officer of some king." Then it is curious that if the two predecessors of Gopāla were really sprung from a royal dynasty they should be referred to as plebeians in the Khalimpur grant. It would require very strong proofs to show that a reigning family which could trace its descent to kings of the past would have remained silent about that connection in their genealogical tables. It is so unusual in India.

Tāranāth informs us that Gopāla first began to reign in Bengal and then brought Magadha under his power. Though mixed up with stories, the account of the Tibetan historian about the election of Gopāla is in agreement with the Khalimpur grant. The statement that Gopāla was first raised to the throne of Bengal appears to be also supported by the commentary of the Rāmacarita which refers to Varendra as the janakabhū of Rāmapāla. The Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva also refers to the recovery of the janakabhū by Rāmapāla, which is taken by some scholars to mean Varendra." The Monghyr grant of Devapāla informs us that Gopāla conquered the world up to the sea (vijitya yenā juladhe vasundharām). From the fact that his son was able to undertake extensive military campaigns it is not improbable that Gopāla fully consolidated his position before he died. The Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyanapāla compares him with Lokanātha Daśabala (Buddha), both being said to have overcome the Kāmakāris. In the Khalimpur record of his son he is given the epithet paraṃ-Saugata. According to Tāranāth 'he built the Nalandara temple not far from Otantapura and reigned for 45 years.' We have no dated colophons of MSS. or inscriptions of his reign.

2 EI, Vol. XVIII, p. 304.
Gopāla was succeeded by Dharmapāla, his son by Dedda-devī. The Khalimpur grant of this king refers to his extensive conquest in Northern India. We are told that "with a sign of his gracefully moved eyebrows he installed the illustrious king of Kānyakubja, who readily was accepted by the Bhoja, Matsya, Madra, Kuru, Yadu, Yavana, Avanti. Gandhāra and Kīra kings, bowing down respectfully with their diadems trembling, and for whom his own golden coronation jar was lifted by the delighted elders of Pañcāla." (V. 12.) In connection with this statement, there is in the preceding verse (V. 11), a veiled reference to Mahendra being terrified at the movements of his armies. The political events hinted at in these two verses are partly indicated by verse 3 of the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyanapāla, which runs as follows: "This mighty one (i.e. Dharmapāla) again gave the sovereignty which he had acquired by defeating Indrarāja and other enemies, to the begging Cakrāyudha, who resembled a dwarf in bowing; just as formerly Bali had given the sovereignty (of the three worlds) which he had acquired by defeating Indra and his other enemies (the gods) to the begging Cakrāyudha (Viṣṇu), who had descended to the earth as a dwarf." The three verses when read together seem to imply that Dharmapāla, after having extended his power over a large portion of Northern India, dethroned one Indrarāja of Kanauj and installed in his place a feudatory of his named Cakrāyudha. If this Indrarāja is identified with the Indrāyudha of the Jaina Harivamsa, the ruler of the north (calculated from Vordhamāna-Wadhwan in Kathiawar), who was ruling contemporaneously with Vatsarāja of Avanti, the ruler of the east, evidently the Gurjara-Pratihāra king of that name then, it would appear that Dharmapāla achieved considerable military and diplomatic success in Northern India sometime after 783-84 A.D. To Kielhorn, when editing the Khalimpur grant in 1896-97, the

1 *EI*, Vol. IV, pp. 243 ff.; Kielhorn suggested that Dedda-devī was "the daughter of the Bhadra King"; but his interpretation has been opposed in *Gauḍālekhamālā*, p. 12.

name of Cakrāyudha, king of Kanauj was a mystery. But since then the discovery of other inscriptions of contemporary reigning families of India has solved the difficulty. These are in brief as follows: verse 80 of the Radhanpur grant of the Rāṣṭrakūta Govinda III (Saka 730 = 808 A.D.) tells us that Dhora (Dhruva) drove into the trackless forest Vatsarāja 'who boasted of having with ease appropriated the fortune of Gauḍa,' and 'took away from him, not merely the two Gauḍa umbrellas of state but also his fame.' ¹ As the Wani grant of the same king (Saka 730 = 807 A.D.), which contains the same verses as the Radhanpur grant, does not contain verse 15 of the latter, which refers to defeat of the 'Gurjara' by Govinda,—a victory so decisive that the Gurjara king's whereabouts were not known to any—it is possible that the final defeat of the Gurjara may have occurred between the two dates of the grants (807-808 A.D.).² The identity of this Gurjara king is probably revealed by the Sanjan grant of Amoghavarṣa (Saka 793 = 871 A.D.), which, besides referring to the victory of (Dhruva) Dhārāvarṣa over the Gauḍa king, tells us that Govinda III defeated in battle Nāgabhata, and as the former advanced to the springs of the Himalayas "those (kings) Dharma and Cakrāyudha surrendered of themselves."³ Line 12 of the Baroda grant of Karka II (Saka 734 = 812-13 A.D.) seems to refer to a conflict of Dhruva and the Gauḍa king between the Ganges and the Jumna.⁴ Verse 9 of the Sagartal (Gwalior) inscription of Bhoja tells us that his grandfather Nāgabhata (c. 815-33 A.D.)⁵ defeated 'Cakrāyudha whose lowly demeanour was manifest from his dependence on others,'⁶ while the next verse of the same inscription refers to the defeat of the lord of Vaṅga (Vaṅgāpati) at

the hands of the Gurjara king. Without going into details we may say that the statements of the Pāla records are substantially borne out by the Gurjara and Rastrakūṭa inscriptions. It seems likely that after the fall of Yaśovarman (c. 731-36 A.D.) there was no effective government in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā valley. Taking advantage of the weakness of the Kanauj prince Indrāyudha (c. 783-84 A.D.), Dharmapāla invaded Northern India and placed his own nominee on the throne of Kanauj. But he had soon to meet other rivals in the persons of the Gurjara Vatsarāja and Nāgabhaṭa II, and the Rastrakūṭas Dhrūva and Govinda III. The struggle for the possession of the rich lands of the upper Ganges was thus trilateral and may be represented by the following table:—

| Dharmapāla (c. 769-815 A.D.) | Vatsarāja (c. 783-84 A.D.) | Dhrūva (779-94 A.D.) | Nāgabhaṭa (c. 815-33 A.D.) | Govinda III (c. 794-814 A.D.) |

The success of the Pālas appears to have been of short duration. At any rate if the Rastrakūṭa records are to be believed, both Cakrāyudha and Dharmapāla were in distress evidently due to the attack of Nāgabhaṭa sometime before 814 A.D. Thus Dharmapāla’s imperial position in Northern India had vanished, and if the Sanjan plates mean anything, he tried to form an alliance with the Rastrakūṭa Govinda III for checking Nāgabhaṭa II. As verse 22 of the same inscription shows, the alliance probably resulted in the defeat of Nāgabhaṭa about 807-08 A.D.;¹ but the advance of the Rastrakūṭa army up to the Vindhya was probably not favourable to the re-establishment of Pāla hegemony in Northern India.²

¹ J.L., Vol. X, p. 44.
² The Monghyr grant of Devapāla tells us that Dharmapāla in the course of his campaigns advanced up to Kedāra-tīrtha, Gaṅgāśāgara and Gokarna while according to the Badal pradānti of Gurava Miśra, Garga is said to have made Dharmas the soverign of the East. See El., Vol. XVIII, p. 304; Vol. I, II, pp. 160 ff. The places mentioned by the Monghyr grant may have marked the extreme limits of Pāla hegemony.
According to the Bhagalpur inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla and the Badal praśasti of Gurava Miśra, Dharmapāla was assisted in his military campaigns by his younger brother Vākṣapāla and his Brahman minister Garga.

Dharmapāla married Raṇādevī, the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Parabala, who has been identified with a prince of the same name whose Pathari (Long. 78°15', and Lat. 2°56', Bhopal Agency, C.P.) pillar inscription is dated in V.E. 917 (c. 861 A.D.). If this Parabala was really the father-in-law of Dharmapāla, his inscription must have been incised very late in the life of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief. From his seal as well as his title Paruma-saṅgata, it is clear that Dharmapāla was a Buddhist. But it is a curious commentary on his Buddhism that the Monghyr grant of his son should give him the credit for making the castes (varṇān) conform to their proper rules (svadharame). According to Tibetan tradition it was Dharmapāla who built the celebrated Buddhist monastery of Vikramas̐ilā on a hill situated on the bank of the Ganges. We have the following records of the reign of Dharmapāla:

(1) Bodhgaya stone inscription.—Discovered by Cunning-ham in the south of the Mahābodhi temple at Bodhgaya. It is a short inscription of 9 lines incised on a stone bearing the figure of Viṣṇu, Sūrya, and Śrī (Bhairava ?). It records the instal-lation at Mahābodhi of a four-faced (image) of Mahādeva (Mahādevaśaturnukhaḥ) and the construction of a puṣkariṇī at a cost of 3,000 drāmmanas by Keśava, the son of the sculptor (silābhita) Ujjvala in the 26th year of king Dharmapāla.

(2) Khalimpur grant.—Purchased from a cultivator of the village of Khalimpur, near Gaur in the Malda district. Single

---

3 Dr. R. I. Mitra first tried to give the reading of the inscription in the *JASB*, 1880, p. 80; first properly edited by Prof. N. Chakravarti in JASB, Vol. IV (N.S.), pp. 101 ff.; then by A. K. Maitra in Gaṇḍalekhamālā, pp. 29 ff., under the name Kesara-praśasti. Preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.
plate (written on both sides, 33 + 29 lines) surmounted by a highly wrought ornament soldered on the top of it. The main part of the ornament is a seal formed by five concentric rings. On the upper part of the seal is a wheel on a pedestal with a deer facing on either side. Immediately below we have the legend Śrīmān-Dharmapāladevaḥ. Then comes the genealogy of the donor. The inscription was issued from Pāṭaliputra-samāvāsita-Śrīmāj-jayaskandhāvāra by Paramasaugato-Mahārājādhirāja-Śrīmad-Dharmapāladevaḥ. The grant which is dated in his 32nd year, records the gift of the three villages of Kraunḍaśvabhra, Madhasāmalī and Pālitaka in the Viṣaya of Mahantāprakāśa, attached to the Mandala of Vyāghrataṭī in the Pundravardhana-Bhukti and the village of Gopippalī in the Amraśandikā-Mandala attached to the Viṣaya of Sthālikkaṭa to the temple of Nanna-Nārāyaṇa-bhaṭṭāraka, established by Mahāsāmāntādhipati Nārāyaṇavarman. The grant was made at the request of this officer, and the Dūtaka of the grant was the Yuvarāja Tribhuvanapāla. The description of the camp at Pāṭaliputra, beginning with Sa khalu Bhāgirathī-patha pravartamāna and ending with pādāta-bhara-namad-avaneḥ first occurring in this inscription after verse 13, became the stereotyped description of the Jaya-śandhāvāras of the Pālas in all subsequent grants.1

(3) A MS. of the Haricarita-kāvyā by Caturbhuja, containing the statement that one of his ancestors, Svarnarekha, got the village of Karṇaja in Varendrī as a Śāsana from Nṛpa Dharmapāla. Svarnarekha is described in the passage as Śruti-smṛti-purāṇa-pada-pravīṇah, and was apparently a Brahman (vībra).2

(4) Clay Seals.—Recently in a mound at Paharpur, District

---

1 The inscription was first discovered and published with a translation and a small but clear photo-etching in JASB, Vol. LXII, Part 1, pp. 39 ff. Then edited by Kielhorn in EI, Vol. IV, pp. 243 ff.; re-edited in Gaṇḍaleghamāla by A. K. Maitra, pp. 9 ff. The inscription is reported to be in the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

2 CPMDN, p. 131.
Rajshahi, North Bengal, clay seals have been discovered bearing the name *Śrī-Dhairapāla-deva.*

The evidence of these records shows that Dharmapāla ruled at least for 32 years, and held sway over territory extending from Pātaliputra to Rajshahi. I have already discussed the reasons for thinking that he reigned for a longer period which according to my calculation is 46 years (769-815 A.D.), and it is likely that he ruled directly over a more extensive area than the evidence of the inscriptions at present indicates. In his Khalimpur plate the *Yuvārāja* Tribhūvanapāla is mentioned as the *Dūtaka* of the grant. Though not explicitly mentioned as such, he is usually taken by scholars to have been the eldest son and heir of Dharmapāla. As in the subsequent inscriptions Devapāla is mentioned as son and successor of Dharmapāla, it is supposed that he must have died during his father's lifetime. This is a possible explanation, though the likelihood of an Aśoka or Aurangzib ousting their elder brothers who were de-facto *Yuvārājas* is not entirely eliminated. It should also be noticed that in Indian history a *Yuvārāja*, unless it is established on other evidence, should not necessarily be taken as the eldest son. In the case of Devapāla however the suggestion of any violence at the time of his accession appears to be contradicted by verse 12 of his Monghyr grant, which tells us that he succeeded to his father's dominions without any trouble (*nirupapalavam*), even as the Bodhisattva got *Saugatam padam*.

In the Pāla records Devapāla appears as a mighty conqueror. We are told in his Monghyr grant that during his victorious expeditions his war-elephants reached the Vindhayas, while his cavalry roamed about in the Kāmboja country (V. 13). In another verse of the same inscription, the *praśastikāra* tells us that

---

this king enjoyed the whole region bounded on the north by the Himalayas, in the south by Rāma’s bridge (ā-setoh prathita-da-
sāya-ketu-kirte), and by the abodes of Varuṇa and Lakṣmi
(i.e., the oceans), on the east and the west (V. 15). In the
Bhalgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla Jayapāla, a son of Vākpāla and
grandson of Gopāla, claims to have undertaken successful expedi-
tions at the direction of Devapāla. We are told that at his
approach the lord of Utkala took fright and fled from his capi-
tal, while the king of Prāgjyotiṣa only continued to rule in his
kingdom in safety when he agreed to hold the commands of Jay-
apāla on his proud head (V. 6). The Badal pillar inscription
of the time of Guravamiśra also supplies interesting informa-
tion on the victories of Devapāla. From this inscription we find
the names of three ministers of Devapāla:

Devapāla ... Darbhapāṇi = Sarkarā-devi.

(Gauḍēśvara) ... Someśvara = Rallā-devi.

... Kedāra Mīśra = Vavvā.

We are told by the composer of this prāśasti that, aided by
the diplomacy (nīti-kauśala) of his minister Darbhapāṇi, Deva-
pāla made tributary the whole region from Revā’s father (Vin-
dhyas) to the father of Gaurī (Himalayas) and from the eastern
to the western ocean whose waters are red with the rays of the
rising and setting sun’ (V. 5). Thanks again to the wise coun-
sel of the third minister Kedāra Mīśra, ‘the Gauḍēśvara long
ruled the sea-girt earth, having eradicated the race of the Utka-
las, humbled the pride of the Hūnas, and scattered the conceit
of the rulers of Dravidā and Gurjara.’ 1 Following Kielhorn,
scholars usually identify this king of Gauḍa with Devapāla. No
doubt many of these claims are much too extravagant to be taken
seriously; but apart from these statements, there appears to be

1 It is interesting to note that Tāranātha also represents Devapāla as having greatly
increased the power of the Pālas. He is said to have ‘brought into submission the
kingdom of Varendra in the east and afterwards the province of Oḍiśa.’ See
sufficient evidence to show that Devapāla really had some military success. The chief rivals of the Pālas at this period were the Gurjaras and the Rastrakūṭas. The contemporary princes may be arranged in the following tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devapāla (c. 815-854 A.D.)</th>
<th>Nāgabhaṭa (c. 815-833 A.D.)</th>
<th>Amoghavarṣa (814-77 A.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmabhadra</td>
<td>Bhoja (c. 836-90 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In describing the career of Dharmapāla we have already noticed how his preliminary success appears to have been ended by the vigorous attack of Nāgabhaṭa II, who may have even captured Kanauj by ousting Cakrāyudha. But the success of the Gurjaras combined the other claimants for Kanauj against him. If we are to believe the Rastrakūṭa records, the Gurjaras were defeated and the triumphant Deccani army advanced up to the Himalayas. What happened after this is not clear. Whether Nāgabhaṭa still held Kanauj, or whether Cakrāyudha was restored to his throne, is uncertain. But it is likely that the alliance between Govinda and Dharmapāla which is hinted at in the Sanjan plates did not last long; for the Nilgund inscription of Amoghavarṣa tells us that Govinda III fettered the Gaudas. But the death of Govinda III in c. 814 A.D. and the internal dissensions of the Rastrakūṭas which followed must have come as a welcome relief to the Pālas. The death of Nāgabhaṭa II in about 933 A.D. and the accession of the weak Rāmabhadra further helped Devapāla to realize his ambition. He may have again recovered the same position in Northern India which was enjoyed by his father Dharmapāla for some time. But as the Barah grant of Bhoja, dated in 836 A.D., tells us that it was issued from Mahodaya, it must be assumed that either Devapāla lost ground during the latter part of his reign or that Kanauj remained under the Gurjaras since the time of Nāgabhaṭa II and could not be recovered.

by the Pālas.\footnote{EI, Vol. V, p. 211.} Indeed verse 18 of the Gwalior inscription which refers to Bhoja’s victory over Dharmapāla’s son appears to indicate a Gurjara success over Devapāla.\footnote{Ibid, Vol. XVII, pp. 99 ff.}

The recent discovery of the Nālandā copper-plate of Devapāla has thrown an interesting sidelight on the history of Bengal and Bihar of this period. The plate records the grant of five villages in the Viqayas of Rājgrha and Gayā by the Pāla king at the request of Suvarṇadvipādhāpūti Mahārāja Bālaputrādeva, grandson of a Sailendra king of Yava-bhūmi. The land was intended for the upkeep of a Buddhist monastery built by the Sailendra king at Nālandā.\footnote{For the Sailendras see JBRA, 1887-89, XVII, Part II, pp. 1-10; EI, Vol. XVII, pp. 316 ff. See also in this connection The Yupa Inscriptions of King Mālasrman from Koetī (East Bornec), edited by Dr. Vogel, pp. 202 ff.} As Yava-bhūmi and Suvarṇadvipā have been identified with the islands of Java and Sumatra this record is an evidence of intercourse between the lower Ganges valley and the islands of the East Indian Archipelago in the middle of the 9th century. There may have been a regular pilgrim-traffic, possibly by sea, between these islands and the mouths of the Ganges.

The following records of Devapāla’s reign have so far been discovered:

(1) Monghyr grant.—Discovered in Monghyr in 1780. Single plate of thick copper written on both sides (28+29 lines). On the top of it is soldered a seal; in the central panel of this is the well-known Sarnath device, the dharma-cahra, with two antelopes at the sides. Underneath is the royal name Śri-Devapāladevasya. The inscription opens with a verse in praise of Buddha, and then gives the genealogy of the donor from Gopāla. It was issued from Śri-Mudgagiri-samāvāṣita Śrīmāj-jayaskanāhāvāra by Ps.-P.-Pb.-M.-Śrī-Dharmapāladeva- pādānudhyāta Ps.-P.-Pb.-M.\footnote{Henceforth these titles will be represented in abbreviation as follows: Paramasangata = Ps., Paramesvara = P., Paramabhūtāraka = Pb., Mahārājādhīraja = M.} Śrīmad-Devapāla, and records
the gift of Meṣikā-grāma, in Krimilā-Visaya and Śrī-Nagara (mod. Patna district)-Bhukti, to the Bhaṭṭa-pravara Vihe- 
karāṭa Miśra in the year 33 of the king’s reign. The Dūtaka of 
the inscription was the son of the donor, Yuvarāja Rājayapāla.¹

(2) Nālandā grant.—Unearthed at Nālandā in 1921. Single 
plate: 42 lines (obverse), and 24 lines (reverse). The seal is 
the same as in the Monghyr grant. The introductory portion 
(first 25 lines) is identical with the same portion of the Monghyr 
plate. This record was also issued from Mudgagiri, but is 
posterior to the other record by six years, being dated in year 
39. Genealogy same as in the Monghyr grant. It records that 
Devapāladeva, at the request of Suvarṇadvīpādhipati Mahāraja- 
Śrī-V(B)ālaputradeva, granted five villages, four of which lay in 
Rājagrha-Visaya of Śrīnagara-Bhukti while the other lay in 
Gayā-Visaya. The grant was made for the upkeep of the 
monastery built at Nālandā by the said king of Suvarṇadvīpa 
(Sumatra ?). The endowment is entirely Buddhist. The 2nd 
side of the plate introduces the Dūtaka of the grant, who 
is referred to as Dharmādhikāre’smin.² Śrī-V(B)alavarmā- 
Vyāghrataṭi-Mandalādhipati.³ Then follows an account of 
Bālaputradeva. We are told that there was a king of 
Yava-bhūmi who was a Sailendra-vamsatilaka. He had a son. 
As Paulomi was to Indra, so was Tārā the agramahiṣi to this 
son. Tārā was the daughter of the great ruler Dharmasetu 
(Varmasetu ?) of the lunar race (Rājūḥ Soma-kulānvayasya

¹ The plate was first published in 1788 in Vol. I, pp. 123 ff. of the Asiatic Researches. 
The inscription then mysteriously disappeared. In 1892 Kielhorn published a text and 
translation of the record from its lithographic representation in the Asiatic Researches. 
See IA, Vol. XXI, pp. 254 ff. This text was published with notes in the Gaṇḍālakhamālā, 
pp. 33 ff. It was one of the romances of Indian history when the grant was discovered a 
few years back in Kenwood House in England in the course of some repairs. It has been 
now edited by Dr. Barnett with an excellent photographic facsimile from the original plate 
in EI, Vol. XVIII, pp. 301 ff.; the grant now belongs to Kenwood Estate.
² In this religious function according to the editor; but could it mean in this Depart- 
ment of Law?
³ Vyāghrataṭi is in the Khalimpur grant included in the Bhukti of Puṇḍravaradhana.
mahātaḥ Dharmasētoḥ). As the son of Suddhodana was born of Māyā, so was born of her the illustrious Bālaputra. Having realised the transitoriness of wealth and attracted by the excellences of Nālandā he built a vihāra in that place. Though the inscription is Buddhist, it is significant that in the last verse a hope is expressed for the continuance of the grant in the following words: 

“as long as the Ganges has her limbs agitated by the extensive plaited hair of Hara,”—etc.¹

(3) Ghosrawa stone inscription.—The stone was discovered 7 miles south of the town of Bihar in the village of Ghosrawa in 1848. It has 19 lines of Sanskrit verse, and records the establishment of a Vajrāsana by a Buddhist monk, Vīradēva. The inscription opens with verses in praise of Vajrāsana (Buddha), and then gives an account of Vīradēva. In Nagara-hāra (near mod. Jalalabad), the ornament of the countries of Uttarāpatha, there was born Rājasakha-dvijavara Indragupta, who married Rajjekā. Their son Vīradēva after reading the Vedas and having finished other studies (Sāstras) went to Kanīṣka-mahā-vihāra (near modern Peshawar), and became a disciple of ācārya Sarvajñāsānti. After some time Vīradēva came to Mahābodhi in order to worship Vajrāsana. From that place he went to Yaśovarāmapura² to see sahadeśi-bhikṣus. There he remained for a long time and received worship from the bhuvanādhipa-Devapāla, and later on was appointed as the director of the Nālandā (modern Baragaon) monastery. He there built a bhavana as high as Kailāsa peak for Vajrāsana.³

(4) Nālandā image-inscription.—The inscription is incised on a metallic image of Saṁkarṣaṇa excavated at Nālandā.⁴

¹ The inscription was discovered by Hfrānand Sāstri at Nālandā in 1921; mentioned in the ASI, Central Circle, 1920-21, pp. 37 ff. It was edited by N. G. Majumdar from the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, in April 1926 and in EI, Vol. XVII, pp. 810 ff. by H. Sāstri.

² Bihar according to Cunningham; according to Hultsch Ghosrawa.


⁴ ASI, 1920-21, p. 35.
The evidence of these records show that like his father Devapâla at least retained his hold on Bihar and North Bengal. As we have already suggested, there is evidence that he wielded greater power than the distribution of his inscriptions would suggest.\(^1\) We have again no means of knowing his exact reign-period. Tārānātha assigns him 48 years, while his inscriptions so far discovered give us his 39th year. Though it is not unlikely that he may have reigned for some time after this, the years c. 815-54 A.D. assigned to him in our chronology may be taken as a rough approximation of his reign-period.\(^2\) The Pâla records are silent about the names of any queen of Devapâla, and mention only one son, the Yuvanâja Râjyapâla, who was the Dâtaka of the Monghyr grant issued in the 23rd year of his reign. As he is not mentioned in any subsequent Pâla records, it has been usually assumed that he died during the reign of his father.\(^3\) As nothing indicates that the next ruler succeeded to the throne peacefully, and, on the contrary, there appears to have been a palace revolution, the arguments applied in the case of Tribhuvanapâla\(^4\) apply with more force in his case. But if it is to be supposed that he died before his father, I would suggest that the event may have taken place before the 29th year of Devapâla and this would explain the rather unusual procedure of appointing an officer of North Bengal to serve as

---

\(^1\) The statement in the Badal praśasti that Devapâla always stood at the gate awaiting the leisure of his Brahman minister Darbhâpâpi and that he sat on his throne trembling before him should not be coupled with the election of Gopaīla, as in Gaudâlekhamâlā, p. 79 fn. Though it is possible that the ministers enjoyed great power it would be perhaps going too far to represent them as King-makers. The passages referred to above occur in a private inscription of the ministerial family, which naturally tried to praise its members in the orthodox style of the praśastikâras.

\(^2\) If, as seems not unlikely, the Gauḍâpâla, the master of Kadâra Mîra, be taken as Devapâla, then 3 generations served him as ministers, an undoubted evidence of the king's long reign. As Kadâra Mîra was also the minister of the next king, he may be accepted as a young contemporary of Devapâla.

\(^3\) For a different view see Gaudâlekhamâlā, p. 40 fn, where Mîra suggests the identification of Râjyapâla with Vigrâhapâla I. But as there is sufficient reason to believe that the latter was not the son of Devapâla his argument falls to the ground.

\(^4\) See supra, p. 290.
Dūtaka in a grant of land in Bihar, executed in Monghyr. In any case the Pāla inscriptions always represent Vigrahapāla I as the successor of Devapāla. In the Badal prābasti king Sūrapāla is placed between Devapāla and Nārāyaṇapāla. Thus it is likely that Vigrahapāla I and Sūrapāla were names of the same person. The relationship of this Vigrahapāla-Sūrapāla with Devapāla has however given rise to considerable differences of opinion. In the Centenary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal Dr. Hoernle stated: 'It seems clear from this (Ampachi) grant that Vigrahapāla was not a nephew, but a son of Devapāla; for the pronoun "his son" (tāt-sūnuḥ) must refer to the nearest preceding noun which is Devapāla. In the Bhāgalpur grant this reference is obscured through the interpolation of an intermediate verse in praise of Jayapāla, which makes it appear as if Vigrahapāla were a son of Jayapāla.' Mr. Maitreya held that, since in both these grants Devapāla is distinctly called Jayapāla’s pūrvaja, they must be brothers. Dr. Kielhorn on the other hand expressed the opinion that Vigrahapāla-Sūrapāla was the son of Jayapāla, and the grandson of Vākpāla, the second son of Gopāla I. This view seems to be supported by the fact that the names of Vākpāla and Jayapāla are entirely omitted from the inscriptions of Dharmapāla and Devapāla, and regularly appear in the inscriptions of the descendants of Vigrahapāla I, which is explained only by assuming that they were the grandfather and father of that king. It is also significant that in the inscriptions which follow Vigrahapāla I the victories of Devapāla’s reign are mainly ascribed not to Devapāla himself but to Jayapāla, which finds a parallel in the Badal prābasti, which ascribes the victories to the ministerial family. But the latter is a private inscription the main object of which was to praise the family of Garga. The praise of Vākpāla and Jayapāla

1 Part II, Appendix II, p. 206.
2 Gauḍālekhaṇḍa, pp. 65-66 l., notes.
in the official records of Vigrahapāla's successors appears to be meaningless unless we assume that they were specially connected with Vigrahapāla I in the way that Kielhorn has suggested.

Vigrahapāla I appears to be a rather shadowy personality. Though it is sometimes said of him that he was the cause of infinite trouble to his enemies, or that he was a veritable enemy-destroying Indra, no definite victories are ascribed in any inscription to him. Our suspicions seem to be confirmed by V. 17 of the Bhāagalpur grant of his son Nārāyaṇapāla, which runs as follows: "Let asceticism be mine and the kingdom thine. Thus two men have spoken to two others, Vigrahapāla to him and Sagara to Bhagīratha." This appears to be a clear hint that Vigrahapāla I abdicated in favour of his son. Another hint of his peaceful disposition seems to be contained in V. 7 of the same inscription, which compares him with Ajātāṣatru, which was a name of the elder Pāṇḍava Yudhiṣṭhira.¹ The same verse informs us that Vigrahapāla married Lajjā, the ornament of the Haihaya race (Haihaya-vanīsa-bhūṣā). The Badal prākṣasti informs us that Śūrapāla often attended the sacrificial ceremonies of his Brahman minister Kedāra Miśra, and with bent head and his soul bathed in the waters of faith, received the holy waters (V. 15). To this king are ascribed two inscriptions incised on the pedestal of two images of Buddha. These are said to have been found somewhere in Bihar and are supposed to contain the name of Uddanḍapura (mod. town of Bihar). The inscriptions record that the images were installed by Pūrṇadāśa, a Buddhist monk of Sind, in the 3rd year of Śūrapāla.²

¹ Gauḍalakhamāla, p. 67 fn. I think Maitreyā is right in taking this sense. A comparison with the Nāga (Haryāṇa?) king Ajātāṣatru of Magadha is most improbable.
² These inscriptions are apparently the same which are edited by Prof. N. Chakravarti in JASB, 1908, pp. 107-08; Mr. Chakravarti was of opinion that the inscriptions belong to Śūrapāla II. Mr. R. D. Banerji on palaeographic grounds referred them to Śūrapāla I. See MāSB, Vol. 8, No. 3, p. 57. He is supported by Mr. Bhattacharyya in the IHQ, September 1927, pp. 586-87, who rightly points out that the date on the plate published by Chakravarti is 3 and not 2.
Vigrahapāla I was succeeded by his son Nārāyaṇapāla. Though very few political facts are known for his long reign, yet from the number and distribution of his records he appears to have been a more substantial figure. The following records are known for his reign:

1) Gaya stone inscription.—At present lying in the courtyard of the Viśṇupāda temple at Gaya. It contains 16 lines of ‘very incorrect Sanskrit, like that of the Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. of Nepal ;’ very carelessly incised. The purpose of the inscription is to record the erection of a monastery for Brahmanical ascetics by a man named Bhāṇḍadeva in the 7th year of king Nārāyaṇapāla.¹

2) Indian Museum stone inscription.—Two lines incised on ‘a long piece of carved stone, probably a portion of a pedestal. Most probably it came with other sculptures from the Behar Museum.’ Its find-place is not definitely known. The inscription records the creation of an image in the 9th year of Paramēṣvara-Nārāyaṇapāladeva by the Andhra-vaiṣayika Sākya-bhikṣu Sthavira Dharmamitra.²

3) Bhagalpur grant.—Discovered in Bhagalpur, in Bihar. Single plate written on both sides; 54 lines (front side 29 and back 26). The usual seal contains the legend Śrī-Nārāyaṇapālandevāśya. The inscription begins with a verse in praise of Loka-nātha Daśabala (Buddha), then gives the genealogy of the Pālas from Gopāla to the donor. Verse 3 contains the famous passage about the relationship of Dharmapāla with Indrarāja and Cakrāyudha of Kanauj. From this inscription onwards Vākpāla and Jayapāla regularly appear in the genealogical tables of Pāla inscriptions, and the victories of Devapāla’s reign are ascribed to Jayapāla. The Śāsana was issued from the Jayaskandhāvāra at Mudgagiri, and records the

¹ Discovered and noticed by Cunningham, _ASR_, Vol. III, p. 120, No. 6, Pt. XXXVI; re-edited in _MASR_, Vol. V, No. 8, pp. 60-61.
grant of Muktikā-grāma in Kakṣa-Viṣaya in Tīra-Bhukti (mod. Tirhut) by Ps.-M. Vigharahaladeva-pādānudhyāta P.-Pb-M. Nārāyaṇapāladeva, to the temple of Śiva-bhaṭṭāraka and Pāṣupata-ācārya-pariṇād at Kalaśapota. The gift was made in the 17th year of the king. In lines 38-39 the king boasts of having built 1,000 temples for the said Śiva in the same locality. The Dūtaka of the grant was Bhaṭṭa Gurava "who knew the meaning of the idea of Brahman...was extremely well-read in all the Śrutis together with their aṅgas, and performed great yajñas." The record was incised by Maṅkhadāsa, who is described as Sat-Samataṭa-janmā. It is to be noticed that the title Paramasaugata does not occur here among the titles of the king.  

(4) Badal pillar inscription.—Found incised on a stone monolith at a distance of 3 miles from Badal in Dinajpur district, Northern Bengal. It contains 29 lines. Characters are well engraved and skilfully formed. The first 28 lines are in Sanskrit verse. The proper object of the inscription was to record in verses 27-28 the erection of a Garuḍa-stambha, i.e., a pillar bearing on its top a figure of the mythical bird Garuḍa, by the Brahman Gurava Miśra, who was a minister of Nārāyaṇapāla. But the epigraph is really a panegyric on Gurava Miśra and his ancestors, who served as counsellors and ministers of the Pālas from Dharmapāla to Nārāyaṇapāla. Kielhorn had suggested that this Gurava is identical with the Bhaṭṭa Gurava mentioned as the Dūtaka of the Bhagalpur grant. The inscription was incised by Śūtradhāra Viṣṇubhadra. The upper part of the pillar with the figure of 'the foe of the serpents' is broken off and is now missing.  

1 First edited by Dr. R. L. Mitra in JASB, Vol. XLVII, Part I, p. 384. It was re-edited by Hultsch in IA, Vol. XV, pp. 304 ff. The text is reprinted in the Gaṇḍalekhāmālā with notes. It is now preserved in the Asiatic Society of Bengal.  

(5) Uddanḍapura image-inscription.—The inscription is incised on a brass image of Pārvatī. It is a votive inscription, and runs as follows: "The pious gift of Ṭhāruka, son of Rāṇaka Ucha (Utsa), resident of Uddanḍapura (mod. town of Bihar), in the 54th year of the reign of the illustrious Nārāyaṇapāladeva." ¹

From these records it is clear that Nārāyaṇapāla ruled for at least 54 years, and must have held a large portion of Bihar. In his case too, though we have plenty of vague praise, there is no evidence of his military activity or success. Even the Badal prāṣasti fails to note any such victories for Gurava Miśra, the minister of Nārāyaṇapāla, as it mentions in the case of Garga, Darbhapāṇi, or Kedāra Miśra, the ministers of Dharmapāla and Devapāla. The reason for this becomes clearer when we look to the following table of the most important contemporary kings who had relations with the Pālas:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vigrantapāla I (c. 854-57 A.D.)</th>
<th>Bhoja (c. 885-90 A.D.)</th>
<th>Amoghavarṣa (c. 814-77 A.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nārāyaṇapāla (c. 857-911 A.D.)</td>
<td>Mahendrapāla I (c. 890-910 A.D.)</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa II (c. 888-915 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Nilgund stone inscription of Amoghavarṣa (866 A.D.) informs us that the rulers of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Magadha worshipped him.² This statement is also found in the Sirur stone inscription (866-67 A.D.) of the same king.³ In the Deoli grant of Kṛṣṇa III, Kṛṣṇa II is said to have initiated the Gaudas in Vinayavrata and received worship from Aṅgas, Magadhás and others.⁴ Bhoja was already in the possession of Mahodaya as early as 836 A.D. His Gwalior inscription, dated in 876 A.D.,

² The text is given on the same page, fn. 57; also in IA, 1918, Vol. 47, pp. 109-110.
³ The image is to be now in the Museum of the Bāhāḍiya Sāhitya-Pariṣad. The inscription is as follows: Śrī-Nārāyaṇapāladevarājya Saṁvat, 54. Śrī-Uddanḍapura-vāstvāya Rāṇaka-Uchāputra Ṭhārukasya.
⁵ IA, Vol. XII, p. 215, line 6.
informs us that he was bent upon 'conquering the three worlds.' During the remaining years of his reign and his son's rule there is unquestionable epigraphic evidence to show that the Gurjaras held the whole of Northern India from the Karnal district in the Punjab to the Kathiawar peninsula in the south, and the borders of the Pala dominions in the east. In the Sagartal (Gwalior) inscription Bhoja claims to have burnt in the fire of his rage the powerful people of Bengal (brhad-vaṅgān). The success of the Gurjaras against the Pālas is shown by a series of inscriptions discovered in Bihar. A slab of stone bearing the figures of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu in the walls of a modern temple of Śiva at Ramgaya (just opposite the temple of Gadādhar at Gaya on the other side of Phalgu) bears a short inscription, which tells us that it was a gift of a certain Sahadeva in the 8th year (from) the abhiṣeka of Mahendrapāla. Another image-inscription of the same king was discovered at Gunariya, near the Grand Trunk Road in the Gaya district. It is dated in year 9 of the same king. A third inscription of the same king was recently discovered at Itkhorī in the Hazaribagh district, on an image of Tārā. Another image inscription is reported to have been seen by Captain Kittoe while two other inscriptions said to have been discovered in Bihar and belonging to the reign of Mahendrapāla are preserved in the British Museum. It is thus clear that a large slice of Bihar including

1 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 156, V. 22.
5 Ibid., p. 64; Cunningham, ASR, Vol. III, p. 124.
6 ASI, 1920-21, p. 35.
8 NKGWS, 1904, pp. 210-11. It should be noted that of these two records one is an image-inscription dated in Saṅvat 6, while the other contains 8 verses and is dated in Saṅvat 2. The statement that they were discovered in Magadha is made by Mr. R. D. Banerji in MAB, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 64, and Bakṣgālīr Itihās, 2nd Ed., Vol. I, p. 237, fn. 69. Kielhorn, who notices the two inscriptions, does not say where they were originally found, and I do not know Mr. Banerji's authority for his assertion.
at least Gaya and Hazaribagh districts passed under the control of the Gurjaras. Bhoja had already obtained some successes against Devapāla. The pressure was continued in the subsequent period; but it appears that up to the 7th year of Nārāyaṇapāla, the Pālas succeeded in holding Magadha against the Gurjaras, who were now at the head of a mighty empire. As I have already shown, Vigrahapāla and Nārāyaṇapāla appear to have been rather men of peace, and were no match for their powerful rivals. Their position seems to have grown worse when they also became the targets of the attacks of the Rāstrakūṭa sovereigns. It is indeed significant that during this long period of more than half a century (c. 854-911 A.D.) there is not a single allusion in the Pāla records to a victory over the Gurjaras or the Rāstrakūṭas.

The silence of the prāṇastikāras bears eloquent testimony to the decadent state of Pāla power during these years. Our conclusion is remarkably confirmed by the recent discovery of a stone pillar-inscription of the 13th year of Mahendrapāla in the northern Maṇḍapa of the Paharpur vihāra in Rajshahi district (North Bengal).¹ The Dighwa-Dubauli plate of this Gurjara emperor, dated in V. S. 955 (A.D. 898), records his grant of land in Srāvasti-Bhukti (Gonda and Bahraich districts in U.P.).² So it seems that some time after the 17th year of Nārāyaṇapāla (c. 874 A.D.) the Gurjaras gradually advanced eastward along the Northern bank of the Ganges, till in the 13th year of Mahendrapāla they annexed the whole of Tirhut and Northern Bengal. If the Uddanḍapura inscription of the 54th year of Nārāyaṇapāla has been correctly read we must suppose that the districts of Patna, Monghyr, Bhagalpur and the Santal Parganas, all on the southern bank of the Ganges in Bihar still remained under the Pālas, who possibly also ruled over portions of west, east and south Bengal. But as the Gurjara inscriptions show, their

² IA, 1896, Vol. XV, p. 113. For the correction of the date wrongly read by Fleet as 155, see JBRAS, Vol. XXI, 1902-04, pp. 405 ff.
western rivals had crossed the Gandak and the Son in an
enveloping movement to strangle their precarious existence in
Bihar and West Bengal.

Nārāyānapāla was succeeded by his son Rājyāpāla. The
Bangad grant of Mahīpāla informs us that this king constructed
many temples with lofty halls and dug numerous tanks deep as
the sea (V. 7). The same inscription informs us that he married
Bhāgyadevi, the daughter of Tuṅgadeva, 'the moon in the family
of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas' (V. 8). Kielhorn suggested that this Rāṣṭra-
kūṭa prince was Jagatūṇḍa II, the son of Kṛṣṇa II, while N.
Vasu suggested that he is to be identified with the latter prince,
who had the biruda Śubhvatuṅga. A third suggestion is that he is
the same as the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Tuṅga-Dharmāvaloka
whose stone inscription was discovered in Bodhgaya. Only one
inscription has so far been discovered of this Pāla king. This
is the Barguon pillar-inscription of his 24th year. It was found
at Baragun, near Bihar (Patna District) on the site of old
Nālandā. The pillar and the record appear to have belonged to
the ruins of an ancient Jain temple. The inscription consists
of five lines of incorrect Sanskrit, and records the visit of one
Vaidānātha (Vaidyanātha), son of Monoratha, of the Vanika-
kula, to a temple in the month of Mārga[sīrṭa], in the 24th
year of the reign of the illustrious Rājapāla (Rājyāpāla).
This inscription shows that the Pālas still held the Patna district, and
possibly also Monghyr, Bhagalpur and the Santal Parganas.
The Gurjaras probably were in possession of the region now
known as Shahabad district, and having crossed the Son

1 This is also found in V. 7 of the Amgachi grant of Vigrahapāla III, and the Manahali grant of Maḍanapāla (V. 7)

2 This is found also in V. 8 of the Amgachi grant of Vigrahapāla III and the Manahali grant of Maḍanapāla (V. 8).

JASB, 1892, Vol. LXI, p. 80, fn. 9; N. Vasu, Vaṅga Jatiya Itiḥās (Rājanya-Kānda), p. 168; Dr. R. L. Mitra, Buddha Gayā, p. 195, Pl. XL, lines 8-9; Bāṅgalīr Itiḥās, 2nd Ed.,

3 IA, 1917, Vol. 47, p. 111. The pillar is now in a modern Jain temple at
Baragun; see also JBORS, December 1928, p. 489.
somewhere near Dehri, occupied Gaya and Hazaribagh districts, while in the north they overran the whole of Tira-Bhukti and Varendri. But there is reason to conclude, as we shall see further on, that the Gurjara success was short-lived and their occupation of Gaya was not permanent. Rājayapāla ruled at least for 24 years (c. 911-35 A.D.), and was succeeded by his son Gopāla II. From the number and distribution of the records of this prince it is reasonable to conclude that there was probably a revival of Pāla power under his rule. The following dates and records of his reign have so far been discovered:

1) Bodhgaya stone image-inscription.—Discovered in Bodhgaya. The inscription is incised on the pedestal of an image; it begins with a verse in praise of the Jina (Buddha), and then records the erection of an image of the Muni (Buddha) by Dharmabhimā, who describes himself as Sindicdhvabhava (native of Sindhu?) and also as Ākrasena. In the last line we have ..'Śri-Gopāla-deva-rājye.' No year is mentioned. But as the script shows a resemblance to the Badal prāsasti and may therefore be referred to the 10th century A.D., the inscription has rightly been ascribed to Gopāla II.¹

2) Nalanda Vāgīśvarī stone image-inscription.—Discovered in the ruins of Nalanda. The inscription is incised on the pedestal of the image and records the erection of a statue of Vāgīśvarībhaṭṭārikā at Nalanda in the 1st year of the reign of Pb.-M.-P. Gopāladeva. As the script of the record is later than that of the inscription of Dharmapāla, it is now generally regarded as belonging to Gopāla II. It has been suggested that the word Suvrnavrīhisaktī occurring after the name of the

¹ Dug out by Cunningham in 1879; see plate XXVIII, No. 2 in his Mahābodhi; also ibid., p. 69. Edited by Prof. N. Chakravarti in JASB, 1905, Vol. IV (N.S.), pp. 102-05; see also JASB, 1909, pp. 103-04. Text reprinted in Gaudālekhamālā with notes, pp. 86 ff. According to H. P. Sāstī, Sindicdhvabhava should signify Dharmabhīma's racial origin. This epithet according to the Pandit therefore makes Ākrasena a relative of Dharmapāla. The image is now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.
godess indicates the custom of encasing the statues in gold plates.¹

(3) A MS. of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā was copied in the Vikramaśila-deva-vihāra in the year 15 of P.-Pb.-Ps.-M. Gopāladeva.²

(4) A palm-leaf MS. of the Maitreya Vyākarana bears the date year 57 of Gopāladeva's reign. The characters of the MS. are described as Kuṭila of the 10th century A.D. The treatise gives in the form of a prophecy the life of Maitreya, the future Buddha, and his teachings. The work was thrice translated into Chinese, for the first time by Kumārajīva (384-417 A.D.).³

From the records cited above it appears that Gopāla II probably ruled for at least 57 years. This is in harmony with the statement found in the Bangad grant of Mahāpiṇḍa and all subsequent grants that Gopāla II ruled this earth 'for a long time' (cirataram avaner ekapatnyā, etc.). The reappearance of Pāla inscriptions in Gaya district appears to indicate a revival of Pāla power during this period (c. 935-92 A.D.) and synchronises with the rapid decline of their western rivals, the Gurjara-Pratihāras. In the Deoli inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III, Kṛṣṇa II is said to have defeated an unnamed Gurjara sovereign, possibly Bhoja II.⁴ This Rāṣṭrakūṭa victory was followed by another crushing defeat of the Gurjaras. The Cambay plates of Govinda IV inform us that Indra III's cavalry crossed the unfathomable Yamunā and devastated the city of Mahodaya

¹ First discovered by Buchanan. See Martin's Eastern India, Vol. I, Plate XV, figure 4. Cunningham noticed it in ASR, Vol. I, Plate XIII, p. 120. The inscription was fully read by H. P. Sāstri and properly edited by Prof. N. Chakravarti in JASB, 1908, Vol. VI (N.S.), pp. 103-06. The same text is printed in the Gaṇḍahakamāla, pp. 86-87.

² JRAS, 1910, pp. 150-51.

³ A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Collection by H. P. Sāstri, Vol. I (Buddhist MSS.), Calcutta, 1917, pp. 14-15. Mr. R. D. Banerji has recently challenged Sāstri's reading of the date; JBORS, December 1928, pp. 490 ff. He suggests that the date is 17 while D. R. Bhandarkar thinks that it is 11. Sāstri still maintains that it is 57. I have given Sāstri's reading pending my personal examination of the date of the MS.

(916-17 A.D.). The Kanarese poet Pampa tells us that Narasimha, a Cālukya feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, put to flight the army of the Ghurjara-rāja and terrified Mahipāla so much that the latter fled in consternation 'not stopping to eat or sleep or rest.' The Rāṣṭrakūṭa general, who was a contemporary of Indra III, claims to have 'bathed his horse at the junction of the Ganges and the sea.' It thus appears that the Gurjaras were for a time completely overwhelmed by their southern rivals, and though there is evidence that Mahipāla succeeded in recovering some amount of his power, there can be no doubt that these defeats shook the empire of Bhoja and Mahendrapāla to its very foundations so that in the period that followed, its vassal states gradually broke away under dynasties owning little or no allegiance to the central government. It is therefore not surprising that the Pālas should have striven at this time to regain some of their lost territories, and succeeded. But the decline of the Gurjaras did not afford any permanent protection to the Pālas on their western frontier. The Khajuraho inscription of the Candella Yasovarman informs us that sometime before 953-54 A. D. he defeated the king of Gauda along with other princes of northern India.

During the latter part of the reign of Gopāla II, or during that of his son Vigrahapāla II, a great calamity appears to have fallen on the fortunes of the Pālas. Verse 12 of the Bangad grant of Mahipāla I, son of Vigrahapāla II, tells us that this prince recovered his paternal kingdom, 'which had been snatched away through pride of prowess by people who had no claim

---

2 The Pampa Bhārata or Vikramāditya Vijaya of Pampa (941 A.D.), Ed. by L. Rice (Bibliotheca Caruatica), Bangalore, 1898, pp. 3 ff. The actual passage tells us that he bathed his horses in the junction of the Ganges and the sea (Gṛgā-Parḍhiya). This statement may contain a hint that the Gurjara arms, which we have seen had already advanced as far as Itkbori in Hazaribagh, possibly had advanced eastwards till sometime before 916-17 A.D. they had reached the mouths of the Hugli through Manbhum, Bankura, and Midnapur districts.
to it.' ¹ Who were these enemies conquered by Mahīpāla? The question is probably answered by the discovery of a pillar-inscription amongst the ruins of Bangad, in the district of Dinajpur, in North Bengal. The inscription contains only three lines, and records the erection of a temple of Siva by a king of Gauḍa of the Kāmboja family (Kāmbōjā-nvayaja Gauḍapati). The inscription possibly contains a date in the compound Kuṇjara-ghaṭa-varṣena, which according to some scholars means ‘in the year 888.’ This date is then referred to the Saka era (A.D. 966). But this view has not been accepted by some prominent orientalists. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, for instance, took it to mean, ‘he who pours forth an array of elephants.’ Recently Mr. R. D. Banerji has referred the inscription, on palaeographic grounds, to the period between Nārāyaṇapāla and Mahīpāla I.² This conclusion seems to agree with the fact that during the reigns of Rājyapāla, Gopāla II, and Vigrāhapāla II (c. 911-92 A.D.) no record of the Pāla rulers have yet been discovered in North Bengal. After the Badal praśasti of the time of Nārāyaṇapāla we have to come down to the reign of Mahīpāla I before we can find any inscription in that locality. Thus it is not unlikely that Mahīpāla probably referred to this portion of Bengal as snatched away from his family and recovered by him. There is no means of knowing either the names or the number of the Kāmboja kings who ruled in Gauḍa. It is difficult even to find out the origin of this line of princes. The word Kāmboja does not materially help us. It occurs once in the Monghyr grant of Devapāla in connection with his victorious campaigns. The context of the passage where it occurs, as well as its association with horses, would seem to

¹ This is also found in v. 10 of the Manahali grant of Madanapāla.
² This inscription was first published by Westmacott with Dr. R. L. Mitra’s translation and comments in the IA, Vol. I, pp. 127-28. For controversies on this publication see ibid, pp. 195 and 237. It was again edited by K. P. Chanda, in JASB, 1911, Vol. VII (N. S.), pp. 615-20. The inscribed pillar now stands in the garden in front of the palace of the Mahārāja of Dinajpur.
indicate that the composer of the inscription was referring to the Kāmbojas who are coupled with the Gandhāras and placed somewhere near modern Afghanistan. Prof. Foucher has pointed out that Nepalese tradition applied the name Kāmboja-desa to Tibet. Accepting this suggestion, Chanda held that "the Gauḍāpati of the Kāmboja family probably came from Tibet, Bhutan, or some other Himalayan country at the head of a Mongolian horde who are now represented by the Koch, and the Paliyas of Northern Bengal, also known as Rājvanśis." ¹ In this connection I would venture to point out that there was a Gandhāra and possibly also a Kāmboja as well on the north-eastern frontier of India, near the regions now known as Yunnan and Szechwan ² and it is not unlikely that these conquerors of Northern Bengal may have come from that direction. The history of the Brahmaputra valley, as we have shown elsewhere, tells of more than one invasion by the Mongoloid tribes on its north-eastern frontier and the extension of the power of some of these conquerors to the west beyond the Karatoya is probably not beyond the range of possibility. An Assamese conquest of North Bengal, though only a temporary one, is shown by the Nidhanpur inscription of Bhāskaravarman.³

The above discussion shows that, so far as our present stock of information allows us to conclude, it is more than likely that the Pālas lost Northern Bengal (Gauḍā) during the period (c. 911-92 A.D.). The Bangad grant of Mahāpāla gives the following descripti on of Vighrahapāla II.⁴

¹ JASB, 1914, p. 619; Gauḍarājamalā, p. 337.
² Campa, by R. C. Majumdar, Lahore, 1927, p. xiv; Indian Cultural Influences in Cambodia by B. R. Chatterjee, pp. 278-79. From about 12th century there was a school of repute among the monks of Lsittka, Southern Shan States, known as Kāmboja-Saṅgha, see Harvey, History of Burma, p. 109. fn. 1.
³ El, Vol. XII, p. 73, line 3. See also supra, pp. 336 ff.
⁴ Ibid, Vol. XIV, pp. 329-30. In the place of the word -mmaruṣa in this plate, occurs -s=taruṣa in other grants. Kiellern while editing this inscription read s=taruṣa. See JASB, 1892, Vol. LXI, Part I, p. 83. V. 11 of this grant occurs also in the Amgachi grant (V. 14) where it describes the activities not of Vighrahapāla II, but of Vighrahapāla III.
"As the moon, the scatterer of myriads of rays, from the Sun, so from him was born Vigrahapala-deva the scatterer of innumerable riches. By his rise (or birth), who was pleasing to the eyes on account of personal beauty (or by his soft rays), who was pure (or spotless), who was learned in the arts (kalāmaya), was alleviated the distress of the world" (V. 10).

"Whose war-elephants, like clouds, having drunk clear water in the eastern country, which abounds with water, after that having roamed according to their own will in the sandal-forests of the Malaya (country), (and) having caused a coolness in the Maru lands by throwing dense sprays (of water emitted from their trunks), enjoyed the slopes of the Himalayas" (v. 11).

Mr. A. K. Maitreya has read in these two verses an indirect hint of the calamities which according to him fell in the reign of Vigrahapala II. He says:—"By referring to him as a moon sprung from the sea and getting thereby an opportunity of fastening upon him the (fault of) kalāmaya, the poet may have hinted at his adversities. In the next śloka, the story of his elephants, after roaming about hither and thither and finding rest at last in the slopes of the Himalayas, and the reference immediately after this to the recovery of lost dominions by Mahipala, may lead us to believe that the first eclipse of the Pala power probably occurred in the reign of Vigrahapala II."  

This conclusion has been accepted by other scholars as reasonable, and fits in well with our scheme of things. Though there is at present nothing to support my guess I would venture to suggest that there might have been some connection between the extension of the Gurjara power in North Bengal and the Kāmboja rulers of the same locality. If my suggestion

1 Gaudālekhamāla, p. 100, fn. The interpretation seems to be rather forced specially in the case of V. 11, which appears clearly to refer, as Kielhorn took it, to his tours of conquest. But this vague eulogy should not mean anything.

that these rulers were of Yunnanese origin, who came to the Brahmaputra valley and then to North Bengal, be accepted then it is possible they might have come to Bengal as allies of the Gurjaras. A double attack like this was eminently successful against Śaśānka when Hārṣa and Bhāskaravarman combined against him. The withdrawal of Gurjara power after their defeat by the Rāṣṭrakūtas in c. 916-17 A.D. left the Kāmbojas masters of Northern Bengal. Anyhow it is certain that there was no great interval between the disappearance of the Gurjara hold on Gauḍa proper and the rise of this line of kings.¹

Vigrahapāla II was succeeded by his son Mahīpāla I. For his reign we have the following dates and records:

(1) The Baghaura Nārāyana image-inscription.—This image-inscription was discovered in a village near the subdivisional town of Brahmanbaria in the Tippera district. It was dug out of a pond in the village of Baghaura of that subdivision. The inscription is incised under the lotus-seat of a standing image of Nārāyana. The characters belong to the N. E. variety generally known as Kuṭila, which gave birth to modern Bengali script. The inscription is dated in year 3 in the reign of Mahīpāladeva, and records that the image was the meritorious work of Paramavaśīnava Vanika Lokadatta, belonging to (the village of) Bilaktnāka (probably the mod. village of Bilakendual near Baghaura) in Samataṭa. As Mahīpāla II had a short and troublesome reign, the inscription has been referred to Mahīpāla I.²

(2) A Cambridge library palm-leaf MS. the Astasāhasrikā- prajñāpāramitā, was copied in the year 5 of P.-Pb.-Pš.-M. Mahīpāladeva. For reasons given in (1) this date is also referred to Mahīpāla I.³

¹ After the MS. was sent to the typist Dr. Raychaudhuri of the University of Calcutta has written to me about the connection of the Gurjara-Pratihāras and Kāmbojas. As far as I know, he believes that the Kāmbojas came into N. Bengal in the train of the Gurjara forces from N. W. India.
³ OBMG, pp. 100-01.
(3) A Nepal palm-leaf MS. of the same work was written at Nalanda in the year 6 of the reign of Pbh.-M.-P.-Ps. Vigrahapala-deva-padanudhyata Pbh.-M.-P.-Ps.-Mahipala-deva. For the reason given in (1), this date is also referred to the reign of Mahipala I.  

(4) Bangad grant.—Discovered among the ruins called Ban Rajgarh or Bangad in the Dinajpur district, Bengal. Single-plate surmounted by a highly wrought ornament containing the usual seal of the Pala's, and the inscription Sri-Mahipala-devavasya. Inscribed on both sides, 34 lines on the front and 28 lines on the back. The first 24 lines give the genealogy of the Pala's from Gopala to Mahipala I. Verse 12 runs as follows: 'from him (Vigrahapala II) was born Mahipaladeva, who, slaying all enemies and having obtained his patrnal kingdom, which had been snatched away through pride of prowess by people who had no claim to it, placed his lotus-like feet on the heads of kings.' The inscription was issued from the 'victorious camp' situated at Vilā(?)-sapura on the Bhāgirathi. It records that in the 9th year of Ps.-M.-Vigrahapaladeva-padanudhyata P.-Pbh.-M. Mahipaladeva, in the name of Lord Buddha, after bathing in the Ganges according to custom (vidhi), gave to the excellent Brahman Bhattaputra Kṛṣṇaditya Sarman the village of Kuraṭapallikā in the Gokulika-Mandala in the Kōtivāra-Viṣaya in the Pundravardhana-Bhūkti. The Dūtaka of the grant was the Mantri Bharta Vāmana, and it was incised by the Silpi Mahudhara. The first 5 ślokas of the inscription are also found in the Bhāgalpur grant of Narayanapala. The 6th is slightly different. 

(5) Bodhgaya stone image-inscription.—The inscription consists of 3 lines, and is incised on the pedestal of an image of

---

1 The MS. was exhibited by H. P. Shastri at the March meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1899; see Proceedings for that year, pp. 69-70.

2 The inscription was first published by Kielhorn in JASB, 1892, Vol. LXI, Part I, pp. 77-87. The text was then printed in the Gaudalekhamāla with notes. Recently it has been again edited by Mr. Banerji in EI, Vol. XIV, pp. 324-380. The plate is now the property of Mr. N. N. Vasu of Bengal.
Buddha sitting in the Bhūmi-sparśa-mudrā. It is in an imperfect state of preservation, having lost a number of letters. It records the erection of two gandha-kutās, probably along with this image, in the 11th year of M.-P.-Pb.-Ps. Mahāpāladeva. For the reasons given in (1) this date is also referred to Mahāpāla I.¹

(6) Nālandā stone inscription.—This inscription was discovered during excavations at the site of the great temple of Bālāditya at Nālandā. The inscription consists of 11 lines, and apparently records the gift of the elaborately carved gateway at the foot of which the inscription is reported to have been discovered. We are told that this gift was made by Pravara-mahāyāna-yāyināḥ-Paramopāsaka Bālāditya, a resident of Tailādhaka (mod. village of Telārā or Telāḍha, about 21 miles to the west of Bargaon, i.e., ancient Nālandā), and an immigrant from Kauśāmbī, in the year 11 of Mahāpāla, when (the great temple) was restored after it had been burnt down. On palaeographic ground the inscription was referred to Mahāpāla I by Kielhorn.²

(7) Saranath stone inscription.—Discovered in digging stones at Sarnath at about 520 ft. to the west of great tower, of Dhamekh. The inscription consists of only two lines, and is incised on the pedestal of an image of Buddha, which is now broken above the hips. "The historical part of the inscription is

¹ The inscription was first noticed by Cunningham, see his AŠR, Vol. III, p. 122, No. 9, plate XXXVII, No. 5; edited by B. D. Banerji in MAB, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 75. The image is now worshipped as one of the five Pāḍgavas in a small shrine in front of the great temple at Bodhgaya.

² The inscription was discovered by Captain Marshall in 1864. A cast of the inscription which was sent to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, was lost, and the epigraph was rediscovered by Mr. Broadley. Noted by Cunningham in his AŠR, Vol. III, pp. 122-128; then edited by Kielhorn in NKGWG, 1904, Heft 2, pp. 111-112. Prof. N. Chakravartī edited it again in JAS, 1908, Vol. IV (N.S.), pp. 105-107; text printed with a plate and notes in the Gaudālakhamālā, pp. 101-103, under the name 'Bālāditya Stone Incription.' For identification of Tailādhaka see AŠR, Vol. XI, pp. 164 ff. The record is now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.
engraved below the statue.” Then follows a band of sculptures of seven panels. The central panel contains the Dharmacakra, the 3rd and the 5th two antelopes (exactly as in Pāla seals), the 2nd and the 6th two tigers, and the 1st and 7th two kneeling male figures, which support the stone above with their hands, like the giants in front of Cave III at Nasik. The inscription begins with Om namo Buddhāya. Then we are told that “The illustrious Śhatrapāla and his younger brother the illustrious Vasantapāla, whom the lord of Gauḍa, the illustrious Mahipāla, caused to establish in Kāśi hundreds of precious monuments of his glory, such as Iṣanas (i.e., Lingas ?), paintings (citra) and bells (ghaṣṭā), after he had worshipped the feet of the guru Śrī-Vāmanasī at Vāmanastī......repaired the Dharmarājika and the Dharmacakra with all its parts and constructed this new gandha-kūṭa with stones coming from 8 different holy places (aṣṭa-mahāsthāna-saṅkha-viniṁita).” The date (V.) Samvat 1083 (A.D. 1026) is given at the end.¹

(8) Imadpur image-inscription.—In the course of excavations of a mound called Jowhri Di, near the village of Imadpur in the Muzaffarpur district of Bihar, two groups of inscribed brass figures were dug out. The inscriptions, which were identical ran as follows: Śrīman Mahipāladeva-rājasa Samatt 48 Jeṣṭa dina Sukala pakṣa 2.²

(9) Titarawa image-inscription.—The inscription is incised on the base of a colossal statue of Buddha at Titarawa, an

¹ The inscription (now in Lucknow Museum) was discovered in 1794, and a transcript of it was published in Asiatic Researches, Vol. V, p. 133; Cunningham published a defective translation in his ASR, Vol. III, pp. 121-122; the text is given in Vol. XI, p. 128. Dr. Holtzsch edited it in IA, 1885, Vol. XIV, pp. 129-140. Dr. Vogel discussed the inscription in the ASI, 1903-1904, pp. 293-298; Arthur Venis challenged some interpretations of Holtzsch in JAŚB, 1906, Vol. II (N.S.), pp. 445-447; edited also in the Guḍaṭaleka-mālā, pp. 101-109; the interpretation of the inscription is full of difficulties. In the main I have followed Holtzsch.

² These inscriptions have not yet been edited. They are noticed by Hoernle in fn. 17 of his article on the Pālas of Bengal in IA, 1885, Vol. XIV, p. 165. The excavations are noticed in a small article in JAŚB, 1881, Vol. I, p. 98.
ancient site 6 miles from the town of Bihar in the Patna district of Bihar. The record consists of "three lines of very small letters which are too much injured to be read easily. The last word in the legible portion of the 3rd line is the name of Mahipāla."  

It is evident from the above that Mahipāla I had a long reign. According to Taranāth, he ruled for 52 years. The Imadpur image inscriptions show that he reigned at least for 48 years (c. 992-1040 A.D.). I have already referred to the arguments advanced to prove that the year 1026 A.D. of the Sarnath inscription was his last year, or the year immediately following his death, as inconclusive. It is evident from the number and distribution of his records that Mahipāla was a successful king. I have drawn attention to the passage in his grants and subsequent inscriptions which give him credit for having recovered his paternal kingdom (vāhu-darpād anadhikrta-viluptam rājyam āsādyā pitrām) by killing his enemies in war. Since the earliest inscription of his reign comes from Samata, it has been assumed by certain scholars that before he succeeded in recovering his ancestral dominions, his kingdom was reduced to that portion of Bengal. They find confirmation of their conclusion in V. 11 of the Bangad plate of Mahipāla, which according to them informs us that Vigrahapāla II, after losing his kingdom, took shelter in the eastern country where water


3 *JASB*, 1921, Vol. XVII (N.S.), p. 4. Dr. R. C. Majumdar argues that since the sum total of the known reign-periods of the successors of Mahipāla I, when added to 1026 takes us to the second quarter of the 12th century A.D. "it may be held that Mahipāla died c. 1026 A.D., and the same conclusion must be upheld even if it is proved that Madanapāla continued to rule for some time after the conquest of Varendra by Vijayasena" (c. 1120 A.D. ?). In *Bāhūpāla Itihās*, 2nd Ed., Vol. I, pp. 257-258, the author argues that since the Sarnath epigraph does not use either Pravardhamāna-vijaya-raja or Katāyana-vijaya-raja and the composer of the inscription has used akārayat, it should be assumed that at the time of the inscription Mahipāla was dead. But he had the good sense to point out that his arguments could not be used with any force, since the inscription in question is composed in verse and not in prose. See also supra, p. 291 and fn. 1.
abounds *(deśe prācī pracura-payasi)*. Apart from the fact that the inscription in question (No. 1) is an image-inscription which can be moved from place to place, I would point out that verse 11 of the Bangad grant does not bear that interpretation. It simply refers to the roaming about of the army of Vigrāha-pāla from the eastern country to the Maru lands and from the Himalayas to the Malaya country. The distribution of his inscriptions however shows, that, whatever the limits of his ancestral dominions were at the time of his accession, before his 48th year he ruled over Gaya, Patna, and Muzaffarpur districts in Bihar, and possibly over the Tippera district in Bengal. From the composition of the Sarnath inscription, scholars have assumed that even Benares was included in his dominions about 1026 A.D. His Bangad grant shows his power over Northern Bengal. Mahīpāla therefore can very well be regarded as the second founder of the fortunes of the Pālas. But his attempts to revive Pāla power brought him into conflict with other ambitious sovereigns of India. A MS. of the *Candraśaṅkī* of Kṣemāvarta, dated 1331 A.D., refers indirectly to a conflict of Mahīpāla with the Karṇātas. From the fact that it compares Mahīpāla with Candragupta and the Karṇātas with the nava-Nandas, it can be assumed that the Pāla king successfully repulsed an attempted invasion of his territories by the Cālkukyas of Kalyāṇa, who were at this period the rulers of Karṇāta.  

---


3 *JASB*, 1893, Vol. LXII, Part I; *Bāṅgāḷa Itihas*, pp. 251 f. But from the fact that none of the inscriptions of the contemporary Cālkukya sovereigns (Taila II, Satyārāya, Vikramāditya V, and Jayasimha II) refers to any conflict with the Pālas, it may not seem impossible that the author was referring to the Karṇātas of Mithilā and Nepal. But the possibility of such an identification is rendered impossible by the fact that these Karṇātakas probably came to N.E. India in the train of prince Vikramāditya, son of Cālkukya Someśvara I (1044-68 A.D.). See supra, pp. 203 f. The identification of the Coḷas with Karṇātas however is entirely mistaken; see *Gauḍarajamālī*, p. xi.
possibility of another struggle with a western potentate is revealed by a Nepal MS. of the Rāmāyana, the colophon of which tells us that it was copied in (V.) Samvat 1076 (A.D. 1019), when Mahārājadhirāja Punyāvaloka Somavamsodbhava Gaudadhvaja Śrīmad-Gāṅgeyadeva was reigning in Tīra-Bhukti. Some scholars have identified this Gāṅgeyadeva with the Tripuri Kalacuri Gāṅgeyadeva, the father of Lakṣmī-Karna. As his Piawan rock inscription is dated in K.E. 789? (1037 A.D.), there is no inherent impossibility in the identification of the two kings. If they are identified, then we must assume that Gāṅgeyadeva conquered Tirhut and also Benares, which lay between his territories and Tīra-Bhukti, some time before 1019 A.D. This conflicts with the interpretation of the Sarnath inscription according to which Mahipāla was in possession of that city about 1026 A.D. Unless we now hold that building or repairing of temples in one of the sacred places of Buddhism by a Buddhist king need not necessarily imply his possession of that place, we have to agree with Prof. Lévi that this Gāṅgeyadeva was perhaps a member of a local branch of the Kalacuris, for one of whom we have the Kahla (Gorakhpur Dist. U.P.) plates dated in V.S. 1134 and 1135 (A.D. 1077 and 1079). The only other possible interpretation, if we accept the identification of the Gaudadhvaja Gāṅgeyadeva with the father of Lakṣmī-Karna, is to suppose that the latter was defeated some time between A.D. 1019 and 1026 by Mahipāla, who conquered Benares from the Kalacuri ruler.

If the evidence of conflict with the Kāññatas and Kalacuris

---

3 This is quite possible, see supra, pp. 394-95, the Nālandā grant of Devapāla.
4 EI, Vol. VII, p. 85; Le Népal, Vol. II, p. 202, fn. 1. The absence of any expression such as rājya, vijayarājya, Kalyānārājya, etc., in the Sarnath epigraph and the method of dating the inscription in Vikrama era, which is so very unusual for Pāla records found within their dominions, naturally raise the suspicion that Sarnath was possibly not included in Mahipāla's kingdom.
is somewhat problematical, we are on firmer ground when we come to discuss the invasion of Mahīpāla's dominions by the Colas. The Tirumalai (near Pōlur, North Arcot district, Madras) rock inscription dated in the 13th year of the Cola king Parakeśarivarman, alias Rajendra-Coladeva I, contains the following account of his victories in Northern India. "(He) seized by (his) great, warlike army (the following): ..........Odda-Viṣaya which was difficult to approach (and which he subdued in) close fights; the good Kōsalai-nāḍu where Brāhmaṇas assembled; Tanḍa-buttī, in whose gardens bees abounded (and which he acquired) after having destroyed Dharmapāla (in) hot battle; Takkaṇa-lāḍam, whose fame reached (all directions, (and which he occupied), after having forcibly attacked Raṇaśūra; Vangāla-deśa, where the rain wind never stopped (and from which) Govindacandra fled, having descended (from his) male elephant; elephants of rare strength and treasures of women, (which he seized) after having been pleased to put to flight on a hot battle-field Mahīpāla, decked (as he was) with ear-rings, slippers, and bracelets; Uttira-lāḍam, as rich in pearls as the ocean; and the Gaṅgā, whose waters dashed against bathing-places (tīrtha) covered with sand,  .........:"

As the Mērpādi inscription of the same king, dated in his 9th year, does not contain any account of those conquests, it has been assumed with some probability that these victories were obtained in the course of some expeditions undertaken between the 9th and 13th years of his reign. Rājendra Cola I, ascended the throne between the 27th March and the 7th July, A.D. 1012. It may therefore be suggested that this northern expedition probably took place roughly between 1021 and 1025 A.D. There

---

1 The inscription was first edited by Hultsch in South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I, Madras, 1890, pp. 95-99; it was re-edited by him in EI, Vol. IX, pp. 229-33.
are some differences of opinion about the identification of the countries and princes mentioned in the above quotation. But there is general agreement amongst scholars in accepting the identification of Mahipala of the Tirumalai inscription with the first prince of that name in the Pala list. The identifications of Odda-Visaya with modern Orissa and of Kosalai-nadu with Southern Kosala (the upper valley of the Mahanadi and its tributaries), first suggested by Hultzsch, are also generally accepted. But there are differences of opinion about Takhana-ladam and Uttira-ladam. Kielhorn in his list of South Indian Inscriptions accepted the suggestion of Hultzsch that they are to be identified with Dakshina-Lata, and Uttara-Lata and located in Gujarat in the Bombay Presidency. But while re-editing this inscription in 1907-08 Hultzsch accepted the view of Venkayya "that the Tamil term Ilaga does not correspond to Sanskrit Lata (Gujrat), but to Virata (Berar)." He would thus locate the places in Berar. I do not know whether ladam can really stand for Iladam. Anyhow the suggestion of Mr. R. P. Chanda that ladam should be taken to stand for Radhu seems to be more in harmony with the facts. The mention of the Vangala-desa after Takhana-ladam and of the Ganges after Uttara-ladam appear to be favourable to this latter suggestion. The probable identification of Tanda-butti (Danda-Bhukti) with the Balasore district and the Southern portion of Midnapore district, and the mention of Uttara-Radha in Sena

1 First suggested by Kielhorn in EI, Vol. VII, Appendix, p. 120, fn. 4
3 EI, Vol. VII, Appendix, p. 120, No. 733.
4 Annual Report on Epigraphy by Venkayya for 1906-07, pp. 87 ff.; EI, Vol. IX, p. 231, fn. 2. Dr. Barnett suggests: Tapul Iladam or Ladam may stand for either Lata (in Gujarat), or Radha; but I am sure it could not= Visaya, for initial V could not disappear.
5 Gaudaramalā, p. 40.
and Varman inscriptions seem to be additional grounds for locating the places in Western Bengal.\(^1\)

Dharmapāla, who was probably, as Mr. R. D. Banerji has suggested, the ruler of "the marchland between Orissa and Bengal," is otherwise unknown. The ending of his name in pāla is at the present stage of our knowledge an insufficient reason for connecting him with the Pālas. The name of Raṇaśūra, who was apparently the ruler of the tract situated to the north of Danda-Bhukti, raises the question of the authenticity of the Śūra kings of Bengal, who are mentioned in the genealogical lists of Bengal match-makers (ghaṭakas). The Kulapaññijikās of these ghaṭakas contain the following list of Śūra kings: (1) Ādiśūra, (2) Bhiśūra, (3) Kaṭīśūra, (4) Avaniśūra, (5) Dhāranīśūra, and (6) Raṇaśūra.\(^2\) The traditional account of the first of these princes, who is said to have brought five Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas from Kānyakubja to Bengal has been doubted on good grounds by more than one scholar.\(^3\) But it is significant that the name of the 6th prince should be identical with the name of the ruler of Daksīṇa-Rādhā. In the commentary of the Rāmacarita (II, 5), there occurs the name of one Lakṣmīśūra, the ruler of Apara-mandāra, who is described as one of the chief feudatories of Rāmapāla. It has been suggested by some scholars that Apara-mandāra was situated in Western Bengal. The authenticity of a line of princes bearing names ending in Śūra is further proved by the Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena which

\(^1\) Ibid, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 72. The Sena inscription is now edited in EI, Vol. XIV, pp. 156 ff. The grant was discovered in Katwa subdivision of Burdwan district, and the village granted was situated in Uttera-Rādha-Mandala of the Vardhamāna-Bhukti. For the Varman grant, see EI, Vol. XII, pp. 31 ff.


\(^3\) See for the latest opinion on the subject EI, Vol. XIII, pp. 287-89. Ādiśūra is placed by various authorities within the period c. 700-1100 A. D. The following verse in the Kulāśāstras refers to the bringing of Brāhmaṇa by Ādiśūra:

\[
\text{Āśīt purā Mahārāṣṭra Ādiśūra pratapacān}
\text{Ānītecau dvijān paṇca paṇca-gotra-samudbhavān.}
\]

Also consult on this, Chanda's Gouḍārājīmalā and Banerji's Bāgālār Itihās.
informs us that Vijaya married Vilāsadevi, a daughter of the Śūra family.¹ As V. 3 of the Naihati grant of Vallālasena tells us that the predecessors of Vijayasena were ornaments of the Rādhā country,² we can now safely conclude that a line of kings really existed in Western Bengal who were known as Śūras.³ Unfortunately, we do not know anything about the exact relationship between this Raṇasūra and Mahīpāla. But from the description of him in the Tirumalai inscription, he appears to have been quite independent of the Pāla king. The area over which Mahīpāla held sway is further circumscribed by the mention of Govindacandra of the Vaṅgāla-desa, or Eastern Bengal.⁴ Like Dharmapāla of Daṇḍa-Bhukti, this prince also was long unknown and unconnected with any of the other ruling dynasties of the lower Ganges valley. But recently a number of copperplates and an image-inscription have revealed the existence in Eastern Bengal of a line of princes whose names end in Candra. The Rampal grant of Srīcandra was discovered somewhere in Rampal by a cultivator while digging land. It is a single plate; at the top, in the middle, is attached a circular seal “which has in its upper part, the emblem of a Buddhist wheel of law with two deer in couchant posture on both sides of it. Just below the wheel and above the legend Śrī-Śrī-Candradevaḥ something like the emblem of a small conchshell is seen. Beneath the legend again the representation of a digit of the moon with floral decorations on the three sides of it may be marked. The characters of the inscription belong to a variety of alphabets used in India in the 11th and 12th centuries A. D.” The inscription opens with a verse in praise of Jina (i.e., Buddha),

¹ EI, Vol. XV, p. 279.
³ For a prince of Nepal bearing the name Raṇasūra (A.D. 1231), see supra, pp. 312-13.
⁴ Gobindacandra has been identified by Mr. Bhattasali with king Govindacandra of the Bengal ballads, who was the daughter’s son of Tilakaścandra, king of Mahākūl, which is still a pargana of the Tippera district. He has further suggested that Layakasandra of the Bhorella Naṭēvāra image-inscription may have been the father of Tilakaścandra. EI, Vol. XVII, p. 351.
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Dharma and Bhikṣu-saṅgha. Then we are given the following genealogical information about the donor:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{In the Chandravātika} & \ldots & \text{who ruled over Rohitāgiri [mod.} \\
& & \text{Rohtasgañh in Sahabad Dist., Bihar?]} \\
\text{Pūrṇacandra.} & & \\
\text{Buddha Suvānaśacandra.} & & \\
\text{Trailokyasacandra} & \ldots & \text{"The support of the royal majesty smiling in the royal umbrella of the king of} \\
& & \text{Harikela (= Vañga = Eastern Bengal)} \\
& & \text{who became king of the dvipa which} \\
& & \text{had the word Ĉandra prefixed to it} \\
& & \text{(Candradvīpa = some portions of mod.} \\
& & \text{districts of Bakergunj, Khulna and Faridpur)."
\end{array}
\]

Śrīcandra.

The inscription was issued by Ps.-M. Trailokyasacandra-deva-pādānudhyātāḥ P.-Pb-M. Śrīcandra-deva from the Vikramapura-samāvāsita-Śrimaj-jayaskandhāvāra. It records the grant of one pātaka of land in Nehakāśṭhi-grāma of Nānya-Maṇḍata in Pauṇḍra-Bhukti to the Brahmaṇa Pitavāṣagupta Śrman, who was officiating in the Koṭi-homa. The grant was made in the name of Buddha-bhuttāraka. It is not dated.¹ Two other copper plates of this king issued from his camp at Vikrampur have been discovered, though they have not yet been properly edited.² Another inscription of this family,


² Dhulla and Edilpur grants of Śrīcandra, see EI, Vol. XVII, p. 350; Dacca Review,
“incised on the pedestal of a huge image of Nāṭeśa Siva was
dug out of a tank in a village called Bharella police-station
Badkamta in the district of Tippera (Bengal).” The epigraph
consists of two lines, and is written in characters which are
assigned to the latter half of the 10th century A.D. The
inscription is dated in the 18th year of the Vijaya-rājya of
Layahacandradeva, and records the consecration of the image
“on a Thursday under the constellation Pushya, on the 14th
day of the dark half of the month, the day being the 14th
Aśādha counted by the movement of the moon” by Bhāvudeva,
son of Kusumadeva, Lord of Kārmānta (mod. Badkamta,
some 3 miles S.W. of the find-spot of the image).¹

The records cited above reveal the existence of a line of
Candra kings of Vikramapura in Eastern Bengal in the period
c. 950-1050 A.D. The time and locality fit in so well with those
of Govindacandra (c. 1021-25 A.D.) that it is almost impossible
to resist the temptation to conclude that he was one of them.
It is not unlikely, as Mr. Bhattachasali has contended, that they
were related to the Candra kings of Arakan (c. 788-957 A.D.).²
But if these Chandras were independent sovereigns, of a large
portion of Eastern and Southern Bengal, as is evident from
their records and the Tirumalai inscription, and if they also
had control over a portion of North Bengal, as seems to be
the case from their grant of land in Paunḍra-Bhukti (the same
as Paundravardhana-Bhukti), and if we take into account the

---
¹ Edited by Bhattachasali in EI, Vol. XVII, pp 349 ff. The image is now in the Dacca Sāhitya Parishad. Note the similarity of the Pala and Candra seals. The rulers of both the dynasties bore the title Paramasaugata and had no scruples in granting land to the Brahmins in the name of Buddha-bhattāraka.
² Phayre, History of Burma, London, 1868, p. 45; EI, Vol. XVII, p. 850; Mr. Bhattachasali points out the outlandish character of the name Layahacandra and inclines to the conclusion that he may have belonged to the Arakanese branch and refers the image inscription to c. 989 A.D.
existence of independent sovereigns in the Burdwan division, then we must cut down the limits of the so-called empire of the Pālas in the time of Mahipāla and his successors. Undoubtedly there was a revival of Pāla power under this ruler, but the facts revealed in the documents cited above considerably circumscribe the extent of his real power in Bengal and Bihar. The presence of Candras in Vāṅgāla-ṛdesa in about 1021-25 A.D. shows that Mahipāla I must have lost his hold on Eastern Bengal some time after about 995 A.D., or, what is more probable, the Baghaura inscription dated in his 3rd year, being on an image, was transferred to Tippera district from some region further west outside Vāṅgāladesa. We can now understand why the name of the Pālas was omitted by the Musalman writers from the list of princes, who according to them, were active in opposing the rising tide of Islam in Northern India. It was not Mahipāla's asceticism \(^1\) or his envy and religious bigotry,\(^2\) that prevented his name from figuring in the lists of the Muslim chroniclers among the opponents of the Yamīnīs. It was their position as rulers of a comparatively small and decadent principality in the north-east of India, a position which was much too humble to be even compared with that of Dharmapāla, which prevented them from taking any intelligent interest or playing any ambitious role in pan-Indian affairs.\(^3\)

Mahipāla was succeeded by his son Nayapāla,\(^4\) for whose reign we have the following records and dates:

(1) The colophon of a Cambridge University Library MS. of the Pañcarakṣā tells us that it was written on the instructions

---

\(^1\) Gaudarajaśānta, p. 41.

\(^2\) Bāṅgālī Itiḥās, p. 255.

\(^3\) Elsewhere I have shown reasons to doubt the veracity of these statements of Muslim chroniclers. See supra, pp. 91-92 and infra, chapters on the Later Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Candrālakveyas.

\(^4\) Gaudaśekmāla, pp. 105, 108-09, fn. Mr. Maitreya has suggested that Sthirapāla and Vasanatapāla were the brothers of Mahipāla I, while others contend that they may be sons of that king. I think Hultsch was right in his interpretation, and have followed him.
of Pravara-mahāyāna-yāyinī Paramopāsikā-Rājī Uddākā in the year 14 of the vijayarāja of Ps.-M.-P. Nayapāla deva.\(^1\)

(2) Gaya Kṛṣṇadvārikā temple stone inscription.—The inscription is on the entrance of a modern temple built about 100 years back at Gaya, and now known as the Kṛṣṇadvārikā temple. It consists of 18 long lines of Kuṭila characters. It begins with Om namo bhagavate Vāsudevāya, and then praises Viṣṇu. Then come verses Praising ‘Gayā,’ which is described as mokṣadvāra. There the Brāhmaṇas while studying the Vedas made so much noise in the course of their studies that it was difficult to follow other talk. There the smoke from the sacrifices of the Brāhmaṇas was constantly rising. In this city was born in a Brāhmaṇa’s family one Viśvāditya, whose bravery destroyed all his enemies. He constructed this temple of Janārdana in the 15th year of Nayapāla, the ruler of the whole earth. The inscription was composed by the Vāji-vaidya Sahadeva, and incised by Silpi Saṭṭasoma.\(^2\)

(3) Gaya Narasimha stone inscription.—This was discovered “inside the small temple of Narasimha in the Viṣṇu-pāda compound” at Gaya. The inscription consists of 15 lines. It opens with Om Lakṣmiściraṇjayati. It records the “building of the temple of Gadādhara and several other minor temples of Viṣṇu” by Viṣvarūpa at ‘Gayāpuri’ in the 15th year of Nayapāla-deva. The praśasti was composed by Vaidya Vajrapāni, and written by Sarvānanda.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) CBMC, p. 175, No. 1688.

\(^2\) The inscription was noticed by Cunningham in his ASR, Vol. III, p. 128, Plate XXXVII; then Dr. R. L. Mitra in JASB, Vol. XLVII, pp. 218-19, tried to give the substance of the inscription. The inscription was first edited by M. Chakravarti in JASB, 1900, pp. 190-95; re-edited with a complete translation in Gaudālekhamālā, pp. 110-29, under the name Kṛṣṇadvārikā Temple Inscriptions.

\(^3\) The inscription was discovered in 1884, and; was noticed by M. Chakravarti in JASB, 1900, Part I, p. 191, fn. 1; the text of the inscription is given in M. ASB, Vol. V, No. 3, pp. 78-79.
These records show that Nayapāla ruled at least for 15 years (c. 1040-55 A.D.), and held portions of Bihar. It is quite likely that he ruled over a wider area, but unfortunately no other evidence has hitherto been discovered to support that conclusion. There is some possibility that the Pāla kingdom at this time came into conflict with the rising power of the Kalacuris under Lakṣmī-Karṇa (c. 1041-70 A.D.). The Karanbel stone inscription of Jayasimha-deva, the great-grandson of Lakṣmī-Karṇa, tells us that the latter was waited upon by Gauḍa and other princes. The Bheraghat inscription of Alhaṇadevi, the queen of Gayā-Karṇa, the grandson of Lakṣmī-Karṇa, informs us that when the latter gave full play to his heroism, the Vaṅga trembled with the Kalinga. Tibetan tradition contains stories of a war between Nayapāla, king of Magadha and the “Tirthika king of Karṇya of the West.” We are told that failing to capture the city, Karṇya’s ‘troops sacked some of the sacred Buddhist institutions and killed altogether five (men), out of whom four were ordained monks and one upāsaka. At this time the celebrated Buddhist monk Dīpankara Śrījāna (also called Atīśa) who had accepted the post of High Priest of Vikramaśīla at the request of Nayapāla, was in residence ‘at the Vihāra of Mahābodhi at Vajrāsana.’ When a good deal of church-furniture was carried away as booty, Atīśa showed no concern or anger. But “afterwards when victory turned towards (Nayapāla) and the troops of Karṇya were being slaughtered by the armies of Magadha, he took the king of Karṇya and his men under his protection and sent them away.” Atīśa then “caused a treaty to be concluded between the two kings. With the exception of the articles of food that were destroyed at the time of war, all other things which had fallen in the hands of the parties were either restored or compensated for. Unmindful of his health even at the risk of his life, Atīśa again and

1 IA, Vol. XVIII, p. 217, line 11.
again crossed the rivers that lay between the two kingdoms and thereby brought peace to all living beings.”

1 Scholars have proposed to identify this ‘king Karnya of the West’ with the Tripūrti Kalacuri Lakṣmī-Karna. Though this identification is probable, the success of Nayapāla against Lakṣmī-Karna is rendered somewhat doubtful by the Paikor stone pillar-inscription of the latter king recently discovered in the Birbhum district of Bengal.

This fact coupled with the existence of independent dynasties in Eastern Bengal, seems to show that the area under the rule of the Pālas at this time did not extend much beyond portions of Bihar and Northern Bengal. It is significant that in the Tibetan life of Atīśa, quoted above, Nayapāla is described as king of Magadha, and, what is more important, from this time onward all the Pāla inscriptions are found either in Magadha or in Puṇḍravardhana-Bhukti. The reality, or at least the permanence of the alleged treaty between the two kingdoms, to attain which Atīśa is said to have risked his health and life, is also rendered very questionable by the fact that the Rāmacarita clearly refers to the struggles of Karna and Nayapāla’s son Vigrahapāla III. If the Tibetan account of the alliance be correct, this must be accepted as a second war waged by the Kalacuri king against the Pālas. According to Tibetan tradition Dipaṅkara Śrījñāna Atīśa went to Tibet at the invitation of prince Chan Chub, in the reign of Nayapāla. When he started for Tibet he was 59

1 JBTI, Vol. I, 1898, pp. 9-10, and fn. on p. 9; see also Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow, by Saratchandra Das, Calcutta, 1893, p. 51.

2 JASB., 1900, Part I, p. 992. Cauḍarājyamālā, p. 45. If this identification is accepted we may have to move back the date of accession of Nayapāla by a few years. For this war happened a few years before the departure of Atīśa for Tibet in c. 1040 A.D. But the difficulty in accepting this date lies in the fact that Lakṣmī-Karna did not probably come to the throne before 1040 A.D. when his father died. See MASB, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 11.

3 ASI, 1921-22, p. 115.

4 That Dharmapāla also is described as king of Magadha is probably explained by the fact that when these Tibetan documents were compiled, the Pālas were kings only of the Magadha region.

5 MASB, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 23 (commentary on V. 9 of the first chapter).
years old, and he died there at the age of 73. Mr. S. C. Das gives these dates as A.D. 1042 and 1055. But in his Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow edited by his brother N. C. Das in 1893 the date of his birth is given as A.D. 980 and that of his death as 1053. According to this calculation the date of the departure of Atiša works out at 1039 A.D. Prof. Lévi gives this date as c. 1040 A.D. It is better to take the Tibetan date as only approximate.

Nayapâla was succeeded by his son Vigrahapâla (III). We have the following records of his reign, extending over a period of at least 26 years (c. 1055-81 A.D.):

(1) Gaya stone inscription.—The stone on which this is incised is attached to the base of the Akṣayavatā at Gaya. The inscription contains 26 lines, and opens with Om Om namaḥ Šivaḥ. The inscription appears to be a praśasti of one Viśvarūpa-Viśvāditya, who seems to be the person for whom we have two inscriptions at Gaya dated in the 15th year of Nayapâla. It records the building of two temples by him for (Siva) Vaṭeśa and (Siva) Prapitāmahesvāra (?) in the Gayā-Mandala. It is dated in the 5th year of king Vigrahapâla, and claims to have been composed by Vaidya Dharmapâni.

(2) Bihar stone image-inscription.—This was found on the pedestal of an image of Buddha at Bihar. According to Cunningham, it is dated in the 12th year of Vigrahapâla.

(3) The Angachi grant.—Found by a peasant at the village of Angachi in Dinajpur district, Bengal, while digging earth. The record is incised on a single-plate of copper. The royal seal 'consists of a circle with raised rim and beaded border, resting

---

1 JASB, 1891, p. 237.
2 p. 76.
4 The inscription was noticed by Cunningham in his ASR, Vol. III, pp. 182-183; it is edited from the original stone in MASH, Vol. No. 3, pp. 50-52.
5 ASR, Vol. III, pp. 121-22, No. 7. The image is said to have belonged to 'the Broadley collection afterwards called the Bihar Museum' (Collection) which was sent to the Indian Museum, Calcutta. The image at present cannot be traced. See MASH, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 89.
on a mass of arabesque work; on its top rests a small cāitya
over which is an umbrella. A long penon hangs from each
side of the umbrella.’ The upper half of the circle is occupied
by the wheel of law resting on a pedestal and having a small
umbrella over it. There is the usual deer couchant on each
side of it. Below this is the legend Śrī Vigrahapāladevaḥ.
‘The alphabet shows a nearer approach to the complete
Bengali forms than the Bangad grant of Mahipāla I.’ The
inscription is written on both sides of the plate and consists of
49 lines (33 on the front and 16 on the back). The record gives
the Pāla genealogy from Gopāla to Vigrahapāla III. Most of
the verses of this portion are the same as in the Bangad
grant of Mahipāla I. In verse 13 Vigrahapāla III is des-
cribed as the cāturvarṇya-samāśrayah (a supporter of the four
castes). Curiously enough Verse 14 of this inscription begin-
ning with deśe prāci pracura-payasi, which describes the
campaigns of the donor of this grant occurs as V. 11 of the Ban-
gad grant of Mahipāla I as the description of the campaigns of
Vigrahapāla II. The inscription was issued by Ps.-M.
Naya-
pāladeva-pādnudhyātah P.-Ph.-M. Vigrahapāladeva, from the
victorious camp at Haradhāma (?) in the year 12 of his reign
(line 42). It records the grant of some land in the village of
Viṣamapura with a place called Daṇḍatreṣvara (?) in the
Brāhmaṇi-grama-Mandala of Koṭivāra-Viṣaya in the Puṇḍravar-
dhana-Bhukti to the Brāhmaṇa Khuduladeva Sarman. The
grant was made on the occasion of a lunar eclipse in honour of
Buddha-bhaṭṭaraka, etc., after bathing in the Ganges according
to religious practice (vidhivat). The Dūtaka was the Mantrī
Sahasija (?), and the document was incised by the Silpi Mahī-
dharadeva.¹

¹ An account of the grant was given by Colebrooke in the Asiatic Researches, Vol.
IX, pp. 434-438, which was republished in his Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II, pp. 279-292.
The next attempt to give a reading of the inscription was made by Hoernle in the Cente-
nary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Part II, pp. 210-218. This was reprinted
after revision in the IA, 1886, Vol. XIV, pp. 166-168. Kielhorn next published the metri-
cal portion of the grant (first 20 lines) in the same journal in 1892, Vol. XXI, pp. 97-101.
(4) Indian Museum stone image-inscription.—This consists of two lines, and is incised on an image of Buddha in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. It records the erection of the image by the Suvarṇakāra Dehaka in the 13th year of Vigrahapāladeva.¹

(5) A MS. of the Pañcarakṣā was copied in the 26th year of Vigrahapāla. As the reference of this date to Vigrahapāla I and II would tend to push back the reign of Dharmapāla beyond 769 A.D. Dr. R. C. Majumdar has rightly referred it to the 3rd Pāla king of that name.²

(6) Some of the more barbarous specimens of the silver coins discovered in Bihar bearing 'very faint recollections of either the Sassanian head or the fire-altar,' marked with the legend Śrī-Vi, or Śrī-Vigraha, have been assigned by some scholars to this prince. The better specimens are assigned to the two earlier princes of this name. But as the latter appear to have been rather weak rulers with very short reigns, it may be that these coins also should be assigned to the early part of Vigrahapāla III's reign.³

During the reign of Vigrahapāla III, the Pālas again came into conflict with the Kalacuri Lakṣmi-Karna. The commentary on the Rāma-caritra tells us that Vigrahapāla III defeated in battle Karna, the ruler of Dāhala, but did not completely uproot him. We are further told that the Pāla king married Yauvanaśrī, the daughter of Karna.⁴ It is possible that this marriage was the result of an alliance between the two powers. Another foreign invasion of the lower Ganges

Mr. R. D. Banerji has now fully edited the inscription in EI, Vol. XV, pp. 295-301. Mr. Banerji is wrong in asserting in his fn. 1, p. 295, that Kielhorn found Mudgāgiri is the name of the camp in the rubbings sent to him by Fleet. This was the opinion of Hoernle and not Kielhorn, who distinctly says it is 'not Mudgāgiri'; see I.A., Vol. XIV, p. 187, fn. 39, and Vol. XXI, p. 97. The grant is now in the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

¹ MASP, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 112. According to R. D. Banerji this inscription appears to be the same as No. 2; but its date was read by Cunningham as year 12.
valley appears to have taken place during this reign. We are informed by Bilhaṇa that during the latter part of the reign of the Cālukya Someśvara I of Kalyāṇa (c. 1044-68 A.D.) his son Vikramādiṭyā undertook expeditions in northern India and defeated the kings of Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa.¹ It was probably these raids of the Kārnāṭa prince which brought into various parts of north-eastern India bodies of his countrymen who soon afterwards succeeded in carving out separate principalities for themselves. The rise of the Kārnāṭakas of Tirhut and Nepal, as also of the Kārnāṭa-Kṣatriyas of Rādhya (i.e., the Senas), in the 11th century, naturally leads to the suspicion that their origin may have been connected with these Cālukya invasions. It has indeed been suggested that Samantasena, the grandfather of Vijayasena, may have accompanied Vikramādiṭyā in one of these expeditions and carved out a principality somewhere in Western Bengal.² As Someśvara I is also said to have utterly destroyed the power of Karna,³ the lord of Dāhala, it is not unlikely that the Senas of Kārnāṭa entered Rādhya after the expulsion of the Kalacuris from that region by the Cālukyas. Another dynasty which also may have come from the south and settled in Eastern Bengal during this period was that of the Varmans. The existence of this line of princes is revealed by the Belava copper-plate of Bhoja-varman. This inscription was discovered by a peasant while digging earth in the village of Belava, situated on the northern boundary of Rupganj Thana, in the Mahesvardi pargana (Narainganj subdivision, Dacca district). It is a single plate, containing in all 51 lines of writing (front 26 and back 25). The plate had a seal with the representation of Viṣṇu's wheel (Śrimad Viṣṇu-cakra-mudrāyā, line 48) at the top,'' but the impress of the sacred wheel, as well as any possible legend on it was completely scraped off by the finder

¹ Vikramādiṭaka-carita, edited by Bāhler, Bombay, 1875, III, 74.
³ See also supra, chapter on Nepal, pp. 203 ff.
⁴ Vikramādiṭaka-carita, I, 102-108.
of the plate.\textsuperscript{1} The characters of the inscription belong to a period not earlier than the 11th century, and according to some they are "of the late 11th and early 12th century A.D." The inscription opens with \textit{Oṁh Siddhiḥ}, and then traces the genealogy of the donor of the grant from Svayambhu (Brahmā):

\begin{verbatim}
Svayambhū
  Atri
  Candra = Rhūni.
  Budha = Ilā.
  Purūravas = Urvaśī.
  Ayu
  Nahuṣa
  Yayāti
  Yadu...from him starts the line (of the donor).

In his family
Krṣṇa, Hari.
His kinsmen the \textit{Varmans}, who occupied Sirhapura.
In course of time there was one Vajravarman, the ornament of the Yādava soldiers.
\end{verbatim}

Jātavarman,
  = Viraśri (the daughter) of Karna; extended his supremacy among the Āṅgās, conquered the fortunes of Kāmarūpa, put to shame the strength of the arms of Divya, and crippled "the dignity of Govardhana."

Sāmalavarmadeva
  = Āgramahīṣī Mālavyadevi, daughter of the great warrior Udayin.

Bhojavarmān.

\textsuperscript{1} This is the version of Mr. R. C. Basak, the editor of the plate in the \textit{El}; Mr. R. D. Banerji in editing the same inscription in the \textit{JASB}, says that the seal "consists of two concentric circles the outer one of which is thicker than the inner one, with a thick axle and spokes which are thick in the centre but tapering towards the extremities and a nude dancing figure on each side of it." In the plate given in the \textit{El}, I do not find the details observed by Mr. Banerji in the circular space,
The inscription was issued from the jaya-skandhāvāra situated at Vikramapura, and records the gift of a piece of land in the village of Upaylikā, situated in the Kauśāmbī-Aṣṭagaccha-khandala in the Adhāhpattana-Mandala of the Pundra-Bhukti, to the Śāntyāgārādhikṛta Rāmadeva Sarman, an inhabitant of the village of Siddhala in Uttara-Rādhā by M. Sāmalavarmadeva-pādānuḍhyaṭaḥ Paramavaiṣṇava-P.-Pb.-M. Bhojaḥ. The grant is dated in the 5th year of the donor, and it was composed by Puruṣottama.¹

The Varman's claim to come from Simhapura. Mr. Basak identified this place with the Shihapura of the Mahāvanśa which was situated in Lāla (Rādha) between Vaṅga and Madhā, while Mr. Banerji drew attention to the prāśasti of Lakhamandal (at Madha in Jaunsar Bawar district on the Upper Jumna), which refers to 11 generations of Candragupta, the prince of Jālandhara (c. 300-600 A.D.), who claims to belong to the Yādavas of the lunar race reigning at Simhapura.³ This Simhapura is undoubtedly the Seng-ha-pu-lo of Yuan Chhwang situated to the north side of the Salt Range in the Punjab.⁴ But Dr. Hultzsch has pointed out a dynasty of Varman who ruled in a Simhapura nearer home.⁵ The Komarti (near Narasannapeta, Ganjam District) plates of Candravarman and the Brhatproṣṭhā (in Palakonda Taluka, Vizagapatam) grant of

¹ The inscription was discovered in 1912. Since then it had been several times edited. "An imperfect reading of the plate with a faulty translation, without any fac-simile" was published in the Dacca Review, Vol. No. 4 (July 1912); a small photograph of the record was published in the next issue of the same journal. An improved version of the grant then appeared in Sāhitya (Bengali Monthly, Bengali year 1319, Śāvapa-Bhādra) by Mr. R. G. Basak. Mr. R. D. Banerji then edited the inscription in JASB, 1914, Vol. X. (N.S.), pp. 191-31; it has been re-edited by Mr. R. G. Basak in EI, Vol. XII, pp. 37-43, and by N. G. Majumdar in IB, pp. 14-24. Dr. R. C. Majumdar drew my attention to the similarity of the legendary portion of the genealogy of the Candelles and the Varman, cf. EI, Vol. I, p. 122 ff., Verses 4-8.

⁵ EI, Vol. XII, p. 4.
Umāvarman reveal the existence of a line of kings of Kaliṅga who resided in Simhapurā or Sihapura.¹ According to Hultsch, this Simhapura "is perhaps identical with the modern Siṅgupuram between Chicacole and Narasannapēta."² The same scholar has also pointed out that "according to Singhalese inscriptions, the two kings Niśaṅkamalla and Sāhasamalla, the second of whom ascended the throne in A.D. 1200, were sons of the Kaliṅga king Goparāja of Simhapura. The Buddhist chronicle Mahāvaṁsa stated that Tilokasundarī, a queen of Vijayabāhu I (c. 1054-1109 A.D.), was a princess of Kaliṅga, and three relatives of hers......came to Ceylon from Sihapura."³ It is thus not entirely impossible that this enterprising city may have sent a colony northwards to Bengal, where they supplanted the Candras. The script of the Belava grant, which is later than the Rampal plate of Śrīcandra, and the fact that the Varmans issued their charters from the same place (Vikramapura) and grant land in the same area (Pundra-Bhukti) appear to confirm this suspicion.⁴ In their campaign against the Buddhist Candra rulers the Varmans may have posed as the champions of orthodox Hinduism. In Verse 5 of the Belava grant, we are told that "(the knowledge of) the three Vedas is a covering for men, and those who are devoid of it are certainly naked; (thinking) so the kinsmen of Hari, the Varmans, adorning themselves with their hair standing on end in their enthusiasm for the three Vedas and for marvellous fights, and wearing the very solemn name and possessing noble arms, occupied Simhapura." The date of these princes is approximately fixed by the suggested identification of Karna, whose daughter Viśrā was married to Jātavarman, with the Kalacuri king of that name (c. 1041-70 A.D.). Mr. A. K. Maitreya, to whom we are indebted for the

¹ Ibid, Vol. IV, pp. 142-45; Vol. XII, pp. 4-6. The characters of these inscriptions are of "early southern type," belonging to the 4th or 5th centuries A.D. (Pre-Cājukyan).
³ IA, Vol. LI, 1922, p. 158.
suggestion, has also identified Divya, whose strength was put to shame by Jātāvarman, with the Kaivarta ruler Divyoka, who according to the Rāma-carita killed Mahīpāla II, the son of Vigrāhapāla III.¹ If these identifications are accepted, then we may represent the relations of the 4 dynasties thus:²

Nāyapāla (c. 1040-55).....Lakṣmi-Karna (c. 1041-70).....Vajravarman

Vigrāhapāla III = Yauvanaśrī

Viraśrī = Jātāvarman.....Divya

Mahīpāla II (c. 1082).....Yaśāh-Karna

(c. 1055-81) (c. 1070-1125)

The Kāmarūpa prince is probably to be identified with one of the predecessors of Vallabhadeva, whose Assam plates are dated in Saka 1107.³ The identification of Govardhana, whose dignity was crippled by Jātāvarman, is not certain. Mr. Basak has asked: May he be the father of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva of a Bhuvaranesvar inscription,⁴ the Brahman Govardhana "distinguished as a warrior and a scholar," whose father was the Mahāmantri and Sandhicigrahin of a king of Vaṅga? The probability of this identification is increased by the fact that the village of Siddhāla where lay the residence of the donee of the Belava grant is also mentioned in this Bhuvaranesvar epigraph as the residence of this ministerial family. The context of both the inscriptions shows that this village was situated in Rādhā. It is not unlikely that the Vaṅgarāja referred to above is to be identified with one of the Candra kings after whose downfall the family in the time of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, the son of Govardhana, transferred its allegiance to the Varmans. If this guess is correct, king Harivarmanadeva,

³ See supra, pp. 259-60.
who together with his son was aided by the counsel of Bhavadeva, must be supposed to be a later member of the line of Bhojavarman of the Belava grant.\(^1\) Another identification proposed by Pañdit H. P. Śāstri is that the great warrior Udayin, the contemporary of Sāmalavarman, who is mentioned in V. 10 of the Belava inscription, is the same as the Paramāra ruler Udayāditya (c. 1060-87 A.D.) who defeated the Tripurī Kalacuri Lakṣmī-Karna.\(^2\) The same scholar also takes the word Jagad-vijaya-malla in V. 11, not as an adjective of manobhū, but as a proper name, and identifies him with Jagaddeva or Jagadeo, the youngest son of the Paramāra Udayāditya, who served under Jayasimha-Siddharāja, the Caulukya ruler of Anahilapātaka (c. 1094-1144 A.D.).\(^3\) Though some of these identifications have been accepted by other scholars, yet on the whole I think them rather improbable, if not impossible. The reason that led H. P. Śāstri to place all these rulers in Malwa is perhaps the occurrence of the word Mālavya (Mālava?)-devī in V. 11, as the name of the queen of Sāmalavarman.\(^4\) Whatever may be the value of these identifications, it is certain that these Varmans held Eastern Bengal, and portions of North and West Bengal during the latter half of the 11th century. The Belava inscription shows that they had their

\(^1\) Two MSS. dated in the 19th and 39th year of one Harivarmadeva have been discovered in Nepal. N. N. Vasu gave a reading of a grant of the same king, Variga Jātya Itihās, Vol. II, pp. 215-17; but it has never been edited. See Bāṅgālīr Itihās, 2nd Ed., Vol. I, pp. 302-04. In this grant Parama-Vairāga-P.-Pb. M.-Harivarman is said to be the son of M.-Jyotivarma; it is dated in his 42nd year. See F. F. 1922, p. 153, fn. 18; IB, p. 168. For Bhavadeva see also JASB, 1912, pp. 333-48. In the Bhuvanesvar epigraph Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva is called Bāla-Valabhi-bhaṭṭa. Kielhorn could not explain the word. The commentary of the Rāma-caritra II, 5, mentions a Sāmanu of Rāmapālī, Vikramarāja, the ruler of Bāla-Valabhi. There is no doubt therefore that Bāla-Valabhi was the name of a place. In the Rāma-carita it is placed near Dvagrāma which has however not been identified. It was probably a place in West Bengal. See infra, p. 342, fn. 3.

\(^2\) JASB, 1914, Vol. X (N. S.), p. 125. N. G. Majumdar takes Udayin to be a son of Sāmalavarman by another wife. See IB, p. 20, line 17, and p. 191. He also takes Jagad-vijaya-malla as the name of the father of Mālavayadevi.


\(^4\) Ibid.
camp at Vikramapura, and they granted land in Pundra-Bhukti (=Pundravardhana-Bhukti) to inhabitants of villages in Radha. At least one of them, Jatavarman, was so powerful as to gain supremacy over Anga (Bhagalpur region, Bihar), which was certainly under the Pulas during this period. Thus the Pala power under Vigrahapala III must have been restricted to portions of Bihar, North Bengal, and probably the upper part of the Presidency division of Bengal. It is possible that the Varmanas took possession of portions of Pundravardhana Bhukti after the 13th year of Vigrahapala III. In this case it must be assumed that the Pala kingdom was fast declining in the latter part of the reign of this ruler. The crisis was hastened by the death of Vigrahapala III (c. 1081 A.D.) He left three sons, Mahipala II, Surapala II, and Ramapala. Of these the eldest, Mahipala II, succeeded him. The history of his reign and of the troublesome period that followed is entirely derived from the Ramacarita of Sandhyakara Nandi. According to this work there was not much love lost between these brothers, and soon after his accession Mahipala imprisoned Surapala and Ramapala. Taking advantage of these internal dissensions, Divvoka, a chief of the Kaivartas, who appears to have been at first a servant of the Pulas, raised the standard of rebellion in Varendra, and drove away his master from that part of North Bengal which still remained under the Pulas. Mahipala II who is described as lacking in good policy did not accept the advice of his ministers, but foolishly marched out against the rebel chief with a hastily collected force. The campaign ended in disaster. Mahipala was defeated and killed.

1 From the fact that Mathana, the maternal uncle of Ramapala, mentioned in the Ramacarita II, 8, is described as a Rasthakuta it has been assumed that Vigrahapala married a Rasthakuta princess and Ramapala was the son of this queen and not of Kalacuri Yuvanashri; see MASB, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 83.
2 Commentary on I, 31-32 and 36-37. In the commentary the name of the second brother is spelt as Surapala.
3 Ibid, on I, 38.
After this Śūrapāla and Rāmapāla appear to have been released, and the former who was probably senior to Rāmapāla, and is described as sahodara of Mahīpāla in the Manahali grant of Madanapāla, became king of the much reduced Pāla dominions, which now seem to have consisted of only a portion of Bihar and the northern part of the Presidency division of Bengal. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Rāma-carīta does not mention Śūrapāla as having ascended the throne. It passes on from Mahīpāla II to Rāmapāla. But as the Manahali grant of Madanapāla distinctly refers to him as narupati it is almost certain that Śandhyākara Nandī was wrong on this point. A reason for this omission by a courtier of Rāmapāla may have been the fact that Śūrapāla’s reign was rendered rather short by the violent hand of his master, which probably (though definite evidence is lacking) led the court historian to pass over unpleasant details of his patron’s life.¹ Whatever may have been the means by which Rāmapāla secured his throne, his accession was justified by his success. Aided by his maternal uncle, the Rāstrakūta Mathanadeva, he took active measures to reorganise the resources of his kingdom. Taking advantage of the troubles of the Pālas, most of the feudatories appear to have asserted their independence. The first task was to re-establish the royal power over these vassals. The commentator of the Rāma-carīta informs us that Mathana (also called Mahana), riding on his elephant Vindhyamāniṅkya defeated the Pīṭhipati Devarakṣita. The word Pīṭhipati is explained by the commentator as Magadhdhipa. This incident appears to be also referred to in the

¹ Bāṅgālar Itihās, 2nd Ed., Vol. I, p. 280; Prof. Chakravarti referred to this king’s reign two image-inscriptions dated according to him in the 2nd year of Śūrapāla II. See JASB, 1903, Vol. IV (N.S.), pp. 107-08. Paṇḍit H. P. Sāstrī, in his introduction to the Rāma-carīta (MASB, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 13) followed him. But the inscriptions on palaeographic grounds have now been referred to Śūrapāla I (MASR, Vol. V, No. 8, pp. 57-58). This view appears to me to be more probable. The date on the plate given by Prof. Chakravarti is clearly 3 and not 9. See supra, p. 298 and fn. 2.
Sarnath inscription of Kumāradevi, the queen of the Gāhāda-vāla Govindacandra (c. 1114–55 A.D.). We are told that:

"In the Gauḍa country there was a priceless warrior with his quiver (Kāṇḍapaṭika ?), this incomparable diadem of the Kṣatriyas, the Aṅga king Mahana, the venerable maternal uncle of kings. He conquered Devarakṣita in war and maintained the glory of Rāmapāla, which rose in splendour because the obstruction caused by his foes was removed" (V. 7). We are told in verses 3-5 that this Devarakṣita belonged to the Chikkora family, and had succeeded his father Vallabharāja as lord of Pīṭhī. Verses 8-20 inform us that Mahanadeva married his daughter Saṅkara-devī to the lord of Pīṭhī (Devarakṣita), who had by her a daughter named Kumāradevi, who became the queen of the Gāhāda-vāla king Govindacandra. The identification of the two Devarakṣitas, appears to be clear. As the conquest of the Pīṭhi-pati is thus prominently mentioned in these records, it seems that this ruler was a very important feudatory of the Pālas. The Sarnath epigraph also says that after the removal of this obstruction the glory of Rāmapāla 'rose in splendour.' In the list of the Sāmantas of Rāmapāla, as we shall see later on, the lord of Pīṭhī is placed first. It thus appears that Mathana-Mahana, who was the feudatory ruler of the principality of Aṅga, after defeating this prince, finally won him over by giving him his own daughter. This combination of force with

---

1 EI, Vol. IX, pp. 324-327. In view of the meaning of Pīṭhī given by the commentator of the Rāma-carita, as Megadha, Steu Konow's identification with Pithapuram, in Vaṅgi must be given up. Sec ibid, p. 322; IHORS, Vol. IV, p. 267. The same commentator on II, 5, explains Mayadhādhapati, by Pīṭhīpati. See MĀSB, Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 36 and 38. Though this victory of Mathana is given in the second chapter of the Rāma-carita, where the author is describing the campaign of Rāmapāla on the north, it should not be taken as having occurred in that campaign. This incident was an explanatory note on the activities of Mathana just as in the list of the Sāmantas various incidents are mentioned to explain the importance of each of the feudatories. This is finally proved by the fact that the Pīṭhīpati himself was marching with Rāmapāla; and unless we assume that there were two such rulers, which is extremely unlikely, we have to assume that Bhimayāsa, the ally of Rāmapāla, was a successor of Devarakṣita, who was defeated by his uncle Mathana.
diplomacy was eminently successful, and the Pithipatis henceforward materially helped Rāmapāla in his campaign against the Kaivartas. The Pāla prince then travelled to the principalities of his Śāmanta-cakra and of the forest chiefs (āṭaviṅkaḥ = ataviya-sāmantaḥ), to win them over to his cause. ¹ He also distributed wealth and granted land with unstinted generosity. Thus by a judicious use of policy and his sword he at last succeeded in gaining the good will of his feudatories and raised a powerful army consisting of cavalry, elephants and infantry. ² By this time the Kaivarta chief Divvoka was dead. Their leader now was Bhīma, the son of Rūdoka, the brother of Divvoka. The campaign against him was opened by the Mahāpratihāra Śivarāja, the nephew of Mathana. ³ He crossed the Ganges, and entering Varcndrī, crushed the rakṣaka-vyūhas of Bhīma, and for a time was so successful that the whole country appeared to be free from the control of the Kaivartas. ⁴ But this was merely a reconnaissance en force. The real campaign came some time later, when Rāmapāla, in addition to his maternal uncle Mathana, the latter's sons the Mahāmāṇḍalikas Kāhnuradeva and Suvarṇadeva ⁵ and Mathana's nephew the Mahāpratihāra Śivarājadeva, ⁶ was assisted by the following Sāmantas: ⁷

(1) Bhūmayaśas  … the ruler of Magadha, who defeated the army of Kanauj (Kānyakubja-rāja-vājinigavēnā-bhujānga). ⁸

¹ Rāma-carīta, commentary on I, 43.
² Ibid., on I, 44-45.
³ Ibid., on I, 47.
⁴ Ibid., on I, 47-50.
⁵ He was represented by H. P. Sāstri as a brother of Mathana. But I think R. G. Basak is right in taking him to be his son. The passage runs as follows: Mahana...... tadiya nandana-mahāmāṇḍalika Kāhnuradeva-Suvarṇadeva-bhrāṭrī-Mahāpratihāra Śivarājadeva-prabhṛti. I accept that 'bhrāṭrī' in this passage 'should rather go with the word that follows in the compound.' See IHQ, March 1929, pp. 44-45.
⁶ Ibid., on II, 8.
⁷ Ibid., on II, 5-6.
⁸ This Kānyakubja king was probably one of the first three Gāḥḍavāla kings of Kanauj (c. 1075-1155 A.D.).
(2) Viraguṇa ... the ruler of Koṭ-ātavi, who was daksina simhāsana-cakravartī (a ruler of some southern region).

(3) Jayasimha ... the ruler of Daṇḍa-Bhukti, who defeated Utkaleśa Karnakesari.

(4) Vikramarāja ... the ruler of Bāla-Valabbi, which was close to Devagrama.

(5) Lakṣmīśūra ... described as Apara-mandāra-madhūsūdana and Śāmanta-cakra-cūḍāmaṇī,

(6) Sūrapāla of Kujavati.

(7) Rudraśikhara ... the Kalpataru of Tailakampa.

(8) Mayagalasimha ... the ruler (bhūpāla) of Ucchāla.

(9) Pratāpasiṃha ... the ruler (rāja) of Dhekkariya.

(10) Naśasimhabṛjuna ... the Maṇḍalādhipati of Kayaṅgala.

(11) Cāndārjuna of Saṅkaṭagrāma.

(12) Vijayarāja of Nidrābala.

(13) Dvorapavardhana ... the ruler (pati) of Kausāmbi.

(14) Soma of Paduvanvā ... (Paduvanvā-pratibaddha-maṇḍalāpratī-vallabhah?)

The identification of all these princes and their principalities is not easy. Bhīmayaśas appears to have been a successor of Chikkora Devarakṣīta, the son-in-law of Mathana. It is uncertain who was the Kanauj ruler who was defeated by him. But he was possibly the Gāhaḍāvala Candradeva, who appears to have conquered Kanauj some time during the period 1073-1090 A. D. Koṭātavi (the forest principality of Koṭ?) whose ruler Viraguṇa has been described as a southern ruler, has been identified with the Koṭ-des in Sarkār Katak (in Orissa) of the A’in-i-Akbarī.1 But this seems to be improbable, for it involves the assumption that the dominions of Rāmapāla extended so far south as to include portions of Orissa. The principality mentioned next is Daṇḍa-Bhukti. This place is spoken of in the Tīrūmalai inscription of Rajendra Cola as between Koḍala-nāḍu and Takkaṇa-lāḍam. Its king Jayasimha was a neighbour of

the Orissa king Karṇakeśari. Hence it must be located somewhere near the borders of Orissa, Western Bengal, and the western portion of the Central Provinces. It is therefore not unlikely that it was "the march-land between Orissa and Bengal corresponding to the modern British districts of Midnapore and Balasore." But its prince Jayasiṃha is not known from any other source. Nor can we explain his relationship with Dharmapāla, who ruled the same principality in the time of Mahipāla I. The next principality is Bāla-Valabhi,2 which is described by the commentator as Devagrāma-pratibaddha. We have already pointed out that this name occurs in the Bhuvanesvar praebasti of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva. Pāṇḍit H. P. Śāstri has identified it with "Bagdi (Vāgaṭi), one of the five provinces into which Bengal was divided," while others locate it in the Nadia district. Though there is no evidence in support of either of these identifications, it is likely that it was the name of a district in West Bengal. It is to be noted that Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, who is described as Bāla-Valabhi-bhujanga, was a resident of Rādhā. The relationship of Vikramarāja, the ruler of this place, to Harivarmadeva, whom Bhavadeva aided with his counsel, is at present unknown. The next ruler is Lakṣmīśūra of Apara-mandāra. I have already pointed out the presence of Śūra rulers in Western Bengal.3 Though we do not exactly know what relationship, if any, this ruler had to the Śūras of Cola and Sena inscriptions and of

---

1 M.I.B, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 71. According to some scholars Daṇḍa-Bhakti is to be identified with Dātan in Midnapur; see Bāṅgālī Itihās, p. 218. The Orissa king Karṇakeśari, who was defeated by Jayasiṃha, is otherwise unknown. For kings with the title Karṇa, see infra, Chapter on Dynasties of Orissa.

2 In the text the name is given as बालबलिही (भ), c., Bāla-Balabhi(bhi). But in his introduction Śāstri spells the name as Bāla-Valabhi. As the records of this period often confuse between भ and भ, it is possible that Śāstri's emendation of the text was justified. भाल has the sense of 'new'; so the principality may be designated 'New-Valabhi.' Is it possible that it was a colony of the people of Valabhi in Kathiawar which was destroyed by the Arabs in the second half of the 8th century A.D.? See supra, p. 336, fn. 1.

3 Supra, pp. 320-321.
Bengal tradition, he may have belonged to a branch of the same family, and in that case we should locate Apara-mandāra somewhere in Western Bengal. The next ruler,—Śūrapāla, is not otherwise known. The identification of his principality is also uncertain. It would clearly be hazardous to regard him as a kinsman of the Pālas from his name.¹ The next principality, Tailakampa, has been identified with some probability with Telkup, near Pachet, in the Manbhum district (Bihar)² by Paṇḍit H. P. Śāstrī. Nothing is known about its chief Rudraśikha.³ The next principality Ucchāla, has been identified with pargana Ujhiyal in Birbhum. But it has been rightly pointed out that if this identification is to depend only on a mere similarity of sound, there are other places in Bengal bearing like names.⁴ Its ruler, Mayagalasimha, is not known from any other source. The next principality, Dhekkariya, has been identified by Paṇḍit H. P. Śāstrī with modern “Dhekura on the other side of the river Ajaya, near Katwa” in Burdwan district.⁵ The reasons for this equation excepting the similarity of names, are unknown to me. Its rāja Pratāpasimha is not known from any other source. Of the remaining princes and principalities we can only make some suggestions about Vijayarāja and Kauśāmibi. The latter place is evidently not to be identified with the city of the same name near Allahabad. A place nearer home bearing the same name is mentioned in the Belava grant of Rhojavarmun. This is the Kauśāmibi-aśṭagacha-khandula situated in Paudra-Bhukti. Very probably the Kauśāmibi of the Rāma-carita commentary is to be identified with the region

³ Śāstrī in his introduction spells the name as Rudraśikha, no doubt a mistake.
round about this *Khandala* in North Bengal. The evidence which led Mr. R. D. Banerji to identify this *Kauḍāmbi* with Kuśumbā in Rajshahi district is not known to me. ¹ Vijayarāja has been identified by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri with the Sena prince Vijyasena. ² Though there is at present little evidence excepting similarity of names there is no insuperable chronological difficulties in making him a contemporary of Rāmapāla (c. 1084-1126 A.D.), for his reign-period as we shall see later on, falls between about 1097 and 1159. ³ If this identification is accepted, we must locate his principality of Nidrābala in West Bengal, for the Naihati grant of Ballālasena informs us that the princes of his family who preceded him were ornaments of the Rādhā country (V. 3). ⁴

Though all the Sāmantas and their principalities cannot be identified, it should be observed that, so far as it is possible to identify them, most of them are located in portions of West Bengal, Bihar, and North Bengal. This is consistent with our conclusion that East and South Bengal under the Candras and the Varmans were completely freed from the control of the Pālas long before the Kaivarta rebellion. Rāmapāla accompanied by these feudatories, crossed the Ganges probably on a bridge of boats (*Gaṅgāyām taraṇī sambhavena naukāmelakena*). ⁵ In the struggle that followed Bhīma was defeated and taken prisoner. ⁶ It was probably after this victory that Rāmapāla destroyed the Damara of the Kaivartas, which is described as a small town (*upapura*). ⁷ Though imprisoned Bhīma was at first treated kindly by his captors. ⁸ It was only after the resistance of Hari, probably an officer of Bhīma, who rallied the remnants of

⁵ *Rāma-carita*, commentary on II, 10.
the Kaivarta army and was defeated and taken prisoner by one of the sons of Rāmapāla that both Hari and his master were put to death. Rāmapāla celebrated his conquest of Varendri by founding the city of Rāmāvatī. It has been identified with Rāmauti in the Sarkār Lakhnauti of the A'īn-i-Akbarī. The Rāma-carita seems to locate it between the Kāratoya and Ganges. From the camp situated in this city Madanapāla issued his Manahali grant in his 8th year.

After consolidating his territories by this conquest, Rāmapāla according to his biographer, undertook invasions in foreign countries. In the course of these he is said to have conquered Utkala, Kalinga, and Kāmarūpa. We are also told by this authority that a king of the eastern country (prāgdesīya) "who held the title of Varman" sought the protection of Rāmapāla by surrendering his elephants and chariot. It has been rightly assumed that this Varman king must be identified with a prince of the line of Bhojavarman, possibly Harivarman or his son. The cause of his distress may have been an attack on his territories by Vijaya, the feudatory chief of Nidrābala in Western Bengal, who, as we have seen, is perhaps identical with

---

1 MAB, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 14. I do not find any passage which actually refers to the execution of Bhima. This has been assumed by Paṇḍit H. P. Sāstrei, R. D. Banerji, and other scholars. This is not unlikely as Bhima is not heard of again. The Kamuni grant of Vaidyadeva however refers to the recovery by Rāmapāla of Janakabha (Varendri?) after killing Kṛṣṇināyaka Bhima. See EI, Vol. II, pp. 347 ff., V. 4.


3 III, 10.

4 JAB, 1900, Vol. 69, pp. 66 ff.

5 Rāma-carita, II, 45 and 47. The interpretation of Bhavabhūṣaṇa santati to whom Rāmapāla is said to have returned Utkala has given rise to difficulties. Paṇḍit H. P. Sāstrei takes it in the sense of Nāgavahā (Bhava-bhūṣaṇa-Snake) while R. P. Chanda takes it to mean Somavahā (Bhava-bhūṣaṇa-Moon).

6 III, 44; I have accepted the translation of Mr. Maitreyas; see fn. 2, in MAB, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 92.

Vijayasena, the founder of the Sena power, which was soon to destroy the kingdom of the Pālas in Bengal.

For the reign of Rāmapāla we have the following dates and records:

1. **Bihar stone image-inscription.**—This consists of two lines, incised on the pedestal of an erect figure of Tārā, discovered in Bihar. The inscription records in incorrect Sanskrit the dedication of the statue by one Bhaṭṭa Icchāra (Īśvara?) in the 2nd year of the reign of king Rāmapāladeva.1

2. A MS. of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* was written in the 15th year of *M.-P.-Pb.-Ps.* Rāmapāladeva at Nālandā in the Magadha-Viṣaya.2

3. **Chandi-mau image-inscription.**—This consists of 3 lines incised on an image of Bodhisattva Padmapañi near the village of Chandi-mau, 7 miles to the S.W. of Bargaon, the old site of Nālandā. It records the gift of the statue by Paramopāsaka Parama-mahājana Vaṣṭika Sādhū Saharaṇa, who had come from Rājagṛha and was resident in the village of Etrahagrāma, in the 42nd year of the reign of *Pb.-P.-Ps.-M.* Rāmapāladeva.3

4. **The Rāmacarita** of Sandhyākara Nandī (*Nandi-kula-kumuda-kānana-purṇendu*).—This Kāvyā is divided into four cantos and is “written throughout in double en tendre. It is written in imitation of the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya. Read one way it gives the story of the Rāmāyana. Read another way it gives the history of Rāmapāladeva of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal.” The work is called *Kaliyuga-Rāmāyana* and the author *Kalikā-Vālmiki*. But the text is so difficult that it is more or less

---


3 The inscription was noted by Cunningham in his *ASR*, Vol. XI, p. 169; he read the date as 12. The record was then edited in *MASB*, Vol. V, No. 3, pp. 93-94. Mr. R. D. Banerji read the date as 42. It is not impossible that the Mahāmāyā-dikā Iśvara-ghoṣa whose copper-plate has been discovered near Ramganj in the district of Dinajpur, was a vassal either of Rāmapāla or some of his immediate successors. See *IB*, pp. 149-57.
unintelligible except canto 1 and 36 verses of canto 2, for which we have a commentary. The author's ancestral home was at Vṛhadvaṭu which was attached to Paundravardhanapura in Varendra, and his father Prajāpati Nandī who is described as Karanyānām-aṇgrāni was the Sāndhvigrahika of Rāmapāla. The work was completed probably in the reign of Madanapāla, as he ends his work with a wish for the long reign of that prince (IV. 48).¹

It is certain from the records cited above that Rāmapāla's reign extended over at least 42 years (c. 1084-1126 A.D.). It is interesting to note in this connection that Tāranāth assigns him a reign of 46 years.² Among his ministers the Rāma-carita refers to the Sāndhi(vi-grahika) Prajāpati Nandī, while the Kamauli grant mentions the Sāciva Bodhideva. Bodhideva's father Yogadeva served in the same capacity under Vigrahapāla III. The same inscription mentions Rāmapāla's queen Madanadevi. Sandhyākara Nandī tells us that this Pāla king, when residing at Monghyr heard of the death of his uncle Mathana and committed suicide by entering the sacred waters of the Ganges.³ Rāmapāla had more than one son. The commentator of the Rāma-carita refers to prince Rājayapāla, who materially assisted his father in his preparations and campaigns against the Kaivartas. From his comments on I, 23, it is clear that Rāmapāla had at least two more sons.⁴ The Manahali grant of Madanapāla gives us the names of Kumārapāla and Madanapāla as his sons. Tāranāth refers to his son Yakṣapāla who according to him ascended the throne three years before his father's death, and ruled for a year.⁵ The possibility of a son of Rāmapāla undertaking the administration

¹ The work was discovered in Nepal by Paṇḍit H. P. Śāstri, and has been edited by him with an introduction in MAB, Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 1-56.
² IA, Vol. IV, p. 366.
⁴ Yaimandanaṁ putraiḥ Rājayapāladibhiḥ teṣāṁ..............
⁵ IA, Vol. IV, p. 366.