CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

MINOR STATES IN THE DECCAN

I. WESTERN DECCAN

(1) The Bhoja Dynasty of the Goa Region

According to Purānic traditions, the Bhojas were one of the five clans of the Haihaya people who were themselves a branch of the celebrated Yādava tribe. Although the original home of the Yādava tribe lay in the Mathurā region, there is evidence to show that its various branches migrated and settled in different parts of Western India and the Deccan. The Haihayas are associated with the city of Māhishmati on the Narmadā. According to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, Bhoja was the title adopted by some South Indian kings. The Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela, and possibly also the rock edicts of Aśoka, locate the Bhojas in the Deccan, while the Chammak plates of Vākāṭaka Pravarasena II place a territory called Bhoja-kaṭa near about the present Ellichpur district of Berār. The Bhojas of Goa may have been a branch of the Bhojas of Berār. In certain South Indian records, however, the terms bhojakā is used in the sense of a jagirdār. The history of such names of royal houses as Pratihāra and Rāṣṭrakūṭa, which were originally official designations, would suggest that the derivation of the name of the royal family in question from the designation bhojakā is not altogether unlikely. The Mahābhārata (1, 84, 22) seems to use the word bhoja in the sense of a ruler not entitled to use royal epithets.

Four copper-plate charters of the Bhoja kings of Goa have been so far discovered.1 The first of these records has been assigned on palaeographical grounds to the sixth or seventh century A.D. It records the royal order issued to the officials of the Śivapura vishaya by the Dharma-Mahārāja Kāpāli-varman who belonged to the Bhoja dynasty. The charter, issued from the camp of Pāmāsa-kheṭaka, records the grant of a piece of land at Śivapuraka in favour of Śvāmikarāya who was apparently a feudatory of the Bhoja king. Śvāmikarāya, in his turn, granted the land to a Brāhmaṇa named Bhavārya. Śiv-

puraka is no doubt the same as Śivapura mentioned in the inscription of Chandra-varman to be discussed below.

Two other rulers of the Bhoja family, viz Prithivi-malla-varman and Anirjita-varman, are known from their records. Two copper-plate grants of the former and one of the latter have so far been discovered. The first of the two charters of Prithivi-malla-varman was issued from Vaiśabhini-kheṭa and the second from Prithivi-parvata, apparently named after the king. Both the kings appear to have flourished in the seventh century A.D.

P. B. Desai discovered a charter of another Bhoja king named Aśāṅkita from Harigutti in the Aṅkola tāluk of the North Kanara district. The record may be palaeographically assigned to the sixth or seventh century; but whether Aśāṅkita ruled earlier or later than Kāpāli-varman cannot be determined. King Aśāṅkita is said to have granted the village of Sundarikā in the Dīpaka vishaya in favour of a Buddhist monastery at the request of his feudatory Kotṭipeggi of the Kaikeya family of Nandipalli. Whether this Kaikeya chief was related to the Kekaya ruler Sivanauda-varman of the Anaji stone inscription is difficult to decide in the present state of our knowledge. The Buddhist monastery is described as sva (i.e. his or their own), but whether this refers to the Bhoja king or his Kekaya feudatory, or to both of them, cannot be determined. The seal of the Harigutti record bears the emblem of an elephant.

A king named Devarāja issued his Siroda grant from the city of Chandrapura in the twelfth year of his reign. The king was believed formerly to have belonged to the family of the Gomins. But according to the new reading of a passage of the inscription suggested by N. L. Rao, king Devarāja was also a member of the Bhoja family. Chandrapura, the capital of this ruler, has been identified with modern Chandor in Goa. The palaeography of the Siroda grant suggests that Devarāja ruled about the end of the fourth century A.D. He is therefore the earliest known member of the Bhoja family of the Goa region. It seems that this region was in earlier times under the political influence of the kings of the Kuntala country. Devarāja’s seal is said to bear the emblem of a swan, although it may actually be an elephant as on Aśāṅkita’s seal.

Another king of the same region was Mahārāja Chandra-varman of the Goa Grant issued in the second year of his reign. A palaeographical consideration of this record would suggest that the king flou-
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rished some time in the fifth century. King Chandra-varman is known to have granted a piece of land in favour of a Buddhist monastery located at Sivapura which was probably situated in Goa. The damaged condition of the Goa grant of Chandra-varman renders it difficult to determine whether he belonged to the dynasty of the Bhojas. But his seal is supposed to bear the figure of a boar. It is however possible that the emblem on the seal of king Chandra-varman is also actually a lion.

(2) The Chālukya Dynasty (No. 1) of Southern Lāṭa

Southern Lāṭa, as noted above (p. 150), was ruled by the Traikūṭaka dynasty in the fifth century A.D., but nothing is known about its history in the next century. A Chālukya dynasty is found to have been ruling there in the first half of the seventh century A.D. We learn from an inscription found at Kaira that there was a ruler named Jayasimha-mahārāja, whose son was Buddhavarmanarāja. Whether this Jayasimha is identical with Jayasimha, the younger brother of Pulakesīn II of Bāḍāmi, cannot be definitely determined. Buddhavarmanarāja’s son was Vijayarāja, who issued this inscription from the camp of Vijayapura in A.D. 643. It records that the king granted the village of Pariyaya to a religious institution of Jambusara. The village granted is identified with Pariya in the Olpad tāluk of the Surat district. Jambusara (modern Jambusar in Broach district), however, might not have been situated in the kingdom of Vijayarāja, for about this time this region was under the sway of a different dynasty. It is not unlikely that this branch of the Chālukya dynasty was subordinate to the Chālukyas of Bāḍāmi.

(3) Sendrakas of Southern Lāṭa

In the middle of the seventh century a Sendraka family ruled in the Surat district, south of the Tapti. An inscription, found at Bagumra, Balesar district, in the (old) Gaikwad’s territory, gives the following genealogy of the royal family of the Sendrakas:

Bhānuṣakti
Ādityaṣakti
Prithivivallabha
Nikumbhallaṣakti (or Nikumbha alias Allaṣakti)

Nikumbhallaṣakti (or Nikumbha-Āllasákti) granted the village of Balisa, in the vishaya included in the Treyann-Āhāra, in A.D. 655, to a Brāhmaṇa. Treyanna is modern Ten, near Bardoli, Surat district, and Balisa is Vānesa, south-east of Ten. The Sendrakas were supplanted by a Chālukya family in southern Lāṭa.
(4) The Chalukya Dynasty (No. 2) of Southern Latha

Reference has been made above (p. 426) to the two sons of the Chalukya king Pulakesin II (A.D. 609-42), Vikramaditya I and Dharaśraya Jayasimha-varman. Jayasimha-varman’s power is stated to have been increased by his elder brother Vikramaditya I. This seems to imply that he was appointed to govern a province, presumably Southern Latha. Jayasimha had three sons, Maṅgalarāja, Sṛyāśraya Siladitya īṣṭarāja, and Pulakesin. Siladitya, who succeeded his father, issued two grants in A.D. 670 and 692. Siladitya was succeeded by his elder brother Jayasraya Maṅgalarāja, who was also known as Vinayaditya and Yuddhamalla. Maṅgalarāja issued a grant from Maṅgalapuri in A.D. 731. He was succeeded by his youngest brother Pulakesin Avanjanāśraya. An inscription of Pulakesin, dated A.D. 739, states that the king received the titles of ‘solid pillar of Dakshināpatha’ and ‘repeller of the unrepellable’ (anivarta-naivarta-jitī) and two more from the king Śrīvallabha ‘for repulsing a Tājika (Arab) army which, after destroying the Saindhava, Kachchella, Surāshṭra, Chāvoṭaka, Mauya, and Guriṇa kings, and wishing to penetrate the Dakshināpatha, came to reduce the Navasārikā country’. This expedition was obviously led by the officers of Jumaid who, according to Balādhurī, invaded Barwas and Malibah. Although details are lacking, we can easily infer that this bare mention of the Arab incursion refers to a memorable episode in the history of India. The epithet ‘repeller of the unrepellable’ conveys an idea of the great consternation caused by the onrush of the Arabs whom none could withstand. Kingdom after kingdom in Rājasthān fell before them like houses of cards till they advanced to Mālava (Malibah) in the east and Broach (Barwas) in the south. As will be noted later (Ch. XIX), they were checked by Pratihāra Nāgabhāṭa in Mālava, and Pulakesin was the hero of the south. He is entitled to the highest credit, and fully deserves the titles conferred by the king for protecting the Deccan from the incursion of the Arabs. This great achievement is the last thing that we know of this family. The Rāśṭrakūṭas took possession of this part of Latha in the second half of the eighth century A.D.

II. CENTRAL DECCAN

(1) The Rāśṭrakūṭas of Berar

Four kings of a family of Rāśṭrakūṭas are known from the Tivarkhed and Multai copper-plate records of Nannarajya-Yuddhāsura, discovered in the Betul district of Berar. The Tivarkhed charter was issued from the city of Achalapura, which is the same as modern Ellichpur in the Amraoti district, and may have been the capital of these
Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Another grant was issued by the same king from the city of Padmanagara, which has not been quite satisfactorily identified but seems to have been a secondary capital of the family.

Nannarāja-Yuddhāsura is described as the son of Svāmikarāja, the grandson of Govindarāja, and the great-grandson of Durgarāja. They are said to have belonged to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa lineage, although their relation with the other Rāṣṭrakūṭa houses cannot be determined. Since, however, the name of the family was apparently derived from the official designation Rāṣṭrakūṭa, i.e. ruler of a Rāṣṭra, it is difficult to believe that all the various Rāṣṭrakūṭas were actually blood relations.

The date of the Multai inscription of Nannarāja-Yuddhāsura is Saka 631 (A.D. 709) expressed in words. The language of the date portion of the Tivarkheṭ inscription is defective; it has, however, been so amended as to indicate Saka 553 (A.D. 631). But the Saka year intended may be actually 653 corresponding to A.D. 731. The Padmanagara grant is dated in the Saka year 615, i.e. A.D. 693. Thus Nannarāja seems to have flourished roughly about the period A.D. 690-735, and the rule of Durgarāja, Govindarāja, and Svāmikarāja may be roughly assigned respectively to the second, third, and fourth quarters of the seventh century. It is interesting to note that Danti-Varman I, progenitor of the imperial line of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, appears to have ruled about the middle of the seventh century and to have been a contemporary of Durgarāja, great-grandfather of Nannarāja. It is likely, therefore, that both of them were appointed Rāṣṭrakūṭas, or provincial governors by Pulakeśin II of the Chālukya house of Bādāmi—Durgarāja in Berar, and Danti-Varman I probably in the Ellora region. Both these houses of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas appear to have become powerful during the weak rule of the later members of the Chālukya house in the first half of the eighth century. It may be further suggested that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Berar were subdued by Dantidurga or Danti-Varman II, who was a descendant of Danti-Varman I, and established Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereignty in the Deccan by overthrowing the Chālukyas of Bādāmi shortly after A.D. 742, as noted above, in Chapter XVI.

(2) The Somavāṁśis

The family of the Pāṇḍuvaṁśis, who ruled in South Kosala from their capital at Sṛipura at least up to the seventh century (above p. 157), was also known as the family of the Moon (Soma-vaṁśa). The rulers of this family claimed to have been lords of Kosala; but with the exception of only one record of one of the latest members of the
family, their inscriptions have been found in the western part of the ancient janapada of South Kosala which roughly corresponded to the modern Raipur-Bilaspur region of the Madhya Pradesh and the Sambalpur area of Orissa. The history of this family is obscure after Sivagupta (or Mahā-Sivagupta) Bālārjuna, who seems to have been defeated by Pulakesin II some time before A.D. 634. Another group of rulers, claiming descent from the Somavaiṣṭa or the family of the Moon and also suzerainty over South Kosala, is known to have ruled over the eastern part of the janapada from the tenth century. Some of these kings bore such names as Sivagupta and Mahāsvagupta, and the name of one of them ended with the word kesarin, as in the case of one of the Pāṇḍuvaṁśa kings. But these kings never claimed any connection with the Pāṇḍuvaṁśa, and used the distinctive epithet 'lord of Trikaliṅga'. The emblem on their seal was the Gajalakṣmī and not the Garuḍa of the earlier dynasty. The relation of the Somavaiṣṭa with the earlier ruling families of South Kosala, including that of the Pāṇḍuvaṁśa, cannot be determined satisfactorily in the present state of our knowledge.

The earliest known member of the Somavaiṣṭa was Sivagupta. He is endowed with imperial titles in the records of his son who was the real founder of the family's greatness. The reign of Sivagupta may be roughly assigned to the first half of the tenth century. It has been suggested that the city of Pāḷi, identified with the village Pāḷi, 12 miles to the north-east of Ratanpur in the Bilāspur district, was possibly conquered by the Kalachuri king Mugdhatuṅga of Tripuri (near Jabbalpur) from the Somavaiṣṭa ruler Sivagupta. There is, however, no evidence of Somavaiṣṭa rule over the western part of the ancient janapada of South Kosala. If they were actually in occupation of the Raipur-Bilāspur region, they must have been soon ousted from that area by the Kalachuris, although permanent Kalachuri occupation of Chattīśgarh did not materialise earlier than the eleventh century.

Sivagupta's successor was his son Janamejaya, surnamed Mahābhavagupta I, who issued his charters from Suvarnapura, Mūrasīmaṇ and Ārāma. Suvarnapura, no doubt the present Sonpur, till recently the chief town of a State of that name in northern Orissa, was the principal capital of the king. Mūrasīmaṇ, possibly modern Mursinga in Patna area, was a secondary capital, while Ārāma is supposed to have been a royal pleasure-garden near Suvarnapura. Janamejaya Mahābhavagupta was a worshipper of Śiva. He is described as 'lord of Kosala' and is known to have granted lands in that country. The specific mention of Kosala as the country in which the donated lands were situated seems to suggest that the king's dominions comprised territories other than Kosala. The king, like other members of his
family, claims to have been the lord of Trikaliṅga. Whether this indicated a combination of three countries including Kaliṅga, or a particular tract of land between Kaliṅga and South Kosala, cannot be easily determined, although the name was probably used both in a wide and a narrow sense. In a later inscription of the family Janamejaya Mahābhāravagupta I is credited with defeating and killing the king of Odra or Orissa. But whether he was able to annex Orissa to his kingdom is not definitely known. The king seems to have flourished about the middle of the tenth century, and may have been the Kosala king who came into conflict with the Kalachuri monarch Lakṣmaṇarāja (about the third quarter of the tenth century).

Janamejaya’s minister for war and peace was Malladatta, son of Dhāradatta, who served him at least down to his thirty-first regnal year, and was succeeded in the office of minister by a second Dhāradatta, probably a son of Malladatta. This hereditary succession to ministerial offices was an interesting feature of ancient Indian administration, and solves a number of problems in regard to the genealogy of the Somavamsīs.

Janamejaya Mahābhāravagupta I ruled at least up to his thirty-fourth regnal year, and was succeeded by his son Yayāti, otherwise called Mahāśīvagupta I. From this time the titles Mahābhāravagupta and Mahāśīvagupta appear to have been alternately adopted by the rulers of this family. The earlier records of Yayāti Mahāśīvagupta I were issued from Vinītapura which is probably the modern Binka in the ‘Sonpur State’. His latest records were, however, issued from Yayātinagara on the Mahānadi which was apparently a city founded by, and named after, the king. It has been suggested that the city of Vinītapura was renamed Yayātinagara by Yayāti Mahāśīvagupta I. The king was a devotee of Śiva like his father. The lands granted by him are also often specifically stated to have belonged to the Kosala or South Kosala country. An official of the king is once mentioned as associated with Kosaladeśa.

Yayāti Mahāśīvagupta I ruled at least up to his twenty-eighth regnal year. In some of his later inscriptions he is credited with a victory over a king named Ajapāla who cannot be identified. Dhāradatta II, who served Janamejaya Mahābhāravagupta I in the latest years of his reign, continued in the office of minister of war and peace during the reign of Yayāti Mahāśīvagupta I. Later, the minister was succeeded in his office by another member of his family named Siṇhadatta who seems to have been a son of Harshadatta and a grandson of Dhāradatta II.

The reign of Yayāti Mahāśīvagupta seems to have ended in the
beginning of the eleventh century. The later history of the family will be treated in the next volume.

III. ORISSA

(1) The Bhauma-Karas

About A.D. 643, king Harsha-vardhana led an expedition against the kingdom of Koṅgoda, in the eastern part of the Ganjam district, apparently through West Bengal and Orissa which were the territories of the subdued king of Gauḍa. The reason for the expedition was probably the assertion of independence by the Sālodbhayas of Koṅgoda and the neighbouring local powers of Orissa, all of whom owed allegiance to king Saśānka of Gauḍa in the first quarter of the seventh century Harsha seems to have made an attempt to recover the lost dependencies of Gauḍa in Orissa on behalf of the Gauḍa king who was now his subordinate ally. Utkala, or eastern Orissa, which was under the feudatory house of the Dattas during Saśānka’s time, was temporarily subdued by Harsha, and he seems to have recognized a Buddhist royal family as his subordinate in the Utkala or Tosali country. This was the family of the kings who appear to have used the Harsha era of A.D. 606 and called themselves Bhauma in the earlier records and Kara in the later epigraphs. Whether the word Bhauma indicated their aboriginal origin or their relation with the the Bhauma kings of Kāmarūpa (who were however not Buddhists) cannot be determined. The capital of the Bhauma-Karas was the city of Gheśvarāpātaka which may have been the same as Virajas mentioned as the residence of an early king of the family. Virajas, otherwise called Viraja or Virajā, is to be identified with modern Jājpūr in the Cuttack district.

The founder of the Bhauma-Kara family was a chief named Kshe-maṇikara or Lakshmikara who was a paramopāsaka, i.e. a Buddhist. His son and successor was Mahārāja Śivakara I whose other names or titles are known to have been Unmatṛaisiśīha (or ेkesarin) and Bharasaha. His queen was Jayāvali who seems to have been the daughter of the ruler of Rāḍha and to have been wedded according to the Rākṣhasa form of marriage. Rāḍha was the name of the modern Burdwan division in the heart of the kingdom of Gauḍa. Whether Jayāvali belonged to the royal house of Gauḍa or to a viceregal house cannot be determined with certainty. King Śivakara I was a parama-tathāgata (i.e. a Buddhist) and was probably a contemporary of Harsha-vardhana. This date of the king seems to be supported by the Ganjam grant which suggests that Unmatṛakesarin (Śivakara I), stationed at Virajas, conquered parts of Koṅgoda-maṇḍala from Gaṅga
Jaya-varman of Svetaka with the help of his feudatory, Rāṇaka Visha-
vārṇava, some time after the Gaṅga year 120 (A.D. 616-18). The char-
ter, originally issued by Jaya-varman, was reissued by Vishavārṇava
with the permission of Unmaṭtakesarin. It may be pointed out in
this connection that one of the Paralakmedhi grants of Jaya-varman
seems to be the copy of a genuine record of the sixth or seventh cen-
tury to which period the original records of this Gaṅga king are as-
signed on palaeographical grounds, and that the Paralakmedhi grant
referred to is dated in the year 100 of the Gaṅga era corresponding
to a date in A.D. 596-98.5

Sivakara I (Unmaṭtasiṅha-Bharasaha) was succeeded by his son
Subhākara I who was a parama-saugata (i.e. a Buddhist). Although
he calls himself a mahārāja in his Neulpur grant, he is credited with
full imperial titles in his son's record. It is probable that Subhākara I
assumed independence after Harsha-vardhana's death. The date of his
charter is uncertain; but his rule may be roughly assigned to the third
quarter of the seventh century. He was the lord of the Utkala country
and granted lands in Uttara-Tosali (i.e. the Balasore district and the
adjoining areas of the Cuttack district). This evidently shows that
Tosali was either another name of Utkala or the name of a part of
that country. Subhākara I is also said to have subdued the Kaliṅga
people. This may point to his hostile relations with the Gaṅgas. He
married Mādhavadevi who became the mother of the Mahārājñādhi-
rājas Sivakara II and Sāntikara I. King Sāntikara I, who was also
known as Lalitahāra (or ćbharā) I and Gavāda I, may have been the
founder of Gavāḍapura mentioned in a later record of the family.
The Dhauli inscription of his reign is dated in the year 93 (A.D. 699).
Sāntikara I married Tribhuvanamahādevī of the Nāga family, who is
described as a parama-vaiśnavī and as the daughter of Rājamalla of
the southern country. Unfortunately no satisfactory identification of
this Nāga chief of the south is possible in the present state of our
knowledge.

According to a copper-plate inscription, Sāntikara I was succeeded
by Subhākara II who was the son of Sivakara II by queen Mohini-devī
of the Bhavāna family. The charter is dated in the year 100 and was
made by Subhākara II at the request of the queen Nṛṇādevī.

The next occupant of the Bhauma-Kara throne was Subhākara III
who was otherwise called Kusumahāra (ćbharā) or Siṃhadhvaja
(ćketu), and was the son of Sāntikara I and queen Tribhuvanamahā-
devī. He granted lands in both Uttara and Dakṣiṇa Tosali in the year
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103 (A.D. 709). The grant of land in Northern Tosali was made at the request of a feudatory named Pulindaraja in favour of the god Vaidyana-nathabhattaraka (Siva) enshrined at the Pulindeshvara temple. The land granted in South Tosali was actually situated in Kongodamanḍala-cīshaya, and this fact apparently points to the success of the Bhauma-Karas against the Sailodbhavas. This king probably died after a very short reign as he was succeeded first by his mother Tribhuvanamahadevi (also called Siddhagauri) and then by his young son Sāntikara II. Tribhuvanamahadevi is said to have been requested by the feudatories to assume the reins of government in the same way as an ancient queen named Gosvāmini had done. A date in Tribhuvanamahadevi’s reign falls in the year 110 (A.D. 716) or 120 (A.D. 726).

Sāntikara II, who succeeded his grandmother Tribhuvanamahadevi, was also known as Lonabhāra (or Lavanā) I and Gayāda II. He married Hirāmahadevi, daughter of Sīnhamana, and had by her two sons named Subhakara IV (surnamed Kusumahāra or ‘bhāra II) and Sivakara III (surnamed Lalitahāra or ‘bhāra II) both of whom became kings. By this time, the Bhauma-Karas were no longer adherents of the Buddhist faith. Mahārajadhiraṇḍa Subhakara IV calls himself a paramamāheśvara, i.e. devout worshipper of Śiva, in his Talcher grant dated in the year 141 (A.D. 747). His younger brother Sivakara III, who succeeded him, is known from his records dated in the year 149 (A.D. 755). Sivakara III was followed on the throne successively by his two sons, viz Sāntikara III who married Dharmamahadevi and was also known as Lavanabhāra or Lonabhāra II, and Subhakara V who married Gauri and Vakulamahadevi. Both of these probably died without leaving any male issue, and, after the death of Subhakara V, the throne passed on to his queen Gauri who was herself succeeded by her daughter, the Paramamāheśvarī Daṇḍimahadevi. The known dates of Paramabhattārikā Mahārajādhiraṇḍa-Paramesvarī Daṇḍimahadevi are the years 180 (A.D. 786) and 187 (A.D. 793). A recently discovered charter of the queen gives the date as the year 280 which, however, seems to be a mistake for 180. Daṇḍimahadevi retained the hold of the Bhauma-Karas on Kongodamanḍala. She was succeeded by her step-mother Vakulamahadevi who was the daughter of a ruler of the Bhanja family that seems to have owed allegiance to the Bhauma-Karas. The throne next passed on to Dharmamahadevi, who was the widow of Daṇḍimahadevi’s paternal uncle Sāntikara III (Lavanabhāra II). The end of the dynasty is wrapped in obscurity. But it seems that the decline of the Bhauma-Karas was brought about by the rise of their feudatories such as the Bhanjas, Sulksis, Tungas, and Dhavalas who gradually began to rule almost independently.

There is some difficulty in reconciling the chronology of the
Bhauma-Karas suggested above with an event recorded in Chinese historical literature. In A.D. 795 the Chinese emperor Te-tsong received as a token of homage an autographed manuscript addressed to him by the king of Wu-cha (i.e. Odra or Orissa) in Southern India, who was a follower of Mahāyāna Buddhism and whose name, translated into Chinese, was 'the fortunate monarch who does what is pure, the lion'. The original form of the name is supposed to be Śrī-Subhakara-devakesarī (Śīrṣa) who is usually identified with Subhākara I of the Bhauma-Kara dynasty. But the names Śrī-Subhakara and Subhākara are not exactly the same in meaning, and a word indicating 'lion' is conspicuous by its absence from this name. It has to be admitted that both these difficulties are partially removed if the king mentioned in the Chinese source is identified with Śivakara I Unmāṭṭasimha, father of Subhākara I. But even in this case, the name Śivakara does not exactly mean 'who does what is pure' and unmāṭṭasimha actually means 'a furious lion' (unmāṭṭa being a Prākrit corruption of Sanskrit unmattā) and not merely 'a lion'. If these difficulties can be explained away as being due to some confusion on the part of the Chinese writers, Śivakara I Unmāṭṭasimha, the second king of the Bhauma-Kara dynasty, may be assigned to the last quarter of the eighth century. In that case we have to suggest that the era used in the records of the family started from the regnal reckoning of Kshemaikara or Lakshmikara, founder of the Bhauma-Kara dynasty; and that the dynasty, which ruled for about two centuries, flourished between the middle of the eighth and that of the tenth century, and not between the beginning of the seventh and that of the ninth century, as suggested by our chronology. If, however, our chronology of the Bhauma-Karas may be supported, one has to suggest that the Buddhist king of Orissa mentioned in the Chinese source was the founder of a different ruling family who carved out a principality in Orissa at the expense of the Bhauma-Karas about the last decade of the eighth century when the latter were already on the decline. Whatever that may be, there is little doubt that at least the earlier sculptures at the Buddhist sites of the Nalīgiri, Udavasūri, Ratnasūri, and Kendranara regions of Orissa belong to the age of the Karas. A writer has assigned a crowned Buddha of this period 'to the early eighth century A.D'. This dating supports our chronology.

(2) The Bhañjas

There were several branches of the Bhañjas who originally owed allegiance to the Bhauma-Karas but began to rule almost indepen-
dently after the latter's decline. Their history may be discussed under the following heads: (1) the Ādi-Bhañjas of Khijjiṅga-koṭṭa; (2-3) the Early and Later Bhañjas of Khīnjali-maṇḍala; and (4) the Bhañjas of Baud. Of these only the Ādi-Bhañjas and the earlier members of the Early Bhañja family of Khīnjali-maṇḍala flourished before the beginning of the eleventh century and may be treated here. The later members of the Early Bhañja dynasty of Khīnjali-maṇḍala as well as the Later Bhañjas of Khīnjali-maṇḍala and the Bhañjas of Baud would be discussed in the next volume.

It is difficult to determine the relation of these Bhañja families with an early king named Neṭṭabhañja known from his Baud copper-plate inscription. This king, not described as belonging to the Bhañja family, apparently ruled in the eighth century as an independent monarch. The date of the charters, which was issued from Nav-Āṅgulaka (i.e. modern Angul in the Cuttack district) is the year 15 of the king's reign. Another copper-plate grant of the same king was found at or near Russellkoṇḍa in the Ganjam district. The charter was issued from Vārāḍḍa, probably in the same region. Thus the kingdom of Neṭṭabhañja seems to have included the Cuttack and Puri districts with parts of Ganjam. His rise appears to have synchronized with the decline of the Sailodbhayavas of Eastern Ganjam. The most interesting information supplied by the Russellkoṇḍa plates of Neṭṭabhañja is that the king was a scion of the family of Drumrāja, a name as yet unknown from any other source. Another important fact recorded in the inscription is that Neṭṭabhañja represented the hundredth generation of the old royal family.

(a) The Ādi-Bhañjas of Khijjiṅga-koṭṭa

The inscriptions of the family styled Ādi-Bhañja have been discovered in Mayūrbañj in Orissa and its neighbourhood. Khijjiṅga-koṭṭa, named after a koṭṭa or fort which was the residence of the kings of this family, has been identified with modern Khiching, the ancient capital of the old ‘Mayūrbañj State’. Indeed, the name of the State seems to have been derived from the Ādi-Bhañjas, as the progenitor of the family is said to have come out of a mayūrāṇḍa (pea-hen’s egg) at a place called Koṭṭāśrama, and may have been actually called Mayūrabhañja with reference to his birth. He is said to have been nurtured by the sage Vaśishṭha.

The records of the family usually begin with an account of the birth of Virabhadra, the mythical progenitor of the family. A hero named Koṭṭabhañja was born in Virabhadra’s family, styled Ādi-

7 JBORS, XVII, pp. 104 ff.
Bhañja. It may be suggested that Ādi-bhañja was another name of the mythical Virabhadra. It thus seems that Koṭṭabhañja was the real founder of the family, although little is known about his exploits. His other names appear to have been Vibhramatuṅga and Durjayabhañja.

Koṭṭabhañja had two sons, viz Narendrabhañja and Raṇabhañja, both of whom became kings. Two inscriptions of Narendrabhañja have so far been discovered, each ending with a small record of the king’s younger brother and successor Raṇabhañja. One of these subjoined records of Raṇabhañja is dated in the year 293 of an unspecified era. Another charter of Raṇabhañja, found at Jamdapir in the Bamanghati division of Mayūrbhañj, is dated in the year 288, evidently of the same era. There is little doubt that this era is the same as that used in the inscriptions of the Bhauma-Karas to whom the Bhañjas appear to have originally owed allegiance. As already pointed out above (p. 492) this era is either identical with the Harsha era of A.D. 606 or an independent Bhauma-Kara era starting from a date about A.D. 750. Raṇabhañja’s date, 288-93, thus falls in the period A.D. 894-99 or A.D. 1038-43. The second of the two suggestions is rather doubtful, because the dates of the Bhañja records are expressed in symbols instead of figures, and this old system of writing dates is not known to have been continued after the tenth century. Of course it may be conjectured that the symbol for 200 in these dates was actually meant for 100 as in the case of a record of Daṇḍimahādevī referred to above (p. 494). In that case Raṇabhañja’s rule may be assigned to the middle of the tenth century.

We have inscriptions of no less than four Ādi-Bhañja kings, each of whom describes himself as the son of Raṇabhañja. As at least three of these rulers claim to have had their residence at Khiijīṅga-kotṭa, they appear to have ruled the Mayūrbhañj region one after another, although the order of their succession is unknown. These three sons of Raṇabhañja were Raṭhabhañja of the Jamdapir (Bamanghati) plate (No. 2), Prithvibhañja of the Ādipur plate, and the issuer of the unpublished Khiching plate whose name is given on the seal as Māhidabhañja and in the record proper as Mahanmadāhavabhañja. Raṭhabhañja is often erroneously taken to be a brother of Raṇabhañja. This is due to wrong reading and unsound interpretation of his record. In the Khandadeuli plate, issued by Prithvibhañja’s son Narendrabhañja, Prithvibhañja seems to be described as an aupājīka (adopted) son of Raṇabhañja. The name of Mahanmadāhavabhañja, which reminds us of the Arabic name Muḥammad, may be actually a compound of the Sanskrit words mahat, mada, and ṛhava.

⁸ Cf. EL. XXV, pp. 147 ff.
Another son of Raṇabhaṅja was Satrubhaṅja who issued the Kesari plate. He is, however, not stated to have resided at Khijjiṅga-kotṭa and may have ruled over a part of the kingdom side by side with one or more of his brothers. Satrubhaṅja’s queen Anakahdevī and his son yuvarāja Narendrabhaṅja are mentioned in his inscription. It is, however, not known if this yuvarāja ever ascended the Ādi-Bhaṅja throne.

Another king of the same family seems to be Durjavabhaṅja of the Adipur plate (No. 2) who is described as the son of Vibhramatūṅga and grandson of Raṇabhaṅja. It is difficult to determine, in the present state of our knowledge, which of the sons of Raṇabhaṅja had the biruda Vibhramatūṅga; it was possibly another name of Satrubhaṅja of the Kesari plate. The Ādirup plate (No. 2) speaks of Durjavabhaṅja’s queen Chihīpa-mahādevī and his son yuvarāja Koṭṭabhaṅja; it is not known if the yuvarāja succeeded his father on the throne.

(b) Earlier Members of the Early Bhaṅja Family of Khiṅjali-maṇḍala

Khiṅjali-maṇḍala appears to have been the ancient name of the district round the old ‘Konjhar State’ in Orissa. The earlier inscriptions of its ruling family have been discovered from Sonpur, Daspalla and Baud. The maṇḍala or division may have originally formed a part of an independent kingdom which cannot be identified, but it is found under a semi-independent branch of the Bhaṅja family from the beginning of the tenth century. The relation of these Bhaṅjas with the other known branches of the dynasty cannot be determined.

The founder of the Early Bhaṅja family of Khiṅjali-maṇḍala was one Śilābhaṅja I Āṅgāḍḍi. In some records9 of his son, he is represented as the son of Mallagaṅḍhīra and grandson of Yathāsukha, but nothing is known about these earlier members of the family. It is interesting, however, to note that their names have no bhaṅja ending which may have been first claimed by Śilābhaṅja I. Śilābhaṅja I Āṅgāḍḍi was succeeded by his son Satrubhaṅja, otherwise called Gandhaṭa. The king seems to have been the founder of the city of Gandhatapāṭi which is the modern Gandharavāḍi in Baud. He issued his charters from the city of Dhṛtitipura which appears to have been the early capital of this family of rulers, but has not yet been identified. Satrubhaṅja-Gandhaṭa is described as having belonged to the Aṇḍaja or ‘egg-born’ family, and this suggests that he had relation with the Ādi-Bhaṅjas claiming descent from a mythical hero born of a pea-hen’s egg. He is also said to have been the lord of both the Khiṅjali-maṇḍala’s, showing that the original Khiṅjali-maṇḍala was divided into two halves that had been for some time under

9 Cf. JIBRS, XVIII, pp. 387 ff.
different princes. Satrubhaṇja claims to have been a devout worshipper of Vishnu. He ruled at least up to his fifteenth regnal year and was succeeded by his son Raṇabhaṇja, often called Rānaka and Mahāsāmanta. His epithet, ‘one who acquired the five great sounds’, also points to his essential feudatory character. It is, however, not easy to determine who claimed his allegiance, real or nominal. Like his father he had his headquarters at the city of Dhṛitipura. In his earlier records, Raṇabhaṇja is described as a worshipper of Vishnu, and also as having obtained boons from the goddess Stambheśvarī. The word stambha seems to be used in the sense of a śiva-liṅga, and the goddess was probably represented on a liṅga. Such liṅgas, with the representation of the mother-goddess regarded as the energizing power of Śiva, have been discovered in Eastern India. This devotion to Śakti probably led to the king’s conversion to Śaivism in the later years of his life. In an inscription of the fifty-fourth year of Raṇabhaṇja’s reign, the king is described as a devout worshipper of Maheśvara.

There is a clue to determine the period when Raṇabhaṇja, the ruler of Udbhaya-Khīnjalimandala, flourished. The donor of the Patna Museum grant of the time of this king was Mahādevī Vijyā who was very probably one of his queens. The queen is described in the record as the daughter of Rānaka Niyārnama. This Niyārnama seems to be no other than the Kadamba Rānaka Niyārnavā of Jayantyāpura, who was the father of Bhīmakhedi and grandfather of Dharmakhedi. As Kadamba Dharmakhedi is known to have issued the Santahommali plates dated in the Gaṅga year 520 (A.D. 1016) and the Mandasa plates of Saka 917 (A.D. 995), his grandfather Nivarṇavā or Niyārnama seems to have flourished about the middle of the tenth century. The reign of Raṇabhaṇja, son-in-law of Niyārnavā or Nivarṇama, may thus be roughly assigned to the third quarter of that century. Raṇabhaṇja’s grandfather Śilābhaṇja-Āṅgadā and his father Satrubhaṇja-Gandhaṭa appear to have flourished respectively about the first and second quarters of the tenth century.

Raṇabhaṇja was succeeded by his son Nettabhaṇja, surnamed Kalvāṇakalaśa. He seems to have transferred the capital from Dhṛitipura to a new city called Vaṇjulvaka whence his charters were issued. This city cannot be satisfactorily identified; but the fact that his records have been discovered in the Ganjam district seems to show that the family was driven towards the south, under circumstances that cannot be determined at present. Nettabhaṇja was a worshipper of Maheśvara, and his rule may be assigned roughly to the last quar-

10 Cf. JBORS, II, pp. 429 ff. The date of the Tekkali plates (ibid., XVIII, pp. 387 ff.) of the same king is clearly the regnal year 14.
ter of the tenth century. The history of his successors will be treated in the next volume.

(3) The Dhavalas

A single copper-plate grant reveals the existence of a king named Narendra-dhavala. The plate is known to have been secured from the Collector of Ganjam. Unfortunately, it was not noticed by earlier writers that the first line of the record contains the interesting passage Khindarasigheîî (śriṅge) śri-Narendradhavala-rājya Gomunḍa-maṇḍala. It is a kṛaya-śāsana recording the sale of a village called Tadesaragrāma which was apparently situated in Khindaraśrīṅga within Gomunḍa-maṇḍala. The district called Gomunḍa-maṇḍala formed a part or more probably the whole of the dominions of the king named Narendra-dhavala. The village is said to have been originally purchased from Silabhana. J.

King Narendra-dhavala is not known from any other sources. But it seems that his territory lay near the Khijnali-maṇḍala which constituted the dominions of a branch of the Bhaņja dynasty to which Silabhana mentioned in the record belonged. The reference to Silabhana gives an interesting clue as to the time when Narendra-dhavala flourished. There were two Silabhanaś in the Early Bhaņja family of Khijnali-maṇḍala. But there is definite evidence to show that Silabhana mentioned in our record is no other than Silabhanaś I surnamed Gandhaṭa. The inscription in question was engraved by Padmanābha, son of the Vanik Pāṇḍi, and there is hardly any doubt that the same person is mentioned in the Sonpur plates dated in the ninth regnal year of Raṇabhanaśa, grandson of Silabhanaśa I Āṅgaḍḍi, as vanik-svārakāra Padmanābha, son of Pāṇḍi, who engraved that charter. We have roughly assigned the reigns of Silabhanaśa I, Śatrubhaņja, and Raṇabhanaśa of Khijnali-maṇḍala respectively to the first, second and third quarters of the tenth century. The record in question simply says that the village resold was originally purchased from Silabhanaśa, and does not mean that Silabhanaśa was alive when the document was prepared. This fact, together with the other that Padmanābha, engraver of this record, also engraved a grant of the ninth regnal year of Raṇabhanaśa, would suggest that the kṛaya-śāsana was prepared not much earlier than the second quarter of the tenth century.

The Bhaņjas gave their name to the Bhaņjaḥumī or Bhaņjbhum which includes the present Mayūrbhaņja area. Similarly there are

11 Cat. of C.P. Grants in the Govt. Mus., Madras, 1918, p. 58,
12 JBORS, VI, pp. 483 ff.
other neighbouring territories with names of this type, e.g. Mānbhūm or Mānabhūmi, the land of the Mānas; Singhbhūm or Siṅhabhūmi, the land of the Siṅhas; Bīrbhūm or Virabhūmi, the land of the Vīras; Dhalbhūm or Dhavalabhūmi, the land of the Dhavalas; Barābhūm or Varāhabhūmi, the land of the Varāhas; Śekharbhūm or Sekharabhūmi, the land of the Śekharas; Mallabhūm or Mallabhūmi, the land of the Mallas; etc. As regards Dhalbhūm or Dhavalabhūmi, it is interesting to note that the names of the ruling chiefs of this territory are known to have ended with the word Dhavala, that is to say that they belonged to a Dhavala dynasty. Indeed some of the late-medieval rulers of Dhalbhum are famous in the history of Bengali literature. Gopinātha-dhavala and his son Ananta-dhavala, who was the patron of the poet Jagannath Sen, author of the Hitopadesa-pāńchālī, are both mentioned in that work. There is another Dhavala ruling family in the heart of Orissa. The members of the Dompārā Rāja family in the Cuttack district bear names ending with the word dhavala. It is indeed difficult to determine in the present state of our knowledge what relations the present Dhavala dynasties may have had with the ancient Dhavala dynasty of Orissa represented by king Narendra-dhavala. But it is not improbable that they are off-shoots of the old royal family.

(4) The Later Sailodbhavas

We have seen that Sainyabhīta Mādhava-varman II of the Sailodbhava dynasty of Koṅgoda (in the present Ganjam district) acknowledged the suzerainty of Śaśānka of Gauda. But Mādhava-varman II seems to have assumed independence after the death of Śaśānka when he issued the Khurda grant with the title ‘Lord of Kalinga’.13 For whereas his Ganjam plates dated in the Gupta year 300 (A.D. 619) invoke the name of Śaśānka as suzerain, his other records, viz, the Khurdā,14 Buguda,15 Puri,16 and Cuttack Museum plates,17 were issued later without any reference to an overlord. Some of these later records credit him with the performance of the Asvamedha sacrifice. Evidently this was celebrated to commemorate the throwing off of the

13 It has been suggested that the Puri plates of the 50th regnal year of Mādhava-varman II refer to his overlord Lokanātha. I, am, however, inclined to take Lokanātha as a feudatory of the Sailodbhava king.
14 JASB, LXIII, p. 284.
15 EI, III, p. 43. The letters in this inscription appear to be much later. The original document seems to have been copied on the plates at a later date.
16 EI, XXIV, p. 151. The date of the plate has been doubtfully read as 23, but seems to be 13.
17 This is dated in the 50th regnal year.
Gauda yoke. Since he ruled for at least fifty years, his reign may be tentatively assigned to the period A.D. 610-62. He appears to have been the ruler of Kalinga when the Chinese pilgrim Hsuan Tsang visited the Konigoda country about A.D. 639. The pilgrim says: 'The country contained some tens of towns which stretched from the slopes of the hills to the edge of the sea. As the towns were naturally strong, there was a gallant army which kept the neighbouring countries in awe, and so there was no powerful enemy.'

After having assumed independence, the Sailodbhavas appear to have abandoned the use of the Gupta Era. But the independence of the family was seriously threatened about A.D. 643, when the Pushyabhuti king Harsha, after subduing the Gaudas, made an attempt to recover Koni goda, the lost dependency of Gauda. Harsha's success against the Sailodbhavas may not have been conspicuous, but the Buddhist kings of the Bhauma-Kara dynasty, who appear to have received his favour, ultimately conquered the Koni goda country.

Sainyabhita Madhava-varman II was succeeded by his son Ayaśobhita Madhyamaraja who celebrated the Vajapeya and Asvamedha sacrifices. His Pari kud plates are dated in his 26th regnal year 18 and his reign may be placed between A.D. 662 and 690.

Ayaśobhita Madhyamaraja was succeeded by his son Dharmaraja Mānabhita who probably ruled from c. A.D. 690 to 725. The date of his Kondeda grant issued from Saumapura and of the Puri grant issued from Mātrichachātaka seems to be the regnal year 12. It has, however, been supposed to be the year 312 of the Gupta Era in spite of the facts that his grandfather ruled in the Gupta year 300 and that his father ruled for about 26 years. A king named Mādhava, who was probably a younger brother of Dharmaraja and the usurper of his throne, was defeated by Dharmaraja at the battle of Phāsikā. Mādhava then applied for help to king Trivara, who cannot be identified but was probably a later Pāṇḍuvamśi ruler of South Kosala. But the combined forces of Mādhava and Trivara were shattered by Dharmaraja at the foot of the Vindhyas.

The successor of Dharmaraja Mānabhita was his son Madhyamaraja II who was succeeded by his own son Ranakshobha. Ranakshobha's successor was Allaparaja, the son of the former's paternal uncle. Another king of the family was Madhyamaraja III, son of yuvarāja Tailapanibha, whose relation with the other rulers cannot be

18 The date is given in words in l. 45 of the record (EI, XI, p. 284) and this seems to have been repeated in figures in the last line. These figures have, however, been read in various ways.
determined. The major part of the Koṅgoda country was probably conquered by the Bhauma-Karas as noted above (p. 494).

(5) The Sulkīs

The inscriptions of the Sulkīs (also called Solki, Saulkika, etc.) have been found in Dhenkanal and Talcher. They are probably mentioned in the Hārāhā inscription of Maukhari Īśana-varman as Sūlika. The rulers of this family originally assumed feudatory titles and appear to have owed allegiance to the Bhauma-Karas. They issued their charters from the capital city of Kodāloka, and their family deity was the goddess Stambhēśvarī. Kodāloka is possibly to be identified with modern Koālu (about 6 miles from Talcher) on the left bank of the Brahmani in the Dhenkanal subdivision of the Dhenkanal district, Orissa.

One of the earliest records of the family is the Dhenkanal plate of Samasta-mahāsāmanti-ādhipati Raṇastambha who acquired the pañchamahāśālya and was a worshipper of Mahēśvara. The date of this record has been read by H. P. Sastri as 30, and by D. R. Bhandarkar as 203, although the correct reading seems to be 103. The era to which the date should be referred is undoubtedly the same as that found in the records of the Bhauma-Karas. This shows that Raṇastambha of the Sulkī family of the Dhenkanal-Talcher region was a feudatory of the contemporary Bhauma-Kara king Subhākara III whose Hindol and Dharakaṭa plates are dated in the year 103.

19 There is a people called Sulki in the Midnapur district of West Bengal. Some scholars (cf. Majumdar, Orissa in the Making, p. 101 ff.) suggested that the original home of the Sulki royal family of Orissa was also in Midnapur. The view, however, that the dominions of the Sulkis of Orissa included the Hooghly district in Bengal (cf. Banerji, History of Orissa, I, pp. 195-96) is unsupported by any evidence. The theory is based on the identification of the village of Jārā, granted by Raṇastambha in favour of Brāhmaṇa who hailed from a village in the Rādhānapurā, with the village of that name in the Hooghly district. But there is absolutely no evidence in support of the identification.

20 I have elsewhere suggested that Stambhēśvarī was probably the Devī represented on a Śiva-līṅga. It should, however, be pointed out that Stambhēśvarī or Khambēśvarī is still worshipped by the aboriginal people of Orissa in the shape of a pillar or post. See Majumdar, op. cit. pp. 107 ff.

The Kalahandi plates of Mahārāja Tushṭikara, who flourished in the fifth or sixth century A.D., also mentions that ruler as a worshipper of the goddess Stambhēśvarī. Whether, however, the Sulkīs claimed descent from Tushṭikara, and their family deity was the very same as that adored by that earlier king, cannot be determined. It is also uncertain if the pillar of Stambhēśvarī at present standing at the centre of the town of Sompur has anything to do with Tushṭikara and the rulers of the Sulki dynasty.
The Talcher plate appears to be a later record of Ranastambha. In this inscription the king is endowed with a combination of feudatory and imperial epithets, which is probably due to his success in a struggle with the Bhauma-Karas. It is learnt from this record that Ranastambha was also known as Kulastambha, and that he was the son of Kalahastambha-Vikramāditya and the grandson of Kāṅchanastambha. The Jaragram plate of this king also gives the names of the father and grandfather of Ranastambha respectively as Kalahastambha (wrongly read by H. P. Sastri as Kulastambha) and Kāṅchanastambha.

The Bhimagarigarh plate is usually ascribed to the same king named Ranastambha alias Kulastambha, although its issuer seems actually to have been king Kulastambha, son of Ranastambha. In this record the reigning king is described as the lord of the whole Gondrama with Sankhajoti forming the borderland of his kingdom.

Another son of Ranastambha was king Jayastambha. Three copper-plate inscriptions of this king were discovered at Dhenkanal. In one of them Jayastambha is said to have been the son of Ranastambha and grandson of Kulastambha (a mistake for Kalahastambha alias Vikramāditya). The other two records give the name of Jayastambha's father respectively as Nidayastambha and Ālānastambha both of which appear to have been different names of Ranastambha. Alānastambha (i.e. Ranastambha) is represented in Jayastambha's Dhenkanal inscription as the son of Vikramāditya-Kanadastambha (a mistake for Kalahastambha) and the grandson of Kāṅchanastambha. Jayastambha is endowed with both imperial and feudatory epithets.

Another inscription is a charter of King Kulastambha, son of Jayastambha and grandson of Ranastambha. The most interesting fact about this inscription is that it was written by the bhogika Kalyāna who seems to be no other than the bhogin Kalyānadeva, the writer of the Dhenkanal plate of Ranastambha dated in the year 103. This shows that the same person served both the earliest and latest known kings of the family who issued charters. The rule of the family from its third member Ranastambha alias Kulastambha down to his grandson Kulastambha of the record referred to above thus apparently ruled for a rather short period. It seems that this was a period of struggle between the Sulkis and their overlords, the Bhauma-Karas, who probably succeeded ultimately in overpowering their recalcitrant feudatories. The first and second rulers of the family, viz Kāṅchanastambha and Vikramāditya-Kalahastambha, may have been loyal feudatories of the Bhauma-Karas.
(6) The Rulers of Yamagartā

Yamagartā was the name of a mandala that formed a part of the dominions of the Bhauma-Karas. The exact location of this territory is unknown. Since, however, some records of the rulers of Yamagartā have been found in Talcher and Bonai, it may be suggested that the Yamagartā-mandala lay in the valley of the river Brahmani to the west and south-west of the dominions of the Bhañjas of Khiñjali-mandala and Khijjiṅga-koṭṭa.

The earliest known ruler of Yamagartā is Jayasiṁha known from the Dhenkanal plates dated according to an era. The date of the charter has been read as 88, but it is possibly 128. As the era, though unspecified, is apparently no other than that used by the Bhauma-Karas, Jayasiṁha seems to have been the feudatory of a Bhauma-Kara monarch.

Soon after Jayasiṁha, the Yamagartā-mandala seems to have passed to the rulers of a different dynasty, called the Tuṅgavaṁśa. The Tuṅga kings appear to have had their capital at a hill-fort called Mahāparvata. Whether this may be the hill of the same name to the south of the Mahānadi in the Cuttack district (Survey of India Sheet Map No. 73 H/ii) is unknown. The Bonai plates of Mahārāja-Rāṇaka Vīṇītatuṅga show that this ruler claimed to be the lord of the 18 Gondramas (possibly the same as Oriya Āṭhara-Garajat roughly indicating certain forts or States) and of the Yamagartā-mandala. Vīṇītatuṅga was a devout worshipper of Śiva, and his feudatory character is clearly demonstrated by his epithet Rāṇaka and by his claim to have attained the Pañca-mahāśālā. He is said to have belonged to the Śaṅḍilya gotra, and to have come originally from Rohitāgiri (probably Rohtāgarh in the Shahabad district of Bihar). He had a son named Khadgatuṅga who seems to have been ruling some part of his father’s dominions apparently as a viceroy. The most interesting fact about Vīṇītatuṅga is that he is mentioned as a feudatory in both the Talcher plates (dated in the year 149) of the Bhauma-Kara king Śivakara III Lalitāhāra.

A descendant of Vīṇītatuṅga was Gayādatuṅga known from his Talcher and Bengal Asiatic Society’s plates. Gayādatuṅga’s epithets are the same as those of Vīṇītatuṅga; but he is described as the son of Salāṇatuṅga who is said to have been born in the family of Rājjan Jagattuṅga. It is interesting to note that this Jagattuṅga is described in the records of Gayādatuṅga as belonging to the Śaṅḍilya gotra and as emigrating from Rohitāgiri exactly as Vīṇītatuṅga in the Bonai plates. This suggests that Jagattuṅga was either just another name of Vīṇītatuṅga or that Jagattuṅga was a relation (possibly
brother) of Vinīṭatunīga, and that the two migrated to Orissa together. There is no doubt that Gayādatunīga was named after the Bhaumakara king Sāntikara II Gayāda who was the father of Sivakara III. Possibly the family came to Orissa during the reign of Sāntikara II Gayāda and was favoured by that king. This fact suggests further that there was no long interval between Vinīṭatunīga and Gayādatunīga, and that the latter may have been the immediate successor of the former. This is further indicated by the fact that the Yamagarṭa-mandala is known to have been under a ruler of a different family during the reign of queen Daṇḍimahādevī who was the granddaughter of Sivakara III.

An inscription (dated in the year 180) of Daṇḍimahādevī mentions her feudatory Apsarodeva, ruler of the Yamagarṭa-mandala. This shows that the Tunga dynasty of Yamagarṭa made way for a new feudatory family represented by Apsarodeva.

(7) The Vigrahās

The existence of a dynasty of ancient Orissa rulers having names ending with the word vigna seems to be suggested by two records. The Kanasā grant speaks of a king named Loka-vigna. Later, an extremely interesting inscription of the time of Prithivī-vigna, possibly another king of the same family, was discovered at Sumanḍala in the Khallikote area. The most important passage in this record reads *varttamāna-Gupta-rājye varṣa-śatadvaye pañchāsadhuttare Kaliṅga-rāśtram-anusāsati īśr-Prithivī-vigna-bhaṭṭārake.* It speaks of Gupta rule in Kaliṅga in the Gupta year 250, corresponding to A.D. 569, although the Gupta Empire had ceased to exist several decades earlier. The fact that the Gupta Era was used in the Ganjam inscription of Saṅkka, but not in his Midnapur grants, would suggest Gupta influence in Kaliṅga. As regards the continuation of Gupta rule in Kaliṅga as late as A.D. 569, it may be suggested that the Vigrahās were probably themselves scions of the Imperial Guptas on the female side owing nominal allegiance to the Gupta Emperors.

The Sumanḍala inscription actually records the grant of a feudatory of Prithivī-vigna whose name was Mahārāja Dharmarāja. This chief is described as Mahārāj-Obhay-ānvaya (i.e. descendant or son of Mahārāja Ubhayā) and as born of queen Bappadevī. His headquarters were at Padmakholi from where he granted two villages situated in the Parakkhalamāṛgga-viṣhaya. These places were apparently situated about modern Khallikote in Orissa.

21 IHQ, XXVI, pp. 75-79.
IV. EASTERN 'DECCAN

(1) The Eastern Gāṅgas of Kaliṅganagara and Dantapura

The early Eastern Gāṅgas appear to have represented a branch of the Gāṅga family of Mysore. They issued their inscriptions mostly from the city of Kaliṅganagara, identified with modern Mukhaliṅgam in the Ganjam district. Some records of the Gāṅga kings of Kaliṅganagara were issued from Dantapura which is usually identified with Dantavakra near Chicacole in the same district, and may have been a secondary capital of the rulers of this family. A minor branch of the family is known to have ruled at a place called Śvetaka. In all their grants the early Eastern Gāṅgas express their devotion to the god Gokarnesvāra (Śiva) whose temple stood on a peak of the Mahendra mountain. Apparently the temple of this family-deity of the Gāṅgas was situated on modern Mahendragiri in the Ganjam district.

The founder of the Eastern Gāṅga dynasty was king Indra-varman I one of whose records is dated in the 39th year of his reign. His regnal reckoning was continued by his successors so as to give rise to an era. The initial year of this era, that corresponded to the first regnal year of Indra-varman I, appears to have fallen in A.D. 496 or probably some time in the period A.D. 496-99. Indra-varman I thus seems to have ruled from c. A.D. 496 to 535.

Indra-varman I claimed to have been the lord of Trikaliṅga. The exact identification of the Trikaliṅga country, as already noted, is difficult in the present state of our knowledge. But it seems that in a narrow sense it indicated a country or a forest tract, between the Veṅgi-Pishtapura region and the Gāṅga kingdom, lying to the south of Dakshinakosala, not far from the Mahendragiri. In a wider sense, however, it appears to have signified a larger territory including Kaliṅga and some neighbouring countries such as South Kosalā. It is interesting to note that the title 'Lord of Trikaliṅga' was first assumed by the Gāṅgas of Kaliṅganagara, next by the Somavamsis of Kosala and Utkala, and then by the Kalačhuris who are known to have extended their power over parts of Kosala.

King Indra-varman I seems to have been succeeded by Sāṃanta-varman or Mahāsāṃanta-varman who is known from an inscription of the year 60 of the Gāṅga era corresponding to c. A.D. 556. Sāṃanta-varman's relation with Indra-varman I is as yet unknown. The next king Mahārāja Hasti-varman, also called Rājasimha and Ranaḥbhiṭa, issued his charters in the years 79 (c. A.D. 575) and 80 (c. A.D. 576), and was probably succeeded by Indra-varman II alias Rājasimha whose
inscriptions are dated in the years 87 (c. A.D. 583) and 91 (c. A.D. 587). It is not unlikely that Sāmanta-varman and Hasti-varman were both sons of Indra-varman I, and that Indra-varman II was a son of Hasti-varman. Indra-varman II assumed the title Rājasiṅha possibly to distinguish himself from his ancestor Indra-varman I. The earliest inscription of the next king Indra-varman III, who seems to have felt no special necessity to distinguish himself from Indra-varman II, surnamed Rājasiṅha, is dated in the year 128 (c. A.D. 624). The next ruler was Indra-varman IV who clearly distinguishes himself from his earlier namesakes by the patronymic 'son of Dānārṇava'. We do not know, however, if this Dānārṇava ruled the Gaṅga kingdom for some time. His son describes himself as a devout worshipper of Maheśvara. The latest known date of Indra-varman IV is the year 154 (c. A.D. 650).

Nothing is known about the relation of the above rulers with Mahārāja Devendra-varman, who describes himself as a devotee of Maheśvara and a son of Guṇārṇava, and claims to have obtained the whole of Kaliṅga by his own prowess. His known dates range between the years 183 (c. A.D. 679) and 195 (c. A.D. 691). Whether his father Guṇārṇava ruled for some years in the period between c. 650 and c. 679 is as yet unknown. But we know that Devendra-varman was succeeded by his son Ananta-varman who issued the Parlakimedi grant in the year 204 (c. A.D. 700). He had two sons both of whom became kings. The first of them was Mahārāja Nanda-varman (Indra-varman according to some writers) known from his Santa Bommali grant of the year 221 (c. A.D. 717), and the second, Mahārāja Devendra-varman II, who issued his charters in the year 251 (c. A.D. 747) and 254 (c. A.D. 750)

Devendra-varman II seems to have been succeeded by Rājendra-varman I, whose son Ananta-varman II is known from his records of the Gaṅga years 284 (c. A.D. 780) and 304 (c. A.D. 800). The next ruler was Devendra-varman III who was younger brother of Ananta-varman II and issued charters in the Gaṅga years 308 (A.D. 804) and 310 (c. A.D. 806). The throne next passed on to Rājendra-varman II who was a son of Ananta-varman II. The known dates of Rājendra-varman II range between the Gaṅga years 313 (c. A.D. 809) and 342 (c. A.D. 838). He was succeeded by his cousin Satya-varman who was a son of Devendra-varman III. Satya-varman is known from an inscription dated in the Gaṅga year 351 (c. A.D. 847). He seems to have been succeeded by his younger brother Ananta-varman III known from an inscription of the Gaṅga year 358 (c. A.D. 854). The next ruler of the family appears to have been Bhūpendra-varman Mārasiṁha
whose son Devendra-varman IV issued the Cheedivalasa grant in the Gaṅga year 397 (c. A.D. 893) in favour of some Vaṅgaja Brāhmaṇas.

The history of the Eastern Gaṅga kingdom in the tenth century A.D. is wrapped up in obscurity. After Devendra-varman IV, the earliest records of the family are those of king Vajrahasta-Aniyaukabhīma, who belonged to a branch of the family usually styled Later or Greater Gaṅga, and ruled in the period c. A.D. 980-1015. He was the grandfather of the celebrated Vajrahasta-Anantas-varman who was crowned in A.D. 1038. During the tenth century the Gaṅga kingdom seems to have been split up into five small principalities including those of the Gaṅgas of Svetaka and the Kadambas of Jayantyāpura. The claim of Vijayāditya III (A.D. 848-92) of the Eastern Chāluṣyā dynasty to have subdued the king of Kaṅga as well as the introduction of the Saka era seems to point to Eastern Chāluṣyā influence on the Gaṅga kingdom during this century.

The relation of the Greater Gaṅga king Vajrahasta-Aniyaukabhīma and his predecessors with the early Gaṅga kings of Kalināga cannot be determined. There is also a good deal of discrepancy in the two different accounts found in inscriptions in regard to the predecessors of this king. The genealogy given in the records of his grandson Vajrahasta-Ananta-varman (crowned in A.D. 1038) speaks of Guṇamahārnava of the Ātreya gotra who acquired the glory of sāmrājya; his son Vajrahasta (44 years), who united the earth divided into five kingdoms: his three sons Guṇḍama (3 years), Kāmārnava (35 years), and Vinavāditya (3 years); Kāmārnava's son Vajrahasta-Aniyaukabhīma (35 years). According to this account, Guṇamahārnava was the founder of this branch of the family and his son Vajrahasta succeeded, at least partially, in uniting the disjointed parts of the kingdom under his sway. This account of the rise of the greater Gaṅgas is not an improbable one, but a slightly later account, which is apparently doubtful, gives a different story. It traces the descent of the family from Ananta or Vishnu, Brahman born from Vishnu's navel, Atri born of Brahman's mind, and the Moon born of Atri's eye. This is apparently fabricated on the basis of the name of the gotvarshi of the family, as well as of the eagerness to trace the descent of the family from Vishnu after the conversion of Ananta-varman Chodagaṅga (A.D. 1087-1147) from Saivism to Vaishnavism. The Purānic account of the lunar dynasty is then followed in giving the genealogy from the Moon to Yavātī's son Turvasu. It is then said that Turvasu got, by the favour of the goddess Gaṅga, a son named Gaṅgeya whose descendants were called Gaṅga. Kolāhala alias Ananta-varman, founder of Kolāhalapura (modern Kolar in Mysore) in the Gaṅgavāḍi-vishaya, was the seventeenth in descent from Gaṅgeya. Here is a
clear attempt to trace the descent of the Gaṅgas of Orissa from those of Mysore, although the latter claimed to have belonged to the Kāṇvāyana gotra and descended from the solar dynasty of Ikshvāku. Kolāhala’s son was Virochana in whose lineage, after 81 kings had flourished at Kolāhalapura, came Vīrasūha. Vīrasūha’s son Kāmārṇava came to Kaliṅga where he worshipped the god Gokarṇasvāmin (Gokarnaśvara) on the Mahendra mountain and obtained from him the bull crest and the insignia of sovereignty. He conquered Kaliṅga from a king named Bālāditya and ruled for 36 years at the city of Jantrāvura. His successors were: his younger brother Dānārṇava (40 years), his son Kāmārṇava (50 years), his son Raṇārṇava (5 years), his son Vajrahasta (15 years), and his younger brother Kāmārṇava (19 years). The son and successor of Kāmārṇava was Gunamahārṇava (27 years), who is no doubt the homonymous king described in the older account as the founder of the Greater Gaṅga family. The present account, however, gives the following names of the successors of Gunamahārṇava: his son Jītāṅkuśa (15 years), his brother’s son Kalīgalāṅkuśa (12 years), his uncle Gundama (7 years), his brother Kāmārṇava (25 years), and his brother Vināvāditya (3 years). Some scholars believe that this Kāmārṇava and Vināvāditya are mentioned in the Conjeeveram inscription of Jaṭāchoda-Bhima dated A.D. 1001-2. The next ruler was Kāmārṇava’s son Vajrahasta-Anvāṅkabhīma, who is no doubt the homonymous king also known from the older account as flourishing in c. A.D. 980-1015. The second account resembles the fabricated genealogies of the Pallavas, Eastern Chālukyas and other dynasties, and its details are very probably unhistorical.

The rise of the Greater Gaṅgas about the close of the tenth century seems to have been related to the Chola expedition against Kaliṅga during the reign of Rājarāja Chola who claims to have conquered that country some time before A.D. 1003. The fact that Kaliṅga is not mentioned in the list of eastern countries conquered by Rājendra Chola’s armies shortly before A.D. 1023 seems to suggest that the Gaṅga king of that country was then regarded as a subordinate of the Cholas. The Greater Gaṅgas, who are known to have employed Chola officials and contracted matrimonial alliances with the Cholas, probably gained power under the patronage of the Chola conquerors of Kaliṅga. But Chola influence on them was shortlived and nominal.

(2) The Gaṅgas of Śvetaka

When the main branch of the Early Eastern Gaṅgas was ruling from Kaliṅganagara and Dantapura, a minor branch of the family flourished at a place called Śvetaka, the name being often read as Schetaka and identified with modern Chīkāti in the Somapeta tāluk
in the district of Ganjam. The earliest known king of the Śvetaka branch of the Gaṅga family is Mahārāja Jaya-varman, so far known from three records. One of his two Paralakshedra grants seems to be the late copy of a genuine record dated in the Gaṅga year 100 (c. A.D. 596). His Ganjam grant, which seems to be dated in the Gaṅga year 120 (c. A.D. 616), records the gift of a village in the Koṅgodamandal. This charter was re-issued by Rāṇaka Vishavārma on behalf of the Bhauma-kara king Unmaṭṭakesarir (p. 493). This seems to indicate a tripartite struggle among the Sailodbhavas of Koṅgoda, the Gaṅgas of Śvetaka, and the Bhauma-Karas, which possibly facilitated the conquest of the east coast by Saśānaka and invited the invasion of Harsha. Jaya-varman was originally a Rāṇaka, i.e. a feudatory, apparently of the Gaṅga king of Kaliṅganagara. Like the Gaṅgas of the main branch, the kings of Śvetaka were also worshippers of Gokarnesvara. They often claim to have made the whole of Kaliṅga feel the weight of their arms.

Mahārāja Sāmana-varman, who issued the Cheedivalasa grant in the Gaṅga year 185 (c. A.D. 681), was another early king of Śvetaka. He claims to have been the lord of the whole of Kaliṅga, although his relations with Jaya-varman and with his Gaṅga contemporary on the throne of Kaliṅganagara are unknown. A later ruler of Śvetaka was Mahārāja Indra-varman of the Vishamagiri grant, assigned on palaeographical grounds to the eighth or ninth century. The rulers of Śvetaka appear to have been semi-independent feudatories of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara; but on occasions they assumed complete independence.

A group of later rulers of Śvetaka were king Mahendra-varman, his son Prithvī-varman, and his sons Indra-varman and Dānārṇava, all of whom may be roughly assigned to the tenth century. The Śvetaka king Bhūpendra-varman, son of Kailāsa, seems to have flourished still later. The latest known king of the Śvetaka branch of the Gaṅga family was Devendra-varman, who was the overlord of the Kadamba chief Bhīmakhedi II (Śaka 988, A.D. 1066), and his brother Udayāditya or Udayakheṭi (Śaka 1003, A.D. 1081). The Śvetaka house was completely overthrown by the Greater Gaṅga king Ananta-varman Choda-gaṅga about the close of the eleventh century.

(3) The Eastern Chālukyas

Pulakeśin II of the Chālukya house of Bādāmi had a younger brother named Vishṇu-vardhana who was also known as Kubja Vishṇu-

22 Dr. Sircar's statements have been in some cases omitted or modified so as to bring this section in a line with Chapter XVI on the Rāśtrakūṭas written by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri (Ed.).
vardhana and Prithivī-duvarāja (i.e. Prithivī-yuvarāja or Prithivī-vallabha yuvarāja). The Kopparam grant suggests that Vishnuvardhana aided Pulakeshin II in conquering the east coast country before A.D. 631. The Satara grant of A.D. 617 shows that this ‘dear’ younger brother of Pulakeshin II was then ruling over parts of the South Maratha country as yuvarāja and viceroy of his elder brother. In that capacity he granted the village of Alandatīrtha, identified with modern Alundh, about 35 miles to the north of Satara, in favour of certain Brāhmaṇas. A tradition recorded in the Avanti-sundarikathāsāra refers to one narendra Vishnuvardhana of the Nasik region who was a contemporary of Pallava Siṃhavishnu of Kārīchi and king Durvinita, apparently the Gaṅga king of that name. This may mean that Vishnuvardhana was ruling the whole land from Satara to Nasik, or even all the home country of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi when Pulakeshin was absent in connection with his campaigns.

Some time before 631 (about 620 according to some writers), Pulakeshin II subdued the king of Pishtapura (Pīṭhapuram in the Godāvari district) and the last known ruler of the Vishnukundin family in the region of Kunāla or Kollair lake near Ellore. According to the Kopparam inscription dated in the twenty-first regnal year of Pulakeshin II (A.D. 630-31), Prithivīduvarāja (Vishnuvardhana) made, in the presence of Pulakeshin, a grant of land in the Karma-rāṣṭra, which comprised parts of Guntur and Nellore districts. He was thus the viceroy of his elder brother in the newly conquered territory extending along the coast from the Viṣākhapatnam to the Nellore district. He was already well on his way to independence, and soon assumed the title of Mahārāja and became the founder of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty of the Andhra country (Veṅgi).

Vishnuvardhana had the titles makaradhvaja and vishamasiddhi; the former, meaning ‘cupid’, is almost ironical, considering that he is more often described as Kubja (hump-back), the latter a compliment to his success in difficult enterprises, particularly in the subjugation of impregnable fortresses. His Tīmmāpuram and Chipurapalle grants were issued from the city of Pīṣṭapura which was no doubt his capital. They record grants of land in the present Sarvasiddhi and Chipparupalle taluks of the Viṣākhapatnam district. A Sudra general named Buddhavarman, the founder of the Durjaya family, was appointed by Vishnuvardhana I as governor of a dis-

23 EI, XVIII, p. 260.
24 IA, XIX, p. 310.
25 See, however, Eastern Chālukyas, p. 63 for a suggestion that Kubja Vishnu means Vāmana.
26 EI, IX, p. 317; IA, XX, p. 15.
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district styled Giripachima or 'west of the hill'. This tract of land, comprising seventy-three villages, corresponds roughly to a part of the present Sattenapalle taluk of the Guntur district. A certain Atavardi Durjaya of the Matsya family figures as the ajañpti in the Chipurapalle plates. Ayyana-mahadevi, queen of Vishnu-vardhana, is known to have been the executrix of a grant in favour of a Jain temple at Bijavada, modern Vijayavada, in the Krishna district. The temple was perhaps built by the queen and named Nañumbibasadi. This is the earliest mention of Jainism in the Telugu country. It is thus clear that Vishnu-vardhana's dominion included the major part of the Visakhapatnam district in the north and extended to the Nellore district in the south.

Kalakampa of the Patthavardhini family, a general of Vishnu-vardhana I, is said to have killed a chief named Daddara and seized his insignia. The identity of the chief and of his territory are alike obscure. Vishnu-vardhana's rule lasted for eighteen years (624-41). He was followed on the throne by his son Jayasinha I (641-73) who had the title Sarvasiddhi, among others. The majority of grants give him a regnal period of thirty-three years, though some put it at thirty. Several grants of his reign are known, but little of his history. A ghatak, college of higher education, is said to have been functioning at Asanapuram whence he issued one of his grants. Like his father, Jayasinha was a Bhagavata. A stone inscription from Vippara dated in his eighth year counts among the earliest known Telugu inscriptions.

If Udayapura, from which Jayasinha issued the Pedda Maddali plates, is the same as Udayagiri in the Nellore district, the southern frontier of his kingdom must have extended beyond Mannuru and included the northern parts of the present Nellore district. His Mopuru grant mentions Mañga-yuvaraja, usually identified with the grandson of Indra-varmen and son of Vishnu-vardhana II, although it is not clear why Mañga was chosen as yuvaraja though his father and grandfather were alive and active.

27 214 of 1892; also El, VI, pp. 269-70.
28 AFR, 1916-17; Cp. 9 of 1916-17 and II. 21. The date (Svaddita) 8. 684 and the name of the ruler Vishnu-vardhana who renewed the original grant are not easy to reconcile.
29 SII, I., p. 40.
30 Eastern Chalukya chronology bristles with many minor problems, and the copiousness of astronomical data from the inscriptions and the regnal periods mentioned in them have given rise to many discussions which cannot be reviewed here. See N. Venkataramanayya, Eastern Chalukyas of Veñgi (Madras, 1950).
31 No. 147 of 1899 (SII, VI, No. 584).
32 IA, XIII, p. 137.
33 Cp. 9 of 1919-20.
Early in Jayasimha’s reign Pulakesin II of Badami was defeated and killed by the Pallavas of Kanchi who occupied the southern part of the Early Chalukya empire including the city of Badami. Chalukya authority was eventually restored by Vikramaditya I about A.D. 655. In these difficulties the Early Chalukyas do not appear to have received any help from their Eastern Chalukya relative.

Jayasimha’s successor was his brother Maharaja Indra-varman (also Indraraja and Indrabhattachakra) who bore the title Tyagadhenu (Cow of liberality). He is said to have ruled only for a week, although he may have enjoyed considerable administrative power during the later part of his elder brother’s rule. Indra-varman was succeeded by his son Vishnu-vardhana II. He had the titles makaradhvaja and vishamasiddhi like Vishnu-vardhana I, and pralaya-ditya in addition, and ruled for nine years (673-81). His son and successor Maungi yuvraja, also known as Vijayasiddhi, reigned for twenty-five years (681-705). Maungi had three sons Jayasimha II, Vishnu-vardhana III, and Kokkuli, and a daughter Prithivi Pori. Jayasimha II, who had the titles sarvasiddhi and niravadya, succeeded his father and reigned for thirteen years (705-17); his western Chalukyan contemporary Vijayaditya (696-733) also had the title niravadya. After Jayasimha II, there occurred the first succession dispute for the Eastern Chalukyan throne. Kokkuli, the younger of the two surviving stepbrothers, seized the kingdom and ruled it for six months. The only record of his reign calls him Kokkuli Vikramaditya Bhattarakka and gives him the title Vijayasiddhi, Kokkuli’s short reign came to an end when his elder brother Vishnu-vardhana III expelled him from the throne. Some writers believe that the quarrel ended in a compromise by which Kokkuli was allowed to rule in Madhyama-Kalinga with Elamanchili as his capital, and that his dynasty lasted for at least three generations after him during the reigns of his son Maungi Varma Maharaja, grandson Vinayaditya Varma Maharaja, and great-grandson Maharaja Anivarita.

After he had driven out the usurping younger brother, Vishnu-vardhana III enjoyed a long reign of thirty-seven years (718-54). He had the titles samasta-bhuvanashraya, tribhuvananka and vishamasiddhi. His chief queen Vijayamahadevi figures as the ajanapti in one of his grants. Another grant is made by the king’s sister Prithivi

34 EI, XVIII, p. 3.
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36 Cp. 10-12 of 1908-9. There is a difference of opinion as regards the genealogy of the Elamanchili line and its relation to the main line. See e.g. IIIQ, VIII, p. 777.
37 Cp. 9 of 1913-14.
Porī. According to some writers, one of the king’s subordinates, a Nishāda or Boya chieftain Prithivīvyağhra, came into conflict with the famous Pallava general Udayachandra when he attempted to seize the āsvamedha horse let loose by Nandi-varman II. But there is a controversy as regards the identity of Prithivīvyağhra, who is moreover believed by some to have been the performer of the āsvamedha referred to. Prithivīvyağhra sustained a defeat in battle and had to surrender large quantities of gold and pearls, besides several elephants. Some of Vishnu-vardhana’s territory was also annexed by the Pallava ruler on the occasion.

The successor of Vishnu-vardhana III was his son by Vijayamahādevī, Vijayādityā I (754-72) who bore the titles tribhuvanāṅkuśa, vijayasiddhi, sakti-varman and vikrama-Rāma. Early in his reign occurred the political revolution in Western Deccan by which the Rāshtrakūṭa Dantidurga put an end to the rule of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi and established the power of his own dynasty. The subsequent history of the Eastern Chālukyas is characterised by a long-drawn struggle with the Rāshtrakūṭas. Dantidurga’s uncle and successor Kṛishṇa I despatched a large army against Veṅgi under his son yuvarāja Govinda II; according to the Alas plates (A.D. 769), the Eastern Chālukya king (either Vijayāditya or his successor) met the invader in his camp at the confluence of the Musi and the Kṛishṇā rivers, and saved himself ‘by the cession of his treasury, his forces and his country’.

Vijayāditya I was succeeded by his son Vishnu-vardhana IV who ruled for thirty-six years (772-808). His vain attempt to retrieve his position by going to the aid of Govinda II in his war against his younger brother Dhrūva, the defeat inflicted on him by the successful Dhrūva and the peace he made with Dhrūva by offering him the hand of his daughter, Sīlmaḥādevī, have already been noted (p. 451). The subordinate relation of Veṅgi to the Rāshtrakūṭa power continued after the reign of Dhrūva under his son Govinda III, whose inscriptions affirm that the ruler of Veṅgi was ever ready to carry out his suzerain’s behests with alacrity.

Vishnu-vardhana IV had three sons. Two of these, Vijayāditya II and Bhīma Saluki, quarrelled over the succession, while the third, the son of a Haihaya princess and Rudra by name, took the side of Vijayāditya. Vijayāditya II, who is credited with a reign of forty years or more (808-47), was a great warrior who bore the titles

---
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40 EI, VI, pp. 202-12.
41 EI, VI, pp. 244-45, v. 19.
narendra-mirigaṇa (lion among kings), Chālukya-Rāma and vikramaḍhavala (of shining valour). But his reign was full of strife and contention. He resented the hold of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas over Veṅgi and they treated him as a rebel and set up his half-brother Bhīma Saluki as his rival. We have already seen (p. 456) how Bhīma Saluki contrived to rule over parts of the Veṅgi kingdom during the reign of Govinda III for about twelve years, the period during which Vijayāditya is said to have kept up a constant struggle against his enemies, and how in the early years of Govinda’s youthful successor Amoghavarsha I, Vijayāditya gained the upper hand, drove Bhīma Saluki out, and obtained successes against Rāṣṭrakūṭas. This round of hostilities was evidently concluded by a treaty of peace, and Vijayāditya’s son Kali Vishṇu-vardhana V, so called because of his addiction to war, who assisted his father in his wars, married a Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess Śilamahādevī, most probably a cousin of Amoghavarsha from the Lāṭa branch of his family.

Vijayāditya’s successor Vishṇu-vardhana V had the titles kali and viṣhāmasidēlī. He had a short reign of less than two years and was succeeded by Vijayāditya III, the son of Śilamahādevī, who ruled for forty-four years (848-92). He had a number of titles of which guṇaka, guṇaga, or guṇakenallāta (the lover of excellence or virtue), parachakra-Rāma (Rāma to the circle of his enemies), and vallabha are perhaps the most notable. He began his rule with an expedition against the Boya-Koṭṭams in the south. The Boyas were a race of hardy warriors who occupied the northern marches of the Pallava kingdom in the Nellore district, and offered stubborn resistance to the advance of the Chālukyas to the south. Though their country had become part of the Eastern Chālukya kingdom before the accession of Guṇaga Vijayāditya, their power was not completely broken, and the youth of the new monarch seems to have inspired them with fresh hope for their freedom. They were soon taught a lesson by Paṇḍaraṅga, the able general of Vijayāditya and son of Kaṭṭeyarāja who had also a distinguished record in war. The forts of Kaṭṭem and Nellore, where the rebels had gathered in strength, were taken; the former was dismantled and the latter reduced to ashes. Paṇḍaraṅga evidently reached the neighbourhood of the Pulicat lake where there is a village called Paṇḍaraṅgam with a shrine dedicated to Paṇḍaraṅgaśvara. Paṇḍaraṅga was made governor of the country he had subjugated with his headquarters at Kandukur, which is said to have been made as good as Vijayavāda. His descendants continued to rule

43 NDI, G., 86-105.
there for many years as shown by a grant of the time of Ammia II Vijayāditya.44 Pañḍaraṅga won another victory for his master against Rāhana, an enemy who remains only a name as no other reference to him has been found.

When Vijayāditya III sought to cross swords with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power, he met with a reverse. How the war started is not clear. But Vijayāditya seems to have been the aggressor. He laid waste the neighbourhood of Stāñbhapurī (modern Cumbum). The result was the battle of Vīṅgāvallī in which he suffered a serious reverse; he had to submit and acknowledge the suzerainty of Amoghavarsha during the rest of the latter's reign. The exact date of the battle of Vīṅgāvallī is not known, but it was fought before 860, probably round about 855.

We have seen that when Amoghavarsha was obliged by a rebellion in the north to recall his general Bāijkeśa before he had quelled the revolt of the Ganga Nītimārga and his ally the Nolamba Maṅgi, Vijayāditya undertook to complete the work begun by Bāijkeśa, and brought Nītimārga to obedience after destroying Maṅgi in battle. Vijayāditya's military adviser, the Brahmin Vinayaḍī Sarman, was present in the battle and appears to have had a prominent part in directing the operations which ended in the defeat and death of Maṅgi. After the death of Amoghavarsha (880), Vijayāditya III threw off the Rāṣṭrakūṭa yoke, and the attempt of Krīṣṇa II to regain power in Veṅgi ended in disaster. He was defeated in battle along with his brother-in-law Saṅkila, the Chedi prince. Then came the Eastern Chālukya expedition against Dāhala the Chedi country, led by Pañḍaraṅga, by way of Kalinga, Chakravatī and Kosala and the burning of Kiranaṇapura and Achalapura, followed by the submission of Krishna II and his temporary vassalage to the Eastern Chālukya. At the height of his glory, Gunaga Vijayāditya assumed the title tripura-martya-maheśvara, i.e. the human Maheśvara to the three cities, in token of his having burnt the cities of Kiranaṇapura, Achalapura and Nellūrapura.45 The title is calculated to recall the famous legend of Tripura-dahana by Śiva.

The closing years of Gunaga Vijayāditya's reign were uneventful. He was perhaps the greatest monarch of the Eastern Chālukya line. In Vinayāḍī Sarman and Pañḍaraṅga he had an adviser and a general, both Brāhmīns, of exceptional merit. He died in 891-2. He had no children, but a number of brothers of whom Vikramāditya, Nripakāma and Yuddhamalla are mentioned in inscriptions. The first, who had

44 Malayaṇpindī grant, EI, IX, p. 47.
45 ARE, 1914, II. 6.
been yuvāra for some time, died before Vijayāditya, and so his son Chālukya Bhima I succeeded Guṇaga. But the succession was disputed by his uncle Yuddhamalla who seems to have invoked the aid of Krishna II. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion was successful at first, and the Vēmulavāda ruler Baddega took Chālukya Bhīma captive. But Kusunmāyudha, an ally and feudatory of Bhīma, rallied the Chālukya forces, inflicted a defeat on the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and liberated Bhīma I who celebrated his coronation on April 14, A.D. 892 with Vishnu-vardhana as his abhisheka-nāma and ruled for thirty years. But neither Krishna II nor the dāyādas who had opposed his accession were inclined to leave him in peace, and there was a second Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion under Guṇḍayya who is said to have led an army of Kāṅṅātas and Lāṭas. At one of the many battles fought at places such as Niravadyapura (Niḍadavolu) and Paruvaṅguru (Pedavaṅguru), Chālukya Bhīma’s son Iritmartigāṇḍa fell after having killed Guṇḍayya and dispersed his forces. The remaining years of Bhīma’s reign were peaceful. He is described as having illuminated the Veṅgi country after it had suffered from the darkness of Rāṣṭrakūṭa occupation. He was devoted to the worship of Śiva and built the temples of Chālukya-Bhīmavaram and Drākshāramam in the East Godāvari district.46 He died in 922 leaving his kingdom to Vijayāditya IV, the eldest of his surviving sons.

Vijayāditya IV, called Kollabhigāṇḍa or the slayer of heroes, led an expedition against Kalinga, for reasons which are not clear, and lost his life in the hard fought battle at Virajā within six months of his accession.47 It is probable that the disaster that overtook Kollabhigāṇḍa was due to the revolt of his brother Vikramāditya II behind his back, which resulted in the defection of his forces from the field. Vikramāditya II, who came to the throne in 929-30, says that he took the kingdom from his enemies after fighting them in one hundred battles for eight years,48 and so he must have begun the struggle in his elder brother’s reign. An inscription of Amma I, son of Vijayāditya IV, also alludes to the desertion of the army of his father and grandfather and his alliance with his rebellious feudatory relatives.49

Amma I succeeded his father and ruled for seven years (922-29). He was a brave prince who successfully met the revolt of his uncle and other relatives and their intrigues with Indra III Rāṣṭrakūṭa. He owed his success in no small measure to the assistance of two old

46 EI, IV, p. 240; JTA, XI, p. 251.
47 IA, XIII, pp. 213-14.
48 EI, XXV, pp. 191 ff.
49 SII, I, p. 42.
officers who had served his father and grandfather. One of them was Mahākāla, the son of Gaumakāmbā, a foster-sister of Chālukya Bhīma I; the other Bhāṇḍanāditya also known as Kuntāditya, who had begun service under Vijayāditya IV.50 Whether these chiefs were loyal to Amma from the first or were won over from the rebels by the inducements offered to them remains doubtful. The donee of one of Amma’s records51 was Indaparāja, son of Raṭtiya and Govindakāmbā, and a grandson of Indaparāja of the Mahāraṭṭa family. Though he is described as the ‘lord of Mānyakheta’, his exact relation of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family or the circumstances which led him to seek service in the Eastern Chālukya court are not clear. The suggestion that he was a grandson of Indra III and a son of Amogha varsha II who took shelter at the Eastern Chālukya court when that king was overthrown by Govinda IV is not likely. Amma I had the title Rājamahendra; the city of Rājamahendravaram (Rajahmundry) was, however, not his foundation but that of a later king who bore the same title.

Amma I was succeeded by his young son Vijayāditya V, often called Bēta or Kāntihikā-Vijayāditya. A mere lad at his succession, Bēta was not fitted to rule the kingdom in that turbulent age. Within a fortnight of his coronation he was ousted from the throne and was compelled to take refuge in the fort of Piṭhāpura where he became the founder of a local dynasty.52 Tāla, son of Yuddhamalla I, seized the kingdom probably with the help of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. He was not, however, destined to rule long. Scarcely a month elapsed when Vikramāditya II, who had been waging war for the throne during the past eight years, attacked him and put him to death.53 Vikramāditya II was an energetic prince. During the brief period of eleven months (929-30) for which he ruled the kingdom, he recovered Trikalīnga which had been lost after the death of Chālukya Bhīma I.54 At the end of the eleven months he was killed, according to Digu-marru grant,55 the only record which alludes to the incident, by Bhīma II, a brother of Vijayāditya V. Bhīma II reigned for eight months after which he was killed in turn by Yuddhamalla II, son of Tāla I.

The success of Yuddhamalla II was in no small measure due to help from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda IV who took advantage of the

50 EI, V, p. 311 f; SII, I, p. 40.
51 Cp. 3 of 1923-24.
52 No. 492 of 1893 (IMP. Cod 65).
53 EI, XXV, p. 108; IX, p. 55.
54 SII, I, No. 37, p. 45.
55 IA, XIII, p. 214.
disorders in Veṅgi to bring the kingdom under his control by ostensibly espousing the cause of Yuddhamalla. Thus though Yuddhamalla was enabled to proclaim himself king, he had in fact very little real power. A large part of the kingdom was occupied by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa officers and nobles who paid no regard to his authority. Many of his relatives (dāyādas) who had designs upon the throne were still at large, hatching plots to compass his ruin. Though he managed to keep himself on the throne for nearly seven years, he enjoyed no peace. On the death of Vikramāditya II, according to one inscription,56 'the kinsmen princes who were desirous of the kingdom, viz., Yuddhamalla, Rājamārtanda, Kanṭhikā-Vijayāditya etc., were fighting for supremacy and oppressing subjects like Rākhasas.' The feudatory Sabara chiefs, the commanders of the Vallabha (i.e., the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king) and others, states another, 'apportioned the territory among themselves' and 'held it for seven years'.57

The country was rescued from this state of civil war and anarchy by Chālukya Bhīma II Rājamārtanda, a son of Vijayāditya IV by Meḷāṃbā, and a half-brother of Amma I. He was helped by the dynastic revolution in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire in which Govinda IV was deposed and Amoghavarsha II was enthroned. The Chālukyas of Vēmulavāḍa and Mudugonḍa rose against Govinda, and Chālukya Bhīma, making common cause with them, successfully rid the Veṅgi country of Yuddhamalla II and his Rāṣṭrakūṭa mercenaries. After liberating the country he celebrated his coronation in 935.58 Though he ruled for twelve years till 946, little is known of the events of his reign. Besides the references to his fights that preceded his coronation, he is said in one grant, to have slain a number of enemies,59 viz. 'the glorious Rājamāyya and Dhalaga, who excelled far and wide, and the fierce Tāta-Bikki, and Bijja who was always ready for war, and the excessively powerful Ayyapa, terrible and savage, and the extremely great army sent by Govinda, and Lova Bikki, the ruler of the Cholas, and the valorous Yuddhamalla—(all of them) possessed of marshalled arrays of elephants.' As the first and the last names in this list are those of claimants for the throne whom Chālukya Bhīma II disposed of, it seems probable that the other fights, including one with Govinda's 'great army', were all part of the campaign for the throne, and that no new events of the reign are recorded here. Chālukya Bhīma II married two wives—Ūṛjapā or Ankidevi

56 EJ, IX, p. 55.
57 ARE, 1917 II, 24.
58 EJ, XII, p. 249; IX, p. 47.
of the Eastern Gaṅga family, and Lokāmbā of unknown parentage; they presented him each with a son named Dānārṇava and Amma respectively.\textsuperscript{60}

Chālukya-Bhima II was succeeded by his younger son Amma II Vijayāditya. Dānārṇava apparently acquiesced in the supersession, though the reason for it is not clear. Just before his coronation Amma was attacked by Yuddhamalla II,\textsuperscript{61} but Amma repulsed him and became king (A.D. 945). A few years after his coronation he was attacked by Bādapa and Tāla II, sons of Yuddhamalla, with support from Rāśṭrakūṭa Krishna III. Amma had to save herself by flight, and Bādapa crowned himself king as Vijayāditya. The Eastern Chālukya records in the regular line are silent about Bādapa and Tāla II; but their own inscriptions\textsuperscript{62} leave no doubt that they ousted Amma and ruled as kings of Veṅgi, though the area and duration of their rule cannot be ascertained definitely.

Bādapa died in the fulness of his power and was succeeded by his younger brother Tāla II Vishṇu-vardhana. Tāla's rule came to an abrupt end by the return of Amma from exile. This was rendered possible by a change in the attitude of the nobles of the Veṅgi kingdom. They had perhaps some cause of dissatisfaction with Tāla II. Nṛipakāma of Kolanu, who had given one of his daughters in marriage to Amma,\textsuperscript{63} espoused his cause. Amma II returned and slew Tāla II in battle\textsuperscript{64} and regained possession of his kingdom (c. A.D. 955). But he soon became involved in another war with the Rāśtrakūṭas and found himself compelled once more to flee the country. Krishna III sent a strong force to back Dānārṇava, who was enthroned after the flight of Amma to Kaliṅga, perhaps Elamanchili.\textsuperscript{65} Dānārṇava is praised as a popular ruler, but Amma found it easy to displace him soon after the Rāśtrakūṭa forces withdrew from the country. Amma's chequered reign did not end in peace. The Penneru grant seems to suggest that Dānārṇava, who evidently never reconciled himself to the rule of his younger half-brother, once more started a movement against him with the help of Mallana and Goṇḍiva of the Mudugonda Chālukya line and others like Kānārṇava and Vinayāditya of Kaliṅga, and even Nṛipakāma himself; the result was that

\textsuperscript{60} JAHRS, XI, pp. 80-88; Cp. I of 1916-17.
\textsuperscript{61} Korumelli plates, IA, XIV, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{62} EI, XIX, pp. 137, 148; Cp. 6 of 1938-39.
\textsuperscript{63} Gundu grant—IA, XIII, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{64} Prabhupārvu plates, JTA, II, p. 408, where Amma is only called dāyāda, and not mentioned by name.
\textsuperscript{65} Cp. I of 1916-17.
Anma II was defeated and slain in battle (970) and Dānārṇava became king.

A late record of the time of Sakti-varman II (eleventh century) has been taken to imply that the two brothers, Dānārṇava and Amma II murdered each other's son; but the text of the record though corrupt does not lend support to this view. It seems only to state that of the two sons of Rājabhīma, that is, Dānārṇava and Amma II, the younger Amma ruled the kingdom for 25 years. Amma II patronised all religious sects including Jaines and Kālāmukhas.

Dānārṇava, who celebrated his coronation in Saka 892 (A.D. 970-71), had a short reign of about three years; but it was full of stirring incidents. He brought under his sway the Pottapi country extending across the Eastern Ghāts from Rājampet in Cuddapah district to Kālahasti in Chittoor district, and issued a grant from Pottapi conferring the region on the two princes of the Mudugonda Chālukya family who had assisted him in the war against Amma II. This area was, according to a copper plate bearing the date Saka 893 (A.D. 971), in the hand of Vaiduṇba Bhuvana Trinetrava at the time; another record of the same chieftain, found on the Cuddapah-Pushpağiri road, bears a date in the succeeding Saka year 894 (A.D. 972). The Vaiduṇbas were the feudatories of the Rāshtrakūtas, and Dānārṇava must have taken advantage of the weakening of the Rāshtrakūta power after Kṛishṇa III to attack and conquer the Vaiduṇba territory in his south-eastern frontier. This possibly brought Dānārṇava into conflict with the Cholas of the Tamil country who had by that time regained their power in Toṇḍaimandalam, and this may have furnished the occasion for Dānārṇava's son Sakti-varman I to distinguish himself in his boyhood (saiśavañ) in a battle with the Tamils (dramil-āhave). But Dānārṇava had to face a more formidable foe, the Telugu-Choda ruler Jata-Choda Bhīma, i.e. Bhīma, the son of Jata-Choda. Bhīma seems to have fought against the armies of Rāshtrakūta Kṛishṇa III as the youthful vassal of Amma II who had married his sister. He improved his position considerably after the death of Kṛishṇa III, and the success of Dānārṇava against
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72 Svabhaginipadom in his Kailāsanātha epigraph, EI, XXI, pp. 229 ff.
Amma II and the conquest of Pottapi must have galled him greatly. Bhīma therefore started a war against Dānārṇava, killed him in battle (973), and assumed the coveted title of the Veṅgi Chālukyas, viz. rājamakaradhvaja. His rule in Veṅgi possibly lasted twenty-seven years and has been described in Chapter XIV. This period is designated quite correctly as an interregnum in later Chālukya records, for no Chālukya king sat upon the throne of Veṅgi during the period. Dānārṇava’s sons Sakti-varman and Vimaladitya became refugees at the Chola court till the time came for their restoration to Veṅgi under the aegis of Rājarāja Chola.
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

KASHMIR

MANUMENTIAL WORK of Kalhana, the Rājatarangini, forms an invaluable source for the history of Kashmir, but we must endorse the observation of Stein that "it cannot be accepted as the basis of any critical account for the period preceding the seventh century A.D." The account and the chronology as given in Book III of the Rājatarangini are altogether untrustworthy, although some of the rulers mentioned in it are undoubtedly historical as confirmed by the numismatic evidence. Kalhana has assigned a period of 589 years, ten months and one day to the kings of Book III. By reducing the fabulously long reign of three hundred years assigned to Ranaditya to a normal length of twenty years, and making some other minor adjustments, the narrative in Book III may be utilised for preparing an account of the events which took place between c. A.D. 350 and 625. Kalhana's account of the restored Gonandas undoubtedly contains echoes of the Kushana and Huna regimes, although the sequence of happenings has been hopelessly disturbed owing to the vagueness of his sources of information regarding these remote events. From the seventh century onward, Kalhana's account becomes generally reliable.

1. THE PERIOD OF FOREIGN DOMINATION

1. Kushana rule (A.D. 300-50)

The Puranic accounts of the dynasties of the early fourth century A.D. speak of the Mlechchhas in Kashmir, the Indus valley and the Chandrabhagā. But as Mlechcha is a general term applied to various barbaric tribes which invaded India, it is difficult to say which particular foreign tribe was ruling in Kashmir according to the Puranas. It is well known, however, that Kashmir was included in the empire of Kanishka and Huvishka. It cannot be said how long the Imperial Kushanas continued to hold Kashmir, but

1 The text and the English translation of this work by Sir A. Stein are abbreviated in the following notes respectively as Raj. and Stein.
1a Stein, Intro, p. 69.
2 Pargiter, DKA, p. 55.
Kushāna influence certainly lingered on for a long time. The type of all the subsequent Kashmir coinage, without exception, is derived from the standard Kushāna type. It may be that Kashmir was a dependency of the Kushāna king of Kabul, who is known to have given his daughter in marriage to the Sassanian emperor Hormuzd II (A.D. 303-10). Shortly after this Kashmir was conquered by the Little Kushāna chief Kidāra.

2. The Little Kushānas (c. A.D. 350-515)

Kalhana tells us (II, 145)<sup>2a</sup> that a prince of Kashmir named Gopāditya had taken shelter with the king of Gandhāra who wanted to conquer Kashmir. Before the kingdom could be restored to him, Gopāditya seems to have died, leaving behind a son named Meghavāhana. We are further told that the people of Kashmir, headed by the ministers, invited Meghavāhana to rule over Kashmir (II, 151; III, 2). The numismatic evidence shows that the Little Kushāna chief, Kidāra, annexed Kashmir (c. A.D. 350).<sup>3</sup> In the light of the numismatic evidence, Kalhana’s narrative seems to indicate that for a time the Kushānas were compelled to leave Kashmir and retire to the valley of the Kabul, until Kidāra became strong enough to conquer Kashmir which he ruled through a representative. The retention of Kidāra’s name on the Kashmir coinage of the subsequent period, including even some of the issues of the Kārkotas, shows that he was a powerful ruler and was remembered long after.

Meghavāhana of the Rājataranginī was in all likelihood a foreigner as Kalhana says that he belonged to the same race as Trikoṭihantā, i.e. Mihirakula.<sup>4</sup> The extensive conquests which Kalhana attributes to Meghavāhana, including even an expedition to Ceylon, are purely imaginary, although this ruler in all probability is a historical personality. He and his queens built vihāras and stūpas including a monastery named anṛitaḥbhavana which still existed at the time of Ou-Kong’s visit in A.D. 759 and has left its name to the village of Ant-ba-van, a suburb of Śrīnagar. Meghavāhana was a devout Buddhist and is said to have prohibited the slaughter of all living beings even for sacrificial purposes.

The next king in Kalhana’s list is Śreshṭhasena, also called Pravarasena and Tuṅjina. He is said to have built a temple of Śiva at Purāṇādhisṭhāna—modern Pandrethan. He was succeeded by his elder son Hiranya, and the younger son Toramāna was made yuvarāja. Kalhana’s statement that Toramāna struck a large number

---

<sup>2a</sup> These figures within brackets refer to the canto and verse of Rājataranginī.

<sup>3</sup> Altekar, NHIP, VI, pp. 21-22. Rapson, Indian Coins, para 112.

<sup>4</sup> He and his successors are accordingly regarded as Hūnas in Ch. XXXII, § 1.
of coins and was imprisoned by his brother for this offence, is not convincing. As remarked by Stein, 'the very abundance of these coins appears to speak rather for their having been struck, by a powerful ruler than by an ill-fated pretender'. It is more likely that Toramāṇa forcibly ousted his brother and seized the throne. Quite unexpected developments outside Kashmir, however, brought the reign of Toramāṇa to an abrupt end. In Gandhāra the Little Kushānas suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Sassanian emperor Shapur III, and in the Panjab they were attacked about this very time by Chandragupta II who pressed on beyond the Indus. In a critical situation like this it must have become impossible for the Little Kushānas to retain their hold on Kashmir. Kalhana also tells us that Kashmir became kingless about this time and the people invited Vikramāditya to save them from anarchy (III, 242). In all probability this Vikramāditya is identical with Chandragupta II whose victory over the Kushānas must have enabled him to extend his sway over Kashmir. Mātrigupta, the poet, whom Vikramāditya sent to govern Kashmir, was enthusiastically welcomed by the people. He was a liberal donor and a great patron of learning. The poet Bhaṭṭarammahā, author of the lost poem Hayagrīvavadha, was richly rewarded by him. Mātrigupta is assigned a short reign of four years and nine months.

According to Kalhana, Pravarasena, son of Toramāṇa, returned from abroad, conquered Trigarta, and was marching towards Kashmir when Vikramāditya died. Mātrigupta, probably realising that resistance was futile, voluntarily abdicated in favour of the invader.

5 The Kashmir Toramāṇa, who is in all likelihood a Kushāna, should not be confused with his Hūna namesake. On the coins of the Kashmir Toramāṇa the titles Shāhi and Jānu-vla, characteristic of the Hūna king's coinage, are absent. Moreover, on the Kashmir coins appears a goddess holding a lotus while the Hūna coinage bears the Śaiva symbols—the trident and the bull. Finally the occurrence of the name Kīḍāra, on the coins of Kashmir Toramāṇa, distinguishes him definitely from the father of Mihirakula. But Dr. Altekar is inclined to identify the two (Ch. XXXII, §1).

6 See above, p. 115.

7 Whether this Mātrigupta is identical with Kālidāsa or not is difficult to determine. But as regards Vikramāditya, we may reasonably identify him with Chandra-gupta II of the Gupta dynasty. There is some error in Kalhana's account according to which Vikramāditya bore the second name of Harsha. The celebrated ruler Harṣavarmanā is not known to have borne the title of Vikramāditya, nor was Ujjain his capital. Moreover, Harsha flourished in the first half of the seventh century when Kashmir was ruled over by the Kāñkotas. Equally unsatisfactory is the suggestion of Hoernle that Vikramāditya is to be identified with Yasodharman. In his two inscriptions which describe him in detail, there is no mention of his title of Vikramāditya. Moreover, his capital was Daśāpura and not Ujjain.
and retired to Kāśi. Kalhana’s account of Pravarasena can both be amplified and checked with the help of other sources of information. The extensive conquests attributed to this monarch in the Rājata-rajagīti are evidently a conventional description in the manner of a Sanskrit mahākavya. It is impossible to believe that Pravarasena could have conquered Surāśṭra which at this time must have been held by the Imperial Guptas. Equally unacceptable is the statement that he helped Pratāpaśīla Śilāditya, son of Vikramāditya, to regain his lost kingdom. Stein is inclined to identify Pratāpaśīla with Śilāditya of Mo-la-po mentioned by Huan Tsang as having ruled sixty years before his time i.e. c. A.D. 580, but that would be too late a date for Pravarasena who must have flourished before the Hūṇa occupation of Kashmir (c. A.D. 530).

Pravarasena’s reign was quite eventful in another way. This king was a great builder and perhaps his fame in later times was due to the great architectural monuments of his reign. He founded a new city Pravarapura which Stein has identified with modern Śrīnagar still called Pravarapura ‘in Pañcit usage’. In the new city he built several temples, the most important being a shrine of Śiva called Pravaraśvara. The king’s maternal uncle built a stately monastery named Jayendra-vihāra and installed in it a colossal image of the Buddha. It was in this very monastery—the convent of Che-ye-to-lo—that the Chinese pilgrim Huan Tsang resided during his stay in Kashmir. In order to protect the capital from possible inundations of the river Vitastā, Pravarasena built a huge embankment (brihatsetu) which still exists and is called sutu. The rare specimens of the gold and silver coins bearing on the obverse the king’s name Pravarasena, and on the reverse a goddess holding a lotus and seated on a lion, and the legend Kidāra, written perpendicularly, belong in all probability to this monarch. After a long reign of sixty years, Pravarasena was succeeded by his son Yudhishṭhīra. No events of the latter’s reign are recorded except the building of a number of religious edifices by the king and his ministers.

3. The Hūṇas (c. A.D. 515 to 600)

The next ruler mentioned by Kalhana, Lakhaṇa Narendrāditya, is described by him as a son of Yudhishṭhīra. Here again there is need

---

8 It may be questioned how Pravarasena could possibly oust Mātri-gupta—a protégé of the Imperial Guptas. It is probable that Chandra-gupta II Vikramāditya had died and, due to the friction between Govinda-gupta and Kumāra-gupta, the Guptas were not in a position to interfere effectively in the affairs of Kashmir. But this is merely a conjecture.


10 Cunningham, CMI, p. 43
to correct Kalhana's narrative. As pointed out by Stein, Lahkhana is a thoroughly un-Indian name. On a silver coin of the Ephthalite type from Kashmir is found the legend Rāja Lahkhana Udyāditya. Another silver coin closely resembling the coin of Lahkhaṇa, and bearing the legend Deva Sāhi Kiṅgila, has also unmistakable affinity with the Ephthalite type of coinage. It would be quite reasonable to infer from the numismatic evidence that both these kings, whose coins have been discovered in Kashmir, belonged to the Hūṇa race. In the first book of the Rājatarangini, Kalhana has mentioned Mihirakula and Khiṅkhila Narendrāditya amongst the kings of Kashmir. From Kalhana's account of Mihirakula it may be easily inferred that he is describing the White Hūṇa tyrant, although the date assigned is hopelessly incorrect. Kashmir had probably passed into the hands of the Hūṇa's even before the time of Mihirakula. Writing about A.D. 520 the Chinese traveller Sung-Yun tells us that the Ye-tha, i.e. Hūṇa, ruler of Gandhāra 'entered on a war with the country of Kipin'. From the foregoing discussion it may be concluded that some time in the first quarter of the sixth century A.D. the Hūṇas entered Kashmir and Mihirakula, Lahkhana and Khiṅgila were amongst the notable Hūṇa rulers of this kingdom. The Hūṇa power in Kashmir seems to have been shattered by the attacks of the Maukharis of Kanauj (pp. 184-85) and the Pushyabhūtis of Thānesvar (pp. 241-42). Rājvarnahana's expedition against the Hūṇas mentioned in the Harsha-charita may be taken to have dealt the fatal blow to the Hūṇa rule in Kashmir at the beginning of the seventh century. The death of Prabhakara-varahana and the tragic events immediately following it diverted the attention of the Pushyabhūtis to more urgent tasks, and prevented them from interfering in the politics of Kashmir for the time being. But the fate of the Hūṇas had been sealed and they finally disappeared from Kashmir.

It seems that no definite information was available to Kalhana for the period immediately following the collapse of the Hūṇa power, and he has passed on to us legendary accounts mixed with some genuine historical tradition. Ranaḍitya, to whom Kalhana assigns a reign of three hundred years, appears like a king of the fairy land. However, he may be regarded as a historical king since other references to a temple of Ranaśvāmin are available. In any case it is impossible to accept the preposterous length of his reign which must

11 Cunningham, Later Indo-Scythians, pp. 97, 110; Plate VII, fig. ii., and Smith, CCIm.
12 NHIP, VI, p. 200.
be curtailed to a normal period. Vikramāditya and Bālāditya mentioned in the Rājataragini as successors of Raṇāditya, represent a reassertion of indigenous rule. Tradition seems to have preserved vague memories of the heroes who had fought for the liberation of Kashmir, and had consequently been given these illustrious titles. No events of Vikramāditya's reign have been recorded. About Bālāditya, Kalhana narrates an interesting but apparently fictitious story. The king, having been told by his astrologer, that his throne would pass to his son-in-law, married his daughter to a petty clerk in order to preclude any possibility of the transfer of royal fortune from his family to that of his daughter. But the poor clerk, by his intelligence and devoted service soon raised himself in the estimation of his royal father-in-law who bestowed on him both wealth and status, and after Bālāditya’s death got the throne. Shorn of romantic elements the story reveals the historical fact that an adventurous commoner, who had taken service at the court of Bālāditya, ultimately came to occupy the throne. This adventurous youth was Durlabha-vardhana, the founder of the Kārkotā family.

II. THE KĀRKOTĀ DYNASTY (C. A.D. 625-855)

According to Kalhana, Durlabha-vardhana was begotten by the Nāga Kārkotā and hence the dynasty founded by him was called Nāga or Kārkotā. This explanation of the name of the dynasty and the circumstances leading to its establishment, as described above, appear to be rather fanciful. Stein has rightly remarked that 'Kashmir tradition knew the founder of the historical Kārkotā dynasty as a man of humble origin, and the story of his miraculous descent was invented to explain the rise of its founder.' It is difficult to offer a definite explanation of his appellation. According to Sir Alexander Cunningham it arose from the special proclivity of this family for serpent worship. Of course, Kārkotā is mentioned in the Nilamata Purāṇa as one of the Kashmir Nāgas, and several places are associated with him. The Nāga Kārkotā might, therefore, have been the tutelary deity of the dynasty. Another possible explanation is that the dynasty has been named after the place of its origin. Kārkotanagar in Tonk District of Rajasthan was a flourishing settlement of the Mālav tribe. The influx of the Mālavas into Kashmir may be inferred from the fact that a person named Mālava figures as a minister of Bālāditya. Similarly Durlabha-vardhana may have taken service at the Kashmir court. While it is difficult to assert whether he really got

15 Ancient Geography of India, p. 106.
the throne as a result of his marriage and the extinction of the male line of the earlier dynasty, there can be no doubt that he was a capable ruler. He was the first historical monarch who laid the foundations of greater Kashmir. The dynasty which he founded ruled for more than two centuries, from c. A.D. 625 to 855 (see Appendix I). Kalhana tells us little about Durlabha-vardhana except that he built a temple of Vishnu and granted two villages to Brahmanas. But we may have some idea of his achievements from foreign sources. The Chinese pilgrim Hiuan Tsang, who visited Kashmir in A.D. 631, says that Takhashaïla, Uraśa (modern Hazara district), Simhapur (the present Salt Range) and the hill states of Rajapuri (Rajauri) and Parñotsa (Punch) were subject to Kashmir. It is not unlikely that these territories were conquered and brought under the suzerainty of Kashmir by Durlabha-vardhana. The southward expansion of Kashmir seems to have brought it into clash with Harsha-vardhana, the emperor of Kanauj, whose authority extended over Jalañdhara. Hiuan Tsang tells us that Harsha marched up to the frontier of Kashmir to demand the surrender of a sacred tooth of the Buddha which was buried in a stūpa near Purāñadhishthāna, the old capital of Kashmir. The incident took place some time before A.D. 643. Behind the apparently religious character of this move on the part of Harsha, there appears to have been a deeper political motive. It was impossible for Harsha to permit the ruler of Kashmir to extend his authority to the very frontier of his empire, and the demand for the relic must have served as a convenient excuse for the display of his military might.

Hiuan Tsang gives on the whole a favourable picture of the conditions prevailing in Kashmir. He was particularly impressed with the state of learning in the valley, and spent two years amongst the Kashmir savants, studying religious texts and holding discussions on points of religious doctrine.

In the Chinese annals also there is a probable reference to Durlabha. We are told that the Indian king Tu-la-pa was charged with having the envoys of Ki-Pin conveyed to their own country some time between A.D. 627 and 649. According to the chronology accepted by us, this period falls within the reign of Durlabha-vardhana.

The mixed metal coins bearing the legend Sri Durlabha on the obverse and jayati Kidāra on the reverse, belong to this monarch. Kalhana has assigned to Durlabha-vardhana a reign of 36 years which came to a close in A.D. 661.

17 HTB, i, pp. 136, 143, 147, 164. Hiuan Tsang says that Kashmir's suzerainty over Taxila was of recent date.
17a A Remusat, Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques, I, p. 212.
Durlabha- vardhana was succeeded by his son Durlabhaka, born of the queen Anaṅgalekhā. His more popular name was Pratāpāditya which figures on his coins. Pratāpāditya founded a town named Pratāpapura, modern Tāpar, situated between Baramula and Srinagar. Kalhana relates a romantic story of this king’s love and marriage with a lady named Narendraprabhā, the wife of a rich merchant. This queen gave birth to three sons Chandrāpīḍa Vajrāditya, Tārāpīḍa Udayāditya, and Muktāpīḍa Lalitāditya. Pratāpāditya enjoyed a long rule of fifty years. After his death, the throne passed on to his three sons in succession. The eldest, Chandrāpīḍa, ascended the throne in A.D. 711. He has been identified with king Tcheń-t’o-lo-pi-li who, according to the annals of the T’ang dynasty, sought the aid of the Chinese Emperor against the Arabs. We are further informed by the same source that in A.D. 720 the title of king was conferred upon him by the Chinese monarch. Chandrāpīḍa appears to have been a wise and capable ruler. Kalhana narrates two incidents (IV, 55-109) which demonstrate his great love for justice and a keen interest in the welfare of his subjects. The religious monuments attributed to him have not been traced so far. After a rule of eight years and eight months he was put to death through witchcraft by his brother Tārāpīḍa who then ascended the throne in A.D. 720.

After his accession to the throne, Tārāpīḍa began to oppress those very Brahmans through whose machinations he had become king; and is said to have fallen a victim to their witchcraft after a reign of four years and twenty-four days. In A.D. 724 Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa, the youngest son of Pratāpāditya, became king. His reign was marked by unprecedented military activity. Although the account of his conquests, as given in the Rājatarāṅgini, cannot be regarded as wholly true and reads like the conventional descriptions of Sanskrit epic poems, some of the events are undoubtedly historical.

The sovereignty of Kashmir over the northern Panjab from the Sindhu to the Chenab, testified to by Huan Tsang, seems to have been maintained by the successors of Durlabha- vardhana. Lalitāditya extended his sway further towards the south-east. Kalhana tells us that Jālandhara was ruled by his feudatory. The assertion of Lalitāditya’s authority over the plains between the Beas and the Sutlej as well as the hill tracts of Kāngra, which were included in Jālandhara,

18 Kalhana (Raj, IV, 8) says that this name was adopted by him in accordance with the usage of the family of his maternal grandfather since he had been declared by his mother to be the latter’s son. This was evidently an attempt to legitimise the new family. Cf. the note on the verse in the Eng. Translation by R. S. Pandit.

19 A. Remusat, Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques, I, p. 196.
was but a prelude to an attack upon the kingdom of Kanauj. We learn from Kalhana that Lalitaditya advanced to Gadhipurā (modern Kanauj), the capital of king Yaśo-varman, whose history will be related later in Ch. XXI. Although Yaśo-varman was a powerful king, he proved no match for the military genius of Lalitaditya who secured an easy victory. Yaśo-varman sought for an honourable peace; but as Lalitaditya’s minister in charge of Peace and War insisted on assigning a distinctly inferior status to Yaśo-varman, the negotiations fell through. In the resumed fighting, Yaśo-varman suffered a complete defeat and was deposed. Lalitaditya became the master not only of Yaśo-varman’s dominions proper, but of the entire Gangetic plain from the Yamunā to south-west Bengal.20 The rest of Kalhana’s account regarding the conquest of Kaliṅga, Karnaṭa, Koniṅa, Dvārakā, Avanti, etc. is not supported by any independent evidence and appears to be based on imagination.21

After the successful conclusion of the Gangetic campaign, Lalitaditya turned his attention to the north of Kashmir and conquered the Tuṅkhāras (Tukhāras), Bhauṭtas, and Darads. The Tukhāras occupied modern Bakhshān and the adjoining territory on the upper Oxus. Perhaps a Tukhāra named Chaṅkuṇa22 became Lalitaditya’s minister. The memory of this victory survived for a long time as Alberuni records ‘that the Kashmiris still celebrate the victory of Muttai, i.e. Muktāpīḍa over the Turks’. The Bhauṭtas are the Tibetans of Ladakh and the adjacent territory. The expedition against the Bhauṭtas was perhaps necessitated by the establishment of the powerful Tibetan empire and its growing spirit of aggression towards the west. The complete success of Lalitaditya’s expedition is indicated by the Chinese accounts of Muktāpīḍa’s embassy which told the

20 Kalhana clearly states that Yaśo-varman was entirely uprooted by Lalitaditya, Cf samālamudapātaya (Raj, IV, 140). However, it seems that he was not put to death as we are later on told that Yaśo-varman was reduced to the position of a panegyrist of Lalitaditya’s virtues (Raj, IV, 144). Kalhana puts the extent of the conquered territory between the Yamunā and Kālikā which I take to be the Kaṇśīki. The junction of the Kaṇśīki and Arunā (Arun) is known as Kālikāṣaṅgama. Stein, however, has identified it with Kālinadi which joins the Ganges a little below Kanauj. That the territories dependent on Kanauj, i.e. Magadha and Gauda, also must have come under Lalitaditya’s sway seems to be proved by the incident narrated in Raj, IV, 223-35 and the casual reference in IV, 359.

21 The description of Kalhana closely follows the model of Kālidāsa’s account of Raghu’s march, and in many verses the similarity is very close. Cf. Raj, IV, 155 with Raghu mansa. IV, p. 42.

22 Stein thought that Chaṅkuṇa was the Sanskritized form of a Turkish name. But Sylvain Lévi pointed out that the Sanskrit name is a transcription of a Chinese title Tsiang-kium meaning ‘general’, which had found its way into the Tukhāra country. See Stein’s note on Raj, IV, 211.
Chinese about the repeated victories of the king of Kashmir over the Tibetans.\textsuperscript{23} The Darads occupied the valley of the Kishangqâ, the Indus regions of Gilgit, Chilas and Bunji, and Chitral and Yasin beyond the Indus.\textsuperscript{23a}

Another notable military success of Lalitâditya was the victory over Mummuni whose armies were defeated thrice. Mummuni has been identified with the Caliph who bore the title of Amîr-ul-Mûmenîn.\textsuperscript{24} The clash between the Arabs and Kashmir is mentioned by the Muslim historian Balâdhuri who says that during the reign of the Abbasid Caliph Al-mansur his Governor of Sindh conquered Kashmir and took many prisoners of war. But Indian tradition handed down to Kalhana gave quite an opposite story, viz the Kashmirian monarch’s repeated triumphs over the Arabs. The reverses of the Arabs in India early in the reign of Lalitâditya are admitted by Balâdhuri himself.\textsuperscript{25}

Kalhana narrates with disapproval the treacherous murder of the king of Gauda by Lalitâditya, to which a detailed reference will be made in Ch. XXI. But it indirectly testifies to the suzerainty of Kashmir over Gauda.

Lalitâditya’s reign is memorable not only for the glorious conquests, but also for remarkable architectural activity and works of public utility. A scheme of irrigation was initiated at Chakradhara, modern Tsakdar, below Vijbror, where a series of water-wheels were constructed for drawing up the waters of the Vitasta to be distributed to the neighbouring villages. The emperor founded a new capital named Parihâsapura, modern Paraspur, 17 miles from Srinagar and three miles off the Srinagar-Baramula road. It was his ardent wish that the new city should eclipse in beauty the old capital, Pravarapura, and he spent lavishly on the new project. Two magnificent temples of Vishnu under the names Parihâsakeśava and Govardhanadhara, and a vihâra, surpassing in magnitude the great shrine of Mártanda, were built by the king. In the Vishnu temples images of the deities made of silver and gold, and in the vihâra a colossal copper image of the Buddha were installed at an enormous cost. His queens and ministers also built several temples and monasteries. Notable amongst these, was a large stûpa built by the Tokharian minister Chankuṇa. Unfortunately, these state edifices have not escaped the ravages of time and man; but the extensive remains at

\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Chavannes and Lévi, \textit{JA}, 1895, p. 382.
\textsuperscript{23a} Cf. Stein’s note on \textit{Raj}, I, 312-16.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{JA}, 1895, p. 382. Stein’s view on this point (Cf Stein, IV, 167, note) is not justified in view of the Arab historian Balâdhuri’s account of the Arab raids in India. Cf. R. C. Majumdar, ‘Arab Invasion of India’, \textit{JII}, X, Part I Supplement, pp. 40-43.
\textsuperscript{25} Cf. Ch. XIX below.
Paraspor fully bear out the statements of Kalhana, and the visitor to the site can conjure up the picture of the one-time splendid capital. Another architectural monument of exceptional beauty and grandeur was built by the king in honour of the sun-god at Matan (Mårtaṇḍa), five miles from Anantanāg. As remarked by Stein, the ruins of this temple 'command admiration both by their imposing dimensions and the beauty of their architectural design'. The king also built a monastery at Hushkapura which has been identified by Stein with the convent mentioned by Ou-Kong, the Chinese pilgrim, who reached Kashmir in A.D. 759. Kalhana mentions a number of townships founded by Lalitāditya, viz. Sunīśchitapura, Darpitapura, Phalapura, and Parṇotsa, but none of these places can be identified except the last which is modern Punch. But Parṇosta must have existed long before the time of Lalitāditya, as it has been mentioned by Hiuan Tsang.

It is a matter of surprise that no coins of Lalitāditya have been discovered so far.

In his old age Lalitāditya appears to have taken to drinking immoderately. Once in a state of intoxication he ordered his ministers to burn down Pravarapura. However, the clever and wise ministers satisfied the king's whim by setting fire to some distant hay-stacks and saved the city.

Lalitāditya had an insatiable ambition for conquest, and his armies were constantly on the move, even when he was advanced in years. It was probably during one of these foreign expeditions that he met his end. No definite information was available to Kalhana regarding the real cause of Lalitāditya's death, and conflicting stories had been handed down. According to one source the king is said to have died in a country named Āryānaka, through excessive snow, which fell out of season. Another story was that, placed in a critical situation he burnt himself to death to escape ignominy; and according to a third version, he perished along with his army in Uttarāpatha. It may be that he died fighting, probably against...

26 For an account of the archaeological remains at Paraspor see Stein, II, pp. 300-3. and R. C. Kak, Ancient Monuments of Kashmir.

27 Stein has translated Raj, IV, 369 as follows: 'In the belief of some, that ruler of the earth entered, along with his army, those regions in the farthest north which are of easy access to the immortals (alone). I would however interpret the verse differently. I take Uttarāpatha as referring to Central and Northern Panjāb (Cf Frīthādakāṭ-parata Uttarāpathah) where he was evidently fighting a war as is implied by Sakatahah. The sentence amaryasubhahāh bhūmim-prasītah only means 'ascend-e1 to the heaven' (lit. the land accessible to the immortals). In Sanskrit literature dying is often described as 'attaining the friendship of the gods', or 'becoming the guest of the gods'. See also Vishveshvaranand and Iconological Journal, rIII, 239-48.
the Arab armies advancing from Sindh. This would support the statement of Baládhuri, regarding the Arab victories over Kashmir.

Before his death Lalitāditya made certain arrangements to regulate the succession. He instructed the ministers that his eldest son Kuvalayāpiḍā should be his immediate successor. Next his second son Vajrāditya should be placed on the throne, and after the death of Vajrāditya, his youngest son Jayāpiḍā should be crowned king. Lalitāditya's judgment regarding the fitness of the various heirs to wield the sceptre was proved to be perfectly sound by subsequent history. Kalhana assigns a reign of thirty-six years and seven months to Lalitāditya and the end of his eventful reign may be placed in A.D. 761.

In accordance with the express wish of Lalitāditya, the minister Chanikunā proclaimed Kuvalayāpiḍā as king. At first Vajrāditya, the younger son of Lalitāditya, backed by a ministerial party, created trouble and claimed a share of the royal authority, but Kuvalayāpiḍā succeeded in ousting him. However, he soon felt disgusted at the fickleness of those ministers who had supported his younger brother, and after a brief rule of one year he voluntarily retired to a life of solitude and is said to have repaired to Naimishāranya. The throne vacated by him was now occupied by his younger brother Vajrāditya, also called Bappiyaka. He was sensuous, cruel and avaricious. He confiscated the endowments granted by his father to the religious institutions at Parihasapura. After a reign of seven years Bappiyaka died of consumption. He was succeeded by his son Prithivvāpiḍā who ruled for four years and was dethroned by his younger brother Saṅgrimāpiḍā who died after a reign of only seven days.

Vajrāditya's youngest son Jayāpiḍā Vinayāditya, who had been marked out as a competent successor by his grandfather, ascended the throne in A.D. 773. In Kalhana's account of the reign of Jayāpiḍā, fact and fiction have been mixed together and the latter predominates. But for the fact that definite historical data are available for Jayāpiḍā, one might be inclined to regard him as a mythical personality. Kalhana speaks of his expeditions against Bhīmasena, king of the eastern country, but such a king is otherwise unknown so far. Similarly his account of Aramūḍī, a ruler of Nepal, reads more like a romance than sober history.28 To the same category probably belong the descriptions of adventures in the land of the Amazons and against the Nāga Mahāpadma.

Credence may, however, be given to Kalhana's statement that Jayāpiḍā organized an expedition for conquest abroad, to emulate

the glorious achievements of his illustrious grandfather. He left Kashmir with a large army to win laurels in war. But misfortunes followed in his footsteps. As soon as his back was turned his brother-in-law (wife’s brother) Jajja raised a rebellion and usurped the throne. As this news reached the expeditionary force, the soldiers began to desert. Undeterred by these adversities Jayāpīḍa pressed forward and reached Prayāga. Here he dismissed the remaining forces and, eager for adventure, wandered forth all alone and reached Puṇḍra-vardhana the modern Rajshahi division in North Bengal. It is said that an encounter with a lion, in which Jayāpīḍa slew the animal, made a deep impression on the ruler, Jayanta29, who gave his daughter Kalyāṇadevī to the adventurous youth. Jayāpīḍa is said to have defeated the five Gauḍa chiefs and made his father-in-law a supreme ruler. He was soon joined by Mitraśarman, the son of his faithful minister Devaśarman. Having raised an army he marched back to Kashmir, defeating en route the ruler of Kanauj, who was in all probability Vajrāyudha. When he reached Kashmir, Jajja, the usurper, came out to oppose him. The two armies met at Sushkaletra, modern Hukhaliter, and a fierce battle raged for many days. Jajja was defeated and killed, and Jayāpīḍa regained possession of ancestral throne. To commemorate the victory, Jayāpīḍa’s queen Kalyāṇadevī founded a town named Kalyāṇapura which Stein has identified with Kalanpor.

What lends far greater interest to the account of Jayāpīḍa’s reign and endows his personality with a historical reality, is the remarkable literary activity of his time. Two of his ministers, Vāmana and Dāmodaragupta, were writers of repute. Vāmana is the author of the well known work on poetics—Kavyālaṁkārasūtra-vṛitti while Dāmodaragupta wrote the Kuṭṭānīṁita—a treatise on erotics. His court Paṇḍit Bhaṭṭa Udbhata wrote the Alankārasamāgraha, a treatise on poetics, of considerable merit. Jayāpīḍa is said to have evinced special interest in the study of the Mahābhāshya. He invited an erudite scholar named Kṣhīra and received instruction from him. According to Kashmir literary tradition, this Kṣhīra is the author of the well known commentary on the Anarakośa. Amongst the lesser lights of his literary entourage were Manoratha, Saṅkhadanta, Chataka and Sandhimat. The king’s liberal patronage of learning is said to have attracted to his court scholars from all parts of India.

Like his grandfather, Jayāpīḍa also, was greatly interested in raising

29 While V. A. Smith has doubted the historicity of Jayanta and dismissed Kalhana’s account as ‘purely imaginary’, others are inclined to identify him with Ādiśūra or Gopāla; see EHI, p. 387 and Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions Bengal, pp. 309, 393.
beautiful buildings. He invited skilled engineers from all over India to build a city on the marshy ground near the Wular Lake. The new town was named Jayapura. It has been identified with Andarkoth near Sambal. The ruins of these ancient buildings lie scattered over an island in the Sambal lake.

Jayâpiḍa had a second name Vinayâdityya. Coins of mixed metal bearing this name have been found in a large number all over Kashmir. 30

Acting on the evil advice of officers Jayâpiḍa imposed exorbitant taxes on the people. Kalhana tells us that for three successive years the entire produce of land was appropriated by the State. The lust for wealth grew so intense that he confiscated the grants made to Brahmins by previous kings. This led to a serious discontent amongst the priestly class and several Brahmins starved themselves to death in protest. While the king was engaged in a remonstration with a Brâmin, he received an injury which ultimately proved fatal.

Jayâpiḍa died in A.D. 804, after having reigned for thirty-one years. He had two sons both of whom ascended the throne, in succession.

The immediate successor of Jayâpiḍa was his son Lalitâpiḍa, born of the queen Durgâ. He was given to a highly sensuous life, and courtiers, parasites and buffoons were his friends. He took as a concubine, a lovely maiden named Jayâdevî, daughter of a spirit-distiller named Uppa. This marriage ultimately proved suicidal for the Kârkotâ dynasty. However, in spite of his licentious habits, Lalitâpiḍa was charitably disposed, and granted three villages to Brâmanas. He died after a rule of twelve years, A.D. 816, and was succeeded by his step-brother Saṅgrâmâpiḍa II Prîthivyâpiḍa, born of the queen Kalyâñâdevî, the daughter of Jayanta, king of Bengal. Of his reign of seven years no events have been recorded. He died in A.D. 823.

The throne now passed to Chippâṭa-Jayâpiḍa, son of Lalitâpiḍa and the low-born queen Jayâdevî, but as he was a mere child the real power was wielded henceforth by his material uncle Padma's Utpalaka, Kalyâna, Mamma, and Dharma. Utpalaka assumed all the five great posts of High Chamberlain (Mahâpratîhâra), Chief Minister of Foreign affairs (Mahâśândhivigrâha), the Chief Master of the Horse (Mahâśvasâla), the High Keeper of the Treasury (Mahâbhândagâra) and the Chief of the Army (?) (Mahâsâdhanabhâga). The other offices of state 31 were distributed among the remaining four brothers.

30 Cunningham, CMII, p. 45.

31 The five great offices were created by Lalitâdityya Muktâpiḍa. There were, besides these, the older posts of the heads of various departments. Cf. Raj, IV. 141, and Stein's note.
Whatever may be said against this usurpation of power, it has to be admitted that the Utpala brothers carried on the administration efficiently and preserved peace in the land. Men of letters continued to receive proper patronage of the State. The poet Rājānaka Ratnākara wrote his Haravijaya-Kāvya during the rule of Chippaṭa, also called Bṛhaspati.

As Chippaṭa grew in age, his uncles, faced with the probable loss of the monopoly of power they had so long enjoyed, conspired and killed their nephew. Kalhana places the event in the Laukika year 3889 (A.D. 813-14). But modern historical researches have shown that this date is impossible, and Chippaṭa’s death must have taken place more than twenty years later, in c. A.D. 835 (see Appendix).

Having removed Chippaṭa from their path the Utpala brothers got complete control over the disposal of the crown, and placed on the throne the princes of their choice. But the unlimited power which they wielded soon created a feeling of jealousy among themselves.

Utpalaka placed on the throne Ajitāpīḍa, a grandson of Vajrāditya Bappiyaka and a son of Tribhubanāpīḍa. Ajitāpīḍa had no authority and was only a puppet in the hands of Utpalaka. He received one-fifth of the state revenue for his maintenance, and the rest of the income was appropriated by the ministers. The ill-gotten riches however, were well spent on founding towns and building temples. Utpalaka built Utpalapura, modern Kākpor, Padma founded Padmapura, modern Pampar. They bestowed handsome gifts on Brāhmaṇas also. By their liberal expenditure of money, they won the good will of the people. But the mutual jealousies of the brothers had been steadily growing and ultimately culminated in an open conflict between Utpalaka and Mamma. In a fierce battle32 the forces of Utpalaka were routed and Ajitāpīḍa was dethroned in A.D. 850-51.

After dethroning Ajitāpīḍa, Mamma crowned Anaṅgāpīḍa, a son of Saṅgrāmāpīḍa. For three years Mamma wielded unlimited power as the minister of the titular king. He was overthrown by Utpalaka’s son Sukha-varman, who placed his own nominee Utpalāpīḍa, son of Ajitāpīḍa on the throne. His brief rule of two years was marked by the disintegration of the empire. The rulers of the dependencies like Parṇotsa and Dārvābhisāra threw off the yoke. The authority of Kashmir was now confined to the valley of Vītāṣṭa only.

The fortunes of the Kārkotās were waning rapidly. The minister Sukha-varman was himself aspiring to the royal position. His ambition remained unrealised as he was killed by a relative. Sūra, a

32 An account of this battle was given by the poet Saṅkuka in his poem Bhuvanā-bhuyudaya. Saṅkuka’s views on rasa have been quoted by Mammaṭa in the fourth ultāśa of the Kācyapurakāśa.
minister and a partisan of Sukha-varman, deposed Utpalāpiḍa and placed Sukha-varman's son Avanti-varman on the throne. Thus came to an end the line of the Kārkotās, after a rule of a little more than two centuries and a quarter.

III. THE LINE OF UTPALA (A.D. 855 to 939)

The coup d'etat of the minister Śūra, which put an end to the tottering Kārkotā dynasty, ushered in a period of strong and stable rule under the descendants of Uppa, the distiller, the father of Jayādevī, the concubine of Lalitāpiḍa. The new king, Avanti-varman, whom Śūra placed on the throne in A.D. 855-56, was the great-grandson of Uppa, grandson of Utpalaka, and son of Sukha-varman. While Avanti-varman treated Śūra with great respect, the latter served his master with unflinching devotion. Kalhana tells us how Śūra gave practical proof of his loyalty when he cut off the head of his favourite Dāmara, Dhanva, who had incurred the displeasure of Avanti-varman by misappropriating the villages granted to the temple of Bhūtesvara.

The first act of Avanti-varman after his accession was the distribution in charity of the entire wealth in the treasury. This was obviously designed to win public goodwill which undoubtedly he secured, in ample measure. Many of his collaterals (i.e. agnates), however, broke into revolt, but were defeated. In spite of it Avanti-varman treated his relatives with kindness, and appointed his half-brother Śūra-varman as yuvarmāṇa.

Having put down all opposition and established himself firmly, Avanti-varman inaugurated a programme of internal consolidation of his kingdom which had suffered badly by the political strife and was threatened with economic collapse on account of poor production. He eschewed all temptations of the glory of foreign conquests, and did not even attempt to assert his sovereignty over the adjacent states like Dārvābhīsāra which had become independent during the last days of the Kārkotās. The problem of food production was very acute; and required immediate attention. Frequent floods in the Vitastā resulted in damage to the rice crops and large tracts of land had become water-logged and hence unfit for cultivation. These were the main causes of scarcity.

Avanti-varman was fortunate in getting the services of a skilled and intelligent engineer Sūyya, and placed large funds at his disposal. Having carried out a survey of the whole course of the Vitastā, Sūyya discovered with remarkable ingenuity that the floods were caused by obstruction in the bed of the river. Experimental dredging was commenced at Yakshadara, about three miles below Baramula. It was
noticed that huge rocks had rolled down into the bed of the river and obstructed its current. As the rocks were cleared out, water flowed forth swiftly. The experiment being successful, Suyya proceeded with his plans. A dam was thrown across the river and the dried-up bed was thoroughly cleared. Stone walls were constructed along the banks to prevent any further rolling down of the rocks. The river now flowed unobstructed, and villages along its course were relieved of floods. 'Wherever inundation-breaches were known to have occurred new beds were constructed' (v. 95). Suyya next took up the work of reclaiming extensive tracts of land in the neighbourhood of Parihāsapura. The Vitastā, which used to flow to the south of Trigrāmi, quite close to Parihāsapura, was diverted to the north, and its confluence with the Sindhu was shifted from the vicinity of Trigrāmi to its present position near Shadipur. The course of the united streams from the confluence up to the Volur lake was further controlled by constructing stone embankments for a distance of 45 miles and the danger of flood owing to any overflow of the rivers or the lake was altogether removed. On the land thus reclaimed numerous villages grew up. As these were protected by special dykes of a circular shape they were called Kūndalaš.

Another step taken towards increasing production was the provision of irrigation facilities. Suyya carried out researches in the soil in order to determine the water requirements of various types of land, and arranged, on a permanent basis, the size and distribution of the water-courses for each village, by harnessing the waters of the various streams. As a result of Suyya's drainage and irrigation schemes, scarcity was converted into plenty, and the price of rice, the staple food of the people of Kashmir, was reduced to less than one-fifth of its previous price even in normal times. The name of this great benefactor of Kashmir is preserved in the modern town of Sopor (Suyyapura), which he founded at the point where the Jhelum leaves the Wular.

The economic prosperity, combined with political tranquillity, created conditions favourable for progress in art and literature, and there was marked activity in both these spheres. Amongst the notable writers in Sanskrit literature who received Avanti-varman's patronage we can count the famous literary critic Ānanda-vardhana, the author of Dhvanyāloka, Sivasyāmin, the writer of the Buddhist epic poem Kapphinābhīyudaya, Rājānaka Ratnākara, who had finished his Haravijaya-kāvyā during the reign of Bṛhaspati, and the poet Muktākāna.

33 The names of villages Utsakunda and Marakunda, situated on the left bank of the Vitastā, bear testimony to the truth of Kalhaṇa's statement (Stein, IV, 106, note).
Avanti-varman founded a new city, named Avantipura, modern Vantipur, 8 miles from Srinagar. The chief edifices of the new city were a temple of Vishnu-Avantisvamin, and another of Siva-Avantisvara. His minister Sūra built the town of Sūrapura, modern Hurapur, a watch station on one of the passes in the Pir Pantsal range. Kalhana records several other benefactions by the king and his nobles. Avanti-varman’s reign was the golden age in the history of Kashmir, and one may readily agree with Kalhana’s opinion that Avanti-varman had brought back the krita age (v. 122).

Avanti-varman died in A.D. 883 at the temple of Jyeshtēśvara, listening to a recitation of the Bhāgaradgītā. Before he breathed his last he told his minister Sūra, that he had been a devout Vaishnava throughout his life, though, out of regard for his minister’s feelings, he had professed to be a Saiva.

Avanti-varman left a son named Saṅkara-varman, but the succession was contested by his younger uncle Samara-varman, and his cousin Sukha-varman, son of Sūra-varman, another brother of Avanti-varman. However, the power and influence of the chamberlain Ratnavardhana secured the throne for Saṅkara-varman. Sukha-varman who was backed up by another minister, Kannapa, was made yuvarāja. The compromise, however, did not work smoothly. There was a constant tussle between the king and the yuvarāja, which ultimately culminated in open hostility. In the war that followed Saṅkara-varman overthrew both the yuvarāja and Samara-varman.

Having put down the rebellious elements at home, Saṅkara-varman set out for conquests abroad. With a huge force (more than ten lakhs according to Kalhana), he crossed ‘the gate’, one of the passes in the Pir Pantsal range, and descended upon the kingdom of Dārvābhīsāra. Its ruler, Naravāhana did not offer resistance and fled away. Some-

34 For the archaeological remains of Avantipura, see
(a) Sein’s note on V, 45-46, Eng. trans. I.
(b) D. R. Sahní, ASIAR, 1912.
(c) R. C. Kak, Ancient Monuments of Kashmir, pp. 118-125.

35 K. M. Munshi takes the word Pratihāra occurring in Raj, V, 128, as a dynastic appellation and not the name of an Office (Chamberlain). According to him, Ratnavardhana was a member of the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty of Kanauj (vide Imperial Gurjaras, p. 86). But this view is hardly tenable. That Ratnavardhana was a minister is clearly stated in Raj, V, 163. Moreover, had Saṅkara-varman owed his throne to the Pratihāra intervention, his attitude towards the Gurjara protégés in the Panjāb would have been different. We cannot expect him to interfere with the sovereignty of the power to the successful intervention of which he owed his throne.

36 The name of the ruler is given in v. 209. Kalhana tells us that Saṅkara-varman treacherously murdered Naravāhana, when he was living at the Kashmir court.
where in this region Saṅkara-varman defeated and captured a certain Harigana who appears to have been the ruler of a small principality dependent on Dārvābhīsāra.

The ruler of Trigarta (Kangra), Prithivichandra, is said to have come out to pay homage to the invader, but being apprehensive of maltreatment, he retired to a place of safety. Kalhana does not tell us whether Saṅkara-varman took any steps to punish the recalcitrant ruler of the hills. His silence indicates that in all probability the Kashmirian invader did not pursue the matter as his hands were full.

The main target of his attack was Alakhāna,37 the king of Gūjara, whose authority extended over the Panjāb plains immediately to the south of Dārvābhīsāra, and extended from the river Jhelum up to the Ravi. Alakhāna gave battle, but was defeated, and had to cede the Takka region, i.e. the territory between the Chenab and the Ravi comprising the modern districts of Gujranwala and Sialkot.

The historical reference in the statement of Kalhana that he caused the sovereign power, which the emperor Bhoja had taken away, to be conferred on the scion of the Thakkiya family who had taken up service as a chamberlain (v. 151), does not admit of a clear interpretation. The adhirāja Bhoja is undoubtedly the Pratihāra monarch of Kanauj whose sovereignty extended over the Southern Panjāb. But it is difficult to ascertain in which part of the Panjāb the Pratihāras were compelled to give up their claim to sovereignty, unless it may be the Takka country which Alakhāna had ceded. This point will be further discussed in Ch. XXII.

We are informed by Kalhana that Saṅkara-varman desired to subdue, Alakhāna’s supporter, Lalliyā Shahi,38 the powerful ruler of Udabhānda but was not successful in his design. Saṅkara-varman’s failure to subdue the Shahi is indicated by the following words of Kalhana: ‘The illustrious Lalliyā Shahi was not received into service by (Saṅkara-varman) who desired to remove him from his sovereign position’. After these exploits Saṅkara-varman returned to Kashmir. His military expedition had met with only partial success.

Saṅkara-varman founded a city named after himself, but subsequently known simply as Pattana, modern Patan, 17 miles below Śrīnagar. In order to beautify the new city, Saṅkara-varman removed

---

37 The name is undoubtedly foreign, but it is certainly non-Muslim. Names ending in Khan were borne by the Mongol Chiefs in the medieval age, for example Hulaku Khan and Chingiz Khan, who were not Muslims. The view of K. M. Munshi, that Alakhāna was a Viceroy of Bhoja Adivarāha, lacks positive evidence.

38 For Lalliyā Shahi, Cf. Ch. XXVI, Section IV.
from Parihāsapura ‘whatever was of value’. The notable monuments in Pattana were a pair of temples of Śiva, one named after the king and the other after his queen Sugandhā. The minister Ratna-vardhana also built a temple of Śiva.

Śaṅkara-varman had become addicted to vices, and this was a further drain on the treasury which had already been depleted by foreign wars. The king adopted unscrupulous ways for replenishing the treasury and resorted to oppressive taxation. The temples were the first victims of the avarice of the king, who did not hesitate to adopt even fraudulent methods. Sixty-four of these sacred institutions were plundered through officers appointed to supervise the spoliation. The endowments of others were taken over on fixed compensation to be paid from the income of their endowments. Taxes were imposed on the sale of materials of worship at the temples. Śaṅkara-varman introduced the accursed practice of exacting forced labour for purposes of transport. The slightest dereliction in this respect was punished with the heaviest fines. The villagers were further required to contribute towards the monthly salaries of the village officials, and two new departments of taxation were created. Kalhaṇa records with indignation that the people were groaning under the iron heel of the revenue collectors. The only voice of protest against this tyrannous rapacity was raised by the young prince Gopāla-varman, the heir to the throne; but it had no effect on the king’s mind.

According to Kalhaṇa, Śaṅkara-varman was not a man of culture or taste. He liked the company of buffoons instead of scholars and poets, and spoke apabhrāṃśa to the exclusion of Sanskrit. He did not patronise learned men, and brilliant writers like Bhallaṭa had to pass their days in poverty.

The last days of Śaṅkara-varman’s reign were quite unhappy. Twenty or thirty of his children died, and there was trouble on the frontiers. His dvārādhīpa (Warden of the Marches) was murdered at Virāṇaka, a frontier post below Baramula. The king marched out to punish the miscreants and Virāṇaka was destroyed. Śaṅkara-varman proceeded further up the river Indus, and reduced the hilly tracts along its course. While returning from this expedition through Uraśā (modern Hazara district), the king was involved in a skirmish with the people of the hills, and was fatally wounded by an arrow discharged by a śvapāka (a chaṇḍāla) and lost his life in A.D. 902. The ministers kept the king’s death a closely guarded secret, until the army had safely reached Bolyāsaka, modern Bulias, on the right bank of the Vitastā. The king’s funeral rites were performed at this frontier.
town. Before his death he entrusted his son Gopāla-varman to the care of his favourite queen Sugandhā and the ministers.39 Copper coins of Saṅkara-varman, of the usual Kushāṇa type—standing king on the obverse and a seated goddess on the reverse—are commonly found in Kashmir, and from this time onward we have an uninterrupted series of the Kashmir, coinage up to the close of our period.

In A.D. 902 Saṅkara-varman’s minor son Gopāla-varman was proclaimed king under the regency of Sugandhā. The widowed queen developed intimacy with the minister Prabhākaradeva who was put in charge of the treasury. He invaded the Śāhi kingdom of Udabhānda, and having deposed the reigning monarch, placed Toramāna, son of Lalliya, on the throne. Kalhana does not mention the name of the deposed Śāhi ruler. According to Stein, he was, in all likelihood, Sāmantadeva. After this success, Prabhākaradeva’s power and influence were still further enhanced. The young king now felt it imperative to place some check on the minister, and asked him to render accounts of the treasury which was getting empty. Prabhākaradeva offered the false excuse that the money had been spent on the expedition against the Śāhi. Ultimately, the exasperated minister contrived to kill the king by foul means in A.D. 904. Copper coins of Gopāla-varman have been found.

Gopāla-varman having died issueless Saṅkaṭa-varman, another son of Saṅkara-varman, whose royal descent was, however, questionable, was proclaimed king. He died after ten days.

As there was no other male descendant in the direct line of Avanti-varman, Sugandhā herself assumed control of the adminis-
tration. This period witnessed the rise of powerful factions which dominated the politics of Kashmir for a long time. Tantrins, a body of foot-soldiers, had formed a strong union and were in a position to make or unmake kings. Another influential organisation was that of the Ekāṅgas—a body of soldiers performing the duties of royal bodyguards.\footnote{For details see Stein's note on Raj, V, 248-49.}

Sugandhā had pinned her hope on a male heir being born to the widow of Gopāla-varman, but the child died soon after its birth. She now attempted to place one of her own relatives on the throne, but did not succeed in her design. With the support of the Ekāṅgas, and the goodwill of the Tantrins, she managed to rule for two years (904-6).

A further attempt of the queen to regulate the succession resulted in her own fall. She convened a meeting of the ministers, feudatories, Tantrins and the Ekāṅgas, and proposed to crown Nirjita-varman, nicknamed Paṅgu, a grandson of Avanti-varman’s half-brother Sūra-varman. The Tantrins opposed this arrangement, and compelled the queen to relinquish her authority. Deserted by her followers, she considered resistance futile and retired to Hushkapura. The Tantrins crowned Pārtha, the ten-year old son of Paṅgu, under the regency of his father. For the next fifteen years (A.D. 906-21), the Tantrins held virtual control of the administration.

In A.D. 914 the Ekāṅgas made an attempt to restore Sugandhā. But the Tantrins were determined to keep her out. They inflicted a defeat on the Ekāṅgas as they were on their way to the capital. Sugandhā was captured and died in prison.

Pārtha was only a titular ruler. The Tantrins wielded real power, and the king was at their mercy. The administration became thoroughly corrupt, and the ministers and the officers were busy plundering the state. To add to the misery of the unfortunate subjects, a disastrous flood destroyed the entire autumn crop in A.D. 917, and there was a terrible famine. The price of rice which had come down to 36 dinārs in the reign of Avanti-varman, rose to 1,000 dinars per khari. While the people were dying in thousands for want of food, the ministers and the Tantrins amassed wealth by selling their accumulated stores at fabulous prices.

The life in the palace was scandalous. The wives of Paṅgu, the regent, developed illicit intimacy with the youthful minister Sugandhāditya, in order to secure the throne for their respective
offspring Paṅgu himself was intriguing against his own son and paid rich bribes to the Tantrins. In A.D. 921, the Tantrins dethroned Pārtha, and crowned Paṅgu as king.

After a reign of two years (A.D. 921-23) Paṅgu died. Before his death he had anointed his infant son Chakra-varman born of the queen Bappaṭaḍevi. An attempt on the part of the Tantrins to bring back Pārtha failed, as they were defeated by the Ekāṅgas. Chakra-varman retained the crown for ten years, A.D. 923-33. In A.D. 933-34 he was dethroned by the Tantrins who put Śūra-varman (I), a son of Paṅgu born from Mṛgāvatī, on the throne. Śūra-varman, too, was dethroned after a year, as he could not meet the exorbitant demands of the Tantrins.

The Tantrins now restored Pārtha, who enjoyed the kingdom for one year (A.D. 934-35) mainly through the cleverness of his mistress Sāṁbavati who kept the Tantrins conciliated.

In A.D. 935, Chakra-varman once again became king by offering rich presents to the Tantrins. But before the year was out, Chakra-varman, being unable to meet the demands of the Tantrins, fled to Maḍavarājya (Maraz).

The Tantrins now raised the minister Saṁbhu-vardhana to the throne. The exiled monarch Chakra-varman sought the assistance of a powerful Dāmara, Saingrama, and collecting a host of fierce Dāmaras, marched on the capital. In the spring of A.D. 936 a terrible battle was fought near Padmapura, modern Pamparpur, between the Dāmaras and the Tantrins, in which Chakra-varman displayed great valour. He spurred on his steed and slew the Tantrin leader Saṅkara-vardhana. At the death of their leader the Tantrins lost courage and fled. They were pursued and killed in thousands. Saṁbhu-vardhana was taken prisoner and beheaded.

Chakra-varman became king for the third time in A.D. 936. However, he did not make a good use of the power which this victory had placed into his hands. He fell on evil ways and became infatuated with the charms of two dancing girls, Hāṁśi and Nāgalatā, born in the untouchable caste of the Dombas. Hāṁśi was made the chief queen. The low-born relatives of the queen were appointed to high

41 Dāmaras were a class of powerful and turbulent landed aristocracy. We hear of them first in the reign of Avantivarman (p. 539). Gradually they gained more and more power, and by the time of Queen Diddā they had become a potential source of danger. For further details see Stein, (Eng. trans) II, note 6, pp. 304-8. B. P. Mazumdar, PIHC IX, pp. 191-99.
administrative offices and received rich gifts from the king. Kalhana narrates an amusing incident regarding Raiga, the father of these girls, who was granted a village. He went to the officer-in-charge of grants and haughtily reprimanded him for delay in preparing the charters. This state of affairs roused the indignation of the Dhāmaras, as the king now showed scant courtesy to them and even got some of them treacherously murdered. One night in the summer of A.D. 937 some rebellious Dhāmaras entered the palace and killed Chakra-varman.

The ministers now anointed Unmattāvanti, sôn of Pārtha. By acts of wanton cruelty and perverted taste, the ruler proved that he was really true to his name. Persons who were experts in clown’s tricks became his ministers. Parva-gupta, who danced in the royal assembly with his loin-cloth taken off, was most dear to the king. At the instigation of this wicked minister, who was aspiring to the throne, Unmattāvanti exterminated the royal line. He put his infant brothers into prison and caused their death by slow starvation. He confiscated the entire property of his father Pārtha and set assassins upon him. While Pārtha was passing his days in the Javendra-vihāra, the Ekāṅgas. Tantrins, feudatories and ministers, at the king’s behest, attacked and killed him. The land was spared further misfortunes, as Unmattāvanti died of consumption in A.D. 939. Before his death, Unmattāvanti had crowned his supposititious sôn Śūra-varman (II) and entrusted him to the care of the ministers, sāmantas, Tantrins and Ekāṅgas. On hearing of the king’s death, the commander-in-chief (Kampanādhījñā) Kamala-vardhana, who was staying in Maḍava-rājya, marched on the capital, defeated the Ekāṅgas and the Tantrins, and entered the palace, and put an end to the rule of the Utpala dynasty.

IV. THE HOUSE OF VIRADEV (939-49)

Although Kamala-vardhana was in a position to occupy the vacant throne, he preferred to leave it to the Brāhmins to select a suitable ruler for the land, thinking that their choice would eventually fall on him. The Brāhmins debated the matter for several days, and ultimately decided to offer the crown to Yaṣaskaradeva, a Brāhmin famous for learning and eloquence. This is almost a unique event in the recorded history of India.

Yaṣaskaradeva’s great-grandfather Viradeva was a commoner from the village named Piśāchakapura. His grandfather Kāmadeva had served as a tutor to the sons of Meru-vardhana, a minister of Pārtha, and had subsequently risen to the position of a treasurer. His father
Prabhākaradeva wielded great authority as the treasurer of Śaṅkara-
varman. On the rise of the Tantrins he had been ousted from power
and since then the family had been reduced to rather straitened
circumstances, so much so that Yaśaskaradeva had to leave Kashmir
in search of livelihood. He had just returned from abroad with a
reputation for great learning and was elected by the Brāhmīns to
occupy the vacant throne.

Yaśaskaradeva proved a happy choice. He firmly put down all
turbulent elements and established peace and order in the country.
He was charitable. He established a lodging for students coming to
Kashmir from Āryadesa; and granted fifty-five villages to Brāhmīns.
He was remembered long afterwards for his keenness to do justice.
But even this good ruler had some weakness. He was passionately
attached to a courtesan, Lalla, who proved unfaithful. Kalhana
further censures him for conniving at the love intrigue between some
of his queens and a governor.

When Yaśaskara became seriously ill he nominated Varnaṭa, son
of his paternal grand-uncle Rāmādeva, to succeed him and passed
over his own infant son Saṅgrāmādeva as he did not believe that
he was really his son. But Varnaṭa offended the king by his indiffer-
ence and the minister Parva-gupta induced Yaśaskaradeva to bestow
the crown on Saṅgrāmādeva. The king now retired to the matha
he had established for the students, where he died in A.D. 948.

Saṅgrāmādeva, nicknamed Vakrāṅghri (crooked foot), was installed
on the throne under the guardianship of his grandmother and a
council of five ministers. But Parva-gupta, who had an eye on the
throne since the days of Unmattāvanti, ousted all others including
the king’s grandmother and established himself in the palace as the
sole master. He pretended to be greatly devoted to the infant king,
but was only looking for an opportune moment to overthrow him.
On a wintry night in the year A.D. 949, during a heavy snowfall
when the people were keeping indoors, he surrounded the palace
with his troops. After slaying the faithful minister Rāma-vardhana,
he killed Saṅgrāmādeva and threw his dead body into the river.
The ministers, Ekaṅgas, and Tantrins were all afraid of Parva-gupta
and there was no opposition to his accession. The shortlived house
of Viradeva thus gave place to another ministerial family.

V. THE HOUSE OF ABHINAVA (A.D. 949-1003)

Parva-gupta, who thus usurped the throne, was the grandson of a
clerk named Abhinava, and son of Saṅgrāma-gupta, of whom nothing
is known.
Parva-gupta enjoyed the ill-gotten throne only for a year and a half. During this period he oppressed the subjects by imposing heavy taxes. He died in A.D. 950, and was succeeded by his son Kshema-gupta.

Kshema-gupta was a young man of most dissolute character and led a life of reckless indulgence in wine, women, and dice. The only recorded event of his reign is the destruction of the ancient Buddhist monastery called Jayendra-vihāra.42 A Dāmara named Saṅgrāma, who had incurred the king’s displeasure, had taken shelter in this monastery, and in order to kill him, the monastery was burnt down by the king’s orders.

Kshema-gupta’s marriage with Diddā, daughter of Simharāja, ruler of Lohara,43 forms a landmark in the history of Kashmir. As a result of this matrimonial alliance the rule of Kashmir eventually passed into the hands of the Lohara rulers who held it for about two centuries. Kshema-gupta’s extreme fondness for his queen has been commemorated by means of coins44 which bear her name besides his own. Kalhaṇa also tells us that the king got the humiliating appellation of Diddākshema. Another queen of Kshema-gupta was Chandralekhā, daughter of Phalgunā, ‘the lord of the Gate’.

In A.D. 958 Kshema-gupta died of the fatal disease lūtā which he contracted during a jackal hunt, and his infant son Abhimanyu was proclaimed king under the regency of his mother Diddā. The history of Kashmir for the next half a century is the history of Diddā’s capricious likes and dislikes of her ministers, and frequent rebellions sponsored by the dislodged councillors. Phalgunā, who was originally ‘the lord of the Gate’, had risen to the position of Chief Minister during the lifetime of Kshema-gupta. Diddā was jealous of him because of his daughter Chandralekhā’s marriage with Kshema-gupta. An evil-minded courtier named Rakka, further poisoned the queen’s mind by the insinuation that Phalgunā was himself aspiring to the throne. Apprehending maltreatment from the queen, Phalgunā left the capital and repaired to Varāhakshetra

The queen, who was ever alert, discovered that Mahiman and Pāṭala, the sons of Parva-gupta’s daughters, who had been brought

42 This monastery had been built during the reign of Pravarasena, see p. 527 above. The Chinese pilgrim Hsuan Tsang stayed here.
43 It has been identified with the Loharin Valley.
44 Copper-coins bearing the letters ‘di Kshema’ are very common. Cf. CMI, p. 45, Plate IV.
up in the royal palace; were conspiring for the throne, and turned them out. Mahimman raised a revolt with the support of the Brāhmins of Lalitādityapura and marched on the capital. Diddā, however, proved too clever for the rebels, and caused a split in their ranks by bribing the Brāhmin supporters. The rebellion fizzled out, and Mahimman was put to death. One of the rebel leaders, Yaśodāhara who had joined the queen, was appointed commander-in-chief.

Yaśodāhara led an expedition against Shāhi Thakkana, the ruler of some neighbouring hill state, and after defeating him restored him to the throne on his undertaking to pay tribute. The wicked Rakka instigated the queen against the commander-in-chief by telling her that he had taken a huge bribe from the Shāhi. Yaśodāhara lost the queen’s confidence and she sent her men to banish him. The partisans of the commander-in-chief revolted, and even some of the royal troops went over to the rebels. The queen was besieged in the palace, but the rebels did not act swiftly. Some of the devoted ministers, particularly Naravāhana, rallied the royal forces. The rebels were routed in a battle and their leaders were either killed in action or taken prisoner. The queen’s power and prestige were completely restored.

Naravāhana now became the Chief Minister and the recipient of Diddā’s favours. She bestowed on him the title of Rājānaka. But soon the fickle-minded queen became suspicious of him, and in disgust the faithful minister committed suicide.

An attempt to crush the sons of the Dāmara Sāṅgrāma created a rather difficult situation for the queen, and though she cleverly avoided an open clash, she felt uneasy. In order to cope with the Dāmara trouble, she recalled the old Prime Minister Phalgunā.

In A.D. 972 the young Abhimanyu died of consumption and his son Nandi-gupta was anointed king. The death of her son was a great shock to the widowed queen and the intensity of grief diverted her thoughts towards acts of piety. She founded as many as sixty-four religious establishments, and repaired all old and dilapidated temples. Amongst her notable foundations were a temple of Vishnu, under the name Diddāsvāmin, and a matha for visitors from other parts of India like Madhyadeśa, Lāta and Saurāshtra. She founded a town named Kankaṇapura, modern Kangan, on the river Sindh, in memory of her husband. But this enthusiasm for piety soon cooled down,

45 According to Stein, the name of this institution has survived in Didamar, a quarter of Srinagar situated between the sixth and seventh bridges.
and the queen reverted to her old ways. In her lust for power she had her little grandson, Nandi-gupta, murdered in A.D. 973. Another grandson, Tribhuvana, was put to death after being kept on the throne for two years (A.D. 973-75). Her youngest and last grandson Bhīma-gupta was crowned in A.D. 975. At this time the old Prime Minister Phalgunā died, and whatever restraining influence he had exercised on the queen was now removed. She became still more reckless in her ways and led a most licentious and scandalous life. Tuṅga, a Khaśa from Punch who had taken service at the Kashmir court as a letter-carrier in the Foreign Office, attracted the fancy of the lustful queen who became passionately attached to this youth of humble origin. As Bhīma-gupta grew up in years he showed concern at the vicious conduct of his grandmother. The passionate queen at once put him into prison where he died of torture in A.D. 980.

Now, Diddā herself ascended the throne, rendered vacant through her cruel devices. She raised Tuṅga to the position of the Chief Minister (Sārvādhikārī), and he held that post throughout the 23 years’ rule of Diddā.

Kardamarāja, son of Phalgunā, and other displaced ministers raised a revolt under the leadership of Vigraharaṇa, a nephew of Diddā. The rebels induced the Brāhmīns to start a fast unto death, and this excited popular indignation against the queen. Diddā, however, succeeded in winning over some of the Brāhmīns through bribes, and Vigraharaṇa finding his strength dwindling retired. The other rebel leaders were captured and put to death.

A conflict with the ruler of Rājapurī, Prīthvīpāla, afforded an opportunity for Tuṅga to display his valour. As Prīthvīpāla had shown arrogance, it was decided to punish him. An expeditionary force sent under the ministers Siṣṭaka and Hainsarāja met with a complete disaster. The situation was retrieved by Tuṅga who swiftly descended upon Rājapurī by a side track and burnt the city. Prīthvīpāla submitted and agreed to pay tribute. It was a great personal triumph for Tuṅga whose power and prestige now stood higher than ever. On his return to Śrīnagar he was put in charge of the army. A rising of the Dāmara chiefs was quelled by Tuṅga with equal courage and agility.

Diddā, who now enjoyed absolute power, appointed her nephew Sainḍikāmarāja, son of her brother Udayarāja, ruler of Lohara, as yuvārāja. When Diddā died in A.D. 1003, he ascended the throne.
Thus the sovereignty of Kashmir was peacefully transferred to the Lohara dynasty.

APPENDIX I

CHRONOLOGY

The scheme of chronology adopted in this chapter requires some explanation. In the Rājatarangini precise dates for the accession of kings begin to be recorded from the commencement of the reign of Avanti-varman, the first member of the house of Utpala. For all subsequent reigns we have precise dates recorded in the Laukika era, but, for the preceding period, Kالhana only records the lengths of reigns, and the date of each king to be computed by calculating backwards from a fixed date. Moreover, as Kalhana’s narrative covers a very long period, the information regarding the lengths of reign for the very remote periods could not be absolutely definite and correct. As will be seen below corrections have to be made here and there.

1. The Kārkota Period

The earliest date recorded by Kalhana for the accession of a king is the Laukika year 3931, A.D. 855-56, when Avanti-varman ascended the throne. Previous to this, Kalhana mentions two dates (i) the year 3889, A.D. 813-14 when Chippaṭa-Jayāpiḍa (Bṛhaspati) died, and (ii) the year 3926, A.D. 850-51 when dissensions broke out amongst Utpala and his brothers, Ajitāpiḍa was overthrown after the battle between Utpala and Mamma, and Anaṅgāpiḍa was put on the throne by the victorious minister Mamma. While the second date appears to be correct, the accuracy of the first, viz the date of the death of Chippaṭa-Jayāpiḍa has been questioned on several grounds. As pointed out by Bühler, the poet Rājānaka Ratnākara, in his poem Haravijaya, states that he wrote this kāvya under the patronage of the ‘Young Bṛhaspati’, while Kalhana mentions Rājānaka Ratnākara amongst the-court-poets of Avanti-varman. But if we accept Kalhana’s date A.D. 813-14 for the death of Bṛhaspati, also called Chippaṭa-Jayāpiḍa, Ratnākara could hardly have enjoyed the patronage both of Bṛhaspati and Avanti-varman, since their reigns are separated by an interval of at least 42 years. Secondly, it is known
that the ministers Padma, Mamma and Utpala had usurped royal
authority at the commencement of the reign of Bṛhaspati (Chippata-
Jayāpiḍa), i.e. about A.D. 801-2 according to Kalhana's
chronology. Kalhana later on tells us that in or about A.D. 850-51
there was a bloody war between Mamma and Utpala (iv 703-4).
These two statements seem to be incompatible. Stein has rightly
remarked:

'Considering the comparative shortness of the average Indian
generation we can scarcely bring ourselves to believe that the
brothers of humble origin who, at the commencement of Bṛhas-
pati's reign, that is according to Kalhana in A.D. 801-2, were
already strong enough to usurp regal powers, should have been
alive to fight a hard contested battle fully half a century later.
It seems far more probable that the reign of Bṛhaspati fell in
reality much nearer to the middle of the ninth century which
witnessed the events leading to the extinction of the Kārkoṭa
dynasty and its replacement by Utpala's family' (Raj. Eng. trans.
Vol. 1, Intr., p. 96). Therefore, the date A.D. 813-14 for the death of
Chippata Bṛhaspati has to be rejected.

For the Kārkoṭa chronology, therefore, we must take either 850-51,
the year when differences arose amongst the Utpala brothers, or
A.D. 855-56, the year of Avanti-varman's accession, as our starting
point from which to calculate backwards; but—in making these calcu-
lations we must keep in mind the dates of some of the Kārkoṭa
monarchs known from the Chinese Annals. According to Annals of
the Tang dynasty, king Tehen-t'o-lo-pi-li, i.e. Chandrāpiḍa, sent an
embassy to China in A.D. 713. Further, from the same source we
learn that the Chinese emperor granted the title of king to Chandrā-
piḍa in A.D. 720 at the latter's request expressed through the embassy.
It means that Chandrāpiḍa must have been alive at least in A.D. 719.

Kalhana has assigned a total period of 254 years 5 months and
27 days to the Kārkoṭa dynasty. Assuming the correctness of the
lengths of various reigns, and calculating backward from 855-56, we
arrive at A.D. 600 as the date of the establishment of the Kārkoṭa
rule, and the years A.D. 686-94 for the reign of Chandrāpiḍa, who,
sent an embassy to China in A.D. 713. Assuming that Chandrāpiḍa
had ascended the throne two years before this date, there will be
a discrepancy of 25 years between a definitely recorded date for
Chandrāpiḍa, and the computed date. We must prefer the former
and adjust Kalhana's chronology accordingly. As the last date for the
Kārkoṭas and the accession of Avanti-varman is immutably fixed, we
may place the commencement of the Kārkoṭa rule 25 years later, (i.e. in A.D. 625 and assume 230 years A.D. 625 to 855), instead of 254 years 5 months given by Kaliṇa, for the rule of the Kārkoṭas. This reduction of 25 years may be made as follows.

The three years assigned to Jajja should be omitted since his rule falls, as a matter of fact, within the limits of the reign of Jayāpida whose throne he usurped. Secondly, for reasons stated above, we have to reduce the long interval between Chippata Brihaspati and Avanti-vārman. We may, therefore, cut down the 37 years assigned to Ajitāpida by Kaliṇa to 15 only, and place him between 835-50 and his predecessor Chippata Brihaspati between 823-35.

2. *The Pre-Kārkoṭa Period*

To the kings of Book III, Kaliṇa has assigned 589 years 10 months. This period includes the fabulously long reign of 300 years assigned to Ranaḍita. There are good grounds to regard Ranaḍita as a historical figure, but the length of his reign must be reduced. The first king in Book III of the Rājataraṅgiṇī is Meghavahana who in all probability is a representative of the Kidāra Kushānas. Therefore the commencement of his reign may be placed c. A.D. 350. We shall thus get a period of only 275 years (A.D. 350-625) for the kings of Book III, as against 589 years 10 months or 590 years assigned to them by Kaliṇa. It is not very difficult to effect this reduction, as Ranaḍita’s reign alone has to be reduced by about 280 years, and a further reduction of 35 years may be easily made by cutting down the reign of Yogishthiha II to a brief period of 4 years only, since no events of his reign have been recorded and there is nothing to justify the long reign of 39 years assigned to him.

As has been shown in the main narrative, Kaliṇa’s knowledge of this period is not very accurate, and his chronological scheme, therefore, must be treated with great reserve. The pre-Kārkoṭa chronology has therefore to be reconstructed on the general considerations of historical evidence, particularly the numismatic data, and the following broad outlines may be suggested.

| The unknown foreigners (probably Kushānas) | 300–50 |
| The Kidāra Kushānas | 350–410 |
| The Imperial Guptas through their nominee Mātrigupta. | 410–14 |
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The Kidāra Kushāṇas restored under Pravarasena - 414-515
Hūṇas 515-600
Indigenous rule—Vikramāditya and Bālāditya 600-25

The genealogy and chronology of the subsequent period may be represented by the following tables.

The Kārkoṭa Dynasty (A.D. 625-855)
Durlabha-vardhana-Prajñāditya-Anaṅgalekhā.

A.D. 625-61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malhaṇa (did not rule)</th>
<th>Durlabhaka-Pratāpāditya (A.D. 661-711)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chandrāpīḍa-Vinayāditya Tārāpīḍa-Udayāditya Muktāpīḍa-Lalitāditya
711-20 720-24 724-61

Kuvalayāpīḍa 761-62 Vajrāditya-Bappiyaka 762-69

Tribhuvanāpīḍa Prithivyāpīḍa I Saṅgrāmāpīḍa I Jayāpīḍa-Vī- (did not rule) (ruled for 7 days) nayāditya 773-804

Ajitāpīḍa 835-50 Lalitāpīḍa 804-16 Saṅgrāmāpīḍa II (Prithivyāpīḍa)

Utpalāpīḍa 853-55 Chippaṭa-Jayāpīḍa-Bṛhaspati 823-35 Anaṅgāpīḍa 850-53

N.B. The names printed in italics are given merely to indicate line of descent. They did not rule.
3. The Line of Utpala A.D. 855-6 to 939

Uppa (a distiller)

Padma Utpala Kalyana Mamna Dharma m:

Sukhavarman

Avanti-varman Sura-varman Samara-varman
A.D. 855/6-883

Sukha-varman

Saikara-varman-Sugandha
A.D. 883-902 A.D. 904-6 Nirjita-varman (Paingu)
A.D. 921-23

Gopala-varman Saikata-varman
A.D. 902-4 A.D. 904

Partha Chakra-varman Sura varman I
A.D. 906-21 (a) 923-33 933-34
Again A.D. 934-35 (b) 935

Unmattavanti
937-39

Sura-varman II
deposed 939

4. House of Viradeva

Viradeva

Kamideva Ramideva

Prabhakaradeva VarnaTa

Yaaskaradeva
A.D. 939-48

Saingraemadeva
A.D. 949
5. The House of Abhinava A.D. 949-1003

Abhinava (a clerk)

Saṅgrāma-gupta

Parva-gupta A.D. 949-50

Kshema-gupta A.D. 950-58 m Diddā daughter of Siṅharāja
of Lohara A.D. 980-1003

Abhimanuyu A.D. 958-72

| Nandi-gupta 972-73 | Tribhuvana 973-75 | Bhīma-gupta 975-80 |
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