CHAPTER NINETEEN

THE WESTERN FRONTIER

1. RISE OF ISLAM

When Harsha-vardhana and Pulakesin II were struggling for empire in India, the rise of Islam in Arabia was rapidly changing the face of the world. This new religious sect soon developed into a militant political power before whose onslaught kingdoms in Western Asia and Northern Africa tumbled down like houses of cards. The Prophet, who was both the temporal and spiritual head and established his sovereignty over the whole of Arabia, died in A.D. 632. In 636 the mighty Persian Empire collapsed in the battle of Cadesia and before A.D. 640 Syria and Egypt were subdued, and the banner of Islam floated over the whole of Persia as far east as Herat. During the next ten years the Caliphs—as the successors of the Prophet were called—extended the boundary of their empire to the Oxus, and began that forward movement to the west along the entire northern border of Africa which was destined to overwhelm Spain and reach the heart of France from the south, till the great victory of Charles Martel in A.D. 732 checked its progress and fixed the Pyrenees as the further limit of the Muslim Empire in the West.

It is difficult to say whether Harsha-vardhana or Pulakesin, at least one of whom must have carried on diplomatic intercourse with Persia (pp. 420-21), had any knowledge of these great events that were taking place outside the little world in which they lived and fought. But it seems that even if they knew it, they did not realize the gravity of the peril which threatened India. For at the very moment when the forces of Islam were knocking at the gates of India, Harsha-vardhana was busy in his military campaigns against Orissa, and the Pallavas and Chalukyas were engaged in a prolonged and deadly struggle for supremacy. Yet no Indian statesman, even with a moderate knowledge of what was happening immediately outside the borders of India, should have overlooked the fact that the new political situation in the west was fraught with grave danger for the security of his country. This furnishes the first, but by no means, the last, historical example, when India had to pay dear for keeping aloof from the international politics of the day.

So far as we can judge, the ignorance, or the equanimity, of the
Indian potentates was mainly due to the fact that between them and the outside world lay a few petty border states on the west which were not concerned with, and did not count for much in, Indian politics. They served as the iron curtain which shut off the gaze of Indian politicians.

As the first impact of the Muslim invasion fell on them, it is necessary to describe their position and status at some length. Fortunately we can have a much clearer view of the Indian borderland during this period than is generally possible in Indian history. This is due to the detailed account left by the Chinese pilgrim Hsuan Tsang who travelled over this region some time in A.D. 642 or 643.

2. THE FRONTIER STATES

About this time there were four important kingdoms in the western border, viz. the kingdoms of Kapiša and Udýana in the north, that of Sindh in the south, and another, called Tsao-kū-ta or Tsaukuța by the Chinese pilgrim, which lay between these two.

According to the description of Hsuan Tsang, Kapiša was a powerful State whose supremacy was acknowledged by ten other kingdoms in the neighbourhood. Though it is difficult to identify or locate them all, it may be safely presumed that the whole of Afghanistan from Bamiyan on the west to the Indus on the east and from the Hindukush on the north to the Bannu district on the south was subject to the king of Kapiša. It included Kasiristan—a name which is probably- derived from ancient Kapiša—and also the cities of Kabul, Jalalabad and Peshawar.

To the north and east of Kapiša lay Udýana which comprised the present districts of Swat, Panjkora, Bajaur and Buner. But we find it incorporated into the kingdom of Kapiša in A.D. 745, and this probably took place long before.

The kingdom of Sindh, with its feudatory states, comprised the lower valley of the Indus, extending as far north as Multan on the left and Bannu on the right side of that river. Hsuan Tsang mentions two other States bordering on Sindh, viz Lang-kie-lo, immediately to the west, comprising modern Makran and Kirman, and Ki-kiang-na (Kekkan or al-Kikan of the Arab chronicles) which lay to its north. According to the Chinese pilgrim the former was sub-

1 Cunningham (Ancient Geography, pp. 19-20) includes the whole of Afghanistan up to Bolan Pass in the south, but as we shall see later, the region round this Pass formed part of Sindh, and the Kandahar region was probably included in Tsao-kū-ta.

2 JA, 1895, p. 348, n. 3.
ject to Persia, and the latter was divided among a number of independent clans. But according to Chach-nāma, the local chronicle of Sindh, and other authorities to which reference will be made later, not only these two States but also Multan were all dependencies of Sindh. That Hiuan Tsang’s information about these remote countries was not up-to-date follows from the mention of Persia as a suzerain power, for we know that it was overwhelmed by the Arabs several years before. The statement of Chach-nāma may therefore be right, though, as it admits, these outlying provinces sometimes declared independence.

Between the kingdoms of Kapiśa and Sindh, as defined above, Hiuan Tsang locates a large kingdom called Tsao-kū-ta or Tsao-li. This is almost certainly to be identified with Zābul or Zābulistān of the Arab geographers, which comprised the upper valley of the Helmand river together with a large extent of territories both to the east and west of it, and included the cities of Kandahar and Ghaznī (Ghazni).

Hiuan Tsang has left some accounts of the culture of the territories described above. Sindh had an Indian ruler and was Indian in language, literature and religion. This was very nearly true also of Lang-kie-lo (modern Makran and Kirmīan). Hiuan Tsang says that the letters of this country are much the same as those of India, but their language is a little different. He adds that there are some hundred saṅghārāmas (Buddhist monasteries) and several hundred deva temples. It is said in the biography of Hiuan Tsang that ‘from Lang-kie-lo, going north-west, we come to the country of Po-la-see (Persia) which is not within the boundaries of India’.

As regards Tsao-kū-ta or Zabulistan we are told that their writing and spoken language differed from those of other countries, but the people were mostly Buddhist and ‘there were some hundreds of monasteries and above 10,000 Brethren, all Mahāvīnists’. The reigning king was a true believer in Buddhism and there were some tens of deva temples. Numismatic evidence shows that it was a powerful kingdom in the seventh century A.D. One of its rulers Śrī Vāsudeva calls himself king of Zābulistān and Multān. Another coin, whose legend and date are somewhat doubtful, seems to be issued by a king Ṣāhi (or Vahi) Tīgin who calls himself ruler of both India and Persia. The legends on these coins are written both in Indian and

---

3 Life, tr. by Beal, p. 150.
4 Opinions differ about the date of these coins and the reading of their legends. I have followed the views of Cunningham who gives a good account of them in his Later Indo-Scythians, pp. 291-95.
Pehlevi characters. Coins of several other kings, some of them containing the word Zaulistan, have been found in the Indus valley.

Kapiša, which was ruled by a king of the Kshatriya caste, was a stronghold of Buddhism, and its language, though coarser and ruder than that of its dependencies, such as Lamghan, Jalalabad and countries further east, was Indian. Udyāna (Swat valley) was also a stronghold of Buddhism and its ‘spoken language was different from, but bore much resemblance to, that of India’. Hiuan Tsang regarded only the kingdom of Kapiša proper and Tsao-kü-ţa as geographically outside the boundaries of India, but even these may be regarded as politically and culturally a part of this country.

Judged by the test of language, religion, and culture, the western boundary of India, in the seventh century A.D., may thus be roughly indicated by an imaginary line from Kandahar to Kabul, extended north-east right up to the Hindukush and southwest along the boundaries of Baluchistan to the sea-coast. The hilly region in the north between this line and the Hindukush still formed politically a part of India, but a strong admixture of Turkish element, introduced no doubt by the Saka, Kushāna and Hūna invaders, had already distinguished it culturally from India. The king who ruled over these regions was, according to a later tradition, a descendant of Kanishka, but the very fact that Hiuan Tsang calls him a Kshatrima by caste, shows, what we might also otherwise infer, that he had been thoroughly Indianised.

3. KĀBUL AND ZĀBUL

The Arabs cast a longing eye towards the fair plains and cities of India from the very beginning of their militant career.\(^5\) The first military expedition was sent across the sea to Tanah, i.e. Thana near Bombay, about A.D. 637. Similar expeditions were sent against Broach and Debal (a port of Sindh) during the next five years, but none of these achieved any conspicuous success.

\(^5\) The account of the Arab expedition is based on the following:
(a) Kitab Futuh al-Buldān by Ahmad ibn Yahya ibn-Jabir al-Baladhuri, commonly referred to as Baladhuri. Extracts from this work are given in HIED, Vol. I, pp. 113ff. But there is a good English translation by P. K. Hitti (Vol. I) and F. C. Murgottten (Vol. II). I have used this translation and all references in this chapter are to vol. II which deals with India.
(b) Chach-nāma. Extracts from this are given in HIED, but I have used the English translation of the work by Mirza Kalichbeg Ferdunbeg (Karachi, 1900).
(c) Le Strange—The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate. It gives a good geographical account of the Indian borderland.
(d) The Arab Invasion of India by R. C. Majumdar (Supplement to JIH, Vol. X, Part 1).
It has been suggested by some that these three expeditions were neither undertaken for conquest nor authorized by the Caliph. According to this view only groups of Arab merchants landed at these places for purposes of trade, though it is admitted that some skirmishes were fought with the natives. Further the Arabs were not interested in territorial acquisition in India until a grave provocation was given by the ruler of Sindh in c. A.D. 709, when the first armed batch of the Arab Muslims landed at Debal. This view, however, cannot be reconciled either with the general history of Islam's militant career, or with the express statement of Al-Balādhuri, the greatest and most reliable authority on the subject. He represents these as military expeditions, and gives details of many others directed against the frontiers of India which completely refute the view of the peaceful penetration into India by the Arabs. It may be true that a number of Arabs came to India for peaceful purposes and settled in this country; that they learned Indian languages and not only composed original poems but also translated the Qurān into them; that they followed Indian customs and manners, married in Indian society and adopted Indian titles and names; that the Indians were so profoundly impressed with the new faith that on an average 50,000 of them embraced Islam every year. No satisfactory evidence has, however, been brought forward to prove that this state of things was true of the period before the Arab conquest of Sindh. But whatever we might think of these peaceful relations, there is no doubt that the Arabs were eager for territorial conquests in India and made systematic inroads against all the three kingdoms of Kābul, Zābul and Sindh. As the first two were often united in offering resistance to the aggressions of Islam, their history may be treated together in the first place.

The Arabs conquered Seistan shortly after A.D. 650, and advanced towards Zābulistān along the Helmand river till they reached Kish which the Arab chronicler Balādhuri describes as belonging to al-Hind, i.e. India. Kish has been identified with Kaj or Kuhich of the present day near Rudbar, a well-known place on the Helmand, not very far from its mouth. 'Abd-ar-Rahmān ibn-smurah, governor of Seistan during the Caliphate of Othmān, led an expedition against this place and proceeded as far as Bust, higher up on the Helmand. But the progress of Muslim forces was checked here, and they entered into an amicable agreement with Bust and Zābulistān. Soon after this Seistan also revolted and drove out the Muslims who thus lost practically everything they had gained in this region.

6 PAIOC, X, pp. 403ff.
Seistan was reconquered during the Caliphate of ‘Alī (A.D. 656-61) and ‘Abd-ar-Rahmān was re-appointed its governor by the next Caliph Mu-a’wiya (A.D. 661-80). ‘Abd-ar-Rahmān renewed his expedition and his victorious forces advanced as far as Kābul. The city of Kābul was besieged but it made a heroic resistance for several months. The city fell at last and the Muslim governor concluded a treaty. ‘Abd-ar-Rahmān then invaded Zābulistān and conquered it. But as soon as ‘Abd-ar-Rahmān was removed from his post, shortly before his death in A.D. 670, the king of Kābul drove out all the Muslims from the city, and Ratbil (apparently a title by which Arab chroniclers always refer to the king of Zābulistān)7 regained possession of his kingdom and occupied the whole country as far as Bust. But Ratbil, being defeated and pursued by the new governor, concluded a treaty of peace both for his own kingdom and Kābul, on payment of one million dirhams.

Towards the end of the reign of Caliph Yazid (A.D. 680-3) Kābul revolted again, and the Muslim forces sent against it were totally routed at Junzah. The governor of Seistan, who led the army, and some distinguished members of the aristocracy, lay dead on the field and the rest fled. Abu-‘Ubadah, possibly the Muslim representative at Kābul, who was imprisoned, had to be ransomed for 500,000 dirhams.

The king of Zābulistān also declared war against the Arabs and probably proceeded as far as the lake into which the Helmand river flows. Though he was defeated and killed in A.D. 680, the war was continued by his son, who did not oppose the advance of the Muslims till they penetrated deep into his country. Then he blocked the mountain passes and the Muslim general was forced to conclude a treaty by which, on payment of 300,000 dirhams, he promised not to raid the country in future. The Caliph, however, disapproved of the treaty and dismissed the general.

The Muslim invasion of Kābul about A.D. 698 was even less successful. The king of Zābulistān joined the ruler of Kābul and employed his old tactics again with even more brilliant success. The mountain passes were blocked and the Muslim general was dissuaded by his colleagues from offering terms to the enemy. So the army decided to fight their way out and suffered terrible losses and hardships. At last the Muslim general was compelled to purchase the liberation of himself and his remaining followers by a ransom of

7 Elliot, Ravioty, and other scholars held that Kābul and Zābul denoted the same kingdom under Ratbil. But Balādhurī clearly distinguishes the two. As all the kings of Zābulistān are referred to as Ratbil it must be regarded as a title.
700,000 dirhams. But he shortly died of grief for the terrible miseries he had brought upon his men.

It was a veritable disaster for the Muslim forces, and elaborate preparations were set on foot to avenge the humiliation. Heavy war-cress was imposed on Basra and Kuša in order to raise a new army which was so splendidly equipped that it was named the 'peacock army'. 'Abd-ar-Rahmān, who led this army, defeated Ratbil, the king of Zābulistān, in A.D. 699, but profiting by the experience of his predecessors, he moved very cautiously. Hajjāj, the governor of Irak, was dissatisfied with his slow progress and ordered him to advance rapidly. When 'Abd-ar-Rahmān remonstrated, he was threatened with supersession. Thereupon he made a treaty on favourable terms with the king of Zābulistān and declared war both against Hajjāj and the Caliph. In spite of initial successes he was ultimately defeated and took refuge with Ratbil (A.D. 701-2) but a year or two later he died or committed suicide. Ratbil took advantage of the situation and concluded a treaty with Hajjāj by which the latter agreed not to make war upon him for 7 (or 9) years on payment of an annual subsidy in kind. This arrangement continued till the death of Hajjāj in A.D. 714. Then Ratbil refused to pay any tribute, and maintained his independence for forty years without any further molestation.

This prolonged inactivity of the Muslims was undoubtedly due to the internal troubles and weakness of the Caliphate during the last days of the Umayyids. For, soon after the establishment of the powerful Abbasid Caliphate, the governor of Seistan declared war against Ratbil. Ratbil was defeated and promised to pay tribute. He, however, did not pay it regularly, and we are told that the Muslim officers collected tribute from him as best as they could (or according to their strength and weakness).

The Caliph Al-Ma'mūn (A.D. 813-33) sent an army against the king of Kābul who acknowledged obedience, professed Islam, and agreed to pay tribute. But he regained independence and apostatized almost immediately after. Ratbil, who paid double the tribute, and was thereupon left unmolested by Al-Ma'mūn, also soon became independent again.

It was not till A.D. 870 that Zābulistān was finally conquered by Yākūb, son of Lais, who had virtually made himself the master of Seistan. The king was killed and the people were forced to embrace Islam. But Kābul, which was also conquered by Yākūb about the same time, recovered its independence and continued to form a part of India, both politically and culturally, till the end of the tenth
century A.D. Its later history will be dealt with in connection with that of the Shāhiya dynasty.

Though both Kābul and Zābul ultimately succumbed to Islam, the heroic resistance they offered to the repeated onslaughts of that world-power deserves the highest praise and admiration. Few countries in the world, far less small principalities like these, have defied the arms of Islam so bravely and for so long. For more than 200 years the Arabs struggled hard to subdue them, but in vain. They no doubt obtained brilliant victories but also suffered severe reverses. They were able from time to time to impose some sort of suzerainty and occasionally exacted tributes from them. But in spite of this Kābul and Zābul successfully opposed the political and cultural onslaught of Islam till A.D. 870, for a century and a half after Sindh had become a Muslim province.

4. SINDH

A detailed history of Sindh in the seventh century A.D. is given in Chach-nāma, a Persian translation of an old Arabic history of the conquest of Sindh by the Arabs. The date of the original work is not known, but the Persian translation was made about A.D. 1216. It begins with an account of king Sahiras, son of Sāhasi Rāi. He ruled over an extensive dominion which is said to have included Makran, Kandahar, Seistan, and the whole of the Indus valley up to the border of Kashmir. The king personally ruled the central part of his kingdom from his capital at Alor, while the rest of his kingdom was divided into four provinces, with headquarters, respectively, at Bahmanabad, Siwistan, Iskandah and Multan. The rulers of these provinces are referred to as governors by some authorities, but called tributary rulers in Chach-nāma.

Sahiras was succeeded by his son Sāhasi Rāi II. During his reign Chach, a poor Brāhmaṇa, rose to high power and office, and on his master’s death ascended the throne. According to Tuhfat-ul-Kirām, composed in the latter half of the eighteenth century A.D., this event took place in A.D. 622 and the dynasty of Sahiras, consisting of five kings, ruled for 137 years (i.e. A.D. 485-622). The genealogy of the kings, given in this text, does not, however, tally with the account in Chach-nāma.

The provincial rulers did not at first acknowledge the authority of Chach, but were subdued by force, and the stream that separates Makran from Kirman was fixed as the western boundary of his kingdom. Chach also marched against Kandabil, and its people agreed to pay an annual tribute. Kandabil has been identified with Gan-
dava in the Brahui territory in Baluchistan, a little to the south-east of Kelat. According to Al-Balādhuri, Kikān also formed a part of Sindh. Kikān undoubtedly comprised the hilly country near Quetta and Bolan Pass and its name has probably been preserved in Kakar lying to the east of Quetta. It probably formed a part of Kandabil, and in any case, was most likely conquered by Chach.

Thus when Chach died about A.D. 662, he left a vast kingdom to his brother Chandar who ruled for seven years. The death of Chandar was followed by a quarrel about succession and the kingdom was divided into two parts. But Dāhar, the younger son of Chach, who ascended the throne at Alor about A.D. 670, reunited them after 30 years.

The chief event in Dāhar's reign was the Arab invasion which overwhelmed him and his kingdom. As noted above, the Arabs sent an expedition against Debal, the chief sea-port of Sindh, some time between A.D. 637 and 643. Balādhuri speaks of a Muslim victory, but according to Chach-nāma, the governor of Chach defeated the Muslims and killed their leader at the battle of Debal. The latter account seems to be true, for we find Caliph ʿUmar (A.D. 634-44) next sending an expedition towards Makran and Kirman. Evidently, having failed to approach Sindh by sea from the south, he proposed to attack by land the western frontier of the kingdom. But the governor of Irak, whom he asked to supply detailed information, reported that the king of Sindh was very powerful and by no means willing to submit to the Muslims. Thereupon ʿUmar abandoned the idea of attacking it. The next Caliph ʿUthmān (A.D. 644-56) also gave up the project of invading Sindh on getting similar reports.

Some time about A.D. 660, during the Caliphate of ʿAli, a well-equipped Muslim army advanced against Sindh through Kikān, i.e. by the Bolan Pass route. According to Balādhuri, the people of Kikān made a brave stand and routed the Muslim army. The Muslim general was killed together with all but a few of his followers, which included a large number of nobles and chiefs.

After this the Arabs sent several military expeditions against Kikān. The first advanced from the side of Kābul in 665, but did not gain any conspicuous success. The second ended in a disaster, and the routed Muslim army fled to Makran. The next expedition conquered Makran and met with some success in Kikān, but the leader, while raiding the Mid (i.e. the Meds), was defeated and killed. The leader of the fourth expedition was killed in Kikānān. The fifth

---

8 Some scholars identify Kandabil (or Kandail as written by Balādhuri) with Zihri about 57 miles south-west of Gandava (CHI, III, p. 9).
expedition obtained some successes and acquired much booty, but Kikān was far from being subdued. For more than twenty years (A.D. 660-80) the Arabs concentrated their efforts towards the conquest of this outpost of Sindh, but failed. Their only success was the conquest of Makran.

The Arabs did not resume their aggression against Sindh till about A.D. 705 when Hajjāj was governor of Irak. The Muslim governor of Makran made some raids and conquered portions of Kandabil (Gandava). Shortly after this happened an incident which induced Hajjāj to send a full-scale expedition to Sindh. As this ultimately led to the conquest of Sindh, the incident may be discussed in some detail.

A party of widows and orphan daughters⁹ of the Arab traders who had died in Ceylon were sent by the king of that country to Hajjāj. The ship in which they were travelling fell into the hands of the pirates near Debal, the chief port of Sindh, at the mouth of the Indus. Hajjāj wrote to Dāhar to secure the release of these women, but the latter replied that he had no control over the pirates who captured them. It was also alleged that Dāhar refused to arrest and hand over to Hajjāj the Arab convicts who had fled and taken shelter in Sindh.¹⁰ Hajjāj regarded this as the casus belli and proposed to send a powerful expedition to Sindh. The Caliph was at first very unwilling, but later agreed at the importunities of Hajjāj.

Some scholars argue¹¹ that it was this provocation which led the Arabs to think for the first time of territorial conquests in Sindh. But the account of the earlier expeditions, noted above, gives the lie direct to this view. As a matter of fact the conquest of Sindh had been one of the chief objectives of the Arabs for more than a century. This is not only proved by their successive military expeditions against Debal, Makran, and Kikān but also by their practice of designating the leaders of these expeditions in advance as governor of Sindh. Even Hajjāj was appointed governor of Irak, 'Hind and Sindh' (I)¹² as early as A.D. 695. The Arabs had been chafing at their failure to conquer Sindh, and Hajjāj merely seized the piracy as a pretext to subdue a country that had so long defied the arms of Islam.

As soon as Hajjāj secured the permission of Caliph Walid, he sent an expedition against Debal under 'Ubaidullah. As noted above,

⁹ Some scholars refer only to orphan daughters (CHI, III, p. 1) but others include widows (PAIOC, X, p. 409).
¹⁰ PAIOC, X, p. 409.
¹¹ Ibid., p. 404.
¹² IHQ, XVI, p. 597.
Debal was the chief sea-port at the mouth of the Indus, but on account of the constant shifting of the river beds it has not been possible to identify it with certainty. Some have located it near Thatha or Lari Bandar, while others have identified it with present Bhambor or Kakar Bukera. According to Baladhuri the expedition against Debal proved a failure and the Muslim general was killed. Then a second expedition was sent against Debal by way of sea from Oman and it was opposed by Jaisimha, son of Dāhar. After a pitched battle lasting the whole day the Muslim army was routed and its general killed.

Hajjāj then made elaborate preparations for an expedition against Sindh. He placed his nephew and son-in-law Muḥammad, son of Qāsim, at its command and provided him with men, arms, and munitions on a lavish scale. The Caliph lent him the services of 6,000 Syrian soldiers fully armed.

Muhammad advanced through Makran and laid siege to Debal (A.D. 711). With the help of the siege materials reaching him by way of sea, he took the fort of Debal by assault. No quarter was given, and for three days the inhabitants were ruthlessly butchered by the Muslim soldiers.

Muhammad then marched along the Indus and reached Nehrun, modern Haidarabad. According to both Chach-nāma and Baladhuri, our two principal authorities, the town was treacherously surrendered by the Buddhists who had already concluded a secret pact with Hajjāj. According to Baladhuri, the governor of the city was a Buddhist who not only submitted without any fight but actively helped Muhammad in the subsequent campaign. The Buddhist residents of many other towns also did the same. According to Chach-nāma they were influenced, partly by their aversion to slaughter and bloodshed, and partly by their belief in the prophetic saying in the sacred books that India would be conquered by Islam. The last would also partly account for the treachery of the non-Buddhists which, accord-

13 Cf. App. A. to my article ‘Arab Invasion of India’ JIH. X, (i) supplement, which deals with the ancient geography of Sindh, particularly the places that fell on the way of Muḥammad.

14 The full name is written as ‘Imādu’d-din Muḥammad Kāsim, son of Ukaīl Sakīfī in Chach-nāma, which adds that he was then a youth of 17 (I, p. 73). The name usually written in this text is Muḥammad Kāsim. In the Tārīkh-i-Mas‘ūmī (composed in A.D. 1600) he is called Muḥammad, son of Qāsim, and this view is now generally adopted (CHII, III, p. 2). S. N. Dhar states that the name given in Chach-nāma is Karimuddin Muḥammad Kāsim (IHQ, XVI, p. 596) but I have not found it in the translation by Ferdunbegh which he also quotes as authority. I have adopted the spelling in CHII, II.
ing to Chach-nāma, played no mean part in the final outcome of the war.

Muḥammad then conquered Siwistan (Sehwan), after which some leading chiefs tendered their submission. Treachery became contagious and not only powerful and high officials but even 4,000 warlike Jats of Siwistan joined Muḥammad. He then leisurely proceeded along the western bank of the Indus, conquering various places on the way, till he reached a point on the river opposite which Dāhar stood ready with his army to meet him. Here Muḥammad halted for two months, whereupon Hajjāj reprimanded him and urged him to cross the river and fight with Dāhar. He thereupon built a bridge of boats at Sakrah (probably Sakhar) and his whole army passed over to the other side without any loss, mainly due to the treachery of the two brothers who were, in succession, put by Dāhar in charge of the fort in the rocky island of Bet (Bakhar), which was a highly strategic point commanding the passage of the river. By the help of the same two brothers Muḥammad was able to cross without difficulty the lake that lay between him and Dāhar’s main force, near the fort of Raor, which may be identified with Rohri, not far from the capital city Alor.

Here a pitched battle took place, and Dāhar fought with bravery for two days. According to Chach-nāma, which gives a detailed account, Muhammad’s army was nearly routed on the second day. The army of Islam became irresolute, and their lines were broken up in great confusion. Muḥammad, however, rallied his men and the renegade chiefs of Sindh came to his aid. Dāhar, seated on his elephant, personally led the attack, and Muḥammad directed his naptha-ﬂingers to shoot at him. Dāhar’s litter having caught fire, he dismounted and was killed. This was a signal for the disruption of his army which was completely routed.

The survivors took refuge in the fort of Raor which was defended by the brāve queen till conditions became hopeless, and she burnt herself with other ladies to escape the infamy of falling into the hands of the Muslims. Jaisimha, the son of Dāhar, now strongly fortified Alor, the capital city, and Bahmanabad, a famous city and fort, the ruins of which lie about 8 miles to the south-east of Shadadpur railway station, while he himself adopted a mode of guerilla warfare. Muhammad besieged Bahmanabad which offered a stout resistance. Every day the besieged came out and fierce ﬁght continued from morning till evening. They fought for six months in this way, when some leading citizens entered into a secret covenant with Muḥammad and betrayed the fort. At Alor, too, after some ﬁghting, the residents made peace with Muḥammad, whereupon Fosī,
son of Dāhar, who was in charge, left the city and joined his brother Jaisīnha.

Muḥammad then besieged Multan which offered a brave resistance for two months, till a traitor pointed out to Muḥammad the source of water-supply for the town and thus forced it to surrender. The conquest of Multan was followed up by that of Kiraj and Bailaman. The former denotes Kangra and the latter probably some territory in Rājputāna. According to Chach-nāma, Muḥammad himself advanced to the frontier of Kashmir and sent an expedition to Kanauj. But all this may be doubted, as none of the authorities mentions the conquest of intermediate territories.

The triumphant career of Muḥammad was suddenly cut short by political changes at home. Hajjāj died in A.D. 714, and the Caliph Walid, a year later. The next Caliph, Sulaiman, was the sworn enemy of Hajjāj who had also incurred the hostility of Salih, the newly appointed governor of Irak. The enemies of Hajjāj wreaked vengeance upon his family, and Muḥammad was taken prisoner, insulted, and tortured to death by Salih. Such was the tragic end of the man who laid the foundations of Muslim power in India, though posterity has woven a romantic tale round this episode.15

Jaisīnha took full advantage of the internal discord in the Caliphate and re-occupied Bahmanabad. Other conquered chiefs also followed suit. The Caliph sent Habib to subdue the rebels, but it appears that only Alor and a few other localities were conquered by him. The next Caliph ʿUmar II (717-20) offered to recognise the independence of the chiefs of Sindh provided they adopted Islam. Jaisīnha accepted the offer, but soon quarrelled with Junaid, the governor of Sindh, apostatized, and declared war against him. Junaid, however, defeated Jaisīnha and took him prisoner. Thus ended the dynasty of Dāhar and the independence of Sindh.

The circumstantial narrative of the Muslim conquest of Sindh, sketched above, is solely based on Chach-nāma and the history of Balāḏhuri. Both the accounts are written from the point of view of the victors and, as such, it may be doubted whether we can fully rely upon them, specially where the activity of the rulers of Sindh is concerned. That the alleged cause of the war was nothing but an idle pretext for aggressive warfare has been shown above. The triumphant march of Muḥammad from Debal to Raor probably paints him in a too brilliant colour, and underestimates or ignores the efforts

15 No credence should be given to the story that two daughters of Dāhar, who were sent to the Caliph, falsely accused Muḥammad of violating their chastity and thereupon the enraged Caliph sent orders that Muḥammad's body should be sewn in a bag and sent to him (Cf. PIHC, V, p. 249).
of the Hindu ruler. The victories are too often attributed to treachery, and the Buddhist sect is generally, though not always, represented as helping the enemy of the country. Even the powerful chiefs and officials are said to have deserted their king and joined their enemy. Though some scholars are loth to believe all this, there may be some truth in the allegations. It should be remembered that the Brahmin Chach had seized the throne by unfair means less than a century before, and it is not unlikely that his family was disliked by a section of the people, specially the loyal adherents of the old royal family and the Buddhists who formed the predominant element of the people. That this dislike should induce them to betray their country, however deplorable in itself, cannot be ruled out as impossible, particularly when both the authorities emphasize this point and give numerous specific instances. On the other hand, the internal weakness of Sindh may have been the chief cause of its downfall. We should remember that the newly established dynasty could not consolidate its power, owing to the rebellions of provincial governors and the long war of succession which kept the kingdom divided for more than 30 years. As the quarrel with the Muslims broke out within 10 years of the re-union, we may easily presume that the ruler of Sindh could not marshal all its resources effectively against the foreign invader.

All these causes probably operated to bring about the downfall of the kingdom of Sindh. But the comparatively easy conquest of Muhammad, son of Qasim, should not make us forget the long resistance offered by Sindh against the Arabs. Nor must we withhold the need of praise due to the king and the people for the brave defence of the mountain passes of Kikān, occasionally crowned by brilliant victories, and the successful blocking of the southern route across Makran or over the sea for three quarters of a century since the first raid. The Muslim historians have paid high tribute to the enemy for their bravery and fighting qualities and, taking everything into consideration, the modern historians are not justified in regarding the defeat of the Indians as an evidence of their inferiority in military skill and discipline.

This becomes still more clear by the subsequent history of the Muslim power in Sindh. Junaid, who completed the conquest of the country, sent several expeditions to the interior of India. But though for some time the Arabs carried everything before them, and advanced as far as Malwa and the borders of the Deccan, they were

16 Cf. the views of S. N. Dhar in IIIQ. XVI. pp. 598 ff. But it is difficult to accept his view that 'the theory of Buddhist treachery does not stand examination'.
signally defeated by the Pratihāra king Nāgabhaṭa I, Pulakesī, the Chāluṅka chief of Gujarat, and probably also by Yaśōvarman. They were forced to retreat and henceforth their power was confined to Sindh. Even there the general rebellion of the people, who gave up the new faith imposed on them, made the position of the Muslims very precarious. This is clearly admitted by Balādhuri who remarks that as there was 'no place of refuge to which the Muslims might flee' a new capital city was built, called Mahfuzah, on one side of a lake near the old city of Bahmanabad. The capital was shortly removed to Mansurah, a city built on the other side of the same lake. The governor Hakam was killed in course of his attempt to pacify the country, and his successors 'kept fighting the enemy and subduing places in the neighbourhood whose inhabitants rebelled'. Thus, during the last years of the Umayyads, they virtually lost hold over Sindh.

The 'Abbāsid Caliphs made an attempt to re-establish the power of Islam in Sindh. Hishām, the governor of Caliph Al-Mansur (A.D. 754-75), is said to have conquered Multan and Kashmir. But even the little that we know of the history of Kashmir makes it almost impossible to believe that this kingdom was conquered in any sense by the Arabs. As has been noted above its powerful ruler Lalitāditya Muktāpiḍa (A.D. 724-61) is said to have thrice defeated the Arabs. The real fact seems to be that the Arabs came into conflict with Lalitāditya, and in spite of their initial successes, if any, their advance was checked by him. The re-conquest of Multan if true, merely shows that a large part of Sindh again came into the hands of the Arabs. But the brave people of Kīkān held out till c. A.D. 840. According to Balādhuri, an expedition was sent against the Kikanites, who are Zutt (i.e. Jaths), during the Caliphate of Mutasim'shullah (A.D. 833-42). Although they were defeated, we hear of frequent conflicts with the Jaths and the Meds in the neighbourhood of Aṇor, the old Hindu capital of Sindh. We hear of other expeditions in the course of which the Muslim army sometimes met with grave disaster.

Thus with all their strength and resources the 'Abbāsids failed to consolidate the Muslim power even in Sindh. The Arab chronicles admit their failure to achieve further conquests in India. This is confirmed by Indian evidence. The Pāla emperor Dharmapāla is said to have exercised supremacy over the Yavanas or Muslims. The failure of one or more Muslim expeditions is hinted at in several texts and epigraphic records.17 Thus, Khummana-Raso, a late work,

17 These have been brought together by D. C. Ganguly in IIQ, XIV, p. 813.
refers to a Muslim invasion of Chitor which was repulsed by the Guhila chief Khumman with the help of other Indian rulers. The Prabandhakoṣa, composed in A.D. 1348, states that the Chāhmaṇa king Govindarāja defeated Sultān Vega Varisa. This Chāhmaṇa king was most probably the first king of that name who was a feudatory of the Pratihāra emperor Nāgabhaṭa II. This ruler is said to have defeated the Turushkas, which can only mean at this period the Muslim subjects or soldiers of the Caliph. Now, according to Baladhrī, a governor of Sindh under Caliph Al-Mamun (A.D. 813-33), was named Basar, and most probably this was the chief who is named Sultan Veg Varisa in Prabandhakoṣa. It is not unlikely that the three instances, quoted above, all refer to one and the same expedition under the Pratihāra emperor Nāgabhaṭa and his feudatories and allies. The Kalachuri king Kokkalla I, who also claims to have defeated the Turushkas, might have joined the above rulers. It may thus be held that the ‘Abbāsids made a great effort—the first since Junaid’s expedition—to conquer India some time between A.D. 800 and 830, and their forces probably advanced as far as Chitor, but the Indian kings offered a combined resistance to them and forced them to retreat. This is of course only a theoretical reconstruction, but the isolated passages scattered in different texts and inscriptions hardly leave any doubt that the ‘Abbāsid Caliphs made one or more efforts to extend the Muslim power in India, but failed.

With the decline of the ‘Abbāsid power, Sindh became virtually independent and formed a part of the Saffarid kingdom. After its downfall Sindh was divided into two independent states with capitals respectively at Multan and Mansura, neither of which ever became powerful. Multan was in constant dread of a Pratihāra invasion, but found its security against this in the famous image of God (Sūrya) in one of its temples which was venerated all over India. ‘When the unbelievers’, says Al-Mas‘ūdī, ‘march against Multan, and the faithful do not feel themselves strong enough to oppose them, they threaten to break their idol and their enemies immediately withdraw’.18 Ishtakhri also makes a similar statement and adds that ‘otherwise the Indians would have destroyed Multan’.19 As regards Mansura, again Al-Mas‘ūdī tells us that ‘it was constantly at war with a nation called the Meds, who are a race of Sindh, and also with other races on the frontiers of Sindh’.

Thus even more than three hundred and fifty years after their

19 Ibid., p. 28.
first incursion, the Arabs could establish their authority only over the frontier region and the lower valley of the Indus. Their repeated attempts to extend their power into the interior proved a failure. Compared with their military achievements in other parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe, the results of their Indian campaign certainly appear to be insignificant. It reflects no small credit on the military skill and political organization of the people of India that the conquerors of the world had to stop at the gateway of their country and could not enter inside for more than three centuries.20

20 It is hardly necessary now to refer to the views of Elphinstone (Hist. of India, 9th ed., pp. 305-6) and other writers who sought to explain the slow progress of Islam by various theories based on the religious and social institutions of India.
CHAPTER TWENTY

NORTHERN AND EASTERN FRONTIER

1. NEPAL

Jishnugupta

The death of Aînsu-varman (p. 258) was followed by a period of troubles. Yuvarāja Udayadeva, presumably the heir-apparent, mentioned in an inscription of Aînsu-varman, dated 39, disappears from the scene, and the throne is occupied by one Jishnugupta. He is described as the ornament of the Lunar family (Somānvaya) and a casual reference is made in one of his records to his great-grandfather Māna-gupta-gomin. It is also claimed that he got the throne by hereditary right. It appears therefore that he was not connected either with the old Lichchhavi rulers or with the Thākuri family founded by Aînsu-varman, and S. Lévi suggests that he belonged to the Ahir or Abhira clan which had conquered Nepal shortly before Aînsu-varman usurped the sovereignty (p. 215). Be that as it may, the charters of Jishnugupta leave no doubt that he ruled over the whole of the Nepal valley proper, and further that he revived the phantom of Lichchhavi sovereignty. He issued his charters from Kalpākāśita, the palace of Aînsu-varman, but mentions at the beginning the name of a Lichchhavi king residing at the old palace of Mānagriha. Two such kings are known, viz. Bhattāraka Mahārāja Śrī Dhrubadeva and Bhattāraka Śrī Mānadeva. The difference in the titles given to these two Lichchhavi kings is significant, and there is no doubt that they were mere puppets in the hands of Jishnugupta who, though not the legitimate king, exercised in full the royal authority. He also issued coins which resembled those of Aînsu-varman. On the whole, it appears that Jishnugupta not only inherited the dominions, but also continued the policy and tradition of Aînsu-varman, though he did not probably belong to his family. It is also interesting to note that though Aînsu-varman is always called Mahāsāmanta in his own records, he is referred to as Bhattāraka Mahārājādhirāja in an inscription of Jishnugupta dated

1 Like Aînsu-varman, he calls himself Paśupati-Bhattāraka-Pādāṇugrihitā and bappa-pādāṇudhyāta in his charters.
year 48. The date shows that he ascended the throne, shortly, if not immediately, after the death of Aṃśu-varman, whose last known date is 44 or 45, and continued the use of the same era or system of reckoning.

One of Jishnu Gupta’s records refers to yuvrāja Vishnu Gupta. But although evidently heir-presumptive to the throne, he does not seem to have succeeded Jishnu Gupta. Even if he did so, his reign must have been very short, for by A.D. 643² we find Narendradeva of the Lichchhavi dynasty as the king of Nepal. How the old dynasty revived its power after the successive usurpations of Aṃśu-varman and Jishnu Gupta we do not know. But probably it was due to the interference of Tibet. We know from the Chinese chronicles that Narendradeva’s father was removed from the throne by his younger brother, whereupon Narendradeva fled to Tibet.³ It is very likely, therefore, that with the help of the Tibetan king he recovered his paternal throne.

It has been noted above that Udayadeva is mentioned as yuvrāja in one of the records of Aṃśu-varman. Now the Paśupati Temple inscription of Nepal, while giving the genealogy of its rulers, mentions this name along with Narendradeva, and although the lacuna in the record, due to the peeling off of certain letters, does not enable us to state definitely the relation between the two, it may be reasonably presumed that Narendradeva was the son of Udayadeva.⁴ If we accept this view we may, with the help of the Chinese annals, reconstruct somewhat as follows the political history of Nepal since the death of Aṃśu-varman.

² Lévi says that it was during the reign of Narendradeva that a Chinese mission visited Nepal for the first time in A.D. 643 (Nepal, II, p. 164). Yet he says elsewhere (p. 162) that Vishnu Gupta’s reign must have been very short as Narendradeva had restored the Lichchhavi rule in Nepal by A.D. 645. His difficulty was evidently caused by assuming A.D. 595 as the starting point of the era used in the charters of Aṃśu-varman and Jishnu Gupta. For according to this view Jishnu Gupta’s last known date, year 48, becomes equivalent to A.D. 643 when, according to the Chinese evidence, Narendradeva was the king of Nepal. Even if we assume that Jishnu Gupta died in that year, there is hardly any room for Vishnu Gupta. But if, as suggested above, we assume A.D. 586 as the starting point of the era, we get the following chronology which is in full agreement with all known facts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aṃśu-varman</td>
<td>616-632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jishnu Gupta</td>
<td>632-640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnu Gupta</td>
<td>640-642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narendradeva</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Ibid., pp. 162-3.
It would appear that Aṃśu-varman had nominated as his successor a Lichchhavi prince named Udayadeva who ascended the throne after his death. But Dhruvadeva, the younger brother of Udayadeva, drove him out with the help of Jishnugupta. Although Jishnugupta at first accorded full royal honours to Dhruvadeva, he soon usurped the real power, and replaced Dhruvadeva by Mānadeva who was a mere puppet and is simply referred to as Bhaṭṭāraka. In the meantime Udayadeva's son Narendradeva fled to Tibet and evidently asked not only for protection but also for help to recover his paternal throne. Apart from his position as suzerain, the Tibetan king Srong-btsan Gampo was the son-in-law of Aṃśu-varman, and it was but natural that he should espouse the cause of Narendradeva who represented the line of succession sanctioned by Aṃśu-varman. It may appear somewhat strange that in spite of such powerful support to his rival, Jishnugupta should have continued to rule in Nepal. The explanation is perhaps to be found in the fact that the Tibetan army was at this time occupied in a distant campaign. As soon as his hands were free, the Tibetan king placed Narendradeva on the throne of Nepal, evidently by defeating Jishnugupta or his successor.

Narendradeva, Sivadeva II, and Jayadeva II

Narendradeva ascended the throne of Nepal about A.D. 643. A Chinese embassy under Li I-piao, which visited Magadha in 643, passed through Nepal and was received with all honours by Narendradeva. He also helped Wang Hiuán-tse in A.D. 647-48 as will be noted later. In A.D. 651 he sent a mission to China. When Wang Hiuán-tse passed a second time through Nepal in A.D. 657 Narendradeva was still its ruler. Throughout his reign Nepal was visited by a number of Chinese pilgrims who were probably attracted by the piety and devotion of the king. It is no doubt from these sources that the Chinese annalists derived their information about Nepal which we find incorporated in a general account of the country given in the History of the T'ang Dynasty. Although this book was written in the tenth century A.D., the picture it gives of Nepal evidently reflects the condition during the reign of Narendradeva. It portrays Nepal as peaceful and prosperous with a high degree of civilization. Both Buddhism and Brahmanism flourished, and the country was full of temples and monasteries. The epigraphic records fully confirm this. The large number of villages mentioned in them prove that the valley was densely populated. The minute regulations about irrigation presuppose a flourishing state of agriculture. Trade and commerce prospered and the merchants were organised in corpora-
tions managed by small executive committees. Sanskrit was held in high honour and was assiduously cultivated.

All the Vaññāvalīś agree in stating that Narendradeva introduced the cult of Matsyendranātha, the patron-saint of Nepal, in the year 3623 of the Kaliyuga era. This yields the date A.D. 521 or 522 which, of course, is quite wrong. Probably the Vaññāvalīś had a date before them in Saka era, which was wrongly interpreted as Vikrama era, according to the tradition current in later days. In that case the data would be really A.D. 657 which falls in the reign of Narendradeva.

According to the Paññupati Temple inscription, Narendradeva was succeeded by his son Śivadeva and the latter by his son Jayadeva. We have dated records of both and also know how the queen of the former was related to Aṃśu-varman. This will be evident from the following table which, barring the usurpation of Jīshnu-gupta, represents the line of succession from Aṃśu-varman, as suggested above, together with the known dates all of which presumably belong to the same era:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aṃśu-varman (30-44)</th>
<th>Sister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Udayadeva</td>
<td>(Maukhari) Bhoga-varman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narendradeva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivadeva II........m.................................Vatsadevī (119)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadeva II (157)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief difficulty in accepting this genealogy is the long interval in time between Aṃśu-varman and Vatsadevī, as well as between Narendradeva and his grandson. The last known date of Aṃśu-varman being year 44, the daughter of his nephew was alive more than 75 years after his death. Again Narendradeva was on the throne in A.D. 643 while his grandson flourished in A.D. 763, 751 or 743 (according as we interpret the dates by the Harsha era or the Tibetan era of A.D. 595 or 586), i.e., more than 100 years later. These things are not impossible though they must be regarded as very unusual. But the objection or the difficulty is not strong enough to justify us in rejecting the genealogy supplied by the Paññupati Temple inscription which is supported by the independent records of Śivadeva and Jayadeva.
The marriage of Śivadeva with Vatsadevī was perhaps a political alliance between two families, both having rightful claims to the throne. But it possibly meant something more. For Vatsadevī’s mother was a daughter of the powerful king Ādityasena of Magadha and the marriage probably established an alliance between Magadha and Nepal. It was perhaps this alliance which emboldened the ruler of Nepal in A.D. 702 to throw off the yoke of Tibet. It is said that both Nepal and Po-lo-men revolted at the same time. The latter denotes in a general way Central India, but we have no other record to show that any part of India was at this time subject to Tibet. We know, however, that some time between A.D. 713 and 741 Yaśovarman referred to in Chinese annals as king of Central India, sent an envoy to China asking for help against the Tibetans, and another enemy, more formidable still, viz., the Arabs.Śivadeva is reputed to have advanced as far as Gauda in the course of his victorious campaign, it is not unlikely that the ruler of Nepal acted in concert with him, or took advantage of his fight with Tibet, to declare himself independent of that country. But the geographical position of Nepal made it more vulnerable to an attack from the Tibetan side than any part of India and so it was defeated and had to submit again. A reminiscence of the Tibetan supremacy over Nepal is furnished by the inscription of Śivadeva, dated 119, in which a donated village, otherwise rendered free from taxes, is expressly made liable to furnish five porters as Bhotta-vishti, i.e. corvée to Bhotta, the Indian name for Tibet, met with for the first time in this record.

King Śivadeva made many religious endowments and founded a monastery named after him. An inscription containing some donations to this monastery gives Bhṛṭṭaraka Śri Śivadeva as the name of the dāta. It has been suggested that he might be the king himself, and in that case we must hold that he abdicated the throne. This is, however, very unlikely.

Śivadeva’s son and successor Jayadeva II has left us a long record in the Paśupati Temple, dated in the year 153, which, as noted above, has been taken to be equivalent to A.D. 759 by some and A.D. 748 by others. Although neither of these may prove to be correct.

5 Ibid., pp. 174-75.
6 Ibid., p. 169.
the actual date cannot be far removed from them, and there is no doubt that Jayadeva reigned about the middle of the eighth century.

The Paśupati Temple inscription gives the genealogy of the rulers of Nepal which forms the main basis of the history sketched above. It also contains a panegyric of the king in a highly poetic style. One verse of this panegyric is a double entendre. In one sense it describes the beauty and good qualities of the king, but taken in another sense it conveys the idea that he extended his political influence over the Aṅga country, conquered Kāmarūpa, approached Kāñchī in the south, and bestowed his attention even on the work of administration of the distant Surāshṭra country.”7 It is further added that king Jayadeva thus displayed the career of a universal monarch and was therefore known as parachakrakāma (desirous of winning the kingdoms of his enemies). Although some scholars have taken this to be a historical fact,8 most probably it is nothing but a poetic fancy of which other examples are known.9

Jayadeva’s queen Rājyamati was the daughter of Harshadeva of the Bhagadatta family, described as the lord of Gauḍa, Oḍra, Kaliṅga, Kosala and other countries. This Harshadeva is usually regarded as a king of Kāmarūpa and identified with king Harsha-varman, but this is very doubtful.10 But the marriage alliances of Sivadeva and Jayadeva clearly prove that Nepāla was slowly emerging out of its secluded life in the Himālayas in order to take its legitimate place in the polity of the great country or sub-continent of which it geographically formed a part. The inscriptions clearly show that Hiuan Tsang’s description11 of the people as rude and unlettered evidently applied to the general mass of the hill tribes alone, but the cultured section in Nepal fully imbibed the religion, literature and social ideas of the Indian plains.

The Successors of Jayadeva II

For more than a century after the glorious reign of Jayadeva II we know very little of the history of Nepal. No epigraphic record of the period has yet come to light, and the account in the Vaiśāvalis is hopelessly confused. There are, however, external evidences to show that during this period Nepal was subjected to a series of

7 HNI, pp. 301-2.
8 Ibid.
9 Nepal, II, 170.
10 This has been discussed in the section ii of this chapter.
11 HTB, II, pp. 80-81.
foreign invasions. The earliest in point of time is an invasion by Jayāpiḍa, the ruler of Kashmir (A.D. 773-804). The romantic story narrated by Kalhaṇa may be summed up as follows:

In the course of his campaign for world conquest, Jayāpiḍa came to Nepal, but its ruler Aramuḍi refused to submit, and took his position on the bank of a river, the water of which was only knee-deep. Jayāpiḍa and his army, while fording the river, were caught by a sudden tide. The army was destroyed and the king was made a prisoner. He was kept confined in a very high stone building on the bank of the Kālganḍikā (probably the same river). There his trusted minister saw him after allaying the suspicions of the Nepal ruler by false pretensions of entering into a treaty with him against Jayāpiḍa. The minister killed himself in order that by using his body as an inflated skin the king might cross the river after jumping into it from the window. Jayāpiḍa thus crossed the river and joined his army which was kept fully equipped on the other bank by the faithful minister. He then completely defeated the ruler of Nepal and devastated the country’…

The truth of this story has been doubted by most scholars. But as Lévi points out, the barbaric character of the royal name, so different from the Sanskritic names used by the kings of Nepal, shows that the story is perhaps not absolutely without foundation. For if the author invented the whole story out of pure imagination, he would have used a familiar royal name. Lévi suggests that Aramuḍi was probably a Tibetan, sent by the Tibetan king, as suzerain of Nepal, to defend the country against the attack by the king of Kashmir. He further points out that in the name of the river Kālagaṇḍikā it is easy to recognize the Kāla (or Kāli) Gaṇḍakī, the westernmost of the seven Gaṇḍakīs, which would naturally be the first barrier to an invader coming from the west.

Not long after this Nepal was perhaps subjugated by the Pāla king Dharmapāla. It is perhaps the conquest of Nepal which brought the Pālas into conflict with Tibet, and led to invasions of India by successive rulers of Tibet, as will be mentioned later. Nepal must have suffered a great deal as a battle-ground of these two powerful rivals.

It is not till we come to the reign of Rāghavadeva that light dawns again upon the history of Nepal. The name of this king is found in only one Vaṃśāvalī where he is said to have introduced the Samvat or Vikrama era in Nepal. Although the name of Rāghavadeva is

12 Rājataaraṅgini, IV, vv. 531-81.
omitted from the other Vaṁśāvalīś, his existence is proved by a new chronicle discovered by Bendall. What is more important still, this chronicle supplies the names of the successors of Rāghavadeva and their reign-periods, from which it may be reasonably concluded that he reigned near about A.D. 879, which is the epoch of the Newari era, current in Nepal even now. In the light of this new evidence one might regard Rāghavadeva as the founder of the Newari era, a view held by Prinsep and Cunningham, but rejected by S. Lévi. Lévi maintained that after the year 800 of the Śaka era, the Nepalese, who had a dread for the figure 8, simply dropped the figure for hundreds and began to count anew from year 1 of the ninth century of that era.

If we reject this view of the adaptation of the Śaka era, we may find a very good explanation for the founding of a new era in Nepal in A.D. 879. This is the rapid decline in the power of Tibet about the middle of the ninth century A.D. to such an extent that we may well believe that the Newari era of A.D. 879 commemorates the end of Tibetan supremacy in Nepal or the commencement of the reign of Rāghavadeva who freed Nepal from the yoke of Tibet. The two events might have coincided; otherwise, the latter view seems preferable.

According to the new chronicle discovered by Bendall Rāghavadeva ruled for 46 years and 6 months, and the reigns of his three successors covered a period of 20 years. We know practically nothing about these kings. Then came Guṇakāmadeva who is credited with a long reign of 51, 65, or 85 years in different Vaṁśāvalīś. From the date of one of his successors we may reasonably conclude that Guṇakāmadeva ceased to rule before A.D. 1000. Roughly speaking we may regard his reign as covering the second half of the tenth century A.D.

The legends current in Nepal represent Guṇakāma as a great and powerful king. He is said to have founded the city of Kathmandu, though the date given, viz., A.D.-723-24, is more than two centuries earlier than his time. The foundation of two other cities, Patan and Sanku, is also referred to the same period. Though Lévi prefers to take the date as right and reject the association of Guṇakāma with the foundation of Kathmandu, he nevertheless points out that Kāntipurā, the old name of Kathmandu, might be easily traced to Guṇakāma, the two words Kānti and Kāma being derived from the same root. Guṇakāma is also believed to have been the founder of many religious institutions in Nepal, particularly the yāṭrā in honour of

Khasarpana Lokesvara which was obviously designed to benefit Kathmandu by decreasing the importance of the yātra of Matsyendranātha at Patan. He made rich donations, including two fountains of gold, to Paśupati, and brought the goddess Chaṇḍesvari from the east. In spite of his religious endowments on a lavish scale he is said to have amassed a fabulous wealth, which he left in the safekeeping of Nāga Vāsuki, in a cave of mount Indraśāla.

These legends perhaps reflect the transition of a mainly rural and agricultural to an urban and industrial community. The change was facilitated, if not brought about, by the intimate association of Nepal with Tibet and the plains of India. It naturally served as the medium of trade between these two regions, and thus acquired immense wealth which was spent in building temples and monasteries, and in organizing a better civic life. Nepal had now become a progressive state in every sense of the term.

II. KĀMARŪPA

Bhāskara-varman, whose history has been dealt with above, probably died about A.D. 650. So far as available evidence goes he was the last king of the dynasty which had been ruling Kāmarūpa for more than 400 years. We learn from epigraphic records of a later date that shortly or immediately after his death, a Mlechchha chief, Sālāstaṁbha by name, became the ruler of Kāmarūpa and founded a new royal line: On the other hand, we know from Chinese and Tibetan sources that Sron-btsan Gampo, who died about A.D. 650, conquered a large part of India including Kāmarūpa. It is not, therefore, unreasonable to conclude that the Tibetan conquest was the main, if not the direct, cause of the end of the old dynasty, and the rise to power of the Mlechchha chief Sālāstaṁbha. It has been suggested that Mlechchha denotes the tribe called Mech, but it is perhaps better to take it in the general sense of a Mongolid without specifying any particular tribe. The Tibetans evidently placed one of allied descent on the throne of Kāmarūpa in order to maintain their hold on the country.

It has been held by some scholars that although Sālāstaṁbha is called a Mlechchha in a later record, he was really a scion of the dynasty to which Bhāskara-varman belonged, viz., the one founded by the mythical Naraka. But there seems to be little justification for the view. This will be evident from the three following passages

17 Ibid., KS, 19. See list of inscriptions at the end of chapter.
in epigraphic records regarding the successive families that ruled in Kāmarūpa:

1. This powerful kingdom, ruled for generations by the dynasty of Naraka, was, by a turn of adverse fate, occupied by the Mlechchha lord Sālastāṁbha. In his family, too, were born famous kings like Vigrahastaṁbha, twenty in number. When Tyāgasinīha, the twenty-first king, died without any issue, the people thought that they needed a ruler of the dynasty of Naraka and so elected Brahmaṇḍa as king (No. V, vv. 9-10).

2. In his (Naraka’s) lineage was born the king with the strange name Prālaṁbha. He, along with the preceding kings, beginning with Sālastāṁbha and ending with Śri-Harisha, delighted the world by his royal qualities. He (Prālaṁbha) was succeeded by his son Harjara (No. III, vv. 7-8, 11).

3. After many kings in his (Naraka’s) lineage had passed away, Sālastāṁbha occupied the throne. After many kings of Sālastāṁbha’s family, like Pālaka and Vijaya, had passed away, flourished Harjara (No. IV, vv. 9-10).

It is not easy to reconcile the above statements. According to the first, the Naraka dynasty, dethroned by Mlechchha Sālastāṁbha, was not restored till the time of Brahmaṇḍa. According to the second, Prālaṁbha, who presumably founded a new dynasty which replaced that of Sālastāṁbha, belonged to the Naraka dynasty. But the first clearly implied that the kings intervening between Sālastāṁbha and Brahmaṇḍa, 21 in number, which must have included Prālaṁbha and his successors, all belonged to the dynasty of Sālastāṁbha. The third passage corroborates the view that Harjara, and therefore also his father Prālaṁbha, did not belong to Sālastāṁbha’s family.

The most reasonable conclusion that may be drawn from these conflicting statements seems to be somewhat as follows:

There were three distinct royal dynasties founded, respectively, by Sālastāṁbha, Prālaṁbha, and Brahmaṇḍa. There is no doubt that the first was a Mlechchha, and the third, a member of the Naraka dynasty. The position of the second is somewhat doubtful. It claimed to belong to the dynasty of Naraka, but this was not generally recognized, and the kinship was definitely disowned by the third dynasty.

We possess very little knowledge of the dynasty of Sālastāṁbha. Inscription No. II gives us a long list of kings belonging to this dynasty: There are Vijaya, Pālaka, Kumāra, Vajradeva, Harsha-varman, and Bala-varman. Reference is then made to two haughty princes named Chakra and Arathi who always flouted the commands of the
gurus on account of which the kingdom then passed to the son of the younger brothers.

This inscription then refers to Jivadevi, the mother of Harjara, but an unfortunate lacuna prevents us from knowing her relation with the preceding ruler. It is not unlikely that she was his daughter and that would explain why Harjara, though belonging to the Naraka dynasty, was regarded by some as born in the lineage of Sálastaṁbha. But this is a mere hypothesis for the present.

Inscription No. V supplies the name of king Vigrahastaṁbha, which is not met with in the genealogical list given above. Another name Harisha found in inscription No. III might have been equated with Harsha-varman in the above list, but for the statement that he was the last ruler in the line of Sálastaṁbha.

We do not know anything of these kings beyond their names. It is, however, now generally held that king Harsha-varman, mentioned in inscription No. II, was the father of Rājayamā, queen of Jayadeva II of Nepal and was therefore the lord of Gauḍa, Oḍra, Kalinga, and Kosala. The only ground for this identification is the description of Harsha-varman as belonging to the Bhagadatta family. For Bhagadatta was the son of Narakā, whom many kings of Kāmarūpa claim as their progenitor. It is to be noted, however, that Harsha-varman is not referred to in the Nepāl inscription as the lord of Kāmarūpa, and it is very doubtful if any king of this border region could have been so powerful as to overrun Gauḍa, Oḍra, Kalinga, Kosala, i.e., Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and its neighbourhood on the west. Besides, as we have seen above, Harsha-varman, king of Kāmarūpa, was not probably descended from Bhagadatta, whereas there were other royal families, one in Orissa and the other in north-western frontier of India, claiming descent from Bhagadatta. In view of all this it is difficult to regard Harsha-varman of Kāmarūpa, of whom we otherwise know nothing, as the father-in-law of Jayadeva II, and credit him, on that basis, with the conquest of the extensive regions mentioned above.

Prālaṁbha, the founder of the next dynasty, flourished at the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century. The Pāla kings of Bengal are known to have conquered Kāmarūpa about this time, and the change in the royal family may not be altogether unconnected with this event. It is not unlikely, for example, that Prālaṁbha was placed on the throne by Devapāla. But whatsoever that may be, Prālaṁbha’s son Harjara was undoubtedly a powerful ruler. This is proved by his assumption of the imperial titles Mahārājādhirāja,
Parameśvara Paramabhaṭṭaraka in his record (No. I) dated in the year 510 of the Gupta era, i.e., A.D. 829-30. There is no doubt that he freed Kāmarūpa from the yoke of the Pālas. This probably explains why his name occurs as the founder of a royal family in some records, as in the third statement quoted above. The records of Harjaravarman (Nos. I, II) bestow vague praises on him but do not contain any historical information. One of these is a land-grant issued from Hāruppeśvara, which was evidently his capital, as his successors also issued grants from the same city. It has been identified with Tezpur on the Brahmaputra, about sixty or seventy miles further up from Gauhati (ancient Pragyotishapura) which was probably the earlier capital of the kingdom under Bhāskara-varman and his predecessors. A grandiloquent description of the city of Hāruppeśvara is given in a charter of Harjara's son Vanamāla (No. III) which records a grant of some lands to the west of the river Trisrotā. As this may be definitely identified with the modern Tista, Vanamāla's kingdom probably extended up to the Karato'yā which, in some old texts, is described as the western boundary of Kāmarūpa.

Vanamāla, after having enjoyed a long reign, abdicated in favour of his son Jayamāla. Though a devotee of god Mahādeva (Śiva), Vanamāla starved himself to death in right Jain fashion. Jayamāla ascended the throne and assumed the name Vīrabāhu. He also had a long reign and, being attacked by an incurable disease, abdicated in favour of his son Bala-varman. Both Vanamāla and Bala-varman are given imperial titles in their charters, and it may be reasonably inferred that Harjara-varman and his three successors were all powerful kings. Their reign-periods probably covered more than a century, as two of them are specifically said to have reigned for long periods. We may therefore place the end of Bala-varman's reign in the second quarter of the tenth century A.D. As Brahmapāla, the founder of the next dynasty, may be referred on palaeographic grounds to the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century A.D., Bala-varman must have had two or more successors. The last ruler of this family was Tyāgasimha. According to a passage in inscription No. V. quoted above, he died without any issue and with him, some time about A.D. 1000, ended the dynasty founded by Prālambha.

19 This also follows from the description of the city as paśāmahāṁ kaṭakam of king Bala-varman (ins. No. IV, v. 25).
20 KS, Introd., p. 4.
21 Dr. Hoernle referred the alphabet of the copperplates of Ratna-pāla to the first half of the eleventh century A.D. (JASB, 1896, Part i, p. 102). The accession of Brahmapāla, the father of Ratnapāla, may therefore be placed at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century A.D.
SELECT LIST OF INSCRIPTIONS (KĀMARŪPA)

III. Tezpur Cp. of Vanamāla (*JASB*, IX, 1840, p. 766).
V. Boragaon Cp. of Ratnapāla (*JASB*, LXVII, Pt. i, p. 106).
VI. Soalkuchi Cp. of Ratnāpāla (*JASB*, LXVII, Pt. i, p. 122).

(All these inscriptions are edited in the Bengali work *Kamārupaśāsanaśālī* by MM. Padmanath Bhattacharyya. This work is referred to as *KS*).

### III. TIBET AND INDIA

The north-eastern frontier of India, unlike the north-western, has been generally regarded as comparatively safe, as we know of no major invasion from this side during the period of which the history is fairly well known. The gradual infiltration of the Mongoloid tribes, generally pacific in character, though sometimes, as in the case of the Ahoms, effected by a regular invasion, touched only a fringe of the country. India was scarcely affected even by the mass migration of the Tibeto-Burmans from the borders of China and Tibet southwards along the valleys of the Irrawaddy and the Chindwin which created the Burmese nation and the kingdom of Burma in the eleventh century. It was not till many centuries after these people had settled in Burma that their rulers threatened the eastern frontier of India. Barring the rapid advance of the Burmese towards Assam and Chittagong at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the threatened Japanese invasion of India through Manipur in the Second World War, the eastern frontier was never exposed to any serious danger.

The northern frontier, guarded by the Himālayas, is naturally regarded as more secure than the north-eastern, and according to the general belief it has never been exposed even to the dangers that occasionally threatened the latter in recent times. But this popular view is belied by history. As has been pointed out above, for more than two centuries, from c. 600 to 850 A.D., Tibet played an important part in Indian politics and even the Himālayas proved an ineffective barrier against her repeated aggression. Curiously enough, India has no memory of these; but though unrecorded in Indian literature and even unknown to Indian tradition, the truth of Tibetan

---

invasions cannot be reasonably doubted, and it is not unlikely that these had a far greater influence upon the course of Indian history than we are at present prepared to concede. It is, therefore, desirable to give a general outline of the history of Tibet with special reference to its relations with India, even though it would naturally involve repetitions of what has been incidentally said above in connection with different kings and countries.

There can be scarcely any doubt that from time immemorial peoples of Mongol stock from beyond the Himalayas crossed over the range in small batches and settled in the lower slopes of this mountain. The Newaris of Nepal and perhaps other settlers in the neighbourhood of this region are very probably the results of such migration. But in historic times they had no recollection of their original home, nor kept link with their kinsmen beyond the Himalayas, who, like themselves, were divided into numerous petty clans ruling over small principalities.

All this was suddenly changed towards the end of the sixth century A.D. A chief named Srong-btsan, who lived to the west of Sang-ko, re-united all these clans and founded a powerful kingdom some time between A.D. 580 and 600. The country over which he ruled was named 'Bod' which was sanskritized in the forms 'Bhoṭa' or 'Bhoṭṭa', and later transformed by the Europeans into Tibet. At the beginning of the rule of the Tang dynasty in China (c. 620 A.D.) Srong-btsan, king of Tibet, had a regular army of 100,000 men. He conquered various countries, including one called Gru-gu on the border of India, and is said to have extended his authority in the south-west, as far as Po-lo-men or the country of Brāhmaṇas, which is used as a vague designation for India.

The glory of the founder of Tibet is overshadowed by that of his son Srong-btsan-sgam-po. According to the Tibetan Chronicles he ruled from A.D. 629 to 698, but the more reliable Chinese evidence fixes his date from A.D. 622 to 650. He sent a mission to India to learn the Indian alphabet, and introduced it in Tibet with slight modifications adapted to suit his native language. The script he then introduced still forms the basis of Tibetan alphabet. But his relation with India was not always of peaceful nature. He sent an army to help Wang Hüian-ts'o and the easy victory of the latter in India opened up before his eyes a wide vista of conquest which he was not slow to carry into effect. Next, he demanded the hand of the princess of Nepal, and Ámsu-varman dared not refuse marriage alliance with a barbarian chief the reputation of whose great military power and conquests abroad had already reached his ears. All that he could do was to satisfy his vanity by pretending to believe in
the genealogy manufactured by the Tibetans according to which their king was descended from the Lichchhavis or the Sākyas, or the kings of Magadha and Pañchāla. The marriage took place in or before A.D. 639. The young daughter of Aṃśu-varman took with her images of the Buddhist gods and the sacred texts of the Buddhists, and was thus instrumental in introducing Buddhism into Tibet.

Srōṅ-btsan-sgam-po had led a series of successful invasions against China from A.D. 634 to 641, and now demanded the hand of a Chinese princess as a condition for peace. The Chinese emperor at first refused, but ultimately had to sacrifice his scruples to the fear of the Tibetan military hosts. The new queen joined her predecessor from Nepal in placing Buddhism on a firm foundation in Tibet, which thus derived from both China and India the arts, crafts and diverse branches of knowledge that transformed the primitive people to a cultured and civilized state. Kumāra from Central India, Śilamaṇḍu from Nepāl and Tabuta and Ganaṭa (?) from Kāshmir introduced Indian medical science to Tibet. Buddhist scriptures were translated, and Buddhism, being adopted by the king, spread rapidly among the subjects. Srōṅ-btsan-sgam-po was recognized as the incarnation of Bodhisatva Padmapāṇi and his two queens as those of Tārā.

Nepāl at this time was a dependency of Tibet and the close and intimate cultural relation between the two led Sylvain Lévi to formulate the theory that the dates in Aṃśu-varman’s charters are to be referred to an era of Tibetan origin. On the ground of some astronomical details in one of them he fixed A.D. 595 as the starting point of this era. But, as noted above, this does not agree with Hsiian Tsang’s statement that Aṃśu-varman died before his visit to Nepāl in or about A.D. 637. Lévi further pointed out that the era known as San, and now exclusively used in Bengal, must have begun about A.D. 595 as there is a difference of 593 or 594 years between the reckoning of this and the Christian era. He, therefore, suggested that this was also the era of Tibetan origin which was used in Aṃśu-varman’s charters. But this Nepalese era seems to be the Saka era with ‘five hundred’ omitted and the two extreme dates of Aṃśu-varman’s reign, so far definitely known, namely 30 and 40 would correspond to A.D. 508 and 618.23

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

POLITICAL DISINTEGRATION AFTER HARSHA (A.D. 650 to 750)

I. KANAUJ

I. Wang-hiuan-tse’s Expedition

Harsha-Vardhana’s death was followed by a period of anarchy. Ma-Twan-Lin1 relates that

‘in the twentieth year of the Ching-kwan period (A.D. 646), the emperor sent Wang hiuan-tse on an embassy to the kingdom of Magadha. Before he arrived king Siladitya had died, and his kingdom fell into a state of anarchy. One of his ministers named Na-fot-i-a-la-na-shun (Nava...?) usurped the supreme power, and sent soldiers to oppose Wang Hiuan-tse. At this time his suite consisted only of a few dozens of cavaliers, who struggled without success, and were all taken prisoners. Soon after the usurper used violence to make other kingdoms pay him tribute.

‘Hiuan-tse resolved upon action, and retired to a town on the western frontier of Tu-fan, from which he called the neighbouring kingdoms to arms. The king of Tu-fan came with a thousand soldiers, and the king of Nepal with seven thousand cavaliers. Hiuan-tse divided them into several bodies, and marched against the town of Ta-po-ho-lo, which he took by storm at the end of three days. He beheaded three thousand people, and ten thousand more were drowned. A-la-na-shun abandoned his kingdom and fled, then he collected his scattered troops, and attempted a fresh fight, but the general Jin (or Tsiang-shi-jin) took him alive, and also captured and beheaded a thousand men. The remains of the hostile army, obeying the orders of the queen, tried to stop the way upon the banks of the river Khien-to-wei; but Tsiang-shi-jin gave them battle and defeated them. He took the queen and the king’s son prisoners, captured twelve thousand men and women, and twenty

1 IA, IX, p. 20.
thousand heads of cattle, and subdued five hundred and eighty
towns, large and small.

'Shi-kieu-ma (Sríkumāra), king of Eastern India, sent him
thirty thousand oxen and horses, and provisions for all his-army; to
which he added bows, scimitars, and collars of great value. ' The
king of Kia-mo-lo (or Kia-pi-li) gave him some rare articles, a map
of his states and several statuettes of Lao-tsu.

'Hsüan-tse took A-la-na-shun, and presented him at the gate of
the palace (in the capital of China).'

It follows from the above report that after the death of Harsha
anarchy broke out in his kingdom and one of his ministers, whose
name may be restored as Arjuna or Arunāśva, usurped the throne.
Arjuna tried to bring the neighbouring hostile chiefs under his control,
and came into conflict with a Chinese embassy led by Wang Hsüan-
tse, which was on its way to Magadha. Wang Hsüan-tse, having
been defeated, fled to Tufan or Tibet, which was then ruled by
Srōng-ts'an-Gampo, one of whose queens was a Chinese princess. He
organised a strong army, having received help from the king of Tibbt,
king of Nepāl, and Sríkumāra or Bhāskara-varman of Kāmarūpa, and
attacked the town called Ta-po-ho-lo variously identified with Champāran
and Tirhut (Darbhanga and Muzaffarpur districts). Arjuna was
defeated and taken prisoner to China. It is difficult to ascertain the
amount of truth underlying this somewhat romantic story of the Chi-

2 The Khien-to-wei river has been restored as Gandhāra by Beal. But it seems
to be identical with the Gandak. Beal thinks that Ta-po-ho-lo should be pronounced
as Dāvabāra (?). Pauthier reads it as Tu-pu-ho-lo. It is suggested that Tu (the
first character) may be read 'cha' or 'tsa'. Cha-pu-ho-lo is an exact transcription of
Champāran. Champāran, anciently known as Champāranya, is a district in northern
Bihar. Smith identifies Tu-pu-ho-lo with Tirhut (Darbhanga and Muzaffarpur districts),
an ancient Tirabhukti. Kia-mo-lo has been read by some as Kia-pi-li. Dharmapāla
(c. A.D. 800) granted lands in Magadha from his camp at Kapila (?), cf. IA, IX, p. 20
and n. 58; EHI, p. 377; EI XXIII, p. 290; Moon-loved, king of Kia-pi-li, sent an

(For details of the Indo-Chinese Missions and the death of Harsha, see D. Devabuti,
Harsha, Oxford, 1970, pp. 207ff. The authoress has made a critical appraisal of these
missions and the events after the death of Harsha on the basis of the Chinese sources,
which include a few hitherto unknown and unutilized works. She concludes: 'In
spite of the initial losses and early difficulties, Wang Hsüan-t'sē's visit to India
ended in success... A-lo-na-shun, though a prisoner, appears to have received con-
siderate treatment... On presenting the rewards for his success, Wang Hsüan-t'sē was
suitably honoured with promotion to the rank of Ch'ao-san-t's-tu.' op. cit., pp. 228-
29). (Error).
nese ambassador winning brilliant victories and making extensive conquests in a far-off land with the help of a small contingent of 8000 soldiers lent by Nepal and Tibet. Possibly a small border skirmish has been magnified beyond proportion, or the Chinese general took part in a war between two or more Indian states. If the claim of Srong-thon-Gampo to have conquered a large part of India may be taken as a historical fact, and the date of his death be taken as A.D. 650, as proposed by Lévi, his conquests must have begun prior to Wang. Hinán-tse’s visit, and the latter’s so-called campaign may be really a part of that expedition. In any case, the whole episode must be regarded as obscure.

2. The Dynasty of Sayār

We possess no other direct information regarding the history of Kanauj till the rise of Yaśovarman. Chach-nāma, a work of rather late period, while narrating the history of Sindh, makes some passing observations on the subject. It says\(^\text{3}\) that Sayār, son of Rāsil Rāi, was the king of Kanauj when Chach (A.D. 622-62) was ruling Sindh. Agham Lūḥānah, governor of Brahmanabad, sought help from Savār, when he was attacked by Chach. But Agham Lūḥānah died before he received any reply from the king of Kanauj. Sayār seems to have been succeeded by his younger brother Sahiras, and Chach was succeeded by his brother Chandar. Mattah, governor of Siwistan, went to Kanauj, and pointed out to its king Sahiras, son of Rāsil, that it would be easy for him to conquer Sindh as the country was under a weak ruler Chandar. He proposed that after the conquest of the country he should be its ruler on condition of payment of tribute to the king. Sahiras replied that if he could succeed in conquering that country he would prefer to annex it to his own kingdom. Sahiras sent his brother Barhās to Kashmir to secure military help from its king who readily complied and sent an army.\(^\text{4}\) Sahiras conquered the fort of Dew Dhanāz (or Dew-dhanush), and reached Band-kahūveh. He sent a letter to Chandar demanding his surrender. Chandar sent Dharsiah, son of Chach, to defend Brahmanabad, and himself with the assistance of Dahar, another son of Chach, made preparations for the defence of Alor. Sahiras attacked the fort of Alor but failed to capture it. He then tried some foul means to achieve his object, and invited Dahar to his camp on the pretence of having a discussion for the conclusion of a treaty. Dahar having discovered the conspiracy took the offensive and captured Sahiras. Sahiras purchased his release

\(^\text{3}\) Chach-nāma. English Translation by Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg, p. 33; HIED I, p. 142

\(^\text{4}\) The king may be identified with Durlabhaka (A.D. 682-712).
by his promise to surrender the fort of Dew Dhanāz. Nothing more is known of Sahiras.5 We are next told that Mahammad, son of Qāsim, after his conquest of Sindh, made preparations for the invasion of Kanauj, which was then ruled by Rai Harchandar. Muhammad could not carry out his project as he was recalled by the Caliph.

Thus from the Chach-nāma we learn the names of four kings, viz., Rāsil Rai, Sayār, Sahiras, and Rai Harchandar, who ruled Kanauj, the capital of Hind, during a period of 70 years following the death of Harsha.6

3. Yaśovarman

Yaśovarman's ancestry is unknown, but he is mentioned as a member of the lunar race in the Prakrit poetical work Gaudavaho.7 The Chinese annals8 mention him as the king of Central India (Madhyadeśa?), and in the Rājatarāṅgini9 and Bappabhatta-charita10 he is referred to as the king of Kanauj. Composed by Yaśovarman's court-poet Vākpāti, Gaudavaho ('slaving of the king of Gauda') gives somewhat detailed information about the king's conquest of a large number of countries.11 It tells us that at the end of the rainy season Yaśovarman, at the head of cavalry and elephant forces, went out for conquest. He reached the valley of the Son when the cold season set in, and proceeded to the Vindhya mountain, where he paid his reverence to the goddess Vindhavāsini. Vākpāti next mentions that 'the king of the Magadhas fled before him through fear'. The multitude of the allied or feudral kings of the lord of Magadha, however, opposed Yaśovarman, but they were completely defeated. Yaśovarman, having slain the king of the Magadhas who was fleeing, proceeded to the seashore. Next Yaśovarman marched against the Vaṅgas, who were in

5 The Chalukya Vijayāditya (a.d. 680-99), king of Badami, defeated the king of Uttarāpatha. According to the Southerners Uttarāpatha included the Uttar Pradesh.

6 A Chinese authority relates that Ti-mo-si-nya (Bhūmasena ?), king of Central India, sent an embassy to the Chinese emperor in a.d. 692. (K.A.N. Sastri, Foreign Notices of South India, p. 110.)

It is difficult to reconstruct the history of Kanauj on the basis of the story in Chach-nāma, as it is not corroborated by any reliable evidence (EDITOR).


8 Ma-Twan-Lin relates that 'In the Khai-yuen period (A.D. 713-42) an ambassador came from Central India, and asked for troops to punish the To-shi (Tazi=Arabs) and the Tu-fan (Tibetans)' IA, IX. p. 21. Sastri, Foreign Notices, p. 117. Also cf. Stein, Rājatarangini, I, 132. n. 134.

9 Ibid, p. 132.

10 JBBRAS, III, 1928, p. 103.

11 Gaudavaho. A summary of its contents with reference to verses is given in the 'Introduction', pp. XVII-XXXIII.
possession of a large number of warlike elephants, and defeated them. After this victory, Vākpati continues, Yaśovarman proceeded by the road across the Malaya mountain (Sahyādri mountain) and extorted submission from the kings of the southern quarters. He then marched against the Pārasikas and defeated them in a severe battle. After this Yaśovarman levied tribute in those regions which were made inaccessible by the western mountains. He then proceeded to the bank of the Narmadā and went thence to Maru (Marwar), Srikaṇṭha (Thanesar) and the city of Hariśchandra (Avodhā). He next subdued the people of the Mandāra mountain, probably the Himalayan ranges to the east of Garhwal, and even proceeded further towards the north. At the conclusion of his extensive conquests Yaśovarman returned to his capital.

The main theme of Gaudavaho, as the title indicates, is to glorify Yaśovarman for the laurels he won by slaying the king of Gauda. But, strangely enough, the poem does not mention anything about the king of Gauda, or the slaying of any king other than that of Magadhā by Yaśovarman. Hence the commentator Haripāla seems to be right in taking the king of Magadhā as identical with the king of Gauda who, according to Bannabhāṭṭa-charita, a late work, was Dharma. Some are inclined to identify the Gauda king with Jivitagupta II, the last known king of the Later Gupta dynasty of Magadhā.

There are some evidences to show that the statement of Vākpati regarding the extensive conquests made by Yaśovarman cannot be dismissed as merely a panegyric of the court-poet. A stone inscription found in the ruins of Nālandā was issued by Mālada. He was the son of Yaśovarman’s minister Tikina, the ruler of Udichī-deśa and

12 Ibid., p. 235.

13 According to others, the Gauda adversary of Yaśovarman was a chief of the Salla dynasty of the Vindhya region who, as the Ragholi plate (El. IX. p. 46) states, occupied Pundrā after killing its king. Bannabhāṭṭa-charita says that Yaśovarman invaded Gauda, killed its king, and took the poet Vākpati prisoner. Vākpati secured his release by writing the poem Gaudavaho. The same authority makes it clear that Yaśovarman’s adversary Dharma was distinct from the king Dharma, who was a contemporary of Yaśovarman’s son Āna (JBBRS, III. p. 321).

14 El, XX. p. 37. Hirananda Sastri, who has edited this inscription, thinks that the record belongs to the time of king Bālāditya, who was the adversary of the Hūṇa Mihirakula (c. A.D. 530). He suggests that the Yaśovarman of the inscription is identical with Yasoddharman who warred with this Hūṇa chief, and holds that the name Yasoddharman in the Manḍasor inscription is an error for Yaśovarman. But there is nothing in the inscription to suggest that it was issued during the reign of Bālāditya. As the inscription, from the palaeographic point of view, is to be placed in the 8th century A.D., the king Yaśovarman, mentioned there, is to be identified with the hero of the Gaudavaho. R. C. Majumdar, IHQ, VII. p. 699; VIII. p. 37; Bhandarkar’s List No 2105.
the guardian of the frontier. The way in which Yaśovarman has been described in the inscription leaves no scope for doubt that he was in possession of Nālendā. The city named Yaśovarmapura,¹⁵ mentioned in the Ghoshawara inscription of Devapāla, king of the Pāla dynasty, identified with Bihar-Shariff by some, and Ghoshawara close to that locality by others, not far off from Nālendā, is suggested by some to have been founded by the king Yaśovarman. All this corroborates in general Caudavaho’s statement relating to Yaśovarman’s conquest of Magadha. If the king of Magadha was identical with the king of Gauda, Yaśovarman’s victory over Magadhan king made him master of the latter country also. As Vaṅga bordered the Gauda country, it was not difficult for Yaśovarman to force his way into that country. His adversary there, however, cannot be identified.

Udīciḥ, which was administered by Yaśovarman’s subordinate Tikina, is identical with Uttarāpatha.¹⁶ It extended from Pehowa, in the Karnal district, Harvana, to Jalalabad in Afghanistan. Hir-ananda Sastri takes it to mean the old North-Western Frontier Province. Thus a large portion of Harvana and the Panjab and possibly a part of the North-Western Frontier Province were included in the empire of Yaśovarman. This explains why a large number of Yaśovarman’s coins have been found in the Panjab, one of them hailing from a stūpa at Mānikiyāla, in Rawalpindi, Panjab. Bappabhaṭṭa-charita¹⁷ relates that Vākpati composed a poem Madra-mahi-rijaya (conquest of the Madra country) at Kanauj in the court of Yaśovarman’s son Āma. As the poem is not available, it cannot be said definitely whether Yaśovarman or his son Āma is the hero of the poem. Madra was the country, the capital of which was Sākala (modern Sialkot, in the Panjab, Pakistan). In view of the fact that Yaśovarman was in possession of the Panjab, and that Āma was not probably strong enough to launch any extensive campaign, it may be held that the poem narrates Yaśovarman’s conquest of the Madra country.

If the above observations are correct, it will follow that Yaśovarman’s empire extended from North Bengal to the North-West Frontier Province.

A Chinese authority¹⁸ states that I-cha-fon-mo (Yaśovarman), king

¹⁵ IA, XVII, pp. 307-21: VIII, p. 76; ASIR, III, pp. 120, 135.
¹⁶ The Ghoshawara stone inscription of the Pāla Devapala’s reign states that Indragupta was born in Nagarabhara, the ornament of Uttarāpatha. Indragupta’s son Viradeva became the chief of the Nālendā monastery. Viradeva, by his benevolent works, attached the banner of his fame to his two families (cakshu-paternal and maternal), residing in Udīciḥpatha (IA, XVII, p. 307). This proves beyond doubt that Uttarāpatha and Udīciḥ are identical.
¹⁸ Rājatarangini, Stein, I, p. 132.
of Central India, sent his minister Sang-po-ta to the Chinese court in A.D. 731. It is known from Tang annals that an embassy of Mukta-pidha (Lalitaḍitya), king of Kashmir, related to the Chinese court that his master already blocked the five routes to Tibet in alliance with the king of Central India some time between A.D. 736 and 747. This king of Central India (Madhya-deśa) is evidently Yaśo-varman. Yaśo-varman's expedition into the interior of Himalaya beyond Garhwal, as mentioned in the Gaṇḍavaho, was probably undertaken with a view to effecting the blockade of the routes from Tibet.

In view of the great political power of Yaśo-varman, the statement of Gaṇḍavaho regarding his conquest of the Vindhya region, which was at that time ruled by a Śaila dynasty, his victory over some south Indian chiefs and the Pārasikas, apparently the Arabs of Sindh, and his conquest of Maru or Marwar may also be taken to be based on some historical truth, though corroborative evidence is lacking. It is also probable that the kingdom of Kāśi which declared independence soon after the death of Harsha was conquered by Yaśo-varman. Yaśo-varman was undoubtedly one of the greatest kings of his age. Few kings after the Imperial Guptas are known to have succeeded in asserting their supremacy over the vast tract of country extending from North Bengal to the North-West Frontier Province. But Yaśo-varman could not enjoy the rule of his empire for long. According to Kalhana, Lalitaḍitya subsequently grew jealous of Yaśo-varman's power and attacked Gaṇḍhipura (Kanauj). Yaśo-varman, king of Kānya-kubja, first fled and then submitted, and a treaty was concluded between the two monarchs. But when Lalitaḍitya saw in the treaty the name of Yaśo-varman precede his own, he felt insulted, invaded Kanauj, and uprooted Yaśo-varman. The land of Kānya-kubja from the banks of the Yamuna to the Kālikā was annexed to the kingdom of Kashmir.

19 EI, IX, p. 41.

20 A badly mutilated inscription at Śārnāth (near Benares) mentions a king Prakaṭāḍitya, two or three of whose ancestors are named Bāḷāḍitya (CII, III, p. 84). Fleet assigns the inscription, on palaeographical grounds, to the end of the seventh century A.D., and suggests that 'the first Bāḷāḍitya is the one who is so well known in connection with the history of Mihirakula'. This can hardly be accepted without further evidence, and the predecessors of Prakaṭāḍitya seem to have been vassals of the Maukhari and Harsha-vardhana. Nothing is known of his successors. It is known from the Raghboli plate (EI, IX, p. 40) that in the early years of the eighth century a king of the Śaila dynasty killed the cruel kings of Kāśi, and took possession of it. Yaśo-varman of Kanauj asserted his supremacy over Kāśi in the second quarter of the eighth century.

21 Stein, op cit., I, pp. 132 ff; Stein identifies the Kālikā with the Kālindi which falls on the Gaṅgā near Kanauj.
Kalhana's report relating to Yasovarman's signal defeat at the hand of Lalitāditya may be accepted as true. Yasovarman's attempt to bring about political unification of Northern India thus met with failure. His rise to power was as sudden as his disappearance from the political arena. With the collapse of his sovereignty Kanauj lost its supreme position as a political power for more than three quarters of a century.

Yasovarman, who came to the throne after Harachandra who was in possession of Kanauj in A.D. 714, made an alliance with Lalitāditya of Kashmir some time between A.D. 725 and 747 and is known to have been ruling in A.D. 731. According to the Jaina chronicle of the fourteenth century his reign ended some time between A.D. 750 and 754, but according to modern scholars his defeat and dethronement took place between A.D. 736 and 747. The reign of Yasovarman may thus be placed between A.D. 715 and 745.

Yasovarman was a man of learning. The authorship of a drama named Rāmābhijudaya has been ascribed to him by the writers of the tenth and eleventh centuries. He is also said to have composed some verses and he was a great patron of poets. Rājatarāṅgini

21a For Harachandra, see p. 594, footnote 6 (remarks by the Editor).  
22 Bappabhata-Sūri-prabandha, a chapter in the Prabandha-kosā written by Nājakākha-Sūri in v.s. 1405 (A.D. 1349), relates that Yasovarman was the king of Kānya-kubja and Gopāgiri (Gwalior). He banished his queen Yasodevi, who gave birth to her son Āma while in exile. Āma was brought up by the Jaina teacher Siddhasena at Muḍherakapura. Yasodevi and Āma were subsequently restored to Yasovarman's favour, but Āma was later expelled from the court as he was a spendthrift. Āma went back to Siddhasena who educated him along with Bappabhata. At this time, in v.s. 807 (A.D. 750), Bappabhata was initiated. Some time afterwards Yasovarman fell ill, called back Āma, and declared him his successor. After the death of Yasovarman, Āma became king at Gopāgiri. Some time after Āma had ascended the throne, Bappabhata was made a Suri in v.s. 811 (A.D. 757). Hence the date of Āma's accession, according to this source, is to be placed between A.D. 750 and 754. Āma died in v.s. 890 (A.D. 833), and was succeeded by his son Dunduka. He was murdered by his son Bhoja, who took possession of the kingdom (Gaudāvaho, Intr., p. cxviii).

Bappabhata-charita, as contained in the Prabhācaka-charita, written by Chandraprabhasini, agrees in general with the above account in relating the career of Āma. It states that Āma succeeded Yasovarman on the throne of Kanauj, and assumed the name Nāgāvaloka. Āma-Nāgāvaloka died in A.D. 833 and was succeeded by his son Dunduka, who was murdered by his son Bhoja. Bhoja captured the throne of Kanauj shortly after the death of Bappabhata in v.s. 885 (A.D. 828), (IBRRAS, III, N.S. 1927-28, pp. 101, 313). The history of Āma, as given by the Jaina chronicles, is unauthentic and is at variance with the known history of the Gurjara-Pratihāras dealt with in Ch. XXII.

23 This is the view of Lévi and Chavannes (JA, 1895, p. 353).

relates that the poets Vākpatrirāja, Bhavabhūti and others adorned the court of Yasovarman.25

11. THE LATER GUPTAS

Reference has been made already (p. 195) to the tragic end of Mahāsena-gupta and his kingdom. We have also seen how his two sons Kumāra-gupta and Mādhava-gupta found refuge in the court of Thānesvar and became the companions, respectively, of Rājya-vardhana and Harsha-vardhana. We do not hear of them during the long reign of Harsha save a passing reference to the consecration by him of one Kumāra, who may be identified with this Kumāra-gupta.

The first half of the seventh century A.D. is thus almost a complete blank in the history of the Later Guptas. When the curtain lifts again we see Mādhava-gupta on the throne of Magadha, evidently by the grace of Harsha. There is no evidence that Kumāra or his brother even ruled in Mālava. As we shall see later, Harsha did not probably conquer Magadha before A.D. 641. The accession of Mādhava-gupta must therefore be placed some time after that date. It is likely from what has been stated above, that the elder brother Kumāra-gupta was first anointed king, probably of Magadha. This is not disproved by the absence of any reference to him in the Aphsad inscription, for it merely traces the succession and does not profess to give a complete genealogy of the Later Gupta kings. In that case either he died without any issue, or Mādhava-gupta was specially selected by Harsha to succeed Kumāra on account of the long-standing attachment between the two.

The Aphsad inscription bestows high encomiums on Mādhava-gupta in general terms and refers to his military success against enemies. It is likely that he distinguished himself in the wars of Harsha-vardhana. The following passage in this connection deserves special notice: ‘(My) mighty enemies have been slain by me in battle; there remains nothing more for me to do; thus, he, the hero, determined in his mind, (and then) with the desire to associate himself with the glorious Harshadeva...’ On account of the unfortunate lacuna at the end it is difficult to interpret the passage correctly. But it seems to convey that after finishing his worldly duties Mādhava-gupta died, as if from a desire to join in the other world Harsha-deva who had been his life-long associate in this world.26 In any case, we may put the


26 R. G. Basak takes this passage to mean that Mādhavagupta desired to form an alliance with Harsha (HNI, second edition, pp. 148-49). But this is hardly compatible with the view, taken above, that he was associated with Harsha since his boyhood.
death of Mādhava-gupta shortly after that of Harsha, i.e., about A.D. 650.

So long as Harsha was alive the Later Gupta king of Magadha was his feudatory. But the death of Harsha and the consequent dismemberment of his empire gave a splendid opportunity to Ādityasena, son of Mādhava-gupta, to extend his kingdom and to increase his power and authority.

Besides the Apsadb inscription, to which frequent reference has been made, at least three other records of the time of Ādityasena are known. All the four were found in South and East Bihār and record pious donations, one in Nālandā, and the others in the Gayā and Bhagalpur districts. There is thus no doubt that Ādityasena ruled in Magadha and Aīga. In two of these records Ādityasena is styled Paramabhattāraka Mahārājādhirāja, which not only proves that he enjoyed independent status, but also probably shows that he extended his power beyond the frontiers of Magadha and Aīga.

Reference may be made in this connection to an inscription on the porch of the famous temple of Vaidyanātha at Deoghar. The stone bearing this inscription was probably originally fixed to a temple on the Mandar Hill where two other inscriptions of Ādityasena’s queen Konaḍevedi were found. It is written in mediaeval character and purports to be the chapter (prakarana) on the Mandāragiri, i.e., an extract from a book of the type of māhātmyas which describe the glory of the different sites in a sacred locality. The whole of it, however, really forms an eulogy of Ādityasena. He is described as the ruler of the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans, and performer of three Aścamedhas and other great sacrifices, including one in which he gave away his own weight of gold a thousand times over together with a crore of horses. The object of the inscription is to record the building of a temple of Nṛhari (Vishnū) by king Ādityasena and his consort the glorious Koshadevedi at a cost of 30,000 large jewels and three lacs of gold (coins of the kind called) tanakakas. All these acts were done after the king had returned (lit. arrived) from the Chola city (Cholapura).

The name of the queen Koshadevedi is obviously a misreading, or error on the part of the engraver, for Konaḍevedi, the name of the queen of Ādityasena. There is no doubt, therefore, that this king is referred to in the chapter on Mandāragiri. How far its account can be regarded as historical is difficult to say, but it certainly proves that the name

27 These are the Shahpur Stone Image inscription and two identical inscriptions on the Mandar Hill (CII, III, pp. 208-12.)
28 CII, III, p. 212 n.
and fame of Ādityasena as a very rich and powerful king, who performed various Vedic sacrifices, was preserved for nearly a thousand years after his death. This must be regarded as very unusual, and it is not unlikely that the Vaidyanātha temple inscription is a later copy of an old record.

The reference to the Chola city is interesting. Whether it means the capital city of the Cholas in the South and, if so, why Ādityasena went to that remote locality, are alike now unknown. The passage seems to imply that Ādityasena returned from a victorious expedition to the Chola city with enormous treasure which he spent for the sacrifices and religious buildings. In that case, the probability is that the Chola city denoted a locality not very far from Magadha.28a

Although we know but few details of his reign, there is no doubt that Ādityasena raised the power and prestige of his family. Henceforth all the kings of the dynasty use the glorious titles of Parama-bhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja. They certainly ruled over southern Bihar, but we cannot define, even approximately, the limits of the kingdom.29

One of the inscriptions of Ādityasena, found at Shahpur (Patna district), contains a date which has been differently read by various scholars. Fleet’s reading, 66, is now generally accepted, but cannot be regarded as certain. The year 66, if referred to the Harsha era, corresponds to A.D. 672, which would be quite suitable for Ādityasena as his father was more or less of the same age as Harsha.

We learn from an inscription of Jayadeva II, king of Nepal, that his mother Vatsadevi was the daughter of Bhoga-varman of the Maukhari dynasty, and the daughter’s daughter of Ādityasena, king of Magadha. This shows that in place of age-long rivalry the Later Guptas had now friendly relations with the Maukharis.30 Ādityasena’s name is also mentioned by I-tsing as ‘Sun-army’. We are told that

28a The argument is not very convincing (Editor).
29 R. C. Basak thinks that ‘Bengal, specially the southern Bādha and Vaṅga, might have come under his domination’ (HNI, p. 151). H. C. Raychaudhuri thinks that ‘he ruled over a wide territory extending to the shores of the oceans’ (PHAI, p. 516). This is evidently based on the Douglah inscription but such expressions cannot be taken literally. H. C. Raychaudhuri also thinks that either Ādityasena or his son is the Sakaḷottvāṭha-nātha, ‘lord of the whole of North India’, who was defeated by the Chāṇukya kings Vinayāditya (A.D. 680-96) and Vijayaṇāṭya; (ibid). But this is very doubtful and the reference may well be to Yaśovarman.
30 Of the sections dealing with Nepal and the Maukhari in Chap. VIII, H. C. Raychaudhuri says that Bhogavarman, who married the daughter of Ādityasena, ‘presumably became his subordinate ally’ (PHAI, p. 516). But we do not know the status of Bhogavarman, and the marriage-alliance does not necessarily indicate his subordination.
recently’ this king built a temple for the Buddhists not very far from
the Mahābodhi temple at Gayā.\textsuperscript{31}

The names of three successors of Ādityasena are known. These are
Deva-gupta, Vishnu-gupta and Jāvita-gupta II.\textsuperscript{32} They all bear
imperial titles, but hardly anything is known of them. While we know
from the Mangraon inscription of Vishnu-gupta that he ruled for at
least 17 years, the inscription found at the Kaulesvari hill, Hazaribagh,
is the first ‘Later Gupta’ epigraph discovered in the Hazaribagh
district, showing Vishnugupta’s sway over the region.\textsuperscript{33} The inscrip-
tion of Jāvita-gupta II, which gives the complete genealogy from
Mādhava-gupta, was issued from the victorious camp situated near
the fort of Gomatikoṭṭaka. If this fort, as the name implies, was on
the bank of the river Gomati,\textsuperscript{34} we must presume that the Later Gupta
kingdom at this time embraced a part of Uttra Pradesh.

There are good reasons to believe that Jāvita-gupta II was the king
of Magadhā who was defeated and killed by Yaśovarman. The Prākṛit
poem Gauḍavahā, which describes the exploits of Yaśovarman, seems
to imply that this king of Magadhā was also the lord of Gauḍā. But
this view, though generally accepted, cannot be definitely proved. On
the other hand, it has been suggested that the adversary of Yaśovar-
man was the king of Gauḍā who had conquered Magadhā, for other-
wise there is no justification for the title of the poem which means
‘slaying of Gauḍā’.\textsuperscript{35} In any event the end of the Later Gupta dynasty
is obscure, and we cannot trace the causes or circumstances of its
decline and downfall which probably took place in the second quarter
of the eighth century A.D.

\textbf{111. BengaL}

\textbf{1. Gauḍā}

The empire of Saśāṅka and the political eminence to which he had
raised Bengal did not long survive his death. Although details are
lacking, there seems to be little doubt that within a few years a large
part of Bengal passed into the hands of Bhāskara-varman, while the

\textsuperscript{31} Beal, \textit{Life}, p. xxxvi.

\textsuperscript{32} Cf. Deo-Baranark inscription of Jīvita-gupta, \textit{CII}, III, p. 213.

\textsuperscript{33} For the Mangraon ins. see \textit{J.BRS}, XXX. Part ii and \textit{EI}, XXVI, pp. 241 ff, and
for the Kaulesvari hill inscription, see \textit{EI}, XXX, pp. 84 ff.

\textsuperscript{34} This was suggested by Fléét (\textit{CII}, III, p. 215) and has been accepted by
others (\textit{PIHAI}, p. 510) as an evidence that ‘the Later Guptas, and not the Maukharis,
dominated about this time the Gomati valley in the Madhyadesa’. But this cannot
be regarded as certain.

\textsuperscript{35} Cf. \textit{HNI}, p. 131, \textit{HBR}. I, pp. 82, 94.
rest of Saśānka's dominions, such as Koṅgoda, Orissa, and Bihar were
conquered by Harsha-vardhana.

It appears that the political disintegration of Bengal commenced
even before the conquest of Bhāskara-varman. Hiuan Tsang, who
visited this part of the country about A.D. 638, shortly after the death
of Saśānka, specifically refers to four separate kingdoms in Bengal, viz.,
Pundravardhana, Karnasuvraṇa, Tāmralipti and Samatāta, corre-
responding roughly to Northern, Western, Southern, and Eastern Bengal.
He mentions the capital of each of these, but does not say anything
about its political status. It would be unreasonable to infer from Hiuan
Tsang's silence that all these were comprised within Harsha's empire.
For, apart from obvious objections against any such general conclu-
sion, there are good grounds to believe that these territories or por-
tions thereof formed a part of the dominions of Bhāskara-varman
not of Harsha, as mentioned earlier (p. 255). We may thus infer from
Hiuan Tsang's description that the death of Saśānka loosened the
bonds which had united the whole, or a considerable part, of Bengal,
and this paved the way for its conquest by Bhāskara-varman about
the same time when Harsha conquered Kajaigala (near Rajmahal)
and Orissa, and obviously also the region in West Bengal intervening
between the two. The river Bhāgirathi was probably the boundary
between the two dominions.35a

The Maṇjuśrī-mūlakalpa,36 an enigmatic Buddhist chronicle of a
later date, seems to refer to the events of the period in a passage
which has been translated as follows: 'After the death of Soma the
Gauḍa political system (Gauḍa-tantra) was reduced to mutual distrus-
trust, raised weapons and mutual jealousy—one (king) for a week;
another for a month; then a republican constitution... Thereafter
Soma's son Mānava will last for 8 months 5 (½?) days.' Soma un-
doubtedly refers to Saśānka, and the passage evidently portrays the
political disintegration which was either the cause or the effect, per-
haps both, of the invasions of Harsha-vardhana and Bhāskara-varman.
It appears that Mānava, a son of Saśānka, tried to restore the fallen
fortunes of his family, but without success. But soon the situation
was somewhat retrieved by one Jayanāga, who is known both from
coins and inscriptions. He is styled MahārajādhīraJA in his copper-
plate grant,37 and was evidently a ruler of some authority. He cer-

35a We cannot altogether exclude the possibility that the conquests of Bhāskara-
varman took place after the death of Harsha (cf. JIH, XXXI, pp. 111-17) (Editor).
36 JIH, pp. 50-51.
37 EI, XVIII, p. 60.
tainly ruled over Birbhum and Murshidabad districts, but neither the extent of his kingdom nor any detail of his reign is known.

The political disintegration of Bengal continued for nearly a century (A.D. 650-750), which may justly be regarded as a dark period in the history of Bengal. We can imagine a series of foreign invasions which perhaps completely destroyed its political integrity. To begin with it must have been affected by the Chinese and Tibetan invasions which followed the death of Harsha\textsuperscript{37a} (pp. 591-92) and also by the re-establishment of the Later Guptas in Magadha. Some scholars hold that 'the supremacy of Tibet was so firmly established in Bengal that, for 200 years, the Bay of Bengal, was known as the Sea of Tibet'.\textsuperscript{38} Others are of opinion that Bengal, or at least a large part of it, was included in the empire of Ādityasena.\textsuperscript{39} But both these views lack positive evidence. We learn from an inscription\textsuperscript{40} of the Sāila king, Jayavardhana, that the brother of his great-grandfather defeated the Pāumātra king and conquered his dominions. The Pāumātra kingdom probably denoted North Bengal and the Sāila conquest may be referred to the early part of the eighth century A.D. As mentioned earlier (p. 595), the king of Gauḍa was defeated and killed by Yāsōvarman who next conquered Vaṅga.

There are good grounds to believe that Lalitāditya (p. 597), king of Kashmir, also established his authority in Gauḍa. Kalhana has preserved a memorable anecdote in connection with Lalitāditya's suzerainty over Bengal. It is said that once Lalitāditya asked the king of Gauḍa to visit Kāshmir. Being suspicious of his intentions, the king of Gauḍa made Lalitāditya swear by an image of Vīṣṇu that no violence would be done to his person. In spite of this, Lalitāditya had murdered the Gauḍa king treacherously. In order to take revenge for this foul crime, a few faithful followers of the Gauḍa king, undertook the long journey from Bengal to Kāshmir, attacked the temple of Vīṣṇu mentioned already, and broke one of the two images it contained—unhappily the wrong one—though they were all cut to pieces by the soldiers of Kashmir. This heroic devotion to a dead master has elicited the highest praise from Kalhana.\textsuperscript{41}

The same historian has recorded another romantic tale which has some bearing upon the history of Bengal. It is said that Jayāpīḍā, grandson of Lalitāditya, wandering incognito (p. 536), married

\textsuperscript{37a} This is hardly compatible with the author's views on the "so-called campaigns" of Wang-Hhua-tse's, in pp. 591-92 (Errone)

\textsuperscript{38} Sastri, \textit{Foreign Notices}, p. 116.

\textsuperscript{39} HNL, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{40} EI, IX, p. 41.

\textsuperscript{41} Rājatarāṅgīṇī, IV, 323-35.
Kalyāṇadevi, the daughter of Jayanta, the ruler of Pundra-vardhana, and made his father-in-law the supreme ruler by defeating five chiefs of Gauda. The existence of five Gauda chiefs fully answers to the political disintegration of Bengal, as noted already, but Jayanta, either as a local chief, or as a supreme ruler in Bengal, is otherwise unknown.

In addition to the series of foreign invasions of Bengal, mentioned earlier, we have an indirect reference to another. An inscription of king Jayadeva II of Nepal, dated 153, which may be equivalent to A.D. 759 or 748 (p. 580), describes the king’s father-in-law, Harsha of the Bhagadatta dynasty, as the lord of Gauda, Udra, Kalinga, and Kosala. This Harsha is usually taken to be a ruler of Kāmarūpa but this cannot be regarded as certain (p. 581). But as the ‘Bhagadatta dynasty’ is never known to have ruled in Bengal, the lord of Gauda whose daughter was married to king Jayadeva II of Nepal, could only establish his claim to this title by a conquest of the country.

There is no positive evidence that any of these foreigners could consolidate their political authority, far less establish any permanent rule, in Gauda. But the case seems to have been somewhat different in Samatata or Vaṅga, i.e., Eastern Bengal. We learn from Hiuan Tsang that a line of Brāhmaṇa kings ruled in Samatata in the first half of the seventh century A.D., and that Śilabhadra, the head of the Nālandā monastery in his days, was a scion of this ruling family. But towards the close of that century we find a new royal family in this region whose history is known from three records. They disclose the names of three rulers, viz., Khaḍgodvama, his son Jātakahadga, and the latter’s son Devakhadga, who ruled in the Tippera district and the region round it. The somewhat outlandish epithet khaḍga seems to indicate that the rulers were probably foreigners, but R. G. Basak thinks that the surname khaḍga may have represented an indigenous Kshatriya family of East Bengal and is not an outlandish name.42 The Khadka clan played a prominent role in the history of Nepal and founded the Gurkhā dynasty in the sixteenth century. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the Khāḍga dynasty of Bengal also originally belonged to Nepal and came to Bengal in the course of the joint Tibeto-Nepalese expeditions referred to in (p. 591). The Chinese pilgrim I-tsing alludes to a contemporary king of Eastern India named Devavarman, who was a Buddhist devotee as well as his son Bājabhata. This king has been identified by some with Devakhadga who was also a Buddhist. Others, however, identify Devavarman with Devagupta of the Later Gupta dynasty mentioned earlier, (p. 599). The former

42 HNI, p. 255.
view, however, seems more reasonable, and in that case the rule of the Khadga dynasty may be placed approximately between A.D. 650 and 700.\footnote{43}

Two other families are known to have been ruling in the same region and about the same time as the Khaḍgas. The Tippera Grant of Lokanātha of about the middle of the seventh century A.D. discloses the history of four or five generations of Sāmantas (feudatories) of the Nātha family. Lokanātha, the ablest of them, was ‘strong in men and money’ and seems to have ruled over the Tippera region. A certain Jivadhāraṇa, mentioned in this inscription as an erstwhile enemy of Lokanātha, is identical with Samataṃśvara (Lord of Samatāta) Jivadhāraṇa Rāta, of the Kailaṃ Copper-plate Grant. Jivadhāraṇa was the father of Śrīdharana Rāja, also styled Samataṃśvara, and the grantor of the Kailaṃ Plate. Thus it appears that both Lokanātha and Jivadhāraṇa were contemporaneous and refractory feudatories of a common overlord, and in the conflict between them the latter submitted to the former. In any case, these Nātha and Rāta families appear to have ruled in the Tippera region in the second half of the seventh century A.D.\footnote{44}

Lāmā Tāranaṇa\footnote{45} gives a graphic account of the political disintegration of Bengal about this period. Although he flourished in the sixteenth century A.D. he must have had access to some fairly authentic source of information, now lost to us. According to him, Govichandra and Lalitachandra, two kings of the Chandra dynasty, ruled in Vaṅga during the last part of the seventh and the first part of the eighth century A.D. If we believe in this statement, we may hold that it was during the reign of Lalitachandra that Yaśovarman invaded Vaṅga, as mentioned in (p. 596). The author of Gauḍavaḥo, in recording this incident, pays high compliment to the people of Vaṅga whose faces, we are told, ‘assumed a pale colour while offering obeisance to the victor, because they were not accustomed to such an act’ (v. 420). The suzerainty of Yaśovarman over Vaṅga was probably very nominal, and neither Lalitāditya nor Harsha, who exercised supremacy over Gauḍa, is known to have conquered Vaṅga.

\footnote{43} For an account of the Khadga dynasty with full reference to original source: cf. \textit{HABM}, pp. 78-81.

\footnote{44} \textit{IHQ}, XXIII, p. 221; also see \textit{HNI} (2nd edn.). p. 244f. cf. \textit{HABM}, pp. 80-81 for discussion with full references.

\footnote{45} Lāmā Tāranaṇa’s \textit{History of Buddhism} has been translated in German by A. Schießner. For English translation \textit{Cf. IA, IV}, pp. 361 ff. For the account of Bengal, \textit{cf. IHQ}, XVI, pp. 219 ff. and \textit{HBR}, p. 182.
But although Vaṅga might have fared somewhat better than Gauḍa in respect of foreign conquests, there is no doubt that, generally speaking, almost a complete political chaos prevailed in Bengal towards the middle of the eighth century A.D. According to Tāranātha anarchy and confusion prevailed to such an extent after the death of Lalitachandra, that there was no central political authority and ‘every Kṣhatriya, grandee, Brāhmaṇa, and merchant was a king in his own house.’ This picture of the political condition of Bengal about A.D. 750 is strikingly confirmed by contemporary epigraphic evidence, as we shall see later in Chapter XXIII.

IV. MAITRAKAS OF VALABHĪ

Whatever might have been the political status of the kingdom of Valabhi during the reign of Dhruvasena II (p. 263), there is no doubt that it attained complete independence, and even claimed imperial status, under his son and successor Dharasena IV, who ascended the throne some time before the death of Harsha. His known dates range from A.D. 645 to 649 and he is the earliest known member of the Maitraka dynasty to assume the title Mahārājādhirāja Chakravarti. Two of his inscriptions were issued from Bharukachchha. It may be inferred from this that after the downfall of the Kalachuris of Mālava, Lāṭa transferred its allegiance to the Maitrakas. Other inscriptions of the king prove that he held sway over Kaira, Valabhi and Saurāśṭra. He was the patron of the well-known poet Bhāṭṭi, and was succeeded by Dhruvasena III, the youngest son of Derabhaṭa, and the grandson of Śilāditya Dharmāditya. He was on the throne in A.D. 653, and was succeeded by Kharagraha II, the second son of Derabhata, whose inscription is dated A.D. 656. Kharagraha II’s successor was Śilāditya III, the eldest son of Derabhata. Dates of his inscriptions range from A.D. 662 to 676, with one date doubtfully read as 684. His inscriptions prove his supremacy over Saurāśṭra, Valabhi, and Kaira. A Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty held sway over southern Mālava in the second half of the seventh century, probably by ousting the Maitrakas. Śilāditya III was succeeded by his son, the Mahārājādhirāja Śilāditya IV, the dates of whose inscriptions range from A.D. 691 to 706. It is known from the Chinese source that in A.D. 692 Chi-lo-ito (Śilāditya), king of Western India, sent a representative to China with presents to pay homage to the emperor. The king of Western India referred to was

46 IA, VII, p. 73, XV, p. 339.
47 EI, VIII, p. 163.
in all probability Śilāditya IV. Śilāditya IV's successor was his son Śilāditya V, whose inscription is dated A.D. 722. About this time Mālava passed into the hands of the Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa I (pp. 615 ff) It was probably during the reign of Śilāditya V that the Arabs under Imaid invaded the city of Valabhi. On that occasion the prestige of the Maitrakas was saved by Javabhata IV of Lāṭa. Śilāditya V was succeeded by his son Śilāditya VI, an inscription49 of whose reign, dated A.D. 760, was issued from Godrahaka (Godhra, in the Panch Mahals, Rewa Kantha). Śilāditya VI's son and successor was Śilāditya VII, also known as Dhruvabhatra, whose inscription50 dated A.D. 766 was issued from Ānandapura. It proves that he was in possession of Kaira, but Lāṭa was conquered by the Rāshtrakūṭas.

Śilāditya VII is the last known king of the dynasty. In the middle of the eighth century A.D. a Saindhava dynasty is found ruling in the neighbourhood of 'Nawanagar State', Kāthiāwār.51

V. GURJARI AS OF NANDIPURI

Reference has been made (p. 261) to king Dadda II who was powerful enough to give protection to the Maitraka king Dhruvasena II against the emperor Harsha-vardhana. This king, Parama-Māheśvarā Dadda II Praśāntarāga, was succeeded by his son Javabhata II, whose son and successor was the Parama-māheśvarā Dadda III. Dadda III assumed the title Bāhulehāya.52 He was succeeded by his son Parama-māheśvarā Mahāśāmanṭādhipati Javabhata III two of whose inscriptions, dated respectively A.D. 705 and 709, have been discovered.

Javabhata III was succeeded by the Parama-māheśvarā Mahāśāmanṭādhipati Ahirola and the latter by the Mahāśāmanṭādhipati Javabhata IV. Two inscriptions53 of Javabhata IV’s reign, both dated in A.D. 736, refer to his conflict with the Arabs of Sindhi. He is said to have forcibly extinguished the fire (in the State) of Tājīka, who had caused plenty of suffering to numerous people, in the city of the Lord of Valabhi, with the water of the edge of his sword.54 We may conclude from this that Javabhata IV repulsed an attack of the Tājīkas, i.e., the Arabs, when the latter attacked the city of Valabhi. This Lord of Valabhi, as has already been suggested,

49 IA, VI, p. 17.
50 IA, VII, p. 79; CII, III, p. 173.
51 Cf. Ch. XXIV.
52 IA, XIII, p. 78.
53 I.I, XXIII, p. 147; XXIV, p. 176; IA, V, p. 114.
54 I.I, XXIII, p. 151, n. 7; cf. IA, V, p. 176; IA, V, p. 114.
was the Maitraka Śilāditya V. The Nausari Plate, dated A.D. 739, mentioned earlier, seems to be referring to this incident. But the invasion of Valabhi by the Arabs is not known from the Muslim sources. Al Balādhuri reports that Jumāid, an officer under the Caliph Hīsham (A.D. 724-43), sent his lieutenants to Marmād, Mañḍal, Dahnaj, and Barūs (Broach) for conquest (supra, p. 572). Al Balādhuri, however, does not mention anything about the result of these invasions. It is not unlikely that the Arabs invaded both Bharukachchha and Valabhi about the same time, and suffered defeats at the hands of Jayabhāta IV.

Jayabhāta IV is the last known king of the dynasty. After his death a branch of the Chāhamāna dynasty is found in possession of the kingdom of Broach.

1. MINOR DYNASTIES IN RĀJASTHĀN

Rājasthān is the collective and classical name of that part of India which was known to the people either as “Rājwārā” or “Rāethān”, but was corrupted to “Rajputanā” by the British. It is popularly, though wrongly, assumed that the name “Rājasthān” was coined by Tod. Its use before him is, however, proved by the Arzī Bahīs of Jodhpur, now deposited in the Rājasthān Archives, Bikaner, though its connotation was perhaps slightly different.

A large number of States flourished in this region, the ruling families of which came to be known as Rājputs in the eleventh century A.D. or later, and their history will be treated in Chapters XXII, XXIV and XXV. Others are briefly referred to in this section.

1. Kingdom of Kachchhella

In A.D. 641 Hiuan Tsang visited Ku-che-lo, which was 1800 li (300 miles) north of Surāshtra, and 5000 li in circuit. Its capital was Pi-lo-mo-lo, and the reigning king was a Kshatriya. Watters restores Pi-lo-mo-lo as Bhimal (Bhillamālā, mod. Bhīnumal, in Jodhpur), but Saint-Martin identifies it with Barmer, also in Jodhpur. It appears from Brahmagupta’s work, Brahmasphutasiddhānta, that the king Vvāghramukha of the Chāpa dynasty was ruling in Bhillamāla in A.D. 628.55 Hiuan Tsang’s Ku-che-lo is probably identical with Kachchhella of the Nausari plates of Avanijanāśraya-Pulakesirāja,56 though it is usually restored as Gurjara (country).

55 IA, XVII, p. 192.
56 See chapter XVI.
2. Kingdom of Sirohi

In the first half of the seventh century A.D. a king named Varmalāta ruled in the old Sirohi State, Rājputāna. Varmalāta’s feudatory was the king (nripati) Rajjila, son of Vajarbaṭa-Satvāśraya. Rajjila was administering Vaṭa or Vaṭakarasthāna, modern Vasantgadh, five miles south of Pindwara, Sirohi. During the reign of this chief a temple of Kśemāryā (Durgā) was built by a goshīṭin (an association) at Vaṭakarasthāna, in (v.s.) 682, A.D. 625. The temple of Kśemāryā is identical with that of Khi mel mātā in Vasantgadh, where the referred stone inscription was discovered.

In the Sīnāpāla-vadha of Māgha the poet’s grandfather Suprabha-deva is mentioned as a minister to the king Varmalāta. Kielhorn identifies him with the king of this name mentioned in the Vasantgadh inscription.57

3. The Mauryas

A dynasty, bearing the honoured name, Maurya, ruled in the old Kotah State, Rājputāna in the first half of the eighth century. An inscription,58 engraved into a wall of a temple of Mahādeva at Kaswa, a few miles to the east of the town of Kotah, records that there was a king (nripati) Dhavala of the Maurya race. He had a friend Saṅkuka, whose son was the king (nripati) Sivagana. Sivagana built a temple of Siva at Kanvāśrama (mod. Kaswa) and donated for its maintenance two villages, Sarvānka and Chonipadraka in A.D. 738 Chonipadraka is identified with Chaoni, near the town of Kotah. The king Dhavala of this inscription has been identified by some with the king Dhavalappa of the Dhod (in Mewar) inscription who probably suffered a defeat at the hands of the Arabs. According to some he was deprived of his possession of Chitor by the Guhila Kālabhoja Rappa.59

The existence of another Maurya family has been recently brought to light by a fragmentary inscription at Mathura. Four members of this family, namely Krishnaraṇa, Chandragupta, Ārvarāja and Dindirāja, appear to have ruled over a part of Rājasthān and Mathura in regular succession.60

57 EI. IX. p. 190.
58 IA. XIX. p. 57.
59 Cf. Ch. XXV, Sections 3-4.
60 D. C. Sircar’s Presidential Address, History and Archaeology Section, All India Oriental Conference, Delhi, 1957 (This and the next para are added by the Editor.); another inscription coming from the same place is assigned to the Vikrama year 1019 (Bhandarkar’s List, no. 1849).
Tod referred to an inscription on the bank of the Maunasarobar tank near Chitor recording the names of the Maurya (Mori) princes Maheśvara, Bhīma, Bhoja and Māna. The tank was excavated during the reign of the last mentioned ruler in the Mālava year 770. But as there is no trace of the inscription, the reading of the date must be regarded as very doubtful.

4. Sūrasena Dynasty of Bharatpur

A Sūrasena-varṇa (dynasty), founded by Phakka, ruled in the ‘Bharatpur State’ in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. A fragmentary inscription⁶¹ on a pillar in the village Kāmān or Kāmavana (Kammaga of Jain texts), in Bharatpur, forty miles west from Mathurā, mentions king Vatsadāman and his six ancestors. On palaeographic grounds the inscription may be placed in the eighth century A.D.

5. Jhalrapatan

In the latter part of the seventh century a king named Durgagaṇa ruled in Jhalrapatan. Two stone inscriptions⁶² of this king’s reign have been found in Jhalrapatan. One of them states that Voppaka, younger brother of Deva, was ‘a bank-holder during the gaming parties of rich kings’. He built a temple of Siva in saṅvat 746. Bhaṭṭa Sarvagupta composed this laudatory inscription. Bühlner suggests that the above date may be referred to Vikrama, Saka, or Gupta saṅvat, but Dr. Bhandarkar thinks that the date is in Vikrama era, which corresponds to A.D. 689.⁶³ The other inscription is badly mutilated.⁶⁴

⁶¹ IA, X, p. 34. The family is also referred to in Bayana inscription (EI, XXII, p. 120).
⁶³ Bh. List, no. 14.
⁶⁴ Cf. Bayana ins. of Chitralekha, v.s. 1012, EI, XXII, p. 120.