Chapter Twenty-two

THE GURJARA-PRATIHĀRAS

1. THE ORIGIN

Reference has been made earlier (p. 236) to the petty principalities in Rājasthān and Gujarat ruled over by the Gurjaras. But the dynasty which was destined to raise the Gurjara power to the height of its glory flourished some time later, and probably in Malwa. This dynasty, like that of Harichandra in Rājasthān (p. 238), called itself Pratihāra, but the use of the expression Gurjara-Pratihāra in an epigraphic record (no. 11) has led scholars to assume that these Pratihāras were a clan of the Gurjara tribe. This is, however, denied by some scholars, and it is necessary to discuss this question at some length before proceeding with the history of the Pratihāras.1 The word Gurjara2 frequently occurs in the epigraphic records of the period covered by this volume. Some scholars hold that it is the name of a foreign tribe that came to India along with the Hūnas. But others deny this and maintain that Gurjara was primarily the name of a country, though it also denoted the people inhabiting it. This question has been discussed at length elsewhere2a and need not be dealt with here. In the opinion of the present writer Gurjara was originally the name of a tribe and was later used, with slight additions or variations, as a geographical name for the various settlements of the tribe such as Gujranwala, Gujarat, and Gujarkhan in the Punjab; Gujarāt in Saharanpur; Gujargarh in Gwalior; Gurjaratrā in Rājasthān and, lastly, the modern state of Gujarat. These settlements may be taken as

1 This question has been discussed in detail by the present writer in an article published in the K. M. Munshi Commemoration Volume. Among the large number of writers on this subject may be mentioned:
(1) K. M. Munshi, The Glory that was Gurjaradeśa
(2) Dr. D. C. Ganguly (IHQ, X, pp. 337, 613; XI, p. 167; JBORS, XXIV, p. 221, PIIIC, III, p. 513). His views are also summarised in Ch. XXV of this volume.
(3) Dasaratha Sarna (IC, IV, p. 113; Poona Orientalist, II, p. 49. IHQ, XIII; p. 137; ABORI, XVIII, p. 396).
Some other articles (IC, 1, p. 510; XI, p. 161; IHQ, VI, p. 753; IA, LVII, p. 181) may also be consulted.

2 The name is spelt both as Gurjara and Gūjara.

2a Cf. Chs IX, XXI, XXIV.
roughly indicating the gradual progress of the tribe from the western borders of the Panjab to the east and south, and as such lend support to the view that the Gurjaras came from outside India. But this is by no means certain, and we have an analogous case in the Málaivas for whom no foreign origin has been suggested by any scholar. Thus while we may be tolerably certain that the name Gurjara originally denoted an ethnic unit, the theory of its original home outside India may justly be challenged and the question must be left open.

But even if we regard Gurjara as the name of a tribe, it does not necessarily follow that the Pratihāras were a branch or clan of the Gurjara tribe. This view is based on the expression Gurjara-Pratihāra applied to Mathanadeva in the Rajor inscription (no. 11), but this phrase is explained differently by other scholars. Thus D. C. Ganguly takes it to mean 'the Pratihāra family of the Gurjara country' and further argues: 'Even if the term Gurjara, in this connection, is taken to have referred to the tribe, the Gurjara origin of the Pratihāras cannot be definitely proved. It can well be taken to mean that Mathanadeva's father belonged to the Gurjara tribe, and his mother was a member of the Pratihāra family'. Thus he holds that the Pratihāras and the Gurjaras were two distinct peoples. But apart from the far-fetched character of this interpretation, the Gurjara origin of the Pratihāras seems to be indubitably proved by references in contemporary epigraphic records. Thus we learn from the Karhad and Deoli plates that 'on hearing of Krīṣṇa (III)'s conquest of all the strongholds... the hope about Kālānjara and Chitrakūṭa vanished from the heart of the Gurjara.'3 Here the Gurjara can only refer to the Imperial Pratihāras, for no other political power in that age could have any claim on these fortresses. As we shall see later, the Gurjarēśvara, who is said in the Baroda plates to have defeated the lords of Gauḍa and Vajña, can only refer to Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II, and the Gurjararāja Mahīpāla, referred to in the Pampabhāratu, was certainly the Pratihāra king of that name. D. C. Ganguly has attempted to show, but without success, that the references to Gurjara, Gurjara king, etc. in contemporary records do not apply to the Pratihāras but to the Guhilas, and that even if applied to the Pratihāras, they are so called as they conquered the Gurjaras or the Gurjara country and not because they were themselves Gurjaras. These and similar attempts to explain away the obvious interpretation of the phrases Gurjarēśvara, Gurjara-ṛāja, etc., cannot be regarded as of much weight, and there seems to be little doubt that the Pratihāras were regarded as Gurjaras.

3 EI, IV, p. 278; V, p. 188.
The word Pratihāra⁴ means a door-keeper, and both the Jodhpur Pratihāras, referred to earlier (p. 238), and the Imperial Pratihāras; dealt with in this chapter, had a common tradition to the effect that they were so called because their ancestor, the epic hero Lakshmana, served as a door-keeper to his brother Rāma on a famous occasion.⁵ This proves a belief in the common origin of the Kshatriya and Brahmaṇa Pratihāras of Jodhpur and the Imperial Pratihāras of Kanauj, and goes against the assumption that there were no less than five distinct Pratihāra clans who derived their title from the occupation of their ancestors as door-keepers. These five clans are made up of the three just mentioned, together with the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Rajor inscription, and the Baroda Pratihāras of Idar whose existence is very doubtful.⁶ As we have seen above, three of these Pratihāras had the tradition of a common origin, and as they were also Gurjaras, their kinship with the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Rajor inscription may be easily presumed. There is thus no need to explain the origin of the Pratihāras as so many functional groups belonging to different castes and clans, as Ojha and other scholars have done. We should rather regard Pratihāra as the name of a Gurjara clan which believed in a common descent and settled in course of time in various parts of Western India.

11. EARLY HISTORY

The early history of the Pratihāra dynasty founded by Harichandra has been already narrated (p. 238). It has been suggested in this connection that there were probably several Pratihāra kingdoms, founded by the four sons of Harichandra. Howsoever that may be, we can possibly trace the existence of several Pratihāra kingdoms outside Rājasthān. V. A. Smith has referred to traditions, current in different parts of Bundelkhand, to the effect that the Prihāras (undoubtedly a variant or the later form of Pratihāras) settled in this region about the eighth century A.D.⁷ As noted earlier (p. 238) the Pratihāras established a kingdom in Lāṭa or Southern Gujarāt and probably proceeded even further south, for A. Venkatasubbiah has traced the existence of Pratihāra chiefs even in the Kanara country.⁸ But the most important Pratihāra ruling family was that founded by Nāgabhaṭa in the first half of the eighth century A.D. It eclipsed the
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⁴ The name is spelt both as Pratihāra and Pratihāra.
⁵ Cf. Inscriptions no. 1 (v. 3) and no. 2 (v. 4).
⁶ Poona Orientalist, II, p. 49.
⁷ JASB, 1881, Part I, pp. 3 ff
⁸ IA, 1919, p. 132.
power and glory of the other Pratihāra families and raised the name and fame of the clan to a height of greatness such as North India had never witnessed since the days of the Imperial Guptas.

The early history of this family is preserved in the Gwalior inscription (no. 1) of Bhōja, the seventh king. It begins by a reference to the epic hero Lakshmana, who acted as a door-keeper (pratihāra) to his elder brother Rāma on a memorable occasion, and then mentions Nāgabhaṭa as born in his line. We are told that this Nāgabhaṭa defeated the powerful forces of a Mlechchha king. As no other specific incident is mentioned of the first four kings, it was presumably looked upon as an event of great importance in the history of the family. As we shall see later, external evidences enable us to place the reign of Nāgabhaṭa about A.D. 725 and to locate his kingdom, in all probability, in Avantī or Malwa. Now we know from several lines of evidence that about this time the Arabs, having proceeded from the newly conquered territory in Sindh, advanced into the interior of India and conquered several kingdoms in what is now called Rājasthān. We learn from the Nausari plates that the Arabs triumphed over the Saindhavas, the Kachchhellas, the Chāvoṭakas, the Mauryas, the Gurjaras and the kingdom of Saurāshṭra, but their progress further south was checked by the defeat they suffered at the hands of Avanijānāśraya Pulakesīrāja, the Chāluṅka ruly of Gujarāt.9

The Arab chronicler Baladhuri also gives an account of the victorious expedition of the Arabs in the course of which they advanced as far as Broach in the south and Ujjainī in the east. It is, however, significant that according to Baladhuri the Arabs only ‘made incursions against Uzain.’ If we remember that this expression is used by an Arab historian who refers to conquests of other kingdoms by the Arabs, we may easily infer that the Arabs could not achieve any success in their expedition against Ujjainī, the capital of Avantī. But Baladhuri is even more explicit about the disappointment of the Arabs that followed shortly later in this region. For he tells us that while Junaid, the general of Caliph Ḩasham (A.D. 724-43), made extensive conquests and sent officers against Uzain and the country of Malība (i.e., Malwa), Tamīm, who succeeded Junaid (about A.D. 726), was feeble, and in his days the Muslims retired from several parts of India and left some of their possessions. If we consider, against this background, the great achievement of Nāgabhaṭa mentioned in the

9 Transactions of the Vienna Oriental Congress, VII, Aryan Section, p. 231; B. G., I, Pt i, 109. The inscription of Pulakesīrāja is dated A.D. 738 and he came to the throne in A.D. 731. The conflict with the Arabs therefore took place during the interval between these two years.
Gwalior inscription, *viz.*, that he defeated the powerful forces of a Mlechchha king, there can be little doubt about its real significance. It would appear that shortly after A.D. 724 the Arabs, from their secure base in Sindh, sent one or more expeditions against the interior of India and overwhelmed a number of kingdoms. But they were defeated by Nāgabhaṭa, the Pratihāra ruler of Avanti, and, probably some time later, by the Chāhūkya king of Gujarāt. Nāgabhaṭa, who thus justified the family-name *Pratihāra* by defending the inner gate of India, must have achieved a unique position in Indian politics by his great victory over the Arabs, the conquerors of the world. While kingdoms in Western India, including the Gurjara principalities of Jodhpur and Broach, tumbled down, one after another, before the ruthless foreigners, he alone stood firm as a rock and stemmed the tide of conquest which threatened to deluge the whole country. We can well believe that the political prestige of this saviour of India rose very high, and that he laid the foundations of an empire on the ruin and devastations caused in Western India by the Arab invaders.

A copper-plate grant,\(^{10}\) issued by the Chāhamāna ruler Bhartrivaddha from Broach in A.D. 756, mentions Nāgāvaloka as his suzerain. This Nāgāvaloka is generally identified with Nāgabhaṭa I.\(^{11}\) If we accept this identification we must presume that Nāgabhaṭa I established his suzerainty over southern Lāṭa, which had been ruled by a Gurjara family at least up to A.D. 736.\(^{12}\) Whether this Gurjara family was ousted by Nāgabhaṭa I, or perished at the hands of Arabs or due to other causes, we cannot say. But certain it is that a feudalatory Chāhamāna family was now ruling over Broach, and that it probably acknowledged the suzerainty of Nāgabhaṭa I. The grant from Broach records the gift of a village in Akrūreśvara-cishaya which has been identified with Anklesvar tāluk on the left bank of the Narmadā. The feudalatory Chāhamāna principality may thus be regarded as extending up to the Kim river in the south, and probably corresponded to the old Gurjara kingdom of Nandipuri or Broach.

This southward extension of the Pratihāra power brought it into conflict with the Rāṣṭrahāṭas, whose history has been narrated in Ch. XVI. We learn from a record of this dynasty that its founder king Dantidurga conquered Avanti and performed the *hiranyagarbhadāna* ceremony in which a Gurjara king, along with other rulers, was made to serve as *Pratihāra* or door-keeper. It has been very reasonably suggested by D. R. Bhandarkar that the word *Pratihāra* is a

\(^{10}\) *EI*. XII, p. 197.

\(^{11}\) *IA*, 1911, p. 240; *EI* IX, p. 62; XII, p. 200.

\(^{12}\) Cf. Ch XXI.
covert allusion to the name of the clan to which the Gurjara king belonged, and that the passage in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa record thus confirms the inference, based on other evidences, that a Gurjara-Pratihāra family ruled in Avanti. Although this view cannot be regarded as conclusive and has been challenged by others, there can be hardly any doubt that Dantidurga defeated a Gurjara king who ruled in a neighbouring region. The victory of Dantidurga and the performance of the hiranyagarbha probably took place within a few years of A.D. 750 and certainly some time before A.D. 758 when Dantidurga was already dead. We may therefore hold that the Gurjara-Pratihāra king who suffered defeat at the hands of Dantidurga was most probably Nāgabhaṭa I.

Dantidurga claims to have conquered Lāṭa (southern Gujarāt) and Sūndh. But if we have rightly assumed that Nāgabhaṭa was invoked as the suzerain by the feudatory chief of Broach in A.D. 756, it does not appear that the victory claimed by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Dantidurga was either decisive or permanent. It has been urged, on the strength of the Antroli-Chharoli grant, made in A.D. 757 by a feudatory Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief of Gujarāt, that Dantidurga had finally wrested Lāṭa from the Pratihāras. But the villages granted by this charter, all lay to the south of the Kim river, and it would be difficult to agree with Altekar that 'since the donee hailed from Jambusa in the Broach district' it was included in the dominions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa feudatory. On the whole, there is nothing to indicate that Nāgabhaṭa I lost his supremacy over the feudatory principality of Broach which, as noted above, extended up to the Kim river in the south.

It is evident that both Nāgabhaṭa I and Dantidurga fished in troubled waters caused by the Arab raids, and no wonder they came

13 EI, XVIII, p. 239. Cf also GP. 24-4, AR. 40 (n. 32). The Ellora Daśāvatāra Cave Ins. (ASWI, V, p. 87), which mentions the performance of the Mahādāna ceremony by Dantidurga at Ujjaini, further states, a little later, that he occupied, at this place (asmin), a palace of the Gurjara ruler. The pronoun asmin might refer to either Ujjayini or Ellora, where the inscription was actually engraved, and this furnishes a corroborative evidence of the Gurjara rule in Avanti, if not further south. Curiously enough this point has been overlooked by scholars who reject Bhandarkar's view that the Gurjara-Pratihāras were at this time ruling in Avanti. Incidentally, the reference to a palace of the Gurjara ruler either in Ujjayini or at Ellora shows that Gurjara was a tribal name, for none of the two places was situated in the Gurjara country.

14 IHQ, VI, p. 755, ABORI, XVIII, p. 396.
16 IHQ, XXII, p. 94.
17 AR, p. 11.
into conflict. But though Dantidurga might have gained some victories at first, he could not achieve any lasting success either in Avanti or Broach. Perhaps the impending conflict with his Chālukya overlord forced him to abandon his aggressive designs in the north. Howsoever that may be, we may on the basis of available evidence, hold that Nāgabhaṭṭa’s power could not be effectively curbed by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler. But it is interesting to note that the hostile relation between the founders of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and the Pratihāra royal families was but the beginning of that hereditary struggle between the two dynasties which continued for two centuries, and more than once effectively curbed the powers of the latter when it was almost on the point of setting itself up as an imperial power in Northern India.

It is very likely that Nāgabhaṭṭa established his supremacy over the Pratihāras of Jodhpur line, whose power must have been considerably weakened by the disastrous Arab invasion. An official record of this family (no. 2), which gives its whole history, refers to Siluka as a great and powerful king, but states that ‘his son Jhoṭa proceeded to the Bhāgirathī and his grandson Bhilāditya, possessed of satva qualities and disposed to austerities, bestowed the kingdom on his son and proceeded to Gangādvāra.’ As Siluka flourished in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D., there is hardly any doubt that the Pratihāra family of Jodhpur was reduced to political insignificance during the latter part of the eighth century A.D. As the successors of Nāgabhaṭṭa are known to have ruled in Eastern Rājasthān, we may easily presume that the Jodhpur family had to acknowledge the supremacy of either Nāgabhaṭṭa I or his immediate successors. In other words, the family of Nāgabhaṭṭa stepped into the position of headship of the Gurjara-Pratihāras, so long enjoyed by the Jodhpur chiefs.

Nāgabhaṭṭa I, the conqueror of the Arab invaders, thus stands out as a great national hero and empire-builder in the middle of the eighth century A.D. The Gwalior inscription of Bhoja (no. 1) describes him as the image of Nārāyaṇa. There is no doubt that he achieved an all-India reputation by defeating the Arabs and, when he died about A.D. 760, he was able to leave a powerful and extensive kingdom to his brother’s son Kakkuka who succeeded him.

Practically nothing is known about Kakkuka beyond the fact that his original name was Kākustha (Kākutstha), and he came to be known as Kakkuka (i.e., one who always laughs) on account of his habit of saying welcome things in an inverted manner.” He was succeeded by his younger brother Devarāja, who is described
in the Gwalior inscription (no.1) as a very powerful ruler, wielding sovereignty over a number of chiefs. But unfortunately we know no details of his reign.

III. VATSARĀJA

Vatsarāja, the son and successor of Devarāja, is described in the Gwalior inscription (vv. 6-7) as a mighty ruler who had subdued the whole world and was the foremost among the distinguished Kshatriyas. We are fortunate in possessing a great deal of information about him from other sources.

First, we have a passage in the Jaina work Kuvalayamālā stating that it was composed in the Saka year 700 (A.D. 778) at Jávalipura (modern Jalor) which was at that time ruled by the Rānachāstita (war-elephant) Vatsarāja.18 This Vatsarāja has been generally identified with the Pratihāra ruler Vatsarāja. We thus get a sure date for his reign and can fix upon a definite locality over which he ruled. We get further information on both these points from a verse in another Jaina work, Harivīra-Purāṇa by Jinasena, which reads as follows:19

śākesu-ābda—śateśu sapta-su diṣān paṁchottarēś-ūṭtarāṁ
pūt-Indrāyudha—nāmnī Krishṇa—nripaye Śrīvallabhe dākṣiṇāṁ
pūrāṁ śrīmad—Avanti-bhūbhṛiti nripe Vatsādirāje parāṁ
Sauryānāṁ-adhīmanādalam jaya—yute vīre Varāhe-vatī

We learn from the first half of this verse (i.e., ll. 1-2) that in the year 705 Saka (A.D. 783-84), when Jinasena composed the work at a town called Vardhamānapura, there were reigning Indrāyudha in the north, and Śrīvallabha, son of Krishṇa, in the south. The second half of the passage mentions other kings in the other directions, but unfortunately the interpretation is a disputed one. According to Fleet and others, it refers to Vatsarāja, king of Avanti, as ruling in the east, and Varāha or Jayavarāha, in the territory of the Sauryas, in the west. This interpretation was challenged by D. R. Bhandarkar who held that the word nripe in line 3 shows that Vatsarāja was different from king of Avanti. He therefore proposed a new translation, viz., 'in the east, the illustrious king of Avanti, in the west king Vatsarāja, (and) in the territory of the Sauryas, the victorious and brave Varāha.' Subsequently, when editing the Sañjan copper-plate,

18 ABORI, XVIII, pp. 397-98.
19 The verse was originally noticed by K. B. Pathak (IA, XV, p. 141) and subsequently discussed by many scholars. For the different views about its interpretation cf. GP, pp. 23 ff.
he drew attention to verse 9 which refers to the *hiranyagarbha* ceremony of Dantidurga at Avanti already mentioned in p. 616. As he interpreted this verse to mean that the Gurjara-Pratiharas were ruling at Avanti in those days, he accepted the validity of Fleet’s interpretation of the verse in *Harivamśa-Purāṇa*, according to which Vatsarāja was the king of Avanti.\(^{20}\) But though Bhandarkar lately gave up his old view it is still upheld by other scholars\(^{21}\) who further maintain that the verse 9 of the Sañjan plate does not prove the rule of the Gurjara-Pratiharas in Avanti. Some scholars also propose to locate Vardhamānapura, where the *Harivamśa-Purāṇa* was composed, not at Wadhwan in Kāthiāwār peninsula as has been generally supposed, but at Badnawar (in the Dhārā state), about 40 miles to the southwest of Ujjain.\(^{22}\) It is neither possible nor necessary to mention here all the different viewpoints which have been discussed at length elsewhere by the present writer.\(^{23}\) It will suffice to state that no adequate grounds have been shown to reject the original translation of Fleet which is still accepted by the majority of scholars as well as here.

The two Jaina works mentioned above enable us to fix, fairly definitely, the chronology of the Pratiharas of Avanti. As Vatsarāja, who is known to have ruled in A.D. 778 and 783, was the fourth king and third in descent from Nāgabhaṭa I, we may place the accession of the latter at about A.D. 725. If, as suggested above, he died about A.D. 760, the reign of Kakkuka and Devarāja may be placed between A.D. 760 and 775.

Further, the reference to Vatsarāja as king of Avanti, although his kingdom included Jalor in Rājasthān, shows that the nucleus of his kingdom was in Malwa and Nāgabhaṭa I began his career in this region. It is probable that his ancestors advanced eastwards from the common homeland of the Pratiharas in Jodhpur, as another branch moved to the south, and ultimately seized power in Malwa. It is a pity that we know so little about the predecessors or antecedents of Nāgabhaṭa I, but the foundation of a Pratihāra kingdom in Avanti may be easily explained on this basis.

The two Jaina works, mentioned above, prove that both Avanti and Jalor were included in Vatsarāja’s kingdom. The Osia stone inscription\(^{24}\) and the Daulatpura copper-plate\(^{25}\) (no. 13) clearly show that he exercised sway in Gurjaratrā in Central Rājasthān. The only

---

20 *EI*, XVIII, p. 239.
21 *IHQ*, VI, p. 755; *ABORI*, XVIII, p. 396.
22 *IC*, XI, pp. 104-66.
23 *Munshi Commemoration Volume*.
fact of importance which we know about him from the Gwalior inscription (no. 1) is that he wrested the empire from the famous Bhandi clan. We do not know who the Bhandis were, and where their empire lay. It is not, however, unlikely, that Indravudha, his great contemporary in the north according to the verse from Harivamsha-Purana quoted in p 619, represented this imperial power with his seat of authority at Kanauj, and that by defeating him Vatsaraja gained the political supremacy in this region. Howsoever that may be, there is no doubt that Vatsaraja followed an aggressive imperial policy which brought him into conflict with the Pala rulers of Gauda. He attained considerable success in his eastern enterprise but unfortunately the fruits of his victory were snatched away from him by the Rashtrakuta king Dhruva (A.D. 779-94). The whole episode is described as follows in a verse which occurs both in Radhanpur and Wani grants of Govinda III, the son of Dhruva:

'By his (i.e., Dhruva's) matchless armies having quickly driven into the trackless desert Vatsaraja, who boasted of having with ease appropriated the fortune of the royalty of the Gauda, he in a moment took away from him, not merely the Gauda's two umbrellas of state, white like the rays of the autumn moon, but his own fame also that had spread to the confines of the regions.'

Bereft of poetic embellishments this verse refers, first, to the unique position of supremacy which Vatsaraja had attained by defeating the king of Gauda, and secondly, to the crushing defeat inflicted upon him while he was at the height of his success, by the Rashtrakuta king Dhruva.

As regards the first, it is not definitely known whether Vatsaraja actually advanced as far as Bengal and overran a large part of it. For all we know the fight between him and the Pala ruler might have taken place far away from the borders of Bengal, as in the case of the encounter between Dhruva and the Pala king. According to a verse in Prithvarajavijaya, the sword of the Chahamanas king Durlabharaja purified itself by a dip at the confluence of the Ganga and the sea and by the taste of the land of Gauda. It has been argued that Durlabharaja, whose son is known to have been a feudatory of Nagarbhat, was himself a feudatory of Vatsaraja, and accompanied

25 EI, V, p. 208. (The date is 900 v.s. not year 100 of the Harsha era as stated herein.)

26 EI, VI, p. 248.
him in his expedition to Bengal. This may be readily accepted, but the story of his advance, across the whole length of Bengal, up to the mouth of the Ganges, recorded in stray verses composed about four centuries later, should not be accepted as historical without corroborative evidence.

But whatever view we might take, there is no denying the fact that Vatsarāja succeeded in establishing a position of almost unchallenged supremacy in North India when he was attacked by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruva. No specific grounds for this hostility are known to us, and it may be that Dhruva simply revived the old aggressive policy of Dantidurgā against the Pratihāras, whose growing power made them a formidable neighbour and a dreaded rival. But whatever may be the cause, there is no doubt about the result of the conflict. Vatsarāja suffered a serious reverse at the hands of his Rāṣṭrakūṭa adversary. His imperial ambitions were shattered and, what is worse, he probably lost his hold over Malwa. He was forced to take shelter in Rājasthān which henceforth formed the centre of his political authority and the chief seat of the power of the Pratihāra family, until some time later, it was transferred to Kanauj.

The tragic end of Vatsarāja should not make us forget, or minimise in any way, the credit that undoubtedly belongs to him for having laid the foundations of that empire which shone in the full blaze of its glory in the reign of his great-grandson Bhoja. For the imperial dream was not only kept alive, but even realised to a large extent by Nāgabhaṭa II, the son and successor of Vatsarāja.

IV. NĀGABHAṬA II

Nāgabhaṭa II, whose only known date is A.D. 815, probably succeeded his father before 800. As will be noted in the next chapter, the Pāla king Dharmapāla had taken advantage of the reverses of Vatsarāja to build up a mighty empire in North India, and installed his own nominee Chakrāvudha on the throne of Kanauj. But Nāgabhaṭa set himself to the task of retrieving the fortunes of his family. The Gwalior inscription (no. 1) describes his achievements in four verses and some light is thrown on his activities by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records.

It appears that Nāgabhaṭa II first made an alliance with several other states, particularly the Saindhava, Andhra, Vidarbha, and Kalinga. It is said in the Gwalior record that the rulers of these states succumbed to the power of Nāgabhaṭa as moths do unto fire.

27 IHQ. XIV. p. 844; JIH, XXII, p. 99.
28 HB, I, p. 105.
The use of this simile led the present writer to suggest long ago, that the rulers of these four kingdoms were not conquered by Nāgabhāta but joined him of their own accord in the first instance, though as usually happens, they became feudatories or subordinate allies of the Pratihāra emperor. This view has been accepted by some and rejected by others. But the political and geographical situation of these states seems to lend strength to this view. The Saindhavas ruled in the western part of the Kāthiāvār peninsula. The neighbouring province of Lāṭa, as noted in (pp. 616-17), was a bone of contention between the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Pratihāras. The Andhra region was ruled over by the Eastern Chālukyas who were sworn enemies of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and carried on hereditary feuds with them. The Eastern Chālukya king Vijayāditya II, whose rule covered the first half of the eighth century A.D., overran the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dominions, and it is not unlikely that he made common cause with Nāgabhāta against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Kalinga and Vidarbha were immediate neighbours of the Pālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and often felt the brunt of their attacks. It is therefore quite natural that they, too, would form a confederacy with Nāgabhāta against their common enemies, the Pālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

But howsoever that may be, Nāgabhāta made extensive preparations and fought against both his powerful rivals, viz., the Pālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The chronological sequence of his campaigns cannot be ascertained, and we can only refer to them as isolated incidents. He turned his attention towards Kanauj and defeated its ruler Chakrāyudha who was a protegé of Dharmaṇāla. It was a bold bid to recover the position of political supremacy which his father had lost, and naturally involved a trial of strength with the Pāla emperor Dharmaṇāla of Bengal. The conflict between the two was not long in coming. The Gwalior inscription describes how the powerful array of elephants and horses of the lord of Vaṅga was destroyed by Nāgabhāta. The lord of Vaṅga undoubtedly refers to Dharmaṇāla, and the battle probably took place at Monghyr. For the Jodhpur inscription (no. 2) of Bāuka, the ruler of the Jodhpur branch of the Pratihāras, informs us that his father Kakka ‘gained renown by fighting with the Gauda at Mudgagiri (Monghyr).’ As Bāuka’s inscription is dated A.D. 837, his father Kakka must have been a contemporary of Nāgabhāta II. Kakka was too insignificant a chief
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to carry on war on his own account to a distant place like Monghyr. It is probable therefore that he joined the expedition of Nāgabhata against Dharmapāla. Vāhukadhavala, the great-grandfather of a feudatory chief (of Surāshtra) of Nāgabhata’s great-grandson, is said to have defeated king Dharma while Saṅkaragana, the Guhilot prince, is said to have defeated the king of Gauḍa, and made a present of this kingdom to his overlord. It is probable that these two feudal chiefs also helped their overlord Nāgabhata II in his campaign against Dharmapāla.

The next verse in the Gwalior inscription informs us that Nāgabhata captured the strongholds of Ānarta, Mālava, Kirāta, Turushka, Vatsa, and Matsya countries. The conquest of the last two may be regarded as almost a direct consequence of his victory over Dharmapāla. For Matsya is specifically mentioned as a vassal state of Dharmapāla and Vatsa, too, must have belonged to the same category. Kirāta is the name of a primitive tribe, but may be taken as corresponding to the kingdom of the Kiras, another vassal state of Dharmapāla. Thus, one by one the outlying vassal states of the Pāla empire were made to recognize the supremacy of Nāgabhata.

More interest attaches to the fact that Nāgabhata fought with and defeated the Turushkas. According to the Prabhândhakosa, a late composition, the Chāhamāna Govindaśrīja I, also known as Guvāka I, repulsed an attack of Sultan Veg Varisha. Now this Guvāka, son of Durlabhāraja mentioned in (p. 622), is said to have attained pre-eminence in the court of Nāgāvaloka who has been identified with Nāgabhata II. We may therefore readily accept that Guvāka was a feudatory chief of Nāgabhata II. We know from Khummāna Raso that the Guhila chief Khummāna II, joined with other Indian chiefs, defeated in Arab attack during the Caliphate of Al-Mamun (a.d. 817-33). Sultan Veg Varisha, defeated by Guvāka, may be identified with Bashar, son of Dāūd, who was the governor of Sindh under the Caliph Al-Mamun. We may therefore conclude that Nāgabhata II, aided by Guvāka I, Khummāna II, and probably other Indian chiefs, defeated Bashar and captured some of his strongholds. It may be incidentally mentioned here that there was also a Mlechchha settlement about this time on the bank of the Chambal river. For Chaṇḍamahāśena, the Chāhamāna chief of Dholpur
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Branch, claims in his inscription dated A.D. 842\(^35\) to have been obeyed by the Mlechchha rulers on the Charmanvati. These Mlechchha rulers cannot be identified, but the term usually refers to non-Hindu outsiders, and may refer to some Muslim settlements. But although their location would be more suitable for the purpose of Nāgabhaṭa’s invasion, we cannot be sure of their Turkish origin.

Nāgabhaṭa’s campaign against Ānartta and Mālava probably indicates a conflict with his other rival power, the Rāśṭrakūṭas. Ānartta denoted a part of Northern Gujarāt, not far from that portion of Lāṭa, which formed a part of the Rāśṭrakūṭa empire. As regards Mālava, we have already noted above that it originally belonged to the Pratihāras, but at least a portion of it, including Avanti, was conquered by the Rāśṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga. Later Vatsarāja, the father of Nāgabhaṭa, was ruling at Avanti, and probably also over a large part, if not the whole, of Mālava. The fact that Nāgabhaṭa had to conquer Mālava necessarily shows that the Pratihāras had lost it, evidently after the disastrous defeat that Vatsarāja had sustained at the hands of the Rāśṭrakūṭa king Dhruva.

The Gwalior inscription refers to Nāgabhaṭa’s capturing the strongholds of Ānartta and Mālava without saying anything about his conflict with the Rāśṭrakūṭas. But though the Pratihāra court-poet leaves his hero in the full blaze of his glory, we have indubitable evidence to prove that these hereditary enemies made the sun of Pratihāra glory set even in the lifetime of Nāgabhaṭa II.

It has been described above (pp. 452-53) how the Rāśṭrakūṭa king Govinda III, who succeeded Dhruva, had been busy suppressing internal troubles within his kingdom from almost the very beginning of his reign. He could not, therefore, devote much attention to the affairs of the North, which were left to the care of his brother Indrārāja whom he appointed governor of Lāṭeśvara-manḍala which probably included, besides Lāṭa, the whole of the northern possessions of the Rāśṭrakūṭas. Presumably, Nāgabhaṭa took advantage of the preoccupations of Govinda III in the South to reconquer some of the territories Vatsarāja had lost, such as Mālava. This naturally brought him into conflict with Indrarāja. A passage in the Baroda plates refers to this fight as follows: ‘By him (i.e., Indrarāja) alone, the leader of the lords of the Gurjaras, who prepared himself to give battle bravely lifting up his neck, was quickly caused, as if he were a deer, to take to the (distant) regions.’\(^36\) The leader of the Gurjara
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lords undoubtedly refers to Nāgabhaṭa, but the result of the battle was not perhaps so decisive as the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records would indicate. For Vāhukadhabala, the same feudal chief of Nāgabhaṭa who fought against Dharmapāla, is said to have defeated a Kārṇaṭa army, which evidently can only refer to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Here, again, we must presume that Vāhukadhabala fought along with, or at least on behalf of, his suzerain Nāgabhaṭa II. Thus the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and the Pratihāras both claim victory against each other, and we can only conclude that the result was indecisive. The northern frontier of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire was, however, effectively guarded against the Pratihāras, first by Indrarāja and then by his son Karkaraṇa whose Baroda plates tell us that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor had ‘caused his arm to become an excellent door-bar of the country of the lord of Gurjaras’.

But Nāgabhaṭa was too powerful an enemy to be left long to be dealt with by the governor of Lāṭa alone. So Govinda III, evidently after settling affairs in the South, determined to give up the merely defensive policy hitherto pursued. He took the offensive and personally led an expedition on a large scale against Nāgabhaṭa. Several Rāṣṭrakūṭa records refer to the phenomenal success of Govinda III. We are told in the contemporary records that the Gurjara king ‘in fear vanished nobody knew whither, so that even in a dream he might not see battle.’ The Sañjan plates, belonging to the reign of Govinda III’s son, add that Govinda III ‘carried away in battles the fair and unshakable fame of kings and Nāgabhaṭa and Chandra-gupta... uprooted other kings... and afterwards re-instated them,’ and then proceeded up to the Himalayas. The same plates further inform us that Dharma (i.e., Dharmapāla) and Chakrāyudha ‘surrendered to him of themselves’.

Even making due allowance for poetic exaggerations and partisan spirit, we may legitimately conclude from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records that Govinda III’s military campaigns in the North were attended with brilliant success. The serious reverses sustained by Nāgabhaṭa II did not altogether destroy his power, but effectively checked his aggressive designs and gave a further lease of life to the Pāla empire under Dharmapāla and his son Devapāla.

The statement that Dharmapāla and Chakrāyudha submitted, of
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their own accord, to Govinda III, is interesting in more ways than one. We may reasonably presume that Nāgabhaṭa's victory over them preceded the invasion of Govinda III. As such they had every reason to feel grateful to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch for the crushing defeat inflicted upon their powerful rival. It is no wonder, therefore, that they would voluntarily, i.e., without any fight, wait upon and pay respect to Govinda III for the great deliverance. Indeed, the circumstances were such that one might even suspect that it was at their express invitation that Govinda III had undertaken the expedition against Nāgabhaṭa II. This would at any rate satisfactorily explain the complete discomfiture of Nāgabhaṭa II and the triumphant march of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army right across his dominions up to the Himaḷayas.

As noted above, the sequence of the various events during the reign of Nāgabhaṭa II is not known to us. It is, therefore, possible to reconstruct his reign in different ways. It may be argued, for example, that his defeat at the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas took place early in his reign, and later he won the numerous victories recorded in the Gwalior inscription and left a mighty empire to his son. On the contrary, it may be held with equal cogency that he won brilliant victories and was on the point of consolidating his empire in North India, when Govinda III shattered his imperial plans, as Dhruva had done to his father. The latter view appears to be more likely, though one should not be dogmatic on this point.

In the opinion of the present writer the voluntary submission of Dharmapāla and Chakrāyudha to Govinda III clearly indicates that Nāgabhaṭa's victories over them preceded the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion. It is more doubtful when the other victories of Nāgabhaṭa, mentioned above, were won. Probably some of them preceded and others followed his great victory against Dharmapāla. According to the Gwalior record his military successes began even in his boyhood. It is therefore more reasonable to assume that he first made his position strong by a number of successful campaigns before he felt powerful enough to challenge the Pāla empire. His success in this enterprise probably enabled him to score more victories and also seize some of the vassal states of the Pālas. Then, flushed with success, he probably sought to retrieve the lost possession in the south from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and this involved him in that fateful struggle which ended so disastrously for him.

The date of the great victory of Govinda III over Nāgabhaṭa II cannot be determined with certainty, but it certainly took place
before the end of A.D. 805, the date of the Nesara grant which refers in detail to his Northern campaigns. 39

Nāgabhaṭa long survived his defeat at the hands of the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas, and although his imperial ambitions were curbed, his power was not effectively destroyed. A record, dated A.D. 815, found at Buchkala 40 (Bilada district, Jodhpur) gives him all the imperial titles, but describes the locality as sva-vishaya or dominions proper. It would thus appear that he still retained, at least in theory, his imperial status, and the centre of his authority was fixed in Rajasthan. Perhaps it was so from the very beginning of his reign, or after his father Vatsarāja had lost Mālava. It was then from this centre that Nāgabhaṭa had extended his dominions and sphere of influence in all directions. We have already referred to the three feudatories who helped him against the Pālas. To this we may add another, Guvāka I, the founder of the Chāhamāna dynasty of Sākambhari (near Ajmer) who is referred to as his vassal in a later inscription (no. 6, v. 13). Whether these feudal chiefs continued to pay allegiance to Nāgabhaṭa II even after his defeat by Govinda III we cannot say. But that many of them did so is rendered probable by the fact to be noted later, that within a few years of Nāgabhaṭa's death his grandson Bhoja could enlist their support in his military expeditions. It may also be doubted whether Nāgabhaṭa II was able to retain all his conquests mentioned in the Gwalior inscription. Special interest attaches in this connection to his relation with the rulers of Andhra, Kaliṅga, Vidarbha, and the Saindhavas. As mentioned above, the expression used in the Gwalior inscription seems to indicate that though they were at first free and equal partners in a confederacy, they were ultimately reduced to the position of subordinate allies. A number of copper-plate grants 41 of the Saindhava chiefs seem to confirm this view in respect of them. For while these chiefs, for generations, remained loyal and devoted to the Pratihāras, they did not formally invoke the Pratihāra rulers as suzerains, as was done by the Chāpas and the Chālukyas of the Kathiawar peninsula—the two feudatories ruling immediately to their east. But while the political influence of Nāgabhaṭa over the Saindhavas survived his defeat and disgrace, the same cannot be said of the remaining three states. Whether, and if so when, they formed part of the Pratihāra empire, and ceased to be so, are alike unknown.
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Equally uncertain is Nāgabhaṭa's association with Kanauj. It has been held that, after defeating Chakrāyuḍha, Nāgabhaṭa transferred his headquarters to Kanauj which continued to be the capital of the Pratiharas ever since. This view is mainly based on a stray passage in a Jaina text Prabhāvaka-charita, according to which king Nāgāvaloka of Kāṇyakubja, the grandfather of Bhoja, died in 890 v.s. (A.D. 833). The fact that Bhoja was in possession of, and probably had his capital at, Kanauj in A.D. 836 (no. 12) also lends some colour to this view. But as against this we should remember that the Prabhāvaka-charita was composed in the thirteenth century A.D. when Kanauj had long been popularly known as the famous capital of the Pratiharas, and so the Jaina chronicler might easily, though wrongly, associate an early ruler of the family with that famous city. Further, the reference in Buchkala inscription, mentioned above, to the Jodhpur region as the 'dominions proper' of Nāgabhaṭa II also seems to preclude the possibility of his transferring the capital to Kanauj before A.D. 815. Such a transfer after that date does not appear to be very likely in view of what we know of the history of the Pāla empire about this time. Nevertheless the transfer cannot be ruled out altogether as impossible. But whatever we might think of Kanauj, later records leave no doubt that in the east Nāgabhaṭa's dominions included both Gwalior and Kālaṇjara.

The passage in the Prabhāvaka-charita quoted above, places the death of Nāgabhaṭa II in A.D. 833. As his grandson is known to have been ruling in A.D. 836, the date, occurring in a very late chronicle, seems to be somewhat doubtful. If we provisionally accept it, as has generally been done, we have to presume that Rāmabhadra, the son and successor of Nāgabhaṭa II, did not rule for more than two years. But Rāmabhadra's reign was not only short but also inglorious. It would appear from two records during the reign of his son and successor Bhoja, that he had lost hold both over Gurjaratrā in Rājasthān, and Kālaṇjara-mandala. The loss of the latter seems to be confirmed by an inscription found at Gwalior in which one Vaśīlabhaṭṭa is referred to as chief of boundaries in the service of Rāmabhadra, indicating that Gwalior formed the frontier of the Pratiharas during this reign. The only verse referring to Rāmabhadra in the Gwalior inscription of Bhoja seems to imply that Rāmabhadra delivered his country from the vore of foreign soldiers who were notorious for their cruel deeds. There can be hardly any
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doubt that these foreigners were the Pālas, and the discomfiture and disgrace that befell the Pratihāra kingdom can be easily explained by the victories of Devapāla to which reference will be made in the next chapter.

Thus two independent lines of evidence seem to indicate that the power and prestige of the Pratihāras sank to a very low ebb indeed during the reign of Rāmahadra, and it is very probable that the decline had set in even in the closing years of Nāgabhaṭa II. It is therefore more rational to regard the reign of Nāgabhaṭa II, like that of his father, as ending ingloriously, in spite of its brilliant promise at the beginning. Nevertheless their reigns constitute an important landmark in the history of the Pratihāra empire, and their daring enterprise and great military skill mark them out as leading figures in the political history of India during that age.

V. BHOJA I

Bhoja, the son and successor of Rāmahadra, was undoubtedly the greatest king of this dynasty, and the most powerful ruler in India during the second half of the ninth century A.D. He ascended the throne at a time when the fortunes of his family were at the lowest ebb, but when he died more than half a century later, he left a vast consolidated empire which was without any rival in Northern India.

The earliest record of the king is a copper-plate found at Būrah (no. 12). It was issued in v.s. 893 (A.D. 836) from his camp (śaṅkhārāra) at Mahodava in order to confirm an endowment in the Kālañjara-mandala (sub-division) of the bhukti (division) of Kānya-kubja, which had lapsed (i.e., whose enjoyment was obstructed) during the reign of his father. This record is of more than passing interest. Besides proving that Bhoja had ascended the throne in or before A.D. 836, it shows that he was already, in that year, in possession of certain territories near about Kālañjara (Bandā district, U.P.) which was presumably lost to the family during the reign of his father. Further, as Mahodava is a well-known name of Kanauj, we may also hold that he had occupied and probably fixed his capital at Kanauj, even if it had not already been done by his ancestors. To this last conclusion, however, more than one objection has been raised. It has been urged in the first place that Mahodava in this record cannot be identified with Kānya-kubja, as this name occurs side by side as the divisional headquarters. This is no doubt a very valid objection but can hardly be regarded as decisive, for it is just possible that while the older name was retained as a designation for the division, the alternative name was used to denote the capital city. It may be
noted in this connection that the Pāla records of this time also indiscriminately use both the forms 'Kānyakubja' and 'Mahodaya.' The other objection, that as Mahodaya is mentioned as a skandhāvāra (camp) it should not be regarded as the capital city, is less valid; for we know that even far-famed capital cities like Pātaliputra and Vikramapura have been systematically referred to as skandhāvāra in the Pāla and Sena records, and lexicons give both the meanings 'capital' and 'camp' for this word. We may thus legitimately conclude that even as early as A.D. 836 Bhoja had attained considerable success in the east; he had not only recovered the Kālaṇjara district, but also the region in the neighbourhood of Kanauj, which was probably his capital city.

That Bhoja was equally successful in re-asserting his authority over other parts of his kingdom is proved by the Daulatpura copper-plate (no. 13). It records that a piece of land in Gurjaratrā was originally granted by Vatsarāja, and the grant was continued by Nāgabhaṭa II; it, however, fell into abeyance, presumably during the next reign, and was renewed by Bhoja in A.D. 843. Here again, we find a situation, very similar to that recorded in the Barah copper-plate, and we may equally presume that Bhoja recovered the possession of Gurjaratrā which was lost during his father’s reign. Fortunately, we have, in this case, independent evidence to corroborate the presumption.

As has been noted before, Gurjaratrā denoted, in those days, a wide region covering the central and eastern Rājasthān which formed the home-land of the Pratihāras, and was originally included, either in whole or in part, within the dominions of the Jōdhpur branch. It has been already mentioned (p. 618) how this branch came to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pratihāras of Avanti, and how Kakka of this dynasty accompanied the expedition of Nāgabhaṭa II against Dharmapāla. It would appear, however, that Kakka assumed independence after the disastrous defeat suffered by Nāgabhaṭa at the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. In an inscription (no. 2) dated A.D. 837 Kakka’s queen-consort is called a Mahārājī and the exploits of their son Bāuka are referred to in a way which leaves no doubt that he was an independent king. The Daulatpura copper-plate, however, shows that Bhoja regained possession of Gurjaratrā by the year A.D. 843.

We have thus clear evidence that within a few years of his accession Bhoja succeeded in restoring the fallen fortunes of his family to a considerable extent. Evidently he was loyally assisted by at
least some of the old feudatory chiefs. One of them, the Guhilot prince Harsharaja, son of Sainkaragaña (p. 624), boasted of having conquered the kings in the north and presented horses to Bhoja (no. 4). This probably indicates that Bhoja undertook military campaigns in the north and extended the boundaries of his dominions, though, unfortunately, we possess no details.

But the initial success of Bhoja was of short duration. Soon he had to contend with his hereditary enemies, the Pālas and the Rāśtriya-kūtas, and fared badly. We have no direct evidence of his encounter with the contemporary Pāla emperor, Devapāla, but the detailed account of the latter's conquests, which will be discussed in the next chapter, hardly leaves any doubt that he played a dominant part in North Indian politics, and Bhoja's aggressive career suffered a serious set-back. Nor was Bhoja more successful against the Rāśtriya-kūtas. It appears that taking advantage of their internal dissensions Bhoja had taken the offensive but was defeated by Dhruvaraja II, the Rāśtriya-kūta chief of Gujarāt, probably some time between A.D. 845 and 860. The Bagumra Plates,44 which record the defeat of Bhoja, refer to him as 'united in fortune and surrounded by crowds of noble kinsmen', and also as 'having conquered all the regions of the world.' This unimpeachable testimony to the great power and eminence acquired by Bhoja at the beginning of his reign is fully in keeping with what has been said above about his early successes. Whether his defeat preceded or followed his discomfiture at the hands of Devapāla we cannot say, but one probably reacted on the other, and the two together completed his disaster.

Bhoja had probably also to fight with the Kalachuri king Kokkalla I. There are three references in epigraphic records regarding the relation between the two which at first appear somewhat contradictory. The Bilhara inscription45 relates that, after having conquered the whole earth, Kokkalla set up two unprecedented columns of his fame, viz., Krishnaraja in the South and Bhojadeva in the North. The Benares copper-plate46 states that Kokkalla granted freedom from fear of Bhoja, Vallabharaja, Sri Harsha, king of Chitrakūta and the king Saikaraganā. According to the Amoda plates47 Kokkalla 'raided the treasuries of the Karnāṭa, Vaiṅga, Gurjara, Konkana and Sākambhāri kings, and also of those born of the Turushka and Rāghu families.'
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As Kokkalla died before A.D. 888, his contemporary Bhoja must be the Pratihāra ruler Bhoja I, and not Bhoja II, as some have supposed. Now the relation between the two seems to be friendly, at least not hostile, if we take into consideration only the first two references. But among the list of rulers, whose treasuries he raided, are included the Gurjara king and a ruler of the Raghu family, one of which at least must refer to the Pratihāras. It would then appear that Kokkalla at first invaded the dominions of Bhoja I but later helped him against a powerful foe. Among the other chiefs mentioned in the extracts quoted above, Śrī-Harsha (probably the Guhila chief of that name), Śaṅkaragaṇa, the Kalachuri ruler of Sarayūpāra, and the Sākambhari kings of the Chāhamāna family were all vassals of Bhoja. It is therefore likely that Kokkalla joined Bhoja and his feudatories against a powerful foe, and thus granted them freedom from fear. But in the early stage Bhoja and his feudatories probably suffered at his hands.

The reverses sustained by Bhoja had serious repercussion on his power and authority. This is most clearly seen in the renewed power of the Jodhpur branch of the Pratihāras. As we have seen above, Bāuka’s power was curbed and Bhoja regained possession of Gurjaratā by the year A.D. 843. But Bāuka’s step-brother and successor Kakkuka once more established the independence of the family. Two of his inscriptions, dated A.D. 861, not only refer to his great exploits in right royal style, but make specific reference to Gurjaratā and other provinces as forming part of his dominions.

We must therefore conclude that the attempts of Bhoja I to re-establish the glory of his family during the first part of his reign proved a failure. It was not probably till more than thirty years had passed since his accession that he made a second attempt to establish his supremacy. Perhaps we get an allusion to these renewed efforts in the Gwalior inscription (no. 14) of the year A.D. 876 which describes him as bent upon ‘conquering the three worlds’. The times were now indeed very favourable to him. The death of Devapāla had removed a great and powerful adversary. The weakness and pacific disposition of his successors, and possibly also internal dissensions in the Pāla dominions, created a favourable situation and Bhoja seized the opportunity to strike a decisive blow.
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A few scattered notices in different records seem to indicate that Bhoja made elaborate preparations for this expedition by enlisting the support of a number of powerful ruling families that were now rising into prominence. The Kahla plates (no. 5) inform us that Guṇāmbhodhideva, the Chedi ruler of Sarayūpāra (Gorakhpur district), who obtained some territories from Bhojadeva, snatched away the sovereignty of the Gaudas. As Guṇāmbhodhideva flourished in the latter half of the ninth century A.D., we can easily presume that he joined Bhoja in his expedition against Gauda (Bengal) and obtained territory from him as the reward for his help.

It is also very likely that the famous Chedi ruler Kokkalladeva of Tripuri also helped Bhoja in this expedition. As noted above, he probably joined Bhoja and his feudatories against a powerful foe. As Kokkalla also claims to have helped the Rāśṭrakūṭa king, we may naturally conclude that he helped Bhoja against his other great enemy, the Pālas. Bhoja was also assisted by his feudal chiefs, particularly the Guhilots. As noted above, Harsharāja of this family helped Bhoja in his northern campaigns in the early part of his reign. Guhila II, the son of Harsharāja, claims to have defeated the Gauda king and levied tribute from princes in the east (no. 4), and may thus be easily presumed to have joined the eastern expedition of Bhoja.

Lovely helped by these, and probably many other chiefs, Bhoja had perhaps little difficulty in defeating the unwarlike Pāla king Nārāyanapāla. Though no details of this campaign are known, the fact that the whole of the Pāla empire to the west of Magadhā passed into the hands of the Pratihāras leaves no doubt on the result of the conflict. Further, as we shall see, not only Magadhā, but even a considerable part of North Bengal formed a part of the dominions of Bhoja’s successor, and it is more than probable that these conquests were at least partially achieved even during the reign of Bhoja.

Bhoja had now only one rival left, the Rāśṭrakūṭas. Here also the situation turned entirely in his favour. The Rāśṭrakūṭa king Krishna II was involved in a life and death struggle with the Eastern Chālukya prince Gunaga-Vijavāditya III who overran his dominions and even plundered the devastated city of Stambha (above, pp. 464, 517). Whether there was any alliance or understanding between Bhoja and this ruler of the Andhra country, as in the days of Nāgabhaṭa II, we cannot say, but certain it is that war also broke out between Bhoja and Krishna II. Bhoja probably took the offensive. According to a Pratihāra record Bhoja defeated Krishna II, pro-
ably on the bank of the Narmadā, and drove him to the south of the river. Even according to the Rashtrakūṭa records, Bhoja took possession not only of Khetāka (Kaira district, Gujarāt) but also of the region around it. It would then appear that Bhoja, after defeating Krishṇa II, occupied Malwa, advanced towards Gujarāt and at first obtained considerable success. The Rashtrakūṭa records, however, assert that Krishṇa II soon retrieved his losses. He not only recovered the Khetaka region, but also advanced in Malwa, and a sanguinary battle took place between him and the Pratihāra army at Ujjavini which made a deep impress upon posterity. This battle took place some time between A.D. 878 and 888 (supra, pp. 463-64). It is generally held, on the strength of the Rashtrakūṭa records, that Bhoja was defeated in it and lost Malwa. But this is by no means certain. The Rashtrakūṭa records do not assert this, nor even openly claim a decisive victory. On the other hand, Malwa certainly formed a part of the Pratihāra empire in the reign of Bhoja’s successor. It is therefore more reasonable to suppose that Malwa, which was conquered by Bhoja continued in the possession of his family. An inscription at Partabgarh (no. 10) mentions a local Chāhamāna dynasty as a source of great pleasure of king Bhojadeva. It has been rightly assumed that these Chāhamānas acknowledged the suzerainty of the Pratihāra king Bhoja I and helped him in his wars against the Rashtrakūṭas. On the whole a careful comparison of the Rashtrakūṭa and Pratihāra records leaves the impression that Bhoja achieved conspicuous success against the Rashtrakūṭas, who were too weak and distracted at home to assume the offensive against the Pratihāras.

With the two rival powers thus laid low, Bhoja had a unique opportunity of realizing the imperial ambitions which Vatsarāja and Nāgabhaṭa had cherished in vain. Although the gradual stages in the growth of his empire are not known to us we can form some idea of its extent from literary and epigraphic evidences.

An inscription, found at Pehowa, shows that the Karnal district in Haryana was included within the dominions of Bhoja. But that his sovereignty once extended even further into this province is hinted at in the Rājatarangini (v. 151). We are told that Saṅkaravarman, king of Kashmir, ‘caused the sovereign power, which the superior king Bhoja had seized, to be given up to the scion of the Thakkiya family.’ As Saṅkaravarman ascended the throne in A.D. 883.

53 IA, XIX, p. 174.
54 IA, XIII, p. 36; EI, IX p. 31.
55 EI, I, p. 184.
there can be no hesitation in identifying 'the superior king Bhoja' with the Pratihāra emperor Bhoja I. It would then follow that Bhoja had seized sovereignty of some territory, near the border of Kashmir, which Sāukaravarman later wrested from the Pratihāras, either during the reign of Bhoja or, more probably, from his successor. Although the locality cannot be exactly determined, we may reasonably presume that Bhoja established his suzerainty over a considerable part of Haryana and the Panjab, almost right up to the borders of Kashmir.

The Muslim chronicles, to which reference will be made later, seem to indicate that Bhoja's dominions extended up to the Muslim principality in Sindh and included the Kāthiāwār peninsula. The Una grants (no. 3) also show that the Saurāshtra-mandala was included in his empire. In the east the Chedis of Gorakhpur acknowledged his suzerainty (no. 5) and so did probably also the Chandellas, as we shall see later. Although it is not possible, in the absence of positive data, to define more precisely the boundaries of Bhoja's empire, it may be presumed to have included nearly the whole of Northern India with the exception of Kashmir, Sindh, Bihār, Bengal and certain parts of Central India.

Bhoja ruled over this vast empire with his capital at Kanauj, which was once more raised to the dignity of an imperial city and enjoyed this distinction for more than a century. It is unfortunate that we possess no account of the personal history of this great empire-builder. All that we know is that his tutelary deity was goddess Bhāravatī and that he was known by several other names such as Prabhūsa, Ādiavarāṇa and Mihira. It is also likely that he married Kalāvatī, the daughter of the Chāhāmaṇa Chandrarāja.56 His coins, known as 'Ādi-varāhanadramma,' have come down to us and will be described later. We also possess a short glimpse of his reign from an Arab account, which is generally supposed to have been composed by merchant Sulaiman in A.D. 851.57 This account refers to the great power and resources of the Jūra, king of Kanauj, undoubtedly meaning a Guriara-Pratihāra ruler, and if the date is really A.D. 851, or even somewhat later, we can easily identify him as king Bhoja I. Referring to him the Arab writer observes:

56 We learn from the ins. no. 6 that the Chāhāmaṇa princess was given in marriage to the king of Kanauj. As her grandfather Guvāka I was a feudatory of Nāgarbhaṭa II, it is likely that the king of Kanauj who married her was no other than Bhoja I.

57 But Dr. Nairn has adduced good grounds against this view. Arab Geographers' Knowledge of South India. See also Sastri, Foreign Notices, p. 22.
"This king maintains numerous forces and no other Indian prince has so fine a cavalry. He is unfriendly to the Arabs... Among the princes of India there is no greater foe of the Muhammadan faith than he. His territories form a tongue of land. He has got riches, and his camels and horses are numerous... There is no country in India more safe from robbers."

Besides paying tribute to the great power and riches of the Pratihāra king, the Muslim writer draws pointed attention to the fact that he was a sworn and inveterate enemy of the Muslims. This was specially striking by way of contrast to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king who is referred to as a great friend of the Muslims. The description of the territory as a tongue of land evidently refers to the physical configuration of Kāthiāwār Peninsula with which part of the kingdom the Muslim merchants were naturally more familiar than with the rest of it.

Even this very brief sketch throws interesting light on the career of Bhoja, who was powerful enough to maintain peace within his kingdom and defend it against external aggressions. There is no doubt that Bhoja was the most outstanding political figure in India in the second half of the ninth century A.D. He had a long reign of more than 46 years, for two of his known dates are A.D. 836 and 882. Probably he ruled for more than half a century and died some time about A.D. 890, leaving the vast empire acquired by his prowess to his son Mahendrapāla.

VI. MAHENDRAPĀLA

Mahendrapāla must have ascended the throne in or before A.D. 893 which is his earliest known date (no. 3). As already hinted at, he might have come into conflict with Śāṅkaravarman, king of Kashmir, and ceded some territories in the Panjab. But, with this somewhat doubtful reservation, he not only maintained intact the vast empire inherited by him but even probably extended its boundaries, specially in the east. Seven records of his reign, found in South Bihar and North Bengal, with dates ranging between his regnal years 2 and 19, clearly indicate his mastery over these regions fairly early in his reign. It is just possible, as suggested above, that these conquests were wholly or partially achieved, even during the reign of Bhoja. But there is no doubt that Mahendrapāla consolidated these conquests and exercised full supremacy, not only over Magadha but even over Varendra (North

58 IIEID, I, p. 4.
59 Barah Cp (no. 12) and Pehowa Ins. (EI, I, p. 184).
60 HB, I, p. 175.
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Bengal), the ancestral home of his hereditary enemies, the Pālas. Similarly, epigraphic records clearly demonstrate that the suzerainty of Mahendrapāla was unquestionably accepted by his feudatories in the Kāthiāwār Peninsula (no. 3). Between these two extremes his records have been found in Haryana, Jhansi district, and Ayodhyā, and we have epigraphic evidence of Pratihāra supremacy, even in later times, over Malwa and Rājasthān.\textsuperscript{61} It may, therefore, be said, without any exaggeration, that the Pratihāra empire now stretched almost from the Himalaya to the Vindhyas and from the Eastern to the Western Ocean, the boundaries given for the Pāla empire by the court-poet of Devapāla.

Unfortunately we know hardly anything about the life and reign of Mahendrapāla. His name appears also as Mahīndrapāla and Mahendrāyudha, and we know of his epithet Nirbhaya-narendra or Nirbhaya-rāja (the fearless king). His guru, or spiritual preceptor, Rājasekhara, occupies a distinguished place in literature, and his works describe the glory and splendour of the imperial city of Kanauj. Mahendrapāla's last known date is A.D. 907-8 (no. 7), and he probably died not long afterwards.

\textbf{VII. MAHIPĀLA}

The emperor Mahendrapāla had at least two queens, Dehanāgādevī and Mahādevī (or Mahīdevī), who bore him two sons, \textit{viz.}, Bhoja II and Vināyakapāla, both of whom ruled after him. Bhoja II certainly ascended the throne before Vināyakapāla, one of whose known dates is A.D. 931 (no. 9). But Mahipāla, another son of Mahendrapāla, is known to have been ruling in A.D. 914 and 917 (no. 8).

So far we are on sure ground, but then we have an epigraphic record which mentions a king Devapāla, son of king Kshitipāla, as ruling in A.D. 948-49 (no. 7). The locality of this record, and the fact that Bhoja and Mahendrapāla are mentioned in its earlier part, make it highly probable that the two rulers Kshitipāla and his son Devapāla belonged to the imperial Pratihāra family. If we accept this view it is possible to arrange the course of succession, after Mahendrapāla, somewhat as follows:

1. Bhoja II, son of Mahendrapāla
2. Mahipāla
3. Vināyakapāla
4. Kshitipāla
5. Devapāla, son of Kshitipāla

\textsuperscript{61} Although these inscriptions (nos. 4, 5, 10) belong to later times, it is not likely that any successor of Mahendrapāla made these conquests.
But the question of succession is complicated by some other considerations. A king Devapāla, with the epithet Hayapati (Lord of Horses), and his father Herambapāla are mentioned in a contemporary inscription\(^{62}\) in such a way as to indicate that they were powerful kings. It has been suggested accordingly that Hayapati Devapāla is identical with no. 5 in the above list. If this suggestion be accepted, we are bound to hold that no. 4, Kshitipāla, was also known as Herambapāla. Now it is exceedingly curious that Heramba is a synonym of Vināyaka, and Kshiti of Mahi. It is, therefore, reasonable to go one step further and presume that Mahipāla, Vināyakapāla, Kshitipāla, and Herambapāla were all but different designations of one and the same king. This theory is based on the identity of the two kings named Devapāla mentioned in two different records, which is not, however, accepted by all. It also involves the somewhat unusual assumption that one and the same king has been referred to by so many different names in contemporary official records. But the theory has the great merit of simplifying—perhaps oversimplifying—the issue by bringing into order a mass of confusing data. And for the sake of convenience, if for no other reason, we may provisionally accept it as a working hypothesis.

We may therefore hold that Bhoja II succeeded his father Mahendrapāla, but after a brief reign of four or five years made room for his brother Mahipāla,\(^{63}\) who was also known as Kshitipāla, Vināyakapāla and Herambapāla. It has been suggested by some scholars that Mahipāla rebelled against his brother and usurped the throne. But though such a course of events is by no means unlikely, and satisfactorily explains the overwhelming disaster which engulfed the Pratihāra empire within a few years, there is no positive evidence to indicate that there was a struggle for succession to the throne. The statement in the Kalachuri records that Kokkalladeva I ‘set up Bhojadeva’ and granted him ‘freedom from fear’ forms the chief foundation for this theory.\(^{64}\) But, as noted above (p. 633), Bhojadeva almost certainly refers to Bhoja I, and even if it refers to Bhoja II, we have no reason to hold that he asked for the Kalachuri aid against his brother. There are good grounds to believe that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishna II invaded the dominions of the Pratihāras and occupied the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab, though this has been denied by some scholars.\(^{65}\) It is conceivable that Bhoja II or his brother might have

---

\(^{62}\) EI, I, p. 124.

\(^{63}\) N. Ray identifies Bhoja II with Mahipāla (IA, 1928, p. 232).

\(^{64}\) THK, p. 255.

\(^{65}\) PIHC, VI, p. 169.
been protected by some powerful king on an occasion like this. This would satisfactorily explain the statement that a Chandella king placed Kshirtipâla on the throne, as will be noted later, without necessarily implying a fratricidal war of succession.

Suspicion about a contested succession also arises from the fact that while the grant of Vinâyakapâla, dated A.D. 931, refers to his elder brother Bhoja II as his predecessor, the earlier grant, dated A.D. 917, does not mention Bhoja II at all, and represents Mahipâla as having succeeded Mahendrapâla. The case is analogous to the Hitiari seal and other records of the Imperial Guptas (pp. 71, 78ff) which omit altogether the name of Skanda-gupta in drawing up the genealogy of the Imperial Guptas. There are similar other cases in Indian history, and all these may be simply due to the not unusual practice of tracing only direct descent by omitting all references to collateral lines. But it has been urged by some that Bhoja’s name was deliberately omitted by Mahipâla, the successful rebel. But if we accept the identity of Mahipâla and Vinâyakapâla, one is hard put to it to explain the omission of Bhoja’s name in one grant, and not in the other, by the rebellious brother. It has been argued that with the lapse of time memories of the old rivalry and hatred passed away and so the name of Bhoja appears in the grant of A.D. 931 though not in that of A.D. 917.66 But this is at best questionable.

Save for the two very doubtful episodes of a fratricidal war and a Râshrakûta invasion, we have no knowledge of any event in the reign of Bhoja II. Mahipâla, who succeeded him, probably about A.D. 912, reigned in full glory over the vast empire. The Haddala grant,67 dated A.D. 914, gives us his earliest known date and proves his suzerainty over the distant province of Kâthiâwâr Peninsula. Al Mas’ûdî, who visited India in A.D. 915-16, refers to the wide extent of the Pratihâra empire and the rich resources of its ruler, who must be identified with Mahipâla. We are told that he was rich in horses and camels and maintained four armies in four directions, each numbering 700,000 or 900,000 men.68

Al Mas’ûdî adds that the Pratihâra emperor was at war with both his neighbouring states, the Râshrakûta kingdom in the south and the Muslim principality of Multan in the west. The aggressive imperial policy of Mahipâla is also referred to by poet Râjaśekhara, the spiritual teacher (guru) of Mahendrapâla. He graced the court of Mahipâla and refers to him as the ‘pearl jewel of the lineage of Raghu’ and

66 TIIK, p. 255.
67 IA, XII, p. 195.
68 HIED, i, p. 21.
the 'Mahārajādhirāja of Āryāvarta' (Emperor of Northern India). In
the introduction to his drama Bāla Bharatā or Prachanda-Pandava,
Rājaśekhara mentions a large number of peoples and countries defeated
or conquered by Mahīpāla, such as the Muralas, the Mekalas, the
Kaliṅgas, the Keralas, the Kulūtas, the Kuntalas and the Ramaṭhas.
Of these, the Kulūtas undoubtedly occupied the present kulu dis-
trict on the upper course of the Beas,69 and the Ramaṭhas were a
neighbouring people. The Kaliṅgas lived in the Eastern Deccan
coast, the Mekalas in the Mekala Hills (M. P.), and the Kuntalas in
Western Deccan. The location of the Keralas is uncertain, but they,
too, probably lived in the Eastern Deccan. Whether Mahīpāla
actually conquered all these peoples, specially those in the distant
regions of the Deccan, may be doubted, but possibly he had occasions
to fight them and gained some victories.
In any case, the available data, mentioned so far, reflect the un-
diminished splendour and glory of the Pratihāra empire. But the
fight with the Rāśtrakūtas which Al Maṣʿūdī refers to, and which
probably began in Bhoja’s region (supra, pp. 634-35, 640), soon led to
a disaster. We learn from the Rāśtrakūta records that king Indra III
invaded North India; he conquered Ujjayinī, crossed the Yamunā
and devastated the city of Mahodaya (Kanauj).69a Further details are
given in a Kanarese poetical work called Pampabīrāta. We are told
that Narasiṁha, a feudatory of Indra III, took a prominent part in the
expedition. It ended in a complete defeat of king Mahīpāla who fled,
as if struck by thunderbolts, staying neither to eat, nor rest, nor pick
himself up, while Narasiṁha, pursuing, bathed his horses at the
junction of the Gaṅgā (and the Yamunā).70
Thus according to the records of the enemy, Mahīpāla suffered a
crushing defeat at the hands of Indra III who occupied the capital
city of Kanauj and sacked it. Mahīpāla had even to flee for his life,
being hotly pursued by the hostile soldiers as far as Allahabad.71
But even if we accept these details as fairly correct, we cannot regard
the result as decisive. There is no doubt that the Rāśtrakūta invasion
was more of the nature of a raid than a regular conquest. The
Rāśtrakūtas could not stay long in North India to consolidate their
conquests. Mahīpāla also, after the first shock of the disastrous defeat,

69 For a detailed history of this people, see Kalyan Kumar Dasgupta, A Tribal His-
70 AR, p. 102.
71 Altekar thinks that Mahīpāla fled towards Gorakhpur, and Narasiṁha, after
pursuing him for a while proceeded to Allahabad on his way back to the Deccan
(ibid., n. 46).
rallied his forces and retrieved his fortunes. The statement by Rajaśekhara that Mahipāla defeated the Kuntalas and other peoples of the Deccan may refer to his later success against the Rāṣṭrakūta, which is also perhaps reflected in the dramatic work Chanda-Kānsika by Kshemiśvara.72 The fact that even so late as A.D. 946 Malwa still formed part of the Pratihara dominions (no. 10) unerringly indicates that the Rāṣṭrakūta invasion was a passing phase and did not seriously cripple the Pratihara empire.

In his effort to re-establish the fortunes of his family Mahipāla must have received substantial help from his loyal feudatory chiefs. The Chandella record of a later date claims that King Harsha placed Kshitipāla again on the throne.73 It is said of the Guhilot chief Bhata, the grandson of Harsharāja who helped Bhoja I (p. 632), that at the command of his liege-lord he defeated in battle 'the king of the south' at a time of great danger, when the territory of his overlord was invaded by foreign soldiers and everything was in confusion (no. 4). Bhāmāna, the feudatory Kalachuri ruler of Gorakhpur, also boasts of having conquered Dhārā (no. 5). All these may be regarded as alluding to the great counter-attack that Mahipāla organised against the Rāṣṭrakūtas.

It reflects no small credit upon the personality and resources of Mahipāla, that he not only survived the great disaster but could rally his forces and recover his empire by driving away the Rāṣṭrakūtas beyond the Narmadā. Whether he was in a position to recover all the imperial territories it is difficult to say. The epigraphic records prove that the Pratihāras were in possession of Benaras in A.D. 931 (no. 9), Chanderi (Narwar) in A.D. 94274 and Malwa in A.D. 946 (no. 10).

72 In a verse in this work king Mahipāla is said to be the incarnation of Chandra-gupta, and the Karnātas, of the Nandas. Obviously, this implies that the King Mahipāla defeated the Karnātas. Some have identified this Mahipāla with the Pala ruler Mahipāla I, but it is more likely that he was the Pratihāra emperor Mahipāla I and the Karnātas were the Rāṣṭrakūta forces of Indra III. For a full discussion on this point see HBR. I, pp. 143-44. and JOR. VI, pp. 191-98.

73 The inscription (El. I, p. 122) being fragmentary, the connection between Harshadeva and the restoration of Kshitipāla is not absolutely certain. Hoernle takes the reference to be to Yaśovarman (JRAS. 1904, p. 614). But the name of Yaśovarman does not actually occur in the extant portion of the record, and it is also more likely from the chronological point of view that it was Harsha who helped Kshitipāla in recovering the throne. It is also more probable that it refers to the restoration after Rāṣṭrakūta invasion, though Tripathi contends that Harsha helped Kshitipāla in his war of succession against his brother Bhoja II (THK. pp. 256-7).

74 ASIAR. 1924-25, p 168. The author of the report is obviously wrong when he includes the place in the Chandella kingdom on the ground that Vināvakapāla, the ruler of the locality is mentioned in a Chandella inscription. There can be no doubt that he was the Pratihāra ruler of that name.
We must therefore credit Mahipāla with having recovered a large part of his empire if not the whole of it. There is, however, no doubt that the prestige of the Imperial Pratihāras suffered a severe blow, and the gradual decline in the power and authority of the empire, which we notice from this time, was largely due to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion. The sack of the capital city and the flight of the emperor for life, hotly pursued, by the enemy, could not but have had a serious repercussion on the morale of the imperial governors and feudatories.\textsuperscript{75} These gradually asserted independence and new states arose challenging the supremacy of the Pratihāra empire. All these disturbing signs, heralding the downfall of the empire, made their appearance in the second quarter of the tenth century A.D., as will be seen from the detailed history of the Chandellas, Chedis, Paramāras and other dynasties in Chapter XXVI.

Even the Rāṣṭrakūṭa menace was not wholly over. Towards the close of Mahipāla's reign he had to face an invasion of Kṛishṇa III. A Rāṣṭrakūṭa record, dated A.D. 940, boastfully mentions that 'on hearing of the conquest of all the strongholds (by Kṛishṇa III) in the southern regions simply by means of his angry glance, the hope about Kālaṇijara and Chittrakūṭa vanished from the heart of the Gurjara.'\textsuperscript{76} This has been taken to imply that the two famous fortresses of the Pratihāras were captured by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king some time before A.D. 940. It has been contended on the other hand that here is nothing in the above passage to indicate that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army occupied the forts of Kālaṇijara and Chittrakūṭa.\textsuperscript{77} It simply means that the victories of Kṛishṇa III in the south 'acted as a bulwark protecting these forts from falling into the hands of the Gurjara ruler who was evidently entertaining ambitions against them.'\textsuperscript{78} In other words, these forts, which originally belonged to the Gurjara ruler, had evidently passed into the hands of some other power who could reasonably expect the Rāṣṭrakūṭa help, if any attempt were made to recover them. So on hearing of the brilliant victories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the South the Gurjara king lost hope of capturing or recovering them. This seems to be the more reasonable view. As we shall see later, the fort of Kālaṇijara passed into the hands of the Chandellas. These nominally owed allegiance to the Pratihāra emperor, and probably seized the fortress, or, according

\textsuperscript{75} Concrete examples of the defiant spirit of the feudatories will be given later; some of these may be referred to this time.

\textsuperscript{76} Deoli Pl. (v. 25) EI, V, p. 188.

\textsuperscript{77} AR, p. 113, THK, pp. 267-68.

\textsuperscript{78} JOR, XVI, p. 157.
to the first interpretation, recovered it from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas but evidently kept it in their own possession. This was an unmistakable sign of the impending dissolution of the empire. Indeed, everything indicates that although Mahīpāla’s reign ended in outward glory and splendour as evidenced by the flattering description of the poet Rāja-śekhara, the seeds of decay had already been sown and were to bear fruit at no distant date.

VIII THE SUCCESSORS OF MAHIPĀLA

The period following the death of Mahīpāla is the most obscure in the annals of the Imperial Pratihāras of Kanauj. In particular, the question of succession to the throne is one of the most baffling in Indian history on account of the uncertainties mentioned above regarding the successors of Mahendrapāla I.

Vināyakapāla I ruled till at least A.D. 942,79 and was succeeded by his son Mahendrapāla II, whose only known date is A.D. 945-6 (no. 10). The epigraphic records reveal the existence of the following kings during the next 15 years.

1. Devapāla (A.D. 948-9), son of Kshitipāla (no. 7)
2. Vināyakapāla II 80 (A.D. 953-4)
3. Mahīpāla II (A.D. 955)
4. Vijayapāla (A.D. 960), successor of Kshitipāla (ins. No. 11)

The relation between these kings being unknown, different scholars have advanced different theories on the subject.81 As any one theory is almost as good as another, and none rests on sufficiently strong grounds, it will serve no useful purpose to discuss them in detail. But the following alternative genealogies would give the reader some idea of the different views.

```
I. Mahendrapāla II alias Devapāla (no. 1)
   Vināyakapāla II (no 2) alias Mahīpāla II (no. 3) alias Kshitipāla II
      Vijayapāla (no 4)
```

79 ASIAR, 1924-25, p. 168, n. 74.
80 EI. XXII, p. 122.
81 Bh. List, p. 400; IA, LVII, p. 234; THK, pp. 271-75.
II. Mahendrapāśa I

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Bhoja II alias Mahīpāśa I} \\
\text{alias Kṣhitipāśa I} \\
\text{Devapāśa (no. 1)} \\
\text{Mahīpāśa II (no. 3) alias Kṣhitipāśa II} \\
\text{Vijayapāśa (no. 4)} \\
\text{Vināyakapāśa I} \\
\text{Mahendrapāśa II} \\
\text{Vināyakapāśa II (no. 2)}
\end{array}
\]

In the last scheme there is no reference to Mahīpāśa II (no. 3) for it is argued that there is no sufficient ground to hold that he was a Pratihāra emperor, and, for all we know, he may be a vassal ruler who sometimes assumed imperial titles, as proved by the Rajgor inscription (no. 11).

Similarly, there is also difference of opinion whether Vināyakapāśa II is a separate king or is to be identified with the first king of that name. The name occurs in the last line of the Khajuraho inscription of the Chandella ruler Dhaṅga, dated A.D. 954.\(^8^2\) It has no connection with the preceding text of the inscription but is simply introduced at the end by way of saying that ‘Vināyakapāśaladeva was protecting the earth’. There is no doubt that this king, whose name is invoked as a suzerain by Dhaṅga, belonged to the Imperial Pratihāra family. It is, however, to be noted that the Chandella ruler Dhaṅga claims in the very same inscription to have been the master of territory extending up to the Yamunā in the north, Kālaṇjara in the east (or north-east) and Gopāḍri (Gwalior) in the west (or north-west). He thus ruled over a large part of the Pratihāra empire, including the two famous strongholds, Kālaṇjara and Gwalior, which belonged to it since the days of Nāgabhāṭa II, if not earlier. Not to leave us in any doubt, the same Dhaṅga is said, in another record, to have obtained the empire after defeating the Kānyakabjā king, who can only be the Pratihāra emperor. In view of all this the reference to

\(8^2\) EI, I, p. 129.
Vināyakapāla as the suzerain kung protecting the earth, in the official record of Dhāṅga, must be regarded as very curious, to say the least of it. We can only explain this anomaly by supposing that the official records put in this name simply as an old convention and out of respect for the old emperor who at one time really exercised effective suzerainty. Accordingly it is held by some that the king Vināyakapāla in the Khajuraho inscription really refers to the Pratihāra emperor Vināyakapāla I. But as he must have died before A.D. 946, the known date of his son and successor Mahendrapāla II, it has been suggested that the Khajuraho inscription, though originally drafted earlier than A.D. 946, was actually set up in A.D. 954 without any modification of the suzerain's name. But this explanation is not accepted by some scholars who naturally infer from the Khajuraho inscription that there was a second king named Vināyakapāla in the imperial Pratihāra family, ruling in A.D. 954.

In view of this great uncertainty about the succession we are unable to give any definite account of the imperial Pratihāras after the reign of Mahendrapāla II. We know from the single record (no. 10) that we possess of this emperor, that the Chāhamānas of Partabgarh, in South-eastern Rājasthān, acknowledged him as their suzerain, and that both Ujjayini and Maṇḍapikā (Mandu) were being ruled by his governors in the year A.D. 945-46. But this may be regarded as the very last record reflecting the power and glory of the great Pratihāra empire. For the epigraphic records of later dates unmistakably indicate its decline and rapid decay.

Reference has been made above to several Chāhamāna feudatories helping their overlords, the Pratihāra emperors. But Vākpatirāja of the same dynasty, who flourished about the middle of the tenth century A.D., is said to have harassed Tantrapāla, when coming to the Ananta province with the behests of his overlord, who can only be either Pratihāra Mahīpāla or one of his successors. The son of this Vākpatirāja, named Sindhurāja, claims to have imprisoned a number of rulers who were feudatories of the Pratihāras and the great Pratihāra emperor of the Raghu family had to come to the Chāhamāna king in order to secure their release (no. 6, vv 16, 19). The Guhila chief Allaṭa, whose known dates are A.D. 951 and 953, is said to have killed in battle Devapāla, who may be identified with the Pratihāra king of that name.83

Reference has been already made to the Chandella records which leave no doubt that Dhaṅga had wrested a considerable part

83 DHNI, II, p. 1170.
of the Pratihāra empire before the year A.D. 954. An inscription (no. 11), dated A.D. 959-60 and found at Rājorgāḍh, 28 miles to the south-west of Alwar, records an order issued to his officers by the Mahārājādhirāja, Paramesvara, the illustrious Mathanadeva of the Gurjara-Pratihāra lineage, residing at Rājyapura. As Rājyapura is undoubtedly to be identified with Rājorgāḍh, we must hold that Mathanadeva, probably a member of the imperial Pratihāra clan, had set up an independent state in the Alwar region although, like the Chandellas, he invokes in his official record the name of the Pratihāra emperor Vijayapāladeva as his suzerain.

For more than half a century after this we do not hear anything more about any Pratihāra emperor. But we have indirect references to the further disintegration of the empire. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishna III led a second expedition to Northern India about A.D. 963.84 One of his feudatories the Gaṅga Mārasiṁha, so distinguished himself in this campaign that he got the epithet 'the king of the Gurjaras' (pp. 478-79). This shows that the campaign was mainly directed against the Pratihāras and they fared the worst. The victorious Rāṣṭrakūṭas left, by way of a permanent memorial of their northern conquest, a short inscription in Kanarese engraved on a stone slab at Jura, 12 miles from Maihar, a modern railway station in Bundelkhand. Nearer home, king Vajradāman of the newly founded Kachchhapaghāta dynasty of Gwalior, inflicted a crushing defeat upon the ruler of Kānyakubja some time before A.D. 977.85 The feudatory Chāhamānas of Śākhambharī, many of whose chiefs had helped their Pratihāra overlords in their expeditions against the Pālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (pp. 628, 635) asserted their independence, and so did probably also the Guhilots and other vassal states. The Paramāras and the Chaulukyas set up strong principalities, respectively in Malwa and Gujarāt, which had hitherto formed integral parts of the Pratihāra empire.

84 EI, XIX, pp. 287-89.

85 An inscription (IA, 1915, p. 36) in the temple of Sasbahu, at Gwalior; dated V, 1150 (A.D. 1093), records that Vajradāman defeated a ruler of Gāḍhinagara, i.e., Kanauj, and conquered Gopāḍri (of Gwalior). As an inscription (JASB, XXXI, p. 393), dated V. 1094 (A.D. 977), of Mahārājādhirāja Vajradāman is found engraved on the pedestal of a Jaina image in Gwalior, he must have conquered this famous fortress before that date. As noted above, this stronghold of the Pratihāras passed into the hands of the Chandellas before A.D. 954. It is to be noted that Vajradāman claims to have conquered it after defeating the ruler of Kanauj. We must, therefore, hold that either the Pratihāra emperor recovered Kanauj from the Chandellas, some time between A.D. 954 and 977, or helped the Chandellas against Vajradāman when the latter invaded Gwalior. It is also not unlikely that although the Chandella ruler Dhaṅga was actually in possession of Gwalior, it was still nominally regarded as a part of the Pratihāra empire.
The history of these and other powers, which will be related in Chapter XXVI, leaves no doubt that as the tenth century was drawing to its close, the Pratihāra empire fell to pieces. When the curtain rises again, early in the eleventh century A.D., we find that the descendants of Bhoja and Mahendrapāla were still ruling over a small principality round about Kanauj. But the Pratihāra empire had vanished, and North India once more presented the political spectacle that inevitably followed the disruption of a great empire. The situation was rendered worse by the repeated invasions of the Ghaznavid sultans whose hammering blows almost shattered the political fabric of North India. Even then the Pratihāras remembered the rôle they had played in Indian history, and though shorn of power and glory, offered heroic and stubborn resistance to the Muslim invaders. All this will be related in the next volume. But before we conclude the history of the Pratihāra empire we must pay our tribute to it for having successfully defended the western frontier of India for more than two hundred years. Since the days of the Arab invasion, in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D., the Pratihāra empire stood as the bulwark of India's defence against the aggression of the Muslims from the west. This is clearly shown by the Arab writers themselves. They frankly admit that the Muslims were kept in check by the Pratihāras, and would have been driven away even from the principality of Multan if the Pratihāras were not deterred by their threat of breaking the idol of the Sun-god in that city which was revered all over India.86 The Muslims could thus maintain their precarious foothold in the small principality of Sindh, conquered so long ago as A.D. 712, not by their inherent strength, but merely by playing on the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus. The Muslim writers tell us that while the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings befriended them, the imperial Pratihāras were their uncompromising enemies. So they were at the very beginning of their career, and so they remained till the very end. The older generations of historians naturally wondered why Islam, which had conquered the world, could not extend its power into the heart of India before the close of tenth century A.D. although it had obtained a footing in the Indus valley as early as the beginning of the eighth century. These historians indulged in vague speculations to explain this veritable miracle. But we may now offer the true explanation. It is the valour and resources of the Pratihāra emperors that kept the Muslim invaders at bay. So long as they remained powerful, the Muslims could not advance further beyond Multan, and all that they could do was to retain possession of it by playing upon the religious susceptibilities of

86 Cf. Ch. XIX.
the Pratihāras. It was not till the Pratihāra empire fell to pieces that the flood-gates of Muslim invasions were opened and deluged the whole of North India. The later history of India, by the contrast it affords, may be held up as the most eloquent testimony to the glorious rule of the imperial Pratihāras.

IMPORTANT INSCRIPTIONS

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

THE PĀLAS

I. THE ORIGIN

The political disintegration of Bengal during the century that followed the death of Saśāṅka has been described above (pp. 602 ff). A series of foreign invasions destroyed the solid political fabric that Saśāṅka had built up. There was no central authority, and the whole country was divided into a number of petty principalities. Nearly a thousand years later, the Tibetan historian Tāranātha observed with reference to this period: 'In the five eastern provinces, Bhaṅgala, Odīvīsa (Orissa), and the rest, every Kshatriya, Grandee, Brāhmaṇa, and merchant was a king in his own house (in the neighbourhood), but there was no king ruling over the country.' Bhaṅgala, in the above passage, undoubtedly stands for a large part of Bengal, though it is not possible to define its limits. But there is no doubt that Tāranātha fairly describes the political condition of the whole of Bengal. For in a contemporary inscription, the Khalimpur copper-plate (no. I),2 reference is made to mātsya-nyāya, prevailing in Bengal. This word which literally means 'fish-law,' is a well-known technical term used by ancient writers on polity. It denotes a state of political anarchy and confusion in which there is no order or authority and might alone is right, so that the strong can oppress the weak at will, as the larger fish in a pond devours the smaller ones.

The Khalimpur Copper-plate further informs us that in order to put an end to this mātsya-nyāya, or state of anarchy, Gopāla was elected king by the prakritis. Kielhorn, who edited this inscription, elucidated the above passage by saying that 'Gopāla was made king by the people to put an end to a lawless state of things in which everyone was the prey of his neighbour.' He evidently took the word

1. Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India, translated in German by A. Schiefner (Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt von Anton Schiefner, St. Petersburg, 1869). Portions of this book were translated into English in IA. IV; p. 361, but the translation is not always accurate. For a full discussion of Lama Tāranātha's account of Bengal, cf. IHQ. XVI, pp. 219 ff, a summary of which is given in HBR, p. 182.

2. These numbers within brackets refer to the list of inscriptions given in Appendix at the end of this chapter.
prakṛiti in the sense of people, but it has been suggested that prakṛiti should be taken as a technical term meaning principal officers.\footnote{EHBP, p. 112.}

But as there was no strong and stable government in those days we can hardly think of an election of the king by principal officers in a state. It is therefore better to take the word prakṛiti in its ordinary and well-known sense of ‘subjects’ or ‘general people,’ as Kielhorn has done. But we need not literally interpret the passage to mean that there was a regular election of Gopāla as king by the vote of the common people, or by their representatives assembled in a meeting. Most likely the choice was originally made by a number of ruling chiefs and leading citizens, and finally endorsed by the people who could demonstrate their general approval by various means such as acclamation, general rejoicings etc. The chief thing to note in this connection is that the procedure must have involved, at the very initial stage, the willing surrender of authority and possibly abdication of the throne, on the part of a large number of warring chiefs. Such an act of voluntary submission on the part of men in power for the salvation of the country is a rare phenomenon in history. This uncommon spirit of self-sacrifice must have been inspired by a high degree of patriotism and a wise far-seeing statesmanship of no mean order, and no wonder that it ushered in a new era of glory and prosperity in the history of Bengal such as it has never known before or since. The episode of the election of Gopāla was long remembered in Bengal and developed in course of time into a strange semi-mythical legend which has been faithfully recorded by Tāranātha in the seventeenth century.\footnote{HBR, p. 184.}

11. G O P Ā L A (c. a. d. 750-770)

We know very little of the antecedents and early history of Gopāla who was thus called to the throne in a grave emergency by the voice of the people. The Khalimpur Copper-plate (no. 1) merely tells us that his grandfather Dayitavishnu was a learned man, and the fame of his father Vapyata, who killed his enemies, spread over the whole world. These vague and general praises really do not mean very much and merely indicate that Gopāla was not born in a very high or distinguished, far less a royal, family.\footnote{EHBP, p. 112.} His father was

\footnote{The epithet Rājabhatādi-vāṁśa-patīla, applied to Dharmapāla in a contemporary Buddhist work, has led some to conclude that Dharmapāla was descended from Rājabhata identical with Rājarāja or Rājarāja-Bhaṭa, the heir-apparent of Devakhaḍga (p. 605 above). For criticism of this interpretation and other views on the origin of the Pāla family, cf. HBR, pp. 98-100.}
a soldier, and probably Gopāla followed the same profession. He must have won fame and distinction in battles; for otherwise he would not have been chosen the head of the state in those troublesome times. It is probable, though by no means certain, that he was born in Varendra, for in the Rāmācharita,6 this province has been referred to as janaka-bhū or ancestral home of the Pālas. He was a Buddhist and so were his successors,7 and probably also his ancestors.

Of the events of Gopāla’s reign also practically nothing is known. Two inscriptions (nos. 2-3) of his grandson refer in somewhat extravagant terms to his vast army and numerous victorious military campaigns. It is said that after having conquered the earth as far as the sea, Gopāla released his elephants as there was no further need of any military expedition. These general statements can hardly be relied upon, but on the whole we may conclude that Gopāla consolidated his political authority over the whole of Bengal, and left it in peace and prosperity. For, otherwise, it is difficult to believe that his son would have been in a position to undertake military campaigns from one end of North India to the other.

If the reference to victorious military campaigns of Gopāla is based on historical truth, we must presume that Gopāla had to fight with some recalcitrant chiefs in Bengal who did not voluntarily acknowledge his authority. This also follows from the statement made in later Pāla inscriptions (nos. 6-10) that Gopāla obtained enduring peace (for his kingdom) by defeating the attacks of Kāmakāris. The word normally means ‘those who do not acknowledge any authority and act willfully’, and evidently refers to the petty tyrants in Bengal. Some scholars have, however, taken the word to mean ‘king of Kāmarūpa (Kāmaka) who is an enemy,’ and thus inferred from the passage Gopāla’s victory over the king of Kāmarūpa (Assam).8 But this, as well as Gopāla’s conquest of Magadha, noted by Tāranātha, though very probable, cannot be regarded as certain. All that we may reasonably conclude is that Gopāla checked the unruly elements and brought the whole of Bengal under his undivided sway, thereby ensuring the peace and prosperity of the country.

6. A contemporary account of the Pāla king Rāmapāla who flourished in the 11th-12th century A.D. A detailed account of this important poetical work will be given in the next volume in connection with the history of that king.

7. All the copper-plate grants of the Pāla kings begin with an invocation to the Buddha and the rulers are called paraṇa-sougata.

8. IHQ, VII, pp. 531-32.
Gopāla ascended the throne about A.D. 750.9 Tāranātha says that he ruled for forty-five years. According to Mañjusrīmūla-kālpa he ruled for 27 years and died at the advanced age of eighty. But neither of the statements can be regarded as authentic. In view of the circumstances in which he was called to the throne, we may reasonably hold that he was neither very young and inexperienced nor very old at the time. As his son and grandson had both long reigns, covering between them seventy years or more, it is not likely that Gopāla, too, lived to be eighty years or had a very long reign. We may therefore provisionally hold that he ruled for about 20 years, from c. A.D. 750 to 770.

III. DHARMAPĀLA (C. A.D. 770-810).

Dharmapāla, the son of Gopāla and Deddadevi, succeeded his father. We get some interesting account of his reign from the Khālimpur Copper-plate (no. 1) which was issued in the year 32 of his reign. It refers in most extravagant terms to the mighty army and the victorious military campaigns of Dharmapāla, but gives no details. Fortunately we have other evidences which throw light on his eventful military career. It is not possible in the present state of our knowledge to arrange all the known events of his reign, gathered from these scattered references, in a sure chronological sequence. His life and reign have consequently been viewed in different lights by different scholars. The sketch given below is, therefore, tentative and has no claim to finality.

We know from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records that the Pratihāra king Vatsarāja defeated the king of Gauda, and was himself defeated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruva, who later defeated the king of Gauda somewhere between the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā.

The history of both Vatsarāja and Dhruva has been discussed elsewhere, in connection with the dynasties to which they belonged.10 Both were ambitious and aggressive rulers who wanted to establish suzerainty over Northern India. It is evident that the king of Gauda also had the same design, and this brought these three powers into conflict which continued for several generations.

It would appear that Vatsarāja first took the aggressive and advanced towards the east. Where he met the king of Gauda it is difficult to determine. It has been held by some that Vatsarāja invaded

9. The chronology of the Pāla kings has been discussed in Appendix II of HBR, pp. 176 ff; and Appendix I, of HABM, pp. 161 ff.

10. For references to the statements concerning the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Pratihāras cf. Chs. XVI and XXII dealing respectively with these two dynasties.
Bengal and advanced as far as the mouth of the Gaṅgā,11 but this is by no means certain. Vatsarāja, like Dhruva, may have encountered the king of Gauḍa in the Doab. But whatsoever that may be, Vatsarāja’s triumph was short-lived. For he was defeated by Dhruva and forced to seek refuge ‘in the trackless desert.’ Dhruva next defeated the king of Gauḍa between the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā.

This king of Gauḍa was almost certainly Dharmapāla, for his father Gopāla is not known to have advanced so far as the Doab in course of his conquests. But it is not also unlikely that Vatsarāja carried on an expedition against Bengal before Gopāla had succeeded in consolidating the kingdom. But whether it took place during the reign of Gopāla or Dharmapāla, the Pālas survived the Pratihāra invasion. Some time later, either before or after the defeat of Vatsarāja by Dhruva, Dharmapāla took the offensive and advanced as far as Allahabad and perhaps even beyond. He evidently followed in the footsteps of Saśāṅka. But his triumphant career was checked by the reverse he sustained in the hands of Dhruva.

The departure of Dhruva for his own kingdom in the Deccan once more gave an opportunity to the Pālas and Pratihāras to try their strength. But the Pratihāras had evidently suffered more than the Pālas, and took longer to recover. In any event we hear nothing more of Vatsarāja. On the other hand Dharmapāla led many brilliant campaigns from one end of North India to another. First he acquired the sovereignty of Mahodava or Kanauj by defeating Indrāja and other kings, and placed his protégé Chakrāyudha on the throne.12 He then undertook military campaigns in the course of which he proceeded as far as Kedāra, Gokarna, and the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the sea.13 There is no doubt that Kedāra refers to the famous place of pilgrimage on the Himālayas in Garhwal. Dharmapāla therefore must have overrun the greater part of Northern India. Gokarna cannot be identified, but may be located in Nepal.14

11. The expressions used in epigraphic records merely mean that Vatsarāja defeated the lord of Gauḍa, but do not necessarily imply that he actually advanced as far as Bengal. According to a verse in the Prithvirāja-Vijaya the sword of the Chāhamāna king Durlabhārāja purified itself by a dip at the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the sea and by the taste of the land of Gauḍa. It has been inferred from this verse that the feudal chief Durlabhārāja accompanied the expedition of Vatsarāja which overrun the whole of Bengal and advanced as far as the mouth of the Gaṅgā (IHQ, XIV, p. 844). But it is too important a conclusion to be based on merely a stray verse composed about four centuries after the events described.
12. Ins. no. 6, v. 8.
13. Ins. no. 2, v. 7.
14. Kielhorn identified Gokarna with a place of pilgrimage of that name in the Bombay State (IA, 1892, p. 257, n. 56). A more probable identification is with
According to a tradition preserved in the Svayambhu Purana Dharmapala occupied the throne of Nepal. Dharmapala's effective suzerainty over a large part of Northern India is conclusively proved by verse 12 in the Khalimpur Copper-plate (no. 1) which describes a big imperial assembly or durbar held by him at Kanauj. The verse has been translated as follows:

'With a sign of his gracefully moved eyebrows he installed the illustrious king of Kanyakubja, who readily was accepted by the Bhoja, Matsya, Madra, Kuru, Yadu, Yavana, Avanti, Gandhara and Kira kings, bowing down respectfully with their diadems trembling and for whom his own golden coronation jar was lifted up by the delighted elders of Panchala.'

In spite of some obscurity, owing to the defective construction of the last line of the verse, its general purport seems to be clear. A king was installed at Kanyakubja, by or with the permission of Dharmapala, and the phrase 'own golden coronation jar' might imply that Dharmapala was also already consecrated there, probably as emperor. This act (or acts) was (or were) formally approved by the rulers of the various countries named, whose 'bowing down' indicates that they acknowledged the suzerainty of Dharmapala. The assembly at Kanauj, whatever might have been its avowed object, was undoubtedly meant to be a formal assumption of imperial authority by Dharmapala. It was the crowning achievement of his life, and the fruit of a series of successful military expeditions all over Northern India. Some scholars do not seem to realise the full implication of this passage, and do not agree that the states named acknowledged the suzerainty of Dharmapala. But it is difficult to explain in any other way the presence of these distant chiefs in a political assembly at Kanauj, and their accepting, with bowed heads, the consecration of the king of Kanauj and probably also of Dharmapala. The verse in the Khalim-

Gokarna in Nepal on the bank of the Bagmati, about 2 miles to the north-west of Pashupati (IC. IV. p. 266). A further identification will be referred to below (p. 665).

15 It is difficult to understand, far less accept, Tripathi's views on this point. He admits that 'the gathering of distant sovereigns' at Kanauj 'indicates the power and position of Dharmapala who seems to have attained in his day the rank of the premier king of the North,' but denies that these sovereigns were conquered by, or even acknowledged the suzerainty of, Dharmapala. 'The passage in question' he says (with reference to v. 12 of the Khalimpur plate), 'only gives us a list of the principal kingdoms that had dealings with Kanauj, and the assumption that they were subject to it seems altogether fantastic and wide (sic) the mark' (History of Kanauj, pp. 218-17). In his opinion the sovereigns attended the assembly at Kanauj only 'to give respectfully their stamp of recognition to the settlement made by the Gauda monarch.' But it is difficult to understand why their recognition was necessary, and how, in that case, Dharmapala may be regarded as the premier king of the North.
pur plate leaves no doubt that Dharmapāla claimed the position of a suzerain king in Northern India. Fortunately, we have independent evidence to prove that this claim was generally recognised. In the Udayasundarikatha,\textsuperscript{16} composed by the Gujarati poet Soddhalā in the eleventh century A.D., Dharmapāla is referred to as Uttarāpatha-svāmin or Lord of Uttarāpatha, which denotes the western half of Northern India. It has been suggested also that the expression Pañcha-Gauḍa, comprising, in addition to Gauḍa proper, Sārasvata (E. Panjab), Kānyakubja (Gangetic Doab), Mithilā (N. Bihar), and Utkala (Orissa), is reminiscent of the Gauḍa empire of Dharmapāla.\textsuperscript{17}

We may form some idea of the extent of the empire from the verse quoted above. It would appear that Kanauj was an integral part, if not the seat, of the empire. We learn from the Bhagalpur Copper-plate (no. 6) that Dharmapāla conquered Kanauj by defeating Indra-rāja and other enemies, and installed Chakrāyudha, an humble supplicant, as its king. The Pratihāra inscription also describes Chakrāyudha as a 'low or mean person who lived under the protection of another.' There is thus no doubt that although Kanauj had a separate king, he was a nominee of Dharmapāla, and to all intents and purposes, a subordinate ruler. It is very probable that the king who was installed at Kanauj in the presence of the rulers of Bhoja and other countries, as described in v. 12 of the Khalimpur Copper-plate, was no other than Chakrāyudha whose subservient position to Dharmapāla was thus proclaimed to, and accepted by, the assembled chiefs.

The direct political authority and control of Dharmapāla may thus be said to have extended from Bengal and Bihar (and probably also Nepal) at least as far as Kanauj. Beyond this lay the dominions of the chiefs who were either conquered, or acknowledged the suzerainty of Dharmapāla without any fight, and attended the assembly at Kanauj. Among these Gandhāra, Madra, Kuru and Kīra\textsuperscript{18} (Kangra) practically cover the whole of Northern Panjab and, even beyond it, from Peshawar to Kangra. Matsya and Avanti comprise respectively the old Jaipur-cum-Alwar State and Malwa. Bhoja, Yadu and Yavana cannot be definitely located. The first probably refers to Berar and the last to some Muslim principality on the Sindhu or to the west of it. The Yadus or Yādavas are associated with Siṁhapura in the Panjab, as well as with Mathurā and Dwārakā. It is difficult to say which of these territories is meant. But in spite of some uncertainties there

\textsuperscript{16} COS. Edition, pp. 4-6.
\textsuperscript{17} HBR, p. 14. The expression 'Pañcha-Gauḍa' occurs in the Rājatarangini. For its extent cf. Skanda Purāṇa quoted in Sabda-kalpa-drūma (under 'Gauḍa').
\textsuperscript{18} The Kīras occupied the Kangra Valley (IHQ, IX, p. 11).
is no doubt that the empire of Dharmapāla extended from Bengal to the furthest limits of India in the north-west, and perhaps even beyond it, and as far as the Hīmālayas in the north. In the south it included Malwa and perhaps also Berar. These vast territories formally acknowledged the suzerainty of Dharmapāla, but retained their separate entities as states under their own rulers. It is interesting to note that most of these were situated in the region collectively known as Uttarāpatha, of which Dharmapāla is described as the lord in the Sanskrit work mentioned above.

There is no doubt that the victorious military expeditions of Dharmapāla were facilitated by the crushing defeat inflicted on Vatsaraśī by Dhruva and the latter's return to the Deccan (c. A.D. 790) leaving the field free of Dharmapāla. As we have seen above (pp. 623 ff.), Vatsaraśī's son Nāgabhāṭa II retrieved the position of the Pratiḥāra family, and Dhruva's son Govinda III had to undertake a military expedition to chastise him, early in the ninth century A.D. The triumphant career of Dharmapāla may thus be placed approximately between A.D. 790 and 800.

Soon he had to encounter the formidable opposition of Nāgabhāṭa II, who had once more consolidated the power of the Pratiḥāras. Nāgabhāṭa first defeated Chakrāyuḍha, the protégé of Dharmapāla on the throne of Kānyakubja. Next, as could be easily foreseen, there was an encounter between Nāgabhāṭa and Dharmapāla. In a Pratiḥāra inscription Nāgabhāṭa is said to have inflicted a crushing defeat upon the mighty forces of the Lord of Varṣa, and there are some indications that the Pratiḥāras army advanced into the heart of Dharmapāla's empire as far as Mūdagāgiri (Moughyr). This sudden collapse of the Pālas is difficult to explain and was perhaps caused by some unforeseen danger, such as the invasion of Bengal or Bihar by the Tibetan king, which is referred to in the Tibetan chronicles of Ladakh.19 According to these chronicles the Tibetan king Khri-srong-lde-btsan (A.D. 755-97) 'subdued all the provinces on the four frontiers' including 'China in the east and India in the south'. According to another Tibetan text, composed about the ninth century A.D., his son Mu-tig Btsan-po ruled over a considerable part of India. The same text further informs us that two Indian kings, Dharm-dpal and Dru-ḥdpun, acknowledged the suzerainty of the Tibetan king and not only 'paid honour to his commands' but also paid punctually to him rich tributes including gems and all kinds of excellent provi

19 Francke, Antiquities of Tibet, Part II, p. 87; IHC, XV, p. 65.
sions. The name of the first Indian king almost certainly stands for Dharmapala, but the assertion in the Tibetan text that he held his kingdom 'in subject to Tibet' cannot be accepted as historical without corroborative evidence. It is, however, not improbable that the Tibetans invaded Eastern India towards the close of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century A.D. and obtained some successes for the time being. The Tibetan kings might have been provoked by the conquests of Dharmapala in the Himalayan region. As noted above, there is a tradition that Dharmapala conquered Nepal. It has been suggested by some scholars that Gokarna and the Gaṅga-saṃetāmbudhū, conquered by him, are to be identified with Gokarna and Gaṅgāśāgara in Nepal, and, taken along with Kedāra, refer to a campaign of Dharmapala along the foot of the Himalayas.

The Tibetan kings, out of jealousy or fear, might have entered India through Nepal, as one or more of their predecessors had done before. And while Dharmapala was busy fighting with them, Nāgabhāṣa II probably seized the opportunity to attack his hated rival from behind. Being thus seriously challenged on two fronts, Dharmapala probably suffered severe reverses at the hands of both.

But whatever we might think of this imaginary reconstruction of events, there is no doubt that Nāgabhāṣa II obtained a signal triumph over his rival, and seemed to realise his father's dream of establishing a Pratihāra empire in Northern India. But once more fate was against the Pratihāras. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III appeared in the North and shattered the imperial dreams of Nāgabhāṣa by inflicting a crushing defeat upon him. The Pratihāra kingdom lay prostrate under his feet, and he marched right across it to the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab, if not to the Himalayas, as mentioned in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, which further state that Nāgabhāṣa 'in fear vanished nobody knew whither'.

According to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, Dharma (i.e., Dharmapala), and Chakrāvudha submitted to Govinda III of their own accord (p. 453). They had good reasons to do so as they were saved from imminent ruin by the timely interference of Govinda III. Indeed, the circumstances would even suggest or at least make it highly probable that they had invited the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king to invade the dominions of Nāgabhāṣa in order to save themselves. But whatever might have been the cause or object of the northern invasion of Govinda III, it was Dharmapala who benefited most by it. For Govinda III retired

20 F. W. Thomas, Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan, p. 270.
21 IC, IV, p. 268.
to the Deccan, and both he and his successor were too much involved in troubles there to interfere in North Indian politics. Nagabhata's power was destroyed and Dharmapala was left free to exploit the political situation to his own advantage, as he had formerly done after the withdrawal of Dhruya from North India.

We have no definite knowledge of the political activities of Dharmapala after this period. Some scholars are of opinion that Nagabhata II and his successors continued to hold Kanauj, but this does not rest on reliable evidence. On the whole the few incidents of the Pratihara history of this period that we know, and the military expeditions of Dharmapala's successor, Devapala, alike indicate that there was no substantial diminution in the power of Dharmapala during the last part of his reign, and hardly any recovery of power and strength by the Pratiharas till much later in the reign of Bhoja. It is, of course, possible that some of the conquests of Dharmapala, mentioned above, were effected during this period, but it is very likely that most of them were undertaken before the assembly at Kanauj which almost certainly preceded the struggle with Nagabhata. There is therefore no ground to disbelieve the statement in a Pala record (no. 2, v. 12) that peace prevailed in the empire at the time of Dharmapala's death.

Few kings can boast of achievements which stand undeniably to the credit of Dharmapala. By his personal energy, valour and military genius he raised the weak kingdom of Bengal, lately torn by internal dissensions and foreign invasions, to the position of the premier and suzerain state in North India whose supremacy was acknowledged from Peshawar to the border of Assam. So great a change in the political status of Bengal in less than half a century looks almost like a miracle. Much of the credit is no doubt due to the spirit of sacrifice and wise statesmanship displayed by the chiefs of Bengal in electing Gopala as their undisputed leader. But a great deal must also be ascribed to the towering personality and heroism of Dharmapala.

Dharmapala is given full imperial titles Paramesvara, Paramabhattacharya Maharajadhiraaja in the Khallimpur Copper-plate where his father Gopala is simply referred to as Maharajadhiraaja. The difference may be unintentional and accidental, or a deliberate indication of a change in status. There is, however, no doubt that Dharmapala had fully earned the right to use the imperial titles which were henceforth used by the Pala rulers. The Khallimpur Copper-plate gives a highly poetic account of his great popularity with all classes of people and the pomp and grandeur of his imperial court at Pataliputra.

22 The contrary view is maintained by Tripathi (op. cit., pp 230 ff).
23 Ct. v. 13 and the prose passage immediately following it.
Dharmapāla was a devout Buddhist and a great patron of Buddhism. He is reputed to have founded the famous Vikrāṃśilā Vihāra in Magadha which soon rose to fame and distinction as a great centre of learning, only next in importance to Nālandā. It was so called because Dharmapāla had a second name or epithet Vikrāṃśilā. According to some accounts he also built a magnificent monastery at Odantapuri, though the credit for this is given by some to either his father or his son. The great Buddhist establishment at Pāhārpur (Bengal) which will be described later also owes its origin to him, though it was probably developed later by his successor. He was the patron of the great Buddhist writer Haribhadra, and, according to Tāranātha, founded fifty religious schools.24

Dharmapāla was thus a great hero both in war and peace. Of his personal life we know very little. He married Raṃādevī, the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Parabala. The identification of this ruler with the homonymous chief, who is known to have been ruling in Central India in A.D. 861, is rendered doubtful by the long interval in time. It is far more probable that Raṃādevī was connected with the well-known Rāṣṭrakūṭa family of the Deccan. In any event we may presume that his relationship with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas probably helped his political advancement, particularly in his struggle against the Pratihāras. Later inscription affirm that he owed his success in building up an empire largely to the military genius of his younger brother Vākpāla who commanded his army, and to the sage counsel of his Brāhmaṇa minister named Garga. As the achievements and fulsome praise of these two are recorded much later, and then only in the inscriptions of their descendants, there is undoubtedly a great deal of exaggeration in them.

According to Tāranātha Dharmapāla ruled for 64 years. But we have no record beyond his 32nd regnal year, the date of the Khalimpur Copper-plate. He may be assigned a reign of forty years from c. A.D. 770 to 810.

IV. DEVAPĀLA (c. A.D. 810-850)

Dharmapāla was succeeded by his son Devapāla born of his queen Raṃādevī. In the Khalimpur Copper-plate of Dharmapāla we have a reference to yugavṛtta (heir-apparent) Tribhuvanapāla. It has been suggested that he assumed the name Devapāla on his accession. It is, however, more likely that prince Devaṭā, mentioned in the same grant refers to Devapāla. It is probable, therefore, that Tribhuvanapāla died

24 Tāranātha, transl. pp. 157, 206, 217; HBR, p. 115.
during the lifetime of his father, and hence his younger brother Devapāla ascended the throne.

Devapāla was a worthy son of a worthy father. He not only maintained intact the great empire left by his father but also increased its extent and enhanced its prestige. The details of the conquests of his reign are given in the records of the descendants of his general and ministers, and, naturally enough, the credit for the victories is largely given to them. These records were set up after the direct line of Devapāla was ousted from the throne by that of his general, and hence we must make due allowance for the natural exaggerations in reciting the achievements of the forefathers of the reigning king and of his minister, who had become powerful by that time.

The Bādal Pillar inscription (no. 8) contains the eulogy of a line of hereditary ministers of the Pālas. It begins with Garga, the minister of Dharmapāla. We are told that Garga took inordinate pride in the fact that although his master Dharmapāla was at first merely ruler of the east, he made him ultimately ruler of all the directions. Garga's son was Darbhapāni by whose diplomacy Devapāla made tributary the extensive territory lying between the Hīmālayas and the Vindhya, and the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea. The position of Darbhapāni was such that even the great emperor Devapāla had to wait humbly at his door awaiting his pleasure (lit. leisure).

Kedāramiśra, the grandson of Darbhapāni, was the next minister of the Gauḍa king, who is not named but was almost certainly Devapāla. By following the wise counsel of this minister the king exterminated the Utkalas, destroyed the arrogance of the Hūṣas, and humbled the pride of the lords of Dravīḍa and Gurjara.

Of Jayapāla, the general of Devapāla, it is said in another record (no. 6) that he enabled Devapāla to enjoy the dominion of the world by defeating the enemies of Dharma, evidently meaning Dharmapāla. In particular we are told that when, at the command of Devapāla, Jayapāla proceeded on a campaign of conquest, the ruler of Utkala fled from his kingdom merely on the report of his approach, and the king of Prāgījyotisha (Assam), who submitted without any fight, was allowed to rule as a vassal chief.

While we get so many details of conquests in the reign of Devapāla from the records of a slightly later age, two official inscriptions of the king (nos. 2-3) only make two vague general statements about them. First, it is said that his victorious army visited the Vindhya hills and the Kāmboja country; and next, that Devapāla ruled over the whole of India, from the Hīmālaya mountains to the Rāma's bridge (Rāmeśva-ra-setubandha) and from the eastern to the western ocean.
Leaving aside the question of apportioning the credit of these achievements between Devapāla on the one hand and his general and ministers on the other, we may now proceed to explain their full significance. It is clear that Devapāla continued the aggressive imperial policy of his father, and his reign witnessed a series of military campaigns. Two of these were directed against the neighbouring kingdoms of Assam and Orissa, and evidently attained complete success. Assam accepted the suzerainty of the Pāla king and the Pāla empire reached its natural limits on the east. The two different references to Utkala seem to indicate that it was incorporated in the Pāla dominions for the time being.

The Gurjaras no doubt refer to the Gurjara-Pratihāras, the sworn and eternal enemy of the Pālas. It has already been related how Nāgabhātha II, who defeated Dharmapāla, was himself disastrously defeated by the Rāṣṭrakūta king Govinda III. Rāmabhādra, the son and successor of Nāgabhātha II, was a weakling, and the official records of the Pratihāras imply that during his reign the Pratihāra kingdom suffered an invasion from the Pālas (p. 630). Bhoja, the son of Rāmabhādra, at first attained some successes and was in possession of Kanauj and Kālaṇjara by A.D. 836. But his success was short-lived and he suffered a series of reverses between A.D. 850 and 860, if not earlier still (p. 632). Later, he regained his power and prestige and even successfully invaded Bengal, as has already been mentioned (p. 634).

It is a moot point whether Devapāla came into conflict with Rāmabhādra alone or also with Bhoja. At first it appears to be more plausible to accept the view that Devapāla defeated Rāmabhādra, but the accession of Bhoja turned the tide in favour of the Pratihāras and henceforth the Pāla empire was confined to its eastern dominions. According to this view, which is now generally held, the conquests of Devapāla up to Kāmboja, and his sway over territories up to the Arabian Sea, must all be dated prior to A.D. 836, when Bhoja had already established his authority in Kanauj, and the sun of Pāla glory had set.

But there is one very important consideration against this view. The defeat of the Lord of Gurjaras (and others) must have taken place in the latter part of Devapāla's reign, as the credit for this achievement is given to his minister Kedāramiśra, the grandson of his earlier minister Darbhapāṇi. It is, therefore, more likely that the various campaigns against the Dravīḍas, Gurjaras, Hūṇas, and Utkalas should be referred to the fourth and fifth, rather than to the second and third decades of the ninth century A.D. As against the view, mentioned above, it may, therefore be argued, with equal plausibility, that Bhoja's aggressive campaigns brought him into conflict with Devapāla, and the defeat he sustained accounts for his discomfiture between A.D. 850
and 860. In other words, in spite of some initial success Bhoja suffered such reverses in the hands of Devapāla, that his power was eclipsed for a time, and the great Pāla king carried his victorious arms as far as Kāmboja and the Hūnas country. And it was not till after Devapāla's death that Bhoja was again in a position to resume successfully his aggressive policy in the east. It may be mentioned, in support of this view, that even in an official record of Devapāla (no. 3), dated in the years 35 or 39, i.e., towards the very end of his reign, he is described as the ruler of the territory between the eastern and the western seas as in the earlier record dated in his 33rd year. It may be presumed therefore that his power or dominion did not suffer any substantial decline at the time of his death.

The history of the Pāla empire and our judgment of Devapāla's career would have to be considerably modified according as we take the one view or the other. But the available data do not enable us to arrive at a definite conclusion on this question which must therefore be left open. Reference may be made in this connection to a statement in a Tibetan chronicle that Raš-pa-can conquered India as far as the Gaṅgaśāgara which has been taken to mean the mouth of the Ganges.25 Raš-pa-can's reign-period is not definitely known, but he was a contemporary of Devapāla. His claim of conquest, like the earlier ones mentioned above, is not supported by any Indian evidence. But if there is any truth in it, we get a satisfactory explanation for the initial success of Bhoja I. It would then appear that while Devapāla was busy fighting against the Tibetan invader, Bhoja seized the opportunity to strike a blow against him, and obtained some success. But as soon as Devapāla settled matters with the Tibetans, he was in a position to turn to his western enemy. It was probably in the course of this campaign that he not only humbled the arrogance of the lord of Gūjara but also defeated the Hūnas and advanced as far as the Kāmboja country. Of course the possibility is not excluded that he had to carry on more than one campaign. According to this view Devapāla had a short spell of failure or bad luck intervening between two successful periods at the beginning and end of his reign. This reconstruction of his history is fully in keeping with what we know of his ministers. For while credit for great achievements is given to the first minister Darbhapāni and his grandson Kedaramiśra, the family record almost ignores Someśvara, the son of the former. It is, of course, just possible that Someśvara pre-deceased his father, or for other reasons never served as Devapāla's

25 Francke, op. cit., pp. 89-90. The reign-period of Raš-pa-can is A.D. 804-10 according to Francke, and A.D. 817-36 according to Peet (IIIQ, XV, p. 81).
minister. It is, however, equally likely that he occupied the hereditary post, but as the period during which he served as the minister of Devapāla was full of troubles and was one of ignominy rather than of glory, nothing was recorded about him except some vague general praise.

It is difficult to locate the territory of the Hūnas who were defeated by Devapāla. The early history of this powerful tribe has been discussed above (pp. 223 ff). After the defeat and death of Mihirakula the Hūnas ceased to be an important political factor, but they had different settlements in Central and Western India to which occasional reference is made in contemporary epigraphic and literary records (pp. 226 ff). According to the Harsha-charita there was a Hūna principality in Uttarāpatha near the Himalayas, i.e., in the Panjab or on its border (p. 234). It was probably this settlement of the Hūnas which was successfully invaded by Devapāla. For it was not far from Kāmboja which was also invaded by him. It was probably in the course of one and the same campaign that Devapāla defeated both the Hūnas and Kāmbojas. As these tribes lived almost on the outskirts of the Pāla empire, Devapāla's hostility towards them can be easily explained. These expeditions show that the campaigns and conquests of Dharmapāla, mentioned above, were not sporadic outbursts of military activity, far less mere productions of the court-poets' imagination, but a part of imperial policy deliberately pursued with eminently success, during two long and successive reigns. These military expeditions also prove the wide range of the imperial vision of the Pālas, and although the description of their empire as extending from the Himalayas to the Vindhya and from the sea to the sea may not be literally true, the exaggeration may be regarded as a pardonable one.

Even the wider limits of Devapāla's empire, extending up to the southern sea, as given in Devapāla's own records (nos. 2-3) may not be altogether without any basis of truth. For it appears that Devapāla took part in the politics of South India and came into conflict with the Pāṇḍya kingdom which extended up to the southernmost limit of India. Any success against the Pāṇḍya ruler by Devapāla might serve as a justification for the proud claim that his sway extended as far as the Rāmesvara-Setubandha or Adam's Bridge. Although we have no direct evidence of such success its possibility is hinted at by several circumstances.

The earliest reference to the activities of the Pālas in the Far South has been traced in the Vēlviṅguḷī grant, dated about A.D. 769-70. We learn from it that an officer of the Pāṇḍya king, named Mūraṅgāri, took part in a fight 'when Purvarājar (Eastern kings) rose up and put
to flight at Venbail the powerful Vallabha king on the occasion when
the excellent daughter of Gaṅgarāja was secured and offered to
Konarkaṇ (evidently the Pāṇḍya king). It has been suggested by
H. C. Raychaudhuri that the expression Pūrvarāja denotes the
Pāla rulers of Eastern India, who are called Pūrva-kshiti-dhara in
their records, together with their feudatories, and that the Vallabha
refers to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Emperor Kṛṣṇa I of the Deccan. From
this Raychaudhuri concludes: ‘The defeat of Kṛṣṇa I at the
hands of the Pālas and his failure to secure a Gaṅga princess for him-
self or for one of his sons, probably afford a clue to the well-known
hostility of Kṛṣṇa’s progeny towards the Pālas and the Gaṅgas’.
Raychaudhuri’s suggestion would mean that Dharmapāla in collab-
oration with the Pāṇḍyas had achieved a victory against the Rāṣṭra-
kūṭas at Venbail in South India. This would find some corroboration
if we identify Gokarna, one of the places said to have been visited
by the victorious army of Dharmapāla (pp. 654-55), with a place of
that name in the Pudukkottai State, Madras. But both the identifi-
cations on which the theory is based are extremely uncertain. Thus
S. K. Aiyangar takes Pūrvarāja to denote the Pallavas, and K. A. N.
Sastri identifies Vallabha with the Western Chālukya king Kūttı
varman II. Besides, the known facts largely discount the possibility
of a Pāla king in the sixties of the eighth century being powerful
enough to send his army so far south. There is, however, a more
positive evidence of the Pālas taking an active interest in South In-
dian politics in the first half of the ninth century A.D. The genesis of
this politics was the struggle between the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas.
In particular we may note three great battles taking place between
the two. In the first the Pallava king Nandi-varman III (p. 338)
defeated the Pāṇḍya king Śrī-Māra Śrī-Vallabha (c. A. D. 815-62) some
time about A.D. 830. In the second battle which took place a few
years later at Kuḍamukku (Kumbakonam), the Pāṇḍya king Śrī-Māra
repulsed with great loss a confederation of Gaṅgas, Pallavas, Cholas,
Kaliṅgas, Maghadhas and others, led by Nandi-varman III. In the
third battle Nripatuṅga, the successor of Nandi-varman III, defeated
the Pāṇḍya king Śrī-Māra on the bank of the river Arichit, a branch of
the Kāvērī, which falls into the sea near Kārakāl.

Now the Magadhás, included among the confederate forces en-
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gaged in the second battle, can only refer to the Pālas who were the sole masters of this province in the first half of the ninth century A.D. By the conquest and perhaps annexation, of Utkala, the Pālas had become the neighbours of the Kaliṅgas, who formed another member of the confederacy. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the four powers ruling on the eastern sea-board of India, viz., the Pālas, the Kaliṅgas, the Pallavas, and the Cholas formed a political alliance and the federated forces took part in all the three battles fought against the Pāṇḍyas. The success in two of these battles, and perhaps in others, of which no record has yet come to light, against the Pāṇḍyas whose kingdom reached the southern limit of India, might have furnished the justification, in the eyes of the court-poets of the Pālas, for describing Devapāla’s empire as extending up to Adam’s Bridge.

Devapāla’s expedition to the far south of India seems to be confirmed by an unexpected source. It is stated in a Chandella inscription that Vijaya, one of the early kings, of this dynasty, proceeded on a career of conquest to the extreme south where Rāma built his bridge. In view of the position of the Chandellas at this time, it is evident that he could have done so only as a feudatory of some more powerful sovereign. It has accordingly been suggested that he was a vassal of the Pratihāra ruler Bhoja. But we have no evidence that Bhoja ever undertook an expedition to the far south, and if we carefully consider the political geography of India about this time we must admit that it was well-nigh impossible for him to do so. It would be, therefore, more reasonable to assume that the Chandella ruler was a feudatory of Devapāla and accompanied him or his forces to the far south. It may be recalled in this connection that Vijaya’s father Vākpati is said to have made the Vindhyas his pleasure-mound (kṛdā-girī), while Devapāla is also said to have visited the Vindhyas in the course of his victorious military campaign. Further, there is a tradition that the Chandellas supplanted the Parihārs in Bundelkhand. While some other details of the traditional account have proved to be correct, doubts have been expressed about this statement on the ground that it was unlikely that the Chandellas were sufficiently powerful, at the beginning of the ninth century, to drive away the Gurjara-Pratihāras. But this difficulty disappears if we regard the Pālas as the suzerain of the Chandellas. We may hold that after defeating the Pratihāras they gave this region to the Chan
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dellas. This would satisfactorily account for the Chandella tradition and Vijaya's expedition to the far south.

A further confirmation of Devapāla's expedition to the south is supplied by the explicit statement that he humbled the pride of the lord of Dravīḍa. This expression is usually taken to refer to a Rāṣṭra-kūṭa king, and considering the eternal hostility between the two powers and the decline in the power of the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas under Amoghavarsha, the contemporary of Devapāla, the identification seems to be quite plausible. But the term Dravīḍa denotes the South Indian Peninsula and not the region over which the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas ruled. It would be more reasonable, therefore, if in the light of the above discussion we identify the 'lord of Dravida,' defeated by Devapāla, as the Pāṇḍya king or some other ruler of the far south.

Whatever we might think of the various hypotheses mentioned above, about the course of political events, the fact that Devapāla's army took part in a fight against the Pāṇḍyas in the distant south is of great interest. No other ruler of Northern India, not even Aśoka or Samudra-gupta, is known to have sent a military expedition so far south till the days of Alāuddin Khilji, five centuries later. No wonder that the Pāla court-poets of the time viewed this unique achievement as something miraculous, and represented it as tantamount to exercising undisputed sway from the Himālayas to Adam's Bridge. It is, however, noteworthy that after the first flush of enthusiasm was over, the people and poets in Bengal took a more realistic view of the situation and, in a record of somewhat later date (no. 8), the Vindhyas are put as the southern boundary of Devapāla's empire.

In spite of the vagueness and obscurity of some details we may reasonably regard Devapāla as the most powerful potentate in Northern India during the first half of the ninth century A.D. He rounded off the Pāla empire in the east and south-east by the conquest of Assam and Orissa, and kept in check the Pratihāras, and possibly also the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas. The growing power of the former, specially the early success of Bhoja, was no doubt a great menace to the Pālas, but Devapāla proved more than a match for him and led his victorious forces as far as the Vindhyas in the south and the Indus in the west, inflicting defeat upon the wild border tribes like the Hūnas and the Kāmbojas. He also probably felt powerful enough to take part in South Indian politics and joined the great confederacy of the political powers ruling on the eastern coast of India. Although the details of the activities of this confederacy are lacking, we may fairly guess that it involved wars with the Pāṇḍyas and possibly also with the Chālukyas and the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas.
Devapāla was thus a prominent figure in all-India politics. And his name and fame spread far beyond the boundaries of India. About this time there was a mighty empire of the Sailendras comprising Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java and many other islands in the Indian Archipelago (cf. Ch. XXXII). Its ruler Bālaputradeva, a devout Buddhist, built a monastery at Nālandā and, being desirous of endowing it, sent an ambassador to Devapāla asking for the grant of five villages for this purpose. Devapāla granted this request and made over the villages by a formal deed which still exists (no. 3). Nālandā was in those days a famous Buddhist seat of learning of international fame. Devapāla, himself a Buddhist, was a great patron of Buddhism and took deep interest in the affairs of the Nālandā University. This we know from an inscription (no. 4) which records that a citizen of distant Nagarahāra (modern Jalalabad), who was born in a Brāhmaṇa family but later became a learned Buddhist priest, received high honours from Devapāla and was appointed by him the head of the Nālandā monastery.

The available evidences thus leave no doubt that Devapāla extended the boundary of the Pāla empire and enhanced its power and prestige. As noted above, the Pāla empire was a closely knit political unit like the Maurva or the Gupta Empire. The provinces of Bengal and Bihar, which formed its nucleus, were administered directly by the Pālas, but the kingdom outside this limit were probably autonomous principalities acknowledging the suzerainty of the emperor. This not only follows from the fact that no inscription of the Pāla rulers, except one from Mirzapur, U.P. (pp. 672-73), has been found outside Bengal and Bihar, but it also hinted at even in the records of Devapāla. These contain a verse which refers to the conquests of Dharmapāla, as follows:

‘On the conclusion of his world conquest the captive princes, who being (now) released returned to their respective kingdoms after being made to forget all the grudge (they bore against him) by means of various marks of high distinction, remembered the good treatment accorded to them by the king and their hearts yearned for him out of affection as happens to those banished from heaven, remembering their past existence.’

Bereft of poetic embellishments this verse means that the kings who were defeated by Dharmapāla were later reinstated in their dominions, and were on good terms with him. This last expression shows that they accepted with good grace their position as vassals. Their exact relationship with Dharmapāla cannot be determined, but

there is no doubt that they accepted his suzerainty. This follows from
the epithet 'Lord of Āryāvarta' applied to Dharmapāla in a poetical
work of the eleventh century A.D. and the description of the imperial
assembly at Kanauj quoted above.

But although most of the conquered states were merely reduced to
the position of autonomous vassal states, the kingdom of Kanauj
seems to have had the status of a dependency whose subordination
was more clearly pronounced in its relationship with the suzerain
power. Dharmapāla probably got himself crowned as emperor at
Kanauj and, in any case, certainly installed a new king on its throne,
and held there an imperial assembly attended by the vassal chiefs.
All these mark out Kanauj as having a closer relationship with the
emperor than the other vassal states.

The position of Utkala, which roughly corresponded to Orissa, was
also probably somewhat different. There are two distinct references
to the conquest of this region by Devapāla. We learn from an official
record (no. 6) of the time of Nārāyanapāla that on the approach of
the Pāla general the king of Utkala fled from his kingdom. The other
inscription (no. 8) informs us that the Utkalas were exterminated. In
both these cases expressions have been deliberately used to indicate
that the conquest of Utkala was more thorough-going in comparison
with the other conquests mentioned along with it. It is thus not
unlikely that Utkala was annexed to the Pāla empire and formed an
integral part of it for some time.

We can thus easily reconstruct a picture of the Pāla empire at its
greatest extent. Its nucleus, comprising the modern provinces of
Bengal, Bihar and probably also Orissa, was directly administered
by the Pāla emperors, and the Uttar Pradesh (U.P.) formed a close
dependency. Beyond these limits were a large number of principalities in the Panjāb, Eastern Rajasthan, Malwa and Berar which
enjoyed internal autonomy, but acknowledged the suzerainty of the
Pāla emperor and paid him homage and obedience, and probably
also presents and tributes. It is not unlikely that Nepal also belonged
to this category.

We get a good glimpse of the imperial vision of the Pālas from the
grandiloquent description of their camps of victory at Pātaliputra and
Mudgagiri (Monghyr) on the banks of the Ganga, couched in identical
terms in the official records of Dharmapāla and Devapāla:

Now from his royal camp of victory, situated at Pātaliputra (or
Mudgagiri), where the line of various boats, proceeding along
the course of the Ganges, appears like a series of mountain tops
that had been sunk to build a (second) Setubandha; where the
brightness of the day becomes darkened by the dense herd of rutting elephants and it seems as if the eternal rainy season has set in; where the sky becomes grey with the dust raised by the hard hoofs of innumerable horses which are brought as presents by many kings of the North; and where the Earth is bent low under the weight of the foot-soldiers of the numberless princes of Jambudvipa (i.e., India) assembled to do homage to the Supreme lord (i.e., the king).

In spite of the obvious exaggeration and somewhat conventional character of the above passage, which became stereotyped in the official Pāla records, it conveys an idea of the power and grandeur of the Pāla empire in the heyday of its glory.

A passing reference is made to the Pāla empire in an Arab chronicle written in the ninth century A.D. It refers to three great States in India viz., Baliharā, Juzr, and Ruhmi (or Rahma). These three undoubtedly refer to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Gurjaras and the Pālas though the origin of the name Ruhmi cannot be satisfactorily explained. According to the Arab account the Pāla king was at war with the two other powers which ruled over neighbouring kingdoms, but his troops were more numerous than those of his adversaries. When he went out to fight, his army included 50,000 elephants and ten to fifteen thousand camp followers only for fulling and washing cloths.

It is generally held that the above account was composed by an Arab traveller Sulaiman who visited India in or shortly before A.D. 851. But this view rests on insufficient evidence. The probability is that the chronicle was not the work of Sulaiman alone, but was really a compendium of different accounts written by various travellers at different times. The date of its compilation, though not known with certainty, may be taken as A.D. 851 or some time before it.

On the whole we may regard the political condition of India, described in the Arab account, as true of the closing period of Devapāla’s reign, possibly the decade A.D. 840-850, when the Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler Bhoja was trying to re-establish the fortunes of his family and came into conflict with both the Pālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. We have seen above that Devapāla had to fight with the Gurjaras, and probably also with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Thus the picture

36 For the account cf. HIED. I, pp. 5. 25. Hodivala suggests that Ruhmi was a misreading for Dharma, and that this was derived from Dharmapāla; the Arabic expression meaning the kingdom of Dharma (S. H. Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, pp. 4-5). For other suggestion cf. IIHQ. XVI, p. 232.

drawn in the Arab chronicle substantially agrees with what is known from epigraphic records, and the account supplies an independent corroboration of the greatness of the Pāla power about the middle of the ninth century A.D., i.e., almost to the very end of Devapāla's reign.

Devapāla, like his father, was a great patron of Buddhism. It is noteworthy that the foundation of famous monasteries of Vikramaśila, Odantapurī and Somapura are attributed by some Tibetan writers to Dharmapāla, and by others to Devapāla. It is probable that like the Somapura (Paharpur) vihāra, which was undoubtedly founded by Dharmapāla, the other two were also begun by him but completed or embellished by Devapāla.

Devapāla had a long reign. The date of his Nālandā Copper-plate (no. 3) is generally read as 39 but is more probably 35. His reign may be said to cover the period from c. A.D. 810 to 850.

IV. VIGRAHAPĀLA AND NĀRĀYANAPĀLA

According to all the published official records of the Pālas Devapāla was succeeded by a ruler called Vigrahapāla. But in the Bādal Pillar inscription (no. 8) which gives a list of hereditary ministers and the kings they served, the name of the ruler after Devapāla is given as Śūrapāla. As the name of the next king in this list is Nārāyanapāla who, according to the official records succeeded Vigrahapāla, it has been generally assumed that Śūrapāla and Vigrahapāla were two different names of one and the same king. The grounds for this assumption may be stated as follows.38

The Bhagalpur Copper-plate of Nārāyanapāla (no. 6) is the earliest official record, so far known, which traces the succession of the Pāla kings after Devapāla. It begins with Gopāla I (v.1) and, after mentioning Dharmapāla in two verses (vv. 2-3), devotes the whole of verse 4 to the eulogy of his younger brother Vākpāla whose victories 'made the kingdom of his elder brother free from enemies'. The next verse (v. 5) says that he had a son named Jayapāla who, by chastising the enemies of Dharma (i.e., Dharmpāla),39 enabled his elder Devapāla to enjoy peacefully the blessings of sovereignty. Verse 6 refers to the conquest of Orissa and Assam by Jayapāla already mentioned, and verse 7 says that his son Vigrahapāla I became king.

38 For a full discussion, cf. HABM, pp. 170-71.
39 There is a play on the word dharma in Dharma-viśāhā which means enemy of Dharma, i.e., king Dharmpāla as well as persons who are opposed to dharma (virtue, righteousness), i.e., wicked and irreligious people.
Much confusion has been caused by the use of the pronoun 'he' and 'his' in the above verses. According to the rules of Sanskrit grammar such a pronoun refers to the noun immediately preceding it. Accordingly it was at first held that Jayapāla was the son of Vākpāla, and Vighrāhapāla I was son of Jayapāla. Further, as Devapāla is referred to as pūrvaṇa, which usually, though not necessarily, means an elder brother, Devapāla, too, was the son of Vākpāla.

The discovery of Devapāla's own copper-plate grant (no. 2) showed the error of this view. For there he is distinctly said to be the son of Dharmarāja. Then the pendulum swung in the opposite direction. Some scholars held that both Jayapāla and Devapāla were sons of Dharmapāla, and Vighrāhapāla was the son of Devapāla. The latter conclusion is based on the fact that the later Pāla records omit v. 6 and hence the expression 'his son' in v. 7 was taken to refer to Devapāla in the immediately preceding verse.

As regards the first point we must remember that pūrvaṇa only means elder, and there is nothing to show that Devapāla was an elder brother of Jayapāla. As regards the other, it is obvious that the later records merely repeated the genealogical verses of the earlier one, and the deliberate or accidental omission of a verse cannot be taken to modify the clear meaning of the original verses.

There is no doubt that Devapāla was the son of Dharmapāla. There seems to be equally little doubt that Jayapāla was the son of Vākpāla and Vighrāhapāla I was the son of Jayapāla. For, apart from the clear juxtaposition of these names in the early and genuine version of the genealogical verses, we cannot satisfactorily explain the introduction of the names of Vākpāla and Jayapāla for the first time in a record of Nārāyanaṇapāla, except on the supposition that the ruling king traced his descent from them. He evidently based his claim to the throne on the glorious (real or supposed) achievements of these illustrious predecessors rather than on his relationship to Devapāla.

So far as the identity of Sūrapāla I and Vighrāhapāla I is concerned the question has been set at rest by the recent discovery of a Copper-plate Grant39a by Sūrapāla expressly mentioned as the son of Devapāla and Bhavadevi, in the third year of his reign. Besides proving that Sūrapāla was different from Vighrāhapāla I and was the last direct descendant of Dharmapāla, it is important on two other grounds. In the first place, it supplies the name of the queen of

39a The Murzapur Grant of Sūrapāla. For a summary of its contents and its great historical importance, cf. (1) Bulletin of Museums and Archaeology, U.P. nos. 5-6, and (2) IAS XIII (1971), pp. 201 ff.
Devapāla, Bhavadevi, the daughter of king Durlabharāja, presumably, the Chāhamāna king of the same name who is referred to in the Prithvīrāja-vijaya as ‘having his sword purified by a dip at the confluence of the Ganges and the sea, and by the taste of the land of Gauḍa.’ Secondly, it is the earliest Pāla record found outside the boundaries of Bengal and Bihar. The Grant also refers to the conquests of Sūrapāla, though no details are known so far, as the Grant has not yet been properly edited. But in any case, it proves that the Pāla Empire extended to Uttar Pradesh even for some time after the death of Devapāla. Sūrapāla I probably ruled from A.D. 850 to 853.

The circumstances under which the empire passed on to a collateral branch of the dynasty are yet unknown. We know from an inscription of Devapāla that he had a grown-up son whom he had installed as yuvārāja or heir-apparent. It is not, of course, beyond the range of possibility that this son died before his father and the other son Sūrapāla succeeded his father; further, that neither Sūrapāla I nor his brother or brothers left any male issue to succeed him, and consequently Vigrahapāla I, ascended the throne as the next of kin. But it is equally, perhaps even more, likely that Jayapāla, taking advantage of his position as commander of the royal forces, placed his own son on the throne in supersession of the claims of the legitimate heir, or by ousting him. There is no direct evidence of such a palace revolution, but it satisfactorily explains the sudden decline in the power of the Pālas and the collapse of the empire that followed in a few years’ time.

The official records do not credit Vigrahapāla I with any victory. It is significant to note that the same Kedāramiśra to whom the inscription no. 8 gives the credit for most of the victories of Devapāla’s reign also served as the minister of Sūrapāla, but no reference is made to Vigrahapāla I though his son was served by a member of this family as minister. King Vigrahapāla I was evidently of a religious disposition. As we know from another record (no. 6), he abdicated the throne in favour of his son Nārāyaṇapāla and retired to the forest to practise austerities. Two of his inscriptions are dated in his third and fifth regnal years and it does not appear that he reigned for a much longer period. His reign-period probably falls between A.D. 853 and 858.

Nārāyaṇapāla, the son and successor of Vigrahapāla I, seems to have taken after his father rather than his illustrious predecessors.

39a HABM, p. 175, fn. 34.
39c According to ins. No. 2, Devapāla made his own son, yuvārāja Rājiyapāla, the Dūtaka of the grant.
He had a long reign of not less than 54 years (no. 7). His official record (no. 6) only bestows vague general praises upon him, but credits him with no victory. His minister Guravamiśra, the son of Kedāramiśra, and the last of a long series of illustrious hereditary counsellors of State, commemorated the achievements of his forefathers on a Garuda pillar erected by him (no. 8), but does not state anything about him.

The long inglorious reign of Nārāyaṇapāla, extending from c. A.D. 854 to 908, saw the complete collapse of the political power of the Pālas. We cannot trace the stages by which it was brought about but we can easily identify the chief enemies of the Pālas.

The first challenge to the Pāla authority seems to have come from the newly conquered territories in the east. King Harjara of Kāmarūpa (Assam) assumed imperial titles and is said to have achieved many victories. It is evident that he had thrown off the yoke of the Pālas. But it is difficult to ascertain when this was done. One of the known dates of Harjara is year 510 of the Gupta Era, i.e. A.D. 829-30. But the copper-plate grant which gives him the imperial titles was issued by his son, the crown-prince. Most probably Harjara was then too old to take an active part in the administration and as such the grant might be even later than A.D. 850.

Similarly the Kara kings of Orissa also assumed imperial titles during the reign of Sivakaradeva, the fourth king of the dynasty. Although his date is not exactly known, he may be assumed to have ruled about the middle of the ninth century A.D.

It is difficult to say whether Assam and Orissa broke off from the Pāla empire and assumed independent status during the closing years of Devapāla’s reign or shortly after. The latter is more probable for, as we have seen above, Devapāla conquered Utkala perhaps in the latter part of his reign.

According to a Rāśṭrakūṭa record, dated A.D. 866, the ruler or rulers of Anga, Vaṅga and Magadha paid homage to king Amogha-वārsha. This king had a long reign extending from A.D. 814 to 880, but the internal events of this reign make it unlikely that he was in a position to send an expedition to Bengal before he had defeated the king of Veṅgi some time about A.D. 860. It is likely, therefore, that shortly after this campaign, the Rāśṭrakūṭa army proceeded along the Orissa coast and attacked the Pāla kingdom from the south. The Sulki king Mahārājaśhiraja Raṇastambha of Orissa, who claims to have conquered Rāḍha (W. Bengal), perhaps accompanied this

---

40. The detailed history of the kings of other dynasties mentioned in this section, with full references, has been given in the chapters dealing with them.
expedition. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion was—probably nothing more than a military raid, and left no permanent effect. But it is not unlikely, that it encouraged, if it did not directly help, the defection of the Karas of Orissa. There is, however, no doubt that all these events were both causes and effects of the weakness of the Pālas which facilitated the more serious invasion by the other enemy, viz., the Pratihāras from the west.

As already noted, the Pratihāra king Bhoja obtained some success at the beginning of his reign and conquered Kanauj. But Devapāla re-established the supremacy of the Pālas in Northern India. It was not till after his death that Bhoja was once more in a position to challenge the authority of the Pālas. The unwarlike disposition of Vigrahapāla and Nārāyaṇapāla, the invasion of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and possibly also internal dissensions in the Pāla kingdom, gave Bhoja the requisite opportunity. He organised a great confederacy against the Pālas, as noted above (p. 634), and not only conquered Magadha but even a part, if not the whole, of North Bengal. This is definitely proved by a large number of inscriptions of Mahendrapāla in Bihar and North Bengal. There can be hardly any doubt that this Mahendrapāla is identical with the Pratihāra emperor of that name, who succeeded Bhoja.

Two inscriptions of Nārāyaṇapāla (nos. 6, 7) prove that he was ruling over Magadha in the years 17 and 54 of his reign. We may therefore hold that the Pratihāras occupied the Pāla territories in Bihar and North Bengal during this interval i.e., some time after A.D. 870, but Nārāyaṇapāla recovered them before c. A.D. 908. This is indirectly confirmed by the fact that the known inscriptions of the Pratihāras in Bengal and Bihar range between years 2 and 9 or 19 of Mahendrapāla, i.e., between c. A.D. 887 and 894 or 904.

The recovery of his paternal dominions by Nārāyaṇapāla was undoubtedly facilitated by the weakness of the Pratihāras, at the beginning of the tenth century A.D., which culminated in a complete, though temporary, collapse of the Pratihāra empire in A.D. 915. It may be noted in this connection that Nārāyaṇapāla’s mother, Lajjadēvī, was a Kalachuri princess (no. 6, vv. 9-10) probably of Kokkalla’s family. But whether Nārāyaṇapāla obtained any help from his powerful relations in recovering his kingdom, it is difficult to say.

Towards the close of his reign Nārāyaṇapāla again came into conflict with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Their king Krishna II (A.D. 880-914) claims that he was the ‘preceptor charging the Gaudas with the vow of humility’ and that his command was obeyed by Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Gaṅga and Magadha’. This vainglorious statement perhaps means nothing more than a military raid in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, but
it is difficult to estimate the amount of success that attended it. It is interesting to note that Rājayapāla, the son of Nārāyaṇapāla, married Bhāgyadevi, the daughter of Tuṅga, ‘the moon in the family of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas’ (no. 10, v. 8). If, as seems probable, this Tuṅga is the abbreviated form of the name of Jagattunga, son of Krīṣṇa II, we may assume that this marriage alliance marked the end of hostilities between the two. As already noted (p. 641) it was an invasion of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas that led to the collapse of the Pratiḥāra empire in A.D. 915, and it is not unlikely that Nārāyaṇapāla was helped by his Rāṣṭrakūṭa relations in recovering his dominions from the Pratiḥāras.

In any event the long reign of Nārāyaṇapāla is an important chapter in the history of the Pālas. They lost their imperial authority and prestige, and at one time even their very existence was threatened. But fortunately Nārāyaṇapāla was able to recover the home province of Bengal and Bihar before his death, which took place about A.D. 912.

5. THE SUCCESSORS OF NĀRĀYAṆAPĀLA

Nārāyaṇapāla was succeeded by his son Rājayapāla who ruled for at least 32 years (c. A.D. 912 to 944, insc. no. 9). The official records merely credit him with the excavation of large tanks ‘deep as the sea’, and the construction of big temples ‘high as the mountain’. His son by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess Bhāgyadevi, named Gopāla II, succeeded him and ruled for no less than 17 years (c. A.D. 944-61).41 Nothing is known of him or of his son and successor Vigrahapāla II (c. A.D. 961-88).42

The period of about seventy-five to eighty years covered by these three reigns witnessed a great change in the political condition of Northern India. The Pratiḥāra empire broke up into a number of independent principalities, some of which made a bold bid for political supremacy of Northern India. The chief among these were the Chandellas and the Kalachuris, who naturally turned their cove-

41 The regnal year 17 of Gopāla is found in a palm-leaf Manuscript of the Maitreya Vyākaraṇa. This king Gopāla has been unanimously taken to be Gopāla II. H.P. Sastri read the year as 57 (Descriptive Cat. of Sanskrit Ms. I, p. 13) and is supported by others (IHQ, VI, p. 152). Buṭ R. D. Banerji and D. R. Bhandarkar read the date respectively as 17 and 11 (IBORS, XIV, pp. 490-91). The first figure seems undoubtedly to be 1 but the second is doubtful.

42 A Ms. of Paścharakshā was copied in the year 26 of Vigrahapāla, who may be either the second or the third king of this name. He is, however, usually identified with Vigrahapāla II. The same uncertainty prevails regarding king Vigrahapāla mentioned in a Kurkihar Image inscription, dated year 19 (IBORS, XXVI, pp. 37, 240).
tous eyes towards the rich and fertile plains of Bengal and Bihar.

Thus even the passing away of the empire of their eternal enemies, the Pratihāras, gave no respite to the Pālas for they had to bear the brunt of the aggressive imperialism of the two new powers. The detailed history of these has been given in ch. XXVI. It will suffice to state here that the Chandella king Yaśovarman claimed to have cut down the Gauḍas like creepers, while his son Dhaṅga boasted of having imprisoned the queens of Rādha and Aṅga, i.e., North Bengal and East Bihar. We need not take these statements to be literally true, but it appears very probable that Bengal and Bihar were harassed by the invasions of both Yaśovarman and his son Dhaṅga, whose long reign covered nearly the whole of the second half of the tenth century A.D.

The Kalachuri records also refer to successful military expeditions of Yuvarāja I against Gauda, and of his son Lakṣmanarāja against Vaṅgāla, i.e., southern and eastern Bengal. These two kings ruled in the second and third quarters of the tenth century A.D. As noted above, the Telugu Chōda King Bhīma (A.D. 973-99) claims to have overrun western and northern parts of Bengal.

These foreign invasions must have considerably weakened the three successors of Nārāyanapāla whose rule covered the period from about A.D. 912 to 988. Gradually there was a complete disruption of the Pāla kingdom. This is broadly hinted at by the specific reference in foreign records to the constituent parts of the Pāla kingdom like Aṅga, Magadha, Gauda, Rādha and Vaṅgāla. Although such references do not necessarily imply that they were all independent principalities, we have positive evidence to show that there were at least three distinct political units in Bengal and Bihar about this time.

An inscription (no. 11, v. 12) of Mahāpāla, son of Vīgrahapāla II, informs us that he recovered the paternal territory which had been usurped by others. This shows that the Pālas lost Bengal, or at least considerable portions of it, during the reign of Vīgrahapāla II, or immediately after its end. There is no doubt that these usurpers belonged to the Kāmboja family (or clan), for we have two records of these rulers, one in North and the other in West Bengal. An inscription (no. 12) engraved on a pillar, now at Dinajpur, but probably brought from the neighbouring ruins at Bāngarh, in North Bengal, refers to a Gauda king of Kāmboja family, and according to some scholars it contains the date 888 S (A.D. 966). A copper-plate grant (no. 13) found at Irda, records grants of lands in Dānda-bhukti-mandala of Vardhamāna-bhukti (Burdwan division) by Nāyapāla in his 13th reign year. This king succeeded his elder brother Nārāyanapāla and was the son of Rājyapāla and Bhāgyadevi. Rājyapāla is said to have been the
ornament of the Kāmboja family, and full imperial titles are given both to him and to Nayapāla. The grant was issued from the capital city called Priyaṅgu which has not yet been identified.

As we have seen, the son and successor of Nārāyanapāla was called Rājayapāla and his queen was named Bhāgyadevi. The agreement of these two names has led some scholars to identify the Rājayapāla of the Irdā copper-plate with the Pāla ruler of the same name. But then it is difficult to account for the epithet 'ornament of the Kāmboja family' applied to him. It has been suggested that he owed the designation to his mother's lineage. But this is by no means certain, and the question must be left open.43

But whether or not the two Rājyapālas are identical, the Irdā Copper-plate leaves no doubt that there was an independent kingdom in West Bengal under a family called Kāmboja, which might or might not have been related to the Pāla rulers. The Kāmboja king mentioned in the Dinajpur Pillar inscription (no. 11) also probably belonged to the same family which thus ruled over both North and West Bengal.

If we do not identify the two Rājyapālas, we have to assume that these rulers belonged to the Kāmboja tribe which has been known from time immemorial to have lived in the North-West Frontier. The great distance of this region from Bengal has induced some scholars to locate the Kāmbojas, who invaded and conquered Bengal, either in Tibet or in Lushai Hills tracts lying between Burma and Bengal.44

It is not, however, necessary to suppose that there was a regular military conquest of Bengal by the Kāmbojas. It is more likely that a high dignitary or military officer of the Kāmboja tribe in the service of the Pālas grew very powerful and took advantage of the weakness of the Pālas to carve out an independent principality. We know that Devapāla defeated the Kāmbojas and brought horses for his army from their country (no. 2, v. 13). It is not unlikely that cavalry officers were also recruited from that region, and one of them made himself master of North and West Bengal.45

The problem is further complicated by an inscription found at Bhaturiya.46 It refers to a king named Rāivapāla whose command was obeyed by the Mlechchhas, Aṅgas, Kaliṅgas, Vaṅgas, Odras, Pāndyas, Kārṇaṭas, Lātas, Subhas, Kṛitas and Chīnas. It is very likely

43 For a full discussion of this problem, cf. HBB, p. 190, HABM, pp. 126-29.
44 Ibid.
45 EI. XXII, pp. 150 ff; XXIV. 43 ff. Some scholars have suggested that the Kāmbojas might have come to Bengal along with the Prāthiharas when they invaded this province (DHNI, I, p. 311; IHQ, XV. p. 511).
46 EI. XXXIII, p. 150. HABM. pp. 127-29.
that this king Rājyapāla is identical with the Rājyapāla of the Irdā Grant mentioned above. It is difficult to believe that he conquered, on his own account, all the countries mentioned in the record, and, curiously enough, the long list includes three well-known regions in Bengal itself, namely, Aṅga, Vaṅga and Suhma.

In any case there is no doubt that the main Pāla Dynasty lost control over both East and South Bengal, for we have other and more definite epigraphic evidence of the existence of independent rulers in these regions. The earliest is a ruling dynasty with its capital at Devaparvata, a hill-fort in the Mainamati Hills near Comilla in Bangladesh one of whose members, Bhavadeva, assumed the imperial titles Paramēśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, and Mahārājādhirāja.47

The next in point of time seems to be Mahārājādhirāja Kāntideva ruling in Harikela with his capital probably at Vardhamānapura.48 Harikela generally denoted East Bengal, though sometimes it was used in a more extended sense so as to include Southern, and probably also a part of Western Bengal, and sometimes in a more restricted sense, when it embraced the region round Sylhet.49 It is therefore difficult to form an idea of the power of Kāntideva or the extent of his kingdom.

The existence of a very powerful dynasty of seven kings, with names ending in Chandra, ruling in East and South Bengal, is proved by thirteen inscriptions. They probably ruled between A.D. 875 and 1035, the last of whom, Govindachandra, is referred to in the Chola records as the ruler of Vaṅgāla who fought with the invading army of Rājen-dra Chola and fled from the battle-field.50

It will thus appear that the Pāla rulers lost hold over Bengal in the tenth century A.D. and their rule was evidently confined to Magadha. All the records of Rājyapāla, Gopāla II and Vigrahapāla II have been found within the limits of Bihar except a solitary copper-plate of Gopāla II (no. 10) which makes a grant of land in Puṇḍravarṇāhana bhūkti, i.e., North Bengal in the sixth year of his reign. There is no record of any Pāla king in Bengal after this till we come to the reign of Mahāpāla I, the son and successor of Vigrahapāla II. About the time when he ascended the throne, the Kāmbojas were ruling in North and West Bengal and the Chandas in East and probably also in South Bengal. The Pālas, who lost their janaka-bhū or native land, were ruling over Aṅga and Magadha, and even here they were exposed to the invasions of the Chandella Dhaṅga.

47 JASL, XVII (1951), p. 83.
48 Chittagong C.P. of Kāntideva (EI, XXVI, p. 313).
49 HABM, p. 9.
50 For a full discussion, cf. HABM, pp. 199-206.
List of Important Pāla Inscriptions:

3. Nālendā C-p. of Devapāla, year 39 (EI, XVII, p. 318); Monograph no. I of Varendra Research Society; JRASBL, VI, p. 215 (where the date has been read as 35).
5. Bihar Buddha Image Ins. of Vigrāhapāla I or Śūrapāla, year 3 (JASB, N. S., IV, p. 108; JRASBL, IV, p. 390).
7. Bihar Image Ins. of Nārāyaṇapāla, year 54 (IA, XLVII, p. 110).
13. Irla C-p. of Kāmboja king Nayapāla, year 13, (EI, XXII, p. 150; XXIV, p. 43)
Chapter Twenty-four

The Minor Feudatories

During the period when the Pratihāras, Pālas, and Rāṣṭrakūṭas were playing the dominant political role, a large number of minor States flourished in different parts of Northern India. To begin with, they were of no great political importance and were feudatories of one or the other of the three big powers. But as these powers declined, the minor States gradually rose to power and importance. Three of them, viz., the Kalachuris, the Chandellas, and the Paramāras, played the dominant role in North Indian politics in the latter half of the tenth century, and made a bold bid for gaining the position which their suzerains had lost. A few other States rose to great power and fame under the generic name of ‘Rājputs’ in the later history of India. It would be convenient to treat the history of these two categories of States in separate chapters. The remaining States, which never rose to high distinction, but were of sufficient local importance, may be briefly discussed here. Some of the ruling clans began their career during the period under review, but as they did not attain power and distinction till the eleventh century A.D., their history will be dealt with in the next volume. An instance is furnished by the Chandras of Eastern Bengal to whom brief reference has been made in the preceding Chapter.

I. The Dynasties of Saurāśṭra

1. The Saindhavas

When the political power of the Maitrakas of Valabhi began to decline in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D., a number of ruling families rose to prominence in Saurāśṭra, modern Kāthiāwār. One of them was known as the Saindhava.

The Saindhavas\(^1\) claim their descent from the Epic hero Jayadratha. They ruled the western Saurāśṭra-mandala\(^2\) from their capital Bhūtāmbilikā, also called Bhūmilikā (modern Bhumili or Ghumli in the old Nawanagar State of Kāthiāwār, 25 miles north-east of Porban-

---

1 The history of the Saindhavas is mainly based on six copper-plates. (*EI*, XXVI, pp 183 ff).
2 *Apara-Saurāśṭra-mandala.*
dar, in a gorge of the Bardā hills). The earliest known chief of the family was the Mahārāja Ahirvarman, whose son was the Maharajā and Mahāsenāpati Pushyena. They flourished either in the sixth or in the seventh century A.D. The next known king of the dynasty is Pushyadeva, who flourished in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D. Some are inclined to identify Pushyadeva with Pushyena, but this goes against the evidence of palaeography. As noted above (p. 615), the country of the Saindhavas was invaded by the Arabs of Sindh some time before A.D. 739. It was probably Pushyadeva who suffered defeat at the hands of those invaders. Dantidurga, the founder of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereignty in the Deccan, is said to have won victory over the Saindhavas in the middle of the eighth century A.D. His adversary was either Pushyadeva or his successor. Pushyadeva and his successors claim to have been the lords of western sea.

Pushyadeva was succeeded by his son Mahāsāmanta Krishṇarāja I, whose son and successor was Mahāsāmanta Agguka I. Krishṇarāja and Agguka may be taken to have flourished respectively in the third and fourth quarters of the eighth century A.D. The Arabs of Sindh renewed their operations against Saurāshṭra during the reigns of these two kings. About A.D. 756 Hisham was appointed governor of Sindh. He sent ‘Amrū bin Jamāl with a fleet of barks to the coast of Barada’ which is presumably the tract of country adjacent to Bardā Hills. The invasion seems to have proved abortive, and twenty years later another naval expedition was sent against Barada. The Muslim sources relate that on that occasion the Arabs succeeded in capturing a town, but had ultimately to withdraw as an epidemic broke out in the army and carried away a large number of their men. After this disaster the Caliph Mahdi gave up the project of conquering any part of India. A Saindhava inscription relates that Agguka I ‘showed the greatness of Varāha when he easily rescued his country which was being drowned in an ocean of naval force sent by powerful enemies’. These enemies were obviously the Arabs, who occupied the Saindhava country in A.D. 776. It appears from the above statement that Agguka succeeded in defeating the Arabs and in rescuing the country from their grip. Thus the loss of a large number of Arab army, due to the outbreak of an epidemic, was not perhaps the sole cause which forced the Arabs to leave the shore of Saurāshṭra.

3 IA, XXXVIII, p. 145.
4 ASWI, V, p. 186.
5 Apara-samudrādhipati.
6 HIED, I, p. 444.
Krishṇa I and Agguka I were feudatory chiefs, but the name of their overlord is not known. Agguka I was succeeded by his son Mahāśāmanta Rāṇaka, who may be placed in the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. The Pratihāra Nāgabhata II (c. A.D. 800-33) is said to have defeated the Saindhavas (p. 623) and his adversary may have been Rāṇaka. As during this period the empire of the Pratihāras of Kanauj extended at least up to the old Junāgaḍh State, Kāthiāwār, it is not unlikely that western Kāthiāwār also formed a part of it, and Rāṇaka and his successors owed allegiance to them. Rāṇaka had by his two queens two sons Krishnārāja II and Jāika I. He was succeeded by Krishnārāja II, who may be taken to have flourished in the second quarter of the ninth century A.D. From the reign of Krishnārāja II the Saindhavas entered into a long-drawn struggle with the Chāpas of Vardhamāna, modern Vadhwān, in Kāthiāwār. Krishnārāja II, who is referred to as a king (rāja), won a victory over the Chāpas, who at that time were probably ruled by Vikramārka. Some Saindhava inscriptions mention that Krishnārāja II propitiated Rāma like Bharata, ridiculed Duryodhana, drank the blood of Duhṣāsana like Bhīma, and pleased the mountainous people like Saṅkara. Some are inclined to think that the Rāma, referred to, was the Pratihāra Rāmahadra of Kanauj, and Duryodhana and Duhṣāsana might have been some real historical figures. This suggestion does not deserve any consideration in view of the fact that some of the successors of Krishnārāja II are compared with Rāma, Bhīma, and Saṅkara, in the same way Krishnārāja II was succeeded by his infant son Agguka II, and Krishnārāja’s step-brother Jāika I acted as a regent. During the regency Jāika I assumed the title Mahāśāmanta. In A.D. 832 he granted a charter, which was written by Kapila, son of Vikkata, of the Saka family, a very interesting reminiscence of the old Saka rule in this region. He professes through this inscription that ‘though Kamalā (Goddess of Royal Fortune) was anxious to be united to him in preference to Agguka, her rightful lord, he spurned her wily overtures and decided to be the disinterested guardian of his young and inexperienced nephew’. But Jāika issued another inscription which does not mention the names of Krishnārāja II and Agguka II. It is not, therefore, unlikely that in the latter part of his life he overthrew his nephew and occupied the throne. He also fought with the Chāpas of Vardhamāna. He had two sons Chāmūṇḍarāja and Agguka III, and seems to have been succeeded by the former who also is credited with a victory over the

7 Altekar takes this Rāṇaka as a successor of Agguka II (EI, XXVI, p. 207). In my opinion he is identical with Rāṇaka, son of Agguka I.
Chāpas. Chāmunḍarāja was succeeded, or probably supplantèd, by his brother Mahāsāṁanta Agguka III, who also came into conflict with the Chāpas. After a long reign he is said to have ‘decided to crown his son himself, noticing how Lakṣmī, the goddess of Royal Fortune, had become eager to be united with his son Rāṇaka, who had become quite capable of bearing the burden of administration’. It is thus evident that he abdicated in favour of his son Rāṇaka II. Mahāsāṁanta Rāṇaka II issued a land-grant in A.D. 874, the executor of which is the mūvarāja Jāika. Jāika is not known to have ever ruled, and some time before A.D. 886 the throne of Bhūtāmbilikā passed into the hands of Agguka IV, son of Chāmunḍarāja. Agguka IV was succeeded by his son Jāika II, two of whose known dates are A.D. 904 and 915.8 Names of the successors of Jāika, if any, are not known. The dynasty was probably overthrown by the Ābhīra Grāharipu.

2. The Chālukyas

A Chāluka dynasty9 is known to have ruled in Saurāśṭra contemporaneously with the Saindhivas. The territory over which this dynasty ruled cannot be definitely fixed, but comprised a part or whole of ‘Junaṅgadh State’, as the inscriptions of this dynasty have been found in the town of Una in that area. The earliest known king (mahā-mahīpati) of the dynasty is Kalla, who flourished in the third quarter of the eighth century A.D. He was succeeded by his brother Mahalla, who is also described as a great king (mahā-mahīpati). Mahalla was succeeded by Kalla’s son, whose name seems to have been Rājendra. The successor of the latter was his son Bāhukadha-vala, who flourished in the first half of the ninth century A.D. Bāhukadhavala seems to have yielded to the force of the Pratihāra Nāga-bhaṭa II of Kanauj, when the latter invaded Saurāśṭra, for his successors owed allegiance to the Pratihāras. It is very likely that the Chālukyas of Saurāśṭra served the Pratihāras as vassals from the time of Bāhukadhavala. It is stated that Bāhukadhavala defeated in battle Dharma and a Karnāta army, and also conquered kings who are well known rājādhārāja-paramēśvaras (kings of kings, the great lords). This evidently means that Bāhukadhavala took part in Pratihāra Nāga-bhaṭa II’s military campaigns, specially against Dharmapāla of Bengal and the Rāśtrakūṭa Govinda III of Karnāta. Bāhukadhavala was succeeded by his son Avanivarman I. Avanivarman I’s son and suc-

8 IA. II, p. 259.
9 The history of this branch is mainly based on the Una grants, EI. IX, pp. 1 ff.
cessor, Mahāśāmantā Balavarman, was a feudatory of the Pratihāra Mahendrāyudha, also called Mahendrapāla, son of Bhōja. Balavarman made a grant to the temple of the Sun named Tarunāditya in A.D. 893. He killed Jayapā of the Hūṇa-race, and defeated a certain Vīshādha. Jayapā seems to have been the ruler of Hūṇa-maṇḍala, which was situated to the north-west of Mālava. Balavarman was succeeded by his son, Mahāśāmantā Avanivarman II, also known as Yōga. In A.D. 899 Avanivarman made a grant with the approval of Dhanika, the tantrapāla of Mahendrapāladeva. He claims to have defeated one Yakshadāsa and put to flight Dharanīvarāha, who belonged to the Chāpa dynasty of Vardhamānapura and was also a feudatory of the Pratihāras. He suffered a defeat at the hand of the Paramāra Siyaka II in the latter part of his reign, but some time about the middle of the tenth century, when the Chālukas were supplanted by the Ābhiras.

3. The Varāhas of Sauryya-maṇḍala

A king named Mahāvarāha ruled in Saurāśṭra in the third quarter of the eighth century A.D. The Baroda Plate of Karkarāja, dated A.D. 812, states that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa I (c. A.D. 756-72) put to flight Mahāvarāha, ‘who being kindled with the warmth of the sun (Sauryya), attacked him.’ In my opinion there is a pun on the word Sauryya, which may be referring to Sauryya-maṇḍala, mentioned in the Jaina Harivaṃśa. A fragmentary inscription, now deposited in the Barton Museum, Bhavanagar, states that Kṛishnārāja was made to retreat from the Kevā by a king named Varāha whose name may be restored as Mahāvarāha. It thus corroborates the statement of the Baroda Plate that Mahāvarāha entered into a war with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa I. It is known from a passage in the Jaina Harivaṃśa (ante, p. 619) that in A.D. 783 the king Jayavarāha was ruling Sauryya-maṇḍala, which was situated to the west of Vardhamāna. Jayavarāha was in all probability a successor of Mahāvarāha. Nothing further is known of this Varāha family.

4. The Chāpas

The existence of the Chāpas, also known as Chāvaḍās, Chāvoṭakas, and Chāpotaṭas, can be traced from the sixth century A.D. As noted

10 Cf. Author’s History of the Paramāra Dynasty. Also, Ch. XXVI, (III).
11 IA, XII, p. 159. L. 13. Sauryya-oshma-sahidipitam, Kielhorn suggests the Sauryya is an error for Sauryya, and translates the passage as ‘(Mahāvarāha) kindled with the warmth of bravery’.
12 EI, XIX, p. 174. Diskalkar restores the name as Ādivarāha and identifies him
above (p. 615), some time before A.D. 739 they suffered a defeat at the hands of the Arabs of Sindh. The Chāpas seem to have been divided into a number of branches, but the history of only two of them can be systematically traced. One of these ruled from Vardhamāna. The earliest known king (nṛipā) of this line is Vikramārka, who may be taken to have flourished in the early years of the ninth century A.D. He seems to have submitted to the Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II when the latter invaded Saurāśṭra. For the Chāpas of Vardhamāna ruled as feudatories of the Pratihāras of Kanauj. The long-drawn struggle for supremacy between the Chāpas and the Saindhavas (p. 683) began from the reign of Vikramārka, in which, according to the Saindhava records, the Chāpas always suffered reverses. Vikramārka was succeeded by his son, king (rājā) Addaka, after whose name the country round Wadhwan, including the 'Limadi State', was known as Addanaka-deśa. Addanaka is identified with Hadḍala in Kāthiawār. Addaka was succeeded by his son Pulakesi, who is also referred to as a king (rājā). Pulakesi's son and successor was Druvabhaṭa, who was succeeded by his younger brother Dharaṇivarāha. Mahāśāmantādhīpati Dharaṇivarāha, who is known to have been ruling the Addanaka-deśa in A.D. 914 as a feudatory of the Pratihāra Mahīpāla I, suffered defeat at the hands of the Chāluksya Añānavarman II, Yogarāja of Junāgadh. In the middle of the tenth century A.D. the power of Dharaṇivarāha was completely shattered by the Chauḷukya Mūlarāja I after which the Chāpa king took shelter with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhaval of Hastikunḍī. Vardhamāna was annexed to the kingdom of the Chauḷukyas.

A branch of the Chāpa dynasty is known to have ruled in Northern Gujarat. It is stated in some Gujarat chronicles that Vanarāja of the Chāpa family founded a city named Anabillapattana and established there the supremacy of his family in A.D. 745. Vanarāja was followed in succession by Yogarāja, Ratnāditya, Kshemarāja, Akadadeva, and Bhuyagadadeva or Bhuyadadeva, also known as Sāmantasīnha. There is a little discrepancy between this list of the Chāpa kings and those supplied by other Gujarat chronicles, viz., Vichārasrenī, Sukritasāṅkīrttana, and Ratnamālā. It was probably during the reign of Akadadeva that the Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II plundered Ānarta, modern Vadnagar in Baroda. The story runs that three brothers Rāji, Bija, and Dandaka, sons of Bhuvanāditya, king of Kalyāna-kaṭaka in

with the Pratihāra Bhōja I of Kanauj, Bhandarkar states that the word Mahāvarāha suits the metre better than Ādivarāha (Bh. List, no. 2106).

13 IA, XII, p. 193
14 EI, X, p. 20.
Kanauj, went in disguise on pilgrimage to Somanātha. While returning they attended the cavalry-parade organised by the king Śāmantasiṃha at Aṇahilapattana. On that occasion some intelligent remarks made by Rāji on the movements of the horses attracted the attention of Śāmantasiṃha, who took him to be a member of a royal family. The king was so much pleased with him that he gave his sister Līlādevī in marriage to him. Some time afterwards Līlādevī died leaving behind a son Mūlarāja. Mūlarāja grew up in the court of his maternal uncle and subsequently wielded the sovereignty, having slain the latter. It is difficult to estimate the historical value of this story in the absence of any contemporary evidence to support it. But that Mūlarāja got the sovereignty of Aṇahilapattana by defeating the Chāpas admits of no doubt. It is known from the Vaiṣṇagar prāṣasti of Kumārapāla that Mūlarāja I (A.D. 942-95) carried away 'the fortune of the kingdom of the Chāpotkaṭa princes'.

16 EI, I, p. 296.