successes against it and levied tribute, they sometimes also met with failure, and the Sena rulers could justly claim victory against them. Rāṣṭhā was probably a battle-ground between the Muslims of N. Bengal, the Senas of Vaṅga and the rulers of Orissa who had advanced and occupied the southern part of it.\(^{71a}\)

The known reign-periods of the two brothers Viśvarūpasena and Keśavasena exceed seventeen years, and their rule probably covered at least a quarter of a century. As Lakshmānasena was on the throne in A.D. 1205, his two sons may be regarded as having ruled till at least A.D. 1230. One of the records of Viśvarūpasena refers to Kumāra Sūryasena and Kumāra Purushottamasena\(^{72}\) as donors of lands to Brāhmaṇas. They were evidently members of the royal family and probably sons of Viśvarūpasena, but there is no evidence to show that they ever ascended the throne. But as we learn from Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri that the descendants of Lakshmānasena ruled in Bengal (Bang) at least up to 1245 A.D., and probably up to 1260 A.D.,\(^{73}\) it is almost certain that Viśvarūpasena and Keśavasena were succeeded by other members of the family. Nothing is, however, definitely known about them.\(^{74}\)

There is no doubt that the final extinction of the Sena power is due as much to the pressure of the Muslim invaders as to the rebellions of feudal chiefs. The rise of an independent chief Ḍommaṇapāla in the Khāḷī district in or some time before 1196 A.D. has already been referred to above.\(^{75}\) The loss of power and prestige after the conquest of Western and Northern Bengal by the rulers of Orissa and the Muslims induced other local chiefs to assert their independence. One such chief was Raṇavaṇkamalla Śri-Harikāladeva who ruled over the kingdom of Paṭṭikerā in Tippera in A.D. 1221.\(^{76}\) About the same time the Deva family established a powerful kingdom beyond the Meghnā river, to which reference will be made later.\(^{77}\)

All the while the Senas seem to have maintained a precarious existence. The name of a king Madhusena is found in the colophon of a ms. of Pauṇcharakṣā.\(^{78}\) He is styled ‘paraṃ-saugata-paramārājādhirāja’ and ‘Gauḍēṣvara,’ and the date is given as Śaka 1211. Whether this Buddhist king Madhusena, ruling in 1289 A.D., belonged to the well-known royal Sena family, it is difficult to say. The locality over which he ruled is also difficult to determine. For Northern and Western Bengal now formed the dominions of the Muslim rulers of Lakhnawati, and Eastern Bengal had passed into the hands of the Deva family. It is just possible that he was ruling
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in an obscure corner of Southern or Western Bengal, or had seized Eastern Bengal from Daśarathadeva or his successor. Madhusena, who flourished in the last quarter of the thirteenth century A.D., is the last known ruler of Bengal with the name-ending sena who might have inherited the pretensions, if not the power, of the Senas, and kept up the traditions of their mighty and powerful kingdom. In any case, the great Sena family passes out of the history of Bengal with the close of the thirteenth century A.D.

In spite of its ignoble end, the short period of Sena rule in Bengal constitutes an important landmark in its history. A succession of three able and vigorous rulers consolidated the whole province into a united and powerful kingdom such as probably it had never been since the death of Devapāla three hundred and fifty years before. By their strong advocacy of the orthodox Hindu faith, the Senas helped it to attain the position of supremacy in Bengal which it had long ago secured in the rest of India. The Sena period also saw the high-water mark of development of Sanskrit literature in Bengal. Buddhism, in its last phase, was a disintegrating force in religion and society, and there can be hardly any doubt that its predominance in Bengal was the main contributing factor to the phenomenal success of Islam in this region. That Hindu society, religion, and culture in Bengal even partially succeeded in surviving the onslaughts of Islam is mainly due to the new vigour and life infused into them by the sturdy Hindu ruling family of Karnāṭa. But in spite of all the good that they had done, their foreign origin and the short duration of their rule perhaps stood in the way of the growth of that united national life which alone could have enabled Bengal to withstand the irresistible advance of the Muslims in a manner more befitting its past history. The Muslim conquest of Bengal, after the overthrow of the rest of Northern India, was perhaps inevitable in the long run, but the way in which Bihar and half of Bengal passed into their hands, almost without any opposition worth the name, has cast a slur on the courage, the prowess, and the political organisation of the people. Even the most heroic resistance and successful defence of East Bengal for nearly a century against the Muslim power ruling over the rest of Northern India have not succeeded in removing the stain from the fair name of Bengal. History, in this respect, may be said to have repeated itself five and a half centuries later. For we mark the same contrast between the ease with which Bengal was conquered
by the British and the sturdy opposition they received in Upper and Central India, the Deccan, and South Indian Peninsula. Whether it is a mere chance coincidence or due to some fatal inherent defects in national character, it is difficult to say. We may attribute the evil to that unknown and unknowable factor called fate or destiny which sometimes plays no inconsiderable part in the affairs of men, or it may be that the genius of the people of Bengal, in spite of their intellectual brilliance and other virtues, is not amenable to even an elementary sense of discipline and organisation calling for unity in the face of a common danger. Facts may be cited in favour of both the view-points, and in the absence of necessary data for a correct judgment on these and allied problems of the history of Bengal, it is a fruitless task to pursue these speculations to any length. There is, however, no justification for the current view that makes Lakshmaṇasena and Siraj-ud-daula scape-goats for all the disasters that befell Bengal. They were certainly more courageous and patriotic than most of their counsellors and officials, and were perhaps more sinned against than sinning. A large share of the blame must also attach to the people at large, but for whose moral and political lapse we could hardly expect the development of a situation like those to which the unfortunate kings succumbed.
APPENDIX I

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE SENA KINGS

There are, broadly speaking, two radically different views about the dates of the Sena kings. One is based on the assumption that the era current in North Bihar and known as Lakshmanya Saimvat or in its contracted form La Sāhi, started from 1119-20 A.D. and commemorates the accession of Lakshmanasena. The other is based on the identification of 'Rāe Lakhmanīah' of Tabaqat-i-Nasiri with king Lakshmanasena, and on certain passages in two literary works of Vallālasena, viz., Dānasāgara and Adbhutasāgara. These refer to Śaka 1081 or 1082 (1159 or 1160 A.D.) as the beginning of Vallālasena's reign, Śaka 1091 (1169 A.D.) as the date of the composition of Dānasāgara, and 1089 or 1090 (1167 or 1168 A.D.) as the commencement of Adbhutasāgara. The two different viewpoints, with full references, were summed up in 1921 by the author of the present work who opposed the first and expounded at length the second view. Since then important arguments have been brought forward in support of it. Mr. Chintaharan Chakravarti has shown that according to the correct reading of the colophon of an anthological work called Sadukti-karṇāṇṛta, it was composed by Śridharadāsa, the court-poet of Lakshmanasena, in Śaka 1127 (1205 A.D.) during the reign of that king. Further, Mr. R. D. Banerji's contention that the specific dates found in the literary works of Vallālasena are spurious, as they are not found in some manuscripts of the texts, has been considerably weakened. For these dates also occur in a newly discovered manuscript of one of these works, and are referred to not only in certain introductory or concluding passages which are omitted in certain manuscripts of the text, but are scattered throughout the text of Adbhutasāgara. These passages were evidently known to Rājā Todarmall who refers to "the position of the Great Bear, according to the Adbhutasāgara, in the Śaka year 1082 (1160-61 A.D.) while Vallālasena was ruling." Some of the passages containing the dates are also quoted by the famous Smṛiti writer Śrīnātha Āchārya Chūgāmani who flourished about 1500 A.D.

On the whole, the first view, maintained by R. D. Banerji, is hardly supported now by any scholar, and the chronology of the Sena kings, based on the dates furnished by the literary works for
Vallālasena and Lakṣhaṇasena, is now generally accepted. The chronology of the Sena kings may thus be drawn up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of king</th>
<th>Known duration of reign</th>
<th>Year of accession (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vijayasena</td>
<td>62 (? or 32)</td>
<td>A.D. 1095 (1125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallālasena</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot; 1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakṣhaṇasena</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot; 1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvarūpasena</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot; 1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keśavasena</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot; 1225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. J. C. Ghosh\textsuperscript{87} fixes the date of Vijayasena’s accession in A.D. 1088 on the strength of astronomical data contained in the Barrackpur Grant. His arguments, particularly as they involve emendation of the text of the inscription, do not carry much weight. It may be added that calculating on the same astronomical data, Mr. C. C. Das Gupta places the accession of Vijayasena in 1095 A.D.\textsuperscript{88}

On the other hand, as already noted above,\textsuperscript{89} there are grave doubts about the reading of the date in Barrackpur Grant as 62, and regarding it as his regnal year. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar’s suggestion to refer it to Vākrama-Chālukya era would give the date 1137-38 A.D. for Vijayasena, and we may place his accession approximately at 1125 A.D. The same result is attained if we read the date as 32, and regard it as his regnal year. On the whole, a date near about 1125 A.D. appears to be more reasonable than the date c. 1095 A.D. now generally assumed.

A passage in \textit{Adbhutaśūgara} refers to the year ‘bhūja-vasudaśa—1081’ as the beginning (rājyaḍi) of Vallālasena’s reign. Unfortunately the interpretation of this short passage involves two difficulties. In the first place, it is uncertain whether the expression rājyaḍi should be taken literally to mean the first year of the reign,\textsuperscript{90} or, in a general way, to denote the earlier part of the reign.\textsuperscript{91} Secondly, the date given in words means 1082, while it is given in figures as 1081. One of these must be wrong. It has been suggested that the expression bhūja (=2) is a mistake for bhū (=1).\textsuperscript{92} On the other hand, it is equally plausible that 1081 in figures is an error for 1082. It is not possible to arrive at a definite conclusion on any of these points. Although it is difficult to attach much weight to the argument based on astronomical grounds by which Mr. J.C. Ghosh accepts 1081 Śaka current (1158 A.D.) as the year I of Vallālasena’s reign,\textsuperscript{93} it may provisionally be accepted on general grounds.
The exact date of the accession of Lakshmanasena depends upon the correct interpretation of the colophon of Sadukti-karnāmpita. It gives the Śaka year 1127 (1205 A.D.) as corresponding to the regnal year of Lakshmanasena expressed by the somewhat unusual and ambiguous chronogram "rasaika-vimbėbde." Mr. Chintaharan Chakravarti, who arrived at this reading by a collation of different manuscripts, interpreted it to mean 27 (i.e. rasa=6+21).94 Mr. Girindra Mohan Sarkar emended the expression to rājyaika-vimbėbde95 and took it to mean the 21st year. Both the suggestions are equally plausible, but the first one is preferred on the ground that according to Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, Lakshmanasena was eighty years old in or about 1200 A.D., and it is less likely that he lived beyond the age of 90.96 Here, again, it is interesting to note that both the dates have been supported on astronomical grounds.97 In view of many instances of this kind, it is difficult to accept Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya's view, based on astronomical investigations, that Viśvarūpasena was ruling in 1247 A.D.98 though the date is not an improbable one.

Lakshmanasena Era

In view of the chronology adopted above, the epoch of Lakshaṇa Sāṃvat, viz. 1108 or 1119-20 A.D.,99 cannot be regarded as the date of the accession of Lakshmanasena. It is, therefore, necessary to discuss the origin of that Era.

The first point to remember in this connection is that no Sena king, not even the two sons of Lakshmanasena, ever used that era, and that there is no evidence that it was ever known, far less used, in Bengal during the Sena period, or within the next three centuries.100 This raises grave doubts about the foundation of the era by Lakshmanasena or any other Sena ruler of Bengal.

The second point to be noted is the somewhat peculiar phraseology used in the early inscriptions dated in this era. The dates of two inscriptions of Asokachalla at Bodh-Gaya and one of Jayasena, son of Buddhāsena, lord of Piṭhi, at Jānibighā are expressed as follows:

1. Śrimal-Lakhaṇa (kṣaṇa)-senasya-āṭṭita-raja ye Sāṁ 51.101
2. Śrimal-Lakshaṇasena-deva-pādaṇām=āṭṭita-raja ye Sāṁ 74.102
3. Lakshaṇasena-senasya=āṭṭita-raja ye Sāṁ 83.103

Dr. Kielhorn,104 and following him Mr. R. D. Banerji,105 held that in the above expressions the years were counted from the commencement of the Era of Lakshmanasena, but his reign was a thing of
the past. Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri also accepted this view, but he rightly recognised that as Lakshmanaṣena, king of the Sena dynasty of Bengal, was ruling after the years 51 and 74 of the Era which commenced in 1119-20 A.D., king Lakshmanaṣena, who founded this Era and died before its 51st year (i.e., 1170 A.D.) must be a different ruler of that name. The fact that Jayasena, lord of Pithi, issued one of the three records containing a date in that Era, and his father Buddhhasena is mentioned in an inscription as a contemporary of Asokachalla during whose reign the other two records were issued, led Dr. Raychaudhuri to conclude that king Lakshmanaṣena who founded the Era 'must have been the founder of the Sena dynasty of Pithi'. The suggestion is, no doubt, a valuable one, but there is no evidence that the Sena dynasty of Pithi existed as early as 1119-20 A.D. far less that its founder was powerful enough to establish an Era which remained in use for centuries.

The main question, however, is whether we are justified in interpreting the dates of Both-Gaya and Janibigha inscriptions in the manner suggested by Kielhorn. Reference may be made in this connection to similar expressions for indicating dates used with the name of Govindapala, noted above. On the analogy of the interpretation adopted by Kielhorn, Banerji, and Raychaudhuri, we have to assume that an Era was founded by Govindapala, and that he died before year 14 of that Era. It would, therefore, follow that two different Eras were founded within a few years, and both were current together in Gaya from 1161 to 1199 A.D. Further, if the Senas of Pithi had set up the Era in 1119 A.D., their rule as well as the use of their Era must have been in abeyance in Gaya during the period of Govindapala's rule.

Before we can accept the interpretation suggested by Kielhorn, it must be satisfactorily explained why the inscription refers to the atita-rājya of Lakshmanaṣena, and ignores altogether the name of the kings (Vishvarupasena or Kesavasena, if we accept the view of Mr. Banerji, and Buddhhasena and Jayasena, if we accept the view of Dr. Raychaudhuri) of the same dynasty who were reigning at the time the records were actually drawn up. In the case of the Gupta records, the date in the Gupta Era is used along with the name of the reigning king and not a single record uses an expression like "Chandraguptasya=ātīta-rājye sam."

It is difficult on these grounds to accept either the interpretation of the above dates proposed by Dr. Kielhorn, or the theory of
Dr. Raychaudhuri which is based on it. As regards the latter, it may be pointed out that we have no evidence of the existence of a king named Lakshmanasena, other than the Sena ruler of Bengal, who reigned in Mithilā or the Gayā district, where the Era associated with this name is known to have been in use. We should not, therefore, presume the existence of a new king of that name, until it proves impossible to give a rational interpretation of the association of the well-known king Lakshmanasena with that Era. Further, as early as the fifteenth century A.D., Lakshmanasena of the era is definitely stated to be the lord of Gauḍa.110

The only way by which we can reconcile the known facts is to suppose that the Era was started in Bihar, and though associated with the name of the Sena king Lakshmanasena of Bengal, it was not founded by him; as otherwise it would have been in use also in his home-province of Bengal.

The exact circumstances under which an Era was set up in Bihar and associated with the famous king Laksmanasena of Bengal are not known to us.111 But some plausible suggestions may be offered.

It is probable that when the Pāla kingdom in Gayā was finally destroyed, the people, especially the Buddhists, continued for some time to count their dates with reference to the last Buddhist Pāla king,—Govindapāla. Again when the Muslim invaders destroyed the Hindu kingdoms in Bihar and Bengal, the people, unwilling to refer to the pravardhamāna-vijaya-rājya of the foreign conquerors, counted the dates with reference to the destruction of the last Hindu kingdom.112 Roughly speaking, therefore, the Era referred to in the records of Aśokachalla and Jayasena may be regarded as having started about 1200 A.D.

This is corroborated by the fact that Aśokachalla is mentioned in an inscription found at Gayā and dated in the year 1813 of the Buddhist Nirvāṇa Era.113 It is well-known that the Buddhists of Ceylon have preserved a reckoning according to which the Nirvāṇa Era started in 543 B.C., and no other Nirvāṇa Era is known to have been current in twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D. in India. The influence of the Ceylonese monks in Gayā at this time is indicated by the reference to Siṃhalese community of Buddhist monks at Bodh-Gayā in the inscriptions of Aśokachalla. The village granted, by Jayasena to the Bodh-Gayā temple was for the residence of a Ceylonese monk, and his father Buddhasena made grants to a number of Ceylonese sthaviras at Bodh-Gayā. It is, therefore, natural to
take the year 1813 of the Nirvāṇa Era as equivalent to 1270 A.D. This would fit in with the dates 51 and 74 of Aśokachalla referred to an era commencing about 1200 A.D.

This view did not find favour with most of the scholars who held that Aśokachalla flourished between A.D. 1170 and 1193, and Jayasena, son of Buddhhasena, ruled at Pīṭhī in A.D. 1202-3. But the question has been finally decided by the biography of a Tibetan monk, Dharmasvāmin, who came to India and spent two years (A.D. 1234-6) in Bihar. He met king Buddhhasena of Gayā, described as Pīṭhī-pati. The older views have thus been proved to be wrong and the interpretation of aśa-rajya-samvat, as given above, has been fully justified. This has been acknowledged by Dr. A. S. Altekar who first published the account of Dharmasvāmin.\(^{114}\)

It is interesting to note that eras dating from about the same epoch were current also in Bengal. One of them is known as Balalī San and the other Parganāti San. The epoch of the former falls in A.D. 1199 and that of the latter, 1202-3 A.D. Considering that the known instances of the use of these eras are all of later date, it may be presumed that both these eras commemorated the destruction of the Hindu kingdom in Northern and Western Bengal at about 1200 A.D.\(^{115}\)

The view propounded above does not, however, explain the epoch of the La Samh current in Mithilā, viz. 1119-20 A.D. But here, too, we may trace the same idea of deliberately setting up an artificial era associated with the last Hindu ruler; only, instead of counting from the end of the reign, which always evokes a painful memory, people of a later age counted from his birth. It has been stated by Minhaj that at the time of the Muslim raid on Nadiyā Lakshmaṇasena was eighty years old.\(^{116}\) As the event took place within a few years of 1200 A.D., we may place the birth of Lakshmaṇasena about 1120 A.D., which agrees remarkably well with the epoch of the La Sam suggested by Kielhorn, viz., 1119-20 A.D. It may be a mere coincidence that the birth of Lakshmaṇasena falls in a year with reference to which an era called Lakshmaṇa Samvat is current in Mithilā. But then it must be regarded as a very strange coincidence indeed. On the whole, in the present state of our knowledge this seems to be the least objectionable way of explaining the origin of the La Sam in Mithilā. We must, however, reject the view, held by some, that Vallālasena founded the Era on the occasion of the birth of his son Lakshmaṇasena.\(^{117}\) For then it is very likely that the Era would have gained currency also in Bengal.
The artificial character of the Era, set up at a later time with reference to a past event, perhaps explains the great discrepancy in the initial years of that era as calculated from the different instances of its use. Dr. Kielhorn's conclusion, now generally accepted, that the first year of this era began in A.D. 1119-20, was based on a study of six records where the dates could be verified by astronomical calculations. On the other hand, modern reckoning, current in Mithilā, would place the beginning of La Saṅh in 1108 A.D. Mr. P. N. Misra has shown after an elaborate analysis, that out of sixteen dates of the Lakṣmaṇa Samvat hitherto found with data for verification, only nine dates work out satisfactorily with the epoch 1119-20 A.D., and only ten with the epoch 1107-8 A.D. An analysis of eighteen dates in La Saṅh, occurring along with equivalent dates in Śaka or Samvat or both, gives the following results as to the initial year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial year in A.D.</th>
<th>Number of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explain these discrepancies, Mr. K. P. Jayaswal propounded the view that in the time of Akbar, beginning with 1556 A.D., the Fasli era—a lunar reckoning—was promulgated under the name Saṅh, and since that time ‘La Saṅh received a lunar calculation’ and a ‘fixed figure was deducted from the current Saṅh year to obtain La Saṅh.’ This, in his opinion, explains the varying, gradually increasing, difference in the eighteen La Saṅh years, referred to above. This theory is not, however, borne out by facts as the following examples will show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Saṅh</th>
<th>Year in A.D. as counted by the equivalent Saka era</th>
<th>Differ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 505</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 522</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 614</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 624</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 633</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 727</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it will be seen that in one case (Nos. 1 and 2), within a period of seventeen years, there was a difference of four years in the reckoning of La Sain, whereas in another case (Nos. 3 and 6) there was no difference after an interval of 113 years. Again during ten years (Nos. 3 and 4), the difference was three years, but during the next nine years (Nos. 4 and 5) the difference is one of five years. Besides, the difference is not one of gradual increase or decrease with each passing year, as Nos. 3-6 would show.

Mr. Jayaswal concluded from an examination of the eighteen dates mentioned above that up to 1624 A.D. the dating in La Sain was on the basis of the era commencing in 1119-20 A.D. Indeed this was the most vital part of his theory which sought to explain the discrepancy by the introduction of lunar year in Akbar’s time. But he ignored a verse ascribed to Vidayāpati in which the date of the death of king Devaśimha of Mithilā is given as La Sain 293 and Śaka 1324. This would mean that in the fifteenth century A.D. the initial year of La Sain was reckoned to be 1109 A.D.

Even if we disregard this solitary verse, it is impossible, on the grounds mentioned above, to explain the discrepancy in the initial years of La Sain in the way suggested by Mr. Jayaswal. We must, therefore, hold that the initial year of the Era, as reckoned at different times and places, varied between 1108 and 1120 A.D. This can best be explained on the supposition that the La Sain was an artificial reckoning associated with an event of remote past, the date of which was not definitely known at the time when people first began to use the era. Considering that the error was within a limit of twelve years, the birth of Lakshmanasena may be regarded as the event.
APPENDIX II

THE SUCCESSORS OF LAKSHMANASENA

Reference has been made above (p. 236) to three CP. Grants of the two sons and successors of Lakshmanaśena, namely, Keśavasena and Viśvarūpasena (C. 14, 15, 16). The first two records, however, are marked by a singularity, namely, erasure of the name of the original king engraved on the Plate and the substitution of another in its place. Not much was thought of these erasures till the discovery of the third plate (C. 16), and Dr. D. C. Sircar’s attempt to revolutionise the view about the reigns of Lakshmanaśena and his successors by propounding an ingenious theory124 which, in spite of its novelty and boldness, cannot be ignored, and must be taken into consideration before the discovery of fresh evidence decides the question one way or the other.

Dr. Sircar starts with the proposition that the first two records (C. 14, 15) were originally issued by Sūryasena, son, of Viśvarūpasena, mentioned as Kumāra in the third Plate (C. 16), and the name of Viśvarūpasena was subsequently inserted in place of Sūryasena after erasing the name of the latter. He holds that the Plate No. C. 15 was originally issued by Sūryasena in his second regnal year and the corrections, after erasure, were inserted in the plate in the 14th regnal year of Viśvarūpa himself.125

As regards the Plate No. C. 14, Dr. Sircar thinks that the name of the king has been erroneously read as Keśavasena, whereas it is really Viśvarūpasena, engraved after erasing the name of Sūryasena, exactly as in the case of Plate No. C. 15.126

By way of a plausible explanation of this unusual procedure Dr. Sircar suggests that after Viśvarūpasena had been on the throne for some years, his son Sūryasena was raised to the throne, and after about three years, Viśvarūpasena again became king. In his opinion this may be accounted for by one of the three following circumstances 127:

1. Revolt of Sūryasena and his temporary success.
2. Viśvarūpasena was incapacitated by the attack of a disease from which his recovery was not expected.
3. Captivity of Viśvarūpasena in the hands of his enemies for some years.

Dr. Sircar prefers the second alternative and holds that Sūryasena “ruled at least for about three years since the Idilpur Plate (No. C. 14)
was issued in his 3rd regnal year. The period of the son’s rule seems to have corresponded roughly to the years 11-13 of the father’s reign.”

One may accept as possible all the three eventualities mentioned by Dr. Sircar and even agree with his preference for the second. It is, however, difficult to admit, without positive evidence, that the Secretariat of the Sena kings would fail to realize the absurdity of the whole procedure of the substitution of royal names, particularly, as Dr. Sircar himself points out, when such changes resulted in the victories achieved by Viśvarūpasena in Purī, Vārānasī, and Prayāga being attributed to his father, not to speak of other anomalies and absurdities which have been committed in the process. Further, we are to suppose that the third Copper-plate (C. 16), though engraved after Viśvarūpasena had re-ascended the throne, contains all these absurdities simply because its introductory part “is merely a copy of the modified draft of the introductory section of his son’s records and is not a fresh independent composition.” When we remember that all these irregularities and absurdities could have been easily avoided by simply using a new Copper-plate and discarding the old one, two inevitable conclusions follow, namely, (1) that the Secretariat of the Sena kings was managed by people who lacked common sense not to speak of even a modicum of intelligence; and (2) that their sense of economy bordered on niggardliness, for a new Copper-plate would not have cost much.

While, therefore, we must admit that Dr. Sircar has justly stressed the abnormal features in the two Copper-plate Grants (C. 14, 15) and his view about the non-existence of Keśavasena has a great deal in its favour, his other views, particularly the attribution of the victories in Purī, Vārānasī and Prayāga to Viśvarūpasena rather than to Lakṣmaṇasena, cannot be regarded even as plausible until more positive evidence is forthcoming. It should be remembered that after the conquests of Muhammad-ibn-Bakhtyār Khilji in Bihar and Bengal, and of Shihāb-ud-dīn Muhammad Ghūrī up to Vārānasī in the east—all during the reign of Lakṣmaṇasena—it is hardly conceivable that his son and successor Viśvarūpasena could carry his victorious campaigns to Vārānasī and Prayāga, which is an integral part of the new hypothesis. This fact alone seems to be a very strong argument against the proposed reconstruction of history of the period after the death of Lakṣmaṇasena on the basis of the new interpretation of the three Copper-plate Grants (C. 14, 15, 16).
APPENDIX III

VALLĀLA-CHARITA

The text of Vallāla-charita was edited by भराप्रसाद् शास्त्री and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1904, and an English translation of it by the same scholar was published three years earlier. The work was composed by अनंदभाष्ट्र in 1510 A.D., at the command of the ruler of Navadvīpa named Buddhimanta Khān, an influential Rājā in Bengal. The author, अनंदभाष्ट्र claims to be a descendant of one Anantabhaṣṭ्र, a Brāhmaṇa belonging to Southern India.

Another work bearing the same name and edited by Hārla-candra Kaviratna was published in 1889, but it was pronounced by भराप्रसाद् शास्त्री to be spurious and unreliable. भराप्रसाद् शास्त्री says that he was not without suspicion that the text edited by him might be equally spurious. But on a careful examination of the two manuscripts copied in 1707 A.D. and the Bengali year 1198 (=1790-91 A.D.), he pronounced them to be genuine.

भराप्रसाद् शास्त्री does not say on what grounds he declared the text edited by Kaviratna [to be referred henceforward at Text (i) ] as spurious, but so far as can be judged from the internal evidence, both the texts stand on the same footing, and have drawn upon a common source of floating traditions. The Text (i) is divided into three parts, पूर्वा-क्षण्डम, उत्तरा-क्षण्डम and परिशिष्ठम. The first two are said to have been composed by Gopālabhaṣ्ट्र, a teacher of the Vaidya king Vallālasena, at the command of his royal pupil in Śaka 1300 (Part II. vv. 163-165). The colophon of Part I, however, says that it was composed by Gopālabhaṣ्ट्र and corrected by अनंदभाष्ट्र. The third part was composed by अनंदभाष्ट्र, a descendant of Gopālabhaṣ्ट्र, in 1500 Śaka at the command of the ruler of Navadvīpa (Part III. vv. 39-42). We are told that Gopālabhaṣ्ट्र could not complete the work for fear of punishment by the king (III. 1), and अनंदभाष्ट्र completed the work after the destruction of the Senas (III. 40). This text consists mostly of genealogical topics and the crude accounts of the origin of various castes, but it also gives in a condensed form the main story of Vallāla-charita edited by भराप्रसाद् शास्त्री.
This story may be summed up as follows:

"Once Vallālasena borrowed a crore of Rupees (nishka) from Vallabhānanda, the richest merchant of his time, for the purpose of conquering the king of Udantapura; but repeatedly defeated in battle in the neighbourhood of Mañipur (or Fañipur), he determined to make a grand effort and sent a messenger to Vallabha, who was a resident of Śākakoṭa, demanding a fresh loan. The demand was made with the following preamble: 'Because it has become absolutely necessary for us to march against the country of Kīkata with a grand army composed of six divisions, Vallabha should immediately send a crore and a half of Suvarṇas.' In reply Vallabha agreed to pay the money only if the revenues of Harikelī were assigned to him in payment of the debts. This enraged Vallālasena who forcibly took possession of the wealth of a large number of vanīks (merchants) (Ch. II), and inflicted other hardships on them.

"Later, the vanīks offended the king by refusing to partake of dinner at the palace as no separate place was assigned to the Vaiśyas as distinct from the Sat-Śūdras (Ch. XXI). In this connection it was reported to Vallālasena that 'Vallabha, the leader of all the vanīks, was siding with the Pālas, and he was highly arrogant because the king of Magadha was his son-in-law.' On hearing this report the king became furious and declared that henceforth the Suvarṇa-vanīks should be regarded as Śūdras, and any Brāhmaṇa, who officiates in their ceremonies, teaches them, or accepts gifts from them, will be degraded.

"In retaliation the vanīks got hold of all the slaves by giving twice or thrice the ordinary price, and all the other castes were in great distress for want of servants. Thereupon Vallālasena raised the social status of the Kaivartas and ordered that menial service should be their livelihood. Maheśa, the headman of the Kaivartas, was honoured with the rank and title of Mahāmāndaliṇa. Similarly, the Mālākāras (garland-makers), the Kumbhakāras (potters), and the Karmakāras (blacksmiths) were raised to the status of Sat-Śūdras. Finally, the king ordered that the Suvarṇanavanīks should be deprived of their holy threads. Many vanīks thereupon migrated to other countries. At the same time, observing great irregularities in higher ranks of society, Vallāla consulted those versed in the Vedas, and compelled many Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas to pass through purifying ceremonies. The low Brāhmaṇas, who were traders, were degraded from Brāhmaṇhood altogether (Ch. XXIII)."

It will be clear from the above summary, that like many other similar works composed in the 16th and 17th centuries A.D., Vallāla-charita was written definitely with a view to demonstrating that the Suvarṇa-vanīks occupied a high status in society and were unjustly degraded to the present position by the capricious tyranny of Vallālasena. That Vallāla-charita cannot, therefore, be regarded as an historical text admits of no doubt. On the other hand, there is no reasonable ground for thinking that "it is a modern forgery palmed off on the unsuspecting editor," as Mr. R.D. Banerji says."
We have definite evidence\textsuperscript{138} that true facts of the history of Bengal during the Hindu period were not preserved, at least not available to the general people, in the 16th century A.D., and writers, mostly on social matters, tried to build up an historical account on the basis of current traditions, some of which probably had historical basis. So we may well believe, in the case of \textit{Vallāla-charita}, that it has preserved some genuine traditions, but it is difficult to glean them out of a mass of legends. The caste (Brahmakshatra) and genealogy of the Senas are correctly stated.\textsuperscript{139} The description of Vallālasena as a friend of Choḷaṅga\textsuperscript{140} may be accepted, because we know now that the two were contemporaries. The reference to the war with the Pālas fits in well with the history of the period, and is partly corroborated by the extinction of the Pāla rule in Magadha during the reign of Vallālasena. Further, as noted above,\textsuperscript{141} the reference in \textit{Vallāla-charita} to Vallālasena's expedition against Mithilā is supported by other traditions and historical facts. Finally, it must be admitted that the special favour shown by Vallālasena towards the Kaivartas, who so recently rebelled against the Pālas, and his particular animosity against the Suvārvanānīks who were allies of, and related to, the Pālas, furnished an admirable background to the story in a correct historical setting, and it is difficult to believe that a modern forgerer was capable of doing this, specially before the discovery of \textit{Rāmcharita}. Perhaps the \textit{Vallāla-charita} contains the distorted echo of an internal disruption caused by the partisans of the Pāla dynasty which proved an important factor in the collapse of the Sena rule in Bengal.
APPENDIX IV

MUSLIM INVASION OF BENGAL DURING THE REIGN OF LAKSHMANASENA

The only detailed account of the Muslim invasion of Bengal during the reign of Lakshmanasena is supplied by *Tabaqat-i-Nāṣiri,*¹⁴³ a historical work composed by Maulānā Minhāj-ud-din Abū-Umar-i-Usmān who held various high offices under the Sultans of Delhi. In 639 A.H. (=1241 A.D.), he was appointed Chief Qāzi of the Delhi kingdom and of the capital (p. xxvi). Next year he resigned the post and proceeded to Lakhnawati where he remained for two years (p. xxvii). It was evidently during this period that the author got his information about the history of Bengal chronicled by him. The work was actually composed later, and narrates historical events down to 658 A.H. (=1260 A.D.) (p. xxviii).

After referring to a successful attack on the monastery at the city of Bihār by Muḥammad Bakhtyār¹⁴³ (pp. 551-52), the author narrates a silly anecdote about the birth of Rāe Lakhmanīahl¹⁴⁴ (Lakshmanasena), whose seat of government was the city of ‘Nūdíah,’ and who was a very great ‘Rāe’ and had been on the throne for eighty years (p. 554). The author then proceeds to say that after the final conquest of the province of Bihaṛ¹⁴⁵ by Muḥammad, his fame reached the ears of king Lakshmanasena and his subjects. Then a number of astrologers, wise men, and counsellors advised the king to leave the country as, according to the Śāstras (sacred scriptures), the country would shortly fall into the hands of the Turks (p. 556). On inquiry it was learnt that the external appearance of Muḥammad tallied with the description of the Turkish conqueror as given in the Śāstras (p. 557). Thereupon most of the Brāhmaṇs and wealthy merchants fled to Eastern Bengal, Assam and other places, but Lakshmanasena did not follow their cowardly advice or example (p. 557). What followed may be best described in the author’s own words:

“The following year after that, Muḥammad Bakhtyār caused a force to be prepared, pressed on from Bihaṛ, and suddenly appeared before the city of Nūdíah, in such wise that no more than eighteen horsemen could keep up with him, and the other troops followed after him. On reaching the gate of the city Muḥammad Bakhtyār did not molest any one, and proceeded onwards steadily and sedately,
in such manner that the people of the place imagined that mayhap his party were merchants and 'had brought horses for sale, and did not imagine that it was Muhammad Bakhtyār, until he reached the entrance to the palace of Rāe Lakhmanīāh, when he drew his sword and commenced an onslaught on the unbelievers.' (p. 557).

Lakshmanasena was taking his meals "when a cry arose from the gateway of the Rāe's palace and the interior of the city" (p. 557). The cry from the city certainly indicates that the main army of Muhammad or at least a considerable portion of it had already entered into the city. By the time Lakshmanasena realised the actual state of affairs.

"Muhammad Bakhtyār had dashed forwards through the gateway into the palace, and had put several persons to the sword. The Rāe fled barefooted by the back part of his palace.........When the whole of Muhammad Bakhtyār's army arrived, and the city and round about had been taken possession of, he there took up his quarters; and Rāe Lakhmanīāh got away towards Sankanāţâa and Bang, and there the period of his reign shortly afterwards came to a termination. His descendants, up to this time, are rulers in the country of Bang" (p. 558).

"After Muhammad Bakhtyār possessed himself of that territory (Rāe Lakhmanīāh's), he left the city of Nadiyā in desolation, and the place which is (now) Lakhnawati he made the seat of Government" (p. 559).

It is obvious from the above account that Muhammad Bakhtyār made a sudden raid upon the city of Nadiyā where Lakshmanasena was staying. He evidently came by an unexpected route by forced marches. The story of Minhāj has given rise to the popular myth of the conquest of Bengal by eighteen Muslims. But even Minhāj says no such thing. Although only eighteen horsemen, according to him, formed the party of Muhammad when he entered the city, the main part of his army followed him at a short distance, and had penetrated into the interior of the city before the general reached the palace and unsheathed his sword. The entire army was in the city before the raid was over.

The story of the unopposed entry of Muhammad and his eighteen followers into the city raises grave doubts about the truth of the details of the campaign. At a time when Nadiyā was apprehending an attack from the Turks, it is difficult to believe that the royal officers would remain ignorant of the movements of Muhammad even when he had crossed the frontiers of the Sena kingdom, and would readily admit a band of foreigners without any question. It would further appear from Minhāj's account that there was no
military engagement even when the main army arrived. Indeed Minhāj would have us believe that the capital city of the Senas surrendered without a blow and there was neither any army nor a general to defend it. It is admitted by Minhāj himself, that for nearly half a century after the raid the descendants of Lakshmaṇasena continued to rule in East Bengal. If the Sena political organisation could survive the occupation of half their kingdom by the Turks, and their army was strong enough to fight for half a century the Turkish power entrenched at their very door, it is difficult to accept the story of the fall of Nadiyā which presupposes a complete collapse of civil and military organisation of the Senas. It is very likely that the Senas were expecting Muhammad to advance from Bihar along the Ganges through the mountain passes near Rājmahal, and their main forces were posted there to intercept him when, by following unfrequented routes through the hills and jungles of Santal Parganas Muhammad emerged into the plains of Bengal, and by forced marches reached Nadiyā before the news of his invasion could reach the main Sena army. But even making due allowance for such a strategy, and the inefficiency of the intelligence department of the Sena kings, it is difficult to believe that even the most ordinary precautions were not taken to defend the capital city, specially when the king himself was staying there. Minhāj himself tells us that for about a year Nadiyā was fearing a Turkish invasion, and hence a large number of its inhabitants had left the city. Yet we are to believe that the old king, who bravely chose to remain in the capital city, made absolutely no preparation for its defence, and the enemy had not to unsheathe their swords before they entered within its gates and began to massacre its inhabitants.

On the other hand, considering the antecedents of Minhāj, and the general nature of his historical work, it is hard to dismiss his account as a pure invention. The fact seems to be that he had no access to the contemporary official records, if there were any, in respect of Muhammad's campaign in Bengal and Bihar. The absence of such records is easily explained when we remember that Muhammad was not an agent of the Delhi government, and no regular account of his expedition was likely to be preserved in the archives of Delhi. Nor did Muhammad found a royal dynasty in Bengal which could be expected to keep a systematic account of the career of that great adventurer. Minhāj was accordingly obliged to derive his account of the conquest of Bengal and Bihar
from the oral evidence of persons nearly half a century after the events had taken place. In the case of Bihar, he tells us that he had the opportunity of meeting two old soldiers who took part in the expedition (p. 552). In the case of the raid on Nadiyā, Minhāj had evidently no such source, and, as he tells us, he got his information from 'trustworthy persons.' The mental calibre of these 'trustworthy persons' may be judged from the silly stories they told him about the birth of Lakshmanasena and the astrologers' prediction about the impending invasion of the Turks. The lack of their historical knowledge is also proved by the statement that Lakshmanasena reigned for eighty years, which is palpably absurd. More than forty years had passed since the raid of Nadiyā and the establishment of the Muslim rule, and the story of the first Muslim conquest must have been embellished by popular imagination and the fire-side tales of old soldiers who naturally distorted the accounts of the old campaigns in order to paint in glowing colours their own valour and heroism. That various legends were current about this expedition is proved by the silly story recorded a century later by the author of Futuh-us-sālātīn, who did not evidently believe the account of Minhāj. It is probable that similar other stories were also current. Considering the materials on which Minhāj had to rely, we can hardly blame him for his account, but cannot certainly accept it in all its details, specially when these are in conflict with the probable and commonsense view of things. That Nadiyā was the first conquest of Muhammad Bakhtyar may be readily accepted as a fact, but the details of the campaign must be taken with a great deal of reserve.

Even if we take the account of Minhāj at its face value, it is impossible to subscribe to the popular view that Lakshmanasena's cowardice was mainly responsible for the Muslim conquest of Bengal. The old king certainly showed more courage and determination than his subjects who deserted the city of Nadiyā in panic as soon as they heard of Muhammad's expedition in Bihar. He displayed greater wisdom, rationality and statesmanship than his counsellors who advised him to leave the country on the pretext that it was ordained in the Śāstras that this country would fall into the hands of the Turks. If he really fled from Nadiyā barefooted, it was only after the invaders had already taken possession of the city and a hostile force had actually entered into the palace. It is difficult to imagine what other course was open to him. If the
story is true in all its details, which there are grave reasons to doubt, the judgment of posterity must go against the generals and ministers of State who either betrayed their king and master, or were guilty of culpable negligence in performing duties entrusted to them. The incidents of the Nadiyā raid, even as described by Minhāj, do not diminish in any way the credit for bravery and heroism which is justly due to the king who displayed his courage and military skill in numerous battlefields in Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, and Assam, and had led his victorious army as far as Banaras and Allahabad. Minhāj, obviously echoing the popular notion current even forty years later, has described Lakshmanaṣena as a ‘very great Rāe (king)’ (p. 554), and it was reserved for poets, artists and historians of our own time to tarnish the name and fame of this great king. The author of a thesis approved for the Ph. D. Degree of London University has even gone so far as to assert, with reference to Lakshmanaṣena’s pillars of victories in Banaras and Allahabad, that in view of “Lakshmanaṣena’s craven flight without offering any resistance to the small force led by Bakhtyār Khilji,” we may unhesitatingly say that “the monuments of his greatness never existed elsewhere than in the poet’s imagination.” Such statements need no comment.

It is interesting to quote, in this connection, the following appreciation of Lakshmanaṣena by Minhāj:

“Trustworthy persons have related to this effect, that little or much, never did any tyranny proceed from his hand........The least gift he used to bestow was a lak of kaufis. The Almighty mitigate his punishment (in hell)!” (p. 555-56).

Thus although Minhāj knew better than modern authors of the details of the “craven flight,” he did not hesitate to bestow high praises upon Lakshmanaṣena. He even compared him with the great Sultan Qutb-ud-din, and prayed to God to mitigate his punishment in hell, a very unusual concession for a Muslim writer in respect of a Hindu ruler.

On the whole, in spite of the account of Minhāj, which must be regarded as of doubtful value, Lakshmanaṣena must be regarded as a great king endowed with manifold virtues. A brave warrior and a powerful ruler, he was at the same time a poet and a great patron of arts and letters: and his fame for charity and other personal virtues was long cherished with affection undiminished even by the
grim tragedy which overtook him and his kingdom towards the close of his life.

The exact date of the raid on Nadiyā is a subject of keen controversy among scholars and cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. There is, however, a general consensus of opinion that it took place shortly before or after 1200 A.D. Now a verse in Seka-kubhodayā gives the date of the expedition as 1124 Šaka = 1202 A.D.\textsuperscript{152} and the same date is given in Pag Sam Jon Zang.\textsuperscript{153} We may, therefore, provisionally accept this date for the Muslim conquest of Nadiyā.\textsuperscript{154}
APPENDIX V

TRADITIONAL ACCOUNT OF THE LATER SENA KINGS OF BENGAL

Traditions have preserved the names of various kings who succeeded Lakshmanaśena. But they possess very little historical value. This will be evident from the genealogy of the Sena kings preserved in Rājāvalī, one of the best texts of this kind. It begins with Dhīsena, daughter's son of king Jagaptāla of Rāḍhā, which was then subordinate to the empire of Delhi. Dhīsena, having become king of Rāḍhā, Vaṅga, Gauḍa and Varendra, easily obtained the throne of Delhi when his suzerain retired to forest. As he gained the empire without contest he became known as Vijayasena. Having himself become lord of Delhi, he made his eldest son Śukasena, ruler of Rāḍhā etc. Śukasena ruled for three years, and was succeeded by his younger brother Vallālasena, who ruled for twelve years (presumably at Rāḍhā). Then Vallālasena's son Lakshmaṇasena became ruler of Delhi and made his younger brother Keśava, ruler of Rāḍhā etc. Lakshmaṇasena ruled as suzerain for ten years and his successors ruled as suzerains in Delhi and subordinate rulers in Rāḍhā etc., as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suzerains of Delhi</th>
<th>Rulers of Rāḍhā etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keśava</td>
<td>1. Mādhava (son of Keśava)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mādhava</td>
<td>2. Sadāsena (younger brother of Mādhava)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Śūrasena</td>
<td>3. Jayasena (son of Nārāyaṇa-sena, No. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bhīmasena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kārtika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Harisena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Śatrughna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nārāyaṇasena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lakshmaṇa II</td>
<td>(36 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dāmodara</td>
<td>(11 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dāmodara was dethroned by the Chauhān ruler Dvīpāśīha. He and his five successors ruled in Delhi for 150 years, when the last of them, Prithurāja was killed by Yavana Shāhāb-ud-din who became ruler of Delhi.

An account like this is a travesty of history, and does not deserve serious consideration even though it may contain some real historical names. The account of the Sena kings given in Ain-i-Akbari is presumably based upon a text like this, for 'Madhu Sen and Sadā
Sen' mentioned in it are evidently same as the two kings of Rāṉā, Mādhava and Sadāsena, mentioned in the above genealogical list, while 'Kesu Sen and Raja Naujah (Nārāyaṇ)' probably represent Kesāva and Nārāyaṇasena. Madhusena and Naujah may also refer to kings Madhusena (p.238) and Danuja-Mādhava-Dāsaratha referred to in Ch. VIII, Section I.

The account of Tāranātha is equally disappointing. He mentions four early Sena kings, Lavasena, Kāsasena, Manitasena, and Rāthikasena, who together ruled for about eighty years. They were followed by the four kings Lavasena, Buddhāsena, Haritasena and Pratītāsena, who were minor kings, subordinate to the Turushkas. None of these can be safely regarded as a member of the Sena family ruling in Vaṅga after Lakṣmanaśena.

An echo of the final conquest of the Sena territory in Eastern Bengal by the Muslims is perhaps preserved in the tradition about Vallālasena's fight with Vāyādumba. The story is preserved in various forms, and the one given in Vallāla-charita may be regarded as typical of the rest. It may be summed up as follows.

"King Vallālasena banished Dharmagiri, the Mohant (chief priest) of a Śaiva temple at Mahāsthāna, with all his followers, as the latter had insulted the royal priest. Bent upon revenge, Dharmagiri approached Vāyādumba, the lord of the Mlechchhas, and induced him to attack Vikramapura. When Vallāla went to fight, he took a couple of pigeons with him. He told the queen and other members of his family that the return of the pigeons without him would imply his defeat and death, and then they should save their honour by throwing themselves into fire. In the fiercely contested battle that followed, Vallāla gained a complete victory and the Mlechcha army was routed. But unfortunately the pigeons flew away from the cage, and the queens, on seeing them return without the king, threw themselves into fire. As soon as the king saw the cage empty, he hastened towards his capital Rāmapāla, but he was too late. Unable to bear the misery Vallāla also jumped into the fire."

Now, such a story cannot be true of Vallālasena, as the Muslims never approached Vikramapura or Rāmapāla during his reign. So it has been taken to refer to Vallālasena II, who is mentioned as having ruled in 1312 A.D. in a text called Viprakalpa-latikā. But the account, specially the date and genealogy, contained in this book may hardly be relied upon. Dr. James Buchanan heard the story in 1809, but it referred not to Vallālasena, but to Susena, the last king of the Sena dynasty. In any case, it is difficult to derive any historical conclusion from stories of this kind. It is not necessary to refer to similar other stories preserved in old Bengali works.
APPENDIX VI

THE CAPITAL OF THE SENA KINGS

Like the Palas, the Sena kings also seem to have several capitals in Bengal.¹⁶⁰ The most important of them seems to have been Vikramapura near Dacca in East Bengal. Apart from traditions, associating local ruins with Vallālasena, it is a noteworthy fact that the two known Grants of Vijayasena and Vallālasena, and all the five Grants of Lakshmanaśasena dated within the first six years of his reign, were issued from the royal camp at Vikramapura. It was again in this city that the chief queen of Vijayasena performed the elaborate Tulāpurusha Mahādāna.¹⁶¹ As Mr. N. G. Majumdar justly pointed out, it proves that Vikramapura cannot be regarded as a temporary camp, but Vijayasena had something like a permanent residence there.¹⁶²

It is to be noted, however, that the two later Grants of Lakshmanaśasena, and those of his successors, are issued, not from Vikramapura, but respectively from Dhāryagrāma and Phalgugrāma, none of which can be identified. Whether it is merely accidental, or indicates a definite abandonment of Vikramapura as the capital, it is difficult to say. At present an extensive area in the Munshiganj sub-division (Dacca district) is known as Vikramapura. A village called Vikramapura is mentioned in old records, but it has completely disappeared.

Gauḍa was another capital city at least from the time of Lakshmanaśasena. As already noted above, it was probably named Lakshmanaśvatī after Lakshmanaśasena, in imitation of Rāmāvatī founded by Rāmapāla. The Muslims fixed their capital in this city.

Nadiyā is described in Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī as another city of royal residence, during the reign of Lakshmanaśasena.¹⁶³ Mr. R. D. Banerji very emphatically maintained, as one of the grounds of discrediting the accounts of Tabaqāt, that there was no evidence that Nadiyā was ever the capital of the Sena kings.¹⁶⁴ But Nadiyā is referred to as one of the capitals of the Sena kings in the genealogical treatises (kulajis) in Bengal.¹⁶⁵ It is true that these accounts cannot be regarded as of great historical value unless corroborated by other evidence, but the Tabaqāt seems to confirm their statement. In the Pavanadūta of Dhoyī, Vijayapura on the Ganges is referred to as
the capital of Lakshmipatasinga. Mr. M. Chakravarti identifies it with Nadiyā, which agrees well with the directions contained in the poem. Mr. R. P. Chanda identifies it with Vijayanagar, about 10 miles to the west of Rampur-Boalia, the headquarters of the Rajshahi district. But as Vijayapura is mentioned immediately after the description of Triveni-sahgama and there is no reference to the crossing of the river, its identification with Nadiyā appears to be preferable.
Footnotes

1 The original expression is "Dākṣiṇātya-kshaṇḍendra." Mr. N. G. Majumdar (IB. 50) translates it as "kings of the Deccan." I have followed Kielhorn (EI. I. 305).

2 Dr. D. C. Ganguly maintains that v. 8 of the Deopārā Ins. "does not indicate that the fight between Sāmantsena and the despoiler of the Lakhṣmī of the Karpāṭa country took place in the Karpāṭa country. It simply means that Sāmantsena vanquished a king or a freebooter, who had already plundered the Karpāṭa country." Later he suggests that possibly Rājendra Chola, who had already defeated the Karpāṭa king, was repulsed by Sāmantsena somewhere in Northern Rāḍhā in which the latter's kingdom was situated (IHQ. XII. 611-12).

Dr. Ganguly overlooks the very significant statement (v. 1) of the poet that Sāmantsena slaughtered the hostile soldiers to such an extent that the lord of goblins did not leave the southern quarter. This undoubtedly implies that the dead bodies of the enemy's soldiers lay in the south, and therefore the battle also must have been waged in that region. The same inference may be made from the other statement (v. 5) of the poet that war-ballads were sung in honour of Sāmantsena near Setubandha Rāmeśvara. Reference like this indicates a region near the battlefield (cf. e.g., Apsad Stone Ins. I. 11. CII. III. 203).

3 Mr. G. M. Sarkar holds a diametrically opposite view to that of Dr. Ganguly. He maintains "that Sāmantsena's activity was confined only to the southern region," and that he "was in no way connected with any part of Bengal" (JL. XVI. 6, 8).

4 In Barrackpur cp., v. 3 (IB. 61-62, 64), and Mādhainagar cp., v. 3 (IB. 110, 113), the predecessors of Sāmantsena are called kings in a general way. In Naihati cp. (v. 3) alone (IB. 71-72, 76), these princes are specifically said to have adorned Rāḍhā. It is, therefore, difficult to conclude definitely, as Dr. D. C. Ganguly has done, that the forefathers of Sāmantsena were royal personages in the Deccan (IHQ. XII. 611).

5 Deopārā Ins. v. 5 (IB. 46).

6 Mādhainagar cp. v. 4 (IB. 110).

7 Barrackpur cp. v. 4 (IB. 62).

8 IB. 44 and f.n. 3, App. p. 192.

9 Deopārā Ins. v. 5, (IB. 46, 50-51).

10 v. 3, (IB. 109-110, 113).

11 For a fuller discussion of this matter cf. PTOC. II. Calcutta (1922), pp. 343 ff. For Chandra-kavīṭūnva, cf. EI. XVI. 55. Winternitz refers to a Jainā Kāṇakasena (10th cent. A. D.) as the author of Yaśodhara-charita (Hist. Ind. Lit. II. 338). Cf. also ASI. 1921-22, p. 114; Ep. Car. IX. 145, Ins. Nos. 69, 70; p. 173, No. 34. It must be understood that even if this theory be adopted, it leaves open the question whether the priestly family took to Kshatriya profession before or after its migration to Bengal.

12 The Khālimpur cp. of Dharmapāla does not contain any such phrase, but it occurs in the Nālandā cp. of the same king (EI. XXIII. 290). It is interesting to note, however, that Karpāṭa is omitted from this list.
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28 Supra pp. 140, 152.
29 BG. Vol. 1, Part II. p. 452.
30 Ibid. p. 219.
31 Ibid. p. 452.
32 Ins. of Devanagere Taluq, Nos. 2, 3. Ep. Carn. XI.
33 JBoBrRAS. XI. 268.
34 Ablur Ins. I. 51 (EI. V. 257).
35 Madaghal Ins. vv. 12-16 (EI. XV. 315).
36 IHQ. VII. 681 ff.
37 PB. 99.
38 JBOBRS. IX. 306.
39 Cf. IHQ. XII. 475-76.
40 The date of the Barrackpur cp. (1. 49) was read by Mr. R. D. Banerji first as 37 (PB. 105), then as 31 (BI. 292), and finally as 32 (EI. XV. 284). Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya proposed the reading 61 (IA. LI. 157), on grounds which cannot be regarded as conclusive. Mr. N.G. Majumdar subsequently read the date as 62 (IB. 65) without giving any reason why he differed from Mr. Banerji. Although Mr. N. G. Majumdar’s view is now generally accepted, and Vijayasena is credited with a long reign of at least 62 years, the matter cannot be regarded as finally settled (Cf. JRASBL. VII. 217; also p. 242 infra.) although Dr. D. C. Sircar, the latest writer on the subject, categorically states that the correct reading is certainly 62 (Ep. Ind. XXX, p. 80, f. n. 1).
41 Barrackpur cp. v. 7 (IB. 62). In Naihati cp. v. 10 (IB. 72-73), Vilāsadevi is called Pradhānā-mahishī.
42 Raṇasūra is mentioned as ruler of Dakshiṇa-Rādhā in the Ins. of Rājendra Chōla (supra p. 133). Lakshmīsūra, the ruler of Apara-Mandāra, was one of the allied chiefs who joined Rāmapāla in his war against Bhīma (supra p. 148).
43 IHQ. VII. 679 ff.
44 Supra pp. 221-2.
45 This is based on the view that he ruled for 62 years.
46 Cf. App. III. infra.
47 For the identifications proposed, cf. IB. 45.
48 For a detailed account cf. IHQ. VII. 679 ff. Dr. K. C. Pandey has pointed out that as Abhinavagupta refers to Nānyadeva and quotes a passage from his commentary, this Nānyadeva must have flourished before 1014-15 A.D., the date of one of Abhinavagupta’s works [Abhinavagupta—An Historical and Philosophical Study (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series) pp. 121-23]. This point undoubtedly requires further investigation, but as no other Nānya, king of Mithilā and belonging to the Karṇa family, is known to us, we have accepted the identity of the two and fixed his date on the basis of more reliable data.
49 La Sani or Lakshmanaśena Era has been current in Mithilā. According to Lāhubbhārata (Part II, p. 140. JASB. LXV. 26) Vallālasena undertook a military expedition to Mithilā. As he is said to have heard on the way the news of the birth of his son Lakshmanaśena, the expedition evidently took place during the reign of Vijayasena. The Mithilā expedition is also referred to in Vallāla-charita (Ch. XXVII. vv. 1-8) in which it is distinctly said that Vallāla accompanied his father and obtained victory. According to traditions current in Bengal, Mithilā was one of the five provinces of the kingdom of
Vallālasena (Vallāla-charita, I. 8). He is definitely known to have ruled over some parts of Bihar (Ins. No. C. 9).

It is said in the Mādhāinagar (C. 13) and Bhowal cp. (C. 12) that Lakshmanāsena suddenly seized the goddess of fortune of the king of Gauḍa, while he was a Kumāra, and sported with the women of Kaliṅga while he was young. It would thus appear that Lakshmanāsena undertook an expedition against Gauḍa even before he attained his full youth.

It has been suggested (DHNI. I. 259-60) that the adversary was Rāyārideva who is mentioned in Tezpur Plate as having defeated the force of a king of Vaṅga (EI. V. 186). But most probably Rāyārideva fought as a feudatory of the king of Kāmarūpa (HK. 197).

Edilpur cp. v. 13. (IB. 122, 128).

This appears very probable from the statement referred to in f.n. 35.

Cf. IC. II. 578. Bhandarkar identifies Vijaya of the Praśasti with Vijayachandra, father of Jayachandra of Kanauj (IA. 1913, p. 84). But the ‘Gauḍa royal family’ almost certainly refers to the Senas, and Śrīharsha was a contemporary of Vijayasena. Gopinatha Acharya, in his commentary on Naśadhāhya explains Vijaya-prāṣasti as the prāṣasti of the king of Gauḍa named Vijayasena [for this and other evidences, cf. Nalininath Das Gupta, Purātanī (in Bengali) pp. 48-53].

IB. 174.

Cf. Appendix iii. infra. p. 251.

Cf. f.n. 34.

After Nānyadeva, the next king of the Karṇāṭa-kula, authentically recorded, is Harasiṃhadeva ruling in 1314 A.D. (JASB. N. S. XI. 410-11; cf. DHNI. I. 205-6).

For a fuller account cf. Ch. xi. Section 3.

Mādhāinagar cp. v. 9 (IB. 110).

Cf. e. g., Vallāla-charita, Ch. i. v. 8. The authenticity of this work is questionable, and it is difficult to say whether the tradition is old and genuine (See App. iii. infra).

The identification proposed by Cunningham (ASC. XV. 145-46) is now generally accepted. Dr. S. N. Majumdar derived the name from Vyāghraṇātī (Cunningham’s Geography, Ed. by S. N. Majumdar, p. 731), referred to as a maṇḍala in the Puṇḍaravardhana-bhukti in the Khalimpur cp. of Dharmapāla (Ins. B. No. 2) and also mentioned in the Nālandā cp. of Devapāla (B. No. 7) and the Ānuli cp. of Lakshmanasena (C. 9). The derivation, though probable, is not certain. But Southern Bengal, where Bāɡḍī or Vyāghraṇātī is located, was included in Vaṅga or Vaṅgāla.

For a detailed account of Bāɡḍī-mahāl and its later history cf. JASB. N. S. XII 49.

In Rennell’s Atlas, Plate No. vi, “Bagree” is shown as a large tract of country in Vishnupur and Midnapur, between the Rupnarayan and Cossai rivers.

The verses in Bombay ms. (GR. 63) are somewhat different from those in Muralidhar Jha’s edition (IB. 174). The general sense, however, is clear.

IC. IV. 231.

JRAS. *1930, pp. 5-9.
It is to be noted, however, that the representation of Sadāśiva on the royal seal was continued.

Two stanzas of Umāpatidhara refer to the victories against Prāgjayotisha (i.e., Kāmarūpa or Assam) and Kāśi (JASB. N. S. II. 161). A verse of Śaraṇa also mentions the conquest of Gauḍa, Kaliṅga, Kāmarūpa, Kāśi and Magadha, and victory against the Chedi king and a Mlechchha ruler (JASB. N.S. II. 174). The name of the victorious king is not mentioned in any of these poems, but as the authors lived in the court of Lakshmanaṣena, and the conquest of Kāmarūpa, Kāśi, Kaliṅga and Gauḍa are ascribed to that king in the inscriptions, he may be regarded as the hero lauded by the poets. In that case the defeat of the Mlechchha king most probably refers to a conflict with the Muslim invaders. Mr. J. M. Roy, however, records a tradition that the Mags of Arakan claimed suzerainty over Bengal during the reign of Galaya (1133-1153 A.D.) and is of opinion that there was probably a conflict between Lakshmanaṣena and the Mags (Ihākār Itiḥāsa, II. 366).


LA. XVIII. 129; DHNI. I. 537-38.

IHQ. V. 14. The date of this grant is expressed in words as v.s. 124x, the word for the unit figure being lost. It might then be any year between 1240 and 1249 v.s. (1183-1192 A.D.).

For a full discussion on this point cf. JASB. N. S. XVII. 8 ff. and also Appendix infra.

JASB. N. S. XVII. 14.


IHQ. X. 321 ff. Ep. Ind. XXVII. 119; XXX. 42. The name of the chief is given as Śrī-Đommanapāla. I suggested in a letter to one of the editors that the name should be read as Śrīma (d)-Đommanapāla. The same suggestion has been made by Dr. D. C. Sircar (IC. I. 679). Dr. Sircar seems to imply (Ibid. p. 680, f.n. 2) that Đommanapāla was a feudal chief of Lakshmanaṣena, but the whole tenor of the inscription leaves no doubt that Đommanapāla was for all practical purposes an independent chief. I agree with Dr. Sircar that the word Mahārājādhirāja in 1,2 is an epithet of Đommanapāla, and should not be construed, as the editors have done, with vipaksha to indicate that Đommanapāla was hostile to the Mahārājādhirāja i.e., his suzerain ruler. Such an interpretation would be most curious, to say the least of it.

The inscription tells us that the Pāla family to which Đommanapāla belonged migrated from Ayodhyā (IC. I. 679, II. 151, 158.) and acquired the possession (upārjjita) of Pūrva-khaṭikā, whether by conquest or other means, it is not clear. It refers to only two rulers. The proper name of the first ruler cannot be read in full. It begins with Śrī and ends in -pāladeva, with about three letters missing or indistinct after Śrī. The first of these letters has been read as Śrī, but looks more like Gṛī. The next letter has been peeled off, and the following one is almost certainly la. This person is styled Parama-Māheśvara, Mahāmāṇḍalika. He was succeeded by Đommanapāla, who is called Mahāsāmanta-dhipati, Mahārājādhirāja, and something else which is not clearly intelligible.
Whether the family was connected in any way with the Pala rulers of Bengal it is impossible to say. It is very likely that Dommanapāla, son of a provincial Governor or feudal chief under the Senas, assumed independence and founded a principality in eastern Khāḍī which is now represented by the Sundarbans where the plate was found. The subsequent history of the family is unknown.

For an account of the Deva family, Cf. Ch. viii § 1 infra.

Rādhā was not conquered by the Muslims till 1255 A.D. and formed a battleground between them and the rulers of Orissa (H.B. ii. 50).

According to Tabugāt-i-Nāsirī, Lakshmanasena died shortly after the raid on Nadiyā (p. 558). But the colophon of Sadukti-karnāmottara refers to Lakshmanasena as the ruling king in A.D. 1205 (IHQ. III. 188).

This and the account that follows represent the current view. For a very different reconstruction of the history of the period after Lakshmanasena, cf. Appendix II of this chapter.

As both of them granted land in Vikramapura they evidently ruled in the same region, one after the other.

Madhyapāda (Calcutta Sahitya Parishat) cp. (C. 16). This is not dated but in 1.58 it refers to a grant made in year 14. So it must have been engraved in year 14 or later.

Mr. R. D. Banerji came to this conclusion on the ground that the grant of Kēsāvasena contained all the verses found in the Madanapāda Grant of Viśvarūpasena and some additional verses (JASB. N. S. X. 98). But the Madhyapāda cp. of Viśvarūpasena, which has since been discovered, contains these additional verses (IB. 140 ff). The real ground for regarding Viśvarūpasena as the elder brother and predecessor of Kēsāvasena is v. 10 of Edilpur cp. I agree with Mr. N. G. Majumdar's interpretation of this verse (IB. 127; cf. also p. 120), according to which it contains a reference to king Viśvarūpasena and he must, therefore, have preceded Kēsāvasena who issued the Edilpur cp.

v. 21 of Edilpur cp. (IB. 123-24); v. 17 of Madanapāda cp. (IB. 125).

This was the reading of James Prinsep in 1838 (JASB. VII. 43 ff). As the plate is lost and the facsimile published by Prinsep (in which some spots were retouched by him) is the only available reproduction of the record, it is difficult to be sure of the reading. As this verse is reproduced in Madanapāda cp. where the corresponding word reads clearly as 'sagarga,' it is very probable that Prinsep misread this word as 'saganda.' Mr. N. G. Majumdar in his edition of Edilpur cp. accepts the word as 'sagarga' (IB. 124).

Mr. Jayaswal took 'Garga' to mean 'Garjha' i.e., Gharjistan and held that Kēsāvasena defeated Muslim raiders led by Muhammad Ghori (JBOHS. 1918, p. 171). This is, however, a pure guess.

p. 558. As the author refers to events of 658 A.H. (1260 A.D.), the work must have been finished in or after that year. He visited Lakhnavati between 640 and 643 A.H. (1242-1245 A.D.) and it is just possible that his statement about Lakshmanasena's descendants ruling in Bengal may refer to this period.

Cf. HB. II, 51-52.

Madhyapāda (Sahitya Parishat) cp. ll. 54, 57-58 (IB. 147). MM. Sastri read the first name as Sadāsena (IHQ. II. 77).

Cf. f.n. 71.
For an account of the Sena kings preserved in Bengali traditions see App. v. N. Vasu refers to a king called Mādhavasena who issued a Grant in Saka 1145 (=1223 A.D.). He says that a facsimile of the plate is given on p. 516 of Atkinson's Kumayun (JASB. LXV.28). But this book, consisting of only 48 pages, contains no reference to the king or the cp. Atkinson, however, refers elsewhere to "an inscription at the great temple of Jageswar beyond Almora which, though very imperfect, allows the name Mādhavasena to be read." (Notes on the History of the Himalaya of the N. W. P. of India, Ch. iii. 50, iv. 15). No facsimile of the inscription is given, and Atkinson assigns the date 1123 A.D. to this king on the authority of Prinsep. It is difficult to regard Mādhavasena as a Sena king of Bengal on the basis of Atkinson's statement or the tradition that chiefs of Sukhet and Mandi were descended from Sena kings. A verse of Mādhavasena is quoted in Saduktī-karṇāmṛita (JASB. N.S. II. 172) and he may belong to the royal Sena family. But we have as yet no definite evidence of it.

Supra. p. 234.

For a detailed account with reference to authorities cf. Chap. viii. § ii.

Cf. Chap. viii. § i.

The colophon runs thus: "Parameśvara-parama-saugata-parama-rājādhīrāja-
Śrīmādh-Gaṇḍēśvara-Madhusena-devakīnāṁ pravardhanāna-vijayarājye yatrānu-
kenāpi Śaka-narapaṭeḥ Śakābdāḥ 1211 Bhādra di 2." MM. H. P. Āstrī who has given an account of the mss (Sastri Cat. i. 117; Entry No. 77. MS. No. 4078) wrongly read parama-mahārajādhirāja.' He also read; 'Śrīmān-
Gaṇḍēśvara.' There seems to be a letter after Madhusena, which MM. Āstrī ignores and I am unable to read. Perhaps, N. Vasu had this Madhusena in mind when he stated that one Madhusena is referred to in a manuscript as having ruled in Vikramapura in A.D. 1272 (VJI. 358).

The name of a king of Bengal named Chandrasena is said to have been mentioned in a Sanskrit Ins., which is now broken up and built into a mosque at Mangalkot in the Katwa sub-division of Burdwan district [AS(E). 1911-12, p. 8, para 9]. No further account of this inscription or of the king has appeared as yet.

This view was propounded by Kielhorn (IA. XIX. 1ff.). Its staunchest supporter was Mr. R. D. Banerji (JASB. IX. 271 ff. and numerous other articles). It was followed by Mr. S. Kumar (IA. 1915, pp. 215. ff.), Mr. N. G. Majumdar (IA. 1919, pp. 171-76) and Mr. K. P. Jayaswal (JBOSS. IV. 267) among others.

The date of the commencement of Adbhutasāgara is given as 1090 Śaka (1168 A.D.) in the Bombay mss. of that work (Bhandarkar's Report on the Search for Sanskrit mss. during 1887-88, and 1890-91, p. LXXV), and as 1089 Śaka (1167 A.D.) in the text edited by Muralidhar Jha (Prabhakari Co., Benares 1905).

JASB. N. S. XVII(1921), pp. 7-16. The passages in the literary works of Vallālasena, and a detailed discussion of Mr. R. D. Banerji's views will be found there. Some passages were originally noticed by Mr. Manomohan Chakravarti (JASB. 1906, p. 17) and discussed by Mr. Banerji (JASB. N. S. IX. 277). Other passages were noted and discussed by Mr. Chintaharan Chakravarti (IHQ. III. 186; v. 133) and Mr D.C. Bhattacharya (IHQ. III. 547 ff.; IA. LI. 145 ff).

IHQ. III. 188.
**IHQ.** III. 574 ff.; v. 133-35; *JRAS.* 1930, 3 ff.; *IA.* LI. 145 ff. 153 ff.

88 P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I, p. 300. Tadaramal's reference to Vallālasena ruling in 1160-61 A.D. takes away the force of the argument based on Abu-’l-Fazl's statement in *Akbarnamā* (ii. 13) that the *La Saṁ* commemorates the accession of Lakshmanaśena in 1119 A.D.

89 *JASB.* N. S. XI. 347.

90 *IC.* IV. 227.

88 *ABI.* XIII. 217.

89 Cf. above, f.n. 25.

This is the view of Mr. Manomohan Chakravarti (*op. cit.*), R. P. Chanda (GR. 62) and Mr. J. C. Ghosh (*IC.* IV. 228).

91 *JASB.* N. S. XVII. 11, f.n. 6.

90 *IC.* IV. 228-29.

92 *Ibid.* It is curious to note that Mr. C. C. Das Gupta gives 1157 A.D. as the beginning of Vallālasena's reign, although, like Mr. Ghosh, he bases his argument on the astronomical data furnished by the Naihati copper-plate and cites the authority of S. Pillai (*ABI.* XIII. 215-16.).

91 *IHQ.* III. 188.

93 *JL.* XVI. 18-19; cf. also *IC.* IV. 231.

94 For he would be aged 91 in 1211 A.D. which, according to the second view, would correspond to his 27th regnal year when the Bhāwal cp. was issued.

95 *EI.* XXI. 215-16; *IC.* IV. 231.

90 *IHQ.* III. 576.

95 The different views about the epoch of the Era have been discussed later (See infra pp. 246-8).

96 MM. H.P. Ṛāstrī points out that Bengali mss. dated in *La Saṁ* are not met with in South and East Bengal, and have only been found in Dinajpur. 'Most of these mss. are on palm-leaves and above two hundred years old' (*Notices of Sanskrit mss.*, Vol. XI. p. 12). He refers to two mss. dated 435 and 372 *La Saṁ* (*Cat. Durbar Library, Nepal*, i. 33, 51.).

Three mss. of the Dacca University (Nos. 139, 523, and 2589) bear dates in *La Saṁ*. In the first only the hundredth figure 4 is legible. The second gives the date 449. The third is dated in the year 424 of the Gauḍa king. The Era was probably introduced into Bengal from Mithilā in the course of the fifteenth century A.D. when there was a close association between the two provinces in connection with studies in Nyāya.

97 *EI.* XII. 29.

98 *EI.* XII. 30.

99 *IA.* XLVIII. 47.

100 *IA.* XIX. 2.

101 *JASB.* N. S. IX. 2.

102 *AJV.* Part 2, p. 4.

103 *AJV.* Part 2, p. 5.

104 Cf. *IC.* II. 579.

105 See supra p. 194, f.n. 263.

106 *Ibid. N. S.* XXII. 373. See f.n. 100 above.
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For a full discussion on this point cf. JASB. N. S. XVII. 9-10. Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya accepts this interpretation of gata-rājya (IHQ. VI. 166-67).

Indian Antiquary, 1881, p. 341.

For a full discussion of this point, cf. J. N. Banerjea Volume (published by the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University in 1960), pp. 71 ff. and pp. 113-115.

For a detailed account of these eras, cf. Mr. J. Roy. Dākār Itihāsa, p. 393; Dr. N. K. Bhattasali, IA. LII. 314 ff. Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya has given an account of some old documents in Noakhali and Tippera districts, dated in that era. He finds by calculation that the era started from 1201-2 A.D., but “in Sarail Pargana of Tippera district, where also the era was in regular use, it started from 1199 A.D.” A ms. dated in Parganāti Era 327 and Śaka 1451 (= 1529 A.D.) shows that it was the current local era in parts of Bengal, before Bengali San came to be introduced in Akbar’s time (IHQ. XIV. 741). Sometimes the era was named after a particular locality: e.g., in a Bengali ms. the era is referred to as ‘Pargane Bhulua San’ 287 (Bengali ms. No. 2025 of the Dacca University).


A verse in Loghubhāratā says that while Vallāla was engaged in warfare in Mithilā, Lakhmaṇasena was born at Vikramapura. Mr. N. Vasu suggests that Vallāla introduced the La Sanī to commemorate the birth of his son (VJI. 351-52). The same view is upheld on the same ground by Mr. P. C. Barat in JRAS. 1930, p. 8. But this cannot be reconciled with the chronology of the Pāla and Sena kings suggested above.

JASB. N. S. XXII. 365. On this ground Mr. G. R. Grierson (IA. 1899, p. 57) regarded 1108-9 A.D. as the initial year of La Sanī in opposition to the views of Kielhorn.

JASB. N. S. XXII. 385.

The list was compiled by Mr. K. P. Jayswal (JBO RS. XX. 21).

JBO RS. XX. 22.

JASB. N. S. XI. 418-9. Mr. Chakravarti expressed doubts about the genuineness of the verse on the ground that the date in La Sanī does not agree with the Saka date, according to the views of Kielhorn, which was then universally accepted. The other objection that Śivasiṁha, the successor of Devasiṁha, is referred to as the ruling king in a manuscript dated La Sanī 291 is met by himself when he says that if both the dates be true, it indicates that Śivasimha was ruling jointly with his father (op. cit. p. 422).

The problem concerning the epoch of La Sanī has been discussed elaborately by Sukhamay Mukhopadhyaya in his Bengali Book Prāchīn Bāṅgālī Sāhityer Kālakrama (Calcutta, 1958). He has shown that the commencement of La Sanī era varied between A.D. 1079 and 1129.


Ibid, 319.

Ibid. 320.

Ibid, 321.

Ibid.

Ibid, 320.

Ibid.
This is stated in ch. xxvii, second part, vv. 15-16. According to the colophons, chs. xxi-xxiii were taken from Vallāla-charita, by Śaraṇadatta. Ch. xxv. is said to have been composed by Kālidāsa Nandi. The existing text is the uttara-khaṇḍa, i.e., second part (ch. i. v. i). Chs. xxvi-xxvii are said to be khaṭa or additions.

Cf. colophon of ch. xxvii.

Introduction to English translation, pp. v-vi.

This date obviously does not agree with the statement that Gopālabhaṭṭa was a contemporary of Vallālasena. This is not necessarily a proof of modern forgery, but of the lateness and unhistorical character of the work. A modern forger would probably have given the correct date for Vallālasena.

There are some differences in detail in the two accounts, but they are not material for our present purpose (cf. J. M. Roy, Iṭhākār Itihāsa, p. 446 ff. for these differences). The story in the khaṭa or supplement is given in App. iii, p. 252.

And also the Yugis, in Text (i) of Vallāla-charita.

El. XV. 281. Mr. J. M. Roy has also expressed similar views after pointing out the discrepancies between the different texts and the inaccuracies contained in them (Iṭhākār Itihāsa, 446-454). It is probable that the text was tampered with in recent times. For example, the date assigned to the death of Vallālasena—1028 1/2 a. d. (1106 A.D.)—in Ch. xxvii, v. 4, fits in with the theory generally held at the time the text was discovered, but is not supported by any old tradition, and is now definitely proved to be wrong. But J. C. Ghosh and N. K. Dutt opposed the view and laid stress on the accuracy of historical details contained in it (IHQ, XIII. 581; XVI. 708).


Ch. xii. vv. 45, 48, 50-54.

Ch. xii. v. 52.

Supra p. 229.

But J. C. Ghosh and N. K. Dutt opposed the view and laid stress on the accuracy of historical details contained in it (IHQ, XIII. 581; XVI. 708).

The text was printed in Calcutta in 1864 and translated into English by Major H. G. Raverty in 1881. The following account is based on this English translation, and references to its pages are given within brackets. A critical translation of the passage relating to the raid on Nadiyā has been published in IHQ. XVII. 92 ff. The points of difference, for our present purpose, are not very material.

Raverty writes 'Muhammad-i-Bakht-yār,' but the simpler form has been used throughout the text.

This is the name given by Minhāj and there is hardly any doubt that it refers to Lakshmanaśena. The anecdote runs thus: 'When the birth of Lakshmanaśa drew near, the astrologers observed that if the child were born then, he would never become king, but if born two hours later, he would reign for eighty years. The queen-mother having heard this commanded that she should be suspended with her head downwards, with her two legs bound together. At the auspicious hour she was taken down but died after giving birth to the child' (p. 555).
It appears that Muhammad first captured by assault a large monastery, Uddandāpura-vihāra, in Bihar, which he originally mistook for a fortified city (p. 552). He then visited Sultan Qutb-ud-Din at Delhi (p. 552). After his return from Delhi, Muhammad subjugated Bihar (556). Minhāj does not say to whom this province belonged, nor does he refer to any actual battle waged for its conquest.

There is a great deal of controversy about the identification of Sankanāt. The most reasonable view seems to be that it is the same place which is referred to as Sankakoṭa in the Vallāla-charita and described as a stronghold of the Vaiśik community. It has been located in the district of Suvarṇagrāma, at the junction of the Brahmaputra and the Meghna in East Pakistan, not far from Vikramapura, the capital of the Sena kings (IHQ. XVI. 705-6).

A similar story is related in Chach-nāma in connection with the conquest of Sind by Muhammad-ibn-Kāsīm. When he was besieging Debal, the famous sea-port, a Brāhmaṇ came to him and said, “We have learnt from our science of the stars that the country of Sind will be conquered by the army of Islam . . . . . . But as long as that flagstaff stands on the dome of the temple, it is impossible for you to take the fort.” The standard was accordingly removed by throwing stones from the catapult (Chach-nāma, p. 81). It is, however, interesting to note that the historian Balādhuri relates this incident but makes no mention of the prophecy of the Brāhmaṇ. It would thus appear that the story of the astrologer’s prophecy about the conquest of India by the Muslims was widely current all over India for a long time, and the ‘trustworthy persons’ who gave a graphic account of the raid of Nadiyā to Minhāj merely drew upon the usual stock-in-trade of gossip-mongers. It is to be regretted that Minhāj did not possess the true instincts of an historian like Balādhuri; otherwise he would have found out the real character of his ‘trustworthy persons’ and rejected most of their stories as popular gossips.

IHQ. XVII. 95-96.


Poets like Nabin Chandra Sen and D. L. Roy, and the artist Surendra Nath Ganguli have given wide currency to this baseless slander among the people of Bengal.

TK. 325.

P. 9 of the text edited by Dr. Sukumar Sen.

Index, p. x.

The date is given as 1204-5 by Dr. A. L. Srivastava (Sultanate of Delhi, p. 109). According to HB. II (p. 32) the raid on Nadiyā took place about January, 1201, and North Bengal was occupied between October, 1201, and January, 1203.

For the account of Rājāvālt, cf. ‘An Indigenous History of Bengal’ by R. C. Majumdar (Proceedings of the Sixteenth Session of the Indian Historical Records Commission, 1939, pp. 59 ff); also SPP. Vol. 46 (1346 B.S.) pp. 233 ff.

Ain. Transl. II. 146.

Tar. p. 252, 255, 256.

Chs. XXVI-XXVII. These two chapters are described as ‘khila’ or supplement to Vallāla-charita.
For a fuller account of these stories and their different versions, cf. Dhākār Itihāsa, ii. 438 ff.


Vallāla-charita, ch. i. vv. 9-10.
Barrackpur cp. (C. 1).
IB. 60.
Nāsiri-transl. p. 554.
BI. 357.

According to some genealogical accounts, Navadvipa was the capital of Vallālasena in his old age (Sambandha-nirṇaya by Lalmohan Bhattacharya, 3rd edition, p. 608). Cf. also Vallāla-charita, ch. xxvii, second part, v. i. (p. 122).

JASB. N. S. I. 45.
GR. 75.

A place called Vijayanagara (also written as Vijayānagara) is referred to in mediaeval Bengali works such as Goraksha-vijaya (pp. 39, 101, 130), Mśnachetana (p. 8), and Padma-purāṇa (p. 437). It was not far from the Dāmodar river and to the north of it (Gopīchāndera Gāna, edited by Dr. D.C. Sen, Vol. II, p. 428). The identity of Vijayanagara and Vijayapura may be presumed, but cannot be definitely proved.