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PREFACE.

This volume contains the history of the early Rāshṭrakūṭas (Rāṭhōḍas) and their well-known branch, the Gāhaḍavālas of Kanauj up to the third-quarter of the 13th century of Vikrama era, that is, up to the migration of Rāo Sīhā towards Marwār.

In the absence of any written account of the rulers of this dynasty, the history is based on its copper plates, inscriptions and coins hitherto discovered. Sanskrit, Arabic and English1 works, which throw some light on the history of this dynasty, however meagre, have also been referred to. Though the material thus gathered is not much, yet what is known is sufficient to prove that some of the kings of this dynasty were most powerful rulers of their time. Further, some of them, besides being the patrons of art and literature, were themselves good scholars. The artistic and literary works of their time are held in high esteem even to this day.

The extent of their power is sufficiently vouchsafed by the writings of the early Arab travellers and the levying of “Turushkaḍaṇḍa” a tax like “Jaziā” on the Mohammedans, by Gōvindachandra.

Nor was their generosity less defined. Out of numerous copper grants recovered, no less than 42

1 Specially Sir R. G. Bhandarkar’s article in the Bombay Gazetteer.
trace their source of munificence to a single donor, Gòvindachandra. Another magnificent example of their generosity is brought to light by a couplet from the copper grant\(^1\) of Dantivarman (Dantidurga) II, dated Shaka Samvat 675 (V.S. 810=A.D. 753). The couplet runs as follows:—

मातुमस्ये प्रतिमाम्, मामलजच्छुद्वयं ।
बहुत्या भूप्रदानानि, सस्मात्रा प्रकाशिता ॥ १६ ॥

i.e., His (Dantivarman’s) mother by granting lands in charity in almost all the 400,000 villages of his kingdom proved his reverence for her.

Many historians hesitate to believe the Gàhaḍavālas of Kanauj to be a branch of Rāshṭrakūṭas. But in view of the reasons given to meet the various objections regarding this theory, which has been discussed in the first few chapters of this volume, it is evident that in fact the Gàhaḍavālas belonged to a branch of the Rāshṭrakūṭas and came to be so called because of their conquest of Gàdhipur (Kanauj).

The history of the Rāshṭrakūṭas was first published in Hindi in my book named “Bhārata-kē-Prāchīna-Rāja Vamsha,” Vol. III\(^1\). A synopsis of the first few chapters of this book, under the heading of “The Rāshṭrakūṭas and the Gàhaḍavālas” as well as its last chapter named “The Gàhaḍavālas of Kanauj” appeared in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, January 1930 and January 1932 respectively. The matter given in the appendix of this book was published in The “Indian Antiquary,”\(^2\)

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, page 111.
2 Published in A. D. 1926.
January 1930. Hence, this volume is an attempt to bring out the history of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (Rāṭhōdas) in a revised and enlarged form.

It will not be out of place here to express the gratitude to all those scholars whose efforts have been helpful in the preparation of this volume.

As the special letters “ṁ”, and “ṅ”, were not available, simple “m”, and “n” have been used in their places and “sh” has been used for both श and ष. In some places simple “r” is used instead of “ṛ”.

Archaeological Department, Jodhpur.

Bisheshwar Nath Reu,
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THE RĀṢṬRAKUṬĀS.

In 269 B.C. (i.e., 212 years before the Vikrama Era) there flourished a very powerful and religious king in India named Ashoka. He got his edicts inscribed on pillars set up in various provinces of his kingdom. In those found at Mānsērā, Shāhbāzgarhi (North-West Frontier Province), Girnar (Saurashtra) and Dhavali (Kalinga) the words “Raṭhika,” “Ristika” (Rāṣṭrika) or “Laṭhika” appear just after the mention of the Kāmbōjas and the Gāndhāras.

Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, reading both the words “Rasṭhīka” (or Ristika) and “Pētēnīka” thus occurring as one, takes it to have been used to denote the hereditary governing families of Mahārāṣṭra. But, as the edict of Shāhbāzgarhi contains “वर्ण क्रम गंगान राठिकन वितिनिकल” it appears that the words “Raṭhika” and “Pitinika” are used to denote two different tribes.

Mr. C. V. Vaidya holds the word Rāṣṭrika to denote the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Mahārāṣṭra province, whom he considers to be the Mahāraṭṭa Kshatriyas, different from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the north. But in the ancient books “Dīpavamsha” and “Mahāvamsha” of the Pāli language the word Mahāraṭṭa, and not Rāṣṭrika, stands for the inhabitants of Mahārāṣṭra province.

---

1. Asoka by Bhandarkar, page 33. 2. In the “Anguttarnikāya” the words “राठिकेय” and “पितिनिकेय” are also separately stated.
5. From the cave inscriptions of Bhāja, Bāḍaś, Kārli and Nānāghāṭ of the 2nd century of the Christian Era it appears that this Mahāraṭṭa tribe was very generous.
Dr. Hultzsch holds the words "Rathika" or "Raṭrika" (Rashṭrika) as pertaining to Āraṭṭas of the Punjab. But if, in regard to the derivation of the word Āraṭṭa, we were to apply the 'Bahuvarīhi Samāsa,' (का सम्पत्ता व्यासा रा व विनियम व शाखा: ) then the difference of opinion would be squared up to some extent. In the inscriptions of the Rāshṭrākūṭas a second name of their tribe is also found as "Raṭṭa". There should be no hesitation, therefore, in supposing that the Rāshṭrākūṭas were formerly the settlers of the Punjab, whence they migrated to the south and in the course of time carved out a kingdom in the Deccan.

A copper grant of Rāshṭrākūṭa king Abhimanyu has been found from the Unḍikavati. As it bears no date, it is supposed to be of the beginning of the 7th century of V.S. It contains the words:-कृष्णविनियम वर्णकालिक शाखा स्त्रोत 

1 Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. I, page 56. In the "Mahābhārata" the "Āraṭṭa" province is thus described:

प्रभावधो महाद्विन दग दियुवनामसुत || ३१ ||
शिखरे शिखरे स्वरुप शिखरे दैवतनी कहा ||
ब्रह्माण्डा विस्तरण च (सर्वहस्त) वाहिनी: || ३२ ||
ब्राह्मण नाम से वेश:........................

Karṇa Parva, Adhyāya-4,

i.e., the province irrigated by the waters of the Sutlej, the Bīsa, the Rāvī, the Chenāb, the Jhelum, and the Indus and lying outside the mountains is called Āraṭṭa. At the time of the Mahābhārata this province was under the sway of King Shaliya.

In the Dharma and Shravaṇa Sutrās of Bandhūkī, this province is stated as a non-Aryan province (vide first prashīṇa, first chapter and 18-12-12-13 respectively.)

In 326 B.C. (269 years before Vikrama Era) the Āraṭṭas had opposed Alexander near Baluchistan as appears from the works of the contemporary writers.

2. Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. XVI, page 90,

3. Some people read शास्ककान्तिन in place of शास्ककार्णी, but it is incorrect.
The stone inscription\(^1\) of Rājā Dantidurga, fixed in the Dashāvatāra temple of the Ellora caves, contains the line:—`न चेति चलस कृति श्रेष्ठकर्त्तानविद्ये' i.e., who is not aware of the world-famous Rāshtrakūṭa race.

In a copper grant\(^2\) of this very king dated Shaka Samvat 675 (V. S. 810 = A. D. 753) and also in that\(^3\) of Nandarāja of Shaka S. 631 (V. S. 766 = A. D. 709) found at the village of Multai in the Central Provinces, the name of the dynasty is given as "Rāshtrakūṭa". A similar name is found in inscriptions and grants of various other kings. But there are also some old writings, in which this clan is named as "Raṭṭa" such as the inscription of Amōghavarsha I found at Sirūr, in which he is spoken of as" रमन्यकृत्तक्षर यथे"\(^4\).

In a copper grant\(^5\) of Indra III dated Shaka S. 836 (V. S. 971 = A. D. 914) found at Nausāri Amōghavarsha is described as the promoter of prosperity of the "Raṭṭa" race.

In the copper grant of Dēoli\(^6\) it is stated that "Raṭṭa" was the originator of this dynasty and "Rāshtrakūṭa" was his son from whom the dynasty took its name\(^7\).

In an inscription of Ghōsūndi in Mewar the dynasty is named as "Rāshtravarya" and in a copper grant of Nādōl\(^8\) as "Rāshtrauḍa."

---

4. As "Māṭa", "Vaddiga" and "Chāpa" are the corrupt forms of "Mānyakhēṭa" Yādava Vīshṇu Vardhna and "Chāpōthakaṭa" respectively, similarly "Raṭṭa" might also be a corrupt form of "Rāshtrakūṭa".
9. The birth of Rāshtrakūṭa in the family of Raṭṭa is only a poetical conjecture.
10. Copper grant of Chaubhāna Kīrtipāla of V. S. 1218.
In the word “Rāṣṭrakūṭa” “Rāṣṭra” means “kingdom” and “Kūṭa” denotes collection, “lofty” or “excellent”. Thus, the word “Rāṣṭrakūṭa” means “a great or excellent kingdom”. The country ruled over by this dynasty might have been named “Mahārāṣṭra”, which word is similarly formed by prefixing the syllable “Mahā” to the word “Rāṣṭra”.

In modern times, owing to the divergence of dialects, we come across many corrupt forms of the word “Rāṣṭrakūṭa”, such as, “Rāṭhavara, Rāṭhavāda, Rāṭhaura, Rāṭhauḍa, Rāṭhada, Raṭhāḍa and Raṭhōḍa”.

Dr. Burnel finding the word “Raṭṭa” used in the later writings of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas connects them with the Telugu-speaking ‘Rēḍḍi’ tribe. But the latter was a primitive tribe, while the Rāṣṭrakūṭas migrated to the south from the north. (This fact will be dealt with hereafter in a separate chapter). Therefore this theory is untenable.

In the court of Rājā Narāyaṇa Shāha of Mayūragiri there flourished a poet named Rudra. By the order of the said king he compiled a poem named “Rāṣṭraudha Vamsha Mahākāvyya” in Shaka Samvat 1518 (V. S. 1653 = A. D. 1596), the first chapter of which contains the

1 Just as the country ruled over by the “Mālava” race was named Malwa, and that ruled over by the Gurjaras, Gujrat, similarly the country ruled over by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in Southern Kathiawar was named Saurāṣṭra (Sorāṭh) and the country between Nārband and Māhī named Rāṭ and “Lāṭ might be a corrupt form of Kāṭh. (The country including the states of Alirajpur, Jhabua etc., is probably called Rāṭh.) In the inscription of Skandagupta on the Girnar hill, there is a mention of the “Sorāṭh” province. Thus, the names Rāṣṭra (Rāṭh), Saurāṣṭra (Sorāṭh) and Mahārāṣṭra as applied to tracts bear testimony to the greatness of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

2 This form is found in the inscription dated V. S. 1208, of Jaisadhavala, found at Kāyāvalvā (Godwar).

3 This form is mentioned in the inscription of Rāṭhora Salkhā, dated V. S. 1213, found at ‘Vrihaspati Tank’, 8 miles north-west of Jodhpur.

4 This form is found in the inscription of Rāo Shāh of V. S. 1830, found at Bīthū (Dist. Pāli).

5 In the inscription of Rāṭhōḍa Hammira of V. S. 1573, found at Phalodi, the word Rāṣṭrakūṭa is used.
lines:- प्रवर्षयेवद्र विव्यथे राजायात्मक । तस्यकान्त्यं ॥ प्रेमतर स्त्रिया । तुल्यं त्रूं राजस्त्री (द्वैण) । तनामा तनिहि प्रतीत ॥ ७६ ॥ i.e., (the Goddess Lātnā) thus addressed (Rājā-Nārāyaṇa) through the heavens, “He will be thy son and as he has maintained thy kingdom and family, his name will be “Rāshṭrōḍha”.


EMISSION OF THE RĀṢḤTRAKUṬAS FROM THE NORTH TO THE SOUTH.

It has already been stated that Dr. Hultsch holds the Rāṣṭrikaśas, mentioned in the edicts of Ashoka, and the Āraṭṭas, residing in the Punjab at the time of the Mahābhārata, to be of one and the same tribe. The Āraṭṭas existed in the Punjab up to the time of Alexander's invasion. Similarly, in the edicts of Ashoka of Mānsērā, Shāhībazgarhī (N.W.F. Province), Gīrī (Jūnāgadh) and Dhavali (Kalinga), mention of the Rāṣṭrika occurs just after the Kāmbōjas and the Gāndhāras. All these facts go to show clearly that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas at first resided in the north-western part of India and from there they afterwards migrated to the south. Dr. Fleet also holds the same opinion.

2. Though in some inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas they are stated to be 'Chandra Vamshī', yet, in fact, they are 'Sūrya Vamshī'. (This subject will be treated later in a separate chapter). The present rulers of Marwar consider themselves to be the descendants of Kusha, son of Rāmachandra of the Solar race. In the Vaiśṇava Purāṇa, 61 kings are named from Īkṣvākū (a descendant of Sūrya), down to Shri Rāmachandra, and 60 names are enumerated from Shri Rāma to the last (Sūrya Vamshī) king Sūmitra. Thus, from Īkṣvākū down to Sūmitra there are 121 names of kings in all (and 126 perhaps in the 'Bhāgavata'). Beyond this, there is no trace of the Solar kings in the Purāṇas. (According to the Purāṇas the time of Sūmitra comes to about 3000 (?) years before this day.)

In the 'Uttar Kāṇḍa' of the 'Vaiṣṇava Rāmāyana,' Bharat, brother of Shri Rāmachandra, is stated to have conquered the Gāndharvas (the people of Kandhar). It also informs us that Bharata had two sons, Taksha and Pushkala. Taksha founded the city of Takshashilā after his name, and Pushkala founded Pushkalavatī. Takshashilā is the modern Taxila. This city was situated in a circuit of 12 miles to the south-east of Hasanabdal and north-west of Rawalpindi Pushkalavatī was in the north-west near Peshawar. It is not known as Chāṛśādī. Kusha, the son of Shri Rāmachandra, leaving Ayōdhya, had founded the Kushavati city, near modern Mīzāpur, on the bank of the Ganges. It is probable that owing to some mishap the
EMISSION OF THE RĀSHṬRĀKŪṬAS FROM THE NORTH TO THE SOUTH.

Mr. C. V. Vaidya holds the Rāśṭrākūṭas of the Deccan to be the Āryans of the south. But he presumes that they had settled there, having come from the north long before their establishing the kingdom in the Deccan for the second time. But, at the same time, he says that these Rāśṭrākūṭas were present in the Mahārāṣṭra1 even at the time of the edicts of Ashōka. The above conclusion of Mr. Vaidya is merely based on the situation of the edicts of Ashōka, which mention this clan. It has no sound basis, as two of such edicts were found in the North-West, one in Saurāṣṭra and the other in Kalinga.

Dr. D. R. Bhandārkar, connecting the Rāśṭrākūṭas with the western provinces, holds them to be the residents of Mahārāṣṭra.2 But in the fifth edict of Ashōka, found at Shāhvāzgarhi it is thus stated:—

शोभ अभय गंधर्वरं स्थितम् पितित्तिष्ठन् शेषपि भयंतरैं

"Therefore it would be incorrect to connect the words 'स्थितं पितित्तिष्ठन् शेषपि भयंतरैं.' The residents of the western provinces, mentioned here, might be some people different from the Rāśṭrākūṭas.

The family title of these Rāśṭrākūṭas was "Laṭālūrapurādhīshvāra." Mr. Rajvade and others hold this Laṭalūrapura to be the modern Ratnapur in Bilaspur District (C.P.). If this supposition be correct, then the migration of the Rāṭhōras from the north to the south is proved.

 descendants of Kusha might have gone up to their cousins, the descendants of Bharata, and in the course of time having acquired the name "kā, likā or Arāṭha" on their return had gone some to the north and others to the south via Gurmār. But this is only imaginary.

We learn from the ‘Rambhāmanjarī Nāīkā’ of Nyauchanda Sūri that Jayachandra was born in the Iksvākū family (refer page 7.)

1. History of Mediaeval Hindu India, Part II, page 323.
2. Ashōka by D. R. Bhandārkar, page 33,
From the copper grant, dated Shaka S. 972 (V.S. 1107 = A.D. 1051), of the Sölanki king Trilōchanapāla of Lāṭa we learn that Chālukya, the prime ancestor of the Sölanki had married the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of Kanauj. From this it is quite evident that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had also ruled over Kanauj in the early period and about the sixth century of the Vikrama era they took possession of the kingdom of the Sölanki of the Deccan.

This fact is further proved by the copper grant of Sölankī Rājarāja of the Deccan, issued in his 32nd regnal year (Shaka S. 975 = V. S. 1110 = A.D. 1053), found at Yēvūr, which informs that after king Udayana, 39 kings of his dynasty ruled over Ayōdhyā. The last of these was Vijayāditya who founded the Sölanki kingdom in the south. His 16 descendants ruled in the Deccan.

---

1 समादित्वार्धं वेदित्वं तु: लक्षाच्यमान तम्क प्रभुः
काश्यकुमारे महाराज्य राष्ट्रकूटव्य चतुर्वर्षाम्यः।
लक्ष्मी सुखाय तस्यं ते चौधुर्वर्षामुः संततिमिः।

(Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 201)

2. Mr. J. W. Watson, Political Superintendent, Palamur, writes that on Thursday Mangasina Sudi 5, Samvta 986 king Shrīpata Rāṭhōra of Kanauj, on accession to the Gaddi, had made a grant of 16 villages in the north of Gujarāt to Chibādiḍa Brahmapāsa, out of which village Ėtā is still in the possession of their descendants.

Further, he writes that the ancient Arab Geographers have stated the boundary of Kanauj as being adjacent to Sindh. Almasuddī has mentioned Sindh to be under the government of the king of Kanauj and the Mohomedan historians of Gujarāt have also stated the king of Kanauj to be the master of Gujarāt.

(Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, page 41)

In quoting the writing of Mr. Watson here, we mean only to say that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were even formerly the kings of Kanauj and their kingdom extended far and wide. As regards Shrīpata we can only say that he perhaps being a member of the Kanauj royal family was called Kanaujāśhvara. When king Dhruvarāja of Lāṭa had defeated the Pratihārṇ king Bhōjadēva of Kanauj he might have arranged for the grant of some districts of Kanauj to Shrīpata’s father, who was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa by caste. And afterwards Shrīpata on ascending the throne (on his father’s death), might have made the aforesaid grant. The village Ėtā is also described as having been granted by the Rāṭhōras of Kanauj in the Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. V, page 320.

3. In this grant Udayana is mentioned as 47th in descent from Brahmapāsa,
after which their kingdom passed on to another dynasty. Here another dynasty means the Rāshtrakūṭa dynasty, because it is stated in the copper grants of the Sōlankīs of Shaka S. 946 of Miraj and that of Shaka S. 999 of Yēvūr that Jayasimha, having defeated Rāshtrakūṭa Indrarāja, again obtained the kingdom of the Chālukya dynasty.¹

Kīrtivaraman, the great grandson of this Jayasimha, ascended the throne in V. S. 624. So his great grandfather Jayasimha may have lived about the second half of the 6th century of the Vikrama era. Thus, it proves that the Rāshtrakūṭas ruled here in the 6th century. Besides, it is also presumed that the marriage of the ancestor of the Sōlankīs with the daughter of the king of Kanauj might have taken place, when the former ruled at Ayōdhya.

---

¹ Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, Page 12.
THE ORIGIN OF THE RĀŚHṬRĀKŪṬAS.

About 75 inscriptions and copper grants of the time of the Rāśṭrākūṭa kings of the Deccan and Gujarat have up to this time been found, in only 81 of which the Rāśṭrākūṭas are mentioned as belonging to the Yādava line.

The earliest of these containing the lineage of the Rāśṭrākūṭas, is of Shaka S. 762 (V. S. 917 = A.D. 860), while all the other inscriptions and copper plates of the earlier dates are silent on the point as to whether they are Sūrya Vamshis or Chandra Vamshis. Out of the

1 The 8 inscriptions and copper plates are as follows:—

The first of Shaka S. 762 (V. S. 917 = A.D. 880) of king Amoghavarsha I, contains:—

तबियभूमि व राजा स्वरूपे।

(Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, page 29.)

The second of Shaka S. 838 (V. S. 971 = A.D. 914) of Indrārāja III, contains:—

तद्भवेत् यद्यन्ति स राजस्य।

(Journal Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. XVIII, page 261.)

The third of Shaka S. 862 (V. S. 997 = A.D. 930) and the fourth of Shaka S. 856 (V. S. 990 = A.D. 933) of Gōvindaraja IV, mention the lineage of the king as under:—

ब्ययो बलम भवेत् सिद्धिभौतमो यद्यन्तम।

(Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VII, page 36 and

Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 249.)

The fifth of Shaka S. 862 (V. S. 997 = A.D. 940) and the sixth of Shaka S. 880 (V. S. 1015 = A.D. 958) of Krishnaraja III, states:—

ब्ययो दुर्भस्यन्नतमाने।


The seventh of Shaka S. 894 (V. S. 1029 = A.D. 972) is of Karkaraja II, which too contains:—

समभूतन्यो यद्यन्तम।

(Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 264.)

The eighth of Shaka S. 930 (V. S. 1065 = A.D. 1008) is of Kakkala, which also bears:—

“होऽथ्रास्तैहं वंशो ब्रह्मकल्तिको राजानुभूतेन्द्रार्थाश्।”

(Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, page 300.)
above 8, the copper grant of Shaka S. 836 goes a step further as follows:—

तत्रान्विते बिततात्त्विकंश्रावायम्।
श्रीविविवेकसपुरोऽरुपाध्यात्॥

i.e., Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga was born in the line of Yādava Sātyaki.¹

But some time ago about 1800 silver coins of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishnārāja I, were found at Dhamori (Amraoti). On the obverse of these, the head of the king is represented, while on the reverse there is a phrase as stated below:—

‘परामाण्डेवरे महाजित्यवात्सुपात्ते श्री कृष्णराज्’

This Krishnārāja was ruling in V. S. 829 (A.D. 772) and it bears testimony to the fact that at that time the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were considered to be of the Solar origin, and the followers of the ‘Shaiva’ religion.

A copper grant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja III, dated Shaka S. 730 (V. S. 865 = A. D. 808) found at Rādhanpur contains:—

“सविन्नत तत्त्वाध्यये श्रीविविवेक सपुरोऽरुपाध्यात्—
जाते बाबायुवात्सुपात्ते ग्रामाध्यात् परकृष्णराजः।’”¹

i.e., by the birth of this virtuous king, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty became as invincible as the Yādava dynasty by the birth of Shri Krishṇa.

---

¹ Halāyudha in his ‘Kavirahasya’ has also mentioned the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as being the descendants of Yādava Sātyaki. Further, in the copper grant of Krishna III, dated Shaka S. 892 there is a similar description (नद्यत्रा अतिष्ठात भाष्यविज्ञाबाजाः).

² In the copper grant of Gōvindaśandhra of V. S. 1174, the Gāhaḍavāla kings are also mentioned as ‘Paramānāṃśāvāya’ or staunch Shaivites.

³ The word ‘पापात्त्वात्त्व’ is generally preceded by the name of the father of the person mentioned after it. Here the ‘महाजित्यवात्’ alludes to the king’s solar lineage, because in the documents hitherto discovered ‘Mahāditya’ appears neither as a title nor as a name of Krishnārāja’s father. Thus, it doubtlessly refers to his prime ancestor, the Sun.
From this it is quite evident that upto V.S. 865 (A.D. 808) the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty was considered as quite distinct from the Yādava family. But later on, in the copper grant of Amoghavarsha I, dated Shaka S. 872, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas are mentioned as the Yādavas. This is due to mistaken for identity the similitude of the Yādavas with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the foregoing grant; and the authors of the subsequent 7 documents, without thinking over the matter, followed suit.

It may be objected why the Rāṣṭrakūṭas did not care to rectify the mistake if, in fact, they did not belong to the Lunar stock. But instances of adherence to a mistaken theory adopted by the ancestors are not rare. The Sisōdiyā family of the Māhāraṇās of Mēwār is considered, beyond any doubt, to be of the Solar origin, yet Rāṇā Kumbhā, one of the most talented rulers of this dynasty, following the opinions of his predecessors, describes in the ‘Rasikapriyā,’ a rendering by him on the ‘Gītagīvinda’ his prime ancestor Bāpā Rāvala, as the son of a Brāhmaṇa:

‘श्रीकृष्णपर्वेन स्वगोयक्षः: श्रीवच्चनामा वैष्णवोस्मरुः’

In the ‘Rāṣṭraudha Vamsha Mahākāvyā’ of V. S.

---

1 In the inscription of V. S. 1442 of the Yādava king Bhīma, found at Prabhāsapātan, it is thus stated:

कंसो (तो) प्रतिको (श्रो) हि स्वरा सीतारो (स्त्रो:) ।
राठोवर्षल्लु तथा तुलीयः: ।
चन्द्रभक्ष्यभन्नोनितिर्म--
स्त्रेयमानिन्यं मा (सा) स्वभ्रान्व यागाम || 10 ||

i.e., just as the two dynasties known as the Solar and the Lunar are famous, in the like-manner, the third dynasty known as the Rāṭhūrā is also famous. King Dharma of this dynasty married Yamunā, the daughter of king Bhīma.

1653 (already mentioned), it is stated that Goddess Lātanā brought the son, born of the Chandra (Moon), and handed him over to the Sūrya Vamshi king Nārāyaṇa of Kanauj, who had been observing penance for the birth of a son. And, as the child took upon himself the burden of the kingdom and the protection of the dynasty of the said Sūrya Vamshi king, he was named Rāṣṭrādha. This shows that the Rāṭhāras, even at that time too, were considered to be Sūrya Vamshiṣ.

Similarly, in the inscriptions of the Gāhadavāla kings of Kanauj they have been mentioned as Sūrya-Vamshiṣ:

"भास्मीकरितत्वंतिस्तागात: चम्पालाचारां विवे गंगातुः।
साहासिवस्वालिन्व भुवियामान नागर यशोविजय हस्तुसार:।

i.e., on the expiry of a line of kings, ‘Sūrya Vamshi’ Yashōvigraha, as powerful as the Sun himself, came to the throne.

These Gahādvāla Rāṭhāras were also Rāṣṭrakūṭas, (this fact will be proved in the next chapter) therefore,
the fact of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas being ‘Sūrya Vamśhīs’ is unquestionable.¹

1 Though the earliest-known copper grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Abhimanyu contains no date, yet from its character it appears to be of about the beginning of the seventh century of the Vikrama era. The seal on it contains an image of a lion, the vehicle of Goddess Ambikā. Similarly, in the coins of Krishṇarāja I, he is described as ‘Parama Māhāvīra’ or a staunch Shaivite. But in the subsequent grants of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas a ‘Guruḍa’ has been substituted for the lion. This shows that in the later period they might have been influenced by Vaishnavism. (In view of the seals of these copper grants Bhagwan Lal Indraji has also formed a similar opinion—Journal of Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. XVI, page 9.)

Therefore, like the Gōhilas rulers of Bhonsagar, these kings also were considered to be ‘Chanda Vamśhīs’ instead of ‘Sūrya Vamśhīs’. Formerly, when Gōhilas ruled over Kher (Mārwa), they were considered ‘Sūrya Vamśhīs’. But after their migration to Kathiawar they came to be considered as ‘Chanda Vamśhīs’ due to their being influenced by Vaishnavism, as is evinced by the following stanza:—

‘ष्ठन्त्रवर्षिः सर्वस्य गोमुः गौतम बक्षायीं
शाखा मापवि तार सौके प्रवर्तम बाणं,
प्रतिवेष खदार देव चामुण्डा देवी
पंडव कुल परमार भाषा गोहिव चल एवी
विक्रमवर्षावर्ष शालिवाणि वर्षी वर्षोऽति
ते पही तेज भोलामो शोभाम शेषम भयो।’

In the fifth edict of Ashoka, inscribed on the Girnār hill, there is a mention of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and it shows that the latter had also some connection with that province.
THE RĀŚHṬRAKŪṬAS
AND
THE GĀHĀḌAVĀLAS.

As stated in a previous chapter, the Rāśṭra-
kūṭas originally migrated from the north to the south.

From the aforesaid copper grant, dated Shaka S. 972, of Sōlankī Trilōchanapāla, we learn that Chalukya, the prime ancestor of the Sōlankīs, had married the daughter of the Rāśṭrakūṭa king of Kanauj. Similarly, from the ‘Rāśṭraudha Vamsha Mahākāvyā’ it is evident that the Rāśṭrakūṭas ruled at Kanauj at an earlier period.

An inscription\(^1\) of Rāśṭrakūṭa king Lakhanapāla, who flourished\(^2\) about V. S. 1258 (A.D. 1201), found at Bādāūn, contains the following:\n
\[\begin{align*}
\text{प्रक्ष्यातिक राष्ट्रकूटकस्वमापावः} & \text{ प्रक्ष्यातिक} \\
\text{पंचाले धिनिकादर्शकताचारी गोविष्णुपार) } & \\
\text{तत्त्वज्ञानामहस्यभूतानागरीत्रं} & \text{ तत्त्वज्ञानामहस्यभूतानागरीत्रं} \\
\text{कश्चित} & \\
\text{स्वसा} & \\
\text{स्वसा} & \\
\end{align*}\]

\(i.e.,\) the city of Bādāūn, which is protected by the famous Rāśṭrakūṭa kings, is an ornament to the kingdom of Kanauj. Having overpowered the enemies with his strength, Chandra became its first king.

---

2 Mr. Sanyal considers this inscription to be of a date prior to V. S. 1259 (A.D. 1202). This will be considered later on.
3 In the copper plate, dated V. S. 1150, of Chandradēva found at Bādāūn the same word ‘Panchāla’ is used for Kanauj—

\[\begin{align*}
\text{चत्पचाळाचुलु-सुभव-चत्पचाळाचुलु} & \\
\end{align*}\]

(Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XIV, page 193.)
A copper grant¹, dated V. S. 1148 (A.D. 1091), of Gāhāḍavāla Chandradēva found at Chandrāvatī (Benares District) contains:—

िवर्गोऽक्षयकुपयोपलोकातिशब्रह्म: भूप: 
मेघसारस्त्रप्रतापार्जिनिः शेषप्रकोपयां 
भैरवानिषुविवर्गार्ज्जुमस्म योऽम्बवक्ष्योऽपितम् ॥

i.e., Chandradēva, the son of Yashōvigraha, became a very powerful king in this dynasty. Having defeated his enemies by force of arms, he took the kingdom of Kanauj.

The dynasty of Chandradēva is not mentioned in this copper plate.

It is evident from both these documents that Chandradēva at first conquered Badāūn and afterwards took possession of Kanauj. The first of these documents belongs to those who designated themselves as ‘Rāśṭrakūṭas,’ and the second to those who later on assumed the title of ‘Gāhāḍavāla.’ But by taking into consideration the period of Chandradēva of the inscription and of the copper plate, it is found that Chandradēva, who had established his kingdom at Kanauj and Chandradēva, from whom the Badāūn line took its origin, was one and the same person. His eldest son Madanapāla became king of Kanauj, and the younger son Vigrahapāla² got Badāūn as ‘Jāgir.’ The members of the Badāūn family continued to be called ‘Rāśṭrakūṭas’ but those of the Kanauj family, in the course of time, came to be known as Gāhāḍavālas³ after Gādhipura (Kanauj). This changed

---

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IX, pages 302-305.
² Perhaps Chanda Bardā, the author of the ‘Rāśā,’ has also mentioned Lakhanaṇḍa, the descendant of this Vigrahāpāla of Badāūn, as a nephew of Jayachandra.
³ The word “Gāhāḍa” in the “Ḍingala” language means “firmness” and “power.” Therefore, when the kings of this dynasty became powerful and strong, it is probable that, they might have assumed this title, or just as the Rāśṭrakūṭas of the village Rainka (in U.P.) have come to be called Rainkavāla; in the like manner the Rāśṭrakūṭas of this branch, being the residents or rulers of Gādhipura (Kanauj), were styled as Gāhāḍavālas. For in the corrupt “Prākrita”
name of the dynasty appears in only the copper grants of V. S. 1161, 1162 and 1166 of the prince regent Gövindachandra¹ as well as in the inscription of his queen Kumāradevi.²

By taking these facts into consideration we conclude that at first the Rāshtrakūṭas held sway over Kanaūj, after whom the Guptas, the Baisas, the Maukhāris and the Pratihāras³ ruled there one after another. But from the copper grant⁴ of Shaka Samvat 836 (V. S. 971), issued by the Rāshtrakūṭa king Indrarāja III, it appears that he in his invasion of the North, having conquered Upendra, had laid waste Mērū (Kanauj). Probably, Pratihāra Mahipāla was then ruling there.

After this invasion, the kingdom of the Pratihāras (Paḍihāras) became weak and their feudatories began to declare independence.⁵ From this it appears that about V. S. 1111 (A.D. 1054) Chandra of the Rāshtra-

language the form of Gāḍhipura might have become “Gāhaja” instead of “Gāhi-ār.” It may also be noted that when Rāo Sīhā severed all his connections with Kanaūj and migrated to Mārwār, he abandoned his surname Gāhajavān and acknowledged himself as simple Rāshtrakūṭa.

¹ ब्रेंट गाहाजवालेक्षे बस्तु विभवी पूरः;
² Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IX, P 324.
³ In V. S. 924 (A.D. 887) the Rāshtrakūṭa king Dhrurvarāja II of “Lōta” (Gujarat) had defeated Pratihāra king Bhōjadeva of Kanauj. It was Nāghabhata II, the grandfather of this Bhōjadeva, who probably established his capital at Kanauj by defeating Rāshtrakūṭa Chakrāyudha, the successor of Indrāyudha.


⁴ कृतगोयनोद्वारं भेलोमुलितमेवहस्य।
बपेत्रगुर्गज्रेजे सिंवा वेन न विशिष्यम्।

Journal Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. XVIII, page 261. This fact is also borne out by the copper grant, dated Shaka Samvat 852, of Gövinda IV, in which it is stated that Indrarāja III, with his housemen, crossed the Jamuna and laid waste the city of Kanauj:

लोपां बलकाराधामाः सिंवलकलिस्पदिनी।
वेनेन स हि मोहोपारिसमां मिर्जामुलिलिम।

⁵ Even before this, between V. S. 842 and 850 (A.D. 785 and 793), the kingdom of Dhrurvarāja had extended up to Ayādhva in the north. Later, between V. S. 932 and 971 (A.D. 875 and 914), in the time of Krīṣṇarāja II, it spread up to the banks of the Ganges and between V. S. 997 and 1028 (A.D. 940 and 966), in the time of Krīṣṇarāja III, it had extended further north crossing the Ganges.
kūṭa family, taking possession of Badāūn, might have afterwards conquered Kanauj. After the death of this Chandra his eldest son might have succeeded him at Kanauj and Badāūn might have been given in his life-time, as a ‘Jāgīr’ to his second son.

Later, when Harishchandra, the son of Jayachchandra, lost his kingdom of Kanauj, his descendants settled at Mahui in the district of Farrukhabad. But, when the Mohammedans took possession of these places also, Śīhāji, the grandson of Jayachchandra, (son of Baradāisēna) left the country for pilgrimage and reached Mārwār. Here his descendants rule even to this day and consider themselves to be the descendants of Rāshṭrakūṭa king Jayachchandra.

There still exist ruins at Mahui which are locally known as ‘Śīhā Rāo-kā-Khēḍā.’

Rāo Jōdhā, a descendant of Rāo Śīhā, built the fort and founded the town of Jodhpur in V. S. 1516 (A.D. 1459). From the contents of a copper grant, issued by him, it appears that in the time of Rāo Dhūhaḍa, grandson of Rāo Śīhā, a Sārasvata Brāhmaṇa named Lumbārīshi brought down from Kanauj the idol of ‘Chakrēshvarī’, the family deity of the Rāṭhōras, which was then installed at the village of Nāgānā.

In some old manuscript chronicles this idol is said to have been brought from Kalyāṇī. But this Kalyāṇī too must be the Kalyāṇa-Kaṭaka (cantonment) of Kanauj.

All these facts go to prove that the Rāshṭrakūṭas and the Gāhāḍavālas are one and the same.

Dr. Hoernle considers the Gāhāḍavāla family to be a branch of the Pāla dynasty. He is of opinion that the descendants of Nayapāla, the eldest son of Mahipāla, ruled over the province of Gauḍā (Bengal) and that Mahipāla’s younger son, Chandradēva, took the

---

1 Some people think that it was Kōnkan of the Deccan. But in the face of the proofs adduced above, the supposition does not seem to be correct.
kingdom of Kanauj. But this does not seem to be correct. Because firstly, neither in the inscriptions of the Pāla kings are they mentioned as Gāhādvālas, nor is there any mention of the Pāla dynasty in the inscriptions of the Gāhādvālas. Secondly, the ending 'Pāla' occurs in the name of all the kings of the Pāla dynasty from its founder Gōpāla I, to its last king; whereas, only one, out of the 8 Gāhādvāla kings, has used the suffix Pāla in his name. Thirdly, the mere fact of a word being found in the names of two persons, should not be regarded as evidence of the two persons being identical. The names of the kings of the two dynasties are given below:

Pāla dynasty. | Gāhādvāla dynasty.
--- | ---
Vigrahapāla | Yashōvigraha.
Mahipāla | Mahīchandra.
Nayapāla | Chandradēva.

The word ‘Vigraha’ is common to the names Vigrahapāla and Yashōvigraha. Similarly, the word ‘Mahi’ is found in the names Mahīpala and Mahīchandra. We know that Mahipāla of the Pāla dynasty was a powerful king who had regained the lost kingdom of his father and constructed many temples in Benares, through his sons (?) Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla, while Mahīchandra of Gāhādvāla dynasty was not even an independent ruler. Hence, such coincidence by itself cannot in no way be supposed to prove that Mahipāla and Mahīchandra were one and the same person.¹

Fourthly, the dates of the inscriptions of the kings of the Pāla dynasty are indicated by their regnal

---
¹ Moreover, there is an interval of 65 years between the issue of the copper grant of Pāla king Māhipāla dated V. S. 1088 (A.D. 1028) and that of Gāhādvāla Chandradēva of V. S. 1148 (A.D. 1081), which produces doubt as to whether these two kings were father and son. The last copper grant of Chandradēva hitherto discovered is of V. S. 1156 (A.D. 1099).
years instead of by the Vikrama Samvat; whereas the grants of the Gāhāḍavāla kings bear Vikrama Samvat and not the regnal years. Fifthly, kings Dharmapāla and Rāyapāla of the Pāla dynasty had married the daughters of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings Parabala and Tunga respectively; and it has, ere this, been established by proofs that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gāhāḍavālas are collaterals. Therefore, Dr. Hoernle's supposition is not reasonable.

Mr. Vincent Smith considers the northern Rāṣṭrakūṭas (Rāṭhōras) to be the off-shoots of the Gāhāḍavālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Deccan to be the descendants of the non-Aryans. But in the light of the above facts this supposition also seems groundless. Moreover, their marrying the daughters of the Sōlankīs and the Yādavas proves them to be pure Kshatriyas.

Kāshmīrī Pandit Kalhaṇa in his well-known history of Kāshmīr, named 'Rājatarangini', written in the twelfth century of the Vikrama era, mentions 36 clans of the Kshatriyas. In Vikrama S. 1422, Jayasimha had commenced writing the 'Kumārapāla charita' in which he has enumerated the 36 clans mentioning only 'Raṭṭa' as one of them but there is no mention of the Gāhāḍavālas. Similarly, in the 'Prithvirāja Rāsō' the name Rāṭhōra alone occurs but not Gāhāḍavāla. Further, Jayachandra is also stated in it as being a Rāṭhōra.

The Rājā of Rāmpur (Farrukhabad district), the Rāo of Khimsēpur (Mainpuri district) and the chau-dharīs of Surjā and Sordā, allege themselves to be Rāṭhōras, descended from Jajpāla, the son of

1 Among the inscriptions of the Pāla kings, there is only one of Mahīpāla that bears a Vikrama Samvat (1083).
2 This custom was not strictly observed (See p. 32.)
3 Early History of India, (1924), pages 429-430.
4 प्रकाशप्रस्त: संभूतं पद्खंशितं कुण्डु में।
तेजप्रकोश महास्तोत्ति सहस्रं तोवजः; स्थितिम्। II 196 197।
Rājatarangini, Taranga VII.
Jayachandra. Similarly, the Rājās of Bijaipur and Mānda think themselves to be the descendants of Mānika Chandra, the brother of Jayachandra, and are called Chandravamshi Gāhadavāla Rāṭhōras. From this, too, we conclude that the “Gāhadavāla” was the name of a branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty.

In the face of so many strong proofs it would be unreasonable to think that the Gāhadavālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas are of different origins.

Mr. N. B. Sanyāl thinks that, as the title ‘Gādhipurādhipa’ (master of Kanauj) is attached to the name of Gōpāla in the Buddhist inscription of V. S. 1176 (A.D. 1118), found at Sēṭ Māhēṭh, the Gōpāla and his successor Madanpāla mentioned in it are identical with the Gōpāla and the Madanpāla of the inscription of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Lakhanapāla of Badāūn. Gōpāla had taken possession of Kanauj in the last quarter of the eleventh century A.D. i.e., some time between the overthrow of the Pratihāra dynasty of Kanauj in V. S. 1077 (A.D. 1020) and the establishment of Gāhadavāla kingdom of Kanauj by Chandradēva towards the close of the 11th century A.D. And this Chandra had seized the kingdom of Kanauj from the very Gōpāla. This is the reason why the title Gādhipurādhipa appears with the name of Gōpāla alone in the Sēṭ Māhēṭh inscription.

Further, Mr. Sanyāl proceeds to quote the following couplet from the copper grant of Shaka S. 972 (V. S. 1107 = A.D. 1050) of Sōlankī Trilōchanapāla discovered at Surat.

कामुकष्ये महाराज रत्नाकृतास्व कर्मादि ।
लक्ष्मि सुभाष्य तत्त्वं तं चालूवेक्षः नुसृह स्मरणिम् ॥

1 People of Shamsābād say that after the fall of Kanauj some of the descendants of Jayachandra had gone to Nepāl and they called themselves Rāṭhōras. Some fifty years ago on auspicious occasions such as marriage, etc., they used to send for a brick from Shamsābād. This indicates their love for their motherland.
3 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXIV, page 176.
This testifies the rule of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas over Kanauj at an early period.

Mr. Sānyāl then cites the aforesaid Sēṭh Māhēṭh inscription as a proof of the above.

Let us examine this theory critically.

From the copper grant of V. S. 1084 (A.D. 1027) of Pratihāra Trilōchanapāla, and from the inscription of V. S. 1093 (A.D. 1036) of Yashahpāla, we understand that the rule of the Pratihāras over Kanauj had probably continued even after this date. In the copper grant of V. S. 1148 (A.D. 1091) of Gāhādavāla king Chandra it is thus stated:

\[\text{[Text in Devanagari]}\]

This shows that long before the writing of this copper grant, king Chandra had taken possession of Kanauj. For, there is in the above stanza a reference to his several charitable grants of gold weighing as much as his person after a mention of his conquests of Kāshī, Kushika and north Kōshala.

He must have taken some years in performing such great deeds. Therefore, the supposition that Chandra had conquered Kanauj in the last part of the 11th century A.D. and that before this, i.e., in the last quarter of the same century Kanauj was ruled over by Gōpāla of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Badāūn, does not appeal much to reason.

Further, in ascertaining the date of Lakhanapāla's inscription, Mr. Sānyāl says that Qutubuddin Aibak,

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 84.
conquering Badāūn in A.D. 1202 (V. S. 1259), granted that territory as 'Jāgīr' to Shamsuddīn Altamash. This inscription of Lakhanapāla must, therefore, be of a date just before V.S. 1259. According to this opinion if we take Lakhanapāla’s inscription to be of V.S. 1258, i.e., a year before this date, there occurs a period of 82 years between this and the Buddhist inscription, dated V.S. 1176 (A.D. 1118), of king Madanapāla found at Sēṭ Māhēṭh. And this period is quite reasonable for the four generations that intervened between Madanapāla and Lakhanapāla. Again, by supposing V. S. 1171 (A.D. 1114) as the date of the Mohammedan invasion (in which according to Mr. Sanyāl, Madanapāla had fought in the capacity of a feudatory of the Gāhaḍavāla king Gōvindachandra of Kanauj), which is mentioned in the Buddhist inscription of Kumārdevī, the queen of king Gōvindachandra, and by counting back 60 years from this date for the reigns of the 3 ancestors of Madanapāla of Badāūn, the time of his fourth ancestor i.e., king Chandradēva comes to about V. S. 1111 (A.D. 1054). Under the circumstances, if the date of the birth of king Chandra be supposed to be about V. S. 1090 (A.D. 1033) his having lived to an age of 67 years upto V. S. 1157 (A.D. 1100) is not an impossibility. His long life is also proved by the fact that in V. S. 1154 (A.D. 1097), in all probability due to old age, he had in his life-time, transferred the reins of the government to his son Madanapāla of Kanauj. And only three years afterwards, in V. S. 1157 (A.D. 1100) when he died, even his son Madana had grown old. He, too, made over the government of his kingdom to his son Gōvindachandra in V. S. 1161 (A.D. 1104) and died in V. S. 1167 (A.D. 1110).

1 Elliot’s History of India, Vol. II, page 232 and ‘Tabqāt-i-Nāsir’ (Raverty’s translation), page 530.
2 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IX, page 324,
The death of Chandra is held to have occurred in V. S. 1157 (A.D. 1100). From this we conclude that Vigrahapāla (who being his younger son, was given the ‘Jāgīr’ of Badāūn) and his son Bhuvanpāla of the Badāūn inscription might have died during Chandra’s life-time and that Gōpāla ruled over Badāūn at the time of Chandra’s death. It is also probable that his younger son Vigrahapāla and the latter’s son Bhuvanpāla, having predeceased, Chandra in V. S. 1154 (A.D. 1097), being disgusted with the worldly affairs, might have renounced the kingdom and raised his eldest son Madanapāla to the throne of Kanauj. Chandra’s existence might account for the intimate relations that existed between the two families of Kanauj and Badāūn up to the time of Gōpāla. Due to this fact, or that of the late birth of the heir-apparent Gōvindachandra and the probability of Gōpāla’s being taken in adoption, or for some other reason the title ‘Gādhipurādhipa’ might have been attached to the name of Gōpāla. But in the time of his (Gōpāla’s) son due to the disappearance of such causes and also due to the establishment of the relation of a monarch and a feudatory between the two families, the title ceased to apply to Madanapāla. In course of time it might have been thought improper to use this title with the name of Gōpāla even. Had Gōpāla, in fact, conquered Kanauj, the title ‘Gādhipurādhipa’ must have also been mentioned with his name in the Badāūn inscription.

It does not appear reasonable that the writer of the Badāūn inscription, who exults in making such a high sounding mention (महानिर्वाण: सूर्यनुपदितमित्रसंस्कृतं व न कृत्वाचितवात् i.e., owing to the valour of Madanapāla the Mohammedans did not ever dream of coming near the banks of the Ganges) of the battle fought by the ancestor of his patron in the capacity of a feudatory only, should have
forgotten to take notice of such a remarkable deed as
the conquest of Kanauj by Madan's father, Gopāl.

Taking all these facts into consideration if we
suppose the two Chandras, viz., that of Badāūn and the
conqueror of Kanauj, as one and the same, most of the
controversies disappear; and there appears no objec-
tion to doing so.

The Rāshtrakūṭa family of Kanauj mentioned in
the copper plate of V. S. 1107 (A.D. 1050) of Sōlankī
Trilōchanapāla, refers only to the Rāshtrakūṭa family
contemporary with the prime ancestor of the Chālukya
clan, who is said to have married in it and not the
later one. The inscription of Sēṭ Māheṭh, therefore,
cannot be of much importance to support that theory.
OTHER OBJECTIONS.

In this chapter some more objections to the theory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gāhaḍavālas being the members of one and the same dynasty will be considered:—

Historians of the East and the West, who hesitate to admit the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan and the Gāhaḍavālas of Kanauj to be of one and the same dynasty, offer the following reasons for their doubts.

1. That in the inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas they are stated as of the Lunar dynasty, while the Gāhaḍavālas assert that they belong to the Solar stock.

2. That the ‘gōtra’ of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is ‘Gautama’, while that of the Gāhaḍavālas is ‘Kāshyapa.’

3. That in the copper grants of the Gāhaḍavālas they are not stated as “Rāṣṭrakūṭas” but only as “Gāhaḍavālas.”

4. That the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gāhaḍavālas used to intermarry.

5. That the other ‘Kshatriyas’ do not consider the Gāhaḍavālas to be of a high and pure descent.

1. In a previous chapter named “The Origin of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas” we have already discussed this subject. But leaving aside those facts, it may be stated that the classification of dynasties as the Solar, the Lunar, and the Fire dynasties was made only in the ‘Paurāṇik’ age; for the kings of the same dynasty are in some inscriptions stated as belonging to the Solar stock, while in others to the Lunar or Fire dynasty. Here we quote some instances for reference.
The family of the Mahārāṇās of Udaipur (Mewar) is well-known in India to be of the Solar origin; but in the inscription dated V.S. 1331 (A.D. 1274) of Chitor-garh it is stated to be as follows:—

जीवाज्ञानमपूर्व तत्त्वं पुरुषाबलस्वमात्त्रीत्वादिशमिषि—
चियोप्र (डू) हल्यौस वियसातुमभु: कम्बुभूतिः: सहायग
यस्मादात्म्य विप्रकृतस्वपनीतिहीनिमित्तत्वम्—
ष्टयशो बीतारामदयायुपपिताशीत हारीशराय:।

i.e., Bappa (the prime ancestor of the Mahārāṇās), a Brāhmaṇa, coming from Anandapur, worshipped the sage Hārīta.

This fact is also proved by the inscription, of Samar-simha, dated V. S. 1342 (A.D. 1285) and found in the monastery near Achalēśvara temple at Abu.

The book named 'Eklinga Māhātmya', compiled in the time of Rāṇā Kumbhā, states:—

मानन्द्युपिनिन्यत्व विप्रकृतान्तश्च महादेव:।
मयमिति मायुधवतः प्रभव: भूमिहिलावासस्य॥

i.e., Guhadatta, a Brāhmaṇa coming from Anandapur, founded the 'Guhila' dynasty.

In the beginning of the ‘Rasikapriyā’, a commentary by Rāṇā Kumbhā himself, on the "Gītā Gōvinda" of Jayadēva, it is stated:—

भीविशयोपयम सहीत्रवयः: भीवतानामाद्विविषुपोरातः।
हस्पदापालविपालकालयोपमोगायणाय: पोरावयः॥

i.e., Bappa, a Brāhmaṇa, of the ‘Vaijavāpa Gōтра’, got a state by the favour of "Shiva."

In the inscription of Guhilōta Bāläditya, found at Chātsū in the Jaipur State, it is stated:—

इक्षुवाणितोमिस्त्रसमसतस्मादेव:।

i.e., combining in himself the powers of a warrior and of a priest (like Parashurāma), Bhartrihṛdaya became a king in this dynasty. (The poet here has very nicely expressed himself by using the word “भार्तरि"").

From the above references one can easily presume that the founder of the famous Guhilōta dynasty of Mewar
was a Nāgara Brāhmaṇa of the ‘Vaijavāpa Gōtra.’ But are the historians prepared to accept this theory?

Similar is the case of the Sōlanki (Chālukya) dynasty. In the inscription, of Sōlanki Vikramāditya VI, dated V. S. 1133 (A.D. 1076), it is stated as follows:—

\[ \text{Śrī} \text{śvāmānandakumāraratnaśeṣasāṃśaktya} \\
\text{vijaya} \text{nāhānandasthānasūdrasāmānī} \\
\text{śāmīnīdēvatapatrasāmānī} \times \times \times \\
\text{śrīmānānī tālāvberṣa} \]

\text{i.e., the Chālukya dynasty traces its origin to the Moon. This fact is also established by their other inscriptions, by the ‘Dvyaśhraya Kāvya’ of Hēmachandra, and by ‘Vastupālacharita’ of Jinaharshagāni.}

In the copper grant, dated V. S. 1200 (A.D. 1143), of Kūlottungachūḍadēva II, the Chālukyas are said to be Chandravamshīs, belonging to ‘Mānava Gōtra’, and the descendants of the sage Hārīti.

Bilhaṇa, the well-known Kashmirī poet, in his “Vikramānkanadēva Charita”, has stated the descent of this (Chālukya) dynasty from the handful of water by Brahmā. The same fact is proved by the inscription, dated V. S. 1208 (A.D. 1151), of the time of Sōlanki Kumārapāla, by the Kanthunātha inscription of Khambhāt, and by the copper grant, dated V. S. 1107 (A.D. 1050), of Trilōchanapāla.

In the inscription of Bilhārī (Jabalpur district), of the time of Yuvarājadēva II of the Haihayā (Kalachuri) dynasty the Chālukya dynasty is stated to have originated from the handful of water of Drōṇa; but in the ‘Prithvīrāja Rāsō’ the Sōlankis are stated to be ‘Agni vamshīs.’

At present, the Sōlankūs (and the Baghēlas) themselves admit that their originator Chālukya had sprung from the sacrificial fire of Vashishṭha.

---

2 A branch of the Sōlankīs.
OTHER OBJECTIONS.

Now, let us consider the origin of Chauhānas.

In the inscription, dated V. S. 1225 (A.D. 1168), discovered by Col. James Tod in the Hānsī Fort, and in that of V.S. 1377 (A.D. 1320) of Dēvaḍā (Chauhāna) Rāo Lumbhā, found at the Achalēśhvara temple at Abu, the Chauhānas are said to belong to the Lunar dynasty, and to ‘Vatsa Gōтра; while in the inscriptions of the time of Vīsaladēva IV, in the ‘Hammīra Mahākāvya’ of Nayachandra Sūri, and in the ‘Prithvīrājaviyja Mahākāvya’ the Chauhānas are said to belong to the Solar dynasty. Contrary to both these opinions, the ‘Prithvirāja Rāsō,’ and the Chauhānas of the present day hold that their originator had sprung from the sacrificial fire of the sage Vashishṭha.

The origin of the Paramāra dynasty stands as below:—

In the ‘Navasāhasāṅka Charita,’ written by Padmāgupta (Parimala), the originator of this dynasty is said to have sprung from the sacrificial fire of Vashishṭha; and in their inscriptions as well as in “Tilaka Manjari,” written by Dhanapāla, the same opinion is upheld. But Halāyudha, in his “Pingala Sūtra Vṛitti,” has quoted a verse in which king Munja of the Paramāra dynasty is said to have been born of the priest-warrior stock (मात्रार्थककणोन्नतः), which is worth consideration.

Further, the modern Paramāra rulers of Malwa allege themselves to be the descendants of the famous king Vikramāditya. But from the documents of their ancestors this allegation finds no support.

Similarly, views about the origin of the Pratihāra (Paḍihāra) dynasty are also different. Some think this dynasty to have originated from a Brahmaṇa named Harishchandra and a Kshatriya lady named Bhadrā;

1 किप्यो: भ्रोधिविद्वास्य: पक्षी माता च ज्ञातिस्य ।
   साप्ताहल्ले [वे सुता] जाता: [प्रतिहर] गैठि गत्ति:। II
   विषमिणि दण्डान्ते: ॥
   Incription dated V. S. 940, of Pratihāra Bhūka.
while others say that the originator of this dynasty had sprung from the sacrificial fire of Vashishtha.

Looking to these controversies, we should not be surprised to see the misrepresentation about the dynasty of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Perhaps, all this confusion regarding the origin of the different dynasties has arisen from the belief in the legends of the Purāṇas. Hence, this belief should have no importance from the historical point of view.¹

(2) Vigyānēshvara says that the ‘Gōtras’ and the ‘Pravaras’ of the Kshatriyas accord with those of their priests. Therefore, it appears that the above theory was prevalent up to the 12th century of the Vikrama era. It is probable that when the Rāṣṭrakūṭas came to Kanauj, their old priests might have been left behind and new ones appointed, which brought about the change of their ‘Gōtra’ from ‘Gautama’ to ‘Kāshyapa.’ It is also possible that this ‘Gautama Gōtra’ might have been assumed by them on their coming to Marwar, before which they belonged to the ‘Kāshyapa Gōtra.’

In the inscriptions of the ruling families, the mention of these ‘Gōtras’ is very rare. Hence, it is also possible that, in the course of time, having forgotten their original ‘Gōtra,’ they might have adopted the ‘Kāshyapa Gōtra’ as is usual in such cases. Under the circumstances, it does not seem proper to consider the

¹ In the inscription of the Kalachuri Vijjala of the southern India, dated Shaka S. 1084, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas are stated, out of malice, as belonging to the ’Dāitya vamsa’ (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. V, page 16).

² राजन्यविसाः ोग और उत्तरात्मविशाः प्रयुक्तैं (पौराणियम् राजन्यविसाः प्रयुक्तैं—हल्याह भारतलालयः; ) याहवलवम्प्स्तिः, विवाहप्रयक्षणं—सत्सारानाचैः—
   Commentary on verse 53.

This fact is also proved by the following stanza quoted from the Ashvaghoṣa’s ‘Saundarananda Mahākāvya,’ composed in the second century of the Vikrama era.

शुरुराभिः कैलसाणे भवति एव गोतमः २२॥
   सांदर्भादेशेन महाकाव्य, सर्वा १
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Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gāhādvālas, who have been held as collaterals for ages, to be of different lineages, merely on account of the difference of their ‘Gōtrās.’

(3) An inscription of Pratihāra Bāuka, found at Jodhpur, contains.

नक्षिम घेरकोट्रे व वहनवलयालकम्।
विपाक्य तल्स्य भूमी प्रासादान, क्रचविघकम्।

i.e., who obtained the Umbrella after killing the Bhāti king Dēvarāja of the ‘Valla Manḍala.’

Again:—

[भक्ष] वंश विश्वदार्य तर्प्यमात कहोस्ते।
श्रीपिण्यां महराजां जात: श्रीवारक: सुत:।

i.e., a son named Bāuka was born to king Kakka from his wife of the Bhāti clan.

In these inscriptions the writer has omitted the name of the famous Yādava clan, and has only mentioned its Bhāti branch. Are we to infer from this that the Bhātīs are of a different lineage from the Yādavas? If not, on what good grounds are we to suppose the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gāhādvālas as being of different origins? Can we arrive at such a conclusion from the mere fact that in only the three copper grants of the prince regent, Gōvindachandra, of V. S. 1161, 1162 and 1166, as well as in the inscription of his queen Kumārādevī no mention is made of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, but of its Gāhādvāla branch.¹

¹ In the inscription of the Chandāla Khaṭriyas they are mentioned as Chandrātrīyas, that is, the descendants of Chandra, the son of Atri.

In the ‘Pṛitivirāja Rāṣṭa,’ their origin is stated to be from the Moon and Hēmavati, the widowed daughter of Hēmāraja, the priest of the Gāhādvāla king Indrājit; but the Chandālas allege that they are the collaterals of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. They had ruled over Bundelkhand and its neighbouring places.

Similarly, the Bundēlas are also held to be the collaterals of the Gāhādvālas? (Some Paramātras, Chandhānas, etc., also have subsequently got mixed in these Bundēlas?). At present the rulers of Ōrḍhā, Tehrī, Pannā, etc., are of the Bundēla clan.
Even at the present day the Rājpūtas belonging to the Dēvāḍā or Sisōdiya branches of the Chauhāna¹ or Guhilōta clans respectively, when asked, do not declare themselves as Chauhānas or Guhilōtas but simply say that they are Dēvāḍās or Sisōdiyās. Further, the era founded by the famous Haihaya clan is named after their branch as ‘Kalachuri Samvat’ and ‘not Haihaya Samvat.’

(4) An inscription of queen Kumāradēvi of Mahārājādhirāja Govindachandra has been found at Sāranātha² from which we learn that she was the grand-daughter (daughter’s daughter) of Mahaṇa, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa. In the ‘Rāmācharita’, compiled by Sandhyākaranandī, this Mahaṇa (Mathana) is said to belong to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty. Such connections are even now allowed. Care is only taken that the bride should not be the grand-daughter (daughter’s daughter) of the same sub-clan to which the bridgroom belongs.

(5) First of all, the objection has no sound basis. Secondly, the inscription, dated 1166 (A.D. 1109), of the prince regent Gōvindachandra contains:

praṇāvam svāhā

hastānubadhyām prabhāmānaṁ

bhūtān labāt labātaṁ

śatamān labāt labātaṁ

i.e., on the expiry of the kings of the Sōlar and the Lunar dynasties, when the Vēdīc religion began to dwindle away, Brahma himself, with a view to maintain all these, took an incarnation in the person of king Chandradēva in this family.

¹ The ruler of Kotāh, belonging to the Chauhāna dynasty, is known to the general public as of the Hāḍak clan, which is a branch of the Chauhāna dynasty.
² Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IX, pages 319-328.
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This shows that, at that time also, the Gāhaḍavāla family was held in very high esteem.

By taking all these facts into consideration we conclude that “Gahaḍavāla” was a branch¹ of the Rashṭrakūṭa dynasty. This subject has already been dealt with in the chapter “The Rashṭrakūṭas and the Gāhaḍavālas.”

¹ Some people are of opinion that just as the Chūṇḍāvata, Üdāvata and Jagamālāta branches are found in both the Rāṭhōra and the Sīsōdiyās, in the same manner, it is possible that a distinct branch named “Yadava” might have ensued from the Rāṭhōra dynasty, and afterwards people might have connected it with king Sātyaki due to a particular member of the branch having the same name. But just as the names of certain branches of the Rāṭhōras and Sīsōdiyās, being the same, the two dynasties are yet quite distinct; even so the famous Yadavas of the Lunar dynasty and the supposed Yadava branch of Rāṭhōras are distinct from each other. This subject has already been discussed under the chapter “The Origin of the Rashṭrakūṭas.” Moreover, even in the modern times there are many branches such as Nāgadā, Dāhimā, Sōnagarā, Shrīmālī, Gauḍā, etc., which are common to the Brahmāṇas, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas.
THE RELIGION

OF

THE RĀŚHTRAKŪṬAS.

In the earliest copper grant of the Rāśhtrakūṭa king Abhimanyu an image of a lion, the vehicle of 'Ambikā,' is impressed. In the seal of the copper grant of Dantivarman (Dantidūrīga II), of Shaka S. 675 (V. S. 810—A. D. 753), there is the impression of an image of 'Shiva.' In the coins of Kṛishṇarāja I his title is mentioned as 'Parama Māheśvara' and in his inscription of Shaka S. 690 (V. S. 825—A. D. 768) there is an impression of a 'Shiva Linga.' But of the copper grants of the later dates some bear the impression of an image of a "Garuḍa," while others that of 'Shiva.'

The flag of the Rāśhtrakūṭas was called the "Pāli-dhvaja" and they were also known as "Ōka Kētu." Their coat of arms contained the signs of the Ganges and the Jamuna, probably copied from the western Chālukyās of Bādāmī.

---

1 In the 22nd 'Parva' of the 'Ādi Purāṇa,' written by Jinaśena, it is said:—

क्रमबलशिलामाकश्रीशीवमुग्धादिविषादम्.

भूमिस्नातदयाणां भवत: सर्वाणि नेवदको: ||२१६॥

भ्रोतार्त हेताः प्रत्येके पञ्चकिठलम:।

पञ्चकिठलां विशिष्ठ प्रचैतिकंसालोपपरिव ||२१७॥

i.e., flags are of 10 kinds according to the signs, viz., 1. Garland, 2. Cloth, 3. Peacock, 4. Lotus, 5. Swan, 6. Garuḍa, 7. Lion, 8. Bull, 9. Elephant and 10. Quoit. And a 'Pālikētana' or 'Pālidhvaja' is a flag which contains in the 4 directions 108 flags of each of these 10 kinds, or 1080 × 4 = 4320 flags in all the four directions.
The family deity of the later Rāṣṭrakūṭas is known by the names of “Lātanā” (Lāṭānā), “Rāṣṭrashyēnā,” “Manasā” or “Vindhyavāsīnī.” It is said that as this goddess, having incarnated as a falcon, had saved their kingdom, she became known by the name of ‘Rāṣṭrashyēnā.’ In commemoration of the above event a falcon is represented on the “State Flag” of the Marwar Darbar even upto the present day.

From the above it appears that the kings of this dynasty from time to time used to observe the ‘Shaiva,’ the ‘Vaiṣṇava,’ and the ‘Shākta’ religions.

The ‘Uttara Purāṇa’ of the Jainas contains the following:—

राष्ट्रकूट नवांश्यं जालिङ्गविन्ध्यादन्तात्पतिविवक्तौ
तपशोनारोजकोपिरामुक्तप्रतिमयाण; ॥
देवतां व्यज्ञमोक्षवेषण; दुहोतर्योजायाज
स धीरामिनमानेनधृतपरमज्ञातारः जगमालकम् ॥

i.e., king Amoghavarsha, having bowed before the Jaina priest Jinasena, congratulated himself. This shows that Amoghavarsha was the follower of the teachings of Jinasena. In the book named “Rātnamālikā” (“Prasnañottararatnamalikā”), written by Amoghavarda, it is said:—

प्रश्नप्रक्ष्य कथ्यं ग्रामान्तकमालिकानि खच्चे ।
नागनामसरस्ये वेण्य वेयाण्यं बीरस् ॥

1 In the 11th chapter of the ‘Ekalinga Māhātmya’ it is stated:—

कर्णवर्धाणकवेणां तत सुहृत्य स्वायमययोग तस सा ॥१४॥

रेवानां सम्प्रदायाय देवो वाहिनां वाहिनो विभवहता ॥१६॥

दूरज्ञेयस्यप्रत्यस्मयस्य एव देवो वाहिना मेवाधास्वय कायम् ॥१५॥

राष्ट्रकूटवेनेति नामनां मेवाधास्वय ।
केरलि न व भास्क्ष्यम वाहवेनेऽन्यं मनोगिति ॥१२॥

This shows that the protectress of Mewar is also the very Goddess Rāṣṭrashyēnā.’ Its temple is situated on the top of a hill at a distance of 3 miles from the temple of ‘Ekalinga Mahādēva’ in Mewar.
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विवेकानन्दसराजेन्द्र राहेल राहमालिककरि।
रसिद्धस्नेहस्वरूपा सुस्थितां सत्कुलविकृतिः।

i.e., having bowed to Varddhamaṇa (Mahāvīra) I write this ‘Prashnottararatnamalikā.’

Amōghavarsha, who renounced the kingdom because of ‘Jnāna’ (discrimination), has written this book named “Ratnamālikā.”

In the “Gaṅitasastrasangraha” of Mahāvīrāchārya it is stated:

प्रीतिनि: प्राप्तिवा नितिनितिनितिविषयाः।
भीमतास्मोलवेच वेन स्वाहितिषिविषया ॥ ॥

………………………………

विभक्तस्मोरतपत्रस्य स्थायिान्यायवाचिनि:।
केशवपण्डितस्य वार्तालाक्ष्य तत्त्व शास्त्रमु् ॥ ॥

i.e., the subjects under the rule of Amōghavarsha are happy and the land yields plenty of grain. May the kingdom of this king (Nripatunga-Amōghavarsha), the follower of Jainism, ever increase far and wide.

This also shows that Amōghavarsha was the follower of Jainism and presumably he embraced this religion in his old age.

It is quite clear that the ‘Paurāṇik’ religion had flourished to a great extent during the reign of the Rāśhṭrakūṭa kings, and many temples, dedicated to ‘Śhiva’ and ‘Vishṇu,’ were built. All the rock-cut temples, etc., built before the reign of the Rāśhṭrakūṭas of the Deccan, were meant for the Budhists, Jainas and the Nirgranthas only. But it was in the time of these kings that the ‘Kailāsā Bhavana’ of the Ellōra caves, dedicated to ‘Śhiva,’ was constructed for the first time.

Most of the kings of the Kanauj branch of this family were the followers of Vaishnavism and their copper grants found upto this date show that this dynasty was more generous than all the other ruling dynasties.
SCIENCE AND ARTS
IN THE TIME OF
THE RĀṢṬRAKУṬAŚ.

Much improvement was effected in science and arts in the time of the Rāṣṭraḵuṭa kings.

These kings were themselves men of learning and always patronised it. The logician Akalanka Bhaṭṭa, author of the “Rājavārtika”, the “Nyāyavinishchaya,” the “Asṭāshatī” and the “Laghīyastraya”; Mahāvīrachārya, author of the “Ganitasārasangraha”; Jinasēna, writer of the “Ādī Purāṇa” and the “Pārshvābhuyadaya”; another Jinasēna, author of the “Harivamsa Purāṇa”; Guṇabhadrāchārya, writer of the “Ātmanuśāsana”; poet Halāyudha, compiler of the “Kavirahasya”; Sōmadēva Śūri, writer of the “Yashastilaka Champu” and the “Nītivākyāmrita” on politics; Canarese poet Pōnna, writer of the “Shānti Purāṇa” (whom king Krishna III, had honoured with the title of “Ubbhayabhāṣā Chakravartī”=master of two languages; Pushpadanta, writer of the “Yashōdhara Charita”, the “Nāgakumāra Charita” and the “Jaina Mahā Purāṇa”; Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa, author of the “Madālasā Champū”; Lākshmīdhara, compiler of the “Vyavahāra Kalpataru”; and Shri Harsha, author of the “Naishadhiya Charita” and the “Khaṇḍana khaṇḍa khādyā”and others, flourished in the time of these kings.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Sir Bhandārkār inclines to identify the author of the “Kavirahasya” with the Halāyudha, who wrote the “Abhīdhāna ratnamālā,” but Weber places the latter about the end of the 11th century.

\(^2\) In the Jaina library of Kāranjā there is a book named “Jvālā malini kalpa.” This book was completed in Shaka S. 861 during the reign of Krishna III,
The “Prashnottararatnamalika”, written by king Amoghavarsh, which exists even to this day, testifies to the learning of the kings of this dynasty. Its composition is of a very high order. Though some persons think Shankaracharya, and others ‘Shvetambara’ Jainacharya, to be the author of the book, yet in the copies of the book, written by ‘Digambara Jainas,’ it is said to have been compiled by king Amogha varsha and the same fact is proved by the verses quoted from the book in the preceding chapter. This book has also been translated into the Tibetan language, in which, too, the name of the author is written as Amogha varsha.

The same Amogha varsha had also written another book named “Kavirajamarga”, a prosody, in the Canarese language.

We have already stated that art also had much improved in their times. The temple of ‘Kailasa Bhavana’ of the Ellora caves is a living instance of the fact. This cave temple was constructed in the reign of king Krishnaraja I by cutting the rocks. Its excellence is beyond the power of description.

“Jaya dhavala”, a commentary of the principles of the ‘Digambara’ branch of Jainism, was written in the time of Amogha varsha I. From the “Shrikantha charita” of poet Mankha, it appears that Alankara, the minister of king Jayasimha of Kashmir, had called a big assembly in which Pandit Suhana was sent out as a delegate by king Goyindachandra of Kanauj.

1. Of the Ajanta caves, which are famous for their art, Nos. 1 and 2 were also built in the beginning of the reign of the Rashtrakutas of Manyakheta,
THE GLORY
OF
THE EARLY RĀṢḤṬRAKŪṬAS.

In the “Silṣilātuttavārīkh”, a history written by an Arab trader Sulaimān, in A.H. 237 (V.S. 908=A.D. 851) and modified and completed by Abūzaīdūl Hasan of Sirāf, in A.H. 303 (V.S. 973=A.D. 916), it is thus stated:—

“The inhabitants of India and China agree that there are four great or principal kings in the world. They place the king of the Arabs (Khalif of Baghdaḏ) at the head of these........The king of China reckons himself next after the king of the Arabs. After him comes the king of the Greeks, and lastly the Balharā, prince of the men who have their ears pierced (i.e., the Hindus)”.

“The Balharā is the most eminent of the princes of India, and the Indians acknowledge his superiority. Every prince in India is master in his own state, but all pay homage to the supremacy of Balharā. The representatives sent by the Balharā to other princes are received with most profound respect in order to show him honour. He gives regular pay to his troops, as the practice is among the Arabs. He has many horses and elephants, and immense wealth. The coins which pass in his country are the Tāṭāriya dirhams, each of which weighs a dirham and a half of the coinage of the king. They are dated from the year in which the

dynasty acquired the throne. They do not, like the Arabs, use the Hijra of the prophet, but date their eras from the beginning of their kings’ reigns; and their kings live long, frequently reigning for fifty years. The inhabitants of the Balharā’s country say that if their kings reign and live for a long time, it is solely in consequence of the favour shown to the Arabs. In fact, among all the kings there is no one to be found who is so partial to the Arabs as the Balharā; and his subjects follow his example.”

“Balharā is the title borne by all the kings of this dynasty. It is similar to Chosroes (of the Persians), and is not a proper name. The kingdom of the Balharā commences on the seaside, at the country of kukam (Konkan) on the tongue of land which stretches to China. The Balharā has around him several kings with whom he is at war, but whom he greatly excels. Among them is the king of the Jurz1.

In the book “Kitāb-ul-Masālik-ul-Mumālik”, written by Ibn Khurdādbā, who died in A. H. 300 (V. S. 969 = A. D. 912), it is thus stated:2—

“The greatest king of India is Balharā, whose name imports “king of kings.” He wears a ring in which

1 The above statement seems to be a sketch of the reign of king Amoghavarsha I who was ruling in the Deccan when this book was written and who had also attacked Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhravarāja I of Gujrat. The kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhrumarāja I of the Deccan extended from Rāmēshvara in the south to Ayōdhyā in the north. In the Chronology of Nēpāl it is stated that in Shaka S. 811 (V. S. 946 = A. D. 889) Kyāṇadēva, the founder of the dynasty of Karpāṭik, having come up from the Deccan, took the whole of Nēpāl and for 6 generations his descendants ruled there. In Shaka Samvat 811 Krishnarahāja II was the king of Karpāṭik; and seventh in descent from him was Karkarāja II from whom Tailapa II of the Chāluksya dynasty seized the kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. So, it is probable that the descendants of Dhrumarāja I of Mānyakhēṭha, having progressed beyond Ayōdhyā, might have captured a portion of Nēpāl and afterwards Krishnarahāja II, having advanced farther, taken the whole of the country. As the boundaries of China and Nēpāl are adjacent, Sulaimān might have, for this reason, recorded the extent of their kingdom to be up to the Chinese frontier.

2 Elliot’s History of India, Vol. I, page 13. This description refers to the reign of king Krishnarahāja II.
is inscribed the following sentence:—"What is begun with resolution ends with success."

The book named "Murūjul Zahab", written by Al-Masūdi about A. H. 332 (V. S. 1001—A.D. 944), contains the following:—

"The city of Mānkīr, which was the great centre of India, submitted to a king called the Balharā, and the name of this prince continues to his successors who reign in that capital until the present time (332 A.H.)."

"The greatest of the kings of India in our time is the Balharā, sovereign of the city of Mānkīr. Many of the kings of India turn their faces towards him in their prayers, and they make supplications to his ambassadors, who come to visit them. The kingdom of the Balharā is bordered by many other countries of India. ..The capital of the Balharā is eighty Sindi Parasangs from the sea, (and the Parasang² is equal to eight miles). His troops and elephants are innumerable, but his troops are mostly infantry, because the seat of his government is among the mountains...Bayūra³ who is the king of Kanauj, is an enemy of the Balharā, the king of India....The inhabitants of Mānkīr, which is the capital of the Balharā, speak the Kirīya⁴ language, which has this name from Kīra the place where it is spoken."

Al Istakhri,⁵ who wrote the "Kitābul Akālim", in A. H. 340 (V. S. 1008—A.D. 951) as also Ibn Haukal,⁶ who came to India between A. H. 331 and 358 (A.D. 943 and 968) and wrote the "Ashkal-ul-Bilād" in A. H. 366 (A.D. =976), say:—

---

1 Elliot's History of India, Vol. I, pages 10-24. This refers to Krishyārāja III.
2 A "Parasang" is equal to three miles but Sir Elliot has taken it to be equal to 8 miles.
3 This seems to be a corrupt form of Pratihāra.
4 Perhaps, the same is now called the Canarese language.
6 Elliot's History of India, Vol. I, page 84.
“From Kambaya¹ to Saimur² is the land of the Balharā, and in it there are several Indian kings. The city in which the Balharā resides is Mānkīr, which has an extensive territory.”

From the above extracts, taken from the writings of the Arabian travellers, we conclude that at that time the power of the Rāshtrākūṭa kings had reached its zenith.

The Rāshtrākūṭa king Dantidurga defeated Sōlankī (Chālukya) ‘Vallabha’ Kīrtivarman and assumed the title of ‘Vallabharāja,’ which was also attached to the names of all his successors.¹ It is therefore that the aforesaid Arabian writers have mentioned these kings as Balharā, a corrupt form of “Vallabharāja.”²

From the inscription of the Sōmēshvara temple, near Yēvūr (Deccan), it appears that there were 800 elephants in the army of Rāshtrākūṭa king Indra, and that 500 feudatory chiefs followed as his retinue.³

¹ Cambay.
² Presumably this city was on the border of Sind to which we can trace the northern boundary of the kingdom of the Rāshtrākūṭas.
³ Sir Henry Elliot, Col. Tod and others suppose that the Arab writers had used the word Balharā for the kings of Balabhī or for the Chālukya kings themselves, (Elliot’s History of India, Vol I, pages 354-355). But these suppositions are groundless as the Balabhī kingdom had come to an end about V.S. 823 (A.D. 766); and the Chālukya kingdom had been split up into two branches on the death of the Chālukya king Mangalīsana in V.S. 607 (A.D. 610). Pulakēśhin was the head of one of them and Rāshtrākūṭa Dantidurga seized his kingdom from his descendant Kīrtivarman between V.S. 805 and 810 (A.D. 748 and 753). It remained under the Rāshtrākūṭa dynasty up to V.S. 1030 (A.D. 973) about which time it was regained by Chālukya Tailāpa II from Rāshtrākūṭa king Karkarāja II. Thus, about V.S. 805 to 1030 (A.D. 748 to 973) the kingdom of the western branch of the Chālukyaas remained in the possession of the Rāshtrākūṭas. Formerly, the capital of this branch of the Sōlankīas was Bādāmī. But later, Tailāpa II shifted it to Kalyāṇī. The second branch was headed by Vishṇuvallāha, whose descendants were called Eastern Chālukyas. They ruled at Vēṇgī and were the feudatories of the Rāshtrākūṭas.

¹ श्री राजपुतराष्ट्रकूटसिंहस्त्रि.से तुम्हारूतरप्पण्य. सुतन्त्रस्त्रि.से तुम्हारूतरप्पण्य
निर्मात्य राजपुतराष्ट्रकूटसिंह

Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, pp. 708, 12.
In the copper grant, dating from Shaka S. 852 (V. S. 987 = A.D. 930), of Govinda IV, it is stated that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indrārāja III crossed the Ganges with his cavalry and laid waste the city of Kanauj.

A copper grant, dated Shaka S. 915 (V. S. 1050 = A.D. 993), of the ruler of the Shilahāra dynasty of Thānā, contains:—

चोलो चोलोभिमभूद्वनमप्ति रत्नाबविपलान्तः;
वाजीवासाकृतः समभवसबंक्केलर्स्कृतः तथान्तः।
पाराकृष्टः कवित्तोदवायुवधिप्रसङ्गलो त्रिपालापः प्रकृतीः;
समिन्न वर्तप्रायेये सकलस्य तदा सर्गोऽन्यारजसतः॥

i.e., when king Krishnārāja III mobilized his armies, the kings of the Chōla, Bengāl, Kanauj, Andhra and Pāṇḍya countries used to quiver.

In the same grant the extent of the sovereignty of king Krishnārāja III is stated to be from Himālayas in the north to Ceylon in the south, and from eastern sea in the east to the western sea in the west.

About V. S. 1030 = (A.D. 973) the Chālukya king Tailapa II defeated the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Karkarāja and overthrew the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom of Mānya-khēṭa. The copper grant referred to above was issued after this event. This shows that the power of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings was once very great, so much so, that their feudatories indulged in referring to their glories even after their fall.

The country under the sway of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas was called “Raṭṭa Pāṭi” or “Raṭṭa Rājya” and consist-

---

1 Sammāvalaṁmāndavatālahām prāpañcāhām
ed of 7 lacs of villages and towns as is mentioned in
the ‘Skanda Purāṇa’:

i.e., the kingdom of the Raṭṭas (Rāṣṭrakūṭas) con-
stisted of 7 lacs of villages.

The military band called “Tivali” was a speciality
of their processions.

We learn from the copper grant, dated V. S. 1161
(A.D. 1104), of Gōvindachandra, found at Basāhī,
that it was Chandradēva of the Gāhaḍavāla branch of
the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, who had restored order by sup-
pressing the anarchy that had resulted on the deaths of
kings Karṇa and Bhōja. It also refers that Gōvind-
achandra had granted in charity the village of Basahi
(Basāhī) together with the ‘Turushkaḍaṇḍa,’ (cess
levied upon the Mohimedans), which shows that just
as the Mohammedan kings levied ‘Jaziyyā’ upon the
non-Mohammedans, in the like manner, Madnapāla
levied a tax upon the Muslims. This proves his power
and glory. As regards Jayachchandra it is stated in the
‘Rambhāmanjarī Nāṭika’ that he defeated the Chandēla
king Madnavarmadēva of Kālinjar, possessed an ex-
ceptially large army and ruled over the territory
between the Ganges and the Jamuna.

2 बाते भोभोभ्यर्थे विणुवक्रृपुष्कलिनारिचिक्व
भीमेतै भीतिष्कोष घतिति न हृपे चरायद्रे आयमानः
मतर्षो बध [च] रिबी विजिष्विसमिवस प्रातिलोकाहुःके
सता विस्तारपूर्वी सम्रानविचिद्द स चाराविलिन्देयः

King Karṇa referred to here was Karṇa of the ‘Haihayā’ (Kalachuri) clan, who was
alive in V. S. 1099. But there is a controversy about king Bhōja referred to here.
Some say that it was the Paramāra king Bhōja who died about V. S. 1110 and others
think it to be the Pratihāra Bhōja II, who lived about V. S. 980.

3 In the copper grant, dated V. S. 1188 (A.D. 1129), of Gōvindachandra, found
in Oudh, there is also a mention of this ‘Turushkaḍaṇḍa.’

Luḍkhow Museum Report of (1914-15), pages 4 and 10,
CONCLUSION.

Taking all the foregoing facts into consideration we conclude that in the earlier period a branch of the Rāshṭrakūṭas came down to Kanauj, where they established a kingdom, which in the course of time became weak. After this the Guptas, the Baisas, the Maukharis and the Pratihāras in succession ruled over it. About Vikrama Samvat 1137 (A. D. 1080) another branch of Rāashtrakūṭas, once again, conquered Kanauj and established their kingdom.

This branch, being connected with the ‘Gadhipura,’ (Kanauj) afterwards came to be known by the name of “Gāhaḍavāla.” In V.S. 1250 (A.D. 1194) Jayachandra, the Gāhaḍavāla king of Kanauj, was attacked by Shahābuddin Ghōrī and lost his life. When Shahābuddin went back after plundering the town, Harishchandra, the son of Jayachandra, succeeded his father. Though not powerful he was able to retain Kanauj and its neighbouring districts in his possession for some years. But when Qutubuddin Aibak and after him Shamsuddīn Altamash took the country and put an end to the independent kingdom of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, of this branch, Rāo Sīhā, the grandson of Jayachandra, left Kanauj and remained for sometime in Mahuī.¹ Later, when this district was also taken by the Mohammedans, Sīhā (after roaming about for a time) came to Marwar about V.S. 1268.

The descendants of Rāo Sīhā are at present ruling over the States of Mārwār, Bīkānēr, Īdar, Kishangarh, Ratlām, Sītāmaū, Sailānā and Jhābuā.

¹ It is stated in the ‘Āin-l-akabāri’ that Sīhā lived at Khūr (Shamsābād) and was killed there.
HISTORY OF THE RĀṢṬRAKŪṬAS.

According to our opinion the genealogical table from Vijayachandra to Sīhā is as follows:—

Vijayachandra.

Jayachandra. Māṇikachandra.

Harishchandra (Barāśīṣṭa) (Prabhasta). Jayapāla (Jajapāla).

Sētarāma. Sīhā.

The third branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, which had gone down to the Deccan, turned out the Sōlankis and founded a kingdom there. Though we have not yet been able to trace the date of the commencement of this kingdom, yet it is clear that in the time of Chālukya Jayasimha, (in the later half of the sixth century of the Vikrama era) there existed in the Deccan a powerful kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. It was overthrown by the said Jayasimha when he set up the Sōlanki kingdom there. But about 250 years after this, i.e., about V.S. 805—A.D. 747), Dantivarman II defeated Sōlanki Kirtivarman II and re-established the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom in the Deccan. This kingdom lasted for about 225 years, upto V.S. 1030 (A.D. 973), when Sōlanki Tailapa II again overthrew it and defeated Karkarāja II, its last king.

Two branches of the Deccan family of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had ruled over “Lāṭa” (Gujrat) from the beginning of the 6th century of the Vikrama era upto the first half of the 10th century. They were the feudalatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of the Deccan.

Proofs about the rule of the branches of the old Rāṣṭrakūṭas in Saundatti (Dharwar—Bombay), Hathündi (Marwar) and Dhanōp (Shahpurā) have also been found.

Mention of some more inscriptions, etc., of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, found here and there, will be made in the next chapter.

1 Possibly Baradāsiṣṭa may be a younger brother of Harishchandra.
MISCELLANEOUS INSCRIPTIONS

OF THE

RĀŚHTRAKŪṬAS.

The earliest known record of the Rāśhtrakūṭas is the copper grant of king Abhimanyu.¹ From its characters it appears to be of about the beginning of the 7th century of the Vikrama era. In the seal of it the image of a lion, the vehicle of Goddess Durgā, is impressed.

It refers to a charitable grant made at Mānpur for the worship of God ‘Shiva’ and contains the following genealogical table of the kings:—

Mānānka.
Dēvārāja.
Bhavishya.
Abhimanyu.

The seat of Government of Abhimanyu was Mānpur, which is considered by some scholars to be the modern Mānpur (12 miles south-west of Mhow in Malwa).

Two more grants of the Rāśhtrakūṭas have been found at the village of Multai (Bētūl district, C.P.); the first² of which is of Shaka S. 553 (V.S. 688=A.D. 631) and contains the following genealogy:—

Dūrgarāja.
Gōvindarāja.
Svāmikarāja.
Naṅnarāja.

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, page 164.
² Do. do. XI, page 276.
The other is of Shaka Samvat 631 (V.S. 766=A.D. 709) of the time of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Nandarāja and contains the following genealogy:—

Durgarāja.
Gōvindarāja.
Svāmikarāja.
Nandarāja.

In this grant the title of Nandarāja is mentioned as “Yuddha Shūra” and the charity mentioned in it was granted on the 15th day of the bright half of Kārtika. If the Shaka Samvat mentioned in it be considered as the past one, then the date of the grant falls on the 24th October A.D. 709.

In both the aforesaid copper grants the first three names of the genealogical tables are similar, but there is some slight difference in the fourth name. Taking into consideration the dates of the two inscriptions we think that Nandarāja of the second inscription might be a younger brother of Nannarāja of the first and succeeded him on his death.

In the seals of these grants there are the images of “Garuḍa.”

An inscription of V. S. 917 (A.D. 860) has been found at village of Pathārī in the Bhāpāl State, which contains the genealogical table of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of Central India as follows:—

Jējaṭa.
Kakarāja.
Parabala (V. S. 917).

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 234.
2 It is probable that this Durgrāja is a second name of king Dantivarman I of the Deccan, because, firstly, the period of Durgrāja of this inscription synchronises with that of Dantivarman I. Secondly, Dantivarman’s second name was Dantidurga which almost resembles Durgrāja and thirdly, in the inscription of the Dashāvatāra temple the name of Dantivarman II is written as Dantidurgarāja. If this supposition be correct then the Gōvindarāja of this inscription would be a younger brother of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indrāraja I of the Deccan.
Rāṇṇādēvī, the daughter of king Parabala, was married to king Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty of “Gauḍa” (Bengal). Kārkārāja, the father of Parabala defeated Nāgabhaṭa (Nāgāvalōka) who was probably the son of the Pratihāra king Vatsarāja. An inscription of Nāgabhaṭa, dated V.S. 872 (A.D. 815), has been found at the village of Buchkalā (Bilārā district) in Mārwār. But Professor Kielhorn identifies him with the Nāgāvalōka of the Bhrīgukachchhā grant of V.S. 813 (A.D. 756).

An inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas found at Bōdha Gayā contains the following genealogy:

Nanna (Guṇāvalōka).
Kṛttirāja.
Tunga (Dharmāvalōka).

Bhāgyadēvī, the daughter of Tunga, was married to Rājyaṃśa of the Pāla dynasty, who was fourth in descent from the aforesaid Dharmapāla. The inscription bears the year 15, which might be the 15th regnal year of king Tunga who probably lived about V.S. 1025 (A.D. 968).

---

3 This Nāgāvalōka was probably Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa I.
4 Bōdha-Gayā, (by Rājendralal Mittra), page 195.
An inscription of the time of Lakhanapāla¹ has been discovered from Badāūn, which is probably of about V. S. 1258 (A.D. 1201). It contains the following genealogical table:—

```
Chandra.
| Vigrahapāla.
| Bhuvanapāla.
| Gōpāla.
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribhuvanapāla.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madanapāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēvapāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhīmapāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shūrapāla.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amritapāla.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakhanapāla.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

This inscription indicates that Chandra was the first Rāśhrakūṭa king who took the town of Badāūn, which is stated to be the ornament of the kingdom of Kanauj.

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 64.
THE RĀŚHṬRAKŪṬAS OF MANYAKHĒṬA (Deccan)
FROM BEFORE V. S. 650 (A.D. 593)
TO
ABOUT V. S. 1039 (A.D. 982).

In an inscription found at Yēvūr and also in a copper grant of the Sōlankīs found at Miraj, it is thus stated:—

भो राष्ट्रकूटविश्वेश्वर 
राजयशस्य स्वरूपम् सत्यसम् ।
शिराधर रघुनाथपरम्पराय विभाष ।
स्त्यस्तुतुरुतवरसाजनवरम् ।


tathusno vibhājanaḥ: कौशिकाम् तदात्मानः
वेन भारतस्य नागरभीतर्विक्रयाकुतुम्बिः ।

i.e., he (Sōlankī Jayasimha) by defeating Rāśṭra-
kūṭa Indra, the owner of 800 elephants and son of 
Krishṇa, re-established the kingdom of Vallabharāja 
(Sōlankīs). (From the word Vallabharāja mentioned 
in this inscription it appears that this title originally 
belonged to the Sōlankīs and after defeating them the 
Rāśṭrakūṭas assumed it. Therefore, the Arab writers 
have mentioned the Rashṭrakūṭa kings as "Balharāś" 
which is a corrupt form of the word "Vallabharāja").

In the time of Kirtivarman II, son of Vikramāditya, 
(who was 11th in descent from this Jayasimha) the 
Sōlankī kingdom was again overthrown.

From the aforesaid stanzas it appears that the 
Rāśṭrakūṭas ruled in the Deccan before it was con-
quered by Sōlankī Jayasimha in the latter part of the 
sixth century of the Vikrama era. But between V. S.
805 and 810 (A.D. 747 and 753) the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga II again seized a large part of the kingdom from Sōlankī Kirtivarman II.

The history of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, to which this Dantidurga II belonged, is traced through inscriptions, copper grants and Sanskrit books as follows:—

1. DANTIVARMAN (DANTIDURGA I).

This king was a descendant of Indra, son of Krishṇa, mentioned above. He is the first king known through the inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of this line. In the inscription of the Dashāvatāra temple, he is described as a protector of ‘Varṇāshrama Dharma’ (laws of castes and stages of life). He was a good-natured, merciful and independent ruler. He probably flourished before V.S. 650 (A.D. 593).

2. INDRARĀJA I.

He was the son and successor of Dantivarman. His and his father’s names have been taken from the inscription of the Dashāvatāra temple in the Ellörā caves, in which after Dantidurga II, the name of Mahārāja Sharva is mentioned. But in other inscriptions of this branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the names of Dantivarman I and Indrarāja I, are not found, for the pedigrees in them commence from Gōvinda I.

In the aforesaid Dashāvatāra inscription, this Indra is described as a performer of many sacrifices (Yagyās) and a brave king. Prachchhakarāja appears to be his second name.

1 Archaeological Survey report of Western India, Vol. V, page 87; and cave temples inscriptions, page 92.

2 It is not clear who is meant by “Sharva” here. Some think “Sharva” to be a brother of Dantidurga and others take it for Amōghavarsha. From the aforesaid Dashāvatāra inscription it appears that this “Sharva” camped in this temple with his army. Probably “Sharva” was a title or another name of Dantidurga.
3. GÖVINDARĀJA I.

He was the son of Indrarāja and ascended the throne after his death. We learn from the inscription of Pulakēshin II, dated Shaka S. 556 (V.S. 691—A.D. 634) found at Ēhōlē, that at the time when Mangalīśha was killed, and his nephew Pulakēshin II succeeded him, Gōvindarāja with the aid of his allies, taking opportunity of the consequent weakness of the Sōlankīs, attempted to regain the lost kingdom of his ancestors. But as he could not succeed, he concluded peace.²

It appears, therefore, that Gōvindarāja was a contemporary of Pulakēshin II and should have lived about V. S. 691 (A.D. 634).

“Vīra Nārāyaṇa” was another name of Gōvindarāja.

4. KARKARĀJA (KAKKA I).

He was the son and successor of Gōvindarāja I. The Brahmanas had performed several sacrifices during his reign, as this generous king himself was a follower of the Vedic religion and a patron of learning. He had three sons:—Indrarāja, Krishnarāja and Nanna.

5. INDRARĀJA II.

He was the eldest son and successor of Karkarāja. His queen was a daughter of the Sōlankī (Chālukya) dynasty and her mother was born of the Lunar race. This shows that, at that time, the Rāshtrakūṭas and the western Chālukyas were not, in any way, on unfriendly terms.

---

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, pages 5-6.
² लक्ष्मि काश महेंद्रपाले जेवुण्याचिकावे नोक्कडे च विरूद्धकर्तारस्त्योपिनिधया।
मस्त्यानीस्युं मवत्तत्त्वात्। प्रयात: 
तनावास फलामुक्तस्यार्थापि सेव। II
His army consisted of a considerable number of horses and elephants.

6. DANTIVARMAN. (DANTIDURGA II).

He was the son and successor of Indrarāja II. Between V.S. 604 and 810 (A.D. 748 and 753) he took possession of Vātāpi, the northern portion of the kingdom of Chālukya (Sōlanki) Kirtivarman II, and again established the Rāshtrakūṭa kingdom in the Deccan, which remained under this dynasty for about 225 years.

A copper grant of Shaka S. 675 (V. S. 810—A.D. 753), found at Sāmangadh (Kolhāpur State), contains the following lines:

\[\text{माहान्द्री रेखा रोधोमित्रिवदर्यः}
\]
\[\text{धी वक्रं सप्ति धंडलके (धके) न जित्या}
\]
\[\text{राजा धिकाकसम्रभस्तामुप्रेत}_1
\]
\[\text{कांचीशङ्करलाहणविपमोलपापम्—}
\]
\[\text{प्रीयंनवस्त्विस्वेदविपालहाम्}
\]
\[\text{कण्ठार्कं वहमनत्तपार्वत्य (धो) ॥}
\]
\[\text{श्रि (श्रृ) त्रृं: कब्जदिनर्पण्यम् व: सहस्राविध ॥}
\]

*i.e.*, his (Dantivarman II’s) elephants had gone up to the Māhī, the Mahānādi and the Narmada.  

Defeating Vallabha (western Chālukya king Kirtivarman II) he assumed the titles of Rājādhirāja and Paramēshvara; and with a small cavalry defeated the great Karnātik army, which had won a victory over the kings of the Kānchī, Kērala, Chōla and Pāṇḍya as well as over king Harsha of Kanauj and Vajraṭa.

The Karnātik army here referred to was the army of the Chālukyas.  

---

1. Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, page 111.
2. In the copper plate of Tālāgāṇi the reading is “महेश्वरः.”
3. This shows that he had conquered Māhīkāṇthā, Mālīvā and Orīsā.
4. The Aihole inscription contains:

\[\text{मधविहितधिनितपस्तायनांतसामलसंभ-}
\]
\[\text{महिमहकुम्यस्ताकालान्याःपश्चात्विनः}
\]
\[\text{हरिः पृथिवाज्ञानमुद्यागमरभवतु॥}
\]
\[\text{मायाकिलिरिवेण चालायिर द्वै:।}
\]

*i.e.*, the Chālukya king Pulakēśhvar II defeated king Harsha of the Vaisa dynasty.
While conquering the Deccan he also defeated the king of Shri Shaila (in the Karnūl district of Madras). Similarly, he won victories over the kings of Kalinga, Kōshala, Mālava, Lāṭa and Tanka, as well as over the Shēshas (Nāgas). At Ujjain he distributed a large quantity of gold in charity and dedicated jewelled helmets to the God 'Mahākālēshvara.' This indicates that he was a great king of the South. His mother granted lands in charity in almost all the (4,00,000) villages of his kingdom.

A copper grant, of Shaka S. 679 (V.S. 814=A.D. 757), found at Vakkalēri, indicates that though Dantidurga had seized the kingdom from Sōlankī (Chālukya) Kirtivarman II, before Shaka S. 675 (V.S. 810=A.D. 753), yet the latter had retained possession of its southern part upto Shaka S. 679 (V.S. 814=A.D. 757).

A copper grant of Shaka S. 679 (V.S. 814=A.D. 757), of Mahārājādhirāja Karkarāja II of Gujarāt, found in the neighbourhood of Sūrat, shows that this Dantivarman (Dantidurga II), at the time of his victory over the Sōlankīs, had also conquered Lāṭa (Gujarat) and made it over to his relative Karkarāja II.

We come across two names of this king—Dantivarman and Dantidurga. The following appear to be his titles:—Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēśhvarā, Parama Bhaṭṭāraka, Prithvīvallabha, Vallabharāja, Mahārāja Sharva, Khadgāvalōka, Sāhasatunga, Vairamēgha.

1 The country near the sea-coast between the Māhānādī and the Gōḍāvari.
2 This refers to southern Kōshala (or the modern Central Provinces) which was to the south of the province of Oudh, as the province containing Ayōdhyā and Lucknow, etc., was then called northern Kōshala.
3 Country west of the Narmadā near the modern Baroda State.
6 The ruler of Gujarāt at that time was Gujrara Jayabhāṭa II, as appears from his copper grant of Chēdi S. 486 (V.S. 793=A.D. 736). Soon after this Dantidurga II probably seized it from him and made it over to Karkarāja.
The title ‘Khādgāvaloka’ probably implies that his look had the terrible effect of a sword on his enemies.

From the above facts, it is evident that Dantidurga was a very powerful king and his dominions extended from the northern borders of Gujrat and Mālwa to Rāmēśhvarānum in the south.\(^1\)

It appears that after taking the small principalities of the neighbourhood, Dantidurga conquered the Central Provinces. On his return he again went to Kānchī, for the king of that place had, once again, made a fruitless attempt to regain his lost freedom.\(^2\)

In the aforesaid Dashāvatāra inscription, Dantidurga is stated to have defeated Sandhu Bhūpādhipa, whose kingdom probably was in the south somewhere near Kānchī as the inscription mentions, “Kānchī” just after this event.

7. KRISHṆARĀJA I.

He was the younger brother of Indrarāja II and uncle of Dantidurga whom he succeeded.

Three stone inscriptions and one copper grant of the reign of this king have been found:—The first inscription, bearing no date, was found at Hattimattur.\(^3\) The second of Shaka S. 690 (V.S. 825—A.D. 768) at Talēgāon; and the third of Shaka S. 692 (V.S. 827—A.D. 770) at Ālās.\(^4\)

The copper grant of his reign is dated Shaka S. 694 (V.S. 829—A.D. 772.)\(^5\)

---

1. In the copper grant of Rāśṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja, found from Paithan (Nizam’s Dominions), it is stated that he had extended his sway all over India from Rāmēśhvarānum in the south to the Ilīmālayas in the north and from the Western Coast to the Eastern Coast.

2. In the inscription, of Shaka S. 836 (V.S. 971), of Nausārī, it is thus stated:—

   "काशीप्रे विचारिण करेश्वर भूवः:"


4. Do. do. do. page 209. (This inscription belongs to his—Krishṇarāja’s—son, prince regent Gōvindarāja.)

A copper grant, of Shaka S. 730 (V.S. 864—A.D. 807), of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Gōvindarāja III, found at Vānīgāon (Nāsik), alludes to Krishnārāja as follows:—

i.e., just as at the time of churning the sea the 'Mandarāchala' mountain had drawn out Lakṣmī from it; in like manner, Vallabha (Krishnārāja I) drew out Lakṣmī, i.e., seized the kingdom from the Sōlankī (Chālukya dynasty).

Another copper grant, of Shaka S. 734 (V. S. 869—A.D. 812), of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Karkarāja of Gujrat, found at Barōdā, refers to this king Krishnā I in the following terms:—

i.e., Krishnārāja I, the lion (most powerful) among kings, turned the great boar (Kīrtivarman II), proudly advancing to fight, into a deer (i.e., put him to flight).

This event probably took place about V. S. 814 (A.D. 757).

As the copper grants of the Sōlankis bear the mark of a boar, the poet has aptly compared king Kīrtivarman to a boar.

We also understand from this that in the time of Krishnārāja I, the Sōlankī king Kīrtivarman, II had made an attempt to regain his kingdom but, far from achieving any success, he even lost what had remained in his possession.

The army of the king Krishnā also included a large cavalry.

It was this king, who got the Shiva temple known as "Kailāsa Bhāvna" built in the famous Ėlōra caves, in the Nizam’s dominions. This temple is made by

2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 159.
cutting into the rock and is famed for its architecture. Here he also constructed a ‘Dēvakula’ known after him as “Kannēshvara” where many scholars used to live. Besides this he built 18 other Shiva temples which testifies that he was a staunch Shaiva.

The following were the titles of this king:—

Akālavarsa, Shubhatunga, Prithvīvallabha and Shrīvallabha.

He also defeated the self-conceited king Rāhappa.† Vincent Smith and other scholars are of opinion that this Krishṇa I had usurped the kingdom by ousting his nephew Dantidurga II.‡ But this view is incorrect, as from the words ‘कलंकन विस्मरण्ते’ (i.e., on the demise of Dantidurga) occurring in the copper grants§ found at Kāvī and Navasārī, it is evident that Krishṇa had ascended the throne on the death of his nephew Dantidurga.

From the aforesaid grant¶ found at Barōdā it appears that during the reign of this king a prince of this branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had made an attempt to usurp the kingdom. But Krishnaraṇa subdued him.∥ It is probable that this prince was a son of Dantidurga II and that Krishnaraṇa might have assumed power owing to his minority or weakness.

Though it is clearly stated in the copper grant of Karkarāja (dated Shaka S. 894) found at Kardā¶ that

---

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, page 105. Some scholars consider this Rāhappa to be second name of Karkarāja II of Gujrat. It is possible that the rule of Gujrat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas might have thus met its end.
2 Oxford History of India, page 216.
5 यो रंगरुपमूर्ण निरंतरै पारिपालन शास्यं रक्षयं गोर्षिन्द्राय चके।

Some scholars identify this event with the dispossession of Karkarāja II of his kingdom of Gujrat. It is probable that Karkarāja might have raised some disturbance on the death of Dantidurga II.
6 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 264.
Krishṇa uncle of Dantidurga II succeeded to the throne on the latter dying issueless, yet, as the inscription is dated about 200 years after this event, it is to be relied on with caution.

Krishṇarāja I might have acended the throne about V. S. 817 (A.D. 760). He had two sons, Gōvindarāja and Dhruvarāja.

Some scholars hold this Krishṇarāja I, to be the hero of Halayudha's 'Kavirahasya,' while others think that the poem treats of Krisṇarāja III. The latter opinion seems correct. The following is an extract from the work:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Krishṇarāja} & \text{ is the king of the Chāṇḍāla kingdom of the south.} \\
\text{His son} & \text{ is Gōvindarāja, and his successor is Dhruvarāja.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Text in Devanagari}\]

\[\text{Translation:}\]

i.e., in southern India there is a great king named Krishṇarāja.... No other king is a match for this Rāśṭrākūṭa king.... This 'Chandramvamsi' king performs various sacrifices and keeps his chariot foremost on battle-fields.

The famous Jain logician Akalanka Bhaṭṭa, the author of 'Rājavārtika', and other works flourished in his reign.

**SILVER COINS.**

About 1800 silver coins of Rāśṭrākūṭa king Krishṇarāja were found at Dhamōri (Amrāotī, Berār district). These coins are similar to those of the Satraps. They are equal in size to the British Indian silver two annas piece, but in thickness they are about double of it. On the obverse there is the king's head while on the reverse there is an inscription as below:

\[\text{Text in Devanagari}\]

\[\text{Translation:}\]

1 The followers of this opinion consider the date of compilation of the 'Kavirahasya' as V. S. 867 (A.D. 810).
8. GÖVINDARĀJĀ II.

He was the son and successor of Krishnārāja I. From his aforesaid copper grant of Shaka S. 692 (V.S. 827—A.D. 770) it appears that he had conquered Vengī (the eastern coast district between the Gōdāvarī and the Krishnā). He is mentioned as prince in this plate; which shows that his father Krishnārāja I was alive till then.

Two more copper grants of his time are found. The first of these is of Shaka S. 697 (V.S. 832—A.D. 775), in which the name of his younger brother Dhruvarāja appears with the titles—Mahārājādhirāja, etc. The second is of Shaka S. 701 (V.S. 836—A.D. 779) from which it appears that Gōvindarāja was the king even at that time. In this plate the name of Dhruvarāja’s son is mentioned as Karkarāja. From these two copper grants we infer that at that time Gōvinda was a king in name only.

As Gōvindarāja’s name does not occur in the copper grants of Vāṇidindōrī, Barōdā and Rādhanpur, we understand that his younger brother Dhruvarāja had probably dispossessed him of the kingdom. From the copper grant of Wardhā we learn that this Gōvindarāja II was addicted to women and had entrusted the government to his younger brother Nirupama. Probably this vice had caused his downfall.

2 He had gained this victory during his father’s life time. When his camp was pitched near the confluence of the river Krishnā, Vēnā and Musā, the king of Vēnī approached him and acknowledged his supremacy.
4 Do. VIII, page 184.
5 गोविन्दराज इति तस्य ब्रह्म गात्रा संग्रामसंपूर्णायाविविशिष्ट:।
भास्पतानुभुजे निसर्गे विनिवेशति समपूर्ण सार्वभौमस्वास्चार्यविषिविविशिष्ट \\ni.e., king Gōvinda II, son of Krishnārāja I, being addicted to love of women, entrusted the work of his government to his younger brother Nirupama whereby his power declined.
From the copper grant,¹ found at Paiṭhan, it appears that Gōvindarāja II had again made an attempt, with the assistance of the neighbouring kings of Mālwā, Kānchī, Vēngi, etc., to regain his lost power, but his younger brother Nirupama (Dhruvarāja) defeated him and brought the kingdom under his complete sway.

The jain author Jinasēna of the ‘Digambara’ sect, at the close of his work ‘Harivamsha Purāṇa,’ has stated as follows:—

शाकेश्वर्यमण्जोति सहस्र विशं परमेश्वरसमूहताः
पातिर्वधुध्वानिवर्ण हरिधाराप्रदेह दलितागम्।

पूर्वी श्रीमददर्शिका साधिते वर्त्तादि (विं) राजे वर्तिः
सोवार (उ) यामधिसस्त्रवेशेऽलोकेऽवर्तित न।

i.e., in Shaka S. 705 (V.S. 840—A.D. 783), when this book (Purāṇa) was written, king Indrāyudha ² reigned in the north; Krishṇa’s son, Shrīvallabha in the south; Vatsārāja of ‘Avanti’ in the east; and Varāha in the west.

From this we conclude that upto Shaka S. 705 (V.S. 840) Gōvindarāja II³ was ruling, because we learn from the grants of Paiṭhan⁴ and Paṭṭadakal⁵ that his title was “Vallabha” while that of his younger brother, Dhruvarāja “Kalivallabha.”

The following were also the titles of Gōinda II:—
Mahārājādhirāja, Prabhūtavarsha, and Vikramāvalōka. The date of his succession should be about V.S. 832 (A.D. 775), because there exists an inscription of Shaka S. 694 (V.S. 829—A.D. 772) of his father Krishnārāja I.

² Some scholars consider this Indrāyudha to be Rāshtrakūṭa king of Kanauj. Defeating his successor Chakrāṇuj, Pratiḥāra Nāgabha[a II, son of Vatsārāja seized the kingdom of Kanauj.
³ Some scholars hold that the Shrīvallabha mentioned here was Gōvindarāja III, but it is not acceptable.
⁵ Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, page 125. (This inscription belongs to the reign of Dhruvarāja.)
9. DHRUVARĀJA.

He was the son of Krishṇarāja I and the younger brother of Gövindarāja II. He dethroned his elder brother Gövinda II and usurped the throne.

He was a brave and wise ruler as his title Nirupama denotes. He defeated the Pallava king of Kāñchī from whom he took some elephants as a fine. He imprisoned the king of Chēra of the Ganga dynasty, attacked Pratihāra Vatsarāja, the ruler of the North and conqueror of Gauḍa, seized from him the two canopies that he had obtained from the king of Gauḍa, and drove him towards Bhīnmāl (Marwar).

It is this Vatsarāja who is mentioned in stanza of the ‘Harivamshha Purāṇa’, quoted above in the history of Gövindarāja II.

We learn from the copper grant of Begumra that this Dhruvarāja had also seized a canopy from the king of northern Kōshala. The copper grant of Deoli (Wardhā) also supports this view, in which Dhruvarāja is stated to have got three white canopies, two of which were those seized from Vatsarāja and the third must have been taken from the king of Kōshala.

In all probability the kingdom of Dhruvarāja extended over the country from Ayōdhya in the north to Rāmēshvaram in the south.

In the history of his elder brother Gövindarāja we have taken notice of two copper grants of Shaka S. 697 and 701. These plates, properly speaking, pertain to this king.

Three inscriptions in Canarese have been found

1 When Vatsarāja invaded Malwa, Dhruvarāja went with his feudatory, Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karkarāja, the ruler of Lāṭa (Gujrāt), to the help of the king of Malwa. In this action Vatsarāja being defeated escaped towards Bhīnmāl.
at Paṭṭadakal, Narēgal and Lakshmēshvar, which probably also belong to this king.

The following were the titles of Dhruvarāja:—Kali-vallabha, Nirupama, Dhārāvarsha, Shrīvallabha, Mahā-rājādhīrāja, Paramēshvara, etc.

In the Narēgal grant he is also mentioned as ‘Dōra’ (Dhōra) which is a ‘Prākrit’ form of his name.

Another broken inscription1 in Canārese has been found at Shravaṇa Bēlgōla which is of the time of Mahāsamantadhipati Kambayya (Stambha) Raṇāvalōka. This Raṇāvalōka is mentioned (in this inscription) as the son of Shrīvallabha.

The date of the accession of Dhruvarāja should be about V.S. 842 (A.D. 785).2

When he usurped the kingdom of his elder brother Gōvindarāja II, the kings of Ganga, Vēngi,3 Kānchī, and Mālwā sided with him (Gōvinda II) but Dhruvarāja defeated them all. He appointed in his life-time his son Gōvindarāja III as the ruler of the country from Kanṭhikā (Konkan) to Khambhāt (Cambay).

In the copper plate4 dated Shaka S. 715 (V.S. 850—A.D. 793), found at Daulatābād, there is a mention of the charity given by prince Shankaragaṇa, uncle of Dhruvarāja and son of Nanna (grandson of Karkarāja). This inscription also shows that Dhruvarāja was ruling at that time and that he had assumed the sovereignty to save the kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas from the covetous neighbours who tried to take advantage of the weakness of Gōvindarāja II.

---

1 Inscriptions at Shravaṇa Bēlgōla, Vol. 24, page 3.
2 Vincent Smith holds A.D. 780 as the date of the accession of this king.
3 The king of Vēngi at the time probably was Viṣṇupuravdhana IV of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty.
HISTORY OF THE RĀŚṬRĀKŪṬAṢ.

10. GŌVINDARĀJA III.

He was the son and successor of Dhruvarāja. Though he had other brothers, his father, finding him the ablest of all, intended in his life-time to invest him with the ruling powers but he disapproved of the proposal and carried on the administration as a prince regent during his father’s life-time.

His titles appear to be:—“Prithvīvallabha, Pabhūtavāraḥ, Shrivallabha, Vimalāditya, Jagattunga, Kirtinārāyaṇa, Atishayadhavala, Tribhuvanadavala, and Janavallabha, etc. Nine copper grants have been found of his time. The first is of Shaka S. 716 (V.S. 851—A.D. 794) found at Paitihan. The second is of Shaka S. 726 (V. S. 861—A. D. 804) found at Someshvara, which discloses that his queen’s name was “Gāmuṇḍabbē” and that he defeated king Dantiga of Kānchī (Kānji-varam).

This Dantiga might be the Dantivarman of the Pallava dynasty whose son Nandivarman married princess Shankhā, the daughter of the Rāśṭrākūṭa king Amoghavarsha.

The third and the fourth plates are of Shaka S. 730 (V.S. 865—A.D. 808). From these we learn that Gōvindarāja had defeated the combined armies of 12 kings assembled under the banner of his brother Stambha. (This shows that on the death of Dhruvarāja,

---

1 The inscription dated Shaka S. 788 (V. S. 923—A.D. 868) of his son Amoghavarsha I, found at Nilgund, indicates that Gōvindarāja III was called Kirtinārāyaṇa, as he fettered the people of Kārāla, Mālava, Gauḍa, Gurjara and those living in the hillfort of Chitrakūṭa and subdued the Lord of Kānchī.


5 In the copper grant of Shaka S. 724 of Stambha, found at Nūlmangal, the name Shauchakambha (Shauchakambha) is stated instead of Stambha—

“अतामुत्तमो साक्षर्यवनितिस्वरः शौचकम्बभाभो”

From this copper grant it also appears that after this defeat Shauchakambha may have remained obedient to king Gōvindarāja. Another name of this Shaucha-
Stambha may have made an attempt, with the assistance of the neighbouring kings, to usurp the kingdom.)

Gövindarāja liberated king Ganga of Chēra (Coimbatur) who was taken prisoner by his father (Dhruvarāja). But when Ganga again prepared to rebel, he recaptured and re-imprisoned him. From these copper grants we also learn that this Gövindarāja III, having attacked the king of Gujrāt, had put him to flight and conquered Mālwā. He, having subjected Mārāsharva on his invasion of Vindhyaçhala, kept his residence at Shrī Bhavana (Malkhed) till the end of the rains and at the advent of the winter advanced towards the Tunga-bhadra (river) and defeated the Pallava king of Kānchī. Later, in obedience to his call, the king of Vēngi, (country between the Krishṇā and the Gōdāvarī) probably Vijayāditya II of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty, attended his court and acknowledged his supremacy.

From the copper grant of Sanjān we learn that Dharmāyudha and Chakrayudha also acknowledged his supremacy.

The kings of Banga and Magadha also yielded to him.

As his expedition upto the Tungabhadrā is noted in the copper grant of Shaka S. 726, it appears that all these events had taken place before this date (i.e., V. S. 861=A.D. 804).

The said third and fourth copper grants were found at Wāṇī and Rādhanpur and indicate that they were inscribed at Muyūrakhandī, the modern Mōrkhand in the Nāsik district.

The fifth and sixth plates are of Shaka S. 732

khambha was Rānāvalōka. At the recommendation of prince Būṇaya he made a grant of a village for a Jain temple (Epigraphii Carnāticœ, manṣe grant, No. 61, p. 51).

1 Unpublished grant.
(V.S. 867=A.D. 810), and the seventh is of Shaka S. 733 (V.S. 868=A.D. 811).

The eighth plate is of Shaka S. 734 (V.S. 869=A.D. 812); it contains a mention of the charitable grant made by king Karkarāja of Gujrat.

The ninth plate of Shaka S. 735 (V.S. 870=A.D. 813) shows that this Gōvindarāja III, having conquered Lāṭa (the central and southern part of Gujrat), had made his younger brother Indrarāja the ruler of that territory. This Indrarāja was the founder of the second branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of Gujrat.

From the aforesaid facts it appears that this Gōvindarāja III was a powerful monarch. Kings of the countries between the Vindhya and Mālwa in the north to Kānci in the south were under his sway, and his own kingdom extended from the Narmadā to the Tungabhadra.

One more copper grant of Shaka S. 735 (V.S. 870=A.D. 813) has been found at Kadamba (Mysore) which contains a mention of a charitable grant made to the Jain priest Arkakīrtī, the disciple of Vijayakīrtī. This Vijayakīrtī was a disciple of Kulāchārya and this grant was made on the recommendation of king Chāki-rāja of the Ganga dynasty.

In the date of this plate Monday is mentioned as the corresponding day, whereas by calculation Friday falls on that date. Thus, there is some doubt about the genuineness of this plate.

In the foregoing history of Gōvindarāja II, we have cited a stanza from the 'Harivamshapurāṇa.' Its second line reads as follows:—

---

2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 166.
4 The country between the Tapti and the Mālī rivers.
"वालीनरायणसाति कुङ्गावरे शीवकामे बिन्धिगाम्" Some scholars consider the phrase 'कुङ्गावरे' here to be connected with 'शीवकामे' while others think it to be going with the preceding name 'कुङ्गाबुधृष्ण'.

According to the first reading Gōvinda II is meant here as the king of the Deccan, while according to the second reading, if we take Indrāyudha to be the son of Krishnārāja, then the word "Shrīvallabha" remains alone. Thus, those who favour the latter opinion hold that Gōvinda III, and not Gōvinda II, was ruling in Shaka S. 705; but this is not acceptable.

In an inscription of Shaka S. 788 (V.S. 923-A.D. 866), found at Nilgund, it is stated that this Gōvinda III had conquered Kērala, Mālava, Gurjara and Chitra-kūṭa (Chittor). His date of accession ought to be just after V.S. 850 (A.D. 973). The Eastern Chālukya king of Vēŋgī had to build a city wall around Mānya-khēṭa for its protection, by way of subsidy.

In an inscription found at Monghyr, it is stated that Raṅṇādēva, the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Prabala, was married to king Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal. Dr. Kielhorn holds this Parbala to be king Gōvinda III, but Sir Bhandārkar identifies him with Krishṇa II.

11. AMŪGHAVARSHA I.

He was the son and successor of Gōvinda III. The real name of this king has not yet been known. Perhaps, it was "Sharva," but in the copper plates, etc., he is named as Amūghavarsha, e.g.:

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI page 102.
3 See pages 48-49.
i.e., he (Karkarāja) installed Amōghavarsa on the throne by putting down the Rāshṭrakūṭas, that had revolted and seized the territories.

But in fact Amōghavarsa seems to be only the title of the king. The following titles of this king have also been found:—Nripatunga, Mahārāja Sharva, Mahārāja Shanda, Atishayadhavala, Vīra Nārāyaṇa, Prithvivallabha, Shrī Prithvivallabha, Lakshmivallabha, Mahārājādhirāja, Bhaṭāra, Parama Baṭṭāraka, Prabhūtavarsha, and Jagattunga.

He possessed the following seven emblems of the state:—Three white canopies, one conch, one ‘Pālidhvaja,’ one ‘Ōkakētu’ and one ‘Trivali’. The three white canopies mentioned here are, perhaps, the same that were acquired by Gōvinda II.

The following are the copper grants and the inscriptions of the time of this king:—

The first copper grant,¹ of Shaka S. 738 (V.S. 873= A.D. 817), of Rāshṭrakūṭa king Karkarāja of Gujrāt was found at Barōdā. This Karkarāja was the cousin of Amōghavarsa. The second copper plate,² of Shaka S. 749 (V.S. 884= A.D. 827), was found at Kāvī (Broach district); it speaks of the charity distributed by the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Gōvindarāja of Gujrāt.

The third plate,³ of Shaka S. 757 (V.S. 892= A.D. 835), of Mahāsāmantādhipati, Rāshṭrakūṭa king Dhruvarāja⁴ I of Gujrāt, found at Barōdā, shows that the name of Amōghavarsha’s uncle was Indrarāja and that his son (Amōghavarsha’s cousin) Karkarāja subduing the rebellious Rāshṭrakūṭas placed Amōghavarsha on the throne.

---

¹ Journal Bombay Branch Asiatic Society, Vol. XX, page 185.
³ Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIV, page 199.
⁴ Some scholars are of opinion that Dhruvarāja I, of Lāṭa (Gujrāt), had made a futile attempt on Amōghavarsha, who was therefore obliged to march against him. Probably Dhruvarāja was killed in this action.
The first inscription, \(^1\) of Shaka S. 765 (V.S. 900–A.D. 843), fixed in a cave at Kanheri (in the Thana district), shows that Amoghavarsha was ruling in that year, and that his chief feudatory Pulla Shakti (the successor of Kapardipada) was the governor of the whole of the Konkan district. The Pulla Shakti belonged to the Shilahara dynasty of the northern Konkan.

The second inscription, \(^2\) of Shaka S. 775 (V.S. 910–A.D. 853), of Kapardi II, the successor of Pulla Shakti, the chief feudatory, is fixed in another cave at Kanheri. Scholars suppose the actual date of this inscription to be Shaka S. 773 (V.S. 908–A.D. 851). This also shows that Pulla Shakti was a Buddhist.

The third inscription, \(^3\) of Shaka S. 782 (V.S. 917–A.D. 860), of Amoghavarsha himself, found at Kônur, contains a mention of the charity granted by him to the Jain priest Dêvendra at his capital city Manyakhêta. In this plate, the Râshtrakûtâs are stated to be the offshoots of Yadu, and a new title “Vîra Nârâyâna” of king Amoghavarsha is also found in it.

As he had granted lands in 30 villages for a Jain temple built by Bankêya, \(^4\) it appears that he patronised Jainism.

---

2. Do. do. XIII, page 134.
4. This Bankêya belonged to the Mukula clan and was a governor of 30,000 villages under Amoghavarsha. He by the command of the latter invaded Vatâtâvī of Gângavâji. Though the other feudatories refused to help him he advanced and took possession of the fort of Kâdal (north-west of Kadav). Proceeding further, he deposed the ruler of Tâlvan (Talâkâd on the left bank of the Kâvârî) and crossing the Kâvârî, he invaded the province of Saptapada. In the meantime, the son of Amoghavarsha raised the banner of rebellion and many feudatories joined him. But on the return of Bankêya the prince fled away and his allies were all killed. Pleased with this service Amoghavarsha granted the said lands for the Jain temple built by him.

This copper plate speaks of a rebellion by the prince; but in the unpublished copper plate of Shaka S. 763 of Sanjân the word "पुनायनसाहित्य: "—(ञॉक 19) shows that Amoghavarsha had only one son (whom he invested with the ruling powers during his life-time).
The fourth inscription, of Shaka S. 787 (V.S. 922-A.D. 865), of the time of this king, has been found at Mantravāḍī, the fifth of Shaka S. 788 (V.S. 923-A.D. 866) at Shirūr and the sixth (of the same date) at Niilgund; all these belong to the 52nd year of his reign.

From the aforesaid Shirur inscription it appears that Amōghavarsha’s coat-of-arms bore an image of ‘Garuda,’ 4 that his title was ‘Laṭalūrādhīshvara’, and that the kings of Anga, Banga, Magadha, Mālava, and Vēngi acknowledged his superiority. Probably, there may be some exaggeration in this statement.

The seventh inscription 5 of his feudatory Bankēyarasa has been found at Niilgund, which is of the 61st year of Amōghavarsha’s reign. In the fourth unpublished copper grant of Shaka S. 793 (V.S. 928—A.D. 871), found at Sanjān, it is stated that Amōghavarsha had made great efforts to overthrow the kingdom of the Dravīḍas; that the mobilisation of his armies struck terror in the hearts of the kings of Kēral, Pāṇḍya, Chōla, Kalinga, Magadha, Gujrāt and Pallava; and that he had imprisoned for life the ‘Gangavamshi’ ruler and those dependants of his own court who had carried on intrigues with him.

The king 6 of Vēngi got constructed a wall around his garden.

The fifth copper grant, of Shaka S. 789 (V.S. 924—A.D. 867), of the chief feudatory Dhruvarāja

---
4 This shows that he was a follower of Vaishnavism.
6 Later as this king of Vēngi oppressed his subjects, Amōghavarsha imprisoned him and his minister, and, to give publicity to their misdeeds erected their statues in the ‘Shiva’ temple at Kānchī.
7 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 181.
II' of Gujrât, contains a mention of a charitable grant made by him (Dhruvarāja).

The eighth inscription of Shaka S. 799 (V.S. 934- A.D. 877), fixed in a cave at Kanheśri, shows that king Amōghavarsha, being pleased with his feudatory Kapardī II, of the Shilārī clan, made over to him the kingdom of the whole of Kōkkan. From this inscription it also appears that Buddhism had survived in India till then.

From the aforesaid copper grant of Shaka S. 757 (V.S. 892), of Dhruvarāja I of Gujrât, it appears that some disturbances had arisen at the time of Amōghavarsha's accession, when his cousin Karkarāja had helped him. But from the contents of the subsequent inscriptions we understand that Amōghavarsha had gradually gained great power. He shifted his capital from Nāsīk to Mānyakhēṭa (Malkhēd), and remained at constant war with the western Chālukyas of Vēngi.

1 Perhaps a war took place between this Dhruvarāja II of Gujrât and Amōgha-

varsha I.


3 This Malkhēd exists even today about 90 miles to the south-east of Sholapur in the Nizam's dominions.

4 The copper grant of Vijayāditya contains the following :-

गणराज्यात् सार्थे द्वारकाशङ्कर्णहिंदशुः ॥

भुजाकिंत्रपति खंडशदायो नवसिकामे ।

भट्टण्युद्धशतां वृहत्या शंभोभवेश्वरम् ॥

तत्रस्यमद्यर्जरीरो विषयाधिपासुतिः ॥

i.e., in 12 years Vijayāditya II fought 108 battles with the kings of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and the Ganga dynasties, and later built an equal number of 'Shiva' temples. This shows that internal discord may have afforded an opportunity to Vijayāditya to attack and probably to take some portion of the territory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, which Amōghavarsha eventually recaptured, as appears from the following stanza in the copper grant of Navaśāri :-

निमर्गा वंटलुक्काधग्यो श्रावस्तिकशुः पुर् ।

पुष्करीभोजरं पीरो वीरस्वर्णोभवेश्वर ॥

i.e., just as Varaha (one of the incarnations of God) had delivered the earth that had been submerged in the sea, in the like manner, Amōghavarsha delivered once again the kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas that had lapsed under the surging sea of the Chālukyas.
A copper grant of the western Ganga dynasty, found at Sündi, shows that Amoghavarsha had a daughter named Abbalabbā who was married to ‘Gunadattaranga Bhūtuga,’ the great grandfather of ‘Pēramāṇādī Bhūtuga.’ This ‘Pēramāṇādī’ was a feudatory of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Krishṇa III. But this plate is held by scholars to be a forged one.

According to the aforesaid inscription of Shaka S. 788, the date of the accession of this king comes about Shaka S. 736 (V.S. 871–A.D. 815).

The latter part of the ‘Mahāpurāṇa’ written by Gunabhadra sūri (and known as Uttara purāṇa) contains the following:—

\[\text{Yashō Prāṇumvaṃganālakṣitvaratरुद्धसिरंधम्}\\ \text{वर्षमोहकः पियाजसुकुलप्रस्थवर्षुति}\\ \text{संस्मारी स्वसमोबपौर्णपति: पूर्तोपलोकेरपति}\\
\text{स श्रीमान्मनोपद्यमस्वमन्निर्पाये वर्महर्षम्}\]

i.e., blissful for the world is the existence of Jinasēnāchārya, by bowing to whom Amoghavarsha considered himself to be purified.

This shows that Amoghavarsha was a follower of the ‘Digambara’ branch of Jainism and was a pupil of Jinasēna.²

This fact is also borne out by the ‘Pārshvābhyudaya Kāvyā’³ written by Jinasēna. The same Jinasēna compiled the Adipurāṇa (the first half of the Mahāpurāṇa). In the preface to Ganitasārasangraha, a book on mathematics written by Mahāvīrāchārya, Amoghavarsha is stated to be the follower of Jainism.

The “Jayadhavalā,” a book containing the principles

---

2 This Jinasēna was also the author of the ‘Pārshvābhyudaya Kāvyā’ and belonged to the ‘Sēnasangha,’ while Jinasēna the author of the ‘Harivamsha Purāṇa’ (written in Shaka S. 705) belonged to the ‘Punnāṭa Sangha.’
3 ‘द्वयोशास्त्राचे मेलाराजानामीना जनार्दनीकिळ्टे मेषुनुदेशिये’

पारस्म्यमुखर्ष्यमार्गस्यविख्यानमान विद्यायार्षुपस्थित्वन्ति: सर्वसंस्कृते
of the 'Digambar' sect of Jainism, was also written in Shaka S. 759 (V.S. 894-A.D. 837) during the reign of Amoghavarsha.

The Jain priests of the 'Digambar' sect hold that the book named "Prashnotttararatnamalika" was written by Amoghavarsha himself, when he, being disgusted with the world, had renounced the affairs of the state in old age, but the Brähmanaas allege that the book was written by Shankaracharya, while the 'Svētāmbara' Jains say that its author was Vimalāchārya.

In the 'Digambara' Jain manuscripts of the above book we find the following couplet:—

\[\text{विवेकःस्वप्नतरुश्च रहियं रहनालिका, रन्धिष्मोत्तररत्नस्य दशमघिः वदशङ्ख्यणे।}

i.e., king Amoghavarsha, who has renounced the state, being enlightened by real knowledge, has written this book (Ratnamalika).

From this we learn that in old age the king having made over the reins of the government to his son passed the remainder of his life in religious meditation.

This book Ratnamalika was translated into the Tibetan language in which also Amoghavarsha is stated to be its author.

Just about this time many books had been written on Jainism that had then begun to gain a footing.

An inscription, 3 of Vankēyarasa bearing no date, has been found which shows that he was a feudatory of Amoghavarsha and ruler of the districts of Banavāsi,

---

1 From the manuscript copy of the 'Prashnotttararatnamalika' preserved in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, we learn that Shankarachārya was the author of the book in question. (Refer catalogue, edited by Kuppu Swami, Vol. II, part I, C, pages 2640-2641).

2 Besides Krishnarāja, Amoghavarsha had another son named Duddaya (Smith's Early History of India, page 446, Footnote No. 1.)

Belgali, Kundargē, Kandūr, Purigēde (Lakshmēshvara), etc.

From the Kyāsanūr inscription, bearing no date, it appears that Sankaragandha, a feudatory of Amoghavarsha, was the governor of Banavasi.¹

King Prithvipati I, son of Shivamāra of the Ganga dynasty, was also a contemporary of king Amoghavarsha.²

There is a book on prosody named “Kavirājamārga” in the Canarese language which too is said to have been written by king Amoghavarsha.

12. KRISHNARAJA II.

He was the son of Amoghavarsha and acquired the powers of government during his father’s life-time.

Four inscriptions and two copper grants of his time have been found.

Out of these copper grants the first³ found at Baghumra (Baroda district), of Shaka S. 810 (V.S. 945-A.D. 888), contains a mention of the charitable grant made by the chief feudatory Akalavarsha Krishnarāja of Gujrāt. But this inscription is held unreliable by scholars.

The first inscription⁴ of Shaka S. 822 (V.S. 957-A.D. 900) is found at Nandawādige (Bijapur). In fact, it is of Shaka S. 824 (V.S. 959-A.D. 903).⁵ The second inscription⁶ which is also of Shaka S. 822, was found at Ardeshahalli.

The third inscription⁷ of Shaka S. 824 (V.S. 959-A.D. 903), has been found at Mulgund (Dhārwār district.)

---

² C. Mabel Dull’s Chronology of India, page 73.
⁵ Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 221.
The second copper grant,\(^1\) of Shaka S. 832 (V.S. 967- A.D. 910), found at Kapḍavanga (Khaira district), contains a genealogical table of this dynasty from king Krishṇa I to Krishṇa II, and a mention of the village granted by the latter in charity. The name of his chief feudatory, Prachanda of the Brahmataka clan,\(^2\) is also found in it. He ruled over 750 villages, Khēṭaka, Harshapur, and Kāsahdra being the chief among them.

The fourth inscription,\(^3\) of Shaka S. 831 (V.S. 966- A.D. 909), has been found at Aiholē (Bijapur), the actual date of which ought to be Shaka S. 833 (V.S. 968- A.D. 912).

The following were the titles of king Krishṇarāja II:- Akālavarsha, Shubhatunga, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara, Parabhaṭṭāraka, Shrī Prithvivallabha, and Vallabharāja.

In some places the word ‘Vallabha’ is found affixed to his name such as ‘Krishṇavallabha.’ A corrupt form of his name in Canarese is found as “Kannara.”

He married a princess named Mahādēvi, the daughter of Haihaya king Kōkkala of Chēdē and younger sister of Shankkuka. This Kōkkala I was the king of Tripuri (Tēnavar).\(^4\)

The wars with the Eastern Chālukyas had continued down to the reign of this Krishṇarāja II.\(^5\)

---

2. Krishṇarāja had granted a ‘Jāgīr’ in Gujṛat to Prachanda’s father in recognition of his services.
5. In the copper plate of king Bhīma II, of the Chālukya dynasty of Vēngī, it is thus stated:—

तत्तमसंशिल्लकालसिऩ्धारसग्रही विष्ण्वात्सिज्ञानोविज्ञानविद्यायविद्यायदिविस्तरसदिवसाङ्गीतायानि

i.e., king Vijayāditya III who killed king Mangi (son of Vishṇuvardhana V, of the Ganga dynasty), and burnt the capital of king Krishṇarāja II, ruled for 44 years. Probably the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had after this taken possession of that country which was later recaptured by king Bhīma I, a nephew of Vijayāditya.

(Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIII, page 213.)
There is an inscription\(^1\) of Shaka S. 797 (V.S. 932-A.D. 875), of Prithvirāma, the chief feudatory of Krishṇarāja II, who had made a charitable grant of land for a Jain temple at Saundatti. From this inscription it appears that Krishṇa II ascended the throne in Shaka S. 797 (V.S. 932-A.D. 875). But in the foregoing narrative of his father (Amōghavarsha I) we have noted that an inscription of Shaka S. 799 (V.S. 934-A.D. 877) of that king has been found. This shows that in Shaka S. 797 (V.S. 932), or even earlier, king Amōghavarsha I had made over the kingdom to his son Krishṇarāja II. Hence, some feudatories might have commenced to mention his name in their inscriptions even during the lifetime of king Amōghavarsha. We have already mentioned in Amōghavarsha’s history that in his old age he, having renounced the affairs of the state, had written the book “Prashnottararatnamālikā.” This, too, supports the above opinion.

Krishṇa II conquered the Andhra, Banga, Kālinga, and Magadha kingdoms, fought with the kings of Gūrjara and Gauda, and after overthrowing the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom annexed the province of Lāṭa. His kingdom extended from the Cape Commorin to the bank of the Ganges.

In the latter part of the ‘Mahāpurāṇa’ written by Guṇabhadra, a disciple of Jinasēna, it is thus stated:—

\[...\]

i.e., the ‘Uttarapurāṇa’ was concluded in Shaka S. 820 (V.S. 955-A.D. 898), in the reign of king Akālavarsa. Hence, this ‘purāṇa’ may have been finished in the reign of Krishṇa II. His coronation probably took place about Shaka S. 797 (V.S. 932-A.D. 875). But V. A. Smith holds the date of this event to be A.D. 880 (V.S. 937).

---

He perhaps died about Shaka S. 833 (V.S. 986-A.D. 911). The name of the son of Krishna II was Jagattunga II who was married to Lakshmi, the daughter of Rana-vigraha (Shankaragana), the son of king Kókkala of the Kalachuri (Haihaya) dynasty of Chédi.

Just as Arjuna, the well-known hero of the Mahabhárata, married the daughter of his maternal uncle Vásudéva, Pradyumna the daughter of Rukma, and Aniruddha the granddaughter of Rukma, in like manner, in this family of the southern Rāshrakūṭa kings Krishnaraja, etc., married the daughters of their maternal uncles. This custom is still prevalent in the south.

From the copper grant found at Wardhā it appears that this Jagattunga had died in his father’s lifetime. Therefore, after Krishnaraja II, Jagattunga’s son Indra ascended the throne.

The fact of the marriage of Jagattunga II to Lakshmi, the daughter of Shankaragana, is borne out by the copper grant of Kardā. But the same plate speaks of Jagattunga as having married Gövindāmbā, another daughter of Shankaragana and the mother of Amogha-varsha III (Vaddiga), who might have been a younger brother of Indra. (This copper plate also shows that Jagattunga, having conquered many countries, had extended his father’s dominions far and wide, but the history relating to the later period is much confused in this plate.)

1 Bhūṣagathah Ītī Prasiddhasthitam: Śrīnabāsaśvatāparah: 
Prabhavājam: Sa devam vinivahem DivyamgnaPaśarpitaḥ pañca ||

i.e., the handsome prince Jagattunga being devoted to sexual pleasure pre-deceased his father. This fact is also borne out by the Sāngīl and Nāvṣāl copper plates:—

2 Rana-vigraha might be a title of Shankaragana.
3 In the copper grant found at Kardā it is thus stated:—

चिदार्जोत्सवमादिकां सरस्वतिर्सभासिशानायाम   
श्रीमानमोहस्वामृत्युमथष्ठानायाम ||
13. INDRARĀJA III.

He was the son of Jagattunga II, and, owing to the latter’s predeceasing his father, succeeded to the throne on the death of his grandfather Krishṇarāja. His mother’s name was Lakshmī, and he had married Vījāmbā, the daughter of Ammaṇadēva (Anangadēva), son of Arjuna and grandson of Kökkala of the Kala-churi (Haihaya) dynasty. The following are the titles of Indra III:—Nityavarsha, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara, Parama Bhaṭṭāraka, and Śri Prithvivallabha.

Two copper grants of his time have been found at Bagumra, both of which are of Shaka S. 836 (V.S. 972, A.D. 915). These show that Indra III had moved down from Manyakhēta to the village of Kurundaka for his coronation. And on its completion, on the 7th day of the bright half of Phālguna, Shaka S. 836 (24th February 915), he made a charitable grant of gold equal in weight to that of his person and also of a village in the province of Lāta. (This Kurundaka was situated on the confluence of the rivers Krishṇa and Panchagangā).

Besides these, he granted 20 lac Drammas and restored the 400 villages that had been resumed.

In the aforesaid copper plates the Rāṣṭrakūṭas are mentioned as the descendants of Sātyaki and it is also stated that Indra III had laid waste Mēru. Mēru here might stand for Mahōdaya (Kanauj), because in the copper grant of Shaka S. 852, of his son Gōvinda IV, it is stated that he, having led his cavalry across the Yamunā, had laid waste Kanauj. And on that account it came to be called ‘Kushasthala’ a jungle.

---

2 V. A. Smith gives A.D. 912 as the date of accession of Indra III. We cannot say that how far it is correct as in this plate is thus stated:—

“शक्तकालार्थत संवत्सर [राज] खचर्वदिविशिशुष्ठन्ते १५वंसंवत्सरे पाण्डुरगकालस्या संपने अष्टब (२) स्तोत्सवम्” which shows that this event took place in A.D. 915.
An inscription of Shaka S. 838 (V.S. 973-A.D. 916), which was found at Hattimattura (in the Dhārvār district) contains a mention of Lēndēyaras, the chief feudatory of this king.

When Indra III had laid waste Mēru (Mahōdaya or Kanauj) it was ruled over by the Pratihāra Mahipāla. Though the former had dispossessed the latter of his kingdom yet he regained its possession. But in this confusion Mahipāla of Pāncāla lost his western possessions (Saurāshṭra, etc).

Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa, the author of the ‘Damyantī Kathā’ and the ‘Madālasā champū,’ flourished in his time. The writer of the copper grant of Shaka S. 836 (V.S. 972), of Kurundaka, was the same Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa, the son of Nēmāditya and father of Bhāskra Bhaṭṭa. This Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa was contemporary of the great Paramāra king Bhōja of Malvā. The famous astronomer Bhāskarāchāryya, author of the ‘Siddhānta Shirōmanī,’ was fifth in descent from this Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa.

Indra III, had two sons:—Amōghavarsha and Gōvinda.

14. AMŌGHAVARSHA II.

He was the eldest son of Indrarāja III and had probably ascended the throne after him.

A copper grant of Shaka S. 919 (V.S. 1054-A.D. 997), of Mahāmandalēshvara Aparājita Dēvarāja of the Shilāra dynasty, shows that this Amōghavarsha II died soon after his accession (i.e., if he reigned at all it might be for a year or so only.) The date of his accession might be about V.S. 973 (A.D. 916). The Dēolī grant of Shaka S. 862 (A.D. 940) supports the fact that Amōghavarsha II succeeded Indrarāja III.

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 224.
15. GÖVINDARĀJA IV

He was the son of Indrarāja III and younger brother of Amōghavarsha II. The 'Prākritā' form of his name is found to be 'Gōjjiga.' The following were his titles: —Prabhūtavārsha, Suvarṇavarsha, Nripatunga, Vīra Nārāyana, Nītyakandarpa, Raṭṭakandarpa, Shashānka, Nripatitriniṭra, Mahārājādhīrāja, Paramēśhvara, Parama Bhaṭṭāraka, Sāhasānka, Prithvīvallabhā, Vallabhanarṇādrēdvā, Vīkrāntanārāyṇa, Gōjjigavallabha, etc.

The wars with the Eastern Chālukyas of Vēngi again broke out in his time, as is evident from the inscriptions1 of Amma I, and Bhīma III. Two inscriptions and two copper grants of the time of this Gōvinda IV have been found. The first2 of his inscriptions is of Shaka S. 840 (V.S. 975—A.D. 918) found, at Đandapur (Dhārvār district), and the second3 is of Shaka S. 851 (V.S. 987—A.D. 930).

In his first copper grant4 of Shaka S. 852 (V.S. 987—A.D. 930) he is mentioned as the successor of Mahārājādhīrāja Indrarāja III, and a 'Yaduvamshi' (of the lunar origin). The second plate,5 dated Shaka S. 855 (V.S. 990—A.D. 933), from Sāṅglī, contains a mention of the lineage, etc., like the first.

From the copper grant of Deōli (Wardhā) it appears that this king (Gōvinda IV) died at an early age

1 In the copper grants of the Chālukyas it is thus stated about Bhīma III:—

2 'देवध नोहेन्द्रक्रम्यविशिष्टः प्रेमस्वरूपाचरणः लोकस्मिनः'

3 श्रीमान्य युद्धाकर्तिरात्तिकायां संस्फळतः एव जानिबुधः

4 'भारतदेशीय आंतिक मर्मन्तः भूलवक्कल' and Yuddhamalla possessor of mighty elephants, without the help of others. This shows that Gōvinda IV may have made an unsuccessful attack upon Bhīma.

5 At the time of the succession of Amma I, Gōvinda IV had also attacked him but achieved no success.

2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 223.
3 Do. do. Vol. XII, page 211, (No. 48).
5 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 249.
owing to the excess of sexual pleasures. The date of his accession might be V.S. 974 (A.D. 917).

16. BADDIGA (AMOGHAVARSHA III).

He was the grandson of Krishnaraja II and son of Jagattunga II (from his wife Govinda bā). He succeeded Govinda IV, who died a premature death owing to excess of sexual pleasures.

It is stated in the copper grant of Shaka S. 862 (V.S. 997-A.D. 940), of the Rashttrakuta king Krishna III, found at Deolī (Wardha):—

sadā yathā madhyamadāvaprākāsakṣu gūkṣāmāraja iti kṣṇuṣṭaṃpatyā: 1171
sāyoganaṅgatapaśaṅgaṅgatūdhikaraṅgatāsaddhikirintakṣavara: 1
śiṣṣāsprVenāgyeprājyamahālakṣaṃprājyamānadhikinī 1181
śaṃstārāhārāyamahālakṣaṃprājyamānadhikinī
devēnāparī pīṇaśeṣa hṛtikukulatārārājyamānadhikinī praśīta: 1
śrīprājyamānadhikinī pīṇaśeṣa hṛtikukulatārārājyamānadhikinī

i.e., Gōvindarāja IV succeeded Amōghavарsha II, but as he died shortly afterwards on account of excessive sexual habits his feudatories requested Amōghavarsha III, the son of Jagattunga, to take the responsibilities of the government of the Raṭṭas and made him their king.

---

1 In the copper grant dated Shaka S. 855 (A.D. 933) of Śanḍī it is thus stated:—

śāmśeṣaḥ sātāṁ tīrthatā prabhāte nācāsya feṣṭa
bhūṣhōmānaṁmaṇi: kūṭhōrṣamvārauṣayānāmānām

i.e., Gōvindarāja did not wrong his elder brother, nor was he guilty of incest, nor of cruelty, but he had earned the title of 'Sāhasānaka' for his courage and self-abnegation.

We presume from this statement that he might have been blamed of such crimes in his lifetime, to refute which he was obliged to make such mention in his copper plate.

The following were the titles of Amôghavarsa III (Baddiga):—Shri Prithvívallabha, Mahârâjâdhîraja, Paramêshvara, Paramabhaṭṭâraka, etc.

He was a wise and powerful ruler, and a devotee of Shiva. He married Kundakadëvi, the daughter of Yuvarâja I (king of Tripuri or Tênvar), of the Kala-churi (Haihaya) dynasty.

From the inscription of Hëbbâla we understand that the daughter of Baddiga (Amôghavarsa III) was married to king Satyavâkya Könguṇivarma Përamânâdi Bhûtuga II, of the western Ganga dynasty to whom a large territory was given in dowry.

Baddiga may have ascended the throne about V.S. 992 (A.D. 935). He had 4 sons:—Krishnarâja, Jagatunga, Khottiga, and Nirupama. His daughter’s name was Rêvakanimmadî, and she was the elder sister of Krishnarâja III.

17. KRISHÑARÁJA III.

He was the eldest son and successor of Baddiga (Amôghavarsa III). Kannara also appears to be the ‘Prâkrit’ form of his name. His titles have been known to be as follows:—

Akâlavarsha, Mahârâjâdhîraja, Paramêshvara, Paramamâhëshvara, Paramabhaṭṭâraka, Prithvívallabha, Shri Prithvívallabha, Samastabhuvanâshraya, Kandhârapuravarâdhibhîshvara, etc.

From the inscription of Ätkür we learn that he killed king Râjâditya (Mûvaḍîchôla) of the Chôla dynasty in a battle near the place named Takkôla about V.S. 1006-7 (A.D. 949-50), but in fact he was treacherously killed by the Satyavâkya Könguṇivarma Peramânâdi Bhûtuga of the western Ganga dynasty,

2 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 351.
3 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II, page 171. The time of the death of Râjâditya is supposed to be V. S. 1006 (A.D. 949).
for which act Kṛṣṇarāja gave him the districts of Banavāśī, etc.

In the inscription 1 of Tirukkalukkunram, Kṛṣṇa III is stated to have acquired the territories of Kānci and Tanjōr.

From the inscription of Dēōli it appears that Kṛṣṇa III killed king Dantiga of Kānci and Vappuga, defeated king Antiga of the Pallava dynasty, protected the Kalachurīs of the Central India against the invasion of the Gurjaras 3 and defeated many other hostile kings. The feudatory chiefs from the Himalayas to Ceylon and from the Eastern sea to the western sea acknowledged his supremacy. He granted a village in charity to commemorate the illustrious services of his younger brother Jagattunga. Kṛṣṇa III had acquired considerable power even during his father’s lifetime.

In the inscription 4 (of Lakshmēśhvara), dated Shaka S. 890 (A.D. 968-9), it is stated that by his order Mārasi-mha II defeated the Gurjara king, while Kṛṣṇa III himself was like an incarnation of death for the kings of the Chōla dynasty.

From the inscriptions of Kyāsnoor and Dhārwār we understand that his chief feudatory Kalivēṭṭa, of the Chaillakētana dynasty, was the governor of Banavāśī in V.S. 1002-1003 (A.D. 945-46). 5 In one of the inscriptions 6 of the Raṭṭas of Saundattī it is stated that Kṛṣṇa III having appointed Prithvirāma as a chief feudatory had dignified the Raṭṭa family of Saundatti. The

---

3 These Gurjaras might be the followers of the Chālukya king Mūnarāja of Anhilwāḍā and they attempted to take possession of Kālinjar and Chitrakūṭa.
Yadava king Vandiga (Vaddiga) of Senua (district) was also a feudatory of Krishna III.

About 16 inscriptions and 2 copper grants of Krishna’s reign have been found, seven of which bear Shaka Samvats while the remaining 8 bear the king’s regnal years. The description of these is as follows:

The first copper grant of Shaka S. 862 (V.S. 997-A.D. 940), found at Deoli, speaks of a charitable grant made by Krishna III in memory of his deceased brother Jagattunga.

An inscription of Shaka S. 867 (V.S. 1002-A.D. 845) found at Saloitag (Bijapur) contains a mention of a school opened by his minister Narayana, where students used to come from various parts of the country.

In the second inscription of Shaka S. 871 (V.S. 1006-A.D. 949), found at Sholapur, this king is stated to be a Chakravarti (Emperor). The third inscription of Shaka S. 872 (V.S. 1007-A.D. 950), found at Atkur (Mysore), shows that king Krishna III awarded the district of Banavasi, etc., to king Bhutuga II of the western Ganga dynasty for his killing Chola king Raja Ditya. The fourth inscription of Shaka S. 873 (V.S. 1008-A.D. 951) is found at Soratur (Dharwad); the fifth of Shaka S. 875 (V.S. 1014-A.D. 957), at Sholapur; and the sixth of Shaka S. 976 (V.S. 1011-A.D. 954), at Chinchli.

The second copper grant of this king, bearing Shaka S. 880 (V.S. 1015-A.D. 958), found at Karhad, indicates that Krishna III, while invading the South, laid waste

---

2 Do. do. IV, page 60.
3 Do. do. VII, page 194.
4 Do. do. II, page 171.
5 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 257.
7 Kielhorn’s list of the Southern inscriptions of India, No. 97.
the province of Chōla,† conquered the territory of Pāṇḍya, subjugated the king of Ceylon, exacted tributes from the ‘Mānaqḍlika’ rulers and erected a monumental tower at Rāmēśhvaram to commemorate these victories. He also granted a village for the construction of the temples of Kālapriya, Gaṇḍamārtanda and Krīshnēśhvara.

His seventh inscription,‡ dated Shaka S. 884 (V.S. 1019=A.D. 962), was found at Dēvī Hosūr.

Eight inscriptions in Tamil language bearing no date are of his 16th, 17th, 19th, 21st, 22nd, 24th and 26th regnal years. There are two inscriptions of the 17th year. The ninth inscription of Lakshmēśhvara bears neither the date nor the regnal year. In these also he is described as the conqueror of Kāṇchī and Tanjai (Tanjor).

The Vira Chōla, mentioned in the inscription of the 26th regnal year, might be Gaṅga-vāna Pṛithvīpati II.

Krīshṇa III also used to assist his father in the conduct of the Government. He dethroned Rāčhamalla I, of the western Gaṅga dynasty, and installed his own brother-in-law Bhūtuga II,§ in his place. He defeated Kalachuri (Haihaya) Sahasrārjuna, king of Chēdi, and a relative of his mother and wife. The king of Gujrāt was also afraid of his bravery.

---

1 This fact is also supported by an inscription of Krīshṇarāja III, found at the village named Jārā. (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XIX, page 287). This event probably took place in V. S. 1004 (A.D. 947).
2 Kielhorn’s list of the inscriptions of Southern India, No. 89.
6 Do. do. VII, page 142.
7 Do. do. VII, page 143.
8 Do. do. VII, page 144.
9 Do. do. IV, page 82.
10 Do. do. III, page 284.
11 At that time the Pallavas ruled at Kāṇchī and the Chōlas at Tanjor.
12 From an inscription in the Tamil language of a later date it appears that Rāčhamalla was also killed by Bhūtuga,
As an inscription of his 26th regnal year has been found, it is certain that he ruled at least for 26 years.

The drama named "Yashastilaka Champū," written by Sōmadēva, was completed in Shaka S. 881 (V.S. 1016=A.D. 959), in the reign of Krīṣṇa III, and in it Krīṣṇa III has been described as the conqueror of Chēra, Chōla, Pāṇḍya, and Simhala. (A book named "Nītvākyāmrita" on politics was also written by the same Sōmadēva).

We have come across "Parama Māhēshvara" as one of the titles of the king which shows that he was a devotee of Shiva. He may have ascended the throne about V.S. 996 (A.D. 939).

He was a great king and his kingdom extended even beyond the Ganges.

The famous poet Pōnna of the Canarese language, who followed Jainism and wrote the 'Shānti Purāṇa,' also flourished in his reign. Pleased with his talents Krīṣṇa III decorated him with the title of "Ubbhayabhāṣā Chakravartī." The poet laureate Pushpadanta also came to Mānyakhēṭa during his time and compiled the Jain 'Mahāpurāṇa' in the 'Apabhramsha' language, under the patronage of his minister Bharata. Tl. book contains a mention of the plunder of Mānyakhēṭa, which took place in V.S. 1029. This shows that the book in question was completed in the time of Khōṭṭiga, the successor of Krīṣṇa III.

This Pushpadanta had also written the books named "Yashōdharacharita" and "Nāgakumāracharita" which contain a mention of Nanna, the son of Bharata. These books too may have been written in the time of the successors of Krīṣṇa III.

1 When Sōmadēva compiled this work, he was living in the capital of Prince Badōiga, the eldest son of the Chāluṣya Arīkēsari, a feudatory of king Krīṣṇa III.
2 Jain Sāhitya Samshōdhaka, part II, issue 3, page 36.
In the Jain Library of Karanjâ there is a book named “Jvalâ mâlinî Kalpa” at the end of which it is stated:

\[\text{\ldots}\]

i.e., this work was finished in Shaka S. 861, in the reign of king Krishnarâja.

This shows that Krishnarâja was ruling in Shaka S. 861 (V.S. 996=A.D. 939).

18. KHÔTTIGA.

He was the son of Amoghavarsha III. He succeeded his elder brother Krishnarâja III.

It is stated in the copper grant\(^2\) of Shaka S. 984, found at Karđâ (Khândesh):

\[\text{\ldots}\]

i.e., on the death of his elder brother Krishnarâjadeva, Khôttagadêva,\(^3\) son of Amoghavarsha and Kandakadêvi (the daughter of Yuvarâjâdêva), ascended the throne.

Though Khôttaga had an elder brother named Jagatunga, yet, as he predeceased Krishnarâja, Khôttaga succeeded him.

The following were the titles of Khôttaga:—Nityavarsha; Râttakandarpa, Mahârajâdhirâja, Paramëshvara, Paramabhaṭṭâraka, Shri Prithvivallabha, etc.

An inscription\(^4\) in the Canarese language of Shaka S. 893 (V.S. 1028=A.D. 971), contains a title of this king,
'Nityavarsha' and a mention of his feudatory Pēramānaḍī Mārasimha II, of the western Ganga dynasty. This Mārasimha had under his sway 96,000 villages? of Gangavādi, 300 of Bēlavala and 300 of Purigēra.

An inscription of the time of Paramāra king Udayāditya, found at Udaipur (Gwalior), contains the following lines:—

श्रीहर्षविद दत्ति बोधिन्देवलच्छनि
जगशाह ते शुभि नगात्सम: प्रताप: [12]

i.e., Shri Harsha (Siyaka II of the Paramāra dynasty of Mālwā) had seized the kingdom from Khōṭṭigadēva.

At the end of the Prākrita dictionary named ‘Pāiyalachchī Nāmamālā,’ written by Dhanapāla, it is stated:—

विभवाकालस गए भवमातीतकर सहसरलमः
माधवनिबिधाधीए लहिए मलस्वेदिभम् [1276]

i.e., in Vikrama S. 1029, the king of Mālwā plundered the city of Mānyakhēta.

These show that after defeating Khōṭṭīga, Siyaka II may have looted his capital town Mānyakhēta. Just about the date of this event Dhanapāla had compiled the aforesaid dictionary (Pāiyalachchī Nāmamālā) for his sister Sundarā. In this warfare Kankadēva, king of Vāgaḍa and cousin of king Siyaka of Mālwā, was killed and king Khōṭṭīga also fell on the field.

This fact is also borne out by the Jain ‘Mahāpurāṇa’ written by Pushpadanta.

After this event the great power of Rāshṭrakūṭas of the Deccan began to decline.

King Khōṭṭīga may have succeeded to the throne about V.S. 1023 (A.D. 966) and died leaving no male issue.

---

19. KARKARĀJA II.

He was the son of Nirupama, the youngest son of Amoghavarsha III. He succeeded his own uncle Khōttigadēva. The other forms of his name were Kakka, Karkara, Kakkara and Kakkala. His titles were Amoghavarsha, Nripatunga, Viranārayana, Nūtana Pārtha, Ahītamārtanda, Rājatrinētra, Mahā-rājādhīrāja, Paramēshvara, Paramamāhēśhvara, Paramabhāṭṭāraka, Prithvivallabha, Vallabhanarēndra, etc. From the title ‘Parama Māhēśhvara’ it appears that this king was also a Shaiva.

In a copper grant of Shaka S. 894 (V.S. 1029 - A.D. 972), of the reign of Karkarāja, found at Karḍā, the Rāshṭrakūtas are mentioned as Yādavas.

The capital of his kingdom was Mālkhēḍ and he conquered the territories of the Gurjaras, Chōlas, Huṇas and Pāṇḍyas.

In an inscription of his time of Shaka S. 896 (V.S. 1030 - A.D. 973), found at Gundūr (Dhārwar) there is a mention of his feudatory Pēramāṇaḍī Mārasimha II of the western Ganga dynasty who had annihilated Nōlambakula of the Pallava dynasty.

Karkarāja II may have ascended the throne in or about V. S. 1029 (A.D. 972).

The weakness of the Rāshṭrakūta power resulting from the invasion by Paramāra king Sīyaka II, of Mālwa at the time of Khōttiga, afforded an opportunity to the Chālukyas (Sōlankis) to regain their lost power. In order to do so, Sōlanki king Tailapa II attacked Karkarāja after V.S. 1030 (A.D. 973) and re-established.

---
1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 263,
2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 271.
3 In the copper grant of Khārēpāṭan it is stated:—
   कङ्कश्लेष्य भासुयो भुवो भरतो अन्निधि: ॥
   भासीतप्रवतत्साम भ्राभासविरत्ताणवः ॥
   समरे ते विनिदिप्य तत्त्ववेदोमुघ्मः ॥

i.e., the powerful king Karkarāja II, was a nephew of Khōttiga and after defeating him, Tailapa took possession of his kingdom.
the Chalukya (Sölanki) kingdom of Kalyani. Thus ended the Rāṣṭrakūta kingdom of the Deccan.

In the inscription\(^2\) of Vijjala of the Kalachuri dynasty, Tailapa is stated to have killed Rāṣṭrakūta king Karkkara (Karkarāja II) and Raṇakambha (Raṇastambha) who was, perhaps, a relative of king Karkarāja.

The said Sölanki king Tailapa II had married Jākabba,\(^3\) the daughter of Rāṣṭrakūta Bhāmmaha.

The fact about the destruction of the Rāṣṭrakūta kingdom of the Deccan by Tailapa II in the time of Karkarāja is further corroborated by the copper plates of Shaka S. 919\(^4\) and 930\(^5\), of kings Aparājita and Raṭṭarāja of the Shilāra dynasty respectively. This Aparājita was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūtas and became independent on their downfall. In the “Vikramāṇkadevacharita” (Sarga I, stanza 69) it is stated:—

\[\text{विक्रमाणकदेवचरिता} \]

\[\text{कोशित्तकदेव श्रेयसम्युपितं क्रियामयवर्गायं विभिन्नं} \]

\[\text{मुखेन वर्ण्यात्तिंकामहम् चालुक्याचक्रमेह नर्मदल दम्मी} \]

i.e., the state passed on to the Sölanki king Tailapa II, the destroyer of the Rāṣṭrakūta kingdom.

An inscription\(^6\) of Shaka S. 904 (V.S. 1039-A.D. 982), found at Shravana Belgola, contains a mention of Indrarāja IV, who was a grandson of Rāṣṭrakūta king Krishnarāja III. The mother of this Indra IV was the daughter of Gāṅgēyadēva of the Ganga dynasty and Indrarāja married the daughter of Rājachūḍāmaṇi. The titles of this Indrarāja were as follows:—

Raṭṭakandarpadēva, Rājamārtaṇda, Chaladanka kāraṇa, Chaladaggalē, Kirtinārāyaṇa, etc. He is spoken of as a brave and tried warrior and a controller of passions. Having broken the ‘Chakravyūha’ single-handed, he defeated 18 enemies. Girigē, the wife of Kallara, tried all means to captivate his heart, but he resolutely rejected her overtures. She at last challenged him to battle in which too she was defeated.

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, page 15.
6 Inscriptions at Shravana Belgola, No. 57, (page 68) A. 17.
After the death of Karkarāja, Pēramāṇaḍī Mārasimha of the western Ganga dynasty in his efforts to maintain the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom, tried his best to obtain the throne for Indra IV. (It has been noted above that Pēramāṇaḍī Bhūtuga, the father of this Mārasimha, was a brother-in-law of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishna III.) This effort was probably made about V.S. 1030 (A.D. 973) but nothing has been known as to its result. This Indra IV courted death by observing total abstinence from food and drink,¹ which is a principle of the Jain theology, and died on the 8th day of the dark half of Chaitra, Shaka S. 904=V. S. 1039 (20th March 982 A.D.).

### THE GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE RĀṢṬRAKŪṬĀS OF MĀNYAKHĒṬA (Deccan.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Dantivarman I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Indrarāja I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gōvindarāja I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Karkarāja I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indrarāja II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dantidurga or Dantivarman II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gōvindarāja II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gōvindarāja III. (Jagattunga I), Indrarāja (originator of the 2nd branch of Gujrat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Amōghavarsha I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Krishnarāja II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jagattunga II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Amōghavarsha II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gōvindarāja IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Amōghavarsha III (Baddiga).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Indrarāja IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Karkarāja II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Krishnarāja I. Nanna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shanchakamba (Kambayya, Stambha or Raṇāvalōka).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 182.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME.</th>
<th>RELATION.</th>
<th>SPECIAL TITLES.</th>
<th>KNOWN PERIODS.</th>
<th>CONTEMPORARY KINGS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Indrārāja I</td>
<td>Do. No. 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 690, (692) 694.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gōvindarāja I</td>
<td>Do. No. 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 692, (697), 701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Karkarāja I</td>
<td>Do. No. 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indrārāja II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dantīdrṇga (Dantīvarman II)</td>
<td>Do. No. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 697, 701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Krisnārāja I</td>
<td>Brother of No. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 716, 730, 734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gōvindarāja II</td>
<td>Son of No. 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dhrūvarāja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gōvindarāja III</td>
<td>Son of No. 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Amōghavarsha I</td>
<td>Do. No. 10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 735, 749, (757)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Indrārāja IV</td>
<td>Grandson of No. 17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sh. S. 904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By adding 135 to any Shaka Samvat we arrive at the corresponding Vikrama Samvat and by adding 78 we get the corresponding Christian era.
THE RĀSHṬRAKŪṬAS OF LĀTA (GUJRĀṬ).
From before V. S. 814 (A.D. 757)
To
After V.S. 945 (A.D. 888).

First Branch.

It has already been stated that king Dantidurga (Dantivarman II) had seized the kingdom of Chālukya (Sōlankī) king Kīrtivarman II. At the same time the province of Lāta (Southern and Central Gujrāṭ) had also passed into the possession of the Rāshṭrakūṭas.

A copper grant of Shaka S. 679 (V. S. 814—A.D. 757), of Mahārājādhirāja Karkarāja II of Gujrāṭ, has been found at Sūrat, which shows that at the time of his victory over the Sōlankīs, king Dantidurga (Dantivarman II) had made this Karkarāja, who was a relative of the former, the king of the province of Lāta (Gujrāṭ).

From the similarity in the names of the Rāshṭrakūṭa kings of the Deccan and of Gujrāṭ, it appears that the Rāshṭrakūṭa family of Lāta was a branch of the Rashtrakūṭa family of the Deccan. In the said copper grant their genealogy is given thus:

1. Karkarāja I—the first name of this branch known uptill now.
2. Dhruvarāja—son of Karkarāja I.

The aforesaid copper grant of Shaka S. 679 (V.S. 814—A.D. 757) is of the time of Karkarāja II. He was a contemporary of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Dantidurga (Dantivarman II) who had invested him with the ruling powers of Lāṭa. The following are the titles of king Karkarāja II:

Parama Māhēśhvara, Parama Bhaṭṭāraka, Parmēshvara, Mahārājādhirāja.

This king was a very powerful monarch and a devotee of the God Shiva. Some scholars identify him with Rāhappa who was defeated by the Rāshtrakūṭa king Krishṇarāja I of the Deccan. It is probable, therefore, that this dynasty came to an end in consequence of this battle. As no inscription, etc., of this family, beyond the one noted above, has been found, there is therefore no further trace of the history of this branch of the Rāshtrakūṭa rulers.

Second Branch.

In the history of the Rāshtrakūṭas of the Deccan it has been stated that king Gōvindarāja III had made a grant of the province of Lāṭa to his younger brother Indrarāja. From the inscriptions of the descendants of this Indrarāja we arrive at the following history of this branch:

1. INDRARĀJA.

He was the son of king Dhruvarāja and younger brother of Gōvindarāja III of the Rāshtrakūṭa dynasty of the Deccan, who had made him the ruler of Lāṭa (Southern and Central Gujrāt).

In the copper grant1 of Shaka S. 730 (V.S. 865—A.D. 808), of king Gōvinda III, there is a mention of the conquest of Gujrāt, which shows that sometime about this date, Indrarāja got possession of Lāṭa. This Indra had two sons:—Karkarāja and Gōvindarāja.

---

2. KARKARĀJA (KAKKARĀJA).

He was the son and successor of Indrarāja. Two copper grants of his time are found. The first is of Shaka S. 734 (V.S. 869 = A.D. 812), which shows that Gōvindarāja III of the Rāshṭrakūta dynasty of the Deccan made his younger brother Indrarāja, father of Karkarāja, the king of Lāta. The titles of king Karkarāja, viz., Mahā Sāmantādhīpati, Lātēshvara and Suvarṇavarsha, are also mentioned in this plate. This king had protected the king of Mālava from the invasion of the king of Gujrát, who had conquered the Gaúḍa and the Banga provinces. The executor of the grant mentioned in this plate is named therein as prince Dantivarman.

The other copper plate is of Shaka S. 738 (V.S. 873 = A.D. 817).

In the copper grant of Shaka S. 757 (V.S. 892 = A.D. 835), of the chief feudatory Dhruvarāja I of Gujrát, it is stated that having put down the rebellious Rāshṭrakūtas, king Karkarāja had installed king Amōghavarsha I, of Mānyakhēta on the throne of his father (about V.S. 872 = A.D. 815).

From this it appears that at the time of the death of Gōvindarāja III, his son, Amōghavarsha I, was a minor, which afforded an opportunity to the feudatory Rāshṭrakūtas and the Sōlankīs to attempt at dispossessing him of the kingdom but Karkarāja frustrated their attempts.

Karkarāja had a son named Dhruvarāja.

3. GŌVINDARĀJA.

He was the son of Indrarāja and younger brother of Karkarāja. We have found two copper grants of

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 156.
3 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIV, page 199.
his time. The first is of Shaka S. 735 (V.S. 870—A.D. 813) and the second of Shaka S. 749 (V.S. 884—A.D. 827). The first plate speaks of the king’s chief feudatory, Buddhavarsha of the Shalukika clan, and contains Gōvindarāja’s titles, viz., Mahāsāmantādhipati and Prabhūtavārsha. From the other plate, we gather that when Gōvindarāja was at Broach he granted a village for the upkeep of a temple of the Sun god named Jayāditya.

As there exist copper grants of Shaka S. 734 and 738 of Karkarāja, and those of Shaka S. 735 and 749 of his younger brother Gōvindarāja, we understand that the two brothers wielded authority simultaneously for some time.

4. DHRUVARĀJA I.

He was the son of Karkarāja and succeeded to the throne after his uncle Gōvindarāja. The copper grant of Shaka S. 757 (V.S. 892—A.D. 835), mentioned above in the history of Karkarāja, belongs to this king, and contains his titles; viz., Mahāsāmantādhipati, Dhārāvarsha and Nirupama.

He had headed a rising against Amōghavārsha I, which obliged the latter to march against him. Dhruvarāja was probably killed in this action, as is evident from the copper grant of Shaka S. 789 (V.S. 924—A.D. 867) found at Begumra.

5. AKĀLAVARSHA.

He was the son and successor of Dhruvarāja. His titles are found to be Shubhatunga and Subhatātunga. During his reign, too, relations with the Rāśhtракūṭas

3 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIV, page 199.
of the Deccan do not appear to have been friendly. He had three sons;—Dhruvarāja, Dantivarman, and Gōvindarāja.

6. DHRUVARĀJA II.

He was the son and successor of Akālavarsha. In a copper grant of Shaka S. 789 (V.S. 924—A.D. 867) of this king, the executor of the order of charity concerned is named Gōvindarāja. This Gōvindarāja was the son of Shubhatunga (Akālavarsha) and younger brother of Dhruvarāja II. He (Dhruvarāja) had defeated the combined invading armies of Gurjararāja, Vallabha, and Mihira. This Mihira probably was Pratihāra Bhōjadēva of Kanauj, whose title was "Mihira." Mention of a battle with Vallabha shows that this king may have tried to throw off the yoke of suzerainty of the Rāṣṭrakūta king of Mānyakhēta.

This king had granted in charity the district of Trēnnā to a Brahmaṇa named Dhōḍhī who maintained with its revenue, a free boarding house where thousands of Brahmaṇas daily received their food, alike in years of scarcity and plenty. His (Dhruvarāja's) younger brother Gōvinda also fought on his side.

7. DANTIVARMAN.

He was the son of Akālavarsha and younger brother of Dhruvarāja II, whom he succeeded. A copper grant of Shaka S. 789 (V.S. 924—A.D. 867) of his time has been found. It contains his titles, viz., Mahāsāmantadhīpati, Aparimitavarsha, etc. The charity it speaks of was granted for a Buddhist monastery.

1 In the copper grant of Shaka S. 789 of Begumra, it is stated that though his faithless followers foresook him, Akālavarsha regained his paternal kingdom from the army of Vallabha (Amoghabharsha I). Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 181.
2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 181.
3 Chāra Cahermarāja might be the king of Gujrat at this time.
4 The aforesaid copper grant of Shaka S. 789 further goes to show that when enemies invaded his country all his relatives and even his younger brother deserted him.
5 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, page 287.
From the copper grant of Dhruvarāja, II it appears that the two brothers were not on good terms, but in the plate of Dantivarman I, the latter is described as a devotee of his elder brother Dhruvarāja. Probably, therefore, it might be some other brother referred to in the above plate of Dhruvarāja.

8. KRISHṆARĀJA.

He was the son and successor of Dantivarman. A copper grant of Shaka S. 810 (V.S. 945—A.D. 888) of his time has been found which appears to be incorrect. His titles are found to be Mahāsāmantādhipati, Akālavārsha, etc.

This Krishnarāja defeated his enemies at Ujjain in the presence of Vallabharāja.

The history of this family is not traceable any further. By thinking over the contents of the copper grant of Shaka S. 832 (V.S. 967—A.D. 910), of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Krishṇa II of Mānyakhēta, we conclude that sometime between Shaka S. 810 (V.S. 945—A.D. 888) and Shaka S. 832 (V.S. 967—A.D. 910) he (Krishnarāja II), having annexed the kingdom of Lāṭa, put an end to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Gujrāt.

**Genealogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Lāṭa (Gujrāt).**

(Fīvat Branch.)

1. Karkarāja I.
2. Dhruvarāja.
4. Karkarāja II.

(Second Branch.)

Dhruvarāja of Mānyakhēta.

1. Indrārāja.

2. Karkarāja.
3. Gōvindarāja I.
4. Dhruvarāja I.
5. Akālavārsha.
6. Dhruvarāja II.
7. Dantivarman. Gōvindarāja II.
8. Krishnarāja.

**STATEMENT GIVING PARTICULARS OF THE RĀSHṬRAPĀTAS OF LĀTA (GUJRĀT).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Special Title</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Ascertained Dates</th>
<th>Contemporaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Karkarāja I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(First Branch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gōvindarāja</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rāshtrakūta Dantidurga (Dantivarman II) and Krishparāja I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Indraśa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger brother of Gōvinda III of Mānyakhēta.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rāshtrakūta Gōvindarāja III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Karkarāja</td>
<td>Mahāsāmanadhīpatī.</td>
<td>Son of No. 1.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 734 &amp; 738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE RATTAS (RASHTRAKUTAS) OF SAUNDATTI.

From about V. S. 932 (A.D. 875)

To

About V.S. 1287 (A.D. 1230).

It has already been stated that Chalukya (Solan) Tailapa II had seized the kingdom of Manyakheta (Deccan) from the Rashtra king Karkaraja. II. It can be inferred from the inscriptions of these two kings that this event, perhaps, took place just after V.S. 1030 (A.D. 973). But from other inscriptions we learn that long after the downfall of the Rashtra kingdom petty principalities of its younger off-shoots outlived and that they became feudatories of the Chalukyas (Solan).

We are able to trace two such branches of the Rashtra that existed in the modern Dhargarh district of the Bombay Presidency and flourished one after the other at Saundatti (Kuntal in the Belgaum district). Often they are mentioned as Rattas in their inscriptions.

(The First Branch)

1. MERAJA.

This is the first name traceable of this branch.

2. PRITHVIRAMA.

He was the son and successor of Meraja. An inscription of Shaka S. 797 (V.S. 932 = A.D. 875) of this chief has been found, in which he is mentioned as belonging to the Ratta race.

He was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇarāja and ruler of Saundatti. From the date of this inscription we infer that he was a contemporary of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇarāja II, but we have found another inscription of Prithvirāma’s grandson Shāntivarman of the Shaka S. 902 (V.S. 1037= A.D. 980). As there is an interval of 105 years between the dates of these two inscriptions, which seems somewhat extraordinary, it is probable, therefore, that Prithvirāma’s inscription was prepared afterwards and that this is the cause of the inaccuracy in the date. Again, he might be a contemporary not of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇarāja II. but of Kṛishṇarāja III. This Prithvirāma followed Jainism and was created a chief feudatory (Mahāśāṃtādhīpāti) about V.S. 997 (A.D. 940).

3. PIṬṬUGA.

He was the son and successor of Prithvirāma. He defeated Ajavarman in battle. His wife’s name was Nijikabbē.

4. SHĀNTIVARMAN.

He was the son of Piṭṭuga and succeeded to the throne after him. An inscription1 of Shaka S. 902 (V.S. 1037=A.D. 980) of this king has been found, in which he has been described as a feudatory of the western Chālkūya (Sōlankī) king Tailapa II. His wife’s name was Chandikabbē. After this we are unable to trace the history of this branch.

(The Second Branch.)

1. NANNA.

This is the first name traced of the second branch of the Raṭṭa rulers of Saundatti.

2. KĀRTAVĪRYA I.

He was the son and successor of Nanna. An inscription1 of Shaka S. 902 (V.S. 1037—A.D. 980) of this king has been found. He was a feudatory of the Sōlankī king Tailapa II and governor of Kūṇḍi in Dhārwār of which district he had fixed the boundaries. It is probable that this chief may have put an end to the first branch of Saundatti, having wrested authority from Shāntivarman. He had two sons:—Dāyima and Kanna.

3. DĀYIMA (DĀVARI).

He was the son and successor of Kārtavīrya I.

4. KANNA (KANNAKAIRA I).

He was the son of Kārtavīrya and younger brother of Dāyima whom he succeeded. He had two sons, Ėrēga and Anka.

5. ĖRĒGA (ĒRĒYAMMARASA).

He was the son and successor of Kanna I. An inscription2 of his time, of Shaka S. 962 (V.S. 1097—A.D. 1040), has been found in which he is described as the chief feudatory of the Chālukya (Sōlankī) king Jayasimha II (Jagadēkamalla), the ruler of Laṭṭalūra, and was decorated with the five high titles. He was an expert musician. He was also called Raṭṭa Nārāyaṇa. As there was a golden image of Garuḍa on his flag he was further called “Singana Garuḍa”. An ensign conveyed on an elephant, with a band called “Tivili” (like the one played in the processions of the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas of the Deccan) used to decorate his procession.

The name of his son was Sēna (Kālasēna).

1 Kielhorn’s list of South Indian Inscriptions, page 26, No. 141.
6. ANKA.

He was the son of Kanna I and succeeded his elder brother Erēga. An inscription of his time, of Shaka S. 970 (V.S. 1105—A.D. 1048), has been found in which he is mentioned as a chief feudatory of the western Chālukya (Sōlankī) Trailōkyamalla (Sōmēshvara I). Perhaps, another broken inscription of his time has also been found which, too, is of the same year.

7. SĒNA (KĀLASĒNA I).

He was the son of Erēga and a successor of his uncle Anka. He married Mailaladēvi from whom he had two sons:—Kanna and Kārtavīrya.

8. KANNA (KANNAKAIRA II).

He was the son and successor of Sēna (Kālasēna I). One copper grant and one inscription of his time have been found. The copper grant is of Shaka S. 1004 (V.S. 1139—A.D. 1082) in which this Kanna II of the Raṭṭa race is mentioned as a chief feudatory of the Sōlankī (western Chālukya) king Vikramāditya VI. It also appears from this plate that Kanna had purchased many villages from Mahāmanḍalēshvara Munja, king of Bhōgavati (grandson of Bhīma and son of Śindarāja), who belonged to the Sinda dynasty which is stated as the gem of the Nāga race.

The inscription mentioned above is of Shaka S. 1009 (V.S. 1144—A.D. 1087). In it he is mentioned as Mahāmanḍalēshvara (the chief feudatory).

9. KĀRTAVĪRYA II.

He was the son of Sēna I and younger brother of Kanna II. He was also called Kaṭṭa. His wife’s name was Bhāgaladēvi or Bhāglāṃbikā. Three inscriptions

of his time have been found. The first, found from
Saundatti, shows that he was a chief feudatory of the
western Chāluksya (Sōlanki) king Sōmēshvara II and
ruler of Laṭṭalūra. The second inscription is of Shaka
S. 1009 (V.S. 1144—A.D. 1087); in it he is mentioned
as the chief feudatory of Vikramāditya VI, the succes-
sor of Sōmēshvara.

The third inscription is of Shaka S. 1045 (V.S. 1180—
A.D. 1123). But his son Sēna II had assumed power
before this date.

By looking into the inscriptions of Kanna II and
Kārtavīrya II, we understand that the two brothers
had ruled together.

10. SĒNA (KĀLASĒNA II).

He was the son and successor of Kārtavīrya II. An
inscription of his time, of Shaka S. 1018 (V.S. 1153—
A.D. 1096), has been found. He was a contemporary of
Chāluksya (Sōlanki) Vikramāditya VI, and his son
Jayakarna. Jayakarna’s period has been ascertained to
be from V.S. 1159 (A.D. 1102) to V.S. 1178 (A.D. 1121).
So Sēna II may have lived sometime between these
dates. The name of his wife was Lakshmīdevī.

As we have found an inscription of his father, of the
year Shaka S. 1045 (V.S. 1180—A.D. 1123), it appears
that the father and the son both had wielded the
authority together.

11. KĀRTAVĪRYA (KAṬṬAMA III).

He was the son and successor of Sēna (Kālasēna II).
His wife’s name was Padmaladēvī.

A broken inscription of his time has been found at
Kōṇnūr in which his titles are mentioned as Mahāman-

---

2 Do. do. do. 173.
dalēshvara and Chakravartī, which shows that in the beginning he remained a feudatory of the western Chālukya (Sōlankī) kings Jagadekamalla II and Tailapa III. But sometime after V.S. 1222 (A.D. 1165), due to the decline of the power of the Sōlankī and the Kalachurī ( Haihaya) dynasties, he became independent and may have assumed the title of Chakravartī.

From an inscription of Shaka S. 1109 (past) (V.S. 1244 = A.D. 1187) it appears that at that time one Bhāyīdiēva ruled over Kūndī, who was an administrator of criminal justice under Sōlankī Sōmēshvara IV. From this we infer that the Raṭṭas might not have attained full success in gaining independence up to that time.

The name of Kārtavīrya is also mentioned in the inscriptions,¹ found at Khānpur (Kōlhāpur State), of Shaka S. 1066 (V.S. 1200 = A.D. 1143) and Shaka S. 1084 (past) (V.S. 1219 = A.D. 1162) and also in the inscription² of the Bēlgāum district of Shaka S. 1086 (V.S. 1221 = A.D. 1164).

12. LAKŠHMĪDĪVĀ I.

He was the son and successor of Kārtavīrya III. His other names Lakshmanā and Lakshmīdhara are also found. His wife’s name was Chandrikādēvi (or Chandaladēvi).

An inscription³ of Shaka S. 1130 (V.S. 1265 = A.D. 1209) has been found at Hannikēri, which appears to be of his time. As inscriptions have been found of his sons Kārtavīrya IV and Mallikārjuna from Shaka S. 1121 to 1141 and 1127 to 1131 respectively, it appears ordinarily impossible that he lived in Shaka S. 1130. But, if we suppose that the period of the

reigns of the father and sons had run concurrently, as we have done in cases of Kanna II and Kārtavīrya II, then the enigma disappears. But, so long as convincing proofs of the above fact are not forthcoming, nothing can be said with certainty.

He had two sons:—Kārtavīrya and Mallikārjuna.

13. KĀRTAVĪRYA IV.

He was the eldest son of Lakshmīdēva I. Six inscriptions and one copper grant of his time have been found. The first inscription1 of Shaka S. 1121 (past) (V.S. 1257—A.D. 1200) is found at Sankēshvara (Bēlgāum district). The second inscription2 is of Shaka S. 1124 (V.S. 1258—A.D. 1201). The third3 and fourth4 inscriptions are of Shaka S. 1126 (past) (V.S. 1261—A.D. 1204). The fifth5 is of Shaka S. 1127 (V.S. 1261—A.D. 1204). In this inscription Kārtavīrya IV has been mentioned as the ruler of Laṭānūr and his capital is named Vēṇugrāma. His younger brother Yuvarāja Mallikārjuna is also mentioned in it. The copper grant6 of his time is of Shaka S. 1131 (V.S. 1265—A.D. 1208), which also contains a mention of his younger brother and heir—apparent, Mallikārjuna.

The sixth inscription7 is of Shaka S. 1141 (V.S. 1275—A.D. 1218). This king bore the title of Mahāmanda-lēshvara. He had two queens, Ėchaladēvī and Mādēvī.

14. LAKshmĪDĒVA II.

He was the son and successor of Kārtavīrya IV. An

---

2 Graham's Kolhapur, page 415, No. 9.
6 Indian Antiquary Vol. XIX, p. 245.
inscription of his time of Shaka S. 1151 (V.S. 1285—A.D. 1228) has been found in which his title is mentioned as Mahāmanḍalēshvara. His mother's name was Mādēvī.

As no record of this family bearing a date later than Shaka S. 1151 has yet been found, it appears that this branch of the Raṭṭas, probably, ceased to exist at this stage and their kingdom was seized by the Yādava king Singhana of Deogiri. This event may have occurred about V.S. 1287 (A.D. 1230). But the districts north, south and east of Kūndī had already passed out of the possession of Lakṣhmīdēva II even before this date.

In the copper plate of Shaka S. 1160 (V.S. 1295—A.D. 1238) of Haralahalli, Vīchāna, a feudatory of Yādava king Singhana of Deogiri, is stated to have defeated the Raṭṭas.

A copper plate has been found from Sītābaldī of Shaka S. 1008 (1009) (V.S. 1144—A.D. 1087) of Rāṇaka Dhāḍibhaṇḍaka (Dhāḍidēva), the chief feudatory of the western Chālukya (Sōlankī) Vikramāditya VI (Tribhuvanamalla), in which this Dhāḍibhaṇḍaka is stated to be of the Mahā Rāśṭrakūṭa race and to have come from Laṭālūr.

In the inscription of Shaka S. 1052 (V.S. 1186—A.D. 1129) found at Khānpur (Kōlhāpur State) there is a mention of Raṭṭa Ankidēva, a chief feudatory of Sōlankī Sōmeshvara III. But there is no trace as to how he was connected with the above-mentioned branches of the Raṭṭas.

In the inscription found at Bahuriband (Jabalpur), there is a mention of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōlhaṇadēva, who was a chief feudatory of king Gayakarna of the Kalachurī (Haihaya) dynasty. This inscription is of the 12th century, but it gives no clue as to the branch of the Rāshṭrakūṭas to which this Gōlhaṇadēva belonged.

THE GENEALOGY OF THE RāTṬAS OF SAUNDATTI.

(First Branch.)

1. Māraṇa.
2. Prithvirāma.
3. Piṭṭuga.
4. Shāntilavarman.

(Second Branch.)

1. Nanna.
2. Kārtavīrya I.
3. Dāyima.
4. Kanna I.
5. Ėreṇga.
6. Anka.
7. Sēna I.
8. Kanna II.
9. Kārtavīrya II.
10. Sēṇa II.
11. Kārtavīrya III.
12. Lakshmidēva I.
13. Kārtavīrya IV.
14. Lakshmidēva II.

Mallikārjuna.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mārada</td>
<td></td>
<td>(First)</td>
<td>Branch.</td>
<td>Rāṣṭrakūta king Krishṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prithivirāma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 1.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 797.</td>
<td>Arjunavarmān.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pītṛuga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 2.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 902.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Tailapa I and Raṭṭa Kārtavirya I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Śāntivarman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 3.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 902.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Tailapa I and Raṭṭa Śāntivarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Second)</td>
<td>Shaka S. 902.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Tailapa I and Raṭṭa Śāntivarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kārtavirya I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 1.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 902.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Tailapa I and Raṭṭa Śāntivarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dāyaṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mahāśāmanta</td>
<td>Shaka S. 962.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Jayasimha II (Jagadēka-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kannā I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 2.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 970.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara I (Tailōkya-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ėrēgā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother of No. 3.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 962.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Jayasimha II (Jagadēka-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 4.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 962.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Jayasimha II (Jagadēka-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sēṇa I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 5.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 962.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Jayasimha II (Jagadēka-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kārtavirya II</td>
<td>Mahā manoḍalēśvara</td>
<td>Brother of No. 3.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1004 &amp; 1009.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sēṇa II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 7.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1004 &amp; 1009.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kārtavirya III</td>
<td>Mahā manoḍalēśvara and Chakravartī</td>
<td>Brother of No. 8.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1009 &amp; 1045.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lakṣhmīdēva I</td>
<td>Mahā manoḍalēśvara</td>
<td>Do. 9.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1018.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kārtavirya IV</td>
<td>Mahā manoḍalēśvara</td>
<td>Do. 10.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1066, 1064, (past) and 1066.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mallikārjuna</td>
<td>Yuvarāja</td>
<td>Do. 11.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1018.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lakṣhmīdēva II</td>
<td>Mahā manoḍalēśvara</td>
<td>Do. 12.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1121 (past) 1124, 1126 (past), 1127, 1131 &amp; 1141.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mallikārjuna</td>
<td>Yuvarāja</td>
<td>Do. 13.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1127 &amp; 1131.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lakṣhmīdēva II</td>
<td>Mahā manoḍalēśvara</td>
<td>Son of No. 13.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 1151.</td>
<td>Śōlankī Śōmeśvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sind clan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE EARLY RĀŚHTRAKŪṬAS OF RĀJASTHĀNA (RĀJPŪTĀṆĀ).

HASTIKUNḌĪ (HATHŪNḌĪ) BRANCH.

FROM ABOUT V.S. 950 (A.D. 893) TO ABOUT V.S. 1053 (A.D. 996.)

Traces of the existence of Rāśhtrakūṭa kingdoms at Hastikunḍī (Marwar) and Dhanōp (Shaḥpurā) in Rājpūtānā are found even before the advent, to that province, of the descendants of the Gāhaḍāvāla king Jayachandra of Kanauj.

An inscription of V.S. 1053 (A.D. 997) has been found at Bijāpur (Gōdwār district in the Marwar State), in which the genealogy of the Rāṭhōras of Hathūndī is given as follows:—

1. HARIVARMAN.

The aforesaid genealogical table opens with this name.

2. VIDAGDHARĀJA.

He was the son of Harivarman and lived in V.S. 973—A.D. 916).²

3. MAMMATA.

He was the son of Vidagdharāja and seems to have lived in V.S. 996 (A.D. 939).³

---

2 Do. do. do. page 314.
3 Do. do. do. page 314.
4. DHAVALA.

He was the son of Mammaṭa and helped the ruler of Mēwār when Paramāra king Munja of Mālwa attacked him and destroyed Āhāḍa.

He defended the Chauhāna chief Mahēndra of Nāḍōl from the attack of Chauhāna king Durlabhārāja of Sāmbhar and protected king Dharanīvarāha from falling a prey to Sōlankī Mūlarāja king of Anhilwāḍā (Gujrāt). Dharanīvarāha, the ruler of Mārwār, probably belonged to the Pratihāra dynasty. The aforesaid inscription of V.S. 1053 (A.D. 997) belongs to this king (Dhavala).

In his old age king Dhavala made over the reins of the government to his son Bālaprasāda about V.S. 1053. His capital was Hastikundī (Hathūndī).

As no inscription, etc., of a later date of this family has been traced, its further history is yet unknown.

THE GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE EARLY RĀṬHÖRAS OF Hastikundī.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Contemporaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harivarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vidagdharāja</td>
<td>Son of No. 1</td>
<td>V.S. 973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mammaṭa</td>
<td>Do. 2</td>
<td>V.S. 996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dhavala</td>
<td>Do. 3</td>
<td>V.S. 1053</td>
<td>Paramāra Munja, Chauhāna Durlabhārāja, Chauhāna Mahēndra, Sōlankī Mūlarāja and Pratihāra Dharanīvarāha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bālaprasāda</td>
<td>Do. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Probably Mahālakṣhmi, the sister of this king Dhavala, or of his father was married to Bhartrihāṭa II, the ruler of Mēwār, from whom Allāṭa was born.

2 King Dhavala repaired the Jain temple built by his grandfather Vidagdharāja and reinstalled therein the idol of Rishabhānṣṭha.
THE EARLY RĀŚHTRAṆĀṢA OF DHANŌP
(RĀJṆĀṬĀṆĀ).

Sometime back two inscriptions of the Rāṭhōras were found at Dhanōp (Shāhpura) which are now untraceable. One of these was dated the 5th day of the bright half of ‘Pausha’, V.S. 1063, which showed that there was a king named Bhallila of the Rāṭhōra dynasty and his son was Dantivarman. This Dantivarman had two sons:—Buddharāja and Gōvindarāja.

In the inscription of Shaka S. 788 (V.S. 923—A.D. 866) of king Amōghavārsha I, found at Nilgund in the Bombay Presidency, it is stated that his father, king Gōvindarāja III, had conquered the rulers of Kērala, Mālava, Gauḍa, Gurjara, Chitrakūṭa (Chittor) and Kānchī. This shows that the Rāṭhōras of Hastikūndī and Dhanōp might be the offshoots of the Rāṣhṭraṇāṣas of the Deccan.

THE GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE EARLY RĀṬHŌRAS OF DHANŌP.

```
Bhallila.  
| Dantivarman. |
     | Buddharāja. | Gōvindarāja. |
```


THE GĀHAḌAVĀLAS OF KANAUJ.

FROM ABOUT V.S. 1125 (A.D. 1068)

TO

ABOUT V.S. 1280 (A.D. 1223).

Col. James Tod has stated in his ‘Annals of Rājasthāna’ that in V.S. 526 (A.D. 470) Rāthōra Nayapāla acquired the kingdom of Kanauj after killing king Ajayapāla.¹ This assertion does not seem to be correct, for, though the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had had their sway over Kanauj ere this, yet about this particular period king Skandagupta or his son Kumāragupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty ruled over Kanauj². After this, the Maukharis occupied it,³ and their power was set aside, for some time, by the Baisas, who took possession of Kanauj⁴. But after the death of Harsha the Maukharis again made it their capital. About V.S. 798 (A.D. 741) king Lalitāditya (Muktāpiḍa) of Kashmir invaded Kanauj, which then too was the capital of Yashōvarman, the Maukharī ruler⁵. Further it appears from the copper grant⁶ of V.S. 1084 (A.D. 1027) of Pratihāra king Trilōchanapāla and from the inscription⁷ of V.S. 1093 (A.D. 1036) of Yashahpāla that the Pratihāras ruled over Kanauj about that time.

¹ Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān, (Ed. by W. Crooke) page 980.
³ Do. do. do. page 373.
⁴ Do. do. do. page 386.
⁵ Do. do. do. page 376.
⁶ Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 84.
Later, Rāṣṭrakūṭa Chandradēva (whose descendants were afterwards known as Gāhaḍavālas owing to their sway over Gādhipur, i.e., Kanauj), having conquered Badāūn about V.S. 1111 (A.D. 1054), took possession of Kanauj. Thus, the kingdom of Kanauj once more came into the possession of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.²

About 70 copper grants and inscriptions of these Gāhaḍavālas have been found in which they are mentioned as ‘Sūryavamshiś’. But the mention of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty is only found in three grants of V.S. 1161, 1162 and 1166 issued by Gōvindachandra while he was a prince regent as well as in the inscription of his queen Kumāradēvi. Further, there is no mention of the word Rāṣṭrakūṭa or Raṭṭa in them, but they belonged to a branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as has been separately discussed elsewhere.³ The Gāhaḍavālas had their sway over Kāśī (Benares), Oudh, and, perhaps, over Indrasthāna (Delhi) too.⁴

1. YASHŌVIGRAHA.

He is known to be a descendant of the Sōlar dynasty. This is the first name traceable of this family.

2. MAHĪCHANDRA.

Also known as Mahiyala, Mahiala or Mahītala, was the son of Yashōvigraha.

---

1 Journal Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, January 1930, pages 115-119.
2 The kingdom of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruvārāja of the Deccan had extended in the north upto Ayōdhya between V.S. 842-850; later, in the time of Krīṣhṇarāja II, between V.S. 932 and 971, its frontier had reached near the bank of the Ganges. Further, between V.S. 997 and 1023, in Krīṣhṇa III’s time, it had extended even beyond the Ganges. Probably, at this time, a member of this dynasty or some survivor of the early Rāṣṭrakūṭa rulers of Kanauj, might have received a ‘Jāgīr’ here, in whose family king Chandra, the conqueror of Kanauj, was born.
3 Journal Royal Asiatic Society, January 1930, pages 111-121.
4 V.A. Smith’s Early History of India, page 384
3. CHANDRADĒVA.

He was the son of Mahichandra. Three copper grants, of this king, of V.S. 1148 (A.D. 1091), V.S. 1150 (A.D. 1093) and V.S. 1156 (A.D. 1100) have been found at Chandrāvatī.

From the copper grants of his descendants it appears that he made Kanauj his capital and put down the anarchy resulting from the deaths of Rājā Bhōja of the Parmāra dynasty of Mālwā and Karṇa of the Haihaya (Kalachurī) dynasty of Chēdī.

From his first grant, it is evident that he gained strength about V.S. 1111 (A.D. 1054) and afterwards seized the kingdom of Kanauj from the Pratihāras.

This king made several charitable gifts of gold weighing equal to his person. The districts of Kāshī, Kushika (Kanauj), northern Kōshala (Oudh) and Indrasthāna (Delhi) were under his sway. He also built a ‘Vaishnava’ temple of Ādikēshava at Kāshī.

A copper grant, of V.S. 1154 (A.D. 1097), of his son Madanapāla has been found, which contains a mention

1 In the copper grant of V.S. 1150 there is a mention of Pratihāra Dēvāpāla of Kanauj:

"श्रीभैरवपालुपथितिचिन्तितचत्रीत:"
An inscription of Dēvāpāla dated V.S. 1005 (A.D. 948) has been found.


3 बाटे श्रीभैरवपालुपथितिचिन्तितचत्रीति.

4 बाटे श्रीभैरवपालुपथितिचिन्तितचत्रीति.

i.e., being oppressed by the anarchy prevailing after the deaths of Rājās Bhōja and Karṇa, the earth sought refuge with Chandradēva.

King Bhōja mentioned here is supposed by some historians to be the Pratihāra Bhōja?

5 Some historians assign V.S. 1135 (A.D. 1078) to Chandradēva’s conquest of Kanauj.

6 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 11.
of the charity, given by Chandradēva. This shows that, though Chandra was alive up to that date, he had made over the reins of the Government to his son Madanapāla. The following are the titles attached to Chandra’s name:—Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara and Parama Māhēshvara. Chandrāditya appears as a second name of this king.

He had two sons:—Madanapāla and Vigrahapāla. From this Vigrahapāla, probably, the Badāūn family took its origin.

4. MADANAPĀLA.

He was the eldest son and successor of Chandradēva. Five copper grants of the time of Madanapāla have been found, the first being the aforesaid one of V.S. 1154 (A.D. 1097).

The second, of V.S. 1161 (A.D. 1104), is of his son (Mahārājaputra) Gōvindachandra, in which there is a mention of the charitable grant of the village “Basāhi” together with the cess called “Turushkaḍanda.” This shows that just as “Jazia” was levied upon the Hindūs this ‘Turushkaḍanda’ was levied by Madanapāla upon the Mohammedans. Further, this is the first grant in which the word ‘Gahaḍavāla’ is mentioned.

The third, of V.S. 1162 (A.D. 1105), is also of the Mahārājaputra Gōvindachandra and mentions the name of the senior queen of Madanapāla and mother of Gōvindachandra as Rālhadēvi. (This too contains the mention of the word Gahaḍavāla.)

The fourth is of V.S. 1163 (in fact of 1164) (A.D. 1107). This is of king Madanapāla himself, in which his queen’s name appears as Prithvīshrikā.
The fifth,\(^1\) of V.S. 1166 (A.D. 1109), is also of Mahārājaputra Gövindaçandraddēva. (In which also it is stated that he belonged to the Gahaḍavāla clan.)

Madanadēva was the second name of the king. His titles were:—Parama Bhaṭṭāraka, Paramēśhvara, Parama Māhēśhvara and Mahārajādhirāja. He had gained victories in many a battle. From the aforesaid copper grants it appears that Madanapāla, too, in his old age made over the government to his son Gövindaçandra.

**THE SILVER COINS**\(^2\) OF MADANAPĀLA.

On the obverse there is an image of a horseman along with some illegible letters. On the reverse there is an image of a bull with the legend “Mādhava Shṛī Sāmanta” along the border. The diameter of these coins is a bit smaller than \(\frac{1}{2}\) an inch and they are made of base silver.

**THE COPPER COINS**\(^3\) OF MADANAPĀLA.

On the obverse of these, too, there is a rude image of a horseman and the legend “Madanapālādēva.” On the reverse, like the silver coins, there is an image of a bull and the legend “Mādhava Shṛī Sāmanta”. They are a bit bigger than \(\frac{1}{2}\) an inch in diameter.

5. **GÖVINDACHANDRA.**

He was the eldest son and successor of Madanapāla. 42 copper plates and 2 inscriptions of his reign have been discovered, of which the first, second and third copper grants of V.S. 1161 (A.D. 1104), 1162 (A.D. 1105), and 1166 (A.D. 1109)\(^4\) respectively, have already been mentioned in his father’s history. As till then he

---

4. It shows that Gövindachandra defeated the “Gauḍa” and that the “Hammīrs” (Mohammedans) were also awe-struck by his bravery.
was regarded a prince his reign might have commenced from V.S. 1167 (A.D. 1110).

The fourth, fifth and sixth copper plates are of V.S. 1171 (A.D. 1114). Of the fourth, only the first plate has been found, i.e., it is incomplete. The seventh is of V.S. 1172 (A.D. 1116). The eighth of V.S. 1174 (A.D. 1117) was issued from Dēvasthāna and contains a mention of his army of elephants. The ninth is also of V.S. 1174 (in fact of 1175) (A.D. 1119) and the tenth of V.S. 1175 (A.D. 1119). The eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth of V.S. 1176 (A.D. 1119) were issued from the village Khayarā on the Ganges, Mumdaliya and Benares respectively. The eleventh contains the name of his senior queen Nayanakēlidēvi. The fourteenth and fifteenth are of 1177 (A.D. 1120) and the sixteenth of V.S. 1178 A.D. 1122).

The seventeenth plate of V.S. 1180 (A.D. 1123) contains along with the king’s other titles, the decorations ‘Ashvapati’, ‘Gajapati’, ‘Narapati’, ‘Rāja-trayādhipati’, Vividhavidyāvichāravāchaspati’, etc. The eighteenth of V.S. 1181 (A.D. 1124) contains his mother’s name “Rālnaṇadēvi.” The nineteenth of V.S. 1182 (A.D. 1125) was issued from the place “Madapratīhāra” on the Ganges. The twentieth of V.S. 1182

---

1 List of Northern (Indian) inscriptions, No 692; Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 102 and Vol. VIII, page 153. The second was issued from Benāres.
2 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 104.
3 Do. do. do. 105.
7 Journal Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. XXXI, page 123.
10 Journal Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. LVI, page 108. (Dr. Bhandarkar gives the date as V.S. 1187.)
12 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 100.
(A.D. 1127) (originally of V.S. 1183) was issued from the village “Ishpratisthāna” on the Ganges. The twenty-first and twenty-second plates are of V.S. 1183 (A.D. 1123) and V.S. 1184 (A.D. 1127) respectively.

The twenty-third plate is of V.S. 1185 (A.D. 1129).

The twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth plates are of V.S. 1186 (A.D. 1130).

The twenty-sixth plate is of V.S. 1187 (A.D. 1130).

The twenty-seventh plate is of V.S. 1188 (A.D. 1131).

The twenty-eighth plate is of V.S. 1189 (A.D. 1133).

The twenty-ninth and thirtieth plates are of V.S. 1190 (A.D. 1133).

The thirty-first plate is of V.S. 1191 (A.D. 1134), of Mahārājaputra Vatsrājadēva of the “Singara” family, who was a feudatory of king Gōvindachandra and was also called “Lōhaḍadēva”.

The thirty-second and the thirty-third plates are of V.S. 1196 (A.D. 1139) and V.S. 1197 (A.D. 1141) respectively.

The thirty-fourth of V.S. 1198 (A.D. 1141) speaks of a charitable grant made on the occasion of the first anniversary of his senior queen Rālhadēvi’s demise.

The thirty-fifth plate of V.S. 1199 (A.D. 1143) contains a mention of the king’s (Gōvindachandra’s) son Mahārājaputra Rājyapāladeva. The thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth plates are of V.S. 1200

---

13. He was born of Nayanakālūdēvi and might have predeceased his father.
(A.D. 1144), V.S. 1201 (A.D. 1146) and V.S. 1202 (A.D. 1146) respectively. The thirty-ninth¹ and fortieth² plates are of V.S. 1203 (A.D. 1146) and V.S. 1207 (A.D. 1150). A stone pillar inscription³ of V.S. 1207 (A.D. 1151) of this king has been found at Hāthiyadah in which the name of his queen is mentioned as Gōsalladēvi.

The forty-first⁴ copper grant of Gōvindachandra, of V.S. 1208 (A.D. 1151), contains a mention of the charitable grant made by his senior queen Gōsaladēvi, who is described as enjoying all the honours of the state. The forty-second plate⁵ is of V.S. 1211 (A.D. 1154).

An inscription⁶ of Gōvindachandra’s queen Kumārādēvi,⁷ daughter of king Dēvarakshita of the Chikkōra dynasty of Pithikā, was found at Sārnāth, which shows that this queen had built a temple and had dedicated it to Dharmachakra Jina.

Looking to the vast number of the copper grants of Gōvindachandra, we understand that he was a powerful and generous ruler and most probably for some time he was the greatest king in Northern India and had retained his sway over Benāres⁸.

2 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, page 150.
4 Kielhorn’s list of inscriptions of N.I., page 10, No. 131.
7 This Kumārādēvi was a follower of Buddhism. In a manuscript copy of the book entitled ‘Ashṭasārikā’ preserved in the Nêpāl State library, it is thus stated:

"श्रीमोहनमहत्तुल्लभयज्ञानान्यायिन्याया: \nपरस्मोविशिष्टो राजही बसन्तवेदी वेषणमााणि""

This shows that Gōvindachandra’s another queen Vasantadēvi, too, was a follower of the Mahāyāna branch of Buddhism. Some people hold Vasantadēvi to be another name of Kumārādēvi. In the ‘Rāmācharita’ written by Sandhyākaranandī, king Mahāyana, (Mathana), father of Kumārādēvi’s mother is stated to be of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty.

8 Of the 21 copper grants found near Benares 14 belong to this king Gōvindachandra.
He had sent out Suhala, as his delegate, to the great convocation called by Alankāra, the minister of king Jayasimha, of Kāshmir. This fact is stated in the ‘Shrikanṭhacharitakāvya’ of poet Mankha:—

\[ 
\text{भल्म: स मुहल्ललेन तत्तोडतस्य कनिष्ठस्य विजयकर्मः} \text{॥} \\
\text{कुट्टोगोपिन्दनस्वम् कनिष्ठकृतम् भूमि:} \text{॥} \text{१०२} \text{॥} \\
\text{शीतायांश्रिरदेव, सर्गे} \text{२५} \text{।}
\]

\[ 
\text{\textit{i.e., he offered his respects to the great scholar Suhala, the delegate of the king Gòvindachandra of Kanauj.}}
\]

This Gòvindachandra had also fought with the Mohammedan (Turk) invaders of India\(^1\) and had conquered the provinces of Gauḍa and Chêdi. From the decoration “Vividhavidyāvichāravāchaspati” attached to his name we understand that, besides being a patron of learning, he himself was a good scholar.

Under his orders his minister Lakshmīdhara, compiled a book on law entitled “Vyavahārakalpataru.”

Names of his three sons are found as below:—Vijayachandra, Rājayapāla and Asphōtachandra.

Mr. V. A. Smith holds the period of Gòvindachandra’s reign to be from A.D. 1104 to 1155 (V.S. 1161 to 1212).\(^2\) But it is quite clear that his father was alive upto V.S. 1166 (A.D. 1109), hence upto that date he was only a prince regent.

Many gold and copper coins of Govindachandra have been found. Though the metal of the gold coins is rather debased, they are found in abundance. Eight hundred of these were found at the village Nānpāra (Behraich, Oudh) in V.S. 1944 (A.D. 1887) when the Bengal North-Western Railway was under construction.

---

\(^{1}\) Perhaps, these were the Turks that were then making advances from the Lahore side.

\(^{2}\) Early history of India, (Fourth edition), page 400.
THE GOLD COINS\(^1\) OF GÖVINDACHANDRA.

On the obverse there are three lines of the legend. The first line reads ‘श्रीमद्’, the second ‘विन्दचन्द्र’ and the third ‘चेव’. There is also a trident in the third line, which is probably a mark of the mint. On the reverse there is a rude image of the Goddess Lakshmi in the sitting posture. These are a bit larger in size than the current British Indian silver four anna piece.

THE COPPER COINS\(^3\) OF GÖVINDACHANDRA.

On the obverse there are two lines of writing. The first contains “श्रीमद्” and the second “विन्दचन्द्र”. On the reverse there is a very rude image of the Goddess Lakshmi in the sitting posture. These coins are rare and are about the size of the British Indian silver four anna piece.

6. VIJAYACHANDRA.

He was the son and successor of Gövindachandra and was also known as Malladēva.\(^2\) Two copper grants and two inscriptions of this king have been found. The first copper plate\(^4\) is of V.S. 1224 (A.D. 1168) in which the king’s title is mentioned as Mahārājādhīrāja, and that of his son Jayachchandradēva, as Yuvarāja (prince regent). There is also a mention of Vijayachandra’s victory\(^5\) over the Mohammedans. The second\(^6\) copper grant of V.S. 1225 (A.D. 1169) also contains a mention of the king as well as of his heir-apparent in the same manner as the first.

---

5 च्रूतीनेन्द्रधनुशालयाम्बहुवल्लभशारणसौतभूमिपाप:
   This shows that he might have fought with Khusrō of Ghašnī, who at that time, had settled at Lahore.
The first inscription\(^1\) is of V.S. 1225 (A.D. 1169). It does not contain the name of his son. The second inscription,\(^2\) which is dated V.S. 1225 (A.D. 1169), belongs to the commander-in-chief, Pratâpadhavala, and contains the mention of a forged copper grant of Vijayachandra.

The king was a follower of Vaishnavism and built many temples\(^3\) of Vishnu. His queen's name was Chandralâkhâ. He invested his son, Jayachandra, with the powers of administration during his lifetime. His army consisted of a large number of elephants and horses. In the inscription of Jayachandra this king is mentioned as a victor of the world. But in the inscription\(^4\) of V.S. 1220 of Chauhâna Vigrahârâja IV there is a mention of his (Vigrahârajâ's) victory from which it follows that if Vijayachandra had conquered any country he might have done so before this date.

In the 'Prithvîrajâ Râso' Vijayachandra is named as Vijayapâla.

**JAYACHCHANDRA.**

He was the son and successor of Vijayachandra. On the day of his birth his grandfather, Govindachandra, had gained a victory over Dâshârâna country, to commemorate which, the then born grand heir to the throne was named Jaitrachandra\(^5\) (Jayantachandra or Jayachandra).

---

3. The ruins of these temples are still existent in Jajpur.
5. "भाथ जम्भ दिशस्थित एवं झुकरी चन्द्रवे छूए शीर्षणा
\[ \text{संक्षिप्तन्याया} \]
\[ \text{बाथो ग्रहण \& बाथो बाथ यो ग्रहणा बाथ बाथ बाथ बाथ बाथ} \]
\[ \text{बाथो ग्रहण \& बाथ बाथ बाथ बाथ बाथ \& बाथ बाथ बाथ बाथ} \]
\[ \text{ही भारतकुर्जीभण्डानच्याने \& बाथ बाथ बाथ बाथ} \]
\[ \text{सभमार्गी नाकिङ, ५० २३-२४ } \]

(Transliterated in Roman Script)
From the aforesaid copper grant of V.S. 1224, of king Vijayachandra, it is evident that Jayachandra had been invested with ruling powers during his father’s life-time.

In the preface to the drama named ‘Rambhāmanjari Nātikā’, by Nayachandra Sūri, it is thus stated:

“भ्रमितवाराहाराचार्यसमग्रम्भद्वाक्षातिवीरितसारसात्तत्त्वकारिकाकरसारासांस्थ.

म्नायमानहाकुत्वस्य”

i.e., whose (Jayachandra’s) mighty arm is like a pillar to tether the elephant of fortune of king Madanavarmadēva.

This shows that Jayachandra probably had extended his sway over Kālinjar and defeated its king Madanavarmadēva of the Chandēla dynasty. Similarly, having defeated the Bhōrs, he also annexed Khōr.

Fourteen copper grants and two inscriptions of his reign have been found.

The first copper plate is of V.S. 1226 (A.D. 1170) granted from the village Vāḍaviha. It contains an account of the Rājyābhishēka (Coronation) of the king, which was performed on Sunday, the sixth day of the bright half of Āsāṭha, V.S. 1226 (21st June, 1170 A.D.).

The second plate is of V.S. 1228 (A.D. 1172) issued from the Trivēṇi confluence (Allahabad). The third is of V.S. 1230 (A.D. 1173) issued from Vārāṇasī (Benares).

The fourth is of V.S. 1231 (A.D. 1174) issued from Kāshi (Benares). From the thirty-second line of this plate it appears that this copper grant was engraved later in V.S. 1235 (A.D. 1179). The fifth plate is of
V.S. 1232 (A.D. 1175) and contains the name of the king's son, Harishchandra, at whose 'Jātakarma' ceremony the charity mentioned was granted from Benāres. From the thirty-first and thirty-second lines of this plate, too, we infer that the plate was actually prepared like the preceding one in V.S. 1235 (A.D. 1179).

The sixth copper plate is of V.S. 1232 (A.D. 1175). The charity mentioned therein was granted on the occasion of the naming ceremony of Harishchandra. The seventh, the eighth, and the ninth plates are of V.S. 1233 (A.D. 1177) and the tenth is of V.S. 1234 (A.D. 1177). The eleventh, the twelfth and the thirteenth are all of V.S. 1236 (A.D. 1180). These three were issued at the village of Randavai situated on the Ganges. The fourteenth plate is of V.S. 1243 (A.D. 1187). The first inscription of V.S. 1245 (A.D. 1189) of this king has been found at Meohaḍ (near Allahabad) and the second inscription at Buddha Gayā, which is a Buddhist inscription and contains a mention of this king. The fourth digit of the number indicating the year of this inscription being spoiled, it reads 124—only.

This king was a very powerful monarch and had so immense an army that people called him by the nickname 'Dalapangula'12.

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 130.
2 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 199.
3 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 135.
4 Do. do. do. 137.
5 Do. do. do. 138.
6 Do. do. do. 140.
7 Do. do. do. 141.
8 Do. do. do. 142.
9 Do. do. XV, 10.
10 Annual report of the Archaeological Survey of India, (A.D. 1921-22), pages 120-121.
12 "प्रतिमाकल्पतापय श्रीमन्माहेशतनुलचन्त: सतीमालिका-
श्रीमन्माहेशविगुप्त: श्रीमन्माहेशतनुलचन्त: श्रीमन्माहेशतनुलचन्त:
श्रीमन्माहेशतनुलचन्त: श्रीमन्माहेशतनुलचन्त:"
श्रीमन्माहेशतनुलचन्त: श्रीमन्माहेशतनुलचन्त: (रमासारी नाथक, प. 8)

i.e., who has earned the title of "Pangu" (lunar) being unable to mobilize his immense armies without the support of two sticks—Gangā and Yamunā. It is also evident from the above reference that the title of Jayachandra's father was Malladēva and the name of his mother was Chandralēkhā.
Poet Shri Harsha, the author of the famous poem ‘Naishadhiya Charita,’ also flourished in his court. The name of this poet’s mother was Māmalladēvī and that of his father Hīra, as appears from the concluding stanzas of each of the chapters of the aforesaid poem running as follows:—

‘श्रीहर्षवध्या नाखन्दीकुटुबलाहर्षिरे:पुत्रे
श्रीहरसे: धूपे बिन्दुलिंगचर्य मामलवनै च यमु.॥’
i.e., Hīra begot Harsha in Māmalladēvī.
In the conclusion of this ‘Naishadhiya Charita’ it is thus stated:—

‘तामुचकाशमने च लभते ते: काल्यकुन्देश्वरात्.॥’
i.e., in the court of the king of Kanauj Shri Harsha had the privilege of being seated on an “Āsana” and of being honoured with the offer of a betel (तामुल) on attending and leaving the court.

Though there is no mention of Jayachandra in ‘Naishadhiya Charita,’ yet from the ‘Prabandha Kōsha’ compiled by Rājashēkhara Sūri, in V.S. 1405, we learn that this poet flourished in the court of this king.

This Shri Harsha had also written the book named “Khaṇḍanakahandakādya.” It is thus stated in the end of the ‘Dvīrupakōsha’:

हर्षकालाकाशुकालाकाश्वासिताः
श्रीहरसेवरेव नैवतमहादासेवे ज्ञानकृतिः
श्रीबंधुवर्ति सत्रसुवकुलववळवालाप्रिय
श्रीरघुश्रोती द्वियविहस्तकोशस्तां नैवसे ॥

It shows that this book (Dvīrupakōsha) was also written by the same poet.

Jayachandra was the last powerful Hindu monarch of Kanauj. According to ‘Prithvirāja Rāsō’ he had performed the great sacrifice called “Rājasūya Yagya” and the ‘Svayamvara’ ceremony of his daughter Samyōgitā, which brought about the downfall of the Hindu Empire in India. In this
‘Svayamvara’ as Prithvirāja, the Chauhāna king of Delhi, forcibly abducted and married the princess, enmity broke out between the two most powerful kings of India (Jayachandra and Prithvirāja). This internal discord afforded a golden opportunity to Shahābuddin to invade India. But the story of the “Rāsō” is a mere fiction, as firstly there is no mention of ‘Rājasūya’ or the ‘Svayamvara’ of Samyōgīta in the grants or inscriptions of Jayachandra, secondly no trace of the abduction of Samyōgītā is found in the poems connected with Chauhāna Prithvirāja, and thirdly ‘Prithvirāja Rāsō’ records the death of Mahārāvala Samara Simha of Mēvār while helping Prithvirāja against Shahābuddin, but, in fact, he died 110 years after this event. We have fully discussed the subject in the appendix.

Shahābuddin Ghōrī defeated Jayachandra in the battle of Chandāvalī (Etawah district) in A.H. 590 (V.S. 1250—A.D. 1194) and, in the plunder of Benāres, got so much wealth that 1400 camels were employed for its transport to Ghazni.

From this period the Mohammedans acquired sovereignty in Northern India and, being dismayed by this defeat, Jayachandra drowned himself in the Ganges. But anyhow for some time Kanauj remained under the possession of Harishchandra, the son of Jayachandra.

The Mohammedan historians have mentioned Jayachandra as the king of Benāres, which probably was the seat of his Government at that time.

1 ‘Tabqāt-i-Nāsirī, page 140.
3 In the Persian Chronicle, ‘Tājul-Ma‘āsir’, written by Hasan Nizāmī, this event is thus described:—

After taking possession of Delhi next year Qutubuddin Aibak invaded Kanauj. On the way Sultan Shahābuddin also joined him. The invading army consisted of 50,000 horse. The Sultan posted Qutubuddin in the vanguard, Jayachandra met this army at Chandāvalī near Etawah. At the time of the battle king Jayachandra, seated on an elephant, guided his forces, but was eventually killed. The Sultan’s army then plundered the treasure of the fort of Aṣfī and, having proceeded further, similarly took Benāres. He also got 300 elephants in this plunder.

Maulānā Minhājuddin in his ‘Tabqāt-i-Nāsirī’ says that the two generals Qutubuddin and Izzuddin accompanied the Sultan (Shahābuddin) and defeated king Jayachandira of Benāres near Chandāval in A.H. 680 (V.S. 1250).
Jayachandra had built several forts, out of which one was built at Kanauj on the bank of the Ganges, another at Asai, on the Jumna (in Etawah district), and a third at Kurrā (Kaḍā). At Etawah, on a mound, near the bank of the Jumna, there exist, to this day, some remains which are supposed by the local people to be the remains of Jayachandra’s fort.

It is stated in the ‘Prabandha Kōsha’ that king Jayachandra had conquered 700 ‘Yōjana’ (5600 miles) of land. His son’s name was Mēghachandra. Jayachandra’s minister, Padmākara, on his return from Anahilpur, brought with him a beautiful widow named Suhavādēvī. Being smitten with her love Jayachandra kept her as his concubine and from her a son was born. When this illegitimate son came of age, his mother requested the king to declare him his heir-apparent. But the king’s minister, Vidyādhara, announced prince Mēghachandra to be the rightful heir. This offended Suhavādēvī. She sent her secret agent to the Sultān’s court at Taxila (Panjab) and planned the invasion of Kanauj. Though the minister Vidyādhara, having learnt of the conspiracy through his spies, had given timely information to the king, yet he did not give any credit to it. The minister, being thus aggrieved, plunged himself into the Ganges. Shortly afterwards the Sultān appeared with his army on the scene. The king marched out to encounter him and a desperate battle was fought between the two. But it is still a mystery whether the king was killed on the battlefield or plunged himself into the Ganges.

1 This place is in the Allahabad district on the bank of the Ganges. It is alleged that the remains of Jayachandra’s fort on one bank of the river and those of his brother Manikachandra’s fort on the opposite bank are still existent. The peculiar burial ground of the place also tells the tale of a battle being fought there, in which the victorious Jayachandra had destroyed a very large number of his Muslim foes.

2 Mārutunga, too, in his “Prabandhaçintāmaṇī” discridita Suhavādēvī for calling the Mohammedans. This book was written in V.S. 1362 (A.D. 1305).
HARISHCHANDRA.

Harishchandra, son of Jayachchandra, was born on the 8th day of the dark half of Bhadrapada, V.S. 1232 (the 10th August 1175) and after the death of Jayachchandra succeeded to the throne of Kanauj in V.S. 1250 (A.D. 1193) at the age of 18.

It is generally believed that on the death of Jayachchandra the Mohammedans took possession of Kanauj. But in the Mohammedan chronicles of the time such as 'Tajul-Ma-asis' and 'Taqat-i-nasiri', etc., it is stated that after the battle of Chandaval the Mohammedan army went towards Prayag and Benares. They speak of Jayachchandra as the Raja of Benares. This clearly shows that, though Kanauj had been devastated by the Mohammedans and its power had declined, still for some years the descendants of Jayachchandra had a hold over the country around it. It was Shamsuddin Altamash who, for the first time, completely destroyed the Gahdavala kingdom after taking possession of Kanauj.

Though in 'Taqat-i-nasiri' Kanauj has been included in the list of the cities conquered by Qutubuddin and Shamsuddin1 both, yet it is a point worth consideration that when it was already conquered by Qutubuddin, what led Shamsuddin2 to re-conquer it.

Of the aforesaid two copper plates,3 of V.S. 1232, of king Jayachchandra, the first mentions that he granted the village of Vadesar to his family priest on the occasion of the 'Jatakarma' ceremony of his son, prince Harishchandra. And the second refers to the

1 Taqat-i-nasiri, p. 179.
2 In the time of this Altamash a Kshatriya hero named Baru destroyed a number of Mohammedans in Oudh. [Taqat-i-nasiri (English translation) pages 628-629].
3 The first of these two was found at the village of Kamauli in Benares district (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 127); and the second at the village of Sihvar, also in the same district, (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 130).
grant of two villages given to a Brāhmaṇa named Hirishkēśa on the occasion of Harishchandara’s name giving ceremony, performed on the 13th day of the bright half of Bhādrapada, V.S. 1232 (the 31st August, 1175). At this time the prince was only 21 days old.

One copper grant and one inscription of the time of Harishchandra have been found.

The copper grant was issued on the 15th day of the bright half of Pausha, V.S. 1253 (A.D. 1196) in which his titles (which are similar to those of his forefathers are mentioned as follows: — Paramabhaṭṭaraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara, Prama Māhēshvara, Aśvapati, Gajapati, Narapati, Rāja-trayādhipati, Vividhayidyāvichāravāchāspati, etc. This shows that though a large part of the kingdom had passed away from his possession yet he maintained his independence to some extent.

The inscription of this king, too, is of V.S. 1253, which was found at Bēlkhēḍā. Though the king’s name is not mentioned in this inscription, yet from the words “कालयुक्तविनमयसवित” mentioned in it Mr. R. D. Banerji and other scholars hold it to be of the time of Harishchandra.

As stated above, on the death of Jaya-chandra, in the battle with Sultān Shahābuddin, his son Harishchandra became the ruler of the country around Kanauj, while his relatives went towards Khōr.


In this copper plate the Sanuvati is stated both in figures and words. The first digit of the figure appears to have been made by erasing some other figure. Mr. R. D. Banerji reads it as 1257 (Journal Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. VII, page 762, No. 11). If this version be taken as correct then this grant should have been written three years after giving the village of Parnāl.

2 From the history of Rāmpur we learn that when Shamsuddin had invaded Khōr, Jajapāla acknowledged his supremacy and remained there, but his brother Prabhāka (Baradālsena) fled to Mahut (in the Farrukkhabād district), while some of their relatives escaped to Nēpāl. After a time the descendants of Jajapāla leaving Khōr settled in Usēt (in the Budaūn district). Probably Lakhānapālat, too, at that time lived there in the capacity of a feudatory. Afterward being chased by the Mohammedians there, they went towards Bilsad. Later Rām Rāi (Ramsahārya), a descendant of Jajapāla, found the state of Rāmpur in the Etah district. The Rāo
(Shamsābād) (in the Farrukhābād district). But when the few districts that remained under the control of Harishchandra were also attacked by Sultān Shamsuddin Altamash the sons of Harishchandra (Bardāisēna) took their abode first in Khōr then in Mahuī.

But, sometime after, the Mohammedans began their inroads in this district also, and Sīhā, the younger son of Bardāisēna, was obliged, therefore, to migrate to Mārwār.

It is already stated above that Harishchandra’s sons had gone away towards Mahuī. Here, after sometime, his younger son, Sīhā, had built a fort; but later, when this region began to be overrun by the Mohammedans, Sīhā with his elder brother Sētarāmā was obliged to migrate westward with the intention of the pilgrimage to Dvārakā and reached Mārwār.

of Khīmsāpur in the Farrukhābād district also claims his descent from Jaipāla. Similarly, the Chaudharīs of Surjāl and Sarōdhā (Mainpuri district) are known as the descendants of Jaipāla.

It is said that Mānjkachandra was a brother of Jayachandra. The rulers of Mānjdā and Bijāpur, states in the Mirzapur district, as well as some other petty landholders of Ghāzipur district, claim their descent from Gāḍaṇa, the son of Mānjkachandra.

*In the ‘Prātāpagaṇḍha Nāmā’, published in A.D. 1849, this prince is mentioned as Harṣaṇū. Perhaps Harṣaṇū and Prahasta are corrupted forms of Harishchandra.

†Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, page 64.

††At some places the time of this event is given as V.S. 1280.

1 In V.S. 1270 Shamsuddin converted the name of Khōr as Shamsābād after his own name.

2 Possibly Bardāisēna may be a younger brother of Harishchandra.

3 In the history of Rāmpur Sīhā is stated as the grand son of Prahasta, but in the History of Mārwār his grandfather’s name is stated as Bardāisēna. It is, therefore, probable that both these are the surnames of Harishchandra. It is also possible that just as ‘Dānapangula’ was a title of Jayachandra Baradāisēna (Varadāyīsainyā) might be that of Harishchandra.

4 Its ruins are still existent on the bank of the Ganges and are locally known as ‘Sīhā Rāo-kā-Khēdā.’

5 It is stated in “Ām-l-Akbarī” that Sīhā was the nephew of Jayachandra, who lived at Shamsābād and was also killed in the battle fought with Shahsābuddin at Kanauj. (Vol. II, page 507).

In the Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthāna at one place Sīhā is stated as the son of Jayachandra (Vol. I, page 105) while at other as the nephew (Vol. II, page 930). But at the third place he and Sētarāmā both are stated to be the grandsons of Jayachandra (Vol. II, page 940).

In the inscription of Sīhā, dated V.S. 1330, he is stated as the son of Sētarāmā. But if we take Sētarāmā to be the elder brother and adoptive father of Sīhā, firstly the times assigned to Jayachandra and Sīhā adjust themselves well, secondly the controversies arising by the mention of Sētarāmā at one place as the brother and at other as the father of Sīhā would also be squared up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME.</th>
<th>SPECIAL TITLE.</th>
<th>RELATION.</th>
<th>KNOWN DATES.</th>
<th>CONTEMPORARIES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yashövigrāha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Born in Sōlar dynasty, Son of No. 1.</td>
<td>V. S. 1148, 1150, 1156.</td>
<td>Became king after the death of Paramāra Bhūja and Haihaya Karna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mahīchandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>V. S. 1154, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1166.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Madanapañāla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>V. S. 1224, 1225.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gōvindachandra</td>
<td>Vividhāvīdyāvīchāryāchānapati</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>V. S. 1226, 1228, 1230, 1231, 1232, 1233, 1234, (1235), 1236, 1238, 1245.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vijayachandra</td>
<td>Mahārājādhīrāja</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>V. S. 1253.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Genealogical tree of the Gāhaḍavāla family of Kanauj.
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APPENDIX.

FALSE STATEMENTS ABOUT KING JAYACHCHANDRA AND RĀO SĪHĀ.¹

Jayachchandra, king of Kanauj, has often been accused of having caused the downfall of the last Hindū kingdom in Northern India. His grandson Rāo Sīhā also has been accused of having usurped Pālī by treacherously murdering the Pallivāl Brāhmaṇas of that place. No reasons are, however, offered for these suppositions, but the only argument resorted to by these critics, is that these stories are handed down from generation to generation or that they are so mentioned in the “Prithvirāja Rāsō” and in Tod’s “Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthāna.”

In fact, none has yet taken the trouble of investigating the truth or otherwise of the problem. For the consideration of scholars, I lay down my views on the subject here. The brief story of the “Prithvirāja Rāsō” may be told as follows.

Once Kamadhaja Rāi, with the assistance of king Vijaypāla Rāhṭhōḍa of Kanauj invaded Delhi. At this, Tunvara Anangapāla, king of Delhi, requested king Sōmēshvara Chauhāna of Ajmer for help. Sōmēshvara thereupon marched with all his forces and joined Anangapāla. A battle was fought in which the latter won a victory, and the hostile forces retreated. As a mark of gratitude for this timely succour, Anangapāla married his younger daughter

¹ Reproduced from my article in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. LIX, pages 8-9.
Kamalāvatī to Somēshvara and simultaneously his another daughter1 to Vijayapāla of Kanauj.

In V.S. 1115 Kamalāvatī gave birth to Prithvīrāja. Once Nāhada Rāo, king of Maṇḍor, had paid a visit to king Anangapāla of Delhi, and beholding the handsome features of prince Prithvīrāja there, he declared his intention to marry his daughter to him. But later, he abandoned the idea. On this Prithvīrāja invaded Maṇḍor in about V.S. 1129, and having defeated Nāhada Rāo, took his daughter in marriage. Later, in V.S. 1138, Anangapāla, disregarding the right of his elder daughter’s son Jayachchandra, made over the kingdom of Delhi to Prithvīrāja. Subsequently, Prithvīrāja having abducted the daughter of the Yādava king Bhaṇa of Deogiri, who was engaged to Vīrachandra, nephew of Jayachchandra, the armies of Prithvīrāja and Jayachchandra had to meet on the battle-field. Sometime after this, Anangapāla also invaded Delhi to recapture it from Prithvīrāja, on the complaints of his former subjects being now oppressed by Prithvīrāja’s coercive policy, but he did not succeed.

In V.S. 1144, when Jayachchandra proposed to perform a ‘Rājasūya-yajna’ and the ‘Svayamvara’ of his daughter Samyogītā, Prithvīrāja, considering it inadvisable to confront him, thought out another plan to render both the above ceremonies abortive. He at first repaired to Khokhandapura where he killed Jayachchandra’s brother, Bāluka Rāi, and afterwards eloped with Samyogītā. Jayachchandra was, therefore, obliged to wage war against Prithvīrāja. The latter managed somehow to escape, but as many as 64 of his generals were killed and his power was almost annihilated. According to the ‘Rāso,’ Prithvīrāja was 36 years of age when this event took place. So the date of the event must be Vikrama Samvat 1151.

1 Jayachchandra was born to this lady.
The bravery of the young general Dhirasena Pundira in the struggle with Jayachandra attracted Prithviraja’s attention, and the king favoured him most. At this, his veteran generals Chamunda Rai and others became jealous and carried on intrigues with Shahabuddin. But Prithviraja, being too much engrossed with Samyogita, did not pay any heed to these affairs. His government, therefore, gradually showed signs of disintegration. This gave an opportunity to Shahabuddin to invade Delhi. Prithviraja was obliged to come out with his army to meet him. On this occasion, Raval Samarasai of Mewar, his brother-in-law, had also joined Prithviraja in the battle. But due to disorganisation of the army, Shahabuddin eventually won a victory, and Prithviraja was captured and taken to Ghazni. Shortly after this, it is related, Shahabuddin met his death at the hands of Prithviraja at Ghazni, who immediately after killed himself. Shortly after, Rainasai, son of Prithviraja, attacked the Muhammedans of Lahore, to avenge his father’s death, and drove them out. Thereupon Qutbuddin marched against Rainasai and killing him in the battle that followed, advanced further upon Kanauj. Hearing of this, Jayachandra also arranged his army to encounter him. But in the battle that ensued, Jayachandra was killed and the Muhammedans were victorious.

The above story cannot stand any historical test. The Kamadhaja Rai mentioned in it is a fictitious name, inasmuch as we know of no individual of that name in history. Similarly, the name of Jayachandra’s father was not Vijayapala, but Vijayachandra, who lived not in the beginning of the twelfth century of the Vikrama era, but in the first half of the thirteenth century.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) According to the ‘Rasa’ Prithviraja had died at an age of 43; so the date of this event comes to V.S. 1182.
FALSE STATEMENTS ABOUT KING JAYACHOHANDRA
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century, as is evident from his copper plate grants and inscriptions of V.S. 1224 and 1225. Again, although the period of Anangapāla has not yet been precisely ascertained, yet this much is certain that Somēshvara’s third ancestor Vighaharāja (or Visaladēva IV) had acquired possession of Delhi, which is borne out by the inscription of V. S. 1220 (A.D. 1163) on the pillar of Firōz Shah at Delhi. Under these circumstances, we do not understand how Sōmēshvara could have gone to Delhi to help Anangapāla. Moreover, in the “Prithvirajavijaya Mahakavya,” which was written in Prithviraja’s time, the name of Prithviraja’s mother is mentioned not as Kamalāvatī, but as Karpūradēvi, who is stated to be the daughter not of Tuṇvara Anangapāla, but of a king of the Haihaya dynasty (of Tripuri). In the “Hammīra Mahākavya” also the name of Prithviraja’s mother is mentioned as Karpūradēvi. The author of the “Rāśō” has mentioned the date of the birth of his hero Prithviraja as V. S. 1115, but in fact Prithviraja should have been born in V. S. 1217 (A. D. 1160) or somewhat later, as at the death of his father in about V. S. 1236 (A. D. 1179) he was a minor and his mother took charge of the administration.

Let us now consider the tale of Prithviraja having married a daughter of Nāhaḍa Rāo, king of Maṇḍor. This, too, is an absurdity, because from an inscription of V. S. 894 of king Bāuka, who was tenth in descent from this Nāhaḍa Rāo, we conclude that the latter must have lived about V. S. 714, i.e., nearly 500 years before Prithviraja. Sometime between V. S. 1189 and V. S. 1200 the Pratihāra

1 Kleinhorn’s Supplement to Northern List (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, Appendix I), page 18.
3 Journal Royal Asiatic Society, (1913) page 275 f.
4 The names of Prithviraja’s ancestors mentioned in the ‘Rāśō’ appear also to a large extent incorrect.
dynasty of Maṇḍör had ceased to exist, having been overthrown by Chauhāna Rāyapāla, whose son Sahajapāla ruled at Maṇḍör about V.S. 1200, as appears from his inscription found at Maṇḍör. Besides this, the name of the prime ancestor of the Paṭihāra dynasty of Kanauj was also Nāgabhaṭa (or Nāhaḍa). From the copper grant dated V.S. 813 of the Chauhāna king Bhartrīvaḍḍha II, found at Hānsot, it appears that this Nāhaḍa lived in the beginning of the ninth century of the Vikram era. Further, the first Paṭihāra conqueror of Kanauj, too, was Nāgabhaṭa (Nāhaḍa II), who was fifth in descent from the aforesaid Nāhaḍa. He had died in V.S. 890, as appears from the “Prabhāvakacharitra.” No fourth Nāhaḍa besides these has been heard of in the history of India.

We have already mentioned above V.S. 1217 as the approximate birth year of Prithvīrāja. In such a case, it would certainly be impossible to assume that Anangapāla made over the kingdom of Delhi to Prithvīrāja in V.S. 1138.

Further, the story of Prithvīrāja having abducted the daughter of the Yādava king Bhāṇa of Dēgiri and of the consequent battle between Prithvīrāja and Jayachandra, also seems to be spurious. The founder of the city of Dēgiri, was not Bhāṇa, but Bhillama, who had founded the city about V.S. 1244 (A.D. 1187). Neither does this event find place in the history of Bhillama nor does the name Bhāṇa occur in the pedigree of the dynasty. Similarly, Virachandra, the name of a nephew of king Jayachandra, occurs only in the ‘Rāsō’ and nowhere else.

We have mentioned above that an ancestor, third from Prithvīrāja’s father, had acquired possession of Delhi. Thus, the talk of Tunvara Anangapāla’s effort to regain his kingdom from Prithvīrāja on complaint from his subjects about the latter’s high-handedness is an untenable proposition.

2. Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XII, page 197.
There now remains the affairs of the ‘Rājasūya’ and ‘Svayāmvara’ ceremonies performed by king Jayachandra. Had Jayachandra performed such a grand ceremony as the ‘Rājasūya,’ some mention of it would have been found in the inscriptions of that monarch, or in the ‘Rambhāmanjarī Nāṭikā’ by Nayachandra Sūri, of which Jayachandra himself is the hero. Fourteen copper plates and two stone inscriptions of Jayachandra have been found, the last of which is dated V. S. 1245 (A. D. 1189). Although there are, thus, as many as sixteen epigraphic records belonging to him, not one of them contains any reference to his having celebrated a ‘Rājasūya’

The story of Prithvirāja’s elopement with Sāmyogitā seems to be a creation of the fertile brain of the author of the ‘Rāso’. Neither the “Prithvirājavijaya Mahākāvyā” written in Prithvirāja’s time, nor the “Hammīra Mahākāvyā” complied in the last half of the fourteenth century of the Vikrama era, makes any mention of any such event. To rely on the story under these circumstances, is to tread on uncertain ground. The dates of the events given in the “Rāsō” are alike incorrect.

The story of Māhārāvala Samarasingh of Mēwār being a brother-in-law of Prithvirāja, and being killed

---

2 Annual report of the Arch. Survey of India (1921-22), Pages 120-121.
3 Further there is no trace of Somavamsi Mukundādēva of Kātaka in the history of that period, whose daughter is mentioned as the mother of Sāmyogitā, in the ‘Rāsō’.
4 Mr. Mōhan Lāl Vīshnu Lāl Pāṇḍyā had, however, assumed the dates of the ‘Rāsō’ to be based on the ‘Ananda Vikrama Samvat,’ which he takes for granted on the basis of the Words ‘विक्रमाध्यम यज्ञ’ According to this, the Vikrama Samvat is arrived by adding 91 to the Samvat stated in the ‘Rāsō’. Thus, by adding 91 to the Samvat 1168, the date of Prithvirāja’s death arrived at according to the ‘Rāsō,’ we come to 1249. This date alone can be proved to be correct by this method. But the other dates and the periods assigned to Nāhaḍa- Rāo, etc., still remain quite unreliable.
in the battle with Shahābuddin, while helping his brother-in-law Prithvīrāja, is also an idle tale. This battle had, in fact, been fought in V. S. 1249, whereas Mahārāva's Samaraśingh died in V. S. 1359. Under these circumstances, the above statement of the 'Rāsō' cannot be admitted as either true or possible.

After this, there is the mention of Prithvīrāja's son Rānasī, but in fact the name of Prithvīrāja's son was Gōvindarāja. He being a child, his uncle Harirāja had usurped his dominion of Ajmer, whereupon Qutbuddin, having defeated Harirāja, had protected Gōvindarāja.

In the end, there is the mention of an invasion by Qutbuddin against Jayachandra, but, according to the Persian histories of India, this invasion is said to have been made not after Shahābuddin's death, but in his lifetime, and that he himself had taken part in it. He was killed at the hands of the Gakkhars in V. S. 1262 (A.D. 1206). Besides, in the Persian chronicles there is no mention of Jayachandra's collusion with Shahābuddin.

When all these circumstances are taken into consideration, the historical value of the "Prithvīrāja Rāsō" becomes vitiated. Besides, even if we accept for a moment the whole story of the 'Rāso' as correct, yet nowhere in that work is there any mention either of Jayachandra having invited Shahābuddin to attack Prithvīrāja or of his having any other sort of connection whatsoever, with the Muhammedan ruler. On the other hand, at various places in the 'Rāsō' we read of Prithvīrāja's aggressive attacks, his elopement with the princess, his neglect of state affairs through his devotion to Samyōgitā, his proud and overbearing behaviour towards his brave and wise general Chāmunda Rāi, whom he had sent to prison without any fault.

1 'Bhārata-ke Prāchīna Rājavamsa', part 1, page 263.
on his part, and his high-handedness which gave rise to the complaints of the subjects of a state left as a legacy to him by his maternal grandfather. Along with this, we also learn from the ‘Rāsō’ that his unwise steps obliged his own generals to conspire with his enemy Sultan Shahābuddin. In the light of these circumstances, readers will be able to judge for themselves how far it is just to dub king Jayachchandra with the title of Vibhīshāna and thus malign him as a traitor.

Let us now examine the attack made on Rāo Sīhā, grandson of Mahārāja Jayachchandra. Colonel James Tod¹ writes:

"Here in the land of Kher amidst the sandhills of Luni (the salt-river of the desert) from which the Gohils were expelled, Sihaji planted the standard of the Rathors.

"At this period a community of Brahmans held the city and extensive land about Pali, from which they were termed Pallivals, and being greatly harassed by the incursions of the mountaineers, the Mers and Minas, they called in the aid of Sihaji’s band, which readily undertook and executed the task of rescuing the Brahmans from their depredations. Aware that they would be renewed, they offered Sihaji lands to settle amongst them, which he readily accepted."

"Afterwards he found an opportunity to obtain land by putting to death the heads of this community and adding the districts to his conquests."

From the above history it is evident that before rendering aid to these Pallīvāla Brāhmaṇas, Rāo Sīhā had acquired possession of Mehvā and Kheda. It does not seem reasonable that an adventurer, hankering after land, should have renounced possession of

these two large districts, merely to content himself with a few acres of land granted to him by his proteges, the Pallivālas. Further, he had not at that time enough men with him to look after his possessions of Khēḍa and Mēhā as well as for keeping under subjection the Mēras and Mīnās of the hilly tracts, who often overran Pālī. Besides, from the narratives of the old chronicles of Mārwār we learn that the Pallivālas of Pālī were a class of rich traders. It is nowhere recorded that they were masters of the town of Pālī; nor do we find any mention that Rāo Sīhā had murdered them. In the temple of Sōmanātha at Pālī, there is a stone inscription\(^1\) of V.S. 1209 of Sōlankī Kumārapāla, which shows that at that time the latter held sway over Pālī. It also appears from this inscription that one Bāhaḍadēva, probably, a Chauhāna feudatory of Kumārapāla ruled over Pālī at this time on behalf of Kumārapāla. There had also been one Ālaḥaḍadēva, a Chauhāna feudatory and favourite of king Kumārapāla. An inscription\(^2\), dated V.S. 1209, of Kirāḍu shows that this Ālaḥaḍadēva had acquired possession of the districts of Kirāḍu, Rāḍadhadā and Šivā by the favour of king Kumārapāla.\(^3\)

On the death of Kumārapāla, about V.S. 1230, his nephew Ajayapāla succeeded to the throne. From this time the power of the Sōlankis began to decline. Presumably, the Mīnās and Mēras might have taken advantage of this weakness and plundered Pālī, which was then one of the richest cities in the vicinity. In the inscription dated V. S. 1319 at Sūndhā of Chauhāna Chāchīgadēva it is stated that Udayasimha, father of Chāchīgadēva, and great grandson of the aforesaid Ālaḥaḍadēva, was master of the districts of Nādol,

---

2 " " " " " " Vol. IV, (1939-30) p. 7.
Jālör, Maṇḍör, Bāhaḍmer, Ratanapur, Sānchör, Sūrāchand, Rāḍadhaḍā, Khēḍa Rāmsīn, and Bhīnmāl. Udayasimha is also described in this inscription as invincible to the kings of Gujrrāt. We have found four inscriptions of this king ranging from V. S. 1262 to V. S. 1306 at Bhīnmāl. We conclude, therefore, that at some time in this period, this Chauhān feudatory might have thrown off the yoke of the Sōlankī kings of Gujrrāt. At the same time, when we consider the geographical position of the above-mentioned districts, we are led to believe that the city of Pālī, too, must have passed into the possession of the Chauhānas from the Sōlankīs. So that at the time of Rāo Sīhā’s arrival in Mārwār, such an important city as Pālī must have either been in possession of the Sōlankīs or the Chauhānas. What circumstances, then, could have obliged Rāo Sīhā to butcher his helpless and trading suppliants of the Brāhmaṇas, a caste so sacred to a Rājpūt for the possession of Pālī?

Besides this, when finding themselves too weak to ward off the marauding incursions of the hill tribes, these Brāhmaṇas had themselves applied to Rāo Sīhā for help, and having gained experience of his prowess, and having appointed him to be their protector, how could they have ever dared to incur his wrath by an act of effrontery?

Thus automatically Sīhā became master of the city, and so his interest lay in fostering its trade by conferring favours upon its merchants, the Pallīvāḷa Brāhmaṇas, and not in laying waste the country by killing these traders, as is supposed by the learned scholar, Colonel Tod.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE.</th>
<th>LINE.</th>
<th>INCORRECT.</th>
<th>CORRECT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vishńu vardhana</td>
<td>Vishńuvardhana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Semyta</td>
<td>Suvat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mohmedan</td>
<td>Mohammedan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kakkala</td>
<td>Rāṭarāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Varńa</td>
<td>ChandrávatiI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Badāün</td>
<td>grandson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>Rājyapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rājyapāla</td>
<td>Buddhista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Buddhista</td>
<td>Buddhista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7 &amp; 16</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Vigyānēshvara</td>
<td>Vijnēshvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sandarān d Mahā-kāvyā, Sar a</td>
<td>Sandarānanda Mahākāvyā, Sarga I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Buddhista</td>
<td>Buddhista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>kukam</td>
<td>Kukam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja I</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tivali</td>
<td>Tivili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Madnapāla</td>
<td>Madanapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Madnavarmadēva</td>
<td>Madnavarmadēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>rāṣṭrakūtas</td>
<td>Pulakēshīn II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pulakēshīn I</td>
<td>Bhavana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bhavana</td>
<td>ascended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kristarāja</td>
<td>Kristarāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chakrāyudhi</td>
<td>Chakrāyudha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Epigraphi</td>
<td>Epigraphi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Raṇpādēv,I</td>
<td>Raṇpādēv,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tivali</td>
<td>Tivili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Pulia Shakti</td>
<td>Pulia Shakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kapḍavanja</td>
<td>Kapḍavanja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>genealogical</td>
<td>genealogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vinayāditya III (son of Vishńuvardhana V) who killed king Mangi,</td>
<td>Vinayāditya III (son of Vishńuvardhana V) who killed king Mangi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>the Satyavākya oth</td>
<td>Satyavākya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-क्षणक-</td>
<td>क्षणक-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kan—</td>
<td>क—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pēremāṇaḍi o</td>
<td>Pēremāṇaḍi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>rebellious</td>
<td>rebellious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>wielded</td>
<td>wielded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja, II</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja I,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dantivarman I, from</td>
<td>Dantivarman, From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>34, 36 &amp; 43</td>
<td>Qutubuddin (Panjab)</td>
<td>Qutbuddin (Panjab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>desperate</td>
<td>desperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Qutubuddin</td>
<td>Qutbuddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>22 &amp; 24</td>
<td>Vijaysāla</td>
<td>Vijaysāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rāṭhōḍa</td>
<td>Rāṭhōḍa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>disorganis</td>
<td>the disorganised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ERRATA (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gōvindachandra</td>
<td>Madanapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (..)</td>
<td>782 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>son (..)</td>
<td>grand-son (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>81–82</td>
<td>sopprgrant</td>
<td>inscriptoin (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>910 (..)</td>
<td>894 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>of the Sōlankīs found at Miraj (..)</td>
<td>found at Miraj of the Shankīs (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(V.S. 870=A.D. 413)</td>
<td>(V.S. 859=A.D. 812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kādamba</td>
<td>Kādaba (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gōvinda II</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22 (..)</td>
<td>220 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>845 (..)</td>
<td>945 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No. 89</td>
<td>No. 99 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>जापानिक</td>
<td>जापानिक</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Do. No. 12</td>
<td>Grand son of No. 12 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>853 (..)</td>
<td>838 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>158 (..)</td>
<td>158 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>870 (..)</td>
<td>869 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>813 (..)</td>
<td>812 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arjuna varman</td>
<td>Ajavarman (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nayapāla (..)</td>
<td>Nayapāla (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>वनस्पति</td>
<td>वनस्पति (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bījāpur (..)</td>
<td>Bījāpur (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>प्रसादनामा</td>
<td>प्रसादनामा (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ganges (..)</td>
<td>Kāl (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bhāti 13 (..)</td>
<td>Bhāti 31 (..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gold (..)</td>
<td>Silver (..)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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