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FOREWORD

The study of ancient Indian history and culture has reached a stage when it has become absolutely necessary to devote serious attention to compiling regional data in a proper scientific manner. The gradually accumulating material from different parts of India has rendered it well-nigh impossible to make a synthetic study of the whole, unless grounds are prepared by the publication of local or regional history. This necessity has appealed to serious students of history and valuable books have been published in recent years on the history of important regions and dynasties. The present volume is the latest endeavour in the same direction. The Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, whose history forms its chief theme, played an important role in the history of Northern India at a very critical period. The Muslim Turks had already obtained a firm footing in India by the occupation of the Punjab. The known history of Islam should have left no doubt that the further expansion of its dominions in India was merely a question of time. A special importance, therefore, attaches to the princes and peoples of India who flourished during the fateful century and a half that elapsed between the death of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazni and the renewed incursions of the Ghurids. The fate of India hung in balance and depended on what the Indians did or failed to do to avert the great catastrophe. The Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty was one of the most powerful in India during this fateful period, and it ruled over the region which is regarded by common consent as the heart of Indian civilisation. The history of the Gāhaḍavālas is, therefore, bound to be one of supreme interest.

There has been much speculation about the causes of the decline and downfall of the Hindus and their defeat in the hands of the Turks. These speculations are based mostly on a priori reasonings. But the only theory that is likely to appeal to a student of history must be based upon facts concerning
the rulers and the people of the period. An objective study of
the political and cultural history of the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom,
which roughly covered modern U. P. with occasional exten-
sion or diminution, would supply some of the facts needed to
form a proper idea of the causes that led to the downfall of the
Hindus. Similar handbooks, covering other regions, would
complete the chain of evidence which is now sadly lacking.

If Dr. Miss Niyogi has chosen a worthy theme for her
research, she has also carried it in an admirable spirit. The
readers will find in it a dispassionate, critical and purely
objective study of the political history of the Gāhaḍavāla
kingdom as well as the state of religion, society and culture
prevailing at the time within its borders. The book has
removed a longfelt want and will, I hope, prove of great
interest to the students of Indian History.

Calcutta, 28.3. ’58

R. C. Majumdar
PREFACE

The present work was originally a thesis approved by the University of Calcutta in 1952 for the D. Phil. degree, and represents the result of systematic researches conducted by me for nearly five years under the supervision of Dr. B. C. Sen, M.A., LL.B., P.R.S., Ph. D., Reader in the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture of Calcutta University. For a portion of this period (December 1945 to June 1948) I was the recipient of a Research Scholarship of the Bengal Government and was attached to the Royal Asiatic Society (now the Asiatic Society).

While enjoying the Government Scholarship, I was allowed by the Asiatic Society to pay a visit to the Provincial Museum, (now the State Museum) Lucknow, where with the kind permission of the authorities, I was able to examine and check up the readings of forty-nine copper-plates of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. I also examined seven Gāhaḍavāla plates lying with the Asiatic Society. The materials used by me in this work were collected not only from all the available inscriptions of the dynasty, but also from those of contemporary ones, besides coins, various literary and other works and English translations of the Persian and Arabic historical accounts. The findings of other scholars and research-workers were also utilised with grateful acknowledgments in the preparation of this volume.

I am profoundly grateful to Dr. H. C. Ray, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., formerly Professor and Head of the Department of History, University of Colombo, who advised me to choose, as the subject of a detail study, the history of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. This dynasty came to power c. 1089 A.D. and continued to rule over Antarvedi till the Muslim conquest, which took place towards the end of the twelfth century. At the height of its power, the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty exercised
substantial political authority over a territory roughly extending from Delhi to Monghyr and from the foot of the Himalayas to the bank of the Yamuna and maintained wide diplomatic and cultural relations with the contemporary rulers of different parts of India. The rulers of this dynasty came into conflict with the Muslims and at certain stages displayed considerable powers of resistance. Their inscriptions claim that the first king Candradeva protected the sacred places of Kāśi, Kuśika, Uttara-Kośala and Indrasthāniyaka, some of which were important cultural centres of India, prior to the Muslim conquest. The importance of the study of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty lies not only in the political and military achievements of the dynasty but also in the socio-religious and cultural movements with which it became associated in the declining years of the Hindu rule in Northern India.

The introductory chapter of this work aims at reconstruction of the political history of the Antarvedi region from the invasions of Sulṭān Maḥmūd till the rise of the Gāhaḍavālas and serves as a background for the political history of the dynasty. The current theories regarding the origin and early history of the Gāhaḍavālas have been discussed in detail in the next chapter. In the chapters III, IV and V attempts have been made to study the political history and diplomatic relations of the dynasty with the help of new materials obtained through an intensive study of the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions and literary works, including the contemporary Dharma-sāstra digest, Kṛtyakalpataru, which was written at the command of a Gāhaḍavāla king. The geographical data supplied by the inscriptions of this dynasty have been classified and discussed in chapter VI. The last two chapters review the Gāhaḍavāla administration and society, religion and culture and are based mainly on an intensive analysis of the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions, the Kṛtyakalpataru, and other contemporary sources and as such, contain some original materials brought to light and subjected to critical study for the first time. As the epigraphic data have not been exhaustively used before from
the different standpoints indicated above, an appendix has been included, which gives a descriptive list of the inscriptions issued by the Gāhaḍavālas and their feudatories, together with new reading suggested by me in some places on the basis of a careful examination of the original copper-plates.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Dr. J. N. Banerjea, M.A., Ph.D., F.A.S., Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University and Dr. N. Dutt. M.A., B.L., P.R.S., Ph.D., D.Litt., F.A.S., M.P., formerly Professor of Pali in the Calcutta University for the active interest they have taken in the publication of this work. To Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D., F.A.S., F.B.B.R.A.S., I am particularly grateful for writing a valuable Foreword for it. I am also grateful to Dr. N. R. Ray, M.A., D. Litt. & Phil., F.L.A., F.R.A.S., F.R.S.A., M.P., Bageswari Professor of Fine Arts and Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.A., D. Litt., for the interest and sympathy they have shown in the progress of my research work. I must also express my gratefulness to the Government of Bengal for the research scholarship I enjoyed for some time. To the authorities and staff of the Asiatic Society I am grateful for the kind co-operation received during the period I was attached to it as a Research Scholar. I am thankful to the authorities of the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, for allowing me to study the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions lying with them in 1947 and also for kindly furnishing me with some facsimiles. My thanks are also due to my publishers the Calcutta Oriental Book Agency, the Calcutta Oriental Press Private Limited, its Manager and his staff for courtesy and co-operation in connection of printing and publication of this volume. Thankful acknowledgements are also due to my friends, Sri D. Guha of the Department of Pali, Rangoon University and Sm. K. Sen for valuable assistance in preparing the Index. Sm. Sen has further laid me under deep obligation by occasional help in proof-reading and preparing the Corrigenda.
Above all, I am deeply indebted to Dr. B.C. Sen, M.A., LL.B., P.R.S., Ph.D., not only for the unfailing and untiring advice, guidance and sympathy, but also for constant encouragement received from him throughout the years I was engaged in research work under his kind supervision.

Due to unavoidable and unforeseen circumstances, there has been considerable delay in the process of publication of the book; this has, no doubt, enabled me to bring up-to-date and improve certain portions in the light of fresh materials, but unfortunately it has also resulted, in spite of my best efforts, in some misprints and lack of uniformity in transliteration of non-English names. These errors and discrepancies, excepting the most obvious ones, have been corrected in the Corrigenda. Some more errors and misprints might have escaped my notice for which I crave the indulgence of my readers. As to the transliteration of Indian and Persian names, the system adopted in the Dynastic History of Northern India has been followed as far as possible.

Calcutta

1959

Roma Niyogi
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CHAPTER I

POLITICAL HISTORY OF ANTARVEDI AND VĀRĀṆASI
(C. 1000-89 A.D.)

The dawn of the eleventh century marked the beginning of a new era in the history of India. With the invasions of Maḥmūd of Ghazni, which began c. 1000 A.D., India was brought face to face with aggressive Islam. All the previous invaders—the Greeks, the Parthians, the Kuṣāṇas and the Hūṇas had gradually been absorbed by the well-developed and all-embracing Indian culture. Thus India, before the eleventh century A.D., had come into contact with many foreign hordes of warriors, plunderers and gold-seekers with different standards of civilization, but never before had she faced a race of fearless fighters, whose inspiring war cry was ‘religion’. That religion, ‘Islam’, in fact, had been introduced into India by the Arab conquerors of Sind three centuries earlier; but in the eleventh century, it re-appeared in India as a definitely aggressive force in politics and religion.

The conquest of Sind has aptly been described by Lane-Poole as “an episode in the history of India and Islam, a triumph without result.” Ḥajjāj, ruler of Iraq, who was responsible for the conquest of Sind, granted the newly conquered people freedom of worship. Chach-nāma records that “permission was given to them to worship their gods. Nobody must be forbidden or prevented from following his own religion”. ¹ So the conquered and the conquerors lived

¹ Elliot, *The History of India as told by its own Historians*, I, p. 185 (Chach-nāma).
side by side peacefully. The barrenness of Sind and also the fact that it was sandwiched between the powerful kingdom of the Imperial Pratihāras and that of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, were unfavourable to the political expansion of the Arab possessions in India. Moreover, the Arabs did not pursue a vigorous policy of conquest in this country; they did not even consolidate their position in Sind. Muḥammad ibn Qāsim, who effected the final conquest of Sind, was called back abruptly and his work was left unfinished. Subsequently, internecine feuds weakened the home government of the conquerors and soon Sind became divided into petty Muslim states, engrossed more or less with internal politics.

In the invasion of the ruler of Ghazni, on the other hand, India found a new type of enemy—the aggressive Islam. The new invaders, the Turks (Turuškas), had strength not only of the sword but also of faith. Their ambition was not to establish a petty Indian kingdom, but to humiliate and destroy all that seemed to be contrary to the laws of Islam. No wonder that only a few decades after the establishment of the kingdom of Ghazni, the ambition of its rulers clashed with the spirit of independence and the separatist politics of the Hindu states in India. The next two hundred years, which constitute a period of transition, saw the answer to the question whether Islam was to be introduced into India as a guiding factor in the political and social life of the mediaeval period.

Maḥmūd of Ghazni led a series of invasions into India during the years 1000 to 1026 A. D. In the course of these expeditions, he met and defeated almost all the important kings of northern and western India. Wherever the victorious Turkish Sultān went, idols and wealth
vanished. The Sāhīs of Udabhāṇḍapura were exterminated and the Punjab, for the time being, became the base of operations for the Muslims in India. The tottering Pratihāra empire of Antarvedi collapsed under the repeated shocks of terrible blows.

In the beginning of the eleventh century, the erstwhile feudatories of the Pratihāras, the Candrātreyas of Jejāka-bhūkti and the Kalacuris of Tripūrī, and also the Parmāras of Dhārā, who had been feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, strengthened their position in the Madhyadeśa. The kings of these dynasties, together with their contemporaries, who ruled in other parts of the sub-continent (e.g., the Cāluκyas of Aṇāhila-pāṭaka, the Cāluκyas of Kalyāṇi, the Pālas of Gauḍa), were trying more or less to maintain some kind of balance of power in the field of politics; whenever any king became so strong as to be a menace to the safety and independence of other kings, the others combined to bring about his downfall. Thus, combined resistance was organized against two of the greatest warriors of the century, Bhoja of the Paramāra dynasty (c. 1010-55 A.D.) and Lakṣmi-Karna of the Kalacuri dynasty (c. 1041-70 A.D.). The Antarvedi or the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab, ruled by the local princes, however, fell an easy prey not only to the Parmāra and the Kalacuri dynasties, but also to the later Yāmāṇi kings after the death of Sultān Maḥmūd in 1030 A.D. These later Muslim raids were directed mainly against the Doab and though the raiders were being gradually weakened by internal feuds and foreign invasions, their military operations against that region were not effectively checked till the rise of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty at Vārāṇasī and Kānyakubja, sometime before c. 1089 A.D.

As a background to the history of the Gāhaḍavālas,
I shall now relate briefly the political history of the Antarvedi region from the beginning of Māhmūd's invasions to c. 1089 A.D., when Candradeva, the first Gāhdāvāla king issued his first inscription.

In the beginning of the eleventh century A.D., Antarvedi or the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab was under the rule of the fast-declining Pratihāras. The first important king of this dynasty was Nāgabhaṭa II, who is generally believed to have conquered Kānyakubja before V. S. 890/c. 833 A.D.¹ Afterwards, under the able guidance of Bhoja I and Mahendrapāla I, the dynasty at Kānyakubja attained imperial greatness. Epigraphic evidence shows that the dominion of these two Pratihāra kings at the height of their power, extended from the Karnāl district in the Punjab to Bihar and from the Kathiawad peninsula to North-Bengal. Later on, the invasion of Indra III (c. 915-927 A.D.) of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, fratricidal struggles, incapable reigns and incessant Turkish raids contributed to their downfall. The feudatories, one by one, declared independence; the Candrātreyas of Jejakabhukti, the Haihaya-Kalacuris of Tripuri and the Cāhamanas of Sākambharī took full advantage of the growing weakness of the later Pratihāras. The imperial titles of Vijayaśāla, who is mentioned in the Rajorgad stone inscription in 959 A. D.,² were doubtless an echo of the greatness of Bhoja and Mahendrapāla.

The process of disintegration of the Pratihāra empire was particularly hastened by the repeated invasions of Sulṭān Māhmūd of Ghazni. The contemporary account of

¹ Dr. R. C. Majumdar holds that there is no definite evidence to show that Nāgabhaṭa annexed Kānyakubja after defeating Cakrāyūdha. (vide HB., I, pp. 112-3 & fn. 3 of p. 112.)
Maḥmūd’s Indian expeditions, left by ‘Utbī, reveals that in 409 A.H./1018 A.D., when Maḥmūd for the first time sacked Kānyakubja, “the city of seven forts” and “ten thousand temples”, a certain Rājaipāl was on the imperial throne. The same king is referred to as Rājpāl in Gardīzi’s account, written within twenty-two years of Maḥmūd’s death. The Jhūsi inscription of Trilocanapāla (V.S.1084/1027 A.D.) identifies this Rājaipal or Rājpāl with Rājyapāla, whose reign is to be placed between those of Vijayapāla and Trilocanapāla. The account of ‘Utbī indicates that the process of disintegration of the Pratihāra empire had advanced very far indeed by 1018 A.D. In the Antarvedi itself the Ghazni Sultaṇ met and fought as many as five important rulers, some of whom were described as “raί’īs” by the Muslim historians. They were Rāi Hardat of Barba or Baran (Bulandshahr), Rāijaipāl of Kanauj, Candāl Bhor of Asi (Asni on the bank of Gaṅgā, 10 miles to the northeast from Fatehpur) who was “one of the chief men and generals of the Hindus” and was at that time at war with the Rāi of Kanauj being eventually compelled to retreat, and Cand Rāj, “one of the greatest men in Hind”, who resided in the fort of Sherwa (Saharanpur). Besides these, there were Kulacandra, the ruler of Mahaban (Mathurā) and strangely enough, a certain Baru-jaibāl, who had been fighting unsuccessfully with Cand Rāj but, at the same time, was desirous of entering into an alliance with him by marrying his son Bhīmapāla to his daughter. Gardīzi has omitted the name of Candāl Bhor and has described Cand Rāj as being “of Kanauj”. These two accounts clearly indicate that

1 Elliot, HI., II, p.45 (‘Utbī); TF., I, p. 63.
2 IHQ., 1933, p. 938.
3 IA., XVIII, pp. 33-35.
4 Elliot, HI., II, p, 42 (‘Utbī); IHQ., 1933, p. 938.
comparatively notable dynasties like the Candrātreyas and the Kalacuris were not the only ones to defy the declining Pratihāra empire; the local chiefs and the generals too joined in the general scramble for power with little courtesy to the de facto emperor Rājyapāla.

Rājyapāla’s reign must have ended sometime between 1018 A.D., when Maḥmūd invaded Kānyakubja for the first time, and 1019 A.D., when he repeated the attack. According to ‘Utbī and Ibn ul-Athīr, when Maḥmūd approached Kānyakubja for the first time, Rājyapāla fled from the city leaving it unprotected before the plundering army of the Ghazni Sulṭān.¹ Gardīzī, on the other hand, states that the Rāi was captured.² I have already mentioned that this author inaccurately describes Cānd Rāi as being “of Kanauj”, while the real “rāi of Kanauj” was Rājyapāla; moreover Maḥmūd’s activities at Kānyakubja are described very briefly in this account. Most probably Gardīzī, who was writing twenty-two years after Maḥmūd’s death, had no detailed knowledge of the expedition, and was wrong in stating that the Rāi of Kanauj was captured. The contemporary account of ‘Utbī, supported by the generally authentic account of Ibn ul-Athīr, seems to offer a true version of the incident. The evidence of the Muslim historians and Indian epigraphy indicates that the cowardice, displayed by the scion of the imperial line, gave rise to a wide-spread feeling of indignation.³ The return of Sulṭān Maḥmūd to Ghazni was quickly followed by the formation of a confederacy of some of the Indian kings against the worthless Pratihāra emperor. According to the Muslim

1 Elliot, *HI.*, II, p. 44
2 *IHQ.*, 1933, p. 938.
historians, the man, who having been placed in charge of this confederacy, fought with Rājyapāla and killed him, was Nanda. Cunningham identified Nanda with Gaṇḍa, the son of Dhaṅga, the Candrātreya ruler (c.954–1002 A.D.)¹; but Dr. H. C. Ray, on the authority of Ibn ul-Athīr, who gives the name of the leader as “Bīḍā”, identifies him with Vidyādhara, the son of Gaṇḍa². This identification is supported by a Candrātreya inscription from Mahoba and the Dubkund stone inscription (V.S. 1145) of the Kacchapaghātas; these two inscriptions refer to the destruction of the king of Kānyakubja by Vidyādhara.³

There is some doubt as to the identity of the king, who was installed in the place of Rājyapāla by the victorious kings. ‘Utbi’s detailed account comes down only to the year 409 A.H./1018 A.D. Gardīzī writes, “Nanda has promised to help Tarū-Jaipāl and has agreed to take an army to his country”.⁴ This prince has also been mentioned as Parū-jaipāl or Barū-jaibāl by Ibn ul-Athīr and as Narū-jaipāl by Niẓām ud-Dīn.⁵ Dr. H. C. Ray has pointed out that calligraphically these four forms Tarū-, Parū-, Barū, and Narū may be confused and also that these four forms may be regarded as representing the name Trilocanapāla.⁶ But there are some difficulties in this identification. Firstly, from ‘Utbi’s account it is clear that Barū-jaipāl was ruling contemporaneously with Rājyapāla and probably, like other chiefs mentioned by him, was practically independent of imperial control; secondly, the Jhusi inscription describes

---

¹ Elliot, ibid.; TF., ibid.; ASR., II, p. 452.
² Dynastic History of Northern India., I, pp. 604 ff.
³ El., I, pp. 219 ff; El., II, pp. 232 ff.
⁵ TA., p. 12.
⁶ DHNI., I, p. 602.
Trilocanapāla as “Śrī-Rājyapāladeva-pād-ānudhyāta”. Greater difficulty arises from Achīr’s statement that Parū-jaipāl was killed during Maḥmūd’s second raid on Antarvedi. Hence it is not possible to identify him with Trilocanapāla, who issued the Jhusi inscription of V. S. 1048/1027 A.D. It is probable, as Dr. H. C. Ray suggests, that between Rājyapāla and Trilocanapāla there was another prince, who for a very short period occupied the throne of Kānyakubja, with his capital at Bāri, with the support of the confederacy of Indian princes, headed by the Candrātreya king Vidyādhara. Gardizi’s statement that Nanda promised to help Tārū-jaipāl and to take an army to his country, indicates that most probably Tārū-jaipāl was his first protégé, the second being Trilocanapāla. It is significant that while the names of all the other important personages, mentioned by ‘Urbī in connection with Maḥmūd’s first Antarvedi raid, are associated with some city or fort, the name of Parū-jaipāl only stands alone. He may have been a scion of the Pratihāra family, ambitious of occupying the imperial throne itself. It has been suggested that this prince was probably the eldest son of Rājyapāla. Achīr’s account says that after his defeat at the hands of Maḥmūd in 1019 A.D., Parū-jaipāl “requested peace which the conqueror refused except on condition of conversion”; as the proposal seemed impossible “Bārū-jaibāl started to meet Bīdā, but some of the Hindus surprised him and killed him”. It is difficult to explain why the eldest son of an emperor, the rightful occupant of the throne, enjoying the support of the powerful king Vidyādhara, should thus be ‘killed by some of the Hindus’. On the other hand, this difficulty may be obviated

1 DHNI., I, pp. 607 ff.
if it is presumed that Parū-jaipāl or Barū-jaipāl was not the eldest son and heir but probably a cousin and rival of Rājya-pāla. The assassination of Barū-jaipāl, however, may as well have been the result of some private grudge, not connected with any political objective. Omission of his name in the genealogical list of the Jhusi inscription of Trilocanapāla was probably due to his short and inglorious reign and rivalry towards the direct imperial line.

After the assassination of Barū-jaipāl, Trilocanapāla, probably a son of Rājya-pāla, ascended the throne. The Jhusi inscription describes him as ‘Śrī-Rājya-pāladeva-pād-ānudhyāta - parama-bhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-paramesvara-parama-Māheśvara-Śrī-Trilocanapāladevaḥ’. The continued use of the imperial titles, however, did not mean much as the Pratihāra empire had already become a legend. It appears that as a result of the sack of Kānyakubja and Bāri by the Ghazni Sultan, Trilocanapāla was obliged to move further east and take up his residence at Prayāga, where he became but a local king, while the Candrātreyya king Vidyādharā dominated Antarvedi.

The Candrātreyya dynasty rose to power in Jejakabhūkti, in modern Bundelkhand region and was at first a feudatory of the Pratihāra dynasty. When the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III overran Northern India and routed the Pratihāras, some of their Pratihāra feudatories attained prominence by helping their emperor Mahipāla I. Thus a fragmentary Candrātreyya inscription claims that, either Harśa or his son restored Kṣitipāladeva (to be identified with Mahipāladeva I) to the throne. Harśa and his son Yaśovarman further strengthened their position by conquests and judicious marriage alliances. The earliest known record of Yaśovar-

1 El., I. p. 122.
man’s son Dhaṅga (V.S. 1011/954 A.D.) claims that he ruled the land from the Mālava-nādi to the bank of the Kālindī and from the frontier of the Cedi country to Gopāḍri (Gwalior) and refers, for the last time, to the Pratihāra emperor (then Vināyakapāla) as the overlord. None of the Candrāṭreyas inscriptions, issued after that date, acknowledge the overlordship of the Kānyakubja emperors and the Mau inscription on the other hand credits Dhaṅga with a victory over the Kānyakubja king, which won him sovereignty. Dhaṅga is generally identified with the ruler of Kālaṇjara, who according to Firishta, helped the Sāhī king Jayapāla against the Turkish Sultan Sabuk-tigīn. The Nanyaura grant of 995 A.D., which records the gift of a village from Vārāṇasī, shows that the Candrāṭreyas by the reign of Dhaṅga already occupied a considerable portion of the dominion of their overlord. Dhaṅga appears to have died some time after 1002 A.D. at Prayāga and was succeeded by his son Gaṇḍa, who in his turn was succeeded by Vidyādhara, sometime before 1019 A.D. Vidyādhara’s intervention in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab appears to have been the cause of Maḥmūd’s invasion of Kālaṇjara. The accounts of different Muslim historians about this expedition of Maḥmūd are slightly conflicting. Ibn ul-Athīr records that Vidyādhara sent an army equal in strength to meet the forces of Maḥmūd; at this Maḥmūd increased his force and the ruler of Kālaṇjara replied by doing the same; thus the battle grew more fierce till night came, after which they parted. In the morning Vidyādhara retreated and Maḥmūd

1 El., I, pp. 129 ff. 2 El., I, p. 197.
3 CHF., III, p. 507. Dr. H. C. Ray doubts the veracity of Firishta’s statement, vide DHNI., I, p. 63.
4 IA., XVI, p. 201.
pursued the Indian army for some time; he killed and captured a large number of troops and at last returned to Ghazni. Firishta’s account refers only to the retreat of Vidyādhara, and not to any actual engagement. Gardīzī’s account, however, says “he then sent a messenger to Nanda asking him to become a Muslim and save himself from all harm and distress. Nanda returned reply that he had nothing to say to Mahmūd except on the battle field”; afterwards in reply to Mahmūd’s prayer “God struck terror into Nanda’s heart”, he left his camp and ran away. Niẓām ud-Dīn in Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī records that the Sultan returned to Ghazni loaded with immense booty and 580 elephants, all of which belonged to Nanda. In view of the testimony of earlier writers, the exaggerated account of Niẓām ud-Dīn may be disregarded. Possibly there was a retreat, but the struggle was indecisive. Dr. H. C. Ray is of the opinion that the retreat was a strategic one. Mention of a second invasion to Kālaṇjara by Niẓām ud-Dīn (413 A. H.), Firishta (413 A.H.), Gardīzī (413 A.H.) and Ibn ul-Athīr (414 A.H.) appears to support this view. In course of the second invasion Sultan Mahmūd is said to have invested the impregnable fort. The accounts left by Gardīzī and Firishta, however, indicate that though the fort was besieged for a long time by the Muslims, it was not actually reduced by them. Both the parties found the situation very difficult and agreed to meet half way. Thus instead of reckless plunder Mahmūd had to be satisfied with a tribute of 300 elephants and a laudatory

1 DHNI, II, pp. 690-91.
2 TF, I, pp. 63-7.
3 IHQ, 1933, pp. 939-40.
4 TA, (De), pp. 13-14.
5 DHNI, II, p. 691.
poem composed by a Hindu; subsequently he conferred the command of fifteen fortresses on Nanda.¹

From the Candrātreya inscriptions it is clear that Vidyādhara had considerable political influence over the contemporary Indian rulers. The Dubkund inscription proves that the Kacchapaghātas were his feudatories and a Candrātreya inscription records that he was “worshipped” by Bhoja (the Paramāra ruler of Dhāra) and Kalacuricandra (Kokkalla II of the Haihaya-Kalacuri line of Tripuri). Ibn ul-Athīr, when he said that Bīdā was the most powerful of the Indian rulers, was not far from the truth. The successors of Vidyādhara, however, were too weak to keep up this tradition of political leadership and domination in Antarvedi, which, as a result, fell an easy prey to the neighbouring king Gāṅgeyadeva of the Kalacuri dynasty of Tripuri or Đāhala.

The early days of the Kalacuris were spent in consolidating their position by marriage alliances with the Southern Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The dynasty grew powerful under Yuvarāja I and his son Lakṣmanaṇarāja, who fought with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and contracted new diplomatic marriage alliances with the Northern Cālukyas and the Karnāṭa Cālukya line, which ultimately destroyed the Southern Rāṣṭrakūṭas in 975 A.D. Kokkalla II, the grandson of Lakṣmanaṇarāja, has been identified with the Kalacuri-candra, who paid homage to Vidyādhara.² He was succeeded by his son Gāṅgeyadeva, who, according to a Candrātreya inscription from Mahoba, “conquered the world”³ and, according to the Goharwa plates of Lakṣmi-Karna, imprisoned the king of Kīra (in Kangra) and defeated the rulers of Āṅga, Kuntala and Utkala.⁴

Al-Birūnī noted as early as c. 1030 A.D., that Gāngeyadeva was ruling at Dāhala. Some of the Muslim historians also refer to ‘Gang’ in connection with Nīyāl-tīgīn’s Indian expedition. From these accounts it is clear that Sultān Masʿūd who succeeded Sultān Maḥmūd, tried to follow in his father’s footsteps so far as India was concerned. Minhāj states that “several times he led his army into Hindusthan and carried on holy wars as by law enjoined.” Two dates are mentioned in this connection; 424 A.H., when he attacked the fort of Sarsati and 427 A.H., when he marched his army to the fort of Sonipat. More important is the Indian career of his general Nīyāl-tīgīn, who later on met a tragic end. Baihaqi records that in 424 A.H./1033-4 A.D., “after obtaining the necessary permission from the king, Nīyāl-tīgīn was much encouraged........he crossed the river Ganges and went down to the left bank. Unexpectedly he arrived at a city called Banaras which belonged to the territory of Gang. Never had a Muhammadan army reached this place before.” It is to be noted that in course of his march along the left bank of the Gāṅgā, through the whole length of Antarvedi, no army questioned his passage. Even the sacred city of Vārāṇasī, which no doubt has passed recently to the hands of Gang (to be identified with Kalacuri Gāngeyadeva), was left to the tender mercies

1. Al-Birūnī, Kitāb ul-Hind, (Sachau), I, p. 201.
2. TF., (I, p. 102) and Ta’rikh as-Sabuk-tīgīn, Kāmil ut-Tawārikh (Elliot, HI., II, pp. 123-4 & 205) Niẓām ud-Dīn (TA., pp. 20-21)
3. TN., I, pp. 93-5
5. Elliot HI., II, pp. 123-4, also CHI., III, pp. 29-30
6. The Sarnath insc. of Mahipāla of Bengal indicates that the Pālas owned that region as late as 1026 A.D.
of the foreign invader, who for a whole day remained in
the city and plundered it.

A few years after the raid of Nīyāl-tigīn, Gāṅgeyadeva
appears to have extended his dominion as far as Prayāga; but
most probably this happened after V. S. 1093/1037
A.D., which is the date of the Karā inscription of Mahā-
rājādhirāja-Srī-Yaśāhpāla, found in the fort of Karā in
Allahabad.¹ Though there is nothing definite to determine
his exact relationship with the Imperial Pratihāras, Yaśāhpāla
is generally accepted as a scion of that line and the probable
successor of Trilocanapāla. He appears to have been the
last king of that dynasty. After him the eastern portion
of Antarvedi, together with the city of Prayāga, probably
passed under the control of Gāṅgeyadeva sometime before
1041 A.D. No battle, however, seems to have been fought
and possibly after the death of Yaśāhpāla he simply marched
into that territory, occupied it, and later advanced up the
Yamunā into Kangra, where he may have captured some
petty Kīta prince.² The Benares inscription of Gāṅgeya-
deva’s son Lakṣmī-Karṇa, issued on the samvatsara śrāddha
ceremony of his father records that, Gāṅgeyadeva “found
salvation at Prayāga” most probably in 1041 A.D.³

While the eastern portion of Antarvedi, including
Prāyaga, and also Vārāṇasī may have been occupied by
Gāṅgeyadeva, Kānyakubja seems to have acknowledged the
suzerainty of Bhojadeva of the Paramāra dynasty of Dhārā,
who according to a Čandrātreya inscription, once ‘worship-
ped’ Vidyādharā. The Paramāras appeared in the Gujrat
region as the feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, in the middle
of the tenth century A.D. Harṣa Siyaka (c.943-73 A.D.),

¹ JRAS., 1927, pp. 692-95
² EI., XI., p. 143.
³ EI., II, pp. 297 ff.
who is said to have come into conflict with his suzerain, probably materially contributed to their downfall. The next king Vākpāti (II) Muṇja (c. 974 A.D.) was a great warrior and, according to the inscriptions, fought with the Karṇātas, the Lāṭas, the Keralas and the Coḷas and occupied Tripūrī. In the Prabandha-cintāmaṇi Merutūṅga records that Muṇja vanquished Tailapa II (the last of the Southern Rāṣṭrakūṭas) but was later defeated and killed by him. He was succeeded by his younger brother Sindhurāja, whose son Bhojadeva I (c. 1010-55 A.D.) was the most important king of the dynasty. The Udayapur Praśasti credits him with victory over the Keralas, the Lord of Lāṭa, the king of Gurjara, the lord of Cedi and other. Likewise the Dhar Praśasti of Ajayavarman and also the Pārijāta-mañjarī by Madana claim that Bhoja defeated Gāṅgeyadeva. The Basahi inscription of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, issued from the vicinity of Kānyakubja in V.S. 1161/1104 A.D. states that, when after the death of Bhoja and Karṇa, ‘the earth was troubled, she took with confidence, Candradeva as her husband’. From this statement it appears that Bhoja exercised considerable influence in Kānyakubja region. Bhoja I of the Pratihāra dynasty, who established his hold on Kānyakubja by 836 A.D., lived too long ago to be mentioned in an inscription of the twelfth century. So this Bhoja is to be identified with Bhoja I of the Paramāra dynasty. This identification is supported by Merutūṅga, who records that when Bhoja went out for conquest ‘the king of Kānyakubja is here bent

1 DHNI., II, pp. 850-51.
2 Udayapur Praśasti in EI., I, pp. 235 ff.
3 PC., p. 33.
4 DHNI., II, p. 866.
5 Vide infra, chapt III, sec I.
double'. The identity of the king of Kānyakubja, who thus seems to have humbled himself before Bhoja, cannot be ascertained. The military successes of Bhoja were not confined to this area only. Various inscriptions together with the testimony of Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, show that the Cālukyas of Kalyāṇa, the Cālukyas of Aṇahilapāṭaka and some other princes of lesser importance also tasted defeat at his hands. Bhojadeva was defeated and killed by a number of contemporary rulers including, Lakṣmī-Karṇa Kalacuri and Bhīma (I) Cālukya, who may have acted simultaneously to bring about the downfall of a king, who had become powerful enough to endanger their political safety.

The death of Bhoja removed the barrier that checked the westward expansion of the Kalacuris in the Antarvedi region. Gāṅgeyadeva Kalacuri, who was once defeated by Bhoja, had been succeeded by Lakṣmī-Karṇa (c. 1041 A.D.), one of the greatest conquerors of the eleventh century. His Benares grant of 1042 A.D., the Goharwa grant of 1047 A.D., as well as Sarnath inscription of 1058 A.D. prove that he retained control over the territories once possessed by his father. He was engaged also in a number

1 PC., p. 31.
2 Following Mr. N. B. Sanyal's suggestion that, Gāḍhipur-ādhipati Gopāla of the Set-Mahet insc. of V. S. 1176, is to be identified with Gopāla, the third in descent to Candra Raṣṭrakūṭa of the undated Badaun insc. of Lakhanapāla, this Kānyakubja king may be identified with Candra's son Vigrahapāla or grandson Bhuvanapāla. Some difficulties about the suggestion will be discussed in the following pages.
5 EI., II, pp. 297 ff; EI., XI, pp. 139 ff; ASI., 1906-7, pp. 100-01.
of campaigns as attested by the Tibetan evidence, and also by the Paikore, Rewa and Bheraghat inscriptions.\(^1\) It has already been noticed that the Basahi inscription of the Gāḍāvāla Mahārājaputra Govindacandra of 1161 V.S., issued in the vicinity of Kānyakubja, states that after the death of Bhoja and Karna, the earth was troubled till Candradeva became the sovereign.\(^2\) This statement may indicate that after the demise of Bhoja, Karna for some time exercised political sway over Kānyakubja. The Bheraghat inscription of Alhaṇadevi and the Karanbel inscription of Jayasimha reveal that Karna met and defeated almost all the important contemporary rulers;\(^3\) the records of the contemporary dynasties also refer to some of these victories of the Kalacuri emperor. The Benares and Goharwa grants prove that Benares and Allahabad regions were under him. This brilliant career of victories, however, ended in a series of defeats. No fewer than five kings, namely, the Candrātreya Kirtivarman, the Paramāra Udayāditya, the Pāla Vighrāhapāla III, the Cālukya Someśvara I of Kalyāṇa and the Cālukya Bhīma I of Anahilapātaka, claim to have defeated him.\(^4\) Evidently, like the Paramāra Bhoja, Karna too seriously disturbed the balance of power by becoming too powerful for the safety of the contemporary kings, and the latter most probably joined hands in striking him down on all fronts. These events took place sometime before 1073 A.D., which is the first known date of Yaśah-Karna, who succeeded to the throne apparently after the abdication of his father Laks̆mi-Karna.

\(^1\) Sen, Some Historical Aspects of Inscriptions of Bengal, pp. 402-3.
\(^2\) See infra. chapt. III, Sec. I
\(^3\) EI, II, p. 11; IA, XVIII, p. 215.
\(^4\) Prabodha-candr-odaya (Kṛṣṇa Miśra) I, 6; EI, II, p. 155; El., II, p. 302; EI, I, p. 237; RC., I, 6; VC., p. 102.
The Kalacuris were probably deprived of their Antarvedi possession as a result of Karna's defeats by the beginning of the 8th decade of the eleventh century A.D. From Gahadavala Chandradeva's first record we know that by the year 1089-90 A.D., he had not only conquered Kanyakubja but also had taken possession of Kasi (Benares), Uttarakośala (Ayodhya) and Indrasthāniyaka (Delhi). The usual presumption that he began his rule sometime by the beginning of that decade, gives us a gap of almost 10 years between Karna and Candra. The Set-Mahet inscription of 1176 V.S./c.1119 A.D. supplies a clue, which helps us to fill up this gap in history; it refers to a certain Madana, whose father was a Gādhipur-ādhipati Gopāla. The title borne by the father was not continued by the son and it is supposed that, as Gopāla was deprived of the imperial city of Kanyakubja, either as a result of the Muslim invasion of 472 A.H./1079 A.D., or by Chandradeva Gahadavala, who suffered this dynasty to exist as a feudatory, it is but natural that Madana is not described as Gādhipur-ādhipati. So it seems probable that the gap of some ten years was filled up by the reign of king Gopāla, who may have enjoyed real political power for a few years in this territory, since no king of any other dynasty claims to have exercised political authority over Kanyakubja during this short period.

N. B. Sanyal was the first to suggest the identification of this Gādhipur-ādhipati Gopāla with Gopāla, the great-grandson of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Candra, referred to in the undated Badaun inscription of Lakhanaṇapāla. Another scholar

1 Chandrāvati Insc. of V. S. 1148 in El., IX, pp. 302-5.
2 IA., XVII, pp. 61-4.
accepting this identification, further identifies Gopāla with the Candrātreya Kirtivarman’s general Gopāla, who according to the Prabodha-candr-odaya defeated Lakṣmī-Karna and restored the Candrātreya line. According to him, moreover, the undated fragmentary stone inscription of Sallakṣaṇa, found at Jhansi, probably refers to a Kānyakubja king, who protected Kirtivarman and in league with Kirtivarman and Paramāra Udayāditya, defeated Karna.

There are, however, some serious difficulties regarding these identifications. Firstly, let us take the case of Gopāla, who has been mentioned in the Prabodha-candr-odaya and is proposed to be identified with Gopāla mentioned in the See-Mahet inscription of Vidyādhara (1176 V.S.) and the undated Badaun inscription of Lakhanapāla. In the Prabodha-candr-odaya Gopāla is described as the chief Sāmanta of Kirtivarman Candrātreya and the introductory portion of that drama states that “the glorious Gopāla has ordered it to be produced before the king Kirtivarman”.

Another passage informs us that “his (Gopāla’s) anger was roused to re-establish the sovereigns of the race of Moon who had been dethroned by the Lord of Cedī, the Rudra and the Fire of destruction of all royal families on the earth”. The same incident has more than once been referred to in the drama. The fact that such a drama was produced at the court of Kirtivarman by the order of Gopāla, shows that Gopāla must have become a considerably import-

1 IHQ., 1944, pp. 153 ff. (Mathur)
4 Prabodha-candr-odaya, 1, 6.
ant personage in the court, by virtue of the substantial service he rendered in restoring the royal dynasty, by defeating the great Kalacuri conqueror Lakṣmi-Karna. But nowhere in the drama is this great Sāmanta Gopāla said to have been connected in any way with the imperial city of Kānyakubja. The Set-Mahet inscription and the Badaun inscription also contain no reference to a victory over Karṇa and the restoration of the Candrātreya dynasty in connection with Gopāla. This seems extremely unnatural in view of the fact that this was the most notable achievement of Gopāla (presuming that the two Gopālas are identical). Gopāla of the Badaun inscription is very vaguely praised and Gopāla of the Set-Mahet inscription is simply described as Gādhipur-ādhipati. The Jhansi inscription of Sallakṣaṇa, which has been quoted in support of the above theory is extremely unreliable, because of its fragmentary character, which makes it impossible to identify either Sallakṣaṇa or the unnamed king of Kānyakubja. The proposed identification of Gopāla, the Candrātreya Sāmanta with the Gopālas of Set-Mahet and Badaun inscriptions, based on such scanty data, appears to be more or less conjectural.

In a paper contributed by N. B. Sanyal a theory has been put forward, which many scholars seem to accept. Sanyal identifies Gopāla and Madanapāla (the fourth and the sixth names in the genealogical list) of the undated Badaun inscription with Gādhipur-ādhipati Gopāla and his son, king Madana of the Set-Mahet inscription of V. S. 1176/1119 A.D., issued by the minister Vidyādhara.

1 JASB., 1925 (NS) pp. 105 ff.
2 Drs. H. C. Ray, R. S. Tripathi and others.
3 El., I, pp. 61-66.
The title borne by Gopāla in the latter inscription was not continued by the son, and it is supposed that Gādhipura-ādhīpati Gopāla was deprived of Gādhipura by the Gāhaḍavāla Candradeva by about 1080-85 A.D. The Kalacuri domination in Antarvedi most probably terminated sometime before 1073 A.D., the first known inscriptive date of Yaśaḥ-Karna, who succeeded to the throne after the abdication of Lakṣmī-Karna, due to his repeated defeats at the hands of the kings of the rival dynasties. Between the reigns of the Kalacuris and the Gāhaḍavālas, Gādhipura or Kānyakubja, was for some time ruled by a Gopāla, whose dynasty ultimately seems to have become a feudatory of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. According to Sanyal this Gopāla is none other than Gopāla, the great-grandson of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Candra, the ancestor of Lakhanapāla, who issued the undated Badaun inscription. Consequently, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty at Badaun is to be identified with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty at Gādhipura or Kānyakubja, which was represented by Gopāla by the end of the eleventh century and by Madana or Madanapāla in the beginning of the next century.

This suggestion, however, places us in a very difficult situation, which needs to be explained. Firstly, in the Badaun inscription, Vodāmayūtā is specifically described as the ornament of the land of Paṅcāla (cf. "Paṅcāl-ādhidhā-ḍesa-bhūṣaṇa-kāri Vodāmayūtapuri" etc.) and is praised copiously in such a manner as leads us to believe that it was the only important city the dynasty of Candra possessed. It must be admitted, however, that in that age, the possession of Kānyakubja or Mahodaya—undoubtedly the most important city in the Madhyadeśa, with an imperial tradi-

1 Khairha Grant of 1073 A.D. in EI, XII, pp. 205-17.
tion of about 500 years behind it—was considered to be the greatest glory that a king or a dynasty could achieve. The non-mention of Kānyakubja in the record of this dynasty, as well as the reference to Vodāmayūtā as the ornament of Paṅcāla, should effectively imply that Kānyakubja may not have been included amongst their possessions at all. On the other hand, in the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176, there is no reference to Vodāmayūtā, the ornament of the land of Paṅcāla, which the Rāṣṭrakūṭas protected. According to Dr. H. C. Ray "it is not unlikely that they (Rāṣṭrakūṭas) continued to hold Kanauj till the reign of Iltutmish (1211-36 A.D.), who conquered Kinnauj-i-Shergarh". Some of the Muslim historians refer to the capture of Kānyakubja by the Ghūrī Sultan in 1193/4 A.D., when Jayaccandra Gāhaḍavāla was defeated; but the contemporary accounts, the Tāj ul-Ma’āthir and Kāmil ut-Tawārikh do not mention Kānyakubja in connection with this expedition. Thus it is quite possible that this city was not occupied by the Muslims c. 1193 A.D. There is, however, always the possibility that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Badaun, assuming that they possessed Kānyakubja, was displaced from that city or deprived of it, as a result of the turmoil, which followed the defeat of Jayaccandra c. 1193 A.D. and in that case they may have ruled over Kanauj as late as that year. The undated Badaun inscription, on the other hand, could not have been issued later than 1202 A.D., when Badaun was conquered by Qutb ud-Dīn and was conferred as a fief on Iltutmish. Under these circumstances, it is extremely strange that the Badaun

1 DHNI., I, pp. 554-5.
3 Elliot, HI., II, pp. 216 ff. & 250 ff.
inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kanauj, which is assigned
to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century A.D. on
palaeographical reasons, contains no reference whatsoever to
Kanauj.

Secondly, Gopāla, the father of Madana, whose minister
Vidyādharā issued the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176/
1119 A.D., is expressly described in that record as one who
possessed Kānyakubja; the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gopāla, on the other
hand, is praised very vaguely and is not credited with any
great achievement such as the occupation of Kānyakubja
implies. Also, while the dynasty of Lakhanapāla is men-
tioned as Rāṣṭrakūṭa in the Badaun inscription, the dynasty
of Gādhipur-ādhipati Gopāla maintains no such claim.
Viewed singly, this may be dismissed as an example of
‘argumentum ex silencio,’ but taken together with the above
mentioned points, this silence seems to be significant.

Thirdly, Madanapāla of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty is praised
for his successful exploits against the Hamvīra\(^1\), but a
similar praise has not been bestowed on the king Madana of
the Set-Mahet inscription. As this Hamvīra is generally
identified with Ḥajīb Tughā-tigīn, who invaded India some-
time between c. 1099 and c. 1115 A.D.\(^2\), Madanapāla’s
engagement with him was a recently accomplished fact in
V.S. 1176/1119 A.D.; but strangely enough the Set-Mahet
inscription issued in the latter year contains no reference to
it.

It may be contended that as the Gāḍāḍavālas themselves
may have annexed Kānyakubja to the dominion directly
ruled over by them, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas being allowed to con-

\(^1\) cf. “Yat pauruṣasāt pravarataḥ sura-sindhu-tira-Hamvīra-
saṅgama-kathā na kadācid-āsit.”

\(^2\) *DHNI*, I, pp. 514-5
tinue as feudatory chiefs at Badaun, any reference to Kānyakubja was omitted in the Badaun inscription, which is a much later record, because by that time their connection with the imperial city was a matter of past history. This argument, however, may be rejected on the analogy of the above reference. If Madanapāla’s engagement with Hamvīra was not considered an unnecessary detail of past history, why should the occupation of the imperial city by his father be omitted, specially when the dynasty is claimed by some scholars to have belonged to that city?

The points raised above, indicate that there is not sufficient ground to regard the dynasty of Gādhipur-ādhipati Gopāla as identical with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Badaun, although they may have ruled in contiguous areas and were contemporary. Scholars have agreed to accept the existence of two contemporary kings with the same name ‘Madana’, one the overlord and the other the feudatory; there is possibility enough of a third man with the same name, another feudatory of the Gāhaḍavālas. Similarity of names and proximity of dates and areas cannot be reliable grounds for identification at this period, when there were many semi-independent rulers, governing small principalities. The account of ‘Utbi has shown how the Antarvedi region itself was divided among generals and chieftains, who behaved more or less like independent kings. Thus ‘Utbi has referred to two similar names—Cānd Rāi of Sherwa (Saharanpur?) and Candāl Bhor of Asi (Asni, near Fatehpur?), who were ruling in the Antarvedi contemporaneously. The Set-Mahet inscription shows, that even the dynasty of Gopāla, into whose shoes the Gāhaḍavālas stepped, was suffered to exist as a feudatory; it is likely that the dynasty of Badaun also continued to exist as a feudatory
line after the conquest of Antarvedi by the Gāhaḍavāla Candradeva.

The political power of Gopāla, the father of Madana, was either destroyed or greatly diminished as a result of the Muslim invasions of Antarvedi during the reign of Sultān Ibrāhīm (451 A.H./1059 A.D.—492 A.H./1099 A.D.) of Ghazni. The Ḥabīb us-Siyar relates that “after he had strengthened the foundation of reconciliation and friendship (with the Seljuk Sultan), Sultan Ibrāhīm several times led an army to make war on Hind, each time returning victorious to Ghazni”; the Jami‘ut-Tawārikh places one of these expeditions in 472 A.H./1079-80 A.D., when Ibrāhīm took the fort of Agra, as stated in the Diwān-i-Salman.1 This last mentioned work, composed by a contemporary poet, however, gives the credit to Prince Mahāmūd, who was appointed the Governor of Hind. This prince proceeded with an army to conquer Agra; “Amir of Agra Jaisal (or Bathal)’’ was defeated after a stiff struggle. “Now kings from all quarters send their presents unto thee—loads of red gold and files of male elephants. As so many elephants are collected that make their stable at Kanauj and appoint Chānd Rāi to take charge of them.” It is to be noted that in this poetical work of Salīm, there is

1 Elliot, HL., IV, pp. 205 & 523-4. The Jami‘ut-Tawārikh in this connection refers to Azra and Darra; the first name, according to the editor, is a corrupt form of Agra and the second is doubtless that of Dhārā. The Diwān-i-Salman also states that in course of a campaign Prince Mahāmūd conquered Agra, Ujjain, Malwa and Kalanjara. These two works are referring most probably to the same campaign, unless we contend that Agra and Dhārā were harried more than once by the Muslims during the reign of Sultan Ibrāhīm. But Malwa, by the end of the eleventh century, is known to have been attacked only once by the Turukkas (IHQ., IX, p. 953). Paramārī Laksinadeva (c. 1086-94 A.D.), who is said to have defeated the Turukkas, must have done so as a prince.
no mention of Gādhipur-ādhipati Gopāla; however, the Muslim scribes may have transcribed the unfamiliar name Gopāla as the more familiar of the Indian names, Jayapāla. Nothing more is known about the later history of this king. It seems that at Kānyakubja itself a keeper of elephants was appointed by the Muslim invader; this person Cānd. Rai is identified by a group of scholars with Candra, the first Gāhaḍavāla king.¹

While the Kānyakubja area fell an easy prey to the ambition of the local and foreign chiefs, after the fall of Lakṣmi-Kaṅga, the eastern portion of his dominion may have been seized by a king, who belonged to a feudatory branch of his own dynasty. The Kahla inscription of Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara Soḍhadeva of the Kalacuri dynasty, issued in V.S. 1135/1079 A.D., indicates that he had already declared himself independent in the Gorakhpur region.² In this inscription he is described as "the life of the bank of Sarayū" ("Sarayū-pāra-jīvitam") and is recorded to have bathed in the Gaṇḍakī, before granting various pieces of land in the Guṇakala viṣaya (unidentified); his kingdom thus appears to have included a portion of the Gorakhpur district in U. P. and the Saran district in Bihar.³ The existence of another branch of Kalacuri dynasty is indicated by the undated Kasia stone inscription which is ascribed, palaeographically, to the twelfth century A.D.⁴ This branch, however, appears never to have attained any importance, and was probably a feudatory, first of the above-mentioned Gorakhpur branch

¹ IHQ., IX (1933), pp. 951 ff.; also vide infra, chapt. II.
² El., VII, pp. 85-93.
of Kalacuri kings and then of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, who may have conquered the area from Soḍhadeva or his successor. Another person, who, taking advantage of the political chaos, carved out a kingdom in this region (cf. “darada-Gaṇḍakideśa”), was Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara Kirttipāladeva, son of Vikramapāladeva, of Saumya-sindhu, who issued the Lucknow Museum plate of V.S. 1167/1111 A.D. Elsewhere I have suggested that certain mediaeval silver and billon coins of “bull and horseman type” bearing the legend Kirtti or Śrī Kirtti ...deva may be ascribed to this king, who ruled in the north-eastern part of Gorakhpur possibly over a small area to the north of Kasia. Later on, this dynasty may have been uprooted by the third Gāhaḍavāla king Govindacandra.

1 *El.*, VII, pp. 93 ff.
CHAPTER II

THE ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE GAHAḌĀVĀLĀS

Section I. Origin: Different theories

The dynastic name, "Gahaḍāvāla" or "Gāhaḍāvāla," is mentioned only in four inscriptions of the dynasty, namely, the Basahi grant of V. S. 1161, the Kamauli grant of V. S. 1162, the Rahan grant of V. S. 1166, and the undated Sārnath pillar inscription of Kumāradevi. The Kṣātra origin of the dynasty is indicated by the claims put forward in the Candrāvatī inscriptions of V. S. 1150 and 1156 (cf. "Kṣātro-yaṁatra vahu-patra-rath-āṇugamyaṁ-amān-onnatir-vijayate bhuvī nṛpa-vamśaḥ"), and the Sārnath inscription mentioned above (cf. "Jagati Gahaḍāvāle Kṣatra-vamśe prasiddhe 'jani narapatiś-candraś-Candranāmā narendrah"). Curiously enough, the kings of this dynasty trace their origin, not from the sun or the moon or any famous mythical personage, like most of the contemporary kings, but from a modest person, Yaśovigraha by name, who did not even assume a royal epithet. The only other inscriptive reference to this dynastic name is found in the fragmentary stone inscription of queen Uddalladevi of V. S. 1294/1237 A.D., which records the erection of Vindhyāvara Śiva, by the queen Uddalladevi Patṭa-rājñī of Śrīman-Mahamandadeva, a sāmanta of Śri-A(ḍakka)malla of the illustrious Gahaḍāvāla family (cf. "Śri-Kāṇyaubja-deś-odbhūtāyā Rāṣṭrākula-vamśa-

2 EL., XIV, pp. 193-209; IHQ., 1949, pp. 32 ff.
3 Vide infra. Sec. II, of this chapter.
pradipa-mahasamanta-raja- Sri- Bharahadeva - sutaaya Srimad-Gahaadvala - kula - kamala-vikasana-sahasra-nisu-Sri-A(dakka)-malla-samanta-saran-aga-ta-vajra-parhjara-Sri-mahamandadeva-patitarajnya-Sri-Uddalladevy etc."\(^1\). Strangely enough, contemporary literature contains no reference to the dynastic name, though the Kstyaka-kalpataru, a famous treatise of the period, was written at the order of the third king of the dynasty, Govindacandra, and the poet Srihatsha, who composed the Naisadharaciram, attended the court of the last great king Jayaccandra.

Paucity of historical material relating to the earlier days of the Gahaadvala, has given rise to divergent theories about their origin. Dr. Hoernle once opined that the Gahaadvala dynasty was a branch of the Pala dynasty of Gauḍa\(^2\). This, however, is a totally rejected theory now. Two other theories have since been put forward; one of these, arguing that the dynasty was a sept of the Rasttrakuta clan, identifies the first king Candradeva with a Candra Rasttrakuta, mentioned in the undated Badaun inscription of Lakhanapala\(^3\), while the other disclaims the Rasttrakuta origin of the Gahaadvala and identifies the first king with Cand Rai, described as "the keeper of elephants" in Salman's account of Prince Mahmud's invasion of Agra\(^4\). The former theory, which attaches considerable importance to the statements made in the bardic chronicles of Rajputa, tracing the descent of the Rasthodas of Jodhpur from Jayaccandra or Jaitracandra, the penultimate Gahaadvala king, implies

1 El., XXIII, pp. 166-89; also infra. chpt. IV, Sec. III.
that the Gahaḍavālas were in fact the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kanauj, Gahaḍavāla, being the sept-name and Rāṣṭrakūṭa, the clan-name. Arguments forwarded in support of this theory are as follows:

In the first place, the Rājā of Māṇḍā-Biḍāpur in Mirzapur district in U.P., refers to his dynasty as Rāṭhōḍa and claims his descent from Manikcandra, the alleged brother of Jayaccandra.

Secondly, according to Cānd Bardāi, the author of the Prthvīrāja Rāso, Jayaccandra’s epithets were Rāṭhōḍa and Kāmaḍhaja, which are synonymous terms.

Thirdly, the Rājataraṅginī refers to 36 clans and in the Kumārapāla-carita 36 clans are enumerated, but there is no mention of the Gahaḍavālas.

Fourthly, as the Gahaḍavālas themselves claim solar origin, like the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Candra Gahaḍavāla may be identified with Candra Rāṣṭrakūṭa, the ancestor of Lakhana-pāla of the undated Badaun inscription; in this connection it has also been suggested that in order to distinguish themselves from other Rāṣṭrakūṭa clans, they called themselves after the place named Gahaḍa, which may be a town in South India.

The above arguments, however, may be opposed on the following grounds:

Firstly, the claim of the Rājā of Māṇḍā-Biḍāpur is based on a tradition, which is current in modern times, but as no attempt has been made to test its veracity with the help of earlier evidence, its value is doubtful.

As to the second argument, the Prthvīrāja Rāso, ascribed to Cānd Bardāi, was compiled in its present form, in the

1 JIH., XV (1936), pp. 24-25 (Bharadvāja).
2 JIH., XV (1936), pp. 24-29.
sixteenth century A.D.; therefore it cannot be relied upon as a source of sober history for settlement of issues connected with a much earlier period, unless corroborated by contemporary or other reliable data.

Thirdly, the evidence derived from the Rājatarāṅgini and the Kumārapālacarita is extremely inconclusive in view of the fact that the former only mentions the existence of thirty-six Kṣatriya clans, but does not enumerate them, and the latter mentions some of the thirty-six clans only, and not all of them.

Lastly, to these counter-arguments, I may add that the verse which has been quoted to prove that the Gāhāḍavālas themselves claimed solar origin (i.e. “Āśīd-asītādyuti-vanśa-jataḥ kṣmāpala-mālāsu divān gatāsu” etc.) is found in the earliest Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions, with no visarga between “jāta” and “kṣmāpala”¹. This absence of a visarga significantly changes the meaning of the verse, showing that the Gāhāḍavāla rulers really came after the destruction of a solar dynasty, rather than being themselves descended from the Sun. The verse with visarga occurs for the first time in Madanapāla’s Badera inscription of V.S. 1164.² This verse is present in sixty-two Gāhāḍavāla records; out of these, in thirty-nine cases, in which no rigid classification is possible on the basis, either of date or of locality, the visarga is conspicuous by its absence, and in twenty cases it is present. About the rest, the relevant material is not at present available. The evidence of the verse without visarga, is supported not only by its occurrence in most of the inscriptions but also by the land grants of Mahārājaíputra

¹ IHQ., 1949, pp. 32-34.
Govindacandra, which clearly state that the Gāhaḍavālas came to power after the destruction of the dynasties of the Sun and the Moon (cf. “Pradhvaste some-sūrya-odbhava-vidita-mahā-kṣatra-vamśa-dvaye-smīn etc.”) and by the Candrāvatī grants (V.S. 1150 and 1156) of Candradeva, which assert that after the destruction of the scions of the dynasty of Devapāla, who is to be identified with the Pratihāra king of that name (c.948 A.D.), there was the Kṣatra dynasty which acquired Kānyakubja (cf. “Āśīd......Sri-Devapāla-nrpati......etc” in the second verse and “Kālena nāsam-atha tasya gate ‘nvāye dor-daṇḍa-vikrama-hāth-āṛjita-Kānyakubjaḥ Kṣātro ‘yam-atra vahu-patra-rath-āṇugamyamān-onnatir-vvijayate bhuvi nrpa-vamśaḥ”—verse three). If this evidence is accepted, it becomes clear that the Gāhaḍavālas could not have belonged to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa clan.

It is interesting to note how the Gāhaḍavālas are mentioned in relation to the 36 royal tribes. Tod’s comparative chart containing six different lists, is helpful in this respect. The first of these lists, is from a detached leaf of an ancient work from Nadol and contains no reference to the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. The next three lists are incomplete, one being from Cānd Bārdāi and the other two from the Gujrāti and Sanskrit Mss. of the Kumārapālacakita; these lists also make no reference to the dynasty, but the fact that they are incomplete is a bar to any definite conclusion being reached. The chief interest, however, lies in the fifth list

1 Rahan Grant in IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.
2 According to the Rāso the Pratihāras were Agnikula Rājputs; but in the inscriptions they trace their origin from Śrī Rāma’s brother Lakṣmaṇa, i.e. from the Solar race.
3 IHQ., 1949, p. 36
4 Tod’s Rajasthan (Crooke), Vol. I, chart facing p. 98.
obtained from the Khichi bard, Moghji, who flourished in the early part of the nineteenth century; in this list the Rāṭhoḍas are grouped among the tribes that “subdivide” and the Gaharwāl tribe is expressly mentioned as a separate and single tribe. The sixth list prepared by Tod from various lists received “from every one of bardic profession, from all the collectors and collections of Rājasthān”, also represents Gaharwāl as “a separate and single tribe”1. In this connection it may be pointed out that, the Alhā-prastāva (as noticed by Elliot), also mentions the Gaharvāra together with the Govila, which is enumerated as a separate tribe (cf. “Sajji Gaharvāra Guhila aneka” etc.)2. It is to be noted that the early historical traditions and the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions do not contradict the lists of Moghji and Tod by claiming that the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty was a sept of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa clan; moreover, the undated Sārnath inscription of Kumāradevi mentions both the dynasties, the Gāhaḍavāla being the one to which her illustrious husband Govinda-candra belonged and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa being the dynasty of her mother, but gives no indication that the former was a sept of the latter.

Further, Tod has noticed that “the Gaharwār Rajput is scarcely known to his brothers in Rājastān, who would not admit his contaminated blood to mix with theirs......The original country of the Gaharwār is the ancient kingdom of Kāśī”3. The Gaharwār Rājputs are generally found in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab and in the Central India4. It appears that after Jayaccandra’s defeat at Candawar in 1193

1 Tod’s Rajasthan (Crooke), Vol. I, p. 98.
3 Tod’s Rajasthan (Crooke), Vol. I, p. 139.
A.D., some of the Gāhaḍāvālas, who generally lived in the eastern portion of their dominion around Vārāṇasī and Mirzapur, migrated to the neighbouring districts and to the south of the Yamunā\(^1\). Most of those who stayed behind were either killed or converted to Islam; in fact very few of them had the opportunity to migrate southwest, a long way off, to Rajputana. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Vodāmayūtā (whose scion Lakhanapāla issued the undated inscription of Badaun), on the other hand may have had conveniently migrated to Rajasthan sometime after the battle of Candwar but probably before the annexation of Badaun by Ilutmish\(^2\). The chaos that followed in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doab, after the fall of the Gāhaḍāvāla dynasty, appears to have been responsible for the confusion that resulted in the identification of the local feudatory dynasty of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas at Vodāmayūtā, with the erstwhile imperial dynasty of the Gāhaḍāvālas, who were the overlords of Vārāṇasī, Kānyakubja and Vodāmayūtā. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas, when they evacuated Vodāmayūtā, may have carried with them the Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Gāhaḍāvāla tradition and later on explained this tradition by tracing their origin from an alleged brother of Rāṣṭhoda-Gāhaḍāvāla Jayacandra. It is to be noted that though this confused tradition gained some support from the Pṛthvīrāja Rāso (a work compiled in its present form in the sixteenth century A.D. and, as such, is full of many interpolations) and also from the references to a Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty at Kanauj found in the Surat Grant (1051 A.D.)\(^3\) of Calukya Trilocanapāla, it was not universally accepted, so that most of the modern bards of Rajasthan,

---

1 e.g. Āḍakkamalla of the Gāhaḍāvāla dynasty.
3 *IA*, XII, p. 201.
including Moghji, refer to the Gāhadavāla clan as a separate one having no connection with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty.

The term Gāhadavāla itself has given rise to much speculation as to its origin. The Rājā of Kāntit, who claims descent from this line supplies a fanciful legend to prove that the term is a corruption of the title grabavāra. According to that legend this title grabavāra (overcomer of the evil planet) was acquired by Devadāsa, the son of Yayāti, after his victory over the evil planet Sani¹. Crooke suggests that, the word may have been derived from the Sanskrit word gahvura or girigahvura, which was the name of a Purānic people who used to live in the caves². According to another author the word might have been used in the same sense as balavān, an epithet which was assumed by the dynasty because of their vast conquest³. Dr. R. C. Majumdar and C.V. Vaidya believe that the name was derived from a place-name and the former refers in this connection to a place-name Gawarmad, mentioned in a Kanarese inscription of Saka 994 (c. 1076 A.D.).⁴ A perusal of the inscriptions of the Gāhadavāla dynasty shows that none of the common series of sixty-two grants, most of which were issued from Vārāṇasi and surrounding regions, refers to this dynastic name. The term Gāhadavāla (or Gahaḍavāla) is mentioned only on four occasions—thrice in the grants of the Mahārājaputra Govindacandra, which were the first to be issued in the Pañcāladeśa and once in the Sarnath inscription of Kumāradevi. It is possible, as some scholars have suggested, that there is some geographical significance behind this

¹ Mirzapur DG., p. 204.
name, but the inscriptions themselves point not to South India but to the newly conquered regions of the Gähaḍavāla dominion, Pañcāladeśa. Probably, the need for the introduction of a dynastic name was felt for the first time, when they issued inscriptions in the newly conquered district. Curiously enough, this inexplicable dynastic name never attained popularity in contemporary India; neither any of the numerous contemporary inscriptions of other dynasties nor any of the few literary works available seems to have been acquainted with the name Gähaḍavāla, though there are some stray and scanty references to Govindacandra and Jayaccandra in literature.

Having accepted that the dynasty of the Gähaḍavālas is a separate and individual one, another group of scholars have tried to fathom the mystery of their early history. Dr. D. C. Ganguly was the first to suggest a new identification for the first Gähaḍavāla king Candradeva. In the preceding chapter, it has been noted that during the latter part of Gāḍhipur-ādhipati Gopāla’s reign, Antarvedi was once more invaded by the Muslim army. According to the Ḥabīb us-Siyar it was Sulṭān Ibrāhīm himself, who led the army, but according to Salmān the leader of this expedition was Prince Maḥmūd. Anyway, when the Āmir Jaipāl was defeated after a brave struggle, princes from all quarters brought presents for the conqueror and he received so many elephants that a stable was established at Kānyaubja, with Cānd Rāi as its keeper. It has been suggested that “Candradeva joined the Muslims in order to make his fortune. At the outset he accepted the service of the

stable-keeper under Maḥmūd at Kanauj. But immediately after the departure of the Muslim army he forcibly occupied Kanauj and made himself the master of the country...... Candradeva got the sovereignty of Kanauj through the favour of Maḥmūd on his promise to pay an annual tribute to the Sulṭān of Ghazni. During the 12th century A.D. the Muslims made frequent incursions on the kingdom of the Gāhaḍavālas. These were launched obviously to force the successors of Candradeva to be regular in their payment of tribute to the Sulṭān"1. The invasion of prince Maḥmūd referred to above, is said to have taken place in the reign of Lakṣmadeva of Malwa (c. 1086-94 A.D.). In the previous chapter, however, I have pointed out that there is reason to believe that this particular invasion, which affected Agra and Dhārā, probably took place earlier, in A.H. 472/1079-80 A.D².

The proposed identification of Cand Rai, the keeper of elephants, with Candra Gāhaḍavāla, however, involves some difficulties and depends on several assumptions. In the first place, it has been assumed that a tax was imposed on Cand Rai, the keeper of elephants, by the Sulṭān of Ghazni; but there is no reference in the Diwān, Ḥabīb us-Siyar or Jami‘ut-Tawārikh to any tax having been imposed in connection with this expedition. Secondly, though the nature of the tax Turnüşkadanṣa, mentioned in the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions is, by no means, certain, it has been assumed that it was the tax collected by the Gāhaḍavāla kings to pay their tribute to Ghazni. Thirdly, the suggestion, that the cause of the frequent Turk invasions of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion was the non-payment of the tax to Ghazni, i

1 IHQ, IX, pp. 951 ff.
2 Vide supra, p. 25.
not supported by any evidence, Muslim or Indian. The Diwān itself describes in considerable detail the next great Turuṣka raid against the Gāhādvālas; but there is nothing in it to indicate that the expedition was undertaken to punish the successor of Cand Rai for non-payment of tax. Further, the casual reference in the Diwān to the appointment of a certain Cand Rai in charge of elephants at the stable at Kanauj and its silence about his subsequent career seem to show that he did not achieve a higher or more important status, such as the forcible occupation of Kanauj implies, and should not encourage one to identify him with Candradeva Gāhādvāla, whose father was a nrpa (feudatory ruler) and whose dynasty appears to have had some political standing in the Vārāṇasi-Ayodhya region. Identification cannot rest merely on grounds of proximity in time and similarity of names; and in face of all the difficulties mentioned above it will be safe not to accept the proposed identification as definitely proved.

Section II. Early History of the Gāhādvālas

Yaśovigraha, the first known member of the family, was the grandfather of Candradeva; in most of the Gāhādvāla inscriptions, he is described as a noble personage who lived after the demise of the kings of the Solar race (cf. "Āśīd-aśīta-dyutī-vahṣī-jāta-kṣimāpāla-mālāsu divāna gatāsu sāksād-vivāsvān-īva bhūri-dhāmā nāṃnā Yaśovigraha ity-udārāḥ"). The Candravatī inscriptions of V.S. 1150 and 1156 further detail that the Kṣatria dynasty, in which Yaśovigraha was born forcibly occupied Kānyakubja after

1 Vide the following section & appendix A.
the destruction of the descendants of king Devapāla (cf. "Āsid-aśeṣa-naranātha-kirti-koṭi-satīghaṭṭa-ghaṭṭita-lasan-man-pīḍa-pīṭhaḥ, Śrī-Devapāla-nṛpatistṛjagat-pragīta-kumḍeṇdu-dhāma-hima-kairava-kānta-kirtti, Kālena nāśan-atha tasya gate'nnavāyē dor-danḍavikrama........nṛpa-vahīṣah")¹. This king Devapāla of Kāṇyakubja may be identified with the Pratihāra king Devapāla, whose existence is testified to by the Siyadoni inscription of V.S. 1005/948 A.D.² This king was the second son of Mahāpāla I (c.914-943 A.D.) and reigned for a short period after his elder brother Mahendrapāla II (c.945-46 A.D.). Nothing of importance is known about Devapāla except that he was compelled to surrender to his Candrātreyā feudatory Yaśovarman, a celebrated image of Vaikuṇṭha, which he received from the king of Kīra; this image was first obtained from the Kailāsa mountain by the king of Bhōṭa, who presented it to the Kīra king as a token of friendship. Evidently when Devapāla reigned, the glorious days of the Pratihāras were already over and the process of disintegration has set in. It is curious to come across the name of this rather unimportant Pratihāra king, who reigned only for a short period, in an inscription issued in V.S. 1150, when about a century and a half had elapsed since his time. It may, however, be suggested that this Pratihāra king probably granted some substantial favour to some unknown ancestor of Candradeva and for that reason was remembered by his dynasty even after such a long time. The Āśitadyutī-vahīṣa or the Solar race, mentioned above, is to be identified with the Pratihāra dynasty which claimed descent from Laksmaṇa, the brother of Śrī Rāmacandra of

¹ I.I.Q., 1949, p. 36; also supra, p. 32.
² El., I, pp. 162-79.
the Solar race. Another śloka in these Candrāvati grants states that Yaśovigraha seized the earth and made her fond of the sceptre of the king (or justice) (cf. "Tasmin vaṃse

In the *EI.*, Vol. XXVI (p. 270, fn. 3) another suggestion has been put forward by Mr. Krishna Deva who identifies this *Devpāla* with Rāṣṭrakūta *Devpāla*, an ancestor of Lkhanapāla, who issued the undated Badaun inscription; the genealogy of Lkhanapāla is detailed in this inscription as follows (vide *EI.*, I, pp. 61-66 and *DHNL.*, I, p. 553):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigrahapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhuvanapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribhuvanapāla Madanapāla <em>Devpāla</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhimapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śūrapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amṛtapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lkhanapāla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kielhorn on palaeographical considerations places the inscription in the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D. Candradeva’s inscription, on the other hand, clearly states that the family of *Devpāla* had perished even before Candradeva occupied Kānyakubja (cf. “Kālena nāśaṁ-

Kathā tasya gate’nvaṃvaḥ”); the reference to *anuvāya* indicates that after *Devpāla* some kings of his dynasty ruled over that city. Thus the identification of these two homonymous chiefs as one and the same individual would imply that Lkhanapāla, the last known member of the anuvāya of *Devpāla* issued the Badaun inscription in about the 8th decade of the eleventh century and perished before Candradeva occupied Kānyakubja and issued his first inscription in 1089-90 A.D. Obviously, if Kielhorn’s opinion on the palaeography of the undated Badaun inscription is seriously considered, *Devpāla* of this grant cannot be identified with the *Devpāla* mentioned in Candradeva’s inscription. Moreover, in a previous paragraph, I have already pointed out that there is nothing in the inscription of Lkhanapāla which may imply that his dynasty ever had any connection with Kānyakubja.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE GAHAĐAVĀLĀS

samutpanno Yaśovigraha saṁjñākaḥ, vigṛhya medini yena daṇḍa-praṇayini kṛtā"). The use of the words daṇḍa (i.e. royal sceptre or army) and praṇaya implies that he had some conquests to his credit and may have ruled over a small territory; he, however, appears to have been a subordinate chief, as the absence of any royal epithet before his name indicates. Assigning twenty-five years to each generation, we can place him in or about the middle of the eleventh century A.D.; consequently he may have served under the great Kalacuri conqueror Lakṣmī-Kaṇḍa (c.1042-70 A.D.)

Yaśovigraha’s son Mahīcandra (or Mahātala or Mahīyala) is vaguely praised by most of the Gaḥḍavyāla inscriptions, which claim that his fame spread to the other side of the ocean (cf. “Tat-suto’bhūn-Mahīcandraś-candradhāma-nibhan-nijam yen-āpāram-akūpāra-pāre vyāpāritam yaśāḥ”). The Rahan grant of Mahārāja-pratap Govindacandra and Rāṇaka Lavarā-pravāha, however, states that he was a nṛpa (ruler or chief) who had defeated a host of enemies (cf. “Abhūn-nṛpa Gaḥḍavyāla-vanśe Mahītala nāmā jīt-āri-cakraḥ”). Mahīcandra thus appears to have been a feudatory chief, with some military conquests to his credit. He may have fought under Lakṣmī-Kaṇḍa during the latter part of his reign and later on, after the defeat of the king, he probably carved out a small principality for himself, out of the crumbling Kalacuri empire. The modest title nṛpa may, however, indicate that he never attained political sovereignty; he may have continued to acknowledge the overlordship of either Yaśāḥ-Kaṇḍa, the successor of Lakṣmī-Kaṇḍa, or, more

1 IHQ., 1949, p. 36.
2 Ibid.
3 Id., XVIII, pp. 14-19.
probably, of the Gorakhpur branch of the dynasty, whose existence is revealed in the Kahla inscription\(^1\) of Kalacuri Soḍhadeva issued in V.S. 1134/1079 A.D.

Candradeva, the third known member of the dynasty, also appears to have begun his career modestly in his small ancestral domain in Vārāṇasi-Ayodhya region; however, taking full advantage of the disturbed and uncertain political condition of the period, he declared himself independent and occupied the country between Indrasthāṇiṣyaka (to be identified with modern Delhi region) and Kāśī sometime before V.S. 1148/1089 A.D., when he issued the first Gāhāḍavāla inscription from Candrāvatī in the Benares district. In this inscription Candradeva is described as Paramabhaṭṭāraka - Mahārājādhirāja - Parameśvara nija-bhuj-opārjita-Sri-Kānyakubjādhipatya-Srī-Candra-deva.

---

\(^1\) El., VII, pp. 85-93.
CHAPTER III

RISE OF THE GĀHAḌAVĀLAS

The rise of the Gāhaḍavālas in the Antarvedi and Vārāṇasī sometime before V. S. 1148/c. 1089-90 A.D., saw the beginning of the last era of stable government, which the region enjoyed before the Muslim conquest. The reign of Candradeva, the founder of the independent Gāhaḍavāla kingdom was spent in preliminary conquests and subsequent consolidation. During the reign of his son Madanapāla, the newborn kingdom had to face a crisis, the double invasion of the Turuṣkas and the Gaṇḍas, who were, however, overcome by the valiant Mahārājaputra Govinda-candra. In the following pages I shall trace the political history of the dynasty under the first two kings, namely, Candradeva and Madanapāla.

Section I. Candradeva (c.1089—c.1103 A.D.)

Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārāja Maṭhīrāja Paramesvara-Parama-Maheśvara-Srī-Candradeva (or Candradityadeva) is generally described in most of the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions as one "who by his noble prowess suppressed all the troubles of his subjects (Yen-odāratara-pratāpa-śamit-āśeṣa-praj-opadravam)². A śloka in the Basahi inscription of V. S. 1161/1104 A.D. expresses the same idea in greater detail; according to it, after the death of Bhoja and the destruction of Karṇa's fame, when the earth became distressed, king Candradeva acted as the saviour ("Yāte Srī-Bhoja-bhūpe vibudha-vara-vadhū-netra-

1 The year in which Candradeva's first inscription is dated.
-ṣiṃ-āṭīthitvam Śrī-Karṇe kīrtiśeṣaṁ gatavati ca nṛpe kṣm-
attyaye jāyamāne, Bhartāram yam dharitri tridiva-vibhu-
nibhāṁ prītiyogād-upeta trātā viśvāsa-pūrvaṁ samabhavadv-
īha sa kṣmāpatis-Candradevalḥ’). This Bhoja is to be
identified with Bhoja Paramāra (c. 1000-1050 A.D.) and
Karṇa was the famous Kalacuri conqueror Lakṣmī-Karṇa,
who after a series of defeats, abdicated his throne in favour
of his son Yaśah-Karṇa sometime before c. 1073 A.D.
The Rahān grant of V.S. 1166/1109 A.D. likewise states
that, after the destruction of the two great Kṣatra families
of Sun and Moon, when the voice of Veda was almost
extinct, Candradeva was born (cf. “Pradhvaste soma-sūrya-
odbhava-vidita-mahā-kṣatra-vahṣa-dvaye’smin-utsanna-prāya-
veda-dhvanī jagad-akhilaṁ manyamānaḥ Svayambhūḥ” etc.)
It is generally accepted that the former was the dynasty of
the Pratihāras, who claimed descent from Pratihāra
Lakṣmana, the younger brother of Śrī Rāmacandra and so
were of solar origin; this identification is further supported
by two ślokas in Candradeva’s Candrāvati inscription of
V. S. 1150/1093 A.D., which state that the dynasty of
Candra seized Kānyakubja after the destruction of the
descendants of Devapāla. The dynasty of the Moon,
mentioned above, is to be identified with the Haihaya-
-Kalacuri dynasty of Dāhala, to which Lakṣmī-Karṇa
belonged.

The obvious inference from the above reference is that
‘the earth’ (i.e. the country over which Čandradeva ruled
afterwards) was excessively troubled during the short interval
between the defeat of Karṇa and the rise of the Gāhādaṇḍaśas.

3 Vide supra, p. 39.
The evidence of the Muslim historians indicates that the cause of this trouble was the repeated Turuṣka invasions from Ghazni; the contemporary Sultān was Ibrāhīm, who ruled from 451 A.H./1059 A.D. to 492 A.H./1099 A.D. and according to the statements of Ḥabīb us-Siyar, “several times led army to make war on Hind, each time returning victorious to Ghazni.” We have already noticed that on one occasion either Sultān Ibrāhīm or Prince Maḥmūd advanced as far as Agra and defeated Jaipāl or Bāthāl, who has been described as the “Āmir of Agra”.¹ The helplessness of the people (prajā) was further intensified by the fact that, during this period, there was no competent government in the Antarvedi and Vārāṇasi region, which could take any measure to check the Turuṣka menace and remove their distress. At this juncture Candradeva seized power, brought the region from Indrasthāniyaka to Vārāṇasi under his sway and put an end to the sufferings of the people.

So far, four inscriptions of Candradeva’s reign have been discovered, dated respectively in the years 1148, 1150, 1154 and 1156 of the Vikrama Samvat. The third of these inscriptions, though it records a grant by Candradeva, made in V.S. 1154/c.1098 A.D., was actually issued posthumously by his son Madanapāla (cf. “pitṛ-dāna-sāsana-prakāśan-ārtham”). The assumption of the full imperial titles (cf. Parama-bhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara) as disclosed by the earliest inscription of Candradeva, issued from Candrāvata in V. S. 1148/c. 1089-90 A.D.², indicates that he was an independent ruler by this time. A verse in the same inscription states that the king protected the

¹ Vide supra, p. 25.
² EI., IX, pp. 302-05.
sacred places of Kāśi, Kuśika, Uttara-Kośala and Indra-
sthānīyaka (cf. “Kāśi-Kuśik-Uttara-Kośal-Endrasthānīyakāni
paripālayat-ābhigamya”). Kāśi, of course, is Vārāṇasi and
Kuśika is Kānyakubja or modern Kanauj. The sacred place
of Uttara-Kośala is to be identified with Ayodhyā and the
name may be roughly applied to the whole tract of modern
Oudh and Gorakhpur. According to most scholars, Indras-
sthānīyaka was somewhere near the modern village of
Indrapat, the reputed capital of the Pāṇḍavas near Old
Delhi\(^1\). The internal and external geographical data, as
far as they are ascertainable, support the claim that the
region round Kāśi and Uttara-Kośala was included in
Candradeva’s dominion. The identification of Indrasthā-
nīyaka with Indrapat, near Delhi, gives rise to some difficulty
but a reasonable suggestion may be offered to solve it. A
Delhi Museum inscription of 1328 A.D. states that in the
land of Hariyāna, was the city called Dhillikā, which was
built by the Tomaras, and that the land of Hariyāna was
first enjoyed by the Tomaras and then by the Cāhamānas\(^2\).
As there is no mention of the Gāhaḍavālas between these
two dynasties, the authority of Chandradeva in this region
may have been of an indirect nature. In this connection it
is to be noted that no Gāhaḍavāla inscription has been found
to the west of Rahan in Etawah (U.P.). Probably the con-
temporary Tomara chief, who ruled over Delhi acknowled-
ged the suzerainty of the Gāhaḍavāla king and like the
Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty at Badauin, was allowed to continue as a
subordinate ruler in his own dominion. If Cunningham’s
suggestion is accepted, he was either Anāṅgapāla (c. 1049-
79 A. D) or one of his successors\(^3\).

1 \textit{Ibid.}
2 \textit{JASB.}, XLIII, pp. 80-85.
3 \textit{CML.}, p. 40.
Candredeva, the first Gāhāḍavāla king, had to fight many a battle before he could make himself the master of the territory extending from Vārāṇasī to Delhi; most of the Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions describe him as one, who had overcome the circle of his enemies ("Krānta-dvīṣan-
maṇḍalāḥ") and dispelled the darkness caused by the haughty (or steady) warriors ("vidhvast-oddhata-vīrā(dhīrā)-
yodha-rimiraḥ")¹. One of the Candrāvati inscriptions, issued by the king in V.S. 1150/1093 A.D., states that the king overcame Narapati, Gajapati, Giripati and Triṣaṅkupati (c.f. "so'yam narapati-mukuṭa-makariḳa-marakata-prabhā-
paṭala - pallavita - pādapītha - gajapati - gala-garjita-pralaya-
paṁcānanaś - triṣaṅkupati - kapaṭa-pāṭana-kraṅka-pāṭaḥ, . . .
giripati-piṅḍa-caṇḍa-mārutaḥ")². According to some scholars these terms refer to different classes of feudatories.³ The first two epithets figure among the imperial titles used by the Kalacuri kings and also in the inscriptions of Viśvarūpasena and Keśavasena (c.f. "Aśvapati-gajapati-
narapati-rājatāyadhipati")⁴; the other two epithets, Giripati and Triṣaṅkupati, however, rarely occur in inscriptions. It is to be noted that the assumption of the full Kalacuri title by Candradeva’s grandson Govindacandra in V.S. 1182/1125-6 A.D., indicated his victory over the Kalacuri king.⁵ The reference to two of the usual Kalacuri titles in Candradeva’s inscriptions, may contain a hint to the conflict between him and the contemporary Kalacuri king Yasaḥ-Karna. The possibility of such a conflict should not be overlooked in

¹ Found in almost all the Gāhāḍavāla grants.
² Candravati grant of V. S. 1150 in Et., XIV, pp. 193 ff.
³ HK., p. 303.
⁴ cf. Goharwa Insc. in Et., XI, pp. 141, 144, & Bakharganj Insc. in JASB., VII (1838), p. 49.
view of the fact that by c. 1090 A.D., Candradeva held under his sway almost the whole of Antarvedi and Vāraṇasi, which had been occupied by Yaśah-Karna’s father Lakṣmī-Karna Kalacuri, only a couple of decades ago. The Kalacuri hold on this region was weakened as the result of Lakṣmī-Karna’s repeated defeats at the hands of some of the contemporary kings and taking full advantage of the situation, Candradeva, the first Gāhadavāla king, occupied it: Yaśah-Karna, a vaguely praised king, who had inherited little or none of his father’s military genius, may have attempted but could do nothing to regain his father’s lost kingdom. He was probably one of the kings whom Candradeva defeated during his battles fought on the bank of the river Yamunā, referred to in the Sārnath inscription of Kumārdevi, the queen of Govindacandra (cf. “Yad-asahana-ṇṭpaṇāṇa-kāminī-bāṣpa-vāhail sitataram-āśīd-Yamunāḥ nūram-ambhah”)

In the undated Mau inscription of Madanavarman (c. 1129—63 A.D.) of the Candrātreya dynasty, in connection with the king Sallakṣmaṇaśaṁha, who succeeded Kīrtivarman after 1098 A.D., there is a vague reference to Antarvedi-visaya; the śloka, containing the reference, however, is badly damaged and only a few words could be restored (cf. “atha Sallakṣmaṇavarmana-prabhu...puna Antarvedi-visaye...”). As we have noticed in a preceding chapter, the Candrātreya ambition in the Antarvedi was an old tradition and Vidyādhara, a former king had considerable political interest in the Antarvedi; but the weakness of his successors and the rise of Gāṅgeyadeva and Lakṣmī-Karna in the neighbouring dominion, pushed the Candrātreyas to the background and

1 El., IX, pp. 319-28.  2 El., I, p. 201.
Mahodaya was lost to them. When at last the Kalacuri conqueror was vanquished by the combined efforts of the neighbouring kings and the Candrātreya line was restored, probably their Antarvedi claim also was revived. The Mau inscription probably refers to some Candrātreya attempt to recover the lost hold on Antarvedi by king Sallakṣmaṇa-sinīha. The Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions, however, indicate clearly that the dynasty at that time was ruling over Antarvedi, and the Candrātreya expedition in that region undertaken by Sallakṣmaṇa appears to have failed. There is a possibility of his being one of the kings defeated by Candradeva on the bank of the Yamunā.

The most important achievement of Candradeva, however, was the conquest of Kānyakubja or Mahodaya, the capital of Harṣa and the Imperial Pratihāras. Possibly with the conquest of that city, the whole of Pañcāla region submitted to him (cf. “Capala-Pañcāla-cula-cūmbana-caṇha-caṇḍrahāsaḥ”). In each of the official Gāhaḍavāla grants this conquest has been mentioned at least twice, once in the praśasti of the king and once again in the form of an epithet used by him (cf. “Ṣṛimad-Gāḍhipur-ādhirājyaṃ-asaman-dor-vvikramen-ārjjitam” and “nija-bhuj-opārjjita-Ṣrī-Kānyakubj-ādhipatyam”). Obviously, in spite of the dark and inglorious history of the last seventy-five years during which it became a veritable bone of contention among all the ambitious rulers of Northern India, Mahodaya had not lost its charm and the Gāhaḍavālas proudly referred to their suzerainty over the city. But the popular tradition that their capital was at Kānyakubja must be examined carefully. Of the sixty-seven official inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavālas

1 DHNI., II, pp. 701-02.
2 EI., XIV, pp. 193 ff.
3 Vide appendix A for a detail discussion of the topic.
more than forty were issued from Vārāṇasī and most of the rest from various places situated in the eastern portion of the Gāхаdavāla dominion, that is, the region around Vārāṇasī; on the other hand, only one inscription was issued from Kānyakubja and three others from Basahi and Rahan, in its vicinity. This evidence signifies that though the dominion of the Gāхаdavālas included the city of Kānyakubja, the seat of their power was Vārāṇasī. However, one inscription, issued during the reign of Madanapāla by his son Govindacandra, shows that for some time at least, Kānyakubja served as the capital of Candradeva; it states that after defeating his opponents he established his metropolis at Kānyakubja (cf. "Kānyakubje karod-rājā rājadhānīm aninditam" in the Basahi inscription of V.S. 1161.) It appears that sometime between V.S. 1156, when Candradeva’s last inscription was issued and V.S. 1161, when the first inscription of Madanapāla’s reign was issued, the former made the city of Kānyakubja his capital. I have suggested in the previous chapter that the country of Pańcāla round about Kānyakubja, was a late conquest of the king’s who rose to power in Vārāṇasī and Gorakhpur region.² Probably that city was made the capital of his realm, during the latter part of his reign, when the necessary work of consolidation in the newly conquered area had to some extent advanced. There may have been another reason for this delay in making the city his capital. Al-Bīrūnī noticed (c. 1030 A.D.) that “Kanoj lies to the west of the Ganges, a very large town, but most of it is now in ruins and desolate, since the capital has been transferred from thence

1 IA., XIV, pp. 101-04.
2 Vide supra, p. 32 & infra, appendix A.
to the city of Bāri”. During the next fifty or sixty years Kānyakubja enjoyed neither strong nor stable government and was overrun by the Turks as late as c.1079/80 A.D.

The city thus had no opportunity to regain the pomp and splendour of its imperial days. Candradeva, while he was busy in consolidating his position in Pañcāladesa, may not have neglected the task of rebuilding the ruined city in a proper way to make it the capital of a great kingdom. That he had succeeded in this task is evident from Salmān’s contemporary account of Mas’ūd (III)’s Indian invasion, which describes the city as “the Ka’aba of the Samanis and the Kibla of the infidels,…….the treasures of Hind were collected in it”.

Curiously enough, the śloka in Basahi grant of V. S. 1161, which refers to Kānyakubja as the capital, is omitted in the Kamauli grant of V.S. 1162, though it contains all the other ślokas of the former inscription; in fact no other inscription refers to that city as the Gāhaḍavāla capital. It seems that the change of capital did not prove lucky to the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty and consequently it was shifted once more to Vāraṇasī. In the relevant paragraphs the probable reason for this second change of capital will be discussed.

From the above discussion we can form an approximate idea about the dominion of the first Gāhaḍavāla king and his political influence. To the south it appears to have been bounded by the river Yamunā; in the west he had certainly annexed Kānyakubja and the surrounding region (i.e., Pañcāla) and the ruler of Dhillikā or Indrasthāñiyaka, probably a Tomara chief, acknowledged Candradeva’s

1 Al-Birūnī, KH., II, p. 199.
2 Elliot, HL., IV, pp. 523-4.
3 Ibid.
4 Vide the next section.
suzerainty. In the north, his dominion included not only Pañcāla but also Uttara-Kośala or modern Oudh and Gorakhpur region and in the east Vārānasī served as the capital of the king for the greater part of his reign. But probably on this side his dominion did not go far beyond the city on the north side of the Gaṅgā.

Two of Candradeva’s grants issued in V.S. 1150 and 1156, indicate that the king attempted further conquests in the east. A verse which occurs in both, mentions that his army marched on to the east in vast array (cf. “Prācīm-anupracalitāṇi valāṇi yasya dhūlibhir-ambu-ghana-parikam-akārsur-ābdhe” etc.)¹, but claims no definite achievement for this army. It is significant that no other record of this dynasty makes any reference to this eastern project of the king. Possibly the first Gāhaḍavāla king, who was successful in annexing Kānyakubja and in checking the ambition of the Kalacuris and the Candrātreyas in the Antarvedi, had to face a defeat in the east. The eastern neighbour of the Gāhaḍavālas were the Pālas and Rāmapāla was the contemporary king of the dynasty². The Pāla dominion before the accession of Rāmapāla was troubled not only by a fratricidal struggle but also by the Kaivarta rebellion, and Gauḍa, the Pāla capital was occupied by the Kaivarta king Divya and his successors. Rāmapāla, according to the Rāmacarita, spent the early years of his reign

¹ IHQ., 1949, p. 37.
² The recent discovery of the Valgudar insc. helps us to some extent in determining the date of Rāmapāla; taking c. 1144 A. D. to be the 18th year of Madanapāla’s reign and assigning 1 year for Gopāla III and 4 years for Kumārapāla, we can provisionally place Rāmapāla’s reign between 1097 and 1139 A. D. (or between 1084-1126 A. D. if we assign 14 years to Gopāla III; cf. DHNI, I, p. 385). Vide JASL., XX, pp. 43-44.
in consolidating his position by contacting his faithful sāmantas; then with the help of his sāmantacakra, he crushed the Kaivarta rebellion and recovered his ancestral dominion. The list of these sāmantas of Rāmapāla is headed by Bhīmayaśas, the ruler of Piṭḥi-Magadha, who is described in the Rāmacarita-commentary as “Kānyakubja-rāja-bāji-nīganṭhana-bhujaṅgaḥ”; this epithet clearly indicates that, a Kānyakubja king was defeated by him. Drs. H.C. Ray and B.C. Sen have already suggested the identification of this Kānyakubja king with the first Gāhaḍavāla ruler or with one of the first three Gāhaḍavāla kings. According to the Rahan grant of V. S. 1166/1109 A. D., one of these three kings, Govindacandra, claims a definite victory over the Gauḍa army, though in the Rāmacarita there is no reference to any engagement of Rāmapāla with the king of Kānyakubja and Vārāṇasi. It may be inferred from these data that the two Candraśatī inscriptions of Candradeva and the Rahan Grant of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra refer to two different phases of the Pāla-Gāhaḍavāla struggle and the reference to the war with Kānyakubja in the Rāmacarita pertains to the earlier of them. It appears that during these two Pāla-Gāhaḍavāla clashes, which took place before 1109 A.D., the Pāla-sāmanta, Bhīmayaśas, may have been successful in the first one and consequently the account of the eastern expedition of Candra is extremely vague even in his own records; in the second engagement, on the other hand, as the Pāla king Rāmapāla had the worst of it, Rāmacarita is discreetly silent about it and the inscriptions

1 RC (Commentary), I, 42-45.
2 Ibid., II, 5.
4 IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.
of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra make positive claims of having defeated the Gauḍa army. Thus on the strength of the above mentioned verse in the Gāhāḍavāla grants, the Kānyakubja king repulsed by Bhīmayaśas may be identified almost definitely with the first Gāhāḍavāla king Candradeva.

In the Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions, this king is generally praised for his generosity (cf. “hem-ātma-tulyam-anīṣan-
dadātā yen-āṁkitā Vasumati śataś-tulābhiḥ”); it is possible that he indulged in abundant gifts not only out of benevolence, but also as a matter of policy—to enlist the sympathies of the twice-born. These Tulā puruṣa-mahādānas and the pious acts like consecration and decoration of the images of gods, which must have made the first Gāhāḍavāla king a popular monarch, prove that his claim of having restored the earth to the path of virtue, was not an empty boast.

The reign of Candradeva must have ended sometime after V.S. 1156/1100/A.D., when he issued his last inscription but before V.S. 1161/1104 A.D., when the first inscription of his son’s reign was issued.

Section II. Madanapāla (c. 1104-1113 A.D.)

For a long time only four inscriptions of Madanapāla were forthcoming and none of these had been issued by the king himself. Of these, the Basahi grant of V.S. 1161 was issued by the king’s son Govindacandra with the consent of Purohita Jāguka, Mahattaka Bālhana and Pratihāra Gautama, and the Kamauli grant was issued by the same prince with the consent of the personages mentioned above and, in addition, the queen (janaṇī) Rālhādevi. The Rahan

grant of V.S. 1166 was made by the Rāṇaka Lavarāpravāha and issued by Govindacandra with the consent of Mahattaka Gāṅgeya. Details about the Terry & Co. inscription (Vahuvarā) of V.S. 1164 which records a grant of Mahārājīni Prthviśrikā, are not now available. According to Mr. Bendall, who noticed it in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1896), "the language of the grant follows closely that of the above mentioned grant" i.e., the Kamauli grant of V.S. 1162; presumably this one also was issued by Govindacandra. Thus, in none of the above mentioned grants does the king Madanapāla figure, either as the donor or as the announcer, and so there is a tendency to believe that this king, though he reigned, did not actually rule because of some misfortune or illness. Consequently a regency consisting of the crown-prince, the queen, the Purohita, the Pratihāra and the Mahattaka, was formed to look after the affairs of the state. The discovery of the fifth inscription in 1929 A.D. (which was edited in 1941), however, has ended this uncertainty about his reign. The inscription of V.S. 1164/1107 A.D. found in the village of Baḍera in Pratabgarh district, Oudh, had been issued by Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja-Paramēśvara Parama-Mēheśvara, Śrīman-Madanapāladeva, who was also the donor of the grant announced in it. The discovery of this grant proves conclusively that this king did sometimes take part in the administration, but it has now become more difficult to explain the necessity of a regency, which consents to the grants made by the prince, with no reference to the

1 IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.  
2 JRAS., 1896, pp. 787-88  
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reigning king in V.S. 1161, 1162 and 1166 though the king himself was exercising his authority in V.S. 1164.

In the inscriptions, Madanacandra (or pāla) is praised in conventional magniloquent terms for the battles he had won ("Yasy-āśid-vijaya-prayāṇa-samaye" etc. and "Yen-ākriyate vahusah samara-prabandha-sannartita-prahata-satru-kavandha-vandhaḥ"), but there is no specific reference to any particular victory and the claims put forward are of an extremely vague nature. These inscriptions, however, prove beyond doubt that Mahārājaputra Govindacandra took a leading part in the administration and gained important victories. Unlike the other two Gāhaḍavāla princes, Āsphoṭacandra (who issued the Benaras Grant V.S. 1190) and Rājyapāladeva (who issued the Gagaha grant of V.S. 1199 and Benaras grant of V.S. 1203)¹, he is eloquently praised for his achievements, even in the inscriptions issued during his father’s reign.

The Basahi grant, the earliest inscription of this reign, refers to Candra-deva as one who made Kānyakubja his capital, which indicates that probably his son Madanapāla too had his capital in that city in V.S. 1161/1104 A.D.; strangely enough, the Kamauli grant issued in the very next year, contains all the verses of the Basahi grant, except the one which refers to Kānyakubja as the capital; in fact, no other Gāhaḍavāla record mentions that city as the capital. Another interesting feature about these inscriptions is that, while in the earlier one Mahārājaputra Govindacandra grants a village in Jiāvati pattalā from Āsaṭika on the Yamunā, in the latter he grants another village in the same pattalā, ‘situated in Paṅcāladesa’ (‘Paṅcāla-deṣe Jiāvati-

-pattalāyām”), from his victorious camp at Viṣṇupura ("Viṣṇupur-āvāsita-vijaya-kaṭake",—place-name unidentified) on the Gāṅgā. From the above data, some interesting inferences may be drawn: firstly, in V.S. 1162 Mahārājaputra Govindacandra was leading an army and conducting a campaign; secondly, the detailed information about the situation of Jīvatī pattalā that it was in Paṅcāladēsa may indicate that this grant was made from a locality where the pattalā was not well-known; and thirdly, though the Gāhaḍavalā capital was removed from Kānyakubja in V.S. 1162 the hold of that dynasty on the country around was not lost. It thus appears that the city of Kānyakubja was lost to the Gāhaḍavālas sometime between the 25th December 1104 A.D. (the date of the Basahi grant) and 24th October 1105 A.D. (the date of the Kamauli grant) and by the latter date Govindacandra was fighting probably to recover the lost city¹.

The Rahan grant of V.S. 1166/1109 A.D supplies a clue, which helps us to establish the identity of the enemy, who occupied Kānyakubja during Madanapāla's reign; according to one of the verses of that grant, Mahārājaputra Govindacandra "again and again by the play of his matchless fighting makes the Hammīra lay aside his enmity. ("Hammīram nyasta-vairam muhūr-asaṃa-raṇa-krīḍayā yo vidhatte")². The word Hammīra or Hamoīra is a corrupt Indian form of the Arabic administrative term Āmir. The first numismatic reference to this term is found by the beginning of the thirteenth century A.D., on the coins of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Mahammad ibn Sām, (death in 1206

A.D.), who came to India first as his brother’s viceroy to Ghazni and India and later as the Sultān. The Hammīra or the Muslim chief, who was defeated by Govindacandra before V.S. 1166 appears to have been some officer of the contemporary Yamīnī Sultān of Ghazni and Lahore, Mas’ūd (III) ibn Ibrāhīm (c. 1099-1115 A.D.) According to the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, during this Sultān’s reign, “Ḥājib Ṭughā-tīgīn crossed the river Gaṅgā in order to carry on holy war in Hindustan and penetrated to places where, except Sultān Maḥmūd, no one has reached so far with an army before.” The contemporary poet Salmān in his Diwān details the event as follows—“Mas’ūd by the aid of Islam, raised a gallant army. He turned his force towards Hindustan to prosecute a holy war.........took Malhī, the God-forsaken chief of Hind; Kanauj was the capital of Hind which the infidels regarded as their polestar.......It was the Ka’aba of the Sumanis and Kibla of the infidels. The treasures of Hind were collected in it, just as all rivers flow into the sea. Malhī had soldiers, wealth, elephants and arms. Conceive therefore what else he had”. Malhī or Malbīra seems to be a corruption of the name “Madana”. It has been suggested that this Madana was not the Gahaḍavāla king of the same name, but was identical with the Madana, whose minister Vidyādhara issued the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176/1119 A.D. I have, however, already pointed out that the verse (in Basahi grant of V.S. 1161) which mentions Kānyakubja as the capital of Candradeva, signifies that it was also the capital of Madana-
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pāla at least up to the year 1161 V.S. The assumption that this Malbi is not the Gāhaḍavāla Madanapāla but a Gāhaḍavāla feudatory of the same name, mentioned in the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1171, implies that the Gāhaḍavāla king removed his capital from the city of Kānyakubja and handed it over to a feudatory whose father Gopāla once ruled over it. But this assumption presents a serious difficulty; the sudden and permanent abandonment of Kānyakubja as capital by the Gāhaḍavālas, even before the Muslim raid and without any serious reasons, cannot be accounted for. Also Salmān’s reference to Malbi as “the chief of Hind” and his description of Kānyakubja as “the capital of Hind”, where, “the treasures of Hind were collected”, clearly indicate that the city was the capital of the Gāhaḍavāla monarch and not of a petty Gāhaḍavāla feudatory.

These considerations lead us to the conclusion that though there is not much similarity between the two names Malbi (or Malbira) and Madana, the person referred to under the first name by poet Salmān, is to be identified with the Gāhaḍavāla king of the second name. It thus appears that an army of the Ghazni Sulṭān Mas’ūd III, led by Ḥājib Ğughā-tigīn, advanced as far as Kānyakubja by V.S. 1161-62, defeated and, if Salmān is to be believed, captured the second Gāhaḍavāla king Madanapāla who was compelled to ransom his person\(^1\); the valiant Mahārājaputra Govindacandra, however, was fighting the enemies as early as V.S. 1162 when from his “victorious camp” at Viṣṇupura he made the grant of a village in the vicinity of Kānyakubja.

\(^1\) DHNJ., I, p. 514.
The Rahan Grant proves that the Gāhaḍavāla power recovered very soon and as early as V.S. 1166/1109 A.D. Mahārājaputra Govindacandra had already made the Hammīra lay aside his enmity. The Muslim army, against which Govinda had to fight in order to recover Kānyakubja, was probably posted at that city even after the release of Madanapāla. The fact, that like the Basahi Grant of V.S. 1161, the Rahan grant of V.S. 1166 was also made from Asatiṣkā on the Yamunā, indicates that the Gāhaḍavāla authority was probably restored in the imperial city and its vicinity was rendered safe once more. Mahāsāṇḍhivigrabika Lakṣṇīdhara, the author of the Kṛtya-kalpataru, has described the reigning king Govindacandra in rāja-prāśasti as one "who killed in battle, the heroic Hammīra, a paragon of valour, who was eager for the fortune of an unequal combat ("Asama-samara-sampal-lampatāḥ sauryabhājām-avadhīr-avadhī-yuddhe yena Hammīra-vīra)". It is to be noted that there is a vital difference between the respective descriptions in the Rahan Grant and in the Kṛtya-kalpataru; while, the first states that the Hammīra was compelled to lay aside his enmity, the second records that the Hammīra was killed by Govindacandra. Mahāsāṇḍhivigrabika Lakṣṇīdhara being an official of the highest rank in the court of Govindacandra, the statements made by him in the Kṛtya-kalpataru regarding contemporary incidents are about as dependable as those found in the Gāhaḍavāla official records and it appears that the Rahan grant and the Kṛtya-kalpataru refer not to the same incident but to two different ones. About the date of the treatise, the learned editor has argued that "the omission to refer to

1 Kṛtya. Dānakāṇḍa (GOS. 92) p. intro. 48.
the later conquests (e.g. a portion of the Kalacuri dominion) ...... and to Govindacandra's later title (i.e., "Aśvapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatray-ādhipati" etc.) ... must have been done to Lakṣmīdhara's having written early in that reign, before these conquests were made and new virudas acquired". There is thus a possibility that the second incident happened during the early part of Govindacandra's reign or even before that, when he was conducting the administration of the state as a Mahārāja-putra, and was not far removed in time from the first incident mentioned in the Rahan Grant in V.S. 1166. It appears that the Muslim-Gāhaḍavāla encounter that took place before V.S. 1166 was not of a decisive nature and the Muslim general, who was forced to a truce (cf. "Hamvīram nyaste-vairāṁ yo vidhatte" etc.), probably released the reigning Gāhaḍavāla king Madanapāla, who was captured, according to Salmān. Within a few years, however, the raiders may have had dropped the pretence of friendship and made a fresh incursion into the Gāhaḍavāla dominion; but the Gāhaḍavāla army fared better on this occasion and the Hammīra or the leader of the foreign raiders was killed in the battle, as claimed by the Kṛtya-kalpataru. The general vigilance of Govindacandra, both as a prince and as a king, to protect the sacred city of Vārāṇasī and his dominion, as a whole, from the raid of the later Yaminī kings of Ghazni and their governors (āmirs) in India, was probably praised in the undated Sārnath inscription of Kumāradevi, his queen, where he is said to have protected the city from the

1 K. V. Rangaswami Ayanger in the Kṛtya., Dānakāṇḍa, intro. P. 43.
wicked Turuṣkas (cf. "Vārāṇasīṃ bhuvana-rakṣaṇa-dakṣaḥ duṣṭāt Turuṣka-subhaṭa-davitum" etc.).

Fortunately for the Gāhaḍavālas, while they were busy fighting the foreign invaders on the western front, most of the contemporary royal dynasties were represented by more or less weak and inefficient rulers. The comparative silence of the official praśastikāras about Jayavarman and Viravarman, the successors of the Candrātreya Sallakṣmaṇavarman, shows that their reigns did not figure in the brilliant chapters of their dynastic history. Yaśāḥ-Karṇa, the Haihaya-Kalacuri king, whose ambition had already been curbed by Candradeva on the banks of the river Yamunā, receives only vague praises in the Kalacuri records. None of these seems to have effectively pursued any ambitious project against the Gāhaḍavālas.

The enemy on the eastern frontiers of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion, however, was not a weak one and the reign of Rāmapāla saw a temporary revival of the Pāla power in the east. In the previous section it has already been noticed that the early years of the reign of Rāmapāla were spent in suppressing the Kaivarta rebellion and consolidating his territory. The Rāmacarita states that, after this, he undertook expeditions against foreign countries and conquered Utkala, Kaliṅga and Kāmarūpa. Probably during this period his attention was drawn to the earlier onslaught of the Kānyakubja army, sent by Candradeva Gāhaḍavāla and repulsed by the Pāla-Sāmanta Bhīmayaśas, the ruler of Magadha, and as an effective retaliation he sent out an army from Gauḍa to fight the Gāhaḍavālas. Mahārājaputra Govindacandra proved equal to this emergency and repulsed

1 El., IX, pp. 319 ff. 2 RC., III, 45-47.
the Gauḍa army; in the Rahan inscription, he is praised as "one terrific in cleaving the frontal globes of the elephants from Gauḍa" ("dūrvāra-sphāra-Gauḍa-dvirada-vara-ghanā-krūmbha-nirbhedabhīmah")². Lākṣmīdharā, probably refers to this incident in the Kṛtyakalpataru when he describes that Govindačandra's mere sport threatened the Gauḍa elephants, whose roar alarmed all kings to stupefaction ("Krīḍā-tarjita-Gauḍa-garjita-bhayastambhī-bhavat-parthivah")². The Rāmacarita," quite in keeping with the eulogistic character of the work, maintains absolute silence about this unsuccessful expedition of its hero, Rāmapāla. Here a conjecture may be ventured; probably it was Rāṣṭrakūṭa Mathana, the maternal uncle of Rāmpāla, who directed the Pāla expedition against the Gāhāḍavāla dominion and this phase of the Pāla-Gāhāḍavāla struggle terminated with an alliance which was sealed by a marriage between the young hero Mahārājaputra Govindačandra and Kumāradevi the grand-daughter of Mathana and niece of Rāmapāla³. Later events, however, show that this treaty did not last long and the Gāhāḍavālas for some time occupied a substantial portion of the Pāla dominion during the reign of the king Govindačandra.

Summing up the events of his reign, we find that the battles fought were of a defensive character and the victories did not result in any territorial annexation; they only enabled Madanapāla to retain intact, the kingdom he had inherited from his father Candradeva.

The Rahan inscription of V. S. 1166 testifies to the existence of a feudatory, Rāṇaka Lavarāpravāha, whose grant is announced by Mahārājaputra Govindačandra; as the
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localities mentioned in this connection have not yet been identified, the territory ruled over by Lavarāpravāha cannot be ascertained.

Madanapāla appears to have issued coins in silver and copper; these are of the usual "Bull and Horseman" type, then current in Northern India. On the obverse of these coins, is a rude figure of a horseman and around it in a marginal legend runs the king's name Madanapāladeva, generally incomplete (i.e. Madana Mada or Śrī-Ma; on the reverse is the rude outline of a recumbent humped bull and the accompanying legend, Mādhava-Śrī-Sāmanta (or Mādhava-Śrī-Sāma, Sāmanta or Mādha). The silver coins of Madanapāla are rare and sometimes they contain a large percentage of alloy. Thomas describes one coin of this king as "silver and copper" and Cunningham describes another as billon. Weight of these coins, silver, billon and copper, vary from 45.3 grains to 51 grains and, as such, these coins appear to have followed the Indian "Purāṇa" standard of 32 "rati"s, that is, 56 grains¹.

Inscriptions reveal the names of two of the queens of Madanapāla; one of them Rālhadevi, the mother of Govindacandra, consented to a grant in V. S. 1189/1132-3 A. D. Kamauli grant during his son's reign; the grant of another queen Prthvīsrīkā, was recorded in the Bahuvarā inscription of V. S. 1164, also known as the Terry & Co. grant.

CHAPTER IV

ERA OF AGGRANDIZEMENT

The accession of Govindacandra to the Gāhaḍavāla throne saw the culmination of an era of successful aggrandizement. Undoubtedly the greatest king of his dynasty, Govindacandra was also one of the greatest kings of his time; his extensive conquests and wide diplomatic relations made the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty for the time being the most important factor in the field of North Indian politics. As a prince this king had already fought some successful defensive battles during his father's reign, and the grants issued by him at that time clearly say that he was "endowed with all the royal prerogatives" (संस्ता-राजा-प्रक्रीय-पेता). The date of his accession falls between V.S. 1166/1109 A.D., the date of the latest inscription of Madanapāla's reign and V.S. 1171/1114 A.D.¹ when his earliest known inscription was issued.

Section I. Extent of Govindacandra's kingdom

Numerous inscriptions of Govindacandra range over a period of forty years and amply illustrate the political influence of the king. Of these, thirty-seven inscriptions were issued by Govindacandra himself, while three were issued by the princes; an undated pillar inscription was issued by Queen Kumāradevī. Besides these, two inscriptions were issued by two feudalory chiefs and one more by a private individual.

The findspots of these inscriptions and the geographical references in them help us to determine, with a fair amount of exactitude, the extent of Govindacandra’s territory.

The northernmost provenance of Govindacandra’s inscriptions is Mahet in the Goṇḍā district in U.P. where two were found, dated respectively V. S. 1176/1119 A.D. and V. S. 1186/1129 A.D. The first of these inscriptions was issued by Vidyādharā, a minister of king Madana, the son of the Gāḍhipur-ādhīpati Gopāla and the second was by Govindacandra himself. The places mentioned in these inscriptions have been identified with certain localities in the vicinity of Mahet. To the north-east, it is certain that his domain spread beyond the river Gharāgāra and the Little Gaṇḍak, as some of his inscriptions were discovered at Pāli, Gagahā, Lār and Don Buzurg. It is safe to conjecture that on this side Govindacandra’s territories were bounded by the river Great Gaṇḍak. The easternmost findspot is Moner in the Patna district in Bihar, and Maniari pattalā referred to in the Moner Grant of V. S. 1183/c.1124 A. D. has been identified with the village of Moner. The geographical references in the Lār plates of V. S. 1202/1146 A. D. carry us further eastwards. This inscription was issued from the residence (or camp) of Mudgagirī (modern Monghyr) by Govindacandra. Some Pāla inscriptions, however, indicate that he had to retreat from this area by the latter part of his reign.

2 Pāli Grant of V. S. 1171; Don Buzurg Grant of V. S. 1176; Gagahā Grant of V. S. 1199; Lār Grant of V. S. 1202; Pāli Grant of V. S. 1189.
3 JSORS., II, pp. 441-47; JASB., V, 1922, pp. 81-84.
4 EI., VII, pp. 98-100; IHQ., XXX, pp. 212-3.
To the south, however, the extent of Govindacandra's domain cannot be ascertained with exactitude. In the preceding section we have already seen that in all probability Madanapāla's territories were bounded on the south by the river Yamunā. The triumphant assumption of a new title Āśvapati-narāpati-gajapati-rājastrāyādhipati, which was generally used by the Kalacuri kings, together with the facts that some villages formerly donated by Yaśah-Kaṅa Kalacuri to his preceptor (rāja-guru), were transferred by Govinda-candra to another individual, and that the Kalacuri cointype was imitated by this Gāhaḍavāla king, indicates that sometime before V.S. 1177/1120 A.D. (the date of the B.A.S. Land-transfer Grant¹), some portion of the Kalacuri kingdom probably to the south of the Yamunā was annexed by Govindacandra. The existence of a prince belonging to the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, even after the fall of the imperial line, has already been noted; Śri Mahamandadeva, the husband of Uddalladevi, who issued an inscription in V.S. 1294/1237 A.D., appears to be a feudatory of Śrī Āḍakka)mall of the Gāhaḍavāla family. This fragmentary inscription of the queen has been found in the Nagod State, Central India, and records the erection of a shrine to Vindhyēśvara Siva. It is possible that the territory of the Gāhaḍavāla prince Āḍakkamalla was situated between the Yamunā and the Sone near the modern Nagod State area, and Govindacandra may have installed one of Āḍakkamalla's ancestors as a feudatory to rule over that region, recently conquered from the Kalacuri king².

² Vide supra, p. 25 and infra, chap. V, sec. III.
The Rambhāmaṇjarī-nāṭaka by Nayacandra refers to the birth-date of Jayaccandra which, according to it, was also the date of Govinda’s victory over Daśāṅga or Malwa. This statement regarding the conquest of Malwa, however, is not endorsed by any other literary evidence or geographical data found in inscriptions. It is highly probable that Govinda’s dominion on the south-west was bounded by the river Yamunā.

It has been noticed before that the Tomara king of Delhi submitted to the Gāhaḍavāla monarch and was suffered to continue as a feudatory. Evidently the repeated Yamini invasions descended upon Delhi, but as these invasions at that time were no more than plundering raids, they did not uproot the local Tomara dynasty; there is no reason to believe that at the beginning of Govindacandra’s reign this feudatory dynasty was not ruling at Delhi.

The above discussion of the insessional evidence shows that by the end of his reign Govindacandra, for some time, exercised political authority over the whole tract extending from Mudgagiri to Indrasthāniyakā. On the north his arms probably reached the Himalayas and on the south penetrated beyond the Yamunā, into the Kalacuri dominion. The kingdom which he inherited from his father Madanapāla was, however, a smaller one, bounded roughly by the rivers Yamunā, Gaṅgā and Gharharā. Moreover, the Gāhaḍavālas at that time were just recovering from the latest raid of the Yamini Sultān whose army attacked Kānyakubja and probably temporarily displaced them from that city. The inscriptions issued during the previous reign definitely praise Mahārāja Govindacandra for his victory over the

1 Rambhāmaṇjarī-nāṭaka (Bomb. ed. 1899) p. 4.
Hammūra (Āmit) and for a successful engagement against the Gauḍa army; moreover, there are indications that he was associated with his father in the administration of the kingdom. Evidently, even as a yuvārāja his was a capable and considerable personality and, no wonder, on coming to the throne he launched upon a career of aggrandizement and expansion. The onslaught of the Yamānī Sultan on Kānya-kubja, though a rude shock to the Gāhādavālas, was never anything more than a raid and the work of Candradeva was not undone. It is quite probable that Govindacandra, on coming to the throne, had not much to do by way of consolidation of his ancestral domain and his accession was very quickly followed by his first conquest.

Section II. Wars and Conquests

The earliest dated inscription of Govinda’s reign is the first Pāli plate which was issued in the month of Bhādrapada V. S. 1171/1174 A.D.1 In this inscription the new king is praised for having captured the navarājya-gaja. According to some scholars the term navarājya refers to the traditional nine geographical divisions and signifies the king’s conventional claim of being the leading monarch in the Jambudvīpa2. Other scholars are of the opinion that this term refers to Govindacandra’s recapture of the imperial city of Kānya-kubja from the dynasty of Gāḍhipur-ādhipati Gopāla3.

2 EI., XIII, p. 218; HK., p. 312.
3 EI., XXVI, p. 70, R. K. Ghosal has suggested that Gāḍhipur-ādhipati Gopāla appears to have occupied Kānya-kubja from Candradeva and ruled there for about 10 years from 1095 A.D. to 1105 A.D. But the Basahi Grant of V.S. 1161/1104 A.D., indicates that Kānya-kubja was made the Gāhādavāla capital sometime between 1100 and 1104 A.D., and there is nothing in the inscriptions of Candradeva to indicate that after conquering Kānya-kubja he lost it to Gopāla; further, neither the inscriptions of Candradeva
In a previous section I have shown that this Gopāla's reign-period falls, in all probability, before that of Candradeva. Moreover, the recapture of Kānyakubja did not make it a 'new kingdom'; it was a recovery of an old possession rather than a new conquest. So, if we treat Govindacandra's claim as a serious one, we shall have to examine other evidences. The findspot of the first inscription and also the geographical references in it give us a clue for the solution of this problem. Two of the place-names Pāli and Oṇavala have been identified with Pālee and Uneal on the north bank of the river Ghargharā in the Gorakhpur district. As during the reign of Madanapāla the geographical references do not carry us across the Ghargharā and also as the reign itself, being spent mostly in defensive warfare, was not a prosperous one, it is possible that this river formed a natural frontier of this king's territories. Kīrttipāla's inscription of V.S. 1167/1111 A.D. lends support to this view. This copper-plate was found in the Gorakhpur district, U.P., and although the place-names have not yet been identified, the country over which he ruled is stated to have been situated in the Darada-Gaṇḍakī-desa. Though it cannot be definitely located, it is almost certain that it was situated between the rivers Ghargharā and Greater Gaṇḍak. The date when the grant was made may fall within the reign period, either

and Madanapāla, nor the Set-Mahet Inscription of Vidyādhara, minister of Gopāla's son Madanapāla, contains any hint to a Gopāla-Gaṇḍavastra struggle. Under these circumstances, it seems probable that there was no such struggle at any time and Gopāla became the lord of Gāḍhīpura after Lakṣmī-Kaṇṭa's fall and ruled for about a decade till the Turkish raid descended upon Kānyakubja in c.1079 A.D. and paved the way for Candradeva's annexation of that city.

1 JNSI., X, pt. I, pp. 73-74, where I have suggested the identification of king Kirtti of the coins (Smith, CCIM., I, pp. 257 and 263; pl. XXVI. 22) with Kirttipālastra, who issued the Lucknow Museum Copper Plate of V.S. 1167 (El., VII, pp. 93 ff).
of Madanapāla or of Govindacandra. Except for a few silver and billon coins of Kīrttipāla no evidence is forthcoming regarding him or his dynasty. The Pāli grant of Govindacandra, together with its geographical identifications, findspot and reference to navarājyagaja, which he is said to have captured, is highly significant. Most probably Kīrttipāla's kingdom Uttara-Samudra or Saumya-Sindhu beyond the river Ghargharā, was the first new conquest of Govindacandra accomplished sometime between V.S. 1167/1111 A.D. and V.S. 1171/1114 A.D. either as a yuvārāja or as a king.

It has been noted before that even as a prince Govindacandra is credited with a victory over the Gauḍa army and probably the alliance which concluded the indecisive battle was cemented by a diplomatic marriage between Govindacandra and Kumāradevī. This alliance between the Pālas and the Gāhaḍavālas, however, did not last long. Though in the inscriptions of Govindacandra there is no mention of any war or victory in this direction, the geographical references in them prove, beyond doubt, that he did extend his kingdom to the east. The Moner inscription of V.S. 1183/c.1124 A.D.¹ shows that by then he had already occupied Moner in the vicinity of modern Patna in Bihar, while another inscription discovered from Lār, states that he made a grant from Mudgagiri (modern Monghyr) in V.S. 1202/1146 A.D. and proves that he was the master of that city by that year. It may be remembered that during the reign of Govindacandra's father Madanapāla, this area was virtually under the Pāla king Rāmapāla, who, for the time being, checked the disintegrat-

¹ *IBORS.*, II, pp. 441-47.
ing forces working inside the Pāla kingdom. According to Dr. R. C. Majumdar, the expression dhṛta-Madhyadeśa-
tanima, found in the Rāmacarita, means that Rāmapāla kept in check the growing power of Madhyadeśa which undoubtedly refers to the Gāhāḍavāla kingdom\(^1\). Thus the alliance, which was followed by the marriage between the Gāhāḍavāla crown-prince and Kumāradevi, a daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and the Chikkora dynasties, and a niece of the Pāla king, was not broken till c.1124 A.D. This seeming regard for the marriage alliance might have been the outcome of prudence as well as aggressive projects in other directions. The inscriptions of Govindacandra indicate that he had been utilizing this period to achieve victories in the north, probably against the dynasty of Kīrttipāladeva of Saumyasindhu, and, in the south, against the Kalacuri dynasty\(^2\). Hardly five years had elapsed after the last named victory when the Moner inscription recorded the Gāhāḍavāla king’s advance upto Patna where some villages were granted by the conqueror who annexed the adjoining territory.

Twenty years after the Moner inscription, another inscription was issued by Govindacandra in V. S. 1202, 1146 A.D. from Mudgagiri which recorded the grant of a village in “Pāndala pattalā in Govisālaka that belonged to Dudheli in Saruvāra”\(^3\). This grant was discovered at Lār in the Gorakhpur district; Saruvāra, which was mentioned once before in the Pāli grant of V. S. 1171\(^4\) together with Oṇavala (modern Unaül, Gorakhpur), also seems to have

\(^1\) HB., I, p. 165.
\(^3\) El., VII, pp. 98-100.
\(^4\) JBORS., XIX, p. 233.
belonged to the same district. This indicates that the village which was granted at Mudgagiri in V. S. 1202/1146 A.D., was situated in the Gorakhpur district. Some inscriptions, however, prove that Madanapāla of the Pāla dynasty had some hold on the Patna district in the third year of his reign (which falls sometime between May 1145 and May 1147 A.D.) and on the Monghyr district in the fourteenth and eighteenth years of his reign¹. It thus appears that the Gāhadavāla king Govindacandra lost his hold on the Patna district sometime between the years 1145 and 1147 A.D. The uncertainty of two years in the chronology of Madanapāla renders two explanations possible. Either, Govindacandra took the offensive sometime before the 15th April, 1146 A.D. and led his army in the Pāla dominion where he was in possession of the city of Mudgagiri on that date but was later repulsed by Madanapāla, who in pursuit of the Gāhadavāla army, advanced as far as Patna in the third year of his reign; or, it was Madanapāla who took the offensive before the 15th April, 1146 and temporarily occupied Patna, but was ultimately defeated by the Gāhadavāla king who, in pursuit of the Pāla army, advanced as far as Monghyr from where he issued the Lār inscription. Whatever be the real explanation, the temporary nature of the Gāhadavāla occupation of the Monghyr district is probably indicated by the fact that though the grant was made at Mudgagiri, the villages granted were situated in the Gorakhpur district. On the other hand, the firmer and long-continued hold of the Pāla dynasty in the district is indicated by the later inscriptions of Madanapāla while, in about 1165-67 A.D., Govindapāla is known to

¹ JASL., XVII, pp. 27 ff; and ibid., XX, pp. 43 ff.
have been in possession of the Patna-Gaya district. Evidently, towards the latter part of his reign Govindacandra suffered some reverses in the hands of Madanapāla and probably after the death of the Gāhaḍavāla king almost the whole of Bihar passed into the hands of the Pālas for the time being.

During the early part of his reign Govindacandra’s arms were directed against his southern neighbours, the Haihaya-Kalacuris of Tripuri. Yāśaḥ-Karṇa, the son of Lakṣmi-Karṇa, was probably one of those kings who were defeated on the banks of the river Yamunā by Govindacandra’s grandfather Candradeva, and the Kalacuri dominion retreated further south. The B.A.S. Land-transfer Grant of V.S. 1177/1120 A.D. indicates that further encroachments on the Kalacuri territory had been made by Govindacandra; the villages of Karaṇḍa and Karaṇḍatalla, which were originally given to the Rājaguru Rudra-Siva by the Rājā Yāśaḥ-Karṇa, were made over to Ṭhakkura Vaśiṣṭha by the Gāhaḍavāla king (cf. “Rājā-Srī-Yāśaḥ-Karṇadevena rāja-guru - Saivācārya-bhaṭṭāraka - Srī-Rudra-Sivapāśyo-bhikṣatvena śāsanikṛtvā pradattam .......etc.”). Moreover, this is the record where for the first time Govindacandra significantly assumes the well-known Kalacuri title Aśvapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatrayādbhīpati, presumably to celebrate his victory over that dynasty. The title does not occur in any of the grants issued before the year 1177 V.S. and even in other inscriptions issued in that year and the next; all the subsequent inscriptions, however, mention this glorifying title

1 IHQ., XXX, pp. 212-13.
of the king, and his successors also adopted it. The coinage of the Gahaḍavāla dynasty was considerably influenced by this conquest. So far the numismatic evidence shows that Govindacandra's father Madanapāla issued only billon and copper coins of "Bull and Horseman" type; Govindacandra, however, issued gold, billon and copper coins of a new type, namely the "Seated Goddess" (Lakṣmī) type, which was introduced in the Kalacuri dynasty by Yaśāḥ-Karna's grandfather Gāṅgeyadeva¹.

It is difficult to ascertain definitely which portion of the Kalacuri dominion Govindacandra annexed. The place-names mentioned in the above inscriptions have not yet been identified, nor is there any mention of the place from where the grant was made; but the existence of Āḍakakamalla of the Gahaḍavāla family in V.S. 1294/1237 A.D. in the modern Nagod State area, indicates that the territory annexed by Govindacandra may have been situated between the Yamunā and the Sone. The editor of the said B.A.S. inscription suggests that the land was conquered by the Gahaḍavāla king from Yaśāḥ-Karna; however, the facts that the last inscriptive date of this king is 1078 A.D. and that the only known date of his son Gaya-Karna is 1151 A.D.² show that the defeated Kalacuri king may as well have been Gaya-Karna.

It has already been mentioned that according to the Rambhāmaṇjarī-nāṭaka of Nayacandra, Govindacandra conquered Daśārṇa or Eastern Malwa and on the very day of this victory his grandson Jayaccandra was born and was named accordingly. Daśārṇa region at that time was under

¹ CMI., pp. 80 and 87, CCIM., I, pp. 257 and 260-61. and

² cf. Jubbulpur Grant and Tewar Grant.
the Paramāra dynasty and the contemporary kings were Naravarman and Yaśøvarman. The contemporary inscriptions and chronicles indicate that Yaśøvarman's reign was a dark period in the history of the Paramāra dynasty\(^2\), and that a considerable portion of Malwa was conquered by the Cālukya king Jayasimha, the Paramāra king having had to withdraw down the valley of the Kali-Sindhu. The position of the Paramāras at that time was extremely vulnerable and there was every possibility of their being attacked by the militant Gāhadavāla king who may have been allowed to pass through the Candrātreyā dominion, whose king apparently was a friend of the king of Kāși (cf. “Kālam sauhārddavṛtyā gamayati satataṁ trāsaśaṁ Kāși-rājāḥ” etc.\(^3\)). However, except the incidental reference in the Rambhāmañjari-nāṭaka, there is no other evidence—inscriptional, geographical or literary, to prove that Govindacandra ever conquered Daśārṇa and at present it is not possible to determine the veracity of that statement. The Paramāra inscriptions indicate that after the reign of Yaśøvarman, Daśārṇa or Eastern Malwa was for some time controlled by a line of Paramāra Mahākumāras who seem to have acknowledged the suzerainty of the Paramāra king\(^4\).

On the north, south and east, Govindacandra's foreign policy was one of an aggressive character, and it spelt war and annexation. On the west, however, he appears to have adopted a defensive policy. Though the Yaminī dynasty at that time was considerably weakened by internal feuds, the tradition left behind by Maḥmūd was too terrible to be

\(^1\) Vide DHNI., II, pp. 883-87.
\(^2\) Mau Insc. of Madanavarman Candrātreyā in EL., I, p. 198, v. 15.
\(^3\) DHNI., II, pp. 888-91.
forgotten in a century, and the sack of Kānyakubja by the army of Mas'ūd III was but a recent incident. It was quite in the fitness of things that Govindacandra would take all possible precautions to guard this frontier. The undated Sarnath inscription of Kumāradevi, one of the queens of this king says that “Hari, who had been commissioned by Hara in order to protect Vārāṇasī from the wicked Turaška warrior, as the only one able to protect the earth, was again born from him, his name being renowned as Govindacandra”¹. It has been suggested that this king, while reigning, fought another battle against a Turaška army and this time it was to protect Vārāṇasī². It may be remembered here that Govindacandra as a prince recaptured Kānyakubja and probably fought, more than once, against the Muslim generals sent by the Yamini Sultan of Ghazni. The Yamini Sultan, who ruled contemporaneously with Govindacandra, were Shīrzdād (c. 1115-16 A.D.), Arsalān Shāh (c. 1116-18 A.D.), Bahrām Shāh (c. 1118-52 A.D.) and Khusrav Shāh (c. 1152-60 A.D.). One of the chief causes of the downfall of the dynasty was a series of wars of succession and by the beginning of Govindacandra’s reign, one of the most disastrous of them was being fought between Arsalān Shāh and Bahrām Shāh. Sultan Sanjar of Khorassan took the advantage of the situation, sided with Bahrām and defeated Arsalān who took shelter in his Indian possessions. Bahrām became the Sultan of Ghazni under the patronage of Sultan Sanjar³. However, Arsalān, in an attempt to regain Ghazni, defeated Bahrām. Once

¹ EI., IX. pp. 319-28.
² DHNI., I. p. 529.
more the Sultan of Khorassan came to Bahram's rescue and this time it seems that Arsalan was killed. According to the Muslim historians, Bahram led more than one expedition to India. His successor Khusrau Shah was unable to resist the repeated attacks of the 'Guzz' tribe; consequently he had to retire to India where he spent his remaining years. None of the Muslim historians gives us any details of the expeditions led by these Sultans against India. Some of the provincial governors, appointed in 'Hindustan' by these Sultans, also exerted themselves, but their attention seems to have been concentrated on attempts to throw off their allegiance to Ghazni.

Varanasi, on the other hand, was well protected under the direct rule of Govindacandra whose western frontier was guarded by three feudatory dynasties, namely, the Tomaras of Delhi, the Rashtrakutas of Badaun and the dynasty of the Gadhipur-Adhipati Gopala at Kanyakubja. It might have been a deliberate policy of the Gahaçavala king to maintain the security of the western frontier with the help of these feudatory families. Judiciousness of these precautionary measures cannot be overestimated; for, though the central government of the Yamini Sultans was a weak one at that time, one of their ambitious governors of Indian provinces, Muhammad Bahlim, declared independence, advanced as far as the territory of Siwalik and, according to the authority of the Tabagat-i-Nasiri, founded the fort of Nagarawar. This happened in the reign of Bahram Shah who ultimately was able to defeat the rebel. No doubt, this uncomfortable proximity of the foreign

1 TN., I, pp. 110-112.
2 TN., I, p. 110; TA., p. 34; TF., I, p. 154.
invaders warned Govindacandra against destroying the feudatory dynasties on this frontier and annexing their territories.

Under these circumstances, though it was possible that some of the Muslim raids might have affected these feudatory areas and Govindacandra might have repulsed some of them, there seems to have been no possibility of a Muslim army penetrating as far as Vārāṇasi, the seat of power of Govindacandra. The praise bestowed on him for protecting Vārāṇasi against the wicked Turukka, does not necessarily refer to any specific battle fought against a Muslim army which came near Vārāṇasi; it may have been an appreciation of his general vigilance in guarding Vārāṇasi which was not only the Gāhaḍavāla capital but also a seat of religion, culture and learning.

Section III. Diplomatic Relations

Govindacandra's success as a conqueror and imperialist was to a great extent the outcome of his judicious diplomatic relations with some of the neighbouring dynasties. His marriage with Kumāradevī, the niece of Rāmapāla and granddaughter of Mathanadeva, checked the Pāla-Gāhaḍavāla feud for the time being and probably gave Govindacandra the time and opportunity for two of his conquests,—of Uttarasamudra from Kīrttipāla and of a portion of the Kalacuri kingdom from either Yaśaḥ-Karṇa or Gaya-Karṇa. Another of his diplomatic connections may have helped the Gāhaḍavāla king in his Kalacuri struggle. The Ratnapur inscription of Jājjaladeva I (c.1114 A.D.) of the Tuţmaṇa Kalacuri branch states that 'he was allied with the king of Cedī and honoured by the prince of Kānyakubja'. The

inscriptional evidence of the dynasty indicates that up to the reign of this ruler, the Tuṅmāṇa branch accepted the suzerainty of the Kalacuri kings of Tripūrī; but this open declaration of friendship with the overlord during the reign of Jājjaladeva I (c 1109-25 A. D.) shows that he had practically become independent. References to his victory over the Nāgavaṁśā Sōmeśvara and to presents or tributes paid by chiefs of different maṇḍalas like Daksīṇa-Kośala and Lañjikā, strengthen this supposition. It must be remembered that the political condition of the Kalacuris at that time provided ample opportunities for declaration of independence by a powerful feudatory line; after the defeat of the great Lakṣmī-Karna by the confederacy of kings, the fortunes of the Kalacuris were going from bad to worse. His son Yaśāṅ-Karna appears to have been defeated by the Gāhaḍavāla Candradeva, Paramāra Lakṣmivarman, Candrātreyā Sallakṣmaṇa and Cālukya Vikramāditya. No doubt, taking advantage of the inherent weakness of the central government, Jājjaladeva I declared independence, but like a prudent diplomat, he entered into friendly alliance with the powerful neighbouring king Govindacandra who was, by tradition, an enemy of the kings of Tripūrī. It is possible that when a few years afterwards the Gāhaḍavāla king occupied a portion of the Kalacuri territory, Jājjaladeva or his successor Ratnadeva either remained neutral or sided with the king of Kānyakubja and remained in possession of their territory.

1 DHNI., II, pp. 806-08.
Govindacandra’s Candrātreya contemporary was Madanavarman (c. 1129-63 A.D.). His rule marked a revival of the Candrātreya power; the inscriptions of his dynasty and also of other dynasties prove that he did indeed contest successfully against the kings of the Mālava, Cedi and Anahilapāṭaka. The king of Mālava was one of the three contemporary Paramāra kings—Yaśovarman, Jayavarman and Lakṣmīvarman; the king of Cedi was either Yaśāḥ-Karṇa or his son Gaya-Karṇa, while the ruler of Anahilapāṭaka was Jayasimha Siddharāja. The Mau inscription of Madanavarman further states that the king of Kāśi passed his time in friendly behaviour. Though there is no mention of such a friendship in any of the Gāhaḍavāla records, it seems quite probable in view of the fact that the Tripurī Kalacuris were their common enemy. Moreover, at present though there is no evidence to verify the information supplied by the Rambhāmaṇjarī-nāṭaka regarding the conquest of Daśārṇa by Govindacandra, such a conquest may have been possible with the help of the Candrātreya king whose kingdom lay between the Gāhaḍavāla domain and Daśārṇa.

The most interesting inscriptional evidence of Govindacandra’s diplomatic relations is found at Gaṅgaikonda-Cola-puram. This inscription is incised below an inscription of Kulottuṇga I, dated in his 41st regnal year and gives the Gāhaḍavāla genealogy in the usual style from Yaśovigraha to Candradeva. Though it ends abruptly, the date in the preceding inscription shows that it belongs to the reign of either Madanapāla or Govindacandra. The northward
expansion of the Coḷas at this time brought them into hostile contact with the Kalacuris, and Dr. H. C. Ray has pointed out that this probably was the bond of sympathy between the Coḷa emperor and the Gāhaḍavāla monarch; according to him, this inscription was probably written by some Gāhaḍavāla prince who may have visited the Coḷa capital\(^1\). Another evidence of the friendly relation between the two countries is supplied by the Set-Mahet inscription of Govindacandra (V.S. 1176) which records that the king made certain grants at the request of two monks, one of whom was an inhabitant of the Coḷa country. Oḍradeśa or Utkala also may have been friendly with the Gāhaḍavālas, as the other monk mentioned above was a resident of that country.

Literary evidence supplies further proofs of his wide diplomatic relations. The Prabandha-cintāmaṇi of Merutuṅga relates the story of an ambassador of the Cālukya king Jayasimha Siddharāja who went to the court of Jayaccandra, the king of Kāśī\(^2\). From the inscriptionsal evidence it is clear that Jayasimha’s rule extended from c. 1090 to 1145 A.D.; under these circumstances the name of Jayaccandra seems to be a mistake for the contemporary king of Kāśī, Govindacandra. It appears that some sort of diplomatic relation between Aṇahilapāṭaka and Kāśi was maintained even during the reign of Jayasimha’s successor, Kumārapāla, who ruled from c. 1145 to 1170 A.D.; the Kumārapālacarita of Jayasimha records that this Jaina king in his religious zeal sent ministers to Kāśi to suppress injury to animals\(^3\).

---

There is some evidence to show that cultural relationship prevailed between Kāśmīra and Kāśi at this time. According to the Rājatarāṅgini, Govindacandra’s Kāśmīrian contemporary Jayasiṃha “made the rulers in Kānyakubja and elsewhere......proud of his friendship”¹. Moreover, the Śrīkaṇṭṭhacarita by Maṅkha, the Mahāśāṅdhivigrahika of Jayasiṃha of Kāśmīra, states that Govindacandra sent one Suhala to attend the assembly of the Kāśmīrian scholars and officials which was held at the instance of Alāṅkāra, the Kāśmīrian minister (cf. “Anyāḥ sa Suhulas-tena tato-‘vandyata paṇḍitaḥ, dūto Govindacandrasya Kānyakubjasya bhūbhujah”²).

The above review of Govindacandra’s foreign relations shows that while the king aggrandized himself at the cost of some of the old decaying dynasties and some minor dynasties, he maintained friendly relationship with some of the great contemporary rulers. Though there is almost no reference to Govindacandra’s diplomatic relations in the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions, in the literary and epigraphic records of the other contemporary dynasties this Gāhaḍavāla ruler has been mentioned as a friend of almost all important neighbouring kings. There is no doubt that the third Gāhaḍavāla king held a position of high respect and consideration in the political field of Northern India. Govindacandra’s success in the political field no doubt depended to some extent on his able ministers and officials but his inscriptions do not refer to any of them. The Kṛtya-kalpataru by Lalāṃidhara, the Mahāśāṅdhivigrahika of Govinda-

¹ Rājatarāṅgini, II, bk. viii, v. 2453. (Stein p. 191).
² Śrīkaṇṭṭhacarita, canto 25, v. 102, op. cit., ḤK, p. 312 and Dāsgupta and De, History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 323 and 627-8. Also vide infra chap. VII.
candra, claims that the able assistance and counsel of its author helped the king in his path of glory (cf. "Tat-sarvaṁ khalu yasya mantramahimā 'scaryāṁ saḥ Lakṣmīdharaḥ'"). He is also said to have fought successfully with the enemies of the king of Kāśi (cf. "Nītā Kāśy-ādhīpasya yena ripavast-te brahmacaryaparam"). Lakṣmīdhara thus was not only a scholar and author, he was also a successful fighter and a great diplomat. The colophon at the end of the Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa records that Lakṣmīdhara was commanded by Mahārājādhirājā Govindacandra to write the Kṛtya-kalpataru (cf. "Mahārājādhirājā-Govindacandradevat-ādiṣṭena...Śrī-Lakṣmīdhara-bhaṣṭena viracitam...etc."). Thus the explicit references to the valuable services of Lakṣmīdhara and the excellence of his counsel in a work, written at the command of the king himself, amply testify to the influence of Lakṣmīdhara in Govindacandra’s court.

Section IV. Feudatories

The politico-administrative side of Govindacandra’s home policy has been described previously; to the west of his kingdom, he suffered to exist three feudatory dynasties, namely, the Tomaras at Delhi, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas at Badaun and Gādhipur-ādhīpatis Gopāla’s dynasty at Kāṇyakubja, and set up a strong bulwark against the invading army of the Yaṁīni Sulṭānas of Ghazni. If we accept Cunningham’s tentative list of the Tomara kings of Delhi, based on the study of the numismatic evidence, Mahīpāladeva, or more probably some of his successors were the contemporary feudatory princes. The Gāhāḍavālas, however, appear to have lost their hold over this region soon after the death of

1 Kṛtya., Dāna-kāṇḍa, pp. intro. 48-51.
2 CMI., pp. 80-85.
Govindacandra. The Delhi Siwalik Inscription of V.S. 1220/1164 A.D. proves that Delhi was conquered by the Cânäma king Visaladeva sometime before that date. It is possible that this first serious loss of the Gâhâdvâla territory took place after the strong arm of Govindacandra was removed. Of the Râstrakûta rulers of Badaun, Govinda's contemporaries were most probably Gopâla's sons and the grandson. The Badaun inscription of Lakhanapâla, which probably palaeographically belongs to the late 12th or the early 13th century, gives the names of the sons, all of whom seem to have ruled, as Tribhuvana, Madanapâla and Devapâla; the son of the third was Bhîmapâla. The dynasty of Gâdhipur-âdbipati Gopâla, which most probably was a different dynasty from the above one, was represented by Madanapâla, whose minister Vidyâdharâ is the donor of the Set-Mahet grant of V. S. 1176/1119 A.D.³

Siṅgara Vatsarâja's Kamauli grant of V. S. 1191/1134 A.D. reveals the existence of another feudatory dynasty. This grant refers to Candrâdeva, Madanapâla and Govindacandra; it describes the genealogy of the Siṅgara family and refers to Lohaḍarâja, the king and Vatsarâja, the Mahârâjaputra who was the donor of the grant. The existence of another feudatory line is suggested by the Kasia inscription which was issued by a northern branch of the Kalacuri dynasty, different from that of Gorakhpur referred to in the Kahla plates. This dateless and damaged inscription is written in the Nagri character of the 12th century. The Gâhâdvâla inscriptions prove that the dynasty was able to retain its political control over this region even during

1 IA., XIX, p. 219.  
2 EI., I, pp. 61-66.  
3 IA., XVII, 61-64.  
4 EI., IV, pp. 130-33.
Jayaccandra's reign. In spite of the Gahaḍavāla suzerainty, the existence of a line of Kalacuris indicates that this branch was a feudatory of the Gahaḍavālas. Any of the last four kings, namely Sivaraja I, the husband of Bhūḍā, Laksmaṇarāja III and Bhīmata may have been the contemporary of Govindacandra. Evidently, the inscriptive claim that Govindacandra was Samasta-rāja-cakra-saṁsevita-caraṇa was not an empty boast.

Section V. Coins

Govindacandra, evidently with a view to celebrate his victory on the contemporary Kalacuri king, not only assumed the Kalacuri imperial title but also adopted the Kalacuri coin-type. This type is generally described as the 'seated goddess' or 'Lakṣmī' type, and both Gāṅgeyadeva and Laksmi-Karṇa are known to have issued this type of coins in gold. Govindacandra adopted this type in his gold, silver and copper coins. On the obverse of the gold coins, the name of the king Śrīmad-Govindacandra-deva is written in a three line legend and it is generally followed by a trisūla; on the reverse is the rude outline of a four-armed seated goddess generally identified with the goddess Lakṣmī. A few of these coins are described in the Indian Museum Catalogue as of gold but most are of baser metals, so much so that some contain more silver and other alloy than gold. A hoard of 800 gold coins, mostly of extremely inferior metal, was found at Nānpārā in Bahraich district, Oudh, in 1887 A.D. The weight of these coins varies from 59 grains to 68 grains and they appear to follow the foreign standard of Attic Dracmas of 67·2 grains.

1 DHNI., II, pp. 748-751.
Govindacandra’s copper coins issued in above type are comparatively rare and these, like the coins of his father conform to the Indian standard of weight of 32 ratis or 56 grains.

Section VI. The King and his family

The Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions prove that the king was not only well-versed in the art of war and politics, but was also a great patron of learning and could appreciate different branches of it; in all the inscriptions he has been praised as Vividha-vidyā-vicāra-vācaspati. The Kṛtya-kalpataru, a work written at his command by his Minister of Peace and War, Lakṣmīdhara and the presence of his delegate Suhala in the Kāśmīrian assembly of scholars and officials, prove the king’s zeal for intellectual pursuits.

A few details about Govindacandra’s family may be gleaned from his inscriptions. Rālhādevī, who was probably his mother, was living even after the succession of her son to the throne and made a grant in V.S. 1189/1132-3 A.D.;

she, however, must have died sometime before V.S. 1198, because on that date the king observed the “Day of the great queen Rālhādevī” by a grant. Among the marriages of Govindacandra, the most important was the one with Kumāradevī, because of its diplomatic significance. This Kumāradevī was the daughter of Devarakṣita of the Chikkora dynasty of Pithi, who was a Pāla feudatory, and Śaṅkaradevī, the daughter of Mathanadeva of the Raṣṭrakūṭa

1 Indian Coins, p. 31; CML., p. 87; CCIM., pp. 250-257 and ibid Supplementary I, p. 65; Cat. Frouv. Cab. Coins (EB and Assam) pp. 34 ff. and ibid (Lahore) pp. 37 ff.
2 Pali Grant, El., V, pp. 113-15.
3 Kamauli Insce. of V.S. 1198, El., IV, pp. 113-14.
dynasty at Áṅga, also a Pāla-sāmanta. Mathana's sister again was the mother of the contemporary Pāla king Rāmapāla. It has been suggested in a preceding section that this marriage probably took place when Govindacandra was still a prince and resisted successfully the Pāla onslaught directed by Mathana in course of Rāmapāla's digvijaya. The undated Sārnath inscription of Kumāradevi shows that this queen of Govindacandra was a Buddhist. In spite of the diplomatic importance of this marriage, Kumāradevi appears to have been only an ordinary queen and not a patta-mahādevī or chief queen. Both of the other two queens enjoyed the title, perhaps one after another. The Kamauli grant of Govindacandra of V.S. 1176/1119 A.D. records a gift of Patta-mahādevī Nayanakelidevi, while the Vanagarmau grant of V.S. 1208/1151 A.D. records another gift of Patta-mahādevi Gosalladevi; both these queens were endowed with royal prerogatives. A fourth name, Vasantadevi, is mentioned in a colophon of a manuscript of Aśṭasāhasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā in the Nepal Durbar Library. Vasantadevi is described as the Rājñī of Govindacandra-deva and she belonged to the Mahāyāna sect of Buddhism.

Two of the sons of Govindacandra have been mentioned in inscriptions of his reign. Āsphoṭacandra-deva, who was endowed with all the royal prerogatives and anointed as yuvarāja made the grant of V.S. 1190/1134 A.D. Mahārājaputra Rājya-pāladeva made two grants, recorded in the Gagaha plate of V.S. 1199/1143 A.D. and Benares inscription of V.S. 1203/1146 A.D.; in the latter grant a

city named Rājyapālapura, probably named after this prince, has been mentioned. The successor of Govindaśandra, however, was neither uvarāja Āśpoṭacandra nor Mahārāja-
putra Rājypāla, but a third, hereto unknown son, Vijaya-
candra, the first inscription of whose reign is dated in V.S.
1224/c.1167 A.D. Perhaps the first two princes died in
their father's lifetime or perhaps, as some scholars have
suggested¹, there was a war of succession; but at present we
have no concrete evidence to prove the occurrence of such a
fratricidal struggle.

² Vide supra p. 81 fn. 2. A recent publication (History of
the Chandellas by N. S. Bose, Cal., 1956) depending mostly on
"available epigraphic evidence", has attempted to refute the theory
of friendly relation between Govindaśandra and the contemporary
Candrātreyā rulers. (Cf. Hist. of the Chandellas, pp. 81 and 87-88)
"Chattarpur is known to have been in the Chandella kingdom and
the discovery of a Gāhaḍavāla inscription there suggests that by
A.D. 1120 Govindaśandra has conquered the portion of the
Chandella territory" and "The Kāśirāja who is said to have spent
his time in friendly behaviour was no doubt Govindaśandra. But
the discovery of an inscription of Madanavarman in Chattarpur
dated in A.D. 1147 shows that he has captured the lost territories
from the Gāhaḍavālas by that date." The so-called "epigraphic
evidence", however, is based on erroneous identification of the two
Chattarpurs, the former of which is a village near Sheorajpur in
Cawnpur Dist. U.P. (vide Cawnpur DG., p. 334), while the latter,
it is clear from a careful perusal of Dr. Chakraborty's note (ASR.,
1935-36, p. 94), is the state of Chattarpur in M.P.
CHAPTER V

THE DECLINE AND DOWNFALL OF
THE GĀHAḌAVĀLAS

By the very beginning of the reign of Vijayacandra an unmistakable symptom of decline of the Gāhaḍavāla power manifested itself in the loss of Delhi. The full significance of this loss was realised when, about a generation later, the Muslims attacked Delhi region and occupied it, rendering the Gāhaḍavāla frontier practically defenceless. Jayaccandra, the penultimate king of the dynasty did not survive the defeat of Candwar (c. 1193 A.D.) at the hands of the Muslims; the dynasty, however, did not perish with him and the Gāhaḍavāla dominion was not immediately occupied by the invaders, as is evident from the Macchlishahar grant of Hariścandra, the son of Jayaccandra, issued in 1197 A.D.

Section I. Vijayacandra (c. 1155—1169 A. D.)

The last inscription of Govindacandra was dated in V.S. 1211/1154 A.D. and the first inscription of his son and successor Vijayacandra, in V. S. 1224/1168 A. D. It seems probable that after a duration of at least forty years, Govindacandra’s reign ended within a year or two of the date of his last inscription and Vijayacandra’s reign began c. V. S. 1212/1155 A. D. He may have ruled for about fifteen years, as is evident from his last inscriptive date V. S. 1225/1169 A. D. and his successor’s first inscriptive date V. S. 1226/1170 A. D.

So far four inscriptions, dated during Vijayacandra’s reign

1 El., IV, pp. 117-20.
2 Id., XV, pp. 7-13; El., IV, 120-21.
have been discovered. Of these, one was by a private individual and another by Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala of Jāpila, who appears to have been a feudatory of Vijayachandra; the other two inscriptions were issued in the name of the king but the grants embodied therein were actually made by Mahārājaputra Yuvarāja Jayaccandra deva. No inscription, recording a grant by the king himself, has been found. It is to be noted that these two official inscriptions are dated in the last two years of Vijayacandra’s reign and the two unofficial inscriptions also are dated in his last year. Thus there is a period of thirteen years intervening between the date of the last inscription of the preceding reign and that of the first inscription of this reign. The absence of any Gāhaḍavāla record relating to the period between 1154 A.D. and 1168 A.D., is rather unusual for the dynasty which had lately issued so many grants, and may indicate the possibility of an internal feud. It has already been noticed that Yuvarāja Asphoṭacandra deva and Mahārājaputra Rājayapāladeva, two of the sons of Govindacandra, issued land-grants, one after another, during the reign of their father whose successor, however, was a third son Vijayacandra. This may point to fratricidal struggle, but then Yuvarāja Asphoṭacandra and Mahārājaputra Rājayapāla may have predeceased their father so that, after the death of the old king who had been conducting the business of the state for a period of at least fifty years, the third son Vijayacandra succeeded to the throne. In this case the absence of any Gāhaḍavāla inscription may have been due to the crises brought about by the Muslim invasion and the loss of Delhi.

In the inscriptions most of the praises bestowed on Vijayacandra are rather vague and conventional. The
Prthviraja-Raso of Cand Bordai puts forward some concrete claims on behalf of Vijayacandra. But because of the chronological irregularities involved, this account cannot be relied upon. According to this source, Vijayacandra defeated Mukundadeva, the Somavarna, king of Kataka, who was obliged to give his daughter in marriage to the Gahaadvala prince Jayaccandra. The issue of this marriage was a daughter Sarhvyogita or Sarhvyukt, who married the Chahamana king Prthviraja. According to the same source the Gahaadvala king defeated Anangapala, the king of Delhi and Bhola-Bhima of Pattanapura and led expeditions to various trans-Vindhyan and southern regions. It is, however, generally believed that the Somavarna kings of Kosala were displaced by the Gaonas by the beginning of Govinda-candra’s reign, and no such royal name as Mukundadeva is known in the annals of Orissa. If Bhola Bhima is to be identified with Bhima deva II of the northern Calukya line of Anahilapataka, he cannot have been defeated by Vijayacandra, in view of the fact that his reign did not begin till a few years after the termination of Vijayacandra’s reign. Of course there is the possibility of Vijayacandra’s war with a Tomara king of Delhi, who, though a feudatory, may have taken advantage of the foreign invasion to revolt against him.

The Gahaadvala inscriptions refer to Vijayacandra’s successful war against the Muslims; it is said that he “swept away the affliction of the world by streams (of water) flowing, as from the clouds, from the eyes of the wives of the Hammira, the abode of wanton destruction

1 Prthviraja Ras, pp. 123 ff.
3 DHNI., II, pp. 1005 ff.
of the earth" ("Bhuvana-dalana-helā-harmya-Hamvīra-nāri-ṇayana-jalada-dhārā-dhauta-bhūloka-tāpah"). The Hammīra or the Muslim chief who fought with Vijayacandra, is generally identified with the Muslim general of any one of the last two Yamīnī Sulṭāns, either Khusrau Shāh (c. 1150-60 A.D.) or Khusrau Mālik (c. 1160-86 A.D.). Khusrau Shāh’s reign was harassed by the attacks of the Ghuzz tribe and, unable to resist them, he had to retire to India, where Lahore became his capital. By the end of his reign, Ghazni was conquered by Ghiyās ud-Dīn Ghūrī, who deputed his brother Mu’izz ud-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Sām there. Khusrau, the last Yamīnī Sulṭān, began his reign at Lahore. It is quite possible that, having permanently lost Ghazni and with no further project of expansion on the west, these two Yamīnī Sulṭāns may have concentrated their attention on India and consequently came into clash with the Gāḥḍavāla king Vijayacandra. One can easily assume that it was not a very hard task for the Gāḥḍavāla king to ward off the most penetrating of the Yamīnī Sulṭān’s raids in view of the obvious weakness of the later successor of Mahmūd. The incident took place sometime before V.S. 1224/1168 A.D. when it was mentioned for the first time in the Kamauli inscription of Vijayacandra. The exact date of the encounter cannot be ascertained. The Cāhamāna inscriptions prove that Vigrāharāja IV (Visaladeva) carried his arms up to the foot of the Siwalik mountains and fought successfully with the Mlecchas (cf. "Ārāvartam yath-ārtham punarapi kṛtvān Mleccha-viccedanābhir-deva Sākambharindro jagati vijayate Visalo kṣaunipālah" in the Delhi-Siwalik pillar inscription of Vigrāharāja IV of 1164 A.D. and "Dhillikā-grahaṇa-
śrāntam-asi-kālabhalambhitam” in the Bijolia inscription of Someśvara of 1170 A.D.; it is possible that both of them met the invaders near Delhi, Vijayacandra first and the Cāhamāna king afterwards. As the earliest reference to the conquest of Delhi by the Cāhamāna ruler is found in A.D. 1164, it is almost certain that Vijayacandra’s encounter with Hammira took place sometime before that date, as after the occupation of Delhi by Vigraharāja, who fought successfully against the Turuškas between the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom and the Muslim-occupied India, lay the territory annexed by the Cāhamānas.

From inscripal evidence it appears that after the death of Govindacandra, the Gāhaḍavāla dominion was attacked on more than one front. The Mādhāinagar inscription of Lakṣmaṇasena states that as a kumāra he captured Gauḍa and then he defeated the king of Kāśi (cf. “Yen-āsau Kāśirāja samara-bhuvijitā”) and sported with the women of Kaliṅga. The inscriptions of Viśvarūpasena and Śūryasena claim that either Lakṣmaṇasena or Viśvarūpasena raised pillars of victory at Prayāga and Purī. (cf. “Kṣetre Viśvesvarasya ... ... Trivenyāḥ ... yen-occair-yajña-yūpaḥ saha samarajaya-stambha-mālāny-adhāyi’’). It is generally believed that Lakṣmaṇasena really achieved some successes in these regions on two different occasions, once as a prince probably during his grandfather’s expenditures and once again as a king. In the previous chapter it has already been noted that there are different theories about the Sena chronology. According to the theories advanced by Dr. H.C. Ray and

1 IA., XIX, p. 218; JASB., 1886, pp. 41-44.
2 JPASB., V, p. 473.
4 HB., I, pp. 216, 221.
R. C. Majumdar, Lakṣmaṇasena’s reign began either c. 1185 or c. 1179 A.D.¹ which imply that his spectacular raid in the Gāhāḍavāla dominion, mentioned in the inscriptions of his successors, took place either during Jayaccandra’s reign or after his defeat and death at the battle of Candwar. According to another chronological scheme, Lakṣmaṇasena began his reign c. 1156-57 A.D. and led an expedition into the heart of the Gāhāḍavāla dominion sometime in 1157-58 A.D., before the “first anniversary of principal coronation (cf. “Pūrvaka-mūl-ābhiṣekah”, in Mādhāinagar Grant).² The possibility of the temporary success of such an expedition cannot be denied in view of the recent death of Govindacandra and the Ṭuruška war in which his successor had to fight. This war, which certainly took place sometime before 1164 A.D., may have taken place before the Sena raid also in which case the easy success and subsequent penetration of the Sena king into the Gāhāḍavāla territory may be satisfactorily explained. Lakṣmaṇasena may have taken the double opportunity, of Govindacandra’s death and the Muslim invasion of the Gāhāḍavāla dominion, to march upto Vārāṇasī and Prayāga, while Vijayacandra, the successor of Govindacandra, had hastened to the western front with the major portion of his army to fight the dreaded Turuškas and thus probably left the eastern part of his kingdom with inadequate defence. The Sena inscriptions claim definite success for the expedition and the Sena king is said to have defeated the king of Kāśi and erected pillars of victory at Vārāṇasī and Prayāga. It may be mentioned here that in spite of all these disturbances Vijayacandra is found exercising full political authority at Vārāṇasī (from

¹ DHNI., I, p. 386; HB., I, p 231.
² Dr. B. C. Sen, HABI., pp. 424-6.
where the Kamauli grant of V.S. 1124/1164 A.D. was issued by Mahārājputra Jayaccandradeva in the Shahabad district (from where Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala issued the Tārācanḍī Rock Inscription in V.S. 1225/1169 A.D.). In the succeeding years also, as is evidenced by the Benaras College (Sihvar) grant of V.S. 1232/1175 A.D. and the Bodh-Gaya Inscription of V.S. 124x, Jayaccandra was ruling in Patna and Gaya regions.

From the above discussion it is clear that, though Lakṣmaṇasena may have achieved some military success against the Gāhaḍavālas, there was no attempt at territorial annexation. The Gāhaḍavālas, no doubt, were temporarily embarrassed and possibly even their capital was occupied by the Sena army, but in spite of this penetrating raid, their eastern frontier does not appear to have suffered any considerable loss. In the preceding pages it has been noticed that, though the later Yamāṇī Sulṭāns and their governors in North-West India kept up the habit of attacking the Hindu kingdom, the raids planned and executed by them were not so serious in their consequences as those of Sulṭān Maḥmūd. To fight the Tūruṣkas thus may not have been a difficult task for Vijayacandra. After having defeated the Tūruṣkas sooner than expected, he once more hastened to the eastern front to recover the lost possessions and to re-establish his political authority in this region. Lakṣmaṇasena probably had no opportunity to follow up his military success against the Gāhaḍavālas.

An interesting passage in the Prabandha-cintāmaṇi appears to refer to these simultaneous attacks on the Gāhaḍavāla dominion by the Muslims and the Sena king.

1 El., IV, pp. 117-20; IAOS, II, pp. 547-49.
2 cf. H.B., I, p. 221.
According to it during the Cālukya Kumārapāla's reign (c. 1114-73 A.D.) a poet named, Viśvesvara came from Vārānasi to Paṭṭana, where he attended a literary meeting organised by the Jaina teacher Hemacandra. Later on the Cālukya king requested him to stay at his court; but Viśvesvara politely refused saying, that his heart was longing for the sacred place of Prabhāsa because "Karna has come to exist only in story; the city of Benares is scant of people; the bay steeds of Hammira neigh joyously in the quarter of Hari".

The hasty departure of Vijayacandra to the eastern front, just after the repulse of the Turuṣkas weakened his hold on the west, where probably he had had no time to set the house in order. The Rāso refers to Anaṅgapāla of Delhi, who was defeated by Vijayacandra. It is possible that the Delhi Tomara dynasty seized this opportunity to raise the standard of rebellion, but was defeated by the Gāhadavāla king, who, however, could not remain there long enough to re-establish firmly his political authority in the region. The Rāso story about Anaṅgapāla's rebellion is not endorsed by any other authentic evidence but the possibility of such a move should not be overlooked. The Cāhamāna dynasty appears to have reaped the richest harvest of the situation that followed in the wake of the Turuṣka and the Sena invasions on the Gāhadavāla dominion. The Delhi-Siwalik Pillar inscription of Vigranahāja and the Bijolia inscription of Someśvara of the dynasty, record the first serious territorial loss of the Gāhadavālas; according to these inscriptions Vigranahāja had already occupied Delhi probably in course of his expedition to the Siwalik hills in 1164 A.D. More than one inscription

1 PC., pp. 139-40; PCD., p. 108.
3 IA., XIX, p. 218; JASB., 1886, pp. 41-44.
clearly indicate that the Gāhaḍavālas never directly ruled over this region, and the ruling dynasty was probably their own feudatory (cf. "In the country called Hariyāna, a very heaven on the earth, there lies the city called Dhillikā, built by the Tomaras, where subsequent to the Tomaras, the Cāhamāna kings, intent on protecting their subjects, established a kingdom....") in the Delhi Museum inscription of 1328 A.D. and "The land of Hariyāna was first enjoyed by the Tomaras and then by the Cauhānas" in the Palam Baoli inscription of V.S. 1337/c. 1280). So with the passing of that city to the Cāhamāna hands Vijayacandra may not have suffered any military defeat and Vigrarājā may have occupied Delhi, when Vijayacandra was busy in the east in recovering his lost possessions. This conjecture is supported by the inscriptions of these two dynasties, none of which contain any reference to an encounter between these two kings. This incident may have occurred just after Lakṣmaṇasena’s attack on Vārāṇasī and Prayāga c. 1157-58 A.D. and certainly before 1164 A.D.

One of the military successes of Vijayacandra is indicated by the Tārācanḍi Rock inscription of Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala, issued in V.S. 1225/1169 A.D., it denounces a forged grant of the villages of Kalahaṇḍi and Vaḍapilā, secured by bribing Deū, an officer of Kānyakubj-ādhīpati Śrī-Vijayacandra. The fact that an officer of Gādhinagara, posted in the territory of Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala, was empowered to execute land-grants, shows that Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala was under the Gāhaḍavāla imperial authority. As the result of this annexation, the Gāhaḍavāla dominion

1 Eli, I, pp. 93-95; JASB., XLIII, pp. 104-10.
2 JAOS., VI, pp. 547-49.
extended on the south-east up to the river Sone. No record has yet been discovered to prove that this region was annexed by Govindacandra and it is quite possible that it was Vijayacandra who conquered it during his expedition to the east, which was launched to recover his authority in the region.

The inscription of Vijayacandra's son Jayaccandra, while eulogising his father, states that his bright fame, which met with no check in its playful course through the three worlds......and whose fame made intense the fear of the powerful kings when it strode along like Trivikrama in three directions (cf. “Loka-tray-ākramaṇa-keli-viśrāmkhalāṇi........yasya Trivikrama-pada-krama-bhāṃjī bhāṃtī projīṃbhayantī vali-rāja-bhayatī yaśāṃsī”1). This verse thus appears to contain veiled references to Vijayacandra’s successful operations in three directions, in the west against the Muslims, in the south-east against Pratāpadhavala and in the east against the Sena king for the recovery of his political authority. Śrīharṣa, the court poet of Jayaccandra, and the author of the Naiṣadha-carita is said to have composed an eulogistic work, named Śrī-Vijayapraśasti; it is possible that this was written in honour of his patron's father Vijayacandra and was referred to in the inscriptions of Jayaccandra which describes that his father's magnificence was sung by reputed poets (cf. “Prakhyāta-kīrtti-kavi-varṇita-vaiśbha-vāni”2). While bestowing conventional praise on Vijaya-

1 El., IV, pp. 120-21.
2 It has been suggested (IC., II, pp. 576-79) that poet Śrīharṣa, who formerly lived at the court of the Sena king Vijayasena of Bengal, and wrote two eulogistic works in honour of his patron and his dynasty, namely, Gaud-oruviṣa-kula-praśasti and Śrī-Vijayapraśasti. This suggestion is based on the Harṣa-bhāṣya Commentary by Gopinatha Ācārya (of unknown date) written in old Bengali character. (Vide Notices of Sans. Mss., Mitra, IV, p. 212.)
candra's elephant force, the inscriptions, have also noticed the multitude of prancing horses in his army. It is evident that Vijayacandra with the help of this army made a brave stand to maintain the Gāhaḍavāla glory, and the loss of political suzerainty over Delhi was balanced to some extent by the fresh annexations in the south-east. The remote effect of the loss of the Gāhaḍavāla authority on Delhi was, however, a serious one. The strategic Delhi gap which was controlled by this dynasty for three quarters of a century was now lost to them. Theirs was no longer the first dynasty to repulse the foreign raiders from the rich Antarvedi, the heart of Northern India. At Delhi, as the result of this occupation, the Tomara dynasty, which had ruled the region directly for about a couple of centuries, was uprooted. Instead, a governor probably of royal blood was appointed on behalf of the Cāhamānas. When the Turks knocked at the gate of Delhi under the generalship of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī, a brother of Pṛthvīrāja is said to have been in charge of that city. The system which the Gāhaḍavālas had devised for ensuring the protection and safety of the mid-land, as far as it was under them, by establishing a ring of feudatory states along the strategic points on the western frontier, could not now operate under unified control, as some of the regions, where this system had previously worked, were occupied by the Cāhamānas. This splitting of the responsibility for the maintenance of political integrity of the mid-land, between the two rival powers, may have steadily undermined the position of the Indians at their struggle against the Turkish invaders, the result of which was clearly seen, thirty years after the Gāhaḍavālas lost their hold on Delhi.

Of the feudatories of Vijayacandra, only one is men-
tioned in the inscriptions; Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala, the
chief of Jāpila, as we have already noticed, issued an inscrip-
tion, which refers to the king Vijayacandra, king of Gādhini-
agara. According to Colebrooke, who first noticed it,
this inscription found on the Tārācāndī rock in the Shahabad
district, ends with “Mahārājputra Śrī-Śatrughnasya” (“of the
great Rājaputra, the fortunate Śatrughna”); it was subse-
quently edited by Hall from a transcription, which ends
with “Mahārājaputraśceti”\(^2\). An undated Phulwaria inscrip-
tion (from Shahabad district) records a pilgrimage of Nāyaka
Pratāpadhavala to the Tutrāhi falls (in the same district),
with his family and in this connection mentions three of
his sons—Śatrughna, Viradhavala and Sāhasadhavala; on the
strength of this inscription\(^3\), Colebrooke’s reading may be
supported but it is strange that, like the son of the overlord
(cf. Mahārājaputra Śrī Jayaccandra-deva), the son of a
Mahānāyaka also was termed “Mahārājaputra”. The undated
inscription mentioned above, further reveals the name of
the dynasty to which this chief belonged, to be Khayaravāla.
Another short inscription on the rock, near the Tutrāhi falls
gives the name of the chief with a date—Sam 1214 Jaiśthya
vadi 4 Śanau (Saturday, 19th April 1158)\(^4\). A fourth
inscription of this chief comes from Phulwaria, dated about
a month earlier than the Tārācāndī Rock inscription, and
records the construction of a road by Nāyaka Pratāpa-
dhavala\(^5\). This feudatory chief thus appears to have ruled
at least for about eleven years from V.S. 1214/1158 A.D.

2 JAOS., VI, pp. 547-48.
3 PRAS., EC, 1902-03, p. 20.
4 Noticed by Kielhorn in El., IV, p. 311.
5 Ibid El., V, Appendix, p. 22.
to V.S. 1225/1169 A.D. Two other inscriptions of this dynasty are known; the Sone East-Bank Copper-plate refers to the reign of Indradhavala, the son of Sāhasadhavala (mentioned above)\(^1\); according to Kielhorn, Śrī-Pratāpa who issued the Rohtasgarh Rock inscription of V.S. 1279/1223 A.D., probably belonged to this dynasty\(^2\). The Khayaravāla dynasty to which Pratāpadhavala belonged is probably represented to-day by the Kharwar tribe, which still occupies the region round Rohtasgarh and claims descent from the sun\(^3\). Besides this dynasty all the other feudatory lines mentioned before, except, of course, the Tomaras of Delhi, seem to have continued to rule under Vijayacandra.

Like his father Vijayacandra too, used the titles vividha-vidyā-vicāra-vācaspati and aśvapati-narapati-gajapati-rājatrayādhipati; obviously those became the usual titles of the Gāhaḍavāla kings and were used by the last two kings also.

Vijayacandra’s reign ended within five months of his last inscriptive date, Māgha sudi 15, V. S. 1225 and his son’s coronation ceremony took place on Āṣāḍha sudi 4, V. S. 1226.

Section II. Jayaccandra (1170 A. D.—c. 1194 A. D.)

A Kamauli inscription records the coronation of Jayaccandra, which took place on the 21st June 1170 A.D.\(^4\); after a rule of about 24 years this king was most probably killed in a battle with Mu’izz ud-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī in A. H. 590/c.1194 A. D. He may be described as the

---

1 El., XXIII, pp. 222-30.
2 El., IV, pp. 310 ff.
3 Shabbad DG., p. 39; Palamau DG., p. 19.
4 Meo(lad Stone Insc., in JIRAS., 1927, pp. 695-96.
last great king of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. So far, eighteen inscriptions dated in his reign have been found; two of these were issued by private individuals and the rest by the king himself. Most of the grants were discovered in the vicinity of Vārāṇasī. The Benares College grant of V. S. 1132/1175 A.D. records the king’s gift of two villages in Māṇarapattalā, which is generally identified with Maṇiariipattalā mentioned in the Maner inscription of Govindacandra.

(a) Political History

In the inscriptions Jayaccandra is praised in conventional grandiloquent style; these inscriptions moreover, are singularly devoid of any reference to any concrete achievement of the king.

None of the contemporary south-eastern or south-western kings claim any victory against him. His Candrātreya contemporary was Paramardi, who ruled from c. 1165 A.D. to c. 1200 A.D. According to Cānd Bardāi’s Prthvirāja-Rāso, there was enmity between the Cāhamāna and the Candrātreya kings; the Mahobā Khanḍ of this work describes that the Candrātreyas, though assisted by the heroic brothers, Alha and Udal and by Jayaccandra, were defeated more than once by the Cāhamāna king¹. The historicity of the struggle between Paramardi and Prthvīrāja is borne out by a pillar inscription of the latter, dated in 1183-4 A. D. found at Madanapura; it states that, Jejakabhūkti, the country of Paramardi, was invaded by Prthvīrāja². Though there is no direct evidence to prove any alliance between Paramardi and Jayaccandra, it may be

¹ Prthvīrāja-Rāso, pp. 2507-2615.
² ASI, W/C, 1904; p. 55.
remembered that Paramardi’s grand-father Madanavarman was friendly with the Gāhaḍavālas, and the Gāhaḍavālas were but recently deprived of a portion of their territory by the Cāhamānas. Hence they may have quite naturally joined hand against their common enemy.

After the meteoric career of Lakṣmi-Kaṇḍa, the Kalaruci dynasty no longer regained any importance in the political field. Though there were some stray military successes to their credit, these actually got them nowhere. Jayaccandra’s Kalaruci contemporaries were Jayasiṁha and Vijayasiṁha. The former was called a samrāt who carried on successful wars with the lords of Kuntala, Gujaraṭa and Turuṣka. Of the latter’s reign, no incident is known. Neither of these two Kalaruci kings seems to have made any move against the Gāhaḍavālas and there is no reason to assume that the territory formerly annexed by Govindacandra was lost to Jayaccandra.

The Paramāra kings and the princes at the time were busy recovering portions of their dominions after the death of the Cālukya king Kumārapāla. In the Cālukya kingdom the drastic anti-Jaina steps of Ajayarāja, the successor of Kumārapāla, gave rise to religious troubles. Soon, however, he was succeeded by Mūlarāja, who again in a short while, was succeeded by Bhūmadeva. This king, though young and slighted by the Jaina chroniclers, seems to have been a general of no mean skill. According to Ṭabaqṭ-i-Naṣiri, Ṭabaqṭ-i-Akbari and Fīrishta he repulsed the first attack of the Ghūrī dynasty with such success that,

1 El., I, p. 198, v. 15.
3 TN., I, pp. 451-52; TA., p. 36; TF., I, p. 170.
not again in the next twenty years did the Ghūrī Sulṭān try to conquer the Cālukya dominion. However, neither the Paramāras, nor the Cālukyas seem to have any relations, hostile or otherwise, with the Gāhaḍavālas.

It has already been noticed that according to some scholars Jayaccandra’s Sena contemporary was either Lakṣmaṇasena alone, or both Lakṣmaṇasena and his son Viśvarūpasena. Lakṣmaṇasena, of course, was a formidable neighbour for the Gāhaḍavālas and appears to have overrun a portion of their kingdom. During Jayaccandra’s reign, however, there is no hint of a fresh Sena-Gāhaḍavāla encounter; the Benares College Inscription which records the grant of two villages in Mānara Pattalā near Patna in V.S. 1232/1175 A.D. and the Bodh-Gaya inscription of V.S. 124X, indicate that he was able to maintain the eastern frontier of his kingdom intact against the Senas. Moreover Indian literary evidence supported by the contemporary Muslim historians, indicates that Jayaccandra was “the greatest king of India and possessed the largest territory”, and a vast army, and when the Muslims came c. 1193 A.D. he was ruling over Kānyakubja and Vārānasi in full and undiminished glory¹. Under these circumstances, it is hardly to be expected that he should be temporarily driven from his capital and should lose even Prayāga for some time, as the result of a raid by Lakṣmaṇasena. On the other hand, since Jayaccandra’s reign ended c. 1194 A.D., and the Sena king continued to reign even after that date, his march to Kāśi and Prayāga may as well have taken place sometime after the date mentioned above when Jayaccandra’s

¹ Vide infra, pp. 109 ff.
army was routed and the vast Gāhaḍavāla dominion was devastated from end to end.

Jayaccandra is the only king of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty who is well known in Indian literature. This fame was due doubtless to his being the rival of the great Cāhamāna king Prthvīrāja, the most favourite romantic hero of the bardic tradition. Some of the literary works, dealing with the exploits and achievements of Prthvīrāja, naturally refer to Jayaccandra's career.

In the Prthvīrāja Rāso, Prthvīrāja is represented as a king who fought and won numerous battles. Among the great kings, who were defeated by him, the names of the Cālukya, Bhīma, the Candrātreyā Paramardī, and the Gāhaḍavāla, Jayaccandra have been mentioned. Of these the story of the Prthvīrāja-Jayaccandra struggle is painted in the most romantic colours, and it is still sung by the bards. According to the popular Rāso version, after the death of Anāgapāla, the king of Delhi, his daughter’s son Prthvīrāja succeeded him. His rival Jayaccandra is also described as a great hero who won many battles; in fact, according to Cānd Bardāi he launched a world campaign (digvijaya) at the end of which, he performed the Rājasūya sacrifice and utilized the occasion to celebrate the svayamvara of his beautiful and spirited daughter Saṃyogitā. The Cāhamāna king Prthvīrāja was not only not invited to the ceremony, but he was definitely insulted. Saṃyogitā, however, had already decided to marry him and secretly advised the king to attend the svayamvara ceremony; the king came incognito and carried away the princess after an almost singlehanded fight. Though this story presented by

1 Prthvīrāja-Rāso by Cānd Bardāi; Puruṣa-parīkṣā by Vidyāpati; Prabandha-cintāmaṇi by Merutunga, etc.
Cānd Bardāi is romantically appealing and consequently very popular, it is not corroborated by any authentic evidence and to accept it as sober history is certainly difficult. To begin with, we know from the inscriptive evidence, that Delhi was annexed to the Cāhamāna kingdom by Vigraharāja sometime before 1164 A.D. He was succeeded respectively by Pṛthvīrāja II, Someśvara, and Pṛthvīrāja III, the hero of the Rāso, all of whom ruled over the Delhi region.

There is no reliable evidence of conflict between these two kings, but it is quite probable that they were not on friendly terms but positively hostile to each other. Lack of sympathy between these two northern monarchs is shown by their mutual non-cooperation on the eve of the final conquest of India by the Muslims. According to the Kautilyyan statecraft, however, this enmity was perfectly natural.

(b) The Battle of Candwar (c. 1193 A.D.)

The Puruṣaparīkṣā of Vidyāpati, the Rambhāmaṇjarināṭaka of Nayacandra and the Rāso state that Jayaccandra met Mu‘izz ud-Dīn (Sihab ud-Dīn) Ghūrī many times and defeated him¹. All the Muslim historians on the other hand record that Ghīyās ud-Dīn’s brother Mu‘izz ud-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī fought two battles with Pṛthvīrāja at Tarā’īn and only one battle with Jayaccandra near Candwar.

It may be remembered here, that being unable to resist the repeated attacks of the Ghuzz tribe on Ghazni Khusrau Shāh, the penultimate Yamīnī Sultān, was obliged to retire

to Hindustan; twelve years after this, Sultan Ghiyas ud-Din Mahammad ibn Sam of Ghur captured Ghazni, drove away the Ghuzz tribe and bestowed the Sultanate of Ghazni on his brother Mu'izz ud-Din ibn Sam. The new ruler very soon resumed the interrupted eastern foreign policy of the Ghaznavid Sultans, introduced by Sultan Mahmud in the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. The Tabaqat-i-Nasiri states that the Sultan marched an army towards Nahrwalaah through Uchbaha and Multan in A.H. 574/1178 A.D.; fortunately the king of Nahrwalaah or Anahilapattana, Bhimadeva, was able to repulse this attack with great slaughter. After this the Sultan for some time concentrated his attention on the task of uprooting the remnants of the Yamini dynasty, which was represented at that time by Khusrav Mulk, at Lahore. This city was captured in A.H. 583/1187 A.D. when the last ruler of the dynasty surrendered. The Ghur Sultan, then directed his attention to the heart of India. Dr. H. C. Ray has drawn our attention to the fact that the C啊hamanias offered no material help to their cousins at Naclidula or to the C啊lukya king Bhima, when these two were attacked by the Ghurri army. When, however, Tabarbinda was reduced and handed over to a Ghurri officer, Prthviraja became active. He seems to have mustered many ratis, probably all of whom were his cousins and feudatories; Sultan Mu'izz ud-Din met him at Tarain; the king of Delhi at that time was Govinda Rae, a feudatory of Prthviraja. The Ghurri army was defeated at the battle but as the Indians did not

1 TN., p. 449.
3 TN., p. 455.
4DHNI., II, p. 1087.
follow up the victory, it retreated safely. Tabarthind, however, surrendered to the Cāhamāna king. Next year, that is, in A-H. 588/1192 A.D., the Sultān reorganised his force and came back. The hostile parties met again at Tarā’in and after the first clash a truce was signed; but this was ignored by the Ghūr Sultān and the Cāhamāna army was attacked when unprepared. The battle ended in the defeat of Pṛthvīrāja, who was either killed or captured. Then came the turn of Antarvedi, the richest portion of Northern India, ruled over by the Gāhaḍavālas.

Not only the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions but also the Indian literature and the Muslim historians bear testimony to the military strength of Jayaccandra. The cavalry and the elephant force of the dynasty have been highly praised in the inscriptions of Govindacandra and Vijayacandra. The literary works which dwell on the exploits of Pṛthvīrāja, necessarily mention his greatest rival Jayaccandra and his vast army. According to Cāud Bardāī, the army of Jayaccandra was so vast that during the march “the van had reached their ground, ere the rear had moved off”; the Suraj-Prakāś says that it consisted of 80,000 men in armour, 30,000 horses, covered with quilted mail, 300,000 infantry, 200,000 bowmen and battle-axes and a host of elephants with warriors. The Muslim historians also were considerably impressed by the size of the army which the Rāi of Banaras

1 TN., pp. 457-69.
2 According to the Prabandha-cintāmaṇi Sūhavadevi, a concubine of Jayaccandra invited the Muslims to attack Kānyakubja, because her son’s claim to the throne was not recognized (PC., pp. 183 ff. and PCD., pp. 139 ff).
3 Tod’s Rājasthān (Crooke), II, p. 936; Rambhāmañjari-nātaka p. 4; PCD., p. 113.
4 Elliot, HI., II, pp. 223 ff. and p. 251; Firishta, TF., I, pp. 178 ff.
possessed; according to the Tāj ul-Maʿāthir, a contemporary account, Jayaccandra prided himself on the number of his forces and elephants and "had an army countless as the particles of sand". The Kāmil ut-Tawārikh, another contemporary record, relates that "the Hindu prince had 700 elephants and his men were said to amount to a million; there were many nobles in his army. Firishta's account also, refers to "a numerous army of horses, besides upward of 300 elephants" which "Jayachund Rye the prince of Kunowj and Banaras" led. Both the contemporary Muslim accounts indicate, that the invaders were much impressed by the size of the army and the territory, which the king of Vārāṇasī owned; "Jaichānd, the chief of idolatry and perdition........was the greatest king of India and possessed the largest territory extending lengthwise from the borders of China to the province of Malwa and in breadth from the sea to within 10 days journey of Lahore". This account of the extent of his territory was, of course, an exaggeration, but this shows how considerable was the impression which the last great king of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty made on the invaders.

In the Rāso, Jayaccandra is said to have fought more than one successful battle with the Ghūrī king before his defeat at Candwar in c. 1193 A.D.; some other literary works, like the Puruṣaparikṣā and the Rambhāmaṇjari-nāṭaka also endorse this statement1. The Muslim historians, however, refer only to a minor engagement with the Gāhaḍavāla army and to the major battle at Candwar in which, the Hindu king himself took the field. Hasan Nizāmī in the Tāj ul-Maʿāthir records that after reducing Delhi, Ajmer

1 Vide supra 106,
and Kol the Sultan turned his attention towards the Gahadavala dominion; an army of fifty thousand was mustered and a vanguard under the generalship of Quṭb ud-Dīn met and defeated "the army of the enemies of Religion". This army, however, seems to have been a body of Gahadavala frontier guards and not the main army. Ibn Athīr in the Kāmil ul-Tawārīkh also mentions this incursion of Quṭb ud-Dīn, in the province of Hind, where he killed many and returned home with prisoners and booty. When Jayaccandra was informed of this inroad, he collected his forces and in 590 A.H. entered the territory of the Muhammadans, with a vast army. Then the second encounter between the Gahadavala army and the Muslim army took place at Candwar. "The infidels were sustained by their number, the Mussalmans by their courage, and the faithfults were victorious". Jayaccandra who was fighting on an elephant was killed in the battle, according to Firishta, by an arrow shot by Quṭb ud-Dīn himself. Great slaughter followed the victory of Candwar and some 300 elephants were captured alive. The fort of Asni, where the Gahadavala kings kept their treasure, was then plundered and an immense booty, consisting of gold, silver and precious stones was carried away. At Banaras, which was the centre of the country of Hind, "nearly 1000 temples were destroyed and mosques were raised on their foundations, the Raís and chiefs of Hind came forward to proffer their allegiance. The Government of the country was then bestowed on one of the most celebrated and exalted servants of the State in order that he

1 Elliot, HI., II, pp. 278-79.
2 Ibid. TF., pp. 251 ff.
3 TF., I, pp. 1929. For the following account see ibid. pp. 176-79: and Elliot, HI., II, pp. 251 ff, and 278 ff.
might distribute justice and suppress idolatry.” Later on Quṭb ud-Dīn was appointed the Governor of Delhi by the Sultan and Delhi became his capital.

Thus ended the last great stand of Northern India against the Muslim invaders. The fate of Northern India, however, was already sealed with the fall of Delhi to Mu’izz ud-Dīn Ghūrī and though Jayaccandra made a brave stand, it was but against overwhelming odds. The disastrous Cāhaftāna-Gāhadavāla hostility not only destroyed the political solidarity of the midland, the struggle which continued for about thirty years, wore out and weakened the rival parties who were almost equally matched. When Mu’izz ud-Dīn’s invasion on Hindu India endangered the safety of both Prthvīrāja and Jayaccandra, the latter made no attempt to help the former in his life and death struggle; but then, Prthvīrāja himself, as has been pointed out by Dr. H. C. Ray, does not appear to have helped the Cāluksya king and the king of Naḍḍula in their struggle against the Ghūrī Sultan; he made his supreme stand only when his own territory was threatened. Thus both Prthvīrāja and Jayaccandra the two great monarchs of Upper India were equally guilty of callousness and lack of political foresight and none of them could rise above the political trend of the age to appreciate the necessity of presenting a united front to the powerful enemy, who had already planted his feet on North West India. Când’s statement that Jayaccandra invited the Ghūrī Sultan to destroy his rival Prthvīrāja, has been rejected by all eminent historians and Dr. R. C. Majumdar has justly pointed out that “the invasion of this country was an almost inevitable corollary to Muḥammad’s complete victory over the Gāznāvīds in the Punjab”1.

1. An Advanced History of India, p. 278,
Section III. The Last Days of the Gāḍāḍavālas

For a long time it was generally believed that the Gāḍāḍavālas were wiped off as the result of the defeat of Candwar. The discovery of the Macchlishahr grant of Hariścandra, however, conclusively proves the continuation of the dynasty of Candradeva even after that disastrous defeat and the death of Jayaccandra. This inscription, which contains the usual Gāḍāḍavāla ślokas, was discovered at the village Kotwa, pargana Ghiswa, tahsil Macchlishahr near Jaunpur (U. P.); it records the grant of the village of Pamahai on Sunday Pauṣa sudi 45, V. S. 1255/January 6, 1157 A.D., by Parama-bhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja-Paramesvara-Parama-Maheśvar-asvapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatray-ādhipati-vividhavidyā-vicāra-vācaspati-Srī-Hariścandradeva. The names of the localities mentioned in the grant have not been read clearly, but the editor of the grant has suggested the identification of the village Pamahai with the village Poha in the vicinity of the find-spot. It may be noted here that the name of Hariścandra is found mentioned twice in the grants of his father; on the first occasion Jayaccandra made a grant on Bhādra vadi 8, V. S. 1232/August 10, 1175 A.D., to celebrate the jātakarman ceremony of Hariścandra; the second grant was issued on the nāma-karana ceremony of the same on Āsvina sudi 13, V. S. 1232/August 31, 1175 A.D. These inscriptions show that Hariścandra was about 19 years of age at the time of his father’s death c. 1193 A.D. It is difficult to imagine how this boy king sustained his position in the face of Muslim aggrandisement and it has been suggested that he owed his existence to the diplo-

1 El., X, pp. 93-100; IASB., 1911. pp. 757 ff.
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matic foresight of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī, who suffered him to rule as a feudatory. But the use of the full imperial title by the king shows that he claims to have been an independent sovereign and not a feudatory under the Ghazni Sultāns. According to Tripathi, it is unthinkable that this boy-king could maintain his independence even within a circumscribed area, when many a war-worn veteran had fallen. The storm, however, generally uproots the big trees but seldom a sapling and the Gāhādavālas who survived the Muslim attack, did not certainly possess the power which they once enjoyed.

The Belkharā Pillar inscription of Rāṇaka Vijayakarṇa further indicates that the authority of Kānyakubja was respected in the Mirzapur district (U.P.) in V. S. 1253/1197 A.D.; it records the erection of the pillar by a private individual in the kingdom of Rāṇaka Śrī Vijayakarṇa (cf. “Rāṇaka Śrī-Vijayakarṇa-rājya“)1. No reference has been made to Hariśchandra but the inscription is dated in the year of the ‘victorious kingdom of Kānyakubja’ (cf. Paramabhaṭṭārak-etyādi rājāvalī...aśvapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatrayādhipati-vividha - vidyā-vicāra-vācaspati-Srīmat - Kānyakubja-vijayarājya) Vaisākhha sudi 11, V. S. 1253 (April 29, 1197 A.D.). The editor of the grant was probably right, when he conjectured that, as the political condition of the country was extremely uncertain due to the Muslim invasion, the name of the king was not mentioned in Vijayakarṇa’s inscription. Only one year earlier, c. 1196 A.D., the sires of Bhagwāt and Bhīūlī situated between the Gaṅgā and the Karmanāśā had been conferred upon Muḥammad ibn Bakht-yār and the presence of an enterprising Muslim

1 JASB., 11, pp. 763-65.
chief in the neighbourhood, must have greatly endangered Vijayakarṇa’s safety in A. D. 1197. Under these circumstances, the prudence of avoiding a direct reference to the overlord of the kingdom of Kānyakubja in the Belkharā inscription, can readily be appreciated.

A careful study of the accounts of the Muslim historians show that Kānyakubja was not conquered in c. 1193 A.D. Only Firishta includes Kanauj in the list of the cities visited by the Muslim army in that year and states that the Sulṭān “took possession of the country as far as the boundaries of Bengal”; but Firishta’s account is a late one. According to the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī the Muslim army advanced towards Kanauj; it, however, does not tell us whether the army really reached the city or not; on the other hand, according to the same source, Kānyakubja was conquered by Iltutmish, who issued new coins to commemorate the occasion. The contemporary accounts of the Tāj ul-Ma’āshir and the Kāmil ut-Tawārīkh also do not include the city of Kanauj among the places visited and sacked by the Muslims in 1193 A.D. Not only Kanauj but also Badaun and Ayodhya are mentioned amongst the conquests of Iltutmish. So far as the Gāhaḍavālas were concerned, the Muslim invasion proved disastrous, for the reigning king was killed and the empire collapsed. But the authority of the erstwhile empire of Kānyakubja was not fully destroyed in the Antarvedi and the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty continued in the person of the boy-king Hariścandra. The Macchlishahr
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4 Elliot, HI, II, pp. 222 ff. and 250 ff.
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grant and the Belkharā inscription indicate that Hariścandra's authority was respected at least from Jaunpur to Mirzapur, probably on both sides of the Gaṅgā. Vārāṇasi also may have been included in his dominion. The Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširi, by including Banaras among the early conquests of Iltutmish, indicates that the earlier invasion of the city may not have resulted in immediate annexation. Further information regarding Hariścandra is not forthcoming and at present it is not possible to determine how long he reigned. The fragmentary stone inscription of queen Uddalladevi, found in Nagoḍ State, Central India, proves the existence of a Gāhaḍavāla prince in 1237 A.D. This inscription records the erection of a shrine to Vindhyēśvara Siva by Uddalladevi (born at Kānyakubja), the daughter of Mahāśāmanta-rāja Bharahadeva and queen (paṭṭa-rājñī) of Śrī Mahamandadeva, who appears to have been a feudatory of Śrī Aḍakka malla of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty (cf. "Śrīmad-Gabaḍavāla - kula-kamala-vikaśana-sahasram-su-Śrī A (ḍakka)-malla-sāmanta-saraṇ-āgata-vajra-pañjara-Śrīmañ-Mahamanda-deva-paṭṭarājñya-Śrī-Uddalladevyā") ; the date given corresponds regularly to the 12th March, 1237 A.D. The territories ruled over by these two chiefs, Aḍakka malla and Mahamandadeva, are not known, but the findspot and the reference to Vindhyēśvara Siva indicate that these may have been situated between the Yamunā and the Sone. It may be mentioned here that this inscription is one of the four, which refer to the dynastic name Gāhaḍavāla, and also that this is the second inscription which bears testimony to the extension of the Gāhaḍavāla authority to the Vindhyān region, which had previously been under the rule of

1 TN., p. 627.
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the Kalacuris, the first being the Land-transfer Grant of Govindacandra dated in V. S. 1177/1120 A.D. It is possible that after the conquest of a portion of the Kalacuri dominion, Govindacandra handed over the recently annexed region to a branch line of his own family which continued to rule in that area as a feudatory of the imperial family. The absence of any royal title before the names of Āḍakka-malla of the Gāḍaḍavāla family and Mahamandadeva, even after the collapse of the Gāḍaḍavāla imperial authority, is to be noted. As no further information regarding these chiefs is forthcoming, their political status and influence cannot be ascertained. Further, it may be pointed out that none of the known names of the imperial Gāḍaḍavāla line ends with malla and that the name of the husband of Uddalladevi i.e., Mahamandadeva is rather outlandish for a Hindu prince. The respective territories ruled over by these chiefs are not known.

The fate of the other feudatory states which once formed the part of the Gāḍaḍavāla empire may be noted here briefly. Some of the feudatory dynasties, no doubt, perished at the hands of the Muslims and their states disappeared; there may have been a few others, who still recognised the suzerainty of the tottering Gāḍaḍavāla dynasty; but the majority probably

1 In an inscription Muḥammad ibn Tughlak has been called "Mahamaṁda Śahi" (Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions of Northern India No. 682). Also, some of the earliest Muslim gold coins issued in India bear the legend Śri Mahamada Bene Śāme i.e., Muḥammad bin Sām. After the fall of the Gāḍaḍavālas these coins were issued in imitation of the seated goddess or Lākṣmi type of Govindacandra for circulation in the Doab region. (Cunningham, CMI., p. 86 also CCIM., I, p. 260, wrongly ascribed to Govindacandra). The Purusaparikṣā of Vidyāpati, who flourished by the latter part of the 14th cent. (HSL., I, p. 426) contains a reference to a Yavana king of Hastināpura, Mahamaṁda by name, (Darbhanga Ed., p. 26.)
took advantage of the situation and declared themselves independent. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Vodāmayūta seems to be one of them. An undated stone inscription of this dynasty has been discovered at Badaun; it records the erection of a Saiva temple during the reign of Lakhaṇapāla. Palaeographically, according to Kielhorn, this inscription belongs to the end of the twelfth century or to the beginning of the thirteenth century. Lakhaṇapāla is generally accepted as the last independent Hindu king of the region. Probably he was uprooted by Qutb ud-Dīn in A.H. 599/1202 A.D., when Badaun was occupied and later on given to Shams ud-Dīn Ilutmish as a fief. The Khayaravāla rulers of Jāpila also may have continued to rule in the Rohtasgadh region for some time. The Sone East Bank copper plate of V. S. 1254/1197 A.D., issued by Mahāmaṇḍalika Udayarāja of Kadambā dynasty, refers to his overlord Indradhavala, the grandson of Pratāpadhavala. The genealogy traced in this inscription claims that the Dhavala dynasty was founded by Khadirapāla; Pratāpadhavala, the third in descent, who, as we have seen, was a feudatory of the Gāhaḍavāla king Vijayacandra, was the first important member of the dynasty. His son Sāhasadhavala, father of Indradhavala was mentioned in an inscription of Pratāpadhavala. It appears that by A.D. 1197, Indradhavala, the overlord of Udayarāja was an independent and powerful ruler. According to Kielhorn king Śrī Pratāpa of the Rohtasgadh inscription of V.S. 1279/1223 A.D. is a scion of the Khayaravāla or Khadirapāla dynasty of Jāpila. In the

1 El., I, pp. 61-64.
2 Elliot, HI., II, pp. 216 ff, and 250 ff.
3 El., XXIII, pp. 223 ff.
4 El., IV, pp. 310-312.
inscription Śrī Pratāpa claims to have routed the Yavanas (cf. "Yavana-dalana-liḷā-māṁsalaiḥ" etc.); the Yavana, with whom he fought, may have been the army of Muḥammad, the son of Bakht-yār, who according to the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, received the sīefs of Bhagwāt and Bhiūlī, situated between the Gaṅgā and the Karmanāsā in about 1196 A.D.¹, and if this source is to be believed, this dynasty resisted the Muslim army for at least 27 years. The inscription of Uddalladevī implies the existence of another powerful feudatory, Mahā Śāmanta-rāja Bharahadeva, father of the queen, who was born at Kānyakubja. This Bharahadeva appears to have been a Gāhaḍavāla feudatory, who was probably ruling over Kānyakubja during Jayaccandra’s reign and was ultimately dethroned by Ilutumish². The Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī refers also to a Bartu, a chief of Ayodhyā³, who killed about twenty thousand Muslims and was afterwards overthrown by the eldest son of the Sulṭān Shams ud-Dīn Ilutumish. This Bartu was probably either some descendant of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty as Ray has suggested, or one of their feudatories. According to Minhāj, the city of Kanauj was another of Ilutumish’s conquests.

‘The limitations of the victory of the Turks’ are thus clearly manifested by the existence not only of the line of Jayaccandra but also of some of his feudatories and erstwhile feudatories, even after the battle of Cundwar. By the first half of the next century, however, the Muslim arms reached out and uprooted all these kings and dynasties one by one.

¹ TN., I, 549-50.
² Eli., XXIII, pp. 186-89.
³ TN., I, pp. 628-29.
CHAPTER VI

GEOGRAPHICAL DATA IN THE GĀHAḌAVĀLA INSCRIPTIONS

The Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions contain many place-names, providing a valuable means of ascertaining the extent of their dominion under different reigns. The places referred to in these inscriptions have not all been identified, but some of the identifications, which have been suggested, may be used in an attempt to fix the limits of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion in different periods of history. Sometimes although interesting clues may be found, it cannot be proceeded upon on account of uncertainty regarding the identification of the associated groups of places mentioned.

The first reign is that of Candradeva and the Candravati inscription of 1148 V.S./c. 1090 A.D., issued by him is the first inscription of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty\(^1\). This was discovered along with some other Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions from the vicinity of modern Candrauti near Vārāṇasī. This very first grant refers to Candradeva’s conquest of the imperial city of Gādhipura or Kānyakubja and claims that Candradeva protected the sacred places of Kāśi, Kuśika (Kānyakubja), Uttara-Kośala (Ayodhyā) and Indrasthāniyaka (generally identified with Indraprastha or Indarpat near Delhi). Two other inscriptions of Candradeva were found along with the one mentioned above, but the provenance of the fourth inscription B. A. S. Grant of V.S. 1154 is

\(^1\) El., IX, pp. 302-05.
not known\(^1\). The grants of V.S. 1148, 1154 and 1156 were made from Vārāṇaṣi while the Candravati inscription of V.S. 1150, from the confluence of the Sarayū and the Ghargharā, also called Uttara-Kośala (cf. "Uttara-Kośalābhidhānāyām-Ayodhyāyām"). Many of the places mentioned in these grants have been identified. Vaḍagavā village in Vāvana pattalā granted in V.S. 1148, is according to Chhotelal, the present Baragāon 14 miles to the north-west of Vārāṇaṣi. Kaṭhehalī pattalā mentioned in two other inscriptions has been identified with Kaṭehir the largest pargana of Vārāṇaṣi. The Sārnath stone inscription\(^2\) of Kumāradēvi, a queen of Govindaacandra refers to the battles, which Candradeva fought and won on the bank of the river Yamunā.

These geographical references give us a rough idea of the extent of Candradeva’s dominion. On the south and south-west it is bounded by the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā; on the west it probably extended upto Indrasthānīyaka or Delhi; on the north Candradeva’s dominion appears to have been bounded by the river Ghargharā, not including the Goṇḍa district to the north of Ayodhyā, where the political influence of the Gāhadavāla king may have extended across the Ghargharā. A Lucknow Museum plate of V. S. 1167/1111 A.D. issued by Paramabhaṭṭaraka-Mahārājādhirāja-Parameśvara-Parama-Māheśvara-Sṛi-Kīttipādādeva, indicates that the north and north-eastern portions of the Gorakhpur district lay outside the limits of the Gāhadavāla dominion in 1111 A.D.; this inscription records the grant of 2 villages (unidentified) in the Darada-Gaṇḍakī-deśa, by the ruler of

\(^1\) El., XIV, pp. 193-96 and 197-209; JABS., XXVII, pp. 228-41.
\(^2\) El., IX, pp. 319-28.
Saumya-sindhu (or Uttara-samudra), Kīrttipāla by name, whose independent status is evidenced by the full imperial titles used in the record\(^1\). Elsewhere\(^2\), I have suggested that *Darada-Gaṇḍakī*-(or *Darad-Gaṇḍakī*)-deśa was probably the name given to the land, which lay contiguous to a `darat' or mountain and the Gaṇḍakī. The north-eastern part of the Gorakhpur district fulfils these requirements and the plate also was found at Bhāṭpar, Gorakhpur. To the east the Gāhaḍavāla dominion under Candra may have extended up to the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Ghargharā and thus may have included the modern Ballia district. On the south-east the dominion of Candradeva appears to have touched the river Karmanāśa, as some of the villages mentioned in the Candravati grants of V. S. 1150 and 1156, have been located in Candauli pargana between the Gaṅgā and the Karmanāśa; these are Candāvali (Candauli), Majuḍa (Majwar) and Vudhāramauyī (Māvai?).

Of the inscriptions issued during the reign of Madanapāla or Madanacandra, five have come to light. Of these two were found in the Etawah district, one from Pratābgarh and another from Kamauli at Vāraṇasī; the findspot of the Bahuvarā plate, otherwise known as the Terry & Co. grant, is not known. The localities mentioned in the Basahi inscription of V. S. 1161/1104 A.D.\(^3\) and the Kamauli inscription of V. S. 1162/1105 A.D.\(^4\) have been placed in the Etawah district. The village granted by the first

---

1 *El.*, VII, pp. 93 ff.
inscription was Vasabhī in the Jiāvatī pattala, bounded on the east by Vāndhamūa, on the west by Vaḍathalā, on the south by Pusaulī, on the north by Sāvabhada; these villages except Vaḍathalā, have been identified respectively with modern Basahi, Bāndhmau, Pusaulī, and Sabhād in the Etawah district; in the second inscription Jiāvatī pattala is said to have been situated in the Pañcāladeśa. Aruresa pattala mentioned in the Badera grant of Madanpāḷa of V. S. 1164 7/1107 A.D.¹ made from Vārāṇasi, was probably the same as the district of Pratābgarh, whose old name was ‘Arot’. The localities referred to in the other two inscriptions are still unidentified². These identifications indicate that Madanapāḷa may have ruled over very much the same area as his father; it is to be noted, however, that while Candradeva granted land, as the identifications prove, in the eastern portion of his kingdom, inscriptions issued during Madanapāḷa’s reign record grant of land both in the east, in Benares region and in the west, in Pañcāladeśa near Kānyakubja.

The accession of Govindaçandra to the Gāhaḍavadāla throne ushered in an era of expansion. His earliest inscription issued in V. S. 1171/1114 A.D.³ was found at Pali in the Gorakhpur district, to the north of the river Gharharā; some more of his inscriptions were discovered at Gagahā, Lār, Don-Buzurg in Gorakhpur district at Set-Mahet in Goṇḍa district, all to the north of that river; the Pali inscriptions of V. S. 1171 and 1189 refer to Oṇavala (situated in Saruvāra cf. Saruvāre-Oṇavala-pathake), which

¹ JUPHS., XIV, pp. 67-77.
² Bahuvarā Grant (JRAS., 1896 No. 787-88) Rahan Grant. IA, XVIII, pp. 14-19, PĀSB, XIV (1876), pp. 131-35.
has been identified with modern Unaula in Gorakhpur. The Lār inscription of V. S. 1202/1146 A.D. refers to Saruvāra, which is mentioned in the earlier Pali inscription, along with Oṇavāla. Most of the villages referred to in Vāḍacaturāṣṭi pattalā, granted by the Set-Mahet inscription of V. S. 1186/1129 A.D. have been identified; these are situated in the immediate vicinity of Set. Thus the internal and external evidence of the inscriptions clearly proves that Govindacandra extended his dominion to the north beyond the river Ghargharā, most probably upto the foot of the Himālayas as early as V. S. 1171/1114 A.D. The Moner Grant of 1183 V. S./1127 A.D. which records the gift of two villages in Maṇīari (modern Moner in Bihar) pattalā shows that Govindacandra had annexed that region and the Lar plates indicate that Govindacandra's army marched upto Mudgagiri or Monghyr where, from the king's camp, the grant was announced in V. S. 1202/1146 A.D. The B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1177/1120 A.D. records the transfer of Karanḍagrāma and Karanḍatalla in the Antarāla pattalā, which once belonged to the rāja of Yaśāh-Karna; obviously the expansion of Govindacandra's dominion towards the south was carried out at the expense of the Kalacuri dynasty. Unfortunately, the findspot of the inscription is not known and the localities mentioned have not yet been identified. We can only conjecture that, as Candradeva, who fought many battles on the banks of the Yamunā, must have annexed the region upto that river, the

1 Ibnd., and El., V, pp. 113-15.
2 El., VII, pp. 98-100.
4 Jbors., XVIII, pp. 83 ff.
5 Jasb., VI, pp. 547-49.
Kalacuri region, occupied by Gobindacandra, lay somewhere to the south of the Gaṅgā or the Yamunā and to the north of, or in modern Baghelkhand. On the west, however, Govinda’s policy was not of expansion but of defence against the invasions of the Yamini Sulṭāns of Ghazni and their Indian governors. Thus we see that Govindacandra certainly ruled over an area extending from Delhi to Patna and for some time also occupied Monghyr. His kingdom on the north was bounded by the Himalayas and included the towns of Badaun and Set; on the north-east probably the river Greater Gaṇḍak was its natural boundary; further east some areas beyond Vāraṇaśī to the south of the Gaṅgā upto Monghyr were annexed; from Delhi to the region about the river Tons, the Yamunā and the Gaṅgā, appear to have formed the southern boundary; but near the Tons, Govindacandra may have annexed a portion of the Kalacuri kingdom to the south of the Yamunā and the Gaṅgā.

During the next reign, however, the Gāhaḍavāla empire suffered a great loss. The Delhi-Siwalik pillar inscription of Cāhamāna Vigraharāja IV dated c. 1164 A.D.¹ records that Delhi was already occupied by him. On the other hand the Tārācaṇḍi Rock inscription of Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala of Jāpila, dated in V. S. 1225/1169 A.D.², shows that Rohtasgarh region in the Shahabad district of Bihar acknowledged the Gāhaḍavāla suzerainty. Evidently the land between the Karmanāśā and the Sone to the south-east of the Gaṅgā was occupied and consolidated by the Gāhaḍavālas by this time. We have already seen that Govindacandra granted two villages in the

1 IA., XIX, pp. 215-19.
2 JASOS., VI, pp. 547-49.
vicinity of Moner; one of Jayaccandra’s grants refers to Māṇara pattalā¹ (to be identified with Maṇiari pattalā or Moner) while another was found at Bodh-Gayā². Though no inscriptions of these two kings have been found to the west of Fyzabad, the Somnāthpattan Prahasti of Bhāva Bṛhaspati, dated in 1169 A.D. refers to the Kānyakubja- viṣaya as including Vārāṇasi³; the statements of the Muslim historians also indicate that Kanauj and the surrounding regions were under the suzerainty of the Gāhāḍavālas during Jayaccandra’s reign. It seems that both these kings ruled over the territory which roughly extended from Kānyakubja region to the Patna district of Bihar; on the north, the Gāhāḍavāla dominion reached upto the Himalayas and on the south, it probably embraced the greater portion of the Uttara Pradesā to the south of the Gaṅgā.

After the defeat and death of Jayaccandra at the hands of Mu‘izz ud-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī at Candawar in 1193/4 A.D., the Gāhāḍavāla empire collapsed but the whole of the area occupied by the dynasty was not immediately annexed by the Ghūrī Sulṭān and the dynasty itself, represented by Hariścandra, the young son of Jayaccandra continued to rule for sometime. The only grant made by this king in V. S. 1253/1197 A.D. was found in a village in Machchhlishahr⁴; the village granted was Pamahai, not yet identified, and the name of the pattalā in which it was situated, could not be read. Another inscription discovered at Belkharā (Velaṣarā), a few miles to the south-west of

¹ BAS Grant of V.S. 1236 and IA., XVIII, pp. 142-43,
³ Vienna Oriental Journal, III, pp. 7 and 13, op. cit. HK., pp. 6-7.
⁴ El., X, p. 93-100 and JASB., 1911, p. 757 ff.
Chunar in the Mirzapur district, refers to Śrīmat-Kānya-kubja-vijayarājya. This inscription, issued by Rāṇaka Vijayakarna in V. S. 1253/1197, shows that portions of south Bihar also acknowledged the suzerainty of the Kānya-kubja king. In the preceding chapter, it has been already pointed out that the Muslim invasion of 1193/4 A.D., beyond Delhi, was more or less in the nature of a raid; though the Gāhaḍavāla empire collapsed, it was not immediately annexed by the Muslims. The greater portion of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion including Kānya-kubja, Badaun, Jaunpur, Chunar, Rohtasgarh, Vāraṇasī and most probably also Ayodhyā, continued to be outside the sphere of the Muslim political influence; some of these appear to have nominally acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, but possibly most of them continued for a short period, as small independent Hindu States.

We may next proceed to deal with some of the other place-names, not discussed in the foregoing paragraphs, which may have a importance of their own, as adding to the contributions to geography made by the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions.

The geographical denominations in the Gāhaḍavāla grants included viṣaya, pathaka, pattalā and grama and pāṭaka. The first two denominations are but rarely mentioned, the villages granted were generally located in respective pattalās and sometimes they are granted with pāṭaka ("sapāṭaka"). Pāṭaka has been explained by Kielhorn as an ‘outlying hamlet’; Lakṣmīdhara explains it as the family living in one part of the village ("cf. kulam grāmaika-daśaḥ pāṭakākhyāḥ").

1 JASB., 1911, pp. 763-65.
In the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions only Rāpaḍi is expressly described as a viṣaya. Koṭhatakoṭīvarthottara is not specifically mentioned as a viṣaya but the editor of the grant has taken it to be one. None of these two localities have been identified so far. Three of the land-grants relating to Gorakhpur district, U. P., however, supply the name of, what appears to be a viṣaya, with some of its pathakas, pattalās and grāmas. The first plate of V.S. 1177 records the grant of land in Pali and other villages in Siraśi pattalā situated in Oṇavala pathaka in Saruvāra (cf. “Saruvāra-Oṇavala-pathake Siraśi-pattalāyām Pāligrāma-prabhṛti-grāmeṣu”); the Pali grant of V.S. 1189 grants land in Guduvī grāma in Goyara pattalā in Oṇavala pathaka (“Oṇavala-pathake Goyara-pattalāyām Guduvī-grāma”). The third grant, made from Mudgari, and found at Lār, records the gift of Pōṭacavāḍa-grāma in Pāndala pattalā in Govisālaka, which is contiguous to Dudhāli in Saruvāra. (cf. “Saruvāre Dudhāli-saṁbaddha-Govisālaka Pāndala-Pattalāyām Guduvī- grāma”.) From these details, it appears that Oṇavala, Govisālaka and Dudhāli are pathakas situated in Saruvāra; two of the pattalās of Oṇavala are Siraśi and Goyara and another pattalā, Pāndala is situated in Govisālaka. Of the three villages Pāli, Guduvī and Pōṭacavāḍa situated respectively in the pattalās, mentioned above, only the first, Pāli, has been identified, together with its pattalā Siraśi, with the village Pali and the village Sirsī in the vicinity of Unaaula in Unaaula pargana (identified with Oṇavala) in the Gorakhpur district, U. P.

Besides the above localities, the Gāhaḍavāla land-grants refer to about sixty pattalās with some one hundred and fifty villages therein, very few of which, however, have been identified.
GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Most of the Gāhādevāla grants were made at Vārānaseśa and many of the villages appear to have been situated in the surrounding district. The Rajghat inscription of V.S. 1197, which was discovered in the northern outskirts of the city, records the gift of Bhādapa-nārīṇḍapa-grāma with its pāṭakas situated in Amavāli pattalā, which is identified with the villages of Bhadam, situated a quarter mile to the west of Rajghat and Nandesara, about two miles farther west in the Banaras Cantonment. Vaḍagavā-grāma in Vāvana pattalā, granted by the Candrāvatī inscription of V.S. 1148, is generally identified with the village Baragāon, 14 miles to the north-west of Banaras.

Kaṭhehalī pattalā, which Candradeva granted to five hundred Brāhmaṇas in V.S. 1150 is identified with the modern Katehir pargana in the Banaras district. The grant, however, excludes and enumerates the villages of three classes, namely those previously granted to Brāhmaṇas and to divinities and also the tax-free (vikara) villages; these are Bhāṁḍadaha (modern Bhandaha, two miles to the north of Candrāvatī in Katehir pargana, thefindspot of the grant), Paṇīhalī (modern village of the same name three miles to the south of Candrāvatī), Khajuri (a village or mahalla near Cungi), Laghukamavalī (modern Kamauli, eight miles to the south of Candrāvatī), Kuṇḍāma (Kunda, ten miles to the south of Candrāvatī), Soṇadahā (modern Sonadaham on Banaras-Gazipur road), Gulavaṭa (modern Guravata five miles to the south of Candrāvatī), Vaḍathalā (Barthala three miles to the south of Candrāvatī, and the unidentified ones) Ṭakaura, Talabhāma, Talahuti, Uḍeldi, Bhāyi, Lakhuvaḍavīṇḍi, Malenī, Dūṇā, Bhāgama, Utāḍhara-umha, Sēṃcalavana, Pavanāhapura, Sonaka, Upalāica, Adhiva, Caṭhatarā, Anadaurā, Anadaurī, Bṛhatsiū, Bṛhatya-
In the inscription Kaṭhehalī pattalā is said to have been bounded by Bhāgirathī, Barnā, Gomati and Kollaka-nandivāra. Thus Kaṭhehalī pattalā of V. S. 1150 is of very much the same size as the modern pargana of Katehir Kollaka-nandivāra has been tentatively identified with Kol Aslā near Katehir.

Some villages in Brhadṛhedevarāṇaḥ pattalā, granted by the Candravatī inscription of V. S. 1156 also have been identified; these are Gaṅgahaḍā (Gangehara, 18 miles to the south of Candravatī), Deuli (Deoria four kos to the south of Candravatī), Sirisī (six miles to the south of Candravatī), Bhadauhā (Bhadua in Katehir, three miles to the southwest of Candravatī), Manī (Manai across the Ganges two miles to the south of Candravatī), Māṇḍu (Madua-dih sixteen miles to the south of Candravatī), Paṭanā (six miles to the north of Candravatī), Kaṭhālī (Katari 8 miles west of Candravatī), Gaḍasaṭhā (Gadasarā to the south of Katehir), Gauḍī (Gauri six miles to the west of Candravatī), Candravalī (modern Candravalī), Maluyī (situated eight miles to the south of Candravatī), Vudharāmāuyī (Mavai pargana in Candravatī tahsil). In addition to the above identifications made by the editor of the grant, I may suggest the identification of Kaith-noonḍi, with modern Kaithi in Katehir. The villages, which are located in the pattalā, but have not been identified are, Goṁjara, Mayaḍasiṭna, Ṭakaulī, Ghadasitha, Chatterbhū, Bhathāthī, Laghukolī, Malivāḍa Saṅkhavāyī, Vamanā, Dighavaṁṭa Pakaḍiā, Kosaṇḍa, Indiṇī, Čaṅkalāṣi and Vareṭhā.

From the identifications suggested above it appears that Brhadṛhedevarāṇaḥ pattalā extended on both sides of the
Ganga and comprised portions of modern Katehir and Candrawati.

The village of Sarisoda in Bhandheevarakani patthalā, granted by the Candrawati inscription of V. S. 1150 has been identified with Sarsvara, two miles to the north-east of Candauli. A village, Majuada, in Vaṁkānai patthalā, donated by the Candrawati grant of 1156, was identified by the editor of the grant with the modern village of Mahuar two miles to the south-east of Candrawati. I, however, suggest that the name of the village has survived in the name of a pargana in Candauli—Majwar. If this identification is accepted it would appear that both the patthalās, Vaṁkānai and Bhandheevarakani may be located in modern Candauli.

Dhūsa village in Bhandheevaraṭha patthalā granted by the Kamauli inscription of V. S. 1172 may be identified, I think, with Dhus village in Dhus pargana in Candauli, and the name of another patthalā, Nandivara, in which the village of Palasauṇḍi was donated by the Banaras grant of V. S. 1187, appears to have survived in the name of another pargana in Candauli—Narwar.

The village of Gauli in Kachchoha patṭtalā was given away by the Kamauli grant of V. S. 1211 and another village in the same patthalā, Māṭāpura was donated by the Kamauli grant of V. S. 1233. Māṭāpur may be identified with the modern village of Mathia in Majhwa taluq in Mirzapur and the name of the patthalā appears to have survived in the name of a town, Kachwa, in the same taluq. The modern village of Bahuara in Barhar pargana, Robertgunj (Mirzapur, U. P.) may be the same as Vahuvarā in Bhailavata patthalā granted by the Terry & Co. grant of V. S. 1164.
Maṇiari pattalā or Maṇara pattalā, mentioned in the Moner grant of V. S. 1183 and the Banaras grant of V. S. 1232, has been identified with modern Moner in Patna district, the findspot of the grant; the villages granted in the pattalā by these two inscriptions, Guṇāve and Pāḍalī and Sarauḍā and Āmāyi, however, have not been identified yet.

Kauśāmba or Kosamba pattalā mentioned in the B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1233 and Meohar inscription of V.S. 1245, is the same as modern Kosam near Allahabad. Koṭhāravan-dhurī, the village donated therein, has not been identified but Mehavaḍa mentioned in the Meohar inscription has been identified with Meohar. The village of Bhadavana in Mahāvisa pattalā granted by the Bhadawan inscription of V.S. 1184 is identified with Bhadawan village in Karchhana tahsil in Allahabad.

The Baḍera inscription of Madanapāla (of V.S. 1164) grants the village of Sājā in Māṇighapura-caturāsikā which is contiguous to Arureśa pattalā. All these localities have been identified (by the editor); Arureśa pattalā is identified with the district of Pratābgarh whose old name is Aror and Māṇigapura is the modern town and pargana of almost the same name Manikpur; the Sājā village is now a small hamlet in the village of Samaspur-Saja situated in Samaspur taluq, Kunda tahsil, Pratabgarh.

The Ren plate of V.S. 1188, records the grant of the village Dasahalī, which is identified with Dasauli village, six miles to the south of Ren (the findspot of the grant) in Gazipur tahsil of Fatepur district. The name of the pattalā is read as “(? ) navattala pattalā.” On examining the plate I have found out that it may be read as Gānnavattala.

Sāsaimaua village in Koṭi pattalā is the modern Sisamau village which is a part of Kanpur city.
The Basahi grant of V.S. 1161, the Kamauli grant of V.S. 1162 and the Kamauli grant of V.S. 1224 record the gift of three villages respectively Vasabhī, Usithā, and Haripura in Jiāvatī or Jiāvai pattalā. Vasabhī is said to have been bounded by Vāndhamau on the east, Vaḍathalā on the west, Pusauli on the south and Sāvabhada on the north. Vasabhi village is identified with the findspot of the inscription of Basahi village, in Budhuna tahsil, Etawah; three of the neighbouring villages are also identified with Bandhamau, two miles to the east of Basahi, Pusauli, two miles to the south of Basahi and Sābhād two and a half miles to the north-west of Basahi. Usithā and Haripura are still unidentified.

By the Set-Mahet grant of V.S. 1186, Covindacandra donated the villages of Vihāra, Paṭtanā, Upalauṇḍā, Vavvalali, Ghosāḍī connected with Meyi and Payāsi connected with Poṭhivāra in the Vaḍācātaraśīti pattalā to a Buddhist saṁgha. The inscription was discovered at Set and the villages, excepting the first one, have been identified with Patna, about three miles to the south-west of Set, Belaha, near Patna, Ghosadi near Subhagpur and Bayasi, two miles to the north of Set.

Haladoya pattalā of the Kamauli inscription of V.S. 1182 is probably identical with Haladaya pattalā of the B.A.S. inscription of V.S. 1182 and Mahāsonamaua, the village granted by the former is identified with Mahson village in Mahauli pargana (Basti district). Agoḍali granted by the latter inscription has not yet been identified.

Gatiara village granted by the Bangarmau inscription of V.S. 1208, may be identified, I suggest, with Gathwar village in Pacchin-artha pargana, Bikapur tahsil in Fyzabad. The name of the pattalā, whose last two letters are almost
illegible may be tentatively read as Bhīmamayūtāsa (ahsā?).

Vaḍagrāma in Alāpa pattalā granted by the Don Buzurg grant of V. S. 1176 has been identified with the modern village of Bargāon in Sālempur pargana in Gorakhpur.

Besides the above mentioned localities, whose identifications have been suggested, there are many other pattalās, villages and other unspecified localities which have not yet been identified. These are the villages of Maṃḍalā with Alāhvimahāpura (Don Buzurg grant of V.S. 1176), Deūpāli in Ambuālī on Daivahā or Gogra (B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1234), Kemali in Asureśa pattalā (Fyzabad grant of V.S. 1240), Karanḍagrāma and Karanḍratalla in Antarāla pattalā (B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1177), Osia in Bṛhadgrekomisāra pattalā (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1126), Dayaḍāma in Dayaḍāmi (B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1236), Nāgaltī in Devahalī (B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1225), Maṃḍarā and Kaḍahī in Dehaduāra pattalā (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1239), Aḥuāma in Dhanesaramaua (B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1154), Kuṇḍala in Hathauṇḍa (Gagaha grant of V.S. 1199), Avelāvaṭu and Saleṭi in Jāruttha (B.A.S. grant of V.S. 1136), Vaḍesara in Kaṅgalī (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1232), Sunāhī in Kesaure (?) (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1174), Bhānī in Maḍavattala (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1184), Kusuphaṭā in Mahas (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1128), Perōha in Mahasoya (Machhlishahr grant of V.S. 1201), Kaḍāśī in Maṅgalajaṭi (Itaunja grant of V.S. 1186), Kaṇāuta in Nandiṇī (Banaras grant of V.S. 1187), Sohaṭhjaka and Laṁkācaḍa in Navagrāma pattalā (Raiwan grant of V.S. 1187 and Kamauli grant of V.S. 1198), Sulatenni village in Neulasatāvisikā pattalā (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1178), Goḍanti in Paścimacchapana pattalā in the Antarvedi (B. A. S. grant of V.S. 1233), Jaragāma in Puroha (Banaras grant of V.S. 1185),
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Janakadevipura in Rāna (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1196), Urnbari in Rudamauavayalisi (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1190), Rāmaitha in Singurodh (Rahan grant of V.S. 1166), Kāila in Temisapatottara (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1200), Acchavalī in Ughaṇṭerahottara (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1175), Lolirupāḍā (the use of the vernacularized word 'pāḍā' is interesting) in Urnhrālā pattalā (Banaras grant of V. S. 1207), Ahentī, Sarasā and Aṭhasuā in Unāvisa pattalā (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1230). Khāṁbhamaua in Vajairthā-cchāsaṭhi (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1231), Viṣṇupura (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1162), Ajāvṛṣanagara (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1191), Śriṣapratiṣṭhāna (B. A. S. grant of V. S. 1182), Rājyapālapura (Banaras grant of V. S. 1203), Asatikā (Rahan grant of V. S. 1166), Vaḍavihagrāma (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1226), Raṇḍavai on the Ganga (B. A. S. grant of V. S. 1236).
CHAPTER VII

THE GĀHAḌAVĀLA ADMINISTRATION

Section I. Politico-administrative Divisions

The Gāhaḍavālas during their palmy days exercised suzerainty over an area extending roughly from the region around modern Delhi to the district of Patna and from the foot of the Himālayas to the south bank of the Yamunā. Inscriptions indicate that the whole of this vast area was not under the direct rule of the Gāhaḍavāla monarchs; there were some semi-independent feudatory chiefs variously styled as Rāṇaka, Mahānāyaka, Rājā and Mahārāja. Rāṇaka Lavarāpravāha is recorded to have granted the village Rāmāśtha in Siguroḍha pattalā during the reign of Madanapāla. The Kamauli plate of V. S. 1191 records the gift of the village Ambuvāra in the Rāpaḍi viṣaya by the Mahārājaputra Vatsarāja of the Śiṅgara family. As the place-names mentioned in these two inscriptions have not yet been identified, it is not possible to locate the respective areas ruled over by these two Gāhaḍavāla feudatories. The states of the other two feudatories, Mahānāyaka, Pratāpadhavala of Jāpila and Rāṇaka Vijayakarṇa were situated respectively in the Rohtasgaḍh and the Mirzapur districts. The existence of a chief, named Madana of the line of Gāḍhipurāḍhi-pati Gopāla is attested by the Set-Mahet inscription of V. S. 1176 issued by his influential minister Vidyādhara.

1 IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.
2 EI., IV, pp. 130-33.
3 IAOS., VI, pp. 547-49.
4 JASB., 1911, pp. 753-65.
5 IA., XVII, pp. 61-64; JPASB., 1925, XXI (N.S.) pp. 105 ff.
The fragmentary stone inscription of queen Uddalladevi proves the existence of a prince, belonging to the Gāhaḍavāla lineage in V. S. 1294 (1237 A. D.). The status of this prince is not clearly stated in the inscription, but he may have belonged to a branch of the Gāhaḍavāla family, which was feudatory to the Imperial Gāhaḍavālas of Vārāṇasi. From the context of this fragmentary stone inscription, it appears that Śri Mahamandadeva, the husband of Uddalladevi, was a feudatory of Śri Aḍakamalla and the territory ruled over by him may have been situated in the southern part of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion near the Vindhyas. Besides these, there seem to have been some other ruling dynasties, which acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gāhaḍavālas; both the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty at Badaun and the Tomara dynasty at Delhi were most probably subordinate to the Gāhaḍavālas and there also appears to have been a Kalacuri dynasty at Kasia. Thus the geographical references, so far as they have been identified, indicate that these feudatory states were situated mostly on the frontiers of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion and it has already been suggested in a previous chapter, that the protection of the frontier with the help of the feudatory rulers was probably a deliberate policy of the Gāhaḍavālas. Lakṣmīdhara’s commentary, in favour of appointment of local persons (tad-deśajātāh) in frontier regions, (pratyantesu) also point to the same conclusion.

The kingdom proper, which was under the direct rule of the Gāhaḍavāla monarchs (svamanḍala of Lakṣmīdhara), was divided and subdivided into many administrative units.

2 Vide supra, p. 85.
3 Kṛtya., Rājadharmakāṇḍa, pp. (tx.) 31-32.
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The smallest unit mentioned, of course, was the village or the grāma. Some of these villages had one or more pāṭakas or outlying hamlets. The Gahaḍavāla inscriptions refer to about one hundred and fifty villages, a few of which have been identified.

The next administrative division was pattalā. The villages granted were mostly located in respective pattalās and the Gahaḍavāla landgrants mention about sixty pattalās. As relevant data are not available, it is not easy to determine the average dimension of a pattalā or the number of villages a pattalā generally comprised. Some of the pattalās, however, appear to have comprised a fairly large number of villages. Thus the Candrāvatī inscription of V.S. 1150 records the gift of the Kaṭhehalī pattalā with the exclusion of thirty-six villages already given away (cf. “pūrva-datta-deva-dvija-vikara-grāma-varjita”), and that of V. S. 1156 grants thirty villages in Bṛhaḍṛhevedaraṭha pattalā. The names of two of the pattalās, Vādacaturāṣṭī and Māṇighapura-caturāṣīkā apparently suggest that these two consisted of eighty-four villages each. Actually, they seem to be reminiscent of the traditional clan-holdings of Western India, each of which generally consisted of forty-two, eighty-four or one hundred and twenty-six units; this system of agrarian settlement may have been introduced in the Doab region by the Imperial Pratihāras. But by the

1 Cf. “Kulaṁ grām-aikadesaḥ pāṭakākhyāḥ” (Krtya, Rājadhar-makāṇḍa, p. (tx.) 81).

2 El., XIV, pp. 195 and 198.

3 JUPHS., 1941, p. 75. The editor of the grant read vaturāṣīkā which cannot be explained. As, however, va and ca of this period were very much similar and could easily be confused by a scribe, I think, what looks like vaturāṣīkā is the result of a scribe’s mistake for the correct word caturāṣīkā, a reminiscent of the traditional clan-holding of 84 units. Also vide ASAl., p. 66.
time of the Gāhaḍavālas these had ceased to be clan-hold-
ings, being already absorbed in the king’s dominion and conveniently forming administrative units, after possible readjustments. Under the new system, older names may have been retained, but the number denoted by them may have continued in a conventional sense, so that one cannot be sure if a pattalā actually comprised eighty-four villages, even when its name suggests it.¹

The next two administrative divisions, pathaka and viṣaya are but rarely mentioned in the Gāhaḍavāla records. Some pathakas, namely, Oṇavalā, Govisālaka and probably also Dūdhāli were situated within Saruvāra; these were subdivided into pattalās. It has been suggested by Kielhorn that, both Saruvāra or Sru(gā)-ra (as misread in the Kamauli inscription of V. S. 1176 and Koṭhatokoṭiāvarahottara were districts, that is, viṣayas. It is, however, curious that the villages granted in Rāpaḍī viṣaya and Koṭhotakoṭiāvarahottara are mentioned as being located directly in these two viṣayas, without any references to the intermediate admin-
istrative units like pathakas or pattalās².

Besides these administrative units, there were also patta-
nas, towns and cities, from where some of the Gāhaḍavāla grants were made. Sometimes they appear to have been named after kings or the crown-princes, as is shown by the name Rājayapālapura, on the Gaṅgā (unidentified) where Mahārājaputra Rājayapāladeva made a grant in V. S. 1203³.

¹ The name of another pattalā or pattali, Neulaśatāvisikā, men-
tioned in the Kamauli grant of V. S. 1178, likewise indicates that originally it may have consisted of one hundred and twenty units.

² Kamauli Insc. of V. S. 1191 (El., IV, pp. 130-33) and V. S. 1176 (ibid, pp. 107-9).

³ Banaras Grant of V. S. 1203 (El., VIII, pp. 150 ff.).
The practice of naming a place after a king or a crown-prince was well-known in India.¹

Section II. Administration

(a) Central Government

The central government under the Gāhaḍavālas consisted of the king, the queen and the princes, all of whom exercised royal prerogatives, and a number of officials most of whom were in charge of different administrative departments. Some of these officials are mentioned in the land-grants of this dynasty and are described as the rājapuruṣas. Lakṣmīdhara in the Kṛtyakalpataru refers to the king’s officials as amātyas and discusses in detail their requisite qualifications, duties and responsibilities.

King, Queen and Princes: The kingship in the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty was hereditary and from Candradeva, the first independent king of the dynasty to Hariścandra, the last one, we find an unbroken line of successors for six generations, the son always following the father, in order of succession. In fact, kingship in contemporary India was hereditary everywhere; in the absence of any direct successor usually a collateral line stepped in.

The epithets used by the first king of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty were paramabhaṭṭāraka-mabārājādbirāja-paramēśvara; these were conventional expressions of sovereignty used by independent rulers. They further claim to have been served by samasta-rāja-cakra that is, the whole circle of kings (cf. rājacakravartin). That this claim is not merely conventional, is proved by the references to more than one feudatory chief

¹ Also cf. Govinda-vātikā, where Govindacandra bathed before making the grant recorded in the Kamauli plate of V.S. 1190. (El., IV, p. 112).
in the Gāhaḍavāla documents. There is a good deal of controversy over the significance of another title, which was assumed by Govindacandra and was continued to be used by his successors, namely, aśvapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatraya
ādhipati. According to some scholars narapati and gajapati refer to the respective rulers of Teliṅgānā and Karṇāta, while according to another suggestion, those three terms are indicative of different classes of feudatories. It is interesting to note that the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions also refer to three different designations of feudatories, mahānāyaka, rāṇaka and mahārāja. Separately, the terms aśvapati, gajapati and narapati were used by many contemporary kings, but the group of titles mentioned above, as used by the Gāhaḍavāla kings, is found to have been used by the Kalacuri kings as well. The study of the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions shows that the exact Kalacuri form of the title was never used by the Gāhaḍavāla kings before the defeat of the Kalacuri king (either Yaśāḥ-Karṇa or Gaya-Karṇa) by Govindacandra, but almost always after it. The later Pāla kings, Viśvarūpa
sena and Sūryasena also used this group of titles probably after the spectacular Pāla success against the Gāhaḍavāla king during the reign of Laksṭmaṇasena. Some of the inscriptions of Candradeva claim that Narapati, Gajapati, Trisamkupati and Giripati submitted to his prowess; the use of the last two terms may show, though not definitely, that some of the chiefs, whom he defeated, belonged to the hill-tribes and totemistic tribes.

The abhiṣeka or coronation of one of the Gāhaḍavāla kings is mentioned in the Kamauli grant of V. S. 1126, where Jayaccandra is said to have made a grant after perfor-

1 HK., pp. 302-03.
ming the *mantra-snāna* at his coronation\(^1\). The ceremony of anointing a king has been described by Lakṣmīdhara in the Rājadharmakāṇḍa of his *nibandha* Kṛtyakalpataru, where he has quoted the rites described in the Brahmapurāṇa and the Rāmāyaṇa\(^2\). The anointing of the king must take place in an auspicious moment selected by the court-astrologer (śāmvatsarika of Lakṣmīdhara and naimittika of the Gāhāḍavāḷa inscriptions); Jayaccandra was anointed as king on Āśāḍha sud 6, Samvat 1226 (21st June 1170 A.D.). Lakṣmīdhara has devoted a long chapter on the duties of an anointed king (*abhiṣikta-kṛtyāṇi*), most of which is concerned with the protection of the interests and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas, upholding religion and performing necessary religious ceremonies for the welfare of the subjects and the state. In this connection the author has referred to seven religious ceremonies, which should not be neglected by a king, who desired to be prosperous; these are *Deva-yātra*, *Kaumudi-mahotsava*, *Indra-dhvaj-ochrāya*, *Navarātri-pūjā*, *Cibna-pūjā*, *Gavotsarga* and *Vasordhārā*. The list of royal duties also includes development of trade and crafts, the relief of destitutes and liberal medical relief\(^3\). A separate chapter describes in detail the *yātra* or warlike expedition in which, every king should participate.

There is no express reference to a regency in the Gāhāḍavāḷa inscriptions but there are indications of it in two of the inscriptions issued by Mahārājaputra Govindacandra; one of these, the Basahi grant of V. S. 1161, was written with the consent of (*eteṣām sammatyā*) Purohitā Jāguka, Pratīhāra Gautama and Mahattaka Bālhaṇa, while the other one,
the Kamauli grant of V.S. 1162, was written with the consent of the queen (janani) Rālhādevi, in addition to that of the personages mentioned above. A third inscription in which Mahārāja putra Govindacandra announces a grant by Rānaka Lavārāpravāha, was written with the consent of Mahattaka Gāṅgeya\(^1\). This procedure of making gift of taxfree land without any reference to the reigning king but with the consent of the other officials is rather uncommon in the Gāhaḍavāla administrative history. Whether the responsibility of those who consent to the grants ceases there, or whether they constituted a regency, is not known. After the discovery of the Baḍera grant, issued by king Madanapāla himself in V. S. 1164, the necessity of a regency in V. S. 1161, 1162 and 1166, cannot be explained. Also, it is remarkable that neither the mantrin nor the senāpati, two important officials of the state, figure in the list of persons who gave consent to these grants. Further, it should be noted that the contemporary nibandha-writer Mahāsāndhivigrahika Lakṣmīdhara does not deal with any such emergency which may necessitate the forming of a regency.

A few words must be said here about the queen, who seems to have enjoyed a special recognition in the Gāhaḍavāla system of administration. According to Kauṭilya the queen is in the same category with the king's mother, commander-in-chief, purohita (sacrificial priest), minister and yuvarāja, and could draw the highest salary of 48000 paṇas annually\(^2\). The Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions show that the chief queen or paṭṭa-mabādevī was endowed with all the royal prerogatives (samasta-rāja-prakriy-opetā). On three

\(^1\) IA., XIV, pp. 101-04; EI., II, pp. 358-61; IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.

\(^2\) Artha., V, 3.
occasions Nayanakelidevi and Gosalladevi, Govindacandra’s paṭṭa-mahādevīs granted tax-free villages with the consent of the king. During the reign of Madanapāla, his queen Rālhādevi, gave her consent to one of the grants issued by Mahārājaputra Govindacandradeva. Some of the queens seem to have had personal bāndāgāra or treasury, which probably consisted of marriage gifts, bath and toilet money from the father and income from the property settled at the time of marriage by the husband, and such other personal funds. The Hathia-dah pillar inscription of V. S. 1207 (1151 A.D.) records the excavation of a tank by one Bellana described by Cunningham, who noticed this inscription, as the bāndāgarika of queen Gosalladevi. The Machhlishahar inscription of Hariścandra refers to a piece of land which previously may have belonged to Mahārājī Śaṁnaḍarī.

As enjoined in the orthodox Śrauta literature, the heir-apparent to the Gāhāḍavāla throne was often selected in the king’s lifetime and vested with all the royal prerogatives. Lakṣmīdhara, however, has not dealt with the coronation of a yuvarāja. The Gāhāḍavāla documents record that, like the queens Yuvarāja Ṭṣhoṭacandra deva, and Yuvarāja Jayaccandra deva, exercised the royal prerogative of granting tax-free villages with the consent of the ruling kings. Mahārājaputra Rājyapāladeva, a son of Govindacandra, was not actually proclaimed as a yuvarāja, but he too was vested

1 Kamauli Grant of V.S. 1176 (El., IV, pp. 101 ff.) and Bana gargau (or Banagavan) Inscription of V.S. 1208 (El., V, pp. 116 ff.);
2 Cunningham, ASR., I, pp. 95-96;
3 El., X, pp. 93-100;
with all royal prerogatives and issued two grants during his father’s reign. It is to be noted that the Gahaḍavāla princes, including the yuvarājas, announced their grants in their own names, while the gifts made by the queens had to be announced by the reigning king.

The status of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra was rather different from that of the other Gahaḍavāla princes. In none of the grants made by the queens and the other princes of the dynasty was the donor eulogized in the genealogical or praśasti section. Govindacandra, however, was openly praised especially for his splendid military achievements in the inscriptions which he issued during his father’s reign. Moreover, it is significant that though he referred to his father Madanapāla as the ruling king, he used the royal seal in his own name on the grants, which were issued not with the ruling king’s consent but with the consent of the Purohita, the Pratibhāra and the Mahattaka. It thus appears that, though not actually proclaimed a yuvarāja, as the absence of the title indicates, Mahārājaputra Govindacandra, by dint of his own personality and also because of the unexplained inactivity of the reigning king, exercised special powers in administration, which were not enjoyed by the other Gahaḍavāla princes.

The Gahaḍavāla princes seem to have enjoyed the special privilege of using a separate insignia or lāṃchana on their seals, which was different from the Gahaḍavāla royal seal. The latter consisted of the figure of a garuda above and a conchshell below with the name of the king across the centre, while the former consisted of a conchshell above

and an arrow below with the name of the yuvāja across the centre and was used on the inscriptions issued by Āsphoṭacandrdeva and Rājyapāladeva. It seems that during the reign of Madanapāladeva the separate seal for the yuvāraja had not yet evolved, but the existence of a separate lāṃchana (emblem) for the prince is evidenced by the conch-shell and arrow drawn vertically in the proper right margin of the Basahi and the Kamauli grants; these grants were issued with the Gāhaḍavāla royal seal, bearing the name not of Madanapāla but of the prince Govindacandra.

Amātyas or rājapurusās:—The Gāhaḍavāla grants refer to a number of officials, to whom the king conveys his commands and explanations (ājñāpayati, bodhayati ādīsati) regarding the land granted. The inscription of Kalacuri Sodhadeva from Kahla (V. S. 1134), which has much similarity in technique and style with the Gāhaḍavāla grants, mentions in this connection two distinct classes of officers, royal and others; while the first group (rajaapurusāḥ) was certainly appointed by the king from the centre, those belonging to the second, may have been selected or elected by the village people. The Jhusi inscription of Pratihāra Trilocanapāla (V. S. 1084/1027 A. D.) and many other inscriptions of the period also make similar distinction (cf. "Samupagatān rājaapurusāṅ Brāhmaṇ-ottarasmē-ca-prativeśi-samasta-mahattama-janapadin" etc.). The village officials in these cases were generally referred to as mahattama or mahattara. In most of the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions, however, there is no mention of the village headman; the janapada,

the village community or population, however, always figures in these landgrants. Evidently under the Gāhāḍavāla system of administration, the rājapuruṣas were more directly concerned with the formalities and technicalities of a grant, than the village headman.

Rājan, rajūī and yuvarāja are mentioned at the beginning of the list of royal officials who are to be informed about the grants. It has been suggested that these three terms refer, either to the feudatory chiefs and to their families, many of whom generally lived in the court, or to the provincial governors and their families¹. But a perusal of the list which further includes mantrin, purobita, pratibhāra, senāpati, bhāṇḍāgārika, akṣapatakika, bhīṣak, naimittika, anahpurika, dūta, and officers in charge of kari, turaga, pattana, ākara, sthāna and gokula (“kari-turaga-pattan-ākara-sthāna-gokul-ādhikari-puruṣān”), indicates that all these officials, who were to be informed about the gift, were either intimately connected with the king and his court or were directly under his personal authority. Most of the Gāhāḍavāla chiefs on the other hand, as we have already seen, occupied frontier regions and were like frontier guards; as such they could not have lived idly at the imperial court. Moreover, these chiefs could not have any concern in grant of lands which were not situated within their territories. On the other hand, it is quite possible that this was an official convention to refer all the grants to the three highest personalities in the central administration, namely, the king and also the queen and the prince².

¹ HABI., p. 542.
² The Kahla plate of Soḍhadeva Kalacuri, which displays a striking similarity to Gāhāḍavāla grants, also refers to mabārajī and mabārajāpūtra in the same style.
Mantrin: According to the ancient political thinkers of India, mantrin or minister is an important wheel in the administrative machinery. Indeed the political history of ancient India shows, that many a time ministers enjoyed a position of extraordinary importance and influence. The history of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries gives us instances of many ministers, who claim to have practically framed and directed the king’s policy and were respected and obeyed by the king. Sometimes they are openly praised in the inscriptions of their masters, who are described as paying respect and homage to their ministers; thus, ministers Vīlaśiva and his grandson Vidyādhara are said to have been respected and propitiated by Gādhipurādhipati Gopāla and his son king Madana, who appears to have been a Gāhāḍavāla feudatory. Able and ambitious ministers may have sometimes acted as effectual checks to the arbitrariness of kings. But the influence exercised by the ministers over kings was not apparently derived from a constitutional source; it was a purely personal influence, which depended on the strength of their own character and their ability to dominate a weakminded king.

Though the Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions do not disclose the name of the ministers, who may have helped this dynasty to rise to prominence, one piece of contemporary literature reveals the name of one minister, who undoubtedly exercised considerable influence on the policy of the greatest king of the dynasty. As we have already noticed, in the Kṛtyakalpatarau, which was written at the command of Govindacandra, the author Lakṣmīdhara claims that the

1 IA., XVIII, pp. 62-64; IPASB., 1925 (NS), pp. 105 ff.
success of his patron is due to his wonderful counsel. This Lakṣmīdhara describes himself as a mabāśāndhivigrabika (Minister for Peace and War) and mantriśvara (Chief Minister). His father Bhaṭṭa Ṭḍdayadhara also was a mabāśāndhivigrabika. It thus appears that Govindaśandra had more than one minister to help him in his task of administration and empire-building, and Lakṣmīdhara by virtue of his own eminence not only acted as the Chief Minister and thus guided the general administrative policy, but also was put in charge of the most important department—the Foreign Office.

The Rājadharmakāṇḍa of the Kṛtyakalpataru quotes many ancient authorities which enumerates various qualifications which a minister, who tops the list of amātyas or officials, should possess; to sum up—a heroic and successful person, born of a good family, cool-headed and well-versed in the śāstras and nītis and mantra, should be chosen as minister; the quotations give preference to the Brāhmaṇas, and to the maulas or hereditary officers (explained by Lakṣmīdhara as pitr-paitāmahan)¹. Being the son of a mabāśāndhivigrabika, the author himself was a maula officer. Though the importance of a minister places him at the top of the official hierarchy, both in the inscriptions and in the Rājadharmakāṇḍa, it is strange that his name is not included among those, who gave their consent to the grants of the Mahārājaputra Govindaśandradeva, which refer to a purohita, a pratīhāra and a mahattaka in this connection.

Purohita: As befitting a revivalist state, the next important personage in the Gāhāḍavāla court is the purohita or priest. He is expected to perform all the religious cere-

monies, sacrifices and yajñas, bomas and dānas, chanting of
the Vedas and the like, which a king should undertake for
the prosperity and welfare of the state. Following the
ancient precepts, Lakṣmīdharā advises that a Brāhmaṇa of
good family, who has done penance and is well-versed in
the Vedas, Ītihāsa, Dharmāsāstras, Astrology and in the
process of performing various sacrifices and religious cer-
emonies, should be chosen as a priest.

From the reign of Govindacandra the family of Vilha
or Vilhakāya-dikṣita, the donee of the grant of V. S. 1162,
rose to prominence, as is clearly evidenced by a large number
of grants made in their favour by the different Gāhaḍavāla
kings. Vilha’s son Mahāpurohita Jāguśarman may be
identified with purohita Jāguka, who consents to the grants
mentioned above. Jāguśarman, who evidently acts as the
court-priest of king Govindacandra, receives a large number
of tax-free villages. His brother Vyāsa also receives a grant
in V. S. 1178. Jāguśarman’s son Prabharājaśarman or
Prahlādaśarman is not only the court-priest of Jayaccandradeva,
but also his preceptor or guru (cf. Vaiṣṇava-pūjā-vidhi-guru).
Probably it was he, who performed the abhiṣeka ceremony of
Jayaccandra and the jāta-karman and the nāmakarana ceremonies
of his son Hariścandra. Jāguśarman also appears to have per-
formed the annual śrāddha ceremonies of Govindacandra’s
father and mother. Thus the court-priest under the Gāhaḍa-
vāla regime has many duties to perform; not only is he
expected to perform all the religious ceremonies undertaken
by the ruler to promote the prosperity of his domain
and all important state ceremonies like the coronation

1 Kṛṣṭya, Rājadharmakāṇḍa, pp. (tx.) 164 ff.
of kings, but he is also the family-priest of the dynasty and perhaps often acts as preceptor to the princes.

Pratibhāra: Next in importance in the official hierarchy was the pratibhāra; he was probably the same as the dawārika of the earlier days. The pratibhāra has always been looked upon as an important officer of the royal court. He should have a fine presence, tact, charm and suavity. The importance of his position in the Gāhaḍavāla administration system is evidenced by his inclusion among those who consent to the grants issued by the Mahārājaputra Govindacandra. This, however, appears to have been an extraordinary case; the general duties and responsibilities of a pratibhāra were probably more or less like those of the royal chamberlain and palace-mayor.

Senāpati: The simple title used in the Gāhaḍavāla records is equivalent to the high sounding titles used by the other dynasties (i.e. māhā-pracānda-daṇḍanāyaka, māhā-valādbhikṛta or māhā-senāpati) to designate the commander-in-chief. It is interesting to note that Lakṣmīdhara has accepted the Matsya-purāṇa's view, that a senāpati may be either a Brāhmaṇa or a Kṣatriya. A senāpati is expected to be of good family, valiant and hardy; he should know the use of different weapons and have some knowledge of elephants and other animals used in warfare; he should also be well-versed in military strategy and be acquainted with different formations of army. The Gāhaḍavālas doubtless possessed an efficient army from the very beginning and its efficiency and size may naturally have increased in the reign of Govindacandra, who had many military achievements to his credit. The imposing vast-

2 Kṛtya., Rājadharmakāṇḍa, p. (tx.) 23.
ness of Jayaccandra’s army is described vividly by the author of the Prthvīrāja-Rāsa and by the Muslim historians. The position of an officer, in charge of such an army, can easily be realised; the Gāhāḍavāla records, however, do not supply us with the name of any of the senāpatis, who served them and helped them in their career of victory.

Bhāṇḍāgārīka. The position of this officer among the list of officials in the Gāhāḍavāla document indicates that he is an important personage, and as such probably may be compared to the treasurer or collector-general (samāharta) of the Arthasāstra. Literally, it is to be translated as the officer in charge of the royal store; such a title is significant, in view of the fact that a large part of the revenue from the rural area was probably collected in kind at that period. Besides the state-bhāṇḍāgārīka, there were bhāṇḍāgārīkas, in charge of personal bhāṇḍāgāras of the important members of the royal family.

Aksapataṇika: Another officer in the revenue department, one in charge of the receipts of the royal treasury, was designated by Kauṭilya as sannidhāta. He may be compared to the accounts officer or more correctly the accountant-general. The aksapataṇika of the Gāhāḍavāla records was probably an officer of this type and his responsibilities embraced not only the receipts and accounts, but also general records and royal orders relating to the revenue department. According to Lakṣmīdhara the aksara-rakṣita or aksa-paripālaka must not only have knowledge of income and expenditure but should also be able to read people’s character and be well informed about the produce of the land. (cf. "āya-vyaya-jña-loka-jña-deś-oppttti-

1 Vide supra, p. 109-10.
2 Artha., II, 35.
3 Vide supra, p. 144.
4 Artha., II, 5.
viśāradaḥ"). During the first four reigns the Gāhāḍavāla landgrants were mostly written by the karaṇikas and the kāyasthas, who were most probably the clerks attached to the records and revenue department. The reign of Jayaccandra, however, saw an innovation; landgrants henceforth were mostly written by the senior officers in charge of the records, receipts and accounts; in this connection we come across the names of Mahākṣapaṭalika Śripati and Bhogāditya and Aksapaṭalika Viśīka.

Bhiṣak: The next in the list comes the name of bhiṣak or physician (prānacārya of Lakṣmīdhara). He was concerned with the Gāhāḍavāla grants like other high officials of the state and it may be presumed that he was not only a court physician and as such one of the chief personal attendants of the king but also an officer placed in charge of the public health department, whose existence, however, is not directly indicated. A certain Prānacārya Bhaṭṭa-paṇḍita Khona-śarman figures as the donee in the Banaras grant of V.S. 1187.

Naimittika: The astrologer, whose duty is to announce auspicious moments and propitious occasions, is probably the same as samvatsara of Viṣṇu. It is natural for the revivalist Gāhāḍavāla rulers to include an astrologer in the list of court officials.

Antahpurika: Like the inscriptions, Lakṣmīdhara also enumerates the seraglio officer (antahpur-ādhyakṣa) as one of the important officials of the state.

2 Banaras College Grant of V.S. 1232 and Kamauli Grant of V.S. 1231.
Dūta, mentioned in the list of the rājapuruṣas does not seem to have been a messenger or a lower-grade official. The contemporary records indicate that he was more like an envoy or ambassador or political agent and as such one of the top-ranking officers of the kingdom. Lakṣmīdhara following the earlier writers describes him as a person of high talent and integrity of character.

Kari-turaga-pattan-ākara-sthāna-gokul-ādhikaripuruṣāḥ: Other officers connected with the landgrants of the Gāhaḍavilas were those in charge of the elephants and horses (communication?), of cows, of towns, of mines and of the sthānas, probably police units. The cows, the towns and the mines, according to the Arthaśāstra and other authorities, were important sources of revenue¹. Elephants and the horses were indispensable in peace and war. All these officers may have been directly responsible for their departments to the king and were thus in close touch with him and his court.

It is to be noted in this connection, that in the procedure of making a landgrant, the king, together with the queen and the crown-prince, was associated with the heads of all important departments, whose designations have been discussed above, namely, the minister, the priest, the chamberlain, the treasurer or collector-general, the officer in charge of records, receipts and accounts, public health officer (?), ambassador, officers in charges of towns, mines and police department and the officers in charge of elephants and horses. An important omission is that of the judiciary (under dharmādhikarana), which cannot be definitely accounted for. Does it indicate that the judiciary was not intimately connected

¹ Arīha., II, 3, 6; Viṣṇu., III, 25; Manu., VII, 130 etc.
with the royal court? Of course, the legal aspect of the landgrants, in connection with which the list of dignitaries appears, was necessarily a matter for the consideration of the judiciary; after these grants were put in the approved form and issued, it is not necessary to bring the judiciary into the picture. This department appears to have had no responsibility for the executive actions of the state.

Lakṣmīdhara’s list of *amātya* includes many other officials (including the *dharma-ādhikaraṇa*) who were not concerned with the landgrants; the most important among these was the *mahāsāndbhivigrabiṇa*, who was in charge of the Department of Peace and War; such a person was to be an adept in sixfold policy, a judge of opportunity and a diplomat.

Junior officials intimately connected with the landgrants were the *karaṇikas* and the *kāyasthas* who were probably entrusted with the responsibility of drawing up the documents of gift according to the approved Gāhaḍavāla official form; these documents invariably describe these officers as having written the grants. During the latter part of the Gāhaḍavāla rule, however, *mahākṣapaṭalika* and *aṅgapaṭalikas* are mentioned in the place of the *karaṇikas* and the *kāyasthas*. Lakṣmīdhara’s quotation from the Yājñavalkyaśmṛti indicates that the *kāyasthas* possessed some power, which they often misused. The nibandha-writer also refers to the *lekhakas* or scribes, who should be well-versed in scripts of many countries and whose main duty was to write down the documents. The *Mitākṣara* identifies the *kāyasthas* with the *lekhakas*. If this identification is accepted we can assume that the *kāyasthas* (and likewise probably also

2 cf. “Aṅga-rāṇā vai likhed-yaṣ-tu lekhakah śa varah śmṛtaḥ”.
the karanikas) were responsible not only for the preparation of the documents but also for the marking of letters on the copper-plates which were later on incised by the engravers. The engravers of the Gahaḍavala copper-plates were sometimes described as lohaṛa or sūtradāra. Mādhava, who inscribed the Candravatī grant of V.S. 1156, appears to have been a sculptor who made the image of Candra-Mādhava.

The salary of the king’s officials, according to Kauṭilya, is generally to be paid in cash but he also recommends occasional gifts of land in lieu of valuable service. We have no information, regarding the payment of the Gahaḍavala officers in cash, but it appears that sometimes they received taxfree land from the state. The Candravatī grant, mentioned above, records the gift of a whole pattalā with the exception of the villages previously granted to gods, Brāhmaṇas and as taxfree ones (vikara-grāma). Several grants of Jayaccandra made to Rāuta Rājayadharavarman, Kṣatriya, son of Mahāmahattaka Ṭhakkura Vidyādhara, appear to be gifts of this category.

(b) Administration of Viṣaya, Pathaka and Pattalā

The Gahaḍavala inscriptions do not supply much concrete information about the administration of the viṣaya, pathaka and pattalā. The contemporary inscriptions of other dynasties refer to various gradations of administrative

1 The following interesting statement is found in the Candravatī grant of V.S. 1150, comprising ninety lines written on five plates:— “What should I speak of king Candra, by the sound produced from whose copperplate grants given to Brāhmaṇas and divinities at the time of their being engraved with rows of closely written lines; the universe become deafened” (EI., IV, p. 128).

2 IA., XVIII, pp. 134-43.
officers like the rāṣṭrapati, viṣayapati, bhogapati, maṇḍalesvara and such others. The Gāhaḍavāla records mention only two designations which may be compared to the above ones. The Candrāvatī inscription of V. S. 1150/1093 A.D. includes the name of the viṣay-ādbhikāri-puruṣa in the list of officers to be informed in respect of this landgrant. This instance is unique in the Gāhaḍavāla records and the necessity of the introduction of the viṣay-ādbhikāri-puruṣa is easily realised, if we remember that on this occasion, not a village, but a whole pattalā, with the exception of certain villages, is granted. Evidently these viṣay-ādbhikāri-puruṣas are the administrative officers in charge of the viṣayas or provinces in the Gāhaḍavāla domain. A careful study of the list, in which he has been placed among the officers in charge of elephants, horses, towns, mines and cow-pens, however, indicates that probably he is a less important person in comparison with the minister, the purohita, the commander of forces, the record officers and others connected with the central administration. This officer-in-charge of the viṣaya may have been directly responsible to the king for the administration of his province, but he, it seems, is not generally concerned with the less important transfer of land like the gift of a village, which is to be notified to the parties concerned through the records and accounts (aṅgapaṭalā) department. The Candrāvatī inscription indicates that he is addressed and commanded by the king on the occasions of important land-transfers. The inscriptions give us no information about his office but it may have included all the important administrative departments within his jurisdiction.

1 El., XIV, pp. 193 ff.
No evidence is forthcoming about the administrative officer in charge of the pathaka or his function, but presumably these were on the lines of the office and functions of the viṣay-ādbhikāri-puruṣa on a more limited scale.

The only designation which may have been connected with the pattalā, is found in the undated Sārnath inscription of Kumārādevī, the queen of Govindaacandradeva; this inscription records that, Jambukī, at whose request, the Dharmacakra-Jina (erected by Dharmāsoka), was repaired, was placed at the head of all the pattalikās². The pattalikā (and probably also pattalika) appears to have been the junior administrative officer in charge of a pattalā². Instances of women being appointed as provincial governors are to be found in the history of the Cālukya and the Rāṣṭrakūta dynasties in South India³. The designation pattalikā indicates that, women administrative officers were sometimes placed in charge of the pattalās, under the Gāhaḍavāla administrative system.

(c) Town Administration

The importance of town was realised by the Gāhaḍavāla kings. The pattan-ādbhikāri-puruṣa or the city administrative officer is enumerated among the high officials, who were directly associated with the king in affairs concerning landgrants. The specific and separate mention of the municipal officer, even in a grant which refers to the viṣay-ādbhikāri-puruṣa indicates that probably the Gāhaḍavāla

---

2 According to Dr. D. C. Ganguly in the Paramāra administrative system, the king's representative in the village was the 'pattalika' (History of the Paramāra Dynasty, p. 244).
3 Altekar, Rāṣṭrakūtas., pp. 154 and 180.
towns were not under the authority of the provincial or the district administrative officers, but formed separate administrative units and the officers appointed over them may have been directly responsible to the crown. Some towns have been mentioned in the inscriptions but details about the municipal administration are not available.

(d) Village Administration

Mahattama, an officer, who may have been connected with the village administration, is mentioned only in four landgrants, namely the Basahi, the Kamauli and the Rahan grants of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra and the B.A.S. land-transfer inscription of the same person, as a king. It is to be noted that, in these cases the mahattama is carefully distinguished from the purusa or officials in the same style as in the Kaha inscription of Soḍhadeva¹. Earlier inscriptions and many of the contemporary ones also sometimes refer to mahattara in this connection (cf. The Later Gupta and the Pāla inscriptions). The Arthaśāstra mentions two classes of village officials, the headman or the grāmika and the village elders of the grāmavṛddhas². Later, however, the designations of these officers may have changed, and the grāmavṛddhas come to be known as mahattaras, and the headman of the village, probably as the mahattama; the basis of selection also may have changed from age to property. The explicit distinction made between the mahattama and the rājapuruṣa clearly indicates that the former was not appointed by the crown, but probably

elected by the villagers or the village elders. (Generally, however, the Gahaḍavāla inscriptions do not include mabattama among the persons and dignitaries who are to be informed, about the landgrants.) The above mentioned exception may be due to the fact that these inscriptions granted land in territories, which were only recently conquered at the time of issuing these documents and the local system of administration had not yet been replaced by the Gahaḍavāla system.

Two other officials bearing designations similar to mabattama may have been connected with village administration. Mahattaka of the Gahaḍavāla inscriptions may be the same official as mabamtaka of the Kahla plate of Soḍhādeva, who unlike the mabattama is included among the rājapurusas enumerated therein.

Two mabhattakas gave consent to the landgrants, issued by the Mahārājaputra Govindacandra-deva—Mahattaka Bālhana to the Basahi and the Kamauli grants and Mahattaka Gāṅgeya to the Rahan grant. (It is to be noted that on all these occasions, the mabattama is included among the personnel to be informed about the grants.) A third mabhattaka Dāyimśarman received a house (āvāsa) at Vārāṇasi by Govindacandra’s Benares grant of V.S. 1171\(^1\). A maha-mabhattaka is mentioned in the B.A.S. grants issued in V.S. 1233. This person, Thakkura Vidyādhara by name, was the father of Rauta Rājyadharavarma, Kṣatriya, the recipient of a number of grants made by the king.

Both of these two officials, mabhattaka and mahāmabhattaka may have been connected with the village administration; it is, however, certain that the duties and responsibilities

\(^1\) IHQ., 1940, pp. 99-102.
of a *mahattaka* are not limited to one village only. Mahattaka Bāhāna consents to the grants of two different villages, Vasabhi and Usitha, both of which, however, were situated in the same pattalā, Jīvāti; on the other hand, Mahattaka Gāṅgeya consents to the grant of a third village Rāmaitha in a different pattalā, Siguroḍha. Lakṣmīdhara’s quotations also indicate that though there may have been rural self-governing bodies, the king was expected to appoint his own officers both in towns and in villages. Such royal officers in villages were probably the same as the grāmādhyakṣas of Viṣṇu. As during the latter part of mediaeval Hindu India, the designation of the village headman (who was not a rājapuruṣa), changed from grāmika to mahattama, so also the designation of the royal officers posted in groups of villages in a pattalā, may have changed from grāmādhyakṣa to mahattaka. On this analogy it may be presumed that mahā-mahattaka was appointed to superintend the activities of all the mahattakas posted in a viṣaya. The Kahla inscription of Kalacuri Soḍhadeva also refers to an official, mahāmahattaka, among the list of different rājapuruṣas.

(e) Feudatories

Because of the paucity of materials it is extremely difficult to form an idea about the status of the feudatory chiefs under the Gāhaḍavālas. All the official inscriptions of the dynasty conventionally refer to the king as being served by a circle of all the princes (*samasta-rāja-cakra-*)

---

2 Vide *supra*, p. 146, f.n.2.
The word sāmanta is mentioned only once in one of the records of this dynasty, the very last one, issued by the last king Hariścandradeva in V.S. 1253, among the officials, who were to be informed about the landgrant and it is interesting to note that he is placed between pratibhāri and senāpati. The inscriptions themselves present direct evidence of the existence of at least five lines of feudatories, represented by Rāṇaka Lavarā-pravāha of the Rahan grant of V.S. 1166, king Madana of the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176, Sirīgara Vatsarāja of the Kamauli grant V.S. 1191, Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala of Jāpila of the Tārācaṇḍī Rock inscription of V.S. 1225 and Rāṇaka Vijayakarṇa of the Belkharā Pillar inscription of V.S. 1253. The existence of some other lines of feudatories is suggested by the numismatic and later epigraphic evidence; among them may be enumerated the Tomaras of Delhi, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Vodāmayūtā and the northern Kalacuries of Kasia.

The Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176 was not issued by the king Madana, but by his influential saciva or minister Vidyādharā, on the occasion of the construction of a vihāra at the unidentified town of Ajāvṛṣa or Jāvṛṣa. This inscription, not being a landgrant, nowhere mentions the name of the reigning sovereign Govindacandradeva. The inscription of Mahārājaputra Vatsarāja of Sirīgara dynasty whose great-grand-father acquired a rāja-pati (royal fillet), on the other hand, is a landgrant, and records the donation of Āmbuvāra village in the Rāpaḍi-

2. Vide supra, p. 85.
3. IA., XVII, pp. 61-64; JPASB., 1925 (NS) XXI, pp. 105 ff.
viṣaya. This grant is issued by the donor himself, but contains an eulogy of the Gāhāḍavāla kings from Yaśovigraha to Govindacandra, in the usual Gāhāḍavāla style; then follows the eulogy of the donor and his family; the seal is missing\(^1\).

The landgrant of Rāṇaka Lavarāpravāha is announced on behalf of the suzerain by Mahārāja putting Govindacandra\(^2\). The inscription of another Rāṇaka, issued probably during the last days of Hariścandra, the last king of the dynasty, indicates that this term rāṇaka has been used to denote the feudatory chiefs; the Belkharā inscription of V.S. 1253/1197 A.D. records the erection of a pillar by Rāuta Śrī Śakarūka in the reign of Śrī Vijayakarṇa in the victorious reigning year of 1253 of Kāṇyakubja\(^3\). This inscription indicates that in the Gāhāḍavāla regime, the areas ruled by the Rāṇakas were looked upon as feudatory states.

The charter, issued by Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala, the ruler of Jāpila, found incised on the Tārācanḍī Rock (Shahabad district), is of peculiar administrative interest\(^4\). The Mahānāyaka in this charter declares, that some Brāhmaṇas have bribed Deū, an officer of the overlord of Kāṇyakubja and secured forged grants regarding the gift of two villages and that the spurious document is not to be believed and the taxes and the dues are to be collected as before. The grant is probably endorsed by Mahārāja-patra Śatrugna, who was a son of the Mahānāyaka, as an undated inscription of the chief reveals. Nothing is stated in the charter to indicate that the Mahānāyaka was

\(^{1}\) El., IV, pp. 130-33.
\(^{2}\) IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.
\(^{4}\) JAOS., VI, pp. 547-49.
not a raṇapurusa himself, but his rather contemptuous reference to Deu who had the authority to convey orders and messages from the Central Government to him, and as such, was doubtless an important raṇapurusa, either in the records department or in the embassy, seems to indicate, that, the Mahānāyaka was not a raṇapurusa or in his own words bhūpadāsa, but a feudatory chief. The fact that the charter was issued specially for the information of his progeny, sons and grandsons, supports the above conclusion. No doubt the office of the provincial governor and many other offices were often hereditary (maula) but these officers being raṇapurusas, had to be formally appointed by the king. The Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala, on the other hand refers quite confidently to his sons and grandsons as his successors, as if their appointment did not depend upon any superior authority. It is, however, indicated by this rājasāsana, that the king had the power to grant land and appoint his own officers within the territory ruled over by Pratāpadhavala.

Two other inscriptions belonging to Pratāpadhavala, have been found but neither of them refers to the reigning king Vijayacandra of Kānyakubja. One of these was issued about a month earlier than the above charter and records the construction of a road by the Nāyaka Pratāpadhavala (afterwards styled mahānāyaka); the other mentions his name with a date in the year V. S. 1158/1214 A. D. From a fourth inscription, an undated one, it appears that this chief belonged to the Khayaravāla dynasty1.

The foregoing discussion shows that at least three

---

different feudatory designations were known, namely, Rāṇaka, Mahānīyaka and Mahārāja; whether these denoted differences in status, is not clear. It has been noted, however, that while, a feudatory mahārājaputra (son of a mahārāja) had the authority to announce his own grant, the landgrant, made by a rāṇaka, was announced by the suzerain. There is no information as to the various obligations, financial and others, of these feudatory chiefs. Sometimes in the landgrants issued by the feudatory chiefs the authority of the Gāhaḍavālas king is acknowledged by simple reference to him; in some cases at least, the sovereign could grant land in the feudatory territories. Presumably the feudatories were required to help him in his wars with men and money.

Section III. Revenue and Expenditure

(a) Revenue

The sources of information regarding the revenue system of the Gāhaḍavālas are their inscriptions, specially their landgrants. Almost all these grants were made, either by the king or with the permission of the king, in favour of the Brāhmaṇas to whom were transferred the agrarian rights enjoyed by the king, together with the right of collecting taxes and sometimes some other dues also. Most of these inscriptions record gifts of one or a few villages, while a singular one records the transfer of a whole pattalā to five hundred Brāhmaṇas; a few of the grants record the transfer of plots of lands in different villages.

1 EL., IV, pp. 107-09 and EL., XIII, pp. 216-20.
2 In this connection two denominations of land measure are mentioned; the incomplete Pali grant of V.S. 1171 records the gift
The usual donative documents of the Gāhaḍavālas clearly distinguish between the taxes (dāya or ādāya) and the agrarian rights and privileges and such others, which constitute other sources of royal revenue in the village area and describe these in two different clauses. Thus the official form of a grant of this dynasty is as follows:

(i) Genealogy, praśasti and virudas of the donor in verse and prose.
(ii) Location of the village or the land granted.
(iii) Notice to the officials and others, who should be aware of the gift.
(iv) Description of the village or land with boundaries and specific mention of the agrarian rights to be conceded in favour of the grantee.
(v) Date, place and occasion of the grant.
(vi) Religious rites.
(vii) Name and family of the donee.
(viii) Announcement of the grant.
(ix) Specific mention of some of the taxes conceded in favour of the donee.
(x) Imprecatory and benedictory verses and the names of the writers and others.

of land measuring 30 balas ("Pāligrāma-prabhūti-grāmeṣu bala trimśad-amke bala 30"; vide JBORś., 1933, pp. 234-38). The Ren grant of V.S. 1188 records the gift of fertile land (sāknabhūmi) measuring 20 balas by Govindacandra (IA., V, pp. 247-52). Two other grants of the same king refer to, another measure, nālu or nāluka; the Pali grant of V.S. 1189 records the gift of 10 nālukas of land while the Gagaha grant of V.S. 1199 records gift of some plots of land of different measurements in nālus. (EI., V, pp. 113-15 and IA., XVIII, pp. 20-21). The Rahan inscription of V.S., 1166 announcing the grant of a feudatory also refers to bala measurement (IA., XVIII, p. 10).
Pratihara Trilochananapala's Jhusi grant, issued from Prayaga in V. S. 1034, and Kalacuri Sohadeva's Kahla plate and a few of the inscriptions of the contemporary kings also attempt a similar distinction between taxes and royal rights and such other sources of revenue. The epigraphic evidence of the dynasty shows that generally the taxes were divided into two broad classes—regular (nity-<i>adāya</i> or <i>niyat-adāya</i>) and irregular (<i>anity-<i>adāya</i> or <i>aniyat-adāya</i>). A comparative study of these records shows that <i>bhāgabhogakara</i> was certainly one of the regular taxes; other well-known taxes of the period, which are also mentioned in the Gahaḍavāla inscriptions, were <i>biranya</i>, <i>nidbinikṣepa deśavandha</i>, <i>lavanakara</i>, <i>parṇakara</i>, <i>jalakara</i>, <i>gokara</i>, <i>ākara</i> and <i>pravanikara</i>. Besides these, there are some other taxes of uncertain character, which are not found anywhere else; of these <i>Turuḍkadaṇḍa</i>, <i>kumāragadiśānakā</i> and <i>kūṭaka</i> are mentioned frequently in the Gahaḍavāla grants. <i>Vṛṣatīṭhuprastha</i>, <i>vṛṣaticchavata</i>, <i>akṣapaṭalaprastha</i>, <i>akṣapaṭal-adāya</i>, <i>pratibhāra-prastha</i>, <i>varaṇajhe</i>, <i>valadi</i> and <i>vāhyāvāhyaantarasiḍḍhi</i> occur only in the Basahi, Kamauli and Rahan grants of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra.

<i>Bhāgabhogakara</i>: This is a common enough tax of the period and is found mentioned not only in the Gahaḍavāla records, but also in the inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Cālukyas, the Paramāras, the Kalacuris, the Candrātreyas and others. According to Tripathi this term really signifies three different taxes, namely the <i>bhāga</i> (grain-share or share of produce), <i>bhoga</i> (enjoyment of certain rights by the landlord when the land lies fallow) and <i>kara</i> (rent proper payable in cash or kind). Altekar explains the term

1 <i>HK</i>., p. 348.
bhāgabhogakara as two different taxes, namely, bhāgakara (bhāga, saḍbhāga or udraṅga) and bhogakara (representing uparikara or petty taxes realised in kind)\(^1\). Ghoshal, on the other hand, refers to it as a technical term signifying the king’s grain-share on the produce of land paid in kind\(^2\). It is thus admitted by both Altekar and Ghoshal that, bhāgabhogakara (whether the term refers to two different taxes, or is used as the denomination of a single specific tax), constituted the portion of revenue, which was generally paid in kind.

All the grants of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, excepting of course, the Pañcāla group mention bhāgabhogakara in the list of taxes; the Pañcāla group of grants, however, refers to bhāga, bhāgabhāga (bhoga?) and bhāgabhoga in its place; it also mentions some obscure taxes not known anywhere else. It has already been contended that the Pañcāla region was probably a late conquest of the first Gāhaḍavāla king, Candradeva, and that it was not under the direct rule of the dynasty for a long period but was probably placed under the dynasty of Gāḍhipur-ādhipati Gopāla\(^3\). The three grants, noted above, were the first to be issued from that region and it is possible that the usual Gāhaḍavāla official phraseology and technicalities had not yet replaced those prevailing in the Pañcāla region around Kānyakubja. The bhāga and the bhoga of these grants thus may have been the same as udraṅga and uparikara and were probably collected separately. Under the usual Gāhaḍavāla system, however, (as illustrated by the majority of their grants) the term bhāga-bhogakara

---

1 Altekar, Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times, pp. 212-16.
2 HRS., p. 214.
3 Vide infra, appendix A.
appears to have been used as a single technical denomination, signifying king's share and other taxes, connected with land, to be realised in kind. This contention is supported by the position of the bhāṇḍāgārika in the list of officials, which shows that he was an important royal officer. Evidently, a good percentage of the king's revenue, if not most of it, consisted of the taxes paid in kind and often in the shape of perishable food-stuff, which were to be deposited in the bhāṇḍāra or the storehouse and not in koṣa or the treasury; bhāgabhogakara, probably comprising more than one regular tax (to be paid in kind) on the produce of land, may have been collected by a separate set of collectors, to facilitate quick conveyance to the bhāṇḍāra, for immediate disposal.

The Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions do not supply us with any information regarding the actual rate of land-tax levied by the government; the injunction laid down by the law-givers of ancient India, however, gives us a rough and broad outline of the principle of taxation on land. Sukra's canon of taxation advises that, the king should realise his revenue in such a way as the cultivators are not destroyed; that he should do so like the garland-makers, who do not destroy the flower-plant and not like the charcoal-makers who destroy the tree. Lakṣmīdhara's quotations from different Dharmasāstrās also condemn any method of taxation which may ruin the prosperity of the people. According to Sukra, the tax levied on land irrigated by a river, should be half the produce and on those irrigated by tanks and wells, one-third the produce; unirrigated land should

1 Sukra., IV, 2, p. 113.
2 Krtya., Rājadharmanakanda, pp. (tx) 87 ff.
be taxed at the rate of one-fourth of the produce and barten ones at one-sixth. The Šukraṇīti further enjoins that, before the assessment, land should be classified carefully on basis of fertility and measured exactly; and no tax should be assessed upon the persons who improve the land by irrigation, until they have earned twice their cost of production including the government dues.

_Hiranya:_ It has been explained variously as gold, income-tax or tax on capital or as a term which signifies the state's right to gold and other minerals. Ghoshal, however, has shown on comparative study that it was most probably land revenue paid in cash; possibly the tax on some of the produce, which was quickly perishable and not easily divisible into shares, were paid in cash, while the bulk of the land revenue was paid in kind as _bhāgabhogakara._

_Daśavandha:_ In the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions this has been mentioned only once, in the Basahi grant of V. S. 1161. Manu explains this term as a fine imposed on witnesses, who do not appear in cases of loans of money. The _Arthaśāstra_ explains it as a share of one-tenth of the produce given by a landlord to a cultivator or labourer. In the South Indian inscriptions it appears to indicate a special grant of land to persons for repairing or building a tank on condition of paying, in cash or in kind, one-tenth of the produce or one-tenth of the normal tax; these grants were known as _daśavandha-mānya_. This specially reduced tax may have been mentioned in the Gāhaḍayāla grant as

1 _Sukra_, IV, 2, pp. 115-16 and 121-22.
2 _HRS._, pp. 60-62.
3 _Manu_, VIII, p. 107.
4 _Artha. Tr._ (Shamsastri) p. 200.
the daśavandha ādāya; this tax was little known in the Northern India though it was a common enough tax in South India.

Nidhinikṣepa: This ādāya is mentioned only once in the Gāhādavāla records, in the Kamauli inscription of V. S. 1230. According to the lexicons both the terms nidhi and nikhṣepa mean treasure-trove; nikṣepa also means unsealed or buried property or property held in trust. Tripathi has taken the whole word to mean treasure-trove. According to Altekar it refers to the king's right to the treasure-troves and buried or unclaimed wealth. All the ancient law-givers enjoin king's right to the treasure-troves, except when the discoverer is a Brāhmaṇa. According to some, the person who finds the treasure, should inform the king, who would take it after giving one-sixth to the finder. When, however, a Brāhmaṇa finds it, he may keep the whole. Nārada recommends no remuneration for the finder and says that, the whole should be taken by the king, and that a Brāhmaṇa may take it only after it has been given to him by the king. According to Śukra a king should issue edicts forbidding his subjects to take treasure-troves. The canons of Gautama, Vasiṣṭha, Viśṇu and Manu maintain that the property of the heirless non-Brāhmaṇas should go to the king. The Dharmaśāstras do not recognise brothers, cousins and uncles as heirs and a person dying

1 HK, p. 349.
2 Rāṣṭrakūṭas, pp. 242 ff.
4 Nār., VII, pp. 6-7.
5 Śukra., I, p. 304.
6 Gaut., XXVIII, 41-42; Vaś., XVI, 83-87; Viśṇu., XVII, 13-14; Manu., IX, 189.
without a male issue is considered heirless; the right of the widow to the property is also not recognised. Nirukta and Yājñavalkya, however, recognise the widow’s right of inheritance.

The explanation of Tripathi and Altekar, however, is open to criticism, in view of the fact that the king’s right to treasure-troves and such other property was, strictly speaking, not a tax, but a royal privilege and should have been included among the agrarian rights of the king. Of course, the inclusion of nidhinikṣepa among the taxes in only one Gāhaḍavāla grant might have been due to a mistake; but on the other hand, it may be suggested that it was probably a tax imposed by the Gāhaḍavāla government on the property held in trust. Lakṣmīdhara has devoted a whole chapter of the Vyavahārakāṇḍa to the compilation and clarification of laws relating to nīkṣepa or deposit.

Ākara: As the name signifies, this was most probably a tax on mines. The evidence of the inscriptions proves that mines were sometimes considered a state monopoly. Viṣṇu also says that the king can take the whole output of the mines. The Arthaśāstra, which refers to the king’s vibhāga on the produce of a mine together with various toll, dues and duties indicates that the mines were owned by private persons also and as usual the vibhāga or the saṭbhāga was paid to the king. Manu also enumerates the mines among the sources of revenue and enjoins that the king should take the half of the produce of the mines. Sukra likewise, lays down that after the expenses being deducted,

1 Nir., III, 5; Yāj., II, 135-6.
2 Viṣṇu., III, 55.
3 Artha., II, 12.
4 Manu., VII, 62 and VIII, 39.
half of gold, one-third of silver, one-fourth of copper, one-sixth of zinc and iron, half of the precious metals and half of salt should be paid to the king\(^1\). It is possible that though the mines were sometimes considered a state monopoly, private individuals were often allowed to own mines, specially base metal and salt mines (cf. all the Gāhaḍavāla grants conceding the right of *loha-lavaṇākara* in favour of the donees) with the permission of the king, and in such cases the tax levied on the output of the mines were probably known as the *ākara*. This levy is mentioned in only one Gāhaḍavāla inscription, the Basahi grant of Maharājaputra Govindacandra\(^2\).

*Jalakara and gokara*: These two taxes are mentioned for the first time in the Gagaha inscription of Govindacandra in V. S. 1199/1143 A. D. and then in the Banaras grant of V. S. 1203/1146 A. D. and also in some of the inscriptions of Jayaccandra.

The first item, *jalakara*, was corrected by Kielhorn as *jātakara*, though all the plates clearly support the reading *jalakara*\(^3\). The Arthaśāstra refers to a tax which may have been similar to *jalakara* or water-tax; according to it *udakabhāga* is to be levied on the produce of the king’s own land at the varying rates of one-fifth, one-fourth and one-third according to the system of irrigation adopted by the tenants; one-third or one-fourth the produce was paid for the lands watered by rivers\(^4\). According to Ghoshal, on later analogy it seems probable that these charges were levied not as a substitute for, but as an addition to,

---

ordinary items of land revenue. Šukra, however, enjoins that the primary land assessment should be based on irrigation and fertility of the soil; as such the question of imposition of a separate water-rate would not arise. The jalakara mentioned in the Gāhadavāla records may not have been a tax of the same kind as udakabhāga of Kauṭilya; on the other hand, it may have been a tax on the produce of water, fish for example. The list of royal rights conceded in favour of the donee includes the term sa-matsy-ākara and proves that fish was a source of income at this period and, consequently, also a source of revenue. A South Indian inscription issued by Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, records a dispute between a temple authority and an individual over the ownership of a river, which was settled by dividing the income from fishing equally among the parties.

A tax on cows was levied in South India under the term nalla or good cows. Gokara may have been a similar tax levied probably on the breeding of cows. During a financial crisis, Kauṭilya has advised taxation on the breeding of cows. Also vraja was a constituent of āyakārīra and according to Kauṭilya there were taxes on the sale and tending of cattle. On this analogy, gokara of the Gāhadavāla grants may, alternatively, have been a tax on the sale of cows in the villages.

Lavaṇakara and parṇakara are mentioned only once in the inscriptions of this dynasty, in the Machlishahr grant

---

1 ASAI., p. 12.
4 Artha., V, 2.
5 Artha., II, 29-30.
of Hariścandra issued in V. S. 1253. The importance of salt as a source of revenue is recognised by Kauśilya and in his system of revenue administration there was an officer to superintend the department of salt, lavanādhyakṣa¹. He was to collect out of prepared salt, the lavanabhāga and the prakrāya. It seems that while the salt mines generally may have belonged to the king, private manufacture of salt was allowed under the king’s licence. According to the condition of the Gāhādavāla land-grants the king’s right to the salt mines and the base metal mines in the lands granted were conceded in favour of the grantee; further by this tax the ‘king’s share’ of the private manufacture of salt by other persons in the village was also granted.

Parnākara or grass-tax is mentioned in legal literature also; according to Sukra the king is entitled to take one-third, one-fifth, one-seventh, one-tenth or one-twentieth from the collectors of grass and wood². The tax paid by the collectors of grass was probably called parṇakara.

Pravanihika: This tax has been explained by Ghoshal as a tax imposed on a certain class of merchants; the term pravani is mentioned after vanik in a list of persons belonging to a village granted by Mathanadeva³. A grant of a Somavatiḥi king of Trikaliṅga, refers to pravanihika⁴. Tripathi explains the term as a tax on turnpikes, intended to preserve the peace of the village by discouraging the advent of a large number of visitors; he has also suggested that it may have been a tax for the upkeep of the road⁵.

¹ Artha, II, 12
³ El., III, No. 36; HRS., p. 263.
⁴ El., XI, No. 14; HRS., p. 263.
⁵ HK., p. 348.
Pravanā according to the lexicons means catuspatha; as such pravani may have been some kind of road-cess or tax on road. The Arthaśāstra on the other hand refers to a kind of deya in connection with the expenditure involved in conveying the merchandise to foreign countries; it has been called ativāhika and has been explained as mārg-ātivāhana-sabāya-bhūt-āyudhiya-deyam; probably it was a fee for the military guides who escorted and helped the foreign merchants; these merchant-guides appear to have been appointed by the state. In the Gāhaḍavāla domain also, there may have been state guides (pravani?) posted in every village, whose duty probably was to escort and guide the merchants from the interior of the country to the high-way crossing leading to the next village or town. Pravanikara or the tax paid for the service of these guides, probably went partly to the remuneration of these guides and partly to the royal treasury.

Turuṣkadaṇḍa: This ādāya, though unknown in the grants of other dynasties, is frequently mentioned in the inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavālas. Divergent opinions have been expressed by the scholars about the interpretation of this unusual tax and needless to say, none of them offers a satisfactory solution of the problem that is Turuṣkadaṇḍa. Thus, it has been variously explained as a tax on the aromatic reed, a tribute paid to Ghazni by the Gāhaḍavālas, a tax imposed on the Turuṣka settlers or prisoners, a tax levied on the subjects of the Gāhaḍavālas to ward off the Turuṣka attacks.

1 Arth., II, 16 and Artha. Com., p. 243.
The name signifies that the tax or ādāya was in some way connected with the Turuṅkas, the contemporary Muslim invaders of India; in order to determine the nature of relation between this tax and the Turuṅkas we have to depend, to some extent, on the interpretation of the second term dānda. This term is generally used in literature to signify army or punishment. A Yādava inscription indicates that it may, also, mean a contribution which is not a penal measure. Thus, Turuṅkadaṅḍa may be interpreted in various ways: it might have been an ādāya to maintain a standing army against the Turuṅkas or to maintain a band of soldiers recruited from the Turuṅkas; it might have been a fine (i.e. tribute) paid to the Turuṅkas or a fine imposed on the Turuṅka settlers or prisoners; according to the second alternative interpretation of dānda, it may also mean contribution from the Turuṅkas (which amounts to a fine) or for the Turuṅkas, which again may mean either a tribute to Ghazni, or a special allowance to the Turuṅkas in the Gāhāḍavāla dominion or a special levy, imposed in order to meet the expenses of the Turuṅka war.

A systematic study of the Gāhāḍavāla landgrants help us to determine the plausibility of different interpretations mentioned above. This tax is mentioned in the very first inscription of the dynasty in V. S. 1148 and from that date to V. S. 1225, the last inscriptive date of Vijayacandra, it has been mentioned in thirty-one Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions. The geographical references in these landgrants show that collection of this tax was not confined to any particular region; it was collected from all parts of the Gāhāḍavāla

1 Cf. "Vasati-dānda-prayāna-dandauna" in the Paithan plate of Yādava Rāmacandra (IA., XIV, p. 318); also vide SGAL., p. 277.
dominion, from the vicinity of Kānyakubja to the modern Patna region. The tax, however, seems to have been totally discontinued from the reign of Jayaccandra, the penultimate king of the dynasty. Of the seventeen inscriptions (discovered so far) issued during this king’s reign, fifteen recorded grant of land by Jayaccandra himself, and not one of these refers to Turuṣkadaṇḍa, which was more or less a common tax during the previous reign, and is mentioned in the two landgrants issued by Jayaccandra during his father’s reign. The single grant of Hariścandra also does not contain any reference to it. The data, so far available, thus add, yet another puzzling feature to the tax. Our task, therefore, is not only to determine the nature of the tax, but also to explain, within bounds of probability, the cause of its subsequent discontinuance.

We have already seen that according to some interpretations, it might mean a tribute paid to the Sulṭān of Ghazni. A detail study of the Gāhaḍavāla political history, however, has shown that there is no indication of the subordination of the dynasty to the Sulṭānate of Ghazni, either in literature, Indian or foreign, or in inscriptions. Candradeva, according to some scholars, is to be identified with Cāṇḍ Rāi of Kanauj; but we have already seen that, there is not enough ground for this identification. Even if the identification is accepted and it is presumed that Candradeva began his career as a Turuṣka feudatory, his inscriptions clearly indicate that he had become independent by the year V. S. 1148. Under such circumstances, we cannot explain why the Turuṣkadaṇḍa, which certainly did not invoke glorious memories for

1 *HMHL*, III, p. 211.
2 Vide *supra*, pp. 37ff.
the Gāhadāvālas, continued to be collected, though there was no need to meet the expenses for the Ghazni-bound tribute; more inexplicable is the sudden discontinuance of this apparently purposeless but well-established tax from the beginning of the reign of Jayaccandra, when the kingdom was passing through a financial crisis and many new taxes had already been introduced.

The second group of scholars explains the tax as a fine (danḍa) collected from the Turuṣka settlers or prisoners. There is, however, an initial difficulty in interpreting danḍa as a fine, which is a penal measure and cannot technically be described as a tax. In the preceding pages it has been pointed out that the Gāhadāvāla landgrants carefully distinguish between the taxes and other sources of revenue and in the Kamauli grant of V. S. 1162 daśāparādhamāndha or fine collected for ten offences is mentioned, not among the taxes but among the other sources of revenue; Turuṣkadaṇḍa, however, is always found mentioned among the taxes, which indicates that it was not a fine. Further from the landgrants it is clear that the royal revenue, taxes and others, accrued from the villages donated, were conceded in favour of the donee; if we explain it as a fine collected from the Turuṣka prisoners, we must also presume that in the Gāhadāvāla dominion the Turuṣka prisoners were billeted in many villages (sometimes situated far away from the capital) in such considerable quantity as to form an oft-quoted source of village revenue. Such an arrangement of things, however, seems improbable in view of its futility as a revenue measure and also because of the risk involved. Some scholars have explained the term as a tax collected from the Turuṣka settlers; the possibility of a sectarian tax being imposed on the Turuṣkas by the Gāhadāvālas, who
in spite of their revivalist tradition, were extremely tolerant to other religious sects, seems to be a remote one. Lastly, if we assume that the tax was collected from the Turuṣka prisoners or settlers, how are we to explain its discontinuance from the beginning of the reign of Jayaccandra? The suggestion that it was discontinued because it was impossible for the vanquished king like him to realise it, is an anachronous one; for the tax appears to have been discontinued from the beginning of Jayaccandra’s reign (c. 1170 A.D.), while, he was defeated by the Muslims in the very last year of his reign (c. 1193 A.D.).

The use of the term daṇḍa in a Yādava inscription in order to indicate contribution has already been noted. Likewise, Turuṣkādaṇḍa also may be interpreted as a contribution for the Turuṣkas. The purpose of the contribution, however, still remains vague; it might be explained as a contribution for the Turuṣkas at Ghazni (that is, tribute), or for the Turuṣkas within the Gāhaḍavāla dominion or for the Turuṣka war. The compatibility of the first suggestion has already been examined; as for the second possible explanation, there is no conceivable reason which might have prompted the Indian kings to collect a contribution specially for the foreigners within their dominion. The last explanation brings us to the suggestion offered by Smith and supported by Ghoshal, Altekar and Rangaswami Aiyangar1,— the contribution was collected for the Turuṣka war, to ward off the Turuṣkas. Altekar has pointed out that a similar tax was levied by a Coḷa king, Virarājendra, to finance his war against the Cālukyas of Veṅgi2. This suggestion is, to

2 SGAI., p. 277.
some extent, in accordance with the evidence collected so far. Candradeva's inscriptions indicate that the Gāhaḍavāla dominion during his reign touched the frontier of the ‘Hindustan’ occupied by the Turuṣkas, who under the generalship of Maḥmūd of Ghazni had played havoc in Northern India at the beginning of the century. Most probably there was no actual clash between the Turks and Candradeva, but the man who laid the foundation of an empire must have felt the necessity of maintaining a huge standing army and consequently the Turuṣkadaṇḍa appears to have been levied to meet the extra military expense. The subsequent discontinuance of the tax might have been due to the change in frontier on the west during the reign of Vijayacandra when the Cāhamāna king Vigrāharāja IV occupied Delhi and the surrounding regions sometime before 1164 A.D. So roughly from that date, between the Gāhaḍavāla dominion and the Turuṣka menace lay, the strong arms of the Cāhamānas and naturally the Gāhaḍavāla vigilence for defence against the Turuṣkas must have been relaxed; probably in view of the increasing weakness of the later Yamānī Sultāns, they, like many contemporary dynasties, made the mistake of thinking that the Turuṣka menace itself was over. The abolition of a tax, whose purpose had apparently ceased to exist about five years ago, may have been a popular step taken by Jayaccandra at the commencement of his reign.

Kuṭaka and kumara-gadiṇaka: These are two more taxes, well-known under the Gāhaḍavāla regime but unknown elsewhere. In some of the inscriptions the first word has been spelt with a short u. Kuṭa according to the lexicons is a house and kuṭaka might have meant a tax on houses; such taxes have been mentioned in both the Arthaśāstra and the
Sukraniti. The spelling, however, in most of the Gāhadāvāla inscriptions is kūṭaka and not kuṭaka; lexicographically, kūṭa is a plough and kūṭaka, a ploughshare. A similar tax is mentioned for the first time in a grant by a ruler of Uccakalpa under the name balikākara. This term being practically unknown to technical literature, it is not possible to ascertain the cause or amount of the tax on the plough.

The other tax, kumara-gadiāṇaka has been spelt variously in the inscriptions as kumara-gadiāṇaka, kumara-gadiāṇaka, kumara-gadiyāṇaka and such like; in a few cases the first part of the word is spelt as kumāra. This obscure term has been explained as a tax at the rate of so much per gadyāṇaka (i.e. 32 guṇja berries) on behalf of the royal princes. From the analogy of the South Indian inscriptions another explanation of the term may be suggested. One inscription of Coḷa Rājendradeva II, dated in 1072 A.D., records that a pudavari (cloth?) was to be given to the king for every 1500 kuli of land under the kumari cultivation by the hill tribes. The kumari or kumri cultivation, well-known in South India, has been explained by the Yuktiścalpatara, a work of the eleventh century, as shifty cultivation. It is possible that in the Gāhadāvāla regime also kumari or shifty cultivation was carried on in some of the places, possibly in the hill areas and the forest tracts and the assessment on the land under shifty cultivation was different from the ordinary land; because of the comparatively hard labour involved and less output enjoyed in the former process,

1 Artha., II, 6 and Sukra., IV, 2, 128.
2 El., XIX, p. 21.
3 Ghoshal, HRS., p. 294 and V. V. Mirasi, JNSI., VII, p. 29.
5 YK., p. 6.
the tax imposed on land under *kumri* cultivation might have been nominal. It appears that with some other taxes, this tax too was adopted by the Gāhāḍavālas from South India, retaining the South Indian coin-name *gadyāṇaka*; probably the cultivators in South India were required to pay an amount equal to one *gadyāṇaka* for some specified measure and the due in the Gāhāḍavāla kingdom came to be known as *kumara-gadyāṇaka* or *gadiāṇaka*.

*Viṣaya-dāna*: This due has been mentioned only once in the Candrāvatī inscription of Candradeva in V. S. 1150/1093 A.D. It has been explained by Tripathi as some kind of district tax¹. This contention is supported by the fact that the grant, which mentions it, records the grant of a pattalā, with the exception of certain villages. It seems that the *viṣaya-dāna* was a kind of tax paid to the district in connection with the pattalā. The exact nature and amount of the tax cannot be ascertained.

*Valadi* is mentioned only in the Rahan grant of Govindacandra of V. S. 1166. It was probably a tax like the *nalle-rudu* (good bull) of a South Indian inscription². It may be noted here that the Arthaśāstra advocates emergency taxation on the breeding of cow³.

¹ *HK.*, p. 349.
² Gupta, *LSSI.*, p. 333. Several attempts have been made in these pages to explain some of the Gāhāḍavāla taxes with the help of analogies drawn from the South Indian inscriptions. These attempts may be justified in view of the close contact, which is known to have existed between the Coḷas and the Gāhāḍavālas. A remarkable insessional evidence of the friendship has been discovered at Gāṅgalkonḍa-Coḷapuram. This inscription, written below an inscription of Kulottuṅga I, dated in the 41st regnal year, traces the Gāhāḍavāla genealogy from Yaśovigrāha to Candradeva in the usual style, but ends abruptly (vide supra, pp. 81-82).
³ *Artha.*, V, 2.
Aṣapāṭalā-prastha or aṣapāṭal-ādaya and pratihāra-prastha: According to Ghoshal these terms meant ‘contribution of so much per prastha (a well-known liquid measure) payable by the villagers on account of the officers concerned’\(^1\). As such, they belong to the same category of taxes as the vasatidanda and prayāṇadanda for the royal officers mentioned in an inscription of Yādava Rāmacandra.

Some other taxes mentioned in the Gāhāḍavāla grants have not yet been explained and it is difficult to throw any light on their meaning. These are viṁśaticchavathva viśatiṭhuprastha and varavajjhe in Mahārājaḍūtra Govindacandra’s grants, yamalikāmbali mentioned often in Jayaccandra’s grants and dagapasadidirghagovica in Hariścandra’s Machlishahr grant\(^2\).

Besides these taxes, the agrarian right of the king in the villages and sometimes proceeds from some other sources of revenue also are conceded in favour of the donees. The agrarian rights are more or less the same in almost all the grants, whether they were issued from Vārāṇaśī or from some other portion of the Gāhāḍavāla dominion. The only remarkable exceptions are the landgrants of Mahārājaḍūtra Govindacandra, all of which were probably issued from the Kāṇyakubja region.

A perusal of the common series of inscriptions reveals that generally the royal right extended over different parts of the villages excluding the land inhabited and cultivated; it, thus, extended over jala-sthala, lobha-lavan-ākara, matsya-ākara, gartt-oṣara and madhuk-āmra-vana-vāśika-trṣayūti-gocara. The first term jala-sthala, may have meant either

---

\(^1\) HRS., p. 296.
\(^2\) EI., X, p. 100.
marshy land or plain land and water reservoir; these reservoirs probably included vāpi (wells with flights of steps), kūpa (ordinary well), tadāga (tanks) and probably all the gardens on the bank of the reservoirs (kaccharāma). The second term indicates the king’s right over the base metal (loba): mines and salt mines. The inscriptions of this period and of earlier ones show that generally mines were government monopoly; but private persons, specially the Brāhmaṇas, were sometimes allowed to own mines with the king’s licence, on condition of paying regularly the king’s share of the produce, which was probably called ākara. Matisyākara evidently referred to some of the water-reservoirs like tadāgas and also the river, if any, which flows through or along the village. The right of fishing in these places was one of the royal privileges, and this too was generally conceded to the donees with the land. Gartt-oṣara referred to the ditches, drains and trenches and sterile land in a village. Sometimes the madbuka and the āmra gardens were also considered royal property.

Tṛṇayūti and gocara are almost synonymous terms, the former meaning grass-plots and the latter grazing grounds. Tṛṇayūti has been explained sometimes as inadequately fertile plots, which were allowed to lie uncultivated for a year or two by turns. As such, however, tṛṇayūti certainly was the private property of the cultivator and the king’s right over it cannot be entertained. Kauṭilya enjoins the kings to provide pasture grounds in the uncultivable land and probably the villagers were allowed to use these grounds on payment of a tax to meet the initial expense and the cost of upkeep. These plots may have been called tṛṇayūtis and were distinct from the gocara or common grazing ground which was probably the village-
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property; the state appears to have been responsible for protection and maintenance of the former.

Some of the agrarian rights mentioned above possibly carried with them the responsibilities involved. Thus, the donee might have been responsible for the preservation, protection and upkeep of the water-reservoirs, river-banks, fruit-gardens, grass-plots and grazing grounds, though the income from them was but nominal. On the other hand, the right over the base metal mines and the salt mines was highly remunerative and carried little or no responsibility therewith.

All the ancient law-givers refer to the king’s right over the forests and the hill-tracts. These are mentioned in the Candrāvati grant of king Candradeva (V. S. 1150), which records the grant of a pattālā; it was granted with the exception of the previous grants and with rights over giri-gabana-pāsāna together with almost all the rights mentioned above. Forest and hill tracts no doubt constituted an important source of income, yielding elephants, valuable trees and minerals.

The Candrāvati inscription, mentioned above, refers to two other kinds of dues, namely, svanaukābhātaka and tarādāya, along with the taxes but carefully distinguishes them from the taxes. Tarādāya is probably the same as taradeya or ferry duty, explained by Kauṭilya as yātrāvatana. The same author mentions another due, similar to the second one,—nauḥbhātaka—and explains it as the rent (bhātaka) payable by the fishermen and pearlfishers for their use of

1 Cf. “Yathā diyamāna bhāgabhogakara...viṣayadānaprabhṛti-samastādāyen tathā svanaukābhātakatarādāyan-ebhyaḥ upanetavyān upaneṣyath-eti” etc. in EI., XIV, p. 195.
2 Artha., II, 28.
the royal boats. In the Gáhāḍavāla dominion also the royal boats (svanaukā) appear to have been used in private business projects. The inscription which refers to these two dues, records the grant of Kaṭhehali pattalā, bounded on three sides by the three rivers Gomati, Bhāgirathī and Barnā. These dues must have fetched a considerable amount of revenue in the pattalā. These were, however, conceded in favour of the donees.

As we have already seen, the grants of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra, issued from the Paṅcāla region, differ from the other Gáhāḍavāla grants in style and technical terminology. The Rahan grant mentions vāhyāvāhyamtarasiddhi along with the taxes conceded in favour of the donee. The term reminds one of the aṣṭabhoga rights or eightfold enjoyment; these rights were on nidbi (treasure-trove), nikṣepa (buried or unclaimed treasure), pāśāṇa (mountain and rock with mines and minerals), siddhi (cultivated land), sādhyā (product of land), jalāṃta (water and water product), akṣinī (actual privileges), āgāmi (future rights). Vāhyāvāhyamtarasiddhi includes most of the rights mentioned above; vāhyāvāhyam may refer to nidbi, nikṣepa and pāśāṇa, siddhi to both siddhi and sādhyā and tara to water products. On this analogy it appears that vāhyāvāhyamtarasiddhi, might have been a local term which was probably introduced to indicate the royal rights and privileges conceded to the donee; as such, it should have been included not in this section, but in the section that describes the boundaries of the village. However, the style and arrangement of this

1 Shamasastro prefers the other reading which according to Ganapati Sastri is a wrong one (cf. 'nauḥāṣṭakam-ity-apapāṭhaḥ' in Artha. Comm., I, p. 307).

2 Kisamwar Glossary, 48, op. cit. LSSI., p. 329.
group is not always systematic and in the same inscription *tṛṇaparṇakara*, a tax, is found mentioned among other sources of revenue. In the Basahi grant the village was donated with *kṣetra-vana-madbuk-ākāśa-pātāla* and *daś-āparāda* and in the Kamauli grant with *tṛṇayuti-gocara, jala-śthala, āmra-madbuka-gart-ōśara-pāṣāna-nadi-vana-loha-lavan-ākara-daś-āparāda-daṇḍa* and *ākāśa-pātāla*. *Kṣetra* technically means cultivated land and the inclusion of it in the grant shows that the state owned some cultivated plots or some farm in that village. Another term which we have not met with before in the Gahaḍavāḷa grants, is *sākāsapātāla* or *ākāśa-pātālasahita*; probably the rights over mines and buried treasure were indicated by the term *sapātāla*. What is meant by *sākāśa* however is not clear; a similar term *ākāśotpatti* is known in a few of the Candrātreya grants and the term was translated as the produce of the sky, which has been left unexplained.

*Daś-āparāda-daṇḍa* is a common term in inscriptions, and land in ancient India was often granted with *daś-āparāda-daṇḍa* or *daṇḍa-daś-āparāda*. Fleet explains it as the donee’s right to the proceeds of fines for committing ten offences, while according to Ghoshal, it indicates the donee’s right of exemption from the punishment for *daś-āparāda*. According to some scholars the former explanation also implies the donee’s right of jurisdiction over the offences committed. It is, however, possible that, though generally the balance of the fines after meeting the necessary expenses of the village court, was returned to the central treasury, in some cases it was diverted

---

1 IA., XVIII, pp. 16-17.
2 Gupta Inscription, pp. 189 and 218.
3 HRS., 219-20.
to the donee; as such, the term need not necessarily have implied the donee's jurisdiction over the village.

The sources of revenue or āya-śarīra according to Kauṭilya comprise durga, rāṣṭra, khani, setu, vana, vraja and vanik-patha\(^1\). Among the taxes mentioned above, bhāgabhogakara kumaragadįyāṇaka, daśavandha, pānākara, kūṭaka and tara obviously go under the rāṣṭra head of revenue. Praṇikara, svanauktābhāṭaka and jālakara may belong to either of the vanikpatha or rāṣṭra head of revenue. The gokara and valadi were dues of vraja type. From among the revenues from khani only lavanaṭaka and ākara have been mentioned.

Besides these, there certainly were various kinds of occasional taxes like akṣapataḷa-prastha (or -ādāya) and pratibhāra-prastha. Though the inscriptions do not mention, there were also probably the licence fees for private mines and salt-plants. Fines for breaking the laws and committing offences and crimes also must have been another source of revenue; one such group of offences is mentioned in one of the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions, namely, daś-āparādha. Besides these, the treasure-troves as well as the buried and unclaimed treasure and property of heirless persons were generally considered to be king's property.

The imposition of Turuṣkadaṇḍa appears to have been an emergency measure; two other taxes gokara and valadi, if interpreted as taxes on breeding, go under the head of emergency taxation.

As the lands granted by the Gāhaḍavāla kings are always in rāṣṭra or rural area, it is only natural that those grants should not contain any of the items of revenue grouped under the durga head by Kauṭilya; but doubtless many of

\(^1\) *Artha, II, 4.*
them, namely, tolls, fines, registration fees (*mudrā*), licence fees, taxes on building sites, artisans, merchandise, and duties on liquor, prostitutes and gambling, constituted important sources of revenue in the capital city and also in other towns and cities, which under the Gāhāḍavāla system of administration may have been separate units.

(a) Expenditure

Sukra gives us an idea of the state expenditure of the period. According to him the army is the most important head of expenditure and half the revenue must be spent on it. Gifts, principal officers, heads of departments and the king’s personal expenses, each of these four items is entitled to one-twelfth of the revenue; the balance, about one-sixth of the total revenue, is to be deposited in the state treasury.¹

Greater stress was laid on religious expenses and gifts in the description of *vyaya-sarīra* of Kauṭilya, which begins with expenditure for the worship of gods and ancestors and presents for auspicious prayers by the priests (*svasti-vācana*)².

Lakṣmīdharā also lays great stress on religious ceremonies the chanting of the Vedas and various sacrifices and *pujās*, which must be undertaken by a king for the prosperity and welfare of his dominion. The Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions indicate that a vast amount of wealth was spent on religious activities, specially in observances of various religious ceremonies and sacrifices and subsequent *dakṣiṇās* and *dānas* bestowed on the Brāhmaṇas and the *purobitas*. The lands they granted were almost always villages, sometimes with the *pātakas*; once a whole pattalā with the exception of some villages, was given away to the Brāhmaṇas.

¹ *Sukra*, I, p. 316-17.
² *Artha*, II, 4.
Lakṣmīdhara, who as the Mahāsandhivigrahika of Govindacandra directed and undertook many victorious expeditions, has devoted a chapter to the description of yātrā or operations of war. The vastness of the Gāhaḍavāla army, as already noted, impressed both the Indian and the Muslim writers. Thus military expenses also appear to have been heavy, as may be gathered from the maintenance of a vast standing army and the speedy expansion of the Gāhaḍavāla domain.

Another important item of expenditure was the remuneration for the state servants or rājapuruṣas. It is not certain whether they were paid in cash or in kind, that is, in landed property. Kauṭilya refers to eight different grades in salary for different classes of officials; the epigraphic evidence of later periods proves that the state servants were often granted land, in lieu of their services to the state. Lakṣmīdhara's commentary on the Śaṅkha-likhita-smṛti refers to vetana or wages. From this commentary it appears that the warriors and also, all the rājapuruṣas generally received remuneration in cash (vetana) and presents (dāna) in recognition of their valuable services; the famous warriors received robes over and above the vetana and dāna. The B. A. S. land-grants of Jayaccandra in which Rāuta Kṣatriya Rājya-dharavarman received some tax-free villages, indicate that sometimes the Gāhaḍavāla rājapuruṣas received vetana or dāna in kind. This type of tax-free villages, granted to the rājapuruṣas, however, appears to have been distinguished

1 Artha., V. 3; cf. Vat., XIX, 23-24 advocating exemption of the rāja-pumān from taxation.
3 IA., XVIII, pp. 134-43.
from the two other types of tax-free villages, namely, deva-grāma and dvija-grāma (villages granted to the Brāhmaṇas and gods), as the vikara-grāmas in the Candrāvatī inscription of V. S. 1150. Lākṣmīdhara’s commentary mentioned above, also advocates state pension to the sons of warriors killed in action.

Epigraphic and numismatic evidence indicates that there was a heavy strain on the Gāhaḍavāla treasury as early as the last days of Govindacandra; a number of new and obscure taxes were imposed and gold and silver coins of extremely base metal were issued. This financial crisis may be attributed to the religious bounty of the Gāhaḍavāla kings, to their military ambition and to the Turkish menace on the west.

1 El., IV, pp. 193-96.
CHAPTER VIII
RELIGION SOCIETY, AND CULTURE

Section I. Religion

Most of the archaeological material for the religious history of the period, images and the like, perished as the result of the Muslim occupation of Northern India. The Tāj ul-Ma‘āthīr, a contemporary work, claims that after the defeat of Jayaccandra c. 1193 A. D., the Turkish soldiers destroyed at Banaras alone ‘nearly one thousand temples and raised mosques on their foundations’¹. This instance of the Turkish achievement at Banaras has doubtless been cited by the author as the most remarkable example of its kind; numerous mosques and early Muslim buildings in different parts of Northern India bear the unmistakable stamp of being reconstructed with Hindu material². Some early Muslim buildings at Badaun and Jaunpur also were made with the material obtained from the temples and buildings, which according to local tradition, were originally erected in the Gāhadavāḷa period³. Some of the early Sultan's of Delhi were iconoclasts, and the Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī mentions two such accomplishments of Iltutmish (1211-36 A. D.); it has

¹ HI., II, pp. 226 ff. and TF., I, p. 179.
² cf. “Few things in the history of architecture are more remarkable than the skill with which, from the very outset, the Muhammadans transformed the Hindu and Jaina temples into mosques for the Faithful, or the imagination which they displayed in employing Indian sculptors to adorn their edifices with designs incomparably more exquisite than their own,” (Haig, CHI., III, p. 570).
been recorded by the author that ‘in the year 632 H. the Sulṭān led the hosts of Islam towards Malwah, and took the fortress and town of Bhilsan and demolished the idol temple, which took three hundred years in building .......... advanced to Ujjainnagari, and destroyed the idol temples of Mahākāl Diw’ 1.

With the destruction of countless temples, wherever the Muslims appeared, not only did some of the finest specimens of architecture and sculpture of the late mediaeval Hindu India perish, but with them, also valuable material for the study of religious history. Consequently, we have to depend a great deal on the meagre information supplied by the inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavāla kings, which give a picture, though incomplete, of the religious faith and policy of the kings and incidentally glimpses of the general religious condition of the country. Fortunately, the socio-religious ideal set forth in the contemporary Dharmaśāstra digest, Kṛtyakalpataru, by Lakṣmīdhara, the Mahāsāndhivigrāhika of the great Gāhaḍavāla king Govindaçandra-deva, to some extent, supplements the inadequate data, furnished by the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions.

(a) Religious faith and policy of the Gāhaḍavāla kings

The external and internal evidences of the inscriptions clearly indicate that the Gāhaḍavāla rulers were worshippers of Viṣṇu. The bell-shaped seal of these kings, with circular face, represents in relief a figure of Garuḍa, having the body of a man and the head of a bird at the top, together with the name of the king inscribed across the

1 TN., pp. 621-22.
centre and a conchshell placed at the bottom. *Garuda* is the mythological *vāhana* of Viṣṇu and the conchshell may be identified with the *Pāncajanya*. The indication of the seal is supported by the opening verses of the official inscriptions, in which the goddess Lakṣmī, the consort of Viṣṇu is invoked. The Candrāvasī inscription of V. S. 1156 relates that Candradeva, the first king of this dynasty, set up an image of Lord Ādi-Keśava at Kāśi and adorned it with gold and jewels. Another Candrāvasī inscription of the same king records that after a munificent gift of gold and other valuables, equal to the king’s weight and a thousand cows to the image of Ādi-Keśava, a village was granted for the maintenance of the shrine of Candra-Mādhava. An earlier Candrāvasī inscription of the king records a grant in front of Sauri-Nārāyaṇa. Jayaccandra the last great king of the dynasty was initiated (dikṣā-grahaṇa), with the consent of his father, into the worship of Krṣṇa by the priest Praharājaśarman, who has been styled a *Vaiṣṇavapūjāvidbhir*. Thus, the inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavāla kings evidence their predilection for *Vaiṣṇavism* in particular.

Like a true Hindu these kings, however, appear to have followed a liberal religious policy. They offered homage to many other gods of the Hindu pantheon. The foremost among these gods, of course was Śiva, the

---
3 This shrine, as the name indicates, was probably erected by Candradeva himself and Madhavānanda, the writer of the above grant, is said to have made the image of Candra-Mādhava (cf. “Śrī-Candra-Mādhava yena ghaṭitaḥ” in the *El.*, XIV, pp. 197 ff.)
4 *El.*, IX, pp. 302 ff.
Lord of Kāśī. In the inscriptions, the Gāhaḍavāla kings generally described themselves as parama-Māheśvaras or devout worshippers of Siva. Siva was one of the gods, who were generally worshipped, prior to the bestowal of grants by the Gāhaḍavāla kings, the other two being Vāsudeva and Sūrya. He is referred to as Kṛttivāsa in the Kamauli inscription of V. S. 1231, issued by Jayacandra. Moreover, the undated Sārnath inscription of Kumāradevi mentions both Hari and Hara and states that the former, being commissioned by the latter to protect Vārāṇasī, was born in the person of Govindacandra. The B. A. S. grant of V. S. 1177 records the transfer of two villages (Karaṇḍa-grāma and Karaṇḍatalla in Antarāla pattalā), which were originally given by king Yaśah-Karna of the Kalacuri line to the Rājaguru-Saiśācūrya-bhaṭṭāraka Rudra-Siva, the villages being transferred to Ṭhakkura Vaśiṣṭha in the presence of Govindacandra. The Gāhaḍavāla king defeated the Kalacuri ruler sometime before 1125 A. D. and occupied a portion of his kingdom, where this transfer of the landed interest took place. The religion of Ṭhakkura Vaśiṣṭha is not known. No reason for this transfer of property has been stated in the record.

The Candrāvaṭī inscription of V. S. 1150 refers to another important god, Brahman; at the beginning of the Rahan grant salutations have been offered to Paramātman and the third verse states that when the voice of the Veda was almost extinct in the world, Svayambhū himself.

1 EL., IV, pp. 124-26.
was born in the person of Candradeva to restore the earth to the path of virtue\(^1\).

The Sun, whose worship is generally associated with Vaiṣṇavism, also seems to have been a favourite deity with the Gāhaḍavāla kings, and the Sun-god, was worshipped under various names. Thus, half a village was once donated to the God Lolārka by Jayaccandra, while the other half was granted to a number of Brāhmaṇas\(^3\). Gosalladevi, one of the queens of Govindacandra is recorded to have made a grant in front of this God\(^5\). It is interesting to note that the shrine of this god still exists at Banaras and is visited by the Hindu women on the 6th day of the bright half of Bhādra; it is situated in the southern part of the city and is well known as Lolārka-kunḍa\(^4\). The Kamauli grant of V. S. 1228 was made in front of Gaṅgāditya\(^5\) (cf. “deva-Srī-Gaṅgāditya saṁnidhau”), either two deities, Gaṅgā and Āditya, or the Solar god under the epithet of Gaṅgāditya.

The religious life of Jayaccandra, the penultimate king of the dynasty is interesting. The Kamauli inscription of V.S. 1224, to which reference has already been made, records a grant celebrating the initiation of Yuvarāja Jayaccandra as a worshipper of Kṛṣṇa by Praharājaśarman, who has been styled the Vaiṣṇava-pūjāvidbiguru\(^6\). Jayaccandra, however, not only

---

1 Cf. “Om Paramātmame namo” and “Utsanna-prāya Veda-dhvanī jagad-akhilam manyamāna Svayambhūḥ” etc. (IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.)

2 EI., IV, pp. 128-29.

3 EI., V, pp. 116 ff.

4 IC., II, pp. 147 ff. and IA., XXVI, p. 112.

5 EI., IV, p. 122.

6 EI., IV, pp. 117-20.
continued to use the usual epithet *para-māheśvara*, but also granted a village in the presence of the god Kṛttivāsa. The Bodh-Gaya inscription of V.S.124X, on the other hand refers to the monk Śrīmitra, as the *dīkṣāguru* of Kāśiśa Jayaccandra and relates that out of reverence king Jayaccandra himself became his disciple. As the relevant evidence is not available, it is not known whether this initiated disciple of Śrīmitra became an exclusive follower of Buddha or just added another object of veneration to the pantheon of gods generally worshipped by the Gāhaḍavālas. In this connection it may be noted here that the Kāmil ut-Tawārikh refers to a white elephant which Jayaccandra owned; after the defeat of the Gāhaḍavāla king by Sihab ud-Din Ghūrī, a number of Indian elephants were captured and among these, there was a white one. A person who saw it told Ibn Āthīr, the author, that when the elephants were brought before Sihab ud-Din and were ordered to salute, they all saluted except the white one. The white elephant is a rare animal and a sacred one according to the Buddhist scriptures; it is associated with the birth of Buddha and also with his previous births. The statement of the Muslim historian thus endorses the evidence of the inscription mentioned above. The white elephant did not salute Sihab ud-Din because being a sacred animal, it was not taught to do so.

Though all the Gāhaḍavāla kings were devout worshippers of the Hindu gods and generally practised Hinduism, their attitude towards other religions was one of catholicity and toleration. Kumārādevī, one of the queens of Govinda-

3 *HI.*, II, p. 251.
candra was a Buddhist and the Sarnath inscription shows that she was allowed to follow her own religious faith; this undated inscription records the restoration by the queen of the Dharmacakra-Jina (originally set up by Dharmasoka), at the request of Jambukī; a new vihāra was built on this occasion and the Jina was placed in it. Govindacandra seems to have married another Buddhist queen Vasantadevi, who is mentioned in the colophon of a Nepal manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā, which runs as follows: ‘Śrī-Śrī-Kānyakubjādhipaty-āśvapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatray-ādhipati -Śrīmad-Govindacandra-devasya pratāpavaśataḥ Rājñī-Śrī-pravara-Mahāyāna-yājinyāḥ paramopāsikā rājñī Vasantadevyā deyadharma'yam’. Thus the Buddhist queens of Govindacandra were allowed to follow their own religious faith and extend their patronage to it. Govindacandra himself is recorded to have made a gift in favour of some Buddhist monks; in V.S. 1186 the king, after worshipping Vāsudeva and other Hindu gods, granted six villages in Vāḍācaturaśiti pattalā to the Śākyabbikṣu-saṅgha at Jetavana-vihāra at the request of Saugata-parivrājaka mahāpaṇḍita Śākyarakṣita of Utkaladeśa and Saugata-parivrājaka mahāpaṇḍita Vāgīśvararakṣita of Coḍadeśa.

It may be of some significance that of the two Gāhaḍavāla Buddhist queens, neither is described as paṭṭa-mahādevi or samastarājaprakriy-opeta (endowed with all the royal prerogatives), while each of the two Hindu queens receives this honour. Govindacandra’s marriage with Kumāradevi was undoubtedly of great political importance,

1 El., IX, pp. 319-28.
2 El., IX, p. 321. According to some scholars, however, these two queens were identical (Vide HK., p. 315).
for she was the grand-daughter of Mathanadeva Rāṣṭra-
kūṭa and niece of the Pāla king, Rāmapāla. Still she
is not found to have enjoyed the rank given to the Hindu
queens. This may be due to the fact that in spite of his
catholic outlook Govindacandra, who patronized the
revivalist digest-writer and himself followed the Dharmaśāstra
injunctions, was an orthodox Hindu and as such he could
not very well confer the rank of paṭṭamahādevī or chief
queen on a wife, who did not share his religious faith
and functions.

The Gāhaḍavāla tax Turuṣkadaṇḍa was explained by
Sten Konow as a tax imposed on the Turuṣkas; this expla-
nation, if accepted, would imply that the catholicity of the
Gāhaḍavāla kings did not extend to Islam\(^1\). However, accord-
ing to the Kāmil ut-Tawārikh the Mussulmans in and
around Vārāṇasi ‘continued faithful to the laws of Islam
and constant in prayer and good work’\(^2\); this information,
supplied by a Muslim historian, makes the inference highly
probable that in the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom, the Muslims
were not penalised for their religion, but permitted to carry
on their religious duties without any obstruction from the
Hindu rulers.

\(b\) Religious activities of the Gāhaḍavāla kings

The Gāhaḍavāla kings from the very beginning stood
as champions of Hinduism. The Basahi inscription of
Mahārājaputra Govindacandra declares that after the demise
of Bhoja and Karna, when the earth was distressed, Candra-
deva became the lord of the earth\(^3\). Another inscription

---

1 \(EI\., \text{IX, p. 321. But vide supra, pp. 176 ff.}\)
2 \(HI\., \text{I, p. 251.}\)
3 \(IA\., \text{XIY, pp. 101-04 (verse 3).}\)
of the same prince (Rahan grant of V.S. 1166), describes one aspect of the world’s distress, saying that after the fall of the dynasties of the Sun and the Moon, the voice of Veda was almost extinct on the earth; the Creator, in order to save the world from this crisis and to restore the earth to the path of virtue, was born in the person of Candradeva¹. The establishment of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, which restored political stability in the region formerly under the Pratihāra occupation, saw the revival of the normal religious activities with increased enthusiasm, and the Gāhaḍavāla kings themselves took an active part in following the precepts of Hindu religion. The Puranic and ritualistic revivalist spirit of the age is embodied in the Kṛtyakalpataru, the contemporary Dharmasastra digest compiled at the command of Govindacandra, the greatest of the Gāhaḍavāla kings.

In view of the occasional Muslim invasions, one of the most important religious duty of a Hindu ruler was the protection of the tirthas or the sacred places. Four important tirthas were under the Gāhaḍavāla protection, namely, Kāśi, the seat of Saiva worship in Northern India, Kuśika, the legendary capital of the son of Gādhi (who afterwards attained Brāhmaṇahood and became famous as sage Viśvāmitra), Indrasthāṇi, associated with epic traditions and lastly Uttara-Kośala or Ayodhyā, where had been situated the sacred capital of Śrī-Rāmacandra. Some of these had already been sacked by the Muslims and, there was constant danger of fresh Muslim invasions. Candradeva, the first ruler of this dynasty, is credited with having

protected all these tīrthas. Both Govindacandra and Vijayacandra fought with the Muslims and the former is specially praised in the Sārnath inscription as the incarnation of Hari, commissioned by Hara, to protect the sacred city of Vārāņasī, the favourite seat of the latter god.

Lakṣmīdhara advises a king to perform seven religious ceremonies to prevent drought, famine, pestilence and other calamities and to ensure prosperity, wealth, victory and sovereignty; these are Devayātra, or the festival of gods, Kaumudimabotsava in honour of Siva, Indradhvajochrāya or raising of Indra’s staff, Navarātripūjā of Durgā Mahiṣamardini, Cīhapūjā in honour of Durgā, Vasodbhārā or worship of Devī for wealth and Gavotsarga.

Bestowal of gifts on gods and Brahmaṇas was a pious act according to the Śāstras. Numerous grants prove the munificence of the Gāhadaṇāla kings in these directions. Three kinds of mahādānas have been specified in their inscriptions, namely, tulāpuruṣa, gosahasra and pañca-lāṅgala. While praising Candradeva for his bounty, most of his inscriptions state ‘the earth was discoloured hundreds of times by scales, when he constantly gave away gold of his own weight to the Brāhmaṇas’; one of the Candrāvatī inscriptions actually records an occasion when some villages were granted after the performance of the two mahādānas, tulāpuruṣa and gosahasra, in front of an image of Ādi-Keśava. The Kamauli grant of V. S.

2 IA., IX, pp. 319-28 (verse 3).
3 Kṛtya, Rājadharmakāṇḍa, (intro.) pp. 76 ff. and (tx.) pp. 180 ff.
4 Cf. “Hem-ātmatulyam-anisāṁ-dadātā yen-āṁkitā vasumati śaṭasas-tulābhiḥ” etc.).
5 Cf. “Deva-Śrimad-Ādi-Keśava-dakṣiṇa-mūrtau tulāpuruṣa-
1231/35 mentions another occasion, when Jayaccandra performed a *tulāpuruṣa mabādāna* in front of Lord Kṛttivāsa. In V.S. 1181 Govindacandra and his mother Rālaḍaṇādevī bestowed a village as a *pa(m)calāṅgala-mabādāna* on a Brāhmaṇa1. Many a prominent Hindu king is said to have performed the *tulāpuruṣa mabādāna*, such as the Rāṣṭrākūṭa kings Indrarāja III and Govinda IV2; it is said that one who performs this rite, stays for innumerable years in the world of Viṣṇu. The *paṇcalāṅgala vrata* was performed by Devarāya II of Vijayanagara in S.S. 13503. Besides these *mabādānas*, the Gāhaḍavāla kings on various auspicious days, after performing the necessary religious rites, used to grant tax-free villages to Brāhmaṇaṇas and also for the maintenance of temples. The inscriptions of the dynasty refer to two instances of *deva-dānas* or gifts to gods; the Candrāvati inscription of V.S. 1156 records the grant of a village for the maintenance of the shrine of Candra-Mādhava and the Kamauli grant of Jayaccandra refers to the gift of the half of a village to the Sun-god Lolarka4. However, most of the grants of this dynasty record *Brahmadānas*

gosahasra-mahādāna-samanantaram" in the *El.*, XIV, pp. 197-200 and *IHQ.*, March 1949, pp. 31-37.

1 Banaras grant; *IASB.*, LVI, pt. I, pp. 113-18. The editor read the name of the *mabādāna* as ‘para-lāṅgala’. There is, however, a great deal of similarity between ‘ra’ and ‘ca’ of this period, and on examining the plate, I have noticed that it may as well be read as ‘paca-lāṅgala’ or ‘pa(m)ca-lāṅgala’. Various Purāṇas refer to *paṇcalāṅgala* as one of the sixteen *mabādānas*. According to the Matsya-purāṇa, five plough-shares of wood and five of gold, ten fine oxen, decked with gold on their horns and with pearls on their tails, silver on their hoofs and land according to one’s means constitute this *mabādāna*. (Vide Kṛtya., Dānakāṇḍa, pp. 49 and 89-90, and Kane, *History of the Dharmaśāstras*, II, ii. pp. 869 and 875-76).

2 *El.*, IX, p. 24 and VII, pp. 17, 26,


4 *El.*, IV, pp. 126-29,
or gifts of tax-free lands to the Brāhmaṇas; only in a few cases small holdings in villages were given away, but in most of the cases whole villages and on some occasions more than one village were granted to individual donees; Candradeva once gave away a whole pattalā, with the exception of the previously granted deva-duija-vihara-grāmas to five hundred Brāhmaṇas and a village in another pattalā for the residence of those Brāhmaṇas (Brahmapuri)\(^1\).

The erection of temples was another pious deed which some of the Gāhadavāla kings performed. It has already been noticed that Candradeva granted a village for the maintenance of the shrine of Candra-Mādhava; the name indicates that it may have been a shrine dedicated to Mādhava or Viṣṇu by the king himself. A Svetāmvara Jaina temple in Candrautī is still known to the local inhabitants as Candra-Mādhō\(^2\). One of the Candrāvati inscriptions informs that this king decorated a Viṣṇu-Hari-mūrti, consecrated at Kāśi; an image of Lord Ādi-Kesāva was lavishly adorned with gold and precious stones\(^3\).

Madanapāla and Govindacandra may have been too busy with defence, conquest and consolidation to pay serious attention to any temple building project; at any rate, inscriptions and traditions are silent about any such activity. The local traditions of Jaunpur and Zafarabad connect the names of the next two kings, Vijayacandra and Jayaccandra with the construction of a number of temples in the locality\(^4\). The Ataladevi Masjid in the town of Jaunpur, according to local traditions, was originally a temple of

\(^{1}\) El., XIV, pp. 193-96.
\(^{2}\) El., XIV, pp. 197-200.
\(^{3}\) IHQ., March, 1949, p. 37.
Ataladevi erected by Vijayacandra; after the Muslim conquest of Northern India, it was converted into a mosque some time before 1407 A.D. Two other temples are said to have been erected by Vijayacandra and Jayaccandra respectively on the sites where the Khalis Mukhelis and the Jhanjira Masjid are now situated; the tradition says that the old temples were demolished under the governorship of Ibrāhīm and new Islamic structures were set up on their sites. The Lāl-Darwāja Musjid is essentially of Hindu design and contains an inscribed stone slab, mentioning the name of Vijayacandra with a date. Another mosque, the Mosque Seikh Baran, also seems to be of Hindu design and according to some, may have originally formed part of a temple built by Vijayacandra or Jayaccandra. A big mound, called Vijaya Mandil, according to the locally current traditions, is the site of a temple erected by Vijayacandra.

At present it is not possible to determine the veracity of the above traditions connected with the names of the Gāhāḍavāla kings. But it is well known that many of the mosques were built at the sites of old Hindu temples in various parts of India, and often with material derived therefrom. Sometimes inscribed or wrought bricks and stone slabs were cut and sculptured afresh, or laid inside out, in the Islamic structures, to conceal their Hindu origin. The buildings mentioned in the previous paragraph also present some of these features. Local traditions relating to those temples and buildings, therefore, may be regarded as having at least a kernel of truth.

The undated Sārnath inscription records a notable work of restoration (jirṇoddhara) undertaken by Kumāradevi, the Buddhist queen of Govindacandra, namely, the
restoration of the Dharmačakra-Jina, which was known in the days of Dharmaśko; the same inscription also records the erection of a vibhāra for the Buddhist monks by the queen.

(c) Religious condition of the country in general

The inscriptions of the Gahaḍavāla kings indicate that the first king Candradeva ushered in an era of Brahmanical revivalism. Religious activities may have declined in the Madhyadeśa during the anarchical period which followed the downfall of the Pratihāra dynasty as the result of repeated Muslim invasions. The Gahaḍavāla monarchs not only established peace and order in the country and protected the sacred places from defilement, but also, as we have seen, actively patronized the Brahmanical religion in various ways, not confining their devotion to any one god of the pantheon only. The kings, though mostly devout worshippers of Viṣṇu, seem to have cultivated an eclectic attitude, and their capital being the chosen city of Siva, the cults of both the gods appear to have flourished side by side. In the inscriptions there is not a single reference to any struggle or misunderstanding between the worshippers of the two gods; on the other hand the inscriptiveal representation of Govindacandra as an incarnation of Hari, who has been commissioned by Hara to protect Vārāṇasī, not only indicates that they lived in mutual respect and amity, but also provides an interesting example of the idea of cult syncretism.

Lakṣmīdhara's selection of the seven religious rites, to be performed by the king for the prosperity of his realm, throws some interesting light on the religious condition of

1 El., IX, pp. 319 ff.
the country. For the detail description of the ceremonies he has almost entirely depended on the Purānic accounts and has seldom added a critical or explanatory note of his own; consequently, these chapters of the Rājadharmakāṇḍa do not, in any way, supplement our knowledge about these ceremonies, as obtained from the Purāṇas. It may, however, be presumed that his choice, to some extent, reflects popular religious sentiment.

Devayātrā festivals should be performed on certain tithis and nakṣatras in honour of various gods, namely, Brahman, goddess of learning, Gaṅgā, Vināyaka, Nāga, Skanda, Sun, Rudra, Indra, Durgā, Earth-goddess, Creator, Viśṇu, and such others. Kaumudimabotsava, to be performed on the fullmoon day in the month of Kārtika, was a festival dedicated to Śiva. Indradhvaja, the staff of victory, was originally given by Śiva to Viśṇu and from him it passed, on to various gods, the last being Indra. In Navarātrīpūja Durgā is worshipped as the destroyer of the Buffalo-demon. Cībhapūja, also, is performed in honour of Durgā through various emblems and pictorial representations; she is represented as Umā, mounted on a lion, as Mahāmāyā, on a monkey or Garuḍa and so forth. The ancient rite of Vasoddhārā is described in the Vedic Samhitās; in the modified Purānic form, as quoted by Lakṣmīdhora, Devī is to be worshipped for ‘stream of wealth’. Gavotsarga or liberation of cows is to be done after chanting the Vedic mantras. Out of these seven ceremonies, the first one represents eclectic attitude and the second is dedicated to Śiva, while three others are definitely associated with the worship of Durgā; in the opinion of Rangaswami Aiyanger, Sākta influence became very powerful in the days of Lakṣmīdhora and the copious quotations of his from many Sākta Upa-Purāṇas, like the
Devi-Purāṇa and the Kālikā-Purāṇa, reflect but the new spirit of the age.

Among the temples and images at Vārānāsi, inscriptions to Sauri-Nārāyaṇa, Candra-Mādhava, Ādi-Kesava, Viṣṇu-Hari and Kṛttivāsa, are to be found. Besides these, the Bhadāyani temple grant, while describing the location of the houses granted, mentions in this connection four other shrines, namely, those of Aghoreśvara, Pañcoṅkāra, Indra-Mādhava and Lauḍēśvara. In other parts of Northern India also these two popular gods, Viṣṇu and Śiva, their incarnations and emanations were worshipped under various names, such as Nīlakanṭha, Indumauli, Vaidyanātha, Padmanābha, Vyomakesa, Smarāṛati, Bhavānīpati, Ghaṇṭēśvara, Śri-Varāha, Lakṣmīpati, and ‘that form of the husbands of Umā and Lakṣmī’ that is, Hari-Hara.

The existence of two temples at Vārānāsi dedicated to the Sun-gods, Gaṅgāditya and Lolārka and the grant of half a village to the shrine of the latter, show that the Sun cult was also popular. As shown in the Gāhaḍāvāla inscriptions, the necessary religious rites to be performed before making a gift include the invocation of the Sun-god. One of the favourite donees of Govindacandra, Dāmodarāśarman who figures in three landgrants, was a Saura or worshipper of the Sun-god.

Svayambhū, Paramātman or Brahman is mentioned in some Gāhaḍāvāla inscriptions, but the scantiness of the references to this god in these and in other contemporary records indicates that the worship of Brahman has declined.

1 Kṛtya, Rājadharmakāṇḍa, pp. (intro.) 76-82.
2 El., VIII, p. 152.
3 Banaras grants of V.S. 1190, 1203, 1207.
4 IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.
Among other gods, Indra is mentioned in one of the Gāhāḍavāla grants. A small figure of Gaṇeṣa forms the capital of a pillar, which contains the Belkharā inscription of V.S. 1253. This god was worshipped in other parts of India under various names; a Kalacuri inscription refers to him as Helamba or Heramba, and some other inscriptions as Gajānana or Gaṇeṣa.

Among the goddesses, Śrī or Lakṣmī is mentioned in almost all the Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions. Some of the Candrāreya and Kalacuri inscriptions also mention the goddess Lakṣmī or Gaja-Lakṣmī. Bhāratī or the goddess of learning has been invoked in the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176. Some of the Paramāra and Kalacuri inscriptions also refer to Sarasvatī, Vākdevī and Durgā.

The Buddhist inscriptions of the dynasty refer to Vitarāga, Śrī-Sākyasimha, Bodhisattva, Āryā Vasudhārā, Tārīnī, the Lokapālas and the eight māras. It is, however, clear from these inscriptions that the glorious days of Buddhism were over in the Madhyadeśa. After the death of Harṣa, the popularity of the religion declined steadily, more so, because the Pratihāras, who founded the next great empire, were followers of Brahmanical Hinduism. One of the Gāhāḍavāla kings, however, extended his bounty to the Buddhist monastaries at Set-Mahet and it is possible that he was influenced by his Buddhist queen Kumāradevi. This queen, herself, restored the Dharmanaktra-Jina and built a vibāra at Sārnath. The Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176 records that, Vidyādhara, the minister of Madanapāla, the son of Gādhiputādhipati Gopāla, built

1 Candrāvati inscription of V.S. 1150, El., XIV, pp. 193-96.
2 IA., XVI, pp. 202 ff; El., IV, pp. 153 ff; IA., XVII, pp. 61-64; El., II, pp. 7-17 and 180-85.
another *vihāra* at Set-Mahet for the Buddhist monks\(^1\). The Bodh-Gayā inscription of Jayaccandra of V.S. 124X indicates that this king probably went even further and became a disciple of monk Śrīmitra\(^2\). It is, however, evident that the religion had by this time lost a good deal of the popular support once enjoyed by it and was clearly on the decline. The *Dharmacakrā-jina*, an ancient institution had to be restored or rebuilt by Kumāradevī, while the inscription which regrants\(^3\) certain villages to the Buddhist *Samgha* at Set-Mahet, indicates that in view of the obvious weakness of the declining Buddhist institutions, the right of this *Samgha* over those villages came to be questioned. The Bodh-Gayā inscription of V.S. 124X in which the monk Śrīmitra is said to have 'restored the discipline and recovered many lost scriptures and others of the same kind, belonging to the illustrious site of *Mahābodhi*', throws further light on the decaying condition of Buddhism\(^4\). It may be inferred from this that he made an attempt to reorganise the *Samgha* at Sārnath. In Eastern India, however, the religion of Lord Buddha flourished for some time under the royal patronage.

Jainism has not been mentioned in any of the Gāhaḍavāḷa inscriptions; the followers of this religion generally lived in western and south-western India.

(i) *Pious and meritorious works by the public*: The religious enthusiasm of the Gāhaḍavāḷa kings must have inspired their feudatories and subjects in performing many pious and meritorious works. Two of the feudatory chiefs,

---

1. IA., XVII, pp. 61-64; *IPASB.*, 1925, XXI (N.S.), pp. 105 ff.
Rāṇaka Lavarāpravāhā and Śiṅgara Vatsarāja made land-grants to the Brāhmaṇas\(^1\). The catholicity of the ruling dynasty was emulated by Vidyādhara, the minister of Madanpāla, another feudatory chief; this person, though he was a devotee of Mahēśvara, erected a Buddhist vihāra at Set-Mahet.

Pratiṣṭhā (consecration) and utsarga (donation) are highly eulogized in the Purāṇas and the Dharmasastras\(^2\). The inscriptions of the time of the Gāhaḍavālas show that wealthy and influential men sometimes carried out many such pious projects on these lines for the welfare of the public. The Hathia-dah pillar inscription of V.S. 1207 records that Ṭhakkura Bellana, the bhāṇḍāgārika of queen Gosalladevi, together with a number of other ṭhakkuras excavated a tank\(^3\). The Meoḥād stone inscription testifies to the building of a temple to Siddheśvara by a scion of Śrī-Vāstava family in V.S. 1245\(^4\). The Belkharā pillar inscription records the erection of the pillar with a Gaṇeśa capital by Rāuta Śrī-Sakaruka in V.S. 1253\(^5\). Among the ruins at Gaḍhvā near Allahabad, Cunningham noticed ‘no less than eight large statues of Viṣṇu and two of Varābdhāraḥ’ in the PASB., 1880, p. 18 and IHQ., 1929, p. 26. For Burmese initiation in restoration work conducted at Bodh-Gayā during the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see N. Ray, Theravāda Buddhism In Burma, pp. 105-07.

2 According to the Viṣṇudharmasūtra, “one who digs a well (for the public) has half his sins destroyed, when water has begun to flow forth; one who dedicates a pond, is for ever happy (free from thirst) and attains the world of Varuṇa.” The Kālikā-purāṇa says that the reward of sacrifices is only heaven, but by pūraṇa (consecration of temples, tanks and gardens) one secures release from the saṁsāra. (Vide, Kane, HD., Vol, II, pt. II, pp. 889-90).
3 ASR., 1871, Vol, I, pp. 95-96.
4 JRAS., 1927, pp. 695-96.
5 JASB., 1911, pp. 763-65.
ävatāra. According to him, some of these must have belonged to the temple at Gadhwā. Further descriptions of this temple show that it consisted of a number of inscribed columns, and three of the inscriptions, containing names of different personages, were dated in V.S. 1199 (1143 A.D.). It also contains a statue of Vāstavya-Kāyastha Ṭhakkura-Srī-Raṇapāla (in a soldier’s outfit) who appears to have built the temple in V.S. 1199. Like the panels in the railings of the Sanchi stūpa, these columns also may have been the gifts of different devotees, whose names are inscribed therein.

The temple appears to have been built in the Gāhaḍavāla period in honour of Viśṇu.

(ii) Some ‘saṃskāras’ gift-rites and sacred days: Three saṃskāras are mentioned in the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions, namely, śrāddha, jātakarman and nāmakaraṇa. Three grants were issued on the occasion of the saṃvatsarika or ‘annual śrāddha ceremony’ of the parents of Govindacandra; according to these, his father Madanapāla’s death anniversary falls on Kārtika sudi 15 and that of his mother falls on Phālguna vadi 1. A fourth land-grant records the occasion of pitṛpindānaturpana on Śrāvaṇa sudi 15 of the year 1178. Some villages were granted to commemorate the occasions of the jātakarma and nāmakaraṇa ceremonies of Rājaputra Hariścandra, the son of Jayaccandra. The first ceremony was observed on Bhādra vadi 8 (V.S. 1232) and the second was observed twenty days later, on Bhādra sudi 13.

1 Cf. the inscription No. 3, “... Śrī-Mahidharaṅaṣya nitya-praṇāmyeti saṁvat 1199” and the inscription No. 9 “... Ṭhakkura-Srī-Gāṅgukena nitya-praṇāmyeti saṁvat 1199”). (ASR, Vol. III, pp. 57 ff.)
2 EI., IV, pp. 104-14.
4 EI., IV, pp. 126-8; and IA., XVIII, pp. 129-34.
The procedure of making gifts of land is more or less uniform in all the inscriptions. Generally the donor, after bathing in the sacred water ‘satisfying, according to the scriptural injunctions mantras, gods, sages, men, ghost and the manes, greeting the Sun, worshipping Siva and Vāsudeva, offering oblations, rich in preparations of milk, to the fire, and having offered pīnda to the ancestors after (pouring from) the palm (of the donor) water sanctified by contact with a cow’s ear and Kuṣa’, granted land to the donee. A slight difference in religious procedure is noticed in the Rahan grant of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra, where the donor Lavarāpravāha worships his consecrated god Maheśvara with five-fold offerings. According to the Dharmasāstras upacāra or items and stages of pūja are generally sixteen, namely, āvāhana, āsana, pādyā, arghya, ācamaniya, snāna, vastra, yajñ-opavīta, anulepana, pūṣpa, dhūpa, āśa, naivedya, namaskāra, pradakṣiṇa, visarjana; ten and five upacāras are also allowed, and the latter group signifies anulepana, pūṣpa, dhūpa, āśa and naivedya.

Most of the Gāhāḍavāla grants were made on the sacred days, enumerated in the scriptures as auspicious tithis for making gifts. Ayana day, equinocial day, vyatipāta, the suppression of a tithi, on the eclipses of the sun and the moon, new moon day, 12th day, samkrānti, and the

2 Cf. “abhiṣikta-devatā-Maheśvaram paṁcabhir-upacārāi samabhycyca” etc.
full moon day are some of the *tithis* highly recommended for a bath *japa, boma* fast and gift\(^1\). Among the grants of this family, four were made on the occasions of solar eclipse and three on lunar eclipse, three on *uttarāyana-saṁkrānti* and one on the *kanyā-saṁkrānti tithi*; about a dozen grants were made after the *pūrṇimā-tithi*śaṁśāna. Besides these, three other sacred occasions have been mentioned, namely, *aṅkāya-tṛṣīyā, manvantarādi*\(^2\) and *yugādi*\(^3\); seven Gāhāda-vāla grants were issued on *aṅkāya-tṛṣīyā tithi* and one on the *Tretā-yugādi-tithi*; of the fifteen grants issued on the *manvantarā tithis*, nine were recorded on the full moon day of *Kārtika* and it is to be noted that another *manvantarā tithi*, *Māgha sudi 7*, is also mentioned as *mahā-saptami* or *ratha-saptami*\(^4\).

(iii) Some *tūrthas*: The Dharmaśāstras and the Purāṇas have specified the places, where the gifts should be made; places thus recommended are the cowpen, any place before a Śiva image or sacred places like *Vāraṇaśi*, Kurukṣetra, Prayāga, Puṣkara, the banks of the Gaṅgā and such others; besides these, all mountains, all rivers and the sea are considered holy. Most of the land-grants of the Gāhāda-vālas were made on the bank of the Gaṅgā at *Vāraṇaśi,*

---

2 The *tithis* on which the fourteen *manuvantrās* are supposed to begin, i.e., fullmoon days of *Kārtika, Phālguṇa, Caitra, Jayaśtha* and *Āśāda*, newmoon day of *Phālguṇa*, 8th of dark fortnight of *Srāvana* 3rd of bright fortnight of *Caitra* and *Bhādra*, 7th of bright fortnight of *Māgha*, 10th of bright fortnight of *Āśāda*, 11th of bright fortnight of *Paunṣa*, 12th of bright fortnight of *Kārtika*, and 9th of the bright fortnight of *Āsvina* (vide *Matuśa-puṭaṇa*, 17, 6-8).
3 Four *yugādi tithis* are *Vaiśākha śukla-tṛṣīyā, Kārtika śukla-navaṃśi*, *Bhādra krṣṇa-trayodashi* and *Māgha-pūrṇima*, being respectively the beginning of the four *yugas*, *Kṛta, Tretā, Duṣāpara* and *Kali*.
4 Kamauli Grant of V.S., 1224 (*El., IV*, pp. 121-23).
while many of the others were made, either on the banks of some other rivers or at sacred places like Kānyakubja and Ayodhya, situated within the Gāhadavāla territory.

The inclusion of many sacred places in the Gāhadavāla dominion may have inspired Lakṣmīdhara to devote a whole section of his book to ‘Tīrtha-vivecana’ (consideration of sacred places) and to assign an important place to pilgrimage among the duties of human being (kṛtya). The first Gāhadavāla king Candradeva claims to have protected the sacred places of Kāśi, Kuśika, Uttara-Kośala and Indraśthāniyaka; all of these places have been mentioned in Lakṣmīdhara’s work. However, it is to be regretted that this author, who lived in the twelfth century, relied exclusively on the Puranic literature for his account of tīrthas and seldom added a critical note or made any attempt to locate any important shrine. Thus the realistic touch of a contemporary account is lacking in the Tīrtha-vivecanakāṇḍa, though it is valuable for the study of the revivalist ideal set forth in it by the eminent writer.

In Lakṣmīdhara’s treatise Vāraṇasi, the abode of Śiva, is selected as the tīrtha par excellence and about 340 shrines, situated therein, have been enumerated. A long passage from the Liṅga-purāṇa (quoted by Lakṣmīdhara) relates how different deities, nāgas, asuras and sages vied with one another, in installing liṅgas, in honour of Śiva within the sacred bounds of Vāraṇasi1. It is quite possible that some of the old shrines, mentioned in earlier Purāṇa texts (quoted in the Kṛtya) had disappeared by the twelfth century; on the other hand, some of the new shrines, including the one erected by the first Gāhadavāla king,

1 Kṛtya., Tīrthavivekanakāṇḍa, pp. 231-45.
have not been recognized in the Tīrtha-vivecana-kāṇḍa. A few of the sacred places of Varāṇasī, however, appear to have been mentioned in both Lakṣmīdhara’s work and the Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions. The Avimuktakṣetra mentioned in many Gāhāḍavāla grants (e.g. Kamauli plate of Govindacandra and Vatsarāja of V.S. 1191 and Kamauli plate of Govindacandra of V. S. 1198) is described in the Tīrtha-kāṇḍa as the perpetual abode of Śiva (cf. “Ruciram sthānam-āśādyya Avimuktatā tu me gṛham, na kadācin-mayāmuktam avimuktam taraḥ smṛtaḥ”). The Kapālamocana-ghaṭa, from where the Kamauli plate of V. S. 1178 was made by Govindacandra is mentioned as an important sacred place, (mahaśūrtha) in Lakṣmīdhara’s quotation. The shrine of ‘Vedeśvara’ is also mentioned in a Gāhāḍavāla inscription and the Tīrtha-kāṇḍa. The shrine of Ādi-Keśava (ancient Keśava) installed by Candradeva may have been erected over the old shrine of Keśava, which is said to have been situated to the north of ‘Vedeśvara’. The shrine of Lolārka, mentioned in two Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions, and described as being situated to the south of the ‘Kālaṇjara’ (cf. “tasyaiva daksiṇa-bhāga Lolārka nāmā vai Ravi”), still exists as Lolārka-kāṇḍa. Of the four temples mentioned in connection with the gift of a house recorded in the Banaras grant of V. S. 1171, at least one Aghoreśvara, may be identified with the shrine of the great sage Aghora who is said to have attained Rudratva. The Koṭi-tīrtha at Vāraṇasi, mentioned in the Banaras grant of V. S. 1207, is perhaps the same as the shrine of ‘Koṭiśvara’. The god Kṛttivāsa to whom Jayaccandra paid his homage is also mentioned in the Tīrtha-kāṇḍa. Strangely enough, neither

1 Kṛtya, ‘Tirthavivecana-kāṇḍa, pp. 41, 55, 44, 34, 118, 60, 54, 40, 77.
'Candra-mādhava', installed by Candradeva, nor 'Viṣṇu-Hari', adorned by the same is mentioned in Lakṣmīdhara’s work. Kuśika or Kānyakubja is mentioned in the Tirthakāṇḍa as Mahodaya and Kuśastambha. Uṛcara-Kośala is identified in the Candrāvataī grant of V.S. 1150 with Ayodhyā which is mentioned as a tīrtha by Lakṣmīdhara. Prayāga and Kauśāmbī are two other sacred places, mentioned by the Gāhadavāla grants and the Kṛtyakalpataru.  

Section II. Society

(a) The Brāhmaṇas

According to the Dharmaśāstras, teaching the Vedas, officiating at sacrifices and receiving gifts are the privileges of the Brāhmaṇas; the large number of landgrants made mostly to the Brāhmaṇas prove that the Gāhadavāla kings upheld the privilege of the Brāhmaṇas as donees par excellence. In the case of each of these landgrants the king or the donor ceded all his rights and dues to the donee and the land granted virtually became taxfree.

The Rahan grant which regrets the decay of Vedic studies before the advent of the Gāhadavāla dynasty, indicates that the kings of this dynasty encouraged the study of the Vedas. Indeed, the inscriptions show that some of the donees were well-versed in all the four Vedas (cf. catur-vedin or catur-veda-vidyā-vidita), some in two or three Vedas, while some others were students of different Vedic śākhās.

1 Kṛtya., Rājadharmaśāstra, pp. 237 and 246.
2 The most remarkable example is the gift of practically a whole pātalā to five hundred Brāhmaṇas and the gift of a separate village as a Brāhma-puri for the residence of these Brāhmaṇas. Jayaccandra provided a Jayantapura (un-explained) for a number of Brāhmaṇas (El., IV, pp. 128-29).
and pāṭhas (cf. Chāndoga-sākhin, tripatthin). According to the Matsya-purāṇa, the observance of the tulā-puruṣa-
mahādāna requires the presence of priests versed in the four Vedas; Candradeva is said to have performed this ceremony many times and the inscription which records one such occasion, actually refers to Brāhmaṇas, who were catuvedin, besides those who were dvivedin and tripatthin.

The landgrants refer to a number of gotras and pravaras of the Brāhmaṇas who received gifts. According to the Baudhāyana-śrauta-sūtra, “Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gautama, Atri, Vaśiṣṭha and Kāśyapa are the seven sages and Agastyā is the eighth; the progeny of these eight sages is declared to be gotra.” These primary gotras have been divided and subdivided to constitute other gotras and the above work states that there are numerous gotras but only forty-nine pravaras.

The Candrāvatī inscription which mentions five hundred Brāhmaṇa donees, enumerates more than forty gotras in this connection; these are as follows:


1 HD., II, pt. ii, p. 871.
2 HD., II, pt. i, 483-98. According to Hutton, gotra is in fact a clan, theoretically descended from a single ancestor and pravara is perhaps the names contained in a passage, in the Vedic formula used in the worship of his ancestors by a follower of any particular Vedic school. (J. H. Hutton, Caste in India, pp. 48 ff.)
Other inscriptions mention *pravaras* of some of the above *gotras*; such as the group of five *pravaras* Bhārgava Cyavana, Aurva, Jāmadagni and Āpnavān for Vatsa, Vatsa-Bhārgava and Sārkaraṅka *gotras*; Vaśiṣṭha for Vaśiṣṭha *gotra*; Gautama, Āṅgirasa and Autathya,—three *pravaras* for Gautama *gotra*; Bharadvāja, Āṅgirasa and Bārhaspatyasa (or Kāśyapa) for Bhāradvāja *gotra*; Vaitahavya, Gādheya and Bhārgava for Mauneya *gotra*; Kāśyapa, Āvatsāra, Naidhrruta for Kāśyapa *gotra*; Sāndilya, Āsīta, Daivala for Sāndilya *gotra*; Kāṁsāyana, Kauśika, Bhaumya for Pārāvasa; Vaśiṣṭha Śakti, Parāśara for Parāśara *gotra*; Maudgalya, Āṅgirasa, Bhārmyāśva (Vadhryāśva?) for Maudgalya; Govila, Āṅgiraṣa, Amvarīṣa for Govila *gotra*; Vandhula, Aghamarṣaṇa and Viśvāmitra for Vandhula *gotra*.

Among the honorifics and appellations of the period the most common were *śrī* and *ṭhakkura*, and these were applied not only to the Brāhmaṇas but also to the other castes. Another appellation *rāuta*, also was not restricted to any particular caste (e. g. Rāuta Rājyadhavarman Kṣatriya and Rāuta Jāṭeśarman Brāhmaṇa). The honorifics applied specifically to the Brāhmaṇas were *bhāṣṭa* and *miṣra*. Besides these, the following appellations were used mostly by the Brāhmaṇas,—*paṇḍita* and *mabhā-paṇḍita*, *avasti*, *dikṣita* or *mahādikṣita* (according to Keilhorn, a person who or whose ancestors have performed a great sacrificial ceremony, such as *iyotistoma,* *dviveda* or *dvivedin* and *caturvedin* (students of two or four Vedas), *tripāṭhin* (one who is familiar with three *pāthas* of a Veda), *ācārya* (one who performs the *upanayana* of the student and imparts a whole Veda to

1 *El.*, IV, pp. 111-112 and *Id.*, XVIII, pp. 134 ff.
him), prāñācārya (probably an honorific used by the royal physician).  

According to the Dharmāsāstras, six duties are generally imposed on the Brāhmaṇas, namely, study and teaching, performing sacrifices and helping others to perform sacrifices, making gifts and acceptance of gifts. Of these the second, fourth and sixth (i.e. yājana, adhyāpana and prati-graha) are really their means of livelihood under ordinary circumstances. In times of distress, however, the Brāhmaṇa, who maintains his parents and others are allowed to follow the occupation of inferior varṇas. There is a great deal of controversy among the Dharmāsāstra writers as to whether a Brāhmaṇa in distress may follow Kṣatriya occupation. Lākṣmīdharā in his digest quotes the contradictory views of Baudhāyana and Gautama; while the former plainly lays down that a Brāhmaṇa, who has failed to maintain his family by the three rightful occupations, should live

1 An interesting feature of the social life is the extensive use of abbreviated (or vernacularized?) forms of nomenclature in official documents. In most of the cases it is difficult to ascertain the real names from the abbreviated forms used in the inscriptions. The principle of abbreviation followed in the cases of the different members of the royal priest-family may be understood, because their full names as well as their abbreviated forms are found repeated in many inscriptions. Thus the real name of Puravāsā or Purāṣa (son of Nāgānanda) grand-father of Jāguṣarman was Purusottama, and that of his father Vilhakāya was either Viṣṇuṣarman, or Vedaṣarman; Jāguṣarman or Jāguka, the popular name of the maha-purobita of Govindacandra, was the abbreviated from of Yājñavalkyaṣarman; his son was variously mentioned as Praharājaṣarman or Paharājaṣarman, but his real name probably was Prahlādaṣarman. Some other interesting abbreviations are Āhekā, Tulaṣiṣarman, Chochā, Vāchata Nāneṣarman, Jāṭeṣarman, Hāle, Rahhiyaka, and Madanu. (cf. Kamauli Plates of V.S. 1162, 1182, 1224, 1226 and 1232 and Basahi grant of V.S. 1161.  

by Kṣatriya occupation, the latter strictly enjoins that even in fun a Brāhmaṇa must not take up arms. It appears that in Lakṣmīdhara’s opinion a twice-born in distress must not ordinarily skip over the occupation of an intervening varṇa, but a Brāhmaṇa may follow the occupation of a Vaiśya, in preference to taking up the profession of arms. The period of distress being over, the Brāhmaṇa who has degraded himself by following the occupation of a lower varṇa, must purify himself and revert to his usual occupations and duties.

A Brāhmaṇa in distress may also, follow agriculture, cattle rearing and trade. According to the Dharmasastras, a Brāhmaṇa engaged in agriculture or cattle rearing must treat humanely the cattle used for the purpose. A Brāhmaṇa, following trade, is strictly prohibited to sell cooked food, poison, arms, lac, indigo, silk and woollen goods, salt, meat, liquor, hides, honey, bee-wax, soma, cow, learning and man; some of these, however, may be bartered by a Brāhmaṇa, for others of the same species. Most of the Dharmasastra writers consider moneylending as a degrading occupation for the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas; but Bhāspati, who has not only enumerated it as one of the means of livelihood for the higher varṇas in distress but had also praised it as the best, is cited by Lakṣmīdhara in support of its adoption as an āpad-vṛtti.

2 Kṛtya, Gārthashyakāṇḍa, p. (intro.) 72.
3 Cf. “Nistiryārthe samutsṛṣṭya pāvyā ‘tmāmaṁ bhavet-pathi’”. (Kṛtya, Gārthashyakāṇḍa, p. (tx.) 188.
4 Kṛtya, Gārthashyakāṇḍa; p. (tx.) 192.
6 Cf. “Vahavo vartan-opāya ṛṣibhiḥ parikirtitaḥ, Sarveśāṃapi
Generally a Brāhmaṇa is forbidden to follow the occupation of a Sudra, even when he is in distress. If, however, he is in danger of life—prāṇa-saṁśaya—he may adopt śaudra-vṛtti; this dictum from Gautama is quoted approvingly by Lakṣmīdhara, who explains that the term prāṇa-saṁśaya refers to one’s own self and also to those one maintains. It is interesting to note that Gautama who strictly forbids a Bāhrmaṇa to touch arms, allows him to do so when there is danger of life. A Brāhmaṇa (and also a Vaiśya who is generally forbidden to follow the occupation of a higher caste) is allowed to take up arms in order to protect Brāhmaṇas and cows and to prevent intermixture of castes.

Thus, though a sincere advocate of the Purānic ideal of Brāhmaṇahood, the writer of this Dhārmaśāstra digest, who lived in the twelfth century A.D., appears to have realized the change, which had taken place in the social and economic position of the Brāhmaṇas. Though he recommends the Brāhmaṇas to follow their own prescribed occupations, yet, quoting from various writers, he ultimately upholds the view, that a Brāhmaṇa in extreme necessity is allowed to follow any honest profession of any other caste. This attitude of Lakṣmīdhara may be indicative of the fact that the realities of social and economic life in his age were different from those conditions, where the extreme śāstric injunctions could be rigidly followed.

1 Cf. “Śravatīr vṛttr-aśaktāvaśaudrena, Tadapyeke prāṇa-saṁśaye” (Kṛtya, Gārhashthyakānda, p. (tx.) 224).
2 Cf. “Prāناسaṁśaye brāhmaṇo pi śastram-adadita” (Kṛtya, Gārhashthyakānda, p. (tx.) 224).
3 Kṛtya, Gārhashthyakānda, p. (tx.) 188.
(b) Other Castes

Next in importance to the Brāhmaṇas in society, were the Kṣatriyas or the fighting and ruling class. The Gāhāḍavālas themselves claim to have belonged to the Kṣatra lineage\(^1\). Possibly some of the feudatory families also were Kṣatriyas. According to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa a Kṣatriya may use the pravara of his purobita; some late works state that both the gotra and the pravara of the purobita may be used by the Kṣatriyas at the time of marriage\(^2\). Rāuta Rājyadharavarman Kṣatriya is described as belonging to the Vatsa gotra, whose five pravaras are Bhārgava, Cyavana, Āpnavān, Aurva, Jāmadagnya. The feudatory chief of the Śiṅγara dynasty belonged to the Śaṇḍilya gotra, whose pravaras have not been mentioned\(^3\). Among the honorifics, ṭhakkura and rāuta have been mentioned and these were used by both the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas. In Jayaccandra's reign Kṣatriya Rājyadharavarman received six land-grants all of which were granted with usual rights and concessions; these were probably made in lieu of service and not for his social and religious status. The official designation of Rājyadharavarman has not been stated, but his father and grand-father are styled mabhā-mabhattaka\(^4\).

According to the Dharmaśāstras (quoted in the Kṛtyakalpataru) the chief occupation of a Kṣatra, belonging to the ruling class, is to protect cows, Brāhmaṇas and others; a Kṣatra, who was not a king, should worship gods and serve Brāhmaṇas. According to Gautama, an ordinary

\(^1\) E1., IX, pp. 319-28.
\(^2\) HD., II, pt. i, pp. 492-3.
\(^3\) E1., IV, pp. 130-32.
\(^4\) IA., XVIII, pp. 134 ff.
Kṣatra should live by serving the king as a soldier⁴. In time of distress he may follow the vyttī of a Vaiśya. The Vaiśyas generally live by agriculture, trade and money-lending but even a Vaiśya is barred from trading in certain articles, including salt, wine, curd, clarified butter, milk, lac, hide, flesh, indigo, poison, arms, and idols (devān)². It may be inferred from these injunctions of the Dharmaśāstras, quoted by Lakṣmīdhara, that only the lowest order of the society, the Sudras, can trade in the above mentioned articles. It has been specially pointed out that even in times of distress the lower varṇas should not take up the occupation of the upper varṇas³.

The term Kāyastha is mentioned more than once in the official portions of the Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions. Uṣanas and the Vedavyāsa-smṛti refer to the Kāyasthas as a sub-caste and in the latter they are placed among the Sudras. The Rājatarāṅginī, on the other hand, indicates that in Kāśmira even in the reign of Jayasimha (c. 1128-49 A.D.) a contemporary of the Gāhāḍavāla king Govindaśandra, the Kāyasthas were officers and did not form a caste by themselves⁴. It is, however, possible that in some parts of the country, the Kāyasthas were already tending to form an occupational caste in this period⁵. Lakṣmīdhara does not recognise the Kāyasthas as forming a separate caste, and agreeing with the evidence of the Rājatarāṅginī refers to them

¹ Kṛtya., Gārhasṭhyakānda, pp. (tx.) 254-55.
² Kṛtya., Gārhasṭhyakānda, p. (tx.) 258.
³ Cf. “nātv-eva jāyāsim vrśtim-abhimanyeta karhicat” (Kṛtya, Gārhasṭhyakānda, p. (tx.) 257).
⁴ Cf. Rājatarāṅginī, VIII, 238. “About that time there died by strangulation that rogue of an official (kāyastha) the Brāhmaṇa Sivaratha, who had been a great intriguer.” (Tr, Stein, II, p. 134).
⁵ HD., II, pp. 75-77.
as a class of royal officials who were oppressive and from whom the subjects were to be protected1. In the Gāhādvāla inscriptions it is not clear whether the term has been used to indicate a sub-caste or an official designation only. Some of the writers of the Gāhādvāla inscriptions have been described as Kāyasthas (e.g. Kāyastha Ṭhakkura Jālhana of Kamauli grant of V.S. 1172 and Kāyastha Purandara of Bodh-Gayā inscription of V.S. 124X), while others have been termed Karaṇikas (e.g. Karaṇika Ṭhakkura Sahadeva of Don Buzurg inscription of V.S. 1176 and Karaṇika Ṭhakkura Śrīdhara of Chattarpur grant of V.S. 1177); still others have been mentioned simply with the honorific ṭhakkura (e.g. Ṭhakkura Viśvarūpa of Maner grant of V.S. 1185 and Ṭhakkura Kusumapāla of Kamauli inscription of V.S. 1224). Two of the Kāyastha writers, Jālhana (mentioned above) and Kīthana (Kamauli grant of V.S. 1182) belonged to Vāstavya families. The Set Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176 reveals the existence of an illustrious Vāstavya family (cf. Śrīpūrva-Vāstavyakula-pradīpa) at Jávṛṣa or Ajāvṛṣa; a scion of this dynasty, Vidyādhara, who issued this inscription was a minister of Madanapāla, the son of Gādhipurādhhipati Gopāla. In the inscription, however, the family is not stated to have belonged to the Kāyastha lineage. The Meohaḍ inscription of V.S. 1245 records the erection of a Siddheśvara temple by a ṭhakkura (name lost), who belonged to the Śrī-Vāstavya family of Meohaḍ (cf. Mehavāḍgrāma-vāstika-Śrī-Vāstavya-ṭha,......etc.). Two of the dated inscriptions of Gāḍhwā, near Allahabad also refer to two Kāyasthas;

one of them was a certain Vāstavya Kāyastha Raṇapāla of Navagrāma and the latter, Mahidhara was a Kāyastha of ‘Sakasena-jāti’ (cf. “Śrī-Sakasena-jātiya Kāyastha Śrī-Srīcandraputra.....Śrī-Mahidharakasya” etc.).

A Sūtradhāra (Don Buzurg grant of V. S. 1176) and a Lobāra (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1131) also have been mentioned in the inscriptions of this dynasty. The B. A. S. Land-transfer grant of Govindacandra of V. S. 1137 refers to another caste, Kaivarta. According to Atri the Kaivarta is one of the seven antyaja castes, while Manu uses the term to denote the offspring of a Nīśāda and a Ayogava woman, who lives by plying boats.

(c) Marriage

Marriage, one of the most important of the Hindu sāṁskaras, has been treated in detail by Lakṣmīdhara. He explains Manu’s view, that a twice-born should marry a girl of his own caste for the first or sacramental union, as applicable only when a bride of the same caste is available; if not, he may marry from one of the lower castes, a partner of each lower caste being eligible, only when one from a higher caste is not available. Generally the marriage of a twice-born with a Śudrā wife is strongly condemned by most of the Dharmaśāstra writers and such a marriage is looked upon as one for pleasure only. Lakṣmīdhara explains that marriage with a Śudrā woman is strongly condemned but not

1 HD., Vol. II, pt. i, pp. 69-100. The list prepared by Kane from the Dharmaśāstra works contains the names of many other occupational castes.
3 Kṛtya., Gārhasthyakāṇḍa, p. (tx.) 40.
absolutely prohibited; it only fails to confer on the Śudrā wife the status of a sacramental wife.¹

From the texts selected by Lakṣmīdharā in the Kṛtya-kālpataru it appears that he was against sagotra, sapinda and cousin marriages and that his injunctions are applicable to all the varnas. When a sagotra marriage takes place through ignorance, Lakṣmīdharā, following Baudhāyana, states that the wife should not be altogether abandoned but should be maintained like a mother.²

Lakṣmīdharā’s quotations in the digest further indicate that he was against the practice of polygamy. He advocates supersession of a wife only when she is barren, diseased or evil. The dictum of Yājñavalkya, that a superseded wife must receive from her husband a compensation, equal to the expenses of the marriage, is quoted approvingly by Lakṣmīdharā, according to whose interpretation the sum given to the superseded wife must be equal to what the new wife receives as her wedding gift.³ In the case of a second marriage also, the twice-born may secure a bride from a lower varṇa.⁴

(d) Position of Women

The Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions do not furnish us with any data on the position of women of different ranks during the period, except that the queens had to be informed about the landgrants to be issued and were sometimes vested with all

¹ Cf. “Sahadharmacarini tu tadapi sa na bhavat-itii” (Kṛtya, Gārhasthāya-kāṇḍa, pp. (tx.) 44-45).
³ Kṛtya, Gārhasthāya-kāṇḍa, p. (tx.) 105.
the royal prerogatives. Once during the reign of Madanapāla, a grant was made after the express consent of the queen and of some high official had been obtained\(^1\). It can be inferred that the ladies of the royal household were educated to some extent, took some part in administration and generally enjoyed some privileges. The case of Jambukī being made the foremost of all pattalikās\(^2\) by Kumāradevi, the queen of Govindacandra, is unique in the Gāhana dynasty records and reveals two significant facts; firstly there must have been more than one pattalikā and secondly the queen had the authority to appoint and promote the pattalikās. The administrative status of the pattalikās, however, cannot be ascertained for want of further information.

There are no sufficient data, with the help of which a clear idea about the position of the women in general can be formed. In spite of the disapproval of the Dharmasāstras, which is echoed by Lakṣmīdhara, polygamy was widely practised and women were regarded as absolutely dependent on men and inferior to them. Various injunctions of the Dharaṇa-sūtra indicate that their legal and religious position was rather low; they could not recite the Vedic mantras and serve as witnesses in legal cases and were not allowed to be a party in legal transactions, particularly relating to gifts, sales or mortgages of houses or land. Women’s right over śrīdhana was recognised and in the matter of succession to it, daughters were preferred to sons. According to Yājñavalkya, Viṣṇu and Kātyāyana, the widow was considered the first heir of sonless man. Numerous epigraphic and literary references indicate that sometimes satī or self-immolation was practised by widows. Those who refrained from this

\(^1\) El., II, pp. 358-61.  
\(^2\) El., IX, pp. 319-28.
practice, spent the rest of their lives very austerely, like a yasti and sometimes would even cut off their hair. Verses of some women poets are found included in contemporary anthologies like Subhāṣītāvalī and Saduktikarṇāmṛtā; some of the South Indian women poets like Rāmabhādrāmbā and Tirumalāmbā are mentioned as successful composers of poems, though of the usual conventional type.¹

Section III. Culture

(a) Education and Literature

The first Gāhaḍavāla king began his reign with the intention of reviving the Vedic studies and according to the Candrāvatī inscription of V. S. 1150, he himself was a very learned man who had mastered all the dārānas and encouraged all vidyās and kalās. Candradeva without a doubt, encouraged the study of the Vedas in his kingdom; in fact the statement that he performed many tulā-puruṣa-mahādānas, which require the presence of Brāhmaṇas well-versed in all the four Vedas, indicates that these were studied in his reign. While some of the Brāhmaṇas studied all the Vedas, others mastered only one Veda or even specialized in one section of a Veda. Thus the inscriptions of Candradeva mention Rgvedacaraṇecatur-vedin Jāṭe (Kāśyapa-gotra), Yajur-veda-caraṇecatur-vedin Vilha (Vaśiṣṭha-gotra), Atharvacaraṇedvivedin Chihila (Bharadvāja-gotra) Chāndogacaraṇastripāṭhin Vedig (Vatsa-gotra) and also Vāmanavāmi of Kauśika-gotra, who was Chāndogyasākhī.²

Inscriptions of the subsequent kings prove that the study of the Vedas continued to flourish; among the learned Brähmanas, who figure as donees were Sāmkhāyanaśakhi Guṇacandra (Rahan Grant of V.S. 1166), Chāndogyaśakhi Tūḷṭāicasarmā (Don Buzurg Grant of V.S. 1176), Pranācāryabhaṭṭa Paṇḍita Khoṇaśarman of Sāmkhāyanaśakhi (Banaras Grant of V.S. 1187), Damodaraśarman, student of Vājasaneyasakhi (Banaras Grant of V.S. 1190), Anantaśarman, student of Chāndogasakhi (Vanagarmaun Grant of V.S. 1208), Mahāpurohita Jāgu’s brother Vājasaneyasakhi Vyāsa and son Yajurvedasakhi Vaiṣṇava-pūjā-vidhi-gurupraharajaśarman (Kamauli Grant of V.S. 1178) and caturvedavidyāvījita Śrīdhara (Lar Grant of V.S. 1202).

Not only the study of the Vedas but also that of other branches of the śāstras and knowledge were encouraged. It is interesting to note that the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1186 mentions a Kāyastha Surāditya, who was sarva-śāstravit or well-versed in all the śāstras. Damodaraśarman who, as we have seen before, was a student of Vājasaneyasakhi was also well-versed in the five siddbāntas of Iyotih-śāstra (cf. Iyotih-śāstra-siddbānta-pāṇca-kovida) and Sāmkhāyanaśakhi Guṇacandra had the rare accomplishment of śruti-dbāraṇa.

Govindaśarman was the first king to assume the epithet saruvavidyā-vicāra-vācaspāti and there is reason to believe that he deserved it; the Kṛtyakalpataru, an important work of the period, was written, as the colophon at the end of the Vyavahārikaṇḍa states, at his command by his minister for peace and war, Lakṣmīdhara. This work is divided into fourteen kāṇḍas, which are entitled respectively Brahmacāri, Gārhasthya, Naiyatakāla, Śrāddha, Dāna, Pratiṣṭhā, Pūjā, Tirtha, Vrata, Śuddhi, Rājadharma, Vyava-
hāra, Śānti, and Mokṣa. A śloka at the beginning of Rājadharmakāṇḍa states that the success of Govindacandra in the political field was due to the wonderful counsel of the author, Lakṣmīdhara¹. Though little known to-day, the Kṛtyakalpataru seems to have been a well-known work in Mediaeval India and its influence on the succeeding generations of writers was very great. Aniruddha (c. 1160 A.D.) an eminent legal writer of Bengal, quoted from it as an authority and Ballālasena, who came about a generation after Lakṣmīdhara, was greatly influenced by him. Later on, legal writers of Bengal, like Śūlapāṇi (c. 1400 A.D.), Śrīnātha (c. 1500 A.D.) and Raghunandan (c. 1450-1510 A.D.) also extensively used this digest, written in the Gādāvālā period, in their own works. In Mithila and North India, its influence was even greater and the Vivādāratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara and the Smṛtisāra of Harinātha contain copious quotations from the Kṛtyakalpataru. Other writers from North India and Mithila, Vācaspati Misra (c. 1450 A.D.) Viśveśvara Bhaṭṭa, Madanapāla (c. 1360-1390 A.D.) and also some of the Deccan writers like Hemādri (c. 1260 A.D.) and Praṭāparudra (c. 1497-1539 A.D.) were deeply influenced by the Kṛtyakalpataru and some of them have reproduced wholesale, long passages from it in their own works. The most remarkable of these is the case of Praṭāparudra, who refers to the author of the Kṛtyakalpataru moreover as Bhagavān Lakṣmīdhara².

Govindacandra’s grandson Jayaccandra is famous in the

literary world as the patron of Śrīharṣa, the author of the Naiṣadhacaritam. The concluding verses of this work claim that the poet Śrīharṣa was honoured by the king of Kāṇyakubja with a pair of betel-leaves and a seat; this claim is supported by a tradition in the Prabandhakośa which states that Śrīharṣa was a great poet in the court of Jayaccandra, the king of Kāṇyakubja. This poet was the son of Śrī-Hīrapaṇḍita and Śrī-Māmalladevi and possibly he was introduced in the Gāhāḍavāla court in the reign of Vijayacandra, in whose honour he may have composed the Śrī-Vijaya-praśasti. The Naiṣadhacaritam is the most important work of Śrīharṣa. According to Dasgupta and De "it is undoubtedly the last masterpiece of industry and ingenuity that the Mahākāvyā can show.... In spite of many defects, however, the Naiṣadhacaritam is regarded as one of the five Mahākāvyās of Sanskrit literature. It cannot be denied that Śrīharṣa is a master of language and metrics, an artist in the invention of elaborate plays of words and that he has many good ideas in his description of Nature". He was not only a poet but also a philosopher, well-versed in the Vedānta, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Buddhist systems and the Čārvāka. He was the author of the Khāṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khāḍya, a dialectical work on the Vedānta. The concluding verse of each canto of the Naiṣadhacaritam mentions the name of one of the works of this poet, no manuscripts of any of which, however, has yet been discovered. The works referred to in this fashion are the Arṇava-vivaraṇa, Śivaśaktisiddhi, Navasāhasāṅkacarita-campa, Iśvar-ābhisandhi.

1 Cf. "Tāmbuladvayam-āsanam ca labhate yāh Kāṇyakubjeśvarat" etc., in the Naiṣadhacaritam (XXII); also vide Pravandha-kōṣa (Jinavijaya Muni) pp. 56 ff.
2 Vide supra, p. 99.
Sthairyavica-prakaraṇa, Śrī-Vijaya-praśasti, Gauḍ-ortiśa-praśasti and Cindāpraśasti.

In the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions two of the writers are called kavi, Manchara of the Bodh-Gayā inscription of V.S. 124X and Śrī-Kunda of the undated Sārnath inscription of Kumārādevi. The latter has been described as the trusted friend of the Vaṅga king. No work by any of them has been discovered and the contemporary anthologies are silent about them.

(b) Architecture

As quite a number of pre-Muslim architectural specimens in Northern India have ceased to exist, it is not possible to form a correct estimate of the building activities of the Gāhaḍavāla period. Among the one thousand temples destroyed at Vāraṇaśi after the defeat of Jayaccandra, probably there were many erected during this period. According to the information supplied in the inscriptions, Candra-deva appears to have erected temples to Candra-Mādhava and Ādi-Keśava at Vāraṇaśi. Traditions which connect the names of Vijayacandra and Jayaccandra with the erection of a number of temples in Jaunpur region, specially near Jaunpur and Zafarabad, have already been noticed. Most of these temples were converted into mosques, and some of these still exist in ruins as specimens of the early Indo-Muslim architecture, which were fashioned out of Hindu materials by Hindu masons, to suit Muslim taste. The local traditions at Zafarabad indicate that the later Gāhaḍavāla kings probably built a palace and a fort there; Asni,

1 Dasgupta and De, HSL., pp. 325 ff, and pp. 624 ff.
2 UPDG., XXVI, p. 257. and ASR., III, pp. 57 ff.
another stronghold of the Gāhaḍavālas, where according to the Muslim historians, Jayaccandra hid his treasures in a fort, is sometimes located in this area, but according to another theory it was situated 10 miles to the north of Fatehpur in U.P. That there was no lack of private enterprise in the field of building activity is manifested by an inscribed stone slab, in the Kanagra mosque at Banaras, dated A.D. 1190, recording the erection of a number of temples and by the ruins of a temple at Gaḍhwa near Allahabad, erected probably in V.S. 1199/1145 A.D.

(c) Some Important Places and Cultural Contacts

The Gāhaḍavāla kingdom included a number of sacred places and important towns, which had traditionally been great centres of religious and cultural activity. The close association of the kings of this dynasty with these places and the energy they concentrated on their protection and development impart a cultural importance to their reign and mark it out as an era of revitalization of ancient learning. Almost all the inscriptions of this dynasty claim that Candradeva the first Gāhaḍavāla ruler protected the four important āśīnas of Northern India, namely, Kāśi, Kuśika, Uttaraka-Kośala and Indrasthānīyaka. Besides these, the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions incidentally refer to a number of sacred places of lesser importance, and some shrines, as has been noticed before.

Vārāṇasī which according to the Purāṇas was one of the foremost sacred places of India, was also a centre of education and culture even before the rise of the Gāhaḍavālas and al-Birūnī as early as the eleventh century noticed that "Hindu sciences have retired far away from those parts of the country conquered by us, and have fled to the
places, which our hands have not yet reached, to Kāsmīr, Benares and other places”\(^1\). The rise of the Gāhaḍavālas by the end of the eleventh century added political importance to the cultural and religious fame of Vārāṇasī. Though the Gāhaḍavāla kings are referred to in Indian literature as both ‘lord of Kānyakubja’ and ‘lord of Vārāṇasī’, to the Muslim historians Jayaccandra the penultimate king was generally known as the ‘king of Banaras’, and the inscriptive evidence indicates that the city was probably the administrative centre of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion. No doubt the city flourished in pomp and splendour. The contemporary scholar-statesman Lakṣmīndhara refers to about 350 religious shrines of Purānic fame, to which the Gāhaḍavāla kings appear to have made some additions. After the fall of the Gāhaḍavālas, the Muslims occupied the city and they are said to have destroyed more than a thousand temples at Vārāṇasī alone; according to the Kāmil ut-Tawārikh, a contemporary account, they also carried away 1400 camel-loads of treasure\(^2\).

Kuṣīka or Kānyakubja, variously known as Kuṣasthala, Gādhinagara, Mahodaya and Kanauj was another sacred place of Epic and Puranic fame. Under Hārṣa Śilāditya the city became the capital of a North Indian empire. After his death, Kānyakubja became the bone of contention among the great kings of northern and southern India for about two centuries, till the final conquest of the city by the Pratihāras. By the beginning of the eleventh century

---

2. H.I., II, pp. 250 ff. This account, however, omits the name of Asni, where the Gāhaḍavāla treasure was kept and which was plundered by the Muslims before the capture of Vārāṇasī. (Vide Tāj ul-Ma‘āthīr, ibid, pp. 216 ff.)
Maḥmūd of Ghazni twice sacked the city and practically destroyed the Pratihāra imperialism. Al-Bīrūnī (c. 1030 A.D.) describes it as a very large city, the major portion of which was desolate and in ruins since the capital had, at that time been transferred to Bāri. Possession of Mahodaya, however, continued to be a great honour for which, once more, two generations of kings fought, till 1089 A.D., when Candradeva proclaimed himself as the lord of Kānya-kubja. One of the Gāhāḍavāla inscriptions indicates that the city for some time became the capital of the dynasty (cf. "Kānya-kubja karodrājā rājadhānim-aninditam"). The city continued to be under the dynasty till the days of Jayacandra who is well-known in Indian tradition and literature as the king of Kānya-kubja. It is to be noted that Kanauj is not mentioned among the conquests of 1193-4 A.D. by the contemporary Muslim chroniclers.

Besides these, other sacred places and centres of cultural activities, situated in the Gāhāḍavāla dominion and mentioned in the Gāhāḍavāla inscription, like, Prayāga (Kamauli grant V. S. 1228), Kauśāmbi (B. A. S. Grant of V. S. 1233), Uttara-Kośala or Ayodhyā, Indrasthāniyaka, Śrāvasti (Set-Mahet inscription of V. S. 1186) and Gayā (Bodh-Gayā inscription of V. S 124X) have already been noted. Some other places mentioned in the inscriptions appear to have been well known towns of the period, but unfortunately, none of them can be definitely identified. These are Śrīmadapratihāra (Kamauli inscription of V. S. 1282), Viṣṇupura (Kamauli grant of V. S. 1162), Ajāvṛṣa-(or Jāvṛṣa-)nagara (Set Mahet insc. of V. S. 1176), Śrīṣapratisthāna (B. A. S. grant of V. S. 1182) and Rājya-

1 Vide supra, p. 125.
pālapura (Banaras grant of V. S. 1203). Local traditions and ruins indicate that during the later part of the Gāhaḍavāla period, Jaunpur and Zafarabad region formed an important administrative unit of the dominion. All these sacred places and important towns must have attracted people from different parts of India and formed centres for exchange of thought and culture.

Evidence of some external contacts, apparently of cultural import, is furnished by a number of literary works of Kāśmīra and by an inscription from South India. According to Kalhaṇa’s Rājatarangini¹, Jayasiṁha of Kāśmīra (c.1128-49 A.D.) “made the rulers of Kānyakubja and elsewhere, who were powerful owing to the possession of excellent territories, proud by his friendship”. The Śrīkaṇṭhacarita of Maṅkha or Maṅkhaka, Jayasiṁha’s Minister of Peace and War, indicates that this friendship was something more than a political one; the 25th canto of this poem describes the assembly of scholars, which was convoked at the house of Maṅkha’s brother, Alathkara (also a Minister of Jayasiṁha), where this work was read out. Altogether thirty scholars, poets and officials are mentioned in this connection, and Govinda-candra, the king of Kānyakubja is said to have deputed one Suhala to attend this assembly².

A damaged Gāhaḍavāla inscription, with usual verses upto Candradeva’s reign, forms part of another inscription of the 41st regnal year (1110-11 A. D.) of Kulottuṅga at Gaṅgai-konḍa-Coḷapuram, the ancient Coḷa capital³ and

¹ Rājatarangini, VIII, vv. 2452 and 3354.
² Cf. “Anyassa Suhalasa-tena tato-vandyata paṇḍitaḥ, duṭo Govinda-candraśya Kānyakubjasya bhūbhujah”. (Vide HSL., pp. 323 and 627-8 and Śrīkaṇṭhacarita, canto 25, verse 102.)
³ ASL., 1907-08, p. 228.
this find indicates that "some sort of relationship or connection existed between the Gāhadāvālas of Kānyakubja and the Coḷas of Tanjore." In the absence of definite evidence the exact nature of this contact is difficult to determine; but as there is no claim of political influence on any side, Tripathi's conjecture of 'a friendly visit by a Gāhadāvāla prince to the distant south' seems probable¹. This friendship probably continued in Govindacandra's reign and the Set-Mahet inscription of V. S. 1156 records his grant at the request of Saugata-paribrājaka Vāgīśvararakaśīta of Coḍa country, and Saugata-parivrājaka Śākyarakaśīta of Uṭkala-deśa. Both these persons, at that time resided at the Jetavana-mahāvihāra, where they had doubtless come on a religious mission. This inscription is another proof of Gāhadāvāla catholicity which certainly fostered cultural contacts between the Gāhadāvāla dominion and other kingdoms.

¹ HK., p. 313. Also cf. "The increased emphasis on Sun-worship in the Coḷa country in Kulottunga's reign may be due to close association with the Gāhadāvālas, who were great worshippers of the Sun". (Nilkanṭha Sastrī, The Coḷas II, p. 40).
APPENDIX A

Kânyakubja and Vârânasî under the Gâhaḍavâlas

Inscriptions and literature prove that the Gâhaḍavâlas were in possession of Kânyakubja and Vârânasî and it is generally believed that the former was their capital. A careful study of the inscriptive evidence, however, clearly indicates that they had closer and long-continued association with Vârânasî.

Mahîcandra or Mahîyala, the father of Candradeva has been described as a nîpa and Mahârâjâdhirâja Candradeva is known to have protected Kâśi, Kuśika, Uttara-Kośala and Indrâsthamîyaka; the inscriptions which further inform that he himself conquered the Gâdhipurâdhirâjya, imply that the eastern part of his dominion he inherited from his father, a feudatory chief (nîpa). The external and internal geographical evidence of the inscriptions of Candradeva also points again and again to the Vârânasî-Ayodhya region. On the other hand, significantly in the Candrâvatî grant of V.S. 1150, Pañcâla is described as capala or fickle (i.e. unconsolidated). Candradeva’s hold on the newly conquered and much coveted Kânyakubja region seems to have been insecure during the early part of his reign and the prudent king at first made no attempt to remove his capital to Kânyakubja. Towards the latter part of his reign (between V.S. 1156 and 1161) he made this city his capital (vide supra, pp. 49-51). The Gâhaḍavâla success in consolidation of the Pañcâladeśa is testified to by the Basahi, Kamauli and Rahan grants issued during Madanâpâla’s reign; but several characteristics in this Pañcâla group of inscriptions imply that the Gâhaḍavâlas were new-comers in this region and that their consolidation was only partial. Firstly, for the first time the geographical references carry us to the Pañcâladeśa. Secondly, for the first time the dynastic name is mentioned in the inscriptions (the other Gâhaḍavâla inscriptions do not generally refer to it) and from a comparative study it appears that the name was mentioned in these cases because it was unfamiliar in this
region and needed a proper introduction; the name is referred to on two more occasions, once in the undated Sarnath inscription of Kumāradevi, written by a Gauḍa poet to whom the dynastic name was unfamiliar, and once again in the fragmentary stone inscription of Uddalladevi found in an area which was probably conquered by the Gahaḍavālas during the reign of Govindacandra (vide supra, pp. 116-17). Thirdly, some taxes referred to in the Pañcāla group of inscriptions are not found mentioned in any other Gahaḍavāla inscriptions (i.e., Viśatiśāpustha, Viśaticchavata, aksapāṭalapuṣṭha, varavajhe etc.) and marked departure from usual terminology may be noticed in citation of agrarian concessions granted therein; these may indicate that the typical Gahaḍavāla taxes, imposts and terminology were not yet introduced in this newly conquered area (vide supra, pp. 187-89).

The change of capital, however, turned out to be unfortunate and the western part of the Gahaḍavāla dominion was overwhelmed by the Turkish invasion during the reign of Madanaḍa. Though Govindacandra recovered the lost territories, Kānyakubja no longer appears to have served as the Gahaḍavāla capital. The single verse which refer to that city as their capital has not been repeated in any other Gahaḍavāla inscription and most of the inscriptions of this dynasty were issued from Vārāṇasi and the surrounding region.

Among the contemporary inscriptions issued by persons other than the Gahaḍavālas, some associate them with Vārāṇasi, others with Kānyakubja. The Tārācanḍī rock inscription (V.S. 1225) refers to the contemporary Gahaḍavāla king as Gāḍhinagarādhipa and Kānyakubjaṭadhipati and the Belkharā inscription (V.S. 1253) prudently mentions ‘Kānyakubja-vijaya-rāja-samvat’; on the other hand the Bodhgaya inscription (V.S. 124X) describes Jayaccandra as Kāśīśa. The Ratnapur inscription of Jājjalladeva Kalacuri refers to the Gahaḍavāla king as the ruler of Kānyakubja and the Mau inscription of Madanavarman Candrātreya and the Mādhāi-nagar grant of Lakṣmanaṇasena mention him as the king of Kāśī (El., I, pp. 32 ff, 195 ff., and Insc. of Bengal, pp. 106 ff.)
The available literary evidence regarding this point is no less conflicting: The Rāmacarita Commentary (II, 5.), Rājataraṅgini (Stein, VIII, 2453), and Śrīkaṇṭhacarita (XXV, 102) associate the Gāhāḍavāla kings with Kānyakubja. On the other hand, Lakṣmīdhara, the author of the Kṛtya-kalpataru and Mahāśāndhivigrahika of Govindaçandra, describe his patron as Kāśīpati. The contemporary Muslim chroniclers Hasan Nizāmī and Ibn ul-Athīr also refer to the penultimate Gāhāḍavāla king as the ruler of Banaras (HI., II, pp. 223, 251). Confused traditions about the Gāhāḍavāla kings have been preserved in late story anthologies. The Prabandhacintāmaṇi (pp. 112, 183) and the Prabandhakoṣa (pp. 54, 18) mention them as lords of Kāśī and the Puruṣaparīkṣā (IV, no. 12) contains a story of Jayaccandra the king of Kāśī who lived at the city of Kānyakubja on the Bhāgī-rathī.

The apparently conflicting inscriptions and literary data, however, may be reconciled if we remember that the name Kānyakubja has often been used to denote a wider area than the city of Kānyakubja. Under the Pratihāras it was the name of a bhukti, which included Kālañjara-maṇḍala; the Jami 'ut-Tawārīkh also records that the current Persian designation Kanauj stood for Mahades or Madhyadesa, one of the nine traditional divisions of India (HI., I, p. 54); the Somnathpattana praśasti (A. D. 1169) includes Vārāṇasī in the Kānyakubja-viṣaya (Vienna Oriental Jour., III, pp. 7, 13). Considering these points Tripathi has come to the conclusion that ‘in the Gāhāḍavāla plates......the name Kānyakubja or Gāḍhipura is given to the kingdom’ (HK., pp. 6-7). Many of the contemporary and late Indian writers were influenced by the imperial tradition associated with the name of the city and had described the Gāhāḍavāla kings as the ‘lords of Kānyakubja’, which epithet is quite correct if we accept the interpretation of Tripathi. The contemporary Muslim chroniclers, on the other hand, naturally knew little about the imperial tradition of Kānyakubja and refer simply to the actual capital of Jayaccandra. This view is further
strengthened by the fact that in 1193/4 A. D, Kānyakubja was neither protected by the Gāhaḍavālas, nor was it attacked by the Muslim invader; the city was conquered by Iltutmish at a later date (vide supra, pp. 115-16). The survival of the Gāhaḍavāla power in the eastern part of their dominion inspite of complete devastation of Vārāṇasī, is proved by the discovery of the post-Candwar records in this area; on the other hand, though Kānyakubja appears to have been spared in c. 1193 A.D, no such evidence of the survival of the Gāhaḍavālas in that region has yet been discovered. This also tends to support the view that the Gāhaḍavāla administrative centre was at Vārāṇasī and consequently their hold on the eastern part of their dominion was stronger than it was on the west.

A comparative study of all the available evidences, thus clearly indicates that, though the empire over which the Gāhaḍavālas ruled, was traditionally known as the empire of Kānyakubja, it was the city of Vārāṇasī which served as the administrative centre for the greater part of their rule.
APPENDIX B

Epigraphic Notes

SECTION I: INTRODUCTORY

About eighty inscriptions directly connected with the history of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, have been found. They may be conveniently classified into three groups as follow:

Group A includes all inscriptions recording land-grants or other pious deeds of kings, queens and princes of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, group B, inscriptions, recording either land-grants by Gāhaḍavāla feudatory chiefs or other acts of piety by them or by others, owing allegiance to them, and group C, miscellaneous inscriptions, recording various pious deeds of private individuals, directly subject to the Gāhaḍavāla rule.

Group A: Sixty-seven inscriptions belong to the first category, as defined above, which again may be subdivided into classes (a) and (b).

(a) Sixty-two inscriptions, belonging to this class always repeat and whenever necessary, add to the same set of verses in the genealogical and prāśasti sections. Thus the five verses in the first Gāhaḍavāla inscription, dated in V. S. 1148, which describe the genealogy of the dynasty from Yaśovigraha to Candradeva and eulogises the reigning king Candra, are found repeated in the last inscription of the dynasty, issued in V. S. 1253, by the last king Hariścandra; the latter describes the genealogy from Yaśovigraha to Hariścandra, adding new verses, which again describe the exploits of the rulers, subsequent to Candradeva, and are collected from their own inscriptions. In the donative portions also, there is a general similarity of treatment. The manner in which, the verses relating to one king are quoted, practically without any marked change in the records of the subsequent
rulers of the family, shows that there may have been a tendency to preserve historical material in an unaltered form.

(b) The remaining five inscriptions of group A are of special nature inasmuch as they, unlike (a), do not systematically repeat the older verses, but contain new verses of political and religious importance; two Candrāvati inscriptions of Candradeva, Basahi and Kamauli grants of māhārājaputra Govindacandra and the Sarnath inscription of Kumārā-devi belong to this class.

The inscriptions of Govindacandra mentioned above together with the Rahan grant of V.S. 1166, in which Mahārājaputra Govindacandra announces a landgrant by Rāṇaka Lavarāpravāha, differ from the general series of Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions in phraseology and technicalities, in regard to which, they between themselves exhibit some similarity. As the internal and external geographical evidence of these characteristic records associate them with the Paṅcāla area, around Kānyaakubja, they may be regarded as forming a distinct group, to be conveniently described as the Paṅcāla group.

**Group B:** The next group strictly speaking, comprises eight inscriptions, issued by the Gāhaḍavāla feudatories and their subjects between c. 1090 A.D. and c. 1197 A.D. The earliest Gāhaḍavāla feudatory record is the Rahan Grant of V.S. 1166 (belonging to the Paṅcāla group); this inscription contains some new verses about the Gāhaḍavālas and some of the old verses found in Group A(a). One record from Kamauli belonging to Govindacandra's reign was issued by a Mahārājaputra of Siṅgara dynasty. The other six inscriptions were issued to record various pious activities of Vidyādhara, Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala of Jāpila, and Rāuta Šakarūka, a subject of Vijayakarṇa. There are three later inscriptions, which fall outside the chronological limit of the present work; two of these were issued by the descendants of Pratāpadhavala and the remaining one, dated in V.S. 1294, the fragmentary stone inscription of Uddalladevi (V.S. 1294) refers to a Gāhaḍavāla prince Āḍakamalla, probably her husband's overlord.
Group C: Only four inscriptions belonging to the third category are known; three of these were issued respectively by Ṭhakkura Bellana, Bhavibhuṣaṇa and a Vāstavya Ṭhakkura (name illegible). The fourth inscription, which records the construction of a cave, is of considerable religious importance and refers to a Buddhist monk Śrīmitra, who was the dikṣāguru of Jayaccandra.

The Gāhaḍavāla seals: These have already been described and the existence of two types of Gāhaḍavāla seals, one for the kings and the other for the princes, has been pointed out (supra, p. 145). The Gāhaḍavāla seal is bell-shaped and generally slides on a ring which passes through a ringhole, made at the centre of the top and of the plate. In a few cases, one end of a long narrow metal strip is attached to the top centre of the plate by a rivet, while the other end is rolled into a cylindrical hole, through which passes a small ring, which loosely attaches the big ring, on which the seal slides.

SECTION II: A DESCRIPTIVE LIST OF THE GĀHAḌAVĀLA INSCRIPTIONS

A descriptive list of the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions, together with the suggested readings in some cases, is given below:

Group A: The inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavālas issued during the reigns of Candradeva (4), Madanapāla (4), Govindacandra (41), Vijayacandra (2), Jayaccandra (15) and Hariścandra (1).

Unless specially mentioned, these inscriptions contain the usual Gāhaḍavāla verses and were issued under the Gāhaḍavāla royal seal.


2. Candrāvatī grant of Candradeva (Āśvina vadi 15, V. S. 1150/23rd October, 1093 A. D.). Found as No. 1. Contains
some new verses in the genealogical and praśasti sections. King after bathing at the confluence of Sarayū and Ghargharā in Ayodhya (or Uttara-Kośala) granted the pattalā of Kaśhe-
hali (with the exception of the villages already granted) to 500 Brāhmaṇas, who also received Sariṣoda village in Bṛhad-
revaṁkāṇai pattalā for their residence (Brahmapuri). Deposited in PML. Partly edited by Sahni in EI., XIV, pp. 193-96; the praśasti sections, published by me with a facsimile and historical notes, in IHQ., 1949, pp. 31-37.

3. B. A. S. grant of Candradeva (Māgha sudi 3, V. S. 1154/ 8th January, 1098 A. D.?) issued posthumously by Madanapāla. Findspot not known. Records grant of the village Ahuāma in Dhanēsaramaua pattalā to Vāmanasvāmi-
sarman by Candradeva who bathed at Śri-Trilocana-ghatā. Now in ASB. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVIII, pp. 9-14; also vide JASB., XXVII, pp. 220-41.)

4. Candrāvaśī grant of Candradeva (Vaiśākha sudi 3, V.S, 1156/14th April, 1100 A.D.). Found as No. 1. Candradeva after performing a tulāpūraśa-mahādāna in front of Ādi-
Keśava and bathing at Ādikeśava-ghatā granted 30 villages in Bṛhadrevarauha pattalā and 2 villages in Kaśhehali pattalā to the above mentioned 500 Brāhmaṇas and Majauḍa in Vamkānai pattalā to the shrine of Candra-Mādhava. Now in PML. Edited partly by Sahni in EI., XIV, pp.197-200. Praśasti section contains new verses as in No. 2, published by me with historical notes in IHQ., 1949, pp. 31-37.

6. Kamauli grant of Madanapāla and Govindacandra (Kārtika sudi 15, V. S. 1162/24th Oct., 1105 A.D.) Found at Kamauli in Banaras dist. Mahārājaputra Govindacandra bathed at the Gaṅgā and from his victorious camp at Viśnupura granted the village of Usithā in Jiāvari pattalā in Paṅcāla-desa to Vilhakāya Dikṣita. Written with the permission of those mentioned in No 5 and also of Queen Rālha-devī. New verses as in No 5. Seal missing. Conchshell and arrow as above. Now in PML. Ed. by Venis (EL., II, pp. 358-61.)

7. Bahuvarā grant (or Messrs. Terry & Co. grant) of Madanapāla and Pṛthviśrikā (Pauṣa vadi 15, V. S. 1164(?)/16th Dec., 1109 A. D.). Findspot not known. Closely resembles No. 5 Mahārājāni Pṛthviśrikā bathed at Bārānaśī (Ādi-Kesavaghaṭa) and granted Bahuvarā village in Bhailavata pattalā to purohita Devavara and others. Details unknown, never edited; plate probably lost. Noticed by Bendall in JRAS., 1896, pp. 787-88.

8. Baḍera grant of Madanapāla (Vaiśākha sudi 3, V. S. 1164/1107 A. D.). Found at Baḍera, Pratābgarh dist. Oudh. The only known grant of the king, who bathed at Vārāṇaśi and granted Sājā-grāma in Māṇighapura-caturāsikā (the editor of the grant read vaturaśikā but as va and ca of this age may be easily confused by a scribe, I think the correct reading would be ‘caturāsikā’ which is reminescent of the traditional clan-holdings of 84 units), which is contiguous to Arureśa pattalā, to Gaṅgdhara-śarman. Ed. by K. C. Sinha (JUPHS., XIV, pp. 66 ff.)

9. Pali First Plate of Govindacandra (Bhādra, V. S. 1171/A.D. 1114) and found at Pali in Gorakhpur dist.; other plate not yet found. Records the grant of a piece of land, measuring 30 halas, in Pāli in Sīrasī pattalā in Oṇavala pathaka in Saruvāra. The record being incomplete, other details are not known. Now in PML. Ed. by Banerji. (JBORS., 1933 pp. 233-8).

pattalā to Purohita Jāguśarman. Now at PML. Ed. by Kielhorn in *El.*, IV, pp. 101-03.


12. Kamauli grant (Vaiśākha sudi 3, V. S. 1172/7th April, 1116 A.D.). Found at Kamauli. Govindacandra bathed at Vārāṇasī and granted the village of Dhūsa in Brhaghevaratāṭha pattalā to Mahāpurohitā Jāguśarman. There is no ring hole for a seal; the grant was probably never issued. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (*El.*, IV, pp. 103-04).


17. Kamauli grant (Kārtika sudi 9, V. S. 1176/? Oct., 1118-19 A.D.). Found at Kamauli. Govindacandra bathed in the Gāngā at Vārānaśi and granted a village (whose name is illegible) in Saruvāra (the editor read the name as Saru(gā)ra, but on examining the plate I have noticed that the third letter may be read as vā; see No. 9 above), to Mahā-purohita Jāguka. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., IV, p. 109.)

18. Don Buzurg grant (Jyaiśṭha sudi 8, V. S. 1176/ 1119-20 A.D.?). Found at the village of Don Buzurg, 7½ miles north of Mairwa railway station. Govindacandra bathed in the Gāṅgā at his camp-residence (yān-āvāsa) at the village of Maịndaliā belonging to Alāṅvimahāpura and granted the village of Vaḍagrāma in Alāpa pattalā to the Brāhmaṇa Tul-tāica-sarman. Now in PML. Ed. by Sahni (EI., XVIII, pp. 218-24.)

19. Bengal Asiatic Society’s grant (Kārtika sudi 14, V. S. 1177/ 1120 A.D.?). Findspot not known. Govindacandra granted the village of Karaṇḍagrama and Karaṇḍatalla in Antarāla pattalā (which formerly belonged to Rudra-Siva, the preceptor of king Yaśaḥ-Karna) to Vaśiśṭha. The plate now lost (no facsimile). Ed. by Hall (JASB., XXXI, pp. 123-24.)


22. Banaras grant (Bhādrapada sudi 4, V. S. 1181/9th Sept., 1124 A.D.). Findspot unknown. Govindacandra records the grant of the village of Tribhāṇḍi in Yavaala pattalā to Bhūpatisarman by his mother Mahāmātṛ-rājīnī Śrī Rālhaṇa-
devi who performed the Paṅca-lāṅgala-mahādāna (the editor read the name of the mahādāna as ‘para-lāṅgala’, but on examining the accompanying the facsimile, I have noticed that, as there is a good deal of similarity between the forms of the letters ra and ca of the period. The correct reading appears to be pa (ṅ) ca lāṅgala). Ed. by Fuhrer (JASB., LVI, pt. I, pp. 113-18.)


27. Bhadavan grant (Phāḷguṇa vadi 15, V. S. 1184/1127 A. D.). Found at Tala, Pratābgarh. Records a grant of Govindacandra, who bathed at Prayāga and granted the village of Bhadavan with Bhaṭabali and Laghu-Bhadavan in Mahāvisa pattalā to Śīlaśarman. (‘Prayāge vanatau’ a puzzling term appears to be a scribe’s mistake for “Prayage-‘vanato”). Two notable features of the grant—(i) there is
no ringhole for the seal and (ii) no uniformity in writing: first
6 lines small and clearly written letters, then the letters gradu-
ally growing bigger and more spacy—specially the last two
lines. Scribe not mentioned. This grant probably was never
issued formally. Now in PML. Ed. by Mehta (El., XIX, pp.
291-94).

28. Banaras grant (Caitra sudi 15, V. S. 1185/20th
March, 1128 A. D.). Findspot unknown Govindacandra bathed
in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasi and granted the village of Jaragāma
in the Puroha pattalā to Paṇḍita Bhūpatiśarman. Ed. by
Fuhrer (JASB., LXI, pt. I, pp. 118 23.)

29. Itaunja grant (Mārga sudi 2, V. S. 1186/1129 A. D.).
Findspot unknown, recovered from the Raja of Itaunja in U.P.
Govindacandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasi and granted
the village of Kapāsi in Maṅgalajaśī pattalā to Nāneśarman.
Now at PML. Ed. by Sastri (El., XIII, pp. 295-97.)

30. Set-Māhet (Āśādha sudi 15, 1186/ 1128-9 A. D.?).
Found in a monastery on the site of Set on the borders of the
Goṇḍa and Bahraich districts. Govindacandra bathed in the
Gaṅgā at Banaras and granted the villages of Viḥāra, Pattanā,
Upalaiṇḍ, Vavvahali, Meyī-sambaddha-Ghosāḍi and Pothivāra-
sambaddha-Payāsi in the Vāḍā-caturāṣṭi pattalā, to the Saṅgha
of Buddhist friars. The plate is lost. Ed. by Sahni (El., XI,
pp. 20-26.)

31. Banaras grant (Agrahāyaṇa sudi 15, V. S. 1187/16th
Govindacandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Banaras and granted
the village of Palasaunḍi in Nandivāra to Prāṇācārya Bhatta
Paṇḍita Khoṇaṣarman. Now at PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (El.,
VIII, pp 153-55.)

32. Raiwan grant (Mārga sudi 15, V. S. 1187/21st Nov,
1130 A. D.?). Found at Raiwan in Sitapur district in a small
mound. Govindaścandra bathed at Ādikeśava-ghaṭa in the
Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasi and granted the village of Sohānjaka in
Navagrāma pattalā to Bālādityaṣarman. Now in PML. Ed.
by Fuhrer (JASB., LVI, pt. I, pp. 106-13.)

33. Ren grant (Kārtika sudi 15, V. S. 1188/6th Nov., 1131
A. D.). Found at Ren in Mutaur pargana of Gazipur Tahsil of Fatepur (U. P.) Govindacandra bathed at Adikesava-ghaṭṭa in the Gaṅgā at Vārānasī and granted the village of Dosāhali in Gānavattala pattalā (on examining the plate I have suggested the reading;—the first syllable not read before, others noticed in Cat. Arch. Ex. PML., I, p. 21) to Lohaḍa-śarman. Now at PML, Ed. by Hoernle (IA, XIX, pp. 249-52.)

34. Pali grant (Vaiśākha sudi 3, 1189/29th April, 1132 A. D.). Found at Pali in Gorakhpur. Govindacandra bathed in the Śāti (i.e. Gaṅgā) at the Svapnaśvara-ghaṭṭa and recorded the grant of his mother Rālhaṇa-devi, who donated 10 nālukas of land in Guduvī in Goyara pattalā in Oṇavala pathaka to Jayapāla-śarman. Now at PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., V, pp. 113-15.)


36. Banaras grant (Vaiśākha sudi 3, V. S. 1190/30th March, 1134 A.D.). Found at Banaras, Records that Yuvarāja Āsphoṭacandra after bathing in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasī with the king’s permission, granted the village of Kaṇāuita in Nandiṇī pattalā to Dāmodara-śarman. Seal is of Āsphoṭacandra—his name between a conchshell and a barbed arrow pointing to left. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., VIII, pp. 155-56.)


39. Kamauli grant (Phālguṇa vadi 1, V.S. 1197/23rd Feb., 1141 A.D.). Found at Kamauli. Govindacandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at the Vedeśvara-ghaṭa and granted a village (name etc. illegible) to Dhādūka on the day of the great queen Rālha-devī. Now at PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (El., IV, p. 114.)

40. Kamauli grant (Phālguṇa vadi 1, V.S. 1198 (expired) 23rd Feb., 1141 A.D.) Found at Kamauli. Govindacandra bathed at Avimukta-kṣetra in the Gaṅgā at Banaras and granted the village of Laṅkācaḍa in Navagrāma pattalā to Dhādūka on the day of the great queen Rālha-devī. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (El., IV, pp. 113-14.)


43. Machlishahr grant (Vaśākha sudi 3, V.S. 1201/19th April 1143 A.D.). Found near Machlishahr (Ghiswa), in Jaunpur district, U. P. Govindacandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasi and granted the village of Peroha in Mahasoya pattalā to Paṇḍita Vaśāsadharasrāvarman. Now at PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (El., V, pp. 115-16.)

44. Lar plates (Vaśākha sudi 3, V.S. 1202/15th April, 1146 A.D.). Found in the village of Lar in the Gorakhpur district U.P. Govindacandra, while at Mudgagiri, bathed in the Gaṅgā and granted the village of Poṭacavaḍa in Pāndala
pattalā in Govisālaka, contiguous to Duhāli in Saruvāra, to Ṭhakkura Śrīdharā. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (El., VII, pp. 98-100.)

45. Banaras grant (Māgha vadi 5, V. S. 1203/25th Dec., 1146). Found near Bhadayini temple, Banaras. Mahārājaputra Rājyapāladeva bathed in the Gaṅgā at Rājyapālapura and with the consent of Govindacandra granted the village of Camaravāmi in Balaura pattalā to Pañḍita Dāmodara-śarman. The seal is of the prince with his name between a conchshell and an arrow. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (El., VIII, pp. 156-58.)


47. Bangarmau (Kārtika sudi 15, V. S. 1208/ 6th Nov., 1150 A.D.? ) Found at the village of Bangarmau (incorrectly described by Kielhorn as Bangavan) in Daryabad pargana in Barabanki district U.P. Govindacandra announces a grant by Paṭṭamahādevī Mahārājīī Gosaladevi, who bathed in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasī, near the temple of the god Lolārka and with his consent gave away the village of Gatiara in the Bhīmamayāṭasa.....(on examining the plate I think the last letters, not read before, may be tentatively read as “aṁśa”) pattalā to Ṭhakkura Kulhe. Probably incised by two scribes; first 11 lines and the first seven letters of the 12th line deep bold and angular letters, the rest lighter and less angular, rather cursive letters; name of the writer is not mentioned. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn. (El., V. pp. 116-18.)

49. Sarnath stone-slab-inscription (undated) of Kumāradevī. Found at Sarnath. Records the restoration of Dharmacakra-Jina (originally set up by Dharmāśoka) and installation of it at a new vihāra, built for the purpose by Kumāradevī at the request of Jambuki, who was subsequently made the foremost of all pattalikās. In the introductory Kumāradevī is described as the daughter of Devarakṣita (son of Vallavarāja of the Chikkora dynasty of Pithi) and Śaṅkara-devī (daughter of Mathana, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler of Aṅgada) and queen of Govindacandra, son of Madanacandra son of Candradeva of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. Ed. by Sten Konow (EI., IX, pp. 319-28.)

50. Kamauli grant (Āśāḍha sudi 10, V.S. 1224/16th June, 1168 A.D.). Found at Kamauli. King Vijayacandra records that with his consent Yuvarāja Mahārājaputra Jayaccandra, after being initiated as a worshipper of Kṛṣṇa and bathing in the Gaṅgā at Vārānasī near the temple of Ādi-Keśava granted the village of Haripura in Jīvai pattalā to Praharājaśarman son of Jāguśarman. Seal missing. Now at PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., IV, pp. 117-20.)

51. Royal Asiatic Society’s Grant (Māgha sudi 15, V.S. 1225) Findspot unknown. Mahārājaputra Yuvarāja Jayaccandradeva, with the king’s permission, after bathing in the Yamunā at the Vaśiṣṭha-gaṭṭa, granted the village of Nāgallī in the Devahali pattalā to Rāuta Anantaśarman and Dādeśarman. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XV, pp. 7-13.)

52. Kamauli grant (Āśāḍha sudi 6, V.S. 1226/21st June, 1270 A.D.). Found at Kamauli. Jayaccandradeva, after performing the abhiṣeka-mantra-snāna at his camp at Vādaviha, granted the village of Osia in the Brhadgrhokamīśāra pattalā to Rāja-guru Mahāpurohita Prahlādaśarman. Now at PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., IV, pp. 120-21.)

53. Kamauli grant (Māgha sudi 7, V.S. 1228/4th June, 1172 A.D.). Found at Kamauli. Jayaccandradeva bathed at the confluence of rivers at Prayāga near the temple of Gaṅgāditya and granted the village of Kusuphaṭā in the Mahuso
pattalā to Praharājaśarman. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., IV, pp. 121-23.)

54. Kamauli grant (Mārga sudi 15, V. S. 1230/21st Nov. 1173 A.D.). Found at Kamauli. Jayaccandra, after bath in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇaṣi before the god Ādi-Keśava granted the village of Ahenī, Sarasā and Athasū in Unāvisa pattalā to Praharājaśarman. (A crack in the plate has been repaired probably before engraving, by a long narrow strip of metal, which bears 3 letters in 2 lines.). Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., VI, pp. 123-24.)

55. Kamauli grant (Kārtika sudi 15, V. S. 1231/1174 A.D. ?—Postscript—Phālguṇa vadi 9, V. S. 1235/2nd Feb., A.D. 1179). Found at Kamauli. Jayaccandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Kāśi near the god Kṛttivāsa and granted half of the village of Khāmbhamaua in Vajainhāccchāsathi pattalā to Praharājaśarman and the other half of the village to 8 other Brāhmaṇas. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (EI., IV, pp. 124-26.)


57. Banaras College (Sihvar) grant (Bhādra sudi 13, V.S. 1232/30th Aug., 1175 A.D.). Found at the village of Sihvar 6 miles to the north-east of the city of Banaras. Jayaccandra after bathing in the Gaṅgā at Vāraṇaṣi on the occasion of the nāma-karaṇa ceremony of his son Hariścandra granted the villages of Sarauḍā and (Ā)māyi in Māṇara pattalā to Mahāpaṇḍita Hṛṣikeśaśarman. Now in PML. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVIII, pp. 129-34.)

58. Kamauli grant (Vaisākha sudi 3, V. S. 1233/3rd April, A.D. 1177). Found at Kamauli. Jayaccandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Vāraṇaṣi and granted the village of Māṭāpura in Kacchoha pattalā to the temple of god Lolārka and to
Praharājaśarman and 10 other Brāhmaṇas. Now at PML.
Ed. by Kielhorn (El., IV, pp. 128-129.)


60. Bengal Asiatic Society’s grant (Date as above). Found as above. Jayaccandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasī and granted the village of Kośhāravandhūrī in Kosamba pattalā to the donee of above. Deposited as above. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVIII, pp. 136-37.)


62. Bengal Asiatic Society’s grant (Vaisākha sudi 15, V. S. 1236/11th April 1180 A. D.) Found as above. Jayaccandra, while at Raṇḍavai on the Gaṅgā, granted the village of Dayaḍāma in Dayaḍāmī pattalā to the donee of above. Deposited as above. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVIII, pp. 139-40.)

63. Bengal Asiatic Society’s grant (date as above). Found as above. Jayaccandra from Raṇḍavai granted the village of Saleśi in Jārūtha pattalā to the donee of above. Deposited as above. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVIII, pp. 140-42.)

64. Bengal Asiatic Society’s grant (date as above). Found as above, Jayaccandra from Raṇḍavai granted the village of Abhelāvaṭu in Jārūtha pattalā to the donee of above. Deposited as above. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVIII, pp. 142-43.)

65. Lucknow Museum Plate (Phālguna vadi 7, V. S. 1237/22nd Feb., A.D. 1181). Findspot unknown. Jayaccandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasī and granted the village of Mandarā with Kaḍāhī in Dehaduāra pattalā to Brahma-

67. Machlishahr Grant (Pauṣa sudi 15, V. S. 1253/6th Jan., 1197 A. D.) Found at the village Kotwa, pargana Ghiswa, tahsil Machlishahr, in Jaunpur Dist. U.P. Hariścandra bathed in the Gaṅgā at Cyavanesvara-ghaṭa from his camp at Dhanaśvakra (?) and granted the village of Pamahai (pattalā illegible) to Rāhīhiyaka. Now deposited in PML. Ed. by Sastri (EI., X, pp. 93-100.)

Group B. Inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavāla feudatories etc. (7)

68. Rahan grant (Pauṣa vadi 15, V. S. 1166/3rd Jan., 1104 A. D.) Found at Rahan in Etawah Dist, U.P. During the reign of Madanapañḍa, Mahārājaputra Govindacandra records that, Rāṇaka Lavarāpravāha bathed in the Yamunā at the Deva Muraitha-ghaṭa at Aṣāṭikā and granted part of the village of Rāmaitha in Siguroḍha pattalā to Guṇacandra. The grant was written with the consent of Mahattaka Gaṅgeya. Seal missing. Now in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVIII, pp. 14-19.)

69. Set-Mahet Stone Inscription of Madana and Vidyādhara (V.S. 1176/1119-20 A.D.) Found at the village of Mahet in Gonda dist. U.P. Records that Vidyādhara, son of Janaka and grandson of Bīlvaśīva of the Vāstavya family established a saṅgha for the Buddhist monks at the town of Ajāvṛṣa or Jāvṛṣa; Vidyādhara’s master was king Madana and his father Janaka was a minister of Madana’s father Gādhhipūrādhipati Gopāla. Ed. by Kielhorn (IA., XVII, pp. 61-64.)

70. Kamauli Grant of Govindacandra and Śiṅgara Vatsarāja (Bhādrapada sudi 8, V.S. 1191/28th Aug., 1134
A.D.) Found at Kamauli. Describes the Gāhaḍavāla genealogy from Candradeva to Govindacandra quoting from the general series of the Gāhaḍavāla verses (Aa). New verse traces the genealogy of the donor Mahārājaśrī Vatsarāja of the Śrīgara dynasty, which came from Śrīgaraśa. The donor on the kanyā-sāṁkrāṇī bathed in the Gaṅgā at the Avimukta-kṣetra of Banaras and granted the village of Ambavāra in the Rāpaḍī viñāya to Ṭhakkura Dalhūśarman. Now in P.M.L, Ed, by Kielhorn (El., IV, pp, 130-33.)

71. Tutrahi Falls Rock inscription of Pratāpadhavala (Jyaiṣṭha vadi 4, V. S. 1214/19th April, 1158 A. D.). Rock situated five miles to the west of Tilohu in Shahabad district in Bihar. The short inscription which gives the name of the chief with the date has not been published. Noticed by Kielhorn in El., IV, p. 310.


73. Tārācāṇḍī Rock Inscription of Pratāpadhavala (Jyaiṣṭha vadi 3, V. S. 1225/16th April, 1169 A.D.). Situated in the Shahabad dist., Bihar. Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala denounces a document of landgrant, forged by Deū, an officer of Vijayacandra of Gādhhipura (Kanauj). Ed. by F.E. Hall (JAOS., VI, pp. 547-49.)

74. Phulwaria Undated inscription of Pratāpadhavala records the pilgrimage of the chief belonging to the Khayaravāla dynasty with his family to the Tutrahi Falls and mentions in this connection his sons, Śatrughna, Vīradhavala and Sāhasadhavala. Noticed by Bloch (PRAS., EC., 1902-03, pp. 20 ff.)

75. Belkhara Pillar Inscription of Vijayakarṇa and Śakarūka (Vaiśākha sudi 11, V. S, 1254/29th April, 1197 A, D.). The Ganeśa capital on which the inscription is inscribed, is in Belkhara in Mirzapur dist., U.P. Records the erection of the pillar by Rāuta Śakarūka, a subject of Rānaka Vijayakarṇa during the victorious reign of Kānyakubja. Name
of the ruler at Kāṇyakubja is not mentioned. Ed. by R. D. Banerji (JASB., 1911, pp. 763-65.)

Group C. Inscriptions of private individuals, owing direct allegiance to the Gāhāḍavālas.

76. Hathia-dah Pillar Inscription of Bellana (V. S. 1207/1151 A.D.). Incised on a sandstone pillar standing in the middle of a dry tank called Hathia-dah, nearly midway between Azimgarh and Banaras. Records the excavation of the tank by Bellana Ṭhākura, the bhāṇḍāgarika of Gosalladevī, Mahārājī of Govindacandra. Never edited; noticed by Cunningham (ASR., 1871, I, pp. 95-96.)

77. Jaunpur Pillar Inscription of Bhabibhūṣāṇa (Caitra vadi 5, V. S. 1225/19th March, 1169 A.D.). Incised on the face of one of the bracket-capitals of a square pillar of the Lal Darwaza Masjid at Jaunpur. Two incomplete lines give the date in the reign of Vijayacandradeva and refer to Bhāṭāraka Bhabibhūṣāṇa. Noticed by Cunningham (ASR., XI, p. 123.)


80. The Fragmentary Stone Inscription of Uddalladevī (V. S. 1294/1237 A. D.) recording the erection of a shrine to Vindhyeśvara Śiva, may be connected with the Gāhāḍavālas, because it refers to a Gāhāḍavāla prince Āḍakkamalla by name, whose status however cannot be ascertained. Śrī Mahamandadeva, husband of Uddalladevī appears to have been a feudatory of the Gāhāḍavāla prince. Found in Nagod State, Central India. Ed. by M. M. Nagar (EI., XXIII, pp. 186-89.)
APPENDIX C

Genealogical Table

Yaśovigraha

Mahīcandra (Mahītala or Mahīyala)

Candradeva (Candrāditya) c. 1089-1100 A.D.

Madanapāla c. 1100-1114 A.D.
  (m. 1. Prthvīśrikā
      2. Rālhaṇa-devī)

Govindacandra c. 1114-55 A.D.
  (m. 1. Nayanakeli-devī
      2. Gosalla-devī
      3. Kumāra-devī
      4. Vasanta-devī?)

Yuvarāja Rājaputra
Āsphoṭacandra Rājyapāla

Vijayacandra c. 1155-1170 A.D.

Jayaccandra c. 1170-1193 A.D.

Hariścandra c. 1194-1197 A.D.

? Äḍakamalla c. 1237 A.D.
APPENDIX D

Bibliography

ORIGINAL SOURCES

Brahmanical and other non-Muslim works

Bilhana:—Vikramanakadvacarita. Ed. by Bühler, Bombay Sanskrit Series, Bombay, 1875.

Cānd Bardāi:—Pṛthvīrājarāsa. Ed. by S. S. Das, Banaras, 1913. (Also Rāsosāra by S. S. Das.)

Gautama:—Gautama-Dharmaśāstra, Sacred Books of the East, vol. II.


Maṅkha:—Śrīkanṭhacarita. Ed. by Durga Prasad and Parab, Bombay, 1879.


Rājaśekhara:—Prabandhakoṣa. Ed. by Jinavijaya Muni, Santiniketan.

Sandhyākaranandi:—Rāmacarita. (1) Ed. by MM.H. P. Sastri Memoirs of Asiatic Society of Bengal, III. (2) Ed. by Majumdar, Banerji and Basak, Rajshahi, 1939.


Viṣṇu:—Viṣṇusmṛti.


Muslim Works

Elliot and Dawson:—*History of India as Told by Her own Historians*. Extracts from *Ta’rikh-i-Yamini* (‘Utbi). *Tāj ul-Ma’āthir* (Hasan Nizāmi), *Kāmil ut-Tawārīkh* (Ibn Athīr), *Habib us-Siyar* (Khond Mīr), *Chach-nāma*, *Diwān-i-Salmān*, *Jami ut-Tawārīkh* etc.


Inscriptions


Numismatic Works and Catalogues

Banerji, R.D.:—*Prācīna Mudrā* (in Bengali). Calcutta, 1322 B.S.

Brown, C.J.:—*Coins of India*, Heritage of India Series, 1922.

Cunningham, A.:—*Coins of Mediaeval India from the seventh century down to the Muhammadan Conquest*. London, 1894.

Rapson, E.J.:—*Indian Coins*. Strassburg, 1897.


*Catalogue of Provincial Cabinet of Coins, East Bengal and Assam*.

*Catalogue of Provincial Cabinet of Coins, the Punjab*. 
BIBLIOGRAPHY

MODERN WORKS

Banerji, R.D., Bāṅglāra Itihāsa (Bengali). Third Ed. (Majumdar) Calcutta,
Bharadvaja, The Rāṣṭrakūtas and the Gāhaḍavālas. (Journal of Indian History, 1937)
Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II.
Crooke, Tribes and Castes of North-West Province and Oudh. Vol. II.
Elliot, Memoirs of Races of North-West Province of India, Vol. I.
Ganguly, D.C., History of the Paramāra Dynasty, Dacca, 1933. Origin of the Gāhaḍavālas. (Indian Historical Quarterly, 1933.)
Gupta, K. M., Land System in South India between c. 800 A. D. and 1200 A. D. Lahore, 1933.
Haig, Sir W., Cambridge History of India. Vol. III.
Hutton, Caste in India, Cambridge, 1946.
Mathur, The Rāṣṭrakūtas of Kanauj and their Migration to Mewar. (Indian Historical Quarterly 1944).
Nizam, Life and times of the Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna, Cambridge, 1931.

Ramkarana, History of the Rāthors (Sir A. M. Silver Jubilee Vol. III. part 2.)


Smith, V., Early History of India, 4th Ed. Calcutta.


Journals, Reports, Gazettes, etc.

Archaeological Survey Reports. (Cunningham).
Indian Antiquary.
Indian Culture.
Indian Historical Quarterly.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Journal of Asiatic Society and Letters.
Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

Journal of Indian History.
Journal of Numismatic Society of India.
Catalogue of the Archaeological Exhibits, Provincial Museum, Lucknow.

Bombay Gazetteer.
Benares District Gazetteer.
Jaunpur District Gazetteer.
Mirzapur District Gazetteer.
Palamau District Gazetteer.
Shahbad District Gazetteer.
INDEX

Adakamalla, f., 28-9, 34, 67, 75, 116-7, 137, 244
Advanced History of India, (Majumdar, Dutta, Roychoudhury), 112
Agra, 25, 29, 37, 45; Amir of A., 25, 45
Agrarian System of Ancient India, (Ghoshal), 138, 174
Aiyangar, K. V. R., 61, 180, 207
Ajayaråja, N. Calukya k., 104
Ajayavarman, Paramära k., 15
Ajmer, 110
Alancàra, 83, 237
Al-Birûnî, 13, 50-1, 234-36
Alha, 103; A.-prastava, 33
Allahabad, 14, 17, 132
Altekar, A. S., 158, 167-68, 171-72, 180
Amritapala, k., 40
Anahila-päñaka (-pattana), 3, 16-7, 81-2, 92, 108
Anangapala, Tomara f., 46, 92, 97, 106
Aniga, 12, 88
Antarvedi, 1-27, 36, 43, 45, 48-9, 52, 100, 109, 134
Arabs, 1, 2
Archaeological Survey of India, 16, 81, 237. ASI, Western Circle 103; A. S. Reports (Cunningham), 7, 144, 204, 211-12, 233
Arsalân Shâh, Yamini k., 77-8
Arhastra, (Kauśilya), 143, 152, 154, 159, 170, 172-6, 181-83, 186, 189-91; commentary of A., 176, 187; trans. of A., 170
Asni, (Asi ?), 5, 24, 111, 233, 235
Asphoçandra, Gāhādavāla pr., 56, 88-9, 91, 144
Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, 88, 199
Astrology, 150
Asutosh Mukherji Silver-Jubilee Volume, III, 29
Aśvapatiṣaṣṭapatinārapati-rajastrayādhīpata, title, 61, 67, 74, 102, 141, 199
Avimuktakṣetra, tirtha, 216
Ayodhya, 18, 39, 42, 46, 115, 119-21, 127, 201, 215, 217, 236
Azra (Agra), 25
Badaun, 24, 46, 78, 84-5, 115, 118, 125, 127, 137, 193
Bahrám Shâh, Yamini k., 77-8
Baihaqi, 13
Bâlhana, mahattaka, 54, 142, 160-61
Banaras/Benares, 13, 17-8, 42, 97, 109-11, 116, 123, 129, 193, 197, 234-5, 241
Baran (Barba, Bulandshahr), 5
Bāri, 8-9, 51, 236
Barnā, r., 130, 187
Bartu, 119
Bathāl, 25, 45
Baudhāyana, 218, 220, 227
Bellana, 144, 245
Bendall, 55
Bhāgirathī, r., 130, 187
Bhagwat, 114, 119
Bhandarkar, 117
Bharahadeva, f., 29, 116, 119
Bhāva Bhāspati, 126
Bhima, I, Cālukya k., 16-7
Bhimadeva II (Bholā-Bhima)
Cālukya k., 92, 106, 108
Bhimapāla, Rāṣṭrakūṭa 40, 85
Bhimapāla, pr., 5
Bhimata, Kalacuri, f., 86
Bhūli, 114, 119
Bhogāditya, mahākṣapaṭalika, 153
Bhoja I, Paramāra k., 3, 12, 14-7, 43-4, 200
Bhoja I, Pratihāra k., 4, 15
Bhojavarmān, Candraśteya k., 80
Bhoja, 39
Bhūdā, 86
Bhuvanapāla, k., 16, 40
Bīḍā, 7, 8, 12
Bihar, 4, 26, 71, 124-6
Bodh-Gaya, 96, 105, 126
Bombay Gazetteer, 1, 16
Brahmapurāṇa, 142
Bhāspati, 221
Buddha, 198, 210
Bundelkhand, 9
Cāhāmanas, 4, 46, 85, 92-4, 97-8, 100, 103-4, 107, 109, 125, 181; Gāhādvāla hostility, 112
Cakrāyudha, 4
Calcutta Review, 176
Cālukyas, Northern, 3, 12, 16, 92, 105, 108, 112, 167
Cālukyas, Southern, 3, 12, 16, 158
Cālukyas, of Veṅgi, 180
Cambridge History of India, III, 10, 13, 193
Candāl Bhor, Rāi, 5, 24
Candharwar, battle of, 34, 90, 95, 107, 110-1, 113, 119, 126, 242
Cānd Bardāi, 30, 32, 92, 103, 106, 107, 109, 112
Candra, k., 16, 18, 21, 29-30, 40
Cānd Rāi, 5-6, 24-6, 29, 36-8, 178
Candraśteyas, 3-4, 6-10, 12, 14, 17, 19-20, 39, 48-9, 62, 76, 80-1, 89, 103, 106, 167, 188
Castes, Antyāja, 226; Āyogava, 226; Brāhmaṇa, 165, 171, 185, 190, 192, 197, 202-4, 211, 217-23 229-30; Kaiuvaras, 52-3, 62, 226; Kāyasthas,
Caste system, *Gotra-Pravara*, 218-9, 223, 229; Marriage, 226-7; *vṛtti*, 220-4; *apad-va.*, 221;

*Caste in India* (Hutton), 218

Catalogue of the Archaeological Exhibits, Provincial Museum, Lucknow, 146, 195

Catalogue of Coins in Indian Museum, Vol. I, (Smith), 27, 64, 70, 75, 86-7, 117; Supplementary, (Bidyabinode), 64, 87

Catalogue of the Provincial Cabinet of Coins, East Bengal and Assam, 64, 87; the Punjab, 64, 87

Cawnpur, 89; Kanpur, 132

Cawnpur District Gazetteer, 89

Chach-nāma, i

Chikkora dynasty, 72, 87

Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delbi, 27

Coins of Mediaeval India, (Cunningham), 46, 58, 64, 75, 84, 87, 117

Colas, 15, 82, 183, 237-8; Códa deśa, 199, 238

Colas, (K. A. Nilkanta Sastri), 238

Colebrooke, 101

Cunningham, 7, 46, 84, 117, 144, 211

Dāhala, 12-3, 44

Daivahā, t., 134

Darada-Gaṇḍakī-deśa, 70, 121-2

Darra, 25

Dāsāṅā, 68, 75-6, 81

Dāyimārman, Mahattaka, 160

Delhi, 18, 42, 46-7, 68, 78, 84-5, 90-2, 94, 97-8, 100, 102, 106-8, 110, 112, 120-1, 125, 127, 136-7, 162, 181

Deū, 98, 163-4

Devapāla, (Pratihaṇa?), 32, 39, 44

Devapāla (of Badaun), 40, 85

Devarakṣita, Chikkora, t., 87

Dhaṅga, Candrātreya k., 7, 10

Dharmacakra-Jīna, Śrī, 158, 199, 206, 209-10

Dharmāśtrās, 150, 169, 170, 200, 211, 217, 220-1, 223-4, 226, 228, 231

Dharmāsoka, 158, 199, 206

Dhavala (Khayaravāla), d., 118

Dhillaṅkā, 46, 51, 93, 98

Divya, Kaivarta k., 52-3

Divvān-i-Salāmān, 25, 58

Dynastic History of Northern India, (Ray), 7-8, 10-2, 15, 21-3, 26, 40, 49, 52-3, 59, 76-7, 80, 82, 86, 88-9, 92, 95, 108

Early History of India, (Smith), 176

Epigraphia Carnatica, 182

Epigraphia Indica, 4, 6-7, 9-10, 12, 14-21, 26-9, 38-40, 42-3.
INDEX


Etawah, 46, 122-3, 133

Expenditure, Gāḍāvāla, 190-2

Fatehpur, 5, 24, 132

Pirishtha, Ta’rikh-i-101, 104, 109, 111, 115

Fleet, 188

Feudatory designations, Mahānāyaka (nāyaka), 141, 162, 164-5; Mahārāja, 141, 165; nṛpa, 38, 41; Rāṇaka, 141, 162, 163; Sāmanta, 19-20, 28-9, 53, 162

Gāḍāvāla, army, 73, 109-11, 191; capital, 49, 51, 57, 69, 79, 239; name, 28, 30, 35, 239-40; relation with the Cāhamānas, 97-100, 106, 112; relation with the Pālas, 52-4, 62-3, 71-4; relation with the Senas, 94-96, 105-6; relation with the Turks (Muslima), 57-61, 92-3, 110-12, 240; feudatories, 84-86, 98-102, 119, 136, 147, 161-65; seals, 145, 245

Gaharvāra, 33

Gaharwar Rajput, 33

Gajapati, 47, 141

Gaṇḍaka, r., Great, 66, 70, 125; Little, 66; Gaṇḍakī, 26-7, 122

Gang, 13

Gaṅgā (Ganges), r., 5, 13, 52, 57-8, 68, 114, 116, 119, 121-2, 125-6, 131, 135, 139, 214

Gaṅgāi-koṇḍa-Colapuram, 81, 183, 237

Gaṅgas, 92

Gaṅgeya, Mahattaka, 55, 143, 160-1

Gaṅgeya-deva, Kalacuri, k., 12-6, 48, 75, 86

Ganguly, D. C., 158

Gardizī, 5-8, 11

Gaṇḍa, 3, 29, 43, 52, 62, 94; army, 53-4, 63, 69, 71

Gaṇḍorviśa-kula-prāśasti, (Śri- harṣa), 99

Gautama, pratihāra, 54, 142

Gautama-dbarmalāstra, 171

Gawarmad, 35

Gaya, 74, 96, 236

Gayā-Karna, Kalacuri k., 75, 79, 81, 141

Gharharā, r., 66, 68, 70-1, 121-4

Ghazni, 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11, 25, 37, 45, 58-9, 61, 77-8, 84, 93, 107-8, 114, 125, 176-81

Ghiyās ud-Din (Muḥammad ibn Sām) Ghūri, 93, 107-8

Ghoshal, U. N., 168, 170, 173, 175, 180, 182, 184, 188

Ghūr, 108-9; Sulṭān of, 22, 104-5, 111, 112, 126
Ghuzz, (Guzz), 78, 93, 107-8.
Giripati, 37, 141
Gods and Goddesses; Āditya, 197; Gaṅgāditya, 197, 208; Lolārka, 197, 203, 208, 216; Sun, 197, 201, 207-8, 213; Śūrya, 196
Ataladevi, 205
Bhāratī, Sarasvati, Vāgdevi, 209
Brahman, 196, 207-8; Creator, 201, 207; Svayambhū, 44, 196, 208, 201; Paramātman, 196, 208
Dūrga, Mahiṣamardini, 202, 207, 209; Mahāmāyā, 207
Umā, 207
Earth goddess, 207
Gaṅgānana, Gangēśa, 209, 211
Heramba, 209, Vināyaka, 207
Gaṅgā, 197, 207
Hari-Hara, 208
Indra, 202, 207, 209
Lakṣmi, 15, 86, 117, 195, 209
Gaṇa-Lakṣmi, 209
Moon, 201
Naga, 207
Skanda, 207
Śiva, 195-6, 202, 206-8, 213-6; Aghoreśvara, 208, 216; Bhavānīpati, 208; Gaṇeśvara; 208; Hara, 77, 196, 202, 206; Indumauli, 208; Kotiśvara, 216; Kṛṣṇivāsa, 208, 216; Laṅḍeśvara, 208; Maheśvara, 211, 213; Nila-kanṭha, 208; Pañcóṅkāra, 208; Rudra, 19, 207; Siddhā-vara, 211, 225; Smaṟrātī, 208; Vaidyanātha, 208; Vedeśvara, 216; Vindheśvara, 28, 67, 216; Vyomakeśa, 208
Varuna, 211
Viṣṇu, 194-5, 203-4, 206-8, 211-2; Ādi-Keśava, 195, 202, 204, 208, 216, 233; Keśava, 216; Candra-Mādhava, 156, 195, 203-4, 208, 217, 233; Hari, 77, 97, 196, 202, 206; Kṛṣṇa, 195, 197; Lakṣmipati, 208; Padmanābha, 208; Sauri-Nārayana, 195, 208; Varāha, 208, 211; Vāsudeva, 196, 199, 213, Viṣṇu-Hari, 204, 208, 217
Gogra, r., 134
Gomati, r., 130, 187
Gopādri (Gwalior), 10
Gopāla, Gāḍhipurāḍhipati, 16, 18, 21, 23-6, 36, 59, 66, 69-70, 78, 84-5, 136, 148, 168, 209, 225
Gopāla, Rāṣṭrakūṭa, 20-4, 40
Gopāla, Candrātreyā f., 19-20
Gopāla III, Pāla k., 52
Gopinātha Ācārya, 99
Gosalladevi, Gāḍhāvāla q., 144, 197, 211
Govinda IV, Rāṣṭrakūṭa k., 203
Govindacandra, Gāḍhāvāla k., 15, 17, 27, 29, 32-3, 35-6, 41, 43, 47-8, 50, 53-92, 94-5, 99, 103-4, 109, 117, 121, 123-5, 133, 140-6, 148-51, 158-60, 162-3, 166-7, 173, 183-4, 187,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>191-2, 194, 196-206, 208, 212-3, 216-7, 220, 224, 228, 230-1, 237, 240, 241, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govindapálā, Pāla k., 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govinda Rae, Cāhamāsa f., 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govinda-vātiṣkā, 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhila, 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarāṭa (Gujarat), 14, 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptā Inscriptions, (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum), 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḩabib as-Siyar, 25, 36-7, 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḩajib Tughā-ṭīgin, 23, 58-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḩajjāj, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammīra/Hamvīra (Āmir), 23-4, 57-8, 60-1, 69, 92-4, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardat, Rāi, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hariścandra, Gāhaḍavāla k., 90, 113-6, 126, 140, 144, 150, 175, 178, 212, 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hariyāṇa, 46, 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harṣa, Candrātreyā k., 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harṣa Śilāditya, 49, 209, 235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harṣa Siyaka, Paramāra k., 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harṣabrīdaya Commentary, 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḩasan Niżāmi, 110, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastināpura, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemacandrā, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind, 5, 25, 51, 58-9, 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu Revenue System (Goshal)</td>
<td>168, 170, 175-6, 182, 184, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindusthān, 13, 58, 78, 108, 181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Bengal. Vol. I, (Majumdar), 4, 72, 94-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the Candellas (Bose), 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the Dharmaśastras, (Kane), 203, 211, 214, 218, 223-4, 226, 231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of India, (Reu), 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of India as told by its own Historians, (Elliot), 1, 5-7, 13, 22, 25, 29, 36, 51, 58, 115, 118, 193, 198, 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Kanauj, (Tripathi), 47, 55, 86, 126, 141, 167, 171, 175-6, 183, 199, 238, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Medieval Hindu India (Vaidya), 29, 35, 92, 176, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the Paramāra Dynasty (Ganguly), 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the Rāṣṭrākūṭas, (Reu), 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of the Sanskrit Literature (Dasgupta and De), 83, 117, 229, 233, 237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoernle, 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḩrdayadharā, Bhaṭṭā, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn ul-Athir (Ibn Athir) 6-8, 10-2, 111, 198, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhim, Sulṭān, 25, 36, 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilʿutmīsh, Shams ud-Dīn, 22, 34, 115, 119, 193, 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Antiquary, 5, 10, 17-8, 28-9, 32, 34, 41, 44, 50, 53-7, 63, 65-6, 85, 88, 90, 93-4, 97, 113, 122-3, 125-6, 136, 143, 148, 156, 162-3, 166, 173, 177, 188, 191, 197, 200-2, 208-12, 214, 223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indian Coins, (Rapson), 64, 87
Indian Culture, 99, 197
Indian Historical Quarterly, 5, 6,
11, 19, 25-6, 28-9, 31-2,
36-7, 39, 41, 52, 66, 74-94,
126, 160, 176, 195, 198,
203-4, 210-1
Indra III, Rāṣṭrakūṭa k., 4, 9, 203
Indradhavala, Khayaravāla k.,
t2, 118
Indraprastha (Indrapat), 46, 120
Indrasthāniyaka, 18, 42, 45-6,
51, 68, 120-1, 201, 215, 234,
236, 239
Inscriptions, 245 ff.
Ajayagadh rock, 80; Badaun,
16, 18-9, 20-2, 24, 29-30, 34,
40, 85, 118; Bađera, 31, 55,
123, 132, 143; Bahunara, 55,
64, 122-3, 131; Bakhargunj,
47; Banagarmau, 88, 133,
144, 230; Banaras, 14, 17, 56,
88, 131, 134-5, 139, 144-5,
153, 160, 173, 203, 208, 216,
230, 237; Banaras College
(Sihvar), 96, 103, 105, 131,
153; Basahi, 15, 17, 28, 43,
51, 54, 56-8, 60, 69, 122,
142, 146, 159-60, 167, 170,
173, 188, 200, 220, 239;
Belgumi, 80; Belkharra, 114-6,
162-3, 209, 211, 240;
Bhadawar, 132; Bhadāyini
temple, 208; Bherāghat,
17; Bijolia, 94, 97; Bodh-Gaya,
96, 198, 210, 225, 233,
236, 240; B.A.S., 67, 72, 74-
5, 120, 124, 126, 132-5,
159-60, 191, 196, 226, 236;
Chattarpur, 225; Candrāṭva
18, 28, 32, 38, 40, 42, 44,
45, 47, 53, 120-22, 129-31,
138, 156-7, 183, 186, 192,
195-6, 202-4, 209, 217-8,
229, 239; Dulkund, 7, 12;
Delhi Museum, 46, 98; Delphi-
Siwalik, 85, 93, 97, 125; Don
Buzurg, 66, 123, 134, 225-
6, 230; Fyzabad, 134;
Gadhwa, 212, 225; Gagaha,
56, 66, 88, 123, 134, 145
166; Goharwa, 12, 16-7, 47;
Hathīndah, 144, 211; Itauńga,
134; Jhansi, 19-20; Jhusi, 5,
7-9, 146, 167; Jubbulpur, 75;
Kahlā, 26, 42, 85, 146-7, 159-
61, 167; Kamauli, 28, 51,
54-7, 64-5, 85, 87-8, 93, 96,
103, 122, 131, 133-6, 139-41,
143-4, 146, 153, 159-60, 162,
167, 171, 179, 188, 196-7,
202-3, 214, 216, 220, 225-6,
230, 236, 239; Kara, 14;
Karanbel, 17; Kasia, 85;
Khairha, 21; Lar, 66, 71-3,
123-4, 128, 230; Lucknow
Museum, 70, 121; Machli-
shahr, 90, 113, 115, 126,
134, 144, 174, 184; Madana-
pur, 103; Madhainagar, 94-
5, 240; Mahoba, 7, 12; Mau,
6, 10, 48-9, 76, 81, 240
Meoḥad, 102, 132, 211, 225;
INDEX

Moner, 66, 71-2, 103, 124, 132, 225; Nagod, 67, 75, 116; Nagpur, 80; Nanyaura, 10; Paikore 17; Paithan, 177; Palam Baoli 98; Pali, 66, 69-72, 87, 123, 166; Phulwaria, 101; Rahat, 28, 32, 41, 44, 53-4, 57, 60-1, 63, 65, 123, 135, 159-60, 162, 166-7, 183, 187, 196, 201, 213, 217, 230, 239; Raiwan, 134; Rajghat 129; Rajorgadh, 4; R.A.S., 144; Ren, 132, 166; Rewa, 17; Rohetagadh, 102, 118; Sarnath, 13, 16, 28, 33, 35, 48, 61, 65, 77, 88, 121, 158, 196, 199, 202, 205-6, 233, 240; Set Mahet, 16, 18-20, 22-4, 58-9, 66, 70, 82, 85, 123-4, 133, 176, 162, 209, 225, 230, 236, -38; Siyadoni, 39; Sone East-bank, 102, 118; Surat, 34; Taracandi, 96, 98, 101, 125, 162-3, 240; Tutubhi falls, 101; Tewar, 75; Udayapur Prafasti, 15; Valgudar, 52.
Jágusárman (Jáguka), mahápurola-rita, 54, 150, 220, 230, Jaichand/Jayachund Rye, 110
Jaipál, (amit), 36, 45
Jaîrâcândra, 29
Jâjjilâdeva I, Kalacuri k. 79-80, 240
Jambuki, 158, 199, 228
Jami ut-Tawârikh, 25, 37, 241
Jâpila, 91, 101, 118, 125, 136, 162-3
Jâveša (Ajâveša), 135, 162, 225, 236
Jayapâla, Śâhi k., 10
Jayâsinîha (Siddharâja), Câlukya k., 76, 81-2, 104
Jayâsinîha, Kalacuri k., 17, 104
Jayâsinîha, Kâśmir k., 83, 224, 237
Jayavarman, Candâtreya k., 62
Jayavarman, Paramâra k., 81
Jejâkabhuski, 3-4, 9, 103
Jîâvatî pattalâ, (Jiâvâlî), 56-7, 123, 133, 161
Journal, American Oriental Society, 96, 98, 101, 125, 136, 163
Journal, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 20, 46-7, 58, 66-7, 72, 74, 81, 94, 97-8, 104, 113-4, 121-2, 124, 126-7, 136, 196, 211
Journal, Bébar and Orissa Research Society, 66, 69, 71-2, 123-4, 166, 188
Journal, Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 97, 203
Journal of Indian History, 30
Karmanāsā, r., 114, 119, 122, 125
Kāśi, 18, 33, 42, 46, 76, 81-4, 94-5, 105, 120, 195-6, 201, 204, 215, 234, 239, 241
Kasmīr, 83, 224, 235
Kāthehalī pattalā, 121, 129-30, 138, 187
Kauśambīa pattalā, 132, 217, 236
Kauṭilya, 107, 143, 152, 156, 174-5, 185-6, 189-91
Khadirapāla, 118
Khayaravāla (Kharwar), 101-2, 118, 164
Khorassan, 77-8
Khusrau Mālik, Yamini k., 93, 108
Khusrau Shāh, Yamini k., 77-8, 93, 107
Kībla, 51, 58
Kielhorn, 40, 101-2, 118, 127, 139, 173, 219
Kinnauj-i-Shergarh, 22
Kirttivarman, Candrātreya k., 17, 19, 48
Kirttipāladeva, k., 27, 70-2, 79, 121-2
Kisamwar Glossary, 187
Kitāb ul-Hind, (al-Birūni), 13, 51
Kokkala, Kalacuri k., 11-2
Kotiṭūrtha, 216

Journal, Numismatic Society of India, 27, 70, 122, 182
Journal and Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 18, 58, 66, 94, 136, 148, 162, 210
Journal, Royal Asiatic Society, 14, 27, 55, 102, 123, 211
Journal, U. P. Historical Society, 31, 55, 102, 123, 211
Journal, Asiatic Society and Letters, 52, 73, 94
Ka'aba, 51, 58
Kacchapaghātas, 7, 12
Kadamba dynasty, 118
Kalacuris (Haihaya), of Cedi, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12-4, 16-21, 26-7, 41-2, 44, 47-9, 52, 61-2, 67-8, 72, 74, 75, 79-82, 86, 104, 117, 124-5, 141; K., of Gorakhpur, 26-7, 42, 146, 167; K., of Kasia, 26-7, 85-6, 137, 162; K., of Tuṇmāna, 79-80
Kālaṇjara, 10-1, 25, 241
Kālindi, r., 10
Kaliṅga, 62, 94
Kāmaḍhaja, 30
Kāmil ut-Tawārikh, 13, 22, 110-1, 115, 198, 200, 235
Kānyakubja (Kanauj), 3-10, 14-26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36-40, 44, 46, 47-9, 56-60, 62, 68-70, 77-80, 83-4, 98, 105, 109, 114-6, 119-20, 123, 126-7, 163-4, 168, 178, 184, 215, 217, 232, 235-45
Kapālamocanaghaṭṭa, 216
INDEX

Kṣitipāladeva, Pratibhāra k., 9
Kulacandra, 5
Kulottuṅga I, Coḷa k., 81, 183
Kumāradevi, Gāhādvāla q., 28, 33, 35, 48, 61, 63, 65, 71-2, 77, 79, 88, 121, 158, 196-9, 205, 209-10, 228, 233, 240, 244
Kumārapāla, Cālukya k., 82, 97, 104
Kumārapāla, Pāla k., 52
Kumārapālacaritam, (Jayasimha), 30-2, 82
Kurukṣettra, tīrtha, 214
Kuśika, tīrtha, 46, 120, 201, 215, 217, 234-5, 239
Lahore, 58, 93, 108, 110
Lakhanapāla, k., 16, 18-9, 21, 23, 29-30, 34, 40, 85, 118
Lakṣmādeva, Paramāra k., 12
Lakṣmaṇarāja, Kalacuri k., 12; L. III, Kasia Kalacuri k., 86
Lakṣmāṇasena, Sena k., 94-6, 105, 141, 240
Lakṣmikarṇa, Kalacuri k., 3, 12, 14-7, 19-21, 26, 41, 43-4, 48, 70, 74, 80, 86, 97, 104, 200
Lakṣmivarman, Paramāra k., 80-1
Land System in South India, (Gupta), 170, 174, 182-3, 187
Lavarāpravāha, Rāṇaka, 41, 55, 63-4, 136, 143, 163, 211, 213
Lohaḍarāja, 85
Lolāka-kunḍa, 197, 216
Madana, k., 18, 20-1, 23-5, 58-9, 66, 136, 148, 162; M. Rāṣṭrakūṭa, 21, 23, 24, 40
Madanapāla (-candra), Gāhādvāla k., 20-1, 24, 31, 43, 45, 50, 54-65, 67-8, 70-1, 81, 85, 122-3, 132, 136, 143-6, 204, 209, 211-2, 225, 228, 239-40
Madanapāla, Pāla k., 73-5
Madanavarman, Chandrātreya k., 48, 81, 89, 104, 240
Madhyadesa, 3, 21, 72, 206, 209, 240
Madras Epigraphic Report, 172, 174
Mahāban (Mathura), 5
Mahākāl Diw, 194
Mahamaṇḍa, 117; M. Śāhi, 117
Mahamandadeva, 28-9, 67, 116-7, 137
Mahendraapāla I, Pratibhāra k., 39; M. II, 39
Mahicandra (Mahītala, Mahīyala), Gāhādvāla k., 41, 261, 239
Mahipāla, Pāla k., 13
Mahipāla I, Pratibhāra k., 9, 39
Mahipāladeva, Tomara k., 84
Maḥmūd, Yamini k., 1-6, 8, 10-1, 13, 25, 58, 76, 93, 96, 108, 181, 236; M., Yamini pr., 29, 36-7, 45
Mahodaya, 21, 49, 217, 235-6
Majumdar, R. C., 4, 35, 72, 95, 112
Mālava (Malwa), 25, 37, 68, 76, 81, 110, 194; Eastern M., 75-6
Malhi (Malhira), 58-9
Maṇiāri (Māṇara) pattāla, 66, 103, 105, 124, 126, 132
Manikendra, (Gāḥādavāla pr.?), 30
Manusmṛti, 154, 170-2, 226
Māraṇavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, 174
Maśūd, Yamini k., 13
Maśūd III (ibn Ibrāhīm), Yamini k., 51, 58-9, 77
Marriage, 226-7
Mathanadeva, Rāṣṭrakūṭa f., 63, 79, 87-8, 175, 200
Matsyapurāṇa, 151
Miscellaneous Essays (Colebrooke), 101
Mitākṣarā, 155
Moghji, bard, 33, 35
Mudgagiri (Monghyr), 66, 68, 71-3, 124-5, 128
Muḥammad Bahlim, 78
Muḥammad ibn Bakht-yār, 114, 119; M. ibn Qāsim, 2; M. ibn Tughlak, 117
Muʿizz ud-Dīn Muḥammad (Sihab ud-Dīn) Ghūri (ibn Sāmī), 57, 93, 100, 102, 107-8, 112, 114, 117, 126, 198
Mukundadeva, k., 92
Mūlarāja, Čālukya k., 104
Nagabhaṭa, II, Prathihāra k., 4
Nagod, 67, 75, 116
Naiṣadhabaritam. (Śrī-harṣa), 29, 99, 232
Nanda, 7-8, 11-2
Nāradasmṛti, 171
Narapati, 47, 141
Naravarman, Paramāra k., 76, 80
Nayanakelidevi, Gāḥādavāla q., 88, 144
Nirukta, 172
Niyāl-tigin, 13-4
Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, (Mitra), 99
Oḍrādeśa, 82
Officers, designations of, Aṣṭa-patalika, 147, 152-3, 155; Mahāśa., 153, 155; Admātya, 140, 146, 149, 155; Antah-purika, 147, 153; Bhāṇḍā-gārika, 144, 147, 152, 169, 211; Bhishak, 147, 153; Dharmādbhikaṇa, 154-5; Dūta, 147, 154; Grāmādhyakṣa, 161; Karaṇika, 155, 225; Karī-turaga-pattanākara-sthāna-gokulādbhikāri-puruṣān, 147, 154, 157-8, Kāyastha, 155; Lavanādhyakṣa, 175; Lekhaka, 255; Mahattaka, 55, 142-3, 160-1; Mahāmabhattaka, 160, 223; Mahattama, 146, 159-60; Mahattara, 146, 159; Mahāsāṇābhivigrabika, 60, 83, 143, 149, 155, 191, 194; Mantrin, 143, 147-8; Naimittika, 147, 153; Pattalikā, 158, 158.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>279</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>228; Pratihāra, 55, 142, 147, 151, 162; Purobita, 55, 142, 147, 149, 190, 223; Mahā-p., 220, 230; Rāja-puruṣa, 146-7, 159-64; Senāpati, 143, 147, 151, 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oṅavala, 70, 72, 123-4, 128, 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudh, 46, 52, 55, 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāla dynasty, 3, 13, 17, 29, 52-3, 62-3, 66, 71-4, 87-8, 141, 159; relation with the Gāhādvālas, 53, 63, 79, 87-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaman District Gazetteer, 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paṅcāla, 21-2, 35-6, 49-52, 56-7, 123, 168, 187, 239-40, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramārā dynasty, 3, 12, 14-5, 19, 44, 76, 80-1, 158, 167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramārī, Candradhvaja k., 103-4, 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārijāta-mañjarī, (Madana), 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paru-jaipāl (Baru-, Naru-, Taru-), 5, 7-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patna, 66, 71-4, 96, 105, 125-6, 132-3, 136, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattana (-pura), 92, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabandha-cintāmaṇi (Merutuṅga), 15-6, 82, 96-7, 106, 109, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabandha-kośa, (Rājaśekhara), 232, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probodha-candrodaya, (Kṛṣṇa Miśra) 17, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahlāda-śarmān, (Praharāja-), 150, 195, 197, 220, 230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratápādha-vāla, Mahānāyaka, 91, 96, 98-9, 101-2, 118, 125, 136, 162-4, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratihāra dynasty, 2-4, 6, 8-10, 14-5, 32, 39, 44, 49, 138, 146, 201, 206, 209, 235-6, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayāga, 9-10, 14, 94-5, 98, 105, 167, 236; tīrtha, 214, 217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 65, 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings of the Indian Historical Congress (1951), 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings and reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, Eastern Circle, 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pṛthvīrāja, II, Cāhāmāna k., 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pṛthvīrāja, III, Cāhāmāna k., 92, 100, 103, 106-9, 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pṛthvīrāja-Rāsa, (Cānd Bārdāi), 30, 32, 34, 92, 97, 103, 106-7, 110, 152; Rāsa Sāra, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pṛthvīśrīkā, Gāhādvāla qn, 55, 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purānas, 151, 203, 207-8, 211, 214-5, 218; P. ideal, 222; P. literature, 215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puruṣaparikṣā, (Vidyāpati), 106-7, 117, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puṣkara, tīrtha, 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutb ud-Din, Sulṭān, 22, 111-2, 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Races of North West Province of India, Elliot, 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan, Tod's, (Crooke), 32-4, 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājasūya, 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājatarāṅgini, (Kalhaṇa), 30-1, 83, 224, 237, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajputs, Agnikula, 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājyadharavarman, Rāuta, 156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
160, 191, 219, 223
Rājyaapāla, Pratihāra k., 5-9
Rājyapāladeva, Gāhāḍavāla pr., 56, 88, 91, 139, 144, 146
Rājyapālapura, 89, 135, 139, 236
Rālhādevi, Gāhāḍavāla q., 54, 64, 87, 143-4, 203
Rāmacandra, Yādava k., 177, 184
Rāmacarita, (Sandhyākaranandi), 17, 52-3, 62-3, 72; R. Commentary, 53, 241
Rāmapāla, Pāla k., 52-3, 62-3, 71-2, 79, 88, 200
Rambhāmañjūri-nāṭaka, (Nayacandra) 68, 75-6, 81, 107, 109-10
Rāṣṭrakūṭa, clan, 29-30, 32-5; R. dynasty of Badaun, 18, 20-4, 34, 46, 78, 84-5, 118, 137, 162; R. of Aṅga, 63, 72, 87; Southern R., 2-4, 9, 12, 14-5, 158, 167
Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times, (Altekar), 158, 168, 171
Ratnadeva, Kalacuri k., 80
Ray, H. C., 7-8, 10-1, 20, 22, 26, 53, 82, 94, 108, 112, 119
Religion, 193-217; Buddhism, 198-9, 205-6, 209-11; Hinduism, Revivalist, 201, 206, 215; Sākta, 207; Saura, 208, Sāiva, 201, Vaiṣṇava, 195, 197; Islam, 1-2, 34, 200
Religious rites, 150, 202-3, 208; Gift r., 212-3, Brabmadāna, 203, Devadāna, 203, Mahā-
dāna—Tulāpurusa, 54, 202-3, 218, 229—Gosabasra, 202-3; Pañcalāṅgala, 202-3; Cintapañja, 142, 202, 207; Devayātra, 142, 202, 207, Gavotsarga, 142, 202, 207; Indrabhujachṛtya, 142, 202, 207; Kaumudi-mabotsava, 142, 202, 207; Navarātripūjā, 142, 202, 207; Pratisthā, 211; Utsarga, 211; Vasodhārā 142, 202, 207
Rohtaṣgaḍh, 102, 118, 125, 127, 136
Sabuk-tigin, Yamini Sultān, 10
Saduktikarnāmpita, 229
Sāhasadhavala, Khayaravāla pr., 101-2, 118
Sāhi, 3, 10
Sākbambhari, 4, 93
Sakaruka, Rāuta, 163, 211
Sallakṣaṇavarman, 19-20, 48-9, 62, 80
Salmān, 25, 29, 36, 51, 58-9, 61
Samanis (Sumanis), 51, 58
Sammanaḍari, Gāhāḍavāla q., 144
Sāmvyogita (Sāmyuktā), 92, 106
Sanjar, Sultān, 77
Saṅkaradevi, 87
Sanyal, N. B., 16, 18, 20-1
Satrughna, Khayaravāla pr., 101, 163
Saumya-sindhu (Uttara-samudra), 27, 71-2, 79, 122
Sen, B. C., 17, 53, 95
Senā, dynasty, 94-7, 99; Sena-Gāhāḍavāla encounter, 97, 105
INDEX 281

Shabbad District Gazetteer, 102
Shirzad, Yaminî, k., 77
Sindhurâja, Paramârâ k., 15
Sînagara dynasty, 85, 136, 162, 223
Sîvarâja I, Kalacuri f. 86
Smith, V. A., 27, 70, 180
Sojhhadeva, Kalacuri k., 26-7, 42, 146-7, 159-61, 167
Somavârâs rulers, 92, 175
Some Historical Aspects of Inscriptions of Bengal, (Sen), 17, 53, 95, 147
Someśvara, Câhamâna k., 94, 97, 107; S. I, Câlukya k., 17; S. Nâgavarâsi, 80
Sone, r., 67, 75, 99, 116
South Indian Inscriptions, 174, 183
Sri-harśa, 29, 99, 232-3
Srihârâs-carita, (Maûkha), 83, 237
Sri-mitra, 198, 210
Sri Pratâpa, 102, 118-9
Sri-Vijaya-praśasti, (Sri-harśa), 99, 232-3
State and Government in Ancient India, (Alteknâ), 159, 173, 176-7
Subhâsîtavâlî, 229
Suhala, 83, 87, 237
Suhavadevi, 109
Sukranîtî, 169-75, 182, 190
Suraj-prâkâsî, 109
Sûryasena, Sena pr., 47, 94, 141
Tabqât-i-Akbâri, (Nizâm ud-Dîn) 7, 11, 13, 77-8, 104
Tabqât-i-Nâṣîrî, (Minhâj ud-Dîn), 13, 22, 34, 58, 78, 104, 108-9, 115-6, 119, 193-4
Talâpa, Râṣṭhrâkâta k., 15
Taj ul Ma‘âthib, 22, 110, 115, 193, 235
Târâ’in, battle of, 107-9
Ta’rikh-i-Firîshta, 57, 11, 13, 22, 77-8, 104, 109, 111, 115, 193
Ta’rikh us Sabuk-tîgin, 13
Tawney, 82
Taxes and revenue, 165-90;
Akhara, 167, 172-3, 185, 189;
Akkapalâdâya, 167, 184;
Akkapalâprastha, 167, 184, 189;
Akkapalâprastha, 167, 184, 189;
Bhagabhogakara, 167-70, 189
Dalâparâdhanâ, 179, 188-9;
Dalâvandha, 167, 170-1, 189;
Gokara, 167, 173-4;
Halikâkara, 182;
Hiranya, 167, 170; Jâlakara, 167, 173-4, 189;
Kara, 167;
Kumâragadianaka, 167, 181-3;
Kûtaka, 167, 181-2, 189;
Khâni, 189;
Lavânakara, 167, 174, 189;
Matsyâkara; 185;
Naubhâsakara, 186;
Nârâyaṇa, 167, 171-2;
Pârâkara, 167, 174-5, 183;
Pratihârâprastha, Pravanâkara, 167 175-6, 189;
Prayâsana, 177, 184;
Svamaukâbâṣakâra, 186, 189;
Tarâdâya, 186;
Taradeya, 186;
Urânga, 186;
Tirthas, 201-2, 214-7, 234
Tomara dynasty, 46, 51, 68, 78, 84, 97, 100, 102, 137, 162
Tribes and Castes of North-West Province and Oudh, 35
Tribhuvanapāla, 40, 85
Trilocanapāla, Cālukya, 34
Trilocanapāla, Pratihāra, 5-9, 14, 146, 167
Tripathy, R. S., 20, 115, 167, 171-2, 175, 183
Triśaṅkupati, 47, 141
Turukas, (Turks), 2, 4, 25, 51, 62, 77, 94-7, 100, 104, 119, 176; invasions by, 38, 45-70, 96-7, 193
Turuskadāṇḍa, 37, 167, 176-81, 189, 200
Uccakalpa, 182
Uchchah, 108
Udabhāṇḍapura, 3
Udal, 103
Udayāditya, Paramāra k., 17, 19
Udayarāja, Kalacuri k., 118
Uddalladevi, 28-9, 67, 116-7, 119, 137, 244
Ujjain, 25, 194
Uśanas, 224
Uṭṭhi, 5-8, 24
Utkala, 12, 62, 82, 199, 218
Uttara-Kośala, tirtha, 18, 46, 52, 120-1, 101, 215, 217, 234, 236
Vāikate (II) Muñja, 15
Vārāṇasi, 1, 3, 10, 13-4, 34-5, 38, 42-3, 45-8, 50-3, 61, 77-9, 95, 97-8, 103, 105, 110, 116, 120-3, 125-7, 129, 137, 160, 184, 196-7, 200, 202, 206, 208, 214-6, 233-5, 239-42
Vasantadevi, Gāhaḍavāla q., 88, 199
Vatsarāja, Śīṅgara, 85, 136, 162 211, 216
Vedas, 44, 190, 196, 201, 207, 217-19, 228-30
Vedānta, 232
Vedaśvasaṃśīti, 224
Vidyādhara, Candrātreya k., 7, 12, 14, 48
Vidyādhara, minister, 19-20, 23, 58, 66, 70, 85, 136, 148, 162, 209, 211, 225
Vienna Oriental Journal, 126
Vigrahāraja IV (Visaladeva), Cāhamāna k., 85, 93-4, 97-8, 107, 125, 181
Vigrahapāla, Rāṣṭrakūṭa, 16, 40
Vigrahapāla III, Pāla k., 17
Vijayacandra, Gāhaḍavāla k., 89-102, 109, 118, 164, 177, 181, 202, 204, 205, 232-3
Vijayakarṇa, Rāṇaka, 114-5, 127, 136, 162-3, 244
Vijayapāla, Pratihāra k., 27
INDEX

Vijayasena, Sena k., 99
Vijayasimha, Kalacuri k., 104
Vikramādiyā VI, Cālukya k., 80
Vikramānākadevacarita, 16-7
Vikramapāladeva, k., 27
Vināyakapāla, Pratihāra k., 10
Viradhava, Khayaravāla pr., 101
Virarājendra, Coḷa k., 180
Viravarman, Candraśteya k., 62
Viṣṇu, writer, 153-4, 161, 171-2
Viṣṇupura, 57, 59, 135, 236
Viśvarūpasena, Sena pr., 47, 94, 105, 141
Viśada-ratnākara, 231
Vodāmayūtā (Badaun), 21-2, 34, 118, 162
Women, position of, 227-29
Yājñavalkyasmiṣṭi, 155, 171-2, 227-8
Yamini dynasty, 3, 61, 68, 76
Y. Sulṭāns, 58, 68-9, 77-8, 84, 93, 96, 107, 125, 181
Yamunā, r., 14, 34, 48-9, 51, 56, 60, 62, 67-8, 74-5, 116, 121, 124-5, 136
Yāśāḥ-Karnā, Kalacuri k., 17, 21, 41, 44, 47-8, 62, 67, 74-5, 79-81, 124, 141, 196
Yāśāḥpāla, Pratihāra k., 14
Yāsovarman, Candraśteya k., 9, 39
Yāsovarman, Paramāra k., 76, 81
Yāsovigraha, Gāhādavāla; 28, 38, 40-1, 81, 163, 183
Yavana, 117, 119
Yuktiśalpatara, 182
Yuvarāja, I, Kalacuri k., 12
### CORRIGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>998 A.D.</td>
<td>995 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>V.S. 1135</td>
<td>V.S. 1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(c. 1010-1055 A.D.)</td>
<td>(c. 1000-1050 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sūryasena</td>
<td>Keśavasena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>f.u. 2</td>
<td>p. 36</td>
<td>p. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>line 1</td>
<td>V.S. 1224</td>
<td>V.S. 1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.n. 1</td>
<td>IAOS VI</td>
<td>IAOS II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>line 2</td>
<td>(c. 1144-73 A.D.)</td>
<td>(c. 1114-73 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>V.S. 1232</td>
<td>V.S. 1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>V.S. 1253/1197 A.D.</td>
<td>V.S. 1255/1157 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>V.S. 1243</td>
<td>V.S. 1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>V.S. 1226</td>
<td>V.S. 1126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>V.S. 1237</td>
<td>V.S. 1239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>V.S. 1228</td>
<td>V.S. 1128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V.S. 1084</td>
<td>V.S. 1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>V.S. 1183</td>
<td>V.S. 1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>V.S. 1177</td>
<td>V.S. 1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>V.S. 1186</td>
<td>V.S. 1156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. B. The following words are misprinted in the pages indicated against them:—Sallakṣaṇa (pp. 48, 49, 62, 80); Machlishah (pp. 90, 113, 115, 126, 144); antahpurika (p. 147); daśavandha (p. 167); yātrāvetana (p. 186).
Central Archaeological Library,
NEW DELHI.

Call No. 928.01957/Niy.

Author—Rama Niyogi

Title—The History of the
Samudragupta Dynasty.

Borrower No. | Date of Issue | Date of Return
--------------|--------------|-----------------
Sushil, M.E. | 2/5/1975     | 11/9/76
L. E. Agnihotri | 10/9/74 | 28/11/78

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book clean and moving.