THE
HISTORY OF BENGAL
VOLUME I
HINDU PERIOD

EDITED BY
R. C. MAJUMDAR,
M.A., PH.D., F.R.A.S.B.

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF DACCA
RAMNA, DACCA
FOREWORD

THE HISTORY OF BENGAL PUBLICATION COMMITTEE

The idea of writing a comprehensive History of Bengal on modern scientific lines may be traced back to 1912 when Lord Carmichael, the first Governor of the Bengal Presidency, took the initiative and invited MM. Haraprasad Sastri to prepare a scheme. It was proposed to publish the history in three volumes dealing respectively with the Hindu, Muslim and British periods. Several meetings were held in the Government House, Calcutta, but what became of this plan and how far it was matured are not definitely known. Some years later, the late Raja Prafulla Nath Tagore, the grandson of the famous Kali Krishna Tagore, volunteered to pay the entire cost of such a publication, and invited the late Mr. Rakhaladas Banerji to draw up a plan along with some other well-known scholars of his time. Several meetings were held in the house of the Raja, but ultimately nothing came out of it.

Ever since the foundation of the University of Dacca, it was felt that the University should take up the task of preparing a History of Bengal as early as practicable. This idea received an impetus from Sir Jadunath Sarkar, who, in the course of a lecture delivered at the University about the middle of July 1938, emphasised that a History of Bengal on modern scientific lines was long overdue, and that this University, standing as it does in the very heart of an ancient and important seat of Bengal culture, should in the fitness of things take up the work. Sir Jadunath promised his whole-hearted support and active co-operation in this enterprise.

The scheme received a new impetus from Mr. (now Sir) A. F. Rahman, when he joined the University as Vice-Chancellor in July 1934. In his first convocation address next month he emphasised the need of commencing the work, and in his second convocation speech, in July 1935, he announced that some preliminary work had already been done.

By the end of August 1935, the scheme took a more definite shape, as Professor R. C. Majumdar, Head of the Department of History, who had so long been pre-occupied with his own research work on the history of Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East, was now free to take up the work.
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On the 13th of September 1935, the Vice-Chancellor convened a general meeting at his house, of local citizens and University teachers interested in the subject, and a Committee called the History of Bengal Publication Committee was formed at the meeting composed of the following gentlemen:

1. A. F. Rahman, Esq., Vice-Chancellor, Dacca University—Chairman
2. Dr. N. K. Bhattacharjya—Secretary
3. Dr. S. N. Bhattacharjya—Jt. Secretary
4. Professor R. C. Majumdar
5. Sir Jadunath Sarkar
6. Dr. K. R. Quanungo
7. Hakim Habibur Rahman
8. Mr. Sharafuddin

The Committee formally met immediately after the general meeting, and its first task was the framing of a tentative Scheme of Work for the consideration of the Executive Council of the University. Mr. (now Sir) A. F. Rahman very generously announced at the inaugural meeting of the Committee a donation of Rupees one thousand in memory of his deceased mother, and Dr. K. R. Quanungo, Reader in History, promised on behalf of the Friends' Library, Kanungopara, Chittagong, a contribution of Rupees fifty.

The Committee passed several resolutions, one requesting the Executive Council to undertake to find funds for the publication of the proposed History, and to make an initial grant of Rs. 1,000/- and another requesting Professor Majumdar to take the necessary steps for the furtherance of the scheme.

In pursuance of the latter resolution of the Committee, Professor Majumdar wrote to the Vice-Chancellor on the 14th September, 1935, requesting him to place the draft scheme before the Executive Council and to move the Council to provide the necessary funds for the publication of the proposed History, and to make an initial grant of Rupees one thousand for meeting the preliminary expenses.

The scheme was recommended by the Academic Council and in a meeting held on 19th December, 1935, the Executive Council finally approved of the entire scheme, financial as well as administrative, and resolved as follows:

"That the financial and administrative schemes for the publication of the History of Bengal as a Dacca University publication as per Appendix C be approved, that for the purpose of meeting preliminary expenses for the publication of the History, a grant of Rs. 1,000/-
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be now made out of the University funds and that the University undertakes to find funds that might be necessary, in addition to the donation raised, for the publication of the History on the definite understanding that the proprietary right of the History should solely vest in the University of Dacca.”

It is not necessary to reproduce the entire scheme, but the following extracts may be quoted to give an idea of the administrative arrangement:

“Scheme for a History of Bengal

1. It shall be published by and at the expense of the University of Dacca under its general superintendence and control.

2. The History shall be divided into three volumes as follows:
   Vol. I. The Hindu Period.
   Vol. II. Pre-Mughal Period (1200-1576 A.D.).
   Vol. III. Mughal Period (1576-1757 A.D.).

3. Dr. R. C. Majumdar shall be the editor of the first volume and Sir Jadunath Sarkar should be requested to edit the second and the third volumes.

4. The management of the preparation and publication of the proposed History shall beentrusted to a committee to be called, ‘History of Bengal Publication Committee’ composed as follows:
   1. The Vice-Chancellor—Chairman.
   2. Dr. N. K. Bhattacharji—Secretary.
   3. Dr. S. N. Bhattacharyya—Jt. Secretary.
   Other members—4. Sir Jadunath Sarkar and 5. Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Editors; 6. Dr. K. R. Quanungo; 7. Hakim Habibur Rahman; 8. Mr. Sharafuddin. The Committee shall have power to co-opt other members.”

In the second meeting of the History Publication Committee held on 16th February, 1936, a fund called the History of Bengal Publication Fund was created with the nucleus grant of Rs. 1,000/- made by the Executive Council, and appeals for financial help were also made. In response to these appeals, Sir P. C. Ray made a donation of Rs. 1,000/- and the Government of Bengal offered a similar donation of Rs. 1,000/- to the Fund. Subsequently, the Executive Council sanctioned a sum of Rs. 10,000/- for the printing and publication of the work.

In course of the long period of composition and completion of the work, several noteworthy changes took place in the personnel of
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The Committee as well as in the scheme of the work. Dr. N. K. Bhattacharja resigned the office of Secretary on 25. 5. 36, and Dr. S. N. Bhattacharya was appointed in his place. Dr. A. F. Rahman resigned the office of Chairman on 8. 4. 37, and Dr. R. C. Majumdar was appointed in his place. Professor R. C. Majumdar resigned the office on 29. 6. 42 and Professor M. Hasan succeeded him. Mr. Sharakuddin ceased to be a member of the Committee, and Professor S. K. De, Dr. M. Shahidullah, Dr. M. I. Borah, and Dr. D. C. Ganguly were added as members to the Committee. Dr. D. C. Ganguly was appointed Joint Secretary on 19. 9. 40.

Some changes in the scheme of work, particularly in the distribution of chapters to different scholars, were also made from time to time. The names of the writers finally selected are mentioned in the Table of Contents under each chapter. The Committee convey their thanks to all of them for their valuable co-operation.

Though the work was initiated early in 1936, its progress was delayed for several reasons, to which reference has been made by the editor in the Preface. It is a matter of great satisfaction to all concerned that in spite of all difficulties and handicaps the first part of the work is at last completed and published.

The Committee take this opportunity of expressing their gratitude to Sir Jadunath Sarkar, C.I.E., for commending the work to the University and for accepting the onerous duties of editorship of Volumes II and III of the history. They desire to offer their grateful thanks to Sir A. F. Rahman, for his services in regard to the initiation and promotion of the work during the period of his Vice-Chancellorship. The Committee feel especially indebted to Professor R. C. Majumdar, who, in spite of his heavy administrative duties as Vice-Chancellor, accepted the editorship of Volume I, contributed to it so many chapters, and saw the book through the Press. His energy and enterprise alone have made the early publication of the work possible.

The Committee take this opportunity to convey their thanks to Sir P. C. Ray for his very generous donation for the publication of this work.

The thanks of the Committee are also due to various persons and institutions for the help rendered by them in the publication of this work. Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M.A., F.R.A.S., Director General of Archaeology in India has most generously lent free of charge the blocks preserved in his Department and also supplied prints of negatives at the usual cost. With his kind permission, the Superintendent, Archaeological Section, the Indian Museum and the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Eastern Circle, Calcutta, have
rendered all facilities for the study of the sculptures and taking photos wherever necessary. We take this opportunity to offer the Director General and the members of his Department our most grateful thanks for the very valuable services rendered by them. The authorities of the Asutosh Museum of Indian Art, Calcutta University, Vangiya Sāhitya Parishat, Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Indian Society of Oriental Art, Dacca Museum, Greater India Society and Indian Science News Association, and Messrs. O. C. Gangoly, N. K. Bhattacharji, J. N. Banerjee and S. K. Saraswati have lent us free of charge blocks and photos in their possession and we offer our heartfelt thanks for the readiness with which they have offered their co-operation.

We wish we could say the same thing about the Varendra Research Society at Rajshahi, the only institution in the whole of India from which we have failed to receive the help and sympathy we had every reason to expect, in view of the past history of the institution and its illustrious founder who has rendered yeoman’s service to the advancement of the study of the History of Bengal. This Society alone possesses all the illustrated Buddhist manuscripts, definitely known to be written in Ancient Bengal, whose whereabouts are unknown at present. It is hardly necessary to point out that the coloured illustrations in these mss. are necessary for a proper study of the art of painting in Ancient Bengal. In spite of repeated requests, the Society refused to lend them to us and only gave permission to consult them at Rajshahi. The Vice-Chancellor (who was also the Editor) personally saw the President of the Society and explained that it was impossible to prepare tri-colour blocks at Rajshahi and offered the guarantee of either the Dacca University, or the University of Calcutta (which he hoped to secure from its Vice-Chancellor) for the safe-keeping and return of the mss. if they were sent for a few days to Calcutta. This the Society persistently refused to do with the result that the History of Bengal, containing the first comprehensive treatment of the art of painting, had to be published without those illustrations which have not yet seen the light of the day although the Society has been in possession of the mss. for a quarter of a century. As regards photos of sculptures, the Society offered the use of eleven, already in their possession, only on payment of Rs. 50/- which amounted to the entire cost of their original preparation for the use of the Society. Without pursuing this unpleasant topic any further, it may be said that after prolonged correspondence two photos were lent free on condition that the “Dacca University would give to the Museum free of charge, in return, the blocks of these photographs prepared by them” and “acknowledge duly in the proposed work the courtesy
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thus extended." While we take this opportunity to acknowledge the courtesy that we have received from the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, and thank them for their help, we cannot but regret that it was not forthcoming in a larger measure.

As it has not been possible to indicate under each illustration the source from which its photograph was obtained, a separate "acknowledgement" list has been inserted for this purpose. It is to be definitely understood that the right of reproducing the illustrations is reserved by the persons, authorities and institutions who lent their blocks or photographs.

Finally, we wish to place on record our appreciation of the services rendered by the General Printers and Publishers Ltd., the printers of this volume. The Managing Director of this company Mr. S. C. Das, M.A., an ex-student of the Dacca University, has taken special care to see this volume through the Press and has spared no pains to expedite the publication in the face of exceptional difficulties. Our special thanks are due to him and to Mr. R. K. Ghoshal, M.A. who has not only revised the proofs and prepared the Index, but also made many valuable suggestions for improvement.
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The genesis of the present work has been explained in the Foreword. The editor feels that he owes an explanation for the very long interval between the inception of the work and its publication. In view of the importance of the subject a few relevant facts may be mentioned which will also incidentally explain the changes made in the personnel of the writers referred to in the Foreword.

Shortly after the work was taken up we were denied the cooperation of Dr. N. K. Bhattacharji, M.A., Ph.D., who was the Secretary of the Publication Committee and had agreed to write the chapter on Art. It is unnecessary to discuss here the reasons which led Dr. Bhattacharji to come to this decision, but the change of Secretary and the loss of a valuable contributor naturally caused dislocation of work and involved considerable delay in completing the preliminary steps. The chapter on Art was entrusted to the late Mr. N. G. Majumdar, who naturally desired to collect photos of select specimens of architecture and sculpture before commencing to write. This took up a long time as the specimens to be photographed were spread over a wide area. At last the photos were prepared and he took them with him in his ill-fated journey to the Indus Valley, as he hoped to be able to write the chapter in his leisure hours while on tour. The tragic circumstances under which he met his end in Sind are known to all. His death dealt a severe blow to our scheme, as most of the photos together with the notes prepared by him were irretrievably lost. In this predicament the editor invited two young scholars—Dr. Niharajan Ray and Mr. Sarasi Kumar Saraswati—to write the chapter on Art, and they readily agreed to take up the work. But the preparation of a new set of photographs took up much time and caused considerable delay. We take this opportunity to pay our tribute of respect to the gifted archaeologist who had readily volunteered his valuable co-operation which, alas, was denied us by his sudden and tragic death.

When the chapter on Art was assigned to the late Mr. N. G. Majumdar he had to be relieved of the work already allotted to him and this involved re-allocation of a number of chapters. The new arrangement did not prove at all satisfactory, and most of these chapters had to be written by the editor himself. The sudden departure of one of the contributors for Europe, without any previous intimation, also involved more work for the editor, as no
Preface

A competent scholar was found willing to take up the work at a short notice.

Even when most of the chapters were ready the editor was confronted with other difficulties. It was originally proposed to devote a whole chapter to the ethnology of Bengal, and a specialist on the subject was invited to write it. Repeated reminders, extending over a period of five or six years, were always followed by promises to send the contribution within a short period, but it was not received even when the printing of the volume had made considerable progress. As he never declined the task no substitute could be appointed. At last, in order to avoid the total suspension of the work at a time when in view of the abnormal circumstances every effort had to be made to expedite the printing, the editor had no other option but to write himself a brief note on the subject at the beginning of chapter xv. This chapter dealing with the social conditions of Ancient Bengal was also entrusted to a specialist on the subject. After a great deal of delay the promised contribution was received, but it dealt with pre-historic anthropology only and did not at all touch the real subject. Again, in order to avoid further delay in the publication, the editor undertook to write it himself with the co-operation of Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A., Ph.D. and Dr. R. C. Hazra, M.A., Ph.D. The former worked on the epigraphic and the latter on the literary data, and the materials collected by them were co-ordinated and put into proper form by the editor with certain additions. Special thanks are due to both these scholars for having agreed to undertake the work at such short notice.

Thus more than five years had passed before the volume could be sent to the Press. But three months after the printing had begun the declaration of war by Japan upset the normal life in Calcutta and considerably dislocated her business and industry. The printing press was seriously affected by the panic in the evacuation of the city, and there was considerable delay before satisfactory progress in the work of printing could be resumed. In view of the abnormal situation no efforts were spared to expedite the printing, lest any fresh wave of panic should again suspend the work. Unfortunately, the Japanese air-raids on Calcutta in December last year again dislocated the business life of Calcutta when only the last four chapters remained to be printed. It reflects great credit upon the custodian of the printing establishment that in spite of considerable difficulties, these chapters were at last printed off. Faced with the contingency of having to postpone indefinitely the publication of the volume over which he had worked for more than six years, the editor decided to push up the printing at any cost, even at the risk of sacrificing quality to a certain extent. The proofs
could not be sent for final revision to the authors of the last three chapters and the editor had to undertake the sole responsibility of seeing them through the Press.

This somewhat long and tedious narrative is given here not only as an explanation of the long delay in the publication of the work, but also as an interesting record which might be of use to the future historian of the History of Bengal. For in view of the present state of our knowledge any exposition of the history of Ancient Bengal must be regarded as provisional; and as new evidence is continually and rapidly accumulating, it may be confidently hoped that the present work would turn out to be merely a precursor of many similar volumes which would be written at no distant date. The editor does not pretend to do anything more than laying the foundation on which more competent hands will build in future, till a suitable structure is raised which would be worthy of our motherland. The historian of that not very distant future may perhaps view with greater sympathy the pioneer efforts of his predecessor if he realises the difficulties under which the latter had to carry on his work, in addition to heavy administrative duties throughout the period.

The task of compiling a history of Ancient Bengal is by no means an easy one. The greater part of the subject is yet an untrodden field, and few have made any special study of such branches of it as art and religion, social and economic conditions, law, and administration. These topics have been so far studied almost exclusively with reference to ancient India as a whole, but a regional study, strictly confined within the limits of the territory where the Bengali language is spoken, has not yet been seriously taken up by competent scholars. In respect of political history also, while much work has been done, no serious attempt has yet been made to reconstruct a continuous historical narrative as distinct from the collection and interpretation of a number of archaeological data. In many respects, therefore, the present volume breaks altogether new ground, and faults of both omission and commission are almost inevitable in such a case.

In writing this history we have strictly confined ourselves to the data definitely applicable to the geographical limits of Bengal, and any deviation from this rule has been duly noted.

An attempt has also been made to make the treatment as detached and scientific as possible. Where materials of study are lacking, we have chosen to leave a void rather than fill it up with the help of imaginary or unreliable matter. Many topics of interest and importance have, therefore, been altogether ignored or very imperfectly treated.
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It is hardly necessary to recapitulate the difficulties which are inherent in a work of this kind or to explain the principles adopted in the preparation of this volume. The series of historical works published by the Cambridge University have been deliberately adopted as the standard and model of this work, and the following passage in the Preface to the First Volume of the Cambridge Ancient History admirably sums up our views and ideals:

"In a co-operative work of this kind, no editorial pains could avoid a certain measure of overlapping; and in fields where there is so much uncertainty and such wide room for divergencies of views, as in the first two volumes, overlapping must mean that occasionally different writers will express or imply different opinions. It has not been thought desirable to attempt to eliminate these differences, though they are often indicated or discussed. Such inconsistencies may sometimes be a little inconvenient for the reader's peace of mind, but it is better he should learn to take them as characteristic of the ground over which he is being guided than that he should be misled by a dogmatic consistency into accepting one view as authoritative and final.

"It will easily be understood that it is not possible to give chapter and verse for every statement or detailed arguments for every opinion, but it is hoped that the work will be found serviceable to professional students as well as to the general reader. The general reader is constantly kept in view throughout, and our aim is to steer a middle course between the opposite dangers, a work which only the expert could read or understand and one so 'popular' that serious students would rightly regard it with indifference."

It is a source of great pleasure to us that in spite of delays and difficulties, it has been found possible to bring out the first volume. The printing of the second volume has already made some progress, though in view of the abnormal situation prevailing in Calcutta, it is difficult to say when it will see the light of day.

On behalf of the Dacca University, and the Editorial Board, we wish to express our indebtedness to the various contributors for their whole-hearted co-operation in this project, even at a considerable personal inconvenience.

The editor acknowledges with pleasure the help he has received from his many friends and old pupils. Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, M.A., Ph.D., Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University, not only offered many valuable suggestions, but helped the editor to tide over many difficulties that confronted him from time to time. Mr. Sarasi Kumar Saraswati, M.A., Lecturer, Calcutta University, has regularly assisted the editor in seeing the volume through the Press and taken immense pains in preparing photos, blocks and maps, and properly arranging these materials for publication. Mr. Pramode Lal Paul, M.A., Mr. A. Halim, M.A., and Mr. Kshitish Chandra Ray, M.A. prepared a bibliography of articles, published in oriental journals, for the use of the contributors. Mr. Subodh Chandra Banerji, M.A., Keeper of Manuscripts, Dacca
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University Library, offered many valuable suggestions in writing the chapter on Social Conditions. Mr. Anil Chandra Mukherji has drawn the maps which are published in this volume. The editor conveys his thanks and expresses his indebtedness to these and all others who have helped him in any way in discharging his responsible duties.

The system of transliteration followed in the *Epigraphia Indica* has been adopted in this volume. In chapter xii ĭ and ĭ have been used to indicate the vowels ĭ and ĭ, not joined with any consonant. As regards Indian place-names, the system of spelling adopted in the *Imperial Gazetteer* has been generally followed, though there are some deviations in well-known cases. In writing modern place-names vowels have not been as a rule accentuated except in cases of find-spots of images and inscriptions. In these and similar instances, such as English derivatives from Sanskrit words (like Tantric, Puranic, Brahmanical etc.) it has not been possible to maintain a rigid uniformity, for in view of the fact that different practices are adopted even in standard works, and none of them can be regarded as definitely established, it has not been thought desirable or necessary to take meticulous care to change the spelling adopted by different contributors. Titles of books cited have been printed in italics, and a list of the abbreviations used for books, periodicals, places of publications etc. has been appended. Volumes have been indicated by Roman, and pages by Arabic numerals, with a dot between the two, but without any words like Vol. or p; pp. etc.

As copious footnotes giving full references to books and articles in periodicals have been added throughout the work, it has not been thought necessary to add a long bibliography at the end of the volume. Only a select bibliography is given containing a list of important works of a general nature and such other references as have been specially suggested by the writers of the different chapters.

*Calcutta,*

*April 16, 1943.*

R. C. Majumdar
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ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS


Page 49, fn. 5. Add: The equivalent of the Gupta Year 188 current has been assumed to be 507-8 a.d. But, according to the theory of K. B. Pathak, the equivalent would be 506-7 a.d. (IHQ, vi. 47).

Page 60. Two Copper-plate Grants of Śaṅkūka were discovered, somewhere in the Midnapore district, about six years ago, and a short account of them with photographs and a tentative reading were published in a local paper (Madhab, Aśāśāda 1845 n.s., pp. 3-6). They remained, however, unknown to scholars till the editor of this volume happened to see them in course of a recent visit to Midnapore (April 22, 1943) and brought them down to Calcutta. They have not yet been cleaned and properly studied, but the portions already deciphered by Dr. D. C. Sircar and the editor shows that both of them record grants of land during the reign of Śaṅkūka. One of these Grants was made by the sūmanta-nāhāraja Somudatta, who was the governor of Dandahukta to which administrative unit Utkala-pāla was also attached. The second Grant was made by mahāpratihāra Śubhakirti, who also was the governor of Dandahukta-pāla under Śaṅkūka. Both the Grants were issued from the adhikarana of Tāvira. One of the inscriptions contains a date which is probably samvat 280 or 330, but the numeri-al symbol for hundreds, used in this record, has not been met with before. And the interpretation is, therefore, doubtful. The date of the record, when finally fixed, is likely to throw new light on the history of Śaṅkūka.

Page 137, para 2. The conclusion drawn from the Bāhūra Image Ins. is supported by a new inscription, engraved on an image of Gaṇeśa, recently discovered in the village of Nāriyanpur, in the Tippera district. A paper-rubbing of the inscription was brought to Dr. D. C. Sircar on April 25, 1913, and he has been able to read the whole of it without much difficulty. The inscription records that the image was set up in the 4th regnal year of Mahārājā Mahipaladeva, by the merchant Buddhāmitra, an inhabitant of Vilihāndika in Śamataṭa. Dr. Sircar is inclined to identify this village with Vilakhinda mentioned in the Bāhūra Image Ins.

Page 188, ii. 3-5. The epithet “full moon in the clear sky of Vaiṣṇa” is the result of a wrong reading of the text by the editor of this inscription. The correct reading is śitāmīva-vasā and not śitā-vasa. The new reading, originally suggested by Paramananda Acharya in Mayurakṣa Chronicle, April 1912, has been verified by the editor of this volume.


Page 670. Add at end of para 1: Two specific cases may be cited by way of illustrating the part played by the Bengalis in the ancient Indian colonization in the Far East. In the first place, it appears from the Khāyāpī Ins. that the settlement in Suvarnabhumi (Lower Burma) was apparently colonised from Bengal by the Golas (Gauda). Their name has become the Mon and Burmese appellation for all foreigners from the west (IA. 1894, p. 256; Epigraphia Birmanica, iii. Parj 1, p. 185, fn. 12). Secondly, two Sunakrit inscriptions found in Cambodia exhibit so completely all the peculiarities of the Gauda style, as defined by Dandān and other rhetoricians (infra p. 502), that the great French scholar Georges Cœdès, who edited them, has expressed the view that the records were composed by a Pāṇḍita who either belonged to Bengal or was trained there (Mélanges Spittas Lévi, p. 218).
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CHAPTER I

PHYSICAL AND HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

I. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

Bengal is the name given to the eastern province of British India which stretches from the Himalayas in the north to the Bay of Bengal in the south, and from the Brahmaputra, the Kangsa, the Surmā, and the Sajjuk rivers in the east to the Nāgar, the Barākar, and the lower reaches of the Suvarnārchnā in the west. The area described above lies roughly between 27° 9′ and 90° 50′ north latitude and 86° 35′ and 92° 30′ east longitude. The extent of the province, excluding the States of Hill Tippera, Cooch Bihar, and Sikkim, and the surface area covered by large rivers and estuaries is 77,521 square miles and the total population a little over sixty millions. The majority of the people in the western districts are Hindus. In the east Muslims predominate. The area of some of the southern districts is increasing owing to the recession of the Bay in the south.

The territory inhabited by the Bengali-speaking race stretches far beyond the political boundaries of the modern province of Bengal. It extends to the east into the districts of Goalpara, Sylhet, and Cachar which form parts of the province of Assam, and to the west into the districts of Manbhum, Santal Parganas, and Purba which are included within the official boundaries of Bihar. The sarkārs of Sylhet and Purba, the parganā of Akmahal (now Rājmahal) and the famous Pass of Tejgahri, now in the Santal Parganas, formed integral parts of the subah of Bengal in the days of Akbar. Rennell's map of the northern provinces shows that even as late as 1779 Purba was included within Bengal and not "Bihar" i.e., Bihar. The northern boundary of the province reached the summit of the Himālayas as early as the time of the Gupta kings. In the east "the valley of the Bārak with its two Districts of Cachar and Sylhet had formed the north-eastern part of the Dacca Division" of Bengal as late as the year 1874.

The province of Bengal lacks some of the extraordinary varieties of physical aspect for which the great sub-continent, of which it is an integral part, is justly famous. It has no deserts
and no hills or ridges except on the fringe in the extreme north, east, and west. It cannot boast of anything comparable to the purple waters of the Kashmirian lakes which reflect the splendours of Harmukh, the gushing streams of Central India, which leap into falls amidst the marble rocks near Jubbulpore, or the backwaters and cascades of Malabar that lend charm to the scenery of the western sea-board of the southern Presidency. It can, however, justly take pride in the snow-capped peaks with gold-hued crests in the northern district of Darjeeling, a vast riverine plain which forms the focus of three great river-systems where the country "widens out into a panorama of irrigated fertility," of swamps and flats in the south cut up by hundreds of coves and creeks, once the "royal throne of kings," now the residence of the lord of the jungles.

The hand of nature has split up the province into four grand divisions which fairly correspond to its major political divisions in historic epochs. North of the main branch of the Ganges, now known as the Padma, and west of the Brahmaputra, lies the extensive region which embraces the modern Rajshahi Division and the State of Cooch Behar. The most important part of this area constituted the ancient land of Pundravardhana of which Varendra was a well-known district (mandala). West of another branch of the Ganges, namely the Bhagirathi, or the Hooghly, stretches the great Burdwan Division—the Vardhamana-bhukti of the times of yore. A considerable part of the area answered to the flourishing territory of ancient Radha. Between the Bhagirathi, the Padma, the lower reaches of the Brahmaputra, and the estuary of the Meghna lies the central region of Bengal embracing the bulk of the Presidency Division and a considerable portion of the Dacca Division. This area was known to Pliny and Ptolemy as the territory of the Ganga-dwad, and to Kālidāsa as the land of the Vanga who were specially noted for their skill in handling boats. Beyond the Meghna in the east stretches the Chittagong Division within whose embrace are supposed to lie the buried remains of the royal seat of Samatatha. It has to be noted that the divisions of ancient Bengal referred to above at times transgressed the limits set by nature.

The most characteristic physical feature of Bengal proper is its river-system. The two mighty rivers, the Ganges and the Brahmaputra, with their numerous branches and tributaries have played a large part in shaping its destiny. By the vast deposit of silt carried from uplands, they have created the enormous area of deltaic lowlands and the process is still going on in full vigour. The same fluvial action is also responsible for the constant shiftings
of river-beds to an extent unknown in any other part of India with
the exception, perhaps, of Sind. These changes in river-courses
have made and unmade flourishing cities and thriving marts, and
sometimes changed the whole outlook of large areas. In view of
the great influence exerted by the river-system on the history of
Bengal, it is necessary to make a brief reference to its outstanding
features.

The Ganges enters the province of Bengal at the point where
the low-lying Rajmahal Hills almost touch its waters. The narrow
passes of Telīgarhī and Sikragully (Sikrigali) form excellent
strategic points in Bengal's first line of defence. It is not, therefore,
a mere accident that far-famed capital cities like Gauḍa-Lakhnawati,
Pandua, Tanda and Rajmahal should have grown up in the neigh-
bourhood of this salient.

The present course of the Ganges, after it has swept in a curve
round the spurs and slopes of the Rajmahal Hills, is very different
from what it was before the sixteenth century. In those days it
flowed further north and east and the city of Gauḍa was probably
on its right bank. There has been more than one shifting towards
the south and west before the Ganges reached its present course,
and the dry beds of some of its old channels can still be traced.

About twenty-five miles to the south of ancient Gauḍa the
Ganges divides itself into two branches, the Bhāgīrathī, of which
the lower portion is called the Hooghly, running almost due south,
and the Padmā flowing in a south-easterly direction. To-day the
enormous volume of the waters of the Ganges is carried mainly by
the Padmā, while the upper part of the Bhāgīrathī has shrunk to
a very shallow stream. But formerly the Bhāgīrathī was in all
probability the more important channel of the Ganges. It is
difficult to determine when the great change took place, but there
is hardly any doubt that by the beginning of the sixteenth
century A.D. the Padmā already ranked as the main stream of the
Ganges.

One important evidence adduced in favour of the view that
the Bhāgīrathī was the principal stream of the Ganges in ancient
times, is the great sanctity attached to it by the Hindus. The
mighty Padmā causes havoc and creates terror, but is not looked
upon with great veneration, nor does it claim any traditional
religious sanctity.

The earlier course of the lower Ganges, as it rushed down the
channel of the Bhāgīrathī, was somewhat different from what it is
to-day. Small rivulets from the west like the Bansloi, the Mor, and
the Ajay fell into it after it had broken off from the parent river,
as now, but at Trivenī (near Hooghly) it branched off into three
streams. These were the Sarasvatī flowing south-west past Sātgāon (Saptagrāma), the Yamunā (Jumna) running its course south-east down its present bed, and the Bhāgirathī proper, the middle offshoot, gliding south down the present Hooghly channel up to Calcutta and then through the Adi-Γangā (Tolly’s Nulla) past Kalighat, Baruipur, and Magra to the sea. There are reasons to believe that the Sarasvatī flowed into an estuary near modern Tamluk and received not only the waters of the Rupnārāyan and the Dāmodar but those of many smaller streams issuing from the hills of the Santal Parganas. Sometime after the eighth century A.D. the port of Tamluk lost its importance on account of the silting up of the mouth of the Sarasvatī and the consequent shifting of its course. Its place was eventually taken up by Saptagrāma or Satgaon, higher up the river, which figures as the Muslim capital of South-western Bengal in the fourteenth century A.D. In the sixteenth century the main waters of the Bhāgirathī began to flow through the Hooghly channel. Satgaon was ruined, and first Hooghly, then Calcutta, took its place. The upper Sarasvatī to-day is a dead river, but the Bhāgirathī or the Hooghly has deserted the old Adi-Γangā channel and flows through the lower course of the Sarasvatī below Sankrail.

The course of the Padmā has also considerably changed during the last four centuries. It is difficult to trace accurately its various channels, but the probability is that it at first flowed past Rāmpur Boālī through the Chalan Bil (or Jhil), the Dhaleswari, and the Buḍigangā rivers past Daica into the Meghnā estuary. In the eighteenth century the lower course of the Padmā lay much further to the south. The river flowed through the districts of Faridpur and Bākarganj, and joined the Meghnā estuary just above the island of Dākshin Shāhbaẓpur, about 25 miles due south of Chāndpur. Rājgarh, the famous city of Rājā Rājavalabha, was then on its left bank, and hard by this city ran the river Kālīγangā connecting the Padmā with the Meghnā river. About the middle of the nineteenth century A.D., the main volume of the waters of the Padmā flowed through this channel, which came to be known as the Kirtīnā. Gradually the Padmā adopted its present course.

In addition to the two main streams, the Bhāgirathī and the Padmā, the water of the Ganges reaches the sea through numerous other branches thrown off by the latter. Two of these, the Jalaṅgī and the Māttābhāṅgā flow into the Bhāgirathī and swell the waters of its lower channel, the Hooghly. Many other branches like the Bhairāb and the Kumār are now dying rivers and their place has been taken by the Madhumā and the Afīlkhān.

The Padmā is joined in its lower course by the Brahmaputra
and the Meghā, and the combined rivers form the mighty Meghā estuary. At present the main volume of the waters of the Brahmaputra rolls down the Jamunā which meets the Padmā near Goalundo. But the old course of the Brahmaputra was very different: after tracing a curve round the Garo Hills on the west it took a south-eastern course near Dewanganj, and passing by Jamalpur (near which the Jhināi branched off from it), Mymensing, and the neighbourhood of the Madhupur Jungle in the district of Mymensing, it flowed through the eastern part of the Dacca district, and having thrown off a branch, called Lakhmiyā, passed by Nāngalband to the south-west of Sonārgāon and fell into the Dhaleswari. The Lakhmiyā ran almost parallel to the main course, and passing by Narayanganj met the Dhaleswari a little to the west of its junction with the main stream of the Brahmaputra. This course of the Brahmaputra was already deserted in the eighteenth century when it flowed further east and joined the Meghā near Bhairab-bazar in the Mymensing district. But, as in the case of the Ganges, religious sanctity still attaches to the older course, and even to-day thousands of pilgrims take their bath at the muddy pools near Nāngalband. But the easternmost channel, too, soon dwindled into an insignificant stream. Towards the end of the eighteenth century the Jamuna river increased in importance, and since about 1850 A.D. it has become the main channel of the Brahmaputra.

Of the numerous rivers in Northern Bengal that flowed into the Ganges or the Brahmaputra, a few deserve special mention as having changed their courses considerably in comparatively recent times. The river Tisťā at first ran due south from Jalpaiguri in three channels, namely, the Karatoyā to the east, the Punarbhabā (Purnabhabā) to the west, and the Ātrāi in the centre. This perhaps accounts for its name Tīrrotā (possessed of three streams) which has been shortened or corrupted into Tisťā. Of these the Punarbhabā emptied itself into the Mahānandā. The Ātrāi, passing through a vast marshy area known as the Chalan Bil (Jhil), joined the Karatoyā, and the united stream fell into the Padmā near Jafarganj. The Karatoyā was once a large and sacred river and we have still a Karatoyā-māhātmya which bears testimony to its sanctity. On its banks stood the city of Pupḍravardhana whose antiquity reaches back to the Maurya period. The dwindling Karatoyā still flows by the ruins of this ancient city at Mahāsthāñgarh in the Bogra district, and forms a fixed landmark in the shifting sands of the fluvial history of this province.

As regards the Tisťā, the parent stream of the three famous rivers of Northern Bengal, Hunter calls attention to the fact that
in the destructive floods of 1787 A.D., it suddenly forsook its old channel and rushing south-east ran into the Brahmaputra. There are, however, reasons to believe that the bed to which the mighty torrent turned on this occasion is an old one which had been deserted in ages long gone by. The sudden change in the course of the Tistā in 1787 A.D. was originally regarded by many as having caused the Brahmaputra to sweep through the Jamuna channel, but this view no longer finds general acceptance.

The change in the course of the river Kosi (Kauśikī) is, perhaps, more remarkable than even that of the Tistā. This river which now flows through the district of Purnea and unites its waters with the Ganges at a point much higher up than Rājmahal, originally ran eastward and fell into the Brahmaputra. The channel of the Kosi must have, therefore, been steadily shifting towards the west right across the whole breadth of Northern Bengal. There was a time when the Kosi and the Mahānandā joined the Karatoṇā, and formed a sort of ethnic boundary line between the civilised people on the south, and the Kochs, Kīrtās, etc., on the north.

It would appear from what has been stated above that great changes have taken place in the courses of some of the important rivers in Bengal during the last four or five hundred years. Though positive evidence is lacking, we must presume the possibility of similar changes in the remoter past. It is to be regretted that we have no knowledge of their nature and extent. In any case we must bear in mind that during the period with which this volume deals the courses of the rivers in Bengal were probably somewhat different not only from those of the present time, but even from those in the recent past of which we have more definite knowledge. This point must not be lost sight of in discussing any geographical question concerning ancient Bengal on the basis of the position of the rivers.

The frequent changes in the courses of rivers have been responsible for the ruin of many old places, at times by washing them off, and more often by making them unhealthy and inaccessible. Reference has already been made to Tāmralipti and Saptagramā. It is believed that the shifting of the beds of the Kosi river gave rise to the swamps and floods that contributed to the ruin of the city of Gaṇḍhā. The capricious Padmā has swept away so many cities and villages within living memory, that we can well imagine the devastating effect of this and other rivers on the province of Bengal. In addition to the frequent shiftings of courses, the vast deposit of silt by the rivers in the deltaic region, between the Bhāgirathi and the Padmā, has been a potent instrument in
changing its physical aspect to a considerable extent. For the
deposit of silt constantly raises the level of land in some areas
and makes the other regions comparatively lower and water-logged.
The vast Sunderban area in the delta offers an intriguing problem.
Many hold the view that the Sunderbans had once been a populous
tract but were depopulated by the ravages of nature and the
depredations of marauding peoples like the Maghs and the
Portuguese. References to the Khāḍī-vishaya or -mandala, a flourishing
district in the Sena period which, in later ages, became part of
the dense forest, and to the country between the Biskhūli and
Rābanābād which was depopulated by Maghs, may be recalled in
this connection. Epigraphic evidence proves that the marshy area
called Koṭālpāḍā, near Gopalganj in the district of Faridpur, was
once a thriving seat of civilisation and possibly a centre of sea-borne
trade and commerce. The change in the condition of the interior of
the districts of Jessore and Khulna in recent times also well illustrates
what might have taken place on a much larger scale during the
preceding centuries.¹

II. BENGAL IN HOLY WRIT

The historic lands included within the area now known as
Bengal find no mention in the Vedic hymns. The horizon of the
earliest Aryan singers is apparently limited to the region extending
eastwards only as far as Bhāgalpur. The theologians of the Aitareya
Brāhmaṇa,² however, refer to peoples who lived in large numbers
beyond the frontiers of Aryandom and were classed as daityus.
Among such folks we find mention of the Pundras. Puṇḍranagara,
the capital city of this ancient people, is proved by epigraphic
evidence to have been situated in the Bogra district of Northern
Bengal. Some writers have traced the name of the Vaṅgas, another
early Bengal tribe, to the Aitareya Aranyakas.² In the text occur

¹ For a full discussion, with references to authorities, of the changes in the
courses of rivers, cf. Physical Features of Ancient Bengal by Dr. R. C. Majumdar
(D. R. Bhandarkar Volume, pp. 341-364) and The Changing Face of Bengal—a
Study in Riverine Economy by Dr. Radhakamal Mookerjee (published by the
University of Calcutta). Reference may also be made to W. W. Hunter's A*
Statistical Account of Bengal, C. R. Wilson's The Early Annals of the English in
Bengal, i. 128 ff, address on The Waterways in East Bengal, at the Rotary Club,
Dacca, by J. W. E. Berry (Amrita Basar Patrika, 15-6-38, p. 10) and JASB, 1895,
pp. 1-24; also cf. S. C. Majumdar, Rivers of the Bengal Delta, 1941, and N. K.
Bhattausli, Antiquity of the Lower Ganges and its Courses (Science and Culture,
vi. 233-39).

² See infra p. 35.

³ p. i. 1. Keith, Ait. Ár. 101, 200.
the words "Vayūmśi Vangavagadhāi-Cerapādāh." The expression Vangavagadhā has been emended to Vanga-Magadhāh, that is, the peoples of Vanga and Magadha. The Aranyaka refers to them as folks who were guilty of transgression. Commentators, ancient and modern, differ as to the real meaning of the words used in the text. The possibility that the expressions in the Aranyaka signify old ethnic names is not excluded. But it is extremely hazardous to build any theory about the antiquity of the Vangas on such fragile foundations.

The first unambiguous references to the Vangas occur in the ancient epics and the Dharmasūtras. The Bodhāyana Dharmasūtra1 divides the land known to it into three ethnic or cultural belts which were regarded with varying degrees of esteem. The holiest of the three was Aryāvarta, lying between the Himalayas and the western Vindhyas and watered by the upper Ganges and the Jumna. The zone that stood next in point of sanctity embraced Malwa, East and South Bihar, South Kathiawar, the Deccan, and the lower Indus valley. The outermost belt was formed by the Ariṭhas of the Punjab, the Pundras of North Bengal, the Sauvīras occupying parts of Southern Punjab and Sind, the Vangas of Central and Eastern Bengal, and the Kalingas of Orissa and adjoining tracts. The regions inhabited by these peoples were regarded as altogether outside the pale of Vedic culture. Persons who lived amidst these folks even for a temporary period were required to go through expiatory rites.

In the epics the Vangas are no longer shunned as impure barbarians. The Rāmāyana2 mentions them in a list of peoples that entered into intimate political relations with the high-born aristocrats of Ayodhyā. The search parties that were sent to the east in quest of the heroine are asked to visit the land of the Pundras and Mandara.3 The last mentioned place reminds one of Madāran in Western Bengal (or Mandār Hill near Bhāgalpur).

In the Great Epic Bhīma undertakes a hurricane campaign in the land we call Bengal. Having killed the king of Modāgiri (Monghyr) he fell on the mighty lord of the Pundras as well as the potentate who ruled on the banks of the river Kosi. Having defeated them he attacked the king of the Vangas. Next he reduced to subjection the lords of Tāmrālipta (modern Tamluk in the

---

2. 10. 86-87—Vāvatāvarata chakravātī tāvatī me Varundharaṃ.
   * * * * *
   Vang-Ānga-Magadhi-Metejāh samṛiddhāh Kāśi-Kosālaḥ.
3. 40. 23-25.
Midnapore, district) and Karvaṭa, apparently a neighbouring place, as well as the rulers of the Suhmas (in the present Hooghly district), those who lived in maritime regions, and all the hordes of outlandish barbarians (mlechchhas). Having conquered these territories and despoiling them of their riches, the mighty victor advanced to the Lauhiya (Brahmaputra). From all the kings of the mlechchhas who dwelt on the sea-coast he exacted tribute and precious gems of various kinds. In connection with the same campaign we have reference to a people called Pra-Suhmas who must have lived near the Suhmas in some part of Western Bengal.

Further light on the topography of Bengal in the epic age and the growing esteem in which the land was held by poets of upper India is thrown by the Tirthayātra section of the Vanaparvan. We have here pointed reference to the sanctity of the river Karatoṭā which is known to have flowed past the city of Pundranaagara (Mahāsthāṅgarah) in North Bengal and of the spot where the Ganges emptied itself into the sea (Gangāyāstatra rājendra sāgarasya cha saṅgaṇī).

Jaina writers of the Āchārāṅga-sūtra describe the land of the Lāḍhas (Rādhā) in West Bengal as a pathless country inhabited by a rude folk who attacked peaceful monks. In one of the Upāṅgas, however, the Lāḍhas as well as the Vangas are classed as Aryans. The latter are represented as possessing the city of Tamalitti (Tāmralipti or Tamluk). The Lāḍhas had Koṭivārsha for their chief city. Koṭivārsha (Koṭivarsa) has been identified with modern Bāṅgarh in the Dinajpur district. In the Gupta and Pāla periods Koṭivarsa was included in the Pundravardhana province and not in Rādhā.

The Āchārāṅga-sūtra divides the land of Lāḍha into two parts named Vajjabhūmi and Subbha (=Suhma-)bhūmi. Vajjabhūmi or Vajrabhūmi had its capital, according to commentators, at Panitabhūmi. The name Vajrabhūmi, “Land of Diamond,” reminds us of the sarkor of Madarān in South-west Bengal, mentioned in the Ain-i-Akbari in which there was a diamond mine. The sarkar answers to parts of the modern Birbhum, Burdwan, and Hooghly districts. The ‘Land of Diamond’ may have extended westwards as far as Kokhrā on the borders of Bihar which was famous for its diamond mines in the days of the Emperor Jāhāngīr.

The Suhmas are, as we have seen above, mentioned in the Mahābhārata. They also appear in the Buddhist Samyutta Nikāya.

---

1 It is tempting to identify the Karvaṭa with the Kharwārs of Midnapore and other districts of Western Bengal (Hunter, ii. 49, 51 etc.).
2 IA. 1891, p. 375.
3 i. 8. 3; S. B. E. xxii. 84, 904.
4 v. 80; Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, p. 1252.
and the Telapatta Jātaka\textsuperscript{1} under the name of Sumbhas. Their chief town was Setaka (or Desaka). A Śvetakābdhiśthāna is often referred to in the inscriptions of the Eastern Gaṅgas, but its identity is uncertain.

The Great Epic distinguishes the Suhmas from the people of Tamulk, but the Daśakumāra-charita\textsuperscript{2} includes Dāmalipiṭa (Tāmalipiṭa or Tamluk) in the Suhma territory. The Pavanadētā\textsuperscript{3} of Dhoyi (twelfth century A.D.) places the Suhma country on the Ganges and refers to the famous shrines of Murāri (Vishnū), of Raghukulaguru (the Sun), and of Ardhanārīśvara (combined form of Śiva and his consort) that adorned the land. Mention is also made of a city of Śiva (Chandrārdhamauli) and an embankment that commemorated King Vallālasena. These details, to which attention is invited by several writers,\textsuperscript{4} point to the Triveni-Saptagranā-Pundu area in the Hooghly district as the heart of the Suhma country. Nilakanṭhā\textsuperscript{5} equates Suhma with Rādhā. According to the Dīgvidjaya-pralāsā,\textsuperscript{6} the last mentioned territory lies to the east of Birlīham and to the north of the river Dāmodar. The “Land of Diamond” should be excluded from that part of Rādhā which was known as Suhma.

Early Buddhist writers who knew the “Sumbhas” show little acquaintance with the Vaṅgas. A knowledge of that ancient people is sometimes inferred from the epithets Vaṅgantaputta and Vaṅgiśa found in the Pāli canon.\textsuperscript{7} But the earliest clear Buddhist literary reference to Vaṅga is probably that contained in the Mālinda-pañhā.\textsuperscript{8}

Pāṇini, who flourished long before the second century B.C., knows Gaudapura\textsuperscript{9} but not Vaṅga. The last mentioned territory is, however, well-known to his great commentator, Patañjali.\textsuperscript{10}

III. The Historic Period

The literary references in the Vedic, Epic, and Sūtra texts, both Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical, do not admit of a definite

\textsuperscript{1} Jat. i. No 96. \textsuperscript{2} Sixth Ucchhāvāsa, Mitraguptacharita. \textsuperscript{3} vv. 27 ff. \textsuperscript{4} Cf. R. D. Banerji, JASB. 1905, pp. 235 ff; G. M. Sarkar, J.L. xvi. 23, 57. \textsuperscript{5} C. Chakravarti, Pavanadētāam of Dhoyi, Introduction, p. 25. \textsuperscript{6} Commentary on Mbh. ii. 30, 16. \textsuperscript{7} Vasumati, 1540 (n.s.), Maṭha, p. 610. The work is attributed to a contemporary of Pratāpatrīya (S. Mitrā, Yaśokar-Khidnār Itiāha, 138). \textsuperscript{8} EHRB. 8; Manorathapūrṇa, i. 270; Apadāna, ii. 407 (v. 29). \textsuperscript{9} Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, ii. 808; S.B.E. xxxvi. ii. \textsuperscript{10} (Text 599) The Vaṅga (Vaṅka) of the Mahānīdāsas, i. 154, may not refer to the famous Janapada in Bengal, but to Bangka near Sumatra.
chronological arrangement. For a chronological treatment of the subject it is necessary to turn to the evidence of literature, Indian and foreign, assignable to well-known epochs, and that of early epigraphs.

The historians of Alexander refer to a people whom they call the Gangaridai. According to the evidence of Pliny, Ptolemy, and many other classical writers, the people in question occupied the country of the lower Ganges and its distributaries. Jain and Buddhist legends connect the names of the great Mauryas and their contemporaries with Pundravardhana, and Chinese pilgrims found Asokan monuments in various parts of the province. The existence of Pundrashagara in the Maurya epoch is, in the opinion of some scholars, proved by an old Brâhmi inscription,¹ unearthed at Mahâsthângarh in the Bogra district.

Glimpses of Bengal in the early centuries after Christ are afforded by the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, the Geography of Ptolemy, the Müinda-panho, and the Nâgârjunikonda inscriptions. The Periplus, describing the east coast of India, mentions the river Ganges and a market-town on its bank which had the same name as the river. The city of Gange is also mentioned by Ptolemy who describes it as a metropolis and distinguishes it from Tamalites i.e. Tâmralipti. Of special interest is Ptolemy's reference to the five mouths of the Ganges: namely, the Kambayson mouth, the most western; the second mouth, called Mêga; the third called Kamberikhon; the fourth styled Pseudostomon; and the fifth mouth, Antîbôle. Opinions differ in regard to the identification of these distributaries. In the opinion of the present writer, Kambyon stands for Sanskrit Kapiśâ mentioned by Kâlidâsa. This answers to the modern Kâsâî which flows past Midnapore and, like the Rûpârâyan, may have been erroneously supposed to be a branch of the Ganges. The Mêga has been identified with the Hooghly. The Kamberikhon is said to represent the Kobbadak or Kabadak (Kâpotâksha), the *Cobbaduck* of Rennell's map, which flows past Jhînkargachha. A more plausible identification would be with the Kumâra (Kumâraka) river which issues out of the Mâtâbhângâ branch of the Padmâ and joining the Gôrai, ultimately empties itself into the Haringhâtâ estuary and the Aûrîkhân.² The Pseudostomon, *False Mouth,* is probably so called as it lay concealed behind numerous islands. It is taken to correspond to

---

² Strabo (xv. i. 13) refers to a single mouth.
³ Hunter, ii, 172 ff.; v. 281 ff. etc.
the estuary of the Padma and the Meghna. The Antible (lit. “thrown-back”) \(^1\) is regarded by some as identical with the old Gaṅgā that flows past Dacca. The precise identity must await future research.

The Miśinda-pañho\(^2\) mentions Vaṅga in a list of maritime countries where ships congregated for purposes of trade. In the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions\(^3\) we have reference to Vaṅga in connection with the missionary activities of “the masters and fraternities of monks” of Ceylon.

From the fourth century A.D. onwards the epigraphic records which are assignable to distinct chronological periods (such as the Gupta, early post-Gupta, Pāla and Sena ages) enable us to trace more clearly the chief political or geographical divisions and administrative units of Bengal. Unfortunately the boundaries of some of the units cannot be fixed with any degree of certainty, and the difficulty is increased by the fact that the extent of even well-known divisions like Gaṇḍa, Vaṅga, and Rādhā varied in different ages. All that we can do at the present state of our knowledge is to enumerate the more important divisions with short explanatory notes of the various connotations of the names gleaned from epigraphic and literary sources.

**GAURA**

The precise location of Gaṇḍa, which emerges from obscurity before the sun of the Guptas set for ever, is a matter regarding which there has been considerable divergence of opinion. As already stated, a Gaṇḍapura is mentioned by Pāṇini. Products of Gaṇḍa are well known to the Kauṭūṭya Arthasastra.\(^4\) The country is also familiar to Vātsyāyana, the author of the Kāmasūtra.\(^5\) We learn from the Haraha inscription\(^6\) of 554 A.D. that Iśānavarman Maukhari forced the Gaṇḍa people to seek refuge in the sea. This points to a country not very far from the sea-coast.\(^7\) In the seventh

---

\(^1\) Has it any reference to the action of the Brahmaputra in siltng up and driving back the Ganges? (Hunter, v. 256).

\(^2\) See supra p. 10, fn. 8.

\(^3\) El. xx. 22 ff.

\(^4\) Book ii. 15.

\(^5\) El. xiv. 117.

\(^6\) It is interesting to recall in this connection the statement of Abu'l-Fazl (Ain. ii. 189) that the Ganges “after spreading into a thousand channels joins the sea at Sāţgón.” Fredericke (1570 A.D.) found an “infinite number of ships” at Buttor (Bator) near Sāţgón (Hunter, ii. 300). The estuary (cf. Khāḍi of inscriptions) of the Sarasvati may have been regarded in those days as an arm of the sea. The Gaṇḍa-viśaya lay not very far from it. A few Purāṇas including the Mahāyana refer to the Gaṇḍa-deśa as the territory where a very ancient Ikavāku king
century a.d. a Gauḍa king had undoubtedly his capital at Karnasuvarna near Rungamutty (Rāngāmāti), some twelve miles to the south of Murshidabad.\footnote{Watters, ii. 192, 340; Hunter, x. 92. Cf. JASB. 1853, p. 281; 1893, p. 315; 1908, p. 281. See infra p. 60.}

The Brāhmaṇīṣṭā of Varāhamihira\footnote{xiv. 6-8.} (sixth century a.d.) clearly restricts Gauḍa to a part of Gauda which is distinguished not only from Pauḍa (North Bengal), Tāmraliptika (part of the Midnapore district), Vaṅga and Samatata (Central and Eastern Bengal), but also from Vardhamāna (Burdwan). Curiously enough, the Bhavishya Purāṇa\footnote{IA. 1891, p. 419 f.} defines Gauḍa as a territory lying to the north of Burdwan and south of the Padmā. This corresponds to the kingdom of Gauḍa-Karnasuvarna described by writers of the seventh century a.d. The Anargha-rūghava\footnote{JASB. 1908, p. 270; for the date of the poet see Keith, The Sanskrit Drama, p. 925.} of Murāri (latter half of the eighth century a.d.) mentions Champa as the capital (rājaṛāṇi) of the Gaudas in the time of that poet. This city is probably identical with Champānagarī in the sarkar of Maḍhara mentioned in the Ain-i-Akbari. It stood on the left bank of the Dāmodar, north-west of the city of Burdwan.\footnote{Hunter, i. 368.}

The records of the Pāla and the Sena dynasties and of contemporaneous families who held sway from the latter half of the eighth century a.d. to the Muslim conquest, enable us to glean some additional information about Gauḍa and its relation with Vaṅga during the period of their rule. The potentate who exercised supreme sovereignty in Bengal in the time of Nāgabhata II Pratihāra (first part of the ninth century a.d.) is referred to as Vaṅgapati (lord of Vaṅga) in the Gwalior inscription of Bhoja,\footnote{El. xviii. 108.} grandson of Nāgabhata II. But from the time of Devapāla, and possibly from that of his father Dharmapāla himself, the contemporary and rival of Nāgabhata II Pratihāra, and Dhrva and Govinda III Rāṣṭrakūta, the title Gauḍeśvarā becomes the official style of the reigning emperors. Gauḍa is, however, still referred to as a vishaya or district as we learn from a Kānheri inscription of Amoghavarsha I (814-877 a.d.). The existence of Vaṅga as a political or adminis-

built the city of Śrāvasti. The evidence probably points to Śrāvasti (Sañcer Mahet) in Gondi in Kosa or Oufl, and not to the place of that name in Northern Bengal. It is, however, important to note that the expression Gauḍa-deśa does not occur in the corresponding text of the Maḥābhārata and the Vīśṇu and Brahma Purāṇas. It is thus an obvious interpolation. In the Kāmanītra, the Kosala, that is to say, the people of the Śrāvasti region, ruled over by early Ikshvāku kings, are clearly distinguished from the Gaudas (Raychaudhuri, PHA! 4th ed., pp. 536-537).

\footnote{Watters, ii. 192, 340; Hunter, x. 92. Cf. JASB. 1853, p. 281; 1893, p. 315; 1908, p. 281. See infra p. 60.}

\footnote{xiv. 6-8.}

\footnote{IA. 1891, p. 419 f.}

\footnote{JASB. 1908, p. 270; for the date of the poet see Keith, The Sanskrit Drama, p. 925.}

\footnote{Hunter, i. 368.}

\footnote{El. xviii. 108.}

\footnote{IA. xiii. 154.}
trative unit in the same period is proved by the Nilgund inscription\(^1\) of the same Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch. Gauḍa and Vanga are sometimes mentioned side by side as in the Baroda Plates of Karkarāja\(^2\) (811-12 A.D.). But political union under the same sovereign, styled both Vanga-pati and Gauḍēśvara, was fast making them interchangeable terms. The process was complete in the Mughal and British periods. In a record\(^3\) of the time of Aurangzeb ‘Ālamgir, the subah of Bengal, over which Shāyista Khān presided, is referred to as Gauḍa-maudala.

In the nineteenth century a Bengali poet hailing from the Jessore district in the heart of old Vanga, applies to his own countrymen the designation Gauḍajana.

Regarding the connection of Gauḍa with Rāḍhā evidence seems to be discrepant. In the Prabodha-chandrodaya\(^4\) of Kṛishṇa Miśra (eleventh or twelfth century A.D.), the Gauḍa-rāṣṭra is said to have included Rāḍhā (or Rāḍhāpuri) and Bhūrīśreshṭhika, identified with Bhūrīsura on the banks of the Dāmodar in the Hooghly-Howrah districts. But the Managoli inscription\(^5\) of the Yādava king Jaitugi I distinguishes Lāla (Rāḍhā) from Gauḍa (Gauḍa).

According to Jaina writers\(^6\) of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries Gauḍa included Lakṣmaṇāvatī in the present Malda district. If the commentator of the Kāmasūtra of Vatsyayana is to be believed, it extended southward as far as Kaliṅga.\(^7\) It may be noted in this connection that the Śaktisangama-tantra, a late mediæval work, extends the country from Vanga (Central and Eastern Bengal) to Bhuvanesa (Orissa). The Rājatarangini\(^8\) (twelfth century) uses the term in a very extended sense. We find in this work the expression Paśeča-Gauḍa which in some texts is taken to embrace, besides Gauḍa proper, the countries known as Sārasvata (Eastern Punjab), Kānyaubja (Gangetic Doab), Mithilā (North Bihar) and Utkala (Northern Orissa).\(^9\) This is reminiscent of the Gauḍa empire of Dharmpāla. But there is no early warrant for the use of the term Gauḍa in this wide sense.

In the early Muslim period the name Gauḍa came to be applied to the city of Lakṣmaṇāvatī in the Malda district. It is

---

\(^1\) E.I. vi. 108.
\(^2\) IA. xx. 160.
\(^3\) ASI. 1922-23, p. 145.
\(^4\) Act. 11; IIIQ. 1908, p. 239; Bhāratavarsha, 1888 (n.s.), Śrāvasta, p. 239.
\(^5\) E.I. v. 22; cf. also Jyotisāvatōv quoted in Śabdakalpadruma, pp. 1159-1160 (under Rādhaka). The Pāṇḍava-panḍava places Rāḍhaka-desa to the west of Gauḍa (Varmanati, 1840, Mārga, p. 610).
\(^6\) JASB. 1908, p. 234.
\(^7\) Benares edition, p. 265. The commentator wrote in the thirteenth century (Keith, A History of Sanskrit Literature, 460).
\(^8\) ‘Gauḍa’ in the Śabdakalpadruma.
\(^9\) ‘Gauḍa’ quoted in the Śabdakalpadruma (under “Gauḍa”).
\(^10\) Skanda Purāṇa quoted in the Śabdakalpadruma (under “Gauḍa”).
perhaps this Gauda which is at times included within Pundra by some authorities of a late date. There was also a Gauda in North-Sylhet.

VAÑGA

The earlier references to this famous janapada have been noted above. It is mentioned in the Meherauli inscription⁵ of Chandra and one of the earliest records of the Chālukyas of Vatapi.⁴ Kālidāsa, the traditional contemporary of Diṅnāga (fifth century A.D.), places the Vaṅgas amidst the streams of the Ganges (Gaṅgāsrotot'ntara).⁵ The western boundary of their country possibly at times extended beyond the Hooghly to the river Kapiśa or Kāśāi in the Midnapore district. The inclusion within Vaṅga of an area beyond the Hooghly is also vouched for by the Jaina Upaṅgā styled the Prajāpanā, which mentions Tāṃrapaliṭi (Tamluk) as a city of the Vaṅgas.⁶ The Tamulk territory is, however, usually mentioned in literature as a distinct region.

Vaṅga of Pāla and Sena records seems to have been a smaller tract than the old territory known to the Jaina Prajñāpanā and the Raṅghusamśa of Kālidāsa. It could not have extended as far as Tamulk, as the district beyond the Bhāgirathi, which was once included within its area, now formed part of the Vardhamāna-bhukti. Even a part of the delta embracing Jessore and certain adjoining tracts came to be distinguished as Upa Vaṅga. This last-mentioned territory is already referred to in the Brihat-samhitā of Varāhamihira.⁷ The Digvijaya-prakāśa,⁸ a mediaeval work assigned to cir. 1600 A.D., places in Upa Vaṅga Jessore and some other tracts abounding in forest (Upavango Yaśorādyah desāḥ kānana-samyutah). Vaṅga proper was now restricted to the eastern part of the Gangetic delta. If the Abhidhāna-chintānaṁ⁹ of Hemachandra and the Jayamangala¹⁰ of Yaśodhara are to be believed, it was identified
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1 Bhavishya Purāṇa, IA. 1891, p. 419; cf. Saibandalpadrūma (quoting the Trībāṇḍasvatika) under “Varːndri.” It is, however, to be noted that the Purāṇa places Gauda south of the Padmā. *

2 JASB. 1875, p. 226.

3 The Mahākāla Pillar inscription. IA. xix. 7 ff. *

4 Raṅghusamśa, IV. 86.

5 IA. 1891, p. 375.

6 xiv. 8. Jaṭhara of the passage has been identified with Jaṭār Deul (S. Mitra, Yaśodhara-Khunār Itihāsa, 60).

7 S. Mitra, op. cit. 4, 132.

8 Bhāumikṣṇa, Vaṅgāstu Harikeliyāḥ.

9 Vaṅgā Lohityāt pūrveya (Bereed ed., pp. 294-95). It may be noted in
with or included some territory on the east of the Brahmaputra. Hemachandra actually equates the people of Vaṅga with the inhabitants of Harikeli (Sylhet)\(^1\).

In the later Pāla period Vaṅga was divided into two parts, northern and southern (anuttara). It is to be noted that the sister province of Rāḍhā was also from the ninth or tenth century A.D. divided into two regions styled Uttarā-Rāḍhā and Dakśinā-Rāḍhā.\(^2\) Anuttara or southern Vaṅga is distinctly referred to in the Kamauli Grant\(^3\) of Vaidyadeva, a minister of Kumārapāla. The two divisions of Vaṅga implied in Vaidyadeva’s Grant may have corresponded roughly to the two bhāgas of the same territory mentioned in later Sena inscriptions, namely the Vikramapura-bhāga and Nāvya.

Of the two sub-divisions of Vaṅga, the Vikramapura-bhāga is well-known. But in the Sena period it seems to have embraced a wider area than the modern parganā of Vikrampur in the Dacca Division watered by the Padmā. It seems to have stretched southward as far as the Kotāliṅga and Edilpur Parganās.

Nāvya as a sub-division of Vaṅga is mentioned in the Madhyapāḍā Plate of Viśvarūpasena.\(^4\) A recent writer regarded Nāṇya-mandala of the Rāmpāl Plate as a mistake for Nāvya-mandala.\(^5\) He further identified Nehakāśṭhī in that mandala with Naikāśṭhi in the Bākarganj district. The record of Viśvarūpasena includes in the Nāvya region the Rāmasiddhipāṭhaka which has been identified by the writer mentioned above with a village in the Gaurmādi area of Bākarganj. In the east Nāvya extended to the sea i.e. the head of the Bay and the estuary of the Meghṇā.\(^6\)

Nāvya, which means “accessible by a boat or ship,” is a fitting designation of the south-eastern part of the Gangetic delta which is a labyrinth of rivers and creeks. As Nāvya has the sense of neumness, one is reminded of Nāvyāvakāśikā (lit. new intermediate space or opening) of the Faridpur Grants of the sixth century A.D.\(^7\) The two places may have been connected with each other. But the data at our disposal are too scanty to warrant any definite conclusion regarding the matter.
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\(^1\) EIBP. i. iv.
\(^2\) EL. xxiii. 74, 105.
\(^3\) GL. 140.
\(^4\) IB. 146, 194.
\(^5\) J. Ghosh, Pañcākṣara, 1830 (n.s.), Phālguna, p. 363.
\(^6\) IB. 144, 146.
\(^7\) IA. 1910, p. 200; DR. 1920, pp. 82, 87; EL. xviii. 76
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The connection that Somāśāman, the chief city of Vaṅga during the early Muslim period, is situated about 2 miles inland from the Brahmaputra creek (Hunter, v. 71 and the map in the volume).
This territory finds mention in the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta and later records. Its exact limits in the Gupta age are not known. The Brihad-samhita, a work of the sixth century A.D., distinguishes it from Vanga. The narrative in the record of Hiuen Tsang in the next century describes it as a low and a moist country on the sea-side that lay to the south of Kamarupa (in Assam). It was more than three thousand li i.e. about 600 British miles in circuit and its capital was about twenty li i.e. about 3½ miles in circuit. If the identification of Rajabhata, king of Samata, mentioned by Far Eastern travellers, with Rajarajabhaṭṭa of the Ashrafpur Plates be correct, then it is possible that in the seventh century A.D., Samata had a royal residence at Karmānta. This place has been identified with Bāḍkāmta in the district of Tippera, situated twelve miles west of Comilla. The connection of Samata with the Tippera district in later ages is clearly established by the Bāghāurū image inscription of the time of Mahipāla, and the Mehār copper-plate of Dāmodaradeva, dated 1234 A.D. Hiuen Tsang’s description suggests that in his time it may have included within its political boundaries a part of Central Bengal in addition to Tippera. A descriptive label attached to a picture of Lokanātha in a certain illustrated manuscript places Champitāla in the Tippera district in Samata.

Writers of the seventh century mention, beside the land described above, a country called Harikela. According to I-ting it was the eastern limit of East India. The evidence of the Chinese writer is confirmed by that of the Karpura-mañjarī (ninth century A.D.) which includes Harikela girls among women of the east:

"Thou gallant of the women of the East, thou champak-bloom ear-ornament of the town of Champā, thou whose lustre transcends the loveliness of Rādhā, who hast conquered Kamarupa by thy prowess, who providest merry-makings (kedǐ) for Harikeli."

In the epigraphic records of the Chandra dynasty of Eastern Bengal, Trailokyachandra, ruler of Chandradvipa (Bākarganj district), is described as the mainstay of the king of Harikela. The lexicographer Hemachandra identifies Harikelī, apparently the city of
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1. xiv. 6-8.
2. See infra pp. 86-87.
3. Foucher, Icon. 106, pl. iv. 3; Bhatt. Cat. 12.
4. I-ting, xlvi.
Harikela, with Vaṅga. It has been recently pointed out by a young writer that the Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa mentions Harikela. Vaṅga, and Samatāta as distinct entities and that in two manuscripts in the Dacca University collection, Harikola, that is possibly Harikela, is synonymous with Sylhet. The evidence of the Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa need not, however, be taken to suggest that Harikela was dissociated from Vaṅga in all ages. The case of Tāmralipta suggests that a janapada which is mentioned as a separate kingdom by one authority may have formed part of a neighbouring realm in a different epoch.

CHANDRADVIPA

Chandradvipa is mentioned in the Rāmpāl copper-plate inscription as the name of the territory ruled over by Trailokyachandra (tenth or eleventh century A.D.). The famous Tarā image of Chandradvipa is illustrated in a manuscript dated 1015 A.D. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was the name of a small principality in the district of Bākarganj of which the capital was at first at Kchua and subsequently removed to Madhavapasa. It is identified with the parganā of Baglā (Bākłā) in the sarkar of the same name mentioned in the Ain-i-Akbarī.

The Madhyapādā inscription of Viśvarūpasena mentions two interesting place-names. These are “Bāṅgalabāḍā” and “-ndradvīpa.” The last name has been restored by different scholars as Kandradvīpa, Indradvīpa and Chandradvīpa. The reading Chandradvīpa is supported by the fact that the territory in question included Ghāgharakāṭṭā-pāṭaka. As is well-known, Ghāghar is the name of a stream that flowed past Phullaśrī in north-west Bākarganj in the days of the poet Vijayagupta (fifteenth century A.D.). It exists to the present day.

VAṅGĀLA

Bāṅgalabāḍā stood to the south of Rāmasiddhi mentioned above which has been identified with a place in Gaurnādi in the Bākarganj district. The name can scarcely be dissociated from Vaṅgāla-thāsa mentioned in epigraphic and literary records since the eleventh century A.D. It was Vaṅgāla, rather than Vaṅga, that
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1 See supra p. 15, l.n. 9.
2 Foucher, Icon. 135-37; Bhatt. Cat. 12 ff.
3 H. Beveridge, The District of Bakarganj, 72 ff.
4 Ibid. 70; Ain. II. 123, 124.
5 For Vaṅgāla-house see IIIQ. 1939, p. 140.

EHB. l. iii-iv.
gave its name to the great eastern subah of the Mughal empire that stretched from Chittagong to Garhi, and to the great Presidency of British India round Fort William. Abu’l-Fazl apparently regarded Vanga and Vaṅgāla as identical. He says:

"The original name of Bengal was Bang. Its former rulers raised mounds measuring ten yards in height and twenty in breadth throughout the province which were called di. From this suffix, the name Bengal took its rise and currency."

But Vaṅga and Vaṅgāla are mentioned separately in several inscriptions of South India and the Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi of Shams-i-Sirāj ‘Afi. Though a Vaṅgāla army advanced as far as Pāhārupur in the Rajsahib district in the eleventh century A.D. and the dominions of the Chandra kings of Vaṅgāla embraced, according to tradition, Patṭikerā and Mrikula or Mēhārakula in Tippa as well as Rangpur and Chittagong, the home territory of the Vaṅgālas does not seem to have lain in any of these areas. In a book dealing with the Mayānāmati-Gopichānd legend we have pointed reference to Vaṅgāla Langobardi hailing from Bhaṭi: "Bhaṭi haite āila Vaṅgāla lambā lambā dādi."

Bhaṭi, lit. "downstream," "land of the ebb-tide," is the name given to the low-lying flats of the Gangetic delta that border on the great estuaries. Tāranātha refers to "Bati" as an island-realm near the mouth of the Ganges. Abu’l-Fazl confines the Bhaṭi to the tract of country on the coast of the subah of Bengal. The name is still used to denote the Sundarban region of the districts of Bākarganj and Khulna. The derivation of the name Vaṅgāla (Vanga + āl, from āl, "dike") supports its identification with the part of old Vaṅga (not the whole as stated by Abu’l-Fazl) intersected by khāls and creeks, and abounding in dikes and bridges, that was known as Bhaṭi in the days of Akbar and Tāranātha. It is in this area that Gastaldi (1561 a.d.) places his "Bengala." European writers of the seventeenth century place "Bengala" further to the east. But their evidence, valuable as it is for the contemporaneous period, does not carry the same weight as that of Gastaldi for the earlier ages.
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1 Amin, ii. 120.
2 EI. v. 257; EHPB. i. v; E & D. iii. 295.
3 EI. xxii. 98.
5 Mānīlakrām Rājār Gān, 12. JASB. 1878, p. 150.
6 IA. iv (1876), p. 306.
7 Amin, ii. 116.
8 JASB. 1906, p. 497; Raychaudhuri, SIA. 189-190; R. Mookerjee, The Changing Face of Bengal, Pl. iii-iv (List of Maps). For other views and a detailed discussion on Vaṅgāla, cf. HIQ. xvi. 222 ff.
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Pundra and Varendri

Mention has already been made of the Pundras, a people known to later Vedic texts and the Great Epic. The Digvijaya section of the Mahabharata places them to the east of Monghyr and associates them with the prince who ruled on the banks of the Kosi. This accords with the evidence of Gupta epigraphs and the records of the Chinese writers which agree in placing the territory of the Pundras—then styled Pundravardhana—in North Bengal. The distinction drawn by some writers between the Pundras and the Paundras and the location of the Paundras to the east of Prayaga and west of Magadha lack corroboration by Gupta epigraphs and is not countenanced by the testimony of Chinese pilgrims.

Varendri or Varendri-mandala was the metropolitan district of the Pundravardhana territory, as the city of Pundravardhana-pura—the Pundra-nagara of an old Brâhmi inscription—was situated within its area. The form Varendra (-i)-mandala occurs in the Talcher Grant of Gayadatungadeva and the Kavi-praasti of the Râmcharita of Sandhyâkara Nandi. The latter definitely locates it between the Ganges and the Karatoya. Its inclusion within Pundravardhana is proved by the Silimpur, Tarpendighi and Madhainagar inscriptions. The Tabagat-i-Nasiri mentions Bârind as a wing of the territory of Lakhnawati on the eastern side of the Ganges. The evidence of Indian literature and inscriptions proves that it included considerable portions of the present Bogra, Rajshahi and Dinajpur districts. An important part of Varendri was apparently known as Sâvatthi or Sârvasthi. This territory included Baigrama near Hili in the Dinajpur district, Krojanja or Kolaicha (in Dinajpur or Bogra) and a place called Tarkari which was separated from Bâlagrama in Varendri by Sakaichi, apparently a river. Among other localities of Varendri may be mentioned Bhavagrama, Belahishti, Kântâpura and Nattari. The first two I am unable to identify. Kântâpura reminds one of Kântanagara of the Dinajpur district, while Nattari is undoubtedly Nator in the district of Rajshahi. Varendri may have also included Paduvanvâ which some writers identify with Pabna. This far-famed territory was, like Vaṅga, divided into two parts viz., Dakshina- or South Râdhâ and Uttara- or North Râdhâ.

Râdhâ

This far-famed territory was, like Vaṅga, divided into two parts viz., Dakshina- or South Râdhâ and Uttara- or North Râdhâ. This
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1 Sastrî, Cat. iv. 57.  
2 JASB. N.S. xii. 282.  
3 El. xiii. 890; Râm. Śar. 187, 155 and errata; Asi. 1890-94, Part ii. 287-88; IC. vi. 358.  
4 GL. 182; IB. 100, 106; IA. 1891, p. 490.  
5 See infra Ch. vi. § 6.
mode of division which can be traced back to the ninth century A.D. apparently replaces the older segmentation of the area into Vajjabhūmī and Subbhabhūmī.

**Dakshina-Rādhā**

This part of Rādhā is mentioned in the Gaonri Plates of Vākpati Muñja (981 A.D.). Ten years later it is referred to in the Nyāyakandāli of Śrīdharaśārya. It figures in Chola records of 1023-25 as Takkanalādam. Among other references may be mentioned those in the Amareśvara Temple inscription of Māṇḍhātā (Nimar district in the Central Provinces), composed by Halāyudha, the Prabodha-chandrodaya of Kṛṣṇa Miśra and the Chandī of Kavikankana Mukundarāma. According to these records Dakshina-Rādhā included Bhūrisīrṣṭhi or Bhūrisresṭhi (modern Bhurusut) and Navagrāma in the Howrah and Hooghly districts, as well as Dāmunyā (to the west of the Dāmodar) in the Burdwan district. It is clear from this that the territory in question embraced considerable portions of Western Bengal lying between the Ajay and the Dāmodar rivers. The southern boundary may have reached the Rupnārāyan and the western boundary may have extended beyond the Dāmodar far into the Arambagh sub-division. Tradition, however, recorded in the Digvijaya-prakāśa, restricts Rādhā to the territory lying north of the Dāmodar (Dāmodar-ottare bhāge..... Rādhadesah prakūrītaḥ). Closely connected with Dakshina-Rādhā as a territory subject to the same ruling family (Śūra) was Aparā-Mandāra, perhaps identical with Ma(n)dāran in the Arambagh sub-division of Hooghly.

**Uttara-Rādhā-Manḍala**

The northern part of the famous land of Rādhā was known as Uttara-Rādhā (Uttirālādam of Chola inscriptions) at least as early as the time of the Gaṇga king Devendravarman. This fact is known from the Indian Museum Plates of the Gaṇga year 508 which possibly falls in the ninth century A.D. The district is also known from the Belāva and Nāihāti Grants. The last mentioned
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1. *EI.* xxiii. 105.
5. See *supra* p. 10, f.n. 6 and p. 14, f.n. 5.
7. *EI.* xxiii. 74.
record includes it within the Vardhamāna-bhūkti. But in the time of Lakshmanasena it formed part of the Kankagrama-bhūkti.¹

Among places mentioned in inscriptions² as being situated in Uttara-Rādhā, Siddhalagrama has been identified with Siddhagram in the Birbhum district, and Vāllahaṭṭha with Bālutiyā on the northern borders of the Burdwan district. The Saktipur Grant of Lakshmanasena suggests that the mandala of Uttara-Rādhā also embraced villages in the Kandi sub-division of Murshidabad.

The river Ajay is usually regarded as constituting the boundary line between north and south Rādhā. But the inclusion of a part of the Katwa sub-division within Uttara-Rādhā may imply that at times the Khari, rather than the Ajay, separated northern Rādhā from southern Rādhā. As to the northern limits of the Uttara-Rādhā-mandala, it has already been stated above that the Jaina Prajñāpanā knows Koṭīvarsha or Bāṅgarh in the Dinajpur district as a city in Rādhā. The Chandraprabha of Bharata Mallika refers to a part of Rādhā which lay north of the Ganges (Uttara-Gangarādhām).³ It is, however, clear from contemporary inscriptions and the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the Ganges formed the boundary between “Ral and the city of Lakhan-or” on the one hand, and “Barind and the city of Diw-kot on the other.”⁴

Tāmrālipta (-lipti) or Dāmalipta

Tāmrālipta is already known to the Mahābhārata. In the Dīgpsīya section of the Sabhāparvan it is distinguished not only from territories known to have been situated in Northern, Eastern and Central Bengal, but also from Suhma. This state of things changed in later ages when Tāmrālipti is represented as having formed a part of Vanga in the time of the Jaina Prajñāpanā, and of Suhma in the days of Dāndīn, the author of the Daśakumāra-charita. The core of the territory lay in the modern Midnapore district and its capital has been identified with Tamalites of Ptolemy, the modern Tamluk. In the days of Huen Tsang it lay over 900 li, that is about 150 miles, from Samatata and was about 1400 li (about 223 miles) in circuit. “The land was low and moist,” forming a bay where land and water communication met.

Having surveyed the chief traditional political and geographical divisions of Bengal, we may now refer to the administrative units

¹ Et. xxi. 218.
² p. 33.
³ JRAS. 1925, p. 99; IB. 71.
⁴ Nāṣirī. 1. 584-86.
of the province in different periods. Epigraphic records enable us to determine with a tolerable degree of certainty the approximate location of at least the more important divisions, called bhuktis. The term bhukti, which we first find in the Gupta records, literally means an ‘allotment’ but was applied to denote the biggest administrative unit within a kingdom or empire.

A bhukti was usually divided into smaller areas styled vishaya, manḍala or vīthi. Vishaya and manḍala are sometimes used as synonymous terms. Khāḍi, which is referred to as a vishaya in the Barrackpore Grant, is styled a manḍala in the Sundarban Plate of Lakshmanasena. But a vishaya is at times included within a manḍala. Conversely a manḍala is at times a sub-division of a vishaya. The Khalimpur Plate of Dharmapāla refers to the Mahantāprakāśa-vishaya apparently as a part of the Vyāghraṭaṭi-manḍala. On the other hand, the Bangarh inscription refers to the Gokalikā-manḍala as a part of the Kotivarsha-vishaya.

The terms vishaya and manḍala were in rare cases possibly used to denote the same administrative division as bhukti. Thus Magadhā which is styled a vishaya in the colophon of a manuscript of the Asmathasurikā Prajñāpāramitā written in the fifteenth year of Rāmapāla, is styled a bhukti in a Nālandā Seal inscription. It is, however, possible that the Magadhā-vishaya was only a part of the Magadhā-bhukti. In the Irdā inscription Daṇḍa-bhukti is referred to as a manḍala of the Vardhamāna-bhukti. Apparently we have to class bhuktis into two groups, namely major bhuktis and minor bhuktis. The latter were at times equated with manḍalas.

The denotation of the term vīthi in the Gupta age is not clear. In later times it appears as a sub-division of the bhukti as well as the manḍala. Other sub-divisions of manḍalas referred to in epigraphs are khāṇḍala, āvrīti, and apparently, bhāga. The āvrīti was further sub-divided into chaturakas and the latter into pāṭakas. The chaturaka is mentioned in certain grants as a sub-division of a manḍala, and the pāṭaka, of a bhāga. The pāṭaka seems to have been the lowest administrative unit. Hemachandra defines it as one-half of a grāma or village.

Inscriptions of the Gupta age disclose or imply the existence of three bhuktis in the area now known as Bengal viz., Pundra-vardhana, Vardhamāna, and an unnamed bhukti which included Suvarṇa-vīthi and Nāvyāvaṃśikā. The first two of these along with five others viz., Tira-bhukti, Śrīnagara-bhukti, Kaṅkāgra-bhukti, Daṇḍa-bhukti and Prāgjyotisha-bhukti are known from the
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1 BL. 969; PB. 98.  
2 ASI. 1907-08, p. 159.
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Pāla and Sena records have formed parts of the Gauḍa empire. Of these Tīra-bhukti (Tirhut in North Bihar), Śrīnagarabha-bhukti or Magadha-bhukti (in South Bihar), and Prāgijotisha-bhukti (in Assam) in the main lay beyond the limits of Bengal proper. An old bhukti was sometimes incorporated with a neighbouring division, and a new bhukti carved out of an older one. In the Irda record of the tenth century A.D., Daṇḍa-bhukti forms part of the Vardhamāna-bhukti. In the time of Lakṣhmanasena the northern part of the Vardhamāna-bhukti, together perhaps with some adjacent tracts, was constituted into a separate administrative division styled Kānkagrama-bhukti.

We now proceed to give a brief account of the bhuktis included within Bengal proper with the sub-divisions or smaller units into which they were split up for administrative purposes.

1. Pundravardhana-bhukti

It is mentioned in Gupta epigraphs ranging from the years 124 to 224 that is from 444 to 544 A.D. In the records of the Pāla-Sena age it is variously styled Pundra- or Paundra-vardhana or simply Paundra-bhukti. It seems to have been the biggest administrative division or province of the Gauḍa empire. It extended from the summit of the Himalayas (Hima-vadh-čhikhrā) of a Damodarpur Plate in the north to Khāḍi in the Sundarban region in the south. The Bhāgirathī (Jāhnāvi) separated it from the Vardhamāna-bhukti in the west. The Madhyapādā Plate of Viśvarūpasena extends its eastern boundary to the sea, apparently the Bay of Bengal and the estuary of the Meghnā. According to the Mehār copper-plate, dated 1294 A.D., it comprised even a part of the district of Tippera.

The bhukti was divided into several viṣhayas and mandalas of which twenty-four find mention in known epigraphs. These were:

1-2. Vyāghrataṭṭa-Mandala to which was attached the Mahantāprakāśa-Vishaya.
3-5. Stālikata-Vishaya to which was attached the Amrasaṅḍikā-Mandala near the Udragrama-Mandala.
7-9. Koṭiṭvarṣa-Vishaya in which were included the Gokalikā- and Halāvarta-Mandalas.
14-15. 'Ikkaḍâši-Vishaya which included the Yolâ-Mandâla.
16-17. Saṭaṭapadmâvâṭi-Vishaya in which was included the Kumâratâlaka-Mandâla.
19. Adhâhpattana-Mandâla.
20. Khâḍi-Vishaya or -Mandâla.
21. Varendra- or Varendri-Mandâla.
22. Vaṅga which included the Vikramapura-Bhâga and Nâvyâ.

Nos. 1–6, 8–15, 17–18 and 24 do not admit of precise identification and Nos. 21–23 have been dealt with above. The theory that equates the Vyâghrataṭi-mandâla with Bâgdi is not based upon any convincing evidence. No. 7, Koṭṭivarsha-vishaya, is already mentioned in Gupta inscriptions. The city from which it derives its name is referred to in the Vâyu Purâna. The Jaina Prajñâpanâ places it in Bâdhâ (Lâdhâ). Buṭ Gupta and Pâla inscriptions invariably include it within the Pûndravardhana-bhukti. The head-quarters of the vishaya have been identified with the medieval Diw-kot (Devâkotâ or Devîkotâ). The ruins of the city are found about eighteen miles south of Dinajpur town in the village of Bângarh. Several names of the famous city are mentioned by lexicographers e.g. Umâ (Ushâ-?) vana, Bânapura and Sonitapura.

No. 16 was apparently situated on the banks of the river Padmâ. The name of the vishaya is important as furnishing evidence of the early use of the name Padmâ for the main eastern branch of the Ganges.

The Adhâhpattana-mandâla included the Kauśâmbî-Ashta-gachchha-kandâla. This Kauśâmbi has been identified by some writers with Kusumba in the Rajshahi district. Hunter apparently refers to it as Kusumbi tappâ (fiscal division). 1

Khâḍi, lit. estuary, is referred to as a vishaya in the Barrackpore Grant of Vijayaiesa and as a mandâla in the Sundarban Grant of Lakshmaiesa. It is known to the Dâkârnavâ as one of the sixty-four pîthas or sacred seats and is distinguished from Râdhâ (West Bengal), Vaṅgâla (which includes the south-eastern part of deltaic Bengal), and Harikela (easternmost part of Bengal). The name survives in the Khâḍi parganâ of the Diamond Harbour sub-division of the district of Twenty-Four Parganas. Land in this area was, in the days of Vijayaiesa, measured according to the nala (reed) standard adopted in Samataṭa. This has been taken to

1 Hunter, viii. 180. 2 IB. 60-61.
indicate that Khādi was included within the Samatāta country. But this is not a necessary inference. The services of land-measurers from Samatāta may have been requisitioned by the Sena kings in the area under review as those of Samatāta engravers were utilised by Nārāyaṇapāla and Gopāla II in a preceding age.

Khādi or Khātikā was split up into two parts by the Ganges. The eastern part, Pūrva-khāṭikā or Khādi proper, was included within the Pundravardinha-bhukti. But Paśchima-khāṭikā which lay to the west of the Bhāgirathi in the present Howrah district was a sub-division of the Vardhamāna-bhukti.

II. Suvarṇāvithi-Navyāvakāśikā

In the Gupta age Vanga does not seem to have formed part of the Pundravardinha-bhukti but constituted the domain of a separate Uparīka or governor who was probably stationed at Navyāvakāśikā. The official designation of the province in question is, however, not definitely known to us. One part of it, where stood the provincial head-quarters, is apparently referred to as Suvarṇāvithi in the Ghugrahāti copper-plate inscription of Samāchāرةdeva. The Uparīka in charge of Suvarṇāvithi was the immediate superior of the Vishayapati (district officer) of Vāraka-māndala. The district of Vāraka extended as far as the eastern sea (prāk samudra, apparently the head of the Bay of Bengal together with the estuary of the Meghṇa) and included Dhrulilāṭi, identified with Dhulat near Faridpur town.

It has been suggested that Navyāvakāśikā is to be identified with the ruins at Sabhar in the Dacca district. But Suvarṇāvithi which apparently included Navyāvakāśikā reminds one of Suvarṇa-grāma (Sonārgaon), and not Sabhar. It has, however, to be admitted that there is no dated reference to Sonārgaon before the thirteenth century A.D.

III. Vardhamāna-bhukti

It is mentioned in the Mallasarul Plate of the sixth century A.D., the Irdā Grant of the tenth century, and the Naihāti and Govindapur

---

1 El. xviii. 74 ff. Dr. R. G. Basak holds that Suvarṇāvithi was the name of the headquarters and Navyāvakāśikā, that of the province (HNI. 192). But the use of the term viṭhī as an administrative area, as noted above and below, does not support this view.

2 El. xviii. 66.

3 Suvarṇa-vithi may have reference to the entire area in the south-eastern part of the Dacca district which includes, besides Suvarṇa-grāma, such places as Sonākkādi and Sonākrang (vide map in Hunter, v).
Grants of the twelfth century. It embraced the valley of the Damodar river and is known to have included the Uttara-Rādhā and Daṇḍabhukti-maṇḍalas. At times it stretched from the river Mor in the north to the Suvarnarekhā in the south. It is doubtful if it covered an equally extensive area as early as the sixth century A.D. Varāhamihira distinguishes it not only from Tāmraliptika (in Midnapore), but also from Gaṇḍaka (possibly corresponding to Murshidabad and parts of Burdwan, Birbhum and Malda districts).

Towards the east, the bhukti extended as far as the western branch of the Ganges, now known as the Hooghly. In the tenth century the southern boundary extended to the lower reaches of the Suvarnarekhā. About the middle of the twelfth century the northern boundary is known to have extended beyond the river Ajay so as to embrace within its limits the village of Vāllahiṭṭhā situated in the Uttara-Rādhā-maṇḍala. In the time of Lakṣmīnāsaṇa (last quarter of the twelfth century) Uttara-Rādhā formed part of the Kaṅkagrāma-bhukti.

The main sub-divisions of the Vardhamāna-bhukti as may be determined from known inscriptions of the Pāla-Sena period are as follows:—

1. Daṇḍa-Bhukti-Maṇḍala.
2. Paśchima-Khāṭikā.
3. Dakshina-Rādhā.

The last two sub-divisions have been noticed above. Dakshina-Rādhā is not expressly included within the Vardhamāna-bhukti in any official record of the period. But its inclusion is implied by the well-known fact that in the sixth century A.D. the Vardhamāna-bhukti embraced the valley of the Damodar and from the tenth to about the middle of the twelfth century the bhukti extended from the valley of the Ajay in the north to that of the Suvarnarekhā in the south.

The Daṇḍa-Bhukti-Maṇḍala is referred to in the Irdā inscription and also in the Rāma-charita of Sandhyākara. It is doubtless identical with Tandabuti, “in whose gardens bees abounded,” referred to in Chola inscriptions of 1023-25 A.D. Daṇḍa-Bhukti has been identified by scholars with the marchland between Orissa and Bengal corresponding to the southern and south-western part of the Midnapore district. The name is said to survive in modern Dāntān not far from the river Suvarnarekhā.

Paśchima-khāṭikā is known from the Govindapur Plate of Lakṣmīnāsaṇa. It is apparently distinguished from Pūrva-khāṭikā which is referred to in the Sundarban Plate of Śrīmadommanapāla, dated 1196 A.D. The river Ganges (Hooghly) doubtless formed
the boundary line between the two parts of Khātiḍa or Khāḍi. As already stated above, Khāḍi was a well-known vishaya in the early Sena period. Its eastern part was included in the Pundravardhana-bhukti.

Paśchima-khāṭiḍa included Betaḍa-chaturaka which has been identified with Betada in the Howrah district.² The sub-division may have been carved out of Dakshinā-Rādhā.

IV. Kāṅkagrāma-bhukti

It has been stated above that in the days of Lakshmaṇasena northern Rādhā was attached to the Kāṅkagrāma-bhukti. The place Kāṅkagrāma, from which the bhukti derives its name, is identified by one writer with Kānkjol near Rājmahal.² Other writers recognise in Kāṅkagrāma the village Kagram in the Bharatpur thana of the Murshidabad district.⁸ The only facts that may be regarded as beyond dispute are that the new bhukti embraced considerable portions of the valley of the Mor river. It doubtless included parts of the Birbhum and Murshidabad districts. It is difficult to say how far it extended in the direction of the present Santal Parganas and the ancient territory of Audumbarika or Audambhar mentioned in the Vappaghoshavāṭa inscription and the Ain-i-Akbari. The sarkar of Audambhar stretched from the southern boundary of Purnea to Murshidabad and Birbhum. It included Akmahal (modern Rājmahal) and may have embraced ‘Ka-chu-wen-ki-lo’ (Kajaṅgala-mandala) mentioned by Hiuen Tsang and Sandhyākara. In the time of Jayanāga of the Vappaghoshavāṭa inscription, the Audumbarika-vishaya apparently formed part of the realm of Karnasuvarna. It is possible that the new bhukti of Kāṅkagrāma represents the old kingdom of Gauda-Karnasuvarna mentioned by Varañhamihira, Bāna and Hiuen Tsang.

The Kāṅkagrāma-bhukti included a number of administrative areas styled vīthi. In the Vardhamāna-bhukti, the mandala came between the bhukti and the vīthi. But the new bhukti seems to have been split up directly into vīthis. Like many of the older territories of Bengal, Kāṅkagrāma had a northern and a southern sub-division. The southern part (Dakshina-vīthi) embraced Uttara-Rādhā or at least that portion of it which was watered by the river Mor.

¹ Doubtless identical with “Buttor” of Fredericke (Hunter, iii. 300).
² El. xxii. 214.
³ El. xxii. 214.
⁴ Cf. Paśchapatipa, 1859 (n.s.), Phālguna, p. 670 with Hand-Gazetteer of India, 56.
THE TRANS-MEGHNA TRACTS

The division of the Trans-Meghna area into mandalas, vishayas, and khandas is hinted at in inscriptions discovered in Tippera and Chittagong. The Gunaighar Grant of Vainyagupta of the year 188 (SOB a.d.) refers to a district styled Uttara-mandala which must have answered to a part of Tippera. The Harikela-mandala finds mention in the Chittagong Plate of Kāntideva. The Samata-ta-mandala including the Paraṇāyi-vishaya is mentioned in the Mehar copper-plate of Dāmodara. The Tippera Grant1 of Lokaṇātha of the year 844 (possibly 7th or 8th century a.d.) refers to the Suvrūnga-vishaya—which included a forest sub-division (aṭavi-khanda). A place styled Veja-khanda figures in the Maynāmati copper-plate grant of Ranaṇaṅkamalla Harikāladeva.

We may conclude this account with a reference to the chief cities of ancient Bengal.

CITIES OF ANCIENT BENGAL

As early as Pāṇini we find mention of a city called Gauḍapura. But it cannot be identified. An old Brāhmī inscription refers to the city of Puṇḍranagara which answers to the modern Mahāsthāngarh, an ancient shrine and fort seven miles north of Bogra on the river Karatoṇā. Under the name of Puṇavaḍhana it seems to be mentioned in a Sānchi Stāpa inscription. The city was still flourishing in the days of Huen Tsang (seventh century a.d.), and Sandhyākara Nandī (twelfth century a.d.). It formed the headquarters of a bhukti till the Muslim conquest.

The famous port of Tāmralipti may be older even than the capital city of the Puṇḍras. It is mentioned in the Great Epic. But the earliest dated reference to it is that contained in the Geography of Ptolemy (about the middle of the second century a.d.). The Greek geographer refers to the city as Tamalites and places it on the Ganges in a way which suggests connection with the country of the Mandalai. The town of Tamluk, to which it is taken to correspond, is on the right bank of the river Rupnārīyan about twelve miles from its junction with the Hooghly. As pointed out above, the courses of these rivers have shifted frequently, and it is possible that in early times the port of Tāmralipti may have been situated on the Sarasvatī or another branch of the Ganges. In the days of the Chinese pilgrims, Fa-Hien, Huen Tsang, and I-tsing, and of Daṇḍin, the author of the Daṇḍakumāra-charita, it was the

1 El. xv. 303 ff; HNI. 193; Cf. also infra p. 88.
place for embarkation for Ceylon, Java and China (in the east), and the land of the Yavanas (in the west). The Kathāsarasvatīgāra preserves traditions about people embarking on ships at Tāmrālipi and going to Katāha, possibly in the Malay Peninsula. The decline of the famous port commenced probably after the Duldānī (Hazaribagh) Rock inscription of Udayamāna (about the eighth century A.D.). The Abhidhāna-chintāmani mentions Dāmalīta, Tāmalipīta, Tamālinī, Stambapura and Vīshnugriha as synonyms of Tāmrālipīta. The Trilakṣṇāsēha adds Velākula and Tamālikā (Tamluk).

Along with Tamālites, Ptolemy mentions the royal city of Gange which is already known to the author of the Periplus (first century A.D.):

"Through this place are brought mulabhrum and Gangetic spikenard and pearls, and muslins of the finest sorts which are called Gangetic."

The "market-town," as it is called in the Periplus, stood on the banks of the Ganges. But its exact situation is not known. Nor do we know the site of Vaṅganagara referred to in the Ceylonese chronicles in connection with the story of Prince Vijaya. In the same story figures a city styled Simhapura which is placed in Lāla (probably Rādhā) and is taken to correspond with Singur in the Serampore sub-division of Hooghly. There is, however, a theory which places the city in Kāthiāwar.

The Susūnā inscription of the fourth century A.D. refers to a place called Pushkaraṇa which has been identified with Pokharā on the south bank of the Dāmodar in the Bankura district. To its famous ruler Chandravarman has been ascribed the foundation of Chandravarma-kota mentioned in a Faridpur Grant. This stronghold is said to be represented by the fort at Kotālipāda in the district of Faridpur. From the days of Kumāragupta I (fifth century A.D.) emerges another notable place, Koṭīvarsha, to which reference has already been made above (see supra p. 25).

The Baiogram inscription of 448 A.D. refers to the head-quarters of a district officer at Paśchanagarī. The identity of the place is uncertain. It may have been situated in the Dinajpur district.

Another important site in North Bengal, whose antiquity can be traced back to the fifth century A.D., is Pāhrāpur in the Rajshahi district which was known as Somapura in the days of Dhammapāla and his successors. It was burnt by a Vaṅgāla army in the eleventh century A.D.

In the sixth century A.D. Vardhamāna (Burdwan) and Navyāvakāśikā (possibly in the Dacca district) as well as Punḍra-

\* JASB. 1910, p. 604.  
\* CHI. t. 608.
vardhana appear to have been seats of provincial governors or
divisional commissioners styled Uparka. The grant of Vainyagupta
refers to a royal residence styled Kripura and the naval port of
Chudamaṇi whose location is uncertain. Kripura reminds one of
Nripura of the Naṇlandā Plate of Samudragupta.

In the seventh century Karnasuvarna (possibly in the
Murshidabad district) ranked with Pundravardhana, Tamralipti
and the unnamed capital of Samatāta as one of the premier cities of
Bengal. It was the royal seat of Saśāṅka and of Jayanāga and was
occupied for a time by Bāskaravarman of Assam. Close to the
city was a magnificent monastery styled Rattamattikā or Red Clay
which is taken to answer to Rungamutty (Rāṅgāmāti) on the
western branch of the Ganges, near Berhampore in the Murshidabad
district.

The Ashrafpur Plates refer to Jayakarmānta-vāsaka as a seat
of the Khaḍga kings who possibly ruled over Samatāta. The place
has been identified with Baḍkāmtā near Comilla.

Curiously enough the records of the earliest Pāla kings do not
afford any clue as to the location of their metropolis. We have
only reference to a few camps of victory mostly in the neighbouring
province of Bihar.1 In the time of Dharmapāla, who is referred to as
Vangapati in a Prathīrā record, the ancestral capital may have
been in Eastern Bengal. But from the time of Devapāla, who is
styled Gaundēśvara in the Bādāl Pillar inscriptions, Gauḍa seems
to have been the metropolitan vishaya. The Anangha-rāghava of
Murārī, who probably flourished in the latter part of the eighth
century A.D., refers to Champā as the capital of Gauḍa. The
connection of Champā with a "Pāla" king of Gauḍa has been
inferred from the Jaynagar Image inscription attributed to
"Palapāla," but the reading of the name and of his epithet "Lord of
Gauḍa" is extremely doubtful. Champā in Gauḍa may have been
identical with Champā-nagarī in the sarkar of Madāran mentioned
in the Ain-i-Akbari. It may, however, also refer to the famous city
of that name that stood near modern Bhāgalpur.

The Chittagong Plates of Kāntideva of Harike-la-mandala
(assigned to the ninth century A.D.) mention a royal residence at
Vardhamānapura. If this city stood in Harikela it must be,
distinguished from Burdwan in West Bengal.2 Its precise location
can not be determined in the absence of fuller evidence.

1 Pālaliputra and Kapila in the records of Dharmapāla (Pāla Ins., infra Ch. vi,
App. 1, Nos. 2, 3) and Mudagiri in the records of Devapāla and Nāriyanaṇapāla
(Nos. 6, 14).

2 This point has been further discussed in Ch. vi infra. § iii.
Epigraphic records of the time of Gopāla II, Mahāpāla I, and Vigrahapāla III refer to royal encampments at Vatsaparvati, Vilasapura and possibly Haradhāma. The last two skandhāvāras were situated on the Ganges, as the royal donors bathed in the sacred stream before issuing the grants, mentioned in the records, from those places. Haradhāma, the “abode of Hara” or Śiva, reminds one of the city of Chandrārdhamauli, that is Śiva, in the Suhma country, mentioned by Dhoi in the Pavanadāta. But the identity in meaning of the names of the two places may be accidental.

Rāmapāla, the youngest son of Vigrahapāla III, gave his name to the city of Rāmāvati mentioned in the Manahali record of Madanapāla and the Rāmcharita of Sandhyākara. There should be no hesitation in recognising in this city the Rāmauti of the Ain-i-Akbari. The Senas removed the royal seat to the neighbouring city which became famous in the early Muslim period as Lakhnauti (Lakshmanavati) or Gaur (Gauda). This famous capital stood on the banks of the Ganges close to its junction with the Mahānandā about twenty-five miles below Rājmahal. The Ganges has now changed its course and the ruins of the famous metropolis of mediaeval Bengal, which stretched no less than fifteen miles along its old bank, no longer touch the sacred stream at any point. Though it had to reckon with a rival in Pandua, Gaur retained its importance till the days of Humayūn and Akbar. The great Mughals styled it Jannatabad. Owing to its unhealthy climate the city is said to have been abandoned, at least temporarily, after 1376 A.D. The capital was removed to Tanda and finally to Rājmahal.

Among the less known dynasties that ruled contemporaneously with the Pālas in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D., the Kambojas of Dandabhukti had their capital at Priyangu. The identity of the place is not known. The Chandra and Varman families issue grants from the camp of victory at Vikramapura and are associated with the cities of Rohitāgiri, Paṭṭikera, Mehārapula (or Mrīkula) and Simhapura. The identification of these cities has been discussed in chapters dealing with their political history.

The official capital (rājadhāni) of the Sena kings was, according to the testimony of Dhoi, at Vijayapura. This city stood on the banks of the Ganges in or near the world-sanctifying country

---

1 Pāla Ins., op. cit., Nos. 29, 31, 39.  
3 Dr. B. Hamilton expressed the view that “the city went to ruin not from any great or uncommon calamity; but merely from the removal of the seat of Government” (by Suja). Hunter, vii. 55.  
4 See infra Chs. vii and ix.
Centres of Sena Power

(deśam jagati pāvanām) where the Jumna (Tapana-tanaya) starts off from the Bhāgirathī. This undoubtedly points to the region of Triveni in the northern part of the Hooghly district. The manuscript of the Pavanadūta of Dhoyi styles this territory Brahma which one editor emends to Sūhma. Mr. P. C. Sen,\(^1\) however, believes in the existence of a Brahma country and finds his theory supported by the Kavya-mimamsā which mentions Brahmoṭṭara\(^2\) along with Sūhma. The theory seems plausible enough. But it cannot be said to be definitely established until fuller evidence, epigraphic or literary, is forthcoming.

Triveni is styled Muktaveni (‘with the braids separated’) to distinguish it from Prayaga or Allahabad which is known as Yukta-veni (‘joint-braided’). The place is so-called from the fact, noted above, that the Bhāgirathī, the Sarasvatī and the Jumna branch out at this point. Triveni retained its fame in the early Muslim period and is still one of the most sacred spots in Bengal. Within two miles from it stood Saptagrāma, the mediaeval capital of Southwestern Bengal. The famous city is now represented by Sātgāon, a small village on the left bank of the Sarasvatī about four miles north of Hooghly.

The narrative of Dhoyi makes it likely that Vijayapura did not lie so far north of Triveni as Nadiya which was the seat of ‘Rae Lakhmanāh’ at the time of the Khilji raid. It cannot be identified with Vijayanagara in Rajshahi. The wind-messenger of Dhoyi is not represented as crossing the Ganges at any point, or moving forward to another deśa far away from the sacred region where the Jumna comes out of the Ganges. It is, however, probable that the Senas, from the time of Lakshmanaśena, had a secondary capital at Lakshmanavatī near the Pāla city of Rāmavatī. A third centre of Sena power was Vikramapura in the Dacca district of Eastern Bengal. The importance of this city dates back to the days of the Chandras and the Varmanas. It continued to flourish till the time of Arirāja Danujamadhava, the illustrious Daśarathadeva, of the Deva family. The latter seems to have transferred his capital before 1280 A.D. to Suvarnagratam,\(^3\) modern Sonārgāon in the eastern part of the Dacca district between the Lakhmīyā and Meghā rivers. At about the same period Sātgāon replaced Vijayapura as the metropolis of Southwestern Bengal. Chāṭigrāma, the headquarters station of the Chittagong district and Division, does not appear to be mentioned in classical Sanskrit literature or inscrip-

\(^1\) IHQ. 1938, pp. 584 ff.
\(^2\) Cf. Barmhattar in Ains. p. 141.
\(^3\) It may be that Sonārgāon itself was regarded as a part of the Vikramapura-bhāga in those days. See also infra Ch. ix. § 1.
tions of an early date. But if Tibetan tradition is to be believed, it was the birthplace of the Buddhist Tantrik sage Tila-yogī who flourished in the tenth century A.D. The city was famous for its large Buddhist monastery styled Pandita-vihāra where Buddhist scholars used to hold learned disputations with adherents of rival sects.  

1 For further reference to Chittagong in Tibetan chronicles, cf. IHQ. xvi. 288; JASB. 1886, p. 22.
CHAPTER II

THE LEGENDARY PERIOD

"The vision of the historian," says Vincent Smith, "can not pass the line which separates the dated from the undated." In the case of Bengal, dated history begins only from 326 B.C., with the famous stand made by the warriors of the Gangaridai and the Prasoi to resist the threatening onslaught of Alexander who had advanced to the Hyphasis and was eager to penetrate deeper into the interior of India.

There was probably some kind of organised social and political life in Bengal many centuries before that notable event, but we do not possess any detailed information about it. The little that we know of the earliest period is derived almost solely from a study of the Vedic literature. We cannot but attach due significance to the absence of all references to Bengal in the Rik-samhitā and in later Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas, barring a few casual notices in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and possibly the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, all of which reveal an attitude towards the country and its people which is not one of approbation (See supra pp. 7-8).

We may, therefore, legitimately draw the inference that the primitive peoples of Bengal were different in race or culture, and perhaps in both, from the Aryans who compiled the Vedic literature. We may further hold that Bengal was unknown or but little known to the Vedic Aryans during the period represented by the Rik-samhitā, but that at the time of the later Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas they were gradually coming into contact with the province and adjoining tracts, though this region was still outside the pale of Vedic civilisation. These inferences are fully supported by the famous story of Māthava the Videgha in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

An interesting sidelight is thrown on the orthodox Aryan view of the origin and characteristics of the early people of Bengal by the Sunaḥśeṣa episode of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.1 The Rishi Viśvāmitra adopted as his son a Brāhmaṇa boy who had been offered as a victim in a sacrifice to appease a deity. Fifty elder sons of the sage expressed disapproval of the act and were consequently cursed by their father. "Your offspring," said the offended parent, "shall inherit the ends of the earth."2 They came to be

1 VII. 18-19.
2 M. Haug translates the passage as follows: "You shall have the lowest castes for your descendants."
known as the Andhras, Pundras, Sabaras, Pulindas, and Mutibas
who lived in large numbers beyond the borders of Aryandom, and
ranked as dasyus or outlandish barbarians. An echo of this legend
is found in the thirteenth book of the Mahabharata.

A different account of the origin of the Pundras, and some
cognate tribes including the Vañas and the Suhmas, is given in the
first book of the Great Epic: A blind old sage drifted along the
Ganges on a raft, and passed through many countries, till he was
picked up by a king named Bali. The childless monarch implored
him to raise up offspring on his wife. He did so, and in course of
time the queen gave birth to five sons, Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kalinga,
Pundra, and Suhma. They gave their names to five countries,
which together roughly correspond to the modern provinces of
Bengal and Orissa, with the district of Bhagalpur in Bihar.

In spite of stories about the infusion of the blood of Rishis
from upper India, it is evident that even in later Brahmanical
literature the primitive tribes of Bengal were regarded as dasyus
and transgressors by the sages. The Mahabharata peoples the
Bengal sea-coast with Miśchechhas, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (II. 4. 18)
classes the Suhmas as a sinful (pāpa) tribe along with the Kirātas,
Hūnas, Andhras, Pulindas, Pukkasas, Abhiras, Yavanas, and Khasas,
while the Dharmasūtra of Bodhāyana prescribes expiatory rites
after a sojourn amongst the Pundras and the Vaṅgas.

The wild character of the people of Bengal is also emphasised
by early Jain tradition. It is stated in the Āchārāṇga-sūtra that
when Mahāvīra travelled in the "pathless country" of the Lādhas,
in "Vajjabhūmi" and "Subbhabhūmi," many natives attacked him,
and dogs ran at him. Few people kept off the attacking beasts.
Striking the monk they cried "chu chehhu," and made the dogs
bite him. Many other mendicants had to eat rough food in
Vajjabhūmi. They carried about a strong pole or a stalk to keep
off the dogs. The Jaina writer laments that it was difficult to travel
in Lādha (Rādhā) i.e. in Western Bengal.

The literary evidence bearing upon the non-Aryan character
of the original people of Bengal is supported by linguistic considera-
tions. From an examination of certain tribal names constituting
almost identical pairs or triads, differentiated between themselves
only by the nature of their initial consonants, Sylvain Lévi draws
the conclusion that the primitive peoples of Bengal and some

1 The account is also found in the Purāṇas; Cf. Matsya, Ch. 48. vv. 77 ff;
Vyās, Ch. 99. 11. 85 ff.
2 l. 8. 5; S.B.E. xxxi (Jaina-sūtras, Part 1), p. 84.
3 Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India (trans. by P. C. Bagchi), pp. 194-195.
neighbouring provinces spoke a language that was neither Aryan nor Dravidian, but belonged to a separate family of speech. Other scholars\(^1\) suspect a strong Polynesian influence on the pre-Dravidian population of the southern coast of India. Keith\(^2\) considers much of the evidence adduced by Lévi as of dubious value. It is, however, interesting to note that a Bengal tribe (the Gaudas) and a royal family (the Pālas) in historic ages were considered to have an oceanic connection.\(^3\)

Whatever may have been the ethnic association of the primitive inhabitants of Bengal, it was not long before Aryan influence began to spread in their land. While early Dharmasūtras and grammatical treatises confine the land of the Aryans to the upper Ganges valley, the author of the Māṇava Dharmaśāstra extends it from the western to the eastern sea. It should, however, be noted that the law-giver brands the Paundras as degraded Kshatriyas, and classes them with Dravidians, Scythians, Chinese, and other outlandish peoples. The Sabhāparvan (52. 17) of the Mahābhārata, on the contrary, refers to the Vaṅgas and the Pundras as well-born Kshatriyas. The testimony of the epic accords with that of the Jaina Prajñāpanā which includes the Vaṅgas and Lāḍhas in the list of Aryan peoples, while Dravidians rank as mālikkhas or mlechchhas (barbarians).

By the time when the Tīrtha-yātra section of the Great Epic was composed, the valley of the Karatoya as well as the lower reaches of the Ganges, where the great river runs into the sea, became recognised as sacred spots. The sanctity of the lower Ganges is also implied in the famous story of king Bhagiratha.

About the political history of the ancient peoples of Bengal, Vedic literature gives no details save that it was peopled by a number of tribes as mentioned above. No Bengal king figures in the hymns or even in the Vedic texts on ritual and philosophy, as does Sudāś, hero of the Trīṣus, Janaṃejaya, sovereign of the Kurus, or Janaka, the philosopher-king of the Videhas.

---

\(^1\) E.g. James Hornell, M.A.S.B. vii. No. 8, 1920, quoted in Lévi’s work (ibid. 124).

\(^2\) Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and the Upanishads, ii. 852 f.

\(^3\) ‘Samudrārāga,’ an expression used in the Haraha inscription in reference to the Gaudas, has been taken to mean “living on the sea-shore” (El. xiv. 180) and taking “shelter towards the sea-shore” (HNI. 111). But Samudra may not refer to the sea-shore. The passage in question implies that the Gaudas were considered to have had a place of refuge in the sea itself, perhaps in an island, and not merely in the udit, evāpa or kachchha. This is possible if they were themselves a maritime people, or at least had intimate connection with peoples beyond the seas. Communication between West Bengal and Malaysia was easy in the Gupta Age. Regarding the oceanic connection of the Pālas, cf. the commentary on Sandhyākara’s Rāmacarita, 1. 4.
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The epics of the middle country and the chronicles of Ceylon furnish some detailed information regarding the legendary kings of old. The epic poets knew Bengal as a country that was usually split up into groups of petty states nine of which are specifically named. Their placid contentment was now and then rudely disturbed by the appearance of invaders from the upper provinces. The Rāma-epic records a tradition that the Vaṅgas acknowledged the supremacy of the ruler of Ayodhyā. The people of the lower Ganges sometimes fought for their independence but occasionally "followed a cain-like course as against a river torrent." The Great Epic refers to victorious campaigns undertaken by Karna, Krishṇa, and Bhīmasena in these parts of India. Karna is said to have vanquished the Suhmas, the Punḍras, and the Vaṅgas, and constituted Vaṅga and Anga into one vishaya of which he was the Adhyakṣa or ruler. Krishṇa defeated both the Vaṅgas and the Paṇḍras. His wrath was specially directed towards the "false" Vāsudeva, lord of the Paṇḍras, who is said to have united Vaṅga, Punḍra, and Kirāta into a powerful kingdom, and entered into an alliance with Jarāsandha of Magadhā. Before he met his doom at the hands of Krishṇa, Paṇḍraka-Vāsudeva had to suffer humiliation at the hands of the Pāṇḍu princes. Bhīmasena, in the course of his eastern campaign, subdued all the local princes of Bengal including Samudrasena, his son Chandrasena, and the great lord of the Punḍras himself. In many respects Paṇḍraka-Vāsudeva was a remarkable figure, and may be looked upon as the epic precursor of the Gauḍa conquerors of the seventh and eighth centuries. In the end both the Vaṅgas and the Paṇḍras had to bring tribute to the court of Yudhisṭhīra.

While suffering much at the hands of conquerors from upper India, the Bengal kings availed themselves of opportunities to wreak vengeance on their tormentors. They took part in the internecine strife of the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus, and appear in the battle books of the Mahābhārata as allies of Duryodhana. The Bhīshma-parvan gives a thrilling account of a lively encounter between a scion of the Pāṇḍus and the "mighty ruler of the Vaṅgas":

"Beholding that lance levelled at Duryodhana, the lord of the Vaṅgas quickly arrived on the scene with his elephant that towered like a mountain. He covered the Kuru king's chariot with the body of the animal. Ghatotkacha, with eyes reddened with rage, flung his upraised missile at the beast. Struck with the dart the elephant bled profusely and fell down dead. The rider quickly jumped down from the falling animal"

and Duryodhana rushed to his rescue.

1 n. 10. 87.
While some of the Bengal kings fought on elephants, others rode on "ocean-bred steeds of the hue of the moon." Their dhvajas or standards are also referred to in the epic.

While epic stories recall the military prowess of Bengal rulers "of fierce energy," the Pāli chronicles of Ceylon preserve memories of another field of their activities. A prince named Sihabahu, who inherited the kingdom of Vanga from a maternal ancestor, renounced his claims in favour of a relation, and built a new city in the kingdom of Lāla which came to be known as Sihapura. The new metropolis has been identified by some with Sihar in Kāthiāwār, and the territory in which it lay, with Lāta. But Kāthiāwār was known in ancient times as Surāśṭra, and not as Lāta. The close association with Vaṅga suggests that Lāla of the Pāli chronicles is Lādha of the Jaina Sūtras and Rādhā of Sanskrit records. There is a place in Rādhā known as Singur which is taken by some to represent the Simhapura of the Island Chronicles.¹

The eldest son of Sihabahu was Vijaya. The prince incurred the displeasure of his father and his people by his evil ways, and had to go into exile. With his followers he sailed in a ship to Sopara, north of Bombay. But the violence of his attendants alienated the people of the locality. The prince had to embark again, and eventually "landed in Lākā, in the region called Tambapani." The date assigned by the Ceylonese tradition to the arrival of Vijaya and his "lion-men" (Sihalas) in the island is the year of the Parinirvāṇa according to the reckoning of Ceylon (544 B.C.). But it is difficult to say how far this date can be relied upon² or what amount of historical truth is contained in the story. It may be based upon some genuine tradition relating to the early political relations between Bengal and Ceylon, or may be simply an echo of the later colonial enterprises emanating from Bengal to the over-sea territories towards the south and the south-east.

The few scattered notices of Bengal collected above are but poor substitutes of history. But they enable us to form some general conclusions: First, that the early settlers in Bengal and Orissa

¹ JASB. 1910, p. 604; for other views see CHI. i. xxv; see also IHQ. ii (1926), p. 6; ix (1938), pp. 784 ff. Singur is a notable place in the Hooghly district (Hunter, m. 307).

² In the time of the Periplus (60-80 A.D.) the island was still known as Taprobane (Tambapani or Tamraparni), and Palasimundu. It is only in the Geography of Ptolemy that we come across the new name Salik along with the older designations (Taprobane and Simoundou). The inhabitants of Salik were known to Ptolemy as Salai, doubtless the Sihalas of Ceylonese tradition. The name Shihala is also met with in the Nāgarjunikonda inscriptions of about the third century A.D.
were closely allied tribes of non-Aryan origin, but a gradual process of Aryan infiltration began in the first millennium B.C. Secondly, that there were settled governments in Bengal long before the commencement of the historic period. Thirdly, that the country was normally divided into a number of states some of which occasionally grew very powerful. Lastly, that the kingdoms of Bengal had intimate relations with her immediate neighbours on the west.
CHAPTER III

EARLY HISTORY FROM 326 B.C. TO 320 A.D.

The veil of darkness that enshrouds the early history of Bengal is partially lifted in the latter half of the fourth century B.C. A considerable portion of the country now constitutes the domain of a powerful nation, whose sway extended over the whole of ancient Vanga, and possibly some adjoining tracts. Greek and Latin writers refer to the people as the Gangeridai (variant Gandaridai). The Sanskrit equivalent of the term is difficult to determine. Classical scholars take the word to mean "the people of the Ganges region." Curtius, Plutarch, and Solinus agree in placing them on the further, that is the eastern, bank of the Ganges. Diodorus, too, in one passage locates "the dominions of the nation of the Praisioi and the Gandaridai," whose king had 4,000 elephants trained and equipped for war, beyond the Ganges. This accords with the statements of Curtius and Plutarch. There is, however, another passage of Diodorus where it is stated that

"This river (Ganges), which is 80 stades in width, flows from north to south and empties into the ocean, forming the boundary towards the east of the tribe of the Gandaridai who possesses the largest number of elephants . . . 4,000 elephants equipped for war."

This has been taken by some writers to imply that the territory of the Gandaridai (Gangeridai) lay to the west of the Ganges, understanding by the term the Bhāgirathi or the Hooghly. But Diodorus himself does not make it clear in this passage as to whether he means by the Ganges the westernmost branch or the easternmost one. A third passage of the same writer seems to suggest that the easternmost branch that separates our country from Further India, that is Indo-China, is meant. The passage is quoted below:

"India . . . is inhabited by very many nations among which the greatest of all is that of the Gandaridai, against whom Alexander did not undertake an expedition, being deterred by the multitude of their elephants. This region is separated from Further India by the greatest river in those parts, for it has a breadth of 80 stadia, but it adjoins the rest of India which Alexander had conquered."

The river mentioned in this passage as having "a breadth of 80 stadia" and forming the boundary between Further India and

---

1 M'Cride, Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, 221, 310; Megasthēnes and Arrian (1996), p. 100.
2 xxvii. 32.
3 xii. 37.
4 xxvii. 6.
the Gangaridai is doubtless the Ganges. In the light of this evidence it is more reasonable to identify the stream which, according to a passage quoted earlier, forms the boundary towards the east of the tribe of the Gangaridai, with the easternmost branch of the Ganges rather than with the westernmost mouth of the river.

Incidentally the passages quoted from Diodorus seem to imply that the famous Sicilian writer uses the term Gandaridai (Gangaridai) in two different senses. In its restricted sense he confines it to the easternmost part of India, while in its wider sense he means by it the whole country between the part of "India which Alexander had conquered" and Further India. It is the restricted sense of the term which alone is known to the natural historians and geographers of classical antiquity. Pliny tells us\(^1\) that the final part of the course of the Ganges is through the country of the Gangarides. Ptolemy says\(^2\) that "all the country about the mouths of the Ganges is occupied by the Gangaridai." He mentions Tamalites separately in a way that implies connection with the territory of the Mandalai and Palibothra (Pātaliputra) rather than with the Gangaridai. The truth seems to be that while Greek and Latin historians and geographers in general restricted the dominion of the Gangaridai to the territory about the mouths of the Ganges (Gangārāroto'ntara of the Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa), and one great authority seems to distinguish it from Tamalites (Tāmralipti), Diodorus sometimes uses the term in an extended sense to mean the entire territory between the Hyphasis (Beas) and the borders of Further India or the Trans-Gangetic peninsula. This peculiar use of the term by the Sicilian writer explains why in certain passages the king of the Prasioi\(^3\) and the Gangaridai is sometimes referred to simply as the king of the Gangaridai.\(^4\) The reference to the possession of 4,000 elephants by the king of the Prasioi and the Gangaridai in Book xvii, and by the Gangaridai in Book ii, Ch. 37, suggests that the Gangaridai of Book ii are not the Gangaridae proper of the lower Ganges valley, but the united nation of the Prasioi and the Gangaridai of Book xvii. The extended meaning given to the name Gangaridai (Gangaridai) by Diodorus may have been due in part to the presence in upper India of a city called Gange\(^5\) whose existence is vouched for by Artemidoros and Strabo. This city must be carefully distinguished from Gange, the royal

\(^1\) *Magasthenes* and *Arrion*, 137; *Monahan, EHB.* 5.

\(^2\) *New edition, p. 172.*

\(^3\) The name appears in various slightly differing forms in classical writings (cf. *CHI.* i. 468, fn. 1). The form 'Prasioi' is adopted in this chapter.

\(^4\) *E.g. xvii. 93.*

\(^5\) *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature,* 77.
residence of the Gangaridai, mentioned by Ptolemy and apparently by the author of the Periplus.

It is not easy to determine the precise boundary line between the Gangaridai proper and the people styled the Prasioi who had their capital at Pāṭaliputra. The evidence of Ptolemy suggests that in his days, or in those of the writers on whom he relies, the kingdom, of which Pāṭaliputra was the royal residence, apparently extended as far as the Ganges and may have included Tamralipti. The Gangaridai lay beyond this territory. The exact political relationship between the Prasioi and the Gangaridai in the days of Alexander is not free from a certain amount of ambiguity. This is due in part to the somewhat equivocal language used by the classical historians or their translators. Curtius refers to the Gangaridae and the Prasioi as two nations under one king, Agrammes, but immediately afterwards makes Poros testify to the "strength of the nation and kingdom" which words imply a united realm and not a dual monarchy. Diodorus, too, speaks of the nation of the Prasioi and the Gandaridai whose king was Xandrames. The people over whom this prince ruled is farther on represented simply as the Gandaridai, a use of the term whose significance has been sought to be explained above. Plutarch refers to "the kings of the Gandaridai and the Prasioi" implying the existence of a plurality of such rulers. They were reported to be waiting for Alexander with an army of 80,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 8,000 war chariots, and 6,000 fighting elephants. As the king mentioned by Curtius and Diodorus had only 20,000 horse, 200,000 infantry, 2,000 four-horsed chariots and 3,000 or 4,000 elephants, the additional forces mentioned by Plutarch may, in the opinion of some, point to an extra contingent furnished by a second prince who may be identified with the king of the Gangaridae proper if the first ruler was the monarch of the Prasioi. It is, however, worthy of notice that the number of foot soldiers remains constant in the three accounts. As regards the number of elephants, the discrepancy between the accounts of Curtius and Diodorus suggests divergence of tradition rather than reinforcement by an additional contingent. The bloated number of chariots and horses in the pages of Plutarch is capable of a similar explanation. It is significant that a few lines farther on Plutarch, too, like Curtius and Diodorus, speaks of the "whole country" beyond the Ganges which "Alexander could easily have taken possession of" as the domain of "the king" who "was hated and despised by his subjects for the wickedness of his disposition and the meanness of his origin"—characteristics which cannot fail to recall the famous description of Agrammes by Curtius and of Xandrames by Diodorus. The epithet, "son of a barber," and
sovereignty over the Prasioi undoubtedly point to the identification of the ruler in question with a king of the Nanda line, the nāpita-kumāra of the Parīśiṣṭa-parvan of Hemachandra, or his son.

It may reasonably be inferred from the statements of the Greek and Latin writers that about the time of Alexander's invasion, the Gangaridai were a very powerful nation, and either formed a dual monarchy with the Prasioi, or were otherwise closely associated with them on equal terms in a common cause against the foreign invader.

When Alexander reached the Beas and was eager to cross over to the Ganges valley, the information reached his ears that the king or kings of the Gangaridai and the Prasioi were awaiting his attack with a powerful army. The shock of battle was narrowly missed. The war-worn veterans of the Macedonian king persuaded their leader to trace back his steps to the Hydaspes and ultimately to Babylon.

After the withdrawal of Alexander, the Greek menace was evanescent for several generations. Chandragupta welded the major part of India into one empire. The evidence of Greek as well as Buddhist writers seems to suggest that the authority of the great Mauryas was acknowledged in deltaic as well as in northern Bengal.

The Brāhmī record at Mahāsthān, which is usually assigned to the Maurya period, refers to Pundranagara as a prosperous city. It undoubtedly enjoyed the blessings of good government. Its store-house was filled with coins styled gandakas and hākanikas which were at the service of the people in times of emergency due to water, fire, and pests. The reference to coins in this old inscription is of peculiar interest. As is well known, numerous punch-marked coins have been discovered in various parts of Bengal.1

The discovery of terracotta figurines of the Śunga period at Mahāsthānaghar proves that the city of Pundravardhana continued to flourish even after the fall of the imperial Mauryas. The site of Silua in the Noakhali district has yielded fragments of a colossal image the pedestal of which bore an inscription assigned by archaeologists to the second century B.C.2 The accounts of the Periplus and Ptolemy seem to indicate that in the first two centuries of the Christian era the whole of deltaic Bengal was organised into a powerful kingdom with its capital at Gange, a great market-town on the banks of the Ganges. This city of Gange is placed by Ptolemy considerably to the south-east of "T(h)amalites"

---

1 Cf. Ch. xvi infra.

or Tāmralipti (about whose exact position his information does not seem to be accurate), below the junction of the branches of the Ganges leading to the Mega (possibly the Hooghly) and Kamberikhon mouths respectively. The capital, which thus probably lay in Central Bengal, produced muslin of the finest sort which was much prized by the peoples of the west. There were gold mines in the vicinity. The Periplus refers to a gold coin which is called Calitis.

The reference to gold mines is interesting. One cannot fail to be reminded of the “Gold District” (Suvarṇa-viṭṭha) of a Faridpur Grant, and also of the “Gold Village” (Suvarṇa-grāma) which replaced older Vikramapura as the capital of Vāṅga in the latter half of the thirteenth century A.D. As to the gold coin it is to be noted that a coin made of the precious metal has been unearthed at Mahāsthānaghar representing the standing bearded figure of Kanishka on the obverse and Nannaia on the reverse. It is, however, difficult to say whether the coin mentioned in the Periplus was issued by the imperial government of the Kushānas, or some local administration in the Gangetic delta.

‘Kushāna’ coins have been discovered in several places in Bihar, Bengal, and Orissa. It is a debatable question whether these finds indicate any suzerainty of the Kushāna kings over these territories. Coins, as we know, travel by way of trade far beyond the limits of the kingdom where they are issued. In the absence of any corroborative evidence, therefore, it is not easy to say whether Bengal or any part of it ever formed a province of the Kushāna empire.

The next glimpse of the political condition of Bengal is afforded by the inscriptions of the age of Samudragupta. They disclose the existence of new kingdoms in place of the traditional realms mentioned in the epics and the early literature of the Jaines and the Buddhists. In Eastern Bengal rose the kingdom of Samatata. In Western Bengal we have the kingdom of Pushkaraṇa with its capital probably at Pokharnā in the Bankura district. It was ruled by Simhavarman towards the close of the third or beginning of the fourth century A.D. and then by his son Chandravarman. Chandravarman seems to have been a mighty warrior who extended his dominions eastwards as far as the Faridpur district. For the protection of the newly acquired territory he founded a fortress styled Chandravarma-koṭa.

It would appear that the general political condition of Bengal at the beginning of the fourth century A.D. was not probably very

---

1 ASI. 1920-24, Part II, 258. It is probably an imitation of the issues of Kanishka which were in circulation in a later age in Eastern India.
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different from that depicted in the epics. A number of sturdy states, sheltered by the great barriers of rivers and swamps, constituted its most prominent characteristic. Events, to be described later on, also show that, in this age, as in earlier times, they could occasionally form closer political associations and join hands to fight a common external aggressor.
CHAPTER IV

RISE OF GAUDĀ AND VANGA (320-650 A.D.)

I. BENGAL UNDER THE IMPERIAL GUPTAS

The establishment of the Gupta empire marks the end of the independent existence of the various states that flourished in Bengal at the beginning of the fourth century A.D. With the exception of Samatāta, the rest of Bengal was definitely incorporated in the Gupta empire by the time of Samudragupta. The ruler of Samatāta, to quote the conventional and characteristic court-language of the Guptas, ‘gratified the emperor Samudragupta by payment of all kinds of tribute, by obedience to his commands and by approach for paying court to him.’ In other words, Samatāta was a tributary state, acknowledging the suzerainty of the Gupta Emperor, but with full autonomy in respect of internal administration. The exact limits of Samatāta cannot be ascertained, but it may be taken as roughly equivalent to Eastern Bengal.

Whether the subjugation of Bengal took place during the reign of Samudragupta, or was accomplished wholly or even partly by his father, is difficult to decide. An inscription engraved on an iron pillar at Meherauli, near the Qutb Minār at Delhi, mentions, among other military exploits of a king called Chandra, that he ‘exterminated in battle in the Vanga countries his enemies who offered him a united resistance.’ In the absence of full details about this king Chandra, his identity is a matter of great uncertainty and has formed a subject of keen controversy among scholars. He has been identified, for example, both with Chandragupta I and Chandragupta II. In the former case we must hold that the father of Samudragupta had already added Vanga to the Gupta empire. In

---

1 Allahabad Pillar Ins. 1. 22. CII. iii. 8, 14.
2 For boundaries of Samatāta, see supra p. 17 and infra p. 85, fn. 4.
3 The question whether the Guptas ruled in Bengal before Chandragupta has been discussed infra pp. 69-70.
4 CII. iii. 141.
5 Fleet (CII. iii. 140, fn. 1); Dr. R. G. Basak (HNI. 146); Dr. S. K. Aiyangar (JIH. vi. University Supplement, 14-22).
6 Hoernle (IA. xxi. 45). Formerly V. A. Smith also held this view (JRAAS. 1907, p. 1; EII. 3rd ed., p. 290, fn. 1).
7 Vanga countries (Vangeshu) may mean Vanga (Eastern and Southern Bengal) and other parts of Bengal, or different principalities in Vanga.
the latter case, it must be presumed that Vanga had shaken off the yoke of the Gupta empire, and the son of Samudragupta had to reconquer the province by defeating the combination of the peoples or different states of Bengal.

There is, however, no definite evidence that Chandra of the Meherauli inscription is either Chandragupta I or Chandragupta II, and he may be altogether a different person whose identity yet remains to be established.\(^1\)

In spite of the uncertainty of the data furnished by the Meherauli Iron Pillar inscription, it shows that although Bengal was divided into a number of independent states they did combine and offer a vigorous resistance against a foreign invader named Chandra. The latter was either one of the two Gupta Emperors named Chandragupta, or an earlier ruler whose aggressive policy helped the Guptas by weakening the resources of Bengal and its power of resistance. The latter hypothesis appears more probable, and it is not unlikely that the original kingdom of the Guptas included a portion of Bengal which provided them a basis for further conquests (see infra pp. 69-70).

Evidence is not altogether lacking that Samudragupta himself carried his victorious arms into Bengal. For among the kings of Aryavarta, who were, according to the Allahabad Prasasti, uprooted by Samudragupta, we find the name of Chandravarman who may be reasonably identified with the king of that name mentioned in the Susunia inscription as ruler of Pushkarana.\(^2\) This Pushkarana has been plausibly identified with the village named Pokharnā, 25 miles north-east of Susunia on the south bank of the river Dāmodar, which has yielded considerable antiquities reaching back to the Gupta period, if not earlier.\(^3\) Chandravarman may thus be regarded as the king of Rādhā or the region immediately to its south,

---

\(^1\) MM. Haraprasād Śāstri identifies this king with king Chandravarman, one of the nine kings of Aryavarta defeated by Samudragupta as mentioned in his Allahabad Pillar inscription. He holds that this Chandravarman is the same king who is referred to in the Susunia Rock inscription as son of Simhavarman, ruler of Pushkarana, and believes further, on the strength of an inscription found at Mandāsa, that Pushkarana, where this family of kings ruled, is to be located at Pokharan in the Jodhpur State. MM. Śāstri’s view has been accepted by V. A. Smith and R. D. Banerji: MM. H. P. Śāstri (EI. xii. 815 ff.; xiii. 185; IA. 1913, pp. 917 ff.); V. A. Smith (EHI. 4th ed., p. 907, l.n. 1); R. D. Banerji (EI. xiv. 307 ff.).

Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri holds that Chandra may be one of the “two kings named Sāḍa-Chandra and Chandrānśa mentioned among the post-Andhran kings of Nāga lineage” in the Purāṇa (PHAI. 4th ed., p. 449). None of these proposals, however, is supported by convincing arguments.

\(^2\) IHQ. i. 254-55; PHAI. 4th ed., p. 448.

\(^3\) ASI. 1927-28, pp. 188-89.
by defeating whom Samudragupta paved the way for the conquest of Bengal.

Whatever view we might take of the actual process of the conquest of Bengal, the epigraphic records leave no doubt that in the days of Kumāragupta I Northern Bengal formed an important administrative division of the Gupta empire under the name of Pundravaradhana-bhukti. It was placed in charge of a Governor appointed by the Emperor himself. The Governor, in his turn, appointed officers to take charge of the various districts into which the province was divided. It is to be noted, however, that occasionally even the district officer seems to have been appointed directly by the Gupta Emperor.

The Dāmodarpur copper-plates of Budhagupta indicate that Northern Bengal formed an integral part of the great Gupta empire down to the end of the fifth century A.D. Another inscription from Dāmodarpur, dated in the year 544 A.D., refers to a suzerain ruler, whose name ended in -gupta, but whose proper name is lost. In that year the son of the Emperor was acting as his Governor in Pundravaradhana-bhukti. It appears very probable that the overlord in question belonged to the dynasty of the Later Guptas who claimed suzerainty over Northern Bengal down to the end of the sixth century A.D.

Although Samataṭa was a semi-independent feudatory state in the time of Samudragupta, it seems to have been gradually incorporated into the Gupta empire, for in the year 507-8 A.D. Mahārāja Vainyagupta was the ruler of this region, and granted lands in the Tippera district. He issued gold coins and assumed the title Dvādasāditya. Although he is titled Mahārāja in his own record, he is given the title Mahārājādhirāja in a seal discovered.

---

1 Dhamaiyāna cp. Year 113 (489-90 A.D.), EI. xvii. 345; Bagrampur cp. Year 128 (447-48 A.D.), EI. xxi. 78; Damodarpur cp. Nos. 1 and 2, Years 124, 128 (EI. xv. 190 ff.); SPP. xxix. 189).
2 Nos. 3 and 4 (EI. xv. 134 ff.); see also Paharpur cp. dated 150 A.D. (EI. xx. 61; SPP. xxxix. 143).
3 No. 5. EI. xv. 141 ff. Date corrected in EI. xvii. 193.
4 It has been suggested that the overlord in question was Vainyu Gupta, a large number of whose coins have been found with the legend 'Chandrāditya' on the reverse (EHBP. 13-14).
5 Gunighar cp. IHQ. vi. (1850), pp. 40 ff. It records a grant of land from the victorious camp of Kripura by Mahārāja Vainyagupta, who mediates on the feet of Mahādeva, at the request of Mahārāja Rudradatta, a slave to his feet in the Year 188 current (507-8 A.D.). The land granted must have been in the neighbourhood of Gunighar (Gunikkāghārā of the ins.) where the plate was found, about eighteen miles to the north-west of Comilla.
6 Cf. IHQ. xx. 76 ff.
at Nalanda.\footnote{ASI. 1050-54. p. 230.} The exact status of Vainyaguptâ is difficult to determine. The most reasonable view seems to be that he was a member of the Imperial Gupta family and acted at first as a \emph{de facto} independent ruler whose dominions included Eastern Bengal. Subsequently, taking advantage of the decline of the Imperial Guptas, and also perhaps of the internal disunion and discord, he declared himself openly as the Emperor.\footnote{IHQ. ix. 784 ff.; 986 ff.; vol. x. 154 ff.} In any case, his career proves the direct Gupta rule over Samata at the beginning of the sixth century A.D. Kriputâ, the place from which he issued his land-grant in 507-8 A.D., was evidently the seat of his government. It has not yet been identified, but is possibly to be looked for in Bengal.

Of Suhma or Radha, the remaining part of Bengal, we have no detailed information for the period during which it was subject to the Gupta rule.\footnote{No Gupta records have been found in Radha. Gupta coins have been discovered at Kalighat, Hooghly and Jessore (Allan, CCBM. CXXXV ff.; JASB. ix. 148 ff.). As will be shown infra p. 62, Radha was probably administered by Vijayasena, a Governor of Vainyagupta at the beginning of the sixth century A.D.}

\section{Independent Kingdoms in Bengal}

The different stages in the decline and downfall of the Gupta empire have not yet been fixed with any degree of certainty. There is, however, no doubt, that it showed visible signs of decline towards the beginning of the sixth century A.D.

Apart from what we know of the general political condition in Northern India, this may also be inferred from the assumption of higher rank by the Governor of Pundravardhana (North Bengal)\footnote{In the two Damodarpur spp. (Nos. 1 and 2) of the reign of Kumarak Gupta, the Governor of Pundravardhana is called simply \textit{aparîka}, but in those of Budhagupta (Nos. 3 and 4) and a later one (No. 5) he is called \textit{Uparîka-Mahârîja}.} and the fact that Vainyagupta was ruling as practically an independent king in Eastern Bengal. Within half a century the death-blow was dealt to the mighty Gupta empire by the sweeping victories of Yasodharman. In his Mandasar inscription this great military adventurer, who suddenly leapt to fame and power, proudly claims to have extended his conquests as far as the Brahmaputra river.\footnote{Mandasar Ins. i. 5. (OII. iii. 146).} How far the boasts of Yasodharman were founded on fact it is difficult to say. But in any case the empire of Yasodharman was a short-lived one and no trace of it was to be found after the
middle of the sixth century A.D. The Gupta empire, already weakened by the inroads of the Hūnas, collapsed before the onslaughts of Yaśodharman.

The fall of the Gupta empire, and the failure of Yaśodharman to rebuild one on a durable basis, led to the political disintegration of Northern India marked by the rise of a number of independent powers. The more prominent of these were the Pushyabhūtis of Sthānvivāra (Thaneswar), the Maukharis of Kosala or Oudh and the Later Guptas of Magadha and Malwa. The Later Guptas may have been an offshoot of the Imperial Guptas, but as yet we have no positive evidence in support of this view. They, however, continued the traditions of the Gupta sovereignty in the central and eastern part of the Gupta empire. Bengal also took advantage of the political situation to shake off the foreign yoke and two powerful independent kingdoms viz., Vanga and Gauḍa were established there in the sixth century A.D.

III. The Kingdom of Samātā or Vaṅga

The first independent kingdom that arose in Bengal on the ruins of the Gupta empire seems to have comprised originally the Eastern and Southern Bengal and the southern part of Western Bengal. Two of its important provinces administered by Governors were Vardhamāna-bhukti and Navyāvākāśikā (or Suvarṇavīthī),\(^1\) roughly corresponding respectively to Western and Southern Bengal. It is highly probable that the headquarters of the rulers themselves were in East Bengal and that it was directly under their administration.

Five inscriptions\(^2\) discovered at or near Koṭālipāḍā in the district of Faridpur and one in the Burdwan district\(^3\) reveal the existence of three rulers of this kingdom named Gopachandra, Dharmāditya and Samāchāradeva. The title Mahārājādhirāja assumed by all

---

\(^1\) See supra p. 46.

\(^2\) Three of these were edited by F. E. Pargiter in *IA. xxxix* (1910), pp. 193-216. These are (1) the Grant of Dharmāditya, Year 3; (2) Second Grant of the same king; and (3) Grant of Gopachandra, Year 18 (for date cf. *HNI*. 191). The fourth Grant, the Ghuṛghāṭi cr. of Samāchāradeva was edited by R. D. Banerji (*JASB*. N.S. vi. 429); Pargiter (*JASB*. N.S. vii. 476); and Dr. N. K. Bhattasali (*El. xviii*. 74 ff.). Mr. R. D. Banerji held that “all these four grants are forgeries” (*JASB*. N.S. vi. 429 ff.; vii. 499 ff.; *El. xxii*. 443 ff.). Dr. Bloch also regarded the copper-plate of Samāchāradeva as spurious. (*ASI*. 1907-8, p. 856). Pargiter opposed this view (*JASB*. N.S. vii. 499; *JIRAS*. 1912, pp. 710 ff) and their genuineness is no longer doubted by any scholar. The fifth copper-plate issued in Year 7 of Samāchāradeva, and found at Kurpālā, is yet unpublished.

\(^3\) Mallasāhur cr. of Gopachandra, Year 8. (*El. xxiii*. 165).
these kings proves that they were independent and powerful. This title, in contrast to the subordinate title of Mahârâja applied to Vainayagupta, who ruled shortly before them and perhaps over the same locality, undoubtedly indicates a changed status and the disappearance of the last vestige of the imperial authority of the Guptas over this region. The issue of gold coins by Samâchâradeva supports the same conclusion.

A connection between the old and the new kingdom seems to be established by the fact that one Mahârâja Vijayasena was probably a vassal chief both of Vainayagupta and of Gopachandra. The identity of the person of this name serving under these two kings cannot be definitely proved, but it is generally accepted, and we may assume, therefore, that there was no long interval between the reigns of Vainayagupta (507-8 A.D.) and Gopachandra. If we assume further, as seems very likely, that Vijayasena, who ruled over the Vardhamâna-bhakti under Gopachandra, also held the same office under Vainayagupta, we may reasonably conclude that Vainayagupta ruled over Eastern, Southern and Western Bengal, and that this imperial province of the Guptas constituted an independent kingdom under Gopachandra and his successors.

Neither the relationship between the three kings Dharmâditya, Gopachandra and Samâchâradeva nor their order of succession can

---

1 For gold coins of Samâchâradeva cf. JASB. N.S. xix. Num. Suppl., 54 ff. The inference derived from the legends of these coins that Samâchâradeva was a vassal of Śaṅkha (IC. iv. 225) must be definitely rejected. It rests upon the very doubtful reading Śri Narendravainata on the reverse of the coin described by V. A. Smith in IMC. i. 120, pl. xvi. 11. Smith said that the three letters following Narendra “look like vinata,” but Allan has read the legend as Narendraditya (CCBM. 149), and the legend on the reverse of the other type of coins of Samâchâradeva has been read with certainty by both Smith (op. cit. 122) and Allan (op. cit. 150) as Narendraditya.

Mr. R. D. Banerji, on the other hand, read the legend in both cases as Narendravainata (ASI. 1913-14, p. 250) and held that it cannot be anything else. With all due deference to Mr. Banerji’s emphatic assertion, the reading Narendraditya seems to me to be preferable, and we may reasonably hold that Samâchâradeva assumed the title Narendraditya in imitation of the Gupta kings. But even assuming that the reading ‘Narendravainata’ is correct, its interpretation as “fully subdued or obedient to Narendra,” and the identification of Narendra with Śaṅkha are of extremely doubtful character, to say the least of it. Against the inference based on a series of doubtful data must be placed the clear evidence of the inscriptions of Samâchâradeva that he was an independent monarch.

2 Vijayasena is the Dūtaka of the Gunaighar Grant and is described as Mahâpratihâra Mahâpâtopati Paścâdâikaraṇ-oparika and Mahârâja Śri-Mahâ-sâmosta (II. 15-16, IHQ. vi. 55). In the Mallasrul inscription, he is called Mahârâja, but he uses his own seal.

3 As to the contrary view (IC. vi. 106-7), cf. p. 58, f.n. 2, II. 4-10.
be definitely determined. Pargiter's view that Dharmāditya was the first king and "Gopachandra succeeded him, with no one intervening unless it was for a very short interval" is generally accepted. But if we assume the identity of Vijayasena, we should rather regard Gopachandra as the earliest of the three, and Dharmāditya as coming immediately after him. Samāchāradeva is generally regarded as having flourished after the other two, but it is difficult to say whether there were one or more intervening kings, at present unknown to us.

The existence of a few kings of this line, later than Samāchārdeva, is rendered probable by a large number of gold coins found mostly in different parts of Eastern Bengal, notably at Sabhar (Dacca district) and Kotālipāda (Faridpur district). These are rude and debased imitations of Gupta coins, sometimes found along with those of Saśānaka and Samāchāradeva, which have been referred to the sixth or seventh century A.D. Only two of these coins bear names of kings that can be read with some degree of certainty. The first is a rude copy of Gupta coin of Archer type with the letters 'Prithu vi (ra)' on the left, below the bow, and 'ja' between

---

1 *JA. 1910, pp. 206 ff.*
2 Mr. Pargiter (op. cit.) regarded Dharmāditya as earlier than Gopachandra on two grounds viz., (i) the use of earlier and later forms of y in their respective plates; (ii) the additional epitheta pratita dharmāśāla applied to the land-measurer Sivachandra in the plate of the latter. The first should never have been put forward as a serious argument, for experience has shown that palaeography does not offer a safe basis for comparative chronology within a short period of time, say, less than a century. This is clearly demonstrated in the present instance by the fact that in the Mallasāatrul cp. of Gopachandra the earliest of the three forms of y noted by Pargiter has been exclusively used, while the first plate of Dharmāditya (1. 27) shows a distinctly later form of i. The addition of epithets to Sivachandra may no doubt be cogently explained by his attainment of seniority in service, but may be due to purely personal predilections of the writer. It may also be argued that the epithets were done away with after Sivachandra had been sufficiently long in service when his name was too well-known to require any testimonial. In any case this cannot be regarded as a more cogent argument in support of the priority of Dharmāditya over Gopachandra than the identity of Vijayasena of the Gunaigbar and Mallasāatrul plates favouring the opposite view. For if Gopachandra ruled after Dharmāditya we have to assume that Vijayasena served as a Governor under Vainyagupta, Dharmāditya, Gopachandra and other kings, if any, who might have intervened between them. This is certainly not impossible, but less probable than the other view that Vijayasena served only two kings, Vainyagupta and Gopachandra. Although, therefore, no certain conclusion is possible, it seems more reasonable to take Gopachandra as earlier than Dharmāditya.

3 For these coins cf. *IMC. t. 190, 192 (pl. xvi. 11, 19); CCBM. cvii-cvii, 154, (pl. xiv. 17-19); JASB. N. S. xix. Num. Suppl. 55 ff; Ibid. xxx. Num. Suppl. 1 ff.*
The name of the king who issued it was probably, therefore, Prithuvira, Prithuavira or Prithuviraja.\footnote{Allan has described this unique coin in Numismatic Chronicle, Fifth Series, xiv. 835.}

The second coin belongs to a class of which several have been found. On most of them the legend has been read as Sudhanyã, but one appears to read Śri-Sudhanyāditya.\footnote{JASB. N. S. xix. Num. Suppl. 60.}

These kings, and others whose names are not recorded on the gold coins issued by them, presumably ruled in Vaṅga, and may be regarded as later rulers of the kingdom founded by Gopachandra. But nothing definite can be said about them until further evidence is forthcoming.

Gopachandra, who probably founded the independent kingdom, must have flourished not later than the second quarter of the sixth century A.D., i.e. within a generation of Vainyagupta, for as we have assumed above, Mahārāja Vijayasena was a vassal chief of both. The latest known dates of Gopachandra, Dharmāditya and Samāchāradeva are respectively the regnal years 18, 3 and 14. Their reigns may thus be placed approximately between 525 and 575 A.D. with the margin of a few years both at the beginning and at the end.

The six grants by these kings give interesting details about the provincial administration. All the records taken together undoubtedly imply that there was a free, strong, and stable government in Bengal which brought peace and prosperity to the people and made them conscious of their power and potentialities.

How and when this independent kingdom of Vaṅga came to an end is not known to us. We learn from the Mahākūta inscription\footnote{IA. xix. 7.} that the Chālukya king Kṛtivarman claimed to have conquered, among other countries, Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga and Magadha. As Kṛtivarman ceased to reign in 597-98 A.D., his conquests in Bengal may be placed in the last quarter of the sixth century A.D.

It is not impossible, therefore, that either Samāchāradeva, or one of his successors, was the adversary of Kṛtivarman. The nature and extent of Kṛtivarman’s success are not known, but it might have some effect on the break-up of the kingdom of Vaṅga.

It is not also unlikely that the rise of the kingdom of Gauda under Śaśāṅka dealt the final death-blow to the independent kingdom of Vaṅga. This point will be further discussed in connection with the history of Śaśāṅka (see infra p. 59).
The northern part of Western Bengal and the whole of Northern Bengal were evidently outside the dominions of Gopachandra and his successors. From about this period these territories came to be known as the Kingdom of Gauḍa, though this geographical term sometimes comprised the whole of Western Bengal.¹ Henceforth, throughout the Hindu period, Gauḍa and Vāṅga loosely denoted the two prominent political divisions of Bengal, the former comprising the Northern and either the whole or part of Western Bengal, and the latter, Southern and Eastern Bengal. Although actual political boundaries varied in different times, this rough geographical division persisted throughout the ages, but the names Punḍra or Varendra (Northern Bengal), Rādhā or Suhma (Western Bengal), and Samatā or Harikela (Eastern Bengal) were also used.

The hold of the Imperial Guptas was far stronger over Gauḍa than over Vāṅga or Samatā. This explains the difference in the political evolution of these two constituent parts of Bengal. For while Vāṅga regained its independence in the first half of the sixth century A.D., the history of Gauḍa was a more chequered one. As we have seen above (supra p. 49), one of the Dāmodarpur copper-plates proves the Gupta sovereignty over Northern Bengal at least up to 544 A.D. It is very likely that the Gupta sovereign was a member of the Later Guptas dynasty. The Later Guptas might or might not have been connected by blood with the Imperial Guptas, but they were, to begin with, in possession of a substantial portion of the Gupta empire. That their pretensions as successors of the Imperial Guptas were tacitly recognised is proved by reference to the ‘Gupta suzerainty’ in the records of the Parivrājaka rulers of Bundelkhand in the sixth century A.D.²

One of the Later Gupta kings, Mahāsenagupta, claims to have defeated Susthitavarmā king of Kāmarūpa) on the banks of the Lauhiṭya or Brahmaputra river.³ As he flourished towards the end of the sixth century A.D., it may be presumed that the suzerainty of

---

¹ For the extent of Gauḍa at different periods of history, see supra pp. 12-15. To the evidence cited there in order to show that Gauḍa included Rādhā and was situated close to the sea, the following may be added:

(i) According to the Kathāsaritāgāra, “in the country of Gaur there was a city Bardhamāna by name.” (Tawney’s transl. vi. 204).

(ii) The Gurgi Ins. of the 11th century A.D. states that ‘(out of fear of the Kalachuri king?) the lord of Gauḍa lies in the watery fort of the sea’ (Ed. xxx. 135).

² CII. ii. 95, 104, 107.

³ Aphaśāla Ins. ii. 10-11. CII. iii. 203, 206.
the Later Guptas continued over Northern Bengal throughout that century. This presumption is strengthened by the consideration that we know of no independent ruler of Gauḍa before the end of the sixth century A.D., and the first known independent king Śaṅkha, who flourished early in the seventh century A.D., probably began his life as a Mahāśāmanta, presumably under Mahāsenagupta. The probability, therefore, is that Gauḍa acknowledged the suzerainty of the Later Guptas down to the end of the sixth century A.D.

The Gupta suzerainty over Gauḍa during the sixth century A.D. does not appear to have been either peaceful or uninterrupted. If Yaśodharman really carried his triumphal march right up to the bank of the Brahmaputra river, as he claims, that event must have considerably weakened the power and position of the Guptas in Gauḍa. It is exceedingly likely that although the Gupta suzerainty in Gauḍa survived this catastrophe, it gradually became more nominal than real. That Gauḍa came to be regarded as an important political unit, by the middle of the sixth century A.D., is proved by the Haraha inscription of the Maukhari king Iśānavarman dated 554 A.D.¹ In v. 13 of this inscription the king claims to have defeated the lord of the Andhras and “made the Gauḍa people take shelter towards the sea-shore after causing their land territories to be deprived of their future prospects.”² The exact meaning of the expression is obscure, but the general purport seems to be clear. Iśānavarman, in course of his victorious campaigns, came into conflict with the Gauḍas, ravaged their territories, and forced them to retreat towards the sea. The reference to the sea, combined with the expedition of Iśānavarman to the Andhra country, seems to indicate that the conflict with the Gauḍas took place in the southern part of Western Bengal. Although this region was geographically included in Gauḍa, it was at the time of Iśānavarman’s conquest, probably a part of the kingdom of Vāṅga, founded by Gopachandra, as we have seen above (supra p. 52). It is thus difficult to decide whether Iśānavarman’s adversary was a ruler of Vāṅga or Gauḍa proper. In the latter case we must presume that the whole of Western Bengal then formed part of the kingdom of Gauḍa and the kingdom of Vāṅga came to be confined to Southern and Eastern Bengal.

The fight between Iśānavarman and the Gauḍas must then be regarded as an episode in the long-drawn struggle between the Maukharis and the Later Guptas. For it is well-known that one

¹ El. xiv. 110 ff.
² This passage has been differently (cf. supra p. 87, f.n. 8) interpreted. The translation quoted here is that of Dr. R. G. Basak, HNI. 111.
of the outstanding facts in the early history of the Later Guptas was the unceasing struggle with the Maukhari kings who coveted Magadha and Gauda, which adjoined their territories but formed part of the dominions of the former. It is not necessary, for our present purpose, to give a detailed account of this struggle, and a few salient facts must suffice. Isānavarman, the most powerful of the Maukhari kings, conquered a part of Magadha and defeated the Gaudas.\(^1\) The fact that his successors Śrīvarman and Avantivarman granted a village in the Shahabad district shows that they, too, were in possession of a part of Magadha.\(^2\) On the other hand, the Later Gupta king Kumāragupta defeated Isānavarman, and his son Dāmodara-gupta also defeated the Maukhari kings.\(^3\) It is thus evident that in the hereditary struggle between the Guptas and the Maukhari kings victory inclined alternately to the two sides none of which could claim any decisive success. But fortunes were more favourable to the next Gupta king Mahāsenagupta who carried his victorious arms up to the Lauhitya or Brahmaputra river, if not beyond it, and defeated Susthitavarman, king of Kāmarūpa.\(^4\) Now, whether the home territory of Mahāsenagupta was Mālwa or Magadha,\(^5\) a point on which opinions differ, it is evident that both Magadha and Gauda formed part of his dominions and he put an end to the Maukhari aggression in these territories. This is confirmed by the fact that no other Maukhari king is known to have any pretensions of suzerainty over them. As the recorded dates

\(^1\) Haraha Ins., El. xiv. 110 ff.
\(^2\) Deo-Baranakr Ins. of Jivitagupta II, l. 15, CII. iii. 210, 218. The ins. is fragmentary and the interpretation is conjectural.
\(^3\) Apsadh Stone Ins. of Adityasena, II. 7-8, CIII. iii. 203, 204.
\(^4\) See supra p. 55, f.n. 3 and JASB. N.S. xvii. 921. Dr. R. K. Mookerji held (Harsha, 25, f.n. 1) that Susthitavarman belonged to the Maukheri dynasty. But as R. D. Banerji has shown, this is certainly erroneous (JBOBS. xiv. 255). In spite of Dr. Mookerji’s arguments to the contrary (JBOBS. xv. 252 ff), it is now generally held that Susthitavarman was king of Kāmarūpa.
\(^5\) Originally the scholars held that the Later Guptas ruled in Magadha, and Fleet designates them as Guptas of Magadha (CII. iii. Introduction, p. 14). Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri pointed out that according to Deo-Baranakr Ins. of Jivitagupta II, the Maukhari kings Śrīvarman and Avantivarman held a considerable part of Magadha. He, therefore, held that “after the loss of Magadha the Later Guptas were apparently confined to ‘Mālava’ till Mahāsenagupta once more pushed his conquests as far as the Lauhitya” (PHAI. 2nd ed., p. 378, f.n. 8). Dr. R. K. Mookerji (Harsha, 60, 67), C. V. Vaidya (Hist. Mod. Hindu India, i. 80) and Dr. D. C. Ganguly (JBOBS. xix. 402) definitely locate the Later Gupta dynasty in Mālwa. Mr. R. D. Banerji controverted these views and tried to establish the older view that the Later Guptas ruled in Magadha (JBOBS. xiv. 254 ff). Mr. Banerji’s views have been challenged by Dr. R. K. Mookerji (JBOBS. xv. 251 ff) and Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri (JBOBS. xv. 651 ff). No definite conclusion on this point seems possible.
of Śravavarman and Avantivarman are respectively 553-54 and 569-70 A.D.; it may be presumed that the Maukharī menace was definitely over and Mahāsenagupta re-established his supremacy over Magadha and Gauda towards the close of the sixth century A.D.

The exact political status of Gauda during this period is difficult to determine. It is unlikely that the Later Gupta kings directly administered the territory. The probability is that it was ruled by a local chief who acknowledged their suzerainty. But by the beginning of the seventh century A.D., if not a few years earlier, Gauda formed an independent kingdom under Śaśānka, and Magadha also formed a part of his dominions. The rise of this independent kingdom was probably facilitated by the great calamity which befell Mahāsenagupta who, according to some scholars, was disastrously defeated by the Kalachuris. The extent of the calamity can be measured by the fact that in the year 595 A.D., Ujjayini, which was according to those scholars the capital of the Later Gupta kingdom of Mālava, was in possession of the Kalachuri king Śānkara-gana, and the two young sons of Mahāsenagupta were forced to live in the court of king Prabhākaravardhana of Thaneswar, whose mother Mahāsenaguptā was probably a sister of Mahāsenagupta. This reconstruction of the history of Mahāsenagupta cannot, of course, be regarded as certain, but, if true, it explains the rise of the independent kingdom of Gauda-Magadha out of the ruins of the Later Gupta empire. It also explains why Śaśānka, the founder of this independent kingdom, was involved in a war with the Maukharī king and the ruler of Kāmarūpa, the two great enemies of the Later Guptas, and formed an alliance with Devagupta, king of Mālava. In other words, the political traditions of the sixth century were continued in the seventh century A.D.

It is not also unlikely that the invasion of the Tibetan king Srong Tson dismembered the kingdoms of the Later Guptas in Eastern India and helped the rise of Śaśānka.

---

1 These dates are known from coins, cf. JRAS. 1906, p. 545. According to the reading of Mr. Dikshit the dates are respectively 577-78 and 578-80. The readings of the dates on coins are obviously conjectural and cannot be relied upon. (TK. 83-80).

2 This view is fully developed by Dr. D. C. Ganguly (JBOG. XXX. 465 ff.; IHQ. x. 461) who even goes so far as to assert that it was the Kalachuri king Buddhakarāja, son of Śānkara-gana (and not Devagupta, as is generally held), who defeated and killed Grahavarman, the Maukharī king, and imprisoned his queen Bājāpati at Kanauj. These statements are not, however, supported by any reliable evidence and are based on the assumption that the Kalachuris were the only rulers of Mālava from 595 A.D. to 659 A.D. for which there is no proof (cf. PHAI. 4th ed., p. 514, fn. 1).

3 See infra pp. 91-93.
factor towards the same end may be found in the conquest of Kīrtivarman, the Chālukya king. As noted above (supra p. 54), he claims to have conquered Aṅga, Vaiṅga, and Magadha, and this, if true, must have considerably weakened the position of the Later Guptas in Gauḍa and Magadha. Saśāṅka might have taken advantage of this catastrophe to set up an independent kingdom in Gauḍa. The reaction of these important factors on the politics of Bengal is difficult to determine in view of the paucity of definite data, and the consequent uncertainty of all conclusions. We shall not, therefore, dwell any more on these speculative theories, but treat the history of Gauḍa under Saśāṅka as an independent topic.

V. Saśāṅka

Saśāṅka occupies a prominent place in the history of Bengal. Unlike the three kings in lower Bengal who preceded him, he is more than a mere name to us. He is also the first known king of Bengal who extended his suzerainty over territories far beyond the geographical boundary of that province.

Of his early life and the circumstances under which he came to occupy the throne of Gauḍa we possess no definite information. A seal matrix cut in the rock of the hill-fort of Rohtasgarh records the name of ‘Śrī-Mahāsāmanta Saśāṅka’ i.e. ‘the illustrious great vassal Saśāṅka.’1 If this Saśāṅka be the same as Saśāṅka, king of Gauḍa, as has been usually held by scholars, it would follow that Saśāṅka began his life as a subordinate ruler. Who his overlord was, we do not definitely know, but from what has been said in the preceding section (see supra p. 56), it appears most reasonable to hold that this overlord was no other than Mahāsena Gupta. The theory that Saśāṅka was originally a subordinate vassal of the Maukhari kings,2 though not altogether improbable, is not supported by any convincing evidence. The view that Saśāṅka was also known as Narendragupta is based on insufficient grounds, and even if it were true, there is hardly any justification for the belief that he was connected with the Guptas.3

1 CII. iii. 284.
2 According to Dr. D. C. Ganguly, the Deo-Baranark Ins. “definitely settles that Saśāṅka was a feudatory of Avantivarman and probably for a short period of his son Grahavarman” (IHQ. xii. 467). His fundamental assumption that Avantivarman was in possession of Magadha throughout his reign lacks any evidence. As noted supra p. 56, the probability is that Mahāsena Gupta must have conquered Magadha, as otherwise he could hardly have proceeded up to the Brahmaputra river.
3 PHAI. 4th ed., 514, fn. 3; Allan, CCBM. lxiv. Mr. R. D. Banerji’s view
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All that we definitely know is that some time before 606 A.D. Sāśāṅka became the king of Gauda with his capital at Karpāsuvara, which has been identified with Rāṅgāmāti, six miles south-west of Berhampur in the Murshidabad district.¹

There is hardly any doubt that both Northern and Western Bengal were included in the dominions of Sāśāṅka. Whether they included also Southern and Eastern Bengal cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. While the distant military expeditions of Sāśāṅka lend colour to the supposition that he must have already conquered the whole of Bengal, there is no positive evidence in support of it. On the other hand, Hsüan Tzang’s reference to Śilabhadra, the Buddhist patriarch of Nālandā, as being a scion of the Brahmanical royal family of Samaṭāṭa,² may be held to prove the existence of Samaṭāṭa as a separate independent state in the first half of the seventh century A.D.

But whatever may be the extent of his rule in Bengal, Sāśāṅka’s dominions probably included Magadha from the very beginning, and he soon felt powerful enough to follow an aggressive foreign policy. He extended his suzerainty as far south as the Chilka Lake in Orissa. For, in a record dated in the year 619 A.D., Mahārāja Mahāśāṃanta Śri-Mādhavārāja (ii), the king of the Śilodbhava dynasty ruling over Koṅgoda, invokes the name of Sāśāṅka as the suzerain.³ Although the exact boundaries of Koṅgoda are not known, there is no doubt that it comprised the region round the Chilka Lake in Orissa, and probably extended south to the Ganjam district.⁴ In order to extend his power to the province of Koṅgoda, Sāśāṅka must have defeated the Māna chiefs whom we find in possession of the intervening territory in 602 A.D.⁵ The details of this or other campaigns that Sāśāṅka must have waged in the south are unknown to us.

We are more fortunate in respect of the campaigns of Sāśāṅka in Northern India. As his chief adversary was the great emperor Harshavardhana, we get some detailed information of him from Bāṇabhāṭṭa’s Harsha-charita and the account of the Chinese pilgrim Hsüan Tzang.

that Sāśāṅka was the son or nephew of Mahāsenagupta (BI. 105) has hardly any basis to stand upon.

¹ This view, propounded by Beveridge (JASB. 1893, pp. 815-328), is now generally accepted. Mr. M. Chakravarti, however, did not regard this identification as certain, and suggested that Karpāsuvara may be identified with Gauda or Lakhanawati (JASB. N.S. iv. (1906), pp. 880-81).
² Watters, ii. 109. For the probable existence of a Bhadra royal dynasty, cf. IC. ii. 785-97.
³ Ganjam Cp., EI. vi. 143 ff.
⁴ JAHRS. x. 7.
⁵ Ibid. 10-11.
It seems that the keynote of Śaśānka's foreign policy was to secure his dominions from the aggressive designs of the Maukhari rulers who had for three generations carried on a bitter struggle with the Later Guptas for the possession of Magadha and Gauda. The Maukharis had considerably improved their position by an alliance with the powerful rulers of Thaneswar, for the Maukhari king Graharvarman, the son of Avantivarman, had married Rājyaśrī, the daughter of Prabhākara-varadhana, the Pushyabhūti ruler of Thaneswar. The Maukharis were also freed from any danger from the side of the Later Guptas. For Mahāsenagupta was probably the maternal uncle of Prabhākara-varadhana, and in any case was definitely attached to his cause, as his two sons Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta were sent to the court of Thaneswar to act as companions of the two young princes, Rājyavaradhana and Harshavaradhana. The prospect of Śaśānka was, therefore, gloomy in the extreme. But he was not slow to take advantage of the political situation. It seems that by shrewd diplomacy he succeeded in winning over to his side king Devagupta of Mālava1 who had evidently taken possession of the dominions of Mahāsenagupta and was naturally hostile to the Thaneswar court for its alliance with the Maukharis, the hereditary enemies of his family. It is probable that Śaśānka had gradually extended his authority up to Benares before he decided to strike the final blow.2 The fatal illness of Prabhākara-varadhana gave the allies the required opportunity. The Mālava king defeated and killed Graharvarman and imprisoned his queen Rājyaśrī at Kanauj.3 His next move was an invasion of Thaneswar itself.4 As soon as these news reached Thaneswar, Rājyavaradhana, who had just ascended the throne on his father's death, marched against Devagupta with a hastily collected army of ten thousand cavalry, leaving his younger brother Harsha in charge of the kingdom.5

It is difficult to trace in exact sequence the course of events that rapidly followed. The only facts of which we are certain are that Rājyavaradhana defeated Devagupta, the Mālava king, and

---

1 This generally accepted view, based on the simultaneous hostile operations of Śaśānka and Devagupta against the Maukharis and the Pushyabhūtis, has been challenged by Dr. D. C. Ganguly, who has reconstructed the whole history of the period on an entirely new basis (IHQ. xiii. 461). But this has been sufficiently refuted by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri (PHAI. 4th ed., pp. 515-514).
2 MMK. Ch. 58. p. 684. MMK (J.). v. 715. III. p. 49.
3 HC. Tr. 178. There is no conclusive evidence that Kanauj was the capital of the Maukharis, but it seems to be the most reasonable assumption on the basis of evidence at present available to us. (cf. TK. 83-86).
4 HC. Tr. 178.
5 Ibid. 174-76.
captured a large part of his army, but before he could relieve Kanauj, or even establish any contact with his sister Rājyaśri, the widowed captive Maukharī queen, he was himself killed by Śaśānka. While both Bānabhaṭṭa and Hiuen Tsang agree that Rājyavardhana was treacherously murdered by or at the instance of Śaśānka, they give different accounts of the incident. Again, Harshavardhana’s own inscriptions tell us that Rājyavardhana met with his death in the house of his enemy owing to his adherence to a promise (aṣṭyāṇurodhena).

Apart from these conflicting versions, it is necessary to remember that the charge of treachery is brought against Śaśānka by two persons, Bānabhaṭṭa and Hiuen Tsang, whose writings betray a deep personal prejudice, amounting to hatred, against him. Besides, their story, on the face of it, is hardly credible. Hence some scholars are not disposed to accept at their face value the statements of the two contemporary writers about the treachery of Śaśānka.

The whole question has been discussed in an appendix to this chapter (see infra pp. 71-76) and need not be further dealt with here.

According to Bānabhaṭṭa, Rājyavardhana had started with ten thousand cavalry. Of this a part must have been lost in his fight with Devagupta, and a part was sent back with Bhaṇḍi in charge of the captured forces of Mālava. It is, therefore, extremely unlikely that he himself advanced against Śaśānka. The probability, rather, is that Śaśānka marched forward to help his ally Devagupta, but could not come to his rescue till it was too late. There is hardly any doubt that Śaśānka’s forces met those of Rājyavardhana. The latter with his reduced forces could hardly offer a successful resistance. Nor is it unlikely, in view of his subsequent conduct, that fluched with his successes, or unaware of Śaśānka’s approach, Rājyavardhana did not take adequate measures for resisting the new, and perhaps unexpected danger. In any case, it may be safely presumed, on the basis of known facts, that either he was defeated before he died, or that his chances of gaining a victory were very weak, even if contrary to what Bāṇa says, his irrational credulity did not lead to his death at the hands of Śaśānka, before the contest was finally decided.

The death of Rājyavardhana in 606 A.D. left Śaśānka the master of the situation. But he was prudent enough not to push his successes too far. His main object was accomplished by the complete discomfiture of the Maukharis, and we may presume that his aggressive campaign in the west was at an end.

---

1 *Ibid. 178.

2 *Ibid. 175.
As soon as the news of the death of Rājayavardhana reached Harshavardhana, he took a solemn vow to punish Śasāṅka, and marched with a vast army for taking vengeance upon the king of Gauḍa. On his way he met the messenger of Bhāskaravarman, king of Kāmarūpa, and concluded an alliance with him, presumably against the common enemy, Śasāṅka. Proceeding still further, he met Bhaṇḍī who told him about the details of Rājayavardhana’s murder and of the escape of his sister Rājyaśrī from the prison. Harsha thought it to be his first duty to find out his sister, and leaving the army in charge of Bhaṇḍī, he went out in search of her. After a great deal of difficulty he traced her in the Vindhya forest just in time to save her from an act of self-immolation in fire along with her companions. In the meantime Bhaṇḍī proceeded with the army against the Gauḍa king, and Harsha himself joined it on the bank of the Ganges after rescuing his sister. Of the further progress of his vast army and the development of his “everlasting friendship” with Bhāskaravarman, we possess no definite information, nor are the results of Harsha’s diplomatic and military preparations reported by either Bāṇabhaṭṭa or Hiuen Tsang.

The only reference to an actual conflict between Śasāṅka and Harsha occurs in Ārya-maṇjuśrī-mūlakalpa. It is a late Buddhist chronicle narrating history, like the Purāṇas, in the guise of prophecies regarding future political events. But the most curious feature of the book is the peculiar way in which it refers to the kings, either by the first letter of the name or by a synonym, but never by the full proper name. While the chronicle has no claim to be treated as historical, it can justly be regarded as a collection of old and genuine traditions preserved in the Buddhist world in the mediaeval age.

There are good grounds for the belief that king ‘Soma’ mentioned in Maṇjuśrī-mūlakalpa refers to Śasāṅka, both being synonyms of moon. His adversary, ‘the king whose name begins with ‘Ha,’ may be regarded as Harsha. With these assumptions, the following passage may be taken as an interesting reference to the conflict between the two kings:

‘At that time will arise in Madhysaṅga the excellent king whose name begins with (the letter) ‘Ba’ (i.e. Rājayavardhana) of the Vaikya caste. He will be as

---

1 Ibid. 157, 191, 206 ff; Watters, I. 545.
2 HC. Tr. 216-225.
3 Ibid. 224-225.
4 Ibid. 240.
5 Ibid. 258.
6 The text was first edited by T. Ganapati Sastri and subsequently by Mr. Jayaswal in IHI.
7 IHI. 60. The number of verses refers to MMK(J); the corresponding verses in MMK are on pp. 634-35.
powerful as Soma (Saśānka). He also ends at the hand of a king of the Nagna caste (vv. 719-720).

His younger brother Ha (Harshavardhana) will be an unrivalled hero. He decided against the famous Soma. The powerful Vaiśya king with a large army marched against the Eastern Country, against the excellent capital called Pusdrā of that characterless man. (721-723).... He defeated Soma, the pursuer of wicked deeds; and Soma was forbidden to move out of his country (being ordered) to remain therein (thenceforth) (723). Ha returned having [or not having] been honoured in that kingdom of the barbarian.' (726).

How far the account of Saśānka in Ārya-mañjuśrī-mulakaḷpa, which, by the way, is somewhat vague and uncertain,¹ can be regarded as historical, it is difficult to say. It is at best a Buddhist tradition of the type referred to by Huêen Tsang. It is interesting to note that the stories of Saśānka's oppression against Buddhism, his foul disease, painful death, and going down to hell, as described by Huêen Tsang are repeated in this Buddhist work. It would, therefore, be extremely unsafe to accept the statements recorded in this book as historical. But even if we assume the correctness of the statement, the net result of the elaborate campaign of Harsha, aided by his eastern ally Bhāskaravarman, king of Kāmarūpa, seems to be that, attacked on two flanks, Saśānka had to fall back on his capital, and his enemies caused damage and destruction in his kingdom. But the enemies had to retire soon leaving him master of his own kingdom.

This view finds some support in a statement of Huêen Tsang.² Referring to Kajangala (near Rajmahal) he says that it ceased to be an independent state centuries ago and its capital was deserted.

"Hence when king Śilādiya in his progress to 'East India,' held his court here, he cut grass to make huts, and burned these when leaving."

This shows that at some unspecified date Harsha led a military campaign as far as the borders of Bengal, but evidently went back without any material success. This may refer to the expedition against Saśānka at the early part of his reign, and to this extent it supports the account of MMK. But it is equally likely that

¹ The interpretation of Dr. R. G. Bazar summed up in the following passage seems quite as reasonable as that of Mr. Jayaswal:

"The author here means to say that Harsha defeated Soma (Saśānka).... who was forced to remain confined within his own kingdom, and prevented him from moving further towards the west; and Harsha himself, not being honoured with welcome in these eastern frontier countries returned leisurely to his own kingdom with the satisfaction that he had achieved victory.... There is little doubt that as the result of the first campaign Harsha could not establish political supremacy over Gaṅgra." (HNI. 185).

² Watters, n. 188.
Hiuen Tsang here refers to the court held by Harsha at Kajangala after his return from the conquest of Kōngoda in 648 A.D. Further, it is important to note that in his account of Puṇḍravardhana, Hiuen Tsang makes no mention of Harsha's invasion, such as is described in MMK.

But even if it is assumed, on the very doubtful authority of MMK, that Harsha had some success against Saśāṅka, it must have been very short-lived. For according to Hiuen Tsang's own testimony, Saśāṅka was in possession of Magadhā at the time of his death, which took place shortly before 637-38 A.D. This is confirmed by the statement recorded by Ma-Twan-Lin that Śilāditya assumed the title of king of Magadhā in 641 A.D.

Hiuen Tsang tells us that proceeding eastwards with his army, Harsha invaded the states which had refused allegiance, and waged incessant warfare, until, in six years, he had fought the five Indias. If the implication of this statement is that Harsha subjugated the whole of India, or even Northern India, within six years of his accession i.e. by 612 A.D., the statement hardly deserves any serious consideration. On the other hand, it is not unlikely that Harsha undertook various military campaigns, probably including those against Saśāṅka, during these six years. But he could not achieve any conspicuous success so far at least as Saśāṅka was concerned, as the latter was in possession of Gauḍa, Magadhā, Utkala and Kōngoda long after 612 A.D.

Even assuming that Kanauj was the capital of the Maukharis, there is no reason to hold that Harsha's accession to the throne of Kanauj implied any discomfiture of Saśāṅka. The entire episode about the conquest of Kanauj by Saśāṅka and his ally Devagupta, as described in Bāna's Harsha-charita, is rendered somewhat mysterious by the fact that the official genealogy of the Maukhari kings, as recorded in a Nālandā seal, makes it very doubtful whether Grahavarman ever sat on the Maukhari throne. According to Bāna, Grahavarman was the eldest son of Avantiyarman, and yet the name of the son and successor of Avantiyarman in the Nālandā seal, though partly effaced, is certainly not that of Grahavarman.

1 Beal-Līfe 178.
2 Watters, II. 115. The passage, which has been quoted infra p. 66, shows that Saśāṅka was in possession of Bodh-Gaya shortly before 637-38 A.D.
3 Id. ix. (1880), p. 19.
4 Watters, i. 344. Hiuen Tsang's further statement that after these six years of warfare Harsha reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon, is contradicted by his own statement about campaigns of Harsha against Kōngoda (Beal-Līfe. 178).
5 El. xxiv. 288.
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Bāṇa nowhere says distinctly that Graha Varman was the Maukharī king; but the title ‘Deva’ applied by him to Graha Varman, and the general tenor of his description certainly imply that Graha Varman had succeeded his father on the Maukharī throne. It is, of course, just possible that Graha Varman’s name was omitted in the Nālandā seal as it merely gave a genealogical account and not a list of succession. A more detailed knowledge of the history of the Maukharīs would perhaps throw new light on the activities of Saśāṅka.

All that we know definitely is that Graha Varman was not the last Maukharī king, and a younger son of Avanti Varman ruled over the kingdom, presumably after the defeat and death of his elder brother Graha Varman. Harsha’s accession to the throne of Kanauj must, therefore, have taken place some years after the death of Graha Varman, and there is thus no reason to suppose that Harsha-vardhana occupied the kingdom of Kanauj by defeating Saśāṅka. For it is equally plausible that Saśāṅka put the younger brother of Graha Varman on the throne of Kanauj, and it was by defeating him at a later period that Harsha ascended the throne of Kanauj. On the whole, making due allowance for the paucity of information at our disposal, and the fact that it is derived mostly from the accounts of hostile and prejudiced writers, we are bound to hold that Saśāṅka’s political and military career was a successful one. Beginning his life as a vassal chief, he made himself master of Gauḍa, Magadha, Utkala and Kōṅgoda, and consolidated his position by defeating the powerful Maukharīs. Although this involved him in hostility with two of the most powerful potentates in Northern India viz., the kings of Thaneswar and Kāmarūpa, he held his own against this powerful combination and maintained his extensive dominions till his death.

The date of his death cannot be exactly determined, but it must have taken place after 619 A.D. and before, probably very shortly before, 637 A.D.

While travelling in Magadha in 637-38 A.D. Hiuen Tsang\(^1\) noted that in recent times Saśāṅka cut down the Bodhi tree at Gaya and ordered the removal of the image of Buddha in a neighbouring temple. On hearing that his order was executed, so runs Hiuen Tsang’s account, king Saśāṅka was seized with terror, his body produced sores and his flesh rotted off, and after a short while he died. This account of Saśāṅka’s death, which is reproduced in MMK,\(^2\) is undoubtedly inspired by the hatred which the Buddhists felt for him on account of his anti-Buddhist

\(^1\) Watters, p. 115; B Erl. Records, p. 118, 121-22.
\(^2\) MMK. 855. III. 50.
activities. Curiously enough, an echo of this tradition is found even in late genealogical works of Bengal Brāhmaṇas. According to the traditions preserved among a section of the Graha-Vipra (also called Śaka-dvīpa) Brāhmaṇas, they are descended from twelve Brāhmaṇas living on the banks of the Sarayū river, who were summoned to treat an incurable disease from which Śaśāṅka, the king of Gaṇḍa, was suffering. This tradition, however, says that Śaśāṅka was cured and rewarded the Brāhmaṇas who then settled in Bengal.

Hiuen Tsang has recorded numerous acts of oppression perpetrated by Śaśāṅka against the Buddhists. According to him one of the reasons urged by Bodhisattva to induce Harsha to ascend the throne was that he might “then raise Buddhism from the ruin into which it had been brought by the king of Karṇaśuvarna.” This is, in a way, a confession that Buddhism suffered a great decline on account of the activities of Śaśāṅka. The latter was a devotee of Śiva, and his active patronage of Śaivism might have hastened the process of decline which had already set in in Buddhism. But how far the acts of oppression, charged by Hiuen Tsang against Śaśāṅka, can be regarded as historically true, it is difficult to say. At present, it rests upon the sole evidence of the Buddhist writers who cannot, by any means, be regarded as unbiased or unprejudiced, at least in any matter which either concerned Śaśāṅka or adversely affected Buddhism.

Indeed, such religious intolerance on the part of a king was so rare in ancient India, that some scholars, who are not disposed altogether to disbelieve the Buddhist stories about Śaśāṅka, have sought to explain away this unusual conduct. They attribute Śaśāṅka’s action to political exigencies, on the supposition that the Buddhists in Magadha and other parts of Śaśāṅka’s kingdom were in league with the Buddhist emperor Harshavardhana with whom Śaśāṅka was engaged in a prolonged struggle. This is, however,

1. MMK. also adds ‘oppression upon Jainism.’
2. VII. iv. 88, 90. Mahādeva-kārikā quoted by Umesh Chandra Sarma; Kulapaṇī by Rāmadeva.
3. Extermination of Buddhism and expulsion of Buddhists from a Vihāra in Kuśinagara (Watters, p. 45); throwing into the Ganges a stone, containing footprints of Buddha, in Pātaliputra (p. 92); cutting down the Bodhi-tree, destroying its roots down to the water, and burning what remained (p. 115); attempt to remove an image of Buddha and replace it by that of Śiva (p. 116).
5. His coins bear the image of Mahādeva on the obverse, Allan, CCBM, 147-48. The last incident referred to in f.n. 3 above, also corroborates the view that Śaśāṅka was Śaiva.
a pure conjecture, based on similar tendencies displayed by the Buddhists at a later age to sacrifice national for the sake of sectarian interests.1

Although sufficient data are not available for forming a correct estimate of the character and achievements of Śašāṅka, he must be regarded as a great king and a remarkable personality during the first half of the seventh century A.D. He was the first historical ruler of Bengal who not only dreamt imperial dreams, but also succeeded in realising them. He laid the foundations of the imperial fabric in the shape of realised hopes and ideals on which the Pālas built at a later age. He successfully avenged the humiliation inflicted upon his country by the Maukkhari rulers, and gave a new turn to that age-long duel between Gauḍa and Kanauj which constitutes an important feature in North Indian politics for more than five hundred years. With friendly biographers like Bāna and Huēn Tsang, he would probably have appeared almost as brilliant as Harshavardhana to posterity. But their undisguised enmity has blackened his name and tarnished his fame.2 The discovery of fresh evidence alone can enable us to form a just picture of his career and a fair estimate of his character.

1 According to Chachnāma (Eng. trans. by M. K. Fredunbeg, pp. 78, 89ff, 102), the Buddhists of Sind effectively helped the Muslim invaders of that country.
APPENDIX I

THE GUPTA KINGDOM IN BENGAL.

Dr. D. C. Ganguly has propounded the view that "the early home of the Imperial Guptas is to be located in Murshidabad, Bengal, and not in Magadha."¹

The view is based on the tradition recorded by I-tsing that "Mahārāja Śrī-Gupta built a temple for the Chinese priests and granted twenty-four villages as an endowment for its maintenance. This temple, known as the 'Temple of China,' was situated close to a sanctuary called Mi-li-kia-si-kia-po-no² which was about forty yojanas to the east of Nālandā, following the course of the Ganges."³

Allan, in opposition to Fleet, proposed to identify this Śrī-Gupta with Mahārāja Guptā who founded the Gupta dynasty and was the grandfather of Chandragupta I. Allan, however, located the temple in Magadha, and took I-tsing's statement to imply that Guptā was in possession of Pātaliputra.⁴ To Dr. D. C. Ganguly belongs the credit of pointing out that according to the distance and direction given by I-tsing the temple must have been situated in Bengal. From this fact Dr. Ganguly concludes that the original home of the Guptas was in Bengal and not in Magadha.

Dr. Ganguly's view about the location of the temple is strikingly confirmed by a fact which was noted long ago by Foucher, but to which sufficient attention has not been paid by scholars.⁵ In an illustrated Cambridge ms. (Add. 1643) dated 1015 A.D., there is a picture of a Stūpa, with the label "Mrīgasthāpāna-Stūpa of Varendra." Foucher has pointed out that Mrīgasthāpana is the Indian original represented by I-tsing's Mi-li-kia-si-kia-po-no, although Chavannes doubtfully restored it as Mrīgaśikhāvana. It would, therefore, follow that the 'Temple of China' was near the Mrīgasthāpana Stūpa in Varendra, and must have been situated either in Varendra, or not far from its boundary, on the bank of the Bhāgirathī or the Padmā.

The statement of I-tsing would thus justify us in holding that one Mahārāja Śrī-Gupta was ruling in Varendra or near it.

¹ IHQ. xiv. 582-585.
² Dr. Ganguly inadvertently takes this (Mrīgaśikhāvana?) as the temple founded by Mahārāja Guptā (op. cit. 592).
⁴ CCBM. xv. xix.
⁵ Foucher, Icon. 89-93.
Whether he is to be identified with the founder of the Gupta dynasty depends upon the interpretation we put upon the further statement of I-tsing that Mahārāja Śri-Gupta flourished more than five hundred years before his time. If we interpret it too literally, Gupta must be placed towards the close of the second century A.D., about a hundred years before the founder of the Gupta family. But, as pointed out by Chavannes and Allan, “I-tsing’s statement is a vague one and should not be taken too literally.” Allan holds that “considering the lapse of time and the fact that the Chinese pilgrim gives the statement on the authority of a tradition handed down from ancient times by old men, there seems no reason to doubt the identification on chronological grounds.”

These are undoubtedly forceful arguments and cannot be lightly set aside. Although, therefore, we may not accept Dr. D. C. Ganguly’s view ‘that the early home of the Imperial Guptas is to be located in Murshidabad, Bengal, and not in Magadha,’ it is a valid presumption that parts of Bengal were included in the territory ruled over by the founder of the Gupta family. This presumption, however, cannot be regarded as established historical fact unless further corroborative evidence is forthcoming. For it is solely based on a tradition recorded by a Chinese pilgrim four centuries later, and is opposed to the Purānic testimony which includes Prayāga, Sāketa and Magadha, but not any region in Bengal, among the early dominions of the Guptas.

1 “……… il y a plus de cinq cents années” (Chavannes, op. cit. 88).
2 CCBM. xv.
3 Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, 55, 73
APPENDIX II

ŚAŚĀNKA

A brief review of the facts that may be definitely ascertained about Śaśānka has been given above (see supra pp. 59-68). We propose here to examine critically and consider in some detail the accounts given in Bāṇabhaṭṭa’s Harsha-charita and Hiuen Tsang’s Travels.

As noted above, Bāṇabhaṭṭa narrates in detail how Harsha rescued his sister and then joined on the bank of the Ganges the large army which he had equipped for punishing Śaśānka. It is unfortunate, however, that he brings his narrative to a close at this critical point, leaving us totally in the dark about the encounter between Harsha and Śaśānka. What is worse still, some of the most important details even in this incomplete story are left vague and obscure. Bāṇabhaṭṭa, for example, does not care to explain why Rājyaśrī fled to the remote Vindhya forest instead of seeking shelter in her brother’s dominions which were much nearer and easier of access. But the more significant, and from our point of view, the more unfortunate, omission on the part of Bāṇa, is in respect of the activities of Śaśānka. From the message he puts in the mouth of Śāṅvādaka, a servant of Rājyaśrī, it appears that on the very day on which the death of Prabhākaravardhana was rumoured, Graharvarman was killed, and his queen fettered and confined into prison at Kanauj by the wicked Lord of Mālava.1

This account is supplemented by the statement of Bhāṇḍi:

"I learnt from common talk," said he, "that after His Majesty Rājavarman was taken to paradise and Kānyakubja was seized by the man named Gupta, queen Rājyaśrī burst from her confinement and with her train entered the Vindhya forest."2

Later, the attendants of Rājyaśrī told Harsha the

"full story of his sister’s misfortunes from her imprisonment onward—how she was sent away from Kānyakubja, from her confinement there during the Gaḍa trouble, through the action of a noble man named Gupta—how she heard the news of Rājavarman’s death, and refused to take food, and then how, faint with want of food, she wandered miserably in the Vindhya forests, and at last in her despair resolved to mount the funeral pile."3

It is surprising that Bāṇabhaṭṭa did not notice the apparent inconsistencies between the three versions of the same story.

1 HC. Tr. 173. 2 Ibid. 224. 3 Ibid. 250.
According to Sāṃvādaka, Kanauj was captured by the Lord of Mālava (Devagupta) and perhaps the same king is referred to as Gupta by Bhaṇḍi. But the attendants ascribe the imprisonment of Rājaśīri to 'Gaūḍa trouble.' Further, whereas, according to Bhaṇḍi, Rājaśīri burst from her confinement, presumably by eluding or in defiance of Gupta who had seized Kanauj, the attendants ascribe her release to the kind action of a noble man named Gupta. On the important question whether this Gupta is identical with the Gupta of Bhaṇḍi, Bāṇabhaṭṭa is distressingly silent.

Bhaṇḍi's statement, being admittedly based on common talk, is less reliable than the versions of the servant and attendants of Rājaśīri who were eye-witnesses to the event. We may thus reasonably infer that shortly after Devagupta had captured Kanauj by defeating and killing Graha varman, Śaśānka marched to the help of his ally and reached Kanauj. In the meantime, Devagupta, intoxicated with his recent success, proceeded towards Thaneswar without waiting for the arrival of his ally Īśānaka, and met with his doom. It is evident, however, that Īśānaka still retained his hold on Kanauj, and Rājaśīvadhana had an encounter with him. Bāṇabhaṭṭa does not give any details about the subsequent movements of these two adversaries, but merely states that Rājaśīvadhana "had been allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the king of Gaūḍa, and then, weaponless, confiding, and alone, despatched in his own quarters." What the exact allurements were, and why the king was foolish enough to enter into the enemy's camp without proper escort or safeguard, Bāṇabhaṭṭa does not care to explain.

Hsiuen Tsang, the other contemporary writer, is equally vague and obscure on this point. He tells us that Īśānaka frequently told his ministers, with reference to Rājaśīvadhana, "that if a frontier country has a virtuous ruler, this is the unhappiness of the mother kingdom," and then adds, "on this they (i.e. the ministers) asked the king to a conference and murdered him." Later, Hsiuen Tsang quotes the following speech of Harsha's ministers: "Owing to the fault of his (Rājaśīvadhana's) ministers, he was led to subject his person to the hand of his enemy, and the kingdom has suffered a great affliction; but it is the fault of your ministers." This is hardly consistent with Bāṇa's version, for no heedless act

---

1. Ibid. 178.

St. Julien's translation of the above passage, which is more decisive on this point, runs as follows (IA. 1878. p. 197): "But by the incapacity of his (Rājaśīvadhana's) ministers he has gone and fallen under the sword of his enemy; that has been a great disgrace to the realm. It is we who are to blame."
of the king under the influence of temptation or allurement, but a deliberate plan (or conspiracy?) of the ministers was responsible for the course of events which ultimately put Rājyavardhana in the clutches of his enemy. Besides, emphasis is laid here on the fault of the ministers and not on any treacherous act of Śaśāṅka. To these two contemporary accounts we have to add a third, viz., the statement contained in the inscriptions of Harsha that Rājyavardhana gave up his life at the house of his enemy owing to his adherence to a promise (satyānurodhena).

On the basis of the above accounts, historians are generally agreed that Śaśāṅka treacherously murdered Rājyavardhana. Mr. R. P. Chanda was the first to challenge the accuracy of the view and gave cogent reasons to show that Rājyavardhana was either defeated and taken prisoner or surrendered to Śaśāṅka. Mr. S. S. Banerji and the present writer also supported Mr. Chanda. This view is, however, opposed by Dr. R. G. Basak and Dr. D. C. Ganguly who have reiterated the old theory of Śaśāṅka’s treachery.

This controversy is not likely to be closed until fresh evidence enables us to reach definite conclusions. In the meantime, the arguments on both sides may be summed up to enable the reader to form his own judgment.

The main argument adduced by Dr. Basak and Dr. Ganguly is the agreement between the contemporary sources. But it may be pointed out, that while Bāṇabhāṭṭa and Hiuen Tsang agree that Rājyavardhana was murdered in a treacherous manner, the two authorities differ in essential details, and further the third contemporary source, the inscriptions of Harsha, and one version of Hiuen Tsang make no allusion to treachery at all. Curiously enough, all these accounts are characterised by a deliberate vagueness and obscurity which is difficult to account for.

Following the ordinary canons of criticism the charges of Bāṇa and Hiuen Tsang against Śaśāṅka must be accepted with a great deal of reserve. Both were prejudiced against him on account of his hostility against their patron, and Hiuen Tsang made no secret of his wrath against Śaśāṅka for his anti-Buddhist activities. That Hiuen Tsang was ready, nay almost glad, to believe anything discreditable to Śaśāṅka, is abundantly clear from the various stories he has recorded of Śaśāṅka’s persecution of Buddhism, and his ignoble death. The attitude of Bāṇa is also quite clear from the

---

1. *EI.* iv. 210; i. 67.  
2. *CR.* 8 ff.  
5. *HNI.* 144 ff.  
7. These have been referred to supra p. 67, f.n. 9.
contemptuous epithets like Gaudādhama and Gaudabhujana by which he refers to Saśānka.

Such witnesses would be suspect even if their stories were complete, rational, and consistent. But unfortunately both the stories are so vague and involve such an abnormal element as would not be believed except on the strongest evidence. Hiuen Tsang does not refer to any ill feeling or hostility between Saśānka and Rājyavardhana, nor even any conflict of interests. Nothing but pure jealousy at Rājyavardhana’s virtue prompts Saśānka to incite his ministers to murder him. Apart from the irrational character of the whole story, it is sufficiently refuted by the fact that according to Bāṇa, Rājyavardhana’s rule was so short that Saśānka could have hardly any opportunity to be deeply impressed by his virtue, and “frequently” addressed his ministers on that subject.

The story of Bāṇabhaṭṭa presupposes that although Rājyavardhana was out to fight with Saśānka, who was his mortal enemy and in occupation of Kanauj where Rājaśāri was still kept in prison, he could be tempted to meet his adversary, alone and without any weapon. The story is neither rational nor complete, for Bāṇabhaṭṭa does not even care to mention the nature of allurements which might explain or excuse such an unusual step taken by Rājyavardhana. Dr. R. G. Basak tries to cover this vital defect by assuming that neither Harsha nor Bhāṇḍi knew clearly about the allurement offered by Saśānka to Rājya,¹ and Bāṇa had special reason to conceal the details. How Bāṇa came to know what was unknown to both Harsha and Bhāṇḍi, Dr. Basak does not tell us. Nor does he explain how Śaṅkara, the commentator of Bāṇa, who flourished centuries later,² knew the details of the story though they were not recorded by Bāṇa. It seems that, in this particular case, contrary to the ordinary principle, the accurate knowledge of the details of an event grows in proportion to the lapse of time.

According to Śaṅkara,³ Saśānka enticed Rājyavardhana through a spy by the offer of his daughter’s hand, and while the unlucky king with his retinue was participating in a dinner in his enemy’s camp he was killed by the Gauda king in disguise. This story is hardly consistent with Bāṇa’s account that Rājyavardhana was alone and defenseless when he was killed in his enemy’s house.

¹ HNI. 148. But it is said in Harsha-charita that when Harsha met Bhāṇḍi, “he enquired the facts of his brother’s death, and Bhāṇḍi related the whole story in full.” (HC. Tr. 224).
² Dr. Ganguly places Śaṅkara in the 14th century A.D. IHQ. XII. 468.
³ HNI. 140.
Dr. Basak, oblivious of this inconsistency, accepts the story as correct and remarks, "It is quite plausible, that during a period of truce the offer of the hand of his daughter to Râjyavardhana was made by Śaśâṅka, and lest Râjyavardhana's heedless compliance with such an invitation sent through a messenger should tarnish the reputation of the king, Bâna refrained from giving full details of this incident in his book."\(^1\)

Bâna could not have such a story in view, for it is inconsistent with his own account, and there appears to be no valid reason for suppressing it.

The above analysis would show that there are legitimate grounds for doubting the accuracy of the story. Dr. D. C. Ganguly observes that "there is no warrant for thinking that Bâna and Hiuen Tsang blackened the character of Śaśâṅka with accusations knowing them to be false."\(^2\) Unfortunately such instances are not rare. References to Sirâj ud-daulâ, Napoleon and Tipu Sultan by contemporary English writers, and the contradictory versions of the encounter between Shivaji and Afzal well illustrate the unwillingness or incapacity of hostile writers to give impartial account of dreaded foes. The last instance perhaps furnishes an apt parallel to the Śaśâṅka-Râjyavardhana incident. The Mahratta and Muslim writers accuse respectively Afzal and Shivaji of treachery. In the present instance we have only the version of Kanauj. The Bengali version might have painted the scene in an altogether different way. For the present we can accept the statement in Harsha's inscriptions that Râjyavardhana gave up his life, in his enemy's house, where he went for the sake of a promise, or, as Dr. Basak puts it, to keep his word of honour. That this enemy was Śaśâṅka also admits of little doubt. Further details of this incident may be revealed some day by the discovery of fresh evidence, but until then the modern historians might well suspend their judgment and at least refrain from accusing Śaśâṅka of treachery, a charge not brought against him even by the brother of the murdered. It may also be emphasised that even Buddhist traditions were not unanimous in respect of the treachery of Śaśâṅka. For according to the generally accepted interpretation of MMX., Râjyavardhana was murdered, not by Śaśâṅka, but by a king of the Nagna caste.\(^3\)

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that Hiuen Tsang's emphasis upon the fault of the ministers in respect of Râjyavardhana's death becomes very significant when we remember that Râjyavardhana was a Buddhist and his ministers were most...

\(^1\) Ibid.  
\(^2\) MMQ. xii. 463.  
\(^3\) IHI. 50.
probably orthodox Hindus. Huien Tsang refers to an attempt on Harsha’s life by the non-Buddhists.¹ Who knows that Rājayavardhana’s death was not similarly encompassed by his ministers with the help of Śaśānka who was known to be a great champion of orthodox faith? This is, of course, a mere hypothesis, which lacks convincing evidence, but it would explain the mysterious vagueness of the contemporary authorities and prove that there might be other explanations of Rājayavardhana’s death than the treachery of Śaśānka.²

¹ Beul—Records, 1. 280-21.
² An apt illustration is furnished by the capture of the Roman emperor Valerian by the Persian king Shapur in A.D. 260. It is generally held that in course of negotiations for peace, “the Persian king expressed his desire for a personal interview; the emperor agreed; in fatal confidence he met the Persian king and was taken prisoner.” The following comment is made in Cambridge Ancient History (Vol. XII, p. 133) on this episode: “On the fact of the capture our sources are in complete accord, but they disagree in their accounts of the manner in which it was effected. While Zosimus represents it as a treacherous breach of faith on the part of Shapur, others would place it after a battle with insufficient forces against the superior strength of the enemy, others again—and this must certainly be false—will have it that Valerian had fled from beleaguered Edessa to the Persian King in face of a mutiny of his own starving soldiers.”
CHAPTER V

POLITICAL DISINTEGRATION AFTER ŚAŚĀṆKA.

I. KINGS OF GAṆḍA

The death of Śaśāṇka proved to be a political disaster of the first magnitude. Not only were the dreams of a far-flung Gauda empire rudely shattered, but within a few years his kingdom, including the capital city Karnaṣuvarṇa, passed into the hands of Bhāskararāvarman, the hostile king of Kāmarūpa. The events that led to this complete collapse are not known, and only a few facts of this obscure period in the history of Bengal may be gleaned from the documents at present available to us.

Hiuen Tsang who travelled in Bengal about 638 A.D., shortly after the death of Śaśāṇka, mentions, besides Kajaṅgala (territory round Rajmahal), four kingdoms in Bengal proper, viz., Pundravardhana, Karnaṣuvarṇa, Śamataṭa, and Tāmralipti.¹ The first two undoubtedly denote the two component parts of Śaśāṇka’s kingdom viz., North Bengal and northern parts of Western Bengal including Burdwan, Birbhum, Murshidabad, and Nadia districts. Hiuen Tsang refers to the capital of each of the kingdoms mentioned by him, but does not say anything of their kings and gives no indication of their political status. This silence has led some scholars to think that they were included within the empires of Harshavardhana.² But this assumption is not supported either by the general tenor of Hiuen Tsang’s description or by any facts known so far.

It is obvious from Hiuen Tsang’s account that Śaśāṇka’s death loosened the bonds which united North and West Bengal, and these formed separate kingdoms in 638 A.D. Within a few years both

² The fallacy of this view has been pointed out in JBORS. IX. 819 ff. and IHQ. XV. 182. But Dr. R. G. Bāsak repeats the same and even improves upon it. “The reason,” says he, “for Yuan Chwang not mentioning the name of any king ruling in any of the four or five political divisions of Bengal at that period may be sought in the fact that when he visited (in 645 A.D.) these countries and also Kāmarūpa, he found most of them included in Harsha’s own dominion, and some in that of Bhāskararavāman (italics are ours),” HNI. 927. It may be mentioned in passing that Hiuen Tsang visited Bengal about 638 A.D. and not 648 A.D. as stated above (Watters, II. 125). Mr. Tripathi has merely echoed the old view without any fresh argument (TK. Ch. IV-V; JBORS. XVIII. 890 ff).
these kingdoms were conquered by Bhāskaravarman. The fact that Bhāskaravarman made a grant from the victorious camp at Karnāsuvarna¹ shows that he even succeeded in seizing the capital city of Śaśāṅka.

This may also be indirectly concluded from some incidents referred to in the Life of Hiuen Tsang. It is recorded there that some time about 642 A.D., Bhāskaravarman proceeded with his army of elephants, 20,000 in number, to meet Harsha at Kajāṅgala near Rajmahal, and his 30,000 ships passed along the Ganges to the same destination.² This evidently implies an effective suzerainty of the king of Kāmarūpa over the former dominions of Śaśāṅka.³

It is interesting to note that, according to the Life of Hiuen Tsang, at the time of this meeting Harsha himself had just returned from his victorious campaign in Kongoda,⁴ the kingdom of the Śailodbhavas who formerly acknowledged the suzerainty of Śaśāṅka.

Now Hiuen Tsang’s account, as preserved in his Records, does not refer to Pundravardhana and Karnāsuvarna as subject to Bhāskaravarman, and as regards Kongoda, it even goes so far as to say that its soldiers “rule by force the neighbouring provinces, so that no one can resist them.”⁵ It would thus appear that the dominions of Śaśāṅka in and outside Bengal proper were conquered respectively by Bhāskaravarman and Harsha some time between 638 and 642 A.D. The only exception was Magadha which evidently passed into the hands of one Pūrnavarman, described as last of the race of Asokarāja, at the time when Hiuen Tsang visited

¹ Nidanpur cp. (EI. xii. 65; xix. 115).
² This point was emphasised for the first time by Dr. D. C. Ganguly (IHQ. xv. 128 ff.). It should be remembered, however, that the passage of Bhāskara’s army and ships can also be explained by the assumption of Harsha’s suzerainty over Bengal. Bhāskara’s conquest of Bengal is assumed on the authority of Nidanpur cp., but it is equally probable that after Śaśāṅka’s death his dominions both in Bengal and Orissa were conquered by Harsha. The turmoil following the death of Harsha might have enabled Bhāskaravarman to conquer Bengal and pitch his victorious camp at Karnāsuvarna. In any case, he must have occupied Bengal by 646 A.D. when he is referred to as king of Eastern India in Chinese annals in connection with the expedition of Wang-huen-tee. This view has been fully developed in my Outlines of Anc. Ind. Hist. and Civilisation, p. 348. For other views on the subject, cf. HNI. 225-229. It is difficult to accept Dr. Basak’s suggestion that Bhāskaravarman never conquered Karnāsuvarna, but merely pitched his temporary camp there, as an ally of Harsha during the latter’s second campaign (HNI. 228-29). It would have been highly impolitic, to say the least of it, on the part of Bhāskaravarman to issue a formal royal edict from a place which belonged not to him but to a mighty king like Harsha. Further, as noted above, he is definitely referred to as king of Eastern India in the Chinese annals.
³ Beal-Life. 172.
⁴ Beal-Records. v. 907.
it about 637-38 A.D.¹ But in or about 641 A.D. it was conquered by Harshavardhana.² Kajañgala also was presumably conquered by Harsha.

Thus the available evidences seem to indicate that the death of Śaśāṅka was followed by a disruption of his vast dominions and its component parts formed separate independent states. This gave the required opportunity³ to his life-long enemies Bhāskaravarman and Harshavardhana who conquered respectively his former dominions in and outside Bengal.

The political disintegration of the Gauḍa empire after the death of Śaśāṅka seems to be referred to in that curious Buddhist work Ārya-mañjuśrī-mālakalpa mentioned above. The relevant passage has been translated as follows by Mr. Jayaswal:

“After the death of Soma the Gauḍa political system (Gauḍa-tantra) was reduced to mutual distrust, raised weapons and mutual jealousy—one (king) for a week; another for a month; then a republican constitution—such will be the daily (condition) of the country on the bank of the Ganges where houses were built on the ruins of monasteries. Thereafter Soma’s (Śaśāṅka’s) son Māṇava will last for 8 months 5 (¿?) days.”⁴

This English rendering of the relevant passage by Mr. Jayaswal cannot be regarded as free from doubts, particularly as the reference to a republican constitution is based on an emendation of the text. But it undoubtedly conveys the general sense of the text.

The passage immediately following the above extract in MMK. almost undoubtedly refers to a king Jayanāga of Gauḍa,⁵ and there is equally little doubt that he is to be identified with the king of that name whose coins have been found in Western Bengal,⁶

---

¹ Ibid. 118.
² This may be inferred from the following statement by Ma-Twan-Lin:

“In the fifteenth year of the Ching-Kiwan Period (641 A.D.) Śīlāditya assumed the title of king of Mo-kie-tho (Magadha) and sent an ambassador with a letter to the emperor” [A. ix. (1880) 19].

³ It must be emphasised, that apart from conjectures based on pre-conceived notions about Harsha’s military exploits, and inferences based on doubtful evidences of negative character, the only two positive references to Harsha’s conquests in Eastern India are those of Magadha in 641 A.D., and Kōngoda the following year (apart from a temporary court held at Kajañgala referred to supra p. 78). The reasonable presumption, therefore, is that Harsha led victorious campaign in these regions after, and not before, Śaśāṅka’s death.

⁴ IHI. 51. The word Gaṇapīja has been emended to gaṇarājya.

⁵ Nāgarājā-samālaveyo Gauḍa-rājā bhavīṣyati

ante tasya nripa śīlhām jayotēvat arahatōdāsau [MMK. p. 856].

Jayaswal reads ‘Nagṛāja’ in place of Nāgarāja [MMK (J). v. 760] and takes Nāgarāja to be the name of the king and regards him as belonging to the Bhārāśiva dynasty (IHI. 51).

⁶ For Jayanāga’s coins cf. Allan, CCBM. lxi, cit., 160-61. The coins bear
and who issued a land-grant from the victorious camp of Karṇaśūvarṇa, the capital of Śaśāṅka. ¹

Although the tradition recorded in MMK cannot be regarded by itself as historical, it is corroborated in the present instance by known facts. The general picture of anarchy, confusion, and political disintegration is fully confirmed by the conquests of Harsha and Bhāskaravarman, and merely supplies the details of a presumption to which they inevitably lead. The reference to Jayanāga is also corroborated, as noted above, by coins and inscription of a king named Jayanāga who ruled with Karṇaśuvarṇa as capital.

The date of Jayanāga cannot be ascertained with precision, but judging from his coins and inscription, he may be placed within the period 550-650 A.D. On the basis of the tradition recorded in MMK, we may hold that after the anarchy and confusion caused by the invasion of Bhāskaravarman had subsided, and a son of Śaśāṅka had vainly tried to re-establish the fortunes of his family, the kingdom passed into the hands of Jayanāga. ² He is styled Mahārājādhirāja and was evidently a ruler of some authority. He ruled over Birbhum and Murshidabad districts, but the extent of his kingdom or any other detail of his reign is not known to us.

For more than a century after this the history of Gauda is obscure in the extreme. This period which extends roughly from 650 to 750 A.D. was marked at the beginning by political chaos and confusion in Eastern India caused by the death of Harsha (646 or 647 A.D.), the usurpation of his kingdom by his minister, and the strange military adventures of the Chinese envoy Wang-hiuen-tsé. ³

But the success of the Chinese arms brought into prominence

---

¹ Vappucohavāṣa Grant (EI. xviii. 69 ff), or Māliya Grant (ABORI. xix. 81). It records a grant of land situated in Audumbarika-viśaya which has been identified with Audambar Pargana mentioned in Ain-i-Akbari. It comprised the greater part of Birbhum and a part of the Murshidabad district (EI. xix. 366-67). Sāmanta Nārāyanabhadra was the ruler of this viśaya at the time of the grant.

² Dr. R. G. Basak writes: "The Mañjuari-mālakalpa makes Jayanāga almost a successor of Śaśāṅka, but in our opinion, he and his son (stated to have reigned for a few months only) preceded Śaśāṅka as kings of Karṇaśuvarṇa." (HNI. 140). Dr. Basak gives no reason, and in the absence of more reliable evidence or cogent arguments to the contrary, it is better to accept the tradition recorded in MMK. Dr. Basak refers to a son of Jayanāga, but MMK refers to the son of Śaśāṅka, and not of Jayanāga, as having ruled for eight months and five days. It is just possible that Jayanāga ruled after the death of Śaśāṅka and before the conquest of Karṇaśuvarṇa by Bhāskaravarman.

³ This has been dealt with in detail infra p. 92.
a new factor in North Indian politics. The powerful king of Tibet, Srong-tsan Gampo, who exercised suzerainty over Nepal and had sent military assistance to the Chinese in their hour of need, is credited with extensive conquests in India. There is no reliable record of his exploits, but he is said to have conquered Assam and gradually made himself master of nearly the half of India. In spite of obvious exaggerations the claims were probably not without some basis. We have definite evidence that the dynasty of Bhāskara varman was overthrown not long after his death by a Melechcha ruler. It is also not improbable that the Khādga kings who ruled over parts of Bengal in the seventh century A.D. came in the train of the Tibetan invasion, though of this we have no definite evidence. Although the Tibetan supremacy was short-lived and Indian states threw off the suzerainty of Tibet about 702 A.D., the menace of Tibetan invasion probably played an important part in Indian politics.

Another important political factor was the re-establishment of the Later Guptas in Magadha. That this province was included for a short time in the empire of Harsha admits of no doubt. But not long after his death it came into the possession of Adityasena. He and his three successors ruled over this kingdom in the latter half of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century A.D. They all assumed imperial titles and were evidently very powerful rulers. Some scholars hold that Bengal, or at least a large part of it, was included in their empire, but we have no reliable evidence of any kind to support this view.

---

1 Lévi-Népal. ii. 174. See also infra pp. 91-93.
2 DIINI. i. 239.
3 EHR. 24. It must be noted, however, that important persons with the title Khādga are mentioned in Mallasarul Ins. (6th cent. A.D.) (EI. xxiii. 159).
4 Lévi-Népal. ii. 174-75.
5 See supra p. 79, fn. 2.
6 The history of Adityasena and his successors, Devagupta, Vishnugupta and Jivitagupta is known from six inscriptions (CII. iii. Nos. 42-46 and Vaidyanātha Temple Ins. at Deoghar, CII. iii. p. 213 fn.). All the four kings bear imperial titles viz., Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājadhārāja. All their records have been found in Bihar. No. 46 is issued from the Jayasankalpavāra of Gomatiyaṭṭa and Fleet suggests that it was on the bank of the river Gomati. This is, however, by no means certain. The only other evidence of their rule outside Bihar is furnished by the Vaidyanātha Temple Ins. of which no facsimile is published, and which was written in Maithila character (JASB. lii. 190-91).
It says that Adityasena, having arrived from the Choja city, performed three Āśvamedha and other sacrifices. Dr H. C. Raychaudhuri thinks that these Later Guptas are referred to as Lords of the whole of Uttarapatha (sakal-ottara-patha-nātha) (PHAI. 4th ed., pp. 516-17). No 48 gives the date 66 for Adityasena, which, referred to Harsha Era, would be equivalent to 672 A.D. Adityasena and his three successors may thus be placed approximately between 650 and 725 A.D.
7 Dr. R. G. Basak thinks that ‘Bengal, specially the Southern Rājha and Vaiga’ probably formed parts of Adityasena’s dominions as he extended his
We learn from an inscription\(^1\) of a king of the Śaila dynasty named Jayavardhana that the brother of his great-grandfather defeated the Paundra king and conquered his dominions. According to this record the Śaila dynasty had a remarkable history. Their original home was in the valley of the Himālayas, but they conquered the Gurjara country. Later, they spread to the east and ultimately three branches of the family established themselves at Kāśi, the Vindhyā region, and Paundra. It is said that the two chiefs who conquered Kāśi and Paundra were brothers, and the son of the former became the lord of the Vindhyā regions.

The Paundra kingdom, conquered by the Śailas, has been identified by all scholars with Northern Bengal, on the ground that this region was known as both Pundra and Paundra.\(^2\) Unfortunately, no details of the Śaila rule in Bengal are known to us. The conquest probably took place about 725 A.D.\(^3\)

The next important event in the history of Bengal is the defeat and death of the king of Gauḍa at the hands of Yaśovarman, the king of Kanauj, who undertook a military expedition all over Northern India to establish his position as Lord Paramount like Harshavardhana and Yaśodharman. The date of Yaśovarman's conquests may be approximately fixed between 725 and 735 A.D. He evidently regarded the Lord of Gauḍa as one of his chief adversaries, and his success against the latter has obtained great prominence on account of the title of a famous poetic work Gauḍa-vahā (‘Slaying of the King of Gauḍa’) by his court-poet Vākpātiśāja.\(^4\) Curiously enough, the poem itself, consisting of 1209 verses, refers only once (v. 1194), very incidentally, to the slaying of the Gauḍa king, while five verses (vv. 354, 414–417) refer to the Lord of Magadhā. The latter fled before Yaśovarman in the Vindhyā region (v. 354), but the other kings who accompanied him immediately returned to fight (v. 414). After describing the battle in two verses (vv. 415, 416), the poet simply says that Yaśovarman, having slain the king of the Magadhās, who was fleeing, proceeded to the sea-shore (v. 417).

It has been assumed that the Lord of Gauḍa and Lord of Magadhā, mentioned by Vākpāti, were one and the same person.

---

\(^{1}\) Raghuoli cp. (E1. ix. 41).

\(^{2}\) Cf. Belava cp. l. 27. Bl. 20. DHNI. i. 276.

\(^{3}\) Gauḍa-vahā, edited by Śankar Pāṣḍurang Pāṇḍit (Bombay, 1887).

\(^{4}\) Raghuoli cp. (E1. ix. 41).
The assumption has led to a further one viz. that Gauḍa was subject to the Later Gupta kings of Magadha. But even if the first assumption be correct, the second does not necessarily follow. The emphasis laid on Gauḍa in the very title of the poem would rather lead to the inference that Magadha was subject to the king of Gauḍa.¹ But all these assumptions must be regarded as purely provisional on account of the obscurity of the poem Gauḍa-vahō which has been discussed in detail in Appendix ii.

Yāśovarman followed up his victory against Gauḍa by the conquest of Vaṅga. Thus nearly the whole of modern Bengal passed into his hands. The nature of his rule is not known to us, but it could not have been of long duration. For the promising career of Yāśovarman was cut short by the disastrous defeat inflicted upon him by Lalitāditya, the king of Kashmir, before the close of the first half of the eighth century A.D., and probably not long after 736 A.D.²

Lalitāditya naturally regarded himself as the overlord of the various states which had acknowledged the suzerainty of Yāśovarman. Presumably to enforce this claim, he undertook a dīgvijaya or an expedition of conquest. According to Kalhana’s account his victorious campaign not only led him across the whole of Northern India right up to Kalinga, but also over the whole of Southern India up to the river Kāverī and the Malay mountains. To what extent this may be regarded as historically true it is difficult to say. As regards Bengal, with which alone we are here concerned, there is no direct reference in Kalhana’s account that Lalitāditya invaded, far less conquered, any part of the province. But two incidents reported by Kalhana lead to the presumption that the kingdom of Gauḍa acknowledged his suzerainty.

In the first place, we are told that a troop of elephants from Gauḍa-maṇḍala joined Lalitāditya,³ and it is only reasonable to conclude that the king of Gauḍa acknowledged the suzerainty of Lalitāditya and sent his elephant troops to help him. Secondly, Kalhana relates how the king of Gauḍa was forced to visit Kashmir

¹ The conquest of Magadha is perhaps to be credited to the Śaila rulers of Northern Bengal. As noted above, two other branches of this family ruled in Vindhyā region and Benares, and this circumstance must have helped the Śaila ruler of Bengal to wrest the supremacy of Magadha, probably from Jīvita-gupta ii, the last known ruler of the Later Guptas, who reigned in the first half of the eighth century A.D.
³ RT. iv. 148. Dr. H. C. Ray states that Lalitāditya "reached the Gauḍa land" (DHĀN. i. 277). This is, however, by no means certain, though very probable. In any case RT. does not refer to Lalitāditya’s march to Gauḍa.
at the behest of Lalitāditya, and was murdered there ¹ The Gauḍa king had evidently some fear about his safety, and to remove it, Lalitāditya swore by an image of Vishṇu that no violence would be done to his person. In spite of this guarantee Lalitāditya caused the Gauḍa king to be murdered at a place called Trigrāmi. Here, again, the distant journey undertaken by the Gauḍa king, in spite of misgivings about his own safety, can be reasonably explained only on the supposition that he acknowledged the suzerainty of Lalitāditya.

The sequel to the murder of the king of Gauḍa is interesting enough to be recorded here. Kalhana relates how some loyal and faithful followers of the Gauḍa king took a solemn vow to avenge the foul murder, made the long journey from Gauḍa to Kashmir in the guise of pilgrims, and attacked the temple which contained the Vishṇu image by which Lalitāditya swore the safety of the Gauḍa king. With a full knowledge of certain death, these people entered the temple and broke one of the two images found there, unhappily the wrong one. In the meantime, soldiers came from the capital and cut all the Gauḍas to pieces. The Kashmirian poet has paid the highest tribute to the loyalty and devotion of these people. “Even the creator,” says he, “cannot achieve what the Gauḍas did on that occasion,” and “to this day the world is filled with the fame of the Gauḍa heroes.” ² The story, romantic though it is, is probably true, for otherwise Kalhana would not have reported it, knowing fully how thoroughly it discredits his ideal king Lalitāditya.

Same reliance, however, cannot be placed on another romantic story recorded by Kalhana about Jayāpiḍa, the grandson of Lalitāditya. But though its historical character may well be doubted, a brief account of the curious episode may be given for what it is worth.

Jayāpiḍa, the grandson of Lalitāditya, set out with a vast army for conquering the world, in imitation of his grandfather. But his kingdom was usurped, during his absence, by his brother-in-law Jajja, and he was deserted by his army. Ultimately he dismissed all his soldiers and wandered alone. In course of this romantic enterprise, he entered the city of Paunḍravardhana which was then ruled by a prince called Jayanta, as a subordinate chief to the kings of Gauḍa. He married Jayanta’s daughter, defeated the five Gauḍa chiefs and made his father-in-law their overlord. ³

It is difficult to say what amount of truth, if any, there is in

¹ RT. iv. 325-30. ² RT. iv. 332, 335. ³ RT. iv. 408-468.
this story. But the reference to five Gauḍa kings indicates a state of political disintegration which is supported by other evidences. It appears very likely that Gauḍa became a field of struggle for supremacy among a number of local chiefs who had asserted their independence as there was no central authority to keep them under control.

Another reference to a foreign conquest of Gauḍa, about this period, occurs in an inscription of Jayadeva II, the Lichchhavi king of Nepal. In this record, dated 759 or 748 A.D., the king’s father-in-law, Harsha of the Bhagadatta dynasty, is described as the lord of Gauḍa, Udra, Kaliṅga and Kośala. The fact that the rulers of Kāmarūpa claimed descent from Bhagadatta has led to the presumption that Harsha was ruler of Kāmarūpa. We must remember, however, that the Kara dynasty of Orissa also claimed descent from the same family, and it is equally probable that Harsha belonged to that dynasty. In any case we have no independent evidence about the possession of Gauḍa by any ruler of either Kāmarūpa or Orissa, and it is difficult to say how far the assumption of the title ‘lord of Gauḍa’ was justified by actual exercise of authority in that kingdom.

II. KINGDOM OF VAṆGA

We have no definite information about the political condition of Vaṅga during the reign of Śāśāṅka. But even if it were incorporated in his dominions, it must have again formed an independent state shortly after his death. Hiuen Tsang has referred to the kingdom of Samataṭa, which seems to have included the major part, if not the whole, of Vaṅga proper. How long the independent kingdom established in this region by Gopachandra continued to exist and how it ended are unknown to us. We learn from Hiuen Tsang that a line of Brāhmaṇa kings ruled in Samataṭa in the first half of the seventh century A.D. But he does not give us any information about it beyond stating that Śilabhadra, the

---

1 Tāṇḍavati Ins. dated year 153 (IA. ix. 178). This year is usually referred to the Harsha Era (JHN. 268), but Jayawal refers this and other dates in Nepalese records to a new era starting in 805 A.D. (JBORS. xxi. 164 ff, 184).

2 GR. 17-18; DUNI. i. 941; Lévi-Nepal. ii. 171. Harsha is usually identified with king Harsha mentioned in Tejpur cp. of Vanamāla (JASB. ix. Part ii. 706; Kām. Šās. 84).

3 Cf. Chaurasi Grant of Śivakara (JBORS. 1928, p 304). Some scholars, while holding Harsha to be a king of the Kara dynasty, believes him also to be a descendant of Bhāskaravatman (IHQ. xiv. 841).

4 It is difficult to ascertain the boundaries of Samataṭa which must have varied at different ages. The district of Tippera was definitely included in it.
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patriarch of Nālandā, was a scion of this royal family. Reference may be made in this connection to a vassal chief named Jyeshṭhabhadra, mentioned in the Nidhanpur copper-plate of Bhāskaravarman. The name-ending -bhadra has led some scholars to connect him with Śilabhadra and to postulate the existence of a Bhadra dynasty ruling in Bengal. Although there is not sufficient evidence in support of this view, it is not an unlikely one. This Brahmanical royal dynasty seems to have been overthrown by a line of Buddhist kings whose names contained the word khaḍga as an essential element. The history of this dynasty, generally referred to as the Khadga dynasty, is known from two copper-plates found at Ashrafpur, 30 miles north-east of Dacca, and a short record inscribed on an image of Sarvāṇī (Durgā) found at Deulbādi, 14 miles south of Comilla. These disclose the names of three rulers viz., Khaḍgodyama, his son Jātakahadga, and the latter’s son Devakhadga. They also refer to the queen and the son of the last named king, viz. Prabhāvati and Rājarāja, also called Rājarājabhaṭa. They were all devout Buddhists.

Khaḍgodyama is described as nṛipādhirāja (overlord of kings) and seems to have been the founder of the kingdom. The records unfortunately do not contain any historical information, beyond the usual vague praises, about him or his successors. Of the two copper-plate grants of Devakhadga, one is dated in his 13th regnal year, and the date of the other is doubtful. Both were issued from the royal camp of Karmānta-vāśaka, which was probably their capital. This city has been identified with modern Baḍkāmtā, a

(see supra p. 17). The account of Hiuen Tsang, however, shows that Samastaṭa was an extensive kingdom in his days. "This country," says he, "which was on the sea side and was low and moist, was more than 5,000 li in circuit." (Watters, p. 187). From Samastaṭa the "pilgrim journeyed west for over 900 li to Tāmarāṇipā." (Ibid. 189). From these indications the kingdom of Samastaṭa in the 7th century A.D. may be reasonably regarded as having comprised the area bounded by the old course of the lower Brahmaputra river in the north, Chittagong Hills in the east, and the Bay of Bengal on the south. The western boundary was perhaps formed by a branch of the old Ganges (Pārśva) corresponding to modern Goroī and Madhumati rivers. Cunningham held that Samastaṭa denoted the delta of the Ganges and its chief city occupied the site of modern Jessore. Ferguson and Watters identified it respectively with Dacca and Faridpur districts. (Watters, p. 188).

When [Watters, p. 100.]

IC. II. 793-97. As mentioned supra p. 80, Iṣ. 1, a vassal chief Nārāyanabhādra is mentioned in the Ins. of Jayanāga.

MASB. 1. No. 6, pp. 85-91.

JASB. N.S. XIX. 575 II; HNI. 308.
Date of the Khadga Kings

Police station in the Tippera district,¹ but this identification cannot be regarded as certain.

The date of these kings is also a matter of dispute. Some scholars refer them to the 9th century A.D.,² while others hold that they ruled during the latter part of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century.³ Apart from the evidence of palaeography⁴, on which both the theories are mainly based, the latter view seems to be supported by certain references in I-tsing’s account of fifty-six Buddhist priests of China who visited India and the neighbouring parts during the latter half of the seventh century A.D. One of these priests, Sheng-Chi by name, found Rājabhata ruling over Samatata,⁵ and this ruler has been identified by most scholars with Rājarājabhata of the Khadga dynasty.⁶ From the same work of I-tsing, we know that a certain Buddhist temple situated about 228 miles east of Nālandā⁷ was originally founded by Śrī-Gupta, but the land belonging to it “has now reverted to the king of Eastern India, whose name is Devavarmā.”⁸ This king has been identified by some with Devagupta⁹ of the Later Gupta dynasty of Magadha, and by others with Devakhadga.⁰ It must be remembered, however, that the temple in question was undoubtedly situated in Bengal. Further, Magadha, the home-territory of the Later Guptas, is placed by I-tsing in Mid-India¹¹ and not Eastern India, which is described by him as bounded by Tāmralipti in the south (and west) and Harikela in the east.¹²

The identification of Devavarmā with Devakhadga, therefore, appears to be more reasonable. The Chinese evidence, thus interpreted, leads to the conclusion that the Khadga dynasty ruled approximately between 650 and 700 A.D. and their kingdom comprised nearly the whole of Eastern and Southern Bengal. But these conclusions must be regarded as tentative.

¹ EI. xvi. 351; JASB. N.S. x. 87. ² BI. 293; MASB. i. No. 6, pp. 85 ff. ³ JASB. N.S. xix. 378; JASB. N.S. x. 85; HNI. 202. ⁴ Beal—Life. xl-xl1; Chavannes. Religion des Eminenten (I-tsing), p. 128, f.n. 9. ⁵ JASB. N.S. xix. 378; HNI. 207. ⁶ IHQ. xiv. 534. ⁷ Beal—Life. xxxvi—xxxvii; Chavannes, op. cit., p. 85; IHQ. xiv. 534. ⁸ Dr. R. G. Baak was presumably led to this view (HNI. 180) by the mistaken belief that the land granted by the king was situated near Mahābodhi temple in Gaya, whereas, as noted above, it was more than two hundred miles further to the east, in Bengal (supra p. 89). ⁹ JASB. N.S. xix. 378. ¹⁰ Bodh-Gayā is referred to as situated in Mid-India in connection with the biography of Hsu-en-T’ai (Beal—Life. xxx; Chavannes, op. cit., p. 85). ¹¹ Takakusu—I-tsing. pp. xxxi, xlvi; Chavannes, op. cit., pp. 121, 106; Beal—Life. xl-xl1. Tāmralipti is called the southern district of Eastern India from which people went towards Mid-India, showing that it was on the south-western border of East India.
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The Tippera copper-plate grant of Sāmanta Lokanātha introduces us to a line of feudatory chiefs ruling in East Bengal in the region round Tippera. The founder of the family is described as a paramount ruler, adhimahārāja. His name is lost, except the last two letters -nātha. His successor Śivanātha is, however, referred to as sāmanta. Nothing of importance is known of the next two rulers after whom came Lokanātha who issued the charter.

The facts recorded about Lokanātha are somewhat vague and obscure. It appears that he defeated an army sent against him by his suzerain (paramēsvara). On the other hand, another king, Jivadhārana by name, occupied a part or whole of the kingdom of Lokanātha, but gave up the fight and restored the territory, as the latter obtained the royal charter, presumably from the suzerain. There is a further reference to a fight between Jayatūṅgavarsha and Lokanātha. The natural presumption is that Lokanātha rebelled against his suzerain Jayatūṅgavarsha, and scored an initial success by defeating the army of the latter. But he was ultimately defeated by Jivadhārana, another feudatory chief of Jayatūṅgavarsha. He then submitted to his suzerain, and his dominions were restored to him. But neither Jayatūṅgavarsha, which was obviously a title rather than a proper name, nor Jivadhārana can be identified.

The copper-plate of Lokanātha is dated in words, but unfortunately the portion containing the figure for hundreds is lost, and the extant part gives us only the year 44. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar restores it as 144, and refers it to Harsha Era which would make it equivalent to 750 A.D. Dr. R. G. Basak, on the other hand, restores the date as 544, and referring it to the Gupta Era obtains the date 663-64 A.D. for Lokanātha. The palaeographical evidence, according to Dr. Basak, also refers the inscription to the seventh century A.D. If we accept this date, we may reasonably hold the view that Lokanātha was a feudatory of the Khadga dynasty, and Jayatūṅgavarsha was a biruda (title) of either Khadgodyama or Jātakhadga. It may be added that according to the copper-plates of the Khadgas, Jātakhadga annihilated his enemies and Devakhadga had under him a number of feudal rulers who paid court to him. But whether the Khadgas exercised supremacy over Lokanātha or not, there is no valid reason to suppose, as some scholars have done, that both these dynasties acknowledged a common suzerain, far less that this suzerain was the king of Kāmarūpa.

---

1 Ei. xv. 301-315.  
2 For a fuller account cf. HNI. 183 ff.  
3 IA. ixxi. 44.  
4 HNI. 193.  
5 EHB. 89; IC. ii. 37-45.
The history of the Khāḍga dynasty after Rājarājabhaṭa is not known to us. According to the traditions recorded by the Tibetan monk Tāranāṭha, to which detailed reference will be made in the next chapter,¹ the Chandra dynasty had been ruling in Vaṅga (and occasionally also over Gauḍa) as early as the middle of the seventh century A.D., and its last two rulers Govichandra and Lalitachandra reigned during the last part of the seventh and the first part of the eighth century A.D. It is not improbable that Govichandra supplanted the Khāḍgas and re-established the supremacy of his dynasty.

If we may believe in Tāranāṭha’s statement, it was probably during the reign of Lalitachandra that Yaśovarman invaded Vaṅga. It is, however, equally or perhaps more likely that the king of Vaṅga opposing Yaśovarman was a Khāḍga king. But whoever he may be, he was, according to Gauḍa-vahō, no mean enemy, and possessed large elephant forces (v. 419). The author of Gauḍa-vahō pays indirectly a high tribute to the people of Vaṅga when he says that ‘their faces assumed a pale colour while offering obeisance to the victor, because they were not accustomed to such an act (v. 420).’ This testimony to the peoples’ bravery and love of freedom was perhaps based on the personal knowledge of the author. The suzerainty of Yaśovarman was probably more nominal than real, and in any case it was short-lived. There is no evidence to show that either of the two other foreign rulers, Lalitāditya or Harsha, who probably exercised supremacy over Gauḍa, had any pretensions of suzerainty over Vaṅga.

According to Tāranāṭha, the death of Lalitachandra was followed by a period of anarchy and confusion. There was no king ruling over either Gauḍa or Vaṅga, and as he characteristically puts it, every Kshatriya, Grandee, Brāhmaṇa, and merchant was a king in his own house.

The contemporary records also describe the political condition of Bengal in the middle of the eighth century A.D. as ‘mātsya-nyāya,’² a technical term used in treatises on politics to denote the absence of a central ruling authority, resulting in a chaotic state, where every local chief assumes royal authority and might alone is right.

This lamentable state of political disintegration was undoubtedly caused by the series of foreign invasions and the successive changes of ruling dynasties in Gauḍa and Vaṅga referred to above. They

¹ For references to Tāranāṭha’s account in this chapter cf. App. i. to Ch. vi. infra.
² Khalimpur cp. Pāla Ins., No. 2.
shattered the political fabric reared up with so much care by Gopachandra, Dharmaditya, Samacharadeva and Sasanka. Bengal lapsed into a state of political inanity and the people must have suffered untold miseries. But the very grave peril and the extremity of the evil brought its own remedy.
APPENDIX I

RELATIONS OF TIBET WITH INDIA

Some time between 581 and 600 A.D., an obscure chief named Srong Tsan united the scattered hill tribes and founded a powerful kingdom in Tibet. He had an army of about 1,00,000 soldiers and led a victorious campaign to Central India, a term used by the Chinese to designate Bihar and probably also sometimes U. P. as distinguished from Eastern India comprising Bengal and Assam. The nature and extent of his conquest are not known to us, but it has been suggested that the era known as San and current in Bengal and Assam commemorates this forgotten foreign invasion of Bengal. The name of the era, San, equivalent to the last part of the name of the Tibetan king, and its epoch 593-594 A.D. both favour this hypothesis, but it goes against the generally accepted view that the era originated in the time of Akbar by the conversion of Hijra into a solar year.

Srong Tsan was succeeded by his son Srong-tsang Gampo. He was a remarkable figure. He married a princess of Nepal and also won, under military pressure, the hands of the daughter of the Chinese emperor. Through the influence of his queens he was converted into Buddhism and introduced the religion in his country. The grateful posterity regards him as an incarnation of Bodhisatva Padmapani. He revised Tibetan alphabet on the model of the Indian, invited Indian Pundits to Tibet, and had Buddhist scriptures translated into Tibetan. He founded numerous monasteries and castles at Lhasa and made that his capital. He also extended the suzerainty of Tibet in all directions.

---

1 Lévi-Nepal, p. 147, 158-4.
2 Lévi's view has been refuted by K. P. Jayaswal (J.B.O.R.S. xxii. 172). Some other views on the origin of Bengali San have been summarised by D. Trivedi in J.I.H. xix. 292 ff.
3 The account of Srong-tsang Gampo is based on the following authorities:
   b. A Study on the Chronicles of Ladhak by Dr. L Pétech (published as a supplement to IHQ. xv), Ch. v.
   c. Lévi-Nepal, p. 146-152.
   d. Sarat Chandra Das's account (J.A.S.B. L. 1881), Part 1, pp. 819-824. (This is somewhat antiquated and should be read in the light of Nos. a-c).
   e. L. A. Waddell, The Buddhism of Tibet, Ch. III.
Srong-tsang Gampo was a contemporary of the great Indian emperor Harshavarman. The death of Harsha, towards the close of 646 or the beginning of 647 A.D., was followed by anarchy and confusion, and the succession to the imperial throne was claimed by one of his ministers, who evidently held sway in Bihar and whose name is given in Chinese texts as Na-fu-ti O-lo-na-shuen, the original Indian name being perhaps Arjuna or Arunaśva of Tirabhukti (Tirhut, North Bihar). According to the story preserved in the Chinese annals, this Arjuna attacked a Chinese mission, under Wang-hiuin-tse, that was sent by the Chinese Emperor to Harsha. For reasons, not explained, Arjuna killed most of the members of the mission and plundered their property. Wang-hiuin-tse fled to Nepal, secured 7,000 soldiers from Nepal and 1,200 from Tibet, and, returning to Indian plains, disastrously defeated and imprisoned Arjuna and took him a captive to China. It is said that Wang-hiuin-tse stormed the capital city of Arjuna, and about 580 walled towns in India submitted to him. Even Bhāskaravarman, the king of Kāmarupa, sent supplies to the victorious army led by Wang-hiuin-tse. The whole episode took place during 647 and 648 A.D. in the plains of Bihar, probably to the north of the river Ganges and not far from the river Gandaki.

The story reads more like romance than sober history, and it is difficult to say what amount of historical truth there is in it. For it is as difficult to accept the story of unprovoked hostility on the part of Arjuna as to believe in the utter rout of his army and thorough conquest of his country by 8,000 soldiers.

There is, however, no doubt that the Tibetan king Srong-tsang Gampo was drawn into Indian politics, either in connection with the strange episode of Wang-hiuin-tse or in pursuance of his father's policy. Whether he actually conquered any part of Indian plains is not definitely known, but he is said to have conquered Assam and Nepal, and exercised suzerainty over half of Jambudvipa. There is hardly any doubt that Nepal was at this time a vassal state of Tibet and remained so for nearly two hundred years.

The reign-period of Srong-tsang Gampo is not definitely known, but there is general agreement among scholars that he died about 650 A.D. He was succeeded by his grandson Ki-li-pa-pu (650-679).

\[\text{JA. 9e Serie, t. xv. (1900), pp. 297 ff. It appears that the mission of Wang-hiuin-tse was sent to Magadha and presumably the incidents took place there. The Chinese form of the name of the Indian king may mean O-lo-na-shun, king of Ti-na-fu-ti (p. 308, n. 9). The latter may stand for Tirabhukti (North Bihar).}

\[\text{Lévi-Népal. n. 148.}

\[\text{Tibetan historians give various dates for the birth of Srong-tsang Gampo, ranging between 600 and 617 A.D. (JASB. L. 218). According to Dr. Petech, "it}
who proved an extremely capable ruler. He inflicted a crushing defeat upon China in 670 A.D. and conquered Kashgar and the neighbouring regions in the North. In the South he is said to have extended his conquests as far as Central India,¹ but unfortunately no localities are specified.

In 702 Nepal and Central India revolted against Tibet. Nepal was subdued, and Central India, even if it did not send regular tribute, did not remain free from depredations. For, during the period 713-41 an embassy from Central India came to China to seek for help against the Tibetans and the Arabs.²

Lalitāditya Muktāpiḍa, the powerful king of Kashmir, was also engaged in hostilities against Tibet and sent an embassy to China between 736 and 747 A.D. He represented to the Imperial court, that in conjunction with the king of Central India he had closed the five roads leading from Tibet to India and obtained several victories against the Tibetans.³ After Lalitāditya the task of keeping the Tibetans in check fell upon the Pāla kings of Bengal, and further account of the relations between Tibet and India will be given in Chapter vi.

is established with certainty that Srong-tshan Gampo was born in 569 A.D. and reigned from 608 to 650 A.D.¹⁰ (op. cit., pp. 47-48). Lévi (Nepal, p. 173) and Thomas (Literary Texts, 49) also place the king’s death at 650, the latter assigning him the date 600-630 A.D. Francke notes that the Chinese date for the king’s death is 600-630 A.D. (op. cit.).

¹ Lévi-Nepal, p. 174. I do not know the authority for Sir R. C. Temple’s assertion that “at this period Tibetan rule must have spread southwards far into Bengal” (IA. 1916, p. 26).

² Lévi-Nepal, p. 174-75.

³ Ibid. 175.
APPENDIX II

THE EVIDENCE OF GAUḍA-VAHO

Dr. S. P. Pandit, the learned editor of Gauḍa-vaḥo, has assumed without any discussion that the Lord of Magadha mentioned in that poem was identical with the king of Gauḍa.1

This assumption, though supported by Haripāla’s commentary on Gauḍa-vaḥo,2 rests only on evidence of a very indirect character. The principal argument, of course, is that unless the identity is assumed there remains no justification for the title of the book. But the learned editor himself admits that even such an assumption does not go very far in supporting or explaining the title. Thus he was constrained to remark as follows:

“But this mention of the Magadha king is made in the most incidental manner and with no direct purpose to refer to him as the hero who has given the name to the poem.”3

Another argument is supplied by internal evidence. After singing Yaśovarman’s exploits the poet gives some personal accounts. We are told that one evening the poet was requested by an assembly of learned people to describe fully the manner in which Yaśovarman slew the lord of Magadha (v. 844). In reply the poet said, after describing in general terms the greatness of Yaśovarman in 228 verses, that he would sing next morning the Gauḍa-vaḥo, describing the destruction of many (or one) eastern kings. Next morning when the poet was going to relate the exploits of Yaśovarman to the learned assembly, the poets of the court talked among themselves about Yaśovarman’s virtues and his prowess that had accomplished the death (lit. cut the throat) of the Gauḍa king (v. 1194). (This passing reference is the only allusion to the death of the Gauḍa king in the whole poem). The poet then began: “Hear the wonderful deeds of Yaśovarman.” But here the poem ends.

Now it may be argued that as Gauḍa-vaḥo was sung in response to the request to describe how Yaśovarman slew the lord of Magadha, the king of Magadha was the same as Lord of Gauḍa. It is, however, not quite inconceivable that the poet, in compliance with the request, proposed to give an account not only of the king of Magadha, but also of the various eastern kings,

---

1 GV. xxiv. xlii. 2 Cf. commentary on v. 844. 3 GV. xliii.
Gauḍa rule over Magadha

including that of Gauḍa. It is evident from the abrupt end that he actually accomplished neither, and even if he did so, his work has not come down to us. This is also the view of the learned editor of Gauḍa-vaho.¹

On the whole, the union of Gauḍa and Magadha under one ruler may be a valid presumption but cannot be regarded as a proved fact, on the strength of Gauḍa-vaho. Further, it is legitimate to infer that even if both Magadha and Gauḍa were under the same ruler, it was the ruler of Gauḍa who had Magadha under his sway, rather than vice-versa. For, otherwise there is no justification for the name Gauḍa-vaho.²

¹ GV. XLVIII. For a summary of the various opinions expressed by scholars on this subject cf. Supplementary Notes (pp. cxxxxix-cclvi) by Utgikar in the second edition of Gauḍa-vaho, published by Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona, 1987).

² According to N. B. Utgikar, “the reason for the selection of the name of the Gauḍa king in preference to other kings subdued by Yaśovarman, to form the designation of a highly-pitched poem, may possibly have to be sought for in the latent ill-will that can historically be proved to have existed between the two kingdoms of Kanauj and Gauḍa before the time of Yaśovarman” (2nd ed., p. cclii). This explanation is, however, hardly convincing.
CHAPTER VI

THE PÁLAS

The foundation of the Pála dynasty about the middle of the eighth century A.D. marks a new epoch in the history of Bengal. For the first time the historian has the advantage of being able to follow, in the main, the fortunes of a single ruling dynasty, the order of succession of whose long line of kings is precisely known, and whose chronology may be fixed with a tolerable degree of certainty. This advantage does not forsake him till the end of the Hindu period, in spite of occasional political disintegration and the rise of local dynasties ruling in various parts of the province.

The history of the Pálas, extending over four centuries, may be divided into the following stages:

1. The Origin and Early History of the Pálas.
2. The Pála Empire.
3. The Decline and Fall of the Empire.
4. Restoration.
5. The Break-up of the Pála Kingdom.
7. The End of the Pála Rule.

1. THE ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE PÁLAS

The anarchy and confusion which prevailed in Bengal for more than a century\(^1\) led to a natural reaction. The people, who had suffered untold miseries for a long period, suddenly developed a political wisdom and a spirit of self-sacrifice to which there is no recorded parallel in the history of Bengal. They perceived that the establishment of a single strong central authority offered the only effective remedy against political disintegration within and invasions from abroad to which their unhappy land was so long a victim. They also realised that such a happy state of things could only be brought about by the voluntary surrender of authority to one person by the numerous petty chiefs who had been exercising independent political authority in different parts of the country. The ideal of subordinating individual interests to a national cause was not as

\(^1\) See supra pp. 77-90.
common in India in the eighth century A.D. as it was in Europe a thousand years later. Our admiration is, therefore, all the greater, that without any struggle the independent political chiefs recognised the suzerainty of a popular hero named Gopāla. Thus took place a bloodless revolution which both in its spirit and subsequent results reminds us of what happened in Japan about A.D. 1870.

Unfortunately this memorable episode in the history of Bengal is known to us only in brief outline, and details are altogether lacking. The Khalimpur copper-plate1 issued in the 32nd year of the reign of Dharmapāla, refers to this event in the following couplet:

\[ mātṣyanyāyām = a p o h i t u m ~ p r a k r i t i b h i r = l a k s h m yāh ~ k a r a m i n ~ g rāhitah \]

\[ s r i - G o pāl a = i t i ~ k s h i t i s a - ś i r a s ā m ~ c h u dāmanis = t a t - s u t a h ] \]

Kielhorn translates the above as follows:

"His son was the crest-jewel of the heads of kings, the glorious Gopāla, whom the people made take the hand of Fortune, to put an end to the practice of fishes."

In a footnote to the above, Kielhorn adds: "Gopāla was made king by the people to put an end to a lawless state of things in which everyone was the prey of his neighbour." He also cites authority for his interpretation of the phrase 'mātṣya-nyāya.'

Now there is no dispute regarding the general interpretation of the above passage, viz., that Gopāla was made king in order to put an end to the state of anarchy which prevailed in Bengal. The only point that is open to discussion is the agency that made him king. According to the couplet referred to above, Gopāla was made king by the 'prakrita.' The common meaning of the word is 'subjects,' and it has consequently been held that Gopāla was elected king by the general body of people.2 Although this view has met with general acceptance, it is open to doubt whether the passage refers to anything like a regular election by the general mass of people, and, if so, whether this was at all practicable in those days and in such abnormal times. It would, perhaps, be more reasonable to hold that the choice was originally made by the leading chiefs, and was subsequently endorsed and acclaimed by the people. This may well be regarded as tantamount to an 'election by the people' referred to in the Khalimpur copper-plate.

It has been suggested on the other hand that 'prakrīti' should be taken as a technical term meaning principal officers, and that

---

1. Ins. No. 2 (see list of inscriptions, App. 1 to this chapter).
2. BI. 161, 162, 171; GR. 21; GL. 19 fn.
Gopāla was placed on the throne by the principal officers of the state. This view is supported by an instance recorded in the Rājatarangini, viz., the election of Jalauka as king by a group of seven officials called ‘prakritis.’ It must be remembered, however, that such election is possible, and even very probable, only when there is a strong and stable government exercising authority over the whole kingdom. In the absence of such a central government, we can hardly think of ministers or a set of permanent officials who could offer the throne to a nominee of their own. If we presume, as we must, that a central political authority exercising any sort of control over the whole of Gauda or Vānag had ceased to function for a long period, and the country was divided into a large number of independent principalities, we can scarcely think of a group of officials (presumably of one of these states) placing somebody on the throne of Bengal, or a considerable portion of the province.

On the whole, therefore, we are justified in holding the view that Gopāla was called to the throne by the voice of the people, though perhaps the selection was originally made by a group of leaders or independent ruling chiefs.

Although this remarkable episode has not been referred to in Indian literature, and its very memory has now vanished from Bengal, it was a living tradition among the people even so late as the sixteenth century A.D. This is proved by the curious story recorded by the Tibetan historian Lāmā Tāranātha.

Unfortunately we possess very meagre information about the life and reign of Gopāla. His father Vapyāṭa and grandfather Dayitavishnu are referred to in very general terms in the official records, and there is nothing to indicate that they were ruling chiefs. Vapyāṭa is called ‘destructor of foes,’ but this does not imply anything more than that he was, perhaps, a military chief.

In a commentary to Ashtasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā composed by Harihidra, during the reign of Gopāla’s son Dharmapāla, the latter is described as Rājabhotādi-vanśa-patita. This led MM. Haraprāśad Sāstri to conclude that Dharmapāla belonged “to the family of a military officer of some king.” Others have taken

1 EVBP. 112.  
2 Cf. App. iii to this chapter.  
3 Mr. J. C. Ghosh’s view that Vapyāṭa was the first king of the line rests on very insufficient grounds [IHQ, vii. 761 (881); ix. 481].
4 rājya Rājabhatādi-vanśa-patita-ātri-Dharmapālaya vai
tattva-loka-vidyājñīni virnchītā sat-patih=eyam maya]

The verse, occurring at the end of ch. 82 of the commentary, is quoted and an account of the ms. is given in BI. 164, fn. 4.

5 RC. 6. R. D. Banerji misquoted this passage and by reading ‘the same’ for ‘same’ attributed to MM. Sāstri the view that the Pālins were descended from a general of Rājabhatā (BI 164, fn. 4). MM. Sāstri, far from holding this view,
Rājabhaṭa as a personal name, and identified him with the king of the same name ruling in Samatata when Sheng-chi came to India towards the close of the seventh century A.D.¹ This Rājabhaṭa may be identified with the heir-apparent of Devakhaḍa named in official records of the dynasty as Rājarāja and Rājarāja-Bhaṭa.² The passage cited by MM. Haraprasād Śāstri would thus lead to the conclusion that the Pālas were connected in some way with the Khāḍgas. The fact that the Khāḍgas were Buddhists, like the Pālas, and were ruling in Eastern Bengal, shortly before the accession of Gopāla, undoubtedly strengthens this presumption. On the other hand, apart from the questionable interpretation of Rājabhaṭa as a personal name, the word ‘patita’ creates considerable difficulty. There is no warrant for the assumption that it means ‘descended by the female line.’³ It is normally used in a derogatory sense such as ‘fallen,’ ‘outcast,’ etc., and scarcely ever in the sense of ‘being descended from,’ though the latter meaning is not altogether unknown.⁴

Some scholars have faced a subtle reference to the royal family of Dharmapāla’s mother in the fifth verse of the Khalimpur copper-plate (Ins. No. 2). In this verse Deddadevi, the wife of Gopāla, is compared to the wives of the deities Moon, Agni (Fire), Śiva, Kuvera, Indra, and Vishnu.⁵ In course of the comparison, the word ‘Bhadrātmajā’ is used immediately after Bhadrā, the name of Kuvera’s wife. Kilhorn, while translating this verse, took ‘Bhadrātmajā’ as an epithet qualifying Deddadevi, and translated it as ‘a daughter of the Bhadra king,’ regarding Bhadra as a tribal or family name. Mr. Akshaya Kumar Maitreya, on the other hand, took ‘Bhadrātmajā’ as an ordinary adjective to Bhadrā, meaning daughter of a gentleman. It must be confessed, however, that there is hardly any point in applying such a colourless epithet to Bhadrā alone of all the goddesses mentioned in the verse. Kilhorn, therefore, may be right in his interpretation, and Deddadevi might belong to the royal Bhadra family referred to in the last chapter.⁶

suggest (op. cit.) that Dayita-Vishnu, the grandfather of Gopāla, belonged to the family of Mātri-Vishnu mentioned in the Eran Stone Ins. (Fleet. CII. iii. No. 19).

¹ V. 147. See supra p. 87.
² JASB. N.S. xix. 378. R. D. Banerji rejects this view (BL. 165-66), but it is accepted by R. G. Basak (HNJ. 807). Mr. J. C. Ghosh identifies Rājabhaṭa with Vappyaṭa, the father of Gopāla (IHQ. ix. 481). This seems to be very unlikely.
³ IHQ. v. 593. ⁴ Cf. avalokita-patita = vajal (Chāṇakya-śatakam, 81).
⁵ For a similar comparison cf. Mbh. Adi-P. ch. 199, vv. 5-6.
⁶ See supra p. 86.
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It would thus appear that we have hardly any definite information regarding the origin of the royal Pāla family. Strangely enough, unlike other mediaeval records, we do not find any mythical pedigree of the dynasty in the Pāla inscriptions. In the Kāmauli Plate of Vaidyadeva (Ins. No. 50), who was originally the minister of a Pāla king, Vīgrahapāla III is said to have belonged to the solar dynasty.\(^1\) According to the commentary of Sandhyākara Nandi's Rāmcharita (r. 4), Dharmapāla was 'the light of Samudra's race' (samudra-kula-dīpa) i.e., descended from the ocean.\(^2\) It may be noted that both the records belong to the very end of the Pāla period, more than three hundred and fifty years after the accession of Gopāla, and very little weight attaches to the theories contained in them about the origin of the dynasty. Besides, the membership of the solar or lunar family was commonly claimed for most of the royal houses of those days, and there is nothing distinctive about it. The descent from the samudra or ocean has undoubtedly more novelty in it. A distant echo of this may be traced in an old Bengali text called Dharma-mangala composed by Ghanarāma.\(^3\) It records that Dharmapāla had no son and his queen Vallabhādevī was banished to a forest. There she had a liaison with the ocean and a son was born to her. This silly story gives a wrong name for Dharmapāla's queen, and describes him as a devout Vaishnava and devoted to the Brāhmaṇas.

Tārānātha tells us that Gopāla was succeeded by a son whom Nāgarāja Sagarapāla, the sovereign of the ocean, begot on his younger queen.\(^4\) This is evidently another version of the origin of the Pālas from samudra or ocean. These stories are too silly to be seriously considered,\(^5\) and do not help us in the least in tracing the ancestry of the Pālas. An attempt has been made to reconcile the two different traditions of samudra and sūrya origin by holding that samudra-kula means sūrya-kula or solar race to which Samudra, the son of the mythical king Sagara, belonged.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) This tradition is also recorded in Paj Sam Jon Zang, cf. JASB. 1898, p. 20.

\(^2\) R.C. p. ix.

\(^3\) Quoted in BI. 168, f.n. 18.

\(^4\) Tārānātha, this successor was Devapāla, but according to Bustom (History of Buddhism, translated by Dr. E. Obermiller, Heidelberg 1932, p. 156), he was Dharmapāla.

\(^5\) Mr. R. D. Banerji tries to give a rational interpretation of 'Samudra-kula' by the theory that the Pālas came from the sea (PB.*46).

\(^6\) This view, originally propounded by Mr. Prabhaschandra Sen, has been restated at some length by Mr. J. C. Ghosh (IHQ. ix. 484-85).
As to the caste of the Pālas, the commentary on a verse of Rāmācharita (1.17) distinctly says that Rāmapāla was born of a Kshatriya king. Tāranaṭha tells us that Gopāla was begotten on a Kshatriya woman by the Tree-God. It may be readily believed, therefore, that the Pālas, like most of the ruling families in mediaeval India, were regarded as Kshatriyas. This view is corroborated by the matrimonial relations of the Pālas with the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas and the Kalachuris. But according to that curious work Manjusri-mulakalpa, which refers to kings only by the first letter of the name, kings, who have been identified with the Pālas, are said to be of the menial caste. Abu’l-Fazl calls the Pālas Kāyasthas. But the value of the last two evidences is not very great, and they need not be seriously considered.

Perhaps one of the reasons why no reference to the origin and caste of the Pālas occurs in their own records is the fact that they were Buddhists and did not care so much to adopt Brahmanical institutions or traditions. The copper-plates of the Pālas begin with an invocation to Lord Buddha, and many kings of the dynasty are known to have been great patrons of Buddhism. According to the Tibetan tradition, Gopāla founded a Vihāra or monastery at Nalanda and established many religious schools. Tāranaṭha, as usual, gives a long list of Buddhist teachers who flourished during this reign. Whether Gopāla himself first adopted Buddhism, or whether he was born in a Buddhist family, it is not possible to determine. But certain it is that the successors of Gopāla were all ardent followers of Buddhism, and for nearly four hundred years their court proved to be the last stronghold of that dying faith in India. For this reason the Pāla kings enjoyed an important position in the international Buddhist world, and they maintained intact the fountain-head of later Buddhism from which streams flowed to Tibet in the north and the Indian archipelago in the south and east.

As in the case of the origin of the family, uncertainty also hangs over the location of the original kingdom of Gopāla. The inscriptions do not supply any definite information on the point. The fact that during the first two hundred years of the Pāla rule, covering the reigns of eight kings, almost all the copper-plate grants were issued from victorious camps in Magadha, and all the other inscriptions, with only a single exception, belonged to that region, naturally led many to conclude that the Pālas originally ruled in

2 Tātāra parema bhūpāla gopāla dāsajivinah, MMK (J), v. 885. Mr. Jayaswal takes Gopāla in this verse as referring to the Pāla dynasty. This is very doubtful, especially as Buddha’s doctrine is said to have been lost during their reign (IHII. 78).
3 Ain. Transf. ii. 145.
4 Tar., 204; Bosten, 188.
Magadha and subsequently conquered Bengal. But this view can hardly be maintained in the light of positive evidences which have come to light in recent years.

In the first place, the Rāmcharita definitely refers to Varendra as the ‘janakabhūḥ’ or ancestral home of the Pālas. Secondly, the Gwalior inscription refers to the adversary of Nāgabhaṭa, who can hardly be anybody other than Dharmapāla, as Vaṅgapati. These two evidences make it almost certain that the home and the original kingdom of the Pālas must be placed in Bengal. This is indirectly supported by the Bādāl Pillar inscription which says that Dharmapāla, to begin with, was only the ruler of the east, and gradually spread his dominions in other directions.

We should, of course, remember that Varendra (also called Varendra) denoted the northern, and Vanga, the eastern and southeastern part of Bengal. The evidences of Rāmcharita and Gwalior inscription might, therefore, appear to be contradictory, unless we regard Vanga as denoting the whole province of Bengal. Such an use of the name Vaṅga can, however, be justified or explained only on the supposition that the Pālas were originally the rulers of Vanga, and the name came to be applied to the rest of the province with the growth of their dominions. The conflicting nature of the two evidences, therefore, still remains. Perhaps Tāranātha’s account supplies the best solution of the difficulty, viz., that Gopāla was born of a Kshatriya family near Pūndravardhana, but was subsequently elected ruler of Bhaṅgala, undoubtedly a corrupt form of Vaṅga or Vaṅgala.1

But whatever may have been the limits of the original kingdom of Gopāla,1 it is reasonable to hold that he consolidated his authority over the whole of Bengal. In the Monghyr copper-plate of Devapāla (Ins. No. 6), Gopāla is said to have conquered the earth as far as the sea. This, of course, does not mean much. But it is difficult to believe that his son and successor Dharmapāla could carry on victorious campaigns up to the Punjab, unless he had inherited from his father at least the consolidated kingdom of Bengal.

From the time of Nārāyanapāla onwards the copper-plate grants of the Pāla kings begin with a verse which is an eulogy both of Buddha and Gopāla. Naturally all the epithets are equally applicable to both of them. One of these runs as follows:

\[ \text{jītvā yah kāmak-āri-prabhavāḥ = abhībhavaṁ śāvatiṁ-} \]
\[ \text{prāpa śāntiṁ} \]

1 For fuller discussion, see App. iii to this chapter.
2 R. D. Banerji held that Gopāla was elected ruler of Gauda, Vaṅga, and Magadha (Bl. 102), but no evidence is cited.
Conquests of Gopāla

In the case of Gopāla, the passage seems to mean that he established peace in his kingdom by having defeated the attacks of the oppressors or tyrants, the expression ‘kāmakāri’ meaning those who do not acknowledge any control and act wilfully. The reference in this case is, of course, to the period of anarchy and political disintegration that prevailed before the accession of Gopāla. It has been suggested, however, that ‘Kāmakāri’ means ‘king of Kāmarūpa, who is an enemy;’ Kāma, with the pleonastic suffix ka, standing for Kāmarūpa, under the well-known Sanskrit aphorism that part of a name may be substituted for the full name. It is unreasonable to rule out the interpretation altogether, but it is to be seriously considered whether such an achievement of Gopāla, as the conquest of Assam, or of Magadha (as noted by Tāranātha), would not have been more directly stated in the official records, if it were a fact. Besides, as we shall see (infra p. 117), Kāmarūpa was conquered in the time of Devapāla.

On the whole, therefore, it would be safe to conclude that the main achievement of Gopāla was the establishment of durable peace in Bengal by bringing under control the turbulent elements in the province. That the reign of Gopāla ended in peaceful pursuits and not adventurous military expeditions is also hinted at in verse 32 of the Monghyr copper-plate of Devapāla (Ins. No. 6).

The reign-period of Gopāla is not definitely known. According to Tāranātha, he ruled for forty-five years, but this statement cannot be accepted without corroboration. According to Mañjuśrī-mālakalpa, his reign-period was twenty-seven years. His accession to the throne may be placed with a tolerable degree of certainty within a decade of 750 A.D., and he probably ceased to rule about 770 A.D. The fact that he was called to the throne at a critical moment shows that he must have been fairly advanced in age, and given proof of his prowess and ability. It is not likely, therefore, that he ruled for a very long time. According to Mañjuśrī-mālakalpa, he died at the advanced age of eighty. This is hardly likely, as we know that his son and grandson ruled respectively for at least thirty-two and thirty-five years.

---

1 IHQ, vii. 581-82.
2 ‘Having conquered the earth as far as the sea, he released the war-elephants, as they were no longer required.’
3 Tar., p. 204.
4 MMK (J). v. 680.
5 The dates of the Pāla kings have been discussed separately in App. ii to this chapter.
6 MMK (J). v. 690.
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II. THE PĀLA EMPIRE

1. Dharmapāla (c. 770–810 A.D.)

Gopāla was succeeded in c. 770 A.D. by his son Dharmapāla, who was destined to raise the Pāla kingdom to the high-water mark of glory and power. But before we describe his life and reign, it is necessary to pass in rapid review the political condition of India at the time.

In the Deccan, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had wrested the political power from the Chālukyas, and established themselves as the ruling dynasty in 753 A.D., i.e., about the time when Gopāla ascended the throne. Two powerful rulers of this dynasty, Dhrūva (c. 780-794) and his son Govinda III (c. 794-814), sent strong military expeditions to extend their powers in Northern India, and brilliant, though temporary, successes attended their efforts.1

Their chief adversaries in the north were the Pratihārās. It is not necessary for our present purpose to enter into the controversial details about the early history of the dynasty. It will suffice to say that Vatsarāja, an early ruler of this dynasty, and one of whose known dates is 783-84 A.D., was a powerful king who not only consolidated his power in Mālava and Rājputāna, but also tried to extend his conquests to Eastern India.2 In particular, he defeated the lord of Gauḍa. His success was, however, short-lived. He was defeated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhrūva who completed his triumph by defeating the lord of Gauḍa in the Ganges-Jumna Doab.

It would thus appear that shortly after his accession to the throne, Dharmapāla was involved in a tripartite struggle between the three chief ruling powers of India. It is difficult to follow the exact course of this struggle in strict chronological order, as the few isolated facts, known to us from the inscriptions of the three dynasties, are capable of different interpretations. We can only trace what seems to be the most probable trend of events in the light of all available materials.

The fight between the Gauḍas and the Pratihārās was the natural consequence of the imperial designs of both these powers. Dharmapāla inherited a consolidated and powerful kingdom and began to expand his dominions towards the west, where the political situation was admirably suited to his ambition. With the passing away of Yaśovarman and Lalitāditya, no great power or

---

1 For the history of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, cf. RA.
2 For the history of the Pratihārās, cf. GP; TK. Chs. x-xi.
political personality arose in Northern India, and for nearly half a century it offered a most tempting field to every ambitious political adventurer. Dharmapāla seized the opportunity and rapidly pushed his conquests towards the west. Unluckily for him, Vatsarāja, the king of the Pratiharas, also felt the same urge of imperial ambitions and utilised the same opportunity by pushing his conquests towards the north and east. In the light of subsequent events, one might safely conclude that the possession of the imperial city of Kanauj was the common objective of both, and the contending parties probably came into clash somewhere in the Doab. Dharmapāla was defeated in this encounter, and the effect of this reverse might have been serious, but for the providential intervention of the Rāṣṭrakūta king Dhrūva who inflicted a disastrous defeat upon Vatsarāja.

After defeating Vatsarāja, Dhrūva evidently marched through his dominions right up to the Doab. Here he met Dharmapāla and defeated him. But this was not evidently a lasting victory with any serious consequence to Dharmapāla. Dhrūva was too far away from his base to follow up his victory, and there were probably other causes to induce him to turn back. In any case, he shortly returned to the Deccan.

1 The Pratihāra king Vatsarāja is said to have "appropriated with ease the fortune of royalty of the Gauḍa" (IA. xi. 157; EI. vi. 248). This does not necessarily mean, as has been suggested (BI. 148), that Vatsarāja advanced as far as Gauḍa, far less that he actually occupied both Gauḍa and Vaṅga. For all we know, the encounter of the lord of Gauḍa with Vatsarāja, like that with Dhrūva, might have taken place in the Doab or its neighbourhood, in a territory far from the borders of Bengal. This is more probable as we have no evidence of any extensive territorial conquests of Vatsarāja such as would be implied in a triumphal march from Malwa up to the heart of Bengal. No special importance need be attached to the statement that he took away Gauḍa's umbrellas of state, for the same claim is made by Dhrūva, though in this case we know definitely that the encounter took place in the Doab, far away from Bengal (GP. 54–55). A verse in Prīthvīrāja-vijaya says that the sword of the Chāḥamāna king Durlabhārāja purified itself by a dip at the confluence of the Ganges and the sea, and by the taste of the land of Gauḍa. As Durlabhārāja's son was a feudatory of Nāgarhaṭa, it has been suggested that Durlabhārāja was a feudatory of Vatsarāja and accompanied him in his expedition to Bengal (IHQ. xiv. 844–45). It is, however, not very safe to form such important conclusions on stray verses composed about four centuries after the events described.

2 As the encounter between Dhrūva and the lord of Gauḍa took place in the Gangetic Doab, the latter must have extended his conquests beyond Allabhābad in the west. This circumstance and the fact that the fight must have taken place some time after 780 A.D. leave no doubt that the lord of Gauḍa was Dharmapāla, and not his predecessor.

* RA. 49.
In spite of his reverses, Dharmapala derived the greatest benefit from Dhruva's campaign. His mighty opponent Vatsaraja was a 'fugitive in the trackless desert,' while his (Vatsaraja's) dominions were trampled under feet by the victorious Karnata army. For some time to come Dharmapala had no more fear of opposition from that quarter. So he continued his victorious campaign, and, emboldened by success, advanced to the furthest limits of Northern India.

The full account of this wonderful military campaign is not known, but a few important details have been preserved in the Pala records. According to v. 3 of the Bhagalpur copper-plate of Narayapala (No. 14), Dharmapala acquired the sovereignty of Mahodaya (i.e. Kanauj) by having defeated Indraraja1 and other enemies, and then conferred it upon Chakravudha.

That Dharmapala proceeded far beyond Kanauj in course of his military campaigns is proved by v. 7 of the Monghyr copper-plate (No. 6). It tells us that in course of the victorious campaigns of Dharmapala, his attendants performed religious rites at kedara, Gokarna, the confluence of the Ganges and the sea, and various other holy places. Kedara is undoubtedly the famous place of pilgrimage on the Himalayas in Gharwal, and although Gokarna cannot be definitely identified,2 the verse leaves no doubt that

1 It has been generally taken for granted that this Indraraja is no other than Indrayudha, mentioned in the Jaina Harivamsha of Jinasena as having ruled in the north in the year 783-84 A.D. It is, however, more probable that Indraraja was the brother of the Rashtrakuta king Dhruva whom he had left in charge of Lajesvara-mandala, which presumably represented Gujarat and other Rashtrakuta possessions in the north (GP, 37, f.n. 8). In that case the defeat of Indraraja was a further episode in the Rashtrakuta-Gauda rivalry by which Dharmapala not only avenged his former defeat by Dhruva, but also cleared the way for his further conquests by eliminating the only power that stood between him and the empire. As to Indrayudha, we do not know anything beyond what has been stated in Harivamsha, not even whether he was king of Kanauj, or related in any way to Chakravudha who was placed on the throne of Kanauj by Dharmapala as his protege and vassal.

2 Kielhorn identified Gokarna with a place of that name in the North Kanara district of the Bombay Presidency which is even now a place of pilgrimage frequented by Hindu devotees from all parts of India (J.A. 1892, p. 257, f.n. 50). This identification implies a victorious march of Dharmapala across the Bombay Presidency, right through the dominions of the powerful Rashtrakutas, and it is difficult to accept it without more positive evidence. A more probable identification is that with Gokarna in Nepal, on the bank of the Bagmati, about two miles above and north-east of Pasupati. This identification is strengthened by the tradition preserved in the Suagambha Purana, that Dharmapala, ruler of Gauda, occupied the throne of Nepal. Curiously enough, the same Suagambha Purana
Dharmapāla practically overran the greater part of Northern India.

In the light of the above facts, we can understand the full significance of verse 12 of the Khalimpur copper-plate of Dharmapāla. It describes how Dharmapāla installed the king of Kanyakubja in the presence of the chiefs of Bhoja, Matsya, Madra, Kuru, Yadu, Yavana, Avanti, Gandhāra, and Kira, who uttered acclamations of approval, bowing down respectfully with their diadems trembling. There can be hardly any doubt that the king of Kanyakubja referred to in this passage was Chakrāyudha. It would appear that at the conclusion of his victorious campaign, Dharmapāla held an imperial assembly or Durbar at Kanauj whose sovereignty he had acquired by his own prowess. The Durbar was attended by the vassal chiefs named above, who all witnessed the installation of Chakrāyudha by Dharmapāla as his vassal chief of Kanauj.

This famous scene represents the culmination of Dharmapāla's triumph, and testifies to the formal assumption by him of the position of suzerain of Northern India which he had earned by defeating various kings. The categorical statement that the chiefs of various states assembled in Kanauj and bowed their heads in

refers to Gaṅgāśāgara and places it in or near Kapilavastu. It has been plausibly suggested that Gokarna and 'Gaṅgāśatamārudhik' of the Monghyr copper-plate refer to the two places in Nepal, and that verse 7 of Monghyr copper-plate refers to a campaign of Dharmapāla along the foot of the Himalayas (IC. iv. 260). In support of this it may be pointed out that the confluence of the Ganges and the sea was situated in Bengal itself, and it was too near home to deserve special mention, either as a place of pilgrimage visited by the followers of Dharmapāla, or as a landmark in his victorious campaign. On the whole, it would be better, in the present state of our knowledge, to regard Gokarna as situated in Nepal, and leave the other question undecided.

It may be mentioned here that a place named Gokarna with a temple is referred to in an inscription in the Pudukottai State (Economic Conditions in Southern India by A. Appadorai, Vol. i, p. 21). In the light of what has been said later about the military campaigns of Devapāla in the South Indian peninsula, the location of Gokarna, conquered by Dharmapāla, in the Pudukottai State is worth consideration.

Although the general purport and implication of this verse are clear, its exact meaning is somewhat obscure on account of the defective construction of the last line. The emendation of "dattah śrī-kanyakubjas" into "dattaśri kanyakubjas" (GL. 14, f.n. 12) would give the meaning suggested in the text. The expression "svā-bhishek-odakumbhah," however, implies that Dharmapāla's own coronation (as emperor) also probably took place before Chakrāyudha was placed on the throne of Kanyakubja. Kielhorn suggests in a footnote that the word 'dattah' in the verse, as it stands, "indicates that Dharmapāla had been requested to permit the installation of the king of Kanyakubja" (EI. iv. 228, f.n. 9).
approval of the coronation ceremony held by the command of Dharmapāla leaves no doubt that they all acknowledged his suzerainty, though it is conceivable that some of them might have offered homage and submission even though they were not actually defeated in battle. It would indeed be fantastic to suppose that although they were all independent chiefs, in no way subordinate to Dharmapāla, they had come all the way to Kanauj only to approve of the settlement of political affairs in that city 'by way of diplomatic gesture.' The expression 'pranati-parinatah' hardly leaves any doubt about their status via a via Dharmapāla.

Fortunately, we have got an independent positive evidence in support of the view that Dharmapāla held the position of a suzerain in North India. In the Udayasundari-kathā, a champū-lakṣaṇa composed in the first-half of the eleventh century A.D. by Sūdāhala, a Gujarāti poet, king Dharmapāla is referred to as Uttarapatha-s̄vāmin or lord of Uttarapatha. This Dharmapāla can only refer to the Pāla emperor of that name. The expression Paṇcha-Gauda is also possibly reminiscent of the Gauḍa empire of Dharmapāla.

An idea of the extent of Dharmapāla's empire may be obtained if we can definitely locate the states mentioned in v. 12 of the Khālimpur copper-plate. Among them the kingdoms of Gandhāra, Madra, and Kuru are well-known, and were situated respectively in the western, central, and eastern Punjab, while Kira corresponds to the Kangra district in the north-eastern part of the same province. Matsya corresponds to modern Alwar State with parts of Jaipur and Bharatpur, while Avanti is certainly modern Malwa. Bhoja, Yadu, and Yavana countries cannot be located with certainty. The last-named probably refers to an Arab principality, either in the Indus Valley or in the North-Western Frontier Province. The Yadus or Yādavas ruled over the kingdom of Simhapura in the Punjab, but other regions like Mathurā and Dvārakā are also traditionally associated with them, and it cannot be exactly ascertained which section of the Yādavas accepted the suzerainty of Dharmapāla. In view, however, of the fact that the list includes several other states in the Punjab, the Yadu principality of Simhapura is probably meant. As regards the Bhojas they are an ancient people, and the kingdom of Bhojakāṭa, mentioned in Vākāṭaka copper-plates, includes at least a part of Berar, if not the

1 TK. 816-17, 820.
3 See supra p. 14.
4 For the location and an account of the kingdom of Kira, cf. IHQ. ix, 11-17.
5 Cf. the Lakākṣamaṇḍal Prakāśi (El. t. 10).
whole of it. Thus, on the whole, it may be safely concluded that Dharmapāla exercised his imperial sway over the Punjab, Eastern Rājputāna, Malwa and Berar, and this was the result of the victorious military campaigns which carried him as far as Kedāra in the western Himālayas, and in course of which he defeated Indrarāja and other kings.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the empire of Dharmapāla was not like that of the Mauryas or Guptas, or even of the later Pratihāras. The vassal states were not annexed to the central dominions of the emperor, and their rulers were left undisturbed so long as they acknowledged the supremacy of the emperor, and rendered such homage and military assistance as might have been fixed by usage or treaties. So we cannot regard the Punjab, Eastern Rājputāna, Malwa, and Berar as integral parts of a consolidated dominion under the direct rule of the emperor. This is clearly indicated in verse 8 of the Monghyr copper-plate of Devapāla (No. 6), and is in consonance with the available evidences in our possession.

The kingdom of Kanauj, roughly corresponding to modern U.P., evidently stood on a different footing. Dharmapāla not only conquered it but drove its ruler away, and placed his own nominee on its throne. He had the coronation of this nominee, and probably also his own imperial coronation, celebrated at Kanauj in the presence of a large number of vassal chiefs. It was thus perhaps regarded as a ceremonial capital of the empire. Although he did not definitely annex the kingdom of Kanauj to the central kingdom, comprising Bengal and Bihar, which was ruled by him in person, he left it in charge of his protégé Chakrāyudha, who owed his position entirely to the emperor, and whose status was thus very inferior to that of the other vassal chiefs.

We can thus easily visualise the structure of the Pāla empire under Dharmapāla. Bengal and Bihar, the nucleus of the empire, were under the direct rule of Dharmapāla, a long stretch of territory between the borders of Bihar and Punjab formed the dependency of Kanauj, while a large number of principalities in the Punjab, Eastern Rājputāna, Malwa, Berar, and probably also Nepal (if we believe the story in Sva-yambhu Purāṇa) formed the vassal states, enjoying internal autonomy but paying homage and obedience.

It seems very likely that Dharmapāla completed this imperial fabric during the period that intervened between the retirement of

Dhruva and the re-appearance of his son Govinda III in the scene. As these two events may be dated approximately at 780 and 800 A.D., we may roughly describe the career of Dharmapala somewhat as follows:

c. 770 A.D.—Accession to the throne of Bengal.
c. 770-790 A.D.—Conquest of Magadha and a large part of U.P., even extending beyond Allahabad. Encounter with Vatsaraja and Dhruva in the Ganges-Jumna Doab.
c. 790-800 A.D.—Victorious campaign up to the Indus on the West, Himalayas in the North and even beyond Narbada in the south.

Dharmapala could follow unchecked a career of aggressive militarism in the west mainly because of the collapse of the power of his great adversary, the Pratihara king Vatsaraja. According to the Rashtrakuta records, the latter was forced by Dhruva to leave his kingdom and betake himself to the trackless desert. In other words, Vatsaraja took shelter in the heart of Rajputana which was a stronghold of the Gurjara power and was known after them as Gurjaraträbhumi. The Pratiharas, however, had not given up their political ambitions. Vatsaraja's son and successor Nágabhaṭa II made strenuous efforts to recover the lost lands. He made alliance with the kings of Sindhu, Andhra, Vidarbha, and Kalinga. He thus seems to have organised a confederacy of states situated on the border of the Pāla and Rashtrakūtā empires, and presumably put himself as their champion against both.

Having consolidated his position by his successful diplomatic policy, Nágabhaṭa decided to try his strength against his mighty adversary Dharmapala. He marched against Kanauj where

1 RA. 57; EI. xxiii. 917. The date of Govinda III's northern expedition has been fully discussed in App. II, dealing with Pāla chronology.
2 Supra p. 106.
3 GP. 8, 59. Dr. H. C. Ray's view that Mālava was at this time "under the strong grip of the Pratihāras" (DHNI. ii. 845), is disproved, among other grounds, by the fact that Nāgabhaṭa is said to have seized by a sudden attack the hill-fort of the king of Mālava (EI. xvii. 108). This shows that the Pratihāras had lost hold of Mālava. The known facts, therefore, support the view, that after the Pratihāra king Vatsaraja was defeated by Dhruva, Mālava acknowledged the suzerainty of Dharmapala, but later, when Govinda III invaded Northern India, it became a vassal state of the Rashtrakūtas. Cf. D. C. Ganguly, Paramāra, p. 18.
4 GP. 38-39.
5 The struggle between Dharmapala and Nāgabhaṭa II has been discussed at length with full references to authorities in GP. 40-44. The views stated there form the basis of the account in the text. Mr. N. N. Das Gupta has offered a different construction of the whole history (JBORS. xiii. 50 ff.) His theory that Dharmapala was defeated by Govinda III shortly before his encounter with
Dharmapāla had placed his protégé Chakrāvudha on the throne. Chakrāvudha was defeated and fled to Dharmapāla. A battle between Dharmapāla and Nāgabhaṭa, with the empire of Northern India at stake, was now inevitable. That Nāgabhaṭa made extensive preparations for this enterprise, and was loyally helped by his feudal or allied chiefs, is known from several epigraphic records. The Jodhpur inscription of the Pratihāra chief Bāuka informs us that his father Kakka gained renown by fighting with the Gauḍas at Mūdgarī i.e. Monghyr. Vāhukadhavala, probably a feudatory chief of the Pratihāras, is said to have defeated a king called Dharma (i.e. Dharmapāla), while another feudatory, Śaṅkaragaṇa, claims to have conquered the Gauḍa country and presented it to his overlord. As there are reasons to believe that all these chiefs were contemporaries of Nāgabhaṭa II, it may be safely presumed that they all took part in the campaign of Nāgabhaṭa against Dharmapāla.

It would appear, from the statement about Kakka, that a pitched battle was fought at Monghyr. It would mean therefore that Nāgabhaṭa had marched into the very heart of Dharmapāla’s dominions. It is difficult to explain this weakness or lack of preparation on the part of Dharmapāla, and it is not unlikely that he was attacked by the king of Tibet about the same time (see infra p. 124).

If we are to trust the Pratihāra records, Nāgabhaṭa II must have inflicted a crushing defeat upon Dharmapāla. But the Pratihāra king was not destined to enjoy the fruits of his victory. Once more the dream of founding a Pratihāra empire was shattered by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The triumphant career of Nāgabhaṭa II, like that of his father Vatsarāja, was cut short by the invasion of the hereditary enemy from the south.

It is not improbable that in his dire necessity Dharmapāla invoked the aid of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king against the common enemy. It is equally likely that the growing power of Nāgabhaṭa alarmed Govinda III and he advanced to the north of his own accord. For we know from the Pratihāra records, that Nāgabhaṭa made alliance with the states on the border of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom, and captured the strongholds of Mālava. As Mālava commanded the route between the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom and Northern India, and was probably then subordinate to the former, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king might have accepted the challenge so defiantly thrown, and advanced to the north to settle his own

Nāgabhaṭa would no doubt explain the advance of Nāgabhaṭa II right up to Monghyr, but there does not appear to be sufficient reason to accept this view.

1 EI. xviii. 108, verse 9. 2 EI. xviii. 98, verse 94.
3 EI. ix. 7, verse 9. 4 EI. xv. 14, verse 16.
accounts with the Pratihāra ruler. But whatever may be the cause, the effect of the war was decisive. Nāgabhaṭa's power was thoroughly crushed, and Govinda III made a triumphal march right across his dominions at least up to the Ganges-Jumna Doab.¹

The victorious campaign of Govinda III against Nāgabhaṭa II saved Dharmapāla and Chakravītā from imminent disaster. No wonder, that, as the Rāśṭrakūta records tell us, both of them submitted, of their own accord, to Govinda III.² Indeed, circumstances would even justify the assumption that it was a pre-arranged affair, and that this was the price by which they purchased the timely intervention of the Rāśṭrakūta monarch. In reality, this submission meant nothing. For, as they anticipated, Govinda III soon returned to the Deccan, and Dharmapāla was left free to re-organise his empire.

There is no reliable evidence in support of the view, generally accepted, that Nāgabhaṭa, after having defeated Chakravītā, annexed his kingdom and transferred his seat of government to Kanauj, which henceforth continued to be the capital of the dynasty.³ As a matter of fact, the only known record of Nāgabhaṭa, dated 815 A.D., was found in Buchkala, in the Jodhpur State, and the locality is said to be within his kingdom proper (sva-vishaya).⁴

¹ OP. 42-43; RA. 66; TK. 231.
² "................to whom (Govinda III) ............those (kings) Dharma and Chakrāvītā surrendered of themselves" (Sanjān Plates of Amoghavarsha I, I. 28. El. xviii. 258. Also cf. RA. 66; TK. 292). Mr. N. N. Das Gupta's view that Dharmapāla was defeated in a battle by Govinda III is not supported by the evidence that he quotes (JBORS. xii. 364-65). There are reasons to believe that Govinda III's success against Dharmapāla was too insignificant to be included in contemporary records, and was magnified at a later date (Cf. App. ii).
³ This view is held by Dr. R. S. Tripathi who also places the victories of Nāgabhaṭa II against Dharmapāla and Chakrāvītā after his own defeat at the hands of Govinda III (TK. 233-35). In view of the decisive defeat inflicted upon Nāgabhaṭa by Govinda III, this sequence of events does not appear to be reasonable. The only evidence in favour of the theory that Nāgabhaṭa II transferred his capital to Kanauj is a statement in the Prabhāvaṇaka-charita that king Nāgāvaloka of Kāṇṭhakūṭa, the grandfather of Bhoja, died in 890 v.s. This Nāgāvaloka is probably Nāgabhaṭa II, but the statement about the capital may have been due to the fact that Kanauj was long known as the famous capital of the Pratihāras at the time when the book was composed. If Nāgabhaṭa really transferred his capital to Kanauj, it was very likely towards the close of his reign (c. 880 A.D.), after Dharmapāla had died and his son and successor Devapāla had enjoyed the position of supreme ruler of Northern India for a fairly long period, as is claimed in his records. But the date of the death of Nāgabhaṭa II, viz., 890 v.s. (=889 A.D.) is very doubtful as the earliest known date of his grandson Bhoja, is 890 A.D., i.e. only three years later. The authenticity of the passage in Prabhāvaṇaka-charita may therefore be justly doubted.
⁴ El. ix. 800.
Taking everything into consideration, the most probable view seems to be that Dharmapala's empire did not suffer any considerable diminution during the rest of his life, and the power of the Pratiharas was mainly confined to Rajputana. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that Dharmapala spent his last days in peace, and we may well accept the statement, made in the Monghyr copper-plate (v. 12) of Devapala, that there was no disturbance in the dominions when he succeeded his father Dharmapala.

Dharmapala fully deserved the rest after a long reign of stress and storm. His career was indeed a remarkable one. He inherited a small kingdom from his father, but his prowess and diplomacy, aided by good fortune, enabled him to establish a vast empire in Northern India. He had to fight many battles, and some times suffered serious reverses. On more than one occasion his position appeared precarious. But his undaunted spirit triumphed over all obstacles, and he launched Bengal into a career of imperial glory and military renown to which there has been no parallel before or since. The lure of the imperial city of Kanauj which proved the ruin of Sashanka’s kingdom paved the way for his grand success, and Bengal’s dream of founding an empire in Northern India was at last fulfilled. We can only dimly realise its profound effect on Bengal. The country which only two generations ago was trampled under foot by a succession of foreign invaders, and suffered almost complete political disintegration, suddenly came to be the mistress of the whole of Northern India up to its furthest limits. It was nothing short of a miracle, and no wonder that the whole country was resounding with the tales of wonderful achievements of its remarkable ruler. The court-poet did not perhaps very much exaggerate the state of things when he wrote the following verse about Dharmapala:

"Hearing his praises sung by the cowherds on the borders, by the foresters in the forests, by the villagers on the outskirts of villages, by the playing groups of children in every courtyard, in every market by the guardians of the weights, and in pleasure-houses by the parrots in the cages, he always bashfully turns aside and bows down his face."  

Dharmapala assumed full imperial titles Paramesvara Paramabhattacharya Mahardajadhiraja, whereas his father is called only Mahardajadhiraja. That Dharmapala introduced pomp and grandeur worthy of the empire he had built up, would be evident from the following description of what looks like an Imperial Durbar held in Pataliputra:

"Now—from his royal camp of victory, pitched at Pataliputra, where the manifold fleets of boats proceeding on the path of the Bhagirathi make it seem

1 Khalimpur copper-plate. v. 18 (EI. iv. 292).
as if a series of mountain-tops had been sunk to build another causeway (for Rāma’s passage); where, the brightness of daylight being darkened by densely packed arrays of rutting elephants, the rainy season (with its masses of black clouds) might be taken constantly to prevail; where the firmament is rendered grey by the dust, dug up by the hard hoofs of unlimited troops of horses presented by many kings of the north; and where the earth is bending beneath the weight of the innumerable foot-soldiers of all the kings of Jambudvīpa, assembled to render homage to their supreme lord.”

In spite of the obvious exaggeration of the poet, the above passage is a fair index of the imperial vision of Bengal towards the close of the reign of Dharmapāla.

It is extremely unfortunate that we know so little about the personal history of Dharmapāla, except his political and military achievements. The Khalimpur copper-plate shows that he must have reigned for at least thirty-two years. Tāranātha’s statement that he ruled for sixty-four years cannot be credited in the absence of any corroborative evidence. The Monghyr copper-plate informs us that he married Rāṇṇādevī, the daughter of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Parabala. This Rāshṭrakūṭa king is usually identified with the king of that name who was ruling in Central India in 801 A.D., but this seems very doubtful. It is very likely that Dharmapāla’s father-in-law belonged to the well-known Rāshṭrakūṭa family of the Deccan, but no king of that family with Parabala as name or biruda is known to us so far.

The Khalimpur copper-plate refers to Yuvarāja Tribhuvanapāla as dātaka of the Grant. Whether he is identical with Devapāla, who succeeded Dharmapāla, or a different person, is not known to us. In the latter case, he was probably the eldest son of Dharmapāla who either predeceased his father, or was superseded by Devapāla under circumstances not known to us.

3 Ibid.
4 Cf. Pathār pillar inscription, EI. ix. 948 ff. The date of this inscription has been read as Samvat 817. The figure for hundred is not quite clear on the published facsimile, but the reading has been accepted by all scholars. Now the accession of Devapāla, son of Rāṇṇādevī and Dharmapāla, is generally assigned to c. 810 or 815 A.D. Unless Devapāla was a minor, of which there is no evidence, he must have been born some time before 795 A.D., and his mother’s birth cannot be placed later than 780 A.D. Her father Parabala, therefore, must have been born about 780 A.D. and was therefore more than hundred years old when the Pathār inscription was engraved. Even if we assume that Devapāla was a child at the time of accession, we have to believe that Dharmapāla married, at a fairly advanced age, a young girl of twenty or thereabouts, and that his father-in-law survived him for nearly half a century. These may not be impossible, but are certainly very unusual. On the whole, the identity of Dharmapāla’s father-in-law and the king Parabala of the Pathār inscription must be regarded as doubtful (cf. RA. 88, fn. 19).
5 The late Dr. Fleet proposed to identify him with Govinda m (BG. 7. Part II, p. 394), but he is not known to have any biruda like Parabala.
Dharmapāla had a younger brother named Vākapāla. It is claimed in a later record that he was a valiant hero and destroyed the enemies of his brother. It may be presumed that Vākapāla was the commander of the royal army. Similarly, we learn from another later record that a Brāhmaṇa named Garga was the minister of Dharmapāla. In this record of his descendant, Garga is given the credit of making Dharmapāla, the lord of the east, ultimately the lord of the other directions too. These credits, claimed on behalf of the general and minister of Dharmapāla, may, no doubt, have some foundation, but we must accept them with caution. specially as they come from interested parties.

According to Tibetan tradition, Dharmapāla was a great patron of Buddhism. He is said to have founded the famous Vikramaśīla vihāra in Magadha on the top of a hill on the bank of the Ganges. It had 114 teachers in different subjects and included a central temple, surrounded by 107 others, all enclosed by a boundary wall. According to Bustom, Dharmapāla also built a magnificent monastery at Odantapūrī, but according to Tāranātha, it was founded by either Gopāla or Devapāla. Curiously enough, the legend related by Bustom about the foundation of Odantapurī vihāra by Dharmapāla is exactly the same as is told by Tāranātha about the foundation of a vihāra at Somapuri in Varendra by Devapāla. Now the recent archaeological excavations carried out at Paharpur, in Rajshahi district, leave no doubt that its ruins represent the famous Somapurna-vihāra, and the name of the place is still preserved in the neighbouring village called Ompur. According to the short inscriptions on some clay seals found in Paharpur, the Somapura-vihāra was founded by Dharmapāla. Tāranātha says that Dharmapāla founded fifty religious schools. As already stated above, Dharmapāla was the patron of the great Buddhist writer Haribhadra. It reflects great credit upon the emperor, that amid his pre-occupations with war and politics he could devote his thought and activities to these pious and peaceful pursuits.

---

1 Tar., p. 217. According to other traditions, however, Devapāla is regarded as its founder (Cordier–Catalogus, iii. 321-22).
2 The reference to the Vihāra as Śrīmad-Vikramaśīla-deva-mahāvihāra (Nepal, 290) shows that Vikramaśīla was another name or biruda of Dharmapāla (or Devapāla) who founded it.
3 P. 157.
4 P. 206.
5 For an account of these excavations cf. ASM. No. 55 (Paharpur—K. N. Dikshit).
6 P. 217.
7 Bustom, pp. 156 ff
Although Dharmapāla was a Buddhist king, he was not hostile to Brahmanical religion in any way. He granted land for the worship of a Brahmanical god (Ins. No. 2) and followed the rules of caste laid down in the scriptures (No. 6, v. 5). The appointment of a Brāhmaṇa Garga as his minister, whose descendants occupied the post for several generations (No. 10), shows that politics was not influenced in any way by religion.

2. Devapāla (c. 810–850 A.D.)

Parameśvara Paramabhatṭāraka Mahārājadhīraṇa Devapāla, who succeeded to the throne about 810 A.D., was fully endowed with the prowess and other qualities of his father. The available records seem to indicate that Devapāla not only maintained the empire intact, but even extended its boundaries. The most interesting of these is the Bādāl Pillar inscription (No. 16) which contains an eulogy of five generations of hereditary Brahman ministers who served under four rulers of the Pāla dynasty beginning from Dharmapāla. Extravagant pretensions are put forward in this record on behalf of Darbhapāṇi and his grandson Kedāramiśra who both served under Devapāla. It was Darbhapāṇi's diplomacy, so we are told, which enabled Devapāla to exact tributes from the whole of Northern India, from the Himalaya to the Vindhya mountains, and from the Eastern to the Western seas (v. 5). It was again the intelligence of Kedāramiśra that enabled Devapāla to enjoy the sea-girt earth after having exterminated the Utkalas, curbed the pride of the Hūnas, and destroyed the haughtiness of the Dravida and Gurjara lords (v. 13).

Similar credit is given to the general of Devapāla in the record of a descendant of the former (Ins. No. 14). We are told that on the approach of Devapāla's forces, under his brother Jayapāla, the king of Utkala fled from his capital city, and the king of Prāgjyotisha submitted without any fight (v. 6). Devapāla's own Grant (No. 6) shows that his career of victory led him as far as Kāmboja in the west and Vindhya mountains in the south.

To whomsoever might belong the credit of these remarkable achievements, they undoubtedly testify to the brilliance of Devapāla's reign. It appears that he peacefully inherited the vast empire of his father and firmly established his authority (Ins. No. 6, v. 12). But it was soon apparent that he could not long maintain the extensio empire left by his father merely by peaceful and diplomatic methods, as his minister Darbhapāṇi claims to have done. In those unsettled times, nothing but a policy of blood and iron could have checked the disruptive forces within the empire and aggressive
Conquests of Devapāla

designs of ambitious neighbours. So Devapāla’s long reign of about forty years must have witnessed a series of military campaigns, including those against the Prāgjyotishas, Utakas, Hūnas, Gurjaras, and Dravidas.

Prāgjyotisha is a well-known name of the Brahmaputra valley, and the province or a part of it was also called Kāmarūpa. According to Huen Tsang, Kāmarūpa included the whole of Assam valley and extended up to the Karatoya river in the west. According to the Bhagalpur copper-plate (No. 14), when Jayapāla set out on a conquering expedition the king of Prāgjyotisha lived in happiness for a long time by accepting the order (of Jayapāla) to desist from warlike preparations. It is thus evident that the king of Assam accepted the suzerainty of Devapāla and was left unmolested. This king was probably either Harjara or his father Pālambha.

The conquest of Utkala was, however, more thorough. In addition to the passage quoted above about the flight of the Utkala king from his capital, the Bādāl Pillar inscription informs us that the Utakalas were exterminated. There might have been one or more expeditions against Utkāla, and the kingdom was thoroughly subjugated. Tāranātha informs us that Orissa, like Bengal, suffered from internal disruption, shortly before Gopāla was elected king. But like the Pālas in Bengal, the Kara dynasty restored the solidarity of the kingdom. Subhakara, the third king of this dynasty who bore imperial titles, has been identified by S. Lévi with the king of Wu-cha who sent an autographed manuscript to the Chinese emperor Te-tseng in 795 A.D. His son Śivakara also bore imperial titles, and ruled in Orissa. After him nearly two hundred years elapsed before we hear of another Kara king in Orissa who might or might not have been descended from the earlier Karas. The Pālas probably conquered Utkala during or immediately after the reign of

1 In the Kamauli Grant of Vaidyadeva (EI. ii. 318), the village granted is said to be situated in Kamarupa-mandala and Prāgjyotisha-bhukti. This shows that Kamarupa was regarded as a smaller unit within Prāgjyotisha which necessarily included a larger area. It is, however, generally accepted that the same country was known as Prāgjyotisha in ancient times and as Kamarupa in mediaeval times (HK. 1 ff).

2 For the contemporary history of Assam, cf. DHN. i. 241 ff.

3 Tar., p. 197.

4 Chaurasi copper-plate. JBORS, xiv. 202 ff.

5 The chronology of the Kara kings is involved in difficulties. For the view adopted in the text cf. Orissa by R. D. Banerji, Vol. i. Ch. xi; JAHRS, x. 86.

6 According to Vinayak Misra, the Kara dynasty came to an end about 794 A.D. with the reign of Daṇḍimahādevi (Orissa under the Bhauma Kings, 71).
Sivakara, and their boast that they had exterminated the Utkalas was perhaps not altogether unjustified.

The Hūṇas were the nomadic tribe from Central Asia that played a dominant rôle in the history of India during the latter half of the fifth and the first half of the sixth century A.D. After that they had ceased to be a great power, but ruled over one or more small principalities. One of these was situated in the seventh century A.D. in Uttarāpatha, near the Himālayas. It was probably this principality which was successfully invaded by Devāpāla. Thereafter he proceeded up to Kāomboja, which was to the northwest of the Punjab and immediately to the north of Gandhāra. The Hūṇa principality and Kāomboja were both situated on the outskirts of the Pāla empire and this sufficiently explains Devāpāla’s hostility with them. These detailed conquests show that Devāpāla not only maintained intact the empire he had inherited from his father, but also extended its boundaries by the conquest of Assain and Orissa on one side, and Kāomboja and Hūṇa principalities on the other. The claim that he ruled from the Himālaya to the Vindhyā, and from the Bay of Bengal to the Arabian Sea, was perhaps not very far from truth, and was in any case a pardonable exaggeration, and not a mere bombast.

The Gurjaras mentioned in the Bādāl Pillar inscription were undoubtedly the Pratihāras, the old enemy of the Pālas. We have seen above (supra pp. 106, 112) how the crushing defeat inflicted by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas forced the Pratihāras to confine their activities within Rājputāna and Dharmapāla enjoyed his mighty empire undisturbed by them. Devāpāla also appears to have enjoyed a brief respite from their hostile activities during the first part of his reign. For, as we have seen above (supra p. 112), apart from a doubtful reference in a Jaina text, there is nothing to prove that Nāgabhaṭa recovered his power and occupied Kanauj, and if he did so it was probably not long before the date of his death (833 A.D.) as given in the same text. The records of the Pratihāras show that this did not revive the old glory of the family. The reign of Nāgabhaṭa’s son Rāmabhadrā was an inglorious one, and there are indirect evidences to show that he suffered severe reverses in the hands of his enemies, who even for a time ravaged his own dominions. Rāmabhadrā’s son and successor Bhoja, however, infused a new...
energy and strength among the Pratiharas, and seems to have recovered some of the territories lost by his father. The Barah and Daulatpura copper-plates show that he had occupied Kanauj and recovered Kālaśījara-mandala by 836 A.D., and Gurjaratrā, his ancestral territories in Rājputāna, by 848 A.D. But, evidently, his success was short-lived. For we find Gurjaratrā in possession of another branch of the Pratihāra family in 861 A.D., and Bhoja was defeated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas some time before 897 A.D.

It seems to be almost certain that the lord of Gurjaras, whose pride was curbed by Devapāla, was no other than Bhoja. According to the Bādāli Pillar inscription, this must have occurred fairly late in the reign of Devapāla, for the credit of this achievement is taken by Kedāramiśra, the grandson of his first minister Darbhapāni. We may, therefore, fix the date of this event between 840 and 850 A.D. It was probably shortly after this that Bhoja was defeated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. These successive defeats so weakened his power, that even Gurjaratrā, the territory round Jodhpur in Rājputāna, passed out of his hands. Thus in spite of a short period of trouble, Devapāla had not much to fear from the Pratiharas, and during his long reign that eternal enemy of the Pālas was kept in check.

1 GP. 48; TK. 287-88. 2 GP. 48-50; TK. 242-43. 3 GP. 49-50; TK. 240-41. 4 It may be surmised that in his fight against Bhoja, Devapāla was helped by the Chandellas of Khajurāho. There is a tradition that the founder of this dynasty supplanted the Pratiharas (V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, 3rd ed., p. 590). This statement has not been believed by the historians. But if we remember that Bhoja was ruling over Kālaśījara-mandala in 836 A.D. (which might well have included Khajurāho about 50 miles from Kālaśījara), that he was defeated by Devapāla about 840 A.D., and that since then the Chandellas were in continuous occupation of Khajurāho and the neighbourhood (even though they had later to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Pratiharas), it would not be unreasonable to hold that the Chandellas had helped Devapāla in his fight against Bhoja, and were rewarded, after the latter’s defeat, with the sovereignty of the territory near Khajurāho, perhaps under the suzerainty of Devapāla. Vākpati, the second king in the traditional genealogical list of the Chandellas, is said to have made the Vindhya his pleasure-mount (Khajurāho Ins. v. 13, EI. 1. 188) and Vākpati’s son Vijaya is said to have, like Rāma, in his warlike expeditions reached even the southernmost point of India, presumably for the benefit of an ally, as the epithet ‘saḥād-vyākṛtitā-dakṣa’ shows (Khajurāho Ins. v. 20, EI. 1. 142). Now Devapāla also claims to have reached the Vindhya region and, as we shall see, there are reasons to believe that he sent an expedition to the extreme south. It may be presumed, therefore, that the earlier Chandella kings were allies of Devapāla. This strengthens the view that they might have ousted Bhoja from Kālaśījara with the help of the Pāla king.

Dr. H. C. Ray thinks that the Chandella kings referred to above were feudatory chiefs, perhaps of Bhoja (DHNI. 670-671). Of this there is no
Lastly, we come to the Dravidas who were also defeated by Devapāla. They are usually identified with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and as the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were, like the Gurjaras, the rivals of the Pālas, the reference may be to a successful fight with them. It would then appear that Devapāla had to fight with both the hereditary enemies for maintaining his empire, and he was evidently more successful than his father. His Rāṣṭrakūṭa rival was undoubtedly Amoghavarsha.  

The term Dravida is, however, usually applied to denote, not the Deccan plateau which formed the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dominions proper, but the South Indian peninsula. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the Dravida ruler defeated by Devapāla belonged to this region, and in that case he was most probably his contemporary Pāṇḍya king Sirī-Śrī Śrī-Valabha who ruled about 815-862 A.D. According to the Sīnmanur Plates, this Pāṇḍya king repulsed a hostile confederation consisting of the Gaṅgas, Pallavas, Cholās, Kalingas, Magadhās, and others at a place identified with modern Kumbakonam. The Magadhās in the above list can only refer to the forces of the Pāla king who was in occupation of Magadhā during this period. The conquest of Utkala had brought Devapāla into contact with the Kalingas and there was every inducement on his part to enter into a close political association with them, and, through them, with the other powers mentioned above. For these powers were hostile to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and were repeatedly defeated by them during the reigns of Dhruva and Govinda m. The common enmity to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas would have cemented the alliance, and the southern powers, whose dominions were ruthlessly devastated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, would naturally try to gain the support of such a powerful ruler as Devapāla.

It appears from the Velvikkudi Grant that the Pāṇḍya king was at one time a member of a similar confederacy of Eastern kings which defeated the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishna 1 at Venbai. But evidently he had seceded from it and was an object of its attack. The Sīnmanur Plates refer to his success against the confederacy

---

1 For 915. As Dhaṅga ascended the throne about 954 A.D., Vākapati and Viṣaya, who were removed respectively five and four generations from him, may be regarded as contemporaries of Devapāla.

2 Devapāla's success must have been facilitated by the internal discord in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom. For details cf. R.A. 73-77. Dr. Altekar is wrong in his statement that the Pāla records claim that Nārāyaṇapāla had defeated a Dravida king (Ibid. p. 77). The claim is really made on behalf of Devapāla. Dr. Altekar's identification of the Dravida king with Amoghavarsha seems, however, to be quite reasonable, though his view about the struggle between the Pālas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, based on the wrong assumption, is open to doubt.
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at Kumbakonam, but it is just possible that there were other episodes in connection with this campaign which were less favourable to him.¹

It is thus quite likely that the Dravida king, whose pride was curbed by Devapāla, was the Pāṇḍya ruler Śrī-Māra Śrī-Vallabha. This view is strengthened by verse 15 of the Monghyr copper-plate (No. 6) which describes the empire of Devapāla as bounded by the Himalayas in the north and Rāmeśvar Setubandha in the south. It is no doubt an exaggeration, but there would be at least some basis for this, if we accept the above view. Some military victory near Rāmeśvar in the Pāṇḍya kingdom could be easily magnified by the court-poet, and would offer some explanation of the statement about the extent of his empire; but it would be very curious indeed that such a statement should be made without absolutely any basis of fact. Similarly, the claim of the Chandella king Vijaya that he reached, in course of his conquest, the extreme south where Rāma built his bridge, would be equally absurd unless we suppose that he did this in company with some powerful king; and from what has been said above,² this king may be Devapāla. It is difficult to believe that two court-poets writing in different countries at different times should concoct the same baseless story about two different kings. The available evidences do not enable us to make any positive statement, but the hypothesis about a victorious expedition of Devapāla in the southernmost part of India cannot now be ruled out as altogether fantastic.

Devapāla ruled for at least 35 years³ and his reign may be placed between 810 and 850 A.D. Under him the Pāla empire reached the height of its glory. His suzerainty was acknowledged over the whole of Northern India from Assam to the borders of Kashmir, and his victorious forces marched from the Indus to the upper reaches of the Brahmaputra, and from the Himalayas to the Vindhyas, perhaps even to the southernmost extremity of India. His name and fame were known far outside India, and king Bālaputradeva of the Sālendra dynasty ruling in Java, Sumatra, and Malay Peninsula sent an ambassador to him.⁴ The object of this embassy was to ask for a grant of five villages with which the

¹ This hypothesis of Devapāla’s military expedition to the extreme south of India is based on Dr. H. C. Raychoudhuri’s very interesting paper “The Pūrvaṅga of the Vejvikkūḍi Grant” (Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, 1926, pp. 197 ff). Cf. also supra p. 106, f.n. 2.
² Cf. supra p. 119, f.n. 4.
³ The Nālandā Copper-plate (No. 7) is dated in the 59th or 54th Year. (See App. 1).
⁴ Ibid.
 Sailendra king proposed to endow a monastery he had built at Nalanda. The monastery of Nalanda was in those days the seat of international Buddhist culture, and the Pala emperors, as its guardians, held a high position in the Buddhist world. Devapala was a great patron of Buddhism and he granted the request of the Sailendra king. His interest in the Nalanda monastery and deep devotion to the Buddhist faith are also known from the Ghosharaw inscription (No. 8). It records that Indragupta, a Brahman of Nagarahara (Jelalabad) and a learned Buddhist priest, received ovation from Devapala and was appointed the head of the Nalanda monastery.

A general review of the Pala kingdom towards the close of Devapala's reign is given by the Arab traveller and merchant Sulaiman, who made several voyages to India and wrote an account of it in 851 A.D. The Pala kingdom is referred to as Ruhmi (Rahma, according to Al'Masudi). The Pala king is said to be at war with his neighbours, the Rashtrakutas and the Gurjara-Pratiharas. His troops were more numerous than those of his adversaries. In his military campaigns he took 50,000 elephants, and ten to fifteen thousand men in his army were employed in fulling and washing cloths.1

Reference has already been made above to the nature of Dharmapala's empire. So far as we can judge from the available records, Devapala, too, does not seem to have exercised any direct administrative control over any territory outside Bengal and Bihar. In the case of the Imperial Guptas and Gurjara-Pratiharas, not only inscriptions all over Northern India invoke their name as suzerain, but we have also the records of their officers governing remote territories like Kathiawar peninsula. No such records of the two Pala emperors have yet been discovered beyond the confines of the modern provinces of Bengal and Bihar. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that so far as the rest of the imperial territories were concerned, they were governed by local rulers who acknowledged the suzerainty of the PalaS. This is corroborated by v. 8 of the Monghyr copper-plate of Devapala (No. 6).2

In this connection, it is interesting to note that reference is made to a Pala ruler, Yuvaraja by name, in the Udayasundari-


2 According to this verse, Dharmapala, after his dipuvijaya, removed the sorrows of the conquered kings by presenting them excellent rewards and permitted them to return to their own kingdoms.
kathā composed by Saṃdhala.¹ We learn from this book that a famous poet, Abhinanda by name, graced his court.² The Rāmācharita,³ composed by this poet Abhinanda, gives more details about Yuvarāja who is described as a great conqueror. He had the epithet Hāravarsha, and was the son of Vikramaśīla. He is also referred to as the ornament of the Pāla family (Pāla-kula-chandra, Pāla-kula-pradipa etc.) founded by Dharmapāla (Dharmapāla-kula-kairava-kānan-endu).⁴

These epithets leave no doubt that Yuvarāja Hāravarsha belonged to the Pāla family of Bengal. According to the Rāmācharita, he was a powerful king, a statement which is also corroborated by the Udayasundari-kathā. The question, therefore, naturally arises whether he is to be identified with a known Pāla king, or regarded as a ruler over some territory outside Bengal and Bihar. It has been suggested that Vikramaśīla, the father of Yuvarāja, was another name of Dharmapāla who founded the Vikramaśīla monastery, and Hāravarsha is identical with Devapāla.⁵ Dr. D. C. Ganguly infers from the epithet Hāravarsha that he was connected with some Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom. As Parabala, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of Central India, was the father of Dharmapāla’s queen, Dr. Ganguly suggests that Yuvarāja might have ruled over that territory.⁶ None of these conjectures except perhaps the identity of Dharmapāla (or Devapāla) and Vikramaśīla can be supported by positive evidence. There are some grounds for the belief that the poet Abhinanda was an inhabitant of Bengal,⁷ and in that case Yuvarāja Hāravarsha may be the well-known Pāla king Devapāla or his son. But if Yuvarāja Hāravarsha ruled over any territory outside Bengal and Bihar, this will be the only instance where any part of the Pāla empire was directly administered by the Pāla kings or members of their family. In any case, the history of Yuvarāja Hāravarsha is an interesting episode in the

¹ Published in Gaekwad Oriental Series.
² Ibid. p. 2.
³ Published in Gaekwad Series.
⁴ Cf. i. 110 (p. 10); Introductory verses to chs. viii (p. 65) and vi (p. 47); concluding verses of chs. x (p. 91), xi (p. 102), xxvi (p. 234), vi (p. 55), and xviii (p. 255).
⁵ Introduction to Rāmācharita, pp. xx-xxiii. That Vikramaśīla was possibly a bīrava of Dharmapāla or Devapāla rests on some positive evidence, presumably unknown to the editor (supra, p. 115, fn. 1). But the patron of the poet is also called Pṛthvīvipāla in the concluding verse of Canto 8, and Pṛthvīvipāla in the last verse of Canto 10 (ms. C) or 18 (ms. A). This may be another name of Hāravarsha. In that case he must be different from Devapāla.
⁶ Bhāratavarsha, Śrīvāna, 1340, pp. 247 ff.
⁷ Introduction to Rāmācharita.
history of the Pālas. All that we can infer about the period of his rule from literary evidence, is that he flourished certainly before the eleventh century A.D. and probably before the tenth.¹

In conclusion, a brief reference may be made to the relation between Bengal and Tibet during the reigns of the first three Pāla kings. The political relation between Tibet and India down to the middle of the eighth century A.D. has been discussed above (see supra pp. 91-93). In spite of the victories of Lalitāditya, the Tibetan rulers continued their aggressive policy, and the Tibetan chronicles, of a later date, record their great achievements in India during the period 755-886 A.D.

The Tibetan king Khri-srong-lde-btsan (755-97 A.D.), regarded as an incarnation of Bodhisatva Mañjuśrī, was a very powerful king. According to the Chronicles of Ladakh, "he subdued all the provinces on the four frontiers" including "China in the east and India in the south."² In a Tibetan text, composed not much later than the ninth century A.D., his son Mu-tig Btsan-po is said to have brought under his sway two or three (parts of) Jambudvīpa.³ This somewhat vague statement is supplemented by the following details in the same text:

"In the south the Indian kings there established, the Raja Dharmar-dpal and Drahu-dpun, both waiting in their lands under order to shut up their armies, yielded the Indian kingdom in subjection to Tibet: the wealth of the Indian country, gems and all kinds of excellent provisions, they punctually paid. The two great kings of India, upper and lower, out of kindness to themselves (or in obedience to him), pay honour to commands."⁴

The king Dharmar-dpal in the above passage undoubtedly refers to the Pāla king Dharmapāla. As regards Drahu-dpun, Dr. Thomas, who edited the text, suggests that it might mean "nephew, or grandson, Drahu," but it does not help us in identifying him.

The next important king Raḻ-pa-can (c. 817-c. 836 A.D.), according to the Chronicles of Ladakh, conquered India as far as the

¹ This lower limit is furnished by the date of Sodhula who was a contemporary of both Chhittarāja and Mummunirāja, rulers of Kouka, whose known dates are respectively 1026 A.D. and 1060 A.D. (Introduction to Udāyanandar-kathā, p. 1). The editor of Rāmācharita places Abhinanda and Hāravarsha before 900 A.D. on the ground "that Sodhula in his chronology of famous poets of ancient India beginning from Vāmiki down to his own time places Abhinanda before Rājasekhara." (pp. xx-xxi).
² Francke, Antiquities of Tibet, Part II, p. 87. Dr. L. Petech, Study on the Chronicles of Ladakh. IHQ. xv. 65.
³ P. W. Thomas, Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan, p. 270.
⁴ Ibid. 272-78.
Gangasagara. This has been taken to represent the mouth of the Ganges.¹

The facts culled above from the Tibetan texts throw interesting light upon the political relation between India and Tibet during the first century of Pala rule. How far the Tibetan claims of conquest and supremacy in Indian plains may be regarded as historical facts, it is difficult to say. For the Indian sources contain no reference to any military campaign from Tibet, far less to the exercise of political authority by its king in India proper. While, therefore, we must suspend our final judgment about Tibetan conquest and supremacy in India until fresh evidence is available, we must not ignore the possibility that perhaps the course of events in Bengal during 750-850 A.D. was influenced by Tibet to a much larger extent than we are apt to imagine.²

III. THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE EMPIRE.

The glory and brilliance of the Pala empire did not long survive the death of Devapala. The rule of his successors, whose names and approximate dates are given below, was marked by a steady process of decline and disintegration which reduced the Palas almost to an insignificant political power in North India.

1. Vigrahapala I or Suraapala I  c. 850-854 A.D.
2. Narayanapala  c. 854-908 A.D.
3. Rajyapala  c. 908-940 A.D.
4. Gopala II  c. 940-960 A.D.
5. Vigrahapala II  c. 960-988 A.D.

¹ Francke, op. cit. 89-90. Francke assigns to Ral-pa-can the date 804-16 A.D., but Dr. Petech (op. cit. 81) gives the date 817-836 A.D.
² The alleged victories of Khri-srong-Idg-tsan (755-97 A.D.), for instance, fit in well with what we know of the political condition in Bengal about the middle of the eighth century A.D., and might have played no inconsiderable part in placing a Buddhist ruler on its throne. The specific mention of Dharmapala’s submission to this Tibetan ruler or his son is of special interest. Whatever we might think of the Tibetan claim, a conflict between Dharmapala and the Tibetan ruler is not an improbable one and might explain the former’s defeat by Nagabhata II. In this connection we might recall the tradition that Dharmapala occupied the throne of Nepala which, we know, was under the political subjection of Tibet during the greater part of the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. The expedition of Dharmapala to Kedara and Nepala may also have some connection with Tibetan aggression. The alleged conquests of Ral-pa-can (817-836) might explain the weakness of the Pala kingdom under Devapala which enabled Bhoja to conquer Kanauj some time before 836 A.D. The advance of the Tibetans up to
Devapāla was succeeded by Vigrahapāla. There is some dispute among scholars regarding the relationship between the two, but the most probable view seems to be that Vigrahapāla was the nephew of Devapāla, and not his son (cf. App. iv). According to the genealogy preserved in the Grants of Nārāyaṇapāla and subsequent kings, Dharmapāla had a younger brother named Vākpāla, who was evidently his general and fought his enemies in all directions. Vākpāla’s son Jayapāla was the great general of Devapāla, and conquered Orissa and Assam for his royal cousin. Vigrahapāla, who ascended the throne after the death of Devapāla, was probably the son of this Jayapāla, though some take him to be the son of Devapāla.

For the present, we are absolutely in the dark regarding the circumstances which led to this change in the line of succession. It might have been due to the absence of any heir of Devapāla, although this does not appear to be very likely. For the Monghyr copper-plate of Devapāla (No. 6) shows that he had installed his son Rājyapāla as Crown-Prince, and that this son was alive in the year 23 of his reign, i.e. not more than seven or eight years before his death. Of course, Rājyapāla might have died during this interval, as appears to have been the case with Tribhuvanapāla mentioned above. On the other hand, we cannot altogether eliminate the possibility of an internal dispute regarding succession1 in which the general Jayapāla might have placed his own son on the throne with the support of his army. For the sudden collapse of the Pāla Empire naturally leads to the presumption of a catastrophe of this kind, and the view of an internal disruption is supported by the mention of the kingdoms of Aṅga, Vāṅga, and Magadha in a Ṛāṣṭrakūṭa record dated 866 A.D.

Vigrahapāla, who inherited the throne and the vast empire of Devapāla, is described in very vague and general terms as having destroyed his enemies. The old Kedāramiśra continued as minister. But the Bādāl Pillar inscription (No. 16) which attributes to his diplomacy the great military victories of Devapāla, has nothing to

---

1 This view finds support in the story of Yuvaśrī Haravaraha referred to supra p. 123, if he is regarded as the son of Devapāla, and we accept his association with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom in Central India as suggested by Dr. D. C. Ganguly.
say of the next king whom it calls Šūrapāla. Šūrapāla was obviously another name of Vigrahapāla, and all that the Bādāl Pillar inscription tells us about him is that he attended the sacrificial ceremonies performed by his minister, and poured holy water over his own head for the welfare of his empire. It offers a strong contrast between the warlike Devpāla and his successor who was evidently of a pacific and religious disposition. Vigrahapāla maintained this attitude till the last. He abdicated the throne in favour of his son Nārāyanapāla and retired to a religious life. He had married a princess of the Haihaya family named Lajjā.

Nārāyanapāla also resembled his father rather than his grandfather. He had Kedāramiśra's son Guravamiśra as his minister, but the Bādāl Pillar inscription records no glorious military achievement to his credit. The Bhagalpur copper-plate grant (No. 14), issued in the 17th regnal year of Nārāyanapāla, also refers to his prowess in only vague and general terms, but does not mention any specific conquest. Although he ruled for no less than fifty-four years (No. 15), we have not the least evidence of any military victory of Nārāyanapāla. All these raise a strong presumption about the weakness of these two Pāla rulers, and this presumption is fully borne out by external evidences, particularly the history of the Rāṣṭrakūtas and the Pratihāras, the two hereditary enemies of the Pālas.

As regards the Rāṣṭrakūtas, we learn from the Sirur inscription, dated 866 A.D., that the ruler or rulers of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Magadha paid homage to king Amoghavarsha (814–c. 880 A.D.). The internal history of the Rāṣṭrakūtas makes it highly improbable that Amoghavarsha could have undertaken an expedition against the Pāla ruler before he had defeated the king of Vengi some time about 800 A.D. It is likely that after the conquest of Vengi, the Rāṣṭrakūta forces proceeded along the eastern coast and invaded the Pāla kingdom from the south. It was perhaps of the type of the occasional military raids of the Rāṣṭrakūtas into Northern

---

1 N. Vasu regarded Šūrapāla as the son of Devapāla (VII. 818), but the identity of Šūrapāla and Vigrahapāla is upheld by all scholars (GL. 88 fn.; BI. 817).
3 Ins. No. 14, v. 9. According to Epic and Puranic traditions, Haihaya was a great-grandson of Yadu. His descendants, called Haihayas, were divided into many groups. But the most important line, during the historical period, that claimed to belong to this family, was the Kalachuri. There were two branches of Kalachuris ruling in Northern India at the time when Vigrahapāla ruled, viz., those of Gorakhpur and Dāhilā (or Tripuri). The queen of Vigrahapāla presumably belonged to one of these families.
4 References and authorities for the statements about the Rāṣṭrakūtas will be found in R.A. 75-78.
India, and had no permanent effect. But it must have considerably weakened the military power and the political prestige of the Pālas. The conquest of a portion of Rādhā by the Šulki king Mahārāja Udrakṛṣṇa of Orissa may also be assigned to the same period,¹ and may not be altogether unconnected with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion.

These reverses of the Pālas in the south probably created a favourable opportunity for the Pratihāra king Bhojadeva to renew his ambitious efforts which were checked by Devapāla. The defeat inflicted by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the pacific disposition of Vīgrahapāla and his successor Nārāyaṇapāla must have encouraged Bhoja to wrest the empire of Northern India from the Pālas.² His enterprise proved successful. He first turned his attention towards the west and destroyed the remnant of the political suzerainty enjoyed by the Pālas. He then proceeded to the east and subjugated extensive territories both in Bundelkhand and the United Provinces. It does not appear that he had encountered any opposition from the Pālas until he reached almost the borders of Magadha. But in spite of the weakness of the Pālas, Bhoja made extensive preparations against them.

We learn from the Kahla Plate³ that Guṇāmbodhīdeva, a Kalachuri king of Gorakhpur, who obtained some territories from Bhojadeva, snatched away the sovereignty of the Gauḍas. This Bhojadeva is undoubtedly the great Pratihāra king, who was successful in his expedition against the Pāla king and probably rewarded the services of his feudatory Kalachuri chief by grant of lands. It is also probable that Bhoja obtained the assistance of the famous Kalachuri king Kokkalla I of Dāhala. Kokkalla’s date is not definitely known, but he probably ruled between 840 and 890 A.D.⁴ He is said to have granted freedom from fear to Bhoja and plundered the treasuries of various kingdoms including Vaiṣṇava.⁵ The two events may not be unconnected, and in any case Kokkalla’s raid against Vaiṣṇava, if it was really a fact, must have facilitated the success of Bhoja. Another chief that probably accompanied Bhoja

---

¹ Orissa, 163-85.
² References and authorities for the statements about the Gurjaras-Pratihāras will be found in GP. 80 ff.
³ v. 9, EI. vii. 99.
⁴ DHNI, ii. 754; GP. 82 fn. 4; IHQ. xiii. 482 ff. A recent writer fixes the reign of Kokkalla I between 840 and 885 A.D. (IHQ. xvii. 117 ff).
⁵ Bilhavi Ins. v. 17, El. i. 256, 264; Benares cp. v. 7, El. ii. 306; Amoda Plates. El. xix. 75 ff; Bhoja has been identified by some scholars with Bhoja II, and by others with Bhoja I, but the former view appears to be untenable (IHQ. xiii. 488 ff). Cf. also GP. 82 fn. 4; DHNI. ii. 754; TK. 255-56; IHQ. xvii. 117 ff.
was the Guhilot king Guhila II who is said to have defeated the Gauḍa king. His father Harsharāja joined the campaigns of Bhoja in the early part of his reign. It is, therefore, exceedingly likely that he accompanied Bhoja in his successful Gauḍa expedition and took the credit thereof; for it is difficult to believe that he could have led an expedition against distant Gauḍa on his own account.

Bhoja had thus organised a formidable confederacy against the Pālas, and it seems he inflicted a crushing defeat upon them. Being secured against any trouble from the Rāṣṭrakūtas in the south, and having laid low the power of the Pālas, Bhoja could enjoy in peace the extensive empire he had established in Northern India. In the west he had conquered Karnal in the Punjab and the Kathiawar Peninsula, and probably extended his empire up to the borders of the Muslim principalities in the Indus Valley. In the east the Kalachuris of Gorakhpur as well as the Chandellas of Jejakabhukti (Bundelkhand) acknowledged his suzerainty, and the Pālas were humbled to the dust. Armed with the resources of this vast empire, Bhoja’s son and successor Mahendrapāla followed up the victory over the Pālas with relentless severity. Six of his inscriptions, found in Patna and Gayā districts, leave no doubt that Magadhā was annexed to the Pratihāra empire. Recently, an inscription of Mahendrapāla (No. 53), dated in his fifth year, has been found on a pillar unearthed during the excavations at Pāhārpur in Rājshahi district, the site of the famous Somapura-vihāra of Dharmapāla. It proves that even Northern Bengal had passed on for a time into the hands of the Pratihāras.

It is difficult to give a satisfactory explanation of this phenomenal success of the Pratihāras and the complete collapse of the Pālas during the latter half of the ninth century A.D. The personality of Bhoja and his success in organising a powerful confederacy are no doubt important factors, but able rulers like Devapāla might have successfully contended against both. The failure of the Pāla kings undoubtedly demonstrates their personal incapacity and want of foresight and diplomacy. But there might have been other factors at work. We have already hinted at the probability of a disputed succession after the death of Devapāla. Further, the records of Assam and Orissa show that both these neighbouring

---

1 Chatsu Ins. v. 28. El. xix. 15.
2 The revolt of the Gurjara branch, the constant struggle with the Eastern Chālukyas, and above all the pacific disposition of Amoghavasrtha may explain the absence of active hostility between him and Bhoja. Cf. RA. 77.
3 Ins. Nos. 83, 84, 86-90.
kingdoms, which had been subjugated by Devapāla, had again become powerful. In Assām, king Harjara, one of whose known dates is 829-30 A.D., had assumed imperial titles, and the record of his son Vanamāla describes him as a powerful emperor and conqueror in many battles. In Orissa, the Sailodbhava dynasty re-established its supremacy on the ruins of the Karas, and Sainyabhita III Mādhavavarman Śrīnivāsa (c. 830 A.D.) established the greatness of his family. He and his successor are said to have performed Aśvamedha, Vājapeya and other sacrifices, in token of their political supremacy.

The rise to power of these two dependent principalities might have been either the cause or the effect of the weakness of the Pāla kings. In the absence of positive evidences we cannot hazard any conjecture in favour of the one or the other, but we must keep in view the possibility of the reaction of the greatness of these powers upon the fortunes of the Pālas.

It has been mentioned above that Vīgrahapāla I married a Haihaya princess. This might have been a move on the part of the Pālas to win over the friendship of the Kalachuris. We know that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas formed numerous matrimonial alliances with the family of the powerful Kalachuri king Kokkalla who had at least eighteen sons (and possibly also numerous daughters). It is not unlikely that Vīgrahapāla's queen was a daughter of Kokkalla himself. But, as we know from the case of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, such alliances did not always prevent political rivalries leading to active hostilities. In the case of the Pālas, we cannot say whether the Haihaya alliance was really of any help to them. But it is certain that they were able to recover the possession of Northern Bengal and Magadha before the reign of Nārāyaṇapāla was over.

Three inscriptions of Nārāyaṇapāla, dated in the years 7, 9 and 17, and found in Bihar, seem to prove that the kingdom of Magadha was in his possession at least up to his 17th year i.e. c. 870 A.D. The dates of the seven inscriptions of Mahendrapāla found in Bengal and Bihar range between years 2 and 9 or 19, i.e. c. 887 to 891 or 904 A.D. The Pratihāra power must have been considerably weakened shortly after the last-named year. For some time between 915 and 917 A.D., if not earlier, the Pratihāra king Mahipāla, son of Mahendrapāla, was disastrously defeated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. His capital was sacked and he fled towards the east, hotly pursued by his enemies.

1 Tejpur Ins., Gupta Samvat 510. JBO 31. 511.
2 Haiyunghal cp. Kām-Āt. 50.
4 JAHRES X. 14.
5 DHNI II. 769-81.
6 Ins. Nos. 18-14.
This catastrophe indicates the weakness of the Pratihāras, which was perhaps due to internal troubles following the death of Mahendrapāla and gave an opportunity to the Pālas to retrieve their position. In any case, as we find an inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla (No. 15) in Bihar dated in the year 54 of his reign, we may presume that the Pāla king recovered Northern Bengal and Bihar about 908 A.D., if not earlier.

Nārāyaṇapāla had also probably come into conflict with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishṇa II who succeeded Amoghavarsha about 880 A.D., and ruled till 914 A.D. It is said in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records that Krishṇa II was the 'preceptor charging the Gauḍas with the vow of humility,' and that 'his command was obeyed by Anaga, Kalinga, Gaṅga, and Magadhā.' A petty chief of Velanābuḍ (in Kistna district) named Mallā I, who claims to have subdued the Vāngas, Magadhās, and the Gauḍas, probably accompanied Krishṇa II in his expedition. The nature and result of this expedition are difficult to determine, but perhaps Krishṇa II had some success against the Pāla king. It is very likely that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Tuṅga, whose daughter Bhāgyanēvē was married to Nārāyaṇapāla's son Rājyapāla, is no other than Jagattunga, the son of Krishṇa II. In that case we may presume that the marriage alliance had brought about, at least temporarily, a cessation of hostilities.

Nārāyaṇapāla died about 908 A.D., and was succeeded by his son Rājyapāla who ruled for at least thirty-two years. As noted above, Rājyapāla married Bhāgyanēvē, the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Tuṅga. He is credited in official records with works of public utility such as excavation of big tanks and construction of lofty temples. He was succeeded by his son Gopāla II, who ruled for at least seventeen years. Several records of both these kings have been found in Magadhā, and a copper-plate grant, dated in

---

1 T.K. 254 ff.  
3 Pithapura Ins. v. 11. El. iv. 40, 48.  
4 Cf. Ins. No. 31, v. 8. Tuṅga is usually identified with Jagattunga, son of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishṇa II, who ruled about 914 A.D. (JASB, 1902, Part 1, p. 80). Jagattunga predeceased his father and never ascended the throne. His son Indra III succeeded Krishṇa II. Tuṅga may be regarded as an abbreviated form of Jagattunga who was a contemporary of Nārāyaṇapāla, father of Rājyapāla. But the proposed identification, though very probable, cannot be regarded as certain. For we must remember that there were other Rāṣṭrakūṭa branches, e.g., the one ruling in Gujārāt. R. D. Banerji is inclined (El. 290) to identify Tuṅga with Tuṅgadharmāvaloka whose inscription was found at Both-Gāyā (R. L. Mitra, Buddha-Gāyā, p. 195, pl. xxv). N. Vasu identified Tuṅga with Krishṇa II himself who had the epithet Subhaṭṭaṅga (VII. 196).

5 Cf. Ins. No. 81.  
6 Ins. No. 31, v. 7.  
7 See infra p. 179.  
the sixth year of Gopāla II (No. 23), proves his possession of Northern Bengal.

Thus after the end of the disastrous reign of Nārāyaṇapāla, the prospects of the Pālas appeared somewhat bright. The Pratihāras had suffered a severe blow from which they were not likely to recover for some time, and there was a truce with the Rāṣṭrakūtas cemented by a marriage alliance. The worst crisis in the history of the Pālas seemed to have been over.

But unfortunately for the Pālas, the downfall of the Pratihāras let loose other forces which proved no less disastrous to them. Two great powers, the Chandellas and the Kalachuris, tried to establish their political supremacy in Northern India, and the Pālas had to bear the brunt of their aggressive imperialism.

Yaśovarman, who laid the foundations of the greatness of the Chandellas, is said to have carried on incessant military campaigns all over Northern India, and dominated the whole region from the Himālayas to Malwa and from Kashmir to Bengal. Even making due allowance for the exaggerations of the court-poets, he must be credited with military successes over a wide range of territories. In particular, his conquest of the famous fortress of Kālaṇḍara gave him a dominant position in the heart of Northern India. According to the Chandella records, Yaśovarman ‘was a sword to (cut down) the Gaudas as if they were pleasure-creepers,’ and his son Dhanāga, who ascended the throne some time before 954 A.D. and ruled till about 1000 A.D., kept in prison the queens of Rādhā and Aṇga. These statements may not be literally true, but we may take it for granted that during the reigns of Rājyapāla and his two successors, Gopāla II and Vigrāhapaṇa II, Bengal fared badly in the hands of Yaśovarman and Dhanāga. About the same time the Kalachuri rulers also raided various parts of the country. In the Kalachuri records we find reference to incursions against Bengal by two successive Kalachuri kings, Yuvarāja I and his son Lakṣmaṇarāja, who probably ruled in the second and third quarters of the tenth century A.D. Yuvarāja is said to have had amorous dalliances with the women of Gauda, Karpāṭa, Lāṭa, Kāśmira and Kaliṅga. This is a poetical way of describing military raids in these countries, but it is difficult to get any idea of their nature and effect. Lakṣmaṇarāja is said to have been ‘skilful in breaking (i.e. defeating) Vangāla,’ which, as we have seen above, refers to Southern and

---

1 DIHNI. ii. 674-75.
2 Khajuraho Ins. No. ii. verse 23; No. iv. verse 46 (EI. i. 120, 132, 145).
3 Bihari Ins. v. 24 (EI. i. 235, 265).
4 Gulara cp. v. 8 (EI. xi. 149).
Disruption of the Pāla Kingdom

part of Eastern Bengal. As Lakshmaṇarāja is also known to have conquered Ordu, it is very probable that he advanced through Orissa to the deltaic coast of Bengal, as Rājendra Chola did a few years later.

These foreign raids may be regarded both as causes and effects of the military weakness and political disruption of the Pāla kingdom. The reference in Kālacuri and Chandella inscriptions to the various component parts of the kingdom such as Anga, Rādhā. Gauda, and Vanga as separate units may not be without significance. It is true that sometimes a kingdom is referred to by the name of a particular province within it, but evidences are not altogether wanting that in the present instance, the different states named above really formed independent or semi-independent principalities.

The Pāla records definitely state that the paternal kingdom of the Pālas had been possessed by an usurper before the end of the reign of Vigrāhapāla 11, or in any case shortly after it. It is generally held that this usurper belonged to the line of Kāmboja chiefs who are known to have ruled about this time both in West and North Bengal. It was formerly believed that this was due to the successful invasion of Northern Bengal by the Kāmbojas, a hill-tribe from the north, west or east. But the recently discovered Irdā copper-plate grant (No. 49) puts an altogether different complexion on the whole matter.

This grant was issued from the capital city called Priyāṅgu, and records grants of land in Vardhamāna-bhūlti (Burdwan Division) by the Paramēśvaras, Paramabhaṭṭaraka, Mahārājādhirāja, the illustrious Nayapālañcēva in the 13th year of his reign. He had succeeded his elder brother Nārāyaṇapāla, who was the son of Rājyapāla and Bhāgyadeva. Rājyapāla is given all the three imperial titles, and is described as the ornament of the Kāmboja family.

Now the queen of the Pāla king Rājyapāla, as we have seen above, was also named Bhāgyadevi, and it is, therefore, tempting to identify the king Rājyapāla of the Irdā Plate with the Pāla king of that name. But this assumption is not free from difficulties, and there is no general agreement among scholars on this point. If we identify Rājyapāla of the Irdā Plate with the Pāla king Rājyapāla, we must hold that there was a partition of the Pāla

1 See supra p. 19; IHQ. xvi. 225 ff.
2 Bilhāri Ins. v. 68 (El. i. 360, 388).
4 Dinajpur Pillar Ins. (No. 46) refers to a Gauda king of Kāmboja family.
5 For theories of Kamboja conquest, cf. GR. 57; BI. 231.
6 See infra p. 191.
7 See infra p. 190.
kingdom after his death between two branches of the Pāla family. If we do not accept this identification, the most reasonable view would be to hold that Rājyapāla, an ambitious and powerful Kāmbhoja chief, perhaps a dignitary or high official under the Pālas,1 had taken advantage of the weakness of the Pāla kingdom to set up an independent principality which ultimately comprised Western and Northern Bengal. The theory of a Kāmbhoja invasion is not supported by any positive evidence, and appears to be highly improbable.

But whichever of these views we may accept, the main fact remains that the Pāla kingdom was split up during the second half of the tenth century A.D. The kingdom of Rādhā, mentioned in the inscription of Dhaṅga, therefore, probably refers to the kingdom of Nārāyaṇapāla and Nayapāla comprising Western and Northern Bengal with its capital at Prijāṅgu. The other kingdom, Angrā, would naturally refer to the dominions under Gopāla 11 and Vigrāha- pāla 11, which probably comprised Angrā and Magadha.

The Pālas also lost control over East and South Bengal, and we have definite evidence of the existence of several independent kingdoms in this region. The earliest is the kingdom of Harikela under a Buddhist king Mahārājādhirāja Kāntideva, known from an incomplete draft of a copper-plate grant found in an old temple at Chittagong.2 This grant was issued from Vardhamānapura, presumably the capital of Kāntideva. According to I.-tsing,3 Harikela denoted the eastern limit of Eastern India, but some other Chinese authority applies the name to the coastland between Samata and Orissa.4 If Vardhamānapura is to be identified with Burdwan, as no other city of that name in Bengal is known to us, the latter interpretation of Harikela, which is also supported by Indian sources,5 would be preferable. Kāntideva’s kingdom would thus comprise a

1 The Pālas employed mercenary forces, and certainly recruited horses from Kāmbhoja (Ins. No. 6, v. 13). Mr. N. G. Majumdar has very rightly observed that “if horses could be brought into Bengal from the north-western frontier of India during the Pāla period, it is not unreasonable to suppose that for trade and other purposes some adventurers could also have found their way into that province” (EI. xxv. 108). Mercenary soldiers (especially cavalry) might have been recruited from the Kāmbhojas, and some of them might have been influential chiefs. It has been suggested also that the Kāmbhojas might have come to Bengal with the Pratihāras when they conquered part of this province (Dhns. 1, 311; IHQ. xv. 511).
2 Modern Review, 1922, p. 614. The original plate is now in the Dacca Museum.
3 I.-tsing, p. xxxvi.
4 Cf. the map at the end of vol. ii. of St. Julien’s translation of Huen Tsang which was originally published in Japan in 1710.
5 Harikela is mentioned in Hemachandra’s Abhidhāna-chintānaya (v. 257) as a synonym of Vrāga.
portion of South and West Bengal. The kingdom was presumably founded by him, as his father and grandfather are referred to as ordinary persons. He married Vindurati, the daughter of a great king, and this marriage probably helped him in carving out an independent principality. For the date of Kāntideva we are solely dependent on palaeographic evidence, and we may place his reign during the period 850-950 A.D.¹ It is very likely that Kāntideva flourished during the decadent period that set in after the death of Devapāla, and took advantage of the weakness of the central authority to found an independent kingdom in Eastern Bengal. Ultimately he extended his authority over Southern Bengal and probably even a part of Western Bengal. In other words, he might have been one of the earliest kings of Vangāla, a kingdom which came into prominence since the tenth century A.D.

We know of another independent king, Layahachandradeva, who ruled near about Comilla for at least eighteen years² during the tenth century A.D.

Another dynasty, with names of kings also ending in -chandra, had set up an independent kingdom in Eastern Bengal during the second half of the tenth century A.D. Two rulers of this dynasty, Trailokyachandra and his son Śrīchandra, are known to have ruled over Harikela, with Chandradvipa (comprising roughly the modern district of Bakarganj)³ as their central seat of authority. As another king, Govindachandra, is known to have ruled over Southern and Eastern Bengal at the beginning of the eleventh century A.D., it is probable that he, too, belonged to the same family, and that the Chandra kingdom even originally comprised both Southern and Eastern Bengal.

It would thus appear that during the reigns of Gopāla II and his son and successor Vigrahapāla II, there were three well-defined kingdoms, viz., the Chandra kingdom comprising East and South Bengal, the Kāmboja-Pāla kingdom comprising North and West Bengal, and the Pāla kingdom proper, comprising Aṅga and Magadha. Gopāla II and his son Vigrahapāla II had the curious misfortune of losing the paternal territory of the dynasty, though ruling over other parts of the kingdom.

¹ The editors of the Chittagong Plate have fixed its date on palaeographic grounds between 750-850 A.D. But although the general character of the alphabets would favour such an assumption, certain letters (notably ḷ, ḷ, and ṽ) have decidedly later forms.

² The history of Layahachandra and the other Chandra kings mentioned below is discussed separately in Ch. ix. infra where full references are given.

³ See supra pp. 17-18.
In verse 11 of the Bāngarh Grant of Mahāpāla (No. 31), the elephant-forces of Vīgrahāpāla II are said to have wandered in the eastern regions full of water, the Malaya mountains in the south, the desert regions in the west, and the Himalaya mountains in the north. This description of the aimless wanderings of Vīgrahāpāla’s forces in all directions was regarded by some scholars as a covert allusion to the loss of paternal kingdom by Vīgrahāpāla, and his vain attempt to seek help or refuge in various quarters. A recently discovered copper-plate applies the same verse to Gopāla II. This undoubtedly weakens the force of the argument in favour of the above interpretation, but the verse may not unreasonably be regarded as a poetic method of indicating the great catastrophe which befell the Pāla kingdom during the reigns of Gopāla II, Vīgrahāpāla II, and possibly Vīgrahāpāla III, to whom also the same verse is applied.

IV. RESTORATION UNDER MAHIPĀLA (c. 988-1058 A.D.)

When Mahāpāla I succeeded his father Vīgrahāpāla II about 988 A.D., the prospect of his family was undoubtedly gloomy in the extreme. It reflects no small credit upon him that by heroic efforts he succeeded in restoring the fortunes of his family, at least to a considerable extent.

According to verse 12 of the Bāngarh Grant (No. 31), he recovered his paternal kingdom which was ‘anadhikrita-vilupta.’ This expression has been usually interpreted as ‘snatched away (vilupta) by people who had no claim to it’ (taking anadhikrita in the sense of anadhikārī). Mr. N. G. Majumdar has pointed out that although this is possible, it is somewhat far-fetched, and the proper meaning of the expression is ‘lost owing to non-occupation.’ But whatever interpretation we accept, it is clear that Mahāpāla recovered his paternal kingdom which was in possession of some other ruling family.

The expression ‘paternal kingdom’ has been taken by most writers to apply to Varendra, which was in occupation of the

1 The word read as ‘tāru’ in GL. 95 is really ‘maru’ (desert). Cf. EI. xiv. 588.
2 The view was first put forward by A. K. Maitreyya (GL. 100, fn.) and accepted by R. D. Banerji (BE. 839).
3 V. 10 of Ins. No. 29. The same verse is applied to Vīgrahāpāla III (v. 14 of Ins. No. 99), but it was regarded as an error on the part of the composer. As Gopāla II was an earlier king, the verse must have been current before the time of Vīgrahāpāla II.
4 Kl. xxii. 152.
5 For the expression ‘jana-bhūḥ’ is applied to Varendra in RC.
Kamboja ruler. But, as has been shown above, practically the whole of Bengal proper had passed out of the hands of the Pālas, and there is hardly any justification for regarding Varendra alone as the paternal kingdom of the Pālas. It would, therefore, perhaps, be better to take the paternal kingdom as generally meaning 'Bengal,' and consider how far Mahipāla was successful in recovering it.

The first important evidence in this respect is furnished by a short inscription (No. 30) on an image of Vishnu, found in a village called Bāghāura near Brahmanbaria in the Tippera district. It records the setting up of the image 'in Samatata, in the kingdom of Mahipāla, in the year 3.' Although it is not absolutely certain whether king Mahipāla of the inscription refers to the first or second king of that name, the probability is in favour of the former. In that case, we must presume that Mahipāla must have recovered Eastern Bengal, or at least a part of it, before the end of the third year of his reign.¹

Now, it is not possible for a king with his base in Anå and Magadha to proceed to Eastern Bengal without conquering either Varendra or Rādhā i.e., Northern or Western Bengal. Mahipāla evidently chose the former route. For his Bāngarh Grant (No. 31) shows that he was in occupation of Varendra (North Bengal) in the year 9 of his reign. We may thus hold that Mahipāla had recovered Northern and Eastern Bengal within three years of his accession.

There is no positive evidence that he had recovered either Western or Southern Bengal. But some light is thrown on this question by the account of Rājendra Chola’s invasion of Bengal which requires a somewhat detailed discussion.

The northern expedition of the great Chola emperor was led by one of his generals and lasted about two years from 1021 to 1023 A.D.² Its object was to bring, by force of arms, the sacred waters of the Ganges, in order to sanctify his own land. After

¹ The attribution of the Bāghāura Image Ins. to Mahipāla is not accepted by all. Dr. D. C. Ganguly takes the king to be the Pratihāra king Mahipāla, son of Mahendrapāla (IHQ. xvi. 170 ff.). Dr. H. C. Ray opposes this view (Ibid. 631 ff.), and holds it as probable that Mahipāla of the Bāghāura Image Ins. refers to the first Pāla king of the name. It may be admitted that the available evidence is not sufficient to lead to a definite conclusion, and it is not beyond the range of possibility that Mahipāla of the Bāghāura Image Ins. may be either the Pratihāra king Mahipāla, or a local ruler of Samatata. The view propounded in the text is, however, held by most of the scholars, and appears to be more probable than any other hypothesis.

conquering Odda-vishaya (Orissa) and Kosalai-nādu, the Chola general seized

"Tanḍabutti... (land which he acquired) after having destroyed Dharma-pāla (in) a hot battle; Takkanālādam whose fame reached (all) directions. (and which he occupied) after having forcibly attacked Rāṣṭrāra; Vaṅgāla-deśa, where the rain water never stopped, (and from which) Govinda-chandra fled, having descended (from him) male elephant; elephants of rare strength, women and treasure, (which he seized) after having been pleased to frighten the strong Mahipāla on the field of hot battle with the (noise of the) conches (got) from the deep sea; Uttinalādam (on the shore of) the expansive ocean (producing) pearls; and the Gāṅgā whose waters bearing fragrant flowers dashed against the bauling places."

Now there can be no doubt that Tanḍabutti, Takkanālādam, Uttinalādam and Vaṅgāla-deśa in the above passage denote respectively Daṇḍabhuṭi, Dakshiṇa-Rādhā, Uttara-Rādhā and Vaṅgāla.²

It has been reasonably inferred from the Tamil version quoted above, that the Chola general “attacked and overthrew, in order, Dharmapāla of Daṇḍabhuṭi, Rāṣṭrāra of Southern Rādhā, and Govindachandra of Vaṅgāla, before he fought with Mahipāla and conquered Uttara-Rādhā.” It is not definitely stated that Mahipāla was the ruler of Uttara-Rādhā, though that seems to be the implication, as no separate ruler of this kingdom is mentioned, and the defeat of Mahipāla preceded its conquest. According to the Sanskrit version, however, Southern Rādhā was conquered before Daṇḍabhuṭi,³ a view which is difficult to accept on account of the geographical position of the two.⁴

³ This is the translation of Prof. Sāstri (Colas, 849, as amended in IHQ, xiii. 151-58) which differs to some extent from that of Hultzsch (EI, ix. 233) in respect of the passage concerning Mahipāla. It may be noted that Hultzsch’s translation “Uttimalādam, as rich in pearls as the ocean,” or an alternative translation “close to the sea yielding pearls” (JRAS, 1937, p. 99), is more acceptable than that of Sāstri, for the region is not on the sea-coast, as the latter would imply. As regards Mahipāla, there is some controversy as to whether it refers to the Pāla king Mahipāla 1, or is only a common noun meaning “king” and has reference to a ruler of the Orissa (Odisha) country (JRAS, 1935, pp. 601-03; 1937, pp. 79-90). But most scholars accept the view of Kielhorn that Mahipāla, referred to in the Chola inscription, is the first Pāla ruler of that name (IHQ, xiii. 140). Prof. S. K. Aiyangar holds that Mahipāla refers to king of Orissa, even if it is taken as a personal name (JRAS, 1937, pp. 79-90).

² Prof. Aiyangar’s view that Vaṅgāla was a general name of Bengal and not a part of it (JRAS, 1947, p. 86) is unacceptable in view of the specific mention of Uttara-Rādhā and Dakshiṇa-Rādhā, and specially as we know that the name Vaṅgāla was used about this time to denote a part of Bengal. It is not, however, identical with Vaṅga division of Bengal, as Prof. Aiyangar assumes (Ibid).

⁴ Colas, 848, 851.
The Chola campaign, as Professor K. A. Nilakanta Śāstri has rightly observed, "could hardly have been more than a hurried raid across a vast stretch of country."\(^1\) We also agree with him that the statement in the Tiruvālangādu Plates that the water of the Ganges was carried to Rājendra by the defeated kings of Bengal at the bidding of the Chola general is a boast without foundation. The Chola conquest, no doubt, inflicted losses and miseries upon the people, but does not seem to have affected in any way the political condition of the country.

The detailed account, however, seems to show that Daṇḍabhukti, Southern Rāḍhā, and Vaṅgāla were independent kingdoms at the time of the Chola invasion. Professor Śāstri says that

"the language of the Tamil inscription appears to suggest what seems likely even otherwise, that Mahipāla had a sort of supremacy over the other chiefs named in this context, and that the overthrow of Dharmapāla, Raṇāśūra, and Govinda-chandra led to the final struggle in which Mahipāla was captured together with another person called Saṅgu, perhaps his Commander."\(^2\)

It is difficult to accept the Professor's statement that Mahipāla was captured in the final struggle, as it is explicitly stated that Mahipāla was 'put to flight'\(^3\) or 'frightened.' It is equally difficult to find any support in the Tamil passage, quoted above, for the overlordship of Mahipāla over the other kingdoms mentioned in it, except perhaps in the case of Uttara-Rāḍhā. As we have seen above, Daṇḍabhukti was included within the kingdom of the Mahārājaśhīrāja Nayapāla which also probably included Rāḍhā and Varendra, and Southern and Eastern Bengal were ruled over by the Chandra kings, when Mahipāla ascended the throne. It would, therefore, be more reasonable to conclude that Govindachandra ruled over the old Chandra kingdom or at least a considerable part of it, and Dharmapāla, perhaps a scion of the Kāmboja family, still held Daṇḍabhukti; while a new dynasty, the Śūras, about whom we shall hear more hereafter (see infra p. 210) had established its authority in South Rāḍhā. Mahipāla was thus able to recover, in addition to North and a part of East Bengal, only the northern part of Rāḍhā i.e., approximately that portion of the present Burdwan Division which lies to the north of the Ajay river.

---

\(^1\) Colas, 247. This is also the view of Prof. Aiyangar (JRAS, 1937, p. 83).

\(^2\) Colas, 251-52. The reference to Saṅgu would, of course, be omitted now in view of the amended translation proposed by Śāstri (IHQ, xiii. 101-92) and quoted above.

\(^3\) This is the translation of Hultzsch (EI, ix. 233) and that given by Śāstri in Colas (p. 258). But Śāstri has now substituted it by 'frighten' (IHQ, xiii. 101-92). But even this does not support Śāstri's contention that Mahipāla was captured.
The findspots of Mahipāla's inscriptions\(^1\) show that he was in possession of North and South Bihar. As the inscriptions of Nārāyanapāla, Rājyapāla, Gopāla II, and probably also of Vigrahapāla II, have been found in South Bihar,\(^2\) it may be regarded as having been in the continuous possession of the Pālas since its recovery after the conquest of Mahendrapāla, but we are not sure whether North Bihar was inherited or conquered by Mahipāla.

According to an inscription found in Sārnāth near Benares (No. 29), and dated Samvat 1083, construction and repairs of many sacred structures on that site were undertaken by the order of Mahipāla, king of Gauḍa,\(^3\) the actual work having been entrusted to his two brothers Śthirapāla and Vasantapāla. Normally, we would be justified in inferring from such a record that Mahipāla's suzerainty extended up to Benares in the year 1026 A.D. Such an inference is, however, liable to two objections: In the first place, Benares and Sārnāth being sacred places of almost international reputation, construction of buildings there by Mahipāla does not necessarily imply any political suzerainty over the region. Secondly, as the work of construction is referred to as a past event, Mahipāla probably died before the record was set up; at least, it is not necessary to conclude that Mahipāla was alive in 1026 A.D.\(^4\)

These are, no doubt, forceful arguments, but cannot be regarded as conclusive. As regards the first, the suzerainty over Benares may not be a necessary implication, but in view of the fact that Mahipāla's dominions certainly included the whole of Bihar, it is, in any case, a reasonable inference, so long at least as it is not proved that Benares was under the rule of a different king. As regards the second also, the event might have been a past one, but as no other king of Gauḍa but Mahipāla is referred to in the inscription, the date may be taken as one falling within his rule. For the present, therefore, we may regard Mahipāla as ruling over Tirhut and probably also up to Benares, about 1026 A.D.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Cf. Ins. Nos. 34-34, found in South Bihar, and No. 35, found in North Bihar.


\(^3\) For an account of the monuments referred to in the Ins. cf. JASB. N.S. xv. 101.

\(^4\) Cf. PB. 76; BI. 257.

\(^5\) One historical evidence is usually cited against the conclusion that Mahipāla's authority extended up to Benares in the year 1026 A.D. The colophon of a Nepal ms. of the Rāmdāpaṇa refers to the Maharājādhirāja Purṇāvaloka Somavansadhi Rāva Gauḍadhvajā Śrimad-Gāṅgeyadeva as ruling in Tirhuttikī (Northern Bihar) in Saṃvat 1076. Some scholars identify this Gāṅgeyadeva with the famous Kalachuri king of this name, and hold that his conquests extended up to North Bihar in 1018 A.D. (v.a. 1076). As the Kalachuri records also claim that
Towards the close of his reign, Mahipala came into conflict with the powerful Kalachuri ruler Gangayadeva. The Kalachuri records claim that the latter defeated the ruler of Anga, which can only denote Mahipala. It also appears from the statement of Baihaqi that Benares was in possession of the Kalachuri king in 1084 A.D. when Ahmad Niyal Tigin invaded it. It may be reasonably concluded, therefore, that shortly after A.D. 1026, Mahipala came into conflict with the Kalachuri king Gangayadeva and suffered reverses in his hands.

Mahipala has been criticised by some writers for not having joined the Hindu confederacy organised by the Shahi kings of the Punjab against Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni. Some have attributed his inactivity to asceticism, and others to intolerance of Hinduism and jealousy to other Hindu kings. It is difficult to subscribe to these views. When Mahipala ascended the throne, the Pala power had sunk to the lowest depths, and the Pala kings had no footing in their own homeland. It must have taxed the whole energy and strength of Mahipala to recover the paternal territories and to ward off the formidable invasions of Rajendra Chola and Gangayadeva. It reflects the greatest credit upon his ability and military genius that he succeeded in re-establishing his authority over a great part of Bengal, and probably also extended his conquests up to Benares. Even this success was due, in a large measure, to the

Gangayadeva defeated the ruler of Anga, the two events are naturally connected, and it is generally concluded that Gangayadeva defeated Mahipala and conquered North Bihar some time before 1019 A.D. As such it is also difficult to believe that Mahipala’s conquest extended up to Benares in 1026 A.D. It is not generally recognised that the above view also goes counter to the evidence of the Imadpur (Muzaffarpur district) bronze figure inscriptions of Mahipala (No. 85) dated in the year 48. For the 48th regnal year of Mahipala could hardly be placed before 1019 A.D. when North Bihar is supposed to have been under Gangayadeva.

As a matter of fact, the identification of the Gangayadeva of the Nepal manuscript with the Kalachuri king of that name is open to serious objections, and we cannot build any hypothesis on this basis without further corroborative evidence. This point has been thoroughly discussed by me in IHQ. VII, 681, where I have attempted to show that the date 1076 is to be referred to Saka era (1154 A.D.) when Gangadeva, the successor of Nanyadeva, ruled in North Bihar.

The Gurgi Ins. of Prabodhasiva seems to refer to a conflict between the Gauda king and Kokkalladeva II, the father of Gangya. But no definite sense can be made out on account of the damaged state of the inscription (EI. XXII. 182, fn. 1).

Goharwa cp. EI. XI. 148, v. 17.

2 The identification of Gang with Gangayadeva is very probable, though not certain. Cf. E. & D. II. 123; Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, p. 101; DHII. II. 775.

3 GR. 41-48; BI. 856.
political circumstances in Northern India, viz., the disastrous and repeated invasions of Sultan Mahmud, which exhausted the strength and resources of the great powers, and diverted their attention to the west. It would have been highly impolitic, if not sheer madness, on the part of Mahipāla to fritter away his energy and strength in a distant expedition to the west, when his own kingdom was exposed to the threat of disruption from within and invasion from abroad.¹

On the whole, the achievements of Mahipāla must be regarded as highly remarkable, and he ranks as the greatest Pāla emperor after Devapāla. He not only saved the Pāla kingdom from impending ruin, but probably also revived to some extent the old imperial dreams. His success in the limited field that he selected for his activities is a sure measure of his prowess and statesmanship, and it is neither just nor rational to regret that he had not done more.

The revival of the Pāla power was also reflected in the restoration of the religious buildings in Benares (including Sārnāth) and Nālandā which had evidently suffered much during the recent collapse of the Pāla power. Reference has already been made to the Sārnāth inscription, which mentions "hundreds of pious works" and the repairs of the famous Buddhist monuments of old undertaken by the orders of Mahipāla. Two inscriptions (Nos. 32, 83), dated in the 11th year of Mahipāla, refer to the restoration and repairs of the monuments of Nālandā after they were destroyed or damaged by fire, and the construction of two temples at Bodh-Gayā. Traditions have associated the name of Mahipāla with a number of big tanks and towns in North and West Bengal.² It is perhaps not without significance, that of all the Pāla emperors, the name of Mahipāla alone figures in popular ballads still current in Bengal. Bengal has forgotten the names of its great emperors Dharmapāla.

¹ Dr. H. C. Ray generally supports this view (DHNI. 1. 324; IHQ. xx. 507.), though his statement that the Pālas were "rulers of a comparatively small principality" does not apply to Mahipāla. But this does not justify the criticism of Dr. D. C. Ganguly (IHQ. xvi. 179). It was not so much the size of the kingdom of Mahipāla, but its internal condition and external dangers, that account for the inactivity of Mahipāla. Even according to Dr. Ganguly, Mahipāla was ruler of North and South Bihar, and North Bengal. A ruler over these territories could easily rank among the other powerful potentates of Northern India about that time, and should have joined the common cause, if his kingdom possessed stability and security which Mahipāla's kingdom lacked.

² The big tank called Mahipāl-dīpki (Dinajpur) and the towns of Mahipur (Bogra), Mahisantosho (Dinajpur), and Mahipāl (Murahidabad), and probably also Saṅgardighi (Murahidabad) are associated with the name of Mahipāla, cf. GR. 41-42.
and Devapāla, but cherished the memory of the king who saved it at a critical juncture.

Before we conclude, reference may be made to two other historical events, the association of Mahipāla with which is probable, but not certain.

According to the Jain author Hemachandra, the Chaulukya king Durabha, who ascended the throne of Anahilapātaka about 1009-10 A.D., won over his queen Durabhadevi in a śayonavara ceremony, but, to retain possession of this princess, he had to fight a number of other claimants, amongst whom were the kings of Anga, Kāśi, Avanti, Cheti-deśa, Kuru-deśa, Hṛṣṇa-deśa, Mathurā, and Vindhyā. Now the king of Anga, at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, was Mahipāla I. If, therefore, the Jain author is to be believed, we have a glimpse of a forgotten episode in the life of Mahipāla when he was an unsuccessful suitor for the hands of Durabhadevi. But such stories cannot be taken as historical without independent corroboration.

A manuscript of a drama named Chandā-kauśika, by Ārya Kṣemisvarā, was discovered by MM. Haraprasād Śāstrī in 1893. It contains a verse in which king Mahipāla is said to be an incarnation of Chandragupta, and the Karnaṭas, of the Nandas, and the play was staged before the king by his order. It is obvious that the poet implied that king Mahipāla defeated the Karnaṭas, as Maurya Chandragupta defeated the Nandas. This Mahipāla has been identified by some scholars with the Pāla king Mahipāla I, and it has been suggested that the Cholas were referred to as the Karnaṭas. Mr. R. D. Banerji even went so far as to suggest, on the strength of this evidence, "that though Mahipāla I was defeated by Rājendra Chola when he crossed into Rādhā from East Bengal, he prevented him from crossing the Ganges into Varendra or Northern Bengal, and so the Chola conqueror had to turn back from the banks of the Ganges."

Unfortunately the identification of the king Mahipāla of Chandā-kauśika with the Pāla ruler Mahipāla I is not accepted by others, who rather regard the Pratihāra ruler Mahipāla as the hero of the drama. In the absence of further particulars, it is difficult to decide the question one way or the other. The probability is, however, undoubtedly in favour of the latter view. For while there is no valid reason to regard Rājendra Chola as a Karnaṭa,

---

1 DHNI. ii. 945-46
2 JASB. ii. 250.
3 PB. 78: BI. 251-62.
4 Prof. K. A. N. Śāstrī in JOR. vi. 191-98; IC. ii. 797. Mr. J. C. Ghosh upholds the view of Mr. Banerji (IC. ii. 854.).
the Pratihāra king Mahipāla undoubtedly had a life and death struggle with the Karpātas under Indra III. It is true that Mahipāla was defeated, but the retreat of the Karpāta forces and the re-occupation of Kanauj by Mahipāla could easily be magnified by the court-poet as a glorious victory of Mahipāla over the Karpātas, and such an assumption was well calculated to soothe the wounded vanity of the Pratihāras. In any case, it is not safe to derive any inference from Chanda-kauśika regarding the victory of the Pāla ruler over the Chola army.

v. THE BREAK-UP OF THE PĀLA KINGDOM

Mahipāla was succeeded by his son Nayapāla, who ruled for at least fifteen years (c. 1038-1055 A.D.). The most important event in his reign was his long-drawn struggle with the Kalachuri king Karna or Lakshmi-karna. It is evident that the aggressive policy of Gāṅgeya-deva was continued by his son and successor. The Kalachuri records refer, in vague poetic language, to Karna’s raids against, or encounter with, the chiefs of Vaṅga and Gauda. A more detailed account is furnished by the Tibetan texts. They refer to a war between Nayapāla and the Tirthika king Karunya (or king of Kārṇya) of the west who had invaded Magadha. There can be hardly any doubt that the latter name stands for Karna. As regards the details of the struggle, it seems that at first Karna defeated Nayapāla. It is said that failing to capture the city, Karna’s troops sacked some of the sacred Buddhist institutions, and even carried away a good deal of church furniture. The famous Buddhist monk Dipanikara Śrīśāna (also known as Atiśa) was at that time residing in Magadha, but showed no interest in the struggle that was going on. But, we are told, that ‘afterwards when victory turned towards (Nayapāla) and the troops of Karna were being slaughtered by the armies of Magadha, he took Karna and his men under his protection and sent them away.’ Dipanikara then made serious efforts to bring the struggle to an end.

1 Cf. Ins. Nos. 30-37.
2 Bheraghat Ins. v. 18 (El. ii. 11, 15) ; Karanbel Ins. (IA. xviii. 815, 917). According to v. 29 of the Rewa Stone Ins. (El. xxiv. 118), Karna achieved a decisive victory over the king of the Eastern country who probably lost his life in the fierce fight. This point has been discussed in Ch. vii, infra.
3 For the Tibetan tradition cf. JBTSt. i (1895), pp. 9-10; S. C. Das, Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow, 61. This account, with slight differences in details, is also given in JAB. 1901, p. 51. Mr. Das writes ‘king of Kārṇya (probably Kanauj).’
"Unmindful of his health even at the risk of his life, Atiśa again and again crossed the rivers that lay between the two kingdoms." His efforts proved successful, and a treaty was concluded between the two hostile kings on the basis of the mutual restitution of all conquests and plunder.

It is difficult to say how far the Tibetan tradition is correct. In particular, the part played by Dipamkara seems to have been exaggerated. But, in view of other evidences, the main outline of the story, viz., an indecisive struggle between Karna and Nayapala, followed by a treaty, may well be taken as historical.

According to Tibetan tradition, Dipamkara left India for good at the age of 58, and spent the last thirteen years of his life in Tibet, dying at the age of 73. The date of his departure has been fixed by various authorities at 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041 and 1042 A.D.\(^1\) As we know, the Kalachuri king Karna succeeded his father in 1041 A.D.\(^2\) So even taking the latest date proposed for the departure of Atiśa, it is difficult to reconcile the discrepancy. Perhaps it would be wise not to rely too much on the accuracy of dates derived from Tibetan sources. On the other hand, it is equally likely that the war, referred to in the Tibetan texts, is only a phase of the long-drawn struggle between the Pālas and the Kalachuris which had been going on since the time of Gāṅgeyadeva.

According to the views propounded above, Mahīpāla was in possession of Benares till at least 1026 A.D., but it passed into the hands of the Kalachuri king Gāṅgeya in A.D. 1034. We must, therefore, presume that hostility had broken out before that date, and that it was continued after the death of Gāṅgeya by his son Karna. The initial success of the Kalachuris is testified to by the Tibetan tradition, the claim in Kalachuri records that Gāṅgeyadeva defeated the ruler of Āṅga, and the occupation of Benares by the latter. The discomfort of the Kalachuris towards the end, and their treaty with the Pālas, may have been due, to a great extent, to the death of the great king Gāṅgeyadeva. This theory fits in well with the date of the departure of Dipamkara as given in the Tibetan texts, if we take the latest date proposed viz., 1042 A.D.

In any case, the treaty was merely an interlude, and Karna once more directed his arms against the Pālas during the reign of

---

\(^1\) 1038—JASB. 1891, p. 51.
1039—S. C. Das, Indian Pandits, 50, 76.
1041—IHQ, 189, 159.
1042—JASB. 1891, p. 287.

\(^2\) This is the generally accepted view, though Mr. J. C. Ghosh places it in 1059 A.D. (JC, i. 299).
Vigrahapāla III (c. 1055-1070 A.D.), the son and successor of Naya-
pāla. During the interval he had secured a position of supremacy
by destroying the Paramāras and the Chandelas, and conquering
the upper valley of the Mahānadi.1

The references in Kalachuri records to Karna’s encounter with
the lords of Gauḍa and Vanga presumably refer to this second
expedition, as the area of the struggle in the first case did not
extend beyond Magadhā.2 According to the Kalachuri records,
Vanga trembled in fear of Karna, and the lord of Gauḍa waited
upon him.3 That Karna advanced at least up to the border of
Western Bengal is proved by his record on a pillar at Paikor in
the district of Birbhum.4 But according to Rāmācharita,5 Vigrah-
apāla III defeated Karna and married his daughter Yauvanāśri.
Evidently, in this second expedition, too, Karna, in spite of initial
success, ultimately suffered defeat. Perhaps a peace was concluded,
and the alliance was cemented by the marriage of Karna’s daughter
with Vigrahapāla III.

There is hardly any doubt that the king of Gauḍa mentioned
in the Kalachuri record refers to the Pāla king. It is not, however,
equally certain that the king of Vanga also refers to him. We have
seen above (supra p. 139) that Mahipāla recovered the possession
of East Bengal from the Chandras, but that the latter continued
to rule in South Bengal. It is also very likely that East Bengal,
or at least a part of it, did not long remain under the Pālas but
passed again into the hands of the Chandra kings.6 These Chandra
kings, or the Varmans that succeeded them, might have been ruling
in Vanga at the time of Karna’s expedition, though we are not quite
sure of it.

There is no doubt also that the Pāla rulers Naya-pāla and
Vigrahapāla III were gradually losing their hold over Western
Bengal. A chief calling himself Mahāmāṇḍalika Iśvaraghosha issued
a land-grant, in which he assumed the style of an independent king.
The Grant is not dated, but may be referred to the eleventh
century A.D., about the time of Vigrahapāla III. He issued the
Grant from Dhekka, probably situated in Burdwan district.7

1 DIHN. p. 779.
2 The Tibetan tradition definitely asserts that Karna invaded only Magadhā.
3 Cf. supra p. 144, n. 2.
4 ASI. 1921-22, p. 115; Birbhum-vivarana (Bengali) by H. K. Mukhopādhyāya.
5 n. 9.
6 1. 9, commentary.
7 For detailed discussion, see Ch. vii. infra.
8 Rāmānuja c.v. of Iśvaraghosha. IB. 149. Mr. N. G. Majumdar refers it on
palaeographical grounds to the eleventh century A.D. It is difficult to accept
Dr. D. B. Bhandarkar’s view that the year 35 of the Ins. is to be referred to
Foreign invasions

About the same time we find the rise of the kingdom of Paṭṭikerā in the Tippera district. The existence of Paṭṭikerā as an independent kingdom throughout the second half of the eleventh and the twelfth century A.D. may be inferred from the Burmese chronicles, though unfortunately they do not give any historical account of it.¹

It thus seems that Eastern Bengal had slipped from the hands of the Pālas and remained a separate independent kingdom, first under the Chandras, and then under the Varmans. There were also other petty independent kingdoms in Bengal.

The Pāla kings, constantly engaged in hostilities with the Kalachuris, could hardly recover their ancient territories in Bengal. The Kalachuri power was crushed towards the close of the third quarter of the eleventh century A.D. by the successive defeats that were inflicted upon Karṇa by his neighbours.² But before the Pālas could take advantage of this, they had to face an invasion from the Chālukeeperas of Karṇaṭa. According to Bilhana,³ the court-poet of the Chālukeeperas, the prince Vikramāditya (vii) went out on a career of conquest during the lifetime of his father Someśvara i and defeated the kings of Gauda and Kāmarūpa, among others. As Someśvara i died before the return of his victorious son, the expedition probably took place not long before 1068 A.D. The Chālukeya records refer in a general way to other military expeditions against Bengal during his reign and that of his two predecessors,⁴ whose exact nature and amount of success are difficult to determine. But some very important political events coincide chronologically with these Chālukeya raids, and are not impossibly direct or indirect consequences of the same. The most notable among these is the establishment of a Karṇaṭa Kshatriya family, the Senas, as the ruling power in Rādhā or Western Bengal, and of the Varmans of Sinhapura, in Vanga or Eastern Bengal.

Another foreign invasion of Bengal which may be referred approximately to the middle of the eleventh century A.D., was that

¹ For further discussion cf. Ch. ix. infra.
² dhni. ii. 780
³ Vidarambhadeva-charitra, iii. 74.
⁴ Cf. Ep. Carn. Devanagare Taluq Ins. Nos. 2 and 8, and Sudi Ins. El. xv. 86, 97-99, 104. The earliest raid must have taken place before 1068 A.D., for in the Kalawati Ins. of that year Bhoga-devavarasa, the general of Someśvara i, claims to have conquered Vanga (El. iv. 209). Ácha, a feudatory chief of Vikramāditya, led an expedition to Vanga which will be discussed later (see infra Ch. viii).
of the Somavaiśā, ruler of Orissa, named Mahāśīvagupta Yayāti. In one of his grants, he states, after enumerating his various conquests, that he was cooled by the wind (caused by) profound shaking of the sky of Gauḍa and Rāḍha, and was the full moon in the clear sky of Vaṅga. These are beautifully vague phrases, and do not enable us to form any definite conclusion, but it seems to refer to some military expeditions against North, West, and East Bengal. The date of Mahāśīvagupta Yayāti cannot be determined with any degree of certainty, but he may be placed about the middle of the eleventh century A.D. The king of Orissa was evidently encouraged by the successful expedition of Rājendra Chola and disruption of the Pāla empire. There was not perhaps a long interval between his triumphant raid and the Kārnāta invasion, and while one facilitated the other, the effect of the two was ruinous to Bengal. Reference may also be made in this connection to another Orissan king, Udyotakesāri, who claims to have defeated the forces of Gauḍa. The date of Udyotakesāri is not known, but he probably flourished in the eleventh century A.D.

The series of foreign invasions from the west and the south must have shaken the Pāla kingdom to its very foundations during the reigns of Nayaṇāra and his son and successor Vigrāhasāla. They had not only lost Eastern, Western, and Southern Bengal, but their power in Magadha was also being gradually reduced to a mere shadow. A clear evidence of this is furnished by four inscriptions found at Gayā. Two of these (Nos. 36, 37), dated in the year 15 of Nayaṇāra, refer to one Paritoshas, his son Śūdraka, and the latter's son, called Viśvālīya in one and Viśvarūpa in the other. Nothing is said in the former to indicate the political importance of the family, but the latter says that Gayā was protected (paripalita) for a long time by the strength (bhuvanabalena) of Śūdraka. A third inscription (No. 38), dated in the fifth regnal year of Vigrāhasāla, bestows vague grandiloquent praises upon Śūdraka, and says, about Viśvarūpa, that he destroyed all his enemies. The fourth inscription (No. 52) of the family is

---

2. Mr. R. D. Banerji attributes the conquest to Mahābhāvagupta 1 (Orissa, 212).
3. DHNI i. 405.
5. There is a fifth inscription of the family (No. 51) which has not yet been fully deciphered. The published portion contains the name of Paritoshas, but no historical information.
issued by king Yakshapāla,1 son of Viśvarūpa. The genealogy begins with Śūdraka, who is said to have defeated his enemies and driven them to the forest. Then follows a very significant, but somewhat obscure, expression about him, viz., “Śri-Śūdrakah evayam-apūjaya-Indra-kalpo Gauḍēśvaro nṛpati-lakṣaṇa-pūjaya-yam.” Dr. H. C. Ray has taken this expression to mean that the ‘Lord of Gauḍa paid homage to Śūdraka.”2 I think the expression rather means that the lord of Gauḍa formally honoured Śūdraka by investing him as king with proper ceremony. In any case, it shows that at the time the record was composed, the pretensions of the family rose higher than before. This is further proved by the fact that Śūdraka’s son Viśvarūpa is now called nṛpa or king, and at the very end, where in other inscriptions reference was made to the ruling Pāla king, a wish is expressed that the famous works of Yakshapāla may endure for a long time. A study of these four inscriptions shows the gradual decline of the Pāla power in the Gauḍa district during the reigns of Nayapāla and Vīgrahapāla III.3

Thus towards the middle of the eleventh century A.D. the fabric of the Pāla sovereignty was crumbling to dust. Eastern Bengal, West Bengal and Southern Bengal had definitely passed from their hands, and their suzerainty over Magadha was reduced to a mere name. A new power, the Varmans, occupied Eastern Bengal, and a copper-plate of Ratnapāla4 shows that even Kāmarūpa was hurling defiance at the king of Gauḍa at the beginning or middle of the eleventh century A.D.

VI. DISINTEGRATION AND Temporary Revival

1. Mahīpāla II (1070-75 A.D.)

Vīgrahapāla III had three sons, viz., Mahīpāla II, Śūrapāla II, and Rāmapāla. Mahīpāla, the eldest, succeeded his father. His reign was full of troubles. There were conspiracies against the king, and he was led to believe that his brother Rāmapāla was plotting to seize the kingdom for himself. Accordingly Mahīpāla threw both

1 The Tibetan historian Tāranātha mentions that Yakshapāla, a son of Rāmapāla, was elected king three years before the latter’s death (Ṭa. 251). It illustrates the confused character of the historical tradition preserved by Tāranātha. For while Yakshapāla might have been a contemporary of Rāmapāla during the early part of the reign of the latter, and ruled over a portion of the Pāla territory, he was certainly not the son of Rāmapāla. The fact that Yakshapāla lived in local tradition for five centuries attests to his political importance.
2 DHI. i. 342.
3 DUS. i. No. 2. pp. 184-35.
4 Bargason Grant. IASB. lxvii. 116.
Rāmapāla and Śūrāpāla into prison. But this did not save either his throne or his life. Ere long he had to face a well-organised rebellion of his vassal chiefs. Mahipāla's army was ill-equipped, but disregarding the counsel of his advisers he advanced to fight the rebels. He was defeated and killed, and Varendri passed into the hands of Divya, a high official of the Kaivarta caste.

This revolution and the subsequent recovery of Varendri by Rāmapāla are described in detail in the contemporary Sanskrit Kāvya Rāmcharita.¹ This unique historical document enables us to give a critical account of the history of Bengal for half a century (1070-1120 A.D.) with wealth of details such as are not available in regard to any other period. Unfortunately, the historical value of this book is considerably reduced by the fact that its author, Sandhyākara Nandi, was a partisan of Rāmapāla, and cannot be regarded as an unprejudiced and impartial critic of either Mahipāla or the Kaivarta chiefs who were enemies of Rāmapāla. While, therefore, the main incidents in the reign of Mahipāla II, mentioned in Rāmcharita and referred to above, may be regarded as historical, we should not accept, without due reservation, the author's descrip-

¹ The unique manuscript of the Sanskrit poem Rāmcharita (referred to as RC, in the text) was discovered in Nepal in 1897 by the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍit Harapraśāl Śāstri. The following extracts from his description will give the reader some idea of this important text, the only authentic historical work of ancient Bengal known to us.

"It is a curious work. It is written throughout in double entendre.......

Read one way, it gives the connected story of the Rāmāyana. Read another way, it gives the history of Rāmapāladeva of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal. The story of Rāmāyana is known, but the history of Rāmapāla is not known. So it would have been a difficult task to bring out the two meanings distinctly. But fortunately the man contained not only the text of the Rāmcharita, but a commentary of the first canto and of 36 (sic, really 35) verses of the second. The commentary portion of the manuscript then abruptly came to an end. The commentary, as may be expected, gives fuller account of the reign of Rāmapāla than the text.....

"The author of the text is Sandhyākara Nandi, who composed the work in the reign of Mudrāmapāla Deva, the second son of Rāmapāla. The author enjoyed exceptional opportunities of knowing the events of Rāmapāla's reign and those of his successors, as his father was the Sāndhivigrasha, or the Minister of Peace and War of Rāmapāla."

The text was first edited by MM. H. P. Śāstri and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal (MASB, 133 No. 1). It was re-edited, with a complete commentary and English translation, by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. R. G. Bask, and Papdiit Nuniopel Benerji, and published by the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, in 1939. These two editions will be referred to respectively as RC¹ and RC². All quotations from English translation refer to RC². For all references to text after n. 35, cf. RC¹, as RC¹ offers no commentary to these verses. For other verses either may be consulted. For a fuller discussion (with references) of the historical facts dealt with in this chapter cf. Introduction to RC².
tion of Mahipāla as hard-hearted (1. 32), not adhering to either truth or good policy (1. 36), and resorting to fraudulent tricks (1. 32, 37); particularly, as in one passage (1. 29), he has referred to Mahipāla as a good and great king (vaiśyaprayāra).

It is to be noted, however, that there is nothing recorded in Rāmcharita to justify the belief, now generally held on the authority of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, that Mahipāla II was an oppressive king, and that specially the 'Kaivartas were smarting under his oppression.' Only two important specific facts, as mentioned above, are noted against him. As regards the first, viz., that he imprisoned his brothers Rāmapāla and Śūrapāla (1. 33), the author has the candour to admit that the king was instigated to this iniquitous act by false reports, sedulously propagated by wicked people, to the effect that Rāmapāla, being an able and popular prince, was scheming to usurp the throne (1. 37). The author, of course, implies that Rāmapāla had really no such intention. But this is a point on which we may not place full confidence on his opinions and statements.

The second charge against Mahipāla is that he was addicted to warfare (1. 29), and that disregarding the advice of his wise and experienced ministers, he led a small ill-equipped force against the powerful army of the numerous rebel chiefs (ananta-sāmanta-chakra) (1. 31). The author has unfortunately omitted all details by which we could judge of the actions of the king. He does not say, for example, what was the alternative policy suggested by the experienced ministers; and considering the part played by high officials like Divya, Mahipāla may certainly be excused for not putting implicit faith in their advice. On the whole, it is impossible, from the brief and scattered references in Rāmcharita, to form an accurate idea either of the reign or of the character of Mahipāla II. It is, no doubt, true that he succumbed to a revolt of his feudatory chiefs. This does not, however, necessarily mean, and Rāmcharita does not support the contention in any way, that the king was particularly wicked and oppressive to his people, far less that his personal character or policy was the direct or indirect cause of the revolt.

It is far more probable that this revolt, like other revolts in the Pāla kingdom about the same time, was the effect of the

---

1 The figures within brackets refer to cantos and verses of RC.
2 The actual reading of the commentary is 'bhūtaṁ satyaṁ nayo niţham tayorudrakahone yuktah prasāktaḥ.' But Śrī Śaṅkarācārya emended the text by omitting one 'na' in 'tayorudrakahone' which gives just the opposite meaning. There is no justification for this change, as the context of the passage supports the actual reading.
3 RC, 18.
weakness of the central authority and the general tendency of 
disruption in different parts of the kingdom. That king Mahi-
pāla II could not rise equal to the occasion, and his personal gifts 
were not sufficient to enable him to pass safely through the crisis, 
admit of no doubt. But there is nothing to support the view that, 
judged by the ordinary standard, he was a particularly bad king, 
or that he was in any way specially responsible for the fall of the 
Pāla kingdom. As against this opinion, which is now generally held, 
the extant evidence would in no way militate against the contention 
that Mahiṇḍra II was perhaps a victim to circumstances over which 
he had no control, and that, as a king, he was more sinned against 
than sinning.

2. Varendri under the Kaivarta chiefs

The part played by the Kaivarta chief Divya1 in the revolution 
that cost Mahiṇḍra his life and throne is by no means quite clear. 
From one passage in Rāmācharita (1. 38), it seems very likely that 
Divya was a high official under Mahiṇḍra. There is no specific 
reference in Rāmācharita that he headed the rebellion of the feudatory 
chiefs, or even took part in their encounter with Mahiṇḍra. Yet 
it is expressly mentioned that the Kaivarta king occupied a major 
portion of the kingdom after having killed king Mahiṇḍra (1. 29). 
Further light is thrown on this episode by the verse 1. 38. It says 
that Varendri, the ancestral home of the Pālas, was seized by 
Divya, who was a dasyū and upadhi-vrati. The interpretation of 
the latter phrase has given rise to much controversy. The commentary explains vrata as some action undertaken as an obligatory 
duty, and then adds, chhadaṇa-vrati. Chhadaṇa, like upadhi, 
means ‘plea, pretext, fraud, dishonesty, trick’ etc., and the natural 
interpretation of the two qualifying epithets is that Divya was 
really a villain, though he pretended that his actions were inspired 
by a sense of duty. In other words, though his real motive in rising 
against the king was nothing but ambition and self-aggrandisement, 
he hid it under the cloak of a patriotic action. According to the 
other interpretation, Divya was not a rebel at heart, but had to 
pretend to act as such from a paramount sense of duty. The first 
interpretation appears to be more fair and reasonable, and is 
supported by the epithet ‘dasyū’ which hardly fits in with the 
second.

1 The name is written variously in RC, as Divya (1. 58), Divvoka (1. 56-58 
commentary) and Divvoka (1. 51 comm.).
Character of Divya

It seems to be quite clear from this passage as well as the scattered references throughout the first canto of Rāmcharita, that its author regarded Divya as an evil-doer, and his seizure of the throne as a rebellion, pure and simple. We could hardly expect any other view from the court-poet and a loyal official of the Pālas, and probably the author unduly exaggerated the faults and shortcomings of the enemy. It is quite likely that a writer, belonging to Divya's party, would have represented him in a more favourable light. But the fact remains that the Rāmcharita, the only evidence at present available to us, does not in any way support the view, sedulously propagated by a section of writers in Bengal, that Divya was prompted to seize the throne by the highly patriotic motive of saving the country from the oppressions of the ruling king, or that like Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty, he was called to the throne by the united voice of the people to save them in a great crisis. In spite of strong popular sentiments to the contrary, we are bound to presume, until further evidence is available, that like so many other rebels in all ages and countries, Divya, a highly placed officer of State, took advantage of the weakness of the central authority, the confusion in the kingdom, and perhaps also of dissensions among the royal brothers, to kill his master and king, and seize the throne for himself. There is no need to invent pretexts, or to offer excuses, for an act which was in that age neither unusual nor regarded as unnatural.

As already noted above, Rāmcharita is silent on the point whether Divya actually joined the rebellion of the feudal chiefs. The natural inference is, of course, that he was the leader of this rebellion which proved successful and gave him the throne. It is,

---

1 Thus v. 1. 12 refers to the Kaivarta chief as ‘bad king’ (kutsita inah Kaivarta-musyajah); v. 1. 61 refers to unholy or unfortunate civil revolution (anakhan dharma-vipalana); and v. 1. 27 describes the affray or disturbance (dahanam) caused by the enemy as a world calamity (bhavarasā epidasa).

2 A movement was recently set on foot by a section of the Kaivarta or Māhishyas community in Bengal to perpetuate the memory of Divya, on the basis of the view-points noted above. They refused to regard him as a rebel, and held him up as a great hero called to the throne by the people of Varendra to save it from the oppressions of Mahipāla II. An annual ceremony, Divya-smruti-utsava, was organised by them, and the speeches made on these occasions by eminent historians like Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Rui Bahadur Rama Prasad Chanda, and Dr. Upendra Nath Ghoshal, who presided over these functions, sought to support the popular views (cf. Bhāratavarsha, 1892, pp. 18 ff). This movement died a natural death within a few years.

3 For a detailed discussion of this point, and a view of Divya's rebellion in its true perspective, cf. Dr. R. C. Majumdar's article ‘The Revolt of Divyoka against Mahipāla II and other revolts in Bengal’ (DUS. 1. No. 2, pp. 185 ff).
however, also not improbable, that he played a waiting game, and as soon as the army of Mahipâla was worsted in the battle-field, he boldly seized the throne and killed the king. Whatever view may be correct, there is no doubt that Mahipâla met his death in the hands of Divya, and not during the reign of his nephew Bhumâ, as has been upheld by some.¹

After his accession to the throne, Divya probably came into conflict with Jâtavarm, king of Eastern Bengal. The Belâva copper-plate of Bhôjavarman claims that ‘Jâtavarm brought to disgrace the strength of the arms of Divya.’² It is impossible to come to any definite conclusion from such an isolated reference, beyond the obvious fact that the two independent kingdoms of Varendra and Vanga were hostile to each other.

Of the activities of Divya, after he had usurped the throne, Râmacharita tells us very little. But the fact that three members of the family ruled in succession (t. 39) shows that Divya made his position quite secure in Varendra. Not only did Râmapâla’s efforts to recover Varendra prove futile (t. 40-41), but even his own dominions seem to have been invaded by Divya or his partisans (Ins. No 46, v. 15). These prove that Divya was an able and powerful ruler. He was succeeded by his younger brother Rudoka, but nothing is known of him.

The next king Bhumâ,³ the son and successor of Rudoka, is highly praised as a ruler by the author of Râmacharita. He devotes seven verses (t. 21-27) to a very flattering description of the personal virtues of Bhumâ and the riches and strength of his kingdom. It is not, however, easy to reconcile all these praises with the statement that Varendra was oppressed with cruel taxation before Râmapâla’s conquest (t. 27), and, therefore, presumably in the reign of Bhumâ. On the whole, we may reasonably conclude that Bhumâ restored peace and prosperity (t. 39) after the period of turmoil that must have accompanied or followed the expulsion of the Pâlas, and that the Kaivarta rulers had built up their new kingdom on a strong foundation.⁴

¹ Cf. Dr. U. N. Ghoshal’s Presidential Address at the Divya-smriti-utsara, p. 19. It is true that verse 1. 20 of RC. does not name the Kaivarta king who murdered Mahipâla. But verse 15 of the Manuslgi ep. (Ins. No. 46) proves that Divya was alive after Râmapâla had ascended the throne, i.e. after the death of Râmapâla’s elder brothers Mahipâla and Sârâpâla. The Kaivarta king, who murdered Mahipâla, according to RC. (t. 29), must, therefore, be Divya, and not Bhumâ, who was not a king at that time.

⁲ IB. 14; also infra p. 196.

³ The expression ‘yathâbha-kramaena’ in the commentary to t. 39 proves that Divya, Rudoka, and Bhumâ ruled in unbroken succession.

⁴ The name of Bhumâ has been preserved in local tradition. A rampâlī new
While Bhima was busy consolidating his dominions in Varendri, preparations were going on beyond his frontier which ultimately overwhelmed him and destroyed the fortunes of his family.

3. The reign of Rāmapāla

It has been noted above that Rāmapāla and his elder brother Śūrapāla were both in prison when Mahipāla II was defeated by the rebellious chiefs. What became of them after this catastrophe is not expressly stated. MM. Sāstri’s statement that “they were rescued by their friends,” presumably even before the revolution, is not borne out by RC. It is clear, however, that somehow or other they managed to escape and leave Varendri. Although there is no subsequent reference to Śūrapāla in RC, it is clear from v. 14 of the Manahali copper-plate of Madanapāla (No. 40) that Śūrapāla ascended the throne. Of the events of his reign we know nothing. But the silence of RC. about Śūrapāla’s later history does not justify the assumption made by R. D. Banerji that he was murdered by Rāmapāla. All that we may reasonably infer is that Śūrapāla played no part in the great task of recovering Varendri, which devolved, after his death, upon his younger brother Rāmapāla who succeeded him.

After the usurpation of the throne of Varendri by Divya, Rāmapāla (and presumably also his elder brother Śūrapāla) ruled over the remaining part of the Pāla kingdom, which probably included at first parts of Magadha and Rādhā, and was later confined to Vanga or a part of it.

For some time, Rāmapāla remained inactive, unable to adopt any effective means to recover Varendri (r. 40). But then some new danger arose, and after consultation with his sons and ministers, he resolved on firm and prompt action (r. 42). The exact nature of this new danger is not disclosed in RC., but perhaps it refers to Divya’s campaigns against Rāmapāla referred to above. It was

Rāgra is still known as Bhimer Jāngal. MM. Sāstri held the view (RC. 13) that Bhima “built a Damara, a suburban cit, close to the capital of the Pāla empire.” The only foundation for this statement is the expression wrongly read by him as ‘damaram-upapapram’ in the commentary to r. 27. The expression, as correctly read in RC., viz., ‘damaram-upapalavam,’ shows that there is no reference to any city, far less to any capital city, founded by Bhima, as Mr. R. D. Banerji imagined (PB. 91; BI. 991).

1 RC. 13.
2 BI. 280.
3 Cl. RC. xxiii. where evidences are discussed with full references. The colophon of a MS. proves the rule of Rāmapāla in Magadha in his 25th regnal year (Sāstri-Cat. 1. 168).
probably the danger of losing even the remaining part of his kingdom that forced Rāmapāla to activity.\(^1\)

In sheer despair Rāmapāla begged for help in all possible quarters. The proud inheritor of the throne of Dharmapāla and Devapāla literally travelled from door to door with a view to enlisting the sympathy and support of the powerful chiefs who were formerly, and many of whom still nominally, his vassal chiefs (t. 48). His efforts proved successful. By a lavish offer of land and enormous wealth, he gained over to his side a number of powerful chiefs who possessed well-equipped forces (t. 45). The detailed list of these independent or semi-independent chiefs of Bengal, contained in RC,\(^2\) must be regarded as of utmost historical importance. Apart from giving us an accurate idea of the strength of Rāmapāla in that supreme hour of trial, this list of de facto independent chiefs furnishes a vivid and interesting picture of the political dismemberment of Bengal caused by the decline of the power and authority of the Pālas.

Foremost among Rāmapāla’s allies was his maternal uncle Mathana, better known as Mahāṇa, the Rāṣṭrakoṭa chief who joined Rāmapāla with his two sons, Mahāmāndalika Kāṇḍaradeva and Suvarṇadeva, and his brother’s son Mahāpratihārā Śivarājadeva. Next in point of importance was Bhūmaṇasas, the king of Pithi and lord of Magadhā. The exact location of Pithi is not known but it was certainly in Bihar.\(^3\) Of the other allied chiefs that joined Rāmapāla in his expedition against Varendra, Rāmcharita specifically mentions only the following:

1. Viraguṇa, king\(^4\) of Koṭāṭavī in the south\(^5\)

\(^7\) The new danger might also refer to the invasion of the Paramār king Lakṣmanadeva who ruled some time before A.D. 1097, the earliest known date of his successor (DHINI, p. 888). It is said that “desirous of capturing matchless elephants he first proceeded to Hari’s quarter (i.e. the east),” and “then, just as dread, entered the town of the Lord of Gauḍā” (v. 38, EL. p. 186, 192). It is not certain whether he entered Gauḍā (which was then probably in possession of Divya or Bhima), or the capital city of Rāmapāla, who bore the title, or at least was known as, the lord of Gauḍā. In any case, we cannot say anything about the nature and result of this raid by the Paramāra king.

\(^8\) RC. n. 5, 6, 8. The text gives the names in a very cryptic form. These would not have been intelligible but for the commentary, which not only gives the full name of each king and the locality of his kingdom, but also adds some historical details in many cases. For a full discussion of these cf. RC,\(^6\) pp. xxv-xxviii, which also give references to authorities for the brief statements made in the text.

\(^9\) Cf. ch. ix § 3 infra.

\(^1\) The word ‘king’ is used where the commentary expressly mentions any royal epithet. In other cases the word ‘ruler’ has been used.

\(^2\) Koṭā may be identified with Koṭēśvara to the east of Vishnupur. Aṭi-i-Abārī refers to Mahal Koṭ-deres (Transl. p. 144). According to Beam, it
2. Jayasimha, king of Daṇḍabhukti (Midnapur district).
3. Vikramarṣa, ruler of Bāla-Balabhī.
4. Lakṣahmīśa, lord of Apara-Mandāra (Hooghly district) and head of the group of feudal chiefs of the forest (samast-tavikā-sāmanta-chakra-chudāmanī).
5. Śrīpāla, ruler of Kujaṇṭi (about 14 miles north of Nayādumkā in Santal Parganas).
6. Rudraśikha, ruler of Tailakampa (Manbhum district).
7. Bhāskara or Mayagalasimha, king of Uchchhāla.
8. Pratāpasimha, king of Dhekkariya (Dhekuri near Katwa in the Burdwan district).

was a large pargāna in the northern and central part of Puri (JRAS. 1896, p. 762). The former identification seems more likely.

2 MM. H. P. Śāstri identified it with Bāgāli (RC. 14). Bāla-Balabhī, according to RC., was close to Devagāma which is located by N. Vasu in Nadiyā (VII. 198). Ain-i-Akbari mentions "Deul" which is identified by Beames with the ancient stone fort of Deulgām on the boundary of the districts of Midnapur and Bālassore. If this Deulgon represents ancient Devagāma, we may find in the pargāna of Bālī (also referred to in Ain-i-Akbari) a contracted form of old Bāla-Balabhī. Bālī has been identified with Pippli, the site of the earliest English factory in Bengal, at the mouth of the Suvarnarekhā river (JRAS. 1896, pp. 746-753).

3 Mandāra has been identified with sarbar Madāran, locally called Mandāran. It comprised, according to Beames, "a very long strip of territory running from Birbhum in the North to the junction of the Hooghly and Rupnārāyan rivers in the South" (JRAS. 1896, p. 106). Mandāran is now known as Būtgarh Mandāran (for Blochman's identification, cf. Proc. A.S.B. 1870, p. 117), about seven miles west of the town of Jahanbad or Aramlagh on the Darkeeswar river. De Barro's map (c. 1550 a.d.) shows Mandaram as an important city on a branch of the Ganges river, almost due south of Saptagramā. According to Beames, a local Pāḍīt derives the name from Mandā (land) and aragya (forest). Apara-Mandāra has also been interpreted as on the other side of Mandāra, the famous hill about 30 miles south of Bhagulpur (IA. 1900, p. 244).

4 G. Mitra, Birbhāmunī Itihāsan, 1. 50.

4 Identified with Telkupī. The region is still known as Sikharbhum, perhaps after the royal family (VII. 190). Ain-i-Akbari refers to the pargāna Shergarh, commonly called Sikharbhūm. Beames identifies it with Sikharbhumi, "an immense pargāna occupying the whole western angle of Burdwan between the Dāmodar and Ajay rivers" (JRAS. 1896, pp. 106-7).

6 This has been identified with‘Jain Ujjhia,' a pargāna in Birbhum (VII. 199). Mr. R. D. Banerji objects to this identification on the ground that there are many other parganas called Ujjhia (BI. 288-90), a fact already pointed out by Beames, who takes the word to mean 'high land' (JRAS. 1896, p. 98).

8 BI. 205. The location of Dhekkari in Assam, originally propounded by Mr. N. Vasu, and supported by Mr. N. G. Majumdar (IB. 150) is less likely.

1 The old town of Kānajod lies near the East Indian Railway line about 80 miles south of Rājmahal. For a detailed account cf. Beames in JRAS. 1896, p. 96.
History of Bengal

10. Chandarjuna of Sanka-tagrâma.¹
11. Vijayarâja of Nidrâvalî.²
12. Dvarapavardhâna, ruler of Kausâmbî (Rajshahi or Bogra district).³
13. Soma of Paduwanâ.⁴

In addition to Maha, Bhumâyâsas, and the thirteen rulers mentioned above, Râmapâla was joined by other allied chiefs whose names are not given (ii. 6). An analysis of the list shows that, leaving aside the localities whose identity is unknown or doubtful, almost all the allies of Râmapâla belonged to South Bihar and South-West Bengal.

If the identification of Kausâmbî with Kusumbi in either Rajshahi or Bogra be accepted, we must hold that Râmapâla's diplomacy succeeded in attaching isolated chiefs, even of Varendri, to his side. This must have proved disastrous to the cause of Bihma, as he was now liable to attack from within. Besides, it proves that Varendri did not solidly stand by him, and there was disruption within the newly founded kingdom.

Being joined by the large and well-equipped forces of the confederate chiefs, consisting of cavalry, elephants, and infantry, Râmapâla felt strong enough to make an attempt towards the recovery of Varendri. He despatched a force under his Mahâ-pratihâra, the Râshtrakûta Sivarâja, which crossed the Ganges and devasted Varendri (i. 47-49). There is no reference to any pitched battle, but presumably the frontier guards of Bihma were defeated, and the way was made clear for the crossing of the main force (i. 50).

As soon as Sivarâja reported to Râmapâla that his army had occupied the frontier posts, the entire force of Râmapâla crossed

¹ Aini-Akbari refers to the pargana 'Sakot' in sarkar Satgaon. The name 'Sakot' resembles 'Sanka-', but Beames emends the former as Sigma (IRAS. 1896, p. 104). Sanka-tagrâma is probably the same as Senika-ko, referred to in Vâlballâcharita (ii. 4) and Sanka-nâat referred to in Tabaqat-i-Nâsiri (cf. Ch. viii. App. ii. ii.).
² Cf. RC.² xxvu.
³ Mr. R. D. Banerji identifies it with the "modern pargana of Kusumba in the Rajshahi district." (JASB. N.S. x. 183). But it may also be identified with the pargana Tappe Kusumbi in the Bogra district.
⁴ MM. Sțarih doubtfully identifies Paduwanâ with Pabna (RC.¹ 14), but there is no evidence in support of it, except the similarity of the names. Reference may be made to pargana Paunam in the Hooghly district (Hunter, iii. 416). The name Paunam may be easily derived from Paduwanâ.

Similarly, Paduwanâ resembles Paudumbâ, a village mentioned in a manuscript of Kaushma-prema-tarangini of Bhâgavatâchârîya, dated Saka 1020 (≈1696 A.D.), and preserved in the Dacca University. This village Paudumbâ, is said to be in 'pargann Bijnagar' and 'sarkar Panjara.' Bijnagar is mentioned as a pargana of sarkar Panjara or Panjara (Ans. ii. 136) and comprised the greater part of Dinajpur district (JASB. xii. 216; Hunter, vii. 457, 440).
the Ganges by means of a flotilla of boats, and safely reached the "northern bank" (π. 9-11). The express reference in *RC* to the "northern bank" seems to show that Rāmapāla proceeded from his base in Central or Southern Bengal, and crossed the Pādā. This supports the view, mentioned above, that at the time of this expedition, Vāṅga was the chief stronghold of Rāmapāla’s power. But the considerable shiftings of the courses of the Ganges and the Pādā rivers preclude any definite conclusion.1

After Rāmapāla had crossed the Ganges with his huge army, Bhima opposed him, and a pitched battle took place. The tumultuous battle which is described in nine verses (π. 12-20) was conducted with vigour and ferocity on each side. Both Bhima and Rāmapāla took a very active part in it, and kept close to each other (π. 14). But 'by an evil turn of destiny,' Bhima, seated on his elephant, was taken prisoner. This decided the fate of the battle. Bhima’s army fled and his camp was plundered by the 'unrestrained soldiers' of Rāmapāla (π. 29-30). But shortly after the capture of Bhima, his forces were rallied by his friend Hari, who put up a valiant fight and at first scored some successes (π. 39ff). But Rāmapāla’s son, who was in charge of the fight, "exhausted the golden pitchers by his war-time gifts" (π. 43), and evidently managed to create some discord between Hari and Bhima’s followers which caused obstruction to each other (π. 41). Finally, Hari was won over.2 This sealed the fate of Bhima’s army, and the whole of his kingdom lay prostrate before Rāmapāla.

After having crushed this rising, Rāmapāla wreaked a terrible vengeance upon Bhima. Bhima was taken to the place of execution where important members of his family were killed before his very eyes. Then Bhima himself was killed by means of a ‘multitude of arrows’ (π. 46-49).3 Thus ended the life of Bhima and the rebellion in Varendri.

After the final collapse of the forces of Bhima, Rāmapāla took possession of his immense riches, and "occupied after a long time the dearest land of Varendri" (III. 1). His first task was, of course, the restoration of peace and order. We learn from *RC*, that in addition to the insecurity of life and property caused by the late troubles, the country was suffering from heavy and oppressive taxation (III. 27). Rāmapāla reduced the taxation, promoted cultivation, constructed great works of public utility, and introduced

---

1 Cf. supra pp. 9 ff.
2 This account radically differs from the version of MM. H. P. Śāstri. For full discussion cf. *RC*? xxx-xxxx.
3 For Rāmapāla’s conduct towards Bhima, cf. *RC*? xxix-xxx.
regular administration. The country was rid of the frightful rule; the (wholesale) massacre and arson caused by the enemies was removed; and the land, being brought under cultivation, flourished. Rāmapāla left the cares of government to his son (or sons) who, acting under his orders, maintained good government and restored internal order.  

Rāmapāla fixed his capital at Rāmāvati. Whether the city was founded by him, or he improved an already existing place, is not quite clear. The RC. gives a long description of its beauty and splendour, and it appears from later records (No. 46) that the city continued to be the capital of the Pālas till the end. After having consolidated his power in Varendri, Rāmapāla made an attempt to re-establish the old glory of the dynasty by subjugating neighbouring territories in the east and south. The RC. tells us (iii. 44) that Rāmapāla was propitiated by a Varman king of the East for the latter’s own protection (or deliverance), and presented by him with an elephant and his own chariot. This Varman king must have belonged to the well-known dynasty ruling in East Bengal with Vikramapura as capital.

Rāmapāla also carried his conquests further and brought Kāmarūpa under his control. The victorious campaign was evidently led by an allied or feudal chief who was greatly honoured by Rāmapāla (iii. 47). The vanquished king of Assam was probably Dharmapāla.  

1 Cf. RC. ii. 27, 31, 42.  
2 RC. iv. 1-3. The expression vīnu-samarpita-rāja might refer to one or more sons; v. 6 also refers to Rājyapāla and his brother.  
3 See supra p. 82.  
4 For the erroneous character of MM. Śiātri’s views in this respect, cf. RC. xxxi.  
5 The history of the Varman dynasty has been discussed in ch. vii. The Varman king, referred to in RC., is probably Harivarman, and it is tempting to identify him with the chief Hari, the great friend of Bhima, who rallied the forces of the latter after his defeat, and fought stubbornly with Rāmapāla. Reference is made to a chief called Hari in a subsequent verse of RC., and it is very reasonable to hold that the same person is referred to. It would then appear that after the death of Bhima, Rāmapāla won over Hari (now called iṣa or king) to his side, and established him in a position of great influence (iii. 82). We are further told that the two kings, meaning presumably Rāmapāla and Hari, both of whom were rich in cavalry and very powerful, met together in Rāmāvati and dragged for a long time in each other’s close embrace (iii. 39-40). But although the identification appears plausible, there is no definite evidence in support of it.  
6 In the absence of a fairly accurate knowledge of the chronology of the kings of Kāmarūpa, it is impossible to say, with any degree of certainty, who was ruling in Kāmarūpa about this time. Hoernle assigned Ratanpāla to the first half of the eleventh century a.d. (JASB. lxvii. 104 f.), and if this view is accepted,
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Rāmapāla also tried to expand his power in the south. The task was no doubt facilitated by the fact that the feudatory chiefs of Rādhā had rallied to his standard, and were evidently attached to his cause. Presumably with their help, he invaded Orissa and extended his conquests up to Kaliṅga. Orissa was at that time in a state of political disintegration. The later Eastern Gaṅga kings of Kaliṅga were trying to expand their dominions in the north. King Devendravarma Rājarāja claims to have conquered Odrādeśa.

Dharmarāja may be regarded as the contemporary of Rāmapāla (Kām. śās. 146). For other views, cf. IIIQ, xii, 650.

The Śilāmpūr Stone Ins. (EL. xii. 286) refers to king Jayapāla of Kāmarūpa (r. 932) whose name is not included in the official list of kings of Kāmarūpa (Kām. śās. 146 ff.). He may be the unknown allied king, who conquered Kāmarūpa for Rāmapāla. But it is also not impossible that the ‘highly honoured’ Tīrṇagadeva whose revolt is referred to in the Kāmaṇḍu Grant (No. 50), was the allied king and conqueror of Kāmarūpa. MM. Šāstri’s view that Mayana was the name of this conqueror (RC 15) is due to an error in the rendering of the text (RC 7 xxxiii).

1 The incident is referred to in a verse (m. 45) which runs as follows:—

“He (Rāmapāla) did favour to the vanquished king of Utkala, who was born in the lineage of the ornament of Bhava (Śiva) (Bhava-bhāṣaṇa-saṅtati), and rescued the whole world (from the terror of) Kaliṅga, after having extirpated those robbers (of that place).”

The expression ‘ornament of Śiva,’ which denotes the family to which the vanquished king of Utkala belonged, has been variously interpreted, inasmuch as Nāga (serpent), Soma (moon), or Gaṅga, which are the family-names of well-known ruling dynasties, may all be regarded as the ornaments of Śiva. H. P. Šāstri took the first meaning and held that Rāmapāla conquered Utkala and restored it to the Nāgavaiśas (RC 15). Mr. R. D. Banerji accepted this view (BI. 290). Mr. N. G. Majumdar accepted this meaning of Bhava-bhāṣaṇa, but interpreted the verse in an altogether different way. He translated it as follows: “Rāmapāla favoured (or reinstated) the vanquished king of Utkala who possessed the territory of a Bhava-bhāṣaṇa-saṅtati (i.e., the Nāgas).” He held that this king of Utkala was either Harivarman or his son who had overthrown the Nāga king and made himself master of Utkala (IB. 50).

The Nāgavaiśas kings are known from epigraphic records to have ruled in Bastar State in the Central Provinces, and possibly these kings are referred to in RC, m. 48 as having been defeated by Rāmapāla. It seems to refer to ‘Bhogāvali’ as the territory of the Nāgas, and the lexicographer Hemachandra refers to Bhogāvali as the Nāga capital. The inscriptions of the kings ruling in Bastar State at the beginning of the twelfth century A.D., call them ‘Nāgavaiśasondhava Bhogavati-pura-var-vara-vāra’ (EL. ix. 160 ff.; x. 25 ff.). The Nāgavaiśas kings are not, however, known to have ruled in Orissa proper, i.e., the territory between the river Suvarṇaparaohī and the Chilka Lake. The Nāgavaiśas king Somavara deva, who ruled at the beginning of the twelfth century A.D., refers to the king of Udra as a rival (EL. x. 26). It is, therefore, more reasonable to hold that the king of Utkala, defeated by Rāmapāla, belonged to the Somavaiśas dynasty which is known to have been ruling in Orissa in the eleventh century A.D. (DHNI. i. 595 ff.). One of the Somavaiśas rulers, Mahāvīragupta Yāyāti, as noted above (p. 146) claims to have raided Gaṅga and Rādhā. One of the last kings of this dynasty is named Udyotakesari, and this dynasty is probably to be
some time before 1075 A.D. ¹ Evidently the conquest of Oriissa was not complete, for his son, the famous Anantavarman Chodagaṅga (1076-1147 A.D.), replaced the fallen lord of Utkala, some time before 1112 A.D., ² and claims in an inscription, dated 1118 A.D., ³ to be decorated with the rank of entire sovereignty over the whole of Utkala. It appears, however, that Oriissa was not finally conquered and annexed to the Eastern Gaṅga empire till shortly before 1135 A.D., for in an inscription ⁴ dated in that year. Anantavarman refers to his newly made conquests of three quarters including Utkala. It is probable that shortly after this he removed his capital to the city of Cuttack in Oriissa. ⁵

While the Eastern Gaṅgas were thus steadily encroaching upon Oriissa from the south, that hapless country was also exposed to attacks from the north. We know from Rāmacarita that Jayasimha, king of Daṇḍabhukti, had defeated Karnakeśari, king of Utkala, before he joined Rāmapāla in his expedition against Bhima. Rāmapāla’s conquest of Utkala might have been a continuation of the old campaign, and was undoubtedly facilitated by the success of his allied feudal chief. But it is also not unlikely that his invasion of Utkala was inspired by the dread of the rapidly growing power of the Eastern Gaṅgas. Subsequent conquests of Anantavarman Chodagaṅga right up to the bank of the Ganges ⁶ show that Rāma-

---

¹ Dīghāsuni Ins., v. 3. El. iv. 514 ff.
² Korni cp. JAHRS. i. 118 ff.
³ Vīṣṇupatam cp. IA. xviii. 165 ff.
⁴ Sūrū Kūrūmā Ins. SII. v. No. 1936; quoted by R. Subba Rao (JAHRS. VII. 57, 59, 64).
⁵ The Māttā-pañji states that Chodagaṅga defeated the last king of the Keśa dynasty, Sarasvatiśa, in A.D. 1154, and succeeded to the Utkala kingdom and transferred his capital to Cuttack (quoted by R. Subba Rao, JAHRS. VII. 57). According to Fleet’s version, Chodagaṅga’s conquest took place in 1152 A.D. (El. III. 330).
⁶ According to Śrī-Kūrūma Ins. (SII. v. No. 1935), dated 1135 A.D., Anantavarman Chodagaṅga returned in that year to his capital after subduing the Western, Northern, and Eastern countries, and bringing the whole country, lying between the Ganges and the Godāvari rivers under his firm control (JAHRS. viii
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pāla’s apprehensions were not probably without some reasonable foundations. As Anantavarman Chodaganga and Rāmapāla both claim to have favoured or re-instated the lord of Utkala, it is not difficult to infer that Orissa was only a pawn in a bigger game, and that the two rival kings tried to thwart each other’s ambition by putting up their protégés on the throne of Orissa. It may be surmised from what has been said above that Rāmapāla’s protégé was a Somavarmā Keśārī king. Evidently this Keśārī king had been defeated by Rājaśāya Devendravarman, c.1075 A.D., and replaced by a nominee of the latter. Some time later Rāmapāla helped the defeated king (or his successor) and re-instated him. About 1118 A.D. Anantavarman Chodaganga again replaced the old king, set up by his father, or his successor.

In this way the duel between the Pāla and Eastern Gaṅga kings was carried on at the expense of the unfortunate kingdom of Orissa. It was not perhaps till after the death of Rāmapāla that the Gaṅga king succeeded in finally conquering Orissa and annexing it to his dominions. For, according to Rāmacharita, Rāmapāla protected the whole country right up to Kaliṅga by destroying the niśācharas.³ In this word niśācha, which means thief or ‘chora,’ there may be a veiled allusion to the Gaṅga king Chōḍa-Gaṅga. Rāmapāla was undoubtedly helped in his task of keeping the Gaṅga king in check by the serious danger in which the latter was involved in the south. The Chōla king Kulottuṅga (1070-1118 A.D.) invaded the Gaṅga dominions, and during the closing years of the eleventh, and possibly also in the early years of the twelfth century, the Chōlas penetrated to the northernmost parts of Kaliṅga.² Whether Rāmapāla had actually formed an alliance with the Chōla

---

³ According to the inscriptions of Anantavarman Chodaganga, Narasimha II and Narasimha IV, Anantavarman’s empire extended to the Godāvari in the south, the city of Mithunapura or Midnapur in the north, the Bay of Bengal in the east and the Eastern Ghats in the west (JAHRS, vi. 215). The Kendupatna plate refers to the destruction of the king of Mandura’s capital by Chodaganga and his struggle on the banks of the Ganges (JASB, lxv. 220 ff.).

² Mr. N. G. Majumdar inferred also from RC. iii. 42 that Rāmapāla advanced up to the sea-coast of Orissa (ID. 29). But this view is wrong (cf. the commentary and English translation of the verse in RC.²).

³ The account of the Kaliṅga war of Kulottugī is given in detail in the Tamil work Kalingattuparamai (IA. xix. 329 ff.) and this is corroborated by the Drākṣahārāma Ins. (EI. xxix. 138 ff.). According to this record, the general of Kulottugī “...duced to ashes the whole of Kaliṅga country, defeated the Gaṅga king, destroyed in battle Devendravarman and others, and planted a pillar of victory on the borders of the Odra country.” As the editor points out, “the earliest notice of the conquest of Kaliṅga in the records of Kulottuṅga occurs in a stone inscription dated in the 80th year (1100 A.D.), and as this is repeated in
king we do not know. The Tamil poem *Kulīṅgattupparāni*, which
describes the Chola conquests of North Kālīṅga, also gives a long
list of peoples who paid tributes to Kulottunga. It includes
Vangas, Vangālas, and Magadhas. Kulottunga also assumed
the title “Lord of the earth lying between the river Ganges and the
river Kāverī.”1 Such general statements are, however, liable to
suspicion, and cannot be accepted as historical, though it is not
impossible that Rāmapāla might have thought it politic to maintain
friendly relations with the Chola king by nominally acknowledging
his suzerainty over the disputed border land. For about this time
the Chola king was carrying on hostilities against both the Eastern
Gangas and the Later Chāḷukyas. As Rāmapāla’s territory was also
invaded by both these powers, he might have sought to make
alliance with the Cholas for securing support against the common
enemies.

In a significant passage in *Rāmācharita* (iii. 24), the expression
‘adharita-Karnāṭekhaṇa-nilā’ is used to describe the condition of
Varendri. The only reasonable interpretation seems to be that
Varendri was successfully guarded against the longings of the
Karnāṭas. In other words, the Karnāṭas made attempts to conquer
Bengal, but were prevented by Rāmapāla from doing so.

The Karnāṭa country was at this time ruled by the Chāḷukya
king Vikramaḍīya vi. Reference has already been made above to
the invasions of Bengal by him and his predecessors.2 A feudatory
chief of the Chāḷukya king named Acha also claims to have carried
on raids against Bengal towards the close of the eleventh or the
beginning of the twelfth century.3 But even far more important
than these raids was the establishment of two Karnāṭa ruling families
within the boundaries of the Pāla kingdom. These were the Senas
in West Bengal, and Nānyadeva in Mithilā or North Bihar. The
Senas were kept in check by Rāmapāla, though they ultimately
drove the Pālas from Bengal, and their history has been dealt with
in a separate chapter.4 But, for the time being, Nānyadeva proved
a far more dangerous foe. Up to the end of Mahipāla’s reign, at
any rate, Mithilā was included in the Pāla dominions. How long

---

1 Drākṣārāma Ins., dated 1116 A.D. (SII. iv. No. 1069).
2 See supra p. 147.
3 See infra p. 206.
4 See ch. viii. infra.
the Pālas continued to rule in that region. It is now difficult to say. Nānya, a feudatory chief of Karnatic origin, ascended the throne of Mithilā in 1097 A.D., and his dynasty ruled over that province for a long time. He claims to have broken the powers of Vāṅga and Gauḍa. The ruler of Vāṅga, with whom Nānya deva fought, was probably Vījaya sena who also claims in his record to have defeated Nānya. The lord of Gauḍa was probably Rāma-pāla; for, on general grounds, it appears hardly likely that Nānya could have conquered Mithilā in 1097 A.D. without coming into conflict with Rāma-pāla. In any case, it seems certain that Mithilā definitely passed out of the hands of the Pālas during the reign of Rāma-pāla.

Another power with which Rāma-pāla had come into conflict was the Gāhāḍāvālaas. The founder of this dynasty, Chandrādeva, flourished during the last quarter of the eleventh century A.D. The dynasty ruled over nearly the whole of modern U.P., and their chief seat of authority was probably Benares. Although the imperial city of Kanauj was included in their dominions, and the kings styled themselves as lords of Kanayakubja, they were not infrequently referred to as kings of Benares or Kāśi.

As the boundary of the Gāhāḍāvāla kingdom probably touched that of the Pālas, hostility between the two was natural, and almost inevitable. The first reference to the conflict occurs in the Rāhan Grant, dated 1109 A.D., which describes Govindachandra, son of the reigning Gāhāḍāvāla king Madanapāla, as “terrific in clearing the frontal globes of arrays of irresistible mighty large elephants from Gauḍa.” The king of Gauḍa with whom Govindachandra fought was undoubtedly Rāma-pāla. The expression used in the Gāhāḍāvāla grant does not imply any decisive victory, far less territorial conquest, on the part of the Gāhāḍāvāla prince, but certainly pays a high tribute to the forces of the Pālas. We do not know whether the clash was due to the aggressive action on the part of the Pālas or of the Gāhāḍāvālaas, but the latter view is more probable.

The result of the conflict during Rāma-pāla’s reign is perhaps indicated by the expression dhṛitya-madhya-deśa-tanimā used to describe the political condition of Varendra (RC. iii. 24). It means that Rāma-pāla kept in check the growing power of Madhyadeśa, which undoubtedly refers to the Gāhāḍāvāla kingdom. This may perhaps be partly attributed to a diplomatic marriage. For we know that Govindachandra married Kumāradevi, the princess of Pithi, whose mother was the daughter of Mahaṇa, the famous Rāśṭrakūṭa chief of Aṅga and the maternal uncle of Rāma-pāla.

---

1 For the account of Nānya deva that follows cf. IIIQ. vii. 670 ff.
2 DHNI. i. 507-8.
3 Line 9. (IA. xvii. 16, 18).
This marriage alliance was probably engineered by Mahâna as a means to cement the alliance between the Pâlas and the Gâhaḍavâlas. But such political marriages can seldom check political ambitions for long, and in the present case, at any rate, the alliance did not long survive the death of Mahâna and Râmapâla.

A review of the main incidents of Râmapâla's career, such as may be gleaned from contemporary records, reflects the highest credit upon his character and abilities. Beginning his life as an exile from his native land Varendrî, and maintaining a precarious existence in a corner of his kingdom, Râmapâla succeeded not only in re-establishing his sovereignty over the whole of Bengal, but also in extending his supremacy over Assam and Orissa. He crushed the power of a valiant and popular chief like Bhima and successfully guarded his dominions against such formidable foes as the Gaṅgas, the Châlukyas, and the Gâhaḍavâlas. The author of Râmacarita says with legitimate pride that under Râmapâla Varendrî enjoyed peace for a long period, and no wicked person dared disturb her tranquility. This was probably true in regard to the whole of his kingdom towards the close of his reign.

Râmapâla must have lived up to a considerably old age. According to the Manahali copper-plate,¹ he gave evidence of his valour in the battle-field even during the life-time of his father. He could not, therefore, have been very young when he ascended the throne after his two brothers. The Chandimau Image inscription (No. 42) shows that he must have ruled at least for forty-two years.² It may be safely presumed, therefore, that he lived up to the age of nearly seventy years. He was overwhelmed by the news of the death of his maternal uncle Mahâna, who, with his sons and nephew, had proved the staunchest supporter in his great hour of trial. Unable to bear the sorrow, Râmapâla put an end to his own life by drowning himself in the Ganges at Monghyr according to the time-honoured custom in India.³ Thus ended a great career, a worthy hero of the modern Râmâyana composed by Sandhyâkara Nandi.

VII. THE END OF THE PÂLA RULE

The reign of Râmapâla might well have been regarded by his contemporaries as marking the revival of the greatness of the Pâlas, and inaugurating a new era of peace and prosperity. But events

¹ Ins. No. 46, v. 15.
² According to Târanâthu, Râmapâla ruled for sixty-four years.
³ RC. iv. 8-10.
soon proved it to be but the last flickering of a lamp before its final extinction.

Rāmapāla had at least four sons. Of these, Vittapāla and Rājyapāla played important rôles during the life-time of their father, though none of them ever ascended the throne. The two others, Kumārapāla and Madanapāla, who both ruled over the Pāla kingdom, are not referred to in Rāmācarita as having taken any part in the eventful reign of their father. The seniority among these four brothers according to age, and the reason why Kumārapāla superseded the other brothers, and his son was succeeded by Madanapāla, are all unknown to us. A mystery hangs over this period of history, and it is deepened by the concluding portion of RC. As the title of the book shows, the main purpose of the author was to describe the exploits of Rāmapāla (and of Rāma) and this is clearly stated in several verses at the end of the poem. Yet the story is carried beyond the death of Rāmapāla for three more reigns. This may be explained by supposing that the author desired to bring the historical narrative down to his own time. But what is surprising is that while the poet dismisses in a single verse each of the reigns of Kumārapāla and his son Gopāla III, he devotes no less than thirty-six verses to the reign of Madanapāla. Whether this is purely out of devotion to the reigning king, or there were other motives also for so unceremoniously passing over the reigns of his two predecessors, it is difficult to say. That he deliberately ignored the importance of the two reigns may not unreasonably be concluded from his statement (iv. 15) that Madanapāla’s accession removed the dart of grief resulting from the death of Rāmapāla. On the whole, it appears not unlikely that there were internal troubles during the period immediately following the death of Rāmapāla, and they were not over even when Kumārapāla ascended the throne. Kumārapāla was succeeded by his son Gopāla III. The single verse in RC. referring to him (iv. 19), and a verse in the Manahali ca., have led scholars to conclude that Gopāla III met with an unnatural death even while he was an infant. Mr. R. D. Banerji has even

RC. ii. 36; iv. 6.

Ins. No. 46, v. 17.

Ins. No. 44 would seem to belie the view, if it really belongs to the reign of Gopāla III, and is dated in year 14; for it would then appear that Gopāla III must have reigned for at least 14 years. Mr. N. G. Majumdar refers it to the reign of Gopāla III on palaeographic grounds (ASI. 1906-07, pp. 130). But the alphabets show great resemblance with those of the Dinajpur Pillar Ins., which has been referred to the tenth century A.D., and although one or two letters show an advanced form, others like j and medial e show distinctly early forms. On the whole, it is difficult to say very definitely that the inscription belongs to the reign of Gopāla III and not Gopāla II. Besides, the figure read by Mr. Majumdar as 4
suggested that he was murdered by Madanapāla. But though dark hints to some such foul crime may be detected in RC, there is no positive evidence in support of any of these contentions. All that we definitely know is that Madanapāla succeeded his nephew Gopāla III, and ruled for more than 14 years (Ins. No. 47).

The period covered by the three reigns of Kumārapāla, Gopāla III, and Madanapāla (c. 1120-1155 A.D.) saw the final collapse of the Pāla kingdom. The circumstances leading to this catastrophe are not yet fully known to us, but some of the causes operating to the same end, namely the disruption within and invasions from outside, may be described in some detail.

Troubles began early in the reign of Kumārapāla. The Kamauli Plate (No. 50) tells us that Vaidyadeva, the great and favourite minister of Kumārapāla, obtained victory in a naval fight in South Bengal, and, being ordered by his master, put down the rebellion of Tingyadeva in the east. Tingyadeva was presumably the feudal ruler of Kāmarūpa which was conquered by Rāmapāla. For Vaidyadeva, who put down the rebellion, became ruler of the country which included Prāgyotisha-bhukti and Kāmarūpa-manḍala. The victory of Vaidyadeva, however, did not restore Kāmarūpa to the Pālas, for within a short time, possibly after the death of Kumārapāla, Vaidyadeva practically assumed independence.2

About the same time Eastern Bengal also must have passed out of the hands of the Pālas, for we find an independent Varman dynasty ruling in Vikramapura. According to RC, a Varman ruler acknowledged the suzerainty of Rāmapāla, and sought his protection, but the Belāva copper-plate leaves no doubt that Bhōjavaraman was ruling as an independent chieftain.3 Vaidyadeva’s military campaign in South Bengal perhaps indicates renewed conflict either with Anantavarman Chodaganga, or the Later Chālukyas, leading to the rise of the Senas. As already noted above,4 the Eastern Gaṅga king is said to have carried his victorious arms right up to the bank of the Ganges, as far as Midnapur, some time before 1125 A.D. He also defeated the king of Mandāra on the Ganges, and destroyed his fortified town Aranya, probably Arambagh in Hooghly district.5 On the other hand, the Pāla records claim

is very doubtful (cf. JRASBL. viii. 216). Dr. N. K. Bhattasali’s reconstruction of the history of Gopāla III (IBQ. xvii. 214-216) is too imaginary to be seriously considered.

1 BI. 811.
2 Ins. No. 50, vv. 11, 13-14, and ll. 47 ff.
3 This has been fully discussed in ch. vii. infra.
4 Cf. supra p. 168, f.n. 6.
5 For Mandāra, cf. supra p. 21; also p. 157, f.n. 2 above. For the conquests of Anantavarman in Bengal, cf. the Kendupatna Grant, vv. 22, 29, JASB. xxv. 238, 243.
victory in the campaigns in South Bengal during the reign of Kumārapāla, and a somewhat obscure verse in RC. (iv. 47) seems to imply that Madanapāla had some success in Kaliṅga, or at least had power to defeat the king of Kaliṅga if the latter dared attack him. But shortly a power arose in the borderland between the kingdoms of the Pālas and Anantavarman, which checkmated both and carried its victorious arms in the heart of their dominions. These were the Senas who undoubtedly took advantage of the conflict between the Pālas and the Eastern Gaṅgas to establish their position in South Bengal. Their task was also facilitated by the invasions of the Later Chālukyas to which detailed reference will be made in a later chapter. It is not also altogether unlikely that the naval campaigns in South Bengal during the reign of Kumārapāla were directed against the Senas.

Like the Eastern Gaṅgas and the Chālukyas in the south, the third hostile power, kept in check by Rāmapāla, viz., the Gāhaḍavālas in the west, also took advantage of his death and the consequent weakness of the Pālas to push forward their conquests. The Māner Plates\(^1\) show that by 1124 A.D. they had advanced up to the district of Patna. It is also evident from the Lar Plates\(^2\) that the Gāhaḍavāla king Govindachandra was in occupation of Monghyr in A.D. 1146. Madanapāla must have achieved some success in his fight with the Gāhaḍavālas towards the end of his reign. For the Jaynagar inscription (No. 47) shows that some time before his 14th regnal year, i.e., about 1254 A.D., he had recovered Monghyr. In his war with the Gāhaḍavālas, he received valuable assistance from his kinsman Chandradeva, the lord of Anā. who was the son of Suvarṇadeva and grandson of Mahāṇa.\(^3\) The RC. frequently refers to the alliance between the two, and is full of praises for Chandradeva.\(^4\) It is not unlikely that Chandradeva, like his grandfather Mahāṇa, brought about an alliance between the Pāla and the Gāhaḍavāla king both of whom were his near relatives. For RC. says (iv. 23) that in a moment of peril, when his kingdom was in disorder, Madanapāla made alliance with a king of godly character. But, for the present, this is a pure conjecture.

\(^1\) JASR. xviii. 81. The conflict between the Pālas and the Gāhaḍavālas seems to be also referred to in Prākritī Paṅgālam (II IQ. xi. 565-66).

\(^2\) EL. vi. 98.

\(^3\) IHQ. v. 35 ff. The view, originally propounded by M. H. P. Śāstri (RC.\(^1\) 10) and followed by Mr. R. D. Banerji (BL. 318-19), that this Chandra was the Gāhaḍavāla king Chandradeva is untenable. This point has been discussed in App. ii in connection with the date of Rāmapāla.

\(^4\) v. 10-21.
Even apart from the above express reference, there are other indications in RC. about great troubles within the kingdom of Madanapâla. Madanapâla is said to have destroyed or dethroned a king named Govardhana (iv. 47). A king of this name is referred to in Belâva copper-plate¹ as having been defeated by Jâtavarman, the king of East Bengal. But as Jâtavarman was a contemporary of Divya and Vigrahapâlu III, it is difficult to identify the two Govardhanas, though this cannot be regarded as altogether impossible. In any case, he may be regarded as a local ruler in Bengal.

But more significant is the reference to a battle on the river Kâlindî, which is probably to be identified with the modern river of that name in Malda district which once flowed past or near the capital of Madanapâla. We are told (iv. 27) that Madanapâla had driven back to the Kâlinâdi the vanguard of the forces that had destroyed a large number of soldiers on his side. This probably refers to the conquest of Vikyayasena who had already made himself master of Southern and Eastern Bengal. In his Deopâli inscription, he claims to have driven away the lord of Gauḍa, who was almost certainly Madanapâla. The victory was not perhaps a decisive one, but the authority of Madanapâla in North Bengal was considerably weakened, if not finally destroyed, by this invasion.

It is also not unlikely that the disorder in the kingdom, or the battle on the Kâlinâdi, refers to an invasion of Gauḍa by the Karnâta ruler of Mithilâ. We have seen above that Nânyadeva claimed to have broken the power of Gauḍa and Vanga. A king, described as Gaudadhesa Gângâyadeva and mentioned in a colophon as reigning in Tirhat in Sambat 1076, probably refers to his son Gângadeva ruling in 1154 A.D.² The title Gaudadhesa seems to indicate that he claimed some political authority in Gauḍa. The son of Nânyadeva was almost certainly a contemporary of Madanapâla, and probably attacked his kingdom with some success.

The internal disruption and foreign invasions, described above, led to the collapse of the Pāla kingdom. The Manahâli copper-plate (No. 46) shows that at least up to the eighth year of Madanapâla, a considerable portion of North Bengal, if not the whole of it, was included within his kingdom. The nature and extent of his authority over North Bengal after that date cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. The Jaynagar Image inscription (No. 47) shows that in the 14th year of his reign he

¹ IB. 14; also infra p. 198.
² IHQ. vii. 681.
ruled over the Monghyr district. In view of what we know of the Senas, the Gahadavâlas, and the Karâṭa rulers of Mithilâ, we may safely conclude that when Madanapâla died, the Pâlas had ceased to exercise any sovereignty in Western, Southern, and Eastern Bengal, and in Western and Northern Bihar. In other words, the Pâla kingdom was confined to Central and Eastern Bihar, and probably included a portion of Northern Bengal. Within ten years of the death of Madanapâla, the descendants of Dharmapâla and Devapâla, if any, were driven away even from this last refuge by the Senas, and the Pâlas passed out of history.

Madanapâla is the last king who is definitely known to have belonged to the great Pâla dynasty. Names of some kings ending in -pâla are known from records found in Bihar, but their relationship, if any, with the Pâla dynasty of Bengal has not yet been established. One of these is named Govindapâla, who ruled in the Gayâ district. The colophons of a few manuscripts and a stone inscription are dated in years which seem to be counted from the destruction of his kingdom in 1162 A.D.¹ If this view be correct, Govindapâla must have ascended the throne shortly, if not imme-

¹ Govindapâla is known from two stone inscriptions, one of which was found in Gayâ, and colophons of seven manuscripts (PB. 108-118). One of these alone is dated in the ordinary way—'Parameśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Paramesavapala-Mahârājāya śrīmad-Govindapâlaṃ vinaśa-râja-samvatsare ā. Three others, including the stone inscription, use, however, peculiar expressions such as 'Śrī-Govindapâla-deva-gata-râjye caturdasa-samvatsare,' 'Śrīmad-Govindapâla-devasyatitta-samvatsare,' 'Śrīmad-Govindapâla-devvinânya vinaśjañjâdyadeśa-trivati-samvatsare.' The dates in three other colophons are given simply as 'Śrī-Govindapâlaṃ samvat 24,' 'Govindapâla-devvinânya samvatsare 37,' and 'Śrīmad-Govindapâla-devvinânya samvatsare 39.' The remaining colophon, dated in samvat 38, gives the title Gaudâśvara to Govindapâla. The second stone inscription of unknown origin has never been published, and all that we are told is that it was dated in 1178 A.D. (ASC. XV. 155). The correct interpretation of the above expressions denoting dates has given rise to difficulties (for a full discussion and references, cf. ISJ. N. S. XVII. 8 ff.). Mr. R. D. Banerji held the view that the king ruled for 39 years, though he ceased to exercise any sovereignty in those places where the expression 'gata-râjye,' 'vinaśjañjâdyadeśa,' 'artha-samvatsare,' etc., are used. A far more reasonable view seems to be to interpret them, like similar expressions used in connection with Lakshmanasaena, as the years counted from the cessation of the reign of Govindapâla. Now the Gayâ Stone inscription is dated in 1182 Vâraṇi i.e., v.s., and 'gata-râjye caturdasa-samvatsare.' According to Mr. Banerji's interpretation, this would place the accession of Govindapâla in 1190 V.S. or 1162 A.D., whereas according to the other view, that year would coincide with the end of his reign. In the former case, Govindapâla must have been on the throne till at least 1200 A.D. (30th year). But this is incompatible with the scheme of chronology of the Sena kings, which, though rejected by Mr. Banerji, is now almost universally adopted. This point has been further discussed in Chap. VIII. App. I. in connection with the chronology of the Sena kings.
diately, after Madanapāla. No connection between the two has yet been established, but the name-ending -pāla, the assumption of full imperial titles including 'Lord of Gauda,' and the reckoning of date from the end of his reign raise a strong presumption that he was the last member of the Imperial Pāla dynasty. Whether his kingdom extended much further beyond the district of Gayā, where his stone inscription has been found, cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. The assumption of imperial titles and the epithet 'Lord of Gauda' may be a vain boast, though the possibility is not altogether excluded that he might have temporarily occupied Gauda. For, as we shall see later, the Sena kings had probably to send more than one expedition before they finally seized the Gauda kingdom.

Some scholars have assumed the existence of another Pāla king named Palapāla. But the assumption is based upon very doubtful reading of an inscription, and Palapāla cannot find any place in sober history until further evidence is forthcoming.\(^1\) The same may be said of Indradyumnapāla who is only known from tradition.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Mr. R. D. Banerji introduced this Pāla king on the strength of an inscription found at Jaynagar (\textit{Jbors.} xiv. 496). The reading \textit{Gaundātara Palapāla} is, however, impossible, even according to his own \textit{facsimile}, unless we imagine that one letter (\textit{t}) was dropped by the engraver through mistake, and another letter (\textit{la}) was written in line 1 in two different ways, although separated by only one letter (\textit{Jbors.} xv. 619; \textit{Ibq.} vi. 164). Thus the existence of Palapāla may be seriously doubted.

\(^2\) \textit{Ia.} xxxviii. 248.
APPENDIX I

LIST OF PĀLĀ INSCRIPTIONS

DHARMAPĀLĀ

1. Year 26—Bodh-Gayā Ins. JASB. N.S. iv. 101; GL. 29.

DEVAPĀLĀ

4. Year 9—Kurkihār Image Ins. JBORS. xxvi. 351.
6. Year 33—Moughyr cp. EI. xviii. 304; GL. 33.
8. —Ghoshrwā Stone Ins. IA. xvii. 307; GL. 45.

VIGRAHAPĀLĀ I OR ŚURAPĀLĀ I

10. Year 3—Two identical Bihar Buddha Image Ins. JASB. N.S. iv. 108; PB. 57. For correction of date cf., JRASBL. iv. 390.
11. Sārnāth inscription mentioning Jayapāla, who is perhaps the father of Vighrapāla I. ASI. 1907-8, p. 75.

NĀRĀYĀNAPĀLĀ

12. Year 7—Gayā Temple Ins. PB. 60.
14. Year 17—Bhāgalpur cp. IA. xv. 304; GL. 55.
15. Year 54—Bihar Image Ins. IA. xlvii. 110; SPP. 1328 (n.s.), p. 169.
16. Bādāl Pillar Ins. EI. ii. 160; GL. 70.

RĀJYAPĀLĀ

17. Year 24—Nālandā Pillar Ins. IA. xlvii. 111.

GOPĀLĀ II

22. Year 1—Nālandā Image Ins. JASB. N.S. iv. 105; GL. 86.
History of Bengal


*Vigrahapāla II (or III)*

Mahipāla I
34. Year 31 (probably 21)—Kurkihār Image Ins. *JBORS*. xxvi. 245.
35A. On a colossal statue of the ascetic Buddha at Titawara or Tetravan is an Ins. of three lines. Only the name Mahipāla has been read. *ASC*. 1. 39; iii. 123, No. 11.

Nayapāla

*Vigrahapāla III*

Rāmapāla.
42. Year 42—Chandimau Image Ins. *PB*. 93-94.
VI.]  List of Pāla Inscriptions

GOPĀLA III

43. Nimdighi (Manda) Ins. SPP. xix. 155; PB. 102; IHQ xvii. 207.
44. Year 14 (?)—Rājibpur Image Ins. IHQ. xvii. 217; ASI. 1936-37, pp. 190-33. For the date of this Ins. cf. supra p. 107, f.n. 4 and JRASBL. vii. 210.

MADANAPĀLA

45. Year 3—Bihar Hill Image Ins. ASC. iii. 124. No. 16.
46. Year 8—Manabali cp. JASB. lxix. Pt. i, p. 68; GL. 147.
47. Year 14—Jaynagar Image Ins. ASC. iii. 125. The date is usually read as 10, but cf. JRASBL. vii. 216.

MISCELLANEOUS INSCRIPTIONS

48. Dinajpur (Bāngarh) Pillar Ins. of Kuñjaraghatāvarsha. JASB. N.S. vii. 019; PB. 68; Vaijayatani (Bengali), 1330 (b.s.), p. 249.
49. Irdā cp. of Kāmboja king Nayapāla, Year 13. EI. xxii. 150; xxiv. 43.
50. Kamauli cp of Vaidyadeva (mentions Kumārapāla), Year 4. EI. ii. 350; GL. 127.
52. Gayā Śitala Temple Ins. of Yakṣapāla. IA. xvi. 64ff.; PB. 96.

INSCRIPTIONS OF THE PRATIHAṆĀ KING MAHENDRAPĀLA (ALSO WRITTEN AS MAHINDRAPĀLA) FOUND IN BENGAL AND BIHAR

53. Year 2—British Museum Ins. PB. 64.
54. Year 4—Bihar Buddha Image Ins. ASI. 1933-34, p. 107.
55. Year 5—Pāhārpur Pillar Ins. Dikshit, Excavations at Paharpur (Memoir ASI. No 55.), p. 75.
56. Year 8—Rāmgañā Daśāvatāra Ins. PB. 64.
57. Year 9—British Museum Ins. PB. 64. Pl. xxxi. [The date is read as 9 by R. D. Banerji, and 8 by Kielhorn (Nach. Gotting. 1904, pp. 210-11) and Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (List, No. 1644) The reading '9' seems to be right.]
58. Year 9—Gunariya Ins. PB. 64; JASB. xvi. 278. Pl. v.
59. Year 10 (?)—Bihar Ins. (now missing). PB. 64. (This may be the same as No. 57).
APPENDIX II

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PĀLA KINGS

Nearly twenty years ago, the writer of this chapter laid down a definite scheme of chronology of the Pāla and the Sena kings. His conclusions, though opposed to the prevailing view championed by Mr. R. D. Banerji, have now been generally accepted, with slight modifications, due to new discoveries. It is not necessary, therefore, to discuss the different views once held on the subject, and it will suffice to re-state the fundamental principles on which that scheme was based, and the chronology resulting therefrom.

Proceeding from the one fixed point in the chronology of the Pālas, viz., the date A.D. 1026 for Mahipāla I supplied by the Sārnāth inscription (No. 29), it is possible to fix the approximate dates of his predecessors and successors by counting backwards and forwards from this fixed date, on the basis of the known reign-periods of those kings and a few well-established data, viz., the synchronism between Dharmapāla and Govinda III, Mahipāla and Rājendra Chola, and Nayapāla and Kalachuri Karna; the conquest of Varendra by Vījayasena after the eighth regnal year of Madanapāla; and the end of Madanapāla’s reign before the known date of Govindapāla.

The following table is drawn up on this basis, showing the known reign-periods of kings and making allowance (a) for the excess of their actual reign-periods over those known at present, and (b) the reign-periods of those kings about the duration of whose reign nothing is known so far.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF KING.</th>
<th>KNOWN REIGN-PERIOD.</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE YEAR OF ACCESION.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gopāla I</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>750 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dharmapāla</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>770   &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Devapāla</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>810   &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vigrāhapāla I or Śrānapāla II</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>850   &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nārāyaṇapāla</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>854   &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rājapāla</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>908   &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 JASB. N.S. xvii. 1 ff.
* The latest exposition of Mr. Banerji’s views is in JIBORS. xiv. 489-583. For criticism of these views and general discussion on Pāla chronology, cf. JIBORS. xv. 643-650; IHQ. iii. 578-591; vi. 135-168.
* For the reign-periods, cf. the regnal years of the inscriptions in Appendix I.
Date of Gopāla I

Although the general basis of the chronology has been explained above, it is necessary to make a few remarks regarding the dates assigned to some of the kings.

1. Gopāla I

Dr. M. Shahidullah placed the date of Gopāla’s accession in 715 A.D., chiefly on the strength of Tāranātha’s account. But his whole chronological scheme is vitiated by the wrong assumption that Govichandra was the last king of the Chandra dynasty. He ignores altogether the reign of Lalitachandra who, according to Tāranātha, succeeded Govichandra and ruled for many years in peace. Dr. Shahidullah puts the end of Govichandra’s reign at about 700 A.D. If we add the long reign of Lalitachandra, and the years of anarchy that followed, the commencement of Gopāla’s reign may be reasonably fixed at about the middle of the eighth century. The date has been assumed, in round numbers, as about 750 A.D. but this should be regarded as only an approximate one.

Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya places the accession of Gopāla in 700 A.D., mainly on the strength of Tibetan traditions, and accepts Tāranātha’s statement that Gopāla ruled for 45 years. Presumably Gopāla was fairly advanced in age when he was called to the throne at a critical time. Hence we should not assign a long reign to him.
in the absence of any positive evidence. As regards Tibetan traditions, Taranatha’s account agrees with the proposed date.\(^1\) Besides it has already been noted above (supra p. 124) that in an almost contemporary Tibetan text, Dharmapala is mentioned as a contemporary of Mu-tig Bisanz-po who ascended the throne in 707 A.D. This certainly supports the chronology adopted above, and does not favour the view that Gopala was elected king long before 750 A.D.

2. Dharmapala

The contemporeaneity of Dharmapala and Govinda III shows that Dharmapala must have been on the throne some time during 793-814 A.D., which covers the reign-period of the latter. The statement in the Raishtrakuta records that Govinda III defeated the Gurjara king Nagabhastra, and that Dharmapala submitted to the Raishtrakuta king, perhaps enables us to narrow down the limits of the date. It was formerly supposed that the two events followed one another within a short time, and since the defeat of Nagabhastra is mentioned in the Radhapur Plates dated 27th July, 808 A.D. (according to Kielhorn, but August 809 A.D. according to Altekar),\(^2\) but omitted in the Wani Grant issued in 807 A.D., they must have taken place sometime between these two dates.\(^3\) But this theory must be given up in view of the fact that the defeat of Nagabhastra is mentioned in the Manne Plates,\(^4\) dated S. 724 (=802 A.D.). Nesari Plates dated S. 727 (805 A.D.),\(^5\) and Sisavai Grant dated S. 729 (807 A.D.).\(^6\) The Manne Plates were formerly regarded as spurious, but the newly discovered Sisavai Grant makes it probable that they were genuine. In any case we must hold that the defeat of Nagabhastra by Govinda III took place certainly before 805 A.D., and probably before 802 A.D.\(^7\) Unless, therefore, we assume that Govinda III’s campaign against Dharmapala took place long after he had defeated Nagabhastra,\(^8\) which is very unlikely, we must presume that Dharmapala was on the throne at the beginning of the ninth century A.D.; and as he had already extended his power up to Kanauj by that time, his accession must be placed considerably before it.

---

\(^1\) See infra p. 187.  
\(^2\) GP. 44.  
\(^3\) Khare, *Sources of the Medieval History of the Deccan*, Vol. 1. p. 18. The actual date is December 805 (*El. xxiii. 216, f.n. 6*).  
\(^4\) *El. xxiii. 214-217*.  
\(^5\) For further discussion cf. *El. xxiii. 205-207*.  
\(^6\) This is the view held by Altekar (*D. R. Bhandarkar Volume*, pp. 183-88: *El. xxiii. 926-94*), who thinks that Govinda III fought twice with the northern powers. The first occasion was early in his reign when he merely repulsed a
3. Gopāla II

On the strength of a passage in the Pāla inscriptions, it was held that Gopāla II reigned for a very long period, at least a longer period than his predecessor. But as the same passage occurs in an inscription dated in the 6th year of Gopāla I, it can only be regarded as conventional.

The date in a palm-leaf ms. of the Maitreya Vyākaraṇa was read by MM. H. P. Śastri as year 57 of Gopāladeva’s reign. But Mr. R. D. Banerji and Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar read the date respectively as 17 and 11. In view of these facts the long reign formerly assigned to Gopāla II can no longer be upheld.

4. Vigrahapāla II and III

A manuscript of Pañcharakshā was copied in the twenty-sixth year of Vigrahapāla, who must be identified either with Vigrahapāla II or Vigrahapāla III; for as these two kings ruled within a Gurjara invasion, presumably under Nāgabhata. Later, some time after 808 or 809 A.D., he planned a grand offensive expedition in Northern India, presumably against Dharmapāla. The main argument of Altekar is based on the omission of all references to the victory against Dharmapāla in the stereotyped prasasti of Govinda III, which mentions the defeat of even a petty mountain chief like Māravardha. Altekar holds that as Govinda III died soon after, “he had not the necessary leisure to engage the services of a new poet to describe his sensational victories both in the north and the south. It was left for his son Anugrahamana to rescue from oblivion his father’s memorable achievements.” It is to be noted, however, that even according to Altekar’s chronology, Govinda III survived his victories over Dharmapāla for at least four years, ample time for composing a new prasasti, or rather adding to the old one. Further, the specific reference to the names of king Nāgabhata and Dharmapāla does not occur in the earlier records of Anugrahamana, though they refer to victories of Govinda III over the Gurjara and Gauḍa, but we find it for the first time in a record dated 571 A.D., i.e., more than sixty years after the events took place. Professor Mirashi has justly pointed out, that according to the Sanjāja Plates, Dharmapāla and Chakrāvdha submitted to Govinda III before the latter’s encampment at the capital of Mahārāja Sarva who is identified by all scholars, including Dr. Altekar, with Māravardha, mentioned in the stereotyped draft. The Dharmapāla incident, therefore, must have taken place when that draft was made (EI. xxiii. 207). A consideration of all the facts points to the conclusion that comparatively unimportant success of Govinda III against Dharmapāla was magnified beyond all proportion in later times, and glowing imaginary descriptions were added by later poets.

1 chitra-rām-arunera bhartā abhūt. (v. 8. of the Ins. No. 81).
2 Ins. No. 25.
3 Śastri-Cat. L. t 8.
4 JBOHS. xiv. 490-91. Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya opposes the views of Mr. Banerji and Dr. Bhandarkar and agrees with mm. Śastri that the date is 57 (IH). vi. 159. Mr. Banerji reproduces a micro-photograph of the portion of the ms. containing the date (op. cit.). The first figure seems undoubtedly to be 1, but the second is very doubtful.
5 PB. 89.
century, it would be unsafe to rely on palaeography and assign the ms. definitely to one of them. ¹ For the same reason, king Vighrahapāla mentioned in the Kurkihār Image Ins.² of year 19 should be taken as either Vighrahapāla II or Vighrahapāla III. One of these kings must have, therefore, reigned for at least 26 years. Following previous writers, I have assumed this king to be Vighrahapāla II.

5. Mahīpāla I

The date assigned to Mahīpāla I is based on the assumption that the Sārnāth Ins., dated 1026 A.D., belongs to his reign. This point has been discussed above (supra p. 140). The initial year, 988 A.D., satisfies the astronomical data contained in a ms. written in the 6th year of Mahīpāla’s reign.³

6. Nayapāla

The date of Nayapāla is controlled by the fact that he was a contemporary of the Kalachuri king Karna who ascended the throne in 1041 A.D.⁴ It is difficult to assay the exact value of the Tibetan tradition⁵ in fixing the year of Nayapāla’s accession, but the date suggested is in full agreement with this.

7. Rānapāla

Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya made an attempt to fix the date of Rānapāla’s death on the strength of a passage in Seka-subhodāyā. Apart from the fact that this book cannot claim any historical character, and is merely a collection of fables and legends,⁶ the

¹ JASB. N.S. xvi. 301 ff. Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya adversely criticised the general principles formulated in this paper (IHQ. III. 579), but later himself formulated the same principles (IHQ. vi. 155).
³ This statement is based on the calculation of Mr. D. C. Bhattacharya, IHQ. III. 584. Mr. J. C. Ghosh, on the other hand, places the accession of Mahīpāla in 981 A.D. and supports it on astronomical grounds (IC. i. 281). This only proves how little we may rely on astronomical data in fixing a definite date. Mr. Ghosh’s theory is based on some details furnished by Taranātha which are hardly credible.
⁴ This is the general view based on Kielhorn’s calculation, but Mr. J. C. Ghosh places the accession of Karna in 1039 A.D. (IC. i. 289).
⁵ Cf. the remarks made above in connection with the history of Nayapāla. According to the Tibetan tradition, Nayapāla’s coronation took place shortly before Atiśa left for Tibet (IHQ. vi. 159), an event for which various dates have been proposed between 1038 and 1042 A.D. (v. supra p. 145). D. C. Bhattacharya has calculated the date of Atiśa’s departure as March, 1041 A.D., but this may be doubted. The proposed date of Nayapāla’s accession is, therefore, in full agreement with the Tibetan tradition.
⁶ The book Seka-subhodāyā (‘Blessed advent of the Shākya’) is ascribed to Hākyudha Mūra, the famous minister of Lakṣmaṇapāla, but this is absurd on the
expression recording the date (Sāke yugma-venu-randhra-gate) does not offer any intelligible meaning. By different emendations of the passage, Mr. Bhattacharya and Dr. N. K. Bhattasali fix the year of Rāmapāla’s death as 1042 Śaka (=1120 A.D.). The same date has been suggested for the end of Rāmapāla’s reign according to the general scheme of chronology adopted by me, and not on the basis of the above interpretation.

MM. H. P. Śāstri2 and Mr. R. D. Banerji3 identified Chandra, mentioned as a friend of Madanapāla in Rāmācharita (iv. 16-21), with king Chandradeva who founded the Gāhādrugā dynasty of Kānauj. They therefore held that as this Chandradeva died before 1104 A.D., Madanapāla must have ascended the throne before that. Dr. R. G. Basak has, however, pointed out two very important facts mentioned in Rāmācharita about Chandra, viz., (1) that he was a mahāmāṇḍalika and the ruler of Āṅga, and (2) that his father was Suvarṇa. As Dr. Basak has suggested, Suvarṇa is almost certainly to be identified with the son, named Suvarṇa, of Mahāṇa, the ruler of Āṅga, and the maternal uncle of Rāmapāla. Thus Chandra was the nephew of Rāmapāla, and cousin of Madanapāla. He probably succeeded his grandfather Mahāṇa as ruler of Āṅga, and we know that Mahāṇa died shortly before Rāmapāla. There is thus no valid reason for the belief that Madanapāla was a contemporary of the Gāhādrugā king Chandradeva.

8. Gopāla III

The chronology of the successors of Rāmapāla has been based on the assumption that Gopāla III had a reign of 14 years. The difficulty of assuming the Ins. No. 44 to be dated in the year 14 of Gopāla III has been discussed above (supra p. 167, f.n. 4), but this view has been provisionally accepted.

face of it. Dr. S. K. Chatterji rightly declares it to be a forgery, but regards it as not later than the 16th century (Foreword to the edition of Mr. Sukumar Sen published in Itishkeia Series, p. xvi.). Mr. R. D. Banerji points out that as the book mentions a Muslim king named Hasan Sāha, evidently a mistake for Sulāna Aḥmadān Husain Shāh, the only king of that name who ruled over Bengal, it cannot be earlier than the 17th century (IBORS, xiv. 362). The book cannot by any means be regarded as a reliable source of historical information, though it refers to some historical figures and events. Mr. Banerji, however, goes too far when he asserts that the work does not contain a single passage which may be taken to be historically accurate. (op. cit. pp. 52-25). The statement, for example, that Rāmapāla drowned himself in the Ganges (pp. 60-61) is corroborated by Rāmācharita (iv. 0), and Hallāyudha, Dhūya, Gomathai, and Umāpatidhara are correctly stated to be contemporaries of Lakshmana.  

1 IHQ. iii. 268; iv. 160-61; xvii. 222. 
2 RC. 16. 
3 PB. 103. 
4 IHQ. v. 35-45.
APPENDIX III

LAMA TÅRANÅTHA’S ACCOUNT OF BENGALE

The Tibetan historian Lâma Tåranåtha was born in 1573 A.D., and completed his famous work ‘History of Buddhism in India’ in the year 1608 A.D. His main object was to give a detailed account of the Buddhist teachers, doctrines, and institutions in India during the different periods. He has, however, always taken care to add the names of the kings under whose patronage, or during whose regime, they flourished. In this way he has preserved a considerable amount of Buddhist traditions regarding the political history of India. That these traditions cannot be regarded as reliable data for the political history of India admits of no doubt. At the same time there is equally little doubt that they contain a nucleus of historical truths, which neither Indian literature nor Indian tradition has preserved for us. This fact, which will be illustrated in the following pages, makes it desirable to give a short summary of the political history of Bengal which may be gleaned from the pages of Tåranåtha.

The only kingdom in the east, of which Tåranåtha gives the names of successive generations of kings, is Bhångala, which may be taken to denote, in a general way, Southern and Eastern Bengal. According to Tåranåtha, the Chandra dynasty ruled in Bhångala before the Pâlas, and the names of all the kings mentioned by him prior to Gopâla end in -chandra.

One of these kings was Vrikshachandra, whose descendants, king Vigamachandra and his son king Kåmachandra, ruled in the east during the time of Sri-Harsha (i.e. the emperor Harshavardhana).

1 This Appendix is abridged from an article by the author published in IHQ, xvii. 219 ff. The account is based on the German translation of Tåranåtha’s History of Buddhism by A. Schiefer (Tåranåtha’s Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien. aus dem Tibetischen ubersetzt von Anton Schiefer, St. Petersburg, 1869). Figures within brackets refer to the pages of this book. Portions of this book were translated into English in Indian Antiquary (iv. 501 ff.), but the translation is not always accurate as the following pages will show.

2 Attention may be drawn to the following passages: (1) In Odîvisha, Bhångala, and Rådha (p. 78); (2) In the land Pundravardhana, lying between Magadha and Bhångala (p. 99); (3) In Bhångala and in Varendra (p. 201); (4) Vimalachandra ruled over the three provinces, Bhångala, Kåmañipa, and Tîrabhuti (p. 172).

In one passage Gauđa is referred to as a part of Bhångala (p. 88), but it is not clear whether it means that Gauđa was included within the kingdom of Bhångala, or formed geographically a part of it. The former seems to be the intended meaning.
(p. 198). Next we hear of king Simhachandra, of the Chandra family (presumably the one founded by Vriksachandra), who flourished during the reign of Sila, son of the emperor Sri-Harsha (p. 146). Bālachandra, son of Simhachandra, being driven from Bhaṅgala (presumably by the powerful king Paṅchama Sinhā of the Lichchhavi family whose kingdom extended from Tibet to Trilṅga and Benares to the sea) ruled in Tirahuti (i.e. Trihub in North Bihar) (pp. 146, 158). Bālachandra's son Vimalachandra, however, retrieved the fortunes of his family, and ruled over the three kingdoms Bhaṅgala, Kāmarūpa, and Tirahuti. He married the sister of king Bharthari (Bhartṛihari?) of the Mālava royal family, and was succeeded by his son Govichandra about the time when Dharmakīrtī, the famous Buddhist teacher, died (p. 185). Govichandra was succeeded by Lalitachandra, his relation on the father's side, who ruled for many years in peace (p. 197). After referring to the reigns of Govichandra and his successor Lalitachandra, both of whom attained Siddhi (spiritual salvation), Tārānātha remarks:

"Thus Lalitachandra was the last king of the Chandra family. In the five eastern provinces, Bhaṅgala, Oḍīvia (Orissa) and the rest, every Kahatriya, Grandoe Brahmiṇa, and merchant was a king in his own house (in the neighbourhood), but there was no king ruling over the country " (p. 197).

Then follows a long account of the Buddhist teachers of the period. Continuing the historical narrative in the next chapter, Tārānātha first tells us how a Tree-god begot a son on a young Kahatriya woman near Pundravardhana; how this son became a devotee of the goddess Chundā; how, directed by the goddess in a dream, he went to the Vihāra of Ārya Khasarpana, and, having

Tārānātha's geographical notion is clearly indicated in the following passage:

"Eastern India consists of three parts: Bhaṅgala and Oḍīvia belong to Aparantaka and are called its eastern part. The north-eastern provinces Kāmarūpa, Tripura and Hasama are called Grivarta, adorned with mountains. Proceeding towards the east near the Northern Hills are the provinces Nangara Pukham on the sea coast, Balgu etc., Rakhang, Harisavati and the remaining parts of the kingdom of Munijang; further off are Champā, Kāmboja and the rest. All these are called by the general name Koki" (p. 202).

For further discussion of Tārānātha's account of Bhaṅgala and the light it throws on the location of the original kingdom of the Pālās cf. IHQ. xvi. 819ff. 1 Rai Baladur S. C. Das gives a different version of this account (JASB. 1898, p. 92).

1 The translation of this passage as given in IA. iv. 566-66 viz., 'In Oḍīvia, in Bengal, and the other five provinces of the east......etc.' is wrong. This has been followed in Gaṅgāraṣṭra (p. 21), and Bhaṅgāla Itihāsa (p. 162) by R. Bh. Banerji. The original German passage is: "In den fünf ostlichen Ländergebieten Bhaṅgala, Oḍīvia und den übrigen....."

2 A shepherdess" according to Buston (p. 156).
prayed there for a kingdom, was asked to proceed towards the east (p. 202). Then occurs the following queer story:

"At that time the kingdom of Bhāṅgala had been without a king for many years, and people were suffering great miseries. The leaders gathered and elected a king in order that the kingdom might be lawfully ruled. The elected king was, however, killed that very night by a strong and ugly Nāga woman who assumed the form of a queen of an earlier king (according to some, Govichandra, according to others, Lalitachandra). In this way she killed every elected king. But as the people could not leave the kingdom without a king, they elected one every morning, only to see that he was killed by her during night and his dead body thrown out at day-break. Some years passed in this way, the citizens being elected in turn as king for the day. At this time a devotee of the goddess Chundā came to a house, where the family was overwhelmed with grief. On enquiry he learnt that next day the turn of the elected king fell on a son of that house. He, however, offered to take the place of the son, on receiving some money, and the joy of the family knew no bounds. He obtained the reward and was elected king in the morning. When in midnight the Nāga woman, in the form of a Rākshas, approached towards him, he struck her with the wooden club (which he always carried), sacred to his tutelary deity, and she died. The people were greatly astonished to see him alive in the morning. He thereupon offered to take the place of others whose turn came next to be elected as kings, and he was elected king seven times in course of seven days. Then, on account of his pre-eminent qualifications, the people elected him as a permanent king and gave him the name Gopāla." (pp. 203-4).

This story is a fine illustration of historical myths. The anarchy and turmoil in Bengal, due to the absence of any central political authority, and the election of Gopāla to the throne by the voice of the people, undoubtedly form the historical background against which the popular nursery-tale of a demoness devouring a king every night has been cleverly set. Such a story cannot be used as historical evidence except where, as in the present case, the kernel of historical fact is proved by independent evidence. By a further analysis of the story it may be possible to glean a few more facts about Gopāla.

According to the story, Gopāla was born near Pundravardhana, i.e. in Varendra, although he became king of Bhāṅgala, which undoubtedly stands for Vaṅgāla or Vaṅga. This offers a solution of what might otherwise have been a little riddle. For whereas in the Rāmcharita, Varendra is referred to as janakabhūḥ (father-land) of the Pāls, the contemporary inscriptions call them Vanagapati or rulers of Vaṅga, and refer to Gauḍa and Vaṅga as separate kingdoms. Tāranātha also used the name of Varendra, as distinguished from Bhāṅgala.\(^1\) It may thus be assumed that the birth-place of Gopāla was in Varendra, but the throne which was offered to him was that of Vaṅgāla or Vaṅga.

\(^1\) Cf. supra p. 182, f.n. 2, examples (2) and (3).