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THE PĀLAS OF BENGAL.

BY

PREFACE.

The ground plan of a history of Eastern India from 800 to 1200 A.D. has already been sketched out by Mahāmahopadhyāya Hara Prasād Sāstrī in his short introduction to Sandhyākaranandi’s Rāmacarita. At that time I intended to develop it and add all the available material in a fresh article. This article was finished in October 1911. It was revised by Dr. J. Ph. Vogel, Ph.D., then Officiating Director General of Archaeology, and submitted to the Society. For various reasons, the publication of this part of the Memoirs has been delayed, among which may be mentioned the loss of several impressions of inscriptions.

I have not been able to edit the inscriptions quoted in the body of this paper to my satisfaction, on account of want of time and space. The readings quoted are for the most part true readings. Pandit Binod Bihari Bidyabinod has helped me considerably in deciphering them. The majority of the new records were read by him, and the texts were then revised and modified by me. But in each case a mechanical estampage has been reproduced so that a worthier scholar may re-edit it from the plates. The historical information supplied by each record has been given in the form of a summary in the body of the text.

I am indebted to Mahāmahopadhyāya Hara Prasād Sāstrī, C.I.E., Dr. J. Ph. Vogel, Ph.D., Dr. D. B. Spooner, B.A., Ph.D., Prof. Jadu Nath Sarkar and Mr. K. P Jayaswal, B.A., Bar.-at-Law, for many suggestions. To my friend Mr. Surendra Nath Kumar of the Imperial Library, Calcutta, I am indebted for translations of various passages in French or German. Dr. F. W Thomas, Ph.D., of the India Office Library, and Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle kindly obtained for me photographs of the historical colophones of manuscripts preserved in the Bodleian or the Royal Asiatic Society’s Library. Dr. Thomas obtained for me two impressions of votive inscriptions of Mahendrapāla in the British Museum. Mr. G. H. Tipper, M.A., F.G.S., then Honorary General Secretary of the Society, very kindly obtained photographs of the historical colophones of manuscripts preserved in the Cambridge University’s Library and the Bengal Asiatic Society’s collections. In fact, without his aid it would have been quite impossible for me to complete this work.

INDIAN MUSEUM,
Calcutta, the 30th May, 1914.
The Pālas of Bengal.


[With Plates XXIV—XXXII, XXXVI—XXXVIII.]

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

After the death of Harṣavaradhdhana, nothing is definitely known about the history of Bengal and Bihar, till the rise of the Pālas. In fact the only definite date after the death of Harṣavaradhdhana, is the year 66, of the Harṣa era, on the Shāhpur image of Sūryya. ¹ We know from the Aplśaḍ inscription of Ādityasena, that Mādhavagupta was the contemporary of Harṣa,² and that Ādityasena succeeded in making himself independent in Magadha. The Deo-Banārak inscription of Jivitagupta II carries the genealogy of the family for three generations further. These princes Devagupta, Viṣṇugupta and Jivitagupta II continued to assume Imperial titles, though most probably their possessions were insignificant. The dynasty came to an end with the last-named prince, Jivitagupta II.

The exact circumstances which led to the fall of this ancient dynasty are not known, but it seems certain that the event took place in troublesome times. Bengal was run over by Vaśovarmmadeva of Kanauj during the first two decades of the eighth century A.D.³ Most probably Jivitagupta II was the king who was overthrown by this invasion. Ādityasena's only definite date is 671 A.D., and this gives us about 40 or 50 years for four generations, which is certainly not too much. We do not know anything about the successors of Jivitagupta II, but we know of several other foreign invasions of Bengal about the same time from contemporary records. The invasion from Kanauj was followed by one from Assam. The King Harṣadeva conquered Bengal, Orissa and the Northern Sarkars (Gauda = Oḍr = ādi-Kalinga-Kośala-pati). As his grandson, Jayadeva, the Licchavi, was reigning in the sixth decade of the eighth century A.D.,⁴ the date of his maternal grandfather must be placed some time earlier. Most probably this invasion from Assam closely followed upon the heels of that from Kanauj, or we may one day be surprised to learn that both armies invaded Bengal jointly. Harṣadeva must have held Bengal for a sufficiently long time, so as to enable him to pass through that country and conquer Oḍra (Orissa) Kalinga (Northern Sarkars), and Kośala (Orissa Hill Tracts). The Gauda-vaho and the Rājatarangini has familiarized us with the

² Ibid., p. 207.
³ J.R.A.S., 1908, p. 76.
story of the banished king, Jayāpīḍa, who came to Bengal, married the daughter of
the king, and freed him from the subjection of his liege-
lord. According to the able translator of the Rājatarangini,
the true date of this king is between 760 and 800 A.D. Finally Bengal was con-
quered by the Gurjara and Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings. The Gurjara king Vatsarāja,
according to the Gwalior inscription of Mihira-Bhoja, had seized by main force the imperial
sway from the house of Bhāṇḍi:—

\[
\text{Khyātād = Bhāṇḍi-kūlān = madotkāta-kari-prōkāra durilāṅghato yah śāmrājya-
am = adhiyā-kārminuka-sakhā samkhya hāṭhād = agrahāt—verse 7.}
\]

Most probably after the fall of Harṣavardhana, the family of his cousin
Bhāṇḍi succeeded to the Empire. Bhāṇḍi is mentioned in the Harṣacarita as the
mother’s brother’s son of Harṣa. Vatsarāja is said to have conquered Bengal very
easily and taken away from its king the radiantly white royal umbrellas. In the Wani grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III, his father Dhrūvarāja is said to
have taken away these umbrellas from Vatsarāja and driven him away into the
desert:—

\[
\text{Helī-śvīkṛta-Gauda-rājya-kamalī-mattam praveśy-ācirād = durmārgam = marum-
dhyam = aprati-balair = yo Vatsarājān balaiḥ Gaudīṭyaṃ Saradindupāda-
dhvavalam chaṭradāvyayam kevalam tasmān = n = ṇhīta tad-yāso = pi kakubham}
prānte sthitam tat-kṣuṇāt.
\]

"Having with his armies, which no other army could withstand, quickly caused
Vatsarāja, intoxicated with the goddess of the sovereignty of the country of Gauḍa,
that he had acquired with ease, to enter upon the path of misfortune in the centre
of the deserts or Maru, he took away from him not only the two royal umbrellas
of Gauḍa, that were as radiantly white as the rays of the autumn moon, but
almost, at the same moment, his fame that had reached to the extremities of
the regions."

The late Mr. A. M. T. Jackson supposed that the country conquered by
Vatsarāja was Thanesar. But the Gurjara king conquered Gauḍa and Vaṅga at
the same time and the two umbrellas were, most probably, one for Gauḍa and
the other for Vaṅga like the double crown of Egypt:—

\[
\text{Gauḍendra-Vaṅgapati nirjyaya-durruvidagdhha sad = gurijareśvara dig = arghalatām ca}
yasya,
\]

\[
\text{Nītā bhujam vihata-mālava-raṣṭaṇārtham svāmī tath = śnyam-apī rājya-phaṭāni}
bhunkte.—Baroda plates of Karkarāja.}
\]

The Radhanpur grant also contains the verse about the defeat of Vatsarāja by
Dhrūva. So according to the Wani and Radhanpur grants Dhrūva, father of the
Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III, drove Vatsarāja back into the desert, and wrested
from him the double royal umbrellas of Gauḍa, and according to the Baroda grant

---

3 Cowell and Thomas, Harṣacarita, Or. Tr. Fund Series, p. 116.
7 Epi. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 243.
Govinda III caused Karkarāja’s arm to become the doorbar of the country of the Lord of the Gurjaras, who had become evilly inflamed by conquering the Lord of Gauda and Vaṅga. The verses in both grants do not refer to the same person. The first verse refers to Vatsarāja, the contemporary of Dhruva, but the second verse refers to Nāgabhaṭa II, son of Vatsarāja, who was defeated by Govinda III.

This brings us to the fourth foreign invasion of this period, the invasion of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. It is evident from the verses quoted above that the Gurjara king’s conquest was not a lasting one. Close on his heels followed the southerner and obliged him to relinquish his conquests and even forced him to retire into the desert country, his original home. When the double white umbrella was snatched away from Vatsarāja, the Kingdom of Gauda and Vaṅga must also have passed into the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa conqueror. Nothing is known definitely about the close of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa occupation, but most probably it did not last long. As soon the Rāṣṭrakūṭa forces were withdrawn, the local princes must have re-asserted their authority.

During this period of foreign invasions and consequent anarchy and misrule, the old Royal dynasty must have come to an end, the harassed populace felt the necessity of a strong and able ruler. They held an election about the details of which we know nothing. As a result of this election Gopāladeva, the son of a successful soldier named Vapyaṭa, was elected king. In the Khalimpur grant of Dhummapāla it is said that the people made him take the hand of fortune:—

Mātṣya-nyāyam-apohitum prakṛtibhir-lakṣmyāh karau-grāhitaḥ Śrī-Gopāla iti kṣitiśa-sirasām cudēmanis-tat-sutah, Yasy-ānukritaye sanātana-yaśo-rāśir-diśān-
āsāva śvetimnā yadi paurṇamāsa-rajanī iyotsn-ātibhūra-śrīyā.—verse 4.1.

The composer of the Khalimpur inscription puts the cause of this election very nicely in the above verse: Mātṣya-nyāyam-apohitun, “to escape from anarchy,” as Mr. K. P. Jayaswal translates it.2 That the danger of being swallowed up into the kingdom of a powerful neighbour, was not exaggerated, is amply evident from the foregoing account of the foreign invasions of Bengal during the dark period.

Nothing is known about the origin of this new line of kings, who continued to hold sway over Bihar or Bengal till the final conquest of the country by the Muhammadans. In the oldest inscription of this dynasty Dayitaviṣṇu, the grandfather of Gopāla I, is called the progenitor of this line of kings, and it was stated, that he was sanctified by all sorts of knowledge (sarvva-vidyāvadātah).3 Most probably the family was of such a humble origin that even the names of Dayitaviṣṇu’s forefathers were not known in the time of his great-grandson. In later biographical works and inscriptions like the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākara-nandi and the Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva, mythical accounts are given of the origin of the Pālas. The Kamauli grant mentions very distinctly that

---

1 Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 248.
2 Arthaśāstra of Cāṇakya.
the king Vigrahapāla III was born in the race of the Sun.¹ The Rāmacarita and the Bengali poem Dharmmamaṅgala of Ghanarāma give a different account altogether. This account is given very fully in the Kaṇurpālā of Ghanarāma's work, according to which the kings of the Pāla dynasty after Dharmmapāla were really the descendants of the Sea-god. This tradition is not very coherent as Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasada Sastri has shown. In the Rāmacarita, king Dharmmapāla is mentioned as "the light of the race of the Sea."² Thus the Rāmacarita corroborates the tradition embodied in Ghanarāma's work to some extent. It shows that the origin of the new line of kings was remembered by the people long after their accession and even after their fall. The descent from the Sea most probably indicates that the forefathers of this line of kings came from the Sea and in the absence of a plausible account of their ancestry became known as the children of the Sea-God.

CHAPTER II.

Gopāla I and Dharmmapāla.

Gopāla I was most probably an elderly man when he was called to the throne. Nothing is stated definitely about him or the events of his reign in any of the numerous Pāla inscriptions. In the Khalimpur grant of his son Dharmmapāla we find that he married Deddadevi, the daughter of the king of the Bhadra country. The Bhadras have been variously placed in Middle, Eastern or Southern India in the Brhat Samhita. The Mungir grant of Devapāladeva mentions him as the type of a well-conducted king. In the rest of the copper-plates of the Pāla dynasty the verse quoted below is used about Gopāla I:

\[
\text{Jitvā yāḥ kāma-kāri-prabhavam = abhibhavam śūvalim prāpa śāntim,}
\]
\[
\text{Sa śrīmān lokanātho jayati Daśabalośnyāḥ = ca Gopāladevaḥ.}
\]

We find this verse in the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyanapāla, Dinajpur grant of Mahiḍa I, Amgachi grant of Vigrahapāla III, and the Manahali grant of Madanapāla. No inscriptions of this king either on stone or on plates of copper have been discovered as yet, as has been stated by Mr. V. A. Smith. According to Mr. V. A. Smith, Gopāla I was the king of Bengal, who was defeated by the Gurjara king Vatsarāja. But in my humble opinion the Gurjara and Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasions must have taken place before the accession of Gopāla I. In the next reign we find that the king of Bengal was acknowledged supreme by all kings of Northern India. Now Gopāla was elected king by the people of Bengal and his position consequently was not very strong within his own possessions. He was the son of a military adventurer, and he must have wanted a long and peaceful reign to consolidate his power. The Gurjara king Vatsarāja must also have reigned for a pretty long time as he is mentioned in a Jaina work, which we shall examine later on, to be the contemporary of a king who was overthrown by the son of Gopāla. Most probably Gopāla I had a shorter reign than Vatsarāja, who had overrun Bengal before the accession of the former, but lived long enough to see the former's son conquer his former possessions.

According to Tārānātha, Gopāladeva is said to have reigned for 45 years and Mr. V. A. Smith puts accession to the year 732 A.D., but as we shall see later on when we come to the first definite date of this dynasty, that this is a little premature. Gopāladeva ascended the throne about 750 A.D. and was most probably succeeded by his son Dharmmapāladeva after a very short reign.

---

1 Epi. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 248, v. 5.  
3 Ibid., Vol. XXI, p. 255.  
5 J.R.A.S., 1909, p. 76.
Dharmmapāladeva, the second king of the Pāla dynasty, was the real founder of the greatness of his line and the Empire over which his successors ruled. He was also the leading figure in Northern Indian politics in the last half of the eighth and the first half of the ninth centuries A.D. Most probably Bengal enjoyed some respite from foreign invasions during the reign of Gopāla I, and after him, his son felt strong enough to take part in the disputes of the contemporary monarchs of Northern India, and to conduct long campaigns. Before proceeding to discuss the events of his reign we should consider his date which is the first fixed point in the History of Bengal during this period. The chronology of the Pālas of Bengal was for a long time in a hopelessly confused state. Leaving aside the earlier theories about the dates of the Pālas we find even in recent times widely divergent theories about the date of Dharmmapāla. In the XVth Volume of his reports the late Sir Alexander Cunningham fixed the date of Dharmmapāla’s accession in 831 A.D. In his article 1 on the Cambay plates of Govinda III, Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar places Dharmmapāla in the earlier part of the tenth century. 2 Dharmmapāla’s date seems to have become fixed from synchronisms, which have been given for the first time in the preface of the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandi by the learned Editor. The synchronisms have also been noticed almost simultaneously by two other scholars—Mr. V. A. Smith 3 and Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar. 4

The first question about the true date of Dharmmapāla was raised incidentally in 1891 by the late Dr. Kielhorn on a passage in the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyanapāla:

\[ Jitvā = \text{endra-rāja-prabhrtin} = \text{arātin} = \text{upārjjitā} \text{ yena Mahodaya Śrīh, dattāḥ punāḥ sa valin = ārthayitre Cakrayudhāy = ānativāmanāya}. \]

At that time Dr. Kielhorn was unable to identify the kings Indrarāja or Cakrāyudha. The discovery of the Khalimpur grant supplied some additional facts and the well-known verse:

\[ \text{Bhojair-Matsaiḥ sa-Madraīḥ Kuru-Yadu-Yavanā = Āvanti-Gandhāra-Kirair = bhu-pair = uvāpola-mauli-panaṭati-parinataįḥ sādhu saṅgīryamānāḥ,} \]
\[ \text{Hṛṣyat Paścāla-vṛddh-oddhyța-kanakakama-svābhīṣekodakumbho dattāḥ śri-Kāṇya- kubjas = sa-lalita-calita-bhrulalā-lakṣma-yena}. \]

For a long time nothing could be made out of the historical allusions in the two verses quoted above. It was known to the scholars that a certain verse of the Jaina Hari-varṇa-purāṇa referred to a king named Indrarāja who was a contemporary of Vatsarāja and was living in the year 705 of the Śaka era, i.e. 783 A.D. 5 But so far nobody was able to connect Indrāyudha with the Indrarāja of the Bhagalpur grant. Some time before November 1896, a stone inscription was discovered in some excavations which were being carried

---

1 Arch. Survey Rep., Vol. XV, p. 150.
3 J.R.A.S., 1908, p. 252.
5 Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, pp. 187-88.
6 Epi. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 248.
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on near the city of Gwalior, and a pencil rubbing of which with a photograph
was handed over to the late Dr. Kielhorn by Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle. A summary
of this inscription was published by Dr. Kielhorn and it became known that
Nāgabhata II, son of Vatsarāja of the Gurjara-Pratihāra family, conquered a
king named Cakrāyudha, ‘whose low state was manifested by his dependence
on another (or others),’ and defeated the Lord of Vāṅga.' The Cakrāyudha
mentioned in this inscription is evidently the same Cakrāyudha who received
the sovereignty of Mahodaya from Dharmmapāla of Bengal, and this identity
is made doubly certain by the phrase ‘paraśrayakṛta-sphuṭa-nīca-bhāvam.’ The
inscription has since been edited by Pandit Hirāuanda Sāstri of the Archaeological
Survey, Northern Circle, and the verses about the conquests of Nāgabhata II
run thus:—

Travya = āspadasya sukṛtasya samṛddhim = icchur = yaḥ kṣatradhāra-vidhi-vaddha
valli-prabandhaḥ,

Jitvā paraśraya-kṛta-sphuṭa-nīca-bhāvam Cakrāyudhām vinayanamra-pūrvvārājat.—verse 9 intrusive.

As a confirmation of the above statement came the verses of an unpublished
grant of Amoghavarṣa I, now in the possession of Prof. Śrīdhara R. Bhandarkar,
according to which during the victorious march of Govinda III, Dharmma and
Cakrāyudha submitted of their own accord to that king:—

Himavat = parvata-nirṛjkar = āmbu tiragahiḥ pitaṁ ca gājha-gajair-idhanitam
majjan-turyakair = dviguhyilam bhuyopi tat-kandare, svayam = ev = opanatau
ca yasya māhatas = tau Dharmma-Cakrāyudhā Himavān-kṛttisarupatām
upagatas-tat = kṛttinārāyanah.—verse 23 intrusive.

As Nāgabhata is mentioned in the preceding verse there remains no doubt
about the identity of Dharmma and Cakrāyudha and the Cakrāyudha and the
King of Bengal of the Gwalior inscription. He is the very same person who was
seated on the throne of Mahodaya or Kanauj by Dharmmapāla of Bengal and who
was defeated by the Gurjara king Nāgabhata at the same time as the Pāla king. The
mention of Nāgabhata in the preceding verse makes this identification doubly
certain:—

Sa Nāgabhata-Candragupta-nerpayor-yaśo(? r-yam rane svahāryam = apahārya
dhairya-vikalān-ah-onmulayan.

Yasor-jjanaparo nṛpān-svabhūvi sāli sasyān-iva punah punaratiṣṭhipat-svapada
eva c = ānyān = api.—verse 22 intrusive.

So it is evident that the Kings Nāgabhata II and Govinda III were the
contemporaries of Dharmmapāla and Cakrāyudha. We possess a certain date for
Nāgabhata II, in the Buchkala inscription; the Vikrama year 872=815 A.D.

Govinda III's certain dates range from 794 to 813 A.D. Consequently Dharmpala must be placed in the last decades of the eighth and the first decades of the ninth century A.D.

The most important event in the reign of Dharmpala is his conquest of Northern India. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruva had driven the Gurjara invaders back into the desert and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa occupation of the country most probably did not last long, otherwise there would not have been any necessity of a fresh invasion under Govinda III. The whole of Northern India most probably relapsed into that restless state which necessitated the election of a strong ruler in Bengal On his accession, an able man like Dharmpala practically found the whole country at his mercy. The ancient race of Bhāṇḍī had been ousted from the throne by Vatsaraṇa, Nāgabhaṭa's father, and a king named Indrāyudha was reigning at Mahodaya or Kanauj in the Vikrama year 705-783 A.D. It may be that he also belonged to the family of Bhāṇḍī. When we remember that according to the verse of the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyanapala, Dharmpala ousted a king of Kanauj named Indraraṇa and gave the kingdom to Cakrāyudha, we feel certain that this Indrāyudha is no other than the Indrarāṇa of the Bhagalpur grant.

Dharmpala's Northern Indian campaign must have begun some time after 783 A.D. In the Jaina Harivamśa Purāṇa we find that in the year 705 of the Śaka era Indrāyudha was ruling in the North, Śrī-Vallabha in the South, the Lord of Avanti in the East, and Vatsaraṇa in the West:

Śākeśvabāṣaṭeṣu sāptaṣu disām pāñchottareṣṭtārām  
Pāṇindrāyudhanāmnī Kṛṣṇaṁrpaṇe Śrīvallabhe daksiniṁ,  
Pūrvaṁ Śrīmad-Avantī-bhuhṛtī nṛpe Vatsādirāje pārām  
Sorya nāmaḍhimāṇḍale jayaṁte vire varāhe vati.

We know already from the Wani and Radhanpur grants that Dhruva, Śrī Vallabha and Vatsaraṇa were contemporaries. In the year 783 Dhruva must have been in his old age, and long before that he must have driven Vatsaraṇa back into the desert country from Kanauj and Bengal as the latter is only mentioned as ruler of the West. Again, as Indrarāṇa or Indrāyudha was reigning in the North in 783 A.D., so Dharmpala's Northern Indian campaign must have taken place after that year. As has been already stated above, Dhruva and Vatsaraṇa seem to have had very long reigns. The invasion of Northern India by these two kings seems to have taken place during the earlier parts of their reigns. Bengal most probably enjoyed about fifty years' respite from foreign invasions before Dharmpala came to the throne. Though Indrāyudha, the contemporary of Dhruva and Vatsaraṇa, was dispossessed of his throne by Dharmpala, yet it appears that both of these kings died before Dharmpala's accession, as their sons, Nāgabhaṭa II and Govinda III, are mentioned in the inscriptions as his contemporaries. The first act of Dharmpala

---

1 Ibid., Vol. VII, App. II, p. 3.
after his accession seems to have been the invasion of Kanauj. The exact
cause of this invasion has not been revealed to us by any
of the records discovered up to date. Most probably
the existence of the weak kingdom on his western frontier
tempted him to lead an invasion into the heart of the
middle country. The result of this invasion is already well known. Indrāyudha,
the old king,—old he must have been as he was to some extent the contemporary
of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruva and the Gurjara Vatsarāja,—was deposed. Dharmmapāla
set up a nominee of his own, named Cakrayudha, who was most probably the
king of the Pañcāla Country. The last supposition is based on the fact that
in the Khalimpur grant it is stated that the Elders of the Pañcāla Country
rejoiced at his election. This selection finally proved to be a very costly one
for Dharmmapāla. In the famous historical verse of the Khalimpur grant we
find that the Kuru, Yadu, Yavana, Avanti, Gandhāra, Kīra, Bhoja, Matsya
and Madra kings had to agree to the selection of Cakrāyudha as the king of
Kanauj or Mahodaya. This means, in plain language, that Dharmpāla had
to defeat these kings, and then to force his nominee on them. Consequently we
must acknowledge that Dharmmapāla conquered or overran Eastern Punjab
and Sindh (Kuru and Yadu), Western Punjab and the North-Western Frontier
Provinces (Yavana and Gandhāra), Kangra (Kīra), Malwa (Avanti), and North-
Eastern Rajputana (Bhoja and Matsya). The Madras are mentioned in the Mahā-
bhārata as living outside the pale of Aryan civilization, and most probably the
country meant is some part of Afghanistan.

The accession of Cakrāyudha on the throne of Kanauj was not satisfactory
to Nāgabhaṭa II, the king of the Gurjaras. We know from the 9th verse of
the Gwalior inscription of Bhoja I, that Nāgabhaṭa II defeated Cakrāyudha.
According to the 10th verse of the same inscription he is said to have defeated
the King of Bengal also:—

\[\text{Dūrvvāra-vairu-vara-vāraṇa-vājī-vārayān = angha-samghatana-ghora-ghan—āndhakāram,}\]
\[\text{Nirjitiya Vamgapatim = avirabhūd = vivasvān = udyan = n-iva tri-jagad-eka-vikāsa-
koṣāḥ.—verse 10.}^3\]

It is evident that Dharmpāla tried his best to support his protegee. In
so doing he must have suffered a serious reverse at the hands of the Gurjara king.
In this condition both Dharmmapāla and Cakrāyudha sought the help of the
Rāṣṭrakūṭa Emperor Govinda III. This is proved by the 23rd verse of the
unpublished grant of Amoghavarṣa I in the possession of Mr. S. R. Bhandarkar.
Being solicited by the most influential king of Northern India and his subordinate,
the king of one of the oldest cities in India, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch led a campaign
against the powerful Gurjaras. The result of this campaign has already been stated
above while quoting the 23rd verse of the unpublished grant of Amoghavarṣa I.

The defeat inflicted upon the Gurjaras by the Rāṣṭrakūta Emperor had a very lasting effect. Govinda III made his nephew, the Mahāśāṃantādhipati Karkaraṇa II of the Gujarati Branch of the Rāṣṭrakūta family, a door-bar for the country of the Gurjaras, which we learn from the verse of the Baroda grant of Karkaraṇa quoted above. Besides the unpublished grant of Amoghavarsa I, we have further evidence of the defeat of a Gurjara king by Govinda III. In the Radhanpur grant of Govinda III it is stated that the Gurjara king fled on hearing of the approach of Govinda III, as the rainy season flies away on the approach of autumn;

Samādīy = āsū śilimukhāṁ svā-samayāṁ va (ba)nāsanasy = ṭap riṇp'am vard-dhitā-vam(bam)dhujiva-vibhavam padm-ābhivyadhya-anvitam.
Samnaksatram = udiśyā yam sarad-ṛtum purjanyavad = Gurjaro naṣṭah kv = āpi bhayāt = tathā na samaram svapne = pi paśyed = yathā.—verse 15.¹

The dream of having a capital at Kanauj, which had impelled more than one Gurjara King to invade Northern India, was over. The Mahāśāṃanta became such an efficient door-bar that the Gurjaras were confined to the desert tracts of Rajputana for more than two generations. Dharmaṁpāla and Cakrāyudha were left in undisputed possession of their territories. Further mention of this triangular struggle between the Pālas, Gurjaras and the Rāṣṭrakūtas is to be found in two inscriptions of Mahendrapāla, edited by the late Dr. Kielhorn just before his death. In these grants it is stated that Vāhukadhavala, a feudatory of the Gurjara Emperor Mahendrapāla, but a Cālukya by descent, defeated a king named Dharmaṁ. Now as Vāhukadhavala was the third in ascent from Balavarm, the contemporary of Mahendrapāla, it is probable that he was a contemporary of Nāgabhaṭa II, who, as we have seen above, was the contemporary of Dharmaṁpāla of Bengal. So it now appears to be certain that the king Dharmaṁ defeated by Vāhukadhavala was no other than Dharmaṁpāla of Bengal, who was fighting for his lost prestige in Northern India. In his article on the Una grant of Mahendrapāla, Dr. Kielhorn says that as Balavarm was a contemporary of Mahendrapāla and lived in 893 A.D., so his grandfather Vāhukadhavala must be the contemporary of Bhoja I.² But this is hardly possible as king Dharmaṁpāla must have preceded Bhoja I to some extent at any rate. As Balavarm, as well as his son, Avanivarman II, were the contemporaries of Mahendrapāla so it becomes certain that Balavarm was advanced in age when Mahendrapāla came to the throne. So Balavarm himself must be taken to be the contemporary of the Emperor Bhoja I. Consequently Avanivarman I becomes the contemporary of Rāmabhadra and Vāhukadhavala of Nāgabhaṭa II. This statement is amply supported by the fact that Nāgabhaṭa II had a long war with Dharmaṁpāla of Bengal. Vāhukadhavala is also said in Mahendrapāla’s grants to have defeated the Karnaṭa Army. As Dr. Kielhorn has suggested, the Karnaṭas mentioned are really Rāṣṭrakūtas. Most probably Vāhukadhavala defeated some portion of the Rāṣṭrakūta forces during the Northern Indian campaign of Govinda III.

We know from the Nilgund inscription of Amoghavarsa I, that some time during

¹ Epi. Ind. Vol. VI, p. 244.
² Epi. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 3.
the campaign of Dharmmapāla and Govinda III against Nāgabhaṭa II, the Pāla and Rāṣṭrakūta kings fell out and in the struggle which ensued Dharmmapāla was defeated. This must have taken place after the defeat of Nāgabhaṭa II by the confederate armies:

\[ \text{Kerala-Mālava-Gauḍān = sa-Gurjjarā[\text{R}] = Citrakūṭagiridū[\text{R}] - gasthan \ baddhāvā} \]
\[ \text{Kānciśān = aṭha sa Kirttinārāyaṇo jātāḥ.} \]

Dharmmapāla must have reigned for at least thirty-two years as his Khalimpur grant is dated in that year. Tārānātha says that he ruled for sixty-four years, which is impossible as we shall see in the following pages. The late Dr. Kielhorn was also of opinion that Dharmmapāla had a long reign. In the Monghyr grant it is stated that Dharmmapāla married the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūta chief Parabala, a lady named Raṇīdevi. Recently Dr. Kielhorn has published an inscription found on a pillar at Pathari, in the Native State of Bhopal in Central India. According to this inscription a king of the Rāṣṭrakūtas named Parabala was reigning in the Vikrama year 917 = 861 A.D. This Parabala is most probably the father-in-law of Dharmmapāla. So if Parabala married his daughter to the Pāla king, the latter must have had reigned for a very long time. Parabala and his father were very long-lived men. His father Karkarāja defeated a king named Nāgāvaloka, who was a contemporary of Chāhamāna Guvāka I of Sākambhari and one of whose grants is dated in the year 813 of the Vikrama era = 756 A.D. Dharmmapāla had a son named Tribhuvanapāla, who is mentioned in the Kha'impur grant as the dūtaka, and who seems to have died during the lifetime of his father as Dharmmapāla was succeeded by his second son Devapāladeva after a reign of about forty years.

No coins of Dharmmapāla have been discovered as yet, and the only other inscription of Dharmmapāla besides the Khalimpur grant is a small votive inscription of the 26th year of his reign, found at Bodh-Gaya in the Gaya district of Bengal. The sculpture, on which the inscription has been incised, was removed to the Indian Museum in 1895 when Mr. Broadley’s collection of antiquities was sent to Calcutta by the order of the Government of Bengal. The inscription was published in 1908 by Pandit Nilmoni Chakravartti, Professor of Pali and Sanskrit in the Presidency College, Calcutta. It records the erection of a four-faced Mahādeva in a place called Campaśayatanā, by a man named Keśava, the son of a sculptor named Ujvala, and the excavation of a tank at the cost of three thousand drāmas, in the 26th regnal year of Dharmmapāla. His Khalimpur grant was issued from Pāṭaliputra. It is well known that he is the king of Bengal repeatedly referred to in the Rāṣṭrakūta and Gurjara records. In the Monghyr grant of his son Devāpala, Dharmmapāla’s followers are said to have bathed at Kedāra, and at the mouth of the Ganges during his expeditions, and this bears out the statements made in the

---

1 Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 103.  
3 Ind. Ant., Vol. XXI, p. 255.  
4 Epi. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 250.  
5 Ibid., p. 231, note 4.  
Khalimpur grant. This grant was issued in his 32nd year and records the grant of the villages named Krauṇcaśvabhra, Madhāśammali and Paļitaka in the Vyāghrataṭi mandāla of the Mahantāprakāśa viṣaya, and Gopippali of the Āmraśaṇḍikā mandāla of the Sthālikkaṭa viṣaya, all of which were situated in the Pauṇḍravardhana bhukti, to the temple of the god Nunna-Nārāyaṇa at Subhasthali, at the request of his feudatory, the Mahāsāmantādhipati Nārāyaṇavarmman, which was communicated to the king by the Prince Tribhuvanapāla.
CHAPTER III.

THE STRUGGLE WITH THE PRATIHARAS.

For a long time after the Northern Indian campaign of Govinda III, the Rāṣṭrakūta, Bengal enjoyed immunity from Gurjara invasions. The Rāṣṭrakūtas had barred the Gurjaras so effectively in their desert country, that for the next two or three generations, the Gurjara kings were obliged to remain content with their former boundaries. It was not till the reign of the Gurjara Emperor Bhoja I, Mihira or Ādivarāha, that we hear of a Gurjara invasion of Bengal. After his succession to the throne, Devapāla was engaged in several lengthy campaigns, and pushed his conquests as far as the Himalayas in the North and the Vindhya Hills in the South:—

Bhrāmyadbhir = vijaya-krameṇa karibhiḥ svāṃ = eva Vindhy-āṭavām = uddāma-
plavamāṇa-vāṣpa-payaso dṛṣṭāḥ punar = bāndhavāh. Kambojēsu ca yasya vāji-
yuvabhīr = dhanāst-āνyārāj-āujaso heśa-mīśrita hari-heśita-ravāh kāntāś-ciram
viśiṭāḥ.—II.—19-20.¹

He met with considerable success in his wars, and we find a corroboration of this statement in an inscription incised at the request of the grandson of his minister, Darbhapāṇi Miśra. The Badal pillar inscription records that “By his (Darbhapāṇi’s) policy the illustrious prince Devapāla made tributary the earth as far as Revā’s parent, whose pile of rocks is moist with the rutting juice of elephants, as far as Gauri’s father, the mountain which is whitened by the rays of Īśvara’s moon, and as far as the two oceans, whose waters are red with the rising and the setting of the sun”:—

Ā Revā-janakaṇā = matangaja-madastimyac-chila-saṅghaler = ā-gaurī-pitur = īśvar
endu-kiranaḥ puṣyat = sitimno gireḥ,
Marttaṇḍas-tamay-oday-āruṇa-jalād-ā-vārīraśi-dvayān = nityā yasya bhuvam cakārā
karadām Śrī-Devapālo nrpaḥ.—verse 5.²

In the very same inscription another verse refers to the campaigns of the same king and mentions the names of his antagonists in detail. This verse has been assigned to Vigrahapāla I by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstri,³ but in my humble opinion it refers to the king Devapāla, for the simple reason that the verse referring to Śūrapāla, the next king after Devapāla, according to the Badal pillar inscription, is placed after it. According to this inscription both Darbhapāṇi and his grandson Kedāramiśra were the contemporaries of Deva-

pāla. Somesvara, the son of Darbhapāṇi and the father of Kedāramiśra, was

most probably a general. Kedāramiśra continued as minister under Śūrapāla I or Vigrahapāla I, and his son Guravamiśra was the minister of Nārāyaṇapāla. The second verse in the Badal pillar inscription about the campaigns of Devapāla runs as follows:

\[\text{Utuklit-otkala-kulam hṛta-hūna-garvam kharvēkṛta-dravida-gurjāranaśtha-dar-ppam,} \]
\[\text{Bhū-pitham=abdhi-raśan=ābharaṇamvubhoja Gaudeśvaras=ciram=upāsa dhi-} \]
\[\text{yam yadiyām—verse I3.} \]

"Attending to his (Kedāramiśra's) wise counsel the lord of Gauḍa long ruled the sea-girt earth, having eradicated the race of the Utkalas, humbled the pride of the Hūṇas, and scattered the conceit of the rulers of Dravida and Gurjara."

The invasion of Utkala is a new point, but the fight with the Hūṇas perhaps is the same as that with the Kambojas referred to in the Devapāla, his wars. Monghyr grant. We know from an independent source that there was a war with the Drāvidas, i.e. the Rāṣtrakūṭas. In the Nilgund inscription Amoghavarṣa I, it is stated that he was "worshipped by the lords of Vaiṅga, Aṅga, Magadha, Mālava and Veṇgi":—

\[\text{Ari-nṛpati-makuṭa-ghaṭṭita-caranas=sakala-bhuṇava-vandita-sauryyāhī.} \]
\[\text{Vaiṅg-āṃga-Magadha-Mālava-Vemgiśair=arccīto=tiśayadhavaloḥ. 7-8.} \]

Amoghavarṣa I seems to have been the contemporary of Devapāla as we know that his father Govinda III was of Dharmanapāla. The first three names: Vaiṅga, Aṅga and Magadha, must refer to one and the same kingdom as we know from inscriptions that Vaiṅga, Aṅga and Magadha were under Devapāla, viz. the Monghyr grant and the Ghosrawan inscription. The Rāṣtrakūṭa invasion was most probably over within a very short time, like those under the predecessors of Amoghavarṣa I, and at its close, in spite of the reverses, Devapāla was left master of Northern India. The war with the Gurjara was either followed by the invasion of Amoghavarṣa I, or itself followed that. In either case it is quite clear that the Gurjara king Rāmabhadra suffered this reverse at the hands of this king of Bengal, for neither in the Gurjara copper-plate grants nor in their stone inscriptions are any victories assigned to him.

During the reign of Devapāla, a Brāhmaṇa named Viḍadeva, an inhabitant of Nagarahāra, came on a pilgrimage to the Mahābodhi and paid a visit to the Yaśovarmanmapura Vihiṇā. During his stay in Magadha, Devapāla heard of him and he was made the principal abbot of Nālandā. The Monghyr grant was issued to record the grant of a village named Mēṣika, in the Krīmīlā Viṣaya, and the Śrī-nagara bhūkti, to a brāhmaṇa named Vihekarāta, of the Aupamanyava gotra and the Āśvalāyana Śakha, in the 33rd year of the king. The dītaka of the grant was the king's son Rājyapāla. There is a vast mass of MSS. literature

---

in Bengal recording the descent of Brähmaṇas. For the most part these MSS. are carelessly copied and hardly reliable, save for the names and descent of Brähmaṇas. These records are said to contain historical allusions. Devapāla is mentioned in one of these genealogical works, the old Kārikā of Hari-Miśra-Ghaṭaka. But it is quite possible that the name is a modern interpolation, added to prove the authenticity of the work. The śloka itself as quoted by Babu Nagendra Nātha Vasu runs as follows:—

Kṣāṭpāla-pratībhūr-bhuvah patīr-abhūd Gaṇade ca rāṣṭre tataḥ.
Rājā-bhūt pravalaḥ sadaiva ṣaṇanah Śrī-Devapālas = tataḥ.

The Prince Rājyapāla was made a Yuvarāja before the grant of the copper-plate in the 33rd regnal year, but he must have died during the lifetime of his father as we find that the king Devapāla was succeeded by Vigrahapāla I, the son of his cousin Jayapāla and the grandson of Vakpāla, the younger brother of Dharmapāla. In the Badal pillar inscription, the next king after Devapāla is named Śūrapāla. But these two names belong to one and the same person as we shall have to see later on. In the Monghyr grant the date is given as the 33rd regnal year, but according to Tārānātha, Devapāla is said to have reigned forty-eight years. This is most probably incorrect, though we find that both Darbhapāṇi and his grandson Kedāramiśra were his ministers and contemporaries. Devapāla’s successor was Vigrahapāla I or Śūrapāla I, whose father Jayapāla had led the expedition against the king of Utkala or Orissa at the request of his cousin and conquered Prāgjyotisa for him. Vigrahapāla I is no doubt the same as the Śūrapāla mentioned in the Badal pillar inscription because it is the only name mentioned between Devapāla and Nārāyaṇapāla, and again in the Bhagalpur grant, Vigrahapāla’s name is the only one mentioned between Devapāla and Nārāyaṇapāla. Moreover in the Manahali grant of Madanapāla we do not find the name of Śūrapāla before or close to the name of Nārāyaṇapāla. Had there been a different prince of the name of Śūrapāla, his name would surely have been mentioned in it as that inscription contains almost all the names of the Pāla dynasty. Only two small inscriptions of Śūrapāla I have been discovered as yet. Both of them are dated in the second year of this king and record the erection of images at the Vihāra in Uddāṇapura by an old Buddhist monk named Pūrṇadāsa. These two inscriptions have been assigned to Śūrapāla II on palaeographical grounds by Prof. Nīmoni Chakravartti but that is hardly tenable, as inscriptions of Mahipāla I and Rāmapāla are written in Proto-Bengali character and it is hardly possible that the inscriptions of Rāmapāla’s brother should be written in the acute-angled form of Nagari characters. The name of the Vihāra was read by Prof. Chakravartti as Uddāṇacuṭa, but in reality it is Uddāṇapura. Uddāṇapura is the ancient name of the modern town of Bihar.

---

is mentioned as Adwand Bihar in the Tabaqat-i-Nasiri of Minhaj-ud-din\(^1\) and as Uddandapura in another mediaeval inscription in the town of the Gaya in Bengal.\(^2\) The Tibetan historian Lama Taranatha mentions it as Otantapura,\(^3\) which is the nearest approach to the Sanskrit Uddandapura. Śūrapāla I or Vigrahapāla I married Lajjādevi, the daughter of the Haihaya king of Tripuri.\(^4\) Vigrahapāla’s father, Jayapāla, was a Hindu by inclination, as after his father Vak-pāla’s death he is said to have performed the funeral ceremony according to Hindu rites. Umāpati, a learned Brahmaṇa of Kānjivīlī, is said to have got the Mahādāna on that occasion. The fact is recorded in a commentary on the Chandogaparīṣṭa named Parisiṣṭa-prakāśa by Umāpati’s grandson, Nārāyaṇa:—

*Kṣmāpālaj = Jayapālatalah sa hi Mahāsraddham prabhutam.*

Mahādānam c-arthi-gau = ārhaṇ = ārdhra-hydahāyaḥ prayagīhitr punyavān.—verse 8.\(^5\)

The name of the village where Umāpati lived is given as Kānjivindā in the 2nd verse, but it is clearly a mistake for Kanjivīlī, the name of a well-known town. Nothing is known about the other relatives of this king, besides his son Nārāyaṇapāla who succeeded him. The votive inscriptions mentioned above were incised in the 2nd year of the king and most probably Vigrahapāla I or Śūrapāla I had a very short reign.

Nārāyaṇapāla succeeded to the throne in very troublesome times. The Gurjaras, after their long confinement in the desert, were issuing again for the conquest of Northern India, and this time they were destined to succeed and to make Mahodaya or Kānyakubja their capital. Bhoja I succeeded his father Rāmabhadrā and at the beginning his kingdom seems to have consisted of the ancestral lands of the Gurjara-Prathāras. Step by step Bhoja advanced towards the North. Kanauj or Mahodaya became his capital as several of his grants were issued from that place. It is not known from whom the Gurjara king wrested Kanauj, and it may be that it was taken either from the Pālas or one of their contemporaries. Nothing is known about the state of Uttarāpatha or Northern India about this time, but it is certain that the Pālas lost much of their territorial possessions during this period. Bhoja I invaded Bengal and defeated the king disastrously. The war with Bengal is mentioned in his Gwalior inscription:—

*Yasya vairi bhṛd = bangān = dahataḥ kopa-vahīṇā.*

Pratāpad = arṇnasām rāsin = pātur = vyaitṛṣṇam = avabhau.—verse 21.\(^6\)

This invasion must have taken place late in the reign of Bhoja I, as it must have taken him some time to be seated on the throne, advance towards Kanauj, conquer it and then invade Magadha and Vaṅga. The invasion is recorded in another Pratihāra inscription found at Māndor in Jodhpur. Kakkuka, whose brother Bauka’s

---

\(^1\) Tabaqat-i-Nasiri (Bib. Ind.), p. 491.  
\(^3\) Ibid.  
The inscription is dated Vikrama Samvat 918 = 861 A.D., states that his father Kakka gained fame in a fight with the Gaudas at Mudgagiri:—

Tatotpī Śrīyutasah Kakkaḥ puttro jāto mahamatiḥ.
Yaśo Mudgagiraḥ labdhah, yena Gaudaiḥ samām rāyo.—verse 24.1

Kakka seems to have accompanied Bhoja in his expedition against Bengal. As his son Bauka was alive in 861 A.D.,2 Bhoja I and Kakka must have invaded Bengal a few years earlier, and this invasion must have taken place during the earlier years of Nārāyaṇapāla.

The statements of the Gwalior inscription of Bhoja I and the Mandar inscription of the Pratihāra Kakkuka lead one to believe that there was a great war between the first Pratihāra Emperor Bhoja I and the Pāla Emperor Vigrāhapāla I or Nārāyaṇapāla of Gauda and Vanga. This fact coupled with the discovery at least of three inscriptions mentioning the reign of the Emperor Mahendrapāla, the son of Bhoja I, in Magadhā of Southern Bihar and one copper-plate in Tirhut, proves that the Province of Magadhā was for a time added to the vast Empire of the Pratihāras, either during the war of Bhoja I or after it.

We have positive evidence of the fact that the city of Gayā was in the possession of Nārāyaṇapāla up to the seventh year of his reign, because in that year a man named Bhaṇḍadeva erected a monastery for ascetics in that city. Up to the seventeenth year of Nārāyaṇapāla, Mudgagiri was in his possession as his grant was issued from that place in that year. From this grant we learn that at least a part of Tirabhūkti or Mithilā continued to be in the possession of Nārāyaṇapāla.3 The Pratihāra Kakka most probably gained renown during the siege of the famous fort of Mudgagiri or Mungir.

It appears that during the long reigns of Amoghavarṣa I and Bhoja I,—and they were to some extent contemporaries,—the Gurjaras had not come into collision with the Rāṣṭrakūtas. In the Sirur and Nilgund inscriptions of Amoghavarṣa I, that monarch claims to have been worshipped by the kings of Vanga, Aṅga, Magadhā, Mālava and Vengi:—

Ari-nṛpati-makuta-ghaṭṭita-caraṇas = sakalā bhuvana bandita sauryyaḥ.
Vāṅg-Aṅga-Magadha-Mālava-Vengiśair = arccito = tiṣayadhvalah.4

—verse 6 Nilgund inscription and verse 5 Sirur inscription.5

The kings of Vanga, Aṅga and Magadhā were most probably one and the same person, one of the Pālas, either Vigrāhapāla I or Nārāyaṇapāla. Amoghavarṣa I must have invaded Magadhā and Vanga through Orissa, or otherwise he must have come into conflict with the Gurjaras who were then occupying most of Northern India, but of this no record has been discovered up to date.

But as we have seen above, the Gurjaras succeeded in annexing Magadhā and most probably Tirabhūkti or Tirhut permanently to their dominions and succeeded in keeping them till the rise of the Cedis under Karnaṇadeva, when Mahipāla I

annexed Magdha to his territories. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion was not a lasting one, like the previous ones, and, at the close of the war, the Gurjara-Pratihāras re-occupied Magdha.

According to the Bhagalpur grant, up to the seventeenth year of the king Mudgagiri was in his occupation. After that nothing is known about him. He was succeeded by his son Rājyapāladeva. The names of the other relations of the king are not known. The earliest record of Nārāyaṇapāla is the Gaya inscription of the seventh year. This is at present in the courtyard of the Viṣṇupāda temple in Gaya City. Its discovery was announced by the late Sir Alexander Cunningham in his reports, with a drawing. As this inscription has never before been properly edited, I edit it from the original:

1. Om nama Purusottamāya namaḥ\| Om jayati jagati nāthak prasphurac=cārimūrtir = jagad-arī-vinihantā Śri-mad = eko murāris=tadānu-munu-jiṇoyad[ī]m śhira-samkleśa-rāṣiṁ śphura-

2. -d=ama-guṇayāṁ dhīyāṇa-vṛttān sthirātmā || Prodhwīlātī-darpā-pravala-mana-samṛśa-hetu-svabhāvat Kṛtvā-ātana-nārāsināṁ sphūṭa-vikala-saṭam rūpam = atya-utra-rāudram ye-

3. -n=odīrṇaṁ pṛthiyāṁ khara-nakha-karahārī=bhēdito daityarājakaḥ Śri-māṁ= lokaikanātho bhūvana-hila-vidhītā pātu yuṣmāṁ=sā viṣṇuḥ || Śri-māṁ= aśeṣa-śubha-sambhūtā-cāru-mūṁ-

4. -rītiḥ bhadraṁ sunirmmala-dhiyāṁ pravaro Śrīgrāhā (?) \| Prāptodayādīta kule sukṛti vabhūva yo Vāmadeva iti sarvva-jagat = pṛthāḥ || Tasy = ālmajāḥ pṛja-tamo viduṣāṁ samā-

5. -sit yam Sibadevam-iti vandhu-jano jukhāva [1] Tasyābhavat = suṭavaro varadharma-vṛttīḥ samśmaṇo gurujiṣvāṁ = api V appadevaḥ || Sarvavṛtha-siddhikarav-aika- 

6. -ndaryā-garbha-rucir-āmala-rūpa-saṃpati patni ca tasyā kamal = eva sādā pṛaṣṭā 

khyātā bhavaj = jagati Vallabhadeva = at = iṣṭā || Tābhyāṁ = ajanyāṁ = ajāyata 

suto-mala-


vraja-saṅgata-srīḥ yo Bhāṇḍadeva iti pūrvavāṁ = iha pṛṭīṭāṁ || Vidyul = lolām 

kṣaṇa-parīṇāṁ

8. samśrītānāṁ viditvā jannottṛāsād = amala-bhūvana prāptum = abhyudgatena [1] 

yen = āty = arthāṁ sukṛta-matibhīṣe = sevite dhīyāṇa-mārgge ceto-nyastam [suv]īma- 

lalamam jñānam = āsādānaṁ-

9. -ya || Ten-anēka-dvija-jana bhūvi prema-vṛttīyā Gayāyāṁ Śrī-mād = esā yatiṣu 

vīhitā [b] sad-guṇ-āvāsā-vasāḥ jñātāṁ śreya yad = amala-gunaṁ vrahma-cāryāśra- 

meyāya tenā-

10. stvataj = jagad = amalinām kṛṣṇa-samkleśa-rāṣiṁ || Cātur-vidyānam-samastam prasa- 

mita-kalāsāṁ vrahma-saṁnyasta-vṛttim Śrīmānam sat = kriyātāṁ pṛthita- 

pṛthu-gunaṁ pṛthibhāya-

---

1 Cunningham, Arch. Surv. Rep., Vol. III, p. 120, No. 6, pt. XXXVI.
THE PÁLAS OF BENGAL.

II. -ty-cṣa mānum Bhuyāl=lokos mita-śrīk para-kṛta-sukṛtaṁ pālane rākṣane ca tat =
kvartāvam bhavadbhiḥ shiravamala-guṇah syānvivaya-yathāyam || Sad =vṛtt-
=āmala-vṛ-

12. -tibhiḥ spuṭataram jātādaraṁ sarvataḥ sarvān =etā[n] bhāvīna[k] pārthivendrā
bhūyo bhūyo jācaty =cṣa mānum sāmān =oṣam dharmma-ṣet ur =nārāṇ [ām] kāle
kāle pā-

13. -lauyo bhavadbhiḥ [||] Vāyāganārya-vahis=taṇḍhana-janaiḥ sthātavyam =utr =
āśrame || Ity =etā =vratadhārībhīr =niyamām bhuyād =yathā-nāyanāthā ; Kart-
tāvam tad =ih =āmalaṁ pri-

14. -yatamair=vipraṁ=Gaya-vāsibhiḥ [||] Sphuratu kārtir =iyam guṇa-śalinī sakula
-satva-hit-odaya-hetave tapati yāvad =ayam bhuvibhūṣakarā himaka-

15. -reva sah=āmala-dādhitik , Śrī-Narayanapāladeva iti praṭip-odayo bhūpatiṁ
bhūto bhūmi bhūja[m] sīrobind-āmala yasy-oṣita[m] sāsanam rājūnas=ta-

16. -SYA guṇ-āmalaṁsa mahataḥ samwatamsaaptaṁ Vaiśākhyām subha-śambhṛtena
vidhīna labdhā praśṭhītā-ṃaṇaḥ.

The language of the inscription is very incorrect Sanskrit, like that of the Buddhist
Sanskrit manuscripts of Nepal, and the record itself has been very carelessly incised.
The purpose of the inscription is to record the erection of a monastery for Brāhma-
ical ascetics by a man named Bhāṇḍadeva in the seventh year of the king Nārāya-
apāladeva, in the month of Vaiśākha. It opens with an invocation to Viṣṇu, in his
Man-lion (Narasirha) incarnation and curiously enough it is at present outside the
small temple of Narasirha, in the courtyard of the Viṣṇupāda temple, which, as we
shall see later on, was certainly built during the reign of Nayapāladeva. It may
mean however that the small temple of Narasirha was built by Bhāṇḍadeva near
the monastery and was rebuilt during the time of Nayapāladeva. The genealogy of
the builder is given as follows:—

VĀMADEVA,
married Vallabhadevi,
| SIHADEVA,
| VAPPADEVA,
| BHĀΝḌADEVA.

Another small inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla was found by Pandit Vinoda Vihāri
Vidyavinoda of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, in the Inscription gallery of that
Museum. He has published it in the journal of the Vāngiya Śaḥitya Parishad.1
It is incised on a long piece of carved stone, probably the portion of a pedestal.
Most probably it came with the other sculptures from the Bihār Museum founded by
Mr. Broadley, when that collection was shifted to Calcutta, according to the direc-

tions of the Government of Bengal. There is no record about it in the Office of the Indian Museum. I edit it from an excellent inked impression made for me by Babu Hari Das Datta, of the Archaeological Survey, Eastern Circle, at the order of the late Dr. T. Bloch.

(1) Om Samvat 9 Vaiśākha Śūdi 5 Paramēśvara-Śrī-Nārāyaṇapāladeva-rājya
Andhra-vaiśāyika Śākya-bhikṣu-sthavira-Dharmmamitrasya

(2) ād = atra punyam tud = bhavatv-ācāry = opādhyāya-mātā-pitr-pūrvaāṅgamam
kṛtvā sakala-satva-rāṣer = anuttara-jñāna-prāpta iti ||

It records the erection of an image in the ninth year of the king Nārāyaṇapāla, in the month of Vaiśākha, by a Buddhist Elder, named Dharmmamitra, an inhabitant of the Andhra country.

The Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāladeva was issued when the king was staying at Mudgagiri and records the grant of the village of Makuṭikā to the temple of Siva at Kalaśapota, which was situated in the Kakṣa viṣaya, of Tirabhūkti, thus proving that up to that time Tirabhūkti or modern Tirhut was under the Pāla kings. The Dūtaka of this grant was the Bhaṭṭa Pūṇyakīrtti, otherwise named Guravamīśra, who erected the Garuda-stambha at Badal. The other inscription is not dated. It was incised to record the erection of a stone monolith surmounted by an image of Garuda by the Bhaṭṭa Guravamīśra, the minister of the king. According to this inscription Guravamīśra was the minister of Nārāyaṇapāla, his father Kedāramīśra that of Śūrapāla, and Devapāla, his grandfather Someśvara, a general, and his great-grandfather Darbhapāṇi, the minister of Devapāla, while his great-great-grandfather Garga was the minister of Dharmmapāla. The synchronism is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pāla Emperors.</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Gopāla I,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Dharmanāpāla,</td>
<td>Vākpāla,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Devapāla.</td>
<td>Jayapāla,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śūrapāla I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV or Vigrahapāla I,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Nārāyaṇapāla.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nothing is known about Nārāyaṇapāla's son Rājyapāla, who succeeded him, save that he married the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess Bhāgyadevi, the daughter of Tuṅga, most probably the same as the Tuṅga Dharmmāvaloka, whose inscription at Mahabodhi was published by the late Dr. Rajendra Lalā Mitra in his Buddha-Gaya. The verse about the marriage of Rājyapāla is to be found in the Bangarh grant of Mahipāla I, Amgachi grant of Vigrahapāla III and the Manahali grant of Madanapāla.

1 Buddha-Gaya, p. 195, pl. XL.
We learn from the position of the Badal pillar that the *Varendri* or Northern Bengal was included in the kingdom of Nārāyaṇapāla, and after the loss of Magadha and Tirabhūkti his son must have succeeded to a very small principality which was situated either in Rādhā (Western Bengal) or in the Vaṅga (Eastern Bengal) as we know from later records that about this time a Mongolian tribe invaded Northern Bengal through modern Sikkim or Bhutan and occupied Gauḍa. Later on we shall see that Gauḍa was in the occupation of Mongolians in the Śaka year 888 = 966 A.D. So the invasion must have taken place some fifty or hundred years earlier. These Mongolians are named Kāmbojas in a Sanskrit inscription. In the Mungir grant of Devapāla and the Badal pillar inscription, Devapāla is said to have fought the Kāmbojas, but this may refer to the Western Kāmbojas. The Mongolian or Kāmboja invasion of Northern India must have taken place just after Nārāyaṇapāla as no Pāla records have been found in Northern Bengal till the accession of Mahipāla I.

Magadha was annexed by the Gurjara-Pratihāras to their dominions, and after Nārāyaṇapāla we find the names of the Gurjara princes in the votive inscriptions of Magadha. For a long time scholars have been at a loss to assign a place to a king named Mahendrapāla, several of whose inscriptions have been found in the Gayā District. All along he has been considered to be one of the Pālas of Bengal. The late Dr. F. Kielhorn also thought that he was one of the Pālas, and mentions him in a footnote in his list of the Pāla kings of Bengal.¹ Mr. V. A. Smith, in his recent article on the Pālas of Bengal, goes so far as to assert that he was the successor of Govindapāla, whose inscriptions are dated Vikrama Samvat 1232 and 1235, i.e. 1175 and 1178 A.D.² Mahāmahopādhyāya Haras Prasād Śastri thinks that Mahendrapāla may have belonged to the Pāla dynasty.³ Two inscriptions of this king are definitely known to have been discovered in the Gayā District. One of these were found at Rām-gayā, on the other side of the river Phalgu, just opposite the temple of Gadādhar at Gayā, while the other was found at Guneriya, a village near the Grand Trunk Road. Major Kittoe spoke of a third inscription of this king, but of that we shall have to speak later on. The first of the inscriptions of this king, the one at Rām-gayā, was examined by the late Sir Alexander Cunningham, and the first line was deciphered by him. According to him, the record is incised on the pedestal of the figures of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. Following Cunningham’s description, the image was at last found in the walls of a modern temple of Śiva at Rām-gayā, and after great difficulties, a clear impression was secured. It was evident even at the first sight that the record was considerably older than the inscriptions of Govindapāla, Rāmapāla or even Mahipāla I. The figures of the ten avatāras are now completely hidden by whitewash, but the pedestal has been cleared of it, and it was found that the record had been incised on the right half of it. Acute-angled characters of the ninth century A.D. had been used in it, and on no account can it be placed later than the tenth century. As the record has only been partially edited before, I take the opportunity of placing it on record:

(1) Om Samvat 8 | Śri-Mahindrapāla | rājyābhiṣe-
(2) -ka | Saūdi Riṣi putra Sahadevasya.

"Om, the year 8 (from) the coronation of Mahindrapāla. (The gift) of Sahadeva, the son of the Riṣi (Ṛṣi) Saūdi (Sauri)."

Mahendrapāla, in the ninth or tenth centuries A.D., immediately suggests the name of the son of Bhoja I, the great Pratihāra Emperor Mahendrapāladeva. A comparison with the Asni inscription of Mahipāla confirmed me in the opinion that no other person than the great Pratihāra monarch was being referred to. The forms of P and J are very much similar to those used in Asni inscription and the Ghosrawan inscription of Devapāla. Moreover, the form of the name is identical with that used in the Asni inscription, where we find the name as Mahindrapāla, and not Mahendrapāla as in other inscriptions. Dr. Fleet read this name as Mahiṣapāla.' I saw a beautiful impression of this inscription in the Allahabad exibition of 1890-11, and there the name is clearly legible as Mahindrapāla. Another inscription of Mahendrapāla is to be found at Gunariya, near the Grand Trunk Road, in the Gayā District, which was brought to notice by Major Kittoe. Kittoe's drawing of the inscribed portion of the sculpture is very clear and the record can be edited from it:—

(1) Ye dharmānā hetu prabhavā hetum =teṣām ta-
(2) -thāgato hy = avadat teṣāmca yo niruddho evam vā-
(3) -di mahāśramaṇaḥ | Samvat 9 Vaiśākha.
(4) sūdi 5 Śri-Guṇa-
(5) -carita Śri-Mahindrapā-
(6) -ladevarājye devadhā-
(7) -rmmeyam . . .

Kittoe found a third inscription of this king somewhere in Bihār, but as he did not state the exact locality, it is no use searching for it. Some day it will come up as a new discovery of some one who chances to stumble on it. According to Major Kittoe this inscription was dated in the 19th year of the king:—

"One mentions the fact of the party having apostatized, and again returned to the worship of the Śākya, in the 19th year of the reign of Śri Mahendrapāladeva." There are two votive inscriptions of Mahendrapāladeva in the British Museum. One of these records the erection, most probably, of an image by a Buddhist monk named Kusuma in the ninth year of Mahendrapāla.5 The nature of the contents of the other inscription is not known, but it is dated in the second year of Mahendrapāladeva. It may be that the third inscription mentioned by Major Kittoe, has found its way, by some means or other, into the British Museum. As for the reading of the date, there need not be any difficulty about that, as Kittoe's readings are invariably faulty. So we have definite proof that in the eight and ninth years of the king Mahendrapāla, Magadha formed an integral part of the Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire, which at that time extended from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal.6

No inscriptions of Rajyapāla have been discovered as yet, and so nothing definite can be stated about the length or the events of his reign. According to the inscriptions of the later Pālas, he was succeeded by his son Gopāla II.

The British Museum possesses a Manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā written in the 15th year of Gopāla II at the monastery of Vikramaśīlā. Its colophon runs thus:

Paramesvara-paramabhaṭṭāraka-paramasaṅgata-Mahārājādhirāja-Śrī-mad-Gopālade-
vapravaradhamāna-kalyāṇa-vijaya-rajiy-etyādi samvāt 15 āśmine dine 4 Śrī-mad
Vikramaśīla-deva-vihāre likhīteyam bhagavati.¹

We possess two inscriptions of Gopāla II, and from these we learn that Magadha was temporarily recovered by the Pālas during the reign of this monarch. The first of these inscriptions was discovered by the late Sir Alexander Cunningham, at Bargaon in the Patna District, the ancient Nalanda.² It records the fact that an image of the goddess Vagisvari, at Nalanda, was covered with gold leaf by some unnamed personage in the first year of Gopaladeva.³ The second inscription was discovered amidst the ruins of the Mahābodhi temple at Bodh-Gaya and records the erection of image of Buddha by a person named Śakrasena during the reign of Gopaladeva, no year being mentioned. These inscriptions prove that some time during the reign of Gopāla II, South Bihār or Magadha was temporarily occupied by the Pālas. The reason of this sudden enterprise is not far to seek. During the long reign of Amoghavarṣa I, whose certain dates extend from 817 to 877 A.D., there was no war between the Gurjaras and the Rāṣṭrakūtās.⁴ In fact the only war between Bhoja I and the Rāṣṭrakūtās was his war with the Rāṣṭrakūtās Dhruvarāja II of Gujarat some time before 867 A.D., in which Bhoja I himself was worsted.⁵ After Bhoja I, Mahendrapāla succeeded to an empire which had reached its greatest extent at that time, from Punjab to the borders of Bengal, and from the foot of the Himalayas to Saurāṣṭra.⁶ Mahendrapāla's reign was a very short one, as his certain dates range from 893 to 907 A.D. He had two wives and was succeeded by Bhoja II, his son by Dehanāgā.⁷ Most probably there was some dispute about his succession, which may have been contested by his half-brother Mahipāla II. Bhoja II was assisted to the throne by the Cedi Emperor Kokkalla I, which is referred to in the Bilhari inscription:

Jitvā kṛṣṇam yena pṛthvīm = apuruṣa-kirtti-stambha-dvandvam = āropyate sma,
Kaumuhor-bhavyāndiśyasau Kṛṣṇarājach Kauryeyān = ca Śrī-nidhir-Bhojadevaḥ—verse 17.⁸

We find a corroboration of this statement in the Benares grant of the Cedi Emperor Karkadeva:

Bhoja Vallabharāje Chitrakūla-bhūpāle,
Śaṅkaragane ca rājani yasy = āśid = abhayadaḥ pāniḥ—verse 7.⁹

So the Cedi Emperor also set up the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa II, whose surname was Vallabharāja, on the throne of his father Amoghavarṣa I. Kṛṣṇa II defeated the Gurjaras and at the same time led an invasion into Bengal:—

\[ Tasy = \text{ottarjjīta-Gurjaro hṛta-haṭa-llāt-odbhata-srimado} \]
\[ \text{Gaudānām vinaya-vratārpāna-gurus = Sāmudrā = nirdāharah,} \]
\[ \text{Dvārasth = Āṅgika-Kalinga-Gāmga-Magadhair = abhyarccit = ājīṇa = ciram sūnus = sūntavāg = bhuvāḥ parivṛṭṭa Śrī Kṛṣṇarāja-bhavat.} \]

-verse 13, Deoli plates of Kṛṣṇa III, and verse 15, Karhad plates of the same.¹

The Gurjara king defeated by Kṛṣṇarāja II seems to be Bhoja II. He was succeeded very shortly by his half-brother Mahipāla, under whom the area of the Gurījā-Pratihāra Empire became very circumscribed. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa II also had a very short reign and was succeeded by his grandson Indra III. His certain years range from 902 to 911, and as those of Bhoja II are almost the same, it is almost certain that he was the king who was defeated by Kṛṣṇa II. After the accession of Mahipāla, whose certain dates range from 914 to 917, Indra III invaded the Gurjara Empire, crossed the Yamunā, occupied Kānyakūbdha, and most probably destroyed the city.² Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has already proved that at that time Kṣitipāla or Mahipāla was the reigning sovereign at Kanauj. In this campaign, Narasimha, a feudatory of Indra III, pursued the Gurjara king Mahipāla as far as the confluence of the Ganges. Narasimha, according to the Kārṇaṭaka-Śabdānusāsana by Bhāṭṭa Kālanikadeva, “snatched from the Gurjara king’s arms the goddess of victory, whom, though desirous of keeping, he had held too loosely. Mahipāla fled as if struck by thunder-bolts, staying neither to eat nor rest, nor pick himself up, while Narasimha pursuing, bathed his horse at the junction of the Ganges and established his fame.”³ The mention of the confluence of the Ganges as the extremity of Narasimha’s pursuit of Mahipāla, without any mention of the Gauḍa king, most probably indicates that the Eastern frontier of the Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire at that time extended up to the junction of the Ganges with the Sea. This is not to be wondered at as it is now certain that Magadha formed an integral part of the dominions of Mahipāla’s father Mahendrapāla. During this war Gopāla II of Bengal may have taken the opportunity of recovering some of the traditional possessions of his family and pushed the Western frontier as far as the eastern banks of the Sone. This re-occupation of the Magadha may have been temporary, and Mahipāla may have recovered the possession of his Eastern Provinces, with the help of the Candella Yaśovarman.⁴ As no inscriptions of Gopāla’s successor Vigrahapala II have been discovered, we are not in a position to say definitely whether Magadha continued to be a province of the Pāla Empire or was re-annexed by the Gurjaras. A MS. of the Pañcarakṣa written in the 26th year of Vigrahapāladeva II is preserved in the British Museum collection: the latter part of its colophon runs thus:—

² Karṇaṭaka-Śabdānusāsana, ed. Lewis Rice, p. 26
Before closing this chapter it should be noted that about this time an independent kingdom was established in Eastern Bengal. The existence of this kingdom was made known by the discovery of two copper-plate grants of Devakhadga, the last king of this dynasty. From these copper-plate grants it is now known that the dynasty reigned for three generations:

Khaḍgodyama.

Jātakhadga.

Devakahadga.

Nothing is known about their dates save and except that the grants were issued in the thirteenth year of Devakahadga. The learned Editor of the plates has assigned them to the eighth or ninth century A.D. But on comparison with the inscriptions of the Pāla Emperors it is found that their correct date would be the first half of the tenth century A.D. These two plates are the earliest inscriptions from Eastern Bengal proper, and the record next in order was incised so late as the reign of king Lākṣmaṇasena of Bengal.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND EMPIRE.

The period which follows is entirely different in character, the principal actors having changed. The great Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire was rapidly dissolving and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings were gradually becoming weaker. Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Gurjara invasions became things of the past. New actors were appearing in the political arena. The invasion of the Great Cola Conqueror left a deep impression on north eastern India. It gave Bengal a new dynasty of kings and indirectly hastened the ruin of the Pāla Empire. After the Badal pillar inscription of Nārāyana-pāla, there is no other inscription which can throw light on the history of Northern Bengal for three generations, i.e. till the time of Mahipāla I. About this time some Mongolian tribes occupied the whole of the Northern Bengal and either massacred the old inhabitants or gradually forced them back southwards. A monolithic pillar now standing in the grounds of the place of the Mahārājas of Dinajpur bears a record of one of these Mongolian kings, who also claimed to be the lords of Gauḍa (Gauḍeśvara). At present the whole of Northern Bengal is strewn over with pre-Muhammadan ruins and so far the general theory had been, that these temples, monasteries and towns were ruined at the time of the Muhammadan occupation of the country. But recently a plausible theory has been started by Mr. Ramā Prasād Canda, B.A., on the basis of Dinajpur pillar inscription, according to which the ruin of these ancient cities of Northern Bengal should be differently interpreted. The inscription on the Dinajpur pillar was brought to notice in 1871 when it was published with a rude lithograph.¹ The late Dr. Bloch examined the inscription during one of his tours and hastily gave a reading which I am afraid cannot be supported. Mr. Canda obtained some very clear and beautiful rubbings of this inscription during one of his many visits and submitted a paper on it to the Asiatic Society of Bengal.² According to Mr. Canda, the Koch, Mech and the Palias of the present day are the descendants of the Mongolians who invaded and settled in North Bengal during the latter half of the ninth and the tenth century A.D. The inscription on the Dinajpur pillar, which forms the basis of Mr. Canda’s paper, records the erection of a temple of Śiva during the reign of a king of Gauḍa of the Kāmboja race, in the year 888 of some unspecified era. The date is expressed as a chronogram: Kuṇjara-Gaṭā-varṣena, which probably means 888. This date cannot be referred to the Vikrama era as in that case it would be equivalent to 831 A.D., which is too early to suit the characters used in this inscription. Neither can it be referred to the

Gupta era as in that case it would be equal to 1207 A.D., which is certainly too late. The Kalacuri-Cedi era has never been found to have been used in Bengal. The Śaka era suits best though it has but been sparsely used in the North-East. In that case S. 888 =966 A.D. falls just after the reign of Devapāla, the Pratihāra King of Kanauj. At that time the invaders must have settled down so that the invasion itself must have taken place some time earlier. Northern Bengal was in the undisputed possession of Nārāyaṇapāla at the time of the incision of Guravamiśra’s record. So this invasion must have taken place some time between 850-950 A.D. The irruption of these Mongolian hordes must have taken place through the Himalayas, and most probably they were dispossessed of their former homes in the hills by some other invaders. So the Pālas after Nārāyaṇapāla, i.e. Rājayapāla, Gopāla II, and Vigrahapāla II, were having a rather bad time of it with the Gurjara Empire in the West and occasional Rāṣtrakūta raids thrown in, and with Barbarian hordes advancing in untold numbers through the mountain passes of the North. No wonder that Magadha was annexed to the Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire. At the time of the invasion of Indra III, the Eastern Frontier of the Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire most probably extended right up to the modern Bhagirathi, and its confluence near Saugor Island. North Bengal must have remained in the possession of the Mongolian kings up to the end of the tenth century A.D. In the beginning of the eleventh century we find that the Pālas have recovered possession of Northern Bengal, and from this time onwards right up to the end of the second Pāla Empire, Northern Bengal continued to be in their possession. At the time of the Dinajpur inscription the Pālas seem to have been deprived of Gauda and consequently the Mongolian king became Gauḍēśvara. The name Kāmboja itself is of great interest. Thus far the Kāmbojas or Kamvojas were known to be a northern tribe who lived side by side with the Greeks in Afghanistan and the Western Punjab, as shown by the phrase “Yona-Kāmbojesu” in the XIII Rock Edict of Asoka. The occurrence of the name in a Bengal inscription does not mean that the Kāmbojas, whole or part, immigrated into Bengal from the Punjab across the whole of Northern India, because that would have been an impossibility in those days, but shows that all Mongolians were called Kāmbojas, and that people with Mongolian features crossed over into Bengal through the Northern Mountains and as Kāmbojas. They may or may not have been a part of the people who became known during the Maurya period as the Kāmbojas.

The occupation of Gauda by a barbarian tribe, at a time when the whole of Magadha was in the possession of the Gurjara, shows that the kings of the Pāla dynasty between Nārāyaṇapāla and Vigrahapāla II and Mahipāla I were kings in name only. Most probably they ruled over an insignificant kingdom surrounded by a large number of petty monarchies. The Tirumalai inscription of Rājendra Cola I shows that the ancient Gauda and Vaṅga had become divided into a large number of small kingdoms. The exact state and extent of the Pāla dominions under

---

Vigrahapāla are not known. Most probably he lost even what had belonged to Gopaḷa II as his son Mahipāla I is said to have recovered his paternal kingdom. His only recorded war seems to have been conducted in Eastern Bengal. In the Āṃgāchi and Dinājpur grants there is a verse about this:—

Deśe prācī pracura-paṇāyasi svaccham-āpiya toyam svairam bhṛantāv tad=ānu malay-opatya-kā-candanesī,
Kṛtvā sāndravis=taraṇu jaḍatāṃ sikarair =abhra-tulyāḥ prāley-ādrest katakam =
abhajan yasya senā-gajendrāḥ.—verse II Dinājpur grant of Mahipāla.¹

But this is not very certain, as in the Āṃgāchi grant of Vigrahapāla the verse is attributed to Vigrahapāla III.²

After the death of Vigrahapāla II, Mahipāla succeeded to what remained of the first Empire of the Pālas. In his Dinājpur grant he is said to have recovered the kingdom of his father:—

Hata-sakalavipākṣāḥ saṅgare vāhу-darpādam =anadhikṛta-viśputam rājyaṃ =āśādyā
pitryam
Nīhitaraṇa-padmō bhūḥṭām murdhun tasmād =abhavād =avani-pālāḥ Śrī-
Mahipāladevaḥ.³

After the recovery of his paternal kingdom, Mahipāla I must have turned his attention to the West. In his sixth year Nālanda was included in his kingdom as a manuscript copied at that place in that year of the king has been acquired for the Asiatic Society of Bengal by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstri. Magadha seems to have continued in the possession of the king for a long time. In the eleventh year of the king an image of Buddha was dedicated in or near the temple of the Mahābodhi at Bodh-Gaya, and in the same year the great temple at Nālanda was restored, as it had been burnt down in a fire. After the conquest of Magadha, Mahipāla seems to have attacked Tirabhukti or Mithilā which continued in the possession of the king at least till his 48th year. His kingdom seems to have extended as far as Benares and continued to be included in it till 1020 A.D. In that year, two persons were deputed by the king, named Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla, to execute some repairs near the Buddhist city. The state of the Gurjara kingdom of Kanauj favoured the occupation. Only a few years before it had been devastated by Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazni, and after his departure, the king Rājya-
pāladeva had been deposed and murdered by the Indian Princes for having submitted to an alien conqueror. At that time Trilocanapāla was seated on the throne of the Gurjara-Pratihāras and most probably his power did not extend beyond the con-
fluence of the Yamunā.

In spite of the victories during the earlier part of his reign, Mahipāla I suffered some very severe reverses from the time of the rise of the Cedis, under Gāngeyadeva

¹ J.A.S.B., 1892, pp. 80 & 83.
³ J.A.S.B., 1892, pp. 8–84, 11. 23–24.
and Karna-deva and the invasion of the Coḷa king Rājendra Coḷa I. The invasion of the Coḷa king took place before the 13th year of that prince, i.e. before 1025 A.D. Rājendra Coḷa earned the viruda of "Gangegonḍa" or "Gangā-vijayi" by pushing as far North as the Ganges during this raid. The Tirumalai Rock inscription of the great conqueror records the Northern Campaign in detail. It is said that the king seized the "Odda-viṣaya" which was difficult to approach. This is clearly the Odra Viṣaya of the copper-plate inscriptions of Orissa. Then he entered "Kośalainādu," i.e. the Kośala of the inscriptions of the Soma-vamśi kings of Orissa. Next in order comes the subjugation of Daṇḍabukti. The province has been identified by Mahāmahopādhivāya Hara Prasāda Śastri with the modern province of Bihar, because the ancient name of the town of Bihar was called Otantapuri by the Tibetans and Adwand Bihār by the Muhammadans. But this identification is scarcely tenable.

The place is mentioned in the Rāmacarita of Sandhyā-kaṇanandī where a person named Jayasimha is said to have been its ruler and is said to have aided Rāmapāla in his wars in Northern Bengal. This man is said to have defeated Karna-Keśari, the king of Orissa. Most probably Daṇḍabukti was the march-land between Orissa and Bengal, corresponding to the modern British districts of Midnapur and Balasore, and the man had defeated the king of Orissa in one of his expeditions against Bengal. It is more probable for a king of the march-lands to come into conflict with the king of Orissa than for the ruler of Magadhā. Moreover the order in which the names of the countries are mentioned prevents us from supposing that Bihar is the country mentioned as we shall see later on. From Daṇḍabukti the king passed on to Bengal, attacking and occupying the province of "Takkana-Lāḍam." This name has been taken to be the equivalent of "Dakṣiṇa Lāṭa" by the late Dr. Kielhorn, which is the ancient name of Southern Gujarāt. But Messrs. Hultzsch and Venkayya take it to mean "Dakṣiṇa Virāṭa" or Southern Berar. Mr. Venkayya is a great authority on Tamil, and he supposes that "the Tamil term "Ilaṭa" does not correspond to Sanskrit Lāṭa (Gujarāt) but to Virāṭa (Berar)." But nowhere did it strike the learned scholars that the order in which the countries are mentioned, prevents us from supposing that either Berar or Gujarāt is mentioned. In fact the country mentioned is Southern Rāḍhā. Mr. Venkayya will find, on re-considering the question, that Dakṣiṇa-Rāḍhā is a better equivalent for Tamil Takkana-Lāḍam than Dakṣiṇa-Virāṭa. Immediately after "Takkana-Lāḍam" we have the mention of Vaṅgāla-Deśa, which all authorities agree as being equal to Vaṅga or Eastern Bengal. No sane man would turn from Orissa to conquer Southern Gujarāt or Berar and then return to the East to conquer East Bengal.

1 Epi Ind., Vol. III, p. 323  
after which he turns back to the West to defeat Mahipāla in North Bengal and again rushes to North Gujarat or Berar to conquer it. The more natural explanation is that Rājendra Cola defeated Raṇaśūra, the ruler of Southern Rāḍhā, and then passed on through that country to invade Vaṅga. From very early times a part of Bengal has been called Rāḍhā. It occurs in a dated inscription of the Indo-Scythian period as Rārā. This inscription is at present in the Indian Museum, in Calcutta, but it was discovered in Mathurā in the United Provinces. The record mentions the erection of a Jaina image in the year 62 of the Kuśana era = 150 A.D. at the request of a Jaina monk who was an inhabitant of the country of Rārā. In comparatively modern times the name has been found on two copper-plate inscriptions:—

(I) The newly discovered grant of the Sena king Vallālasena, found at Sitāhāti, near Kāṭwā, in the Burdwan district of Bengal, where we find that the village granted, Vallāhitī, was situated in the North Rāḍhā (Uttara-Rāḍhā-mandale). The very name Uttara-Rāḍhā occurs in the Tirumalai inscription as we shall see later on. Besides this, the kings of the Sena dynasty seem to have ruled in the Rāḍhā country:—

Vamṣe tasya-ābhuyadayini sadācara-caryā-nirūṣhi-prauḍhām
Rāḍhām-akalita-carair =bhūṣayanto-nubhāvaih,
Śaśvad-viṣo-ābhaya-vitaraṇa-sthūlā-laksyavānalaksaih kirtī-ullolaih snapita-viyato jajāire rājaputrāḥ.—verse 3.

There being a Uttara-Rāḍhā we can say from immediate inference, that there was a Dakṣina-Rāḍhā, which in Tamil becomes ‘Takkana-Lāḍam.’

(2) Besides this the Kenduāpatna plates of Narasimhadeva II of Orissa, dated Śaka 1217 = 1296 A.D., show very clearly that Rāḍhā and Vārendrī were well-known names of divisions of Bengal:—

Rāḍhā-Vārendra-yavani-nayan-āṭrā-āṭrā-pūreva dūra-vinivesitakālīma-śrīh,
Tad-vipralambha-karan-ādbhuta-nistaraṅgā Gaṅgāpi nīnām-amunā Yamun= ādhun = ābhūṭ.—verse 84.

At the time of the Cola invasion a king named Raṇaśūra was ruling Southern Rāḍhā. In Bengal there is a tradition that a dynasty of kings with the affix Śūra ruled in Bengal before the Pālas. We have no reliable evidence for this. But three kings of this family, at least with the word Śūra affixed to their names, have been mentioned in epigraphs. These are: Raṇaśūra, of the Tirumalai inscription; Lakṣmīśūra, a king of a division of Bengal named Apara-Mandāra, a contemporary of Rāma-pāla, who was the headman of all feudatories of Forest lands (saṃstāṭavika-sāmanta-cakra-cudāmaṇīḥ); a man named Damaśūra, who is mentioned in a newly-discovered inscription of the time of Gopāla III, found at Manda in the Rājshāhi district of Bengal. After conquering Southern Rāḍhā, the Cola king did not proceed to subdue the northern portion of it, but on the other hand, passed eastwards towards Vaṅga,
which was then ruled by a king named Govinda-Candra. This king has been wrongly identified with a king named Govinda-Candra or Govi-Canda, about whom some songs are current in the State of Kuch-Bihar and the Rungpur district of Bengal. The king of that name mentioned in the Tirumalai inscription is expressly stated to be the King of Eastern Bengal, and so there is very little chance of identifying him with the local hero of Rungpur. After conquering Eastern Bengal, Rājendra Cola turned towards the West and faced Mahipāla, who had been rightly identified by the late Dr. Kielhorn with the Pāla king Mahipāla I, who was defeated. The inscription is so worded that one at once understands that by defeating Mahipāla, the king was able to reach "Uttira-Lāḍam" and the Ganges. Uttira-Lāḍam for the same reasons as have been stated above in the case "Takkana-Lāḍam" should be taken to be Northern Rāḍha, which is actually mentioned as a maṇḍala in the Sitāhāṭi grant of Vallālasena. Moreover there is no evidence to prove that Berar or Virāṭa was divided into two parts at any time. Again from Bengal Rājendra Cola reached Uttra-Rāḍha and after that the Ganges. It is a far cry from Berar to the Ganges, but the sacred river which added lustre to the conquest of Rājendra Cola I in the eyes of the Southern people actually forms the Northern boundary of Rāḍha. The divisions of Bengal across the great river are known as Mithilā and Varendra, the latter of which is mentioned in the Rāma-carita, and at least three copper-plates. So now it is clear that the Ganges formed the Northern boundary of the conquest of Rajendra Cola I. Curiously enough he did not attempt to cross the Ganges to the other side. The Tirumalai inscription being a Praśasti does not mention such details. But the desired details are supplied by an ancient manuscript discovered by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstrī and now in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. In 1893 the Mahāmahopādhyāya published notes on a find of ancient Sanskrit manuscripts among which was a drama named Canda-Kausīka, by Ārya Kṣemīśvara. This play was enacted before the king by his order, and it contains a verse in which the king Mahipāla I is compared with Candragupta and a people named Karṇāṭakas, to the Nandas. So this contemporary work gives the credit of defeating the Karṇāṭakas to Mahipāla I. The Karṇāṭakas seem to be the southerners who invaded Bengal under Rājendra Cola I. It appears that though Mahipāla I was defeated by Rājendra Cola when he crossed into Rāḍha from East Bengal, he prevented him from crossing the Ganges into Varendra or Northern Bengal, and so the Cola conqueror had to turn back from the banks of the Ganges. The manuscript on which Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstrī relies is not a modern one, as it was copied in 1331 A.D. The invasion of the Cola king did not change the political divisions of the country, but it left one permanent mark in the shape of a body of settlers, who occupied the thrones of Bengal and Mithilā as the Sena and Karṇāṭa dynasties during the latter days of the Pālas.

The Cola invasion took place, as has been stated above, before the thirteenth

---

year of the king, i.e. 1025 A.D. The very next year we find that the Wheel of Law at Benares is being repaired, and a new temple (Gandha-kūṭi) built by the brothers Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla under the orders of the king.

The record of these events is found in an inscription discovered amidst the ruins of Sarnāth near Benares more than a hundred years ago. It is incised on the pedestal of an image of Buddha, which is at present in the Provincial Museum at Lucknow. This image was dedicated in the Vikrama year 1083 = 1026 A.D. Very soon after this Benares was taken away from the Pālas by the Cedi Emperor of Gāngeyadeva who invaded North-Eastern India about this time and had occupied it six or seven years ago. Some time before 1881 A.D., some metal images were found near a village Imādpur in the Muzaffarpur district of Bengal, which were pronounced by Dr. Hoernle to have been dedicated in the 48th year of Mahipāladeva. As these images were found in Tirhut or Tirabhukti, it is natural to conclude that Mithila was in the possession of the Pālas up to the 48th year of Mahipāla I. But six years before the erection of the temple of Sarnath, Mithilā passed out of the hands of the Pālas. In the year 1020 A.D. Gāngeyadeva was in possession of Tirabhukti or Mithilā. A copy of the Rāmāyana copied in that year v.s. 1076 mentions Tirabhukti as being in the possession of Gāngeyadeva:

Samvat 1076 aṣāḍha badi 4 mahārajaṁdhirāja punyāvaloka-somavamsodbhava-Gau-dadhvaja-Śrīmad-Gāngeyadeva-bhūnyamāna Tirabhuktiya kalyāṇavijayarājye.

Very soon after Benares passed into the hands of the Cedis. Karnādeva, the son of Gāngeyadeva, was in possession of Benares in 1042 A.D. (Kalacuri-Cedi year 793). Tirabhukti or Mithilā was never recovered by the Pālas. The only Pāla records referring to this Province are the Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyānapāla and the Imādpur image inscription of Mahipāla I.

Mahipāla I was succeeded by his son Nayapāla, who is called Nyāyapala on the authority of some unpublished record, by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śastri. According to Tārānātha, Mahipāla reigned for fifty-two years, which is most probably correct as the Imādpur images were dedicated in the 48th year of the king. Of the relations of the king we only know the names of the brothers Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla, who were most probably nearly related to him besides his son Nayapāla. The long reign of Mahipāla I is very fruitful in inscription and manuscript records. The earliest of these is the manuscript of Astasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, now in the University Library at Cambridge. The colophon runs thus:

Parameswara paramabhaṭṭaraka-paramasangata-mahārajaṁdhirāja Śrīman-Mahipāladeva pravarddhamāna-vijayarājye samvat 5 Āśvina Kṛṣṇe.
The date next in order is to be found in a manuscript of the same work, collected by Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasada Sastri, for the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The reading of the colophon as revised by the late Dr. Theodor Bloch runs as follows:—


This colophon proves that in the sixth year of Mahipāla Nālandā was in his possession, and thus a part at least of Magadha was included in his dominions. Next in order comes an inscription incised on the pedestal of an image of Buddha, in the attitude of touching the earth (Bhūmisparśa mudrā). This image is now being worshipped as one of the five Pāṇḍus, in a small shrine just in front of the entrance of the great temple at Bodh-Gayā. The inscription consists of three lines, in an imperfect state of preservation, the first part of each line having lost a number of letters. It is dated in the eleventh year of the reign of Mahipāla, presumably the first, as the letters still show signs of acute angles at their lower extremities. It has been referred to by Cunningham.2 The text runs:—

1. Deya-dharmmoyam .............. tad-bhavatv = acary = opādhāya-mātā-pitr-purāṇgamam kṛtvā sakala-satva-rāser = anuttara-jñāna = avāptaya iti. | Mahā-
2. [rājādhīrāja-Paramesvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraṇa-Paramasauagata-Śrī-mān = Mahipāladeva-pravardhamāna-vijayarājye kādaśāme svamatsare abhiśikhya-māne]
3. .............. pañcamayān = tithau gandha-Kūṭi-dvaya-sahitā. ........ karitāv = iti.

The name of the donor of the two temples (Gandha-Kūṭidvaya) and the image is unfortunately lost. As the name of the month in this inscription is illegible it is impossible to state whether it was incised before or after Balāditya’s Nālandā inscription of the same year which has been placed next in order. This inscription was discovered by Broadley among the ruins of the great Vihāra at Nālandā where it was found on a door-jamb. According to this inscription the great temple at Nālandā was restored after being burnt down by a man named Balāditya, a Jyāvīsa of Telāçhaka (modern Telara) who had emigrated from Kausūmī, in the eleventh year of Mahipāladeva.3

The restoration of the Great Vihāra at Nālandā.

The conquest of Northern Bengal must have taken place some years earlier. In his ninth year Mahipāla granted the village of Kuraṭapallikā, with the exception of Cuṭapallikā, in the Gokalikā maṇḍala, Koṭivarṣa viṣaya of the Pauṇḍravarddhana bhukti to a Brāhmaṇa named Kṛṣṇādityaśarman. It has been proved by another inscription, the Maṇḍhali grant of Madanapāla, that the Koṭivarṣa viṣaya was situated in Northern Bengal, as both inscriptions have been discovered in the Dinājpur district. An inscription incised on the pedestal of a colossal image of Budha, still in situ, at Tetrawan, an ancient site six miles from Bihār in the Patna District of Bengal, contains the name of Mahipāla, the rest having become illegible. Most probably it was dedicated during the reign of Mahipāladeva. The images discovered at Imādpur in the Muzaffarpur district of Bengal in 1881 were most probably dedicated in the 48th year of Mahipāla I, as Mahipāla II had a very short reign. The 48th year of Mahipāla I must have fallen before 1020 A.D., as in that year the Cedi Emperor Gāngeyadeva was in possession of Tirabhukti or Tirhut. The last inscription of Mahipāla is the Sarnath inscription of the Vikrama year 1083. This inscription was either posthumous, or incised when the city of Benares had passed from the hands of the Pālas to those of the Cedis. The repair of the Wheel of Law and the building of the temple seem to have begun some time before and the work was completed either after Mahipāla’s death or in his last year, when he had lost Benares and Tirhut. Mahipāla was succeeded by his son Nayapāla, called Nyāyapāla by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Praśāda Śastri, on some unknown authority. His minister’s name was Vāmanabhaṭṭa, who is the Dūtaka of the Bangarh grant of this king called the Dinājpur grant by Dr. Kielhorn.

Nayapāla succeeded the throne of the Pālas some time between 1025—30 A.D. At that time the extent of the Pāla Empire had been considerably diminished by the loss of Benares and Tirabhukti. Gāngeyadeva was succeeded by his son Karna, who with the help of some Southerners overran the whole of Northern India. The Nāgpur praśasti of Udayāditya of Mālava speaks of him as one who, joined by the Karnāṭakas, had swept over the earth like a mighty ocean:—

_Tasmin = vaśava-vandhutāṃ = upagate rājye ca kuly = ākule_
_Magnasvāmini tasya vandhur = Udayādityo-bhavat-bhūpatiḥ_
_Yen = oddhṛitya mahārṇuṇav = opama-milat = Karnaṭa-Karna-prabhun = urvīpā-lakadarhitām bhuvam = imāṁ Śrīmad-Varāhāyitam—verse 32._

According to the Bheraghat inscription of Alahanadevi, we find:—

_Pāṇḍyaś = caṇḍimatalām = munoca Muralas = tatyāja gavvva-graham_
_Kūṅgāḥ sadgatim = ajagāma cakape Vaṅgāḥ Kalingaiḥ saha,
_Kira Kiraśaṭāsa paṇijaraghye Hūnāḥ praharsāṁ jahau_
_Yasmin = rājanī Śaurya-bibhrama bharam vibhraty-apūrvva-prabhe—verse 12._

5 Ibid., p. 11.
Karṇḍadeva is said to have subdued or held in check the Pāṇḍyas, Muralas, Kuṅgas, Vaṅgas, Kaliṅgas, Kiras and Hūṇas. In the Karanbel inscription of Jayasimhadeva it is stated that Karṇa was waited upon by the Coḍa, Kuṅga, Hūṇa, Gauḍa, Gurjara and Kira princes:—

_Nicaih sañcara Coḍa-Kuṅga hīm=idad phalgu tvayā valgyate Hūṇ=āivam ranitum na yuktan=īha te tvām Gauḍa garvam=tvaja,

m=āivam Gurjara garjya Kira nibhṛto varhāsva sevā-gatān=iitham yasya mithō-virodhī-nṛpatin dvāsthō vinīṇye janaḥ._—L. II—12.

According to the Cedi inscriptions Karṇa subdued or defeated the king of Gauḍa, whoever he might be. Mr. Monmohan Cakravartti first of all pointed out mentions of a war between Nayapāḷa and the king of Karṇa. The term ‘king of Karṇa’ seems to be a translation of the Sanskrit word ‘Karnarāja,’ ‘the king Karṇa.’ The form Karnya seems to be a mistake. In his article on the Kiṣṇadvārīka temple inscription of Nayapāḷa Mr. Cakravartti has pointed out that Atiśa mediated between Nayapāḷa and the king of Karnya about the year 1035 A.D. So the Cedi Emperor Karṇadeva, who is in reality the same person as the king of Karnya of Tibetan literature, must have invaded Magadha some time before 1035 A.D. The incidents of the campaign are mentioned in Rai Śarat Candra Dās Bahadur’s article on the Life of Atiśa:—

"During Atiśa’s residence at Vajrasena a dispute having risen between the two, Nayapāḷa, king of Magadh, and the Tirthika, king of Karṇya of the West, the latter made war upon Magadhā. Failing to capture the city, his troops sacked some of the sacred Buddhist institutions and killed altogether five (men) ............ Afterwards when victory turned towards (Nayapāḷa) and the troops of Karnya were being slaughtered by the armies of Magadhā, he took the king of Karnya and his men under his protection and sent them away ............ Atiśa caused a treaty to be concluded between the two kings. With the exception of the articles of food that were destroyed at the time of war, all other things which had fallen in the hands of the parties were either restored or compensated for".

Nayapāḷa must have reigned at least fifteen years as two of his inscriptions were incised in that year. The first is the Kiṣṇa-dvārīka temple inscription, referred to above, which records the erection of a temple of Viṣṇu by a low class Brāhmaṇa named Viśvāditya, the son of Śūdraka and the grandson of Paritoṣa, in the fifteenth year of king Nayapāḷadeva. The verses were composed by a veterinary named Sahadeva and the engraving was done by the artisan Saṭṭasoma, son of Adhipasoma. The second inscription was discovered by Mr. Paramesvar Dayāl, then Court of Wards Head Clerk in Gayā, in 1884, inside the small temple of Narasimha in the Viṣṇupāḷa compound. It was pointed out by him to Mr. Cakravartti, and to the late Dr.
But as this inscription has never been properly edited I am taking this opportunity of transcribing it:—

1. Om Lakṣmīs=ciraī=Jayati vārī-viśer-aneka-manthā-kulād-adhigātā ṕuru-śottamasaya ś Suhiyat=tirovalā-sammad ghūrṇamāṇa-netrāvalokana niras-ta-samasta vighnā

2. S=eyam vraha-purī Gay=eti jayati khyāta svayaṃ vedhasā sthānam brahmavī-ḍām pr=iva ghaṭitā mokṣasya saukhyasya ca vruṃkhi kī=ṣ ca bhavanti yatra pitarah pṛetā-


4. nāma viṣṇu-rathavād dvijārājavyaḥ prītya satām ca Parītoṣa iti prasiḍḍāḥ Tasmād=viśher=iva vabhūva sanatkumārah Śrī Śudrako vimala-vuddir=ane-kavidyaḥ

5. Bhūy-ṣūre yena vidhīn=aiwa kṛtā Gay=eyam vāhvor-valena suciram paripālita ca Tasmād=ajayata sutaḥ sutavād=dvijānām yo-bhūt suvismaya-rāṣāvahakartaka-.

6. ś=ca Viṣṇu-pākāraka-nirākṛtaye-vatīrṇaḥ Śrī Viśvarūpa iti kirtitā viṣvarū-pāḥ Yām prāpya c=ārthijana-vṛndam-akalpā-dānam =āpurbhavat ' pulaka-jālam—ana-

7. -nta-modam Śūṣṭi-sphurad=dhanā-kṛtārthataya durāpa-cintāmaṇi-graṇhākam na kādāpi dadhmān Yen=āsuṇrī-caritena mahodayena yanti rasatalam-ivāvani.

8. -r=uddhi-r-eyam Śūṣṇa-mad-Gayā-kāli-malā-dvija-rāja-paśa-samkṣobha-kampitā- tum=bhuja-vikramena Yasmai viśuddha-caritāya nisagraḳ-sauryarāṣī-priyāya vi-

9. -nay-āmala-bhūṣanāya avāyataḥ prabhṛti diva-manusya-loko vadhāṇjaliṣ=citra- taram spṛhayām cakāra u Ten=emaṇ-ça GAdādHaR =AD̐-nilayavyājena tāḥ ki-₅

10. kirttyāyah svetaṁśor=iva raṣmayaḥ sughaṭitā[ḥ] santāpa-saṃtyai sadā Yatrambhō- nidhi viciṣaṃ daśādīṣaṃ prakṣaṇām-aikacchatāḥ pāṭāla-pratīvā-ghora-tiṃ-

11. -ra-pradhuṇasa-dīpā va innovate. Etyāb santu Gayāpuri sutaruni bhūṣavāli kirttyo yāvāc candra-dīvākara ca gaganom Śrī-viṣvarūp-āhvay. h Kartāsām ca tatha pu-

12. -rāna-pūruṣaṅ ājñā- pi dhikṛtya sad-yen-akasmika-vismay-aika-rasikā loko mukur=murcchitaḥ Dākṣiṇyād=uparuddhena prītis-śvita cetasā  Prasastir-e-

13. -ṣā vihīta VAIĐYa ŚRĪ-VAJRAPANINA Visṇu-kauśal-ollāsa-jata- naipuṇa karmamāṇa praṣastir =ēṣā likhitā Sarvvanandena dhīmaṭā Kṣī-rāṃbhō-nidhi mekha-

14. -lā-mani-guṇa-ālamkarīdāyā bhavo bhurtuḥ ŚRĪ-NAYAPĀLA-DEVa-nṛpate rājāsriyam vibhrataḥ samvīte tarasaiva PAŅCA-DAṢAME RĀJYASYA SAMVATSARE kṛtīḥ siddhim =uṣaṇa bhagavataḥ

15. Śrī-mod-GADADHĀRINAH

2 or added afterwards.  
3 Read—manalpa-dānam =avirbhavat—  
4 Read nisarga—  
5 Or—Kautaka—  
6 The last syllable of this line is superfluous.
The main object of the inscription seems to be the recording of the ancestry and the name of the donor as well as the date of the building of the Temple of Gadadhara and several other minor temples of Viṣṇu. As the inscription itself was found in the temple of Narasimha which is only few paces behind that of Gadadhara at Gayā it seems certain that the ancient materials which have been profusely used in the modern temple of Gadadhara are the remains of the temple built by Viṣvarūpa in the fifteenth year of the reign of Nayapāladeva.

The Kṛṣṇa-Dvārīka temple inscription referred to above also records the erection of temple of Viṣṇu in the fifteenth year of Nayapāla:

Saptāṃśu-rāṣṭi-visarit (ac ch) stātha mekhalāyā asyā bhūvah kati na bhūmi-bhujovabhūvah,
Siddhim na kasyaścid =agād =yad =ananda-kalpaśe =ten =ātra Kirttanam =akāri
Janārdanasya,—verse 17.1

The modern temple of Kṛṣṇa-dvārīkā is built almost entirely of ancient materials and it is quite possible that these materials are the only remnants of Viśvāditya or Viṣvarūpa's temple. The only other existing record of Nayapāla is in the colophon of a manuscript of Paṇḍa-rakṣā in the collection of the Cambridge University:

Deyadharmosyam = pravara-mahāyāna-yātinīyāh Paramopāsikā-Rājñi-Uddākāyā
yad = ātra puṇyān = tad = bhavatv = ācary = opādhya-yāya-matā-pitā (pūrvaṁgama)
ā-kṛtvā sakala-satva-rāser-anuttara-jñān = avāpta ya iti || Paramasaugata-Mahā-
rājādhirāja-Paramesvara Śrīman = Nayapāladeva-pravardhāmāna-vijayarājye
samvat 14 Caitra dine 27 likhit-eyam bhaṭṭārīkā iti.2

Nothing else is known about Nayapāla and his relations. He was succeeded by his son Vigrahapāla III. Nayapāla's reign most probably did not extend beyond the date of the Kṛṣṇa-dvārīkā and Gadadhara temple inscriptions and seems to have come to an end some time between 1045 and 1050 A.D. It is said in a commentary on Cakradatta that Cakrapāṇi Datta was the kitchen superintendent of king Nayapāla.3

At the beginning of his reign Vigrahapāla came into conflict with his father's antagonist, the Cedi Emperor Karna. Karna's power at that time was at its lowest ebb. Vigrahapāla III, his war, was being constantly defeated by the neighbouring princes. He had a very long reign, his own with that of his son having covered a century. In the height of his power he had overrun the whole of Northern India but in his old age he suffered many reverses. He was defeated by the Candella Kirttivarma,4 by Udayāditya of Mālava,5 by Bhimadeva I of Anahilvād, who is eulogised by the grammarian Hema-candra for having defeated Karna in battle,6 and by the Western Cālukya Someśvara I, which is recorded by the poet

3 Cakrapāṇi, Ed by Śivādasa Sena, Calcutta, 8. 8. 1302, p. 407.
5 Ibid., Vol. II, p. 192.
Bilhana in his *Vikramāṅka-deva Carita*, where Karna is mentioned as the god of death to the Lord of the Kalaṅjara mountains, e.g. the Candeṣas. In his last war with the Pālas, Karna was defeated and sued for peace. Vigrahapāla III married the aged king’s daughter Yauvanaśrī. Karna’s war with Vigrahapāla and his subsequent relationship was made known to us by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śastri’s unique discovery, “The Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandī”:

*Anyatra | yo Vigrahapālo Yauvanaśriyā Karuṣyas rājñāḥ sutayā saha Kṣauṇīṃ-udūṭāhavān | Sahasā valen - avito-rakṣito ranajitāḥ saṅgrāmajitāḥ Karṇo Dāhāl =ādhipatir-yena. Raṇajita eva parantu rakṣito na unmūlitah—Commentary on verse 9.*

It is evident from the commentary the Karna suffered a severe reverse at the hands of his future son-in-law and that though defeated he was not “‘uprooted,’” i.e. deprived of his kingdom. It may be that the proud Čedi gave his daughter to Vigrahapāla to avert a calamity. Vigrahapāla III probably had a very short reign, not exceeding thirteen years. Had he lived longer the Pāla Empire may have lasted for some time. His sons were continually quarrelling among themselves and reigned for very short periods. The subordinate princes eagerly availed themselves of the opportunity of throwing off the yoke and the Pāla princes never gained the opportunity of subjugating the territories lost at this time.

Three inscriptions of Vigrahapāla III have been discovered as yet, of which one is on a copper-plate and the other two on stone. The copper-plate is the well-known one from Āmgachi in the Dīnājpur District. The inscription has been edited many times but the first twenty lines edited by the late Prof. Kiellhorn and the remaining portion by Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle are the only reliable versions. A fresh edition of this important inscription is very urgently wanted. I hope to take up this work ere long and compare it with the Bangarh grant of Mahipāla I as suggested by Mr. V. A. Smith. The Āmgachi plate records the grant of half of the village named Brāhmaṇi in the Koṭivaraśa visaya of the Paṇḍravarddhana bhukti to a Brāhmaṇa named Khoddhata-devaśarman on the ninth day of Caitra in the 13th year of the king. On the other two inscriptions of this king, the Aksayavatā inscription is the most important. It was noticed by Cunningham in the third volume of his Reports. The late Dr. Th. Bloch published a summary of its contents but at that time the last lines of the inscription were covered with plaster and so he missed the name of the king and the date. After frequent trials I succeeded in removing the plaster and copying the entire inscription. The central part of the inscription has suffered seriously and is only partly legible. Otherwise the inscription is quite clear. It records the erection of a linga (Vaṭeśa) at Aksayavatā and another called Prapitā-
mahesvara close by, in the fifth year of the reign of Vigrahapaladeva. As the record has never been properly edited before I do so from the original stone:—

(1) Om Om namah Śivāya || Dayābhaṅgāram niravadhi-jagad-duṣa-vijayi sphuraj = jñāna-joyotih prasara-nihatal-āhvanta-nicayam || Kim-āpy-antah sāntam sahaja-sukha-pīyuṣa-lakahī ......

(2) -ra ṣrīdayamāṅgo haratu vaḥ || Āsandhyā-kalaṅkān = prati-vapuṣa iva brāhmaṇaṇā = avja-jannā svarga-dvār-ādhirohām = anṛta-pada-sukha-prāptaye pretya bhājaḥ || Sākṣāt samsāra-bhūṣāva ......

(3) Śrīmad-bhūtim saṁvat = trailokya-lakṣaṁ = nilayam = iva purīm Śrī Gayām = esa cakre || Gayāyam = etasyāṁ pūrī sahaka-saundarya nilaye dvijātināṁ mānya dvijā-pada-sarojāka ......

(4) -ma premnā parima-paritoṣasya jananād = abhūd = dhanyah Śrīmān sī khalu Pariḥo-āhvaya iti || Tasmād = abhūj = jalanidhir = iva śūrāsmīn Śrī Śūdrako vimalaṅkāntir = ananta-lakṣaṁ [h] ......


(6) -nī (?) kautuka-rasāṁ = marītṛyo vatiṛṛṇas-tato jāto deva-kumāra-murtiṁrasaṁ Śrī Viśvarūpā = āhvayaḥ || Yo viḍhvaṣa samasta-vairi-nivahāḥ sphurayā = pratīp-ānalaḥ saujaṁyasya nidadāṇa ......

(7) -ma keli-drumāḥ || sāṇḍrāṇandamayo nisorga-madhura-vyāhāra-ratnākaro din = anātha-vipanna-cāraṇa-gaua-trāṇaya cintāmanī || Gaṇḍasthale mrgaṁad-āmala-patha-bhaṅga svairam ......

(8) -lekhaniṁbhiḥ || Adyaśī yasya sura-kinaura-giyanāṁ devyāḥ sīlaśu vijaya-studim = aṅhilantī || Dharmmeṇ = oṭsuśaśmiḥ mudā vihasītan saṁloka maryādayā trayyī vīṣpūrītam ......

(9) -trībhīr-ajjumbhaṁ || yasmin-āsvāṁmi sarvau ṣaṁudaye tepy-arthiṁ saḥhasam sāṇḍrāṇandamayaḥ svā-dānitya-virahān-ṛtyānti pūrṇasayaḥ || N = occai-cayḍa-karo na c-āpi viγada ......

(10) ten-āstam yālī ja lātmabhīḥ praṇitato n-ānyair = aprūṇo bhavah || Jihvāgreṇa vināgaśaḥ prati mūhurt-āpya sthirāṅ-grahāṅ-naiṅaṁsaṁ-digamvar-aiṅa nirato yo viṣvarūpah || ......

(11) -marādhipo pi cakito Vrahmāpī yad-viṣmito deva Viṣvarūpaṁ spuṭam vihasito Rudropi romṣicitaḥ || Uddāma-prasara-prasana-vaḥule yah-kīrtti-kalolini -gamhīr-āṁbhasi majjā ......

(12) -pī sānvodhta || Yad = dvṛggaṁ sam sarati dūraṁ dūraṁ dvāpam yac = cetasā || yam lavāha ......ta ......āsīt || sahasra ..sramaviṛāhaṁ caturdasyāṁ ārambha-rāma iti yah spuṭaśaṁ = upetaḥ || Aṣyām bhū .........

(13) -pā dharmmeṇa maryādayā rājya-Śrībhīr-ālankṛtaḥ pūnar-aniḥ bhog-aiṅkādā .. .. .. .. .. .. Śrī-viśvāvīdeh (?) esa kīrttana-kāthā giya .........

(14) Kīrttī ......tvāṁ vismayakara ......āpi sauryyād = asaţu ......nă Śrīr-apī ...... ni .. ddhi pūnar-īḍrīśī bhavati kīṁ Śrī Viṣvarūpā = oddhāṭa-rekh-eva prati-pa .........
(15) yat-te...ādbhuta | asy-aiva...Prapīlamahasya mahatim-asthāpya kirttim... 
...tataḥ sādhiḥaḥ | Uddhārthi-urārgga-dharmma-nirato yo.............
(16) .......sidham-anayat-tām-eva kirttim punah || Kīm vrūmah.......yasay-
āsādhu-guruṣasya nāsti mahatāḥ .........kīmaa
(17) rāsiḥ suviṣṭavayo yen-ākasmiṇa-vismayena mukhar-ālokaḥ karttur-agri-
.......nivasanaḥ sphurad-dhārāṛgam visṛja ........
(18) -vyāmuverbatimam-cācārā-tyṣṭir-vahu-manoja...... | prasamanam surā-bhāṇḍam 
jaladeḥ || kānakēsvara......jaladeḥ...Śrī Viṣvarūpā-vārava........
(19) tva saḍācarau svviditāḥ Śrī-satkulā...sarvaśaḥ satkulāprīto' kṣayavato devo 
Vateś-āhavyaḥ || Ity-ādyāḥ su-manonṛūpa-racanā-rānā..............
(20) -jñām ca yaḥ | Yen-āty-ādbhuta-vikramena tarasa Śrī-mad-Gaya-maṇḍale 
āsamsāram-udagrā-dharmma-vijaya-stambhā iv-āropitāḥ || Ten-ā i........
(21) -la viṣamam nihār-avatārābhudam || Kirttiḥ Śveta-gabhanṣi-hasta-racite iṣ-rājak-
ām devasya Prapīṭh-mahasya mahatī Śrī-i........
(22) -ti nāmadheya | Sattvaiva dhanināḥ kimvā vahu vrūmahe | kīm tv=īṭagram-yadi 
kirttanaṃ bhagavatāḥ ken-āpi nispādaḥ Śrī-Viṣvāvi........
(23) yaḥ svatāvpa-moksā (?) | —yāvac-candra-divākaraḥ surasarid-dhātri nabho-
maṇḍalam | kartum Kirttikadamba (?) sā vijayi-Śrī-Viṣvarūpā-āhvoye......
(24) ganitum-ālamkārito bhagavān bharttur-Vigraha-śāledeva-ṛṇpate rājyaśriyam 
vibhrataḥ | samprāṭe tarasaiva pāñch-gaṇīte rājyasya samvatṣa 
reat........
(25) Viṣvāditya-gun-ottṣepa prātis-limita-cetasā 
(26) Prāṣastir-voviḥtā c-aīśā Vaidya-Śrī-Dharmma-pāṇīnā ||

The original stone has suffered very much from the effects of the weather so that it is almost impossible to decipher the central portions of the lines at the middle of the inscription. The only other known inscription of this kind is the Bihar inscription of the twelfth year noticed for the first time by Cunningham.¹ He states that it is inscribed in the pedestal of an image of Buddha and belonged to the Broadley collection. The contents of the Broadley collection, afterwards called the Bihar Museum, were added to those of the Indian Museum at the request of the Government of Bengal in 1895 and the collection was transferred to Calcutta under the supervision of the late Babu Pūrṇa Chandra Mukharji. But this inscription could not be traced in the Indian Museum either by the late Dr. Bloch or by his successors. Mention should be made in this connection of an inscription on a stone on which the present image of Gadādhara at Gayā now rests. It seems to have been discovered by the late Babu Pūrṇa Chandra Mukharji and pointed out by him to the late Dr. Bloch.² As the image of Gadādhara cannot be moved without wounding the religious susceptibilities of the Hindu population of Gayā, only the first five lines could be copied:—

(1) Om nano maṛttaṇḍāya || Jāgartya yasmin-nudite prayāti c-āstantu se

¹ Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, p. 121, No. 7.
This inscription has been referred to the reign of Vigrahapaladeva because its writing resembles that of the Aksayavata inscription.

Nothing is known about the relations of Vigrahapīla III save his three sons Śūrapāla II, Mahipāla II and Rāmapāla, all of whom succeeded him one after another. The Rāmacarita mentions two uncles of Rāmapāla, Mahaṇa or Mathanaadeva and his brother Suvarṇadeva, who belonged to the Raṣṭrakuṭa family. So Vigrahapīla must have married another lady of the Raṣṭrakuṭa family whose name has not come down to us. Rāmapāla was the son of the Raṣṭrakuṭa princess and not of the Cedi princess Yauvanaśrī.
CHAPTER V.

THE DECLINE OF THE PĀLAS.

After the death of Vigrahapāla III, his eldest son Mahipāla II ascended the throne of his ancestors. According to the author of Rāmacarita, untoward things began to happen in this reign. He did not act according to the advice of his ministers and was not well disposed towards his remaining brothers Sūrapāla and Rāmapāla. He was told by the people that Rāmapāla was an able prince, as well as a popular and vigorous administrator, and that he would kill him and take away his kingdom. So, by low cunning, he tried to kill him, and at last succeeded in confining him in a prison. It appears that Mahipāla’s younger brother Sūrapāla was sent to prison at the same time as his youngest brother Rāmapāla:—Apareva bhratā Sūrapālana saha kaṣṭagāram kār̥ṣyham mahattavānam rakṣaṇam yatra. This Sūrapāla was older than Rāmapāla, because the author of the Rāmacarita states, that Rāmapāla’s son succeeded to the throne, though Sūrapāla was Rāmapāla’s elder. The brothers were reduced to very great straits while in prison. The author adds in another place that both brothers were sent to prison because Mahipāla had apprehensions of being dethroned by them. About this time Divvoka, a former servant, by cunning, took away a part of Rāmapāla’s paternal kingdom Varendra. Mahipāla went to fight against the confederate rebels with a small force at his command and fell in battle. This happened while Rāmapāla was in prison. Elsewhere it is specified that the Kaivartta King killed Mahipāla. After Mahipāla’s death Rāmapāla seems to have been set free, but driven out of the country, as the author of Rāmacarita states, that Rāmapāla became careless of his body and mind, because he was kept out of his kingdom. Nothing is known about the period following the death of Mahipāla II up to the accession of Rāmapāla. Sūrapāla II seems to have been recognized by the adherents of the Pāla Princes as the successor of Mahipāla II, as he is mentioned by name in the Manahali grant of Madanapāladeva.

The importance of this grant lies in the fact that it does not ignore a single king of the Pāla dynasty from Gopāla I to Madanapāla. Thus it might have omitted the names of Gopāla III and Kumārapāla, because these two Princes are not ascendants of Madanapāla and such names are usually omitted in the genealogical part of a copperplate grant. If Sūrapāla II had not actually reigned his name would have surely been omitted from this grant. For a

---
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similar reason we do not find the name of Rājyapāla, the eldest son of Rāmapāla, who could not have reigned as he died in his father's lifetime:—

Vigrahapāla III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahipāla II</th>
<th>Śūrapāla</th>
<th>Rāmapāla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rājyapāla</td>
<td>Kumārapāla</td>
<td>Madanapāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(died in his father's lifetime)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopāla III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mention of Śūrapāla’s accession to the throne or the recognition of his chiefship in the Pāla dominions, may have been omitted by Sandhyākaranandi, either through carelessness, or as not being relevant to his subject. It may also be possible that Śūrapāla was Rāmapāla’s rival for the throne, and though he had succeeded temporarily he was overthrown in the long run and perhaps murdered at the instigation of his younger brother. Nothing is known about the extent of Śūrapāla’s reign or his death. But it is quite certain that he was succeeded by his younger brother Rāmapāla. In the course of time Divvoka had died and was succeeded by his brother Rudoka. Rudoka was succeeded by his son Bhima, who on his succession, began to harass the people, living in the tract of land, which was still left in the possession of the Pālas. At that time Rāmapāla was in great straits and thought himself to be without friends. But his son and his advisors sought him, and urged him to take the necessary steps, and he regained courage. The author of the Rāmacarita states in another place that he became very anxious to fight with Bhima. His first step was to travel round the country to propitiate the feudatories and subordinate kings of his father’s kingdom, and he succeeded in gaining over the forest feudatories. During his travels he became convinced that all feudatories were well disposed towards him. By giving away lands along river banks and immense wealth, Rāmapāla succeeded in obtaining horse and foot soldiers and elephants from the feudatories. Śivarāja, the son of his maternal uncle and a Mahāpratihāra, crossed the Ganges with foot, horse and elephants and entered the enemy’s country. This expedition was undertaken either to reconnoitre the enemy’s position or as a sort of counter raid. Śivarāja so impetuously attacked Varendra that the viṣayas and grāmas in Bhima’s country became distressed. Śivarāja began to enquire about the ownership of the lands so that the properties of the gods and the Brāhmaṇas might be protected. He succeeded in driving away Bhima’s followers from Varendra proper, and then came back to
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report to Rāmapāla that his paternal kingdom was free of intruders.¹ Sandhyākara Nandi is silent about the events which followed this raid into Vārendri. It appears from the second chapter of his work that the effect of Śivarāja’s success in Northern Bengal was only temporary, because it became necessary for Rāmapāla to lead another and much bigger army into Northern Bengal, accompanied by his principal feudatories. One particular incident in the life of Rāmapāla has been totally left out by his biographer, which is his enmity and wars with Devarakṣita of Pīthī. In the commentary of the 8th verse of the second chapter of his work Sandhyākaranandi hints that Mahāna, the maternal uncle of Rāmapāla, recovered the kingdom, as the Boar incarnation had recovered the earth in former days. There is no reference to the enmity which Devarakṣita, the Lord of Pīthī and of Sindhu, bore towards Rāmapāla, which has become known to us from the Sārnāth inscription of Kumāradevi discovered by Messrs. Marshall and Konow in 1906-7.² It is stated there, that Mahāna, the King of Anā, the venerable maternal uncle of the Kings, conquered Devarakṣita in war, and maintained the glory of Rāmapāla, which rose in splendour, because the obstruction caused by his force was removed:—

Tam jītō yudhi Devarakṣitam-ādhāt Śri Rāmapālasya.
Yo lakṣmīṁ nirjita-vairi-rodhanataya dedīpyamāṇodayāṁ.

verse 7.³

The defeat of Devarakṣita and Mahāna is also mentioned in the Rāmacarita, where it is said that Mathana or Mahāna defeated the King of Pīthī from the back of the elephant Vindhyamāṇikya.⁴ The relationship between Mathana-deva and Rāmapāla has been explicitly mentioned in the commentary on verse 8, Chapter II of the Rāmacarita, so the references about Mathana-deva in the Sarnath inscription of Kumāradevi are quite clear. He is called the maternal uncle of the King because he was the maternal uncle of Rāmapāla, and perhaps also of Śūrapāla and Mahipāla II also. Besides these, the sons of his other sisters might have been reigning in other parts of the country also. The mention of the defeat of Devarakṣita by Mathana or Mahana is significant. The Sarnath inscription of Kumāradevi leaves no doubt about the fact that Mathana relieved Rāmapāla by defeating Devarakṣita. Evidently Devarakṣita of Pīthī had taken the part of one of Rāmapāla’s rival claimants to the throne or invaded the Pāla dominions at a time when the Pāla kings were weakened by the defection of Northern Bengal, and so he expected to have an easy victory. The materials at our disposal are quite insufficient for the narration of details, but the Sarnath inscription of Kumāradevi proves, that though Mathana had humbled Devarakṣita at first, he had subsequently, owing to some unknown reason, given his daughter Śāṅkaradevi in marriage to him.⁵ The probable reason is that either Devarakṣita succeeded in defeating Mathana and a peace was concluded after the marriage, or that Śāṅkaradevi was given to Devarakṣita in order to draw him to the party of Mathana and Rāmapāla. Whatever may be the fact of the case, we are sure that

Devarakṣita did not continue to be the ruler of Pithi for a long time, as we find another king in that country when Rāmapāla led his expedition into Northern Bengal. The relationship between the Pālas, the Gāhadālās, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Magadha and the rulers of Pithi are shown in the table on following page.

Pithi has been identified by Dr. Sten Konow with the modern Pithapuram in the Madras Presidency. But this is perhaps wide of the mark. It is mentioned as a separate principality, the ruler of which makes war upon the Pāla Kings of Bengal, and later on during the war between the Pālas and the Kaivartta King of Bengal, another prince of Pithi is mentioned as a feudatory or as an ally of the Pāla King.

The Position of Pithi. It was hardly possible for the Pāla Kings after Nayapāla and Vigrahapāla III to wage war with the princes of Pithapuram or to demand an acknowledgment of suzerainty from them for any length of time. On the other hand, Pithi should be somewhere near Magadha or a province with a boundary contiguous to the possession of the Pālas. A place named Pithaghaṭṭā is mentioned in an ancient geographical work called Desāvali, a copy of which is in the manuscript collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The addition of the word ghāṭṭā probably means that his place was situated on the Gauges. This Pitha or Pithi was most probably on the western or northern boundary of Magadha and is perhaps represented by the trans-Son districts or Tirhut in the modern days. Some coins bearing the name Paṭha (most probably Pithi) are preserved in the Cabinet of the Indian Museum, but no records are available to prove their find-spots.

The great event of Rāmapāla’s reign was his campaign in Northern Bengal, against the descendants of the rebel Divvoka, in which he was assisted and accompanied by a large number of allies and feudatories.

A long list of these princes is given, at the beginning of the second Chapter of Sandhyākaranandi’s Rāmacarita. Unfortunately very few of the localities mentioned in this list can be identified at present. At the head of the list is the name of Bhimayaśas, Prince of Pithi and Magadha. This prince is apparently the successor of Devarakṣita, as in one of the following verses the commentary describes the defeat of Devarakṣita by Mahāṇa as an already accomplished fact. It may be that Devarakṣita had placed his son Bhimayaśas on the throne after his defeat by Mahāṇa. The commentary distinctly states, that Bhimayaśas was Lord of Pithi and Magadha, but in the commentary on the Rāmacarita Mahāṇa is called Lord of Magadha, and Devarakṣita, King of Sindhu and Pithi. Mahāṇa may have been divested of the possession of Magadha by Bhimayaśas of Pithi, after his defeat of Devarakṣita and the marriage of Mahāṇa’s daughter with him. It also appears that though Devarakṣita was the Lord of Pithi and Sindhu, his successor Bhimayaśas was not. The position of Sindhu is doubtful. Bhimayaśas is said to have

---

defeated the troops of a king of Kānyakubja, whose name has not been discovered as yet. The position of Piṭhī is also indicated by this reference. It seems to have been a buffer state between those of Kānyakubja and Gauḍa. The Pratihāra dynasty was falling, and the kingdom of the proud Gahaḍavāla was rising on its ruins. It is quite possible that Bhimayaṇas of Piṭhī assisted Candra-deva, the Gahaḍavāla, to obtain the city of Kānyakubja and to overthrow the last Gurjara-Pratihāra King. The next prince in the order adopted by Sandhyākara- nandi is Viraguṇa of the forest of Koṭā, who is also styled “the over-lord of the Southern thrones.” But nothing is known about this king. Dr. Kielhorn’s lists of Northern and South Indian Inscriptions do not contain any record which mentions this king of the South. Jaya Simha, the Lord of Daṇḍabhuḵti, seems to have been a man of great importance. The position of Daṇḍabhuḵti has already been indicated.1 It is represented at the present day by the District of Midnapur. So Jaya Simha was the march-lord of the South. The commentary very appropriately mentions the defeat of the King Karna-keśari of Utkala by this prince. It is more natural for the King of Orissa to fight with a prince, whose land lay on his border, than with one, whose possessions were separated from his by a belt of mountains and forests. The position of Devagrāma in Vāla-valabhi, the king of which, Vikrama Keśari, comes next in order, is far less certain. The commentary adds: “Devagrāma-prativaddha-vasudhā-cakravāla- vālavalabhi-taraṅga-vahala-galahasta-prasasta hastavikramo.”8 The explanation of this is not quite certain and nothing can be made out beyond what has already been stated by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Sāstri. Vikrama Keśari was the King of Devagrāma and the surrounding country which was washed by the rivers of Vāla-valabhi. Vāla-valabhi has been identified by Pandit Hara Prasāda Sāstri with Bāgaḍī, one of the five divisions into which Bengal proper was divided before the Muhammadan conquest, but no reliable authority whatsoever can be cited in support of it.

The name Vāla-valabhi itself was unknown in Bengal before the discovery of the Bhuvaneśvara prasasti of Bhavadevabhaṭṭa8 and has not been found anywhere else except the Rāmacarita. There are hundreds of villages in Bengal bearing the name of Devagrāma, and I do not find any reason to confine it to one of them. Even in the Nadiāh district itself there are several Devagrāmas, and so the attempt to identify it with the materials at present at our command is premature. Lakṣmi-śūra is said to be the Madhusūdana of another Mandāra and is described as the head of all Forest feudatories “Samast-āṭavika-sāmanta-cakravāla- maniḥ.”4 The Mandāra mentioned here seems to have been of that name at present in the Bhagalpur district of Bihar. Mandāra hill commands the surrounding hilly and forest country to a great distance, and it may be that its king

---

1 See Ante, p. 71.  
2 Comm. on V. 5, Chap. II, p. 36.  
4 Comm. on V. 5, Ch. II, p. 36.
l lorded over the Saontals of the Forest. The name of the next prince is suggestive. Šūrapāla of Kuja Bați. Šūrapāla is mentioned as being the chief of Kuja Bați. The Tirumalai inscriptions mention a feudatory of Mahipāla I, named Dharmmmapāla, who ruled over Daṇḍabhūkta. Perhaps these princes belonged to the minor branches of the Imperial Pāla Dynasty. Rudraśikha of Tailakampa is mentioned as a great warrior. Perhaps Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstri's identification of Tailakampa with the modern Telkupi in the Manbhum district is correct, but there is no proof in support of it beyond the resemblance in place names. Rudraśikha of Tailakampa.

Mayagala-simha of Ucchāla was the king of a country which was partly surrounded by the sea. The commentary mentions "Aparalohitārṇava" which means another Red Sea, but it is quite possible that the poet intends to mention the river Brahmaputra which is also known as the Lauhitya. Pratāpa-simha of Ḍekkariya is also extolled in the commentary as a great warrior. There is nothing in the commentary to indicate the position of Ḍekkariya, but it has been identified by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstri with the modern village of Dhekura or Dhekūrī in the northern part of the Burdwan District, on the ground of similarity of names. The commentary on the next verse mentions five princes, and among the names of places over which they ruled only two can be identified:—

(1) Narasimhrjuna, the king of the Kayaṅgala mandala;
(2) Candārjuna of Śāṅkaṭagrāma;
(3) Vijayarāja of Nidrāvala;
(4) Dorapavarddhana of Kauśāmbi; and
(5) Soma of Paduvanvā.

Dorapavarddhana of Kauśāmbi seems to have been a landlord of Varendri. Kauśāmbi seems to be the ancient name of the modern Pargana of Kusumba in the Rajshahi District of Bengal. I am indebted to Prof. Jadunath Sarkar of the Patna College for this suggestion. Paduvanvā has been identified by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstri with the modern Pabna on the ground of similarity of names.

At the bottom of the list of feudatories we find mention of Rāmapāla’s cousins on his mother’s side, viz. the princes of the Rāstraṅgita family, and his eldest son Rājyapāla, who died in his lifetime. Rāmapāla’s maternal relations are specified in the next verse, his eldest maternal uncle Mathanadeva, whom we have already met, his brother Suvarṇadeva and their sons, the Mahāmāṇḍalika Kāṅnaradeva, and the Mahāpratihāra Śivarājadeva. Rāmapāla, with his allies and feudatories, crossed the Ganges either on boats or by a bridge of boats. The commentary on the next verse states that the great army

crossed the Ganges by a 'Naukā-melaka'\(^1\), which has been interpreted by Mahāmaho-
pādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstri as "a bridge of boats." The commentary on the work
does not specify the place where the battle took place, but it is quite certain that the contending armies met somewhere
in the south-western part of the modern District of Rāj-
shāhī, or the southern

The campaign, a bridge of
boats on the Ganges.

shāhī part of the Maldah District. According to the commentary
verse 16, Bhima was captured alive during the battle, and the soldiers of Rāma-
pāla received a fresh

imetus from the news.\(^6\) The commentary on another verse
states that Bhima was captured on the back of an elephant.\(^3\)
Bhima’s army most probably dispersed on the capture of
their leader, and Rāmapāla seems to have obtained an easy
victory, which was followed by the sack of the town of

The battle. Capture of
Bhima on the back of an
elephant.

Damara, the capital of
Bhima.\(^4\) The commentary on another verse states that
Rāmapāla destroyed Damara, a small town. The adjective
Upapura is no doubt applied slightly because it happened
to be the capital of the enemy. Bhima remained a captive
and was placed in charge of a certain Vittapāla.\(^5\) The scattered forces of Bhima
were rallied by one of his friends named Hari. In the ensuing battle Rāmapāla’s son
contested every inch of ground and at last succeeded in defeating the Kaivarttas.
Hari was, at last, deprived of his forces, captured and executed with Bhima. Hari
seems to have continued its existence after its sack by
Rāmapāla, and even to this day a village named Damaranaga exists close to Rāmapāla’s capital. In another
verse, Rāmapāla is said to have taken into employ the
soldiers of Bhima.\(^6\) Rāmapāla founded a city named Rāmāvati at the confluence of
the Karatoyā and the Ganges.\(^7\) The site seems to have
been selected for Rāmapāla by a chief named Candeśvara of
Śrī-hetu (not Śrī-haṭṭa) and one Kṣenesvara.\(^8\) The city
was beautified within a very short time, and the author has devoted the best part of
a chapter to its praise. The only feature, worth mentioning, is a Buddhist Vihāra
named Jagaddala-Mahāvihāra, which was built by Rāmapāla in the new city. It is
interesting to note that there is a village named Jagaddala close to the ruins of
Rāmāvati. Rāmāvati continued to be the capital of the Pālas for some time, and
Madanapāla’s Manahali grant was issued from this place.\(^8\) It continued to be a
place of importance for several centuries. In the sixteenth century it gave its name
to a fiscal division, and one of the circles in the Sirkar of Lakhnauti was named
Ramauti\(^10\) in Akbar’s time. Ramauti is an exact transliteration of Rāmāvati as
Lakhnauti is of Lakṣmānāvati, and the identity of Ramauti with Rāmāvati has been
made certain by the discoveries of Babu Haridās Pālit in the Maldah District. This
gentleman has industriously searched the environments of Rāmāvati and has traced

\(^1\) L. C. Comm. on V. 10, p. 38.
\(^2\) L. C. Comm. on V. 16, L. C., p. 40.
\(^3\) L. C. Comm. on V. 20, L. C., p. 41.
\(^4\) Comm. on V. 27, Chap. I, L. C., p. 27.
\(^5\) L. C., p. 14; V. 26, Ch. II, p. 45.
\(^7\) V. 10, Ch. III, L. C., p. 47.
\(^8\) V. 2, Ch. III, L. C.
the following villages bearing ancient names: \textit{Amrauti} or \textit{Ramrauti} (Rāmāvatī), Jagadalā (Jagaddala), Dāmrol (Damara).

After the foundation of Rāmāvatī, Rāmapāla engaged in wars with his neighbours. He attacked Utkala and ruled the country up to Kaliṅga, and returned the kingdom of Utkala to the Nāgavaṁśa. His feudatory chief Māyana conquered Kāmarūpa which seems to have been becoming weaker and weaker at this time, as several invasions into that country were led by successive kings of Bengal or their generals, e.g., Māyana sent by Rāmapāla, Vaidyadeva sent by Kumārapāla, Vijayasena and Laksmanasena. A king of Eastern Bengal sought the protection of Rāmapāla in order to save himself by surrendering to him his best elephants, his coach of state and his armour.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Svaparitrāyanimittm patyā yah prāg-diśiyena.}
\textit{Vara-vārana ca nija-syandana-dānena varmanāraśdhe ||.}
\end{quote}

Rāmacarita III. 44.

This king seems to be one of the Vādavas of Eastern Bengal. Two different powers may have caused him to throw himself under the protection of Rāmapāla: first is an invasion by Pāla forces, and second an invasion of his territories by a new power. Sāmantasena was most probably getting very powerful at this time, and it was he who seems to have caused the Vādava prince to seek the shelter afforded by Rāmapāla.

In his later years Rāmapāla returned to Rāmāvatī, leaving the cares of the management of the state to his eldest son Rājyapāla. About this time Mathanadeva, the king’s maternal uncle, died. The king was residing at Mudgiri (Mudgagiri or Mungir) at this time, and on hearing of his benefactor’s death distributed much wealth to the Brāhmaṇas and entered the sacred river Ganges. Mathanadeva must have become a centenarian at the time of his death, and Rāmapāla himself had become a very old man at the time of his death after forty-six years of reign.

Tārānātha states that Rāmapāla reigned for forty-six years. This is not impossible as the Candimau image was dedicated in the 42nd year of the king. We know the names of three of the sons of Rāmapāla, two of whom succeeded him on the throne. His eldest son, Rājyapaṇa, was an able man, and assisted his father in gaining the throne, in the wars in Vārendri, and finally in administering the kingdom in his father’s old age. He seems to have died during the lifetime of his father, as we find that Kumārapāla succeeded after Rāmapāla’s death. His third son, Madanapāla, ascended the throne after the death or dethronement of his brother Kumārapāla’s son Gopāla III. We know nothing about the other relations of Rāmapāla except his

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item Mem. A.S.B., Vol III, p. 50. This has also been translated differently by Mr. Maitra. “A King of Eastern Bengal, who held the title of Varman, sought the protection of Ramapala in order to save himself by surrendering his elephants and chariot.”
\item L.C., p. 51, Ch. IV, V. 6.
\item L.C., V. 9.
\item Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVIII, p. 246.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
maternal uncles, Mathanadeva or Mahanadeva and Suvarṇadeva and their sons Kāṃṣapāladeva and Śivarājadeva. Sandhyākaranandī’s father, Prajāpatinandi, was the principal minister of peace and war (Maḥasāṅdiśvīvīgraḥīka), but his principal adviser was Bodhīdeva, son of Yogadeva, the minister of his father Vibhrahapāla III.

The earliest record of Rāmapāla is the Tetrawan inscription recording the erection of an image of Tārā by a certain Bhaṭṭa Īchāra, in the 2nd year of the King’s reign. This image was discovered by the late Mr. A. M. Broadley, who read the king’s name as Rāmapati. Cunningham published it in one of his reports. The inscription was finally published by Babu Nilmani Chackravartti with a good ink impression in 1908. It consists of two lines partly damaged, and is at present in the Indian Museum.

The next record in order is a manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā written at Nālandā in the Magadha viśaya. The manuscript was purchased by Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle from Nepal, during his stay in India, and afterwards acquired by the Bodleian Library. It was written in the 15th year of the king and its final colophon runs as follows:

1. — ramuttara ṣāṇānāvāptaya iti, Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvarā Paramabhaṭṭārakasāhasra Pratamarasagata Śrīmad Rāmaṇapāladeva-pravarddhamāna-vijāyakārīye paṇḍadāsane samvatsare abhīlīkhyamāne yatīrāmkenāpi samvat 15, Vaisākṣadine kṛṣṇaṣaptamīyām 7 Asti Magadhaviśaya, Śrī Nālandāvasthita lekhaka Grahaṇukundena Bhaṭṭārīkāpāra-

2. — jñāpāramitā likhitā iti.

Late in the king’s reign an image of the Bodhisatva Padmapāṇi was dedicated, at or near the modern village of Chandimau in the Bihar Sub-division of the Patna District by an inhabitant of Rajagriha. This inscribed image was discovered by Cunningham in 1877 or 1878, but he did not attempt to read it. No attempt has hitherto been made by anybody else to read this inscription. The image was found lying among the number of broken ones in the outskirt of the village of Chandimau in August 1911 and was removed to Indian Museum. A part of the inscription was broken owing to careless packing, but fortunately two inked impressions of the inscription were taken while in situ, otherwise it would have become quite impossible to read the date, as the part bearing the numerals for the year have disappeared. This is the most interesting part of the epigraph as it proves conclusively that Rāmapāladeva reigned for a considerable length of time, at least 42 years, which made Tārānātha’s statement about his length of reign acceptable. Cunningham read the date as 12, but it certainly was 42. The inscription itself runs as follows:

(1) Ye dharmmā hetu prabhavā hetu (m) teśām hy = avadat (t) esām (m) yo nirod-
In the beginning was the word.  

The date is given in the decimal notation so that there remains no doubt about its reading. The first numeral is certainly 4 and not 1. We find it in a contemporary inscription—the Bodh-Gaya inscription of the 74th year of the Lakṣmanasena era. The donor, Sadhu Saharana, was most probably Vaisya by caste and a merchant by profession. Nothing was known about Rāmapāla and his times twenty years ago. When Mr. Venis was editing the Kamalī grant of Vaidyadeva, he was faced with great difficulties for want of materials. The date of Vaidyaveva's grant was fixed by him on conjecture. Recent discoveries have proved beyond doubt, that the grant must be placed half a century earlier. Rāmapāla's date was fixed and the events of his reign made known by the discovery of the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandi.

Nothing has been stated about, and the place of discovery of, this unique manuscript, by the discoverer himself, in the introduction to his edition of the Rāmacarita, but I have since its publication learnt on enquiry from him that the manuscript was purchased in Nepal in 1897. The manuscript itself consists of two different parts:—

1. The text, which is complete, and
2. The commentary, which is incomplete but older than the text. It runs up to the thirty-fifth verse of the second chapter of the text. The text of the work is written in Bengali characters of the 12th or 13th centuries on strips of palm leaf. It is,

Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Sāstri observes, written in imitation of the Rāghava-Pāṇḍaviya, in double cantière.

The text of the Rāmacarita.

The difficulty of understanding such a work is apparent, and had it been discovered without its commentary, it would have been of no use to historians or antiquarians. The principal value of the discovery lies in the commentary. The commentary is a mine of historical information, and supplies the details of the events of Rāmapāla's reign. The style of the composition of the commentary is highly ornamental prose, which makes it very difficult for one to get at the truth. The text does not end after the death of Rāmapāla but continues to describe the events of the reigns of his successors, Kumārapala, Gopāla III, and Madanapāla. If the second part of the commentary is ever recovered, then an abundance of detail will be available, about the events of the time of the three princes mentioned above. There is very little doubt about the fact, that the author of the poem was obliged to write the commentary on it himself. The masses of details which are called up by the use of single works, would have

The Author.

had no meaning to other persons. The author had great facilities for the collection of information as his father was Rāmapāla’s Sāndhivigrahika. The comparison of Rāmapāla with Rāma, the hero of the Rāmāyana, seems to have been habitual with the courtiers of the 11th century A.D. A verse of the Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva mentions the conquest of Mithilā and a king named Bhīma, and at the same time compares Rāmapāla with Rāma:—

\[ Teu yena jagat = traye janaka-bhū-labhād-yathāvad = yasaḥ. \]

\[ Kṣauṇi-nāyaka-Bhīma Rāvana-vadhād-yuddhārūṇav = ollāmganat ||. \]

verse 4.1

According to Lama Tārānatha, Yaksāpāla was a colleague of Rāmapāla.2 It is stated definitely that this prince was the son of Rāmāpāla who was the son of Hastipāla and was the last prince of the Pāla family.3 An inscription of a king (Narendra) named Yaksāpāla was found at Gayā by Sir Alexander Cunningham and published by the late Dr. Kielhorn in 1887. But the king mentioned in this record cannot be the same person as that mentioned by Lama Tārānatha as Rāmapāla’s son, as the genealogy of this Yaksāpāla is given in the inscription. He is the son of Viṣvāditya, who built the temple of Gadaḍhara,4 of Aksayavaṭa and of Prapitāmaheśvara, the grandson of Śūdraka. The family was a very important one during the reigns of Nayapāla Vighrahapāla and his sons. The following inscriptions of the family have been discovered at Gayā:—

(1) Inscription on the gate of the modern Kṛṣṇa-Dvārika temple, recording the erection of a temple of Viṣṇu by a low class Brāhmaṇa named Viṣvāditya in the 15th year of Nayapāladeva.5

(2) Inscription inside the small temple dedicated to Narasimha in the courtyard of the Viṣṇupāda temple recording the erection of a temple to Gadaḍhara and several other minor shrines—by one Viṣvarūpa of the same lineage as Viṣvāditya in No. 1.6

(3) Inscription broken into two parts in the wall of small shrine under the Aksayavaṭa at Gayā, recording the erection of two temples of Śiva—Vateśa and Prapitāmaheśvara—by the same Viṣvāditya.7

(4) Inscription under the image of Gadaḍhara at Gayā—begins with an invocation to the Sun-god and mentioning Paritoṣa, the grandfathrer of Viṣvāditya.8

(5) The Sitalā temple inscription of Yaksāpāla recording the erection of a temple dedicated to various deities and digging a tank named Uttaramāṇasa.9

The last inscription was published in 1887 and at that time the late Dr. Kielhorn was of opinion that “the characters of the inscription are Devanāgarī, or to be more particular, a kind of Devanāgarī, which appears to have been current in the 12th century A.D.” But if the characters of this inscription are compared with those of the Narasimha temple inscription of Nayapāladeva, on the one hand, and the

---

4 Ibid., Vol. XVI, p. 64.
5 See ante, p. 79.
6 See ante, p. 81.
7 See ante, p. 82.
8 See ante, p. 83.
Gadādhara temple inscription of Govindapāladeva, it will be found that the characters of the inscription of Yakṣapala are more akin to those of Kṛṣṇa-Dvārika, Narasimha temple and Aksayavatā than to the latter. In my humble opinion the characters belong to the middle of the 11th century A.D. The inscription was edited without a facsimile and could not be traced easily. Kielhorn had stated that it had been found at Satighat in Gayā, but I could not find any Satighat or any old inscription. The inscription was eventually found hidden behind a door inside a small temple, on the side of a paved tank, called the Śītalā temple, close to the river Phalgu, and just behind the Gaya Zilla School. Dr. Kielhorn's edition is transcribed below, with the exception of the last word which he could not read from the rubbings:

1. Om namah Śūryāya || Viṣaya-madhūkara-pūrṇam Prāni-nikāy-āli viṣva-sata patram Aṣṭāda-dala-rāmasya prakāśayan-navatav yo bhānuḥ ||
2. Tirtham phalgu-taṭ-ādi-tirtha-gaṭanā-vyājena sopāṇini gantṛṇām paramasya dhauta-tamasāṁ dhāmno Gayā rājate | Śri maty-aiva ya–
3. —yā mahimaya-nilac-citrasya jīv-ātmanā śīl-otkarsam-amanyat-ātmani vidhiḥ kṛtvā trilokīn-āpi || Asyam vabhūva ripa-vṛṇdam-a–
5. —yāyaṃ | Tasmād-abhuta-paurṣāmavindhir-abhūt Śri-Viṣvarūpo ur̄pah kṛtī-śrī-matayah svayvanvarataya bhejur-yam-ekeḥ ātmaṃ A
6. —dyāpisphurad-ugra-vikrama-kathān-ākaranayad-yaśya ca svāsambhūtim-arati-ca kram-asama-utrāsād-tadā śāṅgata || Lakṣṇmīm ripoh
7. sva-bhūja-virya-vāsikṛtām yo bhogyām tathā vihīvatān dvīja-pūnagāvānām Eśām yathā yuvatayo dyutim-ādadhānā na–
8. —kānganā iva virejṛt-ilaṭalepi || Yasy-ojvalena yaśasā bhramatā samantācakre cīram dhavālite viśtām di–
11. —ṛddh-oṣbritair-mūrdhābhāthi kurvanta viyati skhaladgatiratham prasthā nadustham raviṁ || Dharmasya ḍhṛtya iva sūnur-ajātašatras-tasy-ātha–
12. dhairya-nilayo-jaṇi Yākṣapālaḥ Ṭuptakratau Kaliyugasya viṛmbhte yaḥ kāṁn-bhrāṃ kratubhujāḥ kratubhujāḥ pu–
13. —poṣ短时间内 pangataya paresv-ayam-ayam bhikṣā-bhūja-nirjjitaḥ sarvaṇ āpy-aṇa-avolym-acirasthiyā mano-bhūr-a–
14. yaṃ | Ity-anyo vidhinā manojña tanu-bhrīj-jetā dviśām yo bhujādaṇḍ-aika pravalaḥ shiro yudhi saḍā minadvajyo nirmmī–
15. —taḥ || Bhūbhāro rohana-bhūditara-taru-tulām-āśrito kalpa-sākhi kīmdhenuḥ kāmadhenuḥ kṣītalā-paraśkāḥ kṛtī–
17. —rthān || Yad-dhṝt-padma-kuṭṭiraka-praṇayitām-apaḍīte śrī-patau suprite vyabhicāraṁ-arataye bhakyā parīkritam, Arthabhyo vi-
18. —nīyukta-yāpy-anudinām pātre sucau jatāyā mat-svāmi-priyavāsa eṣa iti yak kāmann śṛṣṭyā samsṛṣṭaḥ || Munādītaya-Sahasrālinga-
20. ca khyatasy-Ottaramānasasya kaunamaṁ sattrāṁ tathā c-ākṣaye || Śūrya-candra-
masau yāvad-yāvat kṣauni sasāgara. Tāvat śrī Yakṣapaḷāsya rā-
22. Likhit-āsau Śrī Padmapānīnā ||

The characters of this inscription cannot be said to belong to the 12th century A.D., as the form of the test letters are much earlier than those of Rāmapāla. Most probably Yakṣapāla assumed independence during the troublesome times of the reigns of Vigrahapāla III, Mahipāla II and Śīrapāla II. Perhaps he was contemporaneous with Rāmapāla during the earlier part of the latter's reign. He is not mentioned in the Rāmacarita, and most probably he was subdued by Rāmapāla's maternal uncle, Mathanadeva, who is styled Magadhādhipa in the commentary. He might have continued to reign either as a subordinate prince, or as an independent one, because no evidence is forthcoming to prove that any of the Pāla Emperors after Rāmapāla held any part of Western Magadha or South-Western Behar. Rāmapāla's inscriptions have been discovered in Eastern Magadha, but no Pāla record after the time of Vigrahapāla III have been found in the Gayā or Shahabad District, except the two inscriptions of Govindapāladeva. Another powerful dynasty of kings, who founded their monarchy on the ruins of the second Pāla Empire, was that of the Varmans of Eastern Bengal.

Four records of this dynasty have come to light as yet:—

(1) Bhuvaṇeśvara inscription of the time of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva.1

(2) The unpublished copper-plate grant of Harivarmmadeva, which has been noticed by Babu Nagendra Natha Basu in Vaṅgera Jātiya Itihāsa, ’’ Vol. II, p. 215 and plate. This copperplate grant was seen and examined by the author several years ago. It was obtained from the late Mr. Hari Nath De, and was photographed with the permission of the owner. Very little can be made out of the grant at present.

(3) A manuscript of the “Āṣṭa-sāhasriKā Prajñāpāramitā” written in the 19th year of Harivarmmadeva, recently acquired by me.

(4) The Belabo grant of Bhovarman. According to the genealogy given in the inscription, the Varmans were descended from the race of Yadu. In that race were a lines of princes, who ruled at Simhapura, which was in the Punjab, as we know from the Lakkha-mandal-praśasti of the Princess Iśvarā. Vajravarman of that dynasty was the founder of a kingdom in Eastern Bengal. His son, Jātavar-

1 Epi. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 203.
man, was, as we have seen, the contemporary of Vigrahapāla III, who defeated the Cedi King Karnaṇa in Anga, and obtained the hand of his daughter Vira-Śrī, conquered Kāmarūpa and Govardhana, and acquired paramount power. His son was Sāmalavarman, about whom we do not know much. The accounts of Sāmalavarman as found in the genealogical works are wholly imaginary. He was succeeded by his son Bhojavarman. The characters of the new grant show that Harivarman and his father Jyotirvarman cannot either be placed before Vajrarvarman or taken to be his descendants, because most probably Sāmantasena made an end of the Yādava kingdom of Eastern Bengal shortly afterwards. So it appears probable that the two dynasties were to some extent contemporaneous.

The first inscription has indeed been published by the late Dr. Kielhorn, but no facsimile was published at that time. A complete analysis of the characters of these three records or an attempt to fix the date of Harivarman would be out of place here. I intend very shortly to publish another paper on the inscription and the chronology of the Varman kings. It might suffice here to say that the copperplate of Harivarman, though in a very bad state of preservation, gives us the name of the king and his father. The last line of the first side and the first line of the second contained the following sentences:

Mahārājādhirājā-Srīmad-Jyotirvarmmadeva-pādānudhyāta Paramavaiṣṇava-Parameśvara-Paramabhatṭāraka-Mahārājādhirājā Śrīmad-Harivarmmadeva kuśālī.

The grant itself was issued from the victorious camp of Vikramapura, and from it we learn that part at least of Eastern Bengal belonged to Harivarmmadeva and that he was preceded by his father Jyotirvarmmadeva on the throne. The characters of the records of those dynasties show that Harivarman cannot be placed in the 12th century A.D. Consequently it must be admitted that his father Jyotirvarman has to be placed in the earlier decades of the 11th century. The dynasty seems to have continued for three or four generations. We learn from Bhuvanesvara inscription that Bhavadeva I received the village of Hastinibhiṣṭa from the King of Gauḍa. His son was Rathāṅga, whose son was Atyāṅga, and from him was descended Ādīdeva, who was the minister of peace and war (Śāndhivigrahika) of the king of Vanga. It is stated in verse 3 that the family settled in the village of Siddhala in Rādhā. Ādīdeva’s son was Govardhana who was renowned as a warrior and most probably served under Jyotirvarmmadeva. His son Bhavadeva II was the minister of Harivarmmadeva and of his son also.

The newly discovered Belabo plate records the grant of 9 drones of land in the village of Upyālikā, in the sub-division of Kausāmvi-Aṣṭagachha in the Mandala or District of Adhaḥpattana, in the Division or Bhūkti of Paunḍravardhana, to a Brāhmaṇa of the Vajur-deva, named Rāmadevaśarman, son of Viśvarūpadevaśarman, grandson of Jagannāthadevaśarman and great-grandson of Pitāmbaradevaśarman, who was an inhabitant of the village of Siddhala, in Northern Rādhā, and had emigrated from Madhyadesa or Kanauj.

The last line of the Bhuvaneswar inscription of Bhavadeva contained his surname—
Vālavalabhī is mentioned as the name of a country in the Rāmacarita of Sandhyā-karanandi. Vikramarāja of Devagrāma in Vālavalabhi had fought with Rāmapāla, in the war, in Varendra.1 Mahānahopādhyāya Haraprasād Sastri had identified Vālavalabhi with Bāgdi. He translates the passage of the commentary as follows:—

“Vikramarāja, the Rājā of Devagrāma and the surrounding country, washed by the waves of the rivers of Vāla-Valabhi or Bāgdi, one of the five provinces into which Bengal was divided.” The identification stands without any support. From the description given in the commentary on the Ramacarita it appears that Vālavalabhi was pre-eminently a land of rivers, and must be identified either with Eastern or Southern Bengal. The mention of Vikramapura in the copperplate grant of Harivarman does not help us in fixing the chronology of the Varnams. It may be that both dynasties occupied different parts of East Bengal at the same time and may have laid claim to the ownership of the city of Vikramapura. So far we have no positive evidence to prove that Jyotirmarman and Harivarman were descended from the Vādava Vajravarman, and we can only assume that they belong to co-lateral branches of the same family.

The invasion of the great southern conqueror Rājendra Cola I seems to have left some permanent marks in Bengal. We learn from the Śitāhāti grant of Vallālasena, that the ancestors of Sāmantasena, the grandfather of Vijayasena, lived in the country of Rādhā.2 All Sena inscriptions agree in stating that the Sena kings were descended from a family of Karṇāṭa Kṣatriyas, i.e. from a family which originally came from the Kanarese-speaking districts of Southern India. Though the Cālukya King, Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāna, is said to have invaded Bengal during the lifetime of his father Somesvara I,3 it cannot be said that the Cālukya Kings effected any permanent conquest in Eastern India. But, on the other hand, Viḷiṇadeva’s remarks should be taken with great reservation, as none of the records of the Cēdis of Tripūr or Ratnapura mention any Cālukya invasion of Northern India in the middle of the 11th century A.D. On the other hand, Rājendra Cola I defeated the Cālukya King, Jayasimha II, at Muyaṇgi or Musaṇgi, and though Cālukyan poets state that the Cālukyas defeated the Cōḷas, the definite terms of the Melpādi inscription leave no doubt about the fact that the defeat of the Cālukya Kings was decisive, and Rājendra Cola I obtained a large amount of treasure from him.4 Some obscure Karṇāṭa Chief seems to have followed Rājendra Cola I and settled in Western Bengal after the defeat of his Chief on the banks of the Ganges. From him was descended Sāmantasena, who is generally taken to be the founder of the Sena Dynasty. He seems to have succeeded in carving out a small principality for himself in Western Bengal. In the Deopara ṭraṣasti of his grandson, Vijayasena, it is stated that he, Sāmantasena, defeated his enemies after being surrounded by them.5

---

3 Vikramānkhadeva Caritam. (Ed. Bühler, III. 74).
4 South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. III, No. 18, p. 27.
None of the Sena Princes are mentioned in the list of Rāmapāla’s feudatories, and most probably their relations with the Imperial Pālas were not cordial. Sāmanta-sena, probably, came to power during the disturbances, in the earlier part of the reign of Vigrahapāla III. We know nothing about his son, Hēmantasena, who was most probably a very tame vassal of the Emperor Rāmapāladeva.

Rāmapāla’s minister was Bodhīdeva, the son of Yogadeva, who was the prime minister of his father Vigrahapāla III. His minister for peace and war (Sāndhi-vigrahika) was Prajāpatinandi, the father of Sandhyākaranandi. Māyana, one of his principal generals, conquered Assam¹ for him, and according to Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstri, his Chief Medical Officer was Bhadreśvara.²

² Ibid., p. 15.
CHAPTER VI.

THE LAST KINGS.

Rāmapāladeva was succeeded by his second son Kumārapāla about the year 1097 A.D. Immediately after Kumārapāla's accession, rebellions broke out throughout the kingdom. In Assam, which had been conquered for Rāmapāla by the feudatory chief Māyana, Tingyadeva raised the standard of rebellion. Southern Bengal and Western Bengal were overrun by the King of Orissa, Anantavarmman Cōḍagaṅga. Sandhyākaranandi dismisses Kumārapāla with a single verse:

\[ \text{Atha rakṣatā (?) Kumārodita prthu-paripanṭhi-pārthiva-pramadāḥ | Rājyaṃ-upabhujya bharasya sūnur-agamad=divam tanu-tyāgāt.} \] — v. II.1

This most probably indicates that Kumārapāla reigned for a very short time. But during this short reign, he succeeded in obtaining decisive victories in Assam and in Southern Bengal with the aid of his Minister Vaidyadeva, who was the son of Yogadeva, the Prime Minister of Rāmapāla. We learn from the Kamauli Grant of Vaidyadeva that Kumārapāla having learnt of the disaffection of the feudatory chief of Kāmarūpa, named Tingyadeva, deputed Vaidyadeva to overcome him. Vaidyadeva having received a promise of obtaining the kingdom after its conquest, reached Assam by forced marches and defeated Tingyadeva:

\[ \text{Etad He hari-harid bhuvih saktītasya Śrī-Tiṅgyadeva nṛpater-vikṛtim niṣamyā | Gaṇḍesvaraḥ bhuvih tasya nareśvarato Śrī-Vaidyadeva urukṛttir-iyām niyuktah.} \] — v. I3-I4.2

About this time Anantavarmman Cōḍagaṅga invaded Western Bengal and overrun the country up to the banks of the Ganges:

\[ \text{Gṛhaṇāti sna karaṁ bhūmer-gaṅga-gotama-gaṅgayoh | Madhye paśyatsu viśeṣu praṇḍhah praṇḍha-striyā ēva.} \] — v. 22.3

Rāmapāladeva conquered Utkala and Kaliṅga during the reign of either Rāja-Rāja I or his son Anantavarmman. It appears that Anantavarmman invaded the territories of the Pāla Kings immediately after the death of Rāmapāla. It may be mentioned in this connection that Vaidyadeva is said to have obtained a naval victory in Southern Bengal, and it is quite possible that this victory was obtained over the naval forces of Anantavarmman:


2 J.A.S.B. 1896, Pt. I, p. 239.
3 Epi. Ind., Vol. II., p. 351.
Nothing is known about the extent of Kumārapāla's reign or the date of his death. But he does not appear to have reigned more than two or three years. He was succeeded by his infant son Gopāladeva (Gopāla III):—


The infant king seems to have been murdered very soon after his accession:—
Api satrukhnopayid-gopālaḥ svar-jagnma tatiṣṭunāḥ | Hantu(h) kumbhīnasyās-tana-yasy-aikasya sāmayikam-etat.2 v. 12.

A posthumous record of this king has been discovered by Babu Aksayā Kumāra Maitreya at Manda in the District of Rajshahi and presented to the Indian Museum. The palaeography points to the later part of the 11th and the earlier part of the 12th century as its date. The record is full of mistakes and is untranslatable:—

1. Om sūrā-sarīr-urum-viśīḥ sīkaṇu kunda-gauruvr-aviracita parabhāgo vāla ca-
2. nārāvaṇa-suśatvāvamāṇaṃ vibhūjau | Sāmbhu-kośuṁ-bhāra kalama-kavisa roci-
3. rmmanjāri pīnjarīsu || Śripad-Gopāladevas-tridīva muṣarātaḥ sūvpas-
4. yā ṯyaṅka kāsas-tasyaḥ ānaḥ pāda-duhi-prathita iti nijam nāḥ. Vuddhām-asthīta-
pr-
5. -trājñā-ṛatijñō nisita-sarasavai Purasenasakṣayīṣau nisya-yajā-dallirā
6. jā trīdāṣapuram-agōd-Aiddava kṛtaṁjaḥ || Svetam tvato vadhī ya saṅgārti-
prāpya
7. Candra-kīrau-āmalaṃ yasaḥ kṛīḍati trādaśasundarī Drso deva-eva Śūbhadeva
nanda-
8. -nāḥ || Artha tadanuga-gīta-vilasaḥ dharmmadhvāra-masthara-galavīsah Dāma-
śūra sasa-
9. -man vāhitavesah sa yayate Śri-sāmbhāva-kudāsah dagdhā yatra madadbūlaḥ
śara-sa-
10. -nāhāṇa-pūrīta yatra Bhāvakūdāsena Kṛta kūrnā viṛajateḥ || Rātokena le-
nī. khitavya.

We can recognize only a number of names:—

The murder of the infant king and the subsequent accession of his uncle Madanapāla seems to point to a parallel of the murder of the infant King Edward V by his uncle Richard III. About this time some dispute seems to have arisen about the succession, and ultimately Madanapāla’s party seems to have triumphed. Vaidyadeva ignores Madanapāla completely in the Kauvalī copper-plate grant issued in the fourth year of his reign, and so it must be admitted that Vaidyadeva declared his independence after the murder of Gopāla III. Till the reign of Madanapāla the Pāla Kingdom consisted of Eastern Magadha and Northern Bengal.

---

Taking advantage of the internal dissensions in the Pāla Kingdom, Vijayasena seems to have strengthened himself in Eastern and Western Bengal, and when the weakness of the Pālas under Madanapāla became apparent, he invaded Northern Bengal and succeeded in wresting the southern part of Varendra. Madanapāladeva seems to have continued to hold the northern part of Varendra, as his Manahali Grant was issued in the 8th year of his reign from the royal city of Rāmāvatī.¹

We learn from the Deopārā inscription that Vijayasena attacked the King of Gauḍa with great force:—

Tvam Nānya-Vira-vijay-iti girah kavīnām śrutvām-nyathā-manana-rūḍha-nigūḍha roṣah. Gaudendram-adravād-apakṛta Kāmarūpabhūpam Kāliṅgam-api yas-larasā jīgāya. v. 20.²

Most probably Madanapāla is the Gauḍendra mentioned in the verse quoted above. It is stated in the Deopārā inscription that Vijayasena defeated and imprisoned the King of Mithilā named Nānyadeva, so most probably Vijayasena conquered the remaining portion of Varendra before he turned his attention towards the neighbouring district of Mithilā. Vijayasena invades Madanapāla’s dominions were confined to the limits of Magadh after this. Vijayasena did not remain content with Varendra. He despatched a flotilla of armed boats for the conquest of the Western regions.

Ṛṣمصyaya-cakra-jayakeliṣu yasya yāvad-Gaṅgā-pravāhām-anudhāvati nauvitāne Bharggasya maṃsā-sarid-ambhasi bhasma-paṅka-lagun-ōjhit-eva tarir-īndu kalā cakāsti. v. 22.³

But the expedition does not seem to have been very successful, as otherwise the incident would surely have been mentioned in Sena inscriptions. Madanapāladeva was greatly assisted in his war against Vijayasena by Candradeva, the founder of the Gahaḍavālā Dynasty of Kanauj. The author of the Rāmacarita has gratefully acknowledged this in his work:—


Madanapāla seems to have been defeated by Vijayasena some time after the year 1108 A.D., which is the probable date of his Manahali inscription, when Candradeva was dead. Candradeva must have died before 1104 A.D., as in that year the Basāhi Plates of his grandson Govinda-Candra were issued, and that prince is styled “Mahārājaputra”, so it must be admitted that Candradeva had ceased to reign at that time, and his son Madanpāla sat on the throne.⁵

¹ J.A.S.B., 1900, Pt. I, p. 93.
³ Ibid., p. 307.
⁵ Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, p. 103.
Nothing is known about Madanapāla save that he continued to reign for about eleven years longer. Nothing is known about his sons or successors, their extent of reigns or dominion. About fifty years after Madanapāla’s death, another prince of the Pāla Dynasty seems to have reigned in Magadha, but about this we shall have to speak later on.

Four inscriptions of Madanapāla have been discovered up to date, of which three are votive inscriptions, incised on the pedestals of images, while the remaining one is on a copper-plate. The earliest inscription is the "Mana-hali" Grant, which records the grant of a village, perhaps named Kāśṭhagiri, in the Kotīvara-Visaya of the Paundravardhana Bhukti, to a Brāhmaṇa named Vaṭeśvarasvāmi-sārman, an inhabitant of Campāhiṭṭi, as daksīṇā for having read the Mahābhārata to the great queen (Paṭṭa-Mahādevī) Citramatikā, on the 15th day of the month of Caitra, in the 8th year of the King’s reign. The order confirming the grant was issued from the city of Rāmahati, which had been founded by Rāmapāla.1 An image of Śaṭṭhī dedicated in the same year was discovered by Cunningham on Bihar Hill, but it cannot be traced at present.2 Another image dedicated on the 30th Āśvina of the 9th year of the King was also discovered by Cunningham at Jayanagar, near Lakhisarai, in the Monghyr District;3 but this image also is missing at present.

After conquering Varendra, Vijayasena founded a new capital on the northern bank of the Ganges and named it after himself. The new capital was situated close to Rāmahati and its ruins have recently been discovered by the Varendra Research Society.4 He built a new temple of Siva named "Pradyumnesvara" on the bank of a large tank, the site of which also has been identified by the Varendra Archaeological Society. This temple was situated in the village of Devapāra or Deopāra, which is about six miles distant from Vijaypur Milik, the site of Vijayapur, the capital founded by Vijayasena. Vijaypur Milik itself is situated on the banks of the river Ganges, about ten miles due east from the town of Rampur-Boalia.

After defeating the King of Gauda, who has been identified with Madanapāla, Vijayasena attacked Mithilā and conquered several Kings, viz., Rāghava, Varāhana and Vīra.5 He led an expedition to Kāmarūpa and most probably succeeded in overthrowing Vaidyadeva or his successor.6 We learn from the Deopara Inscription that he defeated the King of Kalinga. Most probably Anantavarmanma Cōḷaṅga led another raid into Western Bengal, but was repulsed by Vijayasena. Vijayasena’s dominions comprised of Eastern Bengal, Western Bengal and Northern Bengal. An unpublished copper-plate grant of this King was issued from the victorious camp at Vikramapura, and so it must be admitted that Eastern

---

4 Gouḍarājaṃaḷa, p. 65.
6 Ibid.
Bengal formed a part of his kingdom, and also that the Varnman Dynasty had ceased to reign. The kingdom was bounded on the East by that of Nānyadeva in Mithila and that of Madanapāla in Magadha. Vijayasena must have reigned for at least forty years, as his newly-discovered copper-plate grant was issued in the 37th year of his reign. He was succeeded by his son Vallālasena, and the name of his wife Vilāsadevi is known to us both from his own copper-plate grant and that of his son. Only two inscriptions of Vijayasena have been discovered up to date. The most important one is the Deopārā praśasti, recording the erection of the temple of Pradyūnmeśvara, which must form the basis of all new accounts of the Sena Dynasty, for some years to come. The other inscription is the newly-discovered copper-plate grant, which was brought to me for decipherment by a friend several years ago, but which I am unable to trace at present. This plate records the grant of a village to a Brāhmaṇa of Śāṇḍilya Gotra as the dakṣinā of the Tulāpuruṣa ceremony performed by the Queen Vilāsadevi, and was issued from Vikrampura in the 37th year of the King. Vijayasena’s death seems to have taken place about the year 1108 A.D. Vijayasena was succeeded by his son Vallālasenadeva, who seems to have been an aged man when he came to the throne. His name is well known throughout Bengal as the founder of Kulinism. But as neither his own copper-plates nor those of his son Laksmanasena contain any references to Kulinism, even when referring to Brāhmaṇas to whom land was granted, the legend about its origin should be accepted with great caution. The whole system may be of much later origin and of no historical importance at all. Vallālasena’s dates, as found in some works on Law and Astronomy, the authorship of which are ascribed to him, are misleading. These dates are found in some verses in the Dānasāgara, a work on Law, and in the Adhūtasāgara, a work on Astronomy. I have pointed out elsewhere that these verses are not to be found in all manuscripts of these two works, and should, therefore, be taken as later additions.¹ According to these verses, the Dānasāgara was compiled by Vallālasena in S. 1091 = 1169 A.D.² and the Adhūtasāgara was begun by him in S. 1090 = 1168 A.D.³ Mr. Manomohan Chakravartti has discovered another verse in the Dānasāgara, according to which Vallālasena ascended the throne in S. 1081 = 1159 A.D.⁴, but these verses are hardly of an historical importance, as they appear to be later additions. If, on later enquiry, these verses can be found in all the manuscripts discovered, even then they cannot be accepted as basis for the construction of a chronology, so long as they are to be found in modern manuscripts. If they can be found in manuscript records of the 12th and 13th century A.D., then only these dates can be accepted as correct. I have tried to show elsewhere that the Bodh-Gayā inscriptions of Asokacalla⁵ prove that Laksmanasena died before 1070 A.D.,⁶ consequently, unless some contemporary

⁴ J.A.S.B. (N. S.), 1906, p. 17, Note.
record can be cited as evidence, it cannot be said, on the basis of the verses in the Dān asāgara and the Abhūtasāgara, that Vallaśasena came to the throne in 1159 A.D. and wrote a book on law ten years later. Only one inscription of this king has been discovered up to date. This is a copper-plate grant discovered in January, 1911, at Sitāhātī, near Kātwā, in the Burdwan District of Bengal. It records the grant of the village of Vallaśita in the Uttara Rādhā Maṇḍala of the Vardhamāna bhūkti to a Brāhmaṇa named Ovaśudeva-Śarmman as the Dakṣina of the Hemāśva-Mahādaṇa (the gift of a golden horse), performed by the Queen Vilasadevi, the king's mother, on the 16th Vaiśākha in the 11th year of his reign. The Dūtaka of this grant was the king's minister of peace and war, Hari-ghoṣa, who is the only officer of Vallaśasena whose name has come down to us. Vallaśasena married Rāmadevi of the Calukya family and was succeeded by his son Lakṣmanasena. As the initial year of the Lakṣmanasena era is 1119-20 A.D., so Lakṣmanasena must have ascended the throne in that year, consequently, Vallaśasena cannot be taken to have reigned more than 12 or 13 years. He seems to have been a peaceably inclined, weak, old man, studious in his habits, and a patron of Brāhmaṇism. Both he and his father seem to have belonged to the Śaiva sect, as their inscriptions begin with an invocation to Śiva.

Step by step, the Gāhaḍavāla Kings of Kanauj advanced towards the East. Govindacandra seems to have conquered the whole of Magadhā in the earlier part of his reign (1114 = 54 A.D.). In 1127 he was in a position to grant a village in the Patna District to a Brāhmaṇa. An unpublished grant, a photograph of which has been kindly lent to me by Prof. Jadunath Sircar, M.A., of the Patna College, records the donation of the village of Pādoli, together with the village of Guṇāve in the Maṇiari Pattalā, to a Brāhmaṇa of the Kāṣyapa Gotra named Gaṇeśvarā-Śarmman, after bathing in the Ganges at Kānyakubja, on Sunday, the 11th of the dark half of Jyaistha of the Vikrama year 1183 = 1127 A.D. I have been given to understand by Prof. Sircar that this new inscription will shortly be published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The invasion of Magadhā by the Gāhaḍavāla King seems to have led to hostilities between Govindacandra and Lakṣmanasena. In the Madanapāḍa Grant of Viśvarūpasena and Edilpur Grant of Keśavasena, Lakṣmanasena is said to have erected pillars of victory at Benares (Vāraṇasī) and at Allahabad (Trivenī).

Belāyāṁ daksinavānha-muṣṣala-dhara gadaṁpiṇi samvāśavedyāṁ Tirotāṅge trivenyāh kamalabhava-makhārambha nirvvyājapute yen-occair-aṣṭa-yātāḥ saha samara-jayasthambhamāla nyadhāyī. v.3

The Maṇiari Pattalā mentioned in the copper-plate grant of Govindacandra mentioned above has been identified with the modern Muner, a village of considerable importance in the Patna District, which was a well-known place in the 12th century. Bakhtiyar Khilji directed some of his expeditions against this town before the

conquest of Bihar and Bengal. Govindacandra advanced as far as Monghyr in the year II.46 A.D. and granted the village of Tatacavāda in the Paṇḍālā Patṭalā, in Govisāloka, that belonged to Duhāli in Saruvāra, to a Brāhmaṇa named Thakkura Śrīdhara, after bathing in the Ganges at Mudgagiri (Monghyr) on the occasion of the Aksāyatṛtiya, on Monday the 3rd of the bright half of the Vaisākha of the Vikrama year 1202, the 15th April, II.46 A.D. Govindacandra was most probably leading an expedition into Bengal when he bathed in the Ganges at Monghyr, and granted the village mentioned above. The expedition would surely have been mentioned in some Gahaḍavāla inscription. The use of the era of Laksmaṇasena in two inscriptions at Bodh-Gayā prove that in spite of the efforts of the Gahaḍavāla Kings Eastern Magadha continued to be in the possession of the Senas up to II93 A.D. Most probably the river Son was the boundary line of the Gahaḍavāla and the Sena Kingdoms.

Laksmaṇasena, the son of Vallālasena, ascended the throne in II19 A.D. He was an energetic and able ruler like his grandfather Vijayasena. In the lifetime of his father he led an expedition into Kaliṅga. After his accession to the throne he defeated the King of Benares, i.e., Govindacandra, in battle and conquered Kāmarūpa. In the copper-plate grants of his sons, Keśavasena and Viśvarūpasena, he is said to have planted a pillar of victory on the shores of the Southern Ocean, which most probably means that he defeated some Southern King in battle. Nothing is known about his length of reign, but his kingdom consisted of Eastern, Western and Northern Bengal and the eastern part of Magadha. It is also probable that part of Mithilā was included in his kingdom.

Four copper-plate inscriptions and one stone inscription of this king has been discovered up to date. The earliest of these is the Tarbandighi Grant, found in 1874 at Tarbandighi at Gangarampur in the Dinajpur District. It records the grant of the village of Viṭvahitī in the Paṇḍravardhana bhūkti as the daksinā of the Golden Horse and Chariot ceremonies (Hemāśva-rathā) to a Brāhmaṇa named Śrī Isvara Śarmman.

During the reign of Laksmaṇasena the western part of Magadha seems to have passed into the hands of the Gahaḍavāla Kings of Kanauj. The local rulers practically acquired independence, as an example of which we may cite the name of the Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala of Jāpila. The earliest record of this generation is a short rock inscription near the Tutrahi Falls in the Shahabad District, the date of which corresponds to 19th April, II58 A.D. According to an unpublished inscription at Rohṭasgaḍh, the King set up some monuments on the 27th March, III69 A.D. In the same district, there is another rock inscription at Tārācaṇḍi incised in the Vikrama era 1225, corresponding to III69 A.D. According to another inscription at Rohṭasgaḍh, the family to which this dynasty belonged is called Khayāravāla Vamsa
The relations between this chief and the Gāhādāvāla Kings of Kanauj has been made clear by the Tārāchāndi inscription of the same prince. This inscription was edited by Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall in 1860. According to this inscription, in Samvat 1225 on Wednesday, the third day of the dark half of Jyaiṣṭha, = 16th April, 1169 A.D., Pratāpadhavala announces that a certain copper-plate recording the grant of the villages of Kalahandi and Baḍapilā has been obtained by several Brāhmaṇas by bribing one, Deu, the slave of King Vijayacandra of Kānyakubja. The inscription finally adds that the proprietary share of the rent should be collected yearly as before. This inscription shows very clearly that though Pratāpadhavala was semi-independent, he was obliged to recognize the suzerainty of the Gāhādāvāla King of Kanauj. The villages stated above within his territories could be granted by the King of Kānyakubja to anybody he liked.

After the death of Laksmanasena three of his sons seem to have come to the throne:—(1) Mādhavasena, (2) Viśvarūpasena and (3) Keśavasena. Nothing is known about the order of succession of these princes and their dates. Elsewhere I have tried to prove that Mādhavasena precedes the other sons of Laksmanasena, Viśvarūpa, and he in his turn preceded Keśavasena. One copper-plate inscription of each of these princes have been discovered, viz., those of Viśvarūpa and Keśavasena. A copper-plate of Mādhavasena has been preserved in a monastery in the Tehri State.

Viśvarūpsena is known from his now lost Madanapāḍa Grant of the year 14 of his reign. It records the grant of certain lands in the village Pīṇjakāśṭhi in the Vikramapura division (bhāga) of Eastern Bengal (Vanga) of the Paunḍravaruddhana bhukti to a Brāhmaṇa named Viśvarūpadeva-śarmman. His brother Keśavasena is also known from his Edilpur Grant of the year 3, which records the grant of certain lands in the province (pradeśa) of Eastern Bengal, the division (bhāga) of Vikramapura and the bhukti of Paunḍravaruddhana to Īśvaradeva-Śarmman, a brother of the Viśvarūpadeva Śarmman of the Madanapāḍa Grant. The Sena Dynasty came to an end with the Muhammadan occupation of East Bengal, and the last kings are not known.

In 1161 A.D. we find a king named Govindapāladeva in Magadha. His existence is proved from a stone inscription and six manuscript records. But we are not yet in a position to state clearly whether he belonged to the Imperial Pāla Dynasty or not. Yet the suffix Pāla and the Buddhist titles (e.g. Parama-saṅgata) would lead us to believe that he was descended from them. He seems to have come to the throne in 1161 A.D., as the Gayā Stone Inscription distinctly mentions that his fourteenth regnal year fell in v.s. 1232 = 1175 A.D. A manuscript of the Aśṭasāhasriāl Prajñāpāramitā discovered by Hodgson at Nepal, which was copied in the fourth year of the King’s reign, mentions the

---

2 Atkinson’s Kuniayun.
3 J.A.S.B., 1896, Pt. I, p. 6, pl. I & II.
name of Nālanda (?) as the place of copying. So it may be assumed with a tolerable degree of certainty that Govindapāla ruled a portion, probably the eastern one, of Magadha. The records which mention this king contain some curious phrases and will be edited before we come to discuss the events of the king's reign:

I. The Gaya Stone Inscription of Govindapāla.

This record was found in the walls of a small shrine to the south of the main shrine of Gadādhara, just below the courtyard of the Viṣṇupad Temple at Gayā. It has already been mentioned by Cunningham, who reproduced it in a lithograph, and by Kielhorn. It is incised on the back-slab of an image of a female deity with four hands and consists of fifteen horizontal and one vertical lines. A lingam is to be found at the top of the record, which runs as follows:

1. Oṁ* oṁ svasti namo bhagavate Vāsudevaya! Vrahmāno dvīya parārdhe
2. Vārāha-kalpe vaivaṣvata manvantare Aṣṭāvimśatime yuge kalau pūrva-sam-
3. -ndhyayām samvat 1232 Viśkāri samvatsare Śrī Govindapāla-de-
4. -va-gatarājye caturdasa samvatsare Gayāyam || Vaśiṣṭhā-gotro-
5. -ti-guṇo dvivedaḥ Śrī Ṣaḷaya [s] sūla-sūlan mahāntum || Vidyādharaṁ gu
6. gulinam Gadābhūṁ-maṁhe anākiri dhanā dvijānim || bhokṣātām-avdam pra-
7. ti-soḍaśaiva kārṣṭa-paṇi vṛddhita-eva ladhvāḥ Mulaṅ-ca || paṇcāsād-i
8. -h-aṁ śākṣī Padmābhidhāṇo-tha ca Viṣārūpa || Nrṣimha Śrī-ḍhari-deva
9. Dharo Śrī (?) daṇḍa (?) nī(ya)kau || Viṣṇu-seva-karaṇ ca-ātē tapovan-
   nivāsinaḥ || Rāghavāḥ
10. Śrīkaro s Śūko Dīmodarakaḥ Hidharaṇ Bhikkhodeva nidhirādhammū ca-ātē pāla-
11. -na-kārīnaḥ || A-candrārkaṁ-imam ḍharmmaṁ pāḷaviṣyanti ye sukham ||
   praṭyavādam te-
12. -svamedhāsya phalam prāpsanti mānavaḥ || Āśvine sukla-panicamyām
   bhojyaṁ yo
13. virayed-īdām || Labhaṁ sāv-īsiṁligdham mahāpālaka-panicakam || praṣasti-
14. -r-īyam kṛtā Śrī-Yukenivrayena iktiṁ c-evāṁ Kājaśī-ṛaya-kuṇārābhāyāṁ ||
15. OmŚ Someśvaro-tra sākṣasāti Padmanābha Gayāditya Devarūpaṁsya purato dattā
   ca-āte Kapardarakā ||

The only peculiarity noticeable in this inscription is the use of the word gate. The words giving the regnal year may be taken—

1. to mean that the Vikāri Samvatsara and v.s. 1232 fell in the 15th regnal year, i.e. when the 14th was expired;
2. to mean that Govindapāla himself was dead, but this was the 14th year from the date of his consecration;

---

4 Expressed by a symbol.
5 On right side.
(3) to mean that Govindapāla was alive, but that part of the country which once belonged to him, had then ceased to do so.

At the time of the Muhammadan conquest, we find similar peculiar wording in inscriptions and colophones of MSS. The second conclusion is obviously wrong, as we know from the colophone of one of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Cambridge University Library (see No. 5 below) that his kingdom was destroyed (Vinasā) in his 38th regnal year; so he could not have died before that date. The first interpretation is also obviously impossible, as there is no evidence in the whole range of Northern India Inscriptions of an "expired regnal year" being used to express a date. The third explanation is the only one applicable to the particular case. We find a parallel case in the Belkhara Inscription of V.S. 1253.

The rest of the records are colophones of manuscripts.

(2) Colophone of a MS. of the Aṣṭa-sāhasrika Prajināpāramitā (last page only) recently acquired by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstrī:—

1. —vṛṣa ca dhārayītvā vācayītvā—vṛṣa pravarttānām vihārantu sadārthina iti Ye dharmā hetu prabhava

2. (he)tuṇ-tesān-tathāgato hy-avadat-tesān-ça yo nirodha evam vādī mahāśram-āṇāh | Devadharmanyam pravara-mahā-yāṇa (yāyi-)

3. naḥ Khānodakiya Yaśarāṇ-puruṣasthānaṃ | Dīṇapati Kṣanitī-rakṣitasya yadatra punyana-tadbhavaty-ācary-opādhyāya mā
tā pīṭḥ pūrvamgamam kṛtva sahala satva-rāṣṭe-anuttara-jañāna-phaḥ-āvāptaya iti | Śrīmad-Govinda-prādēvāsaṇa-vyāttī
devahānām sarvāntakā dhṛtyām pravarttānām vahavatī pravara-mahā-yāṇa (yāyi-)

5. Samvat ASA 18 Kūrālīka dine 15 Cangāda pāṭhakāvasthita Khānodakiya Yaśarāṇ-opūre Ācārya Prajinām—

(3) Colophone of a MS. of Amarakośa in the collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal:—

1. —ṣeṣa tati | Arthāntāḥ ady-alam pṛāpt-āpanna-pūrvvāḥ paropagāḥ | taddhitārtho dvīgah samkhya-sarvanāma-tad-anitakāḥ vahuvirih-adig-nāmnām-un

2. —āntkā | Guṇa-dravya-kiṛtyā-yog-opādhibhiḥ (portion of the palm-leaf torn out) r-agāmināḥ | Kutaḥ kartarāya samajnāyām kṛtyāḥ karttari karmanī Anādy-

3. —an-āntena rakt-ādy-arthenā | Parā-virodhī śeṣam tu jñeyam śiṣṭa prayogataḥ | Līṅgasāṅgrahāḥ samāptāḥ ,

4. Paramahāṭhāra-kṛty-āṇā rājāvalī pūrvvavat Śrī-Govinda-pāliya samvat 24 Caitra śudi 8 subham-asti sarvā jayatām-iti
devahānām sarvāntakā dhṛtyām pravarttānām vahavatī pravara-mahā-yāṇa (yāyi-)

5. Samvat ASA 18 Kūrālīka dine 15 Cangāda pāṭhakāvasthita Khānodakiya Yaśarāṇ-opūre Ācārya Prajinām—

(4) Colophone of a MS. of the Guhyāvalī vivriti in the collection of the University of Cambridge:—

1. —Yād-alambhi punyāni-āṇaṃ sarvājagataḥ kila bodhi-lakṣmīḥ | Yat sarvava-

satva-janitī-āśubha-yogatōham syān-nārak-āṇāla-vyāto

2 J.A.S.B., 1900, Pt. I, p. 120, no. 25.
3 Bendall’s Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. in the University Library, Cambridge, p. 188.
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2. -nānī-suhamsaḥ ṣu Guhy-āvali-vīrīṭhī Vīrīṭhī pāṇḍita-sthavira-Śrī-Ghanadeva-vasya ṣu

3. Govinda-pāladevunāṁ sam 37 Śrānukaṁ ṣu likhitam-īdam pustakam kā Śrī-Gayākareṇe ṣu

(5) Colophone of a MS. of the Pāṇcākāra in the collection of the University of Cambridge:

1. Hemante Rānasambhavaḥ  Vasaṇe Amita-bhave Grīṣme Amogha-siddhiḥ  Śīṣire Vajrasatvavāḥ  Dharmanā-dhātu Vajrasatvāḥ dvāre Vajrasa-

2. -tvāḥ Sarva-trailokyam-ekākāra-vajrasatvāḥ praśasyate pāṇcākār-ātmaṁ sarvam trailokyam sacarācaratīḥ  yady-āpi rājyam nirvīka-

3. -pānaye ṣrṣyate ṣu Jagal pāṇcākār-saṅkhāra-vaṇṇakavāna pāṇca-Vuddhāḥ pra-ḥṛtītīḥ Pāṇcāvaraṇa-ṇīrmanvātāḥ Vuddhāḥ syuḥ ṣaṁ-


5. c-añāṇi kathitunā tathāgataḥ  Īśam vīnāṣyāmāḥ bhāvayet satataṁ prāp-nuyagrajaṁ vodhum  Samyak-sambuddha-bhāṣitaḥ pāṇcākār-


7. bhūlīṣhāyanāṁ ṣu Jyāiṣṭha-Kṛṣṇa-āṣṭmyāṁ tithau Yatra sam 38 Jyāiṣṭhādine 8 likhitam-īdams pustakam Kā Śrī-Gayākareṇe ṣu

(6) Colophone of a MS. of the Yoga-ratna-mālā by Kālīṇa or Kṛṣṇacarāya in the collection of the University of Cambridge:

1. -de Mahāsūkṣma-saṅgī-gecaratvāḥ Vajrasatvāgaṇaḥ  Tėśanmanḍaṁ sāram  Nabho-gaham-anābhaṣatvāḥ Virajakṣam kleśakṣayī Mokṣaṁdam

2. Samsārāṭkrāṇīvātāḥ  Pīla te toṁ-āṣ-ītī Tathā śivaḥ praty-ātma-vedyatvāt Vajrapāda-nayor-adhiṣṭhānāṁ yena-ādhiṣṭhaye ṣu Yoge-

3. -yāṁ kṛtvā Hevajra-pāṇiḥkām  yat-punyam-ācitaṁ tena nikṛśaḥ syād-akhilo janaḥ Śrī-Hevajrapāṇiḥkā Yogeṣṭhamālā sa-

4. -miṭṭā ṣu Kṛṣṭ-īyam Pāṇḍit-ācāraya Śrī-Kahna-pādānāṁ-ītī Paramesa-varṣ-ādi rājvālī pūrvvavat Śrīma-

5. -dgovinda-pāladevunāṁ sam 39 bhāḍradine 14 likhitam-īdams pustakam kā Śrī Gayākareṇa ṣu

(7) A MS. of the Asṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā examined by Mahāmohapāḍhyāya Hara Prasāda Śāstri in 1893. "The work is on palm-leaves pressed between two wooden boards, with sticks inserted through holes in place of strings. One of the boards is besmeared with sandal paste, which has accumulated there for ages. The MS. was evidently an object of worship, and as Prajñāpāramitā is also called Rakṣa-

Bhagavati, it appears to have been regarded as a charm for protection against evils. The MS. was copied in the 38th year of Govindapāla, who is styled Gauḍēśvara, i.e. the year 1198 A.D."

\[1\] Bendall's Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. in the Univerity Library, Cambridge, p 190.

(8) A MS. of the Prajināpāramitā of 8000 verses in the collection of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland written at Nalanda in the fourth year of the King’s reign:—

1. Mātā-pitr-pūrvangambam kṛtvā sakala-satva-rāṣer-anuttara-jñāna-phaṇ-āvāp-taya iti | Paramesvara Paramabhaṭṭāraka Paramasaugata Magharāji-dhrāja Śrī-mad-Govindapālasya-vijaya-rājya-saṃvatsare 4 Śuṇy-odakagrāma-vāstavya Śrī-man-Nalanda-

2. m-astu sarva-jāgatām.³

It will be observed that out of these eight records only two mention the King as living. In No. 8 we find the usual titles and no peculiarity, consequently it can be admitted that Govindapāla reigned for at least four years. In No. 4 though titles have been omitted yet the absence of such formulae as “Paramesvaretyādī Rājavalī-pūrvavat” at the beginning, and such phrases as “gatarājye,” “aiitarājye” and “vinaśṭa-rājye” make it certain that the King Govindapāla was alive in the 37th year from the date of his consecration, i.e. 1197 A.D. This being admitted, we find that the phrases gata and aiita are used in other records in a peculiar sense, signifying that the reign of the Prince was at an end, in that particular locality, but that it was still continuing at some other place. Thus in the Gayā Inscription of the Vikrama year 1232 the use of the word gata means that Govindapāla’s reign had ceased at Gayā, but was continuing somewhere else. The use of the word Aiita in the MS. discovered by Mahāmahopādhyāya Hara Prasāda Sāstri, which was copied in 38th year of his reign, signifies that his reign was at an end at the place where the MS. was copied. Only the use of the special word Vinaṣṭa in No. 6 signifies that the remnants of his authority was destroyed in that year, as has been correctly interpreted by Bolland,² by the Muhammdans under Bakhtyār-Kilji. It appears that Govindapāla ruled lower part of Eastern Magadha close to Nalanda and yet bore the title of Gauḍeśvara. He was recognized as the real King by Buddhists in all parts of the country. He managed to continue his reign till 1199, when Cauhān, Gaharwār, Pāla and Sena were all swept away by the whirlwind of Muhammadan invasion.

Extent of Kingdom.

An inscription of the time of Vigrahapāla III was found by me recently on the pedestal of an image of Buddha in the Indian Museum. This appears to be the inscription mentioned by Cunningham.⁴ It runs as follows:—

2. Deya [dha]rmnoyam suvarṇaṇakāra Dehekasya Sāhe sutasya

“The year 13, the 14th day of Mārggaśiśa, of the reign of the illustrious Vigrahapāladeva. The religious gift of the goldsmith Deheka, son of Sāhe.”

Postscript.

An inscription of the time of Vigrahapāla III was found by me recently on the pedestal of an image of Buddha in the Indian Museum. This appears to be the inscription mentioned by Cunningham.⁴ It runs as follows:—

2. Deya [dha]rmnoyam suvarṇaṇakāra Dehekasya Sāhe sutasya

“The year 13, the 14th day of Mārggaśiśa, of the reign of the illustrious Vigrahapāladeva. The religious gift of the goldsmith Deheka, son of Sāhe.”

² Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. in the University Library, Cambridge, Introduction, p. iii.
I have since been informed by Pandit Rajani Kanta Chakravartti of Maldah and Babu Aksaya Kumar Maitreya of Rajshahi that Babu Haridas Palit's identification of Amarti with Ramanti is not correct. I am also informed that there are no villages called Jagdalā or Damrol near Amarti in the Maldah District.

R. D. Banerji.
20 7-1914.
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INDEX.

A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhūtasāgara, work on astronomy ascribed to Vallālasena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādīdeva, Śāndhivigrahika of the king of Vaiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādityasena, independent king of Magadha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādivarāha, see Bhoja I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwand Bihār, see Udaṇḍapura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Amarakoṣa&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoghavāra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantavarman, king of Orissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka, XIII rock edict of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Aṣṭāsāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ātiṣa, the life of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avanivarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avanti (Malwa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bālāditya, temple at Nālandā burnt by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benares occupied by Mahīpāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal, invasions of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Assam, 43; from Kanauj, 43; by Rāṣṭrakūṭas, 45, 60; by Gurjaras, 55; by Amoghavarṣa I, 59; by Mongolian tribes, 63; by Kṛṣṇa II, 66; by Govinda-candra, 107; by Vikramāditya VI, 99; Coḷa invasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhādak country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgyadevi, daughter of Tuṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāṇḍadeva, a monastery at Gayā erected by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Vappadeva's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaṇḍi, cousin of Haṃsavarṇadhana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— race of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhavadeva I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavadeva II, minister of Harivarmanadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhīma, Rudoka's son, 85; execution of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhīmadeva I of Anahilvād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhīmayaṇās, prince of Pīṭhī and Magadha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhoja (N.-E. Rajputana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— I, expedition against Bengal of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— I, Gurjara king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— II, son of Mahendrapāla and De-hanūgā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojavaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boar incarnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodhisatva Padmapāṇi, Chaṇḍīnau image of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brāhmaṇas, descent of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bṛhat Sanihita&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist Vihāra, built by Rāmapāla at Rāmāvati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cakrāyudha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambay plates of Govinda III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauḍa-kausika, a drama by Ārya Kṣemisvāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candārījuna of Saṅkaṭagrāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candradeva, a Gāhālavālī king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāhamāna Gūvika I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology of the Pālās, confusion of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coḷa I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dāmarā, Bhīma's capital | 91 |
| Damaśūra | 72 |
| Dānasaṅgara, ascribed to Vallālasena | 105, 106 |
| Dāṇḍabhukti, subjugation of | 71 |
| Darbhapāṇi Miśra, Devapāla's minister | 55, 57, 62 |
| Dayitvasīṇu, grandfather of Gopāla I | 45 |
## INDEX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deddadevi, the wife of Gopāla I</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dēkkarīya (Dhekura, Dhekuri ?)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposition of Indrāyudha</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devagupta</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devakhaḍa, Jāṭakhaḍa’s son</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devapāladeva</td>
<td>47, 53, 55, 56, 57, 62, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devapara, see Inscriptions—Deopara.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devarakṣita of Pithi, wars of Rāmapāla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with</td>
<td>86, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dharmmamaṅga”</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmamāmitra, Buddhist elder</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmmapāla (Dharmmapāladeva)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—, a feudatory of Mahipāla</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhruvarāja, father of Govinda III</td>
<td>44, 49, 50, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— II of Gujarat</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divvoka, “rebel”</td>
<td>84, 85, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorapavarddhana of Kausāmī</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drāvīḍas (= Rāṣṭrakūṭas)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E

Eastern Bengal, independent kingdom in 67

Empire, the Second Pāla | 68, 69 |

### G

Gadādhara, temple at Gayā | 78, 79, 95 |

Gāhāḍavālā | 87, 88, 89, 105, 107, 108 |

Gandāhara (N.-W. Frontier Provinces) | 51 |

Ganges and Yamunā, confluence of | 66 |

—, bridge of boats on the | 90, 91 |

Gāṅgeyadeva, king of Cedis | 70, 74, 76 |

Garga, Dharmmapāla’s minister | 62 |

Gauḍa, 43, 44, 45, 56, 59, 77, 89; occupied by Mongols | 63 |

—, Kamboja kings of | 69 |

Gayā, city of | 58, 59, 60, 61 |

Ghanarāma, author of Dharmmamaṅga | 46 |

Gopāla (Gopāladeva) I | 45, 47, 48, 62, 84 |

— II | 65, 66, 69, 70 |

— III | 84, 85, 92, 94, 102 |

Gopāladeva’s election | 45 |

Govardhana, Ādīdeva’s son, renowned warrior | 98 |

Govinda III, king of Rāṣṭrakūṭa | 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56 |

Govinda-Candra, king of Vaṅga | 73, 106, 107 |

Govindapāladeva of Magadhā | 96, 97, 108, 111, 112 |

---

**Grants—**

| Āṅgāchī | 47, 70 |
| Amoghaṕarṣa I, grant of | 49, 52 |
| Bangarḥ | 80 |
| Baroda | 52 |
| Belabo | 97 |
| Benares | 65 |
| Bhagalpur | 47, 48, 50, 57, 60, 62 |
| Dinajpur | 47, 70, 76 |
| Edilpur | 106 |
| Harivarmmaṇa | 97 |
| Kamaṇli | 45, 94, 95 |
| Khalimpur | 45, 47, 51, 53, 54 |
| Madanapāḍa | 106, 108 |
| Manahali | 47, 57, 62, 76, 84, 91, 103, 104 |
| Monghyr | 53, 56, 57 |
| Mungir | 47 |
| Patna grant of Govinda-candra | 106 |
| Radhanpur | 44, 50, 52 |
| Sitāḥāṭi grant of Vallīḷasena | 72, 79 |
| Tarpandighi | 107 |
| Una grant of Mahendrapāla | 52 |
| Wani grant by king Govinda III | 44, 50 |

“Guhyavali viṣṇuṭi” | 110 |

Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family | 52 |

Guravamisra, Kedārara’s son | 56, 62, 69 |

Gurjāra family | 49, 58, 60, 62, 64, 89 |

—Pratihāra Empire | 66, 67, 69 |

Gurjaras | 45, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 58, 66, 70, 77 |

### H

Haihaya king of Tripūrā | 58 |

Hari, Bhīma’s friend, execution of | 91 |

Harivamsa-puṇaṇa (Jaīna) | 48, 50 |

Harivarman | 98 |

“Harṣa-carita” | 44 |

Harṣadeva | 43 |

Harṣavarddhana | 43, 44 |

Hatipāla | 95 |

Himalayas | 55 |

Hūṇas, humbled by Devapāla | 50, 76 |

---

**Imprisonment of Rāmapāla and Śūrapāla** | 84 |

Indian Museum, Calcutta, Inscription gallery | 61 |

Indra III, Rāṣṭrakūṭa king | 66 |

Indrārāja (Indrāyudha ?) | 48, 50 |

Indrāyudha | 48, 50, 51 |
## INDEX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscriptions</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ādityasena's</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksayavatā</td>
<td>80, 83, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asni inscription of Mahipāla</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badal pillar inscription</td>
<td>55, 56, 57, 63, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banka's</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belkhara</td>
<td>110, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bheraghat</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhuvanesvara</td>
<td>97, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilhari</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchkala</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deo-Banārak</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deopārā</td>
<td>103, 104, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmapāla</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinajpur pillar inscription, the date of</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadādhara temple inscription at Gayā</td>
<td>78, 79, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahaḍāvāla</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayā</td>
<td>60, 109, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghosrawan</td>
<td>56, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govindapāla</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guniyā</td>
<td>63, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwálīor</td>
<td>44, 49, 58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imādpur</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamauli</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanbel</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalimpur</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇadvārāk temple inscription</td>
<td>77, 79, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendrapāla</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahipāla I</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manda</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māndor</td>
<td>58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melpāḍi</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nālandā</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasiṁha</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilgund</td>
<td>52, 56, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāla</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathari</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratihāra</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— Kakkuka</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmapāla</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rām-gayā</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohtasgadh</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth</td>
<td>74, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitāhāti</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitalā temple</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārāchaṇḍi</td>
<td>107, 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tetrawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirhut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumolai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāṅga Dharmāvaloka's inscription at Mahabodhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakṣapāla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaina work, Vatsarāja mentioned in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātakhaḍga, Khadgodyama's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadeva, the Licchavi, grandson of Harṣadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayapāla, father of Vīgrapāla I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāpīda, story of the banished king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasiṁha of Daṇḍabhūkti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jivitaguṭa II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyotirvarman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaivarta, king of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakka, a general of Bhoja I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalīṅgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāmarūpa, conquests and invasions of 92, 98, 104, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamboja race, king of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambojas, Mongolian tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— the name of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanauj (Mahodaya), 43, 49, 50, 51, 52, 58, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Kaūrṇākumbha”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṇyakūmba, occupied by Indra III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— the capital of the Gurjaras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārkapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇadeva, Cedi emperor 51, 59, 65, 71, 76, 77, 79, 80, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karṇa-Keśari of Utkala, defeated by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasiṁha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karṇaṭakas, defeated by Mahipāla I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karṇaṭa army, defeated by Vāluka-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhavala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauśambī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedāramiśra, Darbhapāṇi's grandson 55, 56, 57, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendedapatna plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keśavasena, Lakṣmaṇasena's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khadgodyama, king of Eastern Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīrā (Kangra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirttivarman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Kokkala I, Cedi emperor .. 65
Košala (Orissa hill tracts) .. 43, 71
Kṣṣaṇa II, Rāṣṭrakūṭa king .. 66
— III .. 66
Kṣṭiptāla, see Mahīpāla
Kulīnism, Vallālasena the founder of .. 105
Kumārapāla .. 84, 85, 92, 94, 101, 102
Kuṅgas, subdued by Karṇaṇadeva .. 77
Kuru (Eastern Punjab) .. 51

L
Laijādevi, the wife of Vīgrahapāla I .. 58
Lakṣmaṇaśena, Vallālasena's son 105, 106, 107
Lakṣmiśūra .. 72, 89

M
Madanapāla, 47, 57, 84, 85, 88, 92, 94, 102, 103, 104
Mādhavagupta .. 43
Mādhavasena .. 108
Magadha 43, 56, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 69, 77, 97, 103, 104, 112
— recovered by the Pālas 65, 66, 70
Mahaṇa, king of Aiiga .. 86, 87
Mahāśamanta, see Karkarāja II
Mahendrapāla .. 52, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66
Mahīndrapāla (Mahendrapāla) .. 64
Mahīpāla I, 47, 57, 59, 63, 66, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 90
— II .. 61, 76, 83, 84, 85, 97
Mehūd of Ghazni .. 70
Mahodaya, see Kanauj.
Mālava .. 56, 59
Mandāra, Lakṣmiśūra, king of .. 89
Mathanadeva, uncle of Rāmapāla, 83, 90, 92, 93, 97
Matsya (N.-E. Raiputana) .. 51
Māyiṇa, conqueror of Assam .. 92, 101
Mithilā (see Tritabhūkti) conquered by Mahīpāla, 70, 73, 74, 95; attacked by Vijayasena .. 104
Monghyr (= Mughagiri) .. 107
Mongolian tribe, invasion of North Bengal .. 63, 68, 69
Mugadagiri, siege of .. 59, 60, 62
Muhammadan occupation .. 68, 108, 110, 112
Muralas, subdued by Karṇaṇadeva .. 77
Mythical accounts of the origin of the Pālas .. 45

N
Nāgabhata II .. 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53
Nāgāvalokaka, defeated by Karkarāja .. 53
Nāgavanīśa, Uttaka returned to .. 92
Nālanda .. 56, 65, 70, 75, 109, 112
Nānyadeva, king of Mithilā .. 103
Narasihśa, victorious chief of Indra III. .. 66
Narasihshadeva II, king of Orissa .. 72
Narasihshāṇija of Kayāṅgala .. 90
Nārāyaṇa, Umapati's grandson, author of Parīśiṣṭapraṣkāṣa .. 58
Nārāyaṇapāla 47, 48, 50, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 69
Nārāyaṇavarman .. 54
Nayapāla, successor of Mahīpāla, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 87, 95
Northern Bengal campaign of Rāmapāla 87
— India, conquered by Dharmmapāla 50
— Indian politics in the 8th and 9th centuries .. 48

O
“Paṇcakara” .. 111
Paṇcāla country .. 51
Paṇca-rakṣā .. 70
Pāḍyas, subdued by Karṇaṇadeva .. 77
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