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

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

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

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

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

मातृभूमिः प्रतिप्रथम, स्रामवल्लभचुतुम्यः।
दत्तः भूप्रदानांति, सत्यवाच्च श्रद्धारिताः॥ १६ ॥

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

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


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

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

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

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

Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, reading both the words “Rasṭika” (or Ristika) and “Pēṭēnika” thus occurring as one, takes it to have been used to denote the hereditary governing families of Mahārāṣṭra. But, as the edict of Shāhbażgarhī contains “सत्य चायूष नकान सरिकने पितिनिकने” it appears that the words “Rāṭhika” and “Pitinika” are used to denote two different tribes.

Mr. C. V. Vaidya holds the word Rāśhtrikā to denote the Rāśhtrakūṭas of the Mahārāṣṭra province, whom he considers to be the Mahārāṣṭa Kṣatriyās, different from the Rāśhtrakūṭas of the north. But in the ancient books “Dipavamsha” and “Mahāvamsha” of the Pāḷī language the word Mahāraṭṭa, and not Rāśhtrikā, stands for the inhabitants of Mahārāṣṭra province.

1 Asoka by Bhandarkar, page 38. 2. In the “Anguttarnikāya” the words “रतिकने” and गांधिरहस्ति are also separately stated.
3 History of Mediaeval Hindu India, part II, page 323.
4 History of Mediaeval Hindu Ind’ia, part II, pages 152-153.
5 From the cave inscriptions of Bhāja, Bālsā, Kārīḷ and Nānāghāṭ of the 2nd century of the Christian Era it appears that this Mahāraṭṭa tribe was very generous.
Dr. Hultzsch holds the words "Rathika" or "Ratриka" (Rashtrika) as pertaining to Arattas of the Punjab. But if, in regard to the derivation of the word Aratta, we were to apply the 'Bahuvrihi Samāsa,' (अ संस्कृतम् व्याप्तं रश्त्रस्त्रिमुखस्मसि) then the difference of opinion would be squared up to some extent. In the inscriptions of the Rāshṭrakūṭas a second name of their tribe is also found as "Raṭṭa". There should be no hesitation, therefore, in supposing that the Rāshṭrakūṭas were formerly the settlers of the Punjab, whence they migrated to the south and in the course of time carved out a kingdom in the Deccan.

A copper grant of Rāshṭrakūṭa king Abhimanyu has been found from the Undikavāṭikā. As it bears no date, it is supposed to be of the beginning of the 7th century of V. S. It contains the words: 'अश्वमद्यलाइत्वं श्रमित्रि राश्त्रमन्यादमिव/ राश्त्राकुट(इ) राजा (नाम) तिलकमूलो मानसं इति रा राश्त्रमन्यादमिव' i.e., king Mānāṅka, the greatest of the Rāshṭrakūṭa race, was adorned with virtue and fame.

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

\[ \text{अंचलनो बालिक्षेता सब पीलुक्षामुन्त || 31 ||} \]
\[ \text{श्राकुटनाम श्राब्दधृग्मन्यात् ॥ ||} \]
\[ \text{समस्यां बिन्यमनं च 'सिस्युप्प' बहिसिभ: || 32 ||} \]
\[ \text{ब्राह्मण नाम ते देशः: .................} \]

Karna Parva, Adhyāya-4,

i.e., the province irrigated by the waters of the Swat, the Bias, the Ravi, the Chenāb, the Jhelum, and the Indus and lying outside the mountains is called Aratta. At the time of the Mahābhārata this province was under the sway of king Shalya.

In the Dharma and Shrauta Sutras of Baudhāyana, this province is stated as a non-Aryan province (vide first prashna, first chapter and 18—12—13 respectively.)

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


3. Some people read ब्राह्मण in place of राश्त्राकुटान्, but it is incorrect.
The stone inscription of Rājā Dantidurga, fixed in the Dashavatāra temple of the Ellora caves, contains the line:—‘न वै वि खलु : जितौ प्रक्षमण्डुकृतनस्य’ i.e., who is not aware of the world-famous Rāṣṭrakūṭa race.

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

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

In the copper grant of Dēoli it is stated that “Raṭṭa” was the originator of this dynasty and “Rāṣṭrakūṭa” was his son from whom the dynasty took its name.

In an inscription of Ghōsūndi in Mewar the dynasty is named as “Rāṣṭravarya” and in a copper grant of Nādōl as “Rāṣṭrauda.”

3 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 234.
4 As “Māṭa”, “Vaddiga” and “Chāpa” are the corrupt forms of “Māṇyakhēṭa” Yādava Vishnurādhma and “Chāpōṭkaṭa” respectively, similarly “Raṭṭa” might also be a corrupt form of “Rāṣṭrakūṭa”.
5 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 218.
8 The birth of Rāṣṭrakūṭa in the family of Raṭṭa is only a poetic conjecture.
9 Copper grant of Chauhāna Kīrtipāla of V. S. 1218.
In the word "Rāśṭrakūṭa" "Rāśṭra" means "kingdom" and "Kūta" denotes collection, "lofty" or "excellent". Thus, the word "Rāśṭrakūṭa" means "a great or excellent kingdom". The country ruled over by this dynasty might have been named "Mahārāśṭra"', which word is similarly formed by prefixing the syllable "Mahā" to the word "Rāśṭra".

In modern times, owing to the divergence of dialects, we come across many corrupt forms of the word "Rāśṭrakūṭa", such as, "Rāṭhavara, Rāṭhavaḍa, Rāṭhaura, Rāṭhauḍa', Rāṭhadā', Rāṭhadā' and Rāṭhōḍa".

Dr. Burnley finding the word "Ratta" used in the later writings of the Rāśṭrakūṭas' connects them with the Telugu-speaking 'Rēḍḍi' tribe. But the latter was a primitive tribe, while the Rāśṭrakūṭas migrated to the south from the north. (This fact will be dealt with hereafter in a separate chapter). Therefore this theory is untenable.

In the court of Rājā Nārāyana Shāha of Mayūragirī there flourished a poet named Rudra. By the order of the said king he compiled a poem named "Rāśṭraudha Vamsha Mahākāvyā" in Shaka Śaṃvat 1518 (V. S. 1653 = A. D. 1596), the first chapter of which contains the

---

1 Just as the country ruled over by the "Mālava" race was named Malwa, and that ruled over by the Gurjaras, Gujarāt, similarly the country ruled over by the Rāśṭrakūṭas in Southern Katiawar was named Saurāśṭra (Soraḥ) and the country between Nārbada and Māhī named Rāṭ and "Lāṭ might be a corrupt form of it. (The country including the states of Alirajpur, Jhabua etc, is probably called Rāṭh.) In the inscription of Skandaṇāpura on the Girnār hill, there is a mention of the "Soraḥ" province. Thus, the names Rāśṭra (Rāṭh), Saurāśṭra (Sorēṭh) and Mahārāśṭra as applied to tracts bear testimony to the greatness of the Rāśṭrakūṭas.

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

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

4 This form is found in the inscription of Rāō Sihā of V. S. 1330, found at Bīṭhū (Dist. Pāli).

5 In the inscription of Rāṭhōḍa Hammira of V. S. 1573, found at Phalodi, the word Rāśṭrakūṭa is used.
lines:—स्नःच्च देह तस्मौवंदेया राजसागरस्तु तत्क्रक्षतुः। अनेन गर्भः च कुलं तत्वोद गर्भेषि
(प्रो) वनामा तद्विश्व प्रतीत्। ॥ २५ ॥ i.e., (the Goddess Lātnā) thus addressed (Rājā-Nārāyaṇa) through the heavens, “He
will be thy son and as he has maintained thy kingdom
and family, his name will be “Rāshṭrōḍha”.

THE RĀSHṬRĀKŪṬAS.
EMIGRATION OF THE RĀṢḤTRAKUṬAS FROM THE NORTH TO THE SOUTH.

It has already been stated that Dr. Hultzsch holds the Rāṣṭrīkās, mentioned in the edicts of Ashoṅka, and the Āraṭṭas, residing in the Punjab at the time of the Mahābhārata, to be of one and the same tribe. The Āraṭṭas existed in the Punjab up to the time of Alexander’s invasion. Similarly, in the edicts of Ashoṅka of Māṇsērā, Shāhbāzgarhi (N.W.F. Province), Girnār (Jūnāgadh) and Dhavali (Kalinga), mention of the Rāṣṭrika occurs just after the Kāṃbōjas and the Gāndhāras. All these facts go to show clearly that the Rāṣṭrakhūṭas at first resided in the north-western part of India and from there they afterwards migrated to the south. Dr. Fleet also holds the same opinion.


2. Though in some inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakhūṭas they are stated to be ‘Chandra Vamśĩs’, yet, in fact, they are ‘Sūrya Vamśĩs’. (This subject will be treated later in a separate chapter). The present rulers of Marwar consider themselves to be the descendants of Kusān, son of Rāmachnanda of the Solar race. In the ‘Vīṣṇu Purāṇa’, 61 kings are named from Ikṣvākū (a descendant of Sūrya), down to Shri Rāmachnanda, and 60 names are enumerated from Shri Rāma to the last (Sūrya Vamshi) king Sumitra. Thus, from Ikṣvākū down to Sumitra there are 121 names of kings in all (and 125 perhaps in the ‘Bhāgavata’). Beyond this, there is no trace of the Solar kings in the Purāṇas. (According to the Purāṇas the time of Sumitra comes to about 3000 (?) years before this day.)

In the ‘Uttar Kāṇḍa’ of the ‘Vālmikīya Rāmāyaṇa,’ Bharat, brother of Shri Rāmachnanda, is stated to have conquered the Gāndhāravas (the people of Kandhar). It also informs us that Bharata had two sons, Taksha and Pushkala. Taksha founded the city of Takshashilā after his name, and Pushkala founded Pushkalavata. Takshashilā is the modern Taxila. This city was situated in a circuit of 12 miles to the south-east of Hasmabad and north-west of Rawalpindi. Pushkalavata was in the north-west near Peshawar. It is at present known as Chārsādā. Kusha, the son of Shri Rāmachnanda, leaving Ayōdhya, had founded the Kushalavati city, near modern Mirzapur, on the bank of the Ganges. It is probable that owing to some mishap the
EMIGRATION OF THE RĀSHṬRAKŪṬAS FROM THE NORTH TO THE SOUTH.

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

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

"Therefore it would be incorrect to connect the words 'रजस्तिकन मित्तिणिकने वेशवि भारत' with शेषवि भारत. 'The residents of the western provinces, mentioned here, might be some people different from the Rāshṭtrakūṭas.

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

¹ History of Mediaeval Hindu India, Part II, page 323.
² Ashōka by D. R. Bhandārkar, page 33.

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

We learn from the 'Rambhāmanjari Nāṭikā' of Nayachandra Sūri that Jayachandra was born in the Ikṣvākū family (refer page 7.)

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

This fact is further proved by the copper grant of Sōlankī Rājarāja of the Deccan, issued in his 32nd regnal year (Shaka S. 975 = V. S. 1110 = A.D. 1053), found at Yēvūr, which informs that after king Udayana, 59 kings of his dynasty ruled over Ayōdhya. The last of these was Vijayāditya who founded the Sōlankī kingdom in the south. His 16 descendants ruled in the Deccan.

1. In this grant Udayana is mentioned as 47th in descent from Brahmā.

2. Mr. J. W. Watson, Political Superintendent, Palanpur, writes that on Thursday Mangasira Sudi 5, Samv. 936 king Shripata Rāṭhōra of Kanauj, on accession to the Gaddi, had made a grant of 16 villages in the north of Gujrat to Chibadiā Brāhmaṇas, out of which village Ėtā is still in the possession of their descendants.

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

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

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

(Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, Page 12.)
THE ORIGIN OF THE RĀSHṬRAKŪṬAS.

About 75 inscriptions and copper grants of the time of the Rāshṭrakūṭa kings of the Deccan and Gujarat have up to this time been found, in only 8 of which the Rāshṭrakūṭas are mentioned as belonging to the Yādava line.

The earliest of these containing the lineage of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, is of Shaka S. 782 (V. S. 917 = A.D. 860), while all the other inscriptions and copper plates of the earlier dates are silent on the point as to whether they are Sūrya Vamshīs or Chandra Vamshīs. Out of the

1 The 8 inscriptions and copper plates are as follows:—
The first of Shaka S. 782 (V. S. 917=A.D. 860) of king Amōghavarsha I, contains:—

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

The second of Shaka S. 833 (V. S. 971=A.D. 914) of Indrārāja III, contains:—

(Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 249.)

The third of Shaka S. 852 (V. S. 987=A.D. 930) and the fourth of Shaka S. 855 (V. S. 990=A.D. 933) of Gōvindarāja IV, mention the lineage of the king as under:—


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


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

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

\[\text{तत्तात्ववे विनतसात्यनितिकिंशाजजम्मा} \]
\[\text{श्रीकृष्णेतृद्धज्ञपित: पुरुषोतमोध्वत्} \]

\[\text{i.e., Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga was born in the line of Yādava Śātyaki.}^1\]

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

\[\text{तर्कमाहिष्ठर}^2 \text{ महाविज्ञापदानुष्ठात}^3 \text{ श्री कृष्णराज }\]

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

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

\[\text{यक्तिमूल सर्वार्थो यज्ञितपति श्रीराष्ट्रकूटकृत्यो}-\]
\[\text{जाते यादववर्णको मस्तुपिपापमीकल्प वर्षे: परे: !}^4\]

\[\text{i.e., by the birth of this virtuous king, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty became as invincible as the Yādava dynasty by the birth of Shri Krishṇa.}^5\]

\[\text{1 Halāyudha in his ‘Kavirahasya’ has also mentioned the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as}
\text{being the descendants of Yādava Śātyaki. Further, in the copper grant of Krishna III,}
\text{dated Shaka S. 862 there is a similar description (तन्त्र सृष्टि सात्यनितिवसापहर:).}^1\]

\[\text{2 In the copper grant of Gōvindachandra, of V. S 1174, the Gāhàdavāla kings}
\text{are also mentioned as ‘Paramanāhēshvara’ or staunch Shaivites.}^2\]

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

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

‘अवेवक्षण प्राणो गोविन्दी श्रीवर्णमाना द्विवर्णमर्मूल’

In the ‘Rāṣṭrāudha Vamsha Mahākāvyya’ of V. S.

---

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

कंशो (सो) प्रसिद्धो (द्रो) हि यथा वर्जीन्द्रो (न्द्रो:) राजोहवयवस्तु तथा न्तीस्मयः।

वताभवदम्घण्डीतितथम्—

tattivaśिवं मा (सा) यष्टुना जगाम ॥ १०॥

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

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

Similarly, in the inscriptions of the Gāhāḍavāla kings of Kanauj they have been mentioned as Śūrya Vamshīs:

1 "मातांदेशिीतेद्वितिविषंशाजात: चमापालमालालिः विंचु मनात्।
सांहल्क्रिवाचाधिक्षु महिषास्कः नात्रा योगेन्द्रवेशः हत्युदरः॥

िे, on the expiry of a line of kings, ‘Śūrya Vamshi’ Yāshōvigrāha, as powerful as the Sun himself, came to the throne.

These Gāhāḍavāla Rāṭhōras were also Rāshtrakūṭas, (this fact will be proved in the next chapter) therefore,
the fact of the Rāshṭrakūṭas being ‘Sūrya Vamshīs’ is unquestionable.¹

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

Therefore, like the Gohila rulers of Bhaonagar, these kings also were considered to be ‘Chandra Vamshīs’ instead of ‘Sūrya Vamshīs’. Formerly, when Gohilas ruled over Kher (Mārwār), they were considered ‘Sūrya Vamshīs. But after their migration to Kathiawar they came to be considered as ‘Chandra Vamshīs’ due to their being influenced by Vaishnavism, as is evinced by the following stanza:

‘चन्द्रचक्रश करिण गोव मुख चक्राकृति
शाखा माधवि सार मण्डल प्रकाश आयू
भ्रमित्रव चन्द्र देव चामुण्डा देवी
वांडव कुल परमांक भाय गोहिल चल एवी
विश्ववंशस्य वर्णमालाय चक्रवर्ति पथो
तै प्रक्ष तेज गोहलादिनो सोरठमुं च सेवक भयो’

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

As stated in a previous chapter, the Rāṣhṭrakūṭās originally migrated from the north to the south.

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

An inscription¹ of Rāṣhṭrakūṭa king Lakhanapāla, who flourished² about V. S. 1258 (A.D. 1201), found at Badaūn, contains the following:—

प्रक्ष्याताबिकिर्ष्टंकुटकुलजयपालस्: पवित्रा
पंचाला वैभवसौभूषणकरी वोद्रास्यूतापुरी ।
................................................
तत्ताबलोकतंत्रवार्तो नरेन्द्र-
श्रेष्ठ: स्यात्मविजितेताविरङ्गनः।

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

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

( Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XIV, page 193.)
A copper grant, dated V. S. 1148 (A.D. 1091), of Gahadavala Chandradeva found at Chandravati (Benares District) contains:

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

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

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

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IX, pages 302-305.
2 Perhaps Chandrā Bardāi, the author of the 'Rāṣṭrakūtas,' has also mentioned Lakhanapāla, the descendant of the Vigrahapāla of Badaun, as a nephew of Jayachandra.
3 The word "Gāhaḍa" in the "Dīṅgala" language means "firmness" and "power." Therefore, when the kings of this dynasty became powerful and strong, it is probable that, they might have assumed this title, or just as the Rāṣṭrakūtas of the village Rainka (in U.P.) have come to be called Rainkāvāle; in the like manner the Rāṣṭrakūtas of this branch, being the residents or rulers of Gadhhipura (Kanauj), were styled as Gahadavālas. For in the corrupt "Prākrit."
name of the dynasty appears in only the copper grants of V. S. 1161, 1162 and 1166 of the prince regent Gōvindachandra¹ as well as in the inscription of his queen Kumāradevi.²

By taking these facts into consideration we conclude that at first the Rāṣṭrakūṭas held sway over Kanauj, after whom the Guptas, the Baisas, the Maukharīs and the Pratihāras¹ ruled there one after another. But from the copper grant⁴ of Shaka Samvat 836 (V. S. 971), issued by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indrarāja III, it appears that he in his invasion of the North, having conquered Upendra, had laid waste Mērū (Kanauj). Probably, Pratihāra Mahīpāla was then ruling there.

After this invasion, the kingdom of the Pratihāras (Pāḍihāras) became weak and their feudatories began to declare independence.⁵ From this it appears that about V. S. 1111 (A.D. 1054) Chandra of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa-langage the form of Gāḍhipura might have become “Gāḥḍa” instead of “Gāḥi-ur.” It may also be noted that when Rāo Sīhā severed all his connections with Kanauj and migrated to Mārwār, he abandoned his surname Gāḥḍavāla and acknowledged himself as simple Rāṣṭrakūṭa.

1 बंधे गाडिवालान्ये बसुर बिजयी तुप:
3 In V. S. 924 (A.D. 867) the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruvarāja II of “Lātā” (Gujarat) had defeated Pratihāra king Bhojadeva of Kanauj. It was Nāgabhata II, the grandfather of this Bhojadeva, who probably established his capital at Kanauj by defeating Rāṣṭrakūṭa Chakrāyudha, the successor of Indrāyudha. History of Rājpūṭāna, Vol. I, page 161, footnote 1.


² Even before this, between V. S. 842 and 850 (A.D. 785 and 793), the kingdom of Dhruvarāja had extended up to Aṃvādhvā in the north. Later, between V. S. 932 and 971 (A.D. 875 and 914), in the time of Krishnārāja II, it spread up to the banks of the Ganges and between V. S. 997 and 1023 (A.D. 940 and 966), in the time of Krishnārāja III, it had extended further north crossing the Ganges.

4 कुतुम्बनीदार हेलोमुखितमोहण।
   बौद्धभिन्नराजेन विद्या ईशे न विद्मितमम्।
Journal Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. XVIII, page 261. This fact is also borne out by the copper grant, dated Shaka Samvat 852, of Gōvinda IV, in which it is stated that Indrarāja III, with his horsemen, crossed the Jamuna and laid waste the city of Kanauj—

—तीर्थाचलकारकचरयुधान मन्न्यप्रतिष्ठार्थी\n   जेनेद्वष्ट मनोव्यावरिनिगः निर्मलमुखितमस्।
kūṭa family, taking possession of Badāūn, might have afterwards conquered Kanauj. After the death of this Chandra his eldest son might have succeeded him at Kanauj and Badāūn might have been given in his life-time, as a ‘Jāgīr’ to his second son.

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

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

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

In some old manuscript chronicles this idol is said to have been brought from Kalyāṇī.1 But this Kalyāṇī too must be the Kalyāṇa-Kataka (cantonment) of Kanauj.

All these facts go to prove that the Rashtrakūṭas and the Gahadavālas are one and the same.

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

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pāla dynasty</th>
<th>Gāhadavāla dynasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigrahapāla</td>
<td>Yashōvigraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahipāla</td>
<td>Mahīchandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayapāla</td>
<td>Chandradēva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---
¹ Moreover, there is an interval of 65 years between the issue of the copper grant of Pāla king Mahipāla dated V. S. 1083 (A.D 1026) and that of Gāhadavāla Chandradēva of V. S. 1148 (A.D. 1091), which produces doubt as to whether these two kings were father and son. The last copper grant of Chandradēva hitherto discovered is of V. S. 1156 (A.D. 1000).
years\(^1\) instead of by the Vikrama Samvat; whereas the grants of the Gāhāḍavāla kings bear Vikrama Samvat and not the regnal years. Fifthly,\(^2\) kings Dharmapāla and Rāyapāla of the Pāla dynasty had married the daughters of the Rāṣṭārkūṭa kings Parabala and Tunga respectively; and it has, ere this, been established by proofs that the Rāṣṭrākūṭas and the Gāhāḍavālas are collaterals. Therefore, Dr. Hoernle's supposition is not reasonable.

Mr. Vincent Smith considers the northern Rāṣṭrākūṭas (Rāṭhōras) to be the off-shoots of the Gāhāḍavālas and the Rāṣṭrākūṭas of Deccan to be the descendants of the non-Āryans.\(^3\) But in the light of the above facts his supposition also seems groundless. Moreover, their marrying the daughters of the Sōlankīs and the Yādavas proves them to be pure Kshatriyas.

Kāshmīrī Pandit Kalhana in his well-known history of Kāshmir, named ‘Rājatarangini’, written in the twelfth century of the Vikrama era, mentions 36 clans of the Kshatriyas.\(^4\) In Vikrama S. 1422, Jayasimha had commenced writing the ‘Kumārapāla charita’ in which he has enumerated the 36 clans mentioning only “Raṭṭa” as one of them but there is no mention of the Gāhāḍavālas. Similarly, in the ‘Prithvīrāja Rāṣō’ the name Rāṭhōra alone occurs but not Gāhāḍavāla. Further, Jayachandra is also stated in it as being a Rāṭhōra.

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

\(^1\) Among the inscriptions of the Pāla kings, there is only one of Mahīpāla that bears a Vikrama Samvat (1083).
\(^2\) This custom was not strictly observed (See p. 32.)
\(^3\) Early History of India, (1924), pages 429-430.
Jayachchandra. Similarly, the Râjâs of Bijaipur and Mânḍâ think themselves to be the descendants of Mânîka Chandra, the brother of Jayachchandra, and are called Chandravamshi Gâhadavâla Râthôras. From this, too, we conclude that the “Gâhadavâla” was the name of a branch of the Râshtrakûta dynasty.

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

Mr. N. B. Sanyâl thinks that, as the title ‘Gâdhipurâdhipa’ (master of Kanauj) is attached to the name of Gôpâla in the Budhist inscription of V. S. 1176 (A.D. 1118), found at Sêṭ Mâhêṭh, the Gôpâla and his successor Madanpâla mentioned in it are identical with the Gôpâla and the Madanapâla of the inscription of Râshtrakûṭa king Lakhanapâla of Badâûn. Gôpâla had taken possession of Kanauj in the last quarter of the eleventh century A.D. i.e., some time between the overthrow of the Pratihâra dynasty of Kanauj in V. S. 1077 (A.D. 1020) and the establishment of Gâhadavâla kingdom of Kanauj by Chandradêva towards the close of the 11th century A.D. And this Chandra had seized the kingdom of Kanauj from the very Gôpâla. This is the reason why the title Gâdhipurâdhipa appears with the name of Gôpâla alone in the Sêṭ Mâhêṭh inscription.

Further, Mr. Sanyâl proceeds to quote the following couplet from the copper grant of Shaka S. 9/2 (V. S. 1107=A.D. 1050) of Sôlanki Trilôchanapâla discovered at Surat.

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

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

Let us examine this theory critically.

From the copper grant¹ of V. S. 1084 (A. D. 1027) of Pratihāra Trilōchanapāla, and from the inscription² of V. S. 1093 (A. D. 1036) of Yashahpāla, we understand that the rule of the Pratihāras’ over Kanauj had probably continued even after this date. In the copper grant³ of V. S. 1148 (A. D. 1091) of Gāhāḍavāla king Chandra it is thus stated:

तीर्थाणि काश्मुरिषि संतर-धोपाक्षे-  
स्वामीयकारिषि पराशालयादभिभये।  
हेमालेवत्यमञ्जरि बद्धता द्विजम्-  
चेनाविहता वहुमति शान्तसङ्गालभी।

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

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

Further, in ascertaining the date of Lakhanapāla’s inscription⁴, Mr. Sānyāl says that Qutubuddin Aibak,

---
¹ Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 31.
conquering Badaūn in A.D. 1202 (V. S. 1259), granted that territory as 'Jāgīr' to Shamsuddīn Altamash. This inscription of Lakhanapāla must, therefore, be of a date just before V.S. 1259. According to this opinion if we take Lakhanapāla’s inscription to be of V.S. 1258, i.e., a year before this date, there occurs a period of 82 years between this and the Budhist inscription, dated V.S. 1176 (A.D. 1118), of king Madanapāla found at Sēṭ Māhēṭh. And this period is quite reasonable for the four generations that intervened between Madanapāla and Lakhanapāla. Again, by supposing V. S. 1171 (A.D. 1114) as the date of the Mohammedan invasion (in which according to Mr. Sanyāl, Madanapāla had fought in the capacity of a feudatory of the Gāhadavālā king Gōvindachandra of Kanauj), which is mentioned in the Budhist inscription of Kumārdēvī, the queen of king Gōvindachandra, and by counting back 60 years from this date for the reigns of the 3 ancestors of Madarapāla of Badaūn, the time of his fourth ancestor i.e., king Chandradēva comes to about V. S. 1111 (A.D. 1054). Under the circumstances, if the date of the birth of king Chandra be supposed to be about V. S. 1090 (A.D. 1033) his having lived to an age of 67 years upto V. S. 1157 (A.D. 1100) is not an impossibility. His long life is also proved by the fact that in V. S. 1154 (A.D. 1097), in all probability due to old age, he had in his life-time, transferred the reins of the government to his son Madanapāla of Kanauj. And only three years afterwards, in V. S. 1157 (A.D. 1100) when he died, even his son Madana had grown old. He, too, made over the government of his kingdom to his son Gōvindachandra in V. S. 1161 (A.D. 1104) and died in V. S. 1167 (A.D. 1110).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) That the ‘gōtra’ of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is ‘Gautama’, while that of the Gāḥaḍavālas is ‘Kāshyapa’.

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

(4) That the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gāḥaḍavālas used to intermarry.

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

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

*Mahārāṇa* Sambhuvaraha Tirtha, the founder of the Mahārāṇa dynasty of Mewar, is stated to be a Solar. But in the inscription dated V.S. 1331 (A.D. 1274) of Chitorgarh, it is stated:

1) Bappa (the prime ancestor of the Mahārāṇās), a Brāhmaṇa, coming from Anandapur, worshipped the sage Harita.

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

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

   भ्राणरुपिण्यत्रिगि भ्राकुलाहनुभो महीदेवः।
   जयति भ्रामहिलवर्मस्य।

   *i.e.*, Guhadatta, a Brāhmaṇa coming from Anandapur, founded the ‘Guhila’ dynasty.

4) In the beginning of the ‘Rasikapriyā’, a commentary by Rāṇā Kumbhā himself, on the “Gītā Gōvinda” of Jayadēva, it is stated:

   भ्रान्रामणस्य जयति भ्रामहिलवर्मस्य।
   जयः प्रगीतिः समकालेन कुलानुल्ल्यः।

   *i.e.*, Bappa, a Brāhmaṇa, of the ‘Vaijavāpa Gōtra,’ got a state by the favour of “Shiva.”

5) In the inscription of Guhilota Bālāditya, found at Chatsā in the Jaipur State, it is stated:

   भ्रामहिलवर्मस्य जयः प्रगीतिः समकालेन कुलाप्रगीतिः।

   *i.e.*, combining in himself the powers of a warrior and of a priest (like Parashurama), Bhartṛibhātata became a king in this dynasty. (The poet here has very nicely expressed himself by using the word “नरहृदय”)

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

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

\[ \text{Brahmaṇa: Pratīṣṭhātanām}\]

\[ \text{Brahmaṇa: Pratīṣṭhātanām}\]

\[ \text{Brahmaṇa: Pratīṣṭhātanām}\]

\[ \text{Brahmaṇa: Pratīṣṭhātanām}\]

i.e., the Chālukya dynasty traces its origin to the Moon. This fact is also established by their other inscriptions, by the ‘Dvyāshrāya Kāvyā’ of Hēmachandra, and by ‘Vastupāḷacharita’ of Jinaharshagāni.

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

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

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

At present, the Sōlankīs (and the Baghēlas)² themselves admit that their originator Chālukya had sprung from the sacrificial fire of Vashishṭha.

---

² A branch of the Sōlankīs.
Now, let us consider the origin of Chauhānas.

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

The origin of the Paramāra dynasty stands as below:—

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

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

Similarly, views about the origin of the Pratihāra (Paḍihāra) dynasty are also different. Some think this dynasty to have originated from a Brahmana named Harishchandra and a Kshatriya lady named Bhadrā;
while others say that the originator of this dynasty had sprung from the sacrificial fire of Vashishtha.

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

(2) Vīgīnēśhvarāsa says that the ‘Gōtras’ and the ‘Pravaras’ of the Kshatatriyas accord with those of their priests². Therefore, it appears that the above theory was prevalent up to the 12th century of the Vikrama era. It is probable that when the Rāṣṭrakūṭas came to Kanauj, their old priests might have been left behind and new ones appointed, which brought about the change of their ‘Gōtra’ from ‘Gautama’ to ‘Kāshyapa.’ It is also possible that this ‘Gautama Gōtra’ might have been assumed by them on their coming to Marwar, before which they belonged to the ‘Kāshyapa Gōtra.’

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

¹ In the inscription of the Kalachuri Vijñāla of the southern India dated Shaka S. 1081, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas are stated, out of malice, as belonging to the ‘Daitya vanīśa’. (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. V, page 16).

² गृहोष्ठ, ग्रामीदेलिनिनिके चक्रस्वयम् (प्राप्तिकृत्वम् स्त्रियालिङ्गां प्रृष्टु एव-इत्यादि आश्चर्यः;) वाचिन्द्रोऽगुणिन, विवर्णप्रह्यद-द्युमृ-विष्णुप्रति-
Commentary on verse 13.

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

Saundarananda Mahākāvya, Sarga I.
Rāṣhṭrakūṭas and the Gāhādavālas, who have been held as collaterals for ages, to be of different lineages, merely on account of the difference of their ‘Gōtras.’

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

\[\text{感染} \text{ Varṣa} \text{ वियुध्यायों तत्स्मात् कर्मसः।} \]

\[\text{वीरवान्} \text{ महाराज्यां जातं; वीरवान्: गुष्टं:।} \]

\[\text{i.e., who obtained the Umbrella after killing the Bhaṭi king Dēvarāja of the ‘Valla Manḍala.’} \]

Again:—

\[\left[ \text{वर्ष} \text{ वियुध्यायों तत्स्मात् कर्मसः।} \right. \]

\[\left. \text{वीरवान्} \text{ महाराज्यां जातं; वीरवान्: गुष्टं:।} \]

\[\text{i.e., a son named Bāuka was born to king Kakka from his wife of the Bhaṭi clan.} \]

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

---

1 In the inscription of the Chandēla Kshatriyas they are mentioned as Chandrātrēyas, that is, the descendants of Chandra, the son of Atri.

In the ‘Prithvirāja Rāṣā,’ their origin is stated to be from the Moon and Hēmavati, the widowed daughter of Hēmarāja, the priest of the Gāhādavāla king Indrajit; but the Chandēlas allege that they are the collaterals of the Rāṣhṭrakūṭas. They had ruled over Bundēlkhand and its neighbouring places.

Similarly, the Bundēlas are also held to be the collaterals of the Gāhādavālas? (Some Paramāras, Chauhāns, etc., also have subsequently got mixed in these Bundēlas?). At present the rulers of Ōrchhā, Tehri, Pannā, etc., are of the Bundēla clan.
Even at the present day the Rajpūtas belonging to the Dēvaḍā or Sīsōdiya branches of the Chauhāna or Guhīlotā clans respectively, when asked, do not declare themselves as Chauhānas or Guhīlotas but simply say that they are Dēvaḍās or Sīsōdiyās. Further, the era founded by the famous Haihaya clan is named after their branch as ‘Kalachuri Samvat’ and ‘not Haihaya Samvat.’

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

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

> प्रथमसेवे सुर्यमोदविविदितस्यचतुर्वंशवैदेशितम्  
> उत्तसङ्ग्राधविकविज्ञवितिं सन्तानामः चतुर्वंश ॥
> हृद्वा वेदस्याय प्रवेदमि मनः शुद्वदिबिचरिवाः  
> उद्वर्द्वी ज्ञानाभावन प्रतिविषाः तथा चतुर्वंशद्रुः च ॥
> वैसे तत्तत्तत: सदा समभूत सूपालचूडः  
> प्रथमसोदविविदितिमिः श्रीचन्द्रदेवी गृहः ॥

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

---
1 The ruler of Kotāh, belonging to the Chauhāna dynasty, is known to the general public as of the Hādā clan, which is a branch of the Chauhāna dynasty.
OTHER OBJECTIONS.

This shows that, at that time also, the Gahadavāla family was held in very high esteem.

By taking all these facts into consideration we conclude that “Gahadavāla” was a branch of the Rashtrakūṭa dynasty. This subject has already been dealt with in the chapter “The Rashtrakūṭas and the Gahadavālas.”

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

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

The flag of the Rāshṭrakūṭas was called the ‘Pālidhvaja’1 and they were also known as ‘Ōka Kētu’. Their coat of arms contained the signs of the Ganges and the Jamuna, probably copied from the western Chālūkyas of Bādāmī.

1 In the 22nd ‘Parva’ of the ‘Ādi Purāṇa,’ written by Jinasēna, it is said:—

वाशिकत्वं बुधमचान्म भवत्वीतमृगाभिवानम्।
ग्रामभ्रमन्त्रकागमं ज्ञेया: स्वरूपासेवना: ||१२१६||
महोदयरात्रं हृद्या: प्रत्येकं पालकेतना: ।
एकाधिर्यं दिशि प्रवृत्तमाहस्तोपवेरिव ||१२२०।।

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

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

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

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

* * *

This shows that the protectress of Mewar is also the very Goddess Rāṣṭrashyēnā.’ Its temple is situated on the top of a hill at a distance of 3 miles from the temple of ‘Ekalinga Mahādēva’ in Mewar.
i.e., having bowed to Varddhamana (Mahāvīra) I write this ‘Prashnottararatnamalikā.’

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

In the “Gaṅitasarasangraha” of Mahāvīrāchārya it is stated:—

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

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

It is quite clear that the ‘Paurāṇik’ religion had flourished to a great extent during the reign of the Rāshtrakūṭa kings, and many temples, dedicated to ‘Shiva’ and ‘Vishnu,’ were built. All the rock-cut temples, etc., build before the reign of the Rāshtrakūṭas of the Deccan, were meant for the Buddhists, Jainas and the Nirgranthas only. But it was in the time of these kings that the ‘Kailāsa Bhavana’ of the Ellōrā caves, dedicated to ‘Shiva,’ was constructed for the first time.

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

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

These kings were themselves men of learning and always patronised it. The logician Akalanka Bhaṭṭa, author of the “Rājavārtika”, the “Nyāyavinishchaya,” the “Asṭashatī” and the “Laghiyastraya”; Mahāvīra-chārya, author of the “Gaṇitasārasangraha”; Jinasēṇa, writer of the “Ādi Purāṇa” and the “Pārśvābhhyudaya”; another Jinasēṇa, author of the “Harivamsha Purāṇa”; Guṇabhadrāchārya, writer of the “Ātmānusshāsana”; poet Halāyudha, compiler of the “Kavirahasya”\(^1\) ; Sōmadēva Sūri, writer of the “Yashastilaka Champu” and the “Nītivākṣyāmrita” on politics; Canarese poet Pōnna, writer of the “Shānti Purāṇa” (whom king Krishna III, had honoured with the title of “Uhayabhelha Chakravarti” = master of two languages; Pushpadanta, writer of the “Yashōḍhara Cha-rīta”, the “Nāgakumāra Charita” and the “Jaina Mahā Purāṇa”; Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa, author of the “Madālasā Champū”; Lākshmīdhara, compiler of the “Vyavahāra Kalpataru”; and Shri Harsha, author of the “Naishadhiya Charita” and the “Khaṇḍana khaṇḍa khādyā” and others, flourished in the time of these kings.\(^2\)

---

1 Sir Bhandārkara inclined to identify the author of the “Kavirahasya” with the Halāyudha, who wrote the ‘Abhidhāna ratnamāla,’ but Weber places the latter about the end of the 11th century.

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

The same Amoghavarsha had also written another book named “Kavirajamārga”, a prosody, in the Canarese language.

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

"Jayadhavalā”, a commentary of the principles of the ‘Digambara’ branch of Jainism, was written in the time of Amoghavarsha I. From the “Shrikīnta charita” of poet Mankha, it appears that Alankūra, the minister of king Jayasimha of Kāshmīr, had called a big assembly in which Pandit Snhala was sent out as a delegate by king Gōvindachandra of Kānauj.

1 Of the Ajantā caves, which are famous for their art, Nos. 1 and 2 were also built in the beginning of the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakhēṭa.
THE GLORY
OF
THE EARLY RĀSHṬRAKUṬAS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The greatest king of India is Balhārā, whose name imports "king of kings." He wears a ring in which

---

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

2. Ellipts History of India, Vol. I, page 13. This description refers to the reign of king Krishnārāja II.
is inscribed the following sentence:—“What is begun with resolution ends with success.”

The book named “Murujul Zahab”, written by Al-Masūdī about A. H. 332 (V. S. 1001=A.D. 944), contains the following:—

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

“The greatest of the kings of India in our time is the Balharā, sovereign of the city of Mānkīr. Many of the kings of India turn their faces towards him in their prayers, and they make supplications to his ambassadors, who come to visit them. The kingdom of the Balharā is bordered by many other countries of India. The capital of the Balharā is eighty Sindi Parasangs from the sea, (and the Parasang\(^2\) is equal to eight miles). His troops and elephants are innumerable, but his troops are mostly infantry, because the seat of his government is among the mountains...Bayūra\(^1\) who is the king of Kanauj, is an enemy of the Balharā, the king of India....The inhabitants of Mānkīr, which is the capital of the Balharā, speak the Kirīya\(^4\) language, which has this name from Kira the place where it is spoken.”

Al Istakhri,\(^5\) who wrote the “Kitābul Akālim”, in A. H. 340 (V. S. 1003=A.D. 951) as also Ibn Haukal,\(^6\) who came to India between A. H. 331 and 358 (A.D. 943 and 968) and wrote the “Ashkal-ul-Bilād” in A. H. 366 (A.D.==976), say:—

---

1 Elliot’s History of India, Vol. I, pages 19-24. This refers to Krishnarāja III.
2 A “parasang” is equal to three miles but Sir Elliot has taken it to be equal to 8 miles.
3 This seems to be a corrupt form of Pratihāra.
4 Perhaps the same is now called the Canarese language.
5 Elliot’s History of India, Vol. I, page 27.
6 Elliot’s History of India, Vol. I, page 34.
"From Kambaya\(^1\) to Saimur\(^2\) is the land of the Balharā, and in it there are several Indian kings. The city in which the Balharā resides is Mānkīr, which has an extensive territory."

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

The Rāshṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga defeated Sōlankī (Chālukya) ‘Vallabha’ Kīrtivarman and assumed the title of ‘Vallabharāja,’ which was also attached to the names of all his successors.\(^3\) It is therefore that the aforesaid Arabian writers have mentioned these kings as Balharā, a corrupt form of "Vallabharāja."

From the inscription of the Someshvara temple, near Yēvūr (Deccan), it appears that there were 800 elephants in the army of Rāshṭrakūṭa king Indra, and that 500 feudatory chiefs followed as his retinue.\(^5\)

1 Cambay.
2 Presumably this city was on the border of Sind to which we can trace the northern boundary of the kingdom of the Rāshṭrakūṭas.
3 Sir Henry Elliot, Col. Tod and others suppose that the Arab writers had used the word Balharā for the kings of Balabhi or for the Chālukya kings themselves, (Elliot's History of India, Vol. I, pages 354-355). But these suppositions are groundless as the Balabhi kingdom had come to an end about V.S. 823 (A.D. 766); and the Chālukya kingdom had been split up into two branches on the death of the Chālukya king Mangalśīna in V.S. 667 (A.D. 610). Pulakēśīn was the head of one of them and Rāshṭrakūṭa Dantidurga seized his kingdom from his descendant Kīrtivarman between V.S. 805 and 810 (A.D. 748 and 753). It remained under the Rāshṭrakūṭa dynasty up to V.S. 1030 (A.D. 973) about which time it was regained by Chālukya Tailapa II from Rāshṭrakūṭa king Karkarāja II. Thus, about V.S. 805 to 1030 (A.D. 748 to 973) the kingdom of the western branch of the Chālukyas remained in the possession of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. Formerly, the capital of this branch of the Sōlankīs was Bādāmi. But later, Tailapa II shifted it to Kalyāṇī. The second branch was headed by Vīshṇuvardhana, whose descendants were called Eastern Chālukyas. They ruled at Vēṇgī and were the feudatories of the Rāshṭrakūṭas.
4 Just as in the Persian histories the title Rānā of the kings of Mewar is used instead of their names; similarly, the Arab writers have used the hereditary title Balharā (Vallabharāja) of the Rāshṭrakūṭa kings of the Deccan instead of their names.

\(^{5}\) ये राणकुट्का कुलमिनद्रित्रिप्रियं कुमायद्वयज्ञतमकावतिभोज्यम्
निषिद्य द्वर्यद्वयस्य श्रद्धां तत्रत्वाति
'Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, pages 12."
In the copper grant, dated Shaka S. 852 (V. S. 987 = A.D. 930), of Govinda IV, it is stated that the Rāṣṭra-kūṭa king Indrarāja III crossed the Ganges with his cavalry and laid waste the city of Kanauj.

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

\begin{quote}
चोलो चोलोभुजार्जणितिमधुबन्धोताहालवा
बाजीश्वराचरोऽ: समवाचमब्रजवैलश्वरे तथानः।
पाषाणेया: खंडलोभुजतचित्तप्रदृश्याणाम् प्रग्नीनः।
यस्मिन्त वस्त्रप्रणायों सकलमपित तद्वा राजकं न आयाजत्॥
\end{quote}

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

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

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

The country under the sway of the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas was called “Raṭṭa Pāṭi” or “Raṭṭa Rājya” and consist-
ed of 7 lacs of villages and towns as is mentioned in the ‘Skanda Purāṇa’:

\[\text{राज्यस्य घटनां व सर्वनामश्रुतिः किल्लिकिम्} \]

* i.e., the kingdom of the Raṭṭas (Rāṣṭrakūṭas) consisted of 7 lacs of villages.

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

We learn from the copper grant,\(^2\) dated V. S. 1161 (A.D. 1104), of Gōvindachandra, found at Basāḥī, that it was Chandradēva of the Gāhadavāla branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, who had restored order by suppressing the anarchy that had resulted on the deaths of kings Karna and Bhōja. It also refers that Gōvindachandra had granted in charity the village of Basahi (Basāḥī) together with the ‘Turushkaḍāṇḍa,’\(^3\) (cess levied upon the Mohmmedans), which shows that just as the Mohmmedan kings levied ‘Jaziyā’ upon the non-Mohmmedans, in the like manner, Madnapāla levied a tax upon the Muslims. This proves his power and glory. As regards Jayachchandra it is stated in the ‘Rambhāmanjarī Nāṭikā’ that he defeated the Chandēla king Madnavarmadeva of Kālinjar, possessed an exceptionally large army and ruled over the territory between the Ganges and the Jamuna.

\(^1\) ‘Skanda Purāṇa,’ Kaumārīkā Khaṇḍa, Adhyaya 39, verse 135.

\(^2\) शास्त्र अधोज्ञपुरुष विकुपक्वब्रह्माचारीसामान्यिकिवसं

\(^3\) इत्यादि विद्विभविसमिं ग्रीतित्योभाकुपेता

\[\text{वशत्व विधायस्य समभवदिद्वं स चनामविधानदेवः} \]

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

\[\text{In the copper grant, dated V. S. 1186 (A.D. 1129), of Gōvindachandra, found in Oudh, there is also a mention of this ‘Turushkaḍāṇḍa.’} \]

\[\text{Lucknow Museum Report of (1914-15), pages 4 and 10.} \]
CONCLUSION.

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

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

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

¹ It is stated in the ‘Āīn-i-akabārī’ that Sīhā lived at Khōr (Shamsābād) and was killed there.
According to our opinion the genealogical table from Vijayachandra to Sihā is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{Vijayachandra} & \text{Māpiṣaḥcandra} \\
\hline
\text{Jayachandra} & \text{Jayapāla (Jajapāla)} \\
\text{Harishcandra (Bardāisīna) (Prahasta)} & \\
\text{Sētarāma} & \text{Sihā}
\end{array}
\]

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

Two branches of the Deccan family of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had ruled over “Lāṭa” (Gujarat) from the beginning of the 8th century of the Vikramā era up to the first half of the 9th century. They were the feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of the Deccan.

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

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

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

OF THE

RĀŚHṬRĀΚŪṬĀS.

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

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

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Mānānka}.\\
\text{Dēvarāja}.\\
\text{Bhuvishya}.\\
\text{Abhimanyu}.
\end{array}
\]

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

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

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Durgarāja}.\\
\text{Gōvindarāja}.\\
\text{Svāmikarāja}.\\
\text{Namārāja}.
\end{array}
\]

2 Do. do. XI, page:276.
According to our opinion the genealogical table from Vijayachandra to Siha is as follows:

Vijayachandra.

Jayachandra.  Manikachandra.

Harishchandra (Baradaisena) (Prahasta).  Jayapala (Jajapala).

Sitarama.  Siha.

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

Two branches of the Deccan family of the Rashtrakutas had ruled over "Lata" (Gujrat) from the beginning of the 8th century of the Vikrama era upto the first half of the 9th century. They were the feudatories of the Rashtrakuta kings of the Deccan.

Proofs about the rule of the branches of the old Rashtrakutas in Saundatti (Dharwar—Bombay), Hathundi (Marwar) and Dhanop (Shahpur) have also been found.

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

1 Possibly Baradaisena may be a younger brother of Harishchandra.
MISCELLANEOUS INSCRIPTIONS
OF THE
RĀŚHṬRAKŪṬAS.

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

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

Mānānka.
Dēvarāja.
Bhavāhya.¹
Abhimanyu.

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

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

Durgarāja.
Gōvindarāja.
Svāmikarāja.
Naumarāja.

The other\(^1\) is of Shaka Samvat 631 (V.S. 766–A.D. 709) of the time of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Nandarāja and contains the following genealogy:

```
Durgarāja.  
| Gövindarāja.  
| Svāmikarāja.  
Nandarāja.  
```

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

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

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

An inscription of V. S. 917\(^3\) (A.D. 860) has been found at village of Pathārī in the Bhōpāl State, which contains the genealogical table of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of Central India as follows:

```
Jējāta.  
| Karkarāja.  
| Parabala (V. S. 917).  
```

---

1. Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 234.
2. It is probable that this Durgarāja is a second name of king Dantivarman I of the Deccan, because, firstly, the period of Durgarāja of this inscription synchronises with that of Dantivarman I. Secondly, Dantivarman’s second name was Dantidurga which almost resembles Durgarāja and thirdly, in the inscription of the Dashāvatāra temple the name of Dantivarman II is written as Dantidurgarāja. If this supposition be correct then the Gövindarāja of this inscription would be a younger brother of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indrarāja I of the Deccan.
Raṇṇādēvi, the daughter of king Parabala, was married\(^1\) to king Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty of ‘Gauḍa’ (Bengal). Karkarāja, the father of Parabala defeated Nāgabhaṭa (Nāgāvalōka) who was probably the son of the Pratihāra king Vatsarāja. An inscription\(^2\) of Nāgabhaṭa, dated V. S. 872 (A.D. 815), has been found at the village of Buchkalā (Bilārā district) in Mārwār. But Professor Kielhorn identifies him with the Nāgāvalōka\(^3\) of the Bhrigukachchha grant of V. S. 813 (A.D. 756).

An inscription\(^4\) of the Rāshtrakūṭas found at Bōdha Gayā contains the following genealogy:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nanna (Guṇāvalōka).} & \\
\text{Kīrtrāja.} & \\
\text{Tunga (Dharmāvalōka).} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Bhāgyadēvi, the daughter of Tunga, was married to Rājayapāla\(^5\) of the Pāla dynasty, who was fourth in descent from the aforesaid Dharmapāla. The inscription bears the year 15, which might be the 15th regnal year of king Tunga who probably lived about V. S. 1025 (A.D. 968).

---

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

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribhuvanapāla.</td>
<td>Madanapāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōpāla.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dēvapāla.</td>
<td>Bhīmapāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shūrāpāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amritapāla.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakhanapāla.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

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

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 64.
THE RĀṢHṬRAKŪṬAS OF MĀΝYAKHĒṬA (Deccan)

FROM BEFORE V. S. 650 (A.D. 593)

TO

ABOUT V. S. 1039 (A.D. 982).

In an inscription found at Yēvūr and also in a copper grant¹ of the Sōlankīs found at Miraj, it is thus stated:—

यो राष्ट्रकूटकुलमिति इति प्रसिद्धे
कुञ्जायतं सुतमण्डलसमेतयम् ।
निगित्य दशनतुपपंचशतो वभार
भूमश्चतुलक्षकुलवहभाजल द्वीम् ॥

......................................................

तद्भवो विजयादित्य: कृतिवर्म तदनन्तज:
शेन चालुक्यराजयभीरननाशिक्यभूद्भूञ्जि ।

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

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

From the aforesaid stanzas it appears that the
Rāṣṭrakūṭas ruled in the Deccan before it was con-
quered by Sōlankī Jayasimha in the latter part of the
sixth century of the Vikrama era. But between V. S.

¹ Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, pages 12-14.
805 and 810 (A.D. 747 and 753) the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga II again seized a large part of the kingdom from Sōlankī Kīrtivarman II.

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

1. DANTIVARMAN (DANTIDURGA I).

This king was a descendant of Indra, son of Krishṇa, mentioned above. He is the first king known through the inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of this line. In the inscription\(^1\) of the Dashāvatāra temple, he is described as a protector of ‘Varnāshrama Dharma’ (laws of castes and stages of life). He was a good-natured, merciful and independent ruler. He probably flourished before V.S. 650 (A.D. 593).

2. INDRARAJA I.

He was the son and successor of Dantivarman. His and his father’s names have been taken from the inscription of the Dashāvatāra temple in the Ellōrā caves, in which after Dantidurga II, the name of Mahārāja Sharva\(^2\) is mentioned. But in other inscriptions of this branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the names of Dantivarman I and Indrarāja I, are not found, for the pedigrees in them commence from Gōvinda I.

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

---

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

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

He was the son of Indrarāja and ascended the throne after his death. We learn from the inscription\(^1\) of Pulakēshin II, dated Shaka S. 556 (V.S. 691=A.D. 634) found at Ėhōlē, that at the time when Mangalīsha was killed, and his nephew Pulakēshin II succeeded him, Gōvindarāja with the aid of his allies, taking opportunity of the consequent weakness of the Sōlankīs, attempted to regain the lost kingdom of his ancestors. But as he could not succeed, he concluded peace.\(^2\)

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

"Vira Nārāyaṇa" was another name of Gōvindarāja.

4. KARKARĀJA (KAKKA I).

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

5. INDRARĀJA II.

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

\(^{1}\) Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, page 5-6.
\(^{2}\) लब्धत्रा कालं मुद्रमुपयोगे जेतुभद्रायिक-कवये गोकिन्द्रे च दादर्शिकरत्नमयवरोधिस्या।
यवशानीपुष्पि मवरसमतन्मेतः प्रयातः
तेनावते फलकुपक्षयापरेशायं सवः॥
His army consisted of a considerable number of horses and elephants.

6. DANTIVARMAN. (DANTIDURGA II).
He was the son and successor of Indrarāja II. Between V.S. 804 and 810 (A.D. 748 and 753) he took possession of Vatāpī, the northern portion of the kingdom of Chālukya (Sōlanki) Kirtivarman II, and again established the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom in the Deccan, which remained under this dynasty for about 225 years.

A copper grant\(^1\) of Shaka S. 675 (V. S. 810—A.D. 753), found at Śamangādh (Kolhāpur State), contains the following lines:

\[
\text{माही महान्ती रेवा रोभोमितिविद्रांगीं}
\]
\[
\text{यो वाहं सप्दि वंडलके (बले) न जिल्वा}
\]
\[
\text{राजाधिकाय परंशुरत्नाय पैति।}
\]
\[
\text{कंचनाकेशकलकरायिन्यं चोलपायं —}
\]
\[
\text{श्रीहर्षवज्जतिके विधानदरम्भ।}
\]
\[
\text{कर्नाटकं वतमन्तस्वेयर्त्ये (त्ये) ॥}
\]
\[
\text{न्द्रि (भृ) लैः कियतभिर्ग यः सहस्रा जिगाय ॥}
\]

i.e., his (Dantivarman II’s) elephants had gone up to the Māhi, the Mahānādī and the Narmadā.\(^3\)

Defeating Vallabha (western Chālukya king Kirtivarman II) he assumed the titles of Rājādhiraśa and Paramēśvara; and with a small cavalry defeated the great Karnāṭik army, which had won a victory over the kings of the Kāncē, Kērala, Chōla and Pāṇḍya as well as over king Harsha of Kanaūj and Vajrāṭa.

The Karnāṭik army here referred to was the army of the Chālukyas.\(^4\)

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, page 111.
2 In the copper plate of Talēgāon the reading is “मजेयमन्वे:”
3 This shows that he had conquered Māhikāntthā, Mālwa and Orissa.
4 The Aihole inscription contains:—

\[
\text{अपरिमितविभुतियुपिन्योक्तसामंतसेनं—}
\]
\[
\text{मधिसुकमयुक्तमन्तपादसरव:।}
\]
\[
\text{गुप्ति पतितमजेन्द्राकान्तवभुतमसूतो}
\]
\[
\text{भवशिल्लितह्यो चेन चापकरे हस्य:।}
\]

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

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

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

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

---

1 The country near the sea-coast between the Māhānādi and the Gōdāvāri.
2 This refers to southern Kōshala (or the modern Central Provinces) which was to the south of the province of Oudh, as the province containing Ayōdhyā and Lucknow, etc., was then called northern Kōshala.
3 Country west of the Narmadā near the modern Baroda State.
6 The ruler of Gujrat at that time was Gujjarā Jayābbatā III, as appears from his copper grant of Chēdi S. 486 (V.S. 793—A.D. 738). Soon after this Dantidurga II probably seized it from him and made it over to Karkarāja.
The title ‘Khaḍgāvaloka’ probably implies that his look had the terrible effect of a sword on his enemies.

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

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

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

7. KRISHṆARĀJA I.

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

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

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

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

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

“क्रिश्नप्रेम पद्मकारिक जयं भुवः”


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

A copper grant,\(^1\) of Shaka S. 730 (V.S. 864–A.D. 807), of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Gōvindarāja III, found at Vāṇīgāon (Nāsik), alludes to Krishṇarāja as follows:

\[
\text{तथाल्लुकम् कृतकालसुविधाता धर्मो वारिष्ठे —} \\
\text{कैलासेऽवृक्षाचलोपि मित्रान्ध्राध्यापन वहनः।}
\]

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

Another copper grant,\(^2\) of Shaka S. 734 (V. S. 869–A.D. 812), of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Karkarāja of Gujrāt, found at Barōdā, refers to this king Krishṇa I in the following terms:

\[
\text{यथाकालकेतिगीतिः शीर्षोऽवस्थितमापत्तम्।} \\
\text{महानवर्ग हरिभचर प्राणप्रताघ: कैलू राज्यसिद्ध।}
\]

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

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

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

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

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

It was this king, who got the Shiva temple known as “Kailāsa Bhavna” built in the famous Elōra caves, in the Nizam’s dominions. This temple is made by

---

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

The following were the titles of this king:—
Akālavarsha, Shubhatunga, Prithvīvallabha and Shrīvallabha.

He also defeated the self-conceited king Rāhappa.¹ Vincent Smith and other scholars are of opinion that this Krishna I had usurped the kingdom by ousting his nephew Dantidurga II.² But this view is incorrect, as from the words ‘तत्त्वम तत्त्वमाते’ (i.e., on the demise of Dantidurga) occurring in the copper grants³ found at Kāvī and Navasārī, it is evident that Krishna had ascended the throne on the death of his nephew Dantidurga.

From the aforesaid grant⁴ found at Barōdā it appears that during the reign of this king a prince of this branch of the Rāshṭrakūṭas had made an attempt to usurp the kingdom. But Krishnārāja subdued him.⁵ It is probable that this prince was a son of Dantidurga II and that Krishnārāja might have assumed power owing to his minority or weakness.

Though it is clearly stated in the copper grant of Karkarāja (dated Shaka S. 894) found at Kardā⁶ that

---

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, page 105. Some scholars consider this Rāhapp to be second name of Karkarāja II of Gujrat. It is possible that the rule of Gujrat branch of the Rāshṭrakūṭas might have thus met its end.
² Oxford history of India, page 216.
⁵ यो चेत्यभयमूल्य विमार्गिनाचे राज्य स्वयं गोवर्धनाकाशे चक्रे।

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

Krishnaraja I might have ascended the throne about V. S. 817 (A.D. 760). He had two sons, Govindaraja and Dhruvaraja.

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

i.e., in southern India there is a great king named Krishnaraja.......No other king is a match for this Rashtrakuta king.......This ‘Chandravanamshi’ king performs various sacrifices and keeps his chariot foremost on battle-fields.

The famous Jain logician Akalanka Bhatta, the author of ‘Rajavartika’, and other works flourished in his reign.

SILVER COINS.

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

"परमाणुप्रसादविष्काशकृष्णानाथ भीश्मराज"

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

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

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

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

2 He had gained this victory during his father's life time. When his camp was pitched near the confluence of the river Krishnā, Vēnā and Musti, the king of Vēngī approached him and acknowledged his supremacy.
4 Do. do. VIII, page 184.
5 i.e., king Gōvinda II, son of Krishnārāja I, being addicted to love of women, entrusted the Work of his government to his younger brother Nirupama whereby his power declined.
From the copper grant, found at Paithan, it appears that Gövindarāja II had again made an attempt, with the assistance of the neighbouring kings of Mālwa, Kānchī, Vēngi, etc., to regain his lost power, but his younger brother Nirupaṁa (Dhruvarāja) defeated him and brought the kingdom under his complete sway.

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

\[\text{Shaṅkavashanēṭu viṣṇu dīṣṭaṃ pūrṇaḥ pātaṅgaḥ}\
\[\text{Pālaśaṅkavarka viṣṇuḥ pūrṇaḥ śrīkṛṣṇaḥ viṣṭhitaḥ}\
\[\text{Puṣṭi śrīmāṇaḥ}\
\[\text{Mogṣhaḥ (g) gāṇapatiḥ gāṇakal (l) vṛ̤tiṅ vṛ̤ṭiḥ}\
\[\text{i.e., in Shaka S. 705 (V.S. 840=A.D. 783), when this book (Purāṇa) was written, king Indrāyudha reigned in the north; Krishna’s son, Shrivallabha in the south; Vatsrāja of ‘Avanti’ in the east; and Varāha in the west.}

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

The following were also the titles of Gövinda II:

Mahārājādhirāja, Prabhūtavarsha, and Vikramāvalīka. The date of his succession should be about V.S. 832 (A.D. 775), because there exists an inscription of Shaka S. 694 (V.S. 829=A.D. 772) of his father Krishnarāja I.

2 Some scholars consider this Indrāyudha to be Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of Kanauj. Defeating his successor Chakrāyudha, Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II, son of Vatsarāja seized the kingdom of Kanauj.
3 Some scholars hold that the Shrivallabha mentioned here was Gövindarāja III, but it is not acceptable.
5 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, page 125. (This inscription belongs to the reign of Dhruvarāja.)
9. DHRUVARĀJA.

He was the son of Krishnarāja I and the younger brother of Gōvindarāja II. He dethroned his elder brother Gōvinda II and usurped the throne.

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

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

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

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

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

Three inscriptions in Canarese have been found

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 Inscriptions at Shravaṇa Bēlgolā, Vol. 24, page 3.
2 Vincent Smith holds A.D. 780 as the date of the accession of this king.
3 The king of Vēngi at the time probably was Vīṇuvaḥdhanā IV of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty.
10. GÖVINDARĀJA III.

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

His titles appear to be:—“Prithvīvallabha, Pabhūtavarsha, Shrīvallabha, Vimalāditya, Jagattunga, Kṛti-nārāyaṇa, ꟢ Atishayadhavala, Tribhuvanadhavala, and Janavallabha, etc. Nine copper grants have been found of his time. The first is of Shaka S. 716 (V.S. 851=A.D. 794) found at Paithan. The second is of Shaka S. 726 (V.S. 861=A.D. 804) found at Somēshvara, which discloses that his queen's name was “Gāmunḍabbē” and that he defeated king Dantiga of Kāncī (Kānji-varam).

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

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

1 The inscription dated Shaka S. 788 (V. S. 923=A.D. 866) of his son Amōghavarsha I, found at Nīlgund, indicates that Gövindarāja III was called Kṛtinārāyaṇa, as he fettered the people of Kērala, Mālava, Gauḍa, Gurjara and those living in the hillfort of Chitrakūṭa and subdued the Lord of Kāncī. (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. V, page 102).


5 In the copper grant of Shaka S. 724 of Stambha, found at Nēlmangal, the name Shauchakambha (Shauchakambha) is stated instead of Stambha — “श्‍राणुभूतस्वाशक्तिविनिष्ठुः सोऽशुचंकमङ्गोऽनं”

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

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

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

The kings of Banga and Magadha also yielded to him.

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

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

The fifth and sixth plates are of Shaka S. 732

khambha was Raṇāvalōka. At the recommendation of prince Bappaya he made a grant of a village for a Jain temple (Epigraphii Carnāṭica, manṛṇa grant, No. 61, p. 51).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 156.
4 The country between the Tāpti and the Māhī rivers.
Some scholars consider the phrase ‘हुँगण्युज्ञे’ here to be connected with ‘भीवक्ष’ while others think it to be going with the preceding name ‘हुँगण्युज्ञे’.

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

In an inscription1 of Shaka S. 788 (V.S. 923-A.D. 866), found at Nilgund, it is stated that this Govinda III had conquered Kērala, Mālava, Gurjara and Chitra-kūṭa (Chittor). His date of accession ought to be just after V.S. 850 (A.D. 973). The Eastern Chālukya king of Vēngi had to build a city wall around Mānya-khēṭa for its protection, by way of subsidy.

In an inscription2 found at Monghyr, it is stated that Raṇṇādevī, the daughter of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Prabala3, was married to king Dharmapaḷa of the Pāḷa dynasty of Bengal. Dr. Kielhorn holds this Parbala to be king Gōvinda III, but Sir Bhandārkar identifies him with Krishṇa II.4

11. AMŎGHAVARSHA I.

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

—

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

But in fact Amōghavarsha seems to be only the title of the king. The following titles of this king have also been found:—Nripatunga, Mahārāja Sharva, Mahārāja Shaṅda, Atishayadhavala, Vīra Nārāyana, Prithvīvallabha, Shrī Prithvīvallabha, Lakshmīvallabha, Mahārājādhirāja, Bhaṭāra, Parama Baṭṭāraka, Prabhūtavarsha, and Jagattunga.

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

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

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

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

³ Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIV, page 199.
⁴ Some scholars are of opinion that Dhruvarāja I, of Lāṭa (Gujrāt), had made a futile attempt on Amōghavarsha, who was therefore obliged to march against him. Probably Dhruvarāja was killed in this action.
The first inscription,\(^1\) of Shaka S. 765 (V.S. 900-A.D. 843), fixed in a cave at Kanhēri (in the Thānā district), shows that Amōghavarsha was ruling in that year, and that his chief feudatory Pulla Shakti (the successor of Kapardipāda) was the governor of the whole of the Kōnkan district. The Pulla Shakti belonged to the Shilāhāra dynasty of the northern Kōnkan.

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

The third inscription,\(^3\) of Shaka S. 782 (V.S. 917=A.D. 860), of Amōghavarsha himself, found at Könūr, contains a mention of the charity granted by him to the Jain priest Dēvēndra at his capital city Mānyakhēta. In this plate, the Rāshtrakūṭas are stated to be the offshoots of Yadu, and a new title "Vīra Nārāyaṇa" of king Amōghavarsha is also found in it.

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

---

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

This copper plate speaks of a rebellion by the prince; but in the unpublished copper plate of Shaka S. 793 of Sanjān the word "पुनःस्माकामक्" (कोक 16) shows that Amōghavarsha had only one son (whom he invested with the ruling powers during his life-time).
The fourth inscription,\(^1\) of Shaka S. 787 (V.S. 922-A.D. 865), of the time of this king, has been found at Mantravāḍī, the fifth\(^2\) of Shaka S. 788 (V.S. 923-A.D. 866) at Shirur and the sixth\(^3\) (of the same date) at Nilgund; all these belong to the 52nd year of his reign.

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

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

The king\(^6\) of Vēngi got constructed a wall around his garden.

The fifth copper grant\(^7\), of Shaka S. 789 (V.S. 924=A.D. 867), of the chief feudatory Dhruvarāja

---

4 This shows that he was a follower of Vaishnavism.
6 Later as this king of Vēngi oppressed his subjects, Amōghavarsha imprisoned him and his minister, and, to give publicity to their misdeeds erected their statues in the ‘Shiva’ temple at Kāṇchi.
7 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 181.
II\(^1\) of Gujrat, contains a mention of a charitable grant made by him (Dhruvaraja).

The eighth inscription\(^2\) of Shaka S. 799 (V.S. 934= A.D. 877), fixed in a cave at Kanhērī, shows that king Amōghavarsha, being pleased with his feudatory Kapardī II, of the Shilārī clan, made over to him the kingdom of the whole of Kōnkan. From this inscription it also appears that Buddhism had survived in India till then.

From the aforesaid copper grant of Shaka S. 757 (V.S. 892), of Dhruvaraja I of Gujrat, it appears that some disturbances had arisen at the time of Amōghavarsha’s accession, when his cousin Karkarāja had helped him. But from the contents of the subsequent inscriptions we understand that Amōghavarsha had gradually gained great power. He shifted his capital from Nāsīk to Mānyakhēṭa (Malkhēḍ),\(^3\) and remained at constant war\(^4\) with the western Chālukyas of Vēngi.

---

1 Perhaps a war took place between this Dhruvaraja II of Gujrat and Amōghavarsha I.
3 This Malkhēḍ exists even today about 90 miles to the south-east of Sholapur in the Nizam’s dominions.
4 The copper grant of Vijayāditya contains the following:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Gōmārāḥवै:सर्वं द्वा शाख्रकःश्वात्मकः॥}
\text{भुजासिनितः: खदसच्चवे नवविकः॥}
\text{प्रांजतं युज्यतं युज्यतं संमोऽंगशालयमसू॥}
\text{ततस्ववमकोऽवदौ स्वयमविपुच्चति:॥}
\end{align*}\]

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

\[\begin{align*}
\text{निस्मात: यज्ञवल्क्यको: श्वाख्यविनिः पुनः॥}
\text{प्रवीधविवोधतं धीरो वेदणारावणोऽसष्टपत॥}
\end{align*}\]

\(i.e.,\) just as Varāha (one of the incarnations of God) had delivered the earth that had been submerged in the sea, in the like manner, Amōghavarsha delivered once again the kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas that had lapsed under the surging sea of the Čālukyas.
A copper grant\(^1\) of the western Ganga dynasty, found at Sündi, shows that Amôghavarsha had a daughter named Abbalabba who was married to 'Guṇadattaranga Bhūtuga,' the great grandfather of 'Pēramāṇaḍi Bhūtuga.' This 'Pēramāṇaḍi' was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishṇa III. But this plate is held by scholars to be a forged one.

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

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

\[ \textbf{वस्तु प्रांगुनान्युजालविस्तारप्रक्रियाविस्म-} \\
\textbf{त्वारम्भोजः: पिरवथूक्तप्रक्रियाविस्म:-} \\
\textbf{संहस्त्वा श्रमोपवर्धणामि: पूर्वोदयसत्येत्यसि} \\
\textbf{स भीमावन्तजनसंस्तूवत्रमवल्पादो अवगम्यरम्यम।} \]

\[ i.e., \text{blissful for the world is the existence of} \] Jinasēnāchārya, by bowing to whom Amôghavarsha considered himself to be purified.

This shows that Amôghavarsha was a follower of the 'Digambara' branch of Jainism and was a pupil of Jinasēna.\(^2\)

This fact is also borne out by the 'Pārshvābhhyudaya Kāvya'\(^3\) written by Jinasēna. The same Jinasēna compiled the Ādipurāṇa (the first half of the Mahāpurāṇa). In the preface to Gaṇitasārasangraha', a book on mathematics written by Mahāvīrāchārya, Amôghavarsha is stated to be the follower of Jainism.

The "Jayadhavala," a book containing the principles

\[ ^{1} \text{Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, page 176.} \]

\[ ^{2} \text{This Jinasēna was also the author of the 'Pārshvābhhyudaya Kāvya' and belonged to the 'Sēnasangha,' while Jinasēna the author of the 'Harivamsha Purāṇa' (written in Shaka S. 705) belonged to the 'Punnāṭa Sangha.'} \]

\[ ^{3} \text{'हत्त्यमौधवपरमेष्टपप्पमुखगीर्जसंस्तहोनंविस्ति:मेष्टनविशिष्टे} \\
\text{पाश्मुन्दवे महाकस्तेश्वरविनं नाम ज्ञाने: बर्गे: 1'} \]
of the ‘Digambar’ sect of Jainism, was also written in Shaka S. 759 (V.S. 894-A.D. 837) during the reign of Amōghavarsha.

The Jain priests of the ‘Digambar’ sect hold that the book named “Prashnottararatnamālikā” was written by Amōghavarsha himself, when he, being disgusted with the world, had renounced the affairs of the state in old age, but the Brāhmanas allege that the book was written by Shankarāchārya,¹ while the ‘Śvetāmbara’ Jains say that its author was Vimalāchārya.

In the ‘Digambara’ Jain manuscripts of the above book we find the following couplet:

\[
\text{विवेकहरूक्षर(वचन) राजिय रत्नमालिका}
\]

\[
\text{राक्षितामोपत्रेश मुखियों सदलकर्ता।}
\]

\[i.e.,\] king Amōghavarsha, who has renounced the state, being enlightened by real knowledge, has written this book (Ratnamālikā).

From this we learn that in old age the king having made over the reins of the government to his son ² passed the remainder of his life in religious meditation.

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

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

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

---

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

² Besides Krishparāja, Amōghavarsha had another son named Duddaya (Smith’s Early History of India, page 446, Footnote No. 1.)

Belgali, Kundargē, Kanḍūr, Purīgēḍē (Lakshmēsh-vara), etc.

From the Kyāsanūr inscription, bearing no date, it appears that Sankaraganda, a feudatory of Amōghavarsha, was the governor of Banavāsi.¹

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

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

12. KRISHṆARĀJA II.

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

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

Out of these copper grants the first³ found at Baghumra (Barodā district), of Shaka S. 810 (V.S. 945=A.D. 888), contains a mention of the charitable grant made by the chief feudatory Akālavarsha Krishṇarāja of Gujrat. But this inscription is held unreliable by scholars.

The first inscription⁴ of Shaka S. 822 (V.S. 957=A.D. 900) is found at Nandawāḍige (Bijāpur). In fact, it is of Shaka S. 824 (V.S. 959=A.D. 903).⁵ The second inscription,⁶ which is also of Shaka S. 822, was found at Ardeshahallī.

The third inscription,⁷ of Shaka S. 824 (V.S. 959-A.D. 903), has been found at Mulgund (Dhārwār district.

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

2 Krishṇarāja had granted a ‘Jāgīr’ in Gujrāt to Prachanda’s father in recognition of his services.
3 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 222.
4 Bharata-ke-Prachina Rajavamsha, part I, page 40.
5 In the copper plate of king Bhīma II, of the Chālukya dynasty of Vēnģi, it is thus stated:—

तत्स्तुतःमिहननक्रियापश्चन्द्रोदस्ति विभाषायकोतिधुर्गुणागरेबंधव्यतिच्यायात्मनक्त्वत्स्तलिपिशिखरम्

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

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

Krishṇa II conquered the Āndhra, Banga, Kālinga, and Magadha kingdoms, fought with the kings of Gurjara and Gauḍa, and after overthrowing the Rāṣhṭrakūṭa kingdom annexed the province of Lāṭa. His kingdom extended from the Cape Comorin to the bank of the Ganges.

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

\[\text{प्रकालवर्षभूषणे पालवत्स्वर्मिलाम्} \]

\[\text{शकसुपक्षकार्याण्यन्त्वस्त्वकार्याण्यन्त्वकित्वहरे} \]

i.e., the ‘Uttarapurāṇa’ was concluded in Shaka S. 820 (V.S. 955-A.D. 898), in the reign of king Akālavarsha. Hence, this ‘purāṇa’ may have been finished in the reign of Krishṇa II. His coronation probably took place about Shaka S. 797 (V.S. 932-A.D. 875). But V. A. Smith holds the date of this event to be A.D. 880 (V.S. 937).
He perhaps died about Shaka S. 833 (V.S. 986-A.D. 911).

The name of the son of Krishna II was Jagattunga II who was married to Lakshmi, the daughter of Ranavigraha (Shankaragana), the son of king Kōkkala of the Kalachuri (Haihaya) dynasty of Chēdī.

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

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

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

1 श्रीमुलश्रिकृत कटिप्रसिद्धमवेदाभिनवितास्वरूप्तांशु:।

2 रामविद्या स दिवं विनिन्ये हित्यांमनाप्राथनबेपत्र धाता।।

3 इति, the handsome prince Jagattunga being devoted to sexual pleasure pre-deceased his father. This fact is also borne out by the Sāngli and Nāvsāri copper plates:—

2 Ranavigraha might be a title of Shankaragaṇa.
3 In the copper grant found at Karḍā it is thus stated:—

चेतवा मानोलिनोरगातानानामन्यश्रुर्गात।।

भीमानमोघवनो गोविन्दास्वामिथामायायाम।।
13. INDRARĀJA III.

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

Two copper grants1 of his time have been found at Bagumra, both of which are of Shaka S. 836 (V.S. 972-A.D. 915). These show that Indra III had moved down from Mānyakhēṭa to the village of Kurundaka for his coronation. And on its completion, on the 7th day of the bright half of Phālguna, Shaka S. 836 (24th February 915),2 he made a charitable grant of gold equal in weight to that of his person and also of a village in the province of Lāṭa. (This Kurundaka was situated on the confluence of the rivers Krishnā and Panchagangā).

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

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

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IX, page 29; and Journal Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. XVIII, pages 257 and 261
2 V. A. Smith gives A.D. 912 as the date of accession of Indra III. We cannot say that how far it is correct as in this plate is thus stated:—

“शत्रुहतकालातीत संवक्तर [शते] वर्षशुद्धिविशद्ददेशु युधसंवत्तरे फल्पुशुद्धस्मयं संपसे
श्रीपद ॥” न्योतसे” which shows that this event took place in A.D. 915.
An inscription\(^1\) of Shaka S. 838 (V.S. 973-A.D. 916), which was found at Hattimattūra (in the Dhārwār district) contains a mention of Lēndēyaras, the chief feudatory of this king.

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

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

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

14. AMŌGHAVARSHA II.

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

A copper grant\(^2\) of Shaka S. 919 (V.S. 1054-A.D. 997), of Mahāmanḍalēshvara Aparājita Dēvarāja of the Shīlāra dynasty, shows that this Amōghavarsha II died soon after his accession (i.e., if he reigned at all it might be for a year or so only.) The date of his accession might be about V.S: 973 (A.D. 916). The Dēolī grant\(^3\) of Shaka S. 862 (A.D. 940) supports the fact that Amōghavarsha II succeeded Indrarāja III.

---

\(^1\) Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 224.
\(^3\) Epigraphia Indica, Vol. V, page 192.
15. GÖVINDARAJA IV.

He was the son of Indrarāja III and younger brother of Amōghavarsha II. The ‘Prākṛita’ form of his name is found to be ‘Gōjjiga.’ The following were his titles:—Prabhūtavarsha, Suvarnavarsha, Nṛipatunga, Vīra Nārāyaṇa, Nityakandarpa, Raṭṭakandarpa, Shashānka, Nṛpatitrinētra, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara, Parama Bhattaraka, Sāhasānka, Prithvīvallabha, Vallabhanarēndradēva, Vikrāntanārāyṇa, Gōjjigavallabha, etc.

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

In his first copper grant⁴ of Shaka S. 852 (V.S. 987—A.D. 930) he is mentioned as the successor of Mahārājādhirāja Indrarāja III, and a ‘Yaduvamshi’ (of the lunar origin). The second plate⁵, dated Shaka S. 855 (V.S. 990=A.D. 933), from Sāngli, contains a mention of the lineage, etc., like the first.

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

¹ In the copper grants of the Chālukyas it is thus stated about Bhīma III:—
‘द्वारे गोविन्दस्य ज्ञात्राः यद्यथात्मकं वो लोकविक्षिप्
विन्दूमं युद्धस्थान जघरं संन्दिशेत् एव’

i.e., Bhīma repulsed the armies of Gōvinda and killed Chōla king Lōlavikkī and Yuddhamalla possessor of mighty elephants, without the help of others. This shows that Gōvinda IV may have made an unsuccessful attack upon Bhīma.

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

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

16. BADDIGA (AMŪGHAVARSHA III).

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

It is stated in the copper grant of Shaka S. 862 (V.S. 997-A.D. 940), of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishṇa III, found at Deōlī (Wārdhā):—

\[\text{\ldots}\]

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

---

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

\[\text{\ldots}\]

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

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

The following were the titles of Amoghavarsha III (Baddiga):—Shri Prithvīvallabha, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, etc.

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

From the inscription of Hēbbāla we understand that the daughter of Baddiga (Amoghavarsha III) was married to king Satyavākya Kōṇguṇivarma Pēramānaḍi Bhūtugā II, of the western Ganga dynasty to whom a large territory was given in dowry.

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

17. KRISHNARĀJA III.

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

Akalavarsha, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara, Paramamāhēshvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Prithvīvallabha, Shri Prithvīvallabha, Samastabhuvanāshraya, Kandhārapuravarādhīshvara, etc.

From the inscription of Ātkūr we learn that he killed king Rājāditya (Mūvaḍichōla) of the Chōla dynasty in a battle near the place named Takkōla about V.S. 1006-7 (A.D. 949-50), but in fact he was treacherously killed by the Satyavākya Kōṇguṇivarma Peramānaḍi Bhūtugā of the western Ganga dynasty,

3 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II, page 171. The time of the death of Rājāditya is supposed to be V. S. 1006 (A.D. 949).
for which act Kṛishṇarāja gave him the districts of Banavāsī, etc.

In the inscription¹ of Tirukkalukkunram, Kṛishṇa III is stated to have acquired the territories of Kānchī and Tanjör.

From the inscription of Dēōlī² it appears that Kṛishṇa III killed king Dantīga of Kānchī and Vappuga, defeated king Antīga of the Pallava dynasty, protected the Kalachurīs of the Central India against the invasion of the Gurjaras³ and defeated many other hostile kings. The feudatory chiefs from the Himalayas to Ceylon and from the Eastern sea to the western sea acknowledged his supremacy. He granted a village in charity to commemorate the illustrious services of his younger brother Jagattunga. Kṛishṇa III had acquired considerable power even during his father’s lifetime.

In the inscription⁴ (of Lakshmēshvara), dated Shaka S. 890 (A.D. 968-9), it is stated that by his order Mārasi-mha II defeated the Gurjara king, while Kṛishṇa III himself was like an incarnation of death for the kings of the Chōla dynasty.

From the inscriptions of Kyāsnoor and Dharwar we understand that his chief feudatory Kaliviṭṭa, of the Chaillakētana dynasty, was the governor of Banavāsī in V.S. 1002-1003 (A.D. 945-46).⁵ In one of the inscriptions⁶ of the Raṭṭas of Saundatti it is stated that Kṛishṇa III having appointed Prithvirāma as a chief feudatory had dignified the Raṭṭa family of Saundatti. The

---

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

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

The first copper grant1 of Shaka S. 862 (V.S. 997=A.D. 940), found at Dèōli, speaks of a charitable grant made by Krishna III in memory of his deceased brother Jagattunga.

An inscription2 of Shaka S. 867 (V.S. 1002=A.D. 845) found at Sālōṭāgī (Bijāpur) contains a mention of a school opened by his minister Nārāyaṇa, where students used to come from various parts of the country.

In the second inscription3 of Shaka S. 871 (V.S. 1006=A.D. 949), found at Shōlāpur, this king is stated to be a Chakravarti (Emperor). The third inscription4 of Shaka S. 872 (V.S. 1007=A.D. 950), found at Atkūr (Mysore), shows that king Krishna III awarded the district of Banavāsī, etc., to king Bhūtuga II of the western Ganga dynasty for his killing Chōla king Rājāditya. The fourth inscription5 of Shaka S. 873 (V.S. 1008=A.D. 951) is found at Soratūr (Dhārwār); the fifth of Shaka S. 875 (V.S. 1014=A.D. 957),6 at Shōlāpur; and the sixth7 of Shaka S. 976 (V.S. 1011=A.D. 954), at Chinchli.

The second copper grant8 of this king, bearing Shaka S. 880 (V.S. 1015=A.D. 958), found at Karhad, indicates that Krishna III, while invading the South, laid waste.

---

2 Do. do. IV, page 60.
3 Do. do. VII, page 194.
4 Do. do. II, page 171.
5 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 257.
7 Kielhorn’s list of the Southern inscriptions of India, No. 97.
the province of Chōla, conquered the territory of Pāṇḍya, subjugated the king of Ceylon, exacted tributes from the ‘Māṇḍalika’ rulers and erected a monumental tower at Rāmēshvaram to commemorate these victories.

He also granted a village for the construction of the temples of Kālapriya, Gandamārtanda and Kṛishṇēshvara.

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

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

The Vīra Chōla, mentioned in the inscription of the 26th regnal year, might be Gāṅgavāna Prithvīpati II.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

1 When Sōmadēva compiled this work, he was living in the capital of Prince Baddiga, the eldest son of the Chālukya Arikeēari, a feodatory of king Krīṣṇa III.

2 Jain Sāhitya Samshōdhaka, part II, issue 3, page 36.
In the Jain Library of Karanji there is a book named “Jvala mālini Kalpa” at the end of which it is stated:—

\( \text{हिंदूतंत्र} \) भिन्नतेश्वरप्रियमालासारसंभवतःसृज्ञतीस्यु संहिताः
भिन्नतेश्वरस्य विकटके पवंशवच्चतुर्तीयायाम्।
शतकप्राहित्वेन: शत्परियायामहान्यान्वरायणे युक्तम्।
भिन्नतेश्वराराजाये समासेन्मयं विद्याः।

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

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

18. KHOTTIGA.

He was the son of Amōghavarsha III. He succeeded his elder brother Krishnarāja III.

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

\( \text{स्त्रवायित्वेन: च चेष्टा भातिरि भीमक्षराजाचेते—}
\text{न्यूराजार्जवित्यति कन्दुदेवर्गमीवल्पन्युप-}
\text{र्जात: खोट्टिगच्चे नृपतिमेतूर्त मृत्वनक्तिक्यतः।} \)

i.e., on the death of his elder brother Krishnarāja-\( \text{देवा, Khōttigadēva,} \) son of Amōghavarsha and Kandakadēvi (the daughter of Yuvarājadēva), ascended the throne.

Though Khōttiga had an elder brother named Jagat-\( \text{tunga, yet, as he predeceased} \) Krishnarāja, Khōttiga succeeded him.

The following were the titles of Khōttiga:—Nitya-\( \text{varsha; Raṭṭakandarpā, Mahārajādhirāja, Paramesh-}
\text{vara, Paramabhatṭāraka, Shīrī Pṛthvīvallabha, etc.}

An inscription\(^4\) in the Canarese language of Shaka S. 893 (V.S. 1028—A.D. 971), contains a title of this king,

---

1 Jain Sāhitya Samśādha, part II, issue 3, pages 145-156.
2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 264.
3 This seems to be only a ‘Prakrit’ form of the king’s real name, mention of which has not yet been found anywhere.
'Nityavarsha' and a mention of his feudatory Pērama-naḍi Mārasimha II, of the western Ganga dynasty. This Mārasimha had under his sway 96,000 villages? of Gangavāḍi, 300 of Bēlavala and 300 of Purigēra.

An inscription1 of the time of Paramāra king Udayāditya, found at Udaipur (Gwalior), contains the following lines:—

श्रीवर्णदेव इति खोंटिगेवचर्ची
जग्राह यो वृद्धि नगासम: प्रताप: [१२]

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

At the end of the Prākrita dictionary named 'Pāiyalachchhi Nāmamālā,' written by Dhanapāla, it is stated:—

विक्रमालस्स गए भ्रवशस्तीलतरे सहस्तस्मि।
मालवनिन्द्वातीले लघुरे मल्लेवर्मिम ॥२७॥

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

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

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

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

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

19. **KARKARAJA II.**

He was the son of Nirupama, the youngest son of Amoghavarsha III. He succeeded his own uncle Khōttigadeva. The other forms of his name were Kakka, Karkara, Kakkara and Kakkala. His titles were Amoghavarsha, Nripatunga, Vīranārayana, Nūtana Pārtha, Ahītamārtanda, Rājatrinētra, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēshvara, Paramamāhēshvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Prithvīvallabha, Vallabhanarēndra, etc. From the title ‘Parama Māhēshvara’ it appears that this king was also a Shaiva.

In a copper grant\(^1\) of Shaka S. 894 (V.S. 1029=A.D. 972), of the reign of Karkarāja, found at Kardā, the Rāṣhṭrakūṭas are mentioned as Yādavas.

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

In an inscription\(^2\) of his time of Shaka S. 896 (V.S. 1030=A.D. 973), found at Gūndūr (Dhārwār) there is a mention of his feudatory Pēramāṇāḍī Mārasimha II of the western Ganga dynasty who had annihilated Nōlambakula of the Pallava dynasty.

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

The weakness of the Rāṣhṭrakūṭa power resulting from the invasion by Paramāra king Siyaka II, of Mālūvā at the time of Khōttīga, afforded an opportunity to the Chālukyas (Sōlankīs) to regain their lost power. In order to do so, Sōlankī king Tailapa II attacked Karkarāja after V. S. 1030 (A.D. 973) and re-established\(^3\)

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 203.
2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, page 271.
3 In the copper grant of Khārēpāṭan it is stated:—

कान्हलस्तम्य आयुक्यो मुनो मर्दाज्ञपितिः ।
प्राचीप्रणमदायेव प्रजापालितशान्तम् ॥
समरे ते विनिमित्य तैलपोष्मुम्भीपति: ।

i.e., the powerful king Karkaraja II, was a nephew of Khōttīga and after defeating him, Tailapa took possession of his kingdom.
the Chālukya (Ṣōlankī) kingdom of Kalyānī. Thus ended the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom of the Deccan.\(^1\)

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

The said Sōlanki king Tailapa II had married Jākabbā,\(^3\) the daughter of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Bhammaha.

The fact about the destruction of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom of the Deccan by Tailapa II in the time of Karkarāja is further corroborated by the copper plates of Shaka S. 919\(^4\) and 930\(^5\), of kings Aparājīta and Raṭtarāja of the Shilāra dynasty respectively. This Aparājīta was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and became independent on their downfall. In the "Vikramāṅkadēvacharita" (Sarga I, stanza 69) it is stated:

\> i.e., the state passed on to the Sōlanki king Tailapa II, the destroyer of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom.

An inscription\(^6\) of Shaka S. 904 (V.S. 1039=A.D. 982), found at Shravana Bēlgōla, contains a mention of Indrarāja IV, who was a grandson of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishnarāja III. The mother of this Indra IV was the daughter of Gāṅgēyadēva of the Ganga dynasty and Indrarāja married the daughter of Rājachūḍāmāni.

The titles of this Indrarāja were as follows:

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

---

\(^1\) Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, page 15.
\(^3\) Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVI, page 21.
\(^6\) Inscriptions at ShravanaBelgola, No. 57, (page 53) A. 17.
After the death of Karkarāja, Pēramānādi Mārāsimha of the western Ganga dynasty in his efforts to maintain the Rāṣṭrakūta kingdom, tried his best to obtain the throne for Indra IV. (It has been noted above that Pēramānādi Bhūtuga, the father of this Mārāsimha, was a brother-in-law of the Rāṣṭrakūta king Krishṇa III.) This effort was probably made about V.S. 1030 (A.D. 973) but nothing has been known as to its result. This Indra IV courted death by observing total abstinence from food and drink,¹ which is a principle of the Jain theology, and died on the 8th day of the dark half of Chaitra, Shaka S. 904=V. S. 1039 (20th March 982 A.D.).

### The Genealogical Table of the Rāṣṭrakūtas of Manyakheta (Deccan.)

| 1. | Dantivarman I. |
| 2. | Indraraja I. |
| 3. | Gōvindaraja I. |
| 4. | Karkaraja I. |
| 5. | Indraraja II. |
| 6. | Dantidurga or Dantivarman II. |
| 8. | Gōvindaraja II. |
| 10. | Gōvindaraja III. (Jagattunga I). |
| 11. | Indraraja (originator of the 2nd branch of Gujrat). |
| 12. | Gōvindaraja III. |
| 14. | Indraraja III. |
| 15. | Amōghavarsha III (Baddiga). |
| 16. | Gōvindaraja IV. |
| 17. | Krishnaraja III. Jagattunga III. |
| 19. | Karkaraja II. |

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 182.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME.</th>
<th>RELATION.</th>
<th>SPECIAL TITLES.</th>
<th>KNOWN PERIODS.</th>
<th>CONTEMPORARY KINGS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Indrāja I</td>
<td>Do. No. 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gōvindarāja I</td>
<td>Do. No. 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indrarāja II</td>
<td>Do. No. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dantidurgā (Dantivarman II)</td>
<td>Brother of No. 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gōvindarāja II</td>
<td>Son of No. 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dhruvarāja</td>
<td>Son of No. 8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gōvindarāja III</td>
<td>Son of No. 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Amoghavarsha I</td>
<td>Do. No. 10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Krishna II</td>
<td>Do. No. 11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Indrarāja IV</td>
<td>Grandson of No. 17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By adding 135 to any Shaka Samvat we arrive at the corresponding Vikrama Samvat and by adding 78 we get the corresponding Christian era.
THE RĀṢḤṬRAḴŪṬAS OF LĀṬA (GUJRĀṬ).
FROM BEFORE V. S. 814 (A.D. 757)
TO
AFTER V. S. 945 (A.D. 888).

First Branch.

It has already been stated that king Dantidurγa (Dantivarman II) had seized the kingdom of Chālukya (Sölanki) king Kirtivarman II. At the same time the province of Lāṭa (Southern and Central Gujrāṭ) had also passed into the possession of the Rāṣḥṭraḵūṭas.

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

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

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

2. Dhruvarāja—son of Karkarāja I.


1
The aforesaid copper grant of Shaka S. 679 (V.S. 814—A.D. 757) is of the time of Karkaraja II. He was a contemporary of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga (Dantivarman II) who had invested him with the ruling powers of Lāta. The following are the titles of king Karkaraja II:

Parama Māhēshvara, Parama Bhaṭṭāraka, Parmēśhvara, Mahārājādhirāja.

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

Second Branch.

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

I. INDRARĀJA

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

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

---

THE RĀṢḤTRAKŪṬAS OF LĀṬA (Gujrāt).

2. KARKARĀJA (KAKKARĀJA).

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

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

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

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

Karkarāja had a son named Dhruvarāja.

3. GŌVINDARĀJA.

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

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

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

4. DHRUVARĀJA I.

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

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

5. AKĀLAVARSHA.

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

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, page 64.
3 Indian Antiquary, vol. XIV, page 199.
of the Deccan do not appear to have been friendly. He had three sons:—Dhruvaraja, Dantivarman, and Govindaraja.

6. DHRUVARAJA II.

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

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

7. DANTIVARMAN.

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

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

8. **KRISHṆARĀJA.**

He was the son and successor of Dantivarman. A copper grant\(^1\) of Shaka S. 810 (V.S. 945—A.D. 888) of his time has been found which appears to be incorrect. His titles are found to be Mahāsāmantādhipati, Akālavārsha, etc.

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

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

---

**GENEALOGY OF THE RĀṢṬRAKŪṬAS OF LAṬA (Gujrāt).**

*(First Branch)*

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

*(Second Branch)*

Dhruvarāja of Mānyakhēta.

1. Indrārāja.

2. Karkarāja.
3. Gōvindarāja I.
4. Dhruvarāja I.
5. Akālavārsha.

6. Dhruvarāja II.
7. Dantivarman.
8. Krishnārāja.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME.</th>
<th>SPECIAL TITLE.</th>
<th>RELATION.</th>
<th>ASCERTAINED DATES.</th>
<th>CONTEMPORARIES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Karkarāja I...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Son of No. 1.</td>
<td>(First Branch.)</td>
<td>Nāgavarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dhruvarāja...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>&quot; 2.</td>
<td>Shaka S. 679.</td>
<td>Rāśṭrakūṭa Dantidurga (Dantivarman II) and Kṛishnārāja I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gōvindarāja...</td>
<td>Mahārājādhirāja.</td>
<td>&quot; 3.</td>
<td>(Second Branch.)</td>
<td>Rāśṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Indrarāja...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dantivarman...</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Brother of No. 6.</td>
<td>&quot; 789.</td>
<td>Rāśṭrakūṭa Kṛishnārāja II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kṛishnārāja...</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Son of No. 7.</td>
<td>&quot; 810.</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE RATṬAS (RĀSHṬRAKUṬAS) OF SAUNDATTI.
FROM ABOUT V. S. 932 (A.D. 875)
TO
ABOUT V.S. 1287 (A.D. 1230).

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

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

(The First Branch)

1. MĒRAḌA.
This is the first name traceable of this branch.

2. FṚITHUBĪRAMA.
He was the son and successor of Mēraḍa. An inscription\(^1\) of Shaka S. 797 (V.S. 932—A.D. 875) of this chief has been found, in which he is mentioned as belonging to the Raṭṭa race.

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

3. PĪṬṬUGA.

He was the son and successor of Prithvīrama. He defeated Ajavarman in battle. His wife's name was Niṅkabbe.

4. SHĀNTIVARMAN.

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

(The Second Branch.)

1. NANNA.

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

---

2. KĀRTAVĪRYA I.

He was the son and successor of Nanna. An inscription\(^1\) of Shaka S. 902 (V.S. 1037—A.D. 980) of this king has been found. He was a feudatory of the Sōlankī king Tailapa II and governor of Kūṇḍi in Dhārwār of which district he had fixed the boundaries. It is probable that this chief may have put an end to the first branch of Saundatti, having wrested authority from Shāntivarman. He had two sons:—Dāyima and Kanna.

3. DĀYIMA (DĀVARI).

He was the son and successor of Kārtavīrya I.

4. KANNA (KANNAKAIRA I).

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

5. ĖRĒGA (ĒRĒYAMMARASA).

He was the son and successor of Kanna I. An inscription\(^2\) of his time, of Shaka S. 962 (V.S. 1097—A.D. 1040), has been found in which he is described as the chief feudatory of the Chālukya (Sōlankī) king Jayasimha II (Jagadekamalla), the ruler of Laṭṭalūra, and was decorated with the five high titles. He was an expert musician. He was also called Raṭṭa Nārāyaṇa. As there was a golden image of Garuḍa on his flag he was further called “Singana Garuḍa”. An ensign conveyed on an elephant, with a band called “Țivili” (like the one played in the processions of the Rāṣṭra-kūtās of the Deccan) used to decorate his procession.

The name of his son was Sēna (Kālasēna).

---

\(^{1}\) Kielhorn's list of South Indian Inscriptions, page 26, No. 141.
\(^{2}\) Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIX, page 164.
6. ANKA.

He was the son of Kanna I and succeeded his elder brother Erēga. An inscription1 of his time, of Shaka S. 970 (V.S. 1105—A.D. 1048), has been found in which he is mentioned as a chief feudatory of the western Chālukya (Sōlankī) Trailōkyamalla (Sōmēshvara I). Perhaps, another broken inscription of his time has also been found which, too, is of the same year.

7. SĒNA (KĀLASĒNA I).

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

8. KANNA (KANNAKAIRA II).

He was the son and successor of Sēna (Kālasēna I). One copper grant and one inscription of his time have been found. The copper grant2 is of Shaka S. 1004 (V.S. 1139—A.D. 1082) in which this Kanna II of the Raṭṭa race is mentioned as a chief feudatory of the Sōlankī (western Chālukya) king Vikramāditya VI. It also appears from this plate that Kanna had purchased many villages from Mahāmanḍalēshvara Munja, king of Bhōgavatī (grandson of Bhīma and son of Sindarāja), who belonged to the Sinda dynasty which is stated as the gem of the Nāga race.

The inscription3 mentioned above is of Shaka S. 1009 (V.S. 1144—A.D. 1087). In it he is mentioned as Mahāmanḍalēshvara (the chief feudatory).

9. KĀRTAVĪRYA II.

He was the son of Sēna I and younger brother of Kanna II. He was also called Kaṭṭa. His wife's name was Bhāgaladēvī or Bhāglāmbikā. Three inscriptions

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

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

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

10. SĒNA (KĀLASĒNA II).

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

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

11. KĀRTAVĪRYA (KAṬṬAMA III).

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

A broken inscription of his time has been found at Könnūr in which his titles are mentioned as Mahāman-
dalēshvara and Chakravartī, which shows that in the beginning he remained a feudatory of the western Chālukya (Sōlankī) kings Jagadēkamalla II and Tailapa III. But sometime after V.S. 1222 (A.D. 1165), due to the decline of the power of the Sōlankī and the Kalachurī (Haihaya) dynasties, he became independent and may have assumed the title of Chakravartī.

From an inscription of Shaka S. 1109 (past) (V.S. 244=A.D. 1187) it appears that at that time one Bhāyi-dēva ruled over Kūndi, who was an administrator of criminal justice under Sōlankī Sōmēshvara IV. From this we infer that the Raṭṭas might not have attained full success in gaining independence up to that time.

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

12. LAKSHMĪDĒVA I.

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

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

---

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

He had two sons:—Kārtavīrya and Mallikārjuna.

13. KĀRTAVĪRYA IV.

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

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

14. LAKSHMĪDEVĀ II.

He was the son and successor of Kārtavīrya IV. An

---

2 Graham’s Kolhāpur, page 415, No. 9.
6 Indian Antiquary Vol. XIX, p. 245.
inscription\(^1\) of his time of Shaka S. 1151 (V.S. 1285—A.D. 1228) has been found in which his title is mentioned as Mahāmandalēshvara. His mother's name was Mādēvī.

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

In the copper plate\(^2\) of Shaka S. 1160 (V.S. 1295—A.D. 1238) of Haralahalli, Vīchaṇa, a feudatory of Yādava king Singhaṇa of Deogiri, is stated to have defeated the Raṭṭas.

A copper plate\(^3\) has been found from Sītābaldī of Shaka S. 1008 (1009) (V.S. 1144—A.D. 1087) of Rāṇaka Dhāḍībhaṇḍaka (Dhāḍīdēva), the chief feudatory of the western Chālukya (Sōlankī) Vikramāditya VI (Tribhuvanamalla), in which this Dhāḍībhaṇḍaka is stated to be of the Mahā Rāṣṭrakūṭa race and to have come from Laṭalūr.

In the inscription\(^4\) of Shaka S. 1052 (V.S. 1186—A.D. 1129) found at Khānpur (Kōlhāpur State) there is a mention of Raṭṭa Ankidēva, a chief feudatory of Sōlankī Sōmēshvara III. But there is no trace as to how he was connected with the above-mentioned branches of the Raṭṭas.

---

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

THE GENEALOGY OF THE RAṬṬAS OF SAUNDATTI.

(First Branch.)

1. Mēraḍa.
2. Prithvirāma.
3. Piṭṭuna.
4. Shāntivarman.

(Second Branch.)

1. Nanna.
2. Kārtavīrya I.
3. Dayima.
4. Kanna I.
5. Ėrēga.
6. Anka.
7. Sēna I.
8. Kanna II.
9. Kārtavīrya II.
10. Sēna II.
11. Kārtavīrya III.
12. Lakshmidēva I.
14. Lakshmidēva II.

### Statement Giving Particulars of the Raṭṭas of Saundatti (Sugandhavartī)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Special Title</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Ascertain Dates</th>
<th>Contemporaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mēraḍa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 1</td>
<td>Shaka 797</td>
<td>Rāṣṭaṇa king Kṛṣṇa, Arjunavarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prthvīrāma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 2</td>
<td>Shaka 902</td>
<td>Sōlanki Tailapa II and Raṭṭa Kārtavīrya I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Piṭṭhūga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 3</td>
<td>Shaka 902</td>
<td>Sōlanki Tailapa II and Raṭṭa Śāṇṭivarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Śāṇṭivarman</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Second Branch.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 1</td>
<td>Shaka 902</td>
<td>Sōlanki Tailapa II and Raṭṭa Śāṇṭivarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kārtavīrya I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Shaka 902</td>
<td>Sōlanki Tailapa II and Raṭṭa Śāṇṭivarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dāyima</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother of No. 2</td>
<td>Shaka 962</td>
<td>Sōlanki Jayasimha II (Jagadēka-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kāṇṇa I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 4</td>
<td>Shaka 97</td>
<td>Sōlanki Śōmēshvara I (Trailōkya-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ėrēga</td>
<td>Mahāśāmanta.</td>
<td>Brother of No. 5</td>
<td>Shaka 97</td>
<td>Sōlanki Śōmēshvara I (Trailōkya-malla).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sēna I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kāṇṇa II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 67</td>
<td>Shaka 1004 &amp; 1009</td>
<td>Sōlanki Śōmēshvara II, Vikramāditya VI and Munja of the Sindha clan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kārtavīrya II</td>
<td>Mahāmaṇḍalēśhvara.</td>
<td>Brother of No. 8</td>
<td>Shaka 1009 &amp; 1045</td>
<td>Sōlanki Śōmēshvara II, and Vikramāditya VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sēna II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 9</td>
<td>Shaka 1018</td>
<td>Sōlanki Vikramāditya VI and Jayakarna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kārtavīrya III</td>
<td>Mahāmaṇḍalēśhvara and Chakravarti.</td>
<td>Do. 10</td>
<td>Shaka 1066, 1084, (past) and 1086</td>
<td>Sōlanki Jadakama II and Tailapa III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lakṣhmidēva I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 11</td>
<td>Shaka 1130</td>
<td>Sōlanki Jadakama II and Tailapa III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kārtavīrya IV</td>
<td>Mahāmaṇḍalēśhvara.</td>
<td>Do. 12</td>
<td>Shaka 1121 (past), 1124, 1126 (past), 1127, 1131 &amp; 1141</td>
<td>Sōlanki Jadakama II and Tailapa III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mallikārjuna</td>
<td>Yuvarāja.</td>
<td>Brother of No. 13</td>
<td>Shaka 1127 &amp; 1131</td>
<td>Shaka 1151.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lakṣhmidēva II</td>
<td>Mahāmaṇḍalēśhvara.</td>
<td>Son of No. 13</td>
<td>Shaka 1151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE EARLY RĀṢHṬRAKŪṬAS OF RĀJASTHĀNA
(RĀJPŪṬĀṆĀ).

HASTIKUṆḌĪ (HATHŪṆḌĪ) BRANCH.

FROM ABOUT V.S. 950 (A.D. 893)

TO

ABOUT V.S. 1053 (A.D. 996.)

Traces of the existence of Rāṣhṭrakūṭa kingdoms at Hastikūṇḍī (Marwar) and Dhanōp (Shāhpurā) in RājpūṭāṆā are found even before the advent, to that province, of the descendants of the Gāhaḍavāla king Jayachachandra of Kanauj.

An inscription1 of V.S. 1053 (A.D. 997) has been found at Bijāpur (Gōdwār district in the Marwar State), in which the genealogy of the Rāṭhōras of Hathūṇḍī is given as follows:—

1. HARIVARMAN.

The aforesaid genealogical table opens with this name.

2. VIDAGDHARĀJA.

He was the son of Harivarman and lived in V.S. 973–A.D. 916.2

3. MAMMĀṬA.

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

---

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

He was the son of Mammata and helped the ruler of Mewár when Paramāra king Munja of Mālwā attacked him and destroyed Ahāda.

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

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

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

THE GENEOALOGICAL TABLE OF THE EARLY RĀTHŪRAS OF Hastikunḍī.

1. Harivarman.
2. Vidagdharāja.
3. Mammata.
4. Dhavala.
5. Bālaprasāda.

STATEMENT GIVINC PARTICULARS OF THE EARLY RĀTHŪRAS OF Hastikunḍī.

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

1 Probably Mahālakshmi, the sister of this king Dhavala, or of his father was married to Bhartrihāṭṭa II, the ruler of Mēwār, from whom Allāta was born.

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

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

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

THE GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE EARLY RĀṬHŌRAS
OF DHANŌP.

Bhallīla.
Dantivarman.

Buddharāja. Gōvindarāja.
THE GĀHAḌĀVĀLAS OF KANAUJ.

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

TO

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

Col. James Tod has stated in his ‘Annals of Rāja-
thāna’ that in V.S. 526 (A.D. 470) Rāṭhōra Nayapāla
acquired the kingdom of Kanauj after killing king
Ajayapāla.¹ This assertion does not seem to be correct,
for, though the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had had their sway over
Kanauj ere this, yet about this particular period king
Skandagupta or his son Kumāragupta of the Imperial
Gupta dynasty ruled over Kanauj². After this, the
Maukharīs occupied it,³ and their power was set aside,
for some time, by the Baisas, who took possession of
Kanauj⁴. But after the death of Harsha the Mau-
khariṇīs again made it their capital. About V.S. 798
(A.D. 741) king Lalitāditya (Muktāpīḍa) of Kāshmīr
invaded Kanauj, which then too was the capital
of Yashōvarman, the Maukhaṇī ruler⁵. Further it
appears from the copper grant⁶ of V.S. 1084 (A.D. 1027)
of Pratihāra king Trilōchanapāla and from the ins-
scription⁷ of V.S. 1093 (A.D. 1036) of Yashahpāla that
the Pratihāras ruled over Kanauj about that time.

¹ Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān, (Ed. by W. Crooke) page 930.
³ Do. do. do. page 373.
⁴ Do. do. do. page 338.
⁵ Do. do. do. page 376.
⁶ Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 34.
Later, Rāṣṭrakūṭa Chandradeva (whose descendants were afterwards known as Gāhadavālas owing to their sway over Gādhipur, *i.e.*, Kanauj), having conquered Badāuin about V.S. 1111 (A.D. 1054), took possession of Kanauj. Thus, the kingdom of Kanauj once more came into the possession of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.²

About 70 copper grants and inscriptions of these Gāhadavālas have been found in which they are mentioned as ‘Śuryavamshīs’. But the mention of the Gāhadavāla dynasty is only found in three grants of V.S. 1161, 1162 and 1166 issued by Gōvindachandra while he was a prince regent as well as in the inscription of his queen Kumāradēvi. Further, there is no mention of the word Rāṣṭrakūṭa or Rāṭṭa in them, but they belonged to a branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as has been separately discussed elsewhere.³ The Gāhadavālas had their sway over Kāshi (Benares), Oudh, and, perhaps, over Indrasthāna (Delhi) too⁴.

1. YASHŌVIGRAHA.

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

2. MAHĪCHANDRA.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“श्रेयेश्वरस्य तुष्यतिक्षिणगतालितः”

An inscription of Dēvapāla dated V.S. 1005 (A.D. 948) has been found.


3 वाले श्रीभोजभूपे विष्णवस्तुप्रेमस्तीमातियतवः

श्रीचंद्रेन कृतिश्रेष्ठ गतविति च वर्णे चतुर्विश्वाय जायमाने ।

भग्नरं यं & (च) रितिविदिविभिन्नों मरणियोगाहुपेत

चता विश्वासम् समभविद्व स चतुर्विश्वाय।।

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

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


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

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

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

4. MADANAPĀLA.

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

The second,² of V.S. 1161 (A.D. 1104), is of his son (Mahārājaputra) Gōvindachandra, in which there is a mention of the charitable grant of the village “Basāhī” together with the cess called “Turushkaḍāṇḍa.” This shows that just as “Jaziā” was levied upon the Hindūs this ‘Turushkaḍāṇḍa’ was levied by Madanapāla upon the Mohammedans. Further, this is the first grant in which the word ‘Gahaḍavāla’ is mentioned.

The third,³ of V.S. 1162 (A.D. 1105), is also of the Mahārājaputra Gōvindachandra and mentions the name of the senior queen of Madanapāla and mother of Gōvindachandra as Rālhanadevi.⁴ (This too contains the mention of the word Gahaḍavāla.)

The fourth⁵ is of V.S. 1163 (in fact of 1164) (A.D. 1107). This is of king Madanapāla himself, in which his queen’s name appears as Prithvīshrikā.

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 11.
2 Do. do. XIV, page 103.
4 She was also called Rālhaṇḍēvī.
5 Journal Royal Asiatic Society, (1896), page 787.
The fifth,\(^1\) of V.S. 1166 (A.D. 1109), is also of Mahā-rājaputra Gōvindachandradēva. (In which also it is stated that he belonged to the Gahadavāla clan.)

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

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

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

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

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

5. GŌVINDACHANDRA.

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

---

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

The fourth, fifth and sixth copper plates1 are of V.S. 1171 (A.D. 1114). Of the fourth, only the first plate has been found, i.e., it is incomplete. The seventh2 is of V.S. 1172 (A.D. 1116). The eighth3 of V.S. 1174 (A.D. 1117) was issued from Dēvasthāna and contains a mention of his army of elephants. The ninth4 is also of V.S. 1174 (in fact of 1175) (A.D. 1119) and the tenth5 of V.S. 1175 (A.D. 1119). The eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth6 of V.S. 1176 (A.D. 1119) were issued from the village Khayarā on the Ganges, Mumdaliya and Benares respectively. The eleventh contains the name of his senior queen Nayanakēlidēvi. The fourteenth7 and fifteenth8 are of 1177 (A.D. 1120) and the sixteenth9 of V.S. 1178 A.D. 1122.

The seventeenth10 plate of V.S. 1180 (A.D. 1123) contains along with the king’s other titles, the decorations ‘Ashvapati’, ‘Gajapati’, ‘Narapati’, ‘Rājatrayādhipati’, ‘Vividhavidyāvichāravāchaspati’, etc. The eighteenth11 of V.S. 1181 (A.D. 1124) contains his mother’s name “Rālhaṇadēvi.” The nineteenth12 of V.S. 1182 (A.D. 1125) was issued from the place “Madapratkhāra” on the Ganges. The twentieth13 of V.S. 1182

---
1 List of Northern (Indian) inscriptions, No 692; Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 102 and Vol. VIII, page 153. The second was issued from Benāres.
2 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 104.
3 Do. do. do. 105.
7 Journal Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. XXXI, page 123.
10 Journal Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. LVI, page 108. (Dr. Bhandarkar gives the date as V.S. 1187.)
12 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 100.
(A.D. 1127) (originally of V.S. 1183) was issued from the village "Ishapratisthâna" on the Ganges. The twenty-first and twenty-second plates\(^1\) are of V.S. 1183 (A.D. 1123) and V.S. 1184 (A.D. 1127) respectively. The twenty-third plate\(^2\) is of V.S. 1185 (A.D. 1129). The twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth plates\(^3\) are of V.S. 1186 (A.D. 1130).

The twenty-sixth plate\(^4\) is of V.S. 1187 (A.D. 1130). The twenty-seventh plate\(^5\) is of V.S. 1188 (A.D. 1131). The twenty-eighth plate\(^6\) is of V.S. 1189 (A.D. 1133). The twenty-ninth and thirtieth plates\(^7\) are of V.S. 1190 (A.D. 1133).

The thirty-first plate\(^8\) is of V.S. 1191 (A.D. 1134), of Mahârâjaputra Vatsrâjadēva of the "Singara" family, who was a feudatory of king Gõvindachandra and was also called "Lõhaḍadēva".

The thirty-second\(^9\) and the thirty-third\(^10\) plates are of V.S. 1196 (A.D. 1139) and V.S. 1197 (A.D. 1141) respectively. The thirty-fourth\(^11\) of V.S. 1198 (A.D. 1141) speaks of a charitable grant made on the occasion of the first anniversary of his senior queen Râlhadēvi's demise.

The thirty-fifth\(^12\) plate of V.S. 1199 (A.D. 1143) contains a mention of the king's (Gõvindachandra's) son Mahârâjaputra Râjyapâladeva.\(^13\) The thirty-sixth,\(^14\) thirty-seventh\(^15\) and thirty-eighth\(^16\) plates are of V.S. 1200

---

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

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

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

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

² Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, page 159.
⁴ Kiellhorn’s list of inscriptions of N. I., page 19, No. 131.
⁷ This Kumāradēvī was a follower of Buddhism. In a manuscript copy of the book entitled ‘Ashīṣasārikā’ preserved in the Nēpāl State library, it is thus stated:—

‘श्रीमद्गोविन्दचन्द्रवेष्टा वरमालमयोऽवताराचन्द्रायात्रि: राज्यमी राजीप्रवत्तोयामाधवायः।
परमोपासिका श्रीराजस्योऽवसन्न्देवाय देयजनोऽवयम्’

This shows that Gövindachandra’s another queen Vasantadēvī, too, was a follower of the Mahāyāna branch of Buddhism. Some people hold Vasantadēvī to be another name of Kumāradēvī. In the ‘Rāmcharita’ written by Sandhyākaranandī, king Mahāpā (Mathana), father of Kumāradēvī’s mother is stated to be of the Raḥṣṭrakūṭa dynasty.

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

िे, he offered his respects to the great scholar Suhala, the delegate of the king Gōvindachandra of Kanauj.

This Gōvindachandra had also fought with the Mohammedan (Turk) invaders of India¹ and had conquered the provinces of Gauḍa and Chēdi. From the decoration “Vividhavidyāvīchāravāchaspāti” attached to his name we understand that, besides being a patron of learning, he himself was a good scholar.

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

Names of his three sons are found as below:— Vijayachandra, Rājyapāla and Āsphōtachandra.

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

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

---

¹ Perhaps, these were the Turks that were then making advances from the Lahore side.

² Early history of India, (Fourth edition), page 400.
THE GOLD COINS OF GOVINDACHANDRA.

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

THE COPPER COINS OF GOVINDACHANDRA.

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

6. VIJAYACHANDRA.

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

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

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

In the ‘Prithvīrāja Rāso’ Vijayachandra is named as Vijayapāla.

**JAYACHCHANDRA.**

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

---

\(^{3}\) The ruins of these temples are still existent in Jaunpur.
\(^{4}\) Bhārata-kē-Prāchīṇa Rājavamsa, Vol. I, page 244.
\(^{5}\) “अाभो जयसम विषाम्पम एव दुधिरी चन्द्रेये जुऱे भीरकम्

पाते तत्मम वस्त्रस्वरु पवमते आ बम्परां चले।

जिते मती दिशापदिहय पदुमा जैवति नाम तभो

दिशं जस्ते राजा बेरिलियो दिदो अमलपदू आ।”

संस्कृतम्;

“जातो यस्मिन् दिने एव दुधिरी चन्द्रेये दुःशिकिता

प्राते तत्मम दशारीयकहु प्रबल यतं बर्मरां बबाम।

जिते मती दिशापदिहय पदुमा जैवति नाम ततः

बले बस्य स राजा बेरिलियो: हसः केषीद्रुसः: “

................................................

श्री भरतकुलरक्षीत्रभीजेत्रचन्द्रनवरेश्वरः

(सूक्ष्मचन्द्र, पृ २१-२४)}
From the aforesaid copper grant of V.S. 1224, of king Vijayachandra, it is evident that Jayachchandra had been invested with ruling powers during his father's life-time.

In the preface to the drama named 'Rambhāmanjarī Nātikā',¹ by Nayachandra Sūri, it is thus stated:—

"म्हलायमानवलायकचेष्टावरेक्षकलाभवस्त-"

i.e., whose (Jayachchandra's) mighty arm is like a pillar to tether the elephant of fortune of king Madanavarmādeva.

This shows that Jayachchandra probably had extended his sway over Kālinjar and defeated its king Madanavarmādeva² of the Chandāla dynasty. Similarly, having defeated the Bhōrs, he also annexed Khōr.

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

The first³ copper plate is of V.S. 1226 (A.D. 1170) granted from the village Vaḍaviha. It contains an account of the Rājyābhishēka (Coronation) of the king, which was performed on Sunday, the sixth day of the bright half of Āshādha, V.S. 1226 (21st June, 1170 A.D.).

The second⁴ plate is of V.S. 1228 (A.D. 1172) issued from the Trivenī confluence (Allahabad). The third⁵ is of V.S. 1230 (A.D. 1173) issued from Vārāṇasī (Benāres).

The fourth⁶ is of V.S. 1231 (A.D. 1174) issued from Kāshī (Benares). From the thirty-second line of this plate it appears that this copper grant was engraved later in V.S. 1235 (A.D. 1179). The fifth⁷ plate is of

---

¹ Page 4.
² His last grant is of V.S. 1219 (A.D. 1163) and that of his successor Paramardidēva of V.S. 1223 (A.D. 1167). This shows that the victory mentioned above was gained by Jayachchandra while he was a prince regent.
³ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 121.
⁵ Do. do. do. 124.
⁶ Do. do. do. 125.
⁷ Do, do. do. 127.
V.S. 1232 (A.D. 1175) and contains the name of the king's son, Harishchandra, at whose 'Jātakarma' ceremony the charity mentioned was granted from Benares. From the thirty-first and thirty-second lines of this plate, too, we infer that the plate was actually prepared like the preceding one in V.S. 1235 (A.D. 1179).

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

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

---

1 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVII, page 130.
3 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 135.
4 Do. do. do. 137.
5 Do. do. do. 138.
6 Do. do. do. 140.
7 Do. do. do. 141.
8 Do. do. do. 142.
9 Do. do. XV, 10.
10 Annual report of the Archaeological Survey of India, (A.D. 1921-22), pages 120-121.
12 "प्रतिमाप्राप्तापद्य श्रीमन्महेभवनुज्ञमन: सतीमिथिका-श्रीचाचन्द्रेकाकुतिष्ठस्यमुक्तामणे: गंगायमनायोतिहिन्दीन्द्रयमन्त्रेण
रिपुविनीदायिन्दलन्दस्यरैवपाध्यायवर्ग: प्रचालितिविद्वस्मितवादत
पंडुरित प्राप्तमहरिद्वद्य श्रीमन्महेभवनेष्कुस्य" (रामभाषारी अधिका, प्र. 6)

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

‘श्रीदरि कविरङ्गात्मकमुकुटालान्महीर: सुतं
श्रीदरि: सुमुचे जितेन्द्रचन्द्रान्म सामहदेवी च यम।’

i.e., Hira begot Harsha in Māmalladēvī.

In the conclusion of this ‘Naishadhiya Charita’ it is thus stated:—

‘ताम्बूलद्वायमानं च समये य: कान्यकुल्जेश्वरात्।’

i.e., in the court of the king of Kanauj Shri Harsha had the privilege of being seated on an “Asana” and of being honoured with the offer of a betel (ताम्बूल) on attending and leaving the court.

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

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

इत्यथ श्रीकविराजजसुकुटालान्महीरार्थित
श्रीमातमयेन नैतिथमहाशयन्ये जाल्कोलिनि।
भौद्यप्रतिवादिभोरितत्तत्तिविन्यत्वांमाप्रिया
श्रीसेष्य हृदी द्रिश्यप्रितस्तकोशस्तस्ता नेवमे॥

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

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

Shahābuddin Ghōrī defeated Jayachandra in the battle of Chandāval1 (Etawah district) in A.H. 590 (V.S. 1250—A.D. 1194) and, in the plunder of Benāres, got so much wealth that 1400 camels were employed for its transport to Ghazni2.

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

The Mohammedan historians have mentioned Jayachandra as the king of Benāres3, which probably was the seat of his Government at that time.

---

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

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

Maulānā Minhājuddin in his ‘Tabqāt-i-Nāsirī’ says that the two generals Qutubuddin and Izzuddin accompanied the Sultan (Shahābuddin) and defeated King Jayachandra of Benāres near Chandāval in A.H. 590 (V.S. 1250).
Jayachchandra had built several forts, out of which one was built at Kanauj on the bank of the Ganges, another at Asaī, on the Jumna (in Etawah district), and a third at Kurra (Kaḍā). At Etawah, on a mound, near the bank of the Jumna, there exist, to this day, some remains which are supposed by the local people to be the remains of Jayachchandra’s fort.

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

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

2 Merutunga, too, in his ‘Prabandhachamāṇja’ discredits Suhavādēvī for calling the Mohammedans. This book was written in V.S. 1362 (A.D. 1305).
HARISHCHANDRA.

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

It is generally believed that on the death of Jayachchandra the Mohammedans took possession of Kanauj. But in the Mohammedan chronicles of the time such as 'Tajul-Ma-asir' and 'Tabqät-i-nāsirī', etc., it is stated that after the battle of Chandāval the Mohammedan army went towards Prayāg and Benāres. They speak of Jayachchandra as the Rāja of Benāres. This clearly shows that, though Kanauj had been devastated by the Mohammedans and its power had declined, still for some years the descendants of Jayachchandra had a hold over the country around it. It was Shamsuddīn Altamash who, for the first time, completely destroyed the Gāhḍavāla kingdom after taking possession of Kanauj.

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

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

1 Tabqät-i-nāsirī, p. 170.
2 In the time of this Altamash a Kshatriya hero named Bartū destroyed a number of Mohammedans in Oudh. [Tabqät-i-nāsirī (English translation) pages 628-629].
3 The first of these two was found at the village of Kāmauli in Benāres district (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV, page 127); and the second at the village of Sīhvar, also in the same district, (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, page 130).
grant of two villages given to a Brāhmaṇa named Hṛṣīkēśha on the occasion of Harishchandra’s name giving ceremony, performed on the 13th day of the bright half of Bhādrapada, V.S. 1232 (the 31st August, 1175). At this time the prince was only 21 days old.

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

The copper grant¹ was issued on the 15th day of the bright half of Pausha, V.S. 1253 (A.D. 1196) in which his titles (which are similar to those of his forefathers are mentioned as follows:—Paramabhaṭṭaraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēśhvara, Prama Māhēśhvara, Ashvapati, Gajapati, Narapati, Rājatrayādhipati, Vividhavidyāvichāravāchaspati, etc. This shows that though a large part of the kingdom had passed away from his possession yet he maintained his independence to some extent.

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

As stated above, on the death of Jayachchandra, in the battle with Sultān Shahābuddin, his son Harishchandra became the ruler of the country around Kanauj, while his relatives went towards Khōr²


² From the history of Rāmpur we learn that when Shamsuddin had invaded Khōr, Jajapāla acknowledged his supremacy and remained there, but his brother Prabhaśa* (Baradāiṣeṇa) fled to Mahāti (in the Farrukhābād district), while some of their relatives escaped to Nēpāl. After a time the descendants of Jajapāla leaving Khōr settled in Usēt (in the Bādāūn district). Probably Lakhanapālat, too, at that time lived there in the capacity of a feudatory. Afterwards being chased by the Mohammedans there, they went towards Bīlesāṭī. Later Rām Rāi (Rāmsahāya), a descendant of Jajapāla, found the state of Rāmpur in the Etah district. The Rao
'Shamsābād') (in the Farrukhābād district). But when the few districts that remained under the control of Harishchandra were also attacked by Sultān Shamsuddin Altamash the sons of Harishchandra (Bardāisēna) took their abode first in Khör then in Mahuí.

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

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

of Khimsēpur in the Farrukhabad district also claims his descent from Jajapāla. Similarly, the Chaudhars of Surjai and Sarōdhā (Mainpuri district) are known as the descendants of Jajapāla.

It is said that Mānikachandra was a brother of Jayachchandra. The rulers of Māṇḍā and Bijāpur, states in the Mirzāpur district, as well as some other petty landholders of Ghāzipur district, claim their descent from Gāḍaṇa, the son of Mānikachandra.

*In the ‘Pratapagadha Nāma’, published in A.D. 1849, this prince is mentioned as Haraṇu. Perhaps Haraṇu and Prahasta are corrupted forms of Harishchandra.
†Epigrapha Indica, Vol. I, page 64.
‡At some places the time of this event is given as V.S. 1280.
1 In V.S. 1270 Shamsuddin converted the name of Khör as Shamsābād after his own name.
2 Possibly Baradāisēna may be a younger brother of Harishchandra.
3 In the history of Rāmpur Sihā is stated as the grand son of Prahasta, but in the History of Mārwār his grandfather’s name is stated as Baradāisēna. It is, therefore, probable that both these are the surnames of Harishchandra. It is also possible that just as ‘Dalapangula’ was a title of Jayachchandra Baradāisēna (Varadāyi-sainya) might be that of Harishchandra.
4 Its ruins are still existent on the bank of the Ganges and are locally known as ‘Sihā Rāo-kā-Khēdā’.
5 It is stated in “Ain-i-Akbarī” that Sihā was the nephew of Jayachandra, who lived at Shamsābād and was also killed in the battle fought with Shahābuddin at Kanauj. (Vol. II, page 507).

In the Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthāna’ at one place Sihā is stated as the son of Jayachandra (Vol. I, page 105) while at other as the nephew (Vol. II, page 850). But at the third place he and Sētarāma both are stated to be the grandsons of Jayachandra (Vol. II, page 940).

In the inscription of Sihā, dated V.S. 1330, he is stated as the son of Sētarāma.

But if we take Sētarāma to be the elder brother and adoptive father of Sihā, firstly the times assigned to Jayachchandra and Sihā adjust themselves well, secondly the controversies arising by the mention of Sētarāma at one place as the brother and at other as the father of Sihā would also be squared up.
### Statement Giving Particulars of the Gāhāḍavālas of Kanauj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Special Title</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Known Dates</th>
<th>Contemporaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yashovigraha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Born in Sōla dynasty.</td>
<td>V. S. 1148, 1150, 1156</td>
<td>Chandāla Madanavarmadēva, Chandhāna Prithvirāja, and Shāhābu−ddīn Ghōrī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mathichandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son of No. 1.</td>
<td>V. S. 1154, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1166.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chandradeva</td>
<td>Mahārājādhirāja.</td>
<td>Do. 2.</td>
<td>V. S. 1148, 1150, 1156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Madanapāla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 3.</td>
<td>V. S. 1154, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1166.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Govindachandra</td>
<td>Vividhevidyāvichāravāchaspati</td>
<td>Do. 4.</td>
<td>V. S. 1161, 1162, 1163, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180, 1181, 1182, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1195, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211.</td>
<td>Became king after the death of Paramāra Bhoja and Haihaya Karna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vijayachandra</td>
<td>Mahārājādhirāja.</td>
<td>Do. 5.</td>
<td>V. S. 1224, 1225.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jayachandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 6.</td>
<td>V. S. 1226, 1227, 1230, 1231, 1232, 1233, 1234, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239, 1240, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hāmishchandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. 7.</td>
<td>V. S. 1253.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Genealogical tree of the Gahadavala family of Kanauj.

Yashovigraha. 
   Måhichandra. 
      Chandradeva. 
       Madanapāla. 
          Gōvindachandra. 
           Vijayachandra. 
               Rājayapāla. 
                   Äspōtachandra. 
               Jayachandra. 
               Māñjikachandra. 

Harishchandra. (Prahasta or Baradāisēna). 
   Jajapāla. 
       Meghachandra. 
       Sētarāma. 

Sēhā.
APPENDIX.

FALSE STATEMENTS ABOUT
KING JAYACHCHANDRA AND RAO SIHĀ.¹

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

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

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

¹ Reproduced from my article in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. LIX, pages 6-9.
Kamalavati to Someshvara and simultaneously his another daughter1 to Vijayapala of Kanauj.

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

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

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

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

1 According to the ‘Rābh’ Pṛthvīrāja had died at an age of 43; so the date of this event comes to V.S. 1198.
century, as is evident from his copper plate grants and inscriptions of V.S. 1224 and 1225. Again, although the period of Anangapāla has not yet been precisely ascertained, yet this much is certain that Somēshvara's third ancestor Vigrahārāja (or Visalādeva IV) had acquired possession of Delhi, which is borne out by the inscription of V. S. 1220 (A.D. 1163) on the pillar of Fīroz Shah at Delhi. Under these circumstances, we do not understand how Sōmēshvara could have gone to Delhi to help Anangapāla. Moreover, in the "Prīthvīrajaviṃśayā Mahākāvyā," which was written in Prīthvīrajā's time, the name of Prīthvīrajā's mother is mentioned not as Kamalāvati, but as Karpūradēvi, who is stated to be the daughter not of Tuṅvara Anangapāla, but of a king of the Haihaya dynasty (of Tripuri). In the "Hammiṃa Mahākāvyā" also the name of Prīthvīrajā's mother is mentioned as Karpūradēvi. The author of the "Rāṣō" has mentioned the date of the birth of his hero Prīthvīrajā as V. S. 1115, but in fact Prīthvīrajā should have been born in V.S. 1217 (A.D. 1160) or somewhat later, as at the death of his father in about V.S. 1250 (A.D. 1179) he was a minor and his mother took charge of the administration.

Let us now consider the tale of Prīthvīrajā having married a daughter of Nāhaḍa Rāo, king of Mandör. This, too, is an absurdity, because from an inscription of V. S. 894 of king Bāuka, who was tenth in descent from this Nāhaḍa Rāo, we conclude that the latter must have lived about V. S. 714, i.e., nearly 583 years before Prīthvīrajā. Sometime between V S. 1189 and V. S. 1200 the Pratihāra

---
1 Kielhorn's Supplement to Northern List (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, Appendix I), page 13.
3 Journal Royal Asiatic Society, (1913) page 275 f.
4 The names of Prīthvīrajā's ancestors mentioned in the 'Rāṣō' appear also to a large extent incorrect.
dynasty of Mandör had ceased to exist, having been overthrown by Chauhāna Rāyapāla, whose son Sahajapāla ruled at Mandör about V.S. 1200, as appears from his inscription found at Mandör.1 Besides this, the name of the prime ancestor of the Paḍihāra dynasty of Kanauj was also Nāgabhaṭa (or Nāhaḍa). From the copper grant2 dated V.S. 813 of the Chauhāna king Bhartrivaddha II, found at Hansot, it appears that this Nāhaḍa lived in the beginning of the ninth century of the Vikram era. Further, the first Paḍihāra conqueror of Kanauj, too, was Nāgabhaṭa (Nāhaḍa II), who was fifth in descent from the aforesaid Nāhaḍa. He had died in V.S. 890, as appears from the “Prabhāvakacharitra.” No fourth Nāhaḍa besides these has been heard of in the history of India.

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

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

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

There now remains the affairs of the ‘Rājasūya’ and ‘Svayaṁvara’ ceremonies performed by king Jayachandra. Had Jayachandra performed such a grand ceremony as the ‘Rājasūya,’ some mention of it would have been found in the inscriptions of that monarch, or in the ‘Rambhāmaṇjarī Nāṭikā’ by Nayachandra Sūri, of which Jayachandra himself is the hero. Fourteen copper plates and two stone inscriptions1 of Jayachandra have been found, the last of which is dated V. S. 12452 (A. D. 1189). Although there are, thus, as many as sixteen epigraphic records belonging to him, not one of them contains any reference to his having celebrated a ‘Rājasūya’

The story of Prithvīrāja’s elopement with Saṁyōgitā seems to be a creation of the fertile brain of the author of the ‘Rāso’. Neither the “Prithvīrājavijaya Mahākāvya” written in Prithvīrāja’s time, nor the “Hammaṇa Mahākāvya” compiled in the last half of the fourteenth century of the Vikrama era,3 makes any mention of any such event. To rely on the story under these circumstances, is to tread on uncertain ground. The dates4 of the events given in the “Rāsō” are alike incorrect.

The story of Mahārāvala Samarasingh of Mēwār being a brother-in-law of Prithvīrāja, and being killed

2 Annual report of the Arch Survey of India (1921-22). Pages 120-121.
3 Further there is no trace of Sauvamahī Mukundadēva of Kaṭaka in the history of that period, whose daughter is mentioned as the mother of Saṁyōgitā in the ‘Rāsō.’
4 Mr. Mēhan Lāl Prāchīna Lāl Pāṇḍyā had, however, assumed the dates of the ‘Rāsō’ to be based on the ‘Ananda Vikrama Samvat,’ which he takes for granted on the basis of the words ‘विश्राममल काल’ in the ‘Rāsō.’ According to this, the Vikrama Samvat is arrived by adding 91 to the Samvat stated in the ‘Rāsō’. Thus, by adding 91 to the Samvat 1158, the date of Prithvīrāja’s death arrived at according to the ‘Rāsō,’ we come to 1249. This date alone can be proved to be correct by this method. But the other dates and the periods assigned to Nāhāda Rāo, etc., still remain quite unreliable.
in the battle with Shahābuddin, while helping his
brother-in-law Prithvīrāja, is also an idle tale. This
battle had, in fact, been fought in V. S. 1249, whereas
Mahārāvala Samarasingh died in V. S. 1359. Under
these circumstances, the above statement of the ‘Rāsō’
cannot be admitted as either true or possible.

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

In the end, there is the mention of an invasion by
Qutbuddin against Jayachchandra, but, according to the
Persian histories of India, this invasion is said to have
been made not after Shahābuddin’s death, but in his
lifetime, and that he himself had taken part in it. He
was killed at the hands of the Gakkhars in V. S. 1762
(A.D. 1206). Besides, in the Persian chronicles there
is no mention of Jayachchandra’s collusion with
Shahābuddin.

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

1 *Bhārata-ke Prāchīna Rājvamsa*, part 1, page 293.
on his part, and his high-handedness which gave rise
to the complaints of the subjects of a state left as a
legacy to him by his maternal grandfather. Along
with this, we also learn from the ‘Rāsō’ that his unwise
steps obliged his own generals to conspire with his
enemy Sultan Shahābuddin. In the light of these
circumstances, readers will be able to judge for them-
Selves how far it is just to dub king Jayachchandra
with the title of Vibhīshāna and thus malign him
as a traitor.

Let us now examine the attack made on Rāo Sihā,
grandson of Mahārāja Jayachchandra. Colonel James
Tod\(^1\) writes:—

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

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

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

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

these two large districts, merely to content himself
with a few acres of land granted to him by his proteges,
the Pallivālas. Further, he had not at that time enough
men with him to look after his possessions of Khēḍa
and Mēhvā as well as for keeping under subjection
the Mēras and Miṅs of the hilly tracts, who often
overran Pālī. Besides, from the narratives of the old
chronicles of Mārwār we learn that the Pallivālas
of Pālī were a class of rich traders. It is nowhere
recorded that they were masters of the town of Pālī;
nor do we find any mention that Rāo Sīhā had mur-
dered them. In the temple of Sōnanātha at Pālī,
there is a stone inscription1 of V.S. 1209 of Sōlankī
Kumārapāla, which shows that at that time the latter
held sway over Pālī. It also appears from this insc-
cription that one Bāhaḍadēva, probably, a Chauhāna
feudatory of Kumārapāla ruled over Pālī at this time
on behalf of Kumārapāla. There had also been one
Ālhaṇadēva, a Chauhāna feudatory and favourite of
king Kumārapāla. An inscription2, dated V.S. 1209,
of Kirāḍū shows that this Ālhaṇadēva had acquired
possession of the districts of Kirāḍū, Rāḍadhadā
and Shīva by the favour of king Kumārapāla.

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

Jalor, Manḍor, Bāhaḍmer, Ratanapur, Sānchār, Sūrāchand, Rādadhaḍā, Khēḍa Rāmsīn, and Bhīnmāl. Udayasimha is also described in this inscription as invincible to the kings of Gujrāt. We have found four inscriptions of this king ranging from V. S. 1262 to V.S. 1306 at Bhīnmāl. We conclude, therefore, that at some time in this period, this Chauhān feudatory might have thrown off the yoke of the Sōlankī kings of Gujrāt. At the same time, when we consider the geographical position of the above-mentioned districts, we are led to believe that the city of Pālī, too, must have passed into the possession of the Chauhānas from the Sōlankīs. So that at the time of Rāo Sīhā’s arrival in Mārwāṛ, such an important city as Pālī must have either been in possession of the Sōlankīs or the Chauhānas. What circumstances, then, could have obliged Rāo Sīhā to butcher his helpless and trading supplicants of the Brāhmāṇas, a caste so sacred to a Rājpūṭ for the possession of Pālī?

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

Thus automatically Sīhā became master of the city, and so his interest lay in fostering its trade by conferring favours upon its merchants, the Pallivāla Brāhmāṇas, and not in laying waste the country by killing these traders, as is supposed by the learned scholar, Colonel Tod.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>35-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The document contains corrections and additions to text, primarily in Sanskrit, including names, titles, and historical figures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>INCORRECT</th>
<th>CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>the Satyavākyo o th</td>
<td>Satyavākyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>oक्रङ्गुको</td>
<td>oक्रङ्गुको</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kan—</td>
<td>Kun—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pēremānaḍi o rebellions</td>
<td>Pēramānaḍio rebellions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>wielded</td>
<td>wielded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja, II</td>
<td>Dhruvarāja II,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dantivarman I, from,</td>
<td>Dantivarman, From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>34, 36 &amp; 43</td>
<td>Qutubuddin (Panjab)</td>
<td>Qutubuddin (Panjab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>desperate</td>
<td>desperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Qutubuddin</td>
<td>Qutubuddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>22 &amp; 24</td>
<td>Vijayapāla</td>
<td>Vijayapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rāḥṭhōḍa</td>
<td>Rāḥṭhōḍa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>disorgani—</td>
<td>the disorgani—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>