

questioning. It became the sole source of authority to the agents of reaction in the task of upholding a stagnant society with its privileges for the higher orders and perpetual repression of the lower castes.

The other Smṛti-writers of the period were the authors of the Yājñavalkya and Viṣṇu Smṛtis. Yājñavalkya closely follows many of the tenets of the Manusamhitā. He enumerates the 19 authors of Smṛti, extols the importance of the Dharmaśāstras and expressly lays down the excellence of these over Arthaśāstras (I. 21 अथ शास्त्रात्तु बलवद्भर्मशास्त्रमतिस्थितिः ।). Like Manu, he mentions the four sources of Dharma, (though he enumerates subsidiary sources of knowledge which are fourteen in number), extols the supremacy of the Brāhmaṇa, directs kings to be kind to them (I. 334) and makes regal authority the sole basis of order and progress. In addition to the traditional privileges, Brāhmaṇas are assigned half of treasure-troves and kings are called upon to take their advice. He is also averse to the independence of women (see I. 85 न स्त्रातन्मूत्रं क्वचित् स्त्रियः ।). Like the author of the Manusamhitā he prescribes for kings the study of the four sciences (Ānvīkṣikī, Daṇḍanīti, Vārttā and Trayī), though the Vedas are put last. He mentions the four traditional means and aims of politics and accepts, like Manu, Kauṭilya's seven limbs of the state. He emphasises the universal coercive jurisdiction of the king (I. 358). In many cases, we have not only a similarity of ideas between the Manusmṛti and the Yājñavalkya but also a similarity in language. Yājñavalkya too is a believer in the obedience of subjects, identifies Daṇḍa with Dharma (I. 354) and uses language similar to that found in the Manusamhitā in

prescribing a life in hell for unrighteous kings (I. 357) who fail to punish properly (*see also* I. 341).

The chapters on civil law are more developed in this *Smṛti* and we have a mention of the ordeals (II. 95). The various sections of law show however a more intimate acquaintance with the *Arthaśāstra* code and *Yājñavalkya* who gives a high place to *Nyāya* (I. 21), utilises more materials from the *Kauṭīliya* as pointed out by Dr. Shamasastry in his footnotes to the English translation. *Yājñavalkya* moreover does not, like the *Mānava Code*, lay down the number of ministers (I. 312). In one place, he alludes to the 'paternal ideal' so prominent in the *Arthaśāstra* (I. 351 *स्याद्राजा भृत्यवर्गेषु प्रजासु च यथा पिता*). He follows also the *Kauṭīliya* when he directs kings (II. 36) to compensate subjects (from the treasury) who lose money or goods stolen by thieves, and thus emphasises the contractual relation between the king and his subjects. In foreign policy *Yājñavalkya* pleads for the retention of existing laws in a conquered country (I. 343). While speaking of the necessity of having ministers, he uses practically the language of the *Arthaśāstrā* (*cf. यथा ह्येकेन चक्रेण रथस्य न गतिर्भवेत्* II. 36—*Yāj. Smṛti*). The *Viṣṇu Smṛti* has almost the same social scheme as the *Manusamhitā* or the *Yājñavalkya Samhitā*. The author denounces marriages of Brahmins with *Sūdra* women and calls upon kings to maintain the law of castes and *āśramas*. He makes *Brāhmaṇas* practically exempt from taxation and they are allowed to appropriate the whole of treasures discovered by them. His scheme of local government is based on older traditions, though slightly differing from that in the *Manusamhitā*.

The author of the Smṛti is a believer in the traditional theory of taxation and makes the king entitled to a share of all incomes, on account of his protection. He assigns to the king the traditional one-sixth, one-eighth or one-twelfth of the produce of land and one-fiftieth of cattle and gold in addition to a sixth on vegetables, spices, flowers, roots, hides and earthenware (VII 130-132). Customs duties and tolls are recognized as well as the produce of mines and a half of treasure-troves. Kings were also allowed to levy taxes on artisans and workmen of all descriptions. The author of the Samhitā makes the king entitled to a tenth part of the money-value of suits adjudicated in royal courts. His criminal code is severe. His theory of the state and of foreign policy is what we find in the Arthaśāstra (VII. 154-174) but he is averse to the destruction of a conquered country.

Mīmāṃsā.—Apart from these three lawgivers, we have no other prominent theorists on politics and government during this period. But from the *Mīmāṃsā*-writer, Śabarasvāmī, we have some clear ideas as to contemporary views on the vexed question of royal ownership of land. This has received prominence in view of the controversy raised by European writers as to whether the share paid to government by Indian cultivators and landlords is rent or tax, and the more so because there have been attempts in some quarters to interpret Sanskrit texts with a view to bringing their import into a line with the ideas and practices which obtain in Europe. The over-zealous ignorance of some writers has also lent support to the theory of the king's ownership of land which is advocated by English writers. But the true import of the passages becomes clear when we go through important texts and care to accept an interpretation fitting to the context and not opposed to the general spirit of Hindu law. Śabara's comment on the Jaimini

Sūtras (VI. 7. 3) where the question of king's rights to alienate his territory in connection with the celebration of the Viśvajit sacrifice enables us to make our ideas clear on this point.

Sabara comments on Jaimini's Sūtra “ न भूमिः स्यात् सर्वान् प्रत्यवशिष्टत्वात् ” as follows :—

अथैव सर्वदाने संशयः । किं भूमिर्देया—न इति । का पुनर्भूमिरत्राभिप्रेता—यदेतन्मृदारब्धं द्रव्यान्तरं पृथिवीगोलकं न क्षेत्रमात्रं सृत्तिका वा—एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः न भूमिर्देया इति । कुतः क्षेत्राणामीशितारो मनुष्या न दृश्यन्ते कृत्स्नस्य पृथिवीगोलकस्य इति । आह य इदानीं सार्वभौमः स तर्हि ब्रूमः । कुतो यावता भोगिनः सार्वभौमा भूमेरीष्टे तावता अन्योऽपि न तत्र कश्चिद्विशेषः । सार्वभौमत्वेऽस्य त्वेतद्विकं यदसौ पृथिव्यां सम्भूतानां व्रीह्यादीनां रक्षणे निविष्टस्य कस्यचिद् भागस्य ईष्टे—न भूमेः—तन्निविष्टाश्च ये मनुष्याः तैरन्यत् सर्वप्राणिनाम् धारणविक्रमणादि यद् भूमिक्तं तत्रेशितं प्रति न कश्चिद्विशेषः । तस्माद् भूमिर्न देया ।

Colebrooke discusses this question in his essay on Mīmāṃsā and summarises the views of the Mīmāṃsā-writers, especially Sabara (commenting on VI. 7. 3) and clearly emphasises the cardinal principle of Hindu law that minor princes as well as their universal overlords are not the owners of the soil. By conquests kings become entitled only to the property of the conquered kings and not to the land of the subjects living on the annexed territory. In these the conqueror is entitled to the share of the produce which goes to the ruler for his protection and punishment of wrong-doing. Nothing else is vested in him. Colebrooke summarises by saying, “ The King's power is for the government of the realm and extirpation of wrongs. For that purpose, he receives taxes from husbandmen and levies fines on offenders. But right of property is not vested in him; else he would have property in houses and

lands appertaining to the subjects abiding in the realm. The earth is not the king's but is common to all beings enjoying the fruits of their labour. It belongs according to Jaimini to all alike. Therefore, although a gift of a piece of land to an individual does take place, the whole land cannot be given by the monarch, nor a province by the subordinate prince but houses and fields acquired by purchase and similar means are liable to gift." On this head we shall have to devote more attention especially in connection with the views of later writers like Kātyāyana or commentators like Vijñāneśvara, Nīlakaṇṭha or Mādhava. Mr. Jayaswal has discussed this question in detail in his *Hindu Polity* (II. 174-178) and it obtained a similar attention from other writers on the Hindu theory of land-tenure (S. C. Mittra's *Landlaws of Bengal*, Ch. I). They have all relied on this passage, and as such they have adopted the right line of agreement and conclusion.⁽⁹⁾

(9) We have already discussed the question of regal ownership of land in connection with the land-policy of the Kauṭiliya government and shown clearly (Ch. II, p. 38) how two classes of land, e.g., the Brahma-deya and the A-karada, remained exempt from rent. The A-karada tenants were owners of free-hold paying taxes in lieu of protection but not rent. There is no denying the fact that through the process of conquest large patches of land passed to the king in proprietary right but conquest never extinguished the rights of freeholders of the conquered kingdom and they retained their ownership till the last days of Hindu independence.

In such a discussion, we should try to have a clear line of demarcation between the king's or the conqueror's suzerain rights and his proprietary right as is done in modern International Law. When a province is annexed by a conqueror, the private property of the ruler or state property in land in that region passes to the conqueror and he is entitled to taxes from his new subjects who enjoy as of old their proprietary rights. The principle of Hindu law is very clear on this point and later writers like Kātyāyana leave no room for misunderstanding.

IV

*Political Thought of the
Buddhists*

The influence of a similar reaction is evident from the study of contemporary Buddhist works. As pointed out already, the social ideals of the Buddhists were subjected to the influence of similar forces and the idea of a theocratic state floated before their eyes. Dharma became the supreme ruling and guiding principle and the Jātaka preambles repeatedly speak of Buddha as Dharma-cakravartī with his lieutenants described as Dharma-senāpati, Śaciva or Bhāṇḍāgārika. As the character of Buddhism changed and the active Bodhisattva became the more intimate object of veneration, the Buddhist came to be more and more influenced by the reaction in favour of an enhanced regal authority. Furthermore, as some of the contemporary teachers and writers on Buddhism were of Brāhmaṇa descent, they merely continued the ancient tradition about kingship and government in the absence of a specific Buddhist political code. This is apparent from the writings of the Northern Buddhists, the most prominent among whom during this period was Aśvaghoṣa. Sprung from a Brahmin family and reputed to have been a courtier at the court of Kaniṣka, he is regarded as the author of a number of works including the epics of Buddha-carita and the Saundarānanda and even of the Vajrasūci. In all these writings, there is nothing which militates against the contemporary teachings of Brahman-

ism, though in social matters we have an attack on caste in the *Vajrasūci*. The closing verses of the first canto of the *Saundarānanda* show clearly that the poet was a believer in the evils of anarchy and goes on to narrate the election of a king at Kapilavastu and the king-elect accepted royalty for the sake of maintaining the precepts of Dharma (l. 60-63—note the words धर्माय नेन्द्रियसुखाय जुगोप राष्ट्रम् ।). Not satisfied with this, Asvaghosa proceeds further and makes Śuddhodana a crowned king instead of an elected president and the king is made to rule, receiving a sixth part of the produce as his share. In the case of the *Jātakamālā* by Āryasūra, it goes a long way to support these views. In Story II, he makes the Śibi king rule his subjects as if they were his children and the king is distinguished not only by his charity, but also builds alms-houses, relieves the distress of all and calls upon his subjects to inform him of their causes of complaint. The other stories are written in the same spirit and they show the influence of the reaction in political thought.

The only deviation from contemporary thought and ideals is Asvaghosa's denunciation of the spirit of caste and his plea for the recognition of the position of men through merit and not by social status or birth (*cf.* जातिब्राह्मणो न भवति । इह हि कैवर्त्तरजकचण्डालकुलेष्वपि ब्राह्मणाः सन्ति . . . एकवर्णी नास्ति चातुर्वर्ण्यम् ।).

The influence of contemporary thought is discernible even in the *Lalitavistara*, which has nothing specifically Buddhistic in it. The influence of Dharma idealism is also found in other writers. Āryadeva, reputed to have been a great teacher and the author of the *Catuhśatikā*, a philosophical work, gives us his views on kingship and has two passages devoted to the consideration of

politics and kingship. In these two passages he pleads for the reign of righteousness and condemns the doing of kings of the Iron Age who had substituted violence for paternal care, had converted the world into a deer park and justified their conduct by the rules of Dharma as laid down by the ṛsis. Āryadeva protests against these presumptions and displays of arrogance on the part of despots ruling in an age of anarchy and in denouncing such conduct falls back on an older tradition reminding kings that they were but the servants of the multitude and subsisted on the wages given by the people they ruled (गणदासस्य ते दर्पः षड्भागेन भृत्य कः ।).⁽¹⁾

Secular Writers.—Leaving the poet Āśvaghoṣa, whose writings have already been considered in connection with Buddhist thought, we proceed to other secular writers of the period, the most prominent among whom are the poets Bhāsa and Śūdraka the author of *Mṛcchakaṭika*. Bhāsa, about whose date there is still much doubt, lived probably not later than the IIIrd or IVth cen. A.D. His dramas are based on plots borrowed from the Epics or

(1) These passages, first cited by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar in his *Carmichael Lectures* (I. p. 129), have been misunderstood by later writers and some of them have proceeded so far as to make them the corner-stone of a Buddhist theory of emancipation of morality from the influence of politics. One writer has attempted to show its direct opposition to the Brāhmanical canon which made politics independent of morality. As instances of such disregard for morality the author cites the rules of Brāhmanical codes, justifying the execution of criminals, slaughter of enemies in battle and treacherous attacks on hostile kings.

A careful analysis, however, makes us hold such conclusions as unwarranted. Brāhmanical works never regard politics independent of morality but on the contrary make the political machinery the upholder of the moral canon. But the very fact that they lay down rules of practical politics makes them sanction coercive measures and sacrifice the extreme tenets of pacifism. Āryadeva, a writer on philosophy, had little room for the rules of conduct to be adopted by a king and hence his plea for pacifism has no bearing upon that question. In common with the Brāhmanical writers he was a believer in the rule of righteousness or Dharma and merely echoes the traditional theories of taxation and the contract subsisting between the king and his subjects.

on legends current in those days. He is a believer in the traditional Brāhmaṇic order of things. In politics, he seems to have been acquainted with the traditional Dharmaśāstra rules. He stands for the supremacy of Dharma, the consolidation of monarchy and of ministerial loyalty to the crown, not to speak of the supremacy of the Brāhmaṇa. Neither a believer in popular supremacy nor in regal despotism, he derives his inspiration from the epic tradition and pleads for the continuance of the traditional regime.

Sūdraka's date has not yet been clearly ascertained but he must have lived near about the 1st century A.D. which saw a lax social life and the decay of Buddhism. His book describes the consequences of an age of anarchy and he gives us the picture of the tyranny of a low-born king, the excesses of his favourites and the consequent revolt of subjects. His kingly ideal is summarised in two verses. In the first verse where Sūdraka is described as the ideal king, he is depicted as one versed in the Vedas and the sciences and performing sacred sacrifices like the Aśvamedha. In the concluding verse of the drama or the Bharatavākya, he prays for an ideal state of existence in which the natural forces contribute to the prosperity of mankind and when the pious are honoured and a righteous king rules obedient to the laws of Dharma.

Towards the close of the period, the study of Arthaśāstra was revived and Kāmandaka wrote his Nītisāra. About this book or its precepts proper attention should be given in connection with the writings of the next period.

BOOK IX POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS FROM REVIVAL TO FINAL DOWNFALL

*IVth Century A.D. to
XIIIth Century A.D*

The close of the IIIrd century A.D. and the dawn of the IVth were marked by a remarkable political revival. Almost all the foreign powers declined and indigenous dynasties raised their heads. Three such powers divided the supremacy over the country amongst themselves. In the plain of Hindustan, the Guptas became the suzerain authority, Central India and the Deccan passed to the Vākātakas,⁽¹⁾ and in the extreme south, a new power, the Pallavas,⁽²⁾ made themselves the overlords of the three Tamil

(1) *The Vākātaka Dynasty.*—They dominated Central India from the close of the IIIrd century A.D. to the middle of the VIth century (530 A.D.). The founder of the line was Vindhyaśakti, whose son Pravarasena I was a great king and in his line arose princes who performed innumerable Vājapeya and Asvamedha sacrifices. The early Vākātakas formed a marital alliance with the Nāgas of Bhārasiya. They were Śaivites and worshippers of Śakti. In the height of their power, the Vākātakas ruled over an empire stretching from the Narmadā to the Kṛṣṇā, while the Kadambas and some other smaller principalities acknowledged their suzerainty. Harisena was the last prominent ruler of the kingdom. (For details see Jouveau-Dubreuil's *Deccan*, pp. 71-76, Vincent Smith's articles in J. R. A. S. 1914, Krishanswamy Iyengar in *Ind. Antiq.* 1926.)

(2) *The Pallavas.*—The origin of the Pallavas is shrouded in mystery. Early writers like V. Smith, Venkayya and Rice regarded the Pallavas as foreigners and tried to identify them with the Paḷavas of Western India. As the result of the researches of a number of workers, especially Dr. Jouveau-Dubreuil, this theory of Persian origin has been discarded and various theories of indigenous origin has gained ground (see Dubreuil pp. 46-57, also Gopalan. *History of the Pallavas*, pp. 1-31). The Pallava power was

principalities which had been fighting for supremacy, while the north-western regions, first conquered by the Mauryas, became permanently detached from the monarchy that dominated Hindustan. The Guptas under Samudragupta made a bid for universal dominion but in spite of their extravagant claims, they failed to extend their supremacy over the Deccan or penetrate the south.⁽³⁾

Under Chandragupta II, Vikramāditya, the Guptas succeeded in annexing the territories of the Śakas of Ujjain, but their power did not long survive. Under Kumāragupta and Skandagupta, there were other waves of foreign invasion and in spite of the best efforts of Skandagupta, the almost imperial power of the Guptas succumbed, by the middle of the VIth century, to these attacks. Offshoots of the dynasty, however, maintained themselves in many of the provinces,⁽⁴⁾ e.g., in Malwa, Magadha and Bengal.

probably founded during the middle of the IIIrd century A.D. by Bapparāja, the fifth in line from him, Viṣṇugopa being a contemporary of Samudragupta (340 A.D.). These rulers issued charters in Prakrit and were followed by princes who have left records in Sanskrit. From 575 to 900 A.D. the South was ruled by the greater Pallavas, who were powerful monarchs and had to fight the Cālukyas in the North. Narasimha-Varman I (630-660 A.D.) defeated Pulakeśin II and invaded Ceylon. Towards the close of the IXth century, the Pallavas became weak and succumbed to the inroads of the Colas.

(3) *Samudragupta's Southern Advance*.—The extravagance of Samudragupta's claims is apparent from the fact that the writer of *Prasasti* does not take care to mention even the Vākātakas who ruled over so extensive an empire. Again, the wrong identification of place-names by modern historians made him appear as the conqueror of the South. In fact, the time has come when scholars will doubt the fact of his having passed beyond the mouth of the Godāvari where he was repulsed and whence he had to beat a hasty retreat. (On this point, see Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil's objections in his *History of the Deccan*, p. 117.)

(4) *The Later Guptas*.—The later history of the Gupta dynasty is yet to be written. Probably, Purugupta succeeded Skandagupta and after him came a number of other Gupta Kings with authority more nominal than real. The names of these are Narasimhagupta Balāditya, Kumāragupta II, Budhagupta, Tathāgatagupta and Balāditya who ruled from about 473 A.D. to cir. 540 A.D. After these princes, the nominal authority of

Other political changes took place about the same time. The Vākātakas were ultimately (by middle of the VIth century) supplanted by the Cālukyas in the Deccan and with these latter, a perennial struggle was waged by the Pallavas of the south. In Northern India, a number of states arose out of the break-up of the Gupta Empire. Powerful kings warred for suzerainty but none succeeded in establishing permanent supremacy. King Yaśodharman who defeated the Hūṇas dominated for a time but was probably defeated by some powerful rival king. Towards the close of the VIth century, a number of dynasties established themselves in various provinces of Northern India. Prominent among these were the ruling families of Magadha, the Valabhi princes,⁽⁶⁾ the rulers of Thaneswar (Prabhākaravardhana's line),⁽⁷⁾

the Guptas in Northern India became further reduced and seems to have been mainly confined to Eastern India. Here we find the line of Kṛṣṇagupta holding sway—namely, Kṛṣṇagupta, Kumāragupta III, Dāmodaragupta, Mahāsenagupta, Devagupta II, and Mādhvagupta. The Guptas had some authority in Eastern India, and on the death of Harṣa, the contemporary Gupta King Ādityasena asserted his sovereign authority over a large part of Eastern India and performed some Aśvamedha sacrifices. The age of anarchy helped him to make extravagant claims. But after the third prince of his line (Jivitagupta II), the authority of the Guptas was finally extinguished.

(5) *Yaśodharman*.—Yaśodharman, described as a “*Janendra*” and a devout Śaivite, defeated the Hūṇas and established authority over a vast empire. His Mandasore inscriptions have come down to us. Probably, his supremacy was short-lived.

(6) *Valabhi Princes*.—The Valabhi princes claimed descent from Senāpati Bhaṭṭārka, a worshipper of the God Maheśvara, commanding an army of Maitrakas (*see* Māliya Copper Pl. Ins. of 252 Gupta year). They attained power and prosperity under his successor. The third prince of the line, Māha-Daṇḍanāyaka and Sāmanta Droṇa Simha, took the title of Mahārāja, while Dharasena IV took the styles and titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Rājacakravarti (cir. 326-330 G. year).

(7) *Thāneśvara Kings*.—Near about Thāneśvara arose the line of Śaivite Kings producing Prabhākara-Vardhana, Rājya-Vardhana, and Harṣa-Vardhana. The founder of the dynasty was Puṣpabhūti.

of Kashmir⁽⁸⁾ (with a number of dependencies), of Kāmarūpa⁽⁹⁾ (in Eastern India), the Maukharis⁽¹⁰⁾ in the upper Ganges Valley, West Bengal (under different lines of kings which produced the conqueror Śaśāṅka)⁽¹¹⁾ and several other localities in Eastern Bengal (for these princes see Dr. R. C. Majumdar's *Monograph on the History of Bengal* pp. 14-17), while in Central India ruled the two lines of Parivrājakas and Uchchakalpa Mahārājas, who had more or less acknowledged the power of the Guptas.

The downfall of the Vākātakas, similarly, caused a serious turmoil in Central India and the Deccan. In their days of prosperity, they had exercised suzerain authority over a large number of minor kingdoms. Thus, their allies and feudatories probably included the princes of Śarabhapura, the Traikūṭakas of the western coast, the Śālaṅkāyanas of Veṅgipūra, their relatives the Viṣṇukundins of Śri-Parvata and the Kadambas of the Kanarese districts.

(8) *Kashmir*.—Kashmir became a powerful kingdom. About the time of Harṣa, the Karkoṭa dynasty was founded by Durlabha-Vardhana, son-in-law of Balāditya. At the time of Hiuen Tsang's visit, the kings of Kashmir exercised suzerainty over a large number of states on the western frontier.

(9) *Kāmarūpa*.—Kāmarūpa too was a separate kingdom. Its earliest epigraphic mention is in the Praśasti of Samudragupta. During Harṣa's time Bhāskaravarman ruled there. He was Harṣa's ally.

(10) *Maukharis*.—The Maukharis were a line of powerful Saivite kings whose inscriptions are found in Jaunpur, near about Gaya and in some places of the Central Provinces. Though occasionally connected by marriage with the Guptas, they were often at war with the latter dynasty. The more important kings of this line were Mahārāja Harivarman, Ādityavarman, Isvaravarman, Sarvavarman, etc.

(11) *King Śaśāṅka*.—The real history of Śaśāṅka is yet to be written. His family and the exact date of his accession are not known, but the name Śaśāṅka occurs in two inscriptions (e.g., Rhotasgarh and Ganjam plates) and it seems that this ambitious prince extended his authority from Ganjam to Northern and Western Bengal and Bihar and made a bid for imperial authority. His capital was Karka-Savarna and gold coins bearing his name have been found. The Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsang calls him the murderer of Rājya-Vardhana, but we have nothing else to prove it.

On the downfall of the Vākātakas, the Kaṭaccuris ruled over a region extending from Nasik to Ujjain, the Eastern Gaṅgas exercised authority near about Orissa, while the Kadambas maintained themselves in Kuntala. But the Kaṭaccuris, Kadambas as well as the Viṣṇukunḍins were conquered by Pulakeśin II of the Cālukya dynasty or by his predecessors.⁽¹²⁾

In the region of the extreme south, the Pallavas of the IIIrd dynasty exercised suzerain authority. They had quarrels with the Cālukyas of the north, Veṅgi being the bone of contention. The Pallava Mahendravarman (600-630) who was a patron of Śaivism checked the Cālukyas, while Narasimha-varman⁽¹³⁾ burnt Vātāpi, causing the death of Pulakṣin II.

Indian during the middle of the VIIth Century.—The middle of the VIIth century saw the waging of a many-sided contest amongst a number of fighting princes. King Harṣavardhana of Kanauj, having his allies of Kāmarūpa and Mālava-Sarāṣṭra and related to the Maukharis, had to fight (according to some) Śaśāṅka of Western Bengal and became the suzerain over a large part of Hindustan, but his southern progress was checked by Pulakeśin II Cālukya, who in his turn was checked by the Pallava Nara-

(12) *Pulakeśin II.*—Pulakeśin II Cālukya was a powerful prince and ruled from 611 to 638 A.D. He conquered Mahārāṣṭra, the principality of the Kadambas, and reduced the Mauryas of Konkan, and the kings of Lāṭa and Mālava. His other enemies were Harṣavardhana in the north and the Pallava Narasimhavarman in the south. He succeeded in checking Harṣa, but a sudden invasion of the Pallava Narasimhavarman made him lose his capital and life. He gave the eastern part of his kingdom to his brother, who founded the line of the Eastern Cālukyas. He received a special embassy from the king of Persia and was visited by Hiuen Tsang.

(13) *Narasimhavarman Pallava.*—Narasimhavarman (630-668 A.D.), the greatest of the Pallavas, not only checked the Cālukyas but sacked and burnt their capital Vātāpi. He also conquered Ceylon and had a very powerful navy. He kept the Ceras, Colas and Pāṇḍyas under his authority.

simha-varman. The Indus Valley and Kashmir⁽¹⁴⁾ together with the north-western frontier states remained separated from the plain of Hindustan and the rulers of Kashmir became for a time the dominant power in that region. Nepal like Kashmir became separated from the politics of Northern India and the dynasties cultivated friendly relations with Tibet and China.

The closing years of Harṣa's reign were remarkable for the dawn of an era of great changes. It was during his life-time that the religion of Islam was preached by Prophet Muhammad and Harṣa was still living while the Arab conquest of Persia was completed and that of the Makran coast undertaken. Lacking in the genius of consolidation Harṣa's sporadic conquests were not likely to survive and his tendencies gave little assurance to that effect. Like the thoughtless religious propaganda of Aśoka, the meaningless charity and extravagance of Harṣa bore bitter fruit. His own kingdom fell into the hands of a usurper, necessitating Chinese and Tibetan interference.⁽¹⁵⁾ The new political condition,

(14) The kings of Kashmir belonging to the Karkota dynasty had become very powerful. Probably King Dur'ab'a-Vardhana was the contemporary of Harṣa. According to Hiuen Tsang, the kings of Kashmir exercised suzerainty over the extreme north-west and were very powerful.

(15) We can hardly understand the reasons why Harṣa is so highly extolled by European writers on the history of India. Not to speak of writers like Ettinghausen or Kennedy, even the late Sir Vincent Smith went so far as to describe him as the last great Emperor of India, whose death marked the final disruption of a central power in Northern India and the beginning of an age of perennial internal struggle until the appearance of the Mussalmans.

Yet a careful study of the history of his reign makes us thoroughly disillusioned. The empire of Harṣa did not even comprise the whole of Northern India, and small as the area was under his suzerain authority, it was hardly consolidated into a lasting empire. He warred on, he conquered,—he thought of further expansion beyond the Narmadā—but he failed to consolidate. As soon as he closed his eyes, nothing remained of that empire: a usurper sat on his throne and Chinamen and Tibetans came to put an end to anarchy.

for a time, robbed Eastern India of its preponderating influence over the politics of India. The suzerainty over the North-Western trans-frontier states passed to other nations and after a bitter struggle the princes of the Tang dynasty became masters of North-Western India and Central Asia.

More serious enemies to Indian culture and political existence appeared in the person of the early propagandists, spiritual and military, of Islam. Arab armies made their appearance on the north and western frontiers of India. Makran was invaded and after the defeat of Sihas-rai and Sāhasī, the Śūdra kings of Sindh, the Makran coast was lost to the Hindus permanently⁽¹⁶⁾ (644 A.D.). Sindh⁽¹⁷⁾ itself resisted for another 70 years under the Brahmin usurper Chach and his son Dāhir, but ultimately suc-

True to speak, his was no empire in any sense of the word. His age, too, was one which marked the high tide of growing Indian demoralisation. While he was indulging in charities and benevolences, his biographer was denouncing even the tradition of an imperial rule and scoffing at the memory of Kauṭilya. With all these, however, he was fortunate enough to have able biographers to sound the trumpet of his glory—one to describe his great conquests which did not survive even a decade after his death, the other to harp on his great piety which did nothing but help in the coming ruin and open the gates of India to a foreign enemy. (For one of the ablest estimates of Harṣa see R. C. Majumdar's paper in J. B. O. R. S. 1923.)

(16) *The Conquest of the Makran Coast*.—Once established in Persia, the Arabs turned their eyes to the Makran coast and Sindh. Probably, Makran was subject to Sindh which was ruled by Sāhasī, a Śūdra according to the evidence of Hiuen Tsang and the Chachnāmā. In all probability, the Makran coast was overrun by the Arabs about the year 640 A.D.

(17) *The Conquest of Sindh*.—Sindh, according to the *Harṣacarita*, had been conquered by Harṣa ("and made the wealth of Sindh his own" पुरुषोत्तमैव दिव्य राज प्रमथ लब्धो गच्छीया कृता). Who this Sindh King was we do not know, but he has been identified with Sahasi. After him, the throne was usurped by a Brahmana named Chacha. This usurper consolidated his authority and was followed by his brother and then by his son Dāhir. Dāhir had a dispute with Hajjaj, the Muslim governor of Persia, regarding reparations for the looting of presents intended for the Khalif Walid by the pirates of Dewal. This led to successive Arab invasions, the last being led by Muhammad bin Kasim, who defeated Dāhir after gaining the help of the local Buddhists. Sindh passed to the Arabs (712-713 A.D.).

cumbed to the invasion of Muhammad-ibn-Kasim who got assistance from the rebellious local Buddhists (714 A.D.). Simultaneously, the Arabs pressed hard in Central Asia and the western border and though with Chinese help, the princes of Kashmir, Udyāna (Swat) and Chitral maintained themselves for some time (720 to 751 A.D.), the defeat of the Chinese General Sien-Chi, made the task of Arab advance towards India easier.

The Great Political Revolution of the VIIIth Century.—But with all these events, India proper was not destined to fall an easy prey to the Islamic armies. In the face of foreign aggression, there came an almost synchronous political revolution which marked the ascendancy of new powers and which checked the spirit of disintegration and anarchy. The Rajputs⁽¹⁹⁾ came to rule

(18) *Islamic Expansion in Central Asia.*—Side by side there was an extension of Islamic power in Central Asia. An Islamic kingdom was founded near Bokhara by Asad, a Zoroastrian convert to Mahomedanism (825 A.D.). Under his son and grandson, the sovereignty of the Samanides was extended over Samarkhand and Fergana. About 912 A.D. an officer of the Samanides, Yakub-i-Lais, captured Herat, occupied Zabulistan from the Rajputs and also took away the citadel of Kabul, which was then in the hands of the Brahmin Shāhīs, whose dynasty was founded by Kallar.

In the reign of the Samanide, Nuh (942 acc.), Turkish slaves were enlisted in the Amir's army, and in the reign of Abdul Malik and his successor Mansur, Turks rose into prominence. One of these Turki slaves, Alaptagin, founded the kingdom of Ghazni and later on this principality passed into the hands of Subuktigin. Subuktigin's son was the celebrated Mahmud who was destined to be the terror of the Hindus.

While the Turks were gaining in power day by day their further eastern extension was blocked by the Hindu state of Kabul and Punjab, ruled by Brahmin kings of the Shāhī dynasty. We have inscriptions of kings Kālakavarman, Bhīma and Jayapāla of this line and coins of many kings. After the capture of Kabul citadel, the capital of the Hindu kingdom was transferred to Wahind (Udahāṇḍa). Jayapāla was Subuktigin's contemporary.

(19) *The Rajputs.*—"Who were the Rajputs," is a question to which a satisfactory answer is yet to be given. Claiming descent from the Kṣatriya heroes of antiquity, they proved themselves to have been the most redoubtable champions of Hinduism and even now they are distinguished by their fine physique and martial bearing. Yet, in spite of all these, they have been regarded as foreigners of low origin or as lower caste Hindus elevated to a higher social position. The main reasons for the adoption of these hypotheses are: (1) they arise suddenly in the VIIth century, (2) the legend of the origin

in most kingdoms. Just about the middle of the VIIIth century A.D. four great powers arose in the country :—

(I) The Gurjara-Pratihāras,⁽²⁰⁾ who had established their principality in the VIth century or even before that time, became a great military power and advanced to the Punjab border and the plain of Hindustan. They were destined not only to make a bid for supremacy over central and western Hindustan but to act as a bulwark against Islamic aggression for nearly two centuries.

of the Agnikūlas points to their artificial elevation by the Brahmins to recruit fighters for Hinduism, (3) similarity of some Rajput tribe-names to some of the non-Aryan clan-names (Huna, Jit, Takṣaka, etc.).

At one time it was fashionable to regard the Rajputs as Scythians, after the views of Colonel Tod. But more recently, there have been new theorisings about the origin of the Rajputs. On this point, Professor D. R. Bhandarkar's *Foreign Elements in Hindu Population* (Ind. Ant., Vol. XL) is of great interest. Sir V. Smith's most recent views are to be found in his *Oxford History of India* (pp. 172-174). Prominent among those who believe in the Kṣātriya origin of the Rajputs is Mr. C. V. Vaidya, the author of the *History of Medieval Hindu India* (Vol. II).

A discussion about the origin of the Rajputs is out of place here. But one or two points may be advanced, to enable our readers to form a clear idea as regards the Kṣātriya origin of the Rajputs. First of all, anthropological measurements go to prove that the Rajputs belong to the best Aryan type in India. Secondly, we believe that a sudden conversion or elevation of foreigners cannot possibly convert foreigners both in physical characteristics and in mentality.

(20) *The Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire*.—The origin of the Gurjara-Pratihāras is shrouded in mystery. But whatever might have been their origin (which question must even yet remain an open one), a Gurjara kingdom was already in existence, north of Valabhi, in the VIIth century A.D. when Hsien Tsang came to India. The first Pratihāra dynasty, claiming descent from the Brahmin Haricandra was probably founded about 550 A.D. and exercised authority over a large tract for about twelve generations. In course of time, feudatory princes of the Pratihāra dynasty established other smaller states. The Pratihāras gradually extended their influence and they had to fight, during the early part of the VIIIth century, the forces of the Arab Governors who, under Junaid Viad, advanced up to Ujjain. But the Arabs were hurled back by a prince of the Pratihāras who ruled in Avanti. The greatness of this family was consolidated by Nāgabhaṭa who flourished during the middle of the VIIIth century A.D.

The Gurjara-Pratihāras and their Struggles.—After Nāgabhaṭa, the family suffered reverses at the time of Devarāja (at the hands of Siluka of the older time) but after him there was a number of powerful rulers, e.g., Vatsarāja, Nāgabhaṭa II, Rāmabhadra, Bhoja, (cir. 840 A.D.), and Mahendra Pāla (1st quarter of the Xth century).

(II) About the middle of the VIIIth century A.D. also arose in Eastern India the Pāla Empire⁽²¹⁾ founded by Gopāla who was raised to the throne by the magnates and the people to end a régime of anarchy.

In the height of their power the Pratihāra rulers ruled over a vast empire, which was more or less feudalised. The empire, in the height of its splendour, extended from the borders of the Punjab and Sindh to those of Bengal, and included Magadha for some time. It included the greater part of the Gangetic valley and almost the whole of Central India and Bundelkhand. Guzerat and a portion of the Punjab were in that Empire. Prominent among the feudatories of the Empire were the Guhilot princes, the Cāhamānas (whose line was founded by Guvāka) and the Candellas. Kanauj, which had been taken from its local king Cakrāyudha, afterwards became the capital of the Empire.

With its vast extent, great wealth and powerful armies, as is proved by the evidence of Muslim writers and travellers (*see* Elliot, Vol. I), the Empire lacked consolidation. Bhoja and Mahendrapāla were the greatest rulers of the line and the monarchy did much to arrest the advance of the Arabs of Sindh.

The supremacy of the Pratihāras was short-lived. They had to contend with powerful enemies. The Pālas of Bengal under Dharmapāla and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the south were their bitterest enemies, not to speak of the Arabs (or the occasional raids of Kashmir Kings). Vaṭṣarāja or Nāgabhaṭa II had to fight with both Dharmapāla and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas under Dhruva. But the death of Dhruva and the southern attack on Govinda the Rāṣṭrakūṭa King saved the Pratihāras from ruin. Dharmapāla in the meanwhile advanced up to Kanauj and put Cakrāyudha on the throne. Nāgabhaṭa suffered again from the attack of Govinda III (807-808 A.D.). Bhoja, too, suffered an attack made by Devapāla, but towards the end of Bhoja's reign, the king of Bengal was discomfited while there was no pressure from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. But about 915 A.D. the Pratihāra Mahipāla suffered a signal reverse at the hand of Indra III, Rāṣṭrakūṭa, but was saved from destruction by the incompetence of Govinda IV. After Mahipāla, the decay of the empire was fast. The Candellas under Dhanga wrested much of the Imperial territories, Gujarat became independent, the Cedis asserted themselves, while the Kacchapaghātas became independent near Gwalior. Rājyapāla, the last ruler of Kanauj, suffered an attack from Mahmud of Ghazni and then died in a war with the Kacchapaghātas and the Candellas. The line ended soon afterwards ingloriously.

(21) *The Pālas of Bengal.*—Bengal during the close of the VIIth and the first half of the VIIIth century was divided into a number of small principalities. The Sailas and Khaḍgas probably divided the country and a large number of petty states existed. By the middle of the VIIIth century (cir. 750 A.D.) the chiefs ended the period of anarchy by electing Gopāla to the throne (*cf.* Khalimpur plate).

The Pāla dynasty founded by him was a long-lived one and produced eminent rulers and conquerors. Dharmapāla, the son of Gopāla, claimed to have conquered nearly the whole of Northern India, and placed Cakrāyudha on the throne of Kanauj, after

(III) Almost simultaneously, there arose the Rāṣṭrakūṭas⁽²²⁾ who, under Dantidurga (753 A.D.), put an end to the Cālukyas and took their place in the Deccan. But before their downfall, the Cālukyas under Vikramāditya I had almost crushed the political power of the Pallavas, so much so that they sank into insignificance.

defeating the Gurjar Nāgabhaṭa (Khalimpur, l. 11 and 12). His son Devapāla, seems to have conquered Assam and Kāliṅga. After Devapāla came Vighrahapāla, Nārāyaṇapāla, Rājyapāla, Gopāla II, Vighrahapāla, and Mahipāla, who suffered an attack from Rājendra Cola. The kingdom was probably weakened by this and probably rival princes established themselves in western and southern Bengal. Mahipāla was followed by Nayapāla, Vighrahapāla, Mahipāla II, Surapāla (Manhali Ins.) and Rāmapāla who saved the dynasty from utter ruin and saved it from the revolt of Divyoka who had usurped authority in a large part of the realm.

(22) *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas*.—They rose to power under Dantidurga, about 753 A.D. and were a dynasty which had long been ruling in the Deccan. Their king, Indra, son of Kṛṣṇa, was defeated by Jayasimha of the earlier Cālukya dynasty, and from that time they were feudatories to the Cālukyas. Dantidurga, who founded the greatness of the line and assumed pompous titles, was deposed by his uncle Kṛṣṇa I. After Kṛṣṇa I, the next great king was Dhruva who carried on war on both fronts, namely, on the north as well as on the south. He forced the Pallavas to pay a tribute of elephants, while crossing the Vindhya he humbled Vatsarāja.

Govinda III (794-814 A.D.), the greatest monarch of the line, made himself suzerain over the region between the Vindhya and the Tūṅghabhadra. He also conquered Lāṭa where he made his brother Indrarāja viceroy. After Govinda, who inflicted a crushing defeat on the Pratihāra, Nāgabhaṭa II (cir. 807 or 808 A.D.), the state suffered from internal complications, which checked for a time its conquering activity. Amoghavarṣa had himself pre-occupied by the war with the Eastern Cālukyas. A number of weak princes succeeded him, and the next great king made war on the king of the Colas, on whom had devolved the task of carrying on war with the prominent Deccan Power. Kṛṣṇa III defeated the Cola king Rājāditya at the battle of Takkolam (949 A.D.).

The last king of the dynasty, Karka II, had to fight the Paramāras of Malwa and also the princes of the Cālukya dynasty. When Mulkhed was at the mercy of the northern enemy, the Cālukya warrior Taila restored the older line, and established the Cālukya dynasty at Kalyāni (973 A.D.).

The Cālukya-Rāṣṭrakūṭa Duel.—The Rāṣṭrakūṭas as the predominant Deccan power had to fight the Gurjaras in the North, the Colas in the South, and, occasionally, the Eastern Cālukyas (an off-shoot of the older Cālukyas) established by Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana, brother of Pulakeśin II, in the province of Veṅgi. This state lasted till 1070 A.D., and some of its kings fought the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. During the reign of Amoghavarṣa I (815 A.D.) the war between the two countries continued vigorously.

(IV) And a few decades later the place of the Pallavas as the suzerain power in the extreme south was taken by the Colas,⁽²³⁾ who continued to hold a supreme position almost to the eve of

The Later Cālukyas.—In addition to these, local Cālukya princes, who had probably become the vassals of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, were ever ready to assert themselves. The dynasty of Taila also claimed descent from the older line and as soon as it was established, it had to carry on war on the two fronts. Taila (973-997 A.D.), the first king, had to fight Muṇja of Malwa, who after sixteen successful raids lost his life in the 17th attack. The next kings, Satyāśraya, Vikramāditya and Jayasimha, had to fight the Colas. The war was a terrible one and went on with varying successes on both sides. In 1052 A.D. was fought the battle of Koppam in which Cola Rājādhirāja lost his life. Someśvara I (1040-1069 A.D.), who fought at Koppam, took up the cause of the Eastern Cālukya prince Kulottuṅga. He was however defeated at Bezwada and Kudal Sangam and committed suicide.

The war was continued by Kulottuṅga, an heir to the Eastern Cālukyas who ascended the Cola throne. But during Vikramāditya VI's long reign, after the peace with the Colas, the Hoysālas made an attack on the Cālukyas. Vikramāditya VI ruled for a long time (1076-1127). Within thirty years of his death, the Empire broke up and the Kalacuryas usurped authority in a large portion of the Empire, under Vijjala (1156-1167). But the Kalacuryas themselves were weakened by the usurpation of Vasava.

(23) *Tamil India and the Rise of the Cola Power.*—As stated already, in the 1st century A.D. the Colas had risen to power and welth under able kings like Kārikala the Blackfoot. But this early supremacy was destroyed by various causes and for some time the Ceras rose to power. Very soon, however, they were supplanted by the Pallavas and during their ascendancy the Ceras, Colas and Pāṇḍyas all had to remain content with the subservient position of feudatories.

But the Pallavas as the predominant power of the South had to contend with a number of enemies, *viz.*, the Cālukyas in the North and the Pāṇḍyas in the South and other enemies.

The Pallavas suffered defeat at the hands of Vikramāditya II Cālukya (741) and on the extinction of the Cālukyas, their successors, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas inherited the quarrel. Govinda III inflicted a crushing defeat on the Kanchi rulers. In their weakness they were attacked by the Pāṇḍyas under Varaguna (cir. 825), but the Pāṇḍyas themselves suffered defeat.

While this duel was going on, the Colas asserted themselves. The Cola king Vijayālāya recovered Tanjore while his son Āditya Cola defeated the last Pallava Aparājita and laid the foundations of the Cola Empire. The next king Parāntaka (906-953 A.D.) reduced the Pāṇḍyas and invaded Ceylon. But very soon, the Colas took up the fight against the Northern power, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Rājāditya lost his life at the battle of Takkolam against Kṛṣṇa III (949 A.D.). In 985, Rājārāja ascended the throne and made himself suzerain over a vast empire stretching from Travancore to the Kāliṅga border and including a large part of Mysore. He conquered the Maldives and Laccadives,

the Mussalman conquest of the south.⁽²⁴⁾ As a result of this, four great political powers arose and warred for supremacy keeping under check a number of other kingdoms and feudatories who transferred their allegiance to the more successful conqueror. The mutual hostility of these kept them engaged and prevented them from presenting a common front to the Islamic hordes that continued to knock at the gates of India. The Gurjara-Pratihāras continued to act as a bulwark to the further eastern advance of the Mussalmans who had however the good fortune of having an ally in the Rāṣṭrakūtas.⁽²⁵⁾ Roughly, such a state of things lasted for nearly two centuries. While these struggles were going on,

formed marriage alliance with the Eastern Cālukyas and put down the Pāṇḍyas. He was succeeded by Rājendra Cola, who, not satisfied with a Tamil Empire, advanced against the Pālas (assuming the title of Gaṅgaikonda) and sent an expedition against the kingdom of Srivijaya in Sumatra. His unfortunate successor lost his life in the battle of Koppam while fighting with the Cālukyas, which work was carried on by his successors.

(24) *Pāṇḍya Revival*.—Vijayālaya's line was then ended by Kulottunga (1070-1118). This prince warred on to conquer Kāliṅga, repelled the Cālukyas and fought the Hoysālas. The last powerful ruler was Rājārāja III (1216-1248). After him the Colas declined and the Pāṇḍya Siri-Maravarman became powerful, capturing and burning Tanjore. Jaṭavarman Sundera Pāṇḍya (1251-1275), was a powerful ruler, but Moslem invasion under Malik Kafur brought the kingdom under Sultan Alauddin Khilji (1310 A.D.).

(25) *Decline of the Gurjara-Pratihāras*.—The Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire suffered from decay after the death of Mahendrapāla (908 A.D.), who may be regarded as the last great Lord Suzerain of North India. Mahendrapāla was succeeded by Bhoja II and then by Mahipāla, who is called Rājādhirāja of Āryāvarta by the poet Rājasekhara. It was probably in his reign that the Moslem traveller Masaudi visited India. He has left a record of his four great armies each numbering 7,00,000 men. But the Empire received a terrible shock at the hands of Indra III (cir. 916 A.D.). This Rāṣṭrakūta attack weakened the Empire, though it did not crush it. After Mahipāla came Mahendrapāla II, Devapāla (cir. 948), Vijayapāla and Rājapāla the contemporary of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni.

The Pratihāras did very great service to India, by checking the inroads of the Mussalmans of Sindh, and the break-up of their Empire was a great catastrophe. The ambitious and rebellious feudatories of the Empire now took advantage of the weakness of the central power and not only asserted independence, but thought of establishing paramount authority.

on in the North-Western frontier the Kabul state held its own under its Brahmin usurpers till the end of the Xth century and the first quarter of the XIth.

Further Feudal Disintegration.—The middle of the Xth century witnessed great political changes and was signalised by great events which were to change the course of later history. After king Mahipāla or Vināyakapāla, who had succeeded in restoring the fortunes of his family, the Gurjara-Pratihāra monarchy underwent a steady disintegration and the ruler of Kanauj suffered constant attacks from his feudatories, who not only asserted their independence but turned their arms against their late master. Prominent among these new states of Northern India were those ruled over by Rajput princes who made dynastic war and mutual hostility the sole objective of their existence. The country fast moved on the path of catastrophe. The danger of the common enemy who was knocking at the gates could hardly rouse these princes to a sense of duty.

The danger of Islamic invasion became however greater day by day and though adverse political circumstances and the distance of the Indian frontier removed for a time the Arab menace, an offshoot the Samani kingdom ruled by the virile Turki converts was established at Ghazni. It was destined to become the *point d'appui* of the Moslem in his designs against the fertile plains of India. That state passed to the hands of able rulers like Alaptgin, Subuktigin and Mahmud, the last of whom was destined not only to strike terror in Hindustan by his cruel and inhuman raids.

Among these may be counted the Candellas led by Dhaṅga who claimed imperial authority about 954 A.D. (Khujaraho inscription). The Cedi Lakṣmaparāja was another such king. The Cālukya Mularāja asserted independence in Gujarat, the Kacchapaghātas established themselves near Gwalior, and the Paramāras asserted themselves as also the Cāhamānas of Sākambhari (see R. C. Majumdar's *Gurjara-Pratihāra*, pp. 76-81).

but to absorb the state of Kabul and Lahore. Islam gained ground every day and the religion of the Prophet spread among the wild hillmen partly by force but more through the excellence of that religion over the debased Buddhism current in those places. The Kabul state under the renowned kings Jayapāla and Ānandapāla fought against Sultan Mahmūd, but their weak forces, though occasionally strengthened by contingents of neighbouring rulers, could do nothing against the invaders flushed with zeal and superior in fighting capacity and brilliant generalship.

With the fall of the Shāhī kingdom of Kabul,⁽²⁶⁾ the natural barrier of protection passed to the ever-vigilant Mussalman enemy, who had in Mahmūd's lifetime annexed the greater part of the Punjab. Later on, the weak successors of Mahmūd found a refuge in this Indian territory.⁽²⁷⁾

From that time, however, the Mussalman conquest of India was a foregone conclusion though a respite of nearly two centuries was granted to the Indian princes of Hindustan, through the

(26) *Fall of the Shāhīs*.—Jayapāla lost Lamghan and the regions to the west of the Indus to Subuktigin. After his death, his son Ānandapāla fought till 1009 or 1010, when he was killed in battle. His son Trilocanapāla carried on the struggle but he was forced to submit. Towards the close of his life, he seems to have lost his kingdom (1021). His successor, the last of the Brāhmaṇa Sāhīs, Bhimapāla, died in 1026. The greater part of the Punjab including Lahore passed to Mahmūd of Ghazni.

(27) *Ghaznirite Sultans of Lahore*.—After the death of Sultan Mahmūd, his son Mas'ūd became king. He ruled his father's Empire and appointed a Kazi and a Governor to rule the Punjab. He seems to have also employed Hindu generals and soldiers. His general Nialtiagin carried on raids into Hindu territory to the east but being unfaithful to his master, he was killed. Mas'ūd thought of making conquests in India, but the western part of his empire being attacked by the Seljuks, he returned from India, and while on his way, lost his life. A number of weak kings then sat on the throne of Ghazni. For forty years, the throne was usurped by a slave named Tughril, but afterwards, Mahmūd's line was restored. After two Sultans, Ibrahim and Farukhjad who ruled till 1118, the throne passed to Bahram who had a long reign of 41 years. He was a weak prince and during his reign Ghazni was sacked and burnt by the Ghoris. Bahram retired to India and ruled there till his death.

weakness of Mahmud's successors⁽²⁸⁾ and the constant rivalry of the Ghaznavite and the Ghori princes. Northern India remained in the meanwhile a medley of principalities wedded to a policy of eternal hostility and mutual strife. There arose new princes and rival dynasties. But, in this new *maṇḍala* the fighting energies of each state was neutralised by the hostility of its neighbours.

Rajput princes ruled in these states. War for supremacy became the objective of these ambitious princes and the boundaries of each state varied with the success or failure of the ruling prince. Consolidation of authority or the building of a stable empire was beyond the comprehension or genius of these chiefs. War for military glory continued the end and aim of their existence and the age was one of *chivalric anarchy*. States gained ascendancy in turn. Able rulers like Bhoja of Malwa, Karna of Cedi, Madanacandra of Kanauj carried on the eternal struggle which did nothing but weaken the country before the very eyes of the advancing enemy. Of the new Rajput families, the Cāhamāna ruled in Sambhar⁽²⁹⁾

(28) *The Decline and Fall of Ghazni*.—On Bahram's death his son Khasru became king. He lost Ghazni first to the Turks and then to the Ghoris. Khasru had to retire to Lahore where he ruled for seven years. The last prince of the house of Mahmud, Khasru II, was defeated, captured and killed by Shahabuddin Mahomed Ghori (1191 A.D.). Coins of the Ghaznavide Sultans of Lahore have come down to us and some of these bear Sanskrit inscription and are copied from Hindu Shāhi coins.

(29) *The Cāhamāna Kingdom of Sambhara*.—It was founded by one Sāmanta, who and whose immediate successors distinguished themselves in the struggle against the Arabs of Sindh. The Bijolia stone inscription gives us an account of this line. One important king was Guvāka. Vighararāja was a great ruler and was succeeded by Durlava (973 A.D.—Harsha stone). After him came a number of princes (Govinda, Vakpati, Vijaya, Durlava, Vighraha, Prithvirāja, Ajaipāla, Arnorāja) who consolidated the power of the line. Some of these, like Arnorāja, had to fight not only the Mussalmans but also had to war with the kings of Gujarat (Kumārāpāla). Viśaladeva was a great soldier, poet and dramatist, who checked and punished the Moslems many times. Viśaladeva ruled at least up to 1163. He was followed by a number of weak kings. The last prince of the dynasty was the celebrated warrior Prithvirāja, the ruler of Ajmere and Delhi, who once defeated Shahabuddin Ghori but was ultimately conquered and killed by him (1193 A.D.). Towards the close of the XIIth century, the Cāhamānas barred the way of the Turko-Pathans to India.

and Ajmir, the Paramāra in Malwa,⁽³⁰⁾ the Haihaya in Cedi,⁽³¹⁾ the Candella in Bundelkhand,⁽³²⁾ the Caulukya in Gujarāt,⁽³³⁾

(30) *The Paramāra Kingdom of Malwa*, with its capital at Dhara, became powerful during the latter half of the Xth century. The first king to assume independence was Siyakadeva, who was followed by Vākpatirājadeva, Muñja and Sindhurājadeva. Muñja who fought Tailapa (973-997) was killed by him in battle. Bhoja (1010-1055) was the greatest king of the dynasty. He was a great author, lawyer, poet and writer on various subjects and was the greatest ruler of his time. He fought the Mussalmans or Turuskas in addition to the adjacent enemy states of Gujarat, the kings of the 2nd Cālukya dynasty of the south, and the Cedis of the east, who were connected with the Cālukyas by marriage. During this struggle Dhara was once occupied by Bhīma of Gujarat and once by Jayasimha Cālukya. Bhoja also fought the Turks. Probably he attacked the rear of Mahmud after the sack of Somnath and sent a contingent to help Anandapāla. After Bhoja, there was disorder in the kingdom and Bhoja's successor Jayasimha was placed on the throne with the aid of Vikramāditya Cālukya. King Udayāditya restored the fortunes of the family and his son Lakṣmapadeva seems to have waged war on all sides. He was followed by Naravarman (1100-1133) and Yaśovarman who suffered defeat at the hands of the Cālukyas and Jayasimha Siddharāja of Gujarat who imprisoned him in a cage. His successor Jayavarman was defeated by Kumārāpāladeva of Gujarat and was decapitated. Other kings ruled after him, namely, Ajaya-Varman, Vindhya-Varman (who recovered much of his ancestral territory from Gujarat and fought the Gujarat kings), Subhāṭa-Varman, Arjuna-Varman and Devapāla-Varman in whose line the main line of the Paramāras was ended with the attack of Sultan Iltutmish.

(31) *The Haihaya Princes of Cedi* were probably not feudatories to the Gurjara-Pratihāras. From inscriptions we know that the earliest king was Kokkala. After him came Dhavala, Bālaharṣa, Yuvarājadeva Lakṣmaṇa, Sankaragaṇa (Yuvarāja II) and Kakalla who were followed by Gaṅgeyadeva (who reigned till 1040). He seems to have occupied Benares and fought Bhoja but was worsted. After him came Karṇa, who next to Bhoja was the greatest king in Āryāvarta. He conquered many kings, extended his Empire over Trikaṭiṅga, Behar and a large part of Hindustan. After his long reign (1040-1080) his son Yaśaṣkarṇa carried on the tradition of his father, ruling till 1125. He was followed by Gayakarṇa, Narasimha-Varman, Jayasimha and Vijayasimha who reigned up to the end of the XIIth century when the dynasty fell with the attacks of the Mussalmans under Shahabuddin Ghorī and his successors in the Delhi Sultanate.

(32) *The Candātreya or Candella Dynasty of Bundelkhand*, with capital at Khajuraho, was founded by a prince named Nannuka (see V. Smith's art. in Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII). The early kings were probably feudatories of a greater power, i.e., the Gurjara-Pratihāras. Nannuka was followed by Vākpati, Vijaya, Rahila. Sriharṣa, Yaśovarman, the last being followed by Dhaṅga, a powerful king who is said to have helped Jayapāla against Subuktgin. He was followed by Gaṇḍa (1000-1023), a contemporary of Mahmud whom he resisted. His son Vidyādhara inflicted a crushing blow on Rājapāla Pratihāra of Kanauj and probably killed him (with the help of the Kacchapaghātas, tributaries to the Candellas, and that of the kings of Malwa and Cedi). Vidyādhara became king

the Gāhāḍavāla in Kanauj,⁽³⁴⁾ the Pāla in Magadha, the Sūra, and later on, the Sena ruled in Western Bengal.⁽³⁵⁾ Himalayan states

and was followed by Devavarman who called himself an independent monarch. Kirtivarman was a contemporary and enemy of Karṇa, the Cedi king, and the two fought for supremacy. He was followed by Sallakṣmana who warred on Malwa and Cedi. After him came (1110 A.D.) Jayavarman and Pṛthivivarman (1120-1125). The next king Madanavarman repelled an attack by Siddharāja Jayasimha of Gujarat and humbled the kings of Malwa and Cedi, he himself being a friend of the Gāhāḍavāla king of Kanauj. The last important king of this line was Paramārdideva (1165-1203). He was worsted by the Cāhamāna Pṛthvirāja (1182) and again by Kutubuddin who captured the fort of Kālāñjara. After him, there were three kings but the line had to fight the Turks constantly and sank into insignificance.

(33) *The Caulukya Dynasty of Gujarāt*, with its capital at Anhilwārā, was founded by Mūlarāja (Xth century). The Gujarāt kings had to fight not only the Cālukyās of the South, the Parmāras of Malwa, the Cāhamānas of Sambhara, but the Arabs of Sindh and later on the Turks. Mūlarāja was succeeded by Cāmuṇḍa (997-1010). He defeated and killed Sindhurāja of Malwa. After two unimportant kings, Bhīma I became the ruler (1022-1064). He was a contemporary of Bhoja and Karṇa Cedi and it was during his reign that Mahmud of Ghazni raided Somnath. He was followed by Karṇa (1064-1094). His successor Jayasimha Suddharāja (1094-1143) fought the Arabs in addition to the kings of Malwa and Cedi. Malwa was overrun cruelly, its king was treated barbarously and it was partly occupied. His successor was Kumārapāla (1143-1173). He subjugated the Gūhilots and the king of Malwa, fought against the Cedis and was favourably inclined to the Jains. He was succeeded by an incompetent prince who was supplanted by Mūlarāja II (1176-1178). He was a king though a minor and signally defeated Muhammad Ghori. Under his successor Bhīma II (1178-1241) and the next prince, the Bāghelās usurped authority. Four kings of this line, e.g., Viśāladeva, Arjuna, Śaraṅga and Karṇa ruled till 1303 when the kingdom was conquered by Alauddin Khilji (1303).

(34) *Gāhāḍavālas of Kanauj*.—The first important king of the Gāhāḍavāla line of Kanauj was Candradeva (cir. 1080) who conquered Kanauj from the local ruler, and captured Benares and probably Oudh. He expelled the Turks to whom the Pratihāras had submitted and claimed to be the greatest monarch of Āryāvarta after Bhoja Paramāra and Cedi Karṇa. After him came Madanapāla and next to him Govinda-Candra, who seems to have conquered the Cedis and extended his empire in the east and checked the Turks now established in the Punjab. He ruled from 1114 to 1164 and was followed by Vijayacandra (1154-1170) who claimed a victory over the Turks. Towards the close of his reign, the Cāhamāna Vīgraharāja of Ajmer captured Delhi and made a bid for suzerainty in Āryāvarta. Vijaya's son Jayacandra was the rival of Pṛthvirāja, the last Hindu king of Ajmer-Delhi. Jayacandra ruled till 1193 when his kingdom was conquered by Shabuddin Muhammad Ghori.

(35) *Bengal*.—It seems that towards the close of the Pāla period, their power in Bengal gradually decayed and passed to other dynasties. The Sūra dynasty was founded and we have the names of Sūra Kings. Names of other kings and of other dynas-

like Nepal, Chamba, Kangra, Kashmir and Kāmarūpa, became isolated from the influence of the political forces working in Hindustan, though maintaining their independence for some time.

In the Deccan and in the South the same state of affairs subsisted. There too arose new dynasties ruling in various places, e.g., the Yādavas⁽³⁵⁾ of Devagiri in Mahārāṣṭra, the Hoysālas of Dvāra-Samudra,⁽³⁷⁾ (further south) the Kākatiyas of Warangal,⁽³⁸⁾

ties are also forthcoming. But during the XIIIth century, the Senas of Lakṣmanāvatī became powerful. The founder of the dynasty was Samantasena, who was followed by Hemantasena, and Vijayasena. The son of the last, Ballālasena, was a powerful king and extended his dominions. Under his son, Lakṣmanasena, the country was invaded by the Turks under Muḥammad-i-bin Bakhtiyār but the Senas continued to rule in Eastern Bengal for some time more.

(36) *The Yādavas of Devagiri* claimed descent from a feudatory of the Cālukyas named Dr̥ḍaprahāra, the ruler of a small kingdom established during the middle of the IXth century A.D. In his family came able feudatory princes like Bhīlāma II, Vestugi and Bhīlāma III. Bhīlāma IV declared his independence and established his capital at Devagiri (1187). His chief enemies were the Hoysāla Yādavas of Dvārasamudra. He was succeeded by Jaitugi and by Sinhāna the most powerful king of the line (1210-1247). While the Ghornies were conquering Āryāvarta, Sinhāna was building up an empire and fighting the king of Gujaraṭ. The next important king was Rāmacandra (1271-1309) in whose time Alaaddin reduced the kingdom to vassalage. Afterwards it was annexed to the Turko-Pathan Empire.

(37) *The Hoysālas of Dvārasamudra* were a Mysoran dynasty claiming descent from one Sāla, who was followed by Vinayāditya (1047-1100). The next great king was Bīḍhadeva, who gave up Jainism and became a Vaiṣṇava (1104-1136) and made himself master of a large southern empire with Dvārasamudra as capital. After him came Narasiṃha I and Vīra Ballāla II (1172-1219) who was consolidating his power against the Yādavas at the time when the Turks were establishing in Hindustan. Narasiṃha II (1220-1235) defeated the Cholas and the Pallavas now sunk into insignificance. He was succeeded by Someśvara (1235-1254), followed by Narasiṃha III (1254-1291) and Vīra Ballāla III (1291-1342), and during the reign of the last, the kingdom passed to the Delhi Turks.

(38) *The Kākatiyas of Warangal* were at first feudatories of the Western Cālukyas. The first important ruler, Triḷḷubhāṣanalla Betmarāja, reigned at Hanamkonda about 1100 A.D. Prolarāja (1130-1162) established himself firmly and built Warangal. His son was Pratāparudra-Deva who conquered the Yādavas and the king of Orissa. Mahādeva and Gaṇapati were the next great kings. Gaṇapati ruled for 62 years and was a powerful king. After him his daughter Rudrambā ruled the kingdom for 30 years. The last king was Pratāparudra II, in whose time Kafer conquered the country. Pratāpa ruled for some time as a vassal and was followed by Kṛṣṇa under whom the kingdom

the kings of Orissa,⁽³⁹⁾ not to mention a host of small principalities and feudatories owing allegiance to the nearest powerful prince of the locality.

In the medley of states, there was neither cohesion nor any political purpose. The princes thought of nothing but eternal war and dynastic hostility. Despotic as they were, everything depended on their pleasure. The people had ceased to have any interest in politics. Religion decayed, the art of war became antiquated, and society stagnant. Nobody thought of the country's interest.

The Mussalman, flushed with victory and fired by his religious fervour, had long bided his time. In the person of Shibābuddin Ghorī, the spirit of conquest re-awakened. The ground had already been prepared and after a short struggle, the Hindu military resistance collapsed with the second battle of Tārain and the death of Prthvīrāja. The Turko-Afghans carried everything before them. Principalities melted away, armies were annihilated and the plain of Hindustan passed to the hands of the Turki conquerors almost within the space of a decade.

Sudden and sweeping as the tide of conquest was, it failed, however, to break the spirit of the people. The armies of Islam could conquer kingdoms but they could not put an end to Hindu culture. Patriotic Rajput princes and tribes carried on an almost continuous resistance. Many of them took shelter in the hills

became insignificant though it continued, till 1423, fighting the Bahmani Sultans by whom it was annexed.

(39) Orissa had an independent dynasty of its own. The Keśaris (Somavamśi) ruled for a long time, but later on the Eastern Gangas founded their supremacy under Vajra-hasta I (984-1019). The Colas under Rājendra Cola invaded the country (about 1021), but afterwards the Gangas became supreme. Rājārāja (1068-1076) and Anantavarman Coḍa-gaṅga (1076-1142) were very powerful kings. They were followed by able princes of other lines who maintained their independence till cir. 1565 A.D.

and deserts. The inaccessible South retained its independence for another hundred years, till the military genius of Sultan Alauddin Khilji, seconded by the zeal of Malik Kafur, enabled Islamic armies to penetrate the South. Yet even then the Mussalman could not establish universal rule over India. The Hindu line of resistance, though broken, showed a new front. The war against Islam and Mussalman advance continued all through the centuries till the advent of the European, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter. Successive revivals took place and every time the Hindu made a bid for his lost political power and missed success only through unforeseen causes and circumstances which the historian of causes and events hardly explains accurately.

BOOK X

POLITICS AND PUBLIC LIFE IN MEDIAEVAL HINDU INDIA

From the above summary of Indian political history we can easily sum up the main political tendencies which operated during the whole period from the Hindu resurrection of the IVth century A.D. to the eve of the Mussalman conquest of Hindustan during the close of the XIIth century A.D. These appear to be the following :—

(1) First of all, there was a continued tendency to a further break-up, though we meet with the periodic rise of strong powers like the Pālas and the Pratihāras. Along with this tendency to break up there was a further development of sub-infeudation and the rise of small local dynasties, which transferred their allegiance to the predominant power of the day. This received its culmination in the rise of the Rajputs and their vassal nobility.

(2) Gradual shifting of the centre of political interest from the East to the West, caused partly by the invasion and immigration of foreign races and partly through the establishment of the Islamic power on the border of north-western India.

(3) The disappearance of Republics and Republicanism.

(4) Perpetual dynastic war which wasted the resources of princes and weakened the kingdoms.

(5) Gradual disappearance of the people as an important factor in political life and the rise of regal irresponsibility, which brought with it the practical disappearance of all real checks on

regal power. Taxes came to be multiplied, the King's voice became supreme in the state, though he could not as yet claim legislative authority. This remained as the only real check on royal irresponsibility.

I. The tendency to break up is remarkable and requires no elucidation. With the fall of the Mauryas, the idea of a ruler controlling the whole of India 'up to the seas' almost passed away. As we have seen, India became divided into a number of *littorals*. Early in the IVth century A.D., five such littorals are recognizable, with a paramount power in each, and flanked by feudatory states. These included (a) the Trans-Indus regions, (b) Kashmir and the hills, (c) the Plain of Hindustan, (d) the Deccan, (e) the Tamilakam. In spite of changes of dynasties and the multiplication of new states, these divisions survived as in Harṣa's time, when we have had (a) the Trans-Indus regions under their own kings, (b) Kashmir under its own king, (c) Hindustan under its suzerain monarch, Harṣa, (d) the Deccan under Cālukya Pulakeśi II, and (e) the extreme South under its overlord the Pallava Narasimhavarman.

The reign of Harṣa, politically uneventful in the history of India, is an important landmark. As in Aśoka's case, we find his spirit of pacifism leading to another political catastrophe attended with foreign invasion, disunion and disruption. The idea of an Indian Empire strong enough to chastise the foreign foe is not only almost forgotten, but receives rather a serious condemnation from Bāṇa who holds up the prospect of an ideal India ruled by innumerable princely families. Harṣa's death was followed by an age of confusion and turmoil, which saw Chinese interference in his kingdom, while hardly before he had closed his eyes, the Mussalmans conquered the Mekran coast and began to lead raids into

India. After a century of such struggles and fightings, two new powers were established in Northern India, namely, the Pratihāras in the West and the Pālas in the East. The Deccan remained under its own suzerain power, though here a struggle went on between the rival dynasties of the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. In course of time, the Eastern Cālukyas also rose into prominence, and several dynasties, the Somavamśis and Gaṅgas, held sway in the northern part of the Coromandal coastal region. In the extreme south, the Pallavas held suzerain power for a long time but were supplanted by the Colas, the Pāṇdyas and Ceras remaining under their sway. In the Trans-Indus region, Sind and Multan passed to the Arabs, but the Shāhiya kingdom, with its capital first at Kabul and later on at Wahind (Udabhānda) under a line of Brahmin rulers, continued to hold out for nearly two more centuries.

With the dawn of the XIth century, we have had a new political condition characterised by a further break-up. The Kabul state was annexed to the Ghazni Empire after it had waged a bitter struggle against Sabuktigin and Sultan Mahmud. At the same time, the Pratihāra monarchy, which had defended the frontiers of India for nearly two centuries under-went decay and dismemberment. Its place was taken not by a single power but by a large number of new states ruled by Rajput dynasties, namely, the state of Ājmere-Sambhara under the Cāhamānas, the state of Kanauj under the Gāhaḍavālas, the state of Malwa under the Paramāras, the state of Gujarat under the Caulukyas, the Cedi state under the Kalacuris, the state of Jejākabhukti under the Candēllas. In Eastern India, the Pālas were driven from Bengal, which passed under the Senas. In the South, the Deccan, hitherto dominated by one power, was subdivided into the states

of the Yādavas of Devagiri and the Kākatīyas of Warangal, with a part passing to the Hoysālas of Dvārasamudra. The Colas ceased to exist: their northern territories passed to the Gaṅgas while the Pāṇdyas also asserted themselves for a time.

This continuous war and the tendency to break up contributed to the multiplication of feudatory families and we reach an overwhelming total towards the close of Hindu independence. Hereditary feudatory lines ruled in districts and divisions and a large part of the territories of a kingdom passed into their hands. Their existence not only weakened the central authority in the kingdoms, but also intensified the magnitude and the bitterness of wars.

It is impossible to make as yet a catalogue of these feudatory families, but their increasing number is apparent from the records which have come to us with perhaps a large number yet to be discovered. Most of these were ruled by princes of a new fighting aristocracy known as the Rajputs. The real history of the rise of the Rajputs, their organisation into thirty-six Kulas and their gradual spread over the greater part of Northern and Central India is yet to be written. Of the principalities in the region of hills, must be mentioned small states like Chamba, Mandi, Suchet or Kot Kangra, which sometimes acknowledged the supremacy of a powerful neighbour but asserted independence whenever opportunities came. New lines come to our view in the plain of Hindustan or in Rajputana. New states arose on the eastern border, and new dynasties arose in Nepal. A Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty established itself in a part of Magadha. Another minor dynasty rose near Badaun, while others arose in regions near about, namely, the Gautamas (near about Fatepur) and the Sengaras of Kanar who were subordinate to the Gāhaḍavālas. A Rāṣṭrakūṭa

dynasty arose with capital at Bijapur and another at Hastikundi. A branch of the Cedis established themselves at Ratnapur, ruling Southern Kośala. Yādava families ruled near Mathurā and Mahāvana. Petty Cāhamāna dynasties arose at Nadul and Brahmapātaka with innumerable princelings under them. These as well as minor Paramāra dynasties like those of Candrāvātī or Abu acknowledged the supremacy of the Gujarat princes or other powerful kings. Minor Tomara families in addition to those ruling at Delhi also existed. Bhaṭṭī Rajputs ruled in many places of the Punjab. Kathiawar was parcelled out among the Guhilas, Cudāsamas or Yādavas, the more important Guhila family being that of Mangrol. The Kacchapaghāṭas (originally ruling at Narwar and acknowledgeing Candella suzerainty) established themselves in the region near about Gwalior, with a branch ruling at Dubhakunda. These princes parcelled out the country among them and held as well as granted tracts of land on military service. While greater families perished these princelings continued to exist and warred against the enemies of their clan as well as the Mussalmans. To ensure the interest of their families and to command an armed retinue they parcelled out their lands among their kinsmen or the *Kulas*. In course of centuries of warfare, there arose a type of clan-feudalism which still subsists in Rajputana and many of the leading families of mediæval and modern India claim descent from these Rajput princes.

II. During this period the centre of Indian political activity moved again to the west partly on account of foreign invasions and partly owing to the immigration of races like the Hūṇas, the Jāts and the Gurjaras. In Hindustan, since the days of Harṣa, the seat of reputed imperial power was located at Kanauj. Some-

time afterwards, the pre-eminence of Kanauj passed to Delhi where the Cāhamānas established themselves and fought against the Turco-Afghans under Muhammad Ghori.

Disappearance of Republics.—Side by side republics decayed. The Vijayagadh inscription solemnising the victory of a nameless Māhārāja and Mahāsenāpati of the Yaudheyas (G. I. No. 58), is practically the last record of a non-monarchical state, if we except the traditional republican confederation of the Brahmanas of Kerala. According to local tradition the Kerala Brahmins subdivided the land into 64 districts and had it ruled by an elected official and an assembly of 64 chiefs each representing one of these divisions. After a time, there was internal discord, as a result of which power was handed over to the Perumal or local sovereign who assumed royal authority.

With the exception of this we have practically no information about any non-monarchical state or community subsisting in mediæval India. What became of them and why they perished is the question which troubles a historian. At one time non-monarchical states were a political power in the country, but, as we have noticed, they became fewer and fewer and in the age succeeding that of the Samhitās they existed only in the fringe areas or in inaccessible mountainous regions. Even in the age of foreign domination these republics, though few, succeeded in maintaining their existence and resisted their foreign and home enemies. But after the VIth century A.D. they ceased to exist altogether.

In the absence of a well recorded history the chief causes that we can assign to their disappearance are to be sought for in the changed social and political condition of the country. As we have noticed they had always come in conflict with the monarchical

principle and decayed with the rise of monarchical authority.

Indeed the rise of Magadha and Kōśala had led to the destruction of a large number of them even in the Vth century B.C. Magadha absorbed a large number of those states which existed in the lifetime of Buddha, while the Śākya, the kinsmen of Buddha, were destroyed by the tyrannical Virudhava. The despots of these days regarded these non-monarchical tribes as thorns in their own flesh and constantly sought opportunities to destroy them. The desire for the unification of the whole country also brought them face to face with these states. This is apparent from the teachings of the *Arthaśāstra*, which calls upon kings to bring Saṅghas to submission.

But there was another significant and more powerful cause of decay. As time went on and social complexities arose, these non-monarchical states lost the solid foundation on which they once were established. It is needless to point out that in most of these states, a ruling oligarchy had the sole voice in the administration. They thus dominated over a subject population which had no political power. In course of time, the latter gained in strength. Economic necessity made the ruling tribe look to their assistance. The subject populations seem to have multiplied and as they increased in importance, the rule of the oligarchy became something odious to them. The domination of one clan or of few families could hardly be tolerated, and thus it contributed to the weakening of the non-monarchical states. Monarchy, on the other hand, stood on a higher level. The king, however despotic or tyrannical he might have been, could not but recognise the needs of the classes and the castes. Under monarchical rule the castes received not only protection but a recognition of their caste-laws and the customs and usages of their

community. Caste, in later time, took a turn towards a "racial federation," and the castes retaining a certain amount of internal autonomy gladly accepted royal rule which looked to the recognition of their rights and customs as an accepted principle.

The next cause was the internal jealousy between the chiefs and families. Nothing more need be said on this head. The history of the Yādavas proves it. Buddha too warns against mutual jealousy and the crafty monarchist of the IVth century B.C. clearly shows how corporations could be easily destroyed by adding fuel to the fire of jealousy existing between families or individuals.

All these factors contributed to the weakening of the republican clans or tribes. Then, with the weakening of the Gupta power in Hindustan, there began another series of foreign invasions and migrations of trans-frontier peoples to India. In the midst of this turmoil, tribe-leaders or oligarchs were compelled to change their old attitude of local independence and political isolation. Many such turned their energies to greater advantage by allowing themselves to be merged in the new fighting aristocracy and turning dynasts themselves. Instances of such are not wanting; the Licchavis established a dynasty in Nepal, while the Yādavas, so long associated with the non-monarchical principle, established principalities for themselves and one of these ruling families established a considerable empire.

India a Medley of States.—Thus, on the eve of Mussalman invasion India was transformed into a medley of states, owning no suzerain and having no political purpose and the country suffered from the evils of perennial dynastic wars. Its ruling princes were continuously fighting against one another without deigning to think of peacefully

governing their states or respecting the rights of their neighbours. Each state had its enemies on all its flanks with allies in the rear of these enemies. The country suffered from the evils of an unstable political equilibrium. War was the normal objective of princes, war for self-preservation on the part of the weaker kings, and war of aggression for the stronger. Once a war broke out, the commotion was felt throughout the country and princes held themselves in readiness for resisting enemies or coming to the succour of allies. Ambitious conquerors traversed vast distances to impose their suzerainty upon weaker princes. Thus, the Pālas under Dharmapāla advanced as far west as Kanauj, the Pratihāras advanced from western India to the heart of Hindustan, and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas traversed the whole of the south and the Deccan to wrest the sovereignty of Kanauj from the Pratihāras. Each state had its enemies on all sides. Thus the Pālas suffered attacks from the east, from the west by the Pratihāras and from the south by the Colas and later on by the Senas. The Pratihāras were similarly assailed on all sides. They were attacked by the Pālas from the east, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas from the south, by their feudatories from Bundelkhand and the Mussalmans from the west. The Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan were similarly assailed by the Tamil power from the south while they had to resist the attacks of the northern powers. The predominant Tamil powers, the Pallavas and the Colas, were in their turn constantly fighting their northern enemies in addition to their own rebellious vassals.

During the last phase of political existence, the evils of this internecine warfare appear more prominently. Chivalrous and brave as the Rajputs were, their narrow-minded clannish patriotism did nothing but plunge the country into the evils of perennial warfare. Each Rajput clan had its circle of enemies

all round and the attainment of superior position by any ruler was sure to cause a series of attacks on it. Thus, the Paramāras of Malwa waged war on all sides and were attacked in turn by the Cālukyas from the south, the Cedis from the east and the Gujarat Cālukyas from the west. They, in their turn, did the same act of aggression to their neighbours and such wars were always accompanied by acts of cruelty. King Muñja led 16 expeditions against the Cālukyas, only to be defeated and put to death by the enemy in the last expedition. The Cālukyas of Gujarat warred with tenacity and vigour on all the adjacent states, namely on Malwa and Ajmer. Similarly, the Cāhamānas were waging war on three fronts, namely, against the Caulukyas in the west, against the Candellas, Tomaras and Gāhadavālas in the east, with the Mussalmans on the west. Similar was the case with the Cedis and the Gāhadavālas of Kanauj. In such a state of affairs, the resources of princes and of dynasties were sure to be spent up in course of these internecine wars. The maximum life of a dynasty was not more than two centuries and unless an able or warlike king was succeeded by an efficient prince on his throne a catastrophe was sure to follow. Foreign invaders and rebellious vassals often completed the ruin of great royal lines.

Savagery in Warfare.—The wars of the period were characterised by a savagery and inhumanity which gave the country a foretaste of the brutalities of foreign conquerors later on. In course of these struggles, the laws of war were often forgotten and horrible miseries were inflicted on the unoffending people of the contending states. Populous cities were often plundered with inhumanity or were destroyed with fire and sword. Very few of the capital cities thus escaped destruction by enemies. As instances of these, we may cite the burning of Vātāpi by the Pallavas and the repeated

sacking of Kāñcī by the Cālukyas who dominated the Deccan. We have information on these points from the conquerors themselves, since the princes of this period were not ashamed to proclaim their own brutal exploits. And we may cite the boast of a Rāstrakūṭa king that he had reduced the great city of Kanañj into *Kuśasthālī*. Similarly, the Colas assumed the title of Madhurāntaka to signalise their destruction of the city of Mādura. Another Cola king boasted of having burned Kalyan, the capital of the later Cālukyas. Other capital cities like Mānyakheta, Dhārā or Anhilawarpattana fared no better. The Paramāra Siyaka sacked Malkhed, while Dhārā repeatedly suffered at the hands of the Cālukyas and other enemies. Anhilwara experienced the same fate.

Not to speak of cities, provinces and countries suffered terribly. The sack of Gujarat by Kulacandra became proverbial. The Colas claimed to have burned the Kalinga country (S.I.I. III.79). Vikrama Cola claimed to have burned not only the Kalinga country but also the city of Kāmpili as well as the whole of Raṭṭapadī. As to the burning of the Rāstrakūṭa country by Rājendra Cola, we have an account in the Soratur inscription. According to that record, the Cola army numbering 9,00,000 pillaged the whole country slaughtering Brahmanas, women and children and destroyed the modesty of women by forcibly carrying them off. Another Cola record speaks of the destruction of non-combatants while the Hoysāla Viṣṇuvardhana claims to have burned enemy towns and territories (Fleet, D. K. D., p. 496). In course of these savage wars, little consideration was shown to fallen enemies and victors did not hesitate to take the lives of their defeated rivals. Eminent princes of this period like Pulakeśi II, Muñja, Tailapa or Bhoja suffered death at the hands of unrelent-

ing enemies. The story of the cruel indignities heaped upon Muñja and his sad end is almost shocking. His death was avenged by Bhoja who in his turn suffered a cruel death at the hands of the Cālukyas. Sindhurāja was probably killed by Cāmuṇḍa of Gujarat. The Rāṣtrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I claims to have put to death some Eastern Cālukya prince while the same boast is made by Jaitrapāla, the Yādava king of Devagiri, who put to death in cold blood the defeated Kākatīya prince Rudradeva. The record of the Colas is worse than shocking. We have repeated mention of the decapitation of the conquered Pāṇḍya king and of other rivals. In some other records belonging to Rājādhirāja and Vīra Rājendra I, we have the account of Mānābharana Pāṇḍya being decapitated while a Kerala prince is described as having been trampled to death under the feet of an elephant. Brutal also is the record of the Gujarat kings and Kumārapāla, supposed to have been a Jain, boasts of having put a conquered king of Malwa in a cage while he had the severed head of another suspended at the gate of his own palace.

Ladies of princely families very often suffered at the hands of the enemies of their family. Thus Harṣa's sister Rājyaśrī was put in chains. The Cola Vīra Rājendra I boasted of having captured and enslaved the wives of Āhavamalla. We have still something worse and Vīra Rājendra boasts of having killed a chief, enslaved the sister and daughter of a conquered prince and cut off the ears and nose of the mother of a defeated enemy. (S. I. I. III, No. 20).

The destruction of sacred places was not unknown. One West Cālukya inscription formally accuses the Cola king of having burnt Jain temples in the Belvola province. The Vaiṣṇavas of the South level similar charges against the Colas,

THE PEOPLE AND THE PROVINCES

The People.—In the midst of this perennial warfare, the people ceased to be an important factor in the political life of the country. They had neither the right nor the voice to control their kings. They became more or less a passive agent in the domain of public administration and their business was to obey their masters, leaving them to mould their destiny. In the big military monarchies of the day, no representative Assemblies existed in which the people could voice their sentiments. The ministers only and the feudatories could speak before the king, but the former depended on the king for advancement while in the case of the latter, their importance depended on their military strength. The priestly classes enjoyed a position of privilege, since the Brāhmaṇa was the sacerdotal order and expounded the law, but even then they worked more to their own interest by living in peace than force their will upon kings. The latter also did their best to protect or reward them.

This condition of abject dependence of the common people was, however, ameliorated to some extent by the excellent system of local autonomy which prevailed in the different provinces of India. Everywhere, the village community flourished with unabated vigour. Like small self-sufficient republics they managed their own affairs, adjusted their own socio-economic arrangements and carried on life in spite of wars and invasions. In addition to village communities, the merchants and artisans had their guilds and these often took upon themselves many of the local duties. They managed the affairs of temples, organised poor relief, established endowments for various purposes and did everything in their power to ensure local peace and prosperity.

In course of time, municipal bodies arose in towns of various provinces and these carried on the administration of the localities.

The activity of these bodies often compensated for the neglect or preoccupation of the central authority and these did much to ensure the economic prosperity of the country. But often, the evils of despotic system told upon the people and in extreme cases of continued misrule, they rose either in rebellion or welcomed successful usurpers to end the tyranny of princes, who added to taxes, violated the primary rights of the people or denied justice to their subjects. In theory the moral right of revolution resided in the people and they chose new rulers to supplant tyrants who had proved themselves incompetent to rule.

The large number of states which existed in India hardly possessed any permanent boundaries or linguistic or ethnic peculiarities. They varied more or less in extent and population and their prosperity or decline depended on the character and military strength of their rulers. At first, the tribal principle predominated in the states but, gradually, that was substituted by the sovereign authority of a ruling dynasty. From the VIth century B.C., the process of unification was launched by the contemporary rulers of Eastern India. Under the Emperor Aśoka, the unifying movement reached its high watermark but with the disruption of the Empire and the foreign invasion the ideal of an All-India Empire passed away.

After the revival of Hindu political influence, India came to comprise different geographical units, each dominated by one powerful dynasty, keeping under check a number of feudatories. In the midst of perennial war, dynasties changed and feudatories multiplied. But in the midst of this turmoil, it is difficult not to note the ever-growing consciousness of local separatism and

divergences of manners and customs made more defined and reinforced by the growth of the Prākṛit dialects.

Local feeling had been growing ever since the spread of Aryan culture in India, and even in the Dharmasūtras, we find a discrimination between the land of the Aryans, and the land of the outer settlers, together with a denunciation of the men of the fringe areas like Vāṅga, Aṅga, Kalinga. At the same time, the great difference in the manners and customs of the North and the South is emphasised. In course of time, local differences were intensified by local influences. The varied degree of foreign domination as well as the growth of the various Prākṛit dialects and Apabhraṃśas contributed to this local separatism. By the time of Vātsyāyana, the people of different localities came to possess certain peculiarities in social life and mentality and he notes these with a view to emphasising the differences in social and sexual life. Of the localities differentiated on the basis of these peculiarities, the following are prominently mentioned (according to *Deśasātmya*):—

1. Madhyadeśa—Between Himalaya and Vindhya, up to Prayāga in the East. *Comm.*
2. Bālhika—Uttarāpatha. *Comm.*
3. Land of the Indus Rivers—The Punjab.
4. Avantī—Region about Ujjain and western Malwa. *Comm.*
5. Lāṭa—West of western Malwa.
6. Mālava—Eastern Malwa. *Comm.*
7. Aparānta—Region bordering the western seas. *Comm.*
8. The country of the Abhiras—Near Śrīkaṇṭha and Kurukṣetra.

9. The country of the Nāgarikas—Region about Pāṭaliputra.
10. Kośala and Strīrājya.
11. Andhra—East of the Karṇāṭa region. *Comm.*
12. Mahārāṣṭra—Between the Narmadā and Karṇāṭa Viṣaya. *Comm.*
13. Drāvīda—South of Karṇāṭa Viṣaya. *Comm.*
14. Strīrājya—West of Vajravanta country. *Comm.*
15. Vanavasī—East of Kaṅkaṇa Viṣaya. *Comm.*
16. Gauḍa—Eastern India.

Coming to a study of the events of Indian political life, we find a considerable element of consciousness in the minds of the people of some localities. The most prominent of such localities are Mahārāṣṭra, Karṇāṭa and Tamil India (land of the Drāvidas, Colas and Keralas). Between the Tamil powers (Cola or Pallava) and the power in Mahārāṣṭra there is a feeling of perennial enmity. The Andhras too are on the way to developing a separate ethnic unit under their kings and a similar spirit is discernible in Orissa. The Gauḍas display their consciousness in resisting the supremacy of the Guptas and other Hindustan powers and gradually Prāgiyotiṣa is on the way to separation politically. Local separatism is fostered in Nepal and in Kashmir by their local isolation. A similar tendency is noticeable in Gujarat. In the Punjab and in the extreme north-western border region the constant influx of new peoples and foreign invaders tends to give the people of those regions a new turn in their political aspirations. Mālava comes to be regarded as a unit ethnically and geographically by its rulers who take the title of Mālava-Cakravartī. Similar is the feeling in Kalinga whose kings take the title of Trikaṇṇa-nātha.

As yet, however, this separatism did not give rise to a spirit of what we call nationalism. But the process of separatism was being fast accelerated. The provincial vernaculars were on the way to their evolution and the writers of *Nibandhas* were noting down the peculiar customs of the different localities. The normal process was, however, far from its culmination when foreign invasions brought a new political condition.

In such a state of affairs, the dynasties remained the more active agents in moulding the destinies of the localities. These dynasties were many and numerous and produced powerful rulers, but none among the latter could seriously think of establishing a real Empire, after the old Mauryan ideal.

As a rule, these dynasties ended with a few generations of powerful rulers and most of them were short-lived, being either swept away by foreign invaders or by rival princely houses. The average life of royal lines hardly exceeded two centuries, the more important of the long-enduring lines being the Guptas, with their branches, the Eastern Cālukyas, the Pālas, the Colas. It was a misfortune that the dynasties of the Cālukyas of Badami (c. 550-752), the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (c. 752-973) or the Pratihāras (c. 750-980) did not subsist more than two centuries. Perhaps, the constant warfare of their kings exhausted the resources and the genius of the family earlier.

The history of the states of India is practically the history of the great dynasties.

II

Kingship

The supreme authority in all states was vested in the king who took pompous styles and titles to designate his sovereign authority. In theory he was bound to take the advice of his ministers and to consult the opinion of the people. But in reality Hindu kings of this period were irresponsible and their power depended on their own personal qualities as well as on the strength of the army. The consolidation of the army, maintenance of its proper discipline and the preservation of the loyalty of the military chiefs were of prime concern to the king, since otherwise the king's hold on the throne and the kingdom was bound to be precarious. First of all, without the army, the security of the state could hardly exist inasmuch as, in the contemporary political world, there was hardly any political equilibrium. No prince could rest in peace in his own kingdom, but every moment expected attacks from his powerful neighbours. Likewise, when a king found himself in possession of a strong military force, he considered it beneath his dignity to remain at peace, since a war of conquest was the normal object of a king's life. Once a war broke out, it was bound to cause complications throughout the whole circle of states. The conqueror's allies as well as those of his enemies marshalled their forces and the shock was bound to be felt throughout the country.

Next to this war against outside enemies, the king had to ensure his own safety by maintaining a strong hold upon his

feudatories, who were ever ready to revolt. Except the smaller feudatories who had no other alternative than to remain content with their limited territories or resources the other feudatories were often bent on creating trouble, and it is well-known to readers of Indian History how powerful monarchies like those of the Guptas or the Pratihāras suffered dismemberment as soon as the king's authority decayed, which occasion was snatched by feudatories to establish independent rule. Weaker feudatories merely remained content with transferring their allegiance to the more powerful conqueror of the day. In some states feudatories often leagued either to destroy the central power or to put a nominee of their own on the throne. The Sanjan plates (Ep. Ind. XVIII) give us at least two instances of the rising of the chiefs against the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. From the Kalasa Ins. (I. A. XIII-19), we know that the revolt of Arikesarin was the cause of Govinda IV's downfall.

His Functions and Duties.—War and diplomacy thus absorbed the main attention of Indian rulers, and the work of civil administration was generally left to ministers. With the exception of some south Indian kings or the founders of the greatness of the different dynasties, kings generally ceased to be as hard working in the cause of their subjects as in the days of the Arthaśāstra or of the Emperor Aśoka.

Under such circumstances, kings generally divided their time between the life in the camp and the pleasures of regal life. The prominence of camp life is obtainable from the repeated mention of the *Jaya-skandhāvāra* in the inscriptions of the various dynasties and in the case of Bengal kings it is difficult to find out their capital or to decide whether they had any fixed capital city at all.

While in the capital city, kings generally attended their *darbar* and heard law-suits because they were the highest judges in

the realm, according to the principles of Hindu law. But as a rule, towards the close of the Hindu period, their work had been vested in Prādvivākas or trained judges and only in rare cases kings exercised the right of appeal. Some Kashmir kings like Candrāpīḍa made themselves prominent by their judicial activity.

Apart from their judicial functions, kings commanded the army, though feudatories or professional military officers headed contingents or led military expeditions. Kings, however, could not put implicit trust in all of them, because, ambitious generals had more often asserted independence or had put an end to the lines of their masters like Puṣyamitra or Vijjala Kalacurya who usurped the Cālukya throne.

While at rest from military pursuits, kings generally issued their commands to district officers or heads of department or supervised grants of land to individuals or the grant of privileges to communes. They often modified the items of taxation, levied new ones or sometimes repealed those which preyed heavily on the people. Remissions of such taxes were, however, few if any. On the other hand, the items of royal exactions went on increasing day by day as we shall see later on.

Prerogatives of Royalty.—The king's powers and prerogatives were almost unbounded. The supreme head of the executive, the highest judge, the commander-in-chief of his army, the king was also the first man in the state. His person was clothed with moral sanctity and he had a number of legal privileges, which we have already mentioned (Pt. I., p. 301). He was immune from arrest and trial in a law court, his proprietary rights did not suffer from prescriptions and he was the final owner of all goods and chattels lost, as well as of property without heir. He also had the right of claiming hospitality and had the power to requisition supplies for himself and the army. In social matters and caste disputes, later

Hindu kings often interferred and we may mention Ballālasena of Bengal prominently in this connexion.

As regards the making of laws, however, the king had no right or authority. That was left to the law-givers and commentators and in the absence of laws, customs had the authority of laws. Kings however issued edicts to repeal obnoxious customs as we know from the evidence of the Daśa-kumāra-carita.

Styles and Titles.—Kings assumed various styles and titles. Generally speaking, a suzerain and independent king assumed the title of *Parama bhaṭṭāraka* (or in Kanarese Bhatara, in the south) *Parameśvara* and *Cakravartin*. The other titles usually were *Mahārājādhirāja*, but towards the close of the Hindu period, this title had also been assumed by feudatories of the Pratihāras.

In addition to these, other titles describing the king's allegiance to a particular deity were assumed. Thus the Guptas designated themselves *Parama-bhāgavata*, the Śaka Satraps called themselves *Parama māheśvara*, the Pālas called themselves *Parama-saugata*, while among the Vākātakas, some kings called themselves, *Parama-Bhairava-bhaktā*. Of later princes, the Gāhadavālas were designated by themselves, *Parama-māheśvara* while among the Pratihāras, we have *Parama-māheśvaras*, *Parama-vaiṣṇavas*, *Parama-sauras* and *Parama-śaktibhaktas* as well. The Eastern Cālukyas assumed in addition the title of *Parama-brahmanya*, while the Kadambas, Pallavas and some of the Gaṅgas and other kings assumed the title of *Dharma-mahārāja*. The Gaṅgas and some of the princes of the southern lines assumed the title of *Permarrdi* (Fleet, D. K. D. 303).

Each family assumed in addition other titles designative of power or might. The Gupta kings assumed titles ending in *Āditya* like *Vikramāditya*, *Kramāditya*, *Mahendrāditya*, etc. The

Rāṣṭrakūṭas assumed titles ending in *Varṣa* and *Tuṅga* in addition to *Vallabha*, *Srīvallabha* or *Sri-Prṭhivī-Vallabha-narendra*. The names of the Cālukyas of Vātāpi end occasionally in *āditya* and they take the high title of *Sri-Prṭhivī-Vallabha* or merely *Prṭhivī-vallabha*. Thus Krisna I was *Akālavarṣa* and *Subhatuṅga*, Dhruva was *Kalivallabha* and *Nirupama*, Govinda III was *Prabhūtarṣa*, *Jagattuṅga*, *Janavallabha*, as well as *Srī-Prṭhivī-vallabha* and *Sri-vallabha-narendradeva*, etc. Amoghavarṣa was *Nṛpatuṅga*, Śarva, Atiśayadhabala, Mahārāja-Śaunda. Krisna II was *Akālavarṣa* and *Subhatuṅga*, Govinda IV was *Nṛpatuṅga* and *Prabhūtarṣa* and *Hiranayavarṣa*. Krisna III was not only designated by the usual titles but was a *parama-māheśvara*, *Akālavarṣa*, *Samastabhubanāśraya*, *Kandharapuravarādhiṣvara*.

The later Cālukyas of Kalyan generally assumed titles ending in *Malla* in addition to other such. Thus, Taila II called himself *Samastabhuvanāśraya*, *Sri-prṭhivīvallabha*, *Satyāśrayakulatilaka*, *Cālukyabhuṣana* and *Bhujabalacakravartin*. The eastern Cālukya kings assumed names ending in *Siddhi* (*Vīṣamasiddhi*, *Ṛtasiddhi*, *Vijayasiddhi*, etc.) and called themselves *Parama-brahmanya*.

The Kalacurya Bijjala took the titles of *Kalacurya-cakravartin* or *Kalacurya-bhujabalacakravartin* in addition to *Samastabhuvanāśraya* and *Srīprṭhivīballava*. His successor Somideva called himself *Rayamurāri* and *Bhujabalamalla*. The Hoysālas took the additional title of *Hoysāla-Cakravartin* and *Yādava-Cakravartin* in addition to *Samastabhuvanāśraya* and *Srīprṭhivīballava*. Some princes took the title *Nihsanka-Cakravartin*; the Yādavas of Devagiri called themselves *Dvāravatīpuradhīśvara* in addition to *Samastabhubanāśraya* and *Srīprithivīballava*.

The Pratiharas called themselves *Hayapati* while some kings of Bengal, as well as many of Kalinga were known as *Gajapati*. The Gāhaḍavalas of Kanauj and the Cedis of Haihaya, later on

assumed the triple title of Hayapati, Gajapati and Narapati. The Yādava Sinhana called himself “Mahodaya-prauḍha-pratāpa Cakravartin.” In the south, the Colas assumed pompous titles like *Tribhuvanacakravartin* while princes like Vīra-rājendra added to it epithets like Sakalabhuvanāśraya, Srīmedinī-vallabha, Pāndya-kulātanka, etc. Among them there was the custom of taking the title Parakesarivarman and Rājakesarivarman alternately. The Orissa and Cedi kings called themselves *Tri-kalinganātha* while some of the Paramāra princes assumed the title of Mālava-Cakravartin. Samudragupta was called Sarva-rājocchettā.

Individual princes assumed peculiar titles showing their learning, military exploits or other attainments. Thus Govinda-Candra called himself Vividha-vicāravācaspati. Some of the Colas called themselves Panditas. Kumarpāla prided himself on his conquest of Arnorāja. Govinda Rāṣtrakūṭa calls himself Sāhasānka, Raṭṭakandarpa, Nṛpati-Trinetra. The Colas called themselves Madhurāntakas and sometimes Simhalāntaka. Narasimhavarman Pallava called himself *Vatapi-konda* while Rajendra Cola called himself *Gangai-konda* (E. I. XVIII, No. 4). The innumerable names of the Pallava king Rājasinḥa are found in Kāñcīpuram temple inscription (S. I. I., I pp. 14—18).

Emblems and Crests.—The different families had their distinctive banners, crests or emblems, in addition to the ordinary insignia of royalty namely, the white umbrella, the crown, the throne, the royal coach, the fan (vyajana) and the chowri (cāmara).

Thus the Guptas had the *Garuḍa* as their banner. The seal of the Valabhi princes was the bull. The boar was the distinctive emblem of the Cālukyas of Badami who had also the Pālidvaja banner, the sign of Gaṅgā and Yamunā and the Dhakkā drum,

which they obtained by advancing to the north (I. A. IX P. 129, Fleet D. K. D. P. 368). While the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had the Pāli-dvaja banner and the Garuḍa seal (*mudrā*) and the Oka Ketu (bird ensign). (See Sirier Ins. D. K. D. P. 402). The Seunas or Yādavas had a standard bearing the golden Garuḍa. The Kalacuryas had the flag with the figure of a golden bull and the bull seal (Rice 78). The Raṭṭas of Saundatti had the elephant crest and the Garuḍa banner. The emblem of the conqueror Yaśodharman was the *aulikara* (*aulikara-lāñchana*), (see G. I. P. 151), meaning either the sun or the moon. The Maukhari seals contain a bull walking to the left with two attendants. In the south, the flag of the Bāṇas displayed a black buck and their crest was a bull. The Pāla records contain a peculiar Buddhist representation.

The emblem of the Colas was the tiger. The Kalacuryas carried the golden bull banner (*Suvarna-vṛṣabha-dhvaja*) and the Damaruka heralded them (D. K. D., p. 469). The banner of the Kadambas was the monkey (*sākhā-cara-narendra-dhvaja*) but they had the lion crest (*siṃha-lāñchana*) as well as peculiar musical instruments. As regards the Pallavas, the Kurram plates bear the usual Pallava seal of the sitting bull. (See also Baikunṭha-perumal Ins. S. I. I. IV). Their other emblems were the *Khaṭṭvāṅga* and the *Samudraghoṣa* drum (Fleet D. K. D., p. 319). The Vinbukadaduti Hāritiputra Sātakarṇi had as his emblem a five-hooded cobra (Fleet D. K. D. I., I. A. XIV, p. 331). The Gaṅgas of Talkad had the rutting elephant as their banner while their crest was the *picchadhvaja* or feather-bunch (Rice, p. 30. D. K. D., p. 299). The Nalas had the three-flag emblem (XIX, No. 17). The emblem of the Hoysālas was the figure of a man killing a tiger while their seal contained the representation of a dead tiger with a rod. Some of the Kākatiya records contain a seal

with representation of the sun, the crescent, the boar and the cow. The Sindas of Sindavādi had a blue flag (*Nīladhvajā*) with the tiger and the deer crest (Rice, p. 147). Some other branches had the tiger crest and hooded snake banner. Another southern dynasty had the banner of snakes (E. I. XIX, No. 29). The Senavaras had the serpent flag and the lion crest. The emblem of the Pāṇdyas was the twin fish. The Sendrakas had the elephant emblem though they called themselves *Bhujagendra* family. The Guttas of Guttal had the lion crest and the fig tree and Garuḍa banner. The Yādavas of Devagiri had (in addition to the Garuḍa banner and the Garuḍa seal) sometimes the *Hanumat* crest. Some of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had on their seal the god Śiva. The Paramāras had the Garuḍa emblem, while the Cāhamānas had on their coins the figure of a horseman. The Cedis of Ratnapura had the *Gajalakshmī* as their seal. The Candella plates contain the figure of Lakṣmī.

Private Income.—To maintain their dignity, kings had ample revenues arising out of various sources which differed in the different provinces.

They seem to have in addition their own *demesnes* or *Svabhogas*, which supplemented their personal income. Out of these, grants were made to queens or royal princes as we find in the Karnāṭa inscriptions.

In those days there was no distinction between state income and the income of the king as was the case in mediaeval Europe. The revenue of the state was the king's revenue and he was the best judge in matters of expenditure. The amount of expenditure on the different heads cannot be ascertained. The Śukranīti, however, makes an attempt to lay down the amount to be spent on the king's own household.