

Chapter - III

Political History from 10th Century A. D. to

11th Century A. D.

The glory and brilliance of the Pāla empire which reached its Zenith during the rule of Devapāla whose suzerainty was acknowledged over a considerable part of Northern India from Kāmarūpa to the territories of the Hūṇa - Kambojas, perhaps even to the southern most extremity of India, did not last long. The rule of his successors Vigrahapāla, Nārāyaṇapāla, Rājyapāla, Gopāla II and Vigrahapala II comprising the period from C 847 A.D. - C 977 A.D. was marked by the steady decline and disintegration of the Pāla empire and the advantage was taken over by the Pāla chieftains who unfurled the flag of independence in different parts of Bengal in view of the decadance of the Pāla empire, the pace of which was infact hastened during the reign of Nārāyaṇapāla. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kings Amoghavarsha and Kṛishna III also succeeded in defeating the power of Gauda, Vaṅga, Aṅga and Magadha¹.

The decline of the Gurjara - Pratihāra empire also provided opportunity to the powers like the Kalachuris and the Chandellas to rise to power which upset the political

stability of Northern India. The Pālas had to bear the brunt of the attack and almost reeled beneath the staggering blows of these and other powers². The Chandella King Yaśovarman appears to have made successful attack against the Gaudas³ and his son Dhaṅga claims to have imprisoned the queens of Rādha and Aṅga⁴. Though the claims are sometimes exaggerated, there remains little doubt in our mind about the weakness and helplessness of the Pāla authority resulting in the emergence of several minor independent dynasties in different parts of Bengal.

The Kambojas

The Kamboja usurpation was the first blow to the Pāla empire which led them to give up their hold upon their paternal territory of Varendrī and it gave the Kambojas the opportunity to assume the title of Gaudapati, the position which was held by the Pāla emperors for several generations as indications of their paramount authority.

Now question naturally comes to our mind. Firstly, who were the Kambojas ? Secondly, How did they come into prominence ? In the inscriptions of Aśoka, a Kamboja

country is mentioned along with 'Yona' which lay on the North-Western frontier of India. The Kambojas were mentioned with the Yavanas and they spoke a language partly Indo - Aryan and partly Iranian⁵. Their country had great reputation for horses to which there are allusions in the Mahābhārata and in the Buddhist literature. This reputation must have reached even far off Eastern India as is evident from the references to the Kamboja horses of Devapāla in his Mongyr and Nālandā grants. The context of the passage where it occurs as well as its association with horses would seem to indicate that the composer of the inscription was referring to the Kambojas who are coupled with the Gāndhāras and placed somewhere near Āfgānisthān⁶. N. G. Majumdar has pointed " If horses could be brought to Bengal from the North-Western frontier of India during the Pāla period, it is not unreasonable to suppose that for trade and other purposes, some adventurers could also have found their way into their province"⁷. According to Foucher, Nepalese tradition applied the name Kamboja-desā to Tibet⁸. It has been supposed by R. P. Chanda that the Kamboja Gaudapati probably came from Tibet, Bhutan or some other Himalayan country at the head of a Mongolian horde who are now represented by Koch and the Paliyās of Northern

Bengal, also known as Rājabaṅśīś⁹.

In the Tibetan work 'Pag-sam-jon-Zang' there are references to both the Kambojas and eastern one is identified as hailing Lusai Hill tract between Burma and Bengal¹⁰. But the work is of later time and there is nothing to show of the existence of the dynasty in the North-Eastern frontier in the 10th Century A.D. It is likely that there was a Gāndhāra and possibly also a Kamboja as well on the North-Eastern frontier of India near the regions known as Yunnan and Szechwan".

It is known that these conquerers of North Bengal might have come from that direction. 'The history of the Brahmaputra Valley' tells us more than one Mongoloid invasions on its North-Eastern frontier and the extension of the power of some of these conquerers to the West beyond the Karatoyā was not impossible. The Nidhanpur copper plate supplies us with the information of the conquest of part of North Bengal by the Kāmarūpa King Bhāskaravarman¹².

It is evident from some sources that the Tibetan Kings like Khrisrong-Idabtsan (C 755 A.D. - C 797 A.D)

invaded India and Mutigtbanpo (C 804 A.D. - C 815 A.D) defeated Dharmapāla and Ral-pa-chan possibly advanced as far as Gaṅgāsāgara¹³.

One Kamboja clan had shown a spirit of restlessness against the neighbour during the reign of Devapāla who defeated and crushed their power for sometime. But the lesson was forgotten during the decadance of the Pāla authority and the Kambojas entering North Bengal found themselves strong enough to proclaim the mastery of Gauda¹⁴.

Mahipala in his copper plate grant claims to have recovered the territory occupied by some intruders from his forefathers. This paternal territory (rājyam pitraṃ) has been identified by some scholars on the strength of the evidence of Sandhyākara Nandī who describes Varendrī as Janaka - Bhu in his Rāmacharita¹⁵. But North Bengal was under the control of the Pālas not of the Kambojas at that time. Again, the ancestral homeland of the Pālas was Vaṅgāla not North Bengal. It is known that the Kambojas during the rule of Mahipāla I (C 977 A.D. - C 1027 A.D) were ruling over a small principality of

of South - Western Bengal and it is not known whether Mahīpāla supplanted them from that region as there are some evidences to show of their rule in the South-Western Bengal after him. Two images erected during the 3rd or 4th regnal year of Mahīpāla have been found in Bāghāura and Nārāyanapur villages in the district of Comilla lying within the territory of the Chandras. So it may be inferred that Mahīpāla probably succeeded in forcing the Chandras to acknowledge his suzerainty. The contemporary Chandra King Ladaha Chandra might have gone on pilgrimage to Prayāga and Vārānasī crossing the territory of Mahīpāla I as subservientally¹⁶.

The Dinajpur plate of records the construction of a Śiva temple by a King of Gauda of the Kamboja family. There are differences of opinion among scholars about the meaning of the compound Kuñjaraghaṭāvarshena inscribed in it¹⁷. Rajendralal Mitra refers it to a Chronogram in the sense of Śaka 888 (966 A.D.)¹⁸. Bhandarkar considers it as an adjunct to the subject 'Gaudapati' meaning "he who pours with an array of elephants"¹⁹. This compound may also be taken to imply that the Gaudapati is very fortunate and rich, being sprinkled with the water from the pots held by Lakshmi's elephants.²⁰

There is no unanimity of opinion among scholars about the date of the inscription. According to R.P. Chanda, the editor of the Dinajpur pillar inscription, this plate is to be placed from palaeographic considerations between the Bādāl pillar inscription and the Deopārā prasasti of Vijayasena and more accurately between Bāngad plate or in the 10th Century A.D.²¹

There are some evidences in support of the view that the Kambojas flourished in the North Bengal or Varendrī in the early part of the 10th Century A.D. The Paśchimbhāg copper plate of Śrīchandra informs us of the attack of the city by Trailokyachandra in about C 920 A.D, by the Gaudapati Kuñjaraghaṭāvarsha. So it may be assumed that Kuñjaraghaṭāvarsha might have flourished in North Bengal sometime about C 915 A.D. - C 925 A.D.²²

The discovery of a copper plate at Irdā²³ enables us to form a correct estimate of the nature and effect of the Kamboja usurpation. The Irdā plate issued by Nayapāla belonging to the family of Rājyapāla is of

great historical importance. Rājyapāla has been described as Saugata while his son and successor Nārāyanapāla has been described as a devotee of Vāsudeva. They all assumed the full imperial titles like Parameśvara, Paramabhātāraka and Mahārājādhirāja. The Irdā plate records the grant of land in the Dandabhuktimāṇḍala within the Vardhamānabhukti²⁴. Dandabhukti has been rightly identified by K.D. Banerjee with Midnapore and Balasore districts²⁵. The Kamboja King of Gauda of the Dinajpur plate and the princes of the Irdā plate represent one and the same family. From this source, it is evident that the Kambojas seized not only North Bengal, but also the South-Western portion of the province including the Vardhamānabhukti. They had their Capital at Priyaṅgu which is still unidentified.²⁶

The Kambojas succeeded in Bengal due to several factors. It may be due to the possible superiority in the use of horse in battle. On the other hand, the Chandra and Pāla Kings were Buddhists while the Kambojas were generally held to be the devotee of Hindu Gods Vishnu and Śiva. Probably the Buddhist creed, professed by the Pālas and the Chandras, was declining in Gauda where the

Kambojas might have been welcomed in consideration of their attachment to Brāhmanical religion.²⁷

It has been explained that the Kamboja usurpation of the 10th Century A.D. was a revolt of a feudal chief of high official and R.C.Majumdar holds "it is not necessary to presume an invasion of the Kamboja tribe as is generally done". That the enrolment of the foreigners in the service of the Pālas is proved by the existence of officials like Mālava-Khaśa-Hūna-Kulika-Karṇāṭa in the service of the Pālas. The Kambojas might have been employed in the military service and raised their heads at an opportune movement as Divya did in later time. It may be mentioned in this connection that the Abyssynian chiefs in the 15th Century usurped the throne of Bengal. On the whole as R.C.Majumdar points out " we must admit that the rule of a Kamboja chief in Bengal may indicate, equally well, either an invasion of Bengal by the Kamboja tribe or the successful revolt of local chief or official in Bengal belonging to that tribe".²⁸

Regarding the decline of the Kambojas we have very little evidence with us. It is probable that Rājyapāla,

the son and successor of Nārāyaṇapāla, succeeded in recovering Varendrī or North Bengal from the clutches of the Kambojas. It is also evident from the inscription of Rājyapāla discovered somewhere in the Rajasahi district that Rājyapāla pulled out the Kambojas from North Bengal. On the other hand, the Kamboja Kings succeeded by Kuñjaraghaṭāvar-sha, did not claim to be Gauḍeśvara though the contemporary Kāmarūpa King Ratnapāla described Rājyapāla as the lord of Gauḍa. The Kāmrūpa King claims to have defeated the Gaudapati Rājyapāla near the river Gaṅgā.²⁹ Again the Bhaturiya inscription of Rājyapāla represents him as a vanquisher of many enemies" including the Chinas and in Indian tradition China often means Tibet and Mahāchina China".³⁰ The China enemies of Rājyapāla were none but the Kamboja enemies of Devapāla^{30a}.

It has been a tendency among scholars to identify the Rājyapāla both of the Pāla dynasty and of the Irdā plate of the Kambojas on several grounds. Firstly, both bear the same name and both had their queen named Bhāgyadevī and the Kamboja rulers Rājyapāla, Nārāyaṇapāla and Nayapāla appear to have assumed the names of their Pāla name-sakes.

But the identification on this basis seems to be baseless. This kind of borrowed names would appear to suggest intermarriages between the two families. The case of Kamboja Rājyapāla and his queen Bhāgyadevī both having the names of the Pāla King Rājyapāla reminds us of the Kāmarūpa King Samudravarman and his queen Dattadevī having borrowed the names of the Gupta emperor Samudragupta and his queen Dattadevī. Samudra Varman was named after his father's overlord or his maternal grandfather. A similar relationship might have existed between Kamboja Rājyapāla and Pāla Rājyapāla. Thus the Kamboja Kings of Priyaṅga might have been subordinate - of the Palas inspite of their imperial titles.³¹ Secondly, both are mentioned as Paramasaugata and both assumed the same imperial titles. But the argument against this is that the assumption of similar titles cannot in any way prove the identification. The Chandra rulers of South-Eastern Bengal also took similar titles. Thirdly, a mother's tribal name is sometimes applied to the name of her children and 'Kamboja - Vamśa - tilaka' has been taken to mean that the mother of the Pāla Rājyapāla belonged to a Kamboja family. But we do not have any reference to any matrimonial connection with the Kambojas³² and hence

D. C. Sircar's theory that ^{Pāla} Rājyapāla was connected with the Kambojas through his mother's side cannot be accepted without any positive evidence. On the other hand, Rājyapāla of this record has the epithet 'Kamboja-Vamśa-tilaka' (as ornament of the Kamboja clan). In the Rāmacharita of Sandhyākara Nandī, the Pālas are styled to have descended from the 'Samudrakula' and in the Kamauli grant they are represented as belonging to solar race. But nowhere the Kamboja origin has been attributed to the Pālas. The son & successor of Rajyapala of the Pāla dynasty was Gopala II whose name appears in the Bāngad, Āngāchi and Manahali plates. The Kings Nārāyanapāla and Nayapāla are the sons and successors of the Kamboja Rājyapāla. In case the Pālas are proved to be identical with the Kambojas, there would then be no necessary for assuming that in the 10th Century A.D. a part of the Pāla territory was lost to the Kambojas. But it has not been unanimously accepted by scholars.³³

The Chandra dynasty of South-Eastern Bengal

During the period of Pala decline several semi-independent powers came into prominence in Bengal. The most important among them were the Chandras and the Varmans.

The history of the Chandras was not fully known to us owing to the dearth of source materials. The three copper plates recently excavated from Maināmatī (two of Iadachandra and one of Govindachandra), the Dacca copper plate of Kalyānachandra and the Paśchimbhāg copper plate of Śrīchandra have brought to light the continuous rule of this dynasty spreading over a period of about a Century and a quarter. We are now able to ascertain the correct genealogy and correct order of succession of the Chandra rulers. Incidentally after the discovery of image inscription of Govindachandra³⁴ and Maināmatī plates of Iadaha-chandra³⁵, it has been now possible to connect them with the Chandra dynasty.

With the help of the newly discovered copper plates A.H.Dani³⁶ furnished the genealogical list of the Chandra dynasty as follows : -

Pūrṇachandra
 Suvarṇachandra
 Trailokyachandra
 Śrī Chandra
 Kalyānachandra
 Iadachandra
 Govindachandra.

We are also able to assign the maximum reigning period of Kings right from Śrīchandra as follows : 37

Śrī Chandra : 46 Years (cf Madanpur plate)

Kalyāṇachandra : 24 Years (cf Dacca plate)

Iadahachandra : 18 Years (cf Bharella image inscription.)

Govindachandra : 23 Years (cf Pāikpārā image inscription.)

We are, thus, able to establish a continuous rule of the dynasty of about one hundred and fifty years, if we assign the reign period of 25 years to Trailokya-Chandra who is seemed to be the first sovereign of the dynasty. The Tirumalai inscription of Rājendra Chola informs us that one Govindachandra, undoubtedly the Govindachandra of the Chandra dynasty, had been ruling in C 1021 - 24 A.D. The Tirumalai inscription³⁸ also informs us that Mahīpāla I of the Pāla dynasty, defeated by Rājendrachola of the Chola dynasty, was a contemporary of Govindachandra. The evidence of Sabdapradīpa, a medical treatise, would be of much help of us in this respect. The author's father Bhadrésvara and Bhadrésvara's father Devagana were serving during the reigns of King Rāmapāla and Govindachandra respectively.³⁹ Hence there was probably a

a gap of one generation between Govindachandra and the Pāla ruler Rāmapāla. If the calculation is accepted, then it appears that the years 1021 - 24 may be placed at the beginning of the reign of Govindachandra & thus the reign period of Govindachandra may be assigned between 1020 - 30 A.D. and counting backward it appears that King Iadachandra ruled in the period from 1000 - 1020 A.D, Kalyānchandra from 975 - 1000 A.D, Śrīchandra from 930 - 975 A.D. and Trailokyachandra who raised his position from a feudatory to independent King, may be placed between 900 - 930 A.D.⁴⁰ On the other hand, the Dacca plate of Kalyānchandra informs that Śrīchandra helped Gopāla II, the Pāla King in regaining power. It has been stated in lines 16 - 17 of the Dacca plate:-

Prithvīpāla - bhya - Pramārjana - Vidhāvārdh Kathorakama.

Govardhanonmathane mahotsava - Guru - Gopāla Samropane⁴¹

Gopāla II might have ruled from 952 - 969 A.D. and

Śrīchandra might have ruled almost contemporaneously.

The dating of the Chandra rulers with the help of sources mentioned above is also supported by the Palaeography.

Thus the reigning period may be placed to the 10th and the 11th Centuries A.D. The comparative study of the

Palaeography of Rāmapāla grant of Śrīchandra with those of the Bhāgalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla⁴², Bāngad grant Mahīpāla I of the end of the 10th and the early 11th Century, the Velāva grant of Bhojavarman of the 11th and early 12th Century A.D. had led R.D. Banerjee to conclude that the Belāva grant of Bhojavarman was slightly earlier than the Rāmapāla grant of Śrīchandra which is earlier than the Bāngad grant of Mahīpāla and the Rāmapāla grant of Śrīchandra is either contemporary or slightly later than the Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla⁴³. Thus we may reasonably conclude that Chandra dynasty flourished in the South-Eastern Bengal in the beginning of 10th Century A.D. and it lasted upto the middle of the 11th Century A.D. ?

It has been supposed that the Chandras of South-Eastern Bengal were probably connected with the Chandras of Ārākān. According to Burmese Chronicles, the Shans invaded Ārākān in the 10th Century A.D. and North Ārākān was conquered by the Burmese King Aniruddha. It has been inferred that the Chandra King were ousted by the Burmese King and a branch of them settled at Paṭṭikerā (Tippera dist) and founded a new Kingdom there. It has been held by Syed Murtaza Ali that

" the Ārākānese Chandras" reduced Harikela first by ousting the descendants of Kāntideva. Later they transferred their Capital to Paṭṭikerā reducing the area. Finally they occupied Dacca district and had their seat of Government at Vikramapura which was the Capital during the time of their greatest glory".⁴⁴ The extension of over Chittagong region⁴⁵ in the 9th Century A.D. leads us to support the eastern region of the family of Śrīchandra. The extension of Chandra power from Harikela to Chandradvīpa and to Vaṅga also strengthen the view of their eastern origin⁴⁶. The records reveal the existence of a line of Kings of Vikramapura in Eastern Bengal in the period from 950 - 1050 A.D. It is not unlikely that the Chandra Kings of Ārākān were related to the Chandras of South-Eastern Bengal⁴⁷. Bhattasali has pointed out the outlandish character of the name Laḍaha Chandra and inclines to the conclusion that he may have belonged to the Ārākānese branch. The discovery of coins very much similar to those of Arakan and terracota plaques with representation of Ārākānese and Burmese men and women at Maināmatī strongly support the connection between Ārākān and Tippera. The Maināmatī copper plate of Ranavaṅkamalla of 1219 - 20 A.D also referes to the Burmese connection with that region⁴⁸.

There is a similarity of eight coins found at Sylhet with those of the Chandra rulers of Ārākān⁴⁹". This attribution will explain the distribution of this coinage throughout South-east Bengal. This may also throw some light on the vexed problem of the origin of the Chandra rulers. At least the coins connect the Chandra rulers of the two dynasties⁵⁰.

So it is apparent that the Chandras of South-Eastern Bengal were probably connected with the Chandra of Ārākān. The only definite evidence is the similarity of coins. But there are other evidences which also do not rule out the possibility of the connection.

Regarding the original homeland of the Chandras, there is a controversy among scholars. The Rāmapāla copper plate⁵¹, the Dhulla plate⁵² and the Madanpur copper plate⁵³ of Śrīchandra informs us that they had been originally the rulers of Rohitagiri. R. D. Banerjee⁵⁴ and N. G. Majumdar⁵⁵ have identified Rohitagiri with Rātāsgarh in the Shahabad district of Bihar and therefore support the outlandish origin of the Chandras. B. C. Sen also supports the external origin of the Chandras⁵⁶. N. K. Bhattasali on the other hand identified it in the lālmāi

hills in the Comilla district⁵⁷. But D. C. Sircar refutes the view of N.K.Bhattachali on the ground that the modification of *lālmāṭi* to *lālmāi* seems to be philologically improbable. In any case, the verse under study mentioning *lālmāi* as *lālambi* shows that Bhattachali's suggestion is wrong and that it offers no challenge to the identification of Rohitagiri with *Ro-tāsgarh*⁵⁸. But other than the similarity sound and sense, there are hardly any evidence to connect Rohitagiri of the Chandra plates with *Rotāsgarh* of Bihar. On the other hand, it goes against the theory that the Chandras were at first feudatory or ally of the King of Harikela⁵⁹. So it would be more logical to identify Rohitagiri somewhere about Chandradvīpa and Harikela where Trailokyachandra and his forefathers acted as feudal lords. Haridas Mitra has located it in *Rāṅgāmāṭi* in the Chittagong Hill tracts.⁶⁰ But in view of the discovery of many other inscriptions at *Maināmāṭi* in the *lālmāi* hills, the antiquity of the place cannot be questioned anywhere and it adds support to the identification of the place with Rohitagiri.

We know very little about the first two rulers of the dynasty. They were probably feudatory chiefs. It is evident from the Madanpur plate of *Śrīchandra* that the first nobleman of the dynasty named *Pūrnachandra* was a man of much importance whose name could be " read on the pedestal of the images and

on (stone) pillars of victory and copper plates in which new epigraphs were inscribed⁶². It is possible to assume that he behaved like an independent in his own land, though he was not declared as a formal King. His son Suvarnachandra was endowed with high qualities⁶³. He was known in the world as Buddha. So it is evident that he was the first in the dynasty to embrace Buddhism. He is not described in the inscription as having ruled as a King. His son and successor Trailokyachandra was the first sovereign of the dynasty and he assumed the title of Mahārājādhirāja which is mentioned in all records as far available. He ruled from Vikramapura as the Capital of the Kingdom.

Trailokyachandra has been described in the Verse 5 of Kedarpur plate as having conquered the earth bounded by four oceans. "Trailokyachandra laid the foundation of the greatness of his family"⁶⁴. The position of Trailokyachandra is stated in verse 5 of the Madanpur plate as follows : "ādhāro - Harikelarāja--(Ka) Kuda - cchatra - smitānām - Śriyām" which has been differently enumerated by different scholars. R. G. Basak states that he was at first a King of Chandradrīpa and later became " the repository of the fortune (Goddess) whose smile was the

white umbrella, the symbol of the royalty of the King of Harikela". The net result of the political achievements of Trailokyachandra was that he was at first a King of Chandradvīpa, but later became the ruler of Harikela. The line has been differently enumerated by N. G. Majumdar who translates the verse as " the support of the fortune Goddess (of other Kings) smiling, at (Joyful on account of) the umbrella which was the royal insignia of the King of Harikela"⁶⁵. If we accept this account without any doubt, it appears that Trailokyachandra was both the defacto and dejure King of Harikela. But the account of R.G.Basak leads us to a different conclusion and indicates that Trailokyachandra was the defacto, if not the dejure ruler of Harikela. D. C. Sircar is of the opinion⁵ that he was not a King of Harikela, but was the ruler of Chandradvīpa (modern Bukherganj Dist.) owing allegiance^{to} or allied with the King of the country of Harikela. Trailokyachandra who flourished about the middle of the 10th Century A.D. perhaps owed allegiance to the line of Harikela Kings represented by Kāntideva about whom we have already discussed⁶⁶.

Śrīchandra was the first independent ruler of the dynasty to throw off the yoke of Harikela King and extended

the Chandra power over wide area of South-Eastern Bengal⁶⁷. The fact that Trailokyachandra was the defacto ruler of Harikela is more acceptable than views of N.G.Majumdar and R.C.Majumdar⁶⁸. So more reasonable opinion is that Trailokyachandra inherited his feudatory position from his father and later accumulated strength and became the mainstay of Harikela King. It was he who extended his influence over Chandradvīpa and supplanted the Harikela King⁶⁹. It is known from the Dacca plate of Kalyāṇachandra that the Gujara-Pratīhāra King Mahendrapāla (885 - 903 A.D) conquered at least South Bihar and North Bengal from the Pāla King Nārāyanapala (854 - 910 A.D) during the time of Trailokyachandra. It had made the position of Nārāyanapāla very much precarious. It is possible that Trailokyachandra sided with Mahendrapāla against Nārāyanapāla and succeeded in annexing wide areas of East Bengal to his original territory of Chandradvīpa in Buckergunge region⁷⁰. But the theory is not accepted today after the discovery of an inscription by G. Bhattacharjee of Barlin Museum. The inscription is now at Malda Museum. Mahendrapāla has been identified with a King of the Pala dynasty^{70a}.

Now a problem naturally comes to our mind as to who was the first independent ruler of the Chandra dynasty.

According to D. C. Sircar, Trailokyachandra was a feudatory ruler and the first independent ruler of the dynasty was Śrīchandra because the latter was adorned with various high sounding titles like 'Parameśvara, Paramabhattāraka and Mahārājādhirāja and that Trailokyachandra was not given with all those high sounding titles except 'Mahārājādhirāja'. But a close observation of the Chandra plates reveals the fact that the ruling King was endowed with full regal titles and his father was given the titles of 'Mahārājādhirāja. In the Dacca plate of Kalyānachandra, Śrīchandra was given only the title of Mahārājādhirāja, while Kalyānachandra was given the full regnal titles. In the Mainamati plates of Iadachandra, his father is simply described as 'Mahārājādhirāja'. So the most justifiable explanation is that Trailokyachandra was at first a feudatory and gradually increased his power and assumed sovereignty by supplanting the Harikela King. Thus Trailokyachandra added Chandradvīpa and Harikela to his paternal Kingdom and felt justified in assuming the title of Mahārājādhirāja.⁷¹

Regarding the exploits of Trailokyachandra informations have been supplied by different epigraphic sources of his

successors though none of his own inscription has been deciphered so far. In the verse 6 of the Paśchimbhāg copper plate of Śrīchandra, it is stated that Trailokyachandra being desirous of conquering the earth bounded by the four oceans, destroyed his enemies by his sword⁷². The verse 7 of the plate gives valuable information about the exploits of Trailokyachandra in the Samatata country with its capital at Devaparvata. The verse is as follows :

"Kshīrodām - anu Devaparvata iti Śrīmad-tad-etat-Purāṇ
Yatr = āgantu - Janasya - Vismaya - rasah Kamboja - Vārtt -
ādbhitaiḥ
Iālambi - Vanaṁ - atravāṭika - Śatair = Anvishya siddh -
Amshadhi Vyāhārā itiha Śrutās = Samatatan = nirjjitya
yat Sainikaih"

It gives some important information about the conquest of Trailokyachandra, Firstly, it informs that Trailokyachandra conquered Samatata country (present Tippera-Noakhali region). Secondly, Devaparvata lying on the bank of Kshīrodā river was the Capital of the Samatata country which is also supported by the evidence of the Kaitān inscription of Śrīdhāranarātā⁷³. Thirdly, the city of Devaparvata appears to have been ravaged

by the Kambojas shortly before the Chandra invasion of Samatata⁷⁴. Kamalakanta Gupta Choudhury enumerated the Paśchimbhāg plate and the exploits of Trailokyachandra in a different way and there is exaggeration in his statement about the conquest of Trailokyachandra. He stated that the victorious army of Trailokyachandra " entered the village of hilly countries, drank from the tunnel like rivers in the table-land of the Vindya Hills and ultimately reached the place where roaring currents of the Kāverī were throwing down the stones from the peak of the Malaya Hills (South India)"⁷⁵.

But D.C.Sircar has expressed doubt on the historical basis of the above statement. The Kāverī rising from the western Ghats and running through the Coimbatore, Salem, Tiruchirappalli and Tanjaur district of Tamilnadu falls to the Bay of Bengal. According to the Purāṇas it rises not from Malaya⁷⁶. The village referred in the verse is in Vaṅga country and the Suruṅganadī following through the Vindhyan region is not known from any other sources. It seems that the curds of Vaṅga, in which the division (Bhāga) of Vikramapura (Dacca Dist.) was situated according to early medieval records, had a name in Chandradvīpa (Buckergunge dist.) which was Trailokyachandra's original

dominions".⁷⁷

In the Maināmatī plate of Iadachandra, it has been stated that under Trailokyachandra Vaṅga was rising in in prosperity⁷⁸. His military achievements have been elaborated in the Dacca copper plate of his grandson Kalyāṇachandra that if, Trailokyachandra had not seen jewels in the clasped hands of the Gaudas, they were imprisoned and if they did not bow to the ground to show respect to him, they were slain with raised swords.⁷⁹ Trailokyachandra was probably successful during the weak succession of either Rājyapāla or Gopāla II of the Pāla dynasty. Now if we reject the eulogistic opinion in different plates about the conquest of Trailokyachandra, it would be the most reasonable explanation that Trailokyachandra had stronghold in the Devaparvata area and he established his sway in the whole of the Samatata area & at that time the news of the Kambojas capturing power in Northern and Western Bengal was heard and were defeated by Trailokyachandra⁸⁰.

Trailokyachandra was succeeded by his son Śrīchandra. Like his father he was also an independent King and assumed the title of 'Parameśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka - Mahārājādhirāja'.

Regarding his military achievements, the Maināmatī plate of Iadahachandra states that his military achievements brought tears to the eyes of the queens of the King of Prāgjyotisha (Assam) and wiped away the smiles of the queens of Gauda King. This refers to Śrīchandra's claim to have defeated the Kings of Bengal & Assam, no doubt of the Pāla and the Mleccha dynasties⁸¹. It has also been confirmed by the Paśchimbhāg plate of Śrīchandra. The verse 12 of the plate informs us that the forces of Śrīchandra entered the woodlands near Lohitya in the course of the conquest of the Kāmrūpa country. The description of Kamarupa with its pigeons, monkeys, plantain trees, deers and blackaloe-woods as given in the verse indicates that the composer was familiar with the country. The importance of the verse lies in the fact that it indicates and invasion of Kāmarūpa by Śrīchandra which is not recorded in any of his grants though the Paśchimbhāg plate is one his earliest grants⁸². It has been elaborated in the Paśchimbhāg plate that Śrīchandra's army had a desire to conquer 'Uttarapatha' and there are the mention of the name of two rivers in the course of the description of the conquest. These are the chitrasīlā which is mentioned in the Mahābhārata and the Puṣṭabhadrā mentioned in the Bhāgavata Purāna. The

Pushpabhadra is a small stream of the north of the Brahmaputra near Gauhati⁸³. It is known that Uttarpatha was the name of the northern part of India including the Himālayān region. The author of the inscription seems to locate the Kāmarūpa country in Uttarapatha. This has been accepted by the Mahābhārata and Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa, but the Purānas and other works of later time like Rājasekhara's Kāvyamīmāṃsā place Kāmarūpa or Prāgjyotisha in the Eastern division⁸⁴. So it confirms Śrīchandra's conquest of Kāmarūpa.

In the Dacca copper plate of Kalyānachandra, it has been stated "He was moist (soft) in the act of washing away the fear of Prithivīpāla, was hard enterprising in the churning of Govardana (earth and the water), was great in the great festivity of re-instating Gopāla, was a protector of sacrifices (vows) in returning the Pāla queen, who was defeated at ease and captured and whose arm was the universal support of various receptacle of various sentiments"⁸⁵. It is apparent that he wiped away the obstacle created by Prithivīpāla against Gopāla and helped Gopāla to restore the throne. It is possible that Gopāla and Prithivīpāla were brothers and they fought for the Pāla Kingdom which was saved by Śrīchandra. This is an important information about the

Pālachandra relation during that time. It has been explained by A. H. Dani and D. C. Sircar that the ruler of Gauḍa defeated by Śrīchandra was the Pāla King. But the Pālachandra friendly relation has been affirmed by the Dacca copper plate of Kalyānachandra. The reasonable argument is that the Kambojas were ruling over North and West Bengal during the 10th Century A.D. and they were called as the 'Lords of Gauḍa'. That the Chandras fought with the Kambojas and not with the Pālas is supported by the fact that Śrīchandra restored Gopāla to his throne. This Gopāla was undoubtedly Gopāla II of the Pāla dynasty who ruled from 940 - 960 A.D and was contemporary of Śrīchandra. It has also been suggested by some that Śrīchandra himself defeated the Pāla King and then restored him to power³⁶.

The Sylhet plate of Śrīchandra refers to his exploits in other regions also. He is stated to have defeated the Utkalas, the Hūnas and the Yavanas. It is difficult to determine Śrīchandra's influence over them. It may be an exaggeration and may be an echo of Bādāl pillar inscription of Devapāla³⁷.

The land grant in the Pundravardhana-bhukti, seems to indicate the temporary occupation of a part of

by Śrīchandra. The possibility is that the territories were lost by the Pālas during the temporary disaster of the dynasty in the rule of Nārāyanapāla towards the end of the 9th Century and the beginning of the 10th Century A.D. Obviously the successors of Nārāyanapāla strove hard to restore the lost territory. So it may be assumed that there was a prolonged struggle between the Pālas, Kambojas and the Chandras and as a consequence to this the territories probably changed hands.

Now a point naturally comes to our mind as to what were the factors that facilitated the rise of the Chandras. It has been suggested by R.C. Majumdar that the invasion of Kalachuri King Kōkkala in Bengal precipitated the rise of the Chandra as an independent power. The King Yuvarāja of the Kalachuri dynasty who flourished in the mid-tenth Century invaded Gauda and defeated probably King Gopala II of the Pāla dynasty⁸⁸. The unfinished condition of Kedārpur plate of Śrīchandra may suggest possibly the cessation of Śrīchandra's authority in Pundravardhana which might have fallen in the hands of the Kambojas. The authority of the Chandras was confined to Eastern Bengal. It also appears that

the Chandras about the mid-tenth Century A.D. had some trouble with the Chedi King Lakshmanarāja who was the son and successor of Yuvarāja who is stated in the Goharwa plate of Karnadeva as Vaṅgāla - bhāṅganipuna (one who showed skill in disrupting the Vaṅgālas)⁸⁹. The Pālas were probably enjoying subordinate or insignificant position. The Centre of gravity seems to have been shifted from Gauda to the Vaṅgala territory where the Chandras had been ruling and there is no evidence to show that Lakshmanarāja annexed the territory⁹⁰.

Śrīchandra was succeeded by his son Kalyānachandra. He has been described in the verse 7 of the Maināmatī plate of Iadachandra as "pure or purifying like water of the Ganges". In the verse 8 of the same plate, it has been stated that Kalyānachandra caused sorrow to the Mleccha and Gauda women. It thus indicates his success against the Mleccha King of Prāgjyotiṣa and the Pāla King of Gauda. All the more, it suggests, as D.C.Sircar informs, that Kalyānachandra obtained successes over the rulers of Bengal and Assam during the reign of his father as the leader of the latter's forces.⁹¹ The above statement about the achievements of Kalyānachandra has been supported by the Maināmatī plate

of Govindachandra. Its 7th verse refers to his fight against the Mlecchas and it is said that he made the river Lohitya redoubled by the tears dropping from the eyes of the Mleccha ladies. It has also been stated in the verse that Kalyānāchandra was successful in a battle against the King of Gauda⁹². The above statement has enough significance regarding the military achievements of Kalyānāchandra. It refers to the Mlecchas who were associated with the Lohitya (Brahmaputra river).

From the above it appears that Kalyānāchandra had extended his power from Kāmarūpa and in the Deltaic region of Bengal. Regarding the identification of the Mlecchas, some scholars are of the opinion that an invasion had taken place from the side of Bihar and it was duly repulsed by Kalyānāchandra.⁹³ Thus it seems that he also saved the further humiliation of the Pālas and the Pāla King became subordinate to him. The successful expedition to the Brahmaputra delta also indicates the importance of the Chandras in Eastern India.

Now there is a controversy among the scholars about the identification of the Gauda ruler. There may be some possibilities

During the temporary decline of Pāla empire, at the time of Vīgrahapāla II and his immediate predecessor Gopāla II, the Pāla empire was invaded by the Kambojas, Chandellas and the Kalachūris. It may be that during the time of the decline of the Pāla empire, the ruler of the neighbouring territory ventured to establish its sway over the Pālas. On the other hand, it may be that the Gauda King defeated by Kalyānachandra was the Kamboja ruler because he was the Kamboja ruler because he was a contemporary of Kamboja Gaudapati who was trying to establish his sway in Western Bengal. But in the absence of name of the Gauda King in the Chandra records, we are not in a position to come to a definite conclusion. It may also be that, he liked his father, helped the Pālas in regaining their hold by defeating the Kambojas. What may be inferred from the above information is that the political exigencies prompted the Chandras to keep friendship with their neighbours and the religious uniformity of the two families helped them to come closer⁹⁴.

We know very little about the other factors of the reign of Kalyānachandra. He is said to be "equal to Bali in liberality. Rāma in prowess and equal to Yudhisthira in truthfulness". All that we may assume is that Chandra

Kingdom continued to enjoy prosperity during his reign.

He ruled for 24 years as is evident from his record.

Kalyānachandra was succeeded by his son Iadachandra. Before the discovery of the Maināmatī plates of Iadachandra and Govinda Chandra, the order of succession to the Chandra throne could not be rightly established. The Palaeographic study of the Bhārella Nartteśvara image inscription of Iadachandra placed his reign period in the second half of the 10th Century A.D.⁹⁵ On the basis of this R.C. Majumdar placed him before Śrīchandra⁹⁶ while B. C. Sen placed him after Śrīchandra. But the Maināmatī plates of the two Kings discovered later on has correctly settled the genealogy of the two Kings and they have been rightly placed after Śrīchandra.

The two copper plates of Iadachandra refer only to his religious activities and do not indicate anything about his military activities. It is inferred that the Chandra empire was firmly settled and that is why he devoted himself to peaceful religious activities. Iadachandra has been described in the verse 12 of the Maināmatī plate that he was master of all the sciences and he had under his control the Goddess Saraswatī, Lakṣmī and the

whole earth. In the verse 13 of the plate he has been described as the Lord of the entire earth bounded by the ocean and he was the master of all the Vidyās or sciences. Ladahachandra visited Vārānasī and took baths in the Ganges and offered tarpana to his ancestors and gift of gold to numerous Brāhmanas. It has also been described that he also made pilgrimage to Prayāga and made gifts to the Brāhmanas. It is interesting to point out that though he was a Buddhist, he paid immense importance to his bath in the river Ganges at Benāras and it was possible for him to go to Benaras crossing the Pāla territory because the Pālas as pointed out by Dr. D.C.Sircar, considered the Chandras as subservient friend (Anugata Mitra). His grant of land in the name of Vāsudeva reflects his bent on other religions sects. His reign period may be between 1000 - 1020 A.D. and his rule for twenty years is evident from the Maināmatī records.

Ladahachandra was succeeded by his son Govindachandra. His name is referred in the Tirumalai inscription of Rājendra-chola as the King of Vaṅgādeśa and he was defeated by the Chola King⁹⁷. His name is also referred in the work Sabdapradīpa. The Betkā and Kulkudī image inscription of him also refer to his rule in Vaṅgāla⁹⁸. His connection with

Chandra dynasty has been established by the newly discovered Maināmatī copper plate⁹⁹. So it can be definitely stated that Govindachandra was a King of the Chandra dynasty.

In his Maināmatī plate it has been elaborated that he learnt very well and in his childhood within a few days, he became wellversed in all the sciences, arts including the sciences of dealing with elephants, horses and chariots.

The Maināmatī plates of the last two Kings are of great importance. It has been assumed from the visit of Iadachandra to Vārānasī and Prayāga at a time when Mahīpāla I of Gauda was in possession of the wide areas of Bengal, Bihar and the Eastern part of U.P., that the Chandra King was the subordinate ally of the Pāla King. Another important information is that the Chandras of South-East Bengal adopted Buddhism and the Kings assumed the title 'Paramasaugata'. The Maināmatī plates of the last two rulers of the dynasty inform us that the last two members of the dynasty repudiated Buddhism and they granted land in favour of a Vaishnavite or Saivite deity in the name of 'Vāsudeva-Bhattāraka' or 'Śiva-Bhattāraka', although these two Kings are also conventionally called 'Paramasaugata', their documents make it clear that they adopted Purānic Hinduism

Govindachandra of the Chandra dynasty has been identified by some scholars with Govindachandra or Gopichandra of Bengal Ballads.¹⁰⁰ It is very difficult to ascertain definitely the date of these ballads and it is possible that these were compiled later time probably in the 17th or the 18th Century A.D. So the authenticity of those ballads is questioned. The Bengal ballads inform that King Govichandra left Kingship and assumed the life of an ascetic¹⁰¹. The genealogy of Govichandra of the Bengal ballads is not similar to that of Govindachandra. Govichandra of the Bengal ballads was the daughter's son of Tilakachandra, the King of Meherkul which is still a Pargana in the Tippera district. The genealogy of Govindachandra of the Chandra dynasty is quite different from the genealogy of Gopichandra of the Bengal ballads.

N. K. Bhattasali has suggested that Iadahachandra of the Bharella Nartteśvara image inscription may have been the father of Tilakachandra¹⁰². But except the similarity of name the two persons cannot be definitely identified.

Muhammad Shahidullah placed Gopichandra between 675 - 700 A.D. and identified him with the King Govichandra of the Chandra dynasty before the rise of the Pālas.¹⁰³ But the epigraphical study prove that they were placed in the 10th

and 11th Century A.D.

The foreign invasion precipitated the downfall of the Chandra empire. The Tirumalai inscription of Rājendra Chola informs that Govindachandra of Vaṅgāla was defeated by the Chola King and Govindachandra fled from the battle field. But there is no concrete evidence to suggest that this defeat had any permanent effect on the Chandra empire. It may be assumed that this invasion had given a shattering blow to the Chandra rule. The invasion of the Kalachuri King Karṇa is said to have given a death blow to the power of the dynasty. Karṇa is said to have achieved a decisive victory over the King of the Eastern country¹⁰⁴ who probably lost his life in the decisive battle. In both the cases the adversary seems to be Govindachandra or his successor of the Chandra dynasty. It then appears that the Chandra Kingdom was finally destroyed by the invasion of Karṇa. The power vacuum in Vaṅga-Samatāṭa was filled up by the rise of another small power called Varmans in that region.

The Kaivarta rebellion

Varendrī under the Kaivarta Chiefs :

The successful revolt of Divya, a Kaivarta chief against the Pala King Muhīpāla II and the consequent

establishment of a dynasty, Kaivarta by caste, on the throne of the Pālas in Northern Bengal during the second part of the 11th Century A.D, is one of the most interesting and significant events of the history of Bengal. The fact is referred to in the Belāva copper plate of Bhojavarman, Kamauli copper plate of Vaidyadeva and the Manahali copper plate of Madanapala, but the detailed information of the episode is given in the Rāmacharita of Sandhyākara Nandī.

The main theme of the Rāmacharita is the rebellion of the feudatories against Mahīpāla II in 1070 - 71 A.D. The assassination of Mahīpāla II led to the establishment of the Kaivarta rule in Varendrī under Divya. The reconquest of Varendrī by Rāmapāla (1072 - 1126) successor of Mahīpāla II has been narrated to great details by Sandhyākara Nandī. The Kamauli plate of Vaidyadeva¹⁰⁵ says that Rāmapāla killed Bhīma and recovered the paternal land which has been termed as Janakabhū very much similar to the recovery of Janaka's daughter Sītā by Rāma. The verse 15 of the Manhali copper plate of Madanapala explains the anxiety of Rāmapāla, because of the serious attack of the Kaivarta King on the Pāla territory. According to Rāmacharita, Varendrī was occupied

by Divya¹⁰⁶, and elsewhere ' the enemy is stated to have occupied a large part of the Kingdom (bhuyah Bhūmandalam) after having killed Mahīpāla II who was called the best of the Kings (nripatisreshtha).

The revolt in North Bengal of the Kaivartas during the reign of Mahīpāla II and the rule of Divya and his two successors indicate the importance of the Kaivarta caste to which they belonged. According to Amarakosha, the Kaivartas include both Dāsa and Dhīvara. The evidences of the Brahma-vaivarta Purāna, Manu and the Jatakas also indicate that the Kaivartas were from ancient times divided into two sections, the cultivators and fishermen^{106a}. Both of them form important sections of the Hindu Society even today. There are many Zamindars and substantial landholders among them. This position is fully in keeping with the part played by them during the Pāla rule.

Regarding the genesis of the revolt we are to depend mainly on the Rāmacharita. In the introduction to the Rāmacharita, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, M. M. Haraprasad Sastri has propounded that "Mahīpāla by his impolitic acts, incurred the displeasure of the subjects

and that specially 'the Kaivartas were smarting under his oppression' and this ultimately led to the rebellion and his defeat and death".¹⁰⁷ Sandhyākara Nandī was the Court poet of Rāmapāla whom Mahīpāla had thrown in prison on the plea of the supposed engagement in conspiracy. Hence, it is possible to have an unprejudiced and impartial account of either Mahīpāla II or of Divya the Kaivartta.

H. P. Sastri has probably based his theory on the commentery of the Rāmacharita about Mahīpāla II who has been describes as durnayabhāja (one who is inclined to imprudent conduct)¹⁰⁸ anītikāraṁbharata (inclined to pursue impoetic methods)¹⁰⁹ Kuṭṭima Kathora (hard as a solid stone) Chitrakūṭa (given to wonderful tricks),¹¹⁰ bhūtānayātrānayukta (determined not to protect truth and polity)¹¹¹ and nikṛiti-Prayukta (resorting to acts of fraudulence).¹¹² All those accusations clearly prove that Sandhyākara Nandī had in him hatred for Mahīpāla II because of his ill treatment for Rāmapāla, the hero of Rāmacharita. But the epithats rājappravara and its commentary 'rājappravarin nripatisreshtam Mahīpālam' of the Rāmacharita clearly indicate that he has also been called as excellent among Kings and it demonstrates that the oppressions of Mahīpāla were not probably the real cause of

the revolt. According to R.C.Majumdar¹¹³, there may be two specific charges against Mahīpāla II. Firstly, he imprisoned his two brothers Rāmapāla and Sūrapāla as he was instigated to this ill-conceived act by false reports sedulously propagated by wicked people, to the effect that Rāmapāla, being an able and popular prince was scheming to usurp the throne. His bad company was also a source of danger to his Kingdom. Had there been any charge against Rāmapāla and Sūrapāla that they were in intrigue against the sovereign, it ought to have been properly inquired and the King should not have taken such a drastic action against him on hearsay evidence. In this respect he was impolitic.¹¹⁴ But the statement that Rāmapāla was a clean man having no intention to usurp the throne can not be totally accepted. During the decadant period of the Pālas, there was every possibility of dynastic trouble aggravating the ambition of younger brother. There are sufficient evidences in history where the younger brother usurped the throne by overthrowing the rule of the elder brother. Sandhyākaranandī was the Court poet of Rāmapāla and so it may be natural that he tried to suppress the real intention of Rāmapāla. In spite of all these, the charge against Rāmapāla has been refuted by R. C. Majumdar on two grounds. In the first place, the success of the revolt did not lead to the placement of

Rāmapāla to the throne. Secondly, the revolt and the consequent loss of Varendrī caused immense mental pain to Ramapala. A charge against Mahīpāla II was that he had an unwise passion for fighting (Yuddha Vyasanā)¹¹⁶ and disregarding the advice of his wise and experienced ministers, he led a feeble illequipped force against the powerful army of the Sāmantas or feudatories (milit-ananta-Sāmanta Chakra),¹¹⁷ But the author has not categorically mentioned the advice given by the ministers and the part played by Divya, a high official of Māhipāla II, might have evoked a sort of suspicions. So by paying no heed to the counsels of the higher officials he probably acted rightly. Above all, it is not possible from the brief and so called references in the Rāmacharita to form an accurate idea either of the reign or of the character of Mahīpāla II. So it is not evident that the wicked and oppressive policy of Mahīpāla was the direct or indirect cause of the revolt.¹¹⁸ All popular uprisings lead to the presumption of guilt on the part of the ruling King. But inspite of all these, there is no ground to suppose that Mahīpāla's mischievous acts were the causes of the outbreak.

The Rāmacharita expresses Rāmapāla as 'sarvasammata' which probably means 'accepted by all' and A.K.Maitreya has

concluded on this basis that Rāmapāla was the elected King and Mahīpāla claimed the throne by law of Primogeniture and this was the cause of the revolt.¹¹⁹ But the crucial point is that if this was the real case, why did the people not elect Rāmapāla. If Rāmapāla was chosen by the people why after the death of Mahīpāla II, the Kaiivarta chief occupied the throne ? All these questions were not answered by A. K. Maitreya.¹²⁰ The main point is that Mahīpāla was of suspicious nature and distracted from the right course of action and followed the impolitic method by imprisoning his two brothers who would have stood by him in time of danger.^{120a} The President of 'Divya Smriti Utsab' Raibahadur Ramaprasad Chandra has concluded that Divya was chosen by Sāmantas in the last half of the 11th Century A.D. and this election was very much similar to the election of Gopāla I by 'Ananta-Sāmanta-Chakra' in the last part of the 8th Century A.D. But the critical study of the two incidents makes it clear that they are not at all similar in nature. The King elected by the rebels cannot be the same thing. On the other hand, the election in latter case is not supported by evidence. The rebels only accepted his leadership and their activities

were not confined to their fight against Mahīpāla II under the platform of Divya. On the contrary, the election in the former case led to the extension of a weak power in Bengal from a small principality to an empire of almost the whole of Āryāvarta and in the latter case the well built pāla empire became the subject of disintegration and thereby invited foreign aggressors to trample upon it. So the two incidents cannot be the same in any respect.¹²¹

A. K. Maitreya's view is that Divyoka like Gopāla I was the chosen of the people and that the common people had a great share in determining the succession to the Pāla throne and that the mainstay of the Pāla authority was the popular support which was lost as a result of the Mahīpāla's coming to power. This view has been supported by Jadunath Sarkar also.¹²² This view has been shared by 'All Bengal Māhīśya Students Union' who held that Divya was elected King by the people of Bengal. But R. C. Majumdar has put forward some doubt on the authenticity of the election of Divya as King. There is no mention of this incident in the Rāmacharita and the time when the election actually took place. Whether it was before the struggle between Mahīpāla

II and Divya or after we do not know for certain. According to R. C. Majumdar, if the election had taken place later why should not the struggle of the subjects against the existing King be termed as 'revolt' ? Secondly, if the election had taken place earlier, this type of the election of King is abnormal, ominous and cannot be taken for granted without sufficient evidences.¹²³

The genesis of the revolt would better be sought in the real condition of the Pāla empire. The revolt of the feudatories was not unnatural. The relation between the Sāmanta and King depended mainly on their respective strengths. The feudal lords paid tribute so long as the King was powerful and the weakness of the suzerain on the other hand inspired the feudatories to shake off the authority of the sovereign.¹²⁴ In history there are many evidences which prove the serious degeneration of the central authority caused by misrule, mischievous domestic cliques and other factors which inspired the ambition of the provincial governors or other high officials leading to utter dismemberment of the existing rule and the rising of local powers to eminence. Divya was not an ordinary Kaiivarta in an humble station of life whom the people satisfied with leadership raised to honour.¹²⁵ So the revolt of Divya was,

perhaps, the effect of the weakness of the central authority and the general tendency of disintegration in different parts of the empire. Mahīpāla could not tackle the situation dexterously and he was not endowed with the qualities to manage the situation correctly. But it cannot at all be accepted that he was a bad King and he was specially responsible for the downfall of the empire. It should be probably accepted, as R. C. Majumdar held that Mahīpāla was perhaps a victim to circumstances over which he had no control and that as a King he was 'more sinned against than sinning'.¹²⁶ The revolt of Divya in Varendra like the revolt of Yaksapāla in Gayā was undoubtedly prompted by the decline of the Pāla dynasty.' The revolt of Divya was thus not a mere solitary episode but a sign of the times and may be looked upon not so much as the cause, but the consequence of the collapse of the authority of the Pālas.¹²⁷ According to a scholar Buddhism was antagonistic to the practice of the fishing craft which formed the occupation of the Kaivartas who suffered from social disadvantage under the regime of the Buddhist Pālas¹²⁸ and this social humiliation led the Kaivartas to the path of rebellion. There is hardly any trace of the disadvantages of this clan because of their fishing craft in the Rāmācharita. On the contrary, the Buddhist Pālas were very much liberal in their religious outlook and that is evident from the epigraph

sources which point out the distribution of lands for the different religion community. Moreover Buddhism at that time incorporated many elements from Hinduism and there was hardly any differences between Buddhism and Brāhmanical Hinduism.

Now from the foregoing discussion, it appears more likely that Divya was a rebel and the whole episode was more probably a rebellion. He took advantage of the degeneration of the central authority, dissensions among the royal members to kill his master and it was an event which was neither unusual nor unnatural at that time. There is a controversy regarding the character of the revolt. Rāmācharita expressed the revolt as 'anīkaṃ dharmaviplavaṃ'¹²⁹ and the world anīkam has been expressed by the commentator as 'alakshmīkaṃ' meaning unfortunate but the commentator is silent about the meaning of the word 'dharmaviplavaṃ'. Some scholars including R. C. Majumdar have termed it as a civil revolution. But the confusion arises regarding the meaning of the word 'dharmaviplavaṃ' because the whole affair seems to indicate that there was very little 'dharma' or sense of duty in the activities of Divya and it seems that Divya violated the duty or deviated from the right path. Divya

occupied Rāmapāla's ancestral land (Janaka-bhū) Varendrī.

It has been described in the Rāmacharita that Divya was a

bhritya who rose to high position, but he acted like a

dasyu and like one who was inclined to observe fraudulent

practice as a vow (upādhi-vratī). The word Dasyu applied

to Divya appears to be correct because the word generally

means robber. As Divya robbed the Pāla Kings of the land of

Varendrī, the poet seems to have applied correctly the word

to the work of Divya. The commentator expressed it as

" dasyunāsatrūnā tadbhāvāpannatvāt avasya karttavyatayā
ārabdham kamavvataṁ Chadmani Vratī."¹³⁰

The interpretation of the epithet 'upādhi-vratī'

has been differently put forward by scholars. The commentary

explains 'Vrata' as some action which is obligatory and the

commentary seems to express 'plea, pretext, fraud, dishonesty,

trick' by the work upādhi'. The reference to the fraudulent

act of Divya shows that he pretended to be loyal to his master

Mahīpāla II, but was in reality conspiring with the rebels to

get the throne and finally joined hands with the rebels openly.¹³¹

N. K. Bhattasali has pointed out that the commentary of the Rāmacharita seems to indicate that Divya probably began

the action as a matter of duty with ulterior motive in mind and when Mahipala II fought with Divya he found the combined army of the feudatories with the latter¹³². It, therefore, seems more likely that the revolt broke out at first in favour of Rāmapāla because of Mahīpāla's mischievous rule, but subsequently Divyoka fished in the troubled water. If often happens that revolution breaks out with certain end in view but is exploited by ambitions and designing men for their personal ends¹³³. Divyo managed to act secretly. In this respect his work was different from other Sāmantas who accumulated strength for open combat. It is evident that Divya carried out his policy without giving a warning to his lord. It happens to be quite likely that Divya belonged to the Sāmanta Chakra and was instrumental in bringing down Mahīpāla II. He remained on the royal side upto the death of Mahīpāla II and after his death, Divya took over Varṅdrī and declared him independent. So in no way the word 'dharmaviplavān' can be associated with the whole task.

Regarding the another characteristic of the revolt, it may be inferred with sufficient basis that it was, like other revolts, a sort of uprising of some subjects who were tyrannised by the oppressive rule of Mahīpāla II. It was probably the quality of Divya that raised him to the status of leader of the movement. But it does not prove that Divya

was the elected King. On the other hand there is no evidence to prove that all the people joined the rebellion. Some joined the rebellion and some acted against it and joined hands with the King as it often happens. The view of MM H.P. Sastri cannot be accepted that only the Kaivarta clan joined the rebellion. The most reasonable view, as propounded by R. C. Majumdar, is that the leadership was given to this community and so the revolt is named after the name of the community like the Watt Taylor rebellion in England and Habsi rebellion in Bengal.¹³⁴

Some scholars hold that the revolt of the Kaivartas was nothing but the reaction of peasants to assert their land rights. The Kaivartas were deprived of plots of land given as service tenures and subjected to heavy taxes (Rāmacharita II 40). The fact that the naked soldiers fought with bows and arrows riding buffaloes shows that they were ordinary peasants (Rāmacharita II 39 - 42). Probably it was a revolt of the peasants against the Pālas who made a common cause with their vassals against the Kaivartas.^{134a}

According to some, the election of Divya is the story of the establishment of democracy by the people of Bengal. But it has been stated in the Rāmacharita that Divya was succeeded by Bhīma as the King of Varendrī. Hence there is no evidence in support of the view that the whole thing led to the

establishment of democracy. After the revolt Divya assumed Kingship. So the above view is baseless.

So it would not be probably right to call it a popular uprising. What is more probable is that it was the revolt of some opportunists who tried to take advantage of the weakness of the Pāla empire to attain their end. It would not probably be reasonable to think that there was popular consciousness among the people of that time and the people did not dare to raise their voice against King who was held in high esteem in the society and his position was almost equal to God and it seems likely that they held it inauspicious to go against the King and they were supposed to abide by the orders of the King whether it was beneficial or harmful. Hence there was nothing popular in the revolt and it was purely the revolt of some self-interested Sāmantas.

Regarding the consequence of the rebellion and the subsequent establishment of the rule of the Kaivartas very little information is found in the Rāmacharita. It appears that the revolution was followed by the establishment of a protectorate and Varendrī came under the protection of Divya his brother Rudeka and his brother's son Bhīma in succession. 135
How long Varendrī was under the possession of the Kaivartas

nothing is known for certain. Regarding the character of the occupation, we are supplied with some materials in the Rāmācharita. According to a verse in the Rāmācharita¹³⁶ the occupation of Varendrī was very much similar to the captivity of Sītā. The verse informs that Sītā was excellent (Vara) in beauty (adhikkyaya) became rakshanīyā of the fierce Rāvana. The verse also points out that Varendrī became rakshnīyā of Bhīma. According to commentary of the Rāmācharita the word 'rakshanīyā' suggests the nature of the occupation in both cases.

It appears that neither Divya nor his brother Rudeka assumed the title of King. They had been leaders and continued to be known by their ordinary names'. 'Bhīma appears to have been called a Rājā, and the Rāmācharita alludes to it. But the royal grant of Vaidyadeva shows that Bhīma was also called a leader (nāyaka).¹³⁷ The three rulers of the dynasty ruled Varendrī in succession. The peace and prosperity of the rule of Bhīma in Varendrī has been highly praised in the work 'Rāmācharita which was written by a Pāla partisan. It has been informed that the whole world enjoyed peace and 'prosperity in plenty'.¹³⁸ R. C. Majumdar held that Bhīma imposed cruel taxation upon people.¹³⁹ However the explanation of the text seems to be wrong. Bhīma was a devotee of Śiva and Pārvatī. Divya ensured the security of Varendrī and due to this Rāmapāla's attempt to recover Varendri proved futile¹⁴⁰ and Divya denied

even to invade Rāmapāla's territory. It proves that Divya was an able and powerful ruler.¹⁴¹ According to A.K.Maitreya, Jātavarman came into conflict with Divya of the Kaivarta dynasty and the power of the latter was put to shame by the former.¹⁴² But it is impossible to come to a definite conclusion from this source that the two independent Kingdoms Vaṅga and Varendrī were inimical to each other.

4. Rāmapāla had remorse for the loss of Varendrī and he was so unhappy that he could not be happy becoming the lord of the earth.¹⁴³ Rāmapāla then attempted to win over a number of chiefs and then ventured to make them ready to fight for him against the Kaivartas and this finally became successful.¹⁴⁴ Rāmapāla won over the circle of feudatories by making presents of land and enormous wealth. It is evident from the list of feudatories that most of them flourished in South-west Bengal and the adjoining regions of Bihar and some of them rebelled against Mahīpāla II. The greatest helpers of Rāmapāla in his war with Bhīma, the Kaivarta lord, were his maternal uncle Rāshṭrakūta Mahana and the latter's son Mahāmaṇḍalika Kanhura and Suvarṇa and brother's son Mahāpratiṅhāra Śivarāja who were all his relatives on the mother's side. This Śivarāja led some forces across the Ganges and devastated

Varendrī¹⁴⁵ apparently meaning certain frontier areas of Bhīma's Kingdom. A terrible fight ensued between Rāmapāla's army that crossed the river from the Southern bank and reached the Northern bank in a fleet of boat, and Bhīma, the Kaivarta leader.¹⁴⁶ The consequence of the fight was the imprisonment of Bhīma owing to bad luck when he was fighting from his elephant's back.¹⁴⁷ The Kaivarta forces fled and the captured King and queen were treated with consideration.¹⁴⁸ A Bengal writer narrated that Bhīma committed suicide when all hopes of his success ended in disdain. R. D. Banerjee held that Hari was killed along with Bhīma.¹⁴⁹ It has been stated in Kamauli grant of Vaiddya-deva that Bhīma had been killed by Rāmapāla.

The Śūra dynasty of Dakṣiṇa-Rādha.

As to the historical basis of a dynasty with the title of Śūra several facts may be cited and on the basis of which alone an account of the dynasty may be prepared. The name of Raṇaśūra is found in the Tirumalai inscription of Rajendra Chola as the ruler of Dakṣiṇa-Rādha and it is stated in the inscription that the Chola ruler defeated Raṇaśūra.¹⁵⁰ In the commentary of the Rāmācharita¹⁵¹ there occurs the name

of Rāmapāla in his venture to defeat Bhima, the Kaivarta King. In an inscription of the time of Gopāla III, there was a man named Damasura. The inscription was found at Manda in the Rājshāhi district.¹⁵² The authenticity of a line of rulers bearing the names ending in Śūra is further proved by the Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena which informs us that Vijayasena married Vilāsadevī, a daughter of the Śūra family.¹⁵³ In the Naihati grant of Vallālasena, it has been informed that the predecessors of Vijayasena were the ornaments of the Radha country. It has been inferred that a line of Kings really existed in Western Bengal who were known as the Śūras. Unfortunately we do not know anything about the exact relationship between Raṇasūra and Mahīpāla of Tirumalai grant. But from the Tirumalai inscription he appears to have been quite independent of the Pāla Kings.

It appears from the above discussion that there appeared one Śūra family, though nothing is known definitely of the extent of their territory and their political status. The evidence of the Tirumalai plate and the Rāmacharita would indicate that they became powerful during the rule of the weak Pāla Kings, but were forced to accept the position of Sāmantas when there was a strong Pāla King.

The history of the Śūra family is hardly available from sources other than that of the Tirumalai plate (1023 A.D) and the foundation of the dynasty may, therefore, be assigned to the beginning of the 11th Century A.D.

Traditional and historical evidences associate them in the Rādha region of Bengal. It may not be improbable that shortly after in invasion of Aṅga and Rādha by the Chandella King Dhaṅgadeva, the state of affair in the latter territory became favourable for the foundation of a new dynasty under the Śūras which continued to rule till they were swept away by the Senas.¹⁵⁴

There is a strong public say of the existence of a King named Ādiśūra who brought Brāhmanas from some parts of India. The traces of the Śūra dynasty may be found in a large number of traditions recorded by the writers of genealogical treatises in Bengal which are popularly known as Kulaji granthas. Among the writers who compiled those volumes mention may be made of Harimiśra, Edumiśra and Dhrūvānanda. Dhrūvānanda is known to be the highest authority on the subject of the Rādhiya Brāhmanas.¹⁵⁵ Most of the Kulaji granthas were the works of much later times and most of them were supposed to be compiled during the 15th or 16th Centuries.

Only one or two works are thought to be of much earlier time, but their manuscripts are not available to us. There are certain limitation of the Kulaji granthas. First and foremost among them is that there are no authentic Kulaji texts which can be dated earlier than the latter half of the 15th Century A.D. Most of the literature is in manuscript and that is why the copies of which, are difficult to obtain. Secondly, the Kulaji texts have been tampered with in various ways and there are good grounds to doubt the the genuineness of the many current texts which are attributed to ancient authors.¹⁵⁶

The sources they produce regarding Ādiśūra who is said to be the founder of the Śūra dynasty are conflicting in many respects and the most crucial question is the date of the King Ādiśūra. According to a text, Ādiśūra came into the political scene of Bengal before the rise of the Pālas. Regarding the date of Ādiśūra, Varendra Kulapanjikā is of the opinion that 'Vedakalambashtaka-Vimīterāj-Ādiśūra sa cha' which is interpreted as equivalent to 732 A.D.¹⁵⁷ According to another tradition, Ādiśūra defeated the Buddhist Pāla King and began to rule Gauḍa after that. In support of the above view, the scholars quote the following 'Tatr-Ādiśūrah-Śūra-vaṁśa-siṁho-Vijitya Bandhanripa-Pālavaṁśān Saśāsa Gauḍam'¹⁵⁸

It is evident from the above source that the founder of the dynasty may be placed in the 11th Century A.D. It is based on the enumeration of 'Vedavānāṅka Sāketi-Gauḍe-Viprāḥ-Samāgatāḥ = 1032 A.D. H.P. Sastri interpretes it as equivalent to 732 A.D.¹⁵⁹

Regarding the family history of Ādiśūra different views have been put forward by different texts. It is known from a tradition that the Śūras came from Darada country.¹⁶⁰ In some other sources he has been identified as the grand father in mother's side of Vallālasena and in others as the 'remote ancestors of Vallālesena'. It is said that he was the ruler of Bengal and Orissa, while others refer him as the ruler of Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Karnāṭa, Kerala, Kāmarūpa, Saurāstra, Magadha, Mālava and Gurjara. According to some, everything were peaceful as he married the daughter of the Kanauj King while others say that he had to fight with the King of Kanauj. Regarding the Capital of his Kingdom there are contradictory opinions. According to some texts, the Capital of Ādiśūra was in Gauḍa while some others are of the opinion that the Capital was at Vikramapura. Regarding the purpose of his bringing five Brāhmanas different views have been put forward. It has been usually held that he brought Brāhmanas as well versed in the Vedas and Vedic sacrifices for the performance of religious practices. According to one tradition, the King of Kāśī insulted Ādiśūra for not having Brāhmanas versed in Vedic

lores in his dominion. King Ādiśūra defeated him in a battle and brought five Brāhmanas.¹⁶¹

The extant Kulaji texts preserve tradition that Ādiśūra and other Śūra princes were forced to take shelter in Rādha after the establishment of the Buddhist Pāla empire.¹⁶² The mention of the names of Dharmapāla and Ranaśūra in South-Western Bengal in the Tirumalai inscription prove that the South-Western Bengal was not under the control of Mahīpāla. N. N. Vasu has expressed contradictory opinions about the identity and the date of the King Ādiśūra. The mainstay of his book is to place the bringing of Brāhmanas in Bengal and the establishment of the rule of Ādiśūra in 654 or 668 Śaka era. In order to establish the theory he took into account different Kulaji grān̄thas and there appeared gross incongruity in his account. In one occasion he identified Ādiśūra with Bhojadeva. But Ādiśūra who assumed imperial dignity on 644 Śaka era cannot be identified with Bhojadeva. As the Gurjara Pratihara King Bhojadeva came into prominence in the Second half of the 9th Century A.D, he can in no way be identified with Ādiśūra flourished much earlier.¹⁶³ It has been inferred that Ādiśūra of Kulaśāstras may identified with Magadhādhirāja Ādisiṅha of Dudhpari rock inscription of the 8th Century A.D.¹⁶⁴

In another occasion Ādiśūra has been identified with Yaśovarman of Kanauj. The view cannot be historically accepted that Yaśovarman was defeated by the King of Gauda. Practically speaking it was only possible to defeat the King of Kanauj Yaśovarman by no other Gauda King than Śasāṅka. Dharmapāla & Devapāla. On the basis of different Kulaji granthas. Ādiśūra cannot be placed in the first half of the 8th Century A.D. & during the tenure of the reign of Yaśovarman, the King of Kanauj.¹⁶⁵

There are difference of opinion regarding the place wherefrom he brought five Brāhmanas. According Harimiśra he brought Brāhmanas from the Kolañcha country.¹⁶⁶ This Kolanacha country has been usually identified with Kanauj. But nowhere in the ancient literature or in epigraphical sources Kalañcha has been identified with Kanauj. Śivarām Apte in Sanskrit dictionary has identified Kolañcha with the name of the country of the Kalīṅgas Manior Williams in his large volume of English-Sanskrit dictionary has expressed the fact about the identification that Kolañcha was 'small of Kaling , the Coromondal coast from Cuttack to Madras ; but according to some, this place is in Gangetic Hindusthān with Kanauj for the Capital'.¹⁶⁷ N. N. Vasu has categorically expressed that Kolañcha cannot be equivalent

to Kanauj and so how can the view that Ādiśūra brought Brāhmanas from Kanauj be accepted ? But most of the Kulaji granthas are of the opinion that he brought Brāhmanas from Kanauj. So it has become very difficult to ascertain the time of Ādiśūra on the basis of conflicting opinions.¹⁶⁸

The genealogy of the Śūras as furnished by the authors of the Kulaji granthas comprises the following names in order of succession. Ādiśūra, Bhūśūra, Kshitiśūra, Avantīśūra, Dharaṇīśūra, Dharaśūra, Anusura,¹⁶⁹ Ādiśūra's grandfather Kaviśūra and his father Mādhavaśūra,¹⁷⁰. In some of the works two more names are inserted between Dharaśūra and Anusūra, viz. Pradyumnaśūra and Varendraśūra. A careful observation of the names will make it clear that the same name except the first and the last appears to have been repeated in various forms. In the Āin-i-Ākbarī there are the mention of ten Kings headed by one Ādityaśūra, but the rest of the names do not end with the Śūra title. The opinions of the Kulaji and the Āin-i-Ākbarī are contradictory. The view is not supported by epigraphic sources and both is tradition. On the other hand the view put forward by different traditions regarding the purpose of bringing Brāhmanas to Bengal that there was dearth of Brāhmanas well versed in Vedic lore and for this the orthodox Hindu customs had fallen into disuse, cannot be

accepted as many passages from the epigraphical records of Bengal in the medieval Bengal may be cited to show the existence of orthodox Brāhmanas in the period from 7th to 11th Century A.D., the tentative time of the Śūras.¹⁷¹ The view of the different Kulaji granthas has been refuted by Narottam Kundu in view of the fact that it has not been supported by any corroborative evidence. He has shown clearly that the story of Ādiśūra in the tradition is a myth and cannot be given historical value.¹⁷² Besides Kulapañjikas, there is no genuine evidence in favour of the existence of an ancient ruler named Ādiśūra in Bengal. The only Ādiśūra known to the history of Eastern India is mentioned in the Nyāyakanika of the Maithil scholar Vāchaspati Miśra as a contemporary of the author. The historical Ādiśūra of Eastern India thus seems to have ruled over parts of Mithilā and contiguous portion of North Bengal as a feudatory of the Pālas about the middle of the 9th Century A.D.^{172a}

But the Ādiśūra episode of bringing Brāhmanas from the Kolancha country has been doubted by D.C. Sircar on the ground that the Sena King Ballāḥa is credited in the Kulapañjī works with the institution of Kulinism and there was no popularity of the use of Śaka era before the advent of the Senas. The possibility of the importation of the legend about the

bringing of the U.P. Brāhmanas, from South India into Bengal, cannot be altogether impossible. According to the Kargudari inscription of the Hangal Kadambas, the mythical Mayūrvarman came to the South from the Himalayan region and brought 18 Brāhmanas from Ahichhatra whom they settled in the Kuntala country.^{172b} In the later Pallava inscriptions there are similar tradition of bringing Brāhmanas from Ahichhatra. In the inscription of the Chola King Kulottuṅga III, there is the mention of the mythical King Arindama who imported Brāhmanas from Antarvedī.^{172c}

So the theory cannot be brushed aside that the tradition might have been brought in Bengal from South India by the Senas who hailed from Karnāṭa region and must have patronised the South Indians. The Pālas had matrimonial relations with South India. So the ~~Ā~~diśura episode may be a figment of imagination, though it is difficult to determine the contribution of South India in the fabrication of Kulapanjī works.^{172d} The genealogy of the Varmanas and the Senas as given in the Kulaji granthas has proved to be false and unreliable. It is not, therefore, safe to construct the dynastic history of the ~~Ś~~uras and not even their genealogy relying on their account.¹⁷³

R E F E R E N C E S

- 1 Epigraphia Indica. Vol. VI, P 106 and ibid, Vol IV,
PP 287-88.
- 2 Dacca University Studies, Vol I, No. II P 129
- 3 Epigraphia Indica, Vol I, P 123
- 4 ibid , Vol XI, P 142 and Vol II, P 293
- 5 Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1911, P 802 ;
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 1912, P 255
- 6 H. C. Roy, Dynastic History of Northern India PP 309 ff
- 7 "Epigraphia Indica, XXII, PP 151 ff
- 8 Smith, Early History of India, 2nd Ed. P 173
- 9 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol VII, P 619
- 10 Ed by S. C. Das, Pag-sam-Jon-Zang, Part I, PP 4, 74
- 11 B. R. Bhattacharyya, Indian Cultural Influence in
Cambodia, PP 278-79 : Harvey,
History of Burma, P 109
- 12 Epigraphia Indica, XII, P 73
- 13 D. C. Sircar, 'Some facts about Mahipāla and the Kamboj
in " The Early Historical Perspective of
North Bengal" edited by B.N.Mukherjee
and P. K. Bhattacharyya.

- 14 B. C. Sen, Some Historical Aspects of the Inscription of Bengal, P 376.
- 15 A. M. Choudhury, Dynastic History of Bengal, PP 73-74
- 16 D. C. Sircar, Pāl-Sen-Yuger-Vaṃśānucharit (in Bengal)
PP 81-82
- 17 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal(NS) Vol VII
P 619 ; R.P.Chanda, Gaudarājamātā, P 35
- 18 Indian Antiquary, Vol I, PP 197-28, 145
- 19 Loc cit
- 20 A. M. Choudhury, Opcit, P 68, Fn 3.
- 21 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal(NS) Vol VII,
PP 615-16 ; R.P.Chanda, Opcit, PP 36-37
- 22 D. C. Sircar, Opcit P III
- 23 Epigraphia Indica, XXII, PP 150 ff
- 24 ibid PP 150-59
- 25 Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol V,
PP 71, 89 ; R.D.Banerjee, Bāṅgālār Itihās (in Bengali)
P 248
- 26 Epigraphia Indica, XXII, PP 151 ff.
- 27 B. C. Sen, Opcit, P 376

- 28 Dacca University Studies, Vol I, No. II P 132
- 29 D. C. Sircar, Opcit, PP 77
- 30 D. C. Sircar, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, 1971, P 104
- 30a D. C. Sircar, Pāl-Sen-Yuger etc. PP 76-77
- 31 New Aspects of History of Orissa, Vol III, Sambalpur University, PP 2 ff ; D.C.Sircar, 'The Kamboja Rulers of Bengal' in the K.K.Handiqui Felicitation Volume ; D. C. Sircar, Pāl-Sen-Yuger-Vaṁśānucharit (in Bengali)
- 32 A. M. Choudhury, Opcit, P 70
- 33 N. G. Majumdar, 'The Evidence of the Irdā Copper Plate' in "Modern Review", in 1937
- 34 Epigraphia Indica, XXVII, PP 26-27
- 35 D. C. Sircar, Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan, PP 41 ff.
- 36 Dr. A. H. Dani, Proceedings of the Indian History Congress (1961).
- 37 Epigraphia Indica, XXVIII, P 51 & PP 337-38 ; Proceedings of the Indian Historical Congress, Aligarh Session, XXIII, Part I, P 36 ; Ep. Ind., XVII, P 349 ; Indian Culture, VII, PP 405-406.

- 38 Epigraphia Indica, IX, PP 232-33
- 39 J. Eggeling, Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of India Office, London, Vol I, Part V, PP 974
- 40 A. M. Choudhury, Opcit, PP 155 ff.
- 41 A. H. Dani, Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 1960, Aligarh, Part I, PP 3 ff.
- 42 Indian Antiquary, Vol XV, PP 304 ff.
- 43 R. D Banerjee, 'The date of Śrīchandra' in 'Sir Asutosh Mukherjee Silver Jubilee Volumes', Vol III, Part III, PP 210-222.
- 44 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan, Vol VI (1961) PP 267-74.
- 45 Chittagong Gazetteer, P 20.
- 46 P. L. Paul, The Early History of Bengal, Vol I, P 78.
- 47 Phayre, History of Burma, London, 1883, P 45 ;
Epigraphia Indica, XVII, P 350.
- 48 Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol IX, PP 282 ff.
- 49 A. P. Phayre, 'Coins of Ārākān, of Pegu and of Burma'
in "The International Numismata Orientalia", London 1882
P 30 ; Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, XLI
1872, PP 201-203.

- 50 A. H. Dani, Journal of the Numismatic Society of India,
Vol. XXIV, P & S I & II 1962, 142.
- 51 Epigraphia Indica, Vol XII, P 138.
- 52 ibid, XXXIII, P 138
- 53 ibid, XXVIII, P 56.
- 54 R. D. Banerjee, Bāṅgālār Itihās, P 233.
- 55 N. G. Majumdar, Inscriptions of Bengal, Vol. III,
P 3 ; Indian Historical Quarterly Vol. II, PP 655-56.
- 56 B. C. Sen, Opcit, P 370.
- 57 Bhāratavarsha, Jyeshtha 1348 B.S. P 768 ; Indian
Historical Quarterly, II, P 525.
- 58 D. C. Sircar, Opcit, P 25.
- 59 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXVIII, PP 338 ff.
- 60 Bhāratavarsha, Jyeshtha, 1348 B.S. P 768.
- 61 F. A. Khan, Maināmātī P 5 ; T. N. Ramachandran,
'Recent Archaeological Discoveries along the Maināmātī
and Lalmai ranges, Tippera district, East Bengal' in
B. C. Law Volume, PP II, 1946, P 218.
- 62 Epigraphia Indica, XXVIII, PP 51 ff.
- 63 N. G. Majumdar, Opcit, PP II-12.

- 64 R. C. Majumdar, History of Ancient Bengal PP 195 ff.
- 65 N. G. Majumdar, Opcit, P 7.
- 66 Indian Historical Review, XXIV, P 73.
- 67 Epigraphia Indica, XXVIII, PP 338 ff.
- 68 R. C. Majumdar, History of Bengal, Vol. I, Dacca University, PP 195 ff.
- 69 A. N. Choudhury, Opcit, P 159.
- 70 D. C. Sircar, Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan, PP 6 - 7.
- 70a G. Bhattacharyya, "The new Pāla ruler Mahendrapāla : The discovery of a valuable charter" South Asian Studies, No. 4 Cambridge, 1988, PP 71 ff.
- 71 R. C. Mukherjee and S. K. Maiti, Corpus of Bengal Inscriptions, P 25.
- 72 D. C. Sircar, Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan, P 22.
- 73 Indian Historical Quarterly, XXIII, PP 221 ff.
- 74 D. C. Sircar, Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan, PP 24 - 25.

- 75 K. K. Gupta Choudhury, "Paśchimbhāg Copper Plate of Māhārājā Śrī Chandradeva (10th Century A.D.)" in Nalinikanta Bhattasali Commemoration Volume" edited by A. B. M. Habibullah, PP 166 ff.
- 76 D. C. Sircar, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, PP 13-15.
- 77 D. C. Sircar, Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan, PP 25-26.
- 78 A. H. Dani, Bāṅglā Ekādemī Patrikā Vol. IV, No. III, 1367 B. S, PP 30 ff.
- 79 Loc cit.
- 80 A. H. Dani, 'Sylhet Copper Plate inscription of Śrīchandra, 5th regnal year'. The paper was read in 'The Asian Archaeology Conference, Delhi, 1961, P 2.
- 81 D. C. Sircar, Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan, P 45.
- 82 ibid, P 27.
- 83 P. N. Bhattacharyya, Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī, P 168.

- 84 D. C. Sircar, Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature, PP 63, 69.
- 85 A. H. Dani, Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 1960, Aligarh, Part I, PP 3 ff.
- 86 R. C. Majumdar, History of Ancient Bengal, P 204.
- 87 Epigraphia Indica, Vol II, PP 160 ff.
- 88 R. C. Majumdar, Opcit, P 205.
- 89 Epigraphia Indica, XI, P 142.
- 90 B. C. Sen, Opcit, P 373.
- 91 D. C. Sircar, Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan, P 46.
- 92 A. H. Dani, Bāṅglā Ekādemi Patrikā, Vol.IV, 1367 B. S. P 32.
- 93 R. R. Mukherjee and S. K. Maiti, Opcit, P 27.
- 94 A. M. Choudhury, Opcit, PP 179 - 80.
- 95 Epigraphia Indica, XVII, PP 349 - 50.
- 96 R. C. Majumdar, History of Bengal, Vol I, P 191.
- 97 Epigraphia Indica, IX, PP 229 ff.
- 98 Epigraphia Indica, XXVII, PP 24 - 27.

- 99 F. A. Khan, Maināmatī, 1963, P 13.
- 100 E. I, XVII, PP 351 ff.
- 101 Bisweswar Bhattacharyya, Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (NS), Vol VI, PP 131 ff.
- 102 E. I, XVII, PP 351 ff.
- 103 N. K. Bhattasali Felicitation Volume, PP 1 ff.
- 104 Epigraphia Indica, Vol II, PP 11, 15 ; Rewa Stone inscription, Epigraphia Indica, Vol XXIV, PP 105, 112.
- 105 Gaudalekhamātā, P 129.
- 106 Rāmacharita, Verse 1/31.
- 107 Rāmacharita published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, P 13.
- 108 Rāmacharita^g, Verse 1/22.
- 109 ibid, v 1/31.
- 110 ibid, 1/32.
- 111 ibid, 1/36.
- 112 ibid, 1/37.
- 113 History of Ancient Bengal, PP 142 ff.
- 114 B. C. Sen, Opcit, P 425.
- 115 Dacca University Studies, Vol I, No. II, PP 125 ff.
- 116 Rāmacharita, Verse 1/22.

- 117 ibid, Verse 1/31.
- 118 History of Ancient Bengal, P 143.
- 119 Indian Historical Quarterly, XIII, PP 40 ff.
- 120 P. L. Paul, The Early History of Bengal, Vol. I,
PP 63 - 64.
- 121 Bhāratavarsha, 1342 B.S. PP 18 - 22.
- 122 Modern Review, 1936, April issue.
- 123 Bhāratavarsha, 1342 B.S. PP 18 ff.
- 124 A. M. Choudhury, Opcit, P 109.
- 125 B. C. Sen, Opcit, P 428.
- 126 History of Ancient Bengal, P 144.
- 127 Dacca University Studies, Vol. I, No. II, P 136.
- 128 B. C. Sen, Opcit, PP 424 - 25.
- 129 Rāmācharita, Verse 1/24.
- 130 Varendra Research Society Rāmācharit, P 29.
- 131 'Introduction' to the work 'The Fall of the Pāla
Empire' by A. K. Maitreya, PP XIII ff.
- 132 Bhāratavarsha, 1343 B.S. PP 32 - 41.
- 133 P.L.Paul, Opcit, P 64.
- 134 Bhāratavarsha, 1342 B.S. PP 18 - 22.

- 134a R. S. Sharma, Indian Feudalism, PP 219 - 221.
- 135 'Introduction' by Dr. D. C. Sircar, PP XIII - XIV ff
in "The fall of the Pala Empire" by A.K.Maitreya.
- 136 Rāmacharita, Verse 1/39.
- 137 D. C. Sircar, Introduction to the work "The Fall of
Pāla Empire" , PP XIII - XIX ff.
- 138 Rāmacharita, Verse II/24.
- 139 Rājshahi Edition of the Rāmacharita, P XII.
- 140 Rāmacharita, V I/40 - 41.
- 141 History of Ancient Bengal, P 146.
- 142 N. G. Majumdar, Opcit, P 14 ; Epigraphia Indica,
Vol. XII, P 30.
- 143 Rāmacharita, Verse 1/41.
- 144 ibid Verse 1/43, 45.
- 145 ibid, Verse 1/46 - 49.
- 146 ibid, Verse II/12-20.
- 147 ibid, Verse II/17, 20, 33.
- 148 ibid, Verse II/29.
- 149 R.D.Banerjee, Bāngālār Itihās, P 263.
- 150 Epigraphia Indica, Vol IX.
- 151 Rāmacharita, Verse II/5.
- 152 R. D. Banerjee, The Pālas of Bengal, P 32.

- 153 Epigraphia Indica, Vol XV, P 279.
- 154 B. C. Sen, Opcit, PP 392 ff.
- 155 B. C. Sen, Opcit, P 392 fn 4
- 156 History of Ancient Bengal, P 471.
- 157 Nagendra Nath Vasu, Vaṅger Jātiya Itihās, Rājanya
Kānda, P 88.
- 158 Gaude Brāhmana, P 83.
- 159 Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Vol I,
1919, P 172.
- 160 Bāṅglār Purāvṛtta, P 204.
- 161 History of Ancient Bengal, P 472.
- 162 N. N. Vasu, Opcit, PP 121 ff ; Journal of the Asiatic
Society of Bengal (NS) Vol. IV, P 286.
- 163 R. D. Banerjee, Bāṅgālār Itihās, PP 215 - 16.
- 164 P.L.Pal, Opcit, P 83.
- 165 R. D. Banerjee, Opcit, PP 215 - 16.
- 166 N. N. Vasu, Opcit, P 95.
- 167 ibid, P 130.
- 168 R. D. Banerjee, Bāṅgālār Itihās, PP 217 - 18.
- 169 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (NS), Vol IV.
- 170 Bāṅglār Purāvṛtta, P 171.
- 171 R. G. Basak, Silimpur Stone slab inscription of the
time of Joyapaladeva, Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XIII,
- 172 Dr. Narattam Kundu, Caste and Class in Pre-Muslim
Bengal, Ph. d thesis, London University, 1963,
PP 40 - 65.

- 172 a D. C. Sircar, Studies in the Society and
Administration of Ancient and Medieval
India, Vol. I, PP 14 - 29.
- 172 b Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part II, PP 560 - 61.
- 172 c N. K. Sastri, The Cholas, PP 550 - 52.
- 172 d D. C. Sircar, Opcit, PP 28-29.
- 173 P. L. Paul, Opcit, PP 83 - 84.