CHAPTER III

POLITICAL BACKGROUND

'A'

The period under survey begins in circa A.D. 629. It is well known that in this year the Chinese pilgrim Hsüan-tsun started on his Indian pilgrimage from the westernmost province of China. He travelled through the Northern caravan route of Central Asia and reached Balkh in 630 A.D. After visiting a few independent states like Bamiyan etc. and crossing the snowy mountains (Hindukush) and the Black ridge (Siah Koh) he reached Kia-pi-shi. From here he went to Tien-chu (India) by way of Lan-po, Na-kie-lo-ha (Jalalabad), Kan-t'o-lo (Gandhāra). He travelled throughout India for fifteen years and returned to China through Kia-pi-shi.

Accounts of his travels are given in the T'a-T'ang Hsi-yü-chi, the She-kia-Fang-chi, and the 'Life' by Hui-Li. These form an important source of our knowledge for the reconstruction of the political condition of the regions of Kapisa and Gandhāra and surrounding areas in the fourth and fifth decade of 7th century A.D.

From Hsüan-tsun's brief sketch of the political situation of the countries which he visited on his way to India it seems that the vast region lying between the Chinese border and the Hindukush was then divided between two supreme powers, viz., the Chinese and the Turks. The Chinese authority under the vigorous rule of the T'ang dynasty extended its power over the area between Chinese border and the former kingdom of Kau-chang.
and its strong influence was felt by the independent kingdoms between Yen-ki and the lake Issik-kiil. The whole region from Issik-kiil to Hindukush and Turfan to Merv was under the control of the 'Khan' of the western branch of the Turks. Besides them, there were a few independent kingdoms in Central Asia.

On the south of Hindukush, lay the kingdom of Kia-pi-si (Kapiša). This kingdom was very powerful at that time. Kapiša was above 4000 li in circuit, and was bounded on the north by the snowy Mountains (Hindukush), as stated earlier. The king, who was selected from the Kshatriya caste, was a clever and shrewed man and had brought under his control some ten kingdoms. Towards the east his authority extended over Lan-po (Laghman), Na-kie-lo-ho (Nagarahāra — Modern Jelalabaḥ), and Kan-t'o-lo (i.e. Gandhāra), as stated before. Its northeastern boundary was formed by Ta-cha-shi-lo (Taxila), a former dependency of Kapiša, as mentioned before. Kasmīra under the vigorous rule of Kārkota Durlabha Vardhana (circa A.D. 631-33) annexed Taxila from the Shahis, as stated earlier. In the south, Kapiša's boundary stretched up to Fa-la-na territory (Bamnu district). It is also likely that it includes Tsao-ku-T'a (Taso-kuta = Arachosia) with its capital at Ho-si-na (Ghajni), since the king of Kapiša apparently escorted Hsüan-tsang on his homeward journey from the town of U-to-kia-han-cha (modern Und), via Lan-po (Lamghan), Fa-la-na, Op-o-kin, Fu-li-shi-sa-tang-na to the frontiers of Kapiša.
Hsüan-tsang, recorded that this prince was a devout follower of Mahāyāna Buddhism. He was fond of religious discussions and held a religious assembly — Moksha Parishad every five years. He did not follow the policy of religious persecution, which was apparent from Hsüan-tsang's reference to the members of Digambara, Pāṣupata sects and others. So, other religions flourished under his care. As it appears from the dates of Hsüan-tsang's visit to Kapiṣa, the king in question ruled at least from circa A.D. 630 to 645. It is possible that his rule began a little earlier and continued up to c. A.D. 645.

Thus, we can infer that the kingdom of Kapiṣa was of considerable importance. It was stretched over a large area and was consisted of greater portion of modern Eastern Afghanistan including Kafiristan and North-western Frontier Province of Pakistan. Hsüan-tsang referred to the king of Kapiṣa as a Kshatriya ruler. He, however, did not mention the name of this Kshatriya chief. This omission makes the matter of identification a difficult one. Here the term either denotes a member of the Kshatriya caste or an Indianized foreigner who followed the vocation of kingly class.

Coins, inscriptions of the earlier period, and the Harsacharita of Bāna records the existence of Hūna supremacy in the area concerned in two previous centuries. Of them, Khingala ruled over Kabul and its surrounding areas in the end of the 6th century A.D. It is not unlikely that the Kshatriya...
king may be either a descendant of this Ḥūna family, or he may be an outsider, who conquered these territories from the Ḥūnas.

Muslim annals, coins, Chinese source support the latter suggestion. The Muslim chronicles referred to one Tarkhan Nizak who was ruling over Badghis area in 651 A.D. and resisted Arab advance on Khurasan from that period up to A.D. 709 when he was killed. It is interesting to note in this connection that a series of coins with king's bust and fire-alter device, depicted a king wearing head-dress which is adorned with Triśula or wings surmounted by a buffalow's head. These coins bearing the Bactrian and Pahlavi legend with traces of Brahmi letters refer to one king NAPKI MALKA, NPSK MLKA or NCKY MALK or NEZAK or N(I)S(A)K MALK, NISAK MALKA i.e. Nisak, the lord or lord of the Nisak family.

According to Dr. B.N. Mukherjee, the bilingual legend of such a coin, now preserved in the Hermitage (Leningrad), bears on the obverse the copy of the bust of Khusrw II. The Pahlavi legend on it may be read, following B.N. Mukherjee, as $N \text{SK} M(a)LK = N(a)sk M(a)lk(a)$ or $N(i)sk$, the lord or lord of the $N(i)sk$ family. The Pahlavi legend on the right is 'Afzut Zarr' and on the left 'Bagh Zutai'. The marginal legend in Bactrian is $\text{(PAH)}O \text{TARAKA NICARA} (= \text{Shao Taraka Nisaga})$. The fire-alter is portrayed on the reverse with Pahlavi legend to left HVR (Hura i.e. Khurasan) and to right HAFT CHAL i.e. (year) 47. The date, if referred to Hijra era, may correspond
to 667 A.D. Specimens of this class of coins have been found in large numbers from Khurasan and Kapisa.

It appears from the coins that in the sixties of the 7th century A.D. a ruler called Nisaga ruled in Khurasan. He was described as belonging to Tarakan [name of a tribe or place]. He used the title Xutai which was the designation of the prince of Bokhara and Gozgan.

This Taraka Nisaga can well be identified with earlier mentioned Tarkhan Nizak of the Muslim chronologists as ruling in the Badghis area in 31 A.H. = 651 A.D. The coin-type of Nisaga is based on that of the earliest Arab governors. So is that of N(a)sk or N(i)sk Malk, who also copied the bust of Khusru II on some of his coins. The name written as NICATA in Bactrian could have been expressed as Pahlavi as N(i)s(a*K(a*).

So, the lord Nisak = Nizak = Nisaga ruled in Khurasan area in the fifties as well as in the sixties of the 7th century A.D. Use of Bactrian and Pahlavi, a few letters of Brahmi legends indicate Nezak's hold over the territories, where these two scripts were equally at home and the third also known; that is Khurasan, Tokharistan and Kapisa-Kabul region. Therefore we can identify the Kshatriya chief with this Nisaga or Nisak. A close examination of coins bearing the legend N*K MLKA certainly indicates that many of them bear portraits of the ruler concerned. But these may not represent one single monarch.
The Chinese Annals also referred to one No-se, king of Kāpīsā, Kī-pin (or Chi-pin) i.e. who sent a mission to China in 719 A.D. The Annals, moreover, recorded that this ruler of Kī-pin used to wear crown simulating the head of an Ox. The striking similarity in the name No-se and Nisak and the use of same kind of headdress suggest that there exists some sort of relationship between these two rulers. But these may not represent one single monarch.

Muslim chronologists refer to Nizak in connection with events ranging from 31 A.H. to 91 A.H. (circa A.D. 651-709 A.D.). In A.H. 91, one Nizak was killed in fighting. "It seems impossible", Habibi remarks, "for a ruler to rule more than 70 years and at least when he was 85 still being active and ready to fight against his opponents." But if Nizak was killed in A.D. 709, No-se = Nisak who ruled in Kī-pin (Kāpiśa) in 719 A.D. must be another ruler of that name. So there were at least two kings called Nisak. This family ruled in Khurasan and Tokharistan (where was Baghlan); Brahmi letters on their coins indicate their authority in parts of North-west India and its borderlands. If the above mentioned Chinese evidence is correct, then No-se (Nizak II) ruled over Kāpiśa. So, even after losing most of their territories to the north of the Hindukush, they retained their hold over Kāpiśa.

Therefore, it is possible that Nizak was originally the name of a Tarkhan king. Later, the name became a family name and his successors were known by this designation.
Otherwise we shall have to believe that he ruled for a very long time and that different busts on his coins are only different conventional busts and not actual portraits. Some of these may even indicate attempts to portray the ruler at different stages of his life.

From the Muslim chronicle we can gather following facts about Nizak's life. As already stated above, Arabs found Nizak ruling over Badghis area at the very outset of their onslaught on Khurasan (A.D. 651). In 31 A.H. (651 A.D.), Nizak solicited the marriage with a daughter of the Sasanian king Yazdegerzad III. At Yazdegerzad's refusal Nizak attacked him at Gunabād. Yazdegerzad fled to Merv where he was killed after a few years. In 34-35 A.H. (A.D. 664-65), he captured Balkh and exterminated the Bermakids. It was conquered by Rābi ibn Ziyād in 51 A.H. = circa 671 A.D.

In 671 A.D., Kabul Shah ousted the Arabs from Kabul, when Nizak was fighting against the Arabs to the north of that region. In 709 A.D. Nizak sent gifts to the king of Kabul and himself went to Baghlan.

In 84 A.H. Yazid bin Mohallab invaded the castle of Nizak in the Badghis region. Nizak handed over the treasury of the castle to the Arabs and made peace with them.

In 87 A.H. Qutaiba bin Muslim was appointed the Governor of Khurasan. Nizak then freed the Muslim from
prisons. Qutaiba demanded Nizak's obedience, who asked for the freedom of the Badghis region. Negotiations broke down. Later Nizak asked Qutaiba to allow him to go to Tukharistan. Nizak arrived at the temple of Now Bahar (Nava Vihara) at Balkh. Here Mugahira bin Abdallah tried to besiege him. But Nizak escaped and retired to Khlum where he made preparation to fight Qutaiba.

"In 90 A.H. Nizak with the help of Ispabad of Balkh, Bazan, Dihkan of Mervrood, Dihkan of Talagan, Tevesal, Suhrkk, Dihkan of Faryab and Jujuni, Dihkan of Juzjan, made arrangements to fight Qutaiba. Kabul Shah promised to resist the Arabs to the south of Hindukush, if Nizak failed to halt them on its north. In 91 A.H. (c. 709 A.D.) Qutaiba ousted the allies of Nizak. Qutaiba fought with Nizak at Khlum and also at Baghlan. Nizak took refuge in the Kärz Valley. There he fell into a trap laid by Salim Nasih, a messenger of the brother of Qutaiba. Salim Nasih persuaded Nizak to believe that he would be granted safety, if he visited Qutaiba who was then at Eshkamish (Modern Eshkamish in Talagan).

But when Nizak and his associates came out of the Kärz valley, they were arrested. Then as ordered by Hajjaj he and his associates were put to death.

The Chinese Annals (the Tang shu) corroborates the evidence of the Muslims. The T'ang-shu referred to several embassies from the king of Ki-pin or Chi-pin (i.e. Kapisa) to
China between A.D. 629-647, when the king sent horses. In return the Chinese emperor sent ambassadors with valuable presents. The king of Ki-pin again sent presents to China.

It seems the king in question whom we may identify with Nizak, sent presents to the Chinese emperor for a very special reason. We know from the T'ang shu that king of Ki-pin sent his youngmen to resist the Ta-chi i.e. Tajiks i.e. the Arabs, in 685 A.D. So, to stem the tide of Arab invasion, the king of Ki-pin i.e. Nizak sought Chinese help. The T'ang shu's reference to kingdom of Ki-pin consisting of the people of Ki-pin, Turks and people of Tokharistan suggests an united kingdom under one king.

The Chinese emperor's bestowal of the title of 'Military incharge of the district of Sieu-sien' on king of Ki-pin in 705 A.D. is nothing but record of plain fact that king of Ki-pin is the leader of the united army as is evidenced by Muslim chronicle's reference. Muslim chronicles recorded that Nizak opposed the Arab inrods with help of Kabul Shah and others as stated, between 705-06 A.D. to 709 A.D. After his death, king of Gujgan, one of his associates and allies, tried to come to terms with Qutaiba in lieu of tribute. For this reason he went to the camp of Qutaiba. His sudden death in his camp in doubtful circumstances infuriated the people of Gujgan. They attacked and drove the Muslims away. Another alley was sent to Damascus in chains and he remained there until his death. It seems from the brief sketch of
events that Nizak, Nisak or Nose group of kings were a formidable enemy of the Muslims in this region. They resisted Muslim attack on Khurasan from 651 A.D. To stem the tide of the Muslim invasion Nizak I sought alliance with the rulers of the neighbouring territories of which the most notable was Kabul Shah with the exception of the Chinese emperor. Kabul did not form part of Nizak's dominion up to 709 A.D. Sending of presents to Kabul Shah and Chinese emperor indicates his friendly relation with Kabul Shah and the Chinese emperor. He not only sought alliance but also led the military operations against the Muslims and made arrangements for the joint defence of their countries in those days. Though the allies suffered a setback in 709 A.D., according to Chinese annals this alliance continued to exist even after the death of Nizak I.

The Chinese source referred to another No-se, a king of Ki-pin who used to wear a headdress simulating an Ox, as referred to above. As already mentioned above, coins of Nisaga show similar crown, which suggests this No-se may be a descendant of the earlier one. This king ruled at least up to 719 A.D. So there were at least two kings called Nizak. This family ruled in Khurasan (Kapiśa being a part of it), Tokharistan, between 651-719. Brahmi letters on their coins indicate their authority in some parts of North-western India and its borderlands. If the Chinese evidence is correct, No-se ruled over Kapiśa. So even after losing most of the territory, to the north of Hindukush, this family might have continued to rule in Kapiśa and nearby areas.
But this state of affairs did not continue for long. The T'ang-Shu referred to king of Ki-pin again, in 719 A.D. The king of Ki-pin sent an ambassador to Chinese court with the offer of an astronomical text in that year. The Chinese emperor conferred to him the title Ho-lo-ta-che Tigin (Tigin of Arrokhadj, Ho-ta-lo-che denoted Arrokhadj or Zabulistan). This country submitted to Kapisa after 711 A.D. This bestowal of title suggests that there may be some upheaval in the country. Possibly king of Zabulistan usurped the throne of Kapisa. It is interesting to note in this connection that in his address to the emperor of China in 724 A.D., the king of Sie-yu (i.e. Zabulistan) was given the title of Tigin — "Tche-k'eu-eul, Sie-yu (Zabulistan)" who received the investiture in 720 A.D. This statement of the T'ang-shu supports the above-mentioned suggestion. Ho-lo-ta-che-Tigin and "Tche-k'eu-eul, may be one and the same person. In 720 A.D., the emperor of China conferred on Tche-k'eu-eul the title Hi-li-fa-of Ho-to-lo-che (Arrokodj).

Again, we find mention of another Tigin in 739 A.D. The T'ang-Shu stated that in A.D. 739 Ou-san T'e-kiš Shah demanded that his son Fou-lin-ki-po should succeed him.

We can infer from the above references to Tegins as rulers of Kapisa, that Kapisa passes from the hands of Nizak dynasty to another group called Tigin between A.D. 719-20. This Tigin group was originally rulers of Zabulistan, as stated
above. They supplanted the Nizak group in Kapisa. Ka-lo-to-che Tegin or Ho-lo-ta-che and Tch-k'eu-eul and Ou-san T'e-kin Shah may denote one and the same person. The first three being title, the fourth Ou-san may be his personal name.

Here again, the evidence of Chinese source is substantiated by a series of coins in silver, copper or billon, issued by Tigino Shao or Shahi Tigin. His silver coins bear on its obverse beardless bust of king with Bactrian legend. Cunningham reads it as Sri Shono. Göbl deciphers the Bactrian legend — CPI TOVINI SOYO (= Sri Togin's Shao).

Dr. Mukherjee reads the legend CPI TOVINI SOHO (Sri Tigino Soho).

Cunningham reads the Brahmi legend in two lines — one on each side, — as: 'Sri Yadavi' on the one hand and mana Sri on the other. According to Göbl, the reading of the Brahmi legend to left is 'Srimā devī' and to right 'Pārē Śrī'. Göbl deciphers the Pahlavi legend on left field as WSt (= 20) and on right field as Ab. Dr. Mukherjee more correctly reads the Brahmi legend to right as 'Śrī ma Devī', (= Mother earth) and to left as Vasu Śrī = Goddess of the earth. In the opinion of Dr. Mukherjee, the Pahlavi legend on left field stands for BWM i.e. 20. The era may be attributed to the era of Yagdezgerzed III, i.e. 708 + 20 = 728 A.D.

One copper or billon coin portrays head of king on
This coin weighs about 92 grammes and may be doubtfully attributed to above-mentioned ruler from the similarity in busts.

Thus, the issuer of these types of silver and copper coins, is Tigino Shao or Soho, i.e. Shahi Tigin. Use of Pahlavi, Bactrian, Brahmi legends suggest his hold over Khurasan, Tokharistan and Kapisa-Gandhāra region. The T'ang-Shu places Tigin between 719-20 to 745 A.D. as stated above. The date A.D. 728 found from coins, tallies exactly with the date supplied by the T'ang Shu. Therefore, the Tigin Shahi may be easily identified with T'e-kin of the Chinese Annals. This Tigin Shahi was a powerful ruler.

Al-biruni, referred to one Barhatkin, i.e. the Vrihat Tigin or Great Tigin as the founder of the dynasty of the Turkish Shahiyas of Kabul. In his opinion, one of this series of kings was Kanak, who built the Vihāra of Purushavara. Al-biruni made a slight mistake here in placing Kanak and Barhatkin to one and the same dynasty. In fact, it is otherwise. These are two separate dynasties. Kanak of Al-biruni was famous Kanishka who belonged to Kushana dynasty.

Tigin is a Turkish word. It is used as a name and suffix in Turkish which means prince of the blood. It is specially used to indicate the son or brother of Khan. The Chinese renders it as T'ie-kin. This designation is very common among the Turkish rulers of North-western India in the
7th-8th centuries A.D. Thus, Tigin dynasty was undoubtedly of Turkish origin. Therefore, we may identify Al-bərūnī's Barhatkin or Great Tigin with this Tigin.

Muslim chronologists stated that Qutaiba came to an ignomious end after the death of the Calip Walid. The next two rule (circa A.D. 715-717 and 717-720 A.D.) being on the whole peaceful gave war-torn Khurasan a brief respite. Muslim chroniclers stated that the "inhabitants of Khurasan could not be kept in order except by sword." They further recorded that there was general rising against the Muslims in different parts of Khurasan in 721 A.D. Possibly Shahi Tigin or Tigin Shahi took this opportunity to reconquer parts of Khurasan. As referred to above, he might have taken the help of allied army of different people of this area. The Chinese source further stated that the king Sha-li-Na-lo-Seng-po-ta-pa-ma i.e. Śīrī Narasingha Potavarman, the Pallava ruler of Kañoči, proposed to the Chinese emperor in A.D. 721 to send elephants and cavalry to fight with the Arabs and Tibetans. This above mentioned statement supports our earlier suggestion that the kings of Kapiśa, Nizak and the Tigin Shahi sought Chinese alliance as a protective measure. Wu-K'ong definitely stated that the king of Ki-pin sent an ambassador to China with a proposal of alliance for mutual protection.

Tigina Shahi was followed by two kings Vakhu or Vasudevā, and Vahi Tigin known from the coins. The exact relationship between these three is unknown at present. But
the adoption of same reverse device points to their belonging to the same branch of a royal family.

From the above-mentioned statement of the Chinese Annals we know that Ou-san-T'e-kin Shah have at least two sons, Fou-lin-ki-po and Pu-fu-chion. Ou-san T'e-kin Shah nominated Fou-lin-ki-po as his successor. Possibly he died at an early age, so Pu-fu-chion succeeded his father on the throne of Kapisa and Udayan in A.D. 745.

This Pu-fu-chion may be identified with Vasudeva or of the coins.

Very little is known about Vasudeva except from coins. He issued silver, copper or billon currency. His silver coins bear the bust of king, copied from Khusru II's coin. The marginal Pahlavi legend is deciphered by Gobbl and B.N. Mukherjee on the basis of several coins, as follows:

1. CIP "S'm r't =
2. Spwr bg hwt'p
3. Whm'n c mrt'n = Wahaman Shā Martan Malka (i.e. lord of Wahaman and Multan.)
4. MLK
5. GdH'Pawt = G(a)da = Gandhara.
6. S pWvr H Wt'p =

The reverse portrays the sun God with rayed flames ascending to a point. The Pahlavi legend has been reconstituted on the basis of several coins by Gobbl and B.N. Mukherjee as follows:
Another copper coin of this type may be doubtfully attributed to Vasudeva. The obverse has the same head of king to front and the reverse bears the identical portraiture of sun god to front with Pahlavi legend:

\[ S \text{pyr } b g' h wt' h \]

\[ T \text{rt} \]

\[ 2y/2'Wlstan = Zaulstan. \]

This coin weighs about 1 gram.

Another silver coin (not represented in Göbl) bears on its obverse head of king to front with Pahlavi legend in the inner and outer flan.

Inner to left x Afzut

Inner to right Saf Varsu Tef = Śrī Vasudeva

Margin : Saf Varsu Tef Wahaman Multan Malka = Śrī Vasudeva, king of Bahaman and Multan.

The reverse portrays same bust of sun-god to front.

Indian legend to right is Śrī Vāṣu Deva (reversed). The Pahlavi legend to left is Tukan Zaulastan (= India, Zabulistan) and in margin Sapardalakshan = Sapādalaksha (= Rajputana).
Another silver coin (not in Göbl) has similar king's head to front (based on Khusru II's coin) with Pahlavi legend on inner and outer flan which cannot be read. According to Cunningham, the Brahmi legend to right is — Sri Bahmana and to left is Vasudeva. Dr. Mukherjee reads the Brahmi legend to left and right as Va ..... ra and Vakhudeva.

The reverse portrays fire altar with two attendants standing to front with two short words in Pahlavi to right and left. Circular legend round the outside cannot be read.

It appears from all these coins that the issuer of this series of coins was Sri Vasudeva or Vakhudeva. He held sway over the countries of Zabulistan, (Ghazni region), Taki (Punjab), India (Hidu), Gandhâra (Bihar), Bahmanabad, Multan and Rajputana. He was a ruler of considerable importance.

We may tentatively identify him with famous Ratbil of the Muslim chronicles. This king opposed Muslims successfully during the middle of the 8th century A.D. Vasudeva's coins are undated. So, with the help of Chinese Annals we may place the beginning of his reign in 745 A.D. Large number of coins indicate a longer reign period of about 20 to 25 years that is 745 + 20 = 765 or 770 A.D.

Again, the T'ang Shu refers to an embassy sent by king of Kapisa to China in A.D. 750. In return the Chinese emperor sent Wu-K'ong with valuable presents in A.D. 751.
Wu-K'ong came to Gandhāra by way of Su-li, Kashgarh, Swat etc. and remained here for sometime. He returned to China about A.D. 790. He definitely stated that king of Ki-pin sent an ambassador to China with a proposal for alliance for mutual protection. The Chinese emperor's sending of another ambassador in return proves that he accepted the proposal. It is further stated by the Chinese Annals that the king of Ki-pin desired to send his son to the Chinese court. The above statement suggests that alliance with Chinese emperor was of great importance to the king of Ki-pin in this time of stress and strains. Wu-K'ong referred to Gandhāra as the eastern capital of Ki-pin and to its rulers as Turks. He noticed construction of several Buddhist establishments in Gandhāra. The king of Ki-pin sent another embassy to China in A.D. 759-60 possibly in return. It is possible the ruler referred to above is no other than Pu-fu-chion = Vāsuđeva himself.

He was followed by Vahi as referred to above. Vahi's coinage consists of silver and copper or billon money with same device and legend.

One of his silver coin has its obverse device beardless head of king with small moustach; his tiara is surmounted by a tiger's head and two triśulas and in the field to right are three characters which Cunningham takes for corrupt Greek Śrī Shano. Göbl reads CPI poYo = Śrī Shouo. According to Dr. Mukherjee these characters stand for CPI poHo = Śrī
In Cunningham's opinion, the Brahmi legend in circle outside is Śrī Hitivi cha' Airān cha Paramesvara Śrī Shahi Tigin Deva'ja = "The fortunate sovereign of both India and Persia, the fortunate Shahi Tigin, the son of heaven." Göbl takes the legend to be — Hitivira kharala vāhi TIGINa deva Karitam. Dr. Mukherjee more correctly reads it as follows: Śrī Hitivi Airān cha Paramesvara VĀHI TIGINa DeVA Kāritam =

Done by Śrī VĀHI TIGINa, the illustrious hero of the earth.

The reverse portrays same head of sun god to front with Pahlavi legend left and right which Cunningham read Saf Takif Tef and Takan Khurasan Malka.

According to Göbl, the Pahlavi legend on the left stands for Haft Haftat = 77 i.e. year 77. The Pahlavi legend to right is Tgyn' Hwr'sn Malka = TIGINo Khorasan Malka = TIGIN, lord of Khūrāsan. Dr. Mukherjee supports Göbl's reading.

Another copper or billon coin of about 0.97 grammes is attributed to this king by Göbl. The obverse has the usual head of king and the reverse portrays a figure with Pahlavi legend h wr's'n = Khurasan.

Therefore, VĀHI TIGIN was a king of Khurasan. The Brahmi legend suggest his rule over north-western parts of India. The date 77 may be interpreted according to Yezdegerzēd era of 708 A.D. i.e. 708 + 77 = 785 A.D.

We can safely presume that his rule began a little earlier between A.D. 770-780. Possibly he lost his hold over
Babulistan during this period. It is interesting to note in this connection Kāśmīra's relationship with the kings of this Shahiya dynasty. At the beginning of the period under survey, Kāśmīra conquered Taxila from the Shahis, as stated above. From this period, Kāśmīra began to expand their empire at the cost of the Shahis. Possibly this policy was followed by the rulers of Kāśmīra in the whole 9th century and in the first decade of 8th century. With the accession of Lalitāditya, a new leaf was turned. Lalitāditya, who understood the true nature of Muslim invasion, maintained friendly relations with the Shahis. Even Shahis accepted office under him.

Vakhudeva, tentatively identified with Ratbil, king of Za bul, as referred to above, was a contemporary of Lalitāditya whose rule began at about circa A.D. 724 and ended in 760 A.D. According to Kalhana, Lalitāditya three times defeated one Mammuni. The name definitely shows that it belongs to one of the Muslim chief of the surrounding areas. As the region under survey is open to the Muslim invasion, it is likely that Lalitāditya took leading part in some of the campaigns of the Shahis, against the Muslims who attacked this region and suffered a disastrous defeat at the hands of Ratbil. Yaśovarman is said to have defeated 'Pārasikas' (Persian) in the Gauda Vaho of Vākpatirāja. As there is no mention of Persian invasion to India in any of the chronicles and as Persia is under the Arabs during this period, it appears that the word Persian here denoted Muslims. It is not unlikely that Yaśodharman took part in the campaign against Muslims as an ally of Lalitāditya.
According to Muslim historians, they became much engrossed in their own affairs in course of time due to dissen-

sion in the Caliphate. Abbasid canvassing was carried on

from Khurasan by its supporters. This attracted so much of their attention that they conducted only limited number of campaigns against the infidels of the area concerned. After experiencing constant warfare from A.D. 650, the inhabitants of the zone under consideration and Khurasan (parts of Afghanistan, Central Asia) returned to settled life in this brief respite, though Islam was propagated and Arabs settled in their midst. After the reconquest of Balkh, it was made the capital of Khurasan in A.D. 736. The city was rebuilt and beautified by the Bermaces in 736 A.D. It seems from the statement preserved in the Futuh ul Buldan and the T'ang-Shu and also from the evidence of coins that Khurasan and Zabulistan became the bone of contention between the Arabs and the Turkish Shahis in the second half of 8th century A.D.

Although Muslims sometimes faced reverses, their hold over Khurasan became stronger and secure with the passing of years. Though, in Zabulistan Vasiudeva-Ratbil got the upper hand for the time being, he was killed in a battle with the Muslims later. His son, forced the Muslims to come to terms with him. This Ratbil may be Vahi Tigin who ruled over Kapiša in 785 A.D.

Thus, deprived of Khurasan, Shahis were forced to retire beyond Hindukush, but continued to rule over Kapiša and its neighbouring areas.
Our information about the last decade of 8th century is very little, except that Vahi was holding sway over Kapisa. However, we may refer to a Sarada inscription from Hund (Und), which mentions a king Anantadeva. For its fragmentary nature, it is not possible to make out the purpose of the text. "All that can be made out from the extant portion is that a part of the text was in the form of a prasasti of king Anantadeva, who was very sincere in his devotion to elders and was taking on innumerable occasions the advice of the Brahmanas and patronized the scholars and learned men. He spared no effort in the task of protecting his subjects." Anantadeva is referred to as "Udrikta Turushka-Pushkala valakshepanaika-dakshamant-manā," i.e. one who was expert in dismissing the power of the Turushkas (Turks) and Pushkalas. The word Turushka denotes Turks of Central Asia. In those days it used to indicate Muslims of Turkish extraction. The word Pushkala indicates inhabitant of Pushkalavati. It is rather interesting, that the Turushkas are mentioned along with Pushkalas. But the phrase may be one of the conventional phrases and does not mean any particular attack. "The date portion of the epigraph, if there is any, is lost. On palaeographic ground, the charter has been assigned to later part of 8th century A.D." Lines 12, 13 of this epigraph refers to three persons viz. navakarmapati Jayantarāja, son of Upendra, the Brahmaṇa Pillaka, son of Virāditya and Kshatriya Bhogika, son of Vihenda. Names of these three persons again appear in the inscription of Maharājñi Kamesvari.
Reference to these three persons in both the inscriptions show that the record belong to one and the same generation. The date of Queen Kāmesvari's inscription is in Lokakāla and falls accordingly to A.D. 774-775 A.D. As has been pointed out above the present charter is closely related to the inscription of Queen Kāmesvari and therefore is not far removed from 774-75 A.D."

Therefore, we can conclude that Anantadeva ruled in Hund and nearby areas from about the middle of the 8th century A.D. It also appears that North-Western part of India faced Muslim inroads from that time.

However, we have no information about his relationship with the Vasudeva group of kings. He might have been a protege of Kāśmir kings, who was ruling Hund and its neighbouring areas in the earlier part of the period under discussion. Otherwise, his claim as expert in dismissing the power of Turushka and Pushkala, sounds impossible. Probably he defeated Turushka and Pushkala with the aid of Kāśmir.

Any way, Gandhāra began to be invaded by Arabs from this period. They attacked, conquered, looted the land and took many captives whom they sold as slaves. Sometimes after subjugating the land they negotiated for peace with the people of that particular tract of land in lieu of tribute. Islam was propagated. Whenever possible, the people of this area revolted and drove out the Muslims from their midst.
and returned to their former faith. The Muslim chronicles reveal that from the 9th century onwards, Muslim rule becomes firmly rooted to the surrounding areas. Account of the later part of the 10th century shows long drawn struggle of the Shahis with the Ghaznavids as an ultimate result.

The Akhbar Makka provides information about the second decade of the 9th century. According to evidence of this book, Muslims invaded Kabul valley in 815-16 A.D. when Amir-al-Mamun was ruling Caliph. The king of Kabul, Pathi Dharmi Deva, suffered a severe defeat in the hands of Muslims. He paid homage to the Amir and accepted Islam. He visited Amir-al-Mamum personally when he came to Khurasan. Accounts of Baladhuri also supported this statement. He stated that Kabul was conquered by Arabs in circa A.D. 815-16. Kabul Shah paid double tribute to Al-Mamun when he visited Khurasan and post was established between these two countries. Moreover, the Akhbar Makka also described that the throne and crown of Kabul Shah were deposited at a sacred Kaba for public inspection. The throne and crown were inscribed with inscriptions from which we find the above-mentioned account. These inscriptions also stated that Kabul, Sind and Gandhāra came under Abbasid rule from about that time. This victory over Kabul Shah who might be the last member of the Turkish Shahi dynasty, weakened their position.

Al-būrūnī, mentioned that the last Turkish Shahiya ruler was Lagaturman, who was evil in thought and action.
So, the people complained about him to the Brahmana minister Kallar. Lagaturman was placed in the jail for correction by Kallar. Ultimately, Kallar deposed the king and usurped the throne. Possibly, this very reason for his defeat at the hands of Muslim and acceptance of Islam, Kallar so easily overthrew Lagaturman.

Whatever might be the case, the evidence of coins points to the issuing of a new series of coins by Spalapatideva. Spalapati Deva issued bull and horsemen, elephant and lion and lion and peacock types. These types were not new to this area. But they definitely indicate that the rulers who issued this types belong to Brahmanical faith. Thus, coins corroborate Al-būrūnī's statement that the members of the next dynasty are the follower of Brahmanical religion. Numismatic study of this series reveals that the coins of Spalapatideva are the earliest of this series and have been found mostly in Afghanistan and less in Punjab. This fact may be taken to prove that Spalapatideva is the first issuer of this currency and his empire includes Afghanistan and Punjab. Therefore, Spalapatideva may be identified with Kallar of Al-būrūnī though his hold over Punjab is not very strong. Large number of coins of Spalapatideva in different varieties clearly show a longer reign period. According to Macdowall Spalapatideva's coinage predates that of Vakkadeva. Vakkadeva's currency in its turn is the earlier than the coins
of Sāmantadeva with simple legend. Khadavayaka's coins post-date that of Sāmantadeva.

According to the evidence of Muslim sources, Kabul Shah suffered a crushing defeat at the Muslim hands in 815-16 A.D., as stated earlier. Usurpation of the throne by Kallar-Spalapati may take place within next two or three years, i.e. about 819-20 A.D. As already stated, larger number of coins of Spalapati indicates longer reign period of about 20 to 25 years. Thus we come to 840-845 A.D. being the end of Spalapatideva's rule.

Therefore, it appears that Kallar-Spalapatideva was succeeded by Vakkadeva. Vakkadeva was succeeded, Sāmantadeva and Khadavayaka. Nothing is known about Vakkadeva except from his coins. Representation of the lion, the mount of Durgā and bull on his coins indicates his veneration for Durgā and Śiva. His coins are recovered though, rarely from Jhelum to Kabul area, mostly from Punjab. This indicates that all these territories were included in his empire. But his kingdom centred round Punjab and his hold over Kabul was not strong. Rarity of his coins indicates a short reign period of 2 to 5 years so we may place him between A.D. 845-50.

Vakkadeva was succeeded by Sāmantadeva. He is Sāmand of Al-būrūni. Sāmantadeva was ruler of some importance. His coins in large numbers are quite common in Kabul
and Punjab. Finds of Sāmantadeva’s coins are known as well from different parts of the Europe, which indicates the presence of an extensive trade with other countries. Arrangement of the coinage into three separate series by scholars, of which first have simple legend Sāmantadeva with better preservation of type, traces of Bactrian legend and of good alloy, the second with Visarganta, and the third issued in billon post-dating the king, does not indicate twice reign period as is suggested by the scholars.

Mr. Macdowall divides mainly Sāmantadeva’s coins into three series, as referred to above, the first with better preservation of type and traces of Bactrian legend and of good alloy (61 to 70 percent gold and silver content), the second with Visarganta legend, and the third billon issues post-dating the king. Sāmantadeva’s two series of coins reveal a particular fact. The gold and silver content of the first series is greater than the second series. Second series contains only 25% percent gold and silver.

Kalhana referred to a famous Shahi ruler Lalliya, whose kingdom extended on the one hand to the Turushkas and on the other to Daradas. Kashmir formed one of its frontiers. He had friendly relation with Gurjara king Alakhana and others of North India. Sankaravarman, who ruled in Kashmir between 880-883 A.D., wanted to remove him from his throne. With this in mind, he led an expedition
against this Shahi king. Sankaravarman's sudden death may be connected with this event.

We already assign beginning of Samantadeva's reign period at about A.D. 850. Samantadeva's coinage suggests a longer reign period of at least 30 to 35 years. It also indicates that the king in question is a ruler of considerable importance and have extensive trade relations with kings in and outside India. Therefore, we can identify him with Lalliya. Lalliya was a sovereign of importance equally feared and loved by his friends and foe and had friendly relation with Alkhana, the Gurjara king and others of North-India. He held sway over Shahi kingdom in about 883 A.D. As already stated, Samantadeva's rule may began at about 850. If we assign him 30 to 35 years rule, we come to 885 A.D. So, it is not unlikely that Lalliya-Samantadeva ruled at least upto 883 A.D. Sankaravarman's expedition possibly came at the last period of his life. What is the outcome of this conflict we do not know. But Sankaravarman's sudden death at the hills of Urasā (Hazara) suggests that he faced reverses in this field.

Scholars on the basis of already mentioned first two series of coins and evidence of Kalhana proposed that Samantadeva ruled twice.

Issue of same type of coins by the same king with little change in legend does not necessarily mean twice reign
period. Use of Visarganta legend instead of simple Sāmantadeva legend shows on the contrary influence of Sanskrit. Hindu Shahis adopted and patronized Sanskrit and Sāradā script instead of Bactrian and Pahlavi, which was used by the kings of this area in the previous centuries. From now on Sanskrit and Gupta-Brahmi script, later on Sāradā began to replace them. Visarganta legend indicates this growing influence of Sanskrit. Secondly, depreciation of gold and silver contents and enhancement of copper may be due to the poorer condition of the treasury at that period. As we already know, Hindu Shahis had to face serious reverses at the hands of Muslims at A.D. 870. In A.D. 870 Yaqub-ibn-Laith captured parts of Kapisa and Kabul from the Shahis who might be no other than Lalliya-Sāmantadeva himself and struck coins at Panjshir in 870-74 A.D. It is interesting to note that a series of coins preserve the name of another ruler Khadavyaka, who issued coins in bull and horseman type with the Arabic legend 'Adal', conforming to the reformed dirham currency of the Arabs. In the opinion of Mr. Macdowal, this king might have been the governor or a tributary king belonging to the same dynasty appointed by Yaqub Laith to govern possibly Kabul-Panjshir area. With the Saffarid’s involvement in Balkh and Bamian, they had very little time to pay attention to Kabul, thus giving a chance to Sāmantadeva to recover his lost territory. Possibly, conflict with Muslims and the kings of Kasmir may cause serious strain on royal treasury which is indicated by
the difference of gold and silver contents of the two series of coins. Samantadeva's coins become the prototype of other states of Northern India. And many coins mostly billon as already stated are issued after his death.

It is interesting to note in this connection, Gurjaras are mentioned by the Muslim chroniclers as the arch enemy of the Muslims. Possibly for mutual protection against the Muslims and forces of Kasmir; Gurjaras and Shahis sought each other's alliance. Two states being contagious lends possibility to this suggestion. Shahis maintained friendly relation with Gurjara kings afterwards which was evidenced by the gift of Vishnu image by a Shahi king to Herambapala. This Shahi chief of Kira may be in all probability Bhimadeva.

It appears from the accounts of Kalhana that the Kasmir's conflict with Shahis became a long-drawn one. Possibly to avenge the defeat at the hands of Lalliya, another expedition was led by Prabhakara-deva, the chief minister of Gopala Varman, who claimed to have vanquished the Shahi ruler. This Shahi ruler may be either Lalliya or his son. Kalhana even stated that Prabhakara, Chief Minister of Gopalavarman bestowed Shahi kingdom on Toramana with the name Kamaluka.

Al-burini also referred to a Kamalu, after Samand. This Kamaluka-Toramana can be identified with Kamalu of Al-buruni. There is some doubt about his bestowal of kingdom
on Kamaluka. Coins bearing the name Kamara has been assigned to this king. According to Al-Ḥarunī he preceded Bhīma. His statement seems to be corroborated by an inscription from De Wai/which mentions the father of Bhimadeva as Kala-Varmadeva (Kamala-Varmadeva). The Muslim historians referred to a king Kamalu as contemporary and opponent of Fardaghan, the governor of Zabolistan in the reign of Saffarid Amar-ibn-Layth (879-900 A.D.). Thus, this Kamalu is chronologically very near to Kamaluka-Toramāṇa (about A.D. 902-904) of the Rājatarangini and may be the same person. In the opinion of H.C. Ray, "this involves a correction by a few years the date of Gopālavarman (A.D. 902-904) as given by Kalhana".

However, it is quite clear from the Muslim source that 'Kamalavarman was already in power when the Saffarids penetrated the Shahi empire a second time i.e. in or before 900 A.D.' Information from the Muslim source completely rules out the probability of Kamalavarman's accession taking place after the date of the accession of Gopālavarman of Kāśmīr. So it seems that Prabhākaradeva's success over the Shahis is not so overwhelming as appears to be from Kalhana's statement. It is not unlikely that the Shahi chief was forced to acknowledge the suzerainty of Kāśmīr and paid tribute. This simple fact is narrated as reinstatement of the Shahi king to give credit to Prabhākaradeva.

The shortage of coins of Kamalavarman indicates a shorter reign period. Reference to Sāmantadeva in the
unique gold coin of Bhima
deva indicates that they were closely related to each other. Therefore, Bhima
deva can not be placed long after 900 A.D. "Taking Kamaluka as a contem-
porary of Gopalavarman, we can suggest that his reign comes to an end not later than 905 A.D."

It appears from the reference to Muslim attack in the Jami-ul-Hikayat that it only affected the north-western fringe of the Shahi kingdom. 'Fardaghan demolished the temple of Sakavanta'. There is no indication of the march of the Muslims towards Kabul.

According to Al-buruni's list Kamalu was succeeded by Bhima. The Rajatarangini calls him Bhima Shahi. Silver
coins of Bhima
deva bears the legend Sri Bhima
deva. Dewai inscription refers to him as Paramesvara.

Paramabhattarakà Maharajadhiraja Sri-Sahi-Bhima
deva. Al-
buruni's Bhima, Kalhana's Bhimashahi, Sri Bhima
deva, Sahi Bhima
deva are one and the same person. This Shahi king was described in the Rajatarangini as the maternal grandfather of Kasmiri Queen Didda, wife of Kshemagupta (A.D. 950-58).

Bhima
deva maintained friendly relation with other countries including Khasas, and Kasmir. He gave in marriage his daughter to the Khasa chief of Simhapura (Lohara) and his grand-daughter Didda was bestowed on king of Kasmir. Bhima
deva built a temple of Vishnu in Kasmir at the time of Didda. In this way he exerted considerable influence on the kings of these territories.
It appears from a reference to "the Shahi, king of Kira", in the Khajuraho inscription of Chandella Yasovarman, that the Shahi chief made a gift of Vishnu image to Herambapāla, the Gurjara Pratihāra king, which he received from the king of Kira, who received it from the king of Bhoṭa or Tibet. As the date tallies with Bhīmadeva's reign, this king may be no other than Bhīmadeva himself. Herambapāla has been identified with Mahipāla, the Gurjara king (A.D. 912-942 A.D.). Rājaśekhara, who graced the court of Mahipāla and also that of his father, referred to his conquest of a number of countries including "Kulutas" and "Ramathas". Kuluta, modern Kulu valley, is contiguous to Kira, i.e. Kangra valley. So it seems that there may be some sort of conflict between the two. The Shahi king renewed his friendship with Herambapāla by making that gift.

Kalhana's reference to the building of a Vishnu temple in Kaśmīra by Bhīmadeva shows his devotion to Vishnu, though his coins indicate his equal veneration for the cult of Dūrga, Śiva and possibly Buddha.

The coins of Bhīmadeva, though small in number found from the Kabul area prove his hold over that region. He used both bull and horseman type and elephant and lion type for silver and copper currency respectively. One unique gold coin of Bhīmadeva is known. On the obverse the king is represented as sitting on the throne, with a standing
female figure to his right. The king holds his right hand out as giving or receiving something from the female figure and his left hand in akimbo and on the reverse a male is portrayed in a kingly pose, sat on vetrāsana (wicker-seat). The right hand is raised and the left hand akimbo resting on thigh. The female figure seated cross-legged on a lotus and holds a lotus and rājāndaṇḍa in her hands. The obverse has the legend Śahi Śrī Bhimadeva. The legend on the reverse is taken to be 'Śrimad Guṇanidhi śrī Śrī Samantadeva.' It seems from the description of the reverse device that the female figure seated on lotus holding a lotus and rājāndaṇḍa is a goddess, possibly Śrī or Lakshmi. This device recalls similar device of Chandragupta Kumāra-devi coins. It also recalls the phrase mentioned in the Gupta inscriptions that Rājalakṣmi selects him from her own accord. It is possible that this same scene is portrayed here. Sāmantadeva was selected by the Rājalakṣmi and Bhimadeva received it from her. The coin legend shows that Sāmantadeva is closely related to Bhimadeva who commemorates him for a very special reason. It is not unlikely that after the recovery of his lands from the Muslims he commemorates Sāmantadeva.

The date of Bhimadeva is controversial. Taking Diddā (950-58 A.D.) into account, Stein suggested that the date of Bhimadeva cannot be pushed back beyond 920 A.D. However, recent opinion would assign Bhimadeva a date between A.D. 915 and 957.
After Bhimadeva, the next Shahi ruler mentioned by Kalhana is Thakkana. During his rule, the relation between Kashmir and Shahi kingdom again become strained in the extreme. According to Kalhana, Yasodhara, Commander-in-chief of Abhimanyu (A.D. 958-972), son of Didda, out of spite, together with his relatives undertook an expedition against the Shahi ruler Thakkana. "Possessed of full energy, he rapidly invaded that country, which is difficult of access on account of its streams and mountains and captured Thakkana by force. He took tribute from that king who did homage, and watered afresh the creeper of fame with water sprinkled at the inauguration ceremony. At that time, Rakka and other wicked persons, who had access to the foolish queen stirred up enmity in her against the Commander-in-chief. When they said in their conversation that he (Yasodhara) was betraying her and that he had taken money for keeping Thakkana on his throne, she took their slander for the truth." When the Commander-in-chief swelled with glory, had reached his residence, Didda dispatched staff-bearers with the evident intention of banishing him. When they heard of this insult, Himmaka, Eramantaka and others remembered what they had agreed upon under their oath by sacred libation (Kosa) and raised a rebellion as before."
At one time the rebellious troops made it a precarious situation for Diddā, but she suppressed it with Naravāhana's help.

Kalhana's above account leaves no doubt in mind about Yaśodhara's success against Shahi ruler. But his reinstatement on the Shahi throne caused the displeasure of Diddā and led to his subsequent rebellion and downfall, which was suppressed by Diddā with the help of Naravāhana.

In the opinion of Stein, 'this Shahi king was a small chief in the neighbouring hill region claiming descent from the great Shahi family'. H.C. Ray takes him to be a ruler whom 'Al-bīrūnī perhaps failed to record in his list of the Hindu Shahi kings'. Perhaps, he might be a Hindu Shahi king who ruled after Bhīmadeva between A.D. 958-59 to 963 A.D., the first known date of Jayapāla, according to Firishtah. What is his relation with Jayapāla and Bhīmadeva we do not know. He maybe son and successor of Bhīmadeva and father of Jayapāla, known as Ishtapāla, according to Firishtah.

In the opinion of Al-bīrūnī the next king in question was Jayapāla. He is none other than Parameśvara Paramabhattāraka Mahārajādhirāja Śrī Jayapāladeva of Barikot inscription. No Shahi title is prefixed, though we have suggested that he was a grandson of Bhīmadeva. This is not unusual, as we know from Bhīmadeva's coin, he is mentioned simply as Śrī Bhīmadeva in coins. It is possible that in this case also the Shahi title was dropped. Jayapāla is known
only from the inscription and Muslim chronicles. No coin of Jayapaladeva has been found so far. It is a peculiar feature of the later Shahi group of kings. The last three rulers did not issue any coins in their own name. Probably the billon coins of Sāmantadeva post-dating the king, may be attributed to last three chiefs. The coins show a gradual reduction of silver and gold contents which varies between 25 to 30 per cent. Possibly the heavy strain on royal treasury forced this king to continue the earlier issues of Sāmantadeva in billon and his successors followed him.

First known date of Jayapala was 963 A.D. when Sabuktigin marched up to Laghman in the lifetime of Alaptagin who died in 963 A.D. It is interesting to note in this connection that Zabul i.e. Ghazni region came under the sway of Yaqub Laith in A.D. 870, as stated earlier. He struck coins at Panjshir in A.D. 875 A.D. But a reference to Hudud ul Alam to Panjshir as gateway of Hind (India) indicates that his success was short lived. The Shahis possibly recovered Panjshir from them. But Yaqub retained his hold over Ghazni. His successors Amr and Abu Bakr continued to rule Ghazni after his death. It is possible that the terms between rulers of Ghazni and the predecessors of Jayapala are not of enmity but of friendship.

Unfortunately for Jayapala and Amr Abu Bakr Lawick, Ghazni soon attracted the attention of Alaptigin, the governor of Balkh and commander in chief of Amir Abul Malik,
the Samanid king, over his troops of Khurasan. On the death of his suzerain in 961 A.D., Alaptigin was involved in the struggle for succession. He supported the cause of Abdul Malik's minor son against the claim of his brother Mansur and decided to lead an expedition to Bukhara. He made an alliance with the governor of Tus. But Mansur, who ascended the throne and owed the allegiance of his people, soon alienated Alaptigin by granting him the position of Commander in Chief over the troops of Khurasan and ordered him to block the passage of enemy on the banks of Oxus. Though Alaptigin reached the banks of Oxus, he understood his dangerous position. He was surrounded by enemies on two sides. So setting fire to his encampment he retired to Balkh. With a view to establish him beyond the reach of his offending suzerain he attacked Ghazni and occupied the fort after four months' siege and proclaimed himself king. Amir Mansur did not leave him to rest in peace. Mansur sent two successive armies to punish him. But these armies met with disastrous defeats and forced Amir to come to terms with him by bestowing the governorship of the territories which Alaptigin conquered and occupied.

Thus the kingdom of Ghazni was founded by Alaptigin at the cost of Abu Bakr Lawick's kingdom. Alaptigin died in A.D. 963, and was succeeded by his son Ishaq who was a weakling. Taking the opportunity Abu Bakr Lawick invaded Ghazni and conquered it. Ishaq fled to the court of the
Samanid king. He returned to Ghazni with a large army after one year and reconquered it. But he died in the same year. So the nobles chose Bilaktigin, a former slave and trusted general of Alaptigin to rule. He ruled for ten years in peace and justice.

After his death, Piritigin was chosen to succeed him, who was a cruel king. The people of Zabul invited the son of its former ruler Abu Ali Lawick to recover his territories. In this attempt, Abu Ali Lawick son of Abu Bakr, was helped by the Kabul Shah, i.e. Jayapala. Jayapala sent a contingent under the leadership of his son. But their attempt met with a disastrous end, and Abu Ali Lawick and the son of Kabul Shah were not only defeated but also captured and put to death by Sabuktigin, a former slave, son-in-law and a trusted general of Alaptigin.

Piritigin's cruelty brought about his downfall in 976-77 A.D. So, Sabuktigin ascended the throne in 977 A.D. With Sabuktigin's accession, the kingdom of Ghazni posed a grave threat to Jayapala's empire. Sabuktigin's principal task was to wage war against the infidels. So his main target became the Shahi kingdom. So he repaired roads leading to India, through which he raided many times Jayapala's territories between A.D. 977-986-7 A.D. He captured many forts, looted properties and taken prisoners. By a clever stratagem Sabuktigin won over Jayapala's ally Sheikh Hamid Lodi of Multan and maintained cordial relation with him upto his death. Shortly after his accession, Sabuktigin
added to his kingdom Bust, Dawar, Qusdur, Bamian, Tukharistan and Ghur. Seeing the desolation of his territories Jayapala accompanied by many chiefs and a vast army, led an expedition against Sabuktigin. The two armies came face to face at a place near a hill called Ghuzak between Lamghan and Ghazni. According to M. Nazim, this encounter took place in 966-67 A.D. The battle was continued for several days without any side giving way. According to Utbi, both sides sought for peaceful settlement. But Jayapala made the first move for peace. But his attempt did not meet with success. In the meantime a snow-storm caused havoc in the camp of Jayapala and forced him to make peace in lieu of large tribute, ceding territories and a few forts. Hostages were exchanged.

After his safe return to his territories, Jayapala did not act according to the conditions of the treaty and imprisoned the hostages. This infuriated Sabuktigin so much that he immediately set out to punish the enemy with a large army. According to Firishtah, Jayapala was also prepared for a decisive battle. He sought help from his allies. Kings of Delhi, Ajmer, Kalanjar, and Kanauj supplied him with troops and money. Reference to four capital cities seem to suggest that the Tomaras, Chahamanas, Chandellas and possibly Gurjaras sent contingents to aid Jayapala. The kings of Bhatia also helped him. But Sheikh Hamid Lodi, as stated above, already won over by Sabuktigin, stood aloof
in this battle. The two armies came face to face on the confines of Lamghan. A fierce onslaught took place. Jayapala's troops could not withstand the repeated charge of Sabuktigin's cavalry on a particular point and gave way. They fled in utter confusion. Sabuktigin pursued the enemy and massacred the large Hindu army and got huge booties. The region round Lamghan was included within Sabuktigin's empire as its result. Islam was propagated.

In the opinion of Firishtah, Bharata, king of Lahore rose in rebellion against Jayapala after this defeat. Anandapala subdued him and reinstated him at the request of the nobles of the town. His son Chandradatta deposed his father for his defeat and ascended the throne. Anandapala imprisoned him by a clever stratagem while he was hunting in a forest and annexed his state at about 999 A.D.

Sabuktigin did not attack Shahi kingdom after this encounter as he was engaged in the Khurasan. He died in Balkh frontier in 997 A.D. He had four sons of whom Mahmud was the eldest and Ismail was the youngest. Ismail ascended the throne after his father's death. Mahmud deposed him and imprisoned him upto his death. Mahmud ascended the throne of Ghazni in A.D. 998. After securing the throne of Ghazni, Sultan Mahmud consolidated his position in Herat, Balkh and Bust. He followed in his father's footsteps and chose holy war as his calling. He directed greater portion
of his efforts to destroy the idolators. He received the title Yamin-ud-Daula from the Caliph. Mahmud already took part in his campaign against Jayapala. His first invasion of Jayapala's territory took place in 1000 A.D. When he raided the Shahi land and captured some forts possibly near Peshawar. In 1001 A.D. he invaded Shahi kingdom with 10,000 or 15,000 picked cavalrymen and encamped in the outskirts of Peshawar.

Jayapala faced this formidable challenge with 30,000 foot soldiers and 300 elephants. He waited for further reinforcement and did not take direct action for sometime. Mahmud realised the situation and attacked immediately. A fierce battle took place in which victory favoured Sultan Mahmud. "Jayapala with fifteen of his sons, and brethren, were taken prisoner and '5,000' troops were slain in the battle field. "Sultan Mahmud acquired great fame and wealth in this battle. Among the spoils of war were sixteen necklaces inlaid with jewels, one of which that belonging to Jayapala was valued by jewellers at that time at 180,000 dinars."

"After this victory Mahmud marched from Peshawar to Waihand and invested its fort and reduced it. A good deal of booty was taken. The whole region from Lamghan to Peshawar came under Sultan's occupation as its result."

According to Firishtah, Jayapala and his chiefs were released on payment of a large ransom. From henceforth
they stipulated to pay an annual tribute. But Sultan Mahmud killed many of the Afghan chiefs who opposed him and took 5 lacs of men, women prisoners to Ghazni. He introduced Islam in the occupied territory, built mosque and appointed teachers to teach rudiments of Islam to the new believers. Then he returned to Ghazni.

On his return to his kingdom Jayapāla considered himself unworthy of the throne on account of his three successive defeats at the hands of Muslim, and possibly his contacts with the mlechchhas who were impure. So Jayapāla abdicated the throne in favour of his son Anandapāla and immolated himself in a funeral pyre.

Thus Jayapāla's reign came to an ignomious end. Jayapāla was a very brave king and general. He faced the Muslim challenge with courage and fortitude. We was aware of the true nature of Muslim attack. If the account of Firishtah is to be believed he made alliance with other kings of North India and united them against the common enemy, i.e. the Muslims. But he was unfortunate. His reliance on the elephant forces against cavalry may be a cause for his failure. Whatever might be the cause he stood against the Muslim onrush with courage and great resolution. The large tribute paid by him to Sabuktigin and Sultan Mahmud in succession and the huge booty indicates as well-stocked royal treasury. Appointment of Ugrabhūti, a grammarian as the preceptor of Anandapāla indicates his patronage of
learning. He equally contributed to the establishment of religious foundations. One devakula i.e. shrine was established on Vajirasthāna (Hazara) during his reign. He was the overlord of a considerable empire at the beginning of 963 A.D. as stated above. His empire included Bamian on the north, Kabul in the west, Kandahar on the south, upto Kangra in the east. At the close of his reign, he lost most of his territories on the west of Indus except Und and was forced to acknowledge the suzerainty of Sultan Mahmud.

He was succeeded by his son Ānandapāla, to whom he wrote the last letter stating his desire to abdicate the throne and immolate himself on the funeral pyre. Ānandapāla's first known date was 1006 A.D. when he came into conflict with Sultan Mahmud. Possibly he ascended the throne shortly after Jayapala's death.

When Ānandapāla came into power most of his territories on the west of Indus except Und were lost to Mahmud, still he was a formidable foe. He had at least two allies, the ruler of Bhatia and Abul Fatah Daud, grandson of Shaikh Hamid Lodi. Daud realised at last the threat Sultan Mahmud posed to his state. So he renewed his treaty with Ānandapāla for mutual protection. Firishtah's reference to kings of Kalanjara, Kanauj, Delhi and Ajmer who sent contingents to help Ānandapāla suggests his cordial relationship with all these kings. He was a brave general.

On the other hand his opponent established his hold
over Persia, Siestan and Khurasan and carried on war successfully with Samanids and Turks under Ilak Khan. He was an equally brave and clever general and no mean opponent.

It seems from the accounts of Giridizi and Utbi that the main obstacle which lay in the path of Sultan Mahmud's conquest of Hind was the Anandapala's kingdom, stretching from Waihand (Und) to Kangra. So to remove him, Sultan Mahmud attacked his friends and allies one by one. The king of Bhatia topped the list. He molested Sultan Mahmud's governors of the occupied territories and defeated them several times.

So in 1004 A.D. he decided to attack Bhatia. He marched by way of Sibi and Hissar and reached Bhatia. The king of Bhatia Bajirao was prepared for this fight. A fierce battle ensued which was continued for three days and nights. At last Bajirao's army was forced to seek shelter behind the rampart of the city. Bajirao left the fort and retired to a forest. The city was beset and reduced by Sultan's army. Mahmud sent troops in hot pursuit of Bajirao when he heard about his flight. They overtook the Bajirao shortly. In despair the king killed himself and his few soldiers fought to the last. The Sultan gained a lot of plunder in this battle including 120 elephants and a great stock of arms and riches. "He converted the inhabitants and built a number of mosques and appointed teachers for the new Muslims to teach them the commandments of the law and make
the lawful and unlawful known to them. Thereafter he retired to Ghazni."

Sultan Mahmud's next target became Daud, ruler of Multan who antagonised Mahmud by his acceptance of Ismaili sect and also by his terms with Ānandapāla. The Sultan decided to make a surprise attack on Multan in 1006 A.D. But the Indus at that time was in spate. So crossing of the Indus proved a formidable task. He, therefore, requested Ānandapāla to give passage for his army through Ānandapāla's territory. On Ānandapāla's refusal he directed his army to destroy Ānandapāla's kingdom. His troops crossed the Indus in down-stream and attacked Ānandapāla and defeated and dispersed him. Ānandapāla fled to the mountains of Kāsmira. The conquered land was ravaged and many prisoners were taken.

Thus, dispersing Ānandapāla, Mahmud marched to Multan and laid siege to it. At his approach, Daud retired with his valuable to an island called Lankā. The city fell to the hands of the Muslim after a contest. The inhabitants agreed to pay 20,000 Dinaras in two instalments every year. Mahmud returned to Ghazni in a hurry when he received news from Arslan Žanzib, governor of Herat about Ilak Khan's (king of Kashgar) invasion. "He instantly repaired to Ghazni having placed the management of affairs of the occupied territories in the hands of Sukhapāla or Nawasa Shah, grandson of Jayapāla who had fallen into the hands of Abu Ali Sanjur at
Nishapur and had been converted to Islam. According to Al-būrūnī, Anandapāla offered to send contingent to Mahmud in his time of stress. Al-būrūnī praised his noble sentiment. But it may be a mere ruse. Or it may be caused by the terms of the peace treaty. As we know from it, the Shahi king had to supply Sultan Mahmud with 2,000 troops and presents and also tribute every year.

Any way, on receiving news about Sukhapāla's activities, Sultan Mahmud returned to the Shahi kingdom in all haste. Sukhapāla in the meantime abjured his religion and held talk with Brahmins with a view to return to his former faith. Sultan Mahmud took it to be a grave offence and marched with lightening speed to punish the offender. He attacked Sukhapāla, defeated and captured his capital. Sukhapāla was forced to pay 400,000 dinaras and was imprisoned for life.

Thus Mahmud singled out Anandapāla. In 1008-09 A.D. he led an expedition to punish Anandapāla for his supporting the cause of Daud. Anandapāla's son Brahmanpāla met him on the banks of the river of Waihand (i.e. Sind) with innumerable host of black soldiers with white swords, bluish spears, rosy helmets and grey elephants. After a fierce engagement Brahmanpāla's army was compelled to flee from their entrenched position. The Sultan's followers began to slaughter the enemies wherever they found them. Sultan Mahmud drove him from one place to another till he reached the fort of Bhīmanagara. This fort was situated on a high
mountain surrounded by water. Here treasures of every sort were deposited by kings of India through the ages. Mahmud beseized it for three days. In the end, he succeeded in entering the fort with some of his companions afterwards. "Gold, silver and diamonds that had been accumulated" there, fell into his hands. Booty beyond counting fell into Mahmud's hand, including a house of gold and silver. The booty was displayed at Ghazni for the people to stare at. He appointed one trustworthy officer to guard the fort, which he possibly could not hold under his control for long. But, it seems from his subsequent invasion of territories, situated within the interior of India that he annexed all the territories on the west bank of Indus.

In 1009 A.D. Mahmud led an attack on the king of Narayana. In the opinion of Muslim historians this place was situated in the heart of Hind, on the main thoroughfare leading to Mid-India. Narayan has been identified with Narayanapur in the old Alwar State, Rajputana by Cunningham. The king of Narayana was a vassal of Anandapala. Anandapala came to the rescue of his vassal. But he was defeated. Moreover, its situation on way to Mid-India is strategically important. As referred to above Mahmud wanted to invade the interior of India. But the Shahi kingdom acted as a buffer between Ghazni and Mid-India. Moreover, the principal high-way leading to the heart of India ran through the territories of Anandapala. So he tried to find out another alternative
through Multan which initiated this attack and subsequent defeat of the king of Narayana.

In the latter part of A.D. 1010 Mahmud again led an expedition against Daud, the king of Multan who had turned hostile again. The popularity of Ismaili sect was also increasing. The Sultan killed a large number of the heretics and took Daud prisoner and re-established his authority over that country.

Seeing these successive defeats of at least his one-time ally, Anandapala realised the precarious situation and futility of his opposition to Sultan Mahmud. He, therefore, came to terms with the Sultan on condition that he would pay a large tribute every year equal to the value of the profit of his territories and plunder of his cities. He would send 50 elephants and 2000 armed and skilled men for military purposes. In return, the Sultan promised not to invade his kingdom, not to burn, or lay waste to his territories. Both parties strictly followed the conditions of the treaty. The relation between the two kings became so cordial that trade was resumed. The caravan between Hind and Khurasan travelled without molestation.

Though the Sultan made an alliance with Anandapala he did not give up his project to invade Hind every year. His next target was Thaneswar which possessed elephants of Ceylon breed, very useful in warfare. The idol temple in
Thaneswar was highly venerated by the kafirs. In A.D. 1012 Mahmud started from Ghazni with a view to conquer and plunder Thaneswar. Anandapala, true to his treaty, gave passage to Mahmud’s army through his kingdom, but requested him not to destroy that sacred city. Anandapala offered an adequate compensation for this. The Sultan did not pay any attention to his proposal and marched towards Thaneswar. He was opposed by Rama, chief of Dera, on his way to Thaneswar on the bank of a river. However, he was defeated and the Sultan continued his march. As Thaneswar formed a part of the kingdom of Delhi, Raja of Delhi sent messengers to invite other kings for help. While preparation was going on, the Sultan reached Thaneswar, captured that city and plundered it. He wanted to invade Delhi but gave up his project for fear of Anandapala on whom he could not fully rely. So, he returned to Ghazni through Shahi kingdom, receiving due hospitality from the Shahi king. Anandapala died between 1012-15 A.D.

Thus, Anandapala’s reign was equally full of battle and hardship. According to Utbi, he was a skilled swordsman, brave general and imposing ruler. Al-biruni praised him for his noble sentiment. He was true to his words and tried to help his friends. Like his father, he patronised learning. His kingdom included at least Und, Lahore, Salt Range and Kangra valley when he inherited it from his father with a number of friends and allies. But the account of the
Muslim chronicles revealed that Mahmud not only drove him east of Indus, but compelled him to pay tribute. He systematically destroyed the allies of Anandapala in the neighbouring regions one after another. The king of Bhatia and Multan were his friends. The chief of Nārāyana was a vassal. By defeating all these kings Mahmud singled him out from his allies and vassals and forced him to submit. Anandapala was succeeded by his son Trilochanapala.

The peace treaty with Anandapala gave Sultan Mahmud at least freedom of movement. But it also caused some inconvenience. We already noted that he gave up the idea of conquest of Delhi for the fear of Anandapala. So, to remove the thorn altogether Sultan Mahmud led another expedition against the Shahis now settled in Nandanā in the Salt Range in A.D. 1014. Trilochanapala was unprepared for this sudden attack. But he tried to defend his fort by sending tried veterans to guard the fort and invited his allies and friends from all quarters to join him in this battle. According to Utbi, the king of Hindustan i.e. Trilochanapala sought the safety of mountains. He stationed his army on a mountain pass behind rocks. The Sultan tried to dislodge him from his perch by sending shower of arrows. When he received help from others he came out in the open to give battle, resting his rear and two flanks on mountains. A furious onslaught took place. Though the allied forces contested every inch of the ground, they
were ultimately defeated with great slaughter. After that the fort of Nandana was invested. Trilochanapāla, himself left for the passes in Kaśmīra. The army losing heart, surrendered it after a few days seize. The Sultan collected much spoils of war from this fort and left the fort in charge of Sharugh.

Mahmud chased him upto Kaśmīrahills. From Girdizi's reference to a victory achieved by Sultan Mahmūd's army and their pillage of the passes leading to Kaśmīra and also from Kañhana's account of Tungh and Trilochanapāla's encounter with the Muslims, it appear they refer to the same event. Sultan Mahmūd's invasion of Kaśmīra took place in 1015 A.D. As referred to above, Trilochanapāla sought help from Sangrāmarāja, the king of Kaśmīra (A.D. 1003-28), when Sultan Mahmūd invaded Nandana in 1014 A.D. After the fall of the fort the Shahi king took refuge on the mountain's of Kaśmīra's frontier. Sangrāmarāja sent a large contingent under the leadership of Tunga who joined Trilochanapāla here. Tunga easily won a victory over a small force sent by the Sultan on reconnaissance mission. He became over-confident and came out in the open to give battle. Trilochanapāla was thus forced to take the field. The joint army though displayed much valour, was ultimately routed. Trilochanapāla retired from the field. Mahmud won this victory in 1015 A.D. He plundered the frontiers of Kaśmīra valley, took many captives and converted some to Islam and returned to Ghazni with spoils of war.
In 1016 A.D. the Sultan decided to attack Kaśmīra. When he reached the pass where the fortress of Lohkot was situated, he besieged it. But winter set in with a heavy snowfall. He was compelled to withdraw the siege and 'sought safety in retirement'. He returned to Ghazni in spring.

Thus by breaking the stronghold of Trilochanapāla, Mahmud now prepared the ground for his repeated attacks into interior of India. According to Kalhana, Trilochanapāla tried to regain the fallen fortunes of his family even after his two successive defeats. Sultan Mahmud's different raids may be connected with this attempt. In 409 A.H. (A.D. 1018) the Sultan decided to invade Kanauj. According to Firishtah, he was one of the kings who sent troops in the aid of Jayapāla and Anandapāla as referred to above. The king of Kanauj was no other than the contemporary Gurjara Pratihāra king himself, an ally of the Turkish and Hindu Shahis throughout their eventful reigns. Though, their power was now in the wane, and became the shadow of their former glory and limited to a stretch of territory still they might have sent troops to help the Shahis. In 1018 A.D. the Sultan marched from Ghazni towards Kanauj with a vast army and crossed the seven rivers on his way towards Kanauj. The chiefs of the states through which passed submitted to him. Janki, son of Shahi, grandson of Bamhi, was controlled the southern passes leading into Kaśmīr submitted to him and offered to act as a guide. As Trilochanapāla's dominion on the
eastern bank of the Indus came under the Sultan's possession as a result of his earlier defeat, he tried to revive his power in the eastern Punjab. As referred to above Kalhana stated that Trilochanapāla displayed great resolution even after he had fallen from his position and relying on his elephant forces tried to revive his power as already referred to above. According to Girdizi, Trilochanapāla came to terms with Nanda who tried to re-establish him on his empire. Trilochanapāla at that time was involved in a conflict with the king of Sharoa, i.e. Sharva. Cunningham identified it with Sirsawa to the east of the Yamuna, near Shaharanpur. From the time of Jayapāla the two kingdoms were hostile to each other. These two opponents fought many battles with disastrous consequences. "At last both were compelled to sue for peace to avoid bloodshed on both sides." For lasting peace Trilochanapāla married his son to the daughter of Chand Rai, king of Sharoa. So the enmity between the two came to an end. "Relying on their matrimonial relation, trusting to the prevailing peace and coming together of their two families' states, Trilochanapāla sent his son to Chand Rai", possibly for further aid. "But the moment his son-in-law fell into his (Chand Rai's) hands, he made him a prisoner and put him in chains. He demanded from him the restitution of property which has been destroyed by his father. Trilochanapāla failed in reducing Chand Rai's fort, in conquering his territories or getting his son released from his prison. The feud continued."
In the meanwhile Sultan Mahmud appeared on the scene. On his approach Trilochanapala fled to the kingdom of Bhima, Paramara king of Malava. The Sultan continued his journey through jungles and forests and at last reached Baran, modern Bulandshar in U.P. The king Hardat ran away from Bulandshar leaving his tribesmen to guard the fort. The garrison losing heart, bought peace by paying 1,00,000 dirhams and 30 elephants. From here, he advanced on Mahaban, on the Yamuna. According to the Muslim chronologists, Kulchand, king of Mahaban was a ruler of considerable importance. As soon as Mahmud invested Mahaban, Kulchand left it and took refuge to a fort in a dense forest and kept everything ready for battle. The Sultan, after a careful search discovered his hide out and attacked him. "A hand to hand fight with swords and spears between the two armies", took place. The Hindus having failed to defend their position, jumped into the Yamuna and tried to cross it. But most of them were drowned in the river. Kulchand, finding no other way to escape killed his wife at first and then killed himself. The Sultan secured a large booty together with 185 war elephants. Then he attacked Mathura. Though the city belonged to the king of Delhi, he entered it without much opposition, plundered, destroyed it, and secured huge spoils of war. From here he marched to Kanauj. On his approach Rajyapala, the Gurjara king of Kanauj, retired to Bari. Kanauj fell easily to his hands in the absence of
any strong opposition. Mahmud next invaded Munj. Munj has been identified by some with Munjhawan, 10 miles south of Kanpur and by others with the place of this name 14 miles north-east of Etawah. It was known as the fort of the Brahmanas. The garrison resisted the invader for 25 days. Realising the futility of their attempt to defend them any longer, a large number of them preferred death than dishonour. A large number of them threw themselves in the fire with their wives and children and some of them jumped to death from the battlements of the fort and others sallied forth from the fort and fell fighting with the enemies. It was eventually found that no single soul survived in the fort. Mahmud took possession of all the valuables of the fort and then advanced towards Asi, Asi is identified with modern Asni, 10 miles north-east from Fatehpur. Its ruler Chandrapal Bhur, renowned in India for his victories in several wars, did not like to face the invader and ran away from here. At the Sultan's order the fort was plundered and demolished and the inhabitants were put to death.

Next, he directed his army to attack Sharva, modern Sirsawa in U.P. Chand Rai, the chief of this state was equally well known in India, prepared for the fight. On the advice of Bhimapala, his son-in-law, he fled from the fort on the Sultan's approach and took shelter in a lofty hill, and hide himself in a thick forest. The Sultan plundered the fort of Sharva, then pushed his way through the jungle, overtook
Chand Rai by night. The forces of Chand Rai were routed and Sultan got huge spoils of war and large number of prisoners as its result. This victory over Chand Rai took in January, A.D. 1019. The Sultan returned to Ghazni from here.

Bhīmapala probably escaped from the prison taking this opportunity. Trilochanapāla got a brief respite after this invasion. But he could not enjoy it for long. As referred to above Ganda, i.e., the Chandella king Vidyādhaṇa tried to aid Trilochanapāla to re-establish his hold over his empire. Moreover, Chandella king, Vidyādhaṇa killed Rājyapāla, who submitted to Mahmud after the fall of Kanauj. So, in A.D. 1020-21 Sultan Mahmud again invaded India to chastise Vidyādhaṇa for his conduct with a vast army. He was opposed on the bank of the Rahiba by Trilochanapāla. The Rahiba may either Ravi or Yamuna. Mahmud found the river difficult to cross. Because the river was very deep and its bottom was full of mud. But he ordered eight men to cross the river in inflated skins. Trilochanapāla sent a small contingent to oppose their landing. But these men were able to cross the river and forced their way through the enemies by showering arrows. The troops of Sultan Mahmud were inspired by their valour and courage, crossed the river in inflated skins and attacked the enemy. Trilochanapāla joined the fray with all his forces. The Hindoos fought fiercely, but were ultimately routed. Trilochanapāla fled from the field. Many Hindoos lost their lives.
in this encounter and 270 elephants fell to the Sultan's hands. Sultan Mahmud reached Bari and raged it to the grounds. He now advanced to punish Vidyādhara, an ally of Trilochanapāla. Innumerable forces of Chandella king struck terror in his heart. But Vidyādhara's sudden disappearance from the field led to the looting of the camp and then he repaired to his country. But his subsequent invasion of Lohkot in the same year may be connected with the event. But the Sultan could not succeed in capturing Lohkot and forced to raise the size and retired to Ghazni. He, again invaded the territories of Chandella king in 1021-22 A.D. He first attacked the fortress of Gwalior and compelled its king to submit to him. Then he invested the fort of Kalañjara. The seize had continued for a long time. At last Vidyādhara sent an emissary with a proposal to raise the seize. Vidyādhara proposed to give him a present of 300 elephants and other valuables for this. Mahmud consented to this proposal. To test the bravery of Turkish soldiers, Vidyādhara ordered to let loose the elephants without riders outside the Gate of the fort. At the command of Sultan Mahmud, his soldiers not only brought them under control, but mounted them. Vidyādhara was so amazed at this bold feat that he wrote a poem praising this incident and sent it to the Sultan. The Sultan reciprocated this gesture by bestowing on him 15 fortresses.

The narrative appears to be peculiar. Because Mahmud so far attacked, destroyed the prosperity of the
cities of idolators one after another, he did not show any act of marcy to those who fell to his hands. So, in this case, it is possible that he did not fare so well in this encounter with the Chandella king and made peace by ceding 15 forts instead.

As stated above, Al-biruni recorded that Trilochana-pala was killed in 1021 A.D. and his son Bhimapala 5 years later. It is not unlikely that Chandella king tried to help Bhimapala. Mahmud therefore came to destroy the last stronghold of the Shahis. But making the peace move the Sultan tried to neutralize that ally also. Nothing is known about Bhimapala except that he was fearless and brave man and married the daughter of king of Sharoa. At the present state of our knowledge, we do not know if he ruled at all or not. As referred to above his death in 1026-27 A.D. may be connected with Sultan Mahmud's Somnath expedition. With his death political power of the dynasty of Hindu Shahis came to an end. Though a few of them Diddapala, Anangapala, Rudrapala took refuge in Kasmir court and received favour from Kasmir king and displayed valour, they met their death not long afterwards. Thus, the dynasty of the Hindu Shahis came to an end. The Turkish Shahis bravely resisted Muslims from the very outset of their onrush to Khurasan and the Hindu Shahis overtook the task from them and successfully held them in check till the beginning of the 11th century A.D. for more than 400 years. It was no mean task. The collapse of their power made a deep impression upon
Al-bûrûnî and Kalhana equally. Al-bûrûnî remarked with a note of pathos: "The Hindu Shahiya dynasty is now extinct, and of the whole house there is no longer the slightest remnants in existence. We must say that, in all their grandeur, they never slackened in the ardent desire of doing that which is good and right, that they were men of noble sentiment and noble bearing." Kalhana expressed his surprise and sorrow over the vanishing glory of the Shahis: "I have not described here at length how rapidly the royal glory of the Shahis has vanished even down to their very name, this being only an incident. Nothing is impossible to Fate. It effects with ease what even in dreams appears incredible, what fancy fails to reach. That Shahi kingdom whose greatness on earth has above been briefly indicated in the account of king Sankaravarman's reign — now one asks oneself whether with its kings, ministers and its court it ever was or was not."
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