CHAPTER II

POLITICAL IDENTITIES AND THE PROCESSES OF STATE FORMATION
CHAPTER II

POLITICAL IDENTITIES AND THE PROCESSES OF STATE FORMATION

Pre- and Proto-historic Antecedents

Archaeological evidence reveals that the proto-historic, cultures namely the late Harappan, the OCP and the PGW could reach only up to the eastern and southern fringes of the Himalayan valley. In the early phase of PGW, a feeble attempt was made to enter the northern frontiers by circumventing the valley. It went as far as Thapli in Tehri Garhwal and Purola in Uttarakashi. But these settlements did not continue too long and reveal a single phase of PGW culture. Most probably these sites belonged to a branch of vedic people who come in search of iron ores. During the later vedic phase (1000 B.C. - 500 B.C.), people of upper Gangetic and Sutlej basins seem to have used the iron ores found in Mandi in Himachal Pradesh, Patiala in Punjab and Kumaon hills in Uttar Pradesh. Although these deposits are not rich, these may have been enough to meet the local demand. These are roughly the areas where the Kūrūtas, Trigarttas, Yaudheyas, Arjunāyanas and Kuṇḍindas flourished later. Other than iron, the raw materials available in Kumaon and Garhwal and used by the upper Gangetic people are sandstone, quartzite, copper, steatite, soapstone, lead, crystal, slate, limestone, saffron, musk and possibly some amount of gold and silver. These are found in a number of districts. In this
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context, the remarks of Traill\textsuperscript{4} on the traffic between Kumaon and Garhwal and the plains are important. He noted the movement of many such raw materials in the nineteenth century. Copper used by the authors of Copper-Hoard cultures most probably came from this region.

In the post-600 B.C. phase, we find a few settlements coming up in Kumaon, Garhwal and the adjoining regions. Some of them acquired urban status during the Śūṅga-Kuśāṇa phase. Ranihat, Moradhwaj, Rishikesh, Śrughna, Sunet, etc., had acquired urban status by the Śūṅga-Kuśāṇa period.\textsuperscript{5} Sunet in Ludhiana where Kuṇinda coins have been found entered the phase of urbanisation around 200 B.C. The surface find of a hoard of thirty thousand coin moulds bearing the legend Yaudheyagānasya show that the site was under the Yaudheyas. Such a large number of coin moulds implies a wide prevalence of money economy in this region.\textsuperscript{6}

Two important points emerge from the study of the pre-historic and proto-historic archaeological finds: (i) No pre-historic tools have been found in occupational deposits, and (ii) we do not find continuity of occupation at any site before the sixth century B.C. This suggests that the area before the sixth century B.C. was inhabited mostly by the pastoral and hunting-gathering peoples. But after the sixth century B.C., we find evidence of habitation sites which means people had settled down on a permanent basis. In this process, trade in different metals especially iron, copper and silver, and in forest products must have played an important role. It brought them in contact with the people of the upper Gangetic basin where the pastoral society of the Rgvedic Aryans was slowly giving way to a sedentary way of life with growing cracks in the egalitarian kin based
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tribal society. A continuous contact was bound to leave lasting impressions on the people of the central Himalayan region. Precisely at this time the vedic Aryans were rapidly moving eastward and had reached eastern Bihar. Some of the groups might have moved towards the Himalayan region. This is evident from the PGW sites of Purola & Thapli. Interestingly, excavations at Jainal Naula in Almora situated on the right bank of Ramaganga and known as Jainal-Naula Burial Complex yielded pots akin to the PGW. Further, the evidence from Baseri in Kumaon has shown two different cultural traits, megalithic and PGW, deeply intermingling. The site has been dated to the beginning of the first millennium B.C. The Megalithic burials found in the region seem to be the work of some local tribes. Any relationship of these Megalithic burials to those of south India is not evident. Excavations at Ladyura in Almora brought to light Megalithic cists and post-holes with fragments of iron objects of indeterminate shape. Unfortunately iron objects remain undated.

We have evidence of the earliest human artefacts in Kumaon and Garhwal in the form of rock-shelters and of Megalithic burials. After this phase, Aryan contact seems to have started. Although, a few Aryan groups might have arrived earlier too, definite evidence is lacking. At Malari, in addition to a complete human skeleton, that of a horse with folded legs has been found. This shows the coming of new people in the region, and with them came their socio-political systems. From sixth century B.C. onwards we have evidence of permanent settlements, which shows that people had a continuous and assured means of subsistence. Other than agriculture, trade also contributed to the development of the area. Iron weapons have been discovered in large numbers in the area which is contiguous to this region and does not have any known source of iron. Iron mines of southern Bihar
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were increasingly exploited since 500 B.C., with the result that the demand for central Himalayan iron diminished considerably. This was because the iron content in the Kumaon Garhwal iron-ore is quite less and the mines themselves were situated in the interior regions. Consequently, the interest of the vedic Aryans in this region also diminished. This interest did not decline totally because there were other items and metals which kept a line of communication continuing. The importance of this trade is reflected in the fact that fourteen edicts of Asoka are found at Kalsi near Dehradun. Around this period, Kuṇindas were reigning supreme in the region. It was around 600 B.C. that republics arose in the foot hills of the Himalayas. According to Romila Thapar, the republics tended to occupy less fertile hilly areas, since the wooded low-lying hills would probably have been easier to clear than the marshy jungles of the plain.9 She adds,

"what is equally plausible, however, is that the more independent-minded Aryan settlers of the plains, rebelling against the increasing strength of orthodoxy in the monarchies, moved up towards the hills and established communities which were more in keeping with tribal traditions such as the early settlements in Punjab. The nature of the republican reaction to vedic orthodoxy indicates that the people of the republics were maintaining an older and continuous tradition.10"

Some of the republics, however, might not have been the rebel Aryan settlers but those Aryans who came in separate waves. The Kuṇindas were perhaps one of them.

**Textual Notices of the Kuṇindas and Numismatic Evidence**

In ancient Indian texts, Kuṇindas have invariably been located in the udācya division and are known variously as Kulinda, Kuṇinda, Kaulinda, etc. The udācya division of the Purāṇas is taken to have been the region
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lying to the northwest of the madhyadeśa. According to Rājaśekhara, it lay beyond Pṛthūda.\textsuperscript{11} Pṛthūda has been identified with Pehoa near Thānesvāra by B.C. Law.\textsuperscript{12} In the Mahābhārata it is said that a Kuṇinda prince lives in the mountains (parvata-vāsāntyaḥ).\textsuperscript{13} So they were the inhabitants of the mountain belt of the udīcya division. The Mahābhārata\textsuperscript{14} also mentions kulindopatyakās, i.e. Kulindas living in the mountain valleys, and more specifically in the Himalayas.\textsuperscript{15} Varāhamihira\textsuperscript{16} refers to the great men of the Kulinda gaṇa (Kaulindāna gaṇa-puṁga-vān). The Mahābhārata mentions\textsuperscript{17} Subāhu a king of the Kuṇindas, and the Viś-ṇu Dharmottara Mahāpurāṇa\textsuperscript{18} speaks of Sarvadaman, a king of the Kulindas. In two other references, the Mahābhārata refers to the territory of the Kunindas, viz. deśān kuṇindāsya\textsuperscript{19} and pūrvaṃ kuṇinda viṣaye.\textsuperscript{20} It appears that there were many branches of the Kulinda tribe. The Mahābhārata knows a branch called Apara Kulinda.\textsuperscript{21} Ptolemy refers to a tribe called ‘Kulindrine’ which has been identified with the Kulinda tribe of the texts.\textsuperscript{22} Ptolemy also states that Kulindrine lived in the region of the lofty mountains where the Vipāśa, the Śatadru, the Yamunā and the Gaṅgā have their sources.\textsuperscript{23} His testimony shows that the Kuṇindas were living in some parts of the present
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day Kumaon and Garhwal region, and in some parts of the Himachal Pradesh.

The ethnic name 'Kulinda' according to S.B. Chaudhuri may have derived from the river Kālindī, i.e. Yamuna. But to us it seems it is more likely that Yamuna got its name Kālindī from the Kulindas just as Bhillāṅgana got its name from the Bhīla tribe.

It was Cunningham who first reported the existence of Kuṇinda coins in the reports of the Archaeological Survey of India in 1870-79. and since then many hoards of Kuṇinda coins have been found in Kumaon and Garhwal, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana and Punjab. In Himachal Pradesh, fifty-four coins of the Kuṇindas with twenty one silver coins of Apollodotus were found at Tappa Mewa in Hamirpura; three silver coins of Amoghabhūti were found along with thirty coins of Apollodotus near Jwalamukhi and a few coins have been found in Chakar and Mandi as well. In Punjab, Kuninda coins have been found at Sunet, Sugh and Rupar while in Haryana coins have been found at Buria, Narayanagarh and Karnal.

The Kuṇindas issued coins mainly in copper and silver. Copper coins seem to have been meant for petty local transactions and silver coins for large scale transactions. Existence of these coins testifies to a flourishing trade in the second-third centuries A.D.

J.Allan on the basis of the find spots of Kuṇinda coins said that the Kuṇindas occupied a narrow strip of land at the foot of the Sivalika between the Yamuna and the Sutlej, territories in the upper courses of the
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Beas and Sutlej. Some literary references to the Kuṇindas seem to confirm this conclusion which was based on the reports of Cunningham. In later years, however, more coins were found from the Kumaon and Garhwal region, which fact suggests occupation of a larger area by the Kuṇindas. According to M.P. Joshi, this is indicated by some surviving place-names and surnames in Kumaon and Garhwal region such as Kunakoti, Kunajhina, Kuni (village names), and Kuni, Kanwal, Kanyal, etc., (surnames). On the basis of the find-spots of the coins, it may be said that the Kuṇindas occupied the areas covering parts of Himachal Pradesh, Kumaon and Garhwal, Punjab and Haryana. However, Kuṇinda supremacy did not remain uninterrupted for four centuries. There were other important tribal oligarchies in the same region such as the Yaudheyas and the Arjunāyanas. Periodic conflicts might not have been a distant possibility, resulting in the shifting of boundaries. For quite some time, the Kuṇinda territories passed into the hands of the Kuśānas. In this period of contraction, the Almora coins belonging to eight kings and the Anonymous or Chatresvara coins were issued.

The Kuṇindas were evidently an oligarchy similar to the Śākyas and Licchavis. This is shown by the expression kaulindān gaṇapungavaṇa (The great men of the Kulinda gaṇa). The ruling oligarchy derived from the same tribe to which the commoners belonged. There is no reference to tribal assembly, although its presence may be presumed. Rāja and mahārāja were the pivot of the administrative machinery as is apparent.
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from the legends on the early coins. The tribe seems to have been divided into the ruling group and ordinary members. One does not know if there was any priestly group among them. Absence of details about Kuṇindas in the Brahmanical texts may show that the brāhmaṇas had no place in their social order. The early Kuṇindas were Buddhists as is evident from the Buddhist symbols on the coins. But later Kuṇindas were Śaivas as is shown by Kuṇinda coins which have the trident and battle axe of Śiva. This development shows some kind of change in the nature of Kuṇinda polity. The Kuṇindas like other tribal republics, later changed over to the monarchical state system. The process must have been facilitated by the flourishing trade testified by the availability of large numbers of coins and the existence of some urban centres in the region. Minting of metal money needs a strong control and command system. It was apparently in the hands of the ruling clan.

The presence of Aśokan inscriptions at Kalsi in Dehradun shows Mauryan influence in the region, and this factor is likely to have influenced political developments in the region. This is suggested by the fact that the Kuṇindas began to issue their own coins from the second century B.C. which are embossed with legends in Pāli, Brāhmaṇī and Kharoṣṭhī scripts.

Three stages have been identified in the minting of the Kuṇinda coins:-(1) Amoghabhūti coins issued about the end of the second century B.C.(2) Almora coins issued about the first century A.D. and (3) Chatreśvara type or Anonymous coins issued around the end of second or beginning of third century A.D. After the third century A.D. we do not find any local coins. The urban centres too were deserted around the third
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century A.D. Thus, the decline of urban centres coincides with the disappearance of Kuñinda coins.

There is some difference of opinion regarding the third type of coins. J. Allan did not ascribe these coins to the Kuñindas. Ajay Mitra Shastri calls these ‘local coins’ distinguishing them from the coins of Kuñindas. According to K.K. Dasgupta there is a marked difference between the style, size and the fabric of the Kuñinda and Anonymous coins. The main difference between the Amoghabāti and the Almora coins on the one hand and the Anonymous coins of a later period on the other, is that the symbols and designs on the former are mostly Buddhist whereas those on the latter are Śaiva. It seems that after the first century A.D. political power of the Kuñindas declined and some other authority emerged in the region. These so called ‘local’ coins are mostly of copper whereas the silver ones outnumbered the copper ones in the earlier hoards. This may indicate the declining fortunes of the Kuñindas. The Kuñinda dominions at some point of time were annexed by the Kuśāṇas. Three Kuśāṇa gold coins belonging to the later Kuśāṇa ruler Vāsudeva II were found at Kashipur in Nainital district. A gold coin of the same king was also found at Moradhwaj. As regards the seat of Kuñinda political power, Cunningham believes that Śrughna was the centre of Kuñinda activities because the coins bearing the name of the Kuñindas are found in great numbers about Sugh (Śrughna) and in its neighbourhood. But the excavated finds of the Śuṅga-Kuśāṇa phase at this site are not at all
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impressive except in terracotta. All the finds taken together may indicate some elements of urbanism in the early historical period.41 The site was deserted after the early historical period. The inscription of Dhanabhūti42 at Bharahut shows that it was an independent small kingdom in the century preceding the Christian era. But there is nothing to show that it ever functioned as the capital of the Kuṇindas. According to K.P. Nautiyal, Kashipur in Nainital district was the capital of the Kuṇinda dynasty.43 However, although an NBPW settlement has been found at Kashipur,44 there is no evidence of continuous habitation till the historic times, which fact casts doubts on this theory. Moreover, no coins other than Kuśāna coins such as that of the later Kuṇindas have been found here. The problem of the Kuṇinda capital still remains unsolved.

After the decline of the political power of the Kuṇindas and till the rise of the Paurava-Varman dynasty in the fifth - seventh centuries A.D., the political history of the region is hazy. In the last quarter of the second century A.D. the Yaudheyas seem to have conquered some parts of the central Himalayan region.45 On the economic front, deurbanization and decline of trade are noticeable features. This is in line with the general trend of decline of trade and urban centres in India as a whole; although on a pan-India level the effect surfaced somewhat later, the areas falling on the border were to experience the effect early. In this situation of economic decline, the political situation also became chaotic. Kingdoms situated in the south and west made inroads into the area. The Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta (API) mentions Kartṛpura which has been generally

41 R.S. Sharma, Urban Decay, p.18.
42 S.P. Dabral, Abhilekha, p.41-42.
identified with Kumaon and Garhwal. But Fleet had identified it with the modern Kartarpur in Jullunder. The identification of Kartarpura with Kumaon and Garhwal was first advocated by J.C. Powell Price. He wrote that among the names of frontier kingdoms mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription in the same sequence where one might expect the kingdom of Kuṇindas. He acknowledged that an inscription in verse cannot always give the geographical position accurately as considerations of metre may not always allow it. Yet in his view this name fits in quite naturally.46

Following this, K.P. Nautiyal contended that the Kuṇindas were mentioned in Samudragupta’s inscription by the name of their capital - Kartarpura.17 However, a careful look at the relevant passage of the API reveals that the author of the inscription divided the areas conquered in two groups. The first group consists of the kingdoms with nṛpati as head and are mentioned by the name of the region itself, while the second group consists of tribal kingdoms known by their tribal names.48 In view of this, it appears somewhat strange that Kuṇindas who dominated the region for over four hundred years and were known to the Purāṇa writers as Kulindas were mentioned by their capital town. Further, the political power of the Kuṇindas had declined after the third century A.D. At the time the API was composed, the Kuṇindas were not a political force. The reference in the API also shows that Kartarpura was a monarchical state and not an oligarchy. Several scholars have identified Kartarpura with Kāṛtīkeyapura of the Paurava-Varman and Katyuri inscriptions. This identification also seems to be unconvincing because in the Paurava-Varman inscription Kāṛtīkeyapura is merely an administrative division and not the capital of the kingdom.

Post Gupta Period

The post-Gupta period was characterised by the decline of foreign trade and urban centres, and there was regionalisation of polity. Agrarian space expanded and a number of regional kingdoms based on agricultural surplus emerged even in those areas which had not yet been affected by the processes of state formation. The Kumaon and Garhwal region had experienced the political system of the Kunindas. After their decline a number of small kingdoms ruled by those who are known to us only through their coins came into existence. Thus we have coins bearing the names of Āseka, Gomitra, Sīvadatta, Sīvapālita, Haradatta and Sīvarakṣīta. Another ruler named Śīlavarman is known to us from his inscription.

In the post-Gupta period we have reference to the tiny kingdom of Goviṣāṇa existing at the time of Hieun Tsang’s visit, and of the two ruling lineages of Lakhamandal. The first ruled in fifth century A.D. and the second about the sixth century A.D. B.Ch. Chhabra draws our attention to the similarity between the Chagalesadāsa of the Lakhamandal prāśasti and the Sanakānik Mahāraja Chagalaga whose grandson has left an inscription dated in Gupta year 82 at a cave near Udaigiri in Gwalior. So, K.P. Nautiyal thinks that this dynasty was of indigenous origin. The term Chagalaga does seem to be of aboriginal derivation, but it is to be noted that Chāgaḷesadāsa was the fifth ruler of his dynasty and all his ancestors Jayadāsa, Guheśa and Acalesa bear sanskrit names.

52 B.Ch. Chhabra, op.cit., p.80.
Another dynasty of the region, which ruled over the kingdom of Simhapura is known to us through the praśasti of the princess Īśvara, who was married to Candragupta, the son of a king of Jalandhara. Confirmation of the existence of the kingdom of Simhapura comes from Hieun Tsang's account. According to the Chinese pilgrim, the capital of the kingdom of Seang-ho-pu-lo or Simhapura was situated at 700 li, or 117 miles to the southeast of Taxila. This has been identified with the town of Sangoli by M.Vivien de St. Martin, and by Ketakṣa or Khetas by Cunningham. G.Bührer identified it with a district lying in Jalandhara itself, on the ground that the marriage of Īśvara to a scion of the royal family of Jalandhara makes it very probable that her people also must have been rulers of a neighboring state. However, the description of Simhapura given by Hieun Tsang suits Ketakṣa or Khetas (about 85 miles from Taxila) better as is ably shown by Cunningham. Lakhamandal, the find spot of the inscription might have been a part of the kingdom of Jalandhar. The inscription palaeographically assigned to 6th-7th century A.D. gives the genealogy of the Simhapura rulers, who claimed their descent from Yadu, as follows: King Senavarman (described as rājarṣi), his son Āryavarman, his son Devavarman, his son Pradīptavarman, his son Īśvaravarman, his son Simhavarman, his son Jalavarman, his son Yajñavarman, his son Acalavarman, his son Divākaravarman, his younger brother Bhāskaravarman, who is said to have acquired a new kingdom through his own prowess. The inscription is issued by the daughter-in-law
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of Bhāskaravarman. As there had been ten rulers preceding Bhāskaravarman’s brother Divākaravarman, apparently the kingdom of Sinhapura must have been founded sometime in the 4th-5th century A.D. We are told that princess Īśvara after the death of her husband, caused the construction of a temple of Bhava and the Prasasti was engraved. Hieun-Tsang mentions another kingdom, i.e. Kiu-pi-shwangna, rendered as Goviśaṇa by M.Julien. The capital was 15 li or 2.5 miles in circuit. Its position was lofty and of difficult access, and it was surrounded by groves, tanks and fishponds. There were two monasteries containing one hundred monks and thirty Brahmanical temples. In the middle of the larger monastery, which was outside the city there was a stupa of Asoka, 200 feet in height built over the spot where Buddha was said to have explained the law. There were also two small stupas only twelve feet high containing his hair and nails. On the basis of this description Cunningham identified Goviśaṇa with the old fort near the village of Ujain. He further wrote, this place is situated one mile east of Kashipur which flourished during the Kuśāṇa period. Some Kuśāṇa gold coins have been found there although the sculptures found there belong to the Gupta times.

In the post-Gupta period the most important kingdom was that of the Paurava-Varmans of Brahmapura. The political history of Brahmapura is constructed on the basis of two comprehensive inscriptions and the accounts of Hieun Tsang. The Chinese pilgrim, visited India in 636 A.D. According to him Po-lo-ki-mo-pou-lo or Brahmapura lay 300 li or 50 miles to the north of Madawara. Cunningham placed this kingdom in the Kumaon and Garhwal region. According to him, this is proved by the fact
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that Hieun Tsang says that this country produced copper, which must refer
to the well known copper mines of Dhanpur and Pokhri in Garhwal that
were worked from a very early date. The inter-regional trade in copper
must have been quite substantial to attract the eyes of the pilgrim.\textsuperscript{64}
Cunningham identified the city of Brahmapura with Vairatpattan or
Lakhanpura situated on the Ramaganga river.\textsuperscript{65} Atkinson placed it at
Barhata in Garhwal on the basis of the fact that this was the seat of an old
dynasty and contains numerous remains of temples and other buildings.\textsuperscript{66}
But Atkinson’s identification is not in agreement with the description of
Hieun Tsang as shown by A. Cunningham. J.C. Powell Price suggested it
to be in the Katyur valley.\textsuperscript{67} Fuhrer on the other hand identified
Brahmapura with the ruins of Manial and Panduwal near Haridwar.\textsuperscript{68}
But mere remains of ancient large habitations cannot be taken as proof of
their being the capital town of any kingdom. Hieun Tsang’s accounts are
generally believed to be quite precise. The kingdom of Brahmapura was
4000 li or 667 miles in circuit and according to Cunningham’s calculations,
“it must have included the whole of the country between the Alakananda and
Karanali rivers....The boundary of this tract measured on the map is between
500 and 600 miles or very nearly equal to the estimate of the Chinese
pilgrim”.\textsuperscript{69} As shown in the first chapter, the mountain and river terraces
along Alakananda are well developed and the valley of Ramaganga is
extremely fertile. Reports of British administrators also show that this tract
had a large number of ruined settlements belonging to the pre-Gorkha times.
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In 1955, Hermann Goetz identified the Brahmapura kingdom with the Çamba region and Brahmar with the Brahmapura of Hieun-Tsang and Varāhamihira. Goetz's identification is based on the following assumptions:

1. No archaeological site in Kumaon is comparable to the city of Brahmapura.

2. Hieun Tsang mentions a vast kingdom, and according to Varāhamihira too, it was an important state, but the identification of Brahmapura with a place in Kumaon would make it a tiny principality.

3. In the whole course of Indian history, the Himalayan kingdoms hardly ever expanded into the plains and rarely into the Tibetan highlands.

4. From Hieun Tsang's account it is clear that not only Brahmapura was situated within the mountains, but also that the outer Himalayan hills were included in other kingdoms like Tākidesa, Jalandha, and Satadru. Thus, the Brahmapura kingdom cannot have had a diameter of more than 50-70 miles. If we should thus roughly allot twice 50 or 70 miles to its south-eastern and north-western frontiers, 500-700 miles still are left for its north-eastern and south-western frontiers. In other words, the Brahmapura kingdom must have extended over 250-350 miles, i.e. it must have covered most of the Punjab Himalaya, from western Kumaon up to the Banihal Pass.
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5. Because of the overlapping of the various claims for suzerainty, however, the aggregate of Hieun Tsang’s figures is much too high.

6. Both Hieun Tsang and Varāhamihira mention that north of Brahmapura there was Suvarṇagotra or Suvarṇabhūmi, the ‘Gold country’. This is Sarthol, known both to Greeks and Indians by hearsay from earliest times. Very little gold trade could pass through Kumaon, and the principal trade routes from Sarthol to India were along the Sutlej or through Lahaul and Kulu, and thus went through the western Pahari area. The ancient Brahmapura kingdom, therefore, must have been identical with the present area of the western Pahari dialect.

7. The Brahmapura kingdom must have been a Gurjara kingdom. The Brahmapura of Talesvara Copper-plates may indeed prove to be the Gurjara capital of Hieun Tsang’s time.

8. In the early seventh century Brahmapura was not far from Matipura-Hardwara. Hieun Tsang’s statement in A.D. 643, that the kingdom was 300 li (i.e. 50-60 miles) north of the latter place, may refer merely to the frontier. For the area of the western Pahari dialect ends in Chaunsa - Bawar, some six miles west of Mussoorie. Also the population of this area resembles the Dogras but not the Kumaonis.

K.P. Nautiyal rejected the view of Goetz on the following grounds:

1. Goetz himself is not very sure of his proposition and says at another place that the matter is not so simple because ‘Hieun Tsang does not mention Brahmapura in Chamba at all’, though he gives detailed description of its neighbours, Kulu as well as the Jalandhara
kingdom, which then covered the Kangra valley.

2. The very foundation of Goetz’s theory seems to be weak as the Chinese traveller specifically places the Brahmapura kingdom near the Gangetic valley and never outside it. There is no justification for altering the geographical direction given by the Chinese pilgrim.

3. Kumaon comprises several archaeological sites, which might have formed once the territory of the Brahmapura kingdom.

4. The Suvarṇagotra or ‘Gold Country’ has been taken by Goetz to refer to Sarthol in Tibet while Atkinson placed it to the north of Ganai in the valley of Gauri which is in Garhwal.

With regards to Goetz’s objection that its placement in Kumaon would make it a tiny and obscure principality, one can only say that Goetz has ignored the calculations of A. Cunningham which we have already discussed. The objection of Goetz that the Himalayan kingdoms hardly ever expanded into the plains is also incorrect. At the height of its territorial expansion, the Katyuri dynasty had expanded its territorial authority up till Bareilly and Saharanpur, and in the early periods the Kuṇīndas had also achieved the same feat. The remark of Goetz that Brahmapura was a Gurjara kingdom ignores the evidence provided by the seals of the Talesvara copperplates. Y.R. Gupte assigned the seal (the original one) to about the latter half of the fifth century A.D.71 This indicates that the Brahmapura kingdom was existing much before the inscriptions were reissued in the sixth and seventh centuries. But there is no evidence of the Gurjaras establishing a kingdom at that early date. They came in the wake of the Hūnas from Central Asia and some of them moved south-west and established a Gurjara kingdom in the eighth century A.D.72

72 R.S. Sharma, Indian Feudalism, pp.87-88.
We come across the word Gurjara in the seventh century A.D. in the Harṣacakrīta of Bāṇa and in the accounts of Hieun Tsang. The former calls Prabhakara Vardhan, the king of Sthanavisvara, as Ḥūṇa-harīṇa - kesari and Gurjara-prajāgara in the same context.75 The Chinese traveller refers to the Gurjara kingdom of Bhinmal and distinctly calls its ruler a kṣatriya prince.74 No such statement is made about the Brahmapura kingdom. No doubt some Gurjara clans moved towards the present day Kumaon - Garhwal and Himachal region, but they remained mostly pastoralists till the nineteenth century.75

The internal evidence of the two inscriptions also show that the Brahmapura kingdom was in Kumaon and Garhwal. The mention of two rivers, i.e. Gomati and Pitrganga, in the inscriptions convincingly show that the eastern part of Kumaon formed the Brahmapura kingdom. Finally, the mention of Kārttikeyapura identified with Bajjnatha in Almora, falls outside what Goetz called 'the area of the western Pahari dialect' and as such goes against his proposed identification. In the light of the above discussion we may assert that the Brahmapura kingdom ought to be located in the Kumaon and Garhwal region.

The Dynasty of Paurava -Varman

On Palæographical grounds Y.R. Gupte assigned the seals of the Talesvara copperplates to the latter half of the fiftieth century A.D. If we take the mean year, we may assume that the Sāsana was issued in A.D. 475 which would be the reigning year of Dvijavarman. The seal mentions three of his predecessors i.e. his father Agnivarman, grandfather Vṛṣavarman and

73 Harṣa-Charitam of Bana, (tr.) Cowell and Thomas, London, 1897, p.133; R.K. Mukherjee, Harṣa, Rulers of India series, Oxford, 1926, p.11
great grandfather Viṣṇuvarman. This means that Agnivarman, Vṛṣavarman and Viṣṇuvarman ruled before A.D. 475. The grant of Dyutivarman mentions the name of his father Agnivarman only and the grant of Viṣṇuvarman mentions his father Dyutivarman and grandfather Agnivarman. We know that the above mentioned grants were duplicated between the middle of the sixth century and the second quarter of the seventh century A.D. If we again take the mean year i.e. \((550+650)/2 = 600\) A.D., the three rulers i.e. Agnivarman, Dyutivarman and Viṣṇuvarman get 125 years which seems highly improbable. That is why between Dvijavarman of the seal and Agnivarman of the epigraph more names should be expected.\(^{76}\) However, Nautiyal takes Dvijavarman of the seal and Dyutivarman of the epigraph to be the same person which is not valid since Gupte has shown that the seal was made from the cast of the original seal. But there is nothing to show who were the immediate successors of Dvijavarman the following genealogical chart (Chart on the following page) may be prepared to trace the dynastic line.

The Paurava-Varman Polity

The Brahmapura kingdom is the first kingdom of this region of which we have some details. The two copper plate inscriptions from Talesvara are the earliest from this area recording land grants, and in this process mention a large number of state officials. It is highly unlikely that in the later part of the fifth century A.D. to which these copper-plates belong, such a vast apparatus of state suddenly came into existence. Clearly, the kingdom existed from an early date and the state system must have developed slowly. There is no doubt that the idea of a hierarchical administrative structure is linked to the spread of brahmanical ideology. The Āśvamedha sacrifices at Jagatgrama in Dehradun and at Purola in

Uttarakashi belonging roughly to the third century A.D. show this. Interestingly four Āśvamedha scarifies were performed at Jagatgram. At Devaprayaga we have some pilgrim records belonging to the second to fifth centuries A.D., which also show growing brahmanical activity in the region.  

The brahmanical influence is seen in the methods of gaining legitimacy. Thus, the Paurava-Varmans sought legitimacy by claiming descent from Pururava, the vedic personage, as well as from both solar and lunar lineages. Their claim of descent from both the solar and lunar lines is strange. Does it reflect the fusion of two powerful tribes? This may have

---

**Geneological Chart of The Paurava-Varmans**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visṇuvarman I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vṛṣavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnivarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvijavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(number of Kings not known)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agnivarman II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyutivarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visṇuvarman II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

---


78 *Soma-dvākarānvayo; soma - dvākara-prāṃśu-vamśa-vesma-pradīpah*, line 3 of the grant of Visṇuvarman dated in his 20th year.
enabled the Paurava-Varmans to consolidate their hold and establish a strong state structure. Most of the official designations appearing in their inscriptions are found in the Gupta inscriptions. The influence of the Guptas is noticeable. In total, twenty nine officials are mentioned in the Paurava-Varman inscriptions. These are as follows:

1. **Danḍoparika** - The word is a compound of *danḍa* and *uparika*. *Danḍa* has many meanings depending upon the context. Generally it is used in the sense of a fine, tax, punishment, judicial punishment, etc. *Uparika* was the chief of the largest Gupta administrative unit *bhumī*. According to Saletore, the office of the *uparika* owed its origin to the fiscal term *uparikara*, for the collection of which this officer was responsible. R.S. Sharma agrees with Saletore. But D.N. Jha is sceptical as it is based simply on the phonetic similarity and there is nothing in the inscriptions to show that the *uparika* realised the *uparikara*. In D.N. Jha's view, the word *uparika* is derived from *upari* or *upri* meaning 'above', and *uparika* may signify an officer who supervised other officers under him. D.C. Sircar regards *danḍoparika* to be a shortened version of *dandanayaka uparika* who in his view was a judge. However, Y.R. Gupte suggests that he may have been a police officer.

2. **Pramatāra** - According to J.Ph. Vogel, *Pramatāra* was an officer concerned with the administration of justice. According to D.C. Sircar, *pramātāra*, *pramattavara* and *pramātṛ* were the same, and *pramātṛ* was 'measurer of the king's grain share.'

---

83 *Glossary*, s.v. *Pramātāra*.
3. **Pratihara** is mentioned in the Satavahana records as the writer of a charter. Literally it means a door-keeper.

4. **Kumāranātya** - **Amāyas** appear as advisors or ministers in the Jātakas, and in the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya they constitute a class of officers from which all other functionaries are recruited. Amāya and rājāmāya appear in Satavahana records but kumāranātya figures in Gupta inscriptions. According to R.S. Sharma the *kumāranātyas* formed the chief cadre from which high functionaries were recruited. Fleet takes the term *kumāranātya* to mean a minister attached to the crown prince. Bloch explains it as ‘one who has been in the service of the king from the time when he was a boy.’ The views of Fleet and Bloch depend merely on the etymology of the term. A careful study of the inscriptive references shows that the *kumāranātya* denoted a class of officers functioning in different capacities very much like the I.C.S. or I.A.S. officers of our times.

5. **Pilupati** - The term, ‘meaning the officer or keeper of elephants’ does not occur in the early Gupta records. It occurs in a sixth-century inscription from Bengal and in the Taleesvara copperplates of Kumaon and Garhwal region. This means that elephants formed a part of the armed forces in this area.

6. **Āsvapati** - literally, the master of horses. Cavalry formed an important part of the Gupta military system. Cavalry was basically a central Asian influence which came to India with the Kusanas. Banabhatta speaks of the superior quality and the high stature of the horses of the

---

84 *Aspects* p.324.
85 *CII*, III, p.16n.
86 *EI*, X, p.50, n.2.
Tuṅgaṇa (Taṅgaṇa) country.\textsuperscript{88} We have discussed its identification in chapter I.

7. Jayanapati - The designation Jayanapati occurs in the grant of Dyutivarma. Jayana denotes armour for cavalry or elephants.\textsuperscript{89} Hence, Jayanapati was the person in charge of the department of armour for cavalry and elephants. This shows that the army was well equipped. The Lekhapaddhati mentions Jayanasālā-karaṇa and it has been explained as ‘the armour department’.\textsuperscript{90}

8. Gaṇjapati - This official designation occurring in our grants is not found in the Gupta records, although we do have Gaṇjadhikārīn and Gaṇjavara interpreted as ‘treasury officer’ in the Rājarātarāṅga. Gaṇja according to Kosambi ‘was a system of income-earning funds’ (sic), established for charity and administered by separate officials called Gaṇjadhikārīn and Gaṇjavara.\textsuperscript{91} Gaṇja is apparently a term of non-Sanskritic origin. Its prevalence in Kashmir and Kumaon-Garhwal may be associated with the speech of the Khasas.

9. Sūpakārapati - Sūpakārapati was the chief cook of the royal kitchen.

10. Tagarapati - Y.R. Gupte takes it to be a wrong reading for nagarapati. But tagarapati seems to be an official heading the works of Tagara makers.\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{88} Tuṅga a Tuṅganaguqam; Sukhāyamānakhatastuyamāna Tuṅga-Tungaṇaṇaṇe, Quoted in D.K. Kanjilal, IHQ, XXXIV, p.128.

\textsuperscript{89} Monier-Williams, SED, s.v. Jayana.

\textsuperscript{90} D.C. Sircar, Glossary, s.v. Jayanasala-karana.


\textsuperscript{92} Tagara is a kind of fragrant powder obtained from a plant similar to Guggula.
11. *Viṣayapati* - *Viṣayapati* mentioned in the Gupta records was the officer in charge of a district and exercised authority over other revenue officers functioning in a *viṣaya*. He served as a link between the king and the officers of lower ranks.\(^{93}\)

12. *Bhogika* - Fleet suggests that *bhogika* is an official title, connected with the technical terms *bhoga* and *bhukti*.\(^{94}\) D.C. Sircar is of the opinion that *bhogika* may indicate an officer in charge of royal stables.\(^{95}\) According to R.S. Sharma,\(^{96}\) the title *bhogika* and *bhogapatika* suggest that these officers were assigned specific areas for enjoying the revenues therefrom. The office of the *bhogika* was generally hereditary. The grant of Viṣṇuvarman records the donation of land by the *bhogika* Varahadatta and by the brother of another *bhogika* named Gellanāṃśaka. This gives credence to R.S. Sharma’s view that *bhogika* was a powerful overlord, comparatively free from the control of the central authority.\(^{97}\)

13. *Bhāgika* - *Bhāgika* was an official who collected the king’s share (*bhāga*) of the agricultural produce in the post-Maurya times. *Bhāga* was a remnant of the tribal stage of distribution system in which kinsmen were entitled to their shares. But what was received as a matter of custom by every kinsmen came to be claimed compulsorily by the king, who no longer functioned in a tribal set-up, and the collector of such shares came to be known as *Bhāgika*.

---

\(^{93}\) D.N. Jha, *Revenue System*, p.194.

\(^{94}\) *Cf. I.,* III, p.100, n.2.

\(^{95}\) D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilisation*, vol.1, Calcutta, 1942, p.334, n.1.


14. Daṇḍavāsika - Daṇḍavāsika is the prākrit form of daṇḍapāśika. He performed the police work in the Gupta polity along with Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, daṇḍika and daṇḍanāyaka.

15. Katuka - The significance of this office is not clear. It appears in the Indian Epigraphy vol.8, no.3 as mahākatuka. Y.R. Gupte suggests that katukas were officers or members of a religious assembly not generally held in respect or were such functionaries whose work was in some ways disagreeable to the public.98 He could have been the executor of harsh punishments which were disliked by the people. Hence, he was perhaps called katuka.

16. Devadronyadhikṛta - He was probably the superintendent of the property of a temple. Devadroni means, according to D.C. Sircar,99 rent free property of a temple.

17. Mahāsattrapati - He is the superintendent of the sattras. Literally meaning ‘a session’, it came to mean as D.C. Sircar points out houses attached to temples for free distribution of food.100 Y.R. Gupte thinks that it meant the master of the sacrificial sessions. However, D.C. Sircar’s interpretation is based on the study of a large number of early medieval records. The officer must have looked after matters relating to temple property.

18. Rājadauvārika - The door-keeper of the royal palace. He was different from pratihāra. The latter was the keeper of the entrance gate, i.e. the main gate, and the former the keeper of the king’s personal chamber.

19. Karaṅkika - The meaning of this designation is not clear. However,

98 El. vol. 13, no.76, p.117n.
99 Glossary, s.v. deva-droni, devadronyadhikṛta
100 Glossary, s.v. Mahāsattrapati
karanika denotes a cup or vessel made of coconut shell used in measuring liquid and when compounded with tambula it denotes the king’s betel box. Hence karanika could be the officer in charge of the karanika i.e. the king’s betel box.

20. Koṭādhikarṇika - He was an officer in charge of or a koṭa i.e. a fort. The actual reading in the text is voṭādhikarṇika. As voṭa means a female servant or slave, Y.R. Gupta takes it to mean superintendent of the female (temple) slaves. However, it is more plausible that the correct reading is koṭa.

21. Amātya - Amātyas to whom all royal orders regarding gifts of land or caves are communicated figure for the first time in the Satavahana records. They constituted a class of officers from which all other functionaries were recruited. The grant of Dyutivarman speaks of amātya Bhadravishnu among those who requested the king for a reissue of the grant which had been destroyed in fire.

22. Sandhivigrahika - Literally translated as the minister of peace and war, the sandhivigrahika first appears under Samudra Gupta. The need for such an office can be well understood in the context of the relations subsisting between the many warring principalities from Gupta times onwards. The main duty of this officer according to R.S. Sharma was to deal with the feudatories who may have been granted charters for military services, and hence he may have been empowered to issue charters to religious establishments also. In the grant of Dyutivarman, Suryadatta held simultaneously the offices duṭaka, sandhivigrahika and pramātāra.

23. Duṭaka - The duṭaka, literally a messenger, appears to have been.

101 Monier-Williams, SED, s.v. vota.
102 R.S. Sharma Aspects, p.324.
employed in connection with formal land grants from the Gupta period onwards. The term diūtaka deriving from diūa, first occurs in a passage of Brhaspati who mentions the functionary as a kind of witness and defines him as a respectable man, esteemed and appointed by both parties. The diūtaka took to the donees the kings sanction, and the king’s order to the local officials whose duty it was to have the charter drawn up and delivered to the recipients of land grants. The diūtaka of the grant of Viśṇuvarman was pramātāra Varāhadatta.

24. Divirapati - The term divirapati has been explained as the designation of an officer who kept accounts. The Grant of Dyutivarman was written by divirapati Viśṇudāsa and the grant of Viśṇuvarman was written by divirapati Dhanadatta. Divirapati Dhanadatta is also mentioned to have granted a piece of land after purchasing it from the balādhyakṣa Lavacandra. Combining the offices of divirapati, sāndhirกรahika and pramātāra, he must have been an influential person. The engraver of both the grants was the sauvarṇika (goldsmith)Ananta.

25. Rajaputraka - Rajaputra or Rājaputraka originally meant the son of a king, but it came to stand for a large section of landed aristocracy in the early medieval period. Thus, according to B.N.S. Yadava Rājaputra chiefs generally held estates comprising a few villages through the favour of some overlord. The grant of Dyutivarman mentions a karvataka held by a certain rājaputtraka.

26. Balādhyakṣa - Balādhyakṣa was an army officer. He is to be distinguished from the senapati or balādhikṛta. Senāpati or balādhikṛta

103 Brhaspati, V.II. Quoted by D.N. Jha, Revenue System, P. 189.
104 D.N. Jha, Revenue System, p.189.
105 D.N. Jha, Revenue System, pp. 165-166.
were leaders of the armed forces. Balādhyakṣa may be we looked after other matters relating to the needs of the army. The grant of Viśṇuvarman speaks of balādhyakṣa Lavacandra as having sold a plot of land in Nimbasaṅī (Kārttikeyapura) to divirapati Dhanadatta.

27. Karika is mentioned in the grant of Viśṇuvarman. Y.R. Gupte, El, vol.XIII, no.7B, line 8. Sircar thinks that it is a mistake for tarika who was a ferry officer.

28. Kulacārika mentioned in the grant of Viśṇuvarman is according to Sircar a wrong reading and should be amended as kulavārika, meaning an arbitrator. However, it may be a derivative of kulācāra (appropriate conduct of a kula) and could refer to kulācārya family priest.

29. Kayastha - Initially, the kayasthas formed only a functional group. In the grants of fifth - sixth centuries A.D. it was used in this sense. Later, the profession crystallized into a cast. The grant of Viśṇuvarman mentions a kayastha Nannaka who is also a landholder. However, this is the solitary reference to kayastha.

It is apparent from the above that the administrative set up was deeply influenced by the Gupta practice. We do not know whether there were any village level self-governing institutions to regulate local issues. But the presence of such a large number of officers in connection with a landgrant suggests a strong monarchical establishment.

Remuneration

After the third century A.D., we do not find any coins of local origin. Hence, we may assume that the officials were paid or remunerated either with land revenue or through landholding. The decline of long

---

108 Glossary, s.v. Karika, Tarika.
distance trade may have speeded up the process of agrarian expansion. In any case, establishment of agrahāra villages as evidenced by the inscription of Dyutivarman must have led to the expansion of agricultural land.\(^{109}\) We have seen that during this period new settlements were coming up and old settlements were being granted to the temples. One important aspect of the grants to the temples was that they were to organise agricultural production (krṣi-karma) on the granted land. In the grant of Viṣṇuvarman a few officials are mentioned as donors of land. Thus, a brother of the bhogika Gellanānakā donated a piece of land measuring two khārīvāpas\(^{110}\) Bhogika Varahadatta also appears as a donee.\(^{111}\)

Further, a field called Śveta was purchased by the divirapati Dhanadatta from the balādhyakṣa Lavacandra for four and a half gold (pieces?) at Kārttikeyapura for the purpose of donation to a temple. Dhanadatta bought another piece of land called Vetasa from the kāyastha Nālakā for eight gold (pieces) in order to be presented at the feet of Vāmanasvāmi. The sale and purchase of land by the state officials for the purpose of making grants to temples show that large-scale transactions were carried out through the bullion, and the state officials were owners of land. These lands might have been granted to them by the state in lieu of salary or perhaps the landowners were the ones who were incorporated in the state machinery. The fact that the grants by these individual officials appear in the royal charter shows that some kind of approval was needed before an individual could make a grant and a record was maintained for making them rent-free.

Although there is a similarity in the lists of officials found in Brahmapura, Qamba and other parts of northern India, one cannot say with

\(^{109}\) Tamrapaṭṭa pāṭa vrīṣatāpa-pattairiḥ abhilikhy = agrahāraḥ pratipādiṭakās - iāni, Grant of Dyutivarman, line 11.

\(^{110}\) Bhogika - Gellanānakā bhrāt-datte kṣetra-sūne dve khārī-vāpaṁ, ln.16.

\(^{111}\) Parvāte ca bhogika-Varahadattā - prayaya bhūmaya bahvayaḥ, ln. 23.
any certainty that all of them really existed or their mention was due to a
sterotyped formula used in the grants. This certainly shows that the state
system was increasingly being modelled on the pattern of the monarchy
that flourished in other parts of north India in early medieval times, and the
practice of making land grants shows the stability of the kingdom as well
as its growing agrarian base.

Decline of the Brahmapura Kingdom and the Rise of Katyuris

When and how the Paurava-Varman rule at Brahmapura came to an end,
is a perplexing question. It seems that the imperial arm of Harṣa and the Tibetan
inroads into the Kumaon and Garhwal region in the middle of the seventh
century resulted in the eclipse of the Brahmapura dynasty as an independent
state. According to R.S. Tripathi, the kingdoms about which Hieun Tsang
maintains a silence were probably included within Kannauj.112 Other than
Brahmapura, Harsa seems to have acquired the smaller kingdoms of Goviśāna
and Matipura as well.113 All these three kingdoms were perhaps allowed to
exist as feudatory kingdoms under Harṣa’s nominal suzerainty. The Tibetan
king Srong-Tsang-Gompo who invaded Nepal, annexed large parts of Kumaon
and Garhwal to his kingdom some time in the seventh century A.D.114 The
relics of Tibetan Buddhism and close relationship between the Tholing Math
and the Badarānātha probably go back to this period.115 This does not mean that
the Tibetan authorities exercised any control over the temple and in any case the
Tibetan control over this region lasted for a short period only. But this might
have resulted in increased contact between the two regions through trade.

After Harṣa and the decline of Tibetan influence we have evidence

114 Rahul Sankrityayana Himalaya Parichaya, 1, Garhwal, Allahabad Law Journal Press,
Allahabad, 1953, pp.68-70.
of at least five kingdoms in the region: (1) The kingdom of Bhillāṅga, (identified with Barahata in Garhwal) (2) the kingdom of Cāndapurgarh (modern Chandapurgarh in Garhwal), (3) the kingdom of Goviśāna (4) the kingdom of Brahmapura and (5) the kingdom of Kārttikeyapura. Out of these five the first two were in new areas, the latter two existed earlier and the fifth one, though it existed earlier as a viśaya, grew into a powerful kingdom in the eighth century. Not much is known about these kingdoms except for some stray references to those in the inscriptions on the temple walls, these appear to have been petty tribal chiefdoms coming under the influence of brahmanic culture. This is suggested by the name Bhillāṅga which must have been a region inhabited by the Bhils. There is a legend according to which this kingdom was ruled by Sonapāla in Samvat 755 (A.D. 699) when a rāja named Kanakapāla came from Malwa and was adopted by him. Sonapāla gave his daughter in marriage to Kanakapāla.116 No record exists which could testify to the authenticity of the above legend but it is based on a widely quoted local tradition. There are many legends regarding Kanakapāla. A small stone inscription of A.D. 889 found at Chandapuragarh speaks of a Kanakapāla Paramā who perhaps came as a pilgrim.117 One cannot be sure whether this Kanakapāla is the same person who later became the king as mentioned in the legend. According to K.P. Nautiyal, Kanakapāla after achieving success in the region of Garhwal established his seat at Cāndapuragarh and not at Barahata, where his father-in-law had been ruling. However, later through his marriage he was able to unite the two kingdoms.118 But the available dates make a gap of 189 years between the two rulers, which makes this assumption difficult. However, the Kanakapāla story shows contact with the people coming from the plains.

116 Pati Ram, The History of Garhwal, p.45, Quoted by K.P. Nautiyal, op.cit., p.44.
In the second half of the seventh century, the centre of political and social activity shifted to the Katyur valley with its nerve centre at the present day Baijanath which is identified with Kārttikeyapura, the capital of the Katyuri Kingdom. The Katyur Valley, according to Traill, has a greater proportion of cultivable land lying waste than any other subdivision in the province.\(^{119}\) Atkinson wrote that Katyur had always been remarkably open and free from jungle and the existence of two large streams made irrigation easy. However, the situation was not very good when Traill wrote his reports, as the whole region was ravaged by the Gorkhas. But, the situation must have been better in the past. This was acknowledged by Atkinson as well.\(^{120}\) The heart of the Katyuri Kingdom covered the area falling between the rivers Gomati and Ramaganga. The space between these two rivers is the most fertile area in the entire region. Several routes used for pilgrimage and intra-regional trade pass through this area. Thus, this area had all the necessary conditions, which could support a large kingdom of the Katyuris.

There is some controversy regarding the origin of the Katyuris. Atkinson traces their origin to the Kabul Valley connecting them with the Kators of that region.\(^{121}\) J.C. Powell Price viewed the Katyuris as connected with the Kuṇindas.\(^{122}\) M.P. Joshi\(^{123}\) agrees with Powell Price. In T.D. Gairola’s view the Katyuris were of Khaśa origin who originally dwelt at Joshimatha and subsequently migrated to the Katyur valley.\(^{124}\) According to K.P. Nautiyal, the Khaśa origin of the Katyuris is the most plausible thesis. Khaśas according to him played an important role in the

---

\(^{119}\) ATK, p.401.
\(^{120}\) ATK, p.402.
\(^{121}\) ATK, pp.381-83.
\(^{123}\) M.P. Joshi, Uttarakhand (Kumaon-Garhwal) Himalaya, p.44.
\(^{124}\) Quoted by K.P. Nautiyal, The Archaeology, p.46.
history of the entire hill region of northern India. Many dynasties of the
early medieval period ruling over these parts seem to have been offshoots
of the Khaśa stock and it seems very likely that the Katyuris who
established the first historical dynasty of Kumaon were also of Khaśa
origin. The Katyuri grants speak of the Khaśa among the inhabitants of the
kingdom.

It is likely that the Kuṇindas, Paurava-Varmans and the
Katyuris, all of them belonged to the Khaśa group, who later began to
claim Rajput status at least around the fourteenth century if not
earlier. Hermann Goetz wrote that the principal ethnic group in the
Himalayas seems to have been the Mongoloid Khaśas, whose
settlements extended from eastern Turkistan (Kashgar) over Kashmir
to Nepal and Assam (Khasis). To them probably belonged the
Audumbaras and the Kuṇindas and other tribal republics of the
Punjab region. Later, a section of the Kuṇindas moved on to
Kumaon, whereas on the Sutlej we find the Urshis, on the Beas the
Audumbaras and Kapisthālas, on the Ravi the Kathas and Darvas and
on the Chenab the Dārvās, Khaśas and Rājanyas. It seems that
Paurava-Varmans and Katyuris too were Khaśas. The ruling families
slowly distanced themselves from their original stock, so much so that
the Katyuris in their charters mention the Khaśas separately. After
the decline of Brahmapura, a section of the Khasas shifted to the
Katyur valley and came to be known as Katyuris. The local tradition
that they migrated from Joshimatha to Katyur may show that they
come from some nearby place. There is another possibility that a
branch of the Paurava-Varman family was ruling at the provincial
centre of Joshimatha and after the decline of the central authority at
Brahmapura, it captured power and founded a new kingdom with its

centre at the Katyur valley. The inscriptions reflect a sort of continuity of administrative set-up.

The Katyuri Dynasty

In D.C. Sircar’s view, the Bagesvara Stone contains three different inscriptions belonging to three different families (Geneological Chart on the following page) represented by (1) Basantanadeva and his successor; (2) Kharaparadeva, Kalyānarājadeva and Tribhuvananarājadeva; (3) Nimbaradeva, Īstagaṇadeva, Lalitasuradeva and Bhūdevadeva.126 Lalitasuradeva traces his genealogy from Nimbara, the first of D.C. Sircar’s third family of kings, the order of succession being the same. Following is the genealogy given in Lalitasuradeva’s inscription:- Nimbarė. Īstagaṇadeva Lalitasuradeva. M.P. Joshi contends that Basantanadeva of the inscription is the same as Basantideva of the Katyuri Vamsāvali who figures as the son of Āsantideva and father of Katār malladeva. According to Joshi, it is likely that the name not traceable in the Bagesvara Stone Inscription, might represent Katāramalladeva, one of the well-known Katyuri kings who constructed the famous Sun Temple at Kataramal in Almora which on stylistic grounds is to be assigned to the close of the seventh or early eighth century A.D.127 But Goetz places the Sūrya shrine much later, and connect it with the Canda dynasty in Kumaon.128 He points out that in Kumaon, the temples of Jagesvara and Mrtyunjaya and the smaller temples at Jagesvara, the Ban Deo, Kacheri and the Maniyar group of shrines at Dwarahat as well as the original Sun temple of Kataramal and the temples of Baijanatha, belong to the Pratihāra style of the 9th century.129 So, M.P. Joshi’s identification seems doubtful.

127 M.P. Joshi, Uttaranchal (Kumaon-Garhwal) Himalaya, p46.
128 H.Goetz, op.cit., p.69.
129 Ibid, p.70.
Genealogical Chart of the Katyuris

Sri Basantanadeva or Masantanadeva
(Sajyanarādevi)

↓

………… (son)

↓

Kharparadeva (cousin)

↓

Kalyānarājadeva (son)

↓

Tribhuvanarājadeva (son)

↓

Nimbartadeva (relationship not known) [780 A.D.]
(Nāsū Devī)

↓

Istaganadeva (son) [810 A.D.]
(Vega Devī)

↓

Lalitasuradeva (son) [835 A.D.]
(Samā Devī)

↓

Bhūdevadeva (son) [875 A.D.]

↓

Salopāditya (relationship not known) [895 A.D.]
(Singhuvali Devī)

↓

Icchātadeva (son) [920 A.D.]
(Singhu Devī and Isāna Devī)

↓

Desatadeva (son) [930 A.D.]
(Padmalla Devī)

↓

Padmatadeva (son) [945 A.D.]

↓

Subhikṣarājadeva (son) [975 A.D.]
Basantanadeva is said to be the founder of the kingdom of Kārttikeyapura. It seems that he was a feudatory or official of the Paurava-Varmanas posted at Kārttikeyapura viṣaya and became an independent ruler on the decline of the Paurava-Varmanas. Basantanadeva was a Vaiṣṇava and not a Śaiva as K.P. Nautiyal thought. It was his son and successor who adopted Śaivism and built many rest houses along the roads to Jayakulabhukti. The successors of this king are merely mentioned in the inscription without any reference to their achievements. When Nimbaradeva succeeded the throne, the kingdom seems to have gained importance. In the Pāṇḍukeśvara Plates, he is recorded as a fighter of wars, vanquishing his enemies and acquiring the kingdom by the strength of his own arms. Powell Price holds that the victory probably referred to some war with the Pālas. On the basis of the similarity between the Pāṇḍukeśvara Plates and the Pāla inscriptions, as well as between the surnames of the writers of Pāṇḍukeśvana Plates and that of Pāla grants (Bhadra), almost all the scholars concluded that there was a Pāla invasion of Kumaon, which ultimately resulted in a treaty by which the hill ṛājas were enrolled as vassals of the Pālas. But only on the basis of similarity of records and surnames of the writers one cannot surmise that the region was under Pāla control. The similarity could be explained in terms of the stereotyped nature of the ṛājasāsana format given in the Vyāsa Smṛti ascribable to A.D. 600-900 which may have been followed by the Pālas as well as the Katyūris. As far as the question of the surname of the writers of both the grants ending in ‘Bhadra’ is concerned, we may

131 Nijabhujo-pārjīt, Plate of Lalitasuradeva, In.3.
133 ATK, p.478.
point out that the Bhadras lived in the Kumaon-Garhwal region itself. Some of the Ayudha kings who superseded the weak successors of Yaśovarman at Kannauj in turn became subjected to the control of stronger powers, especially to the Pālas of Bengal and the Pratīhāras of Rajputana. Since a large part of the Terai region of Kumaon and Garhwal was under Kannauj, this gave the impression that it was also raided by Dharmapāla. Even Hermann Goetz thinks that Dharmapāla had led expeditions into Kumaon but provides no evidence. The largest number of temples of the region belong to the Pratihāra style and not Pāla style.

So, it is highly unlikely that Nimbaradeva had to fight the reigning Pāla king. It seems that he had to fight initially with the other contenders to the throne and later with the subordinate chiefs and feudatories. After Nimbaradeva, his son Iṣṭagaṇadeva succeeded the throne. It is mentioned that he fought his enemies and slew furious elephants with the edge of his swords. Atkinson, on the basis of the reference to elephants said that the invaders came from the plains. But we have seen that the inscriptions of Paurava-Varmans speak of Pilupati, an officer incharge of elephant forces. Besides, it could as well be a conventional description. According to K.P. Nautiyal, Iṣṭagaṇadeva had to dispel some of the petty princes who raised their head during the anarchy in the foothills. This seems quite-plausible. Lalitasuradeva inherited the vast empire from his father Iṣṭagaṇadeva. Two copper-plate grants belonging to him have been discovered. In both he is described as a valiant warrior, "who keeps (other) kings of the earth at peace by his rule over it that has been subdued by
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135 H. Goetz, op.cit. p.68.  
136 Ibid, p.69.  
137 ATK, p.483.  
having recourse to the strength of his bow, bent by his massive arm, just as Prīhu firmly fixed the chief mountains in their places in order to tend the bow, brought into subjection by means of his bent bow”. This may be an allusion to his subduing of some petty tribal chiefs.

K.P. Nautiyal believes that the inscriptional references are to the incursions from the plains especially by the Palas. His belief is on the basis of the Monghyr Copper Plate of Devapāla in which he (810-850 A.D.) is said to have exacted tributes from the whole of northern India from the Himalayas to the Vindhyas and from the eastern to the western ocean. Although, the claim is certainly exaggerated, Devapāla had for some time controlled Kannauj after defeating Bhoja Pratīhāra and might have considered the Kumaon region conquered. But Bhoja had, around A.D.836, recovered Kannauj which remained the capital of the Pratīhāra empire for almost a century. Further, other than the Pālas, many kings from the central and western India claim to have acquired the Himalayan region. For example, Yasōdharmadeva in his Mandasor Pillar Inscription claimed to have ruled over areas falling between Lauhitya in the east to the western sea in the west and between the Himalaya in the north to Mahendra in the south. Similar claims were made by Kṛṣṇa III, the Rāṣṭrakūta, king Amoghavarṣa I, etc.

The grant of a large number of plots and villages shows that the state system had further stabilised by Lalitasuradeva’s time. It is also supported by the fact that new visayas were created at this time in addition to the ones existing from the time of the Paurava-Varman dynasty.

Lalitasuradeva was succeeded by his son Bhūdevadeva. K.P. Nautiyal fixed the date of his accession at A.D. 875 but M.P. Joshi
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139 Quoted in S.P. Dabaral, Abhilekha, p.78.


fixes it at A.D. 855. The difference of twenty years is because Nautiyal has assigned forty years of reign to Lalitasuradeva while Joshi assigns him only twenty years. However, both these dates are conjectural, although it is clear that he reigned in the second half of the ninth century. The statement in the Bagesvara Stone Inscription, “...ears were frequently troubled by the sound of the jewels of the crowns of rajas who bowed before him and whose great weapon destroyed darkness” shows that many chiefs paid tributes and attended Bhūdeva’s court. The language reflects an ethos of feudal relationships. Bhudeva’s rule was of a short period and was probably overthrown by a person called Salaṇāditya. The relationship between Bhūdeva and Salaṇāditya is not clear. In D.C. Sircar’s view the house of Lalitasuradeva was overthrown whereas in K.P. Nautiyal’s view the succession was peaceful.\(^{142}\) Although no evidence is forthcoming in support of either of the two views, one can be sure that Salaṇāditya was a feudatory of Bhūdeva. He could have been from the Katyuri family itself. That Salaṇāditya was a feudatory chief of Bhūdeva is suggested by the fact that he is not given any imperial title. He is said to have established his power “by subduing numerous powerful circles of his enemies.”\(^{143}\) R.S. Tripathi on the basis of an inscription of Mihira Bhoja from Gorakhapur regarding the donation of land to a Kalacuri family, believed that “Mihira Bhoja’s suzerainty was acknowledged upto the foot of the Himalayas. But in K.P. Nautiyal’s view the inscription referred to the Terai area bordering India and Nepal and had nothing to do with Kumaon.\(^{144}\) Salaṇāditya was succeeded by Icṣṭadēva, who ruled for a very short period. He was succeeded by his son Desaṇādēva. In the royal panegyric he is also credited

---


\(^{143}\) R.S. Tripathi, History of Kannauj, Banaras, 1937, p.239.

with defeating a large circle of enemies.  

Padmaṭađeva succeeded his father Desaṭađeva. He “acquired unnumbered provinces on all sides by the might of his arms, the owners of which coming to make him obeisance poured forth such incessant gifts of horses, elephants and jewels before him that they held in contempt the offerings made to Indra”. According to K.P. Nautiyal, Padmaṭađeva occupied some portions of the present Moradabad - Ramnagar area and even went as far as Bareilley and is said have received ‘gifts of horses, elephants and jewels by the rulers coming from various directions. Padmaṭađeva was succeeded by his son Subhikṣaṛājađeva in about the second quarter of the tenth century. It seems even he had to check the revolt of ambitious vassals. His inscription mentions that he “destroyed the expansion of the arrogance of the stone staff-like arms of the enemies by forcibly carrying away their fortunes”. The last part of the quote, i.e. ‘by forcibly carrying away their fortunes’ suggests that it was the refusal to pay tribute or dues on the part of the vassals that led to the wars and looting of their wealth by the Katyuri king. The Katyuri rule seems to have reached its zenith during Padmaṭađeva’s time which was well maintained by Subhikṣaṛājađeva. Subhikṣaṛađeva issued the charter from Subhikṣapura rather than from the usual Karttikeyapurā. In Atkinson’s view, Subhikṣapura was another name for Karttikeyapurā or its suburb. This city was undoubtedly named after the king. There may be some truth in Atkinson’s view that Subhikṣapura was not far from Karttikeyapurā.

145 According to Atkinson, a copper plate grant of Desaṭa, father of Padmaṭa, is preserved in the temple of Balesvara in Eastern Kumaon. It was issued from Karttikeyapurā in the 5th year of that king. This copper-plate however, remains unpublished. Summary of the copper-plats is given by Atkinson, p.471.
146 Ibid., p.484.
147 K.P. Nautiyal, op.cit., p.61.
148 D.C.Sircar, El, vol.31, no.38.III.
149 ATK, p.483.
Subhikṣarājadeva’s reign seems to have ended in the last quarter of the 10th century A.D. A number of rulers of the following centuries figure on the walls of the temples at Dwarahat, Doti and Sira on the basis of which Atkinson surmised that after the rule of Subhikṣarājadeva a number of petty kingdoms came into existence in the valley and this situation continued till the 16th century. An inscription on a Vaikuṇṭha image at Gaṇanātha\(^\text{150}\) records its installation in V.S. 1059 (A.D. 1002) by one Tribhuvanapāla, son of Indrapāla and grandson of Lakhanapāla. This image was originally enshrined in Lākṣmi-Nārāyana temple at Baijanath. In M.P. Joshi’s view, this inscription introduces us to another line of the Katyuris of Kārttikeyapura who ruled between the latter half of the tenth century and first half of the eleventh century.\(^\text{151}\) But as the rulers’ name ends with Pāla, its identification with the main line of the Katyuris ruling from Kārttikeyapura whose names ended in ‘deva’ is doubtful. He may have been a feudatory of the main line.

We have an inscription on an image of Viṣṇu at Kulsari (Chamoli) belonging to the 10th century A.D. which records the installation of the image by Jātabaladeva. Y.S. Kathoch believes that the Kulsari Inscription mentions Katiyura a variation of Katyuri.\(^\text{152}\) The surname ‘deva’ shows that he belonged to the main line of the Katyuris and ruled that area as a tributary prince. At this time, Mankotis of Gangoli and Candras of Campāvata also claimed independence.

**Polity of the Katyuri Kingdom**

The Katyuris had inherited a fairly developed administrative set-up from the Paurava-Varman rulers. During their rule, the administrative

\(^{150}\) *Ind. Arch. AR. 1960-61*, p.49.

\(^{151}\) M.P. Joshi, *Uttaranachal (Kumaon-Garhwal) Himalaya*, p.48.

system became even more elaborate. The list of officials in their inscriptions is almost the same as those found in the Pāla inscriptions. However, such similarity is not rare for the hill regions. Even the lists found in some of the Cāmba records are similar to the one found in the Deo-Barnark Pillar Inscription of Jīvītāgupta who ruled in the eighth century Magadh. Apart from this, remarkable similarity exist between the lists of officials in the Pāla inscription and those in the Cāmba title-deeds. So, these similarities are indicative of the state system being fashioned on the pattern of the monarchy that flourished in other parts of north India. Interestingly, we find Gupta influence on the Paurava-Varman polity and Pāla influence on Katyuri polity. So, there seems to be a continuous interaction between the plains and the hill regions.

We find a number of new official designations in the Katyuri records. These are the offices of the mahāsāmanīdhipati, viśyayavyāprāpta and kāṇḍapati in the Padmaṭadeva’s grant,¹⁵³ and pratisūrika in Lalitāsuradeva’s grant.¹⁵⁴ The pratisūrika may have been the superintendent of gladiatorial combats in which pratisūrika (literally opponents), i.e. prize fighters, took part.¹⁵⁵ The function of kāṇḍapati cannot be determined with certainty; but the word kāṇḍa may have indicated different branches of such combats; possibly, the kāṇḍapati may be taken to have been the same as the pratisūrika,¹⁵⁶ particularly as the grant of Padmaṭadeva mentions kāṇḍapati but not pratisūrika. So both terms could have designated the same official. It must be noted here that while enumerating the offices, the writers of the grant did not categorise them on any principle. All the people who mattered were to be present at
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¹⁵³ D.C. Sircar, EI, vol.31, no.38.11.
¹⁵⁶ Ibid.
the time of the proclamation of a grant in the capital.\textsuperscript{157} That is why professional as well as ethnic groups such as ābhīra, vaṁśik, śreṣṭhī, Khaṣā, Kirāta, Dravīḍa, Kālīṅga, Gauḍa, Hiṁśa, Odṛa, Meḍa, Āṇḍhra, Cāṇḍāla are mentioned indiscriminately. This list included not only officials but also feudatories and ethnic groups. In the category of feudatories we find the mention of rāja, rājānaka, rājputra, sāmanta mahāsāmanta and mahāsāmantādhipati. Thakkuras, mahattamś and mahāmanusyas were heads of villages or heads of ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{158} The rest were officials working directly under the king.

The office of daśāparādhika and cauroiddharaṇikā are important in the sense that the right to punish the offenders of ten offences and punish the thieves was still with the king. This was perhaps because the grantees did not have the necessary infrastructure to maintain law and order in a difficult terrain. Šaulkika, bhāgika, tarapati and bhogapati were tax and toll collectors. Bhāgika is absent in the Katyuri grants. Some other offices of the Paurava-Varman grants which are absent in the Katyuri grants are gaṇjapati, nagarapati, sūpakarapati, jayanapati, katūka, devadṛṇyadhikṛta, mahāsattrapati, aikākisvāmin, rājadauvārika, karāṅkika, koṭādhikaraṇika, karika, kulācārika and balaḍhyakṣa. Absence of devadṛṇyadhikṛta, and mahāsattrapati show that now the temples were free from the royal control and had emerged as power centres. This happened because grants of land and villages had turned them into wealthy landowners. Interestingly, there is no mention of purohita in the entire period of our study. The new titles and offices in the Katyuri grants which are not found in the Paurava-Varman grants are as follows:

1. Rāja - Originally rāja or rājan were the titles used by imperial

\textsuperscript{157} Śrīmaṭ-Kārttikeyaṇapura - viṣva-sampradāyān-saumya-vān=evamīyogasthānā
d\textsuperscript{158} D.C. Sircar, “Three Plates from Pandukṣevasvar”, EI, vol.31, no.38.
rulers but later when emperors assumed grand titles, it became a title of feudatories and lesser chiefs.

2. **Rājānaka** - is same as rājānaka, rājanyaka and rājanika. It was also a feudatory title which could have denoted a smaller feudatory.

3. **Sāmanta** - During the Gupta period sāmanta sometimes meant a neighbouring landlord and in the Arthasastra it has been used in the sense of a neighbouring prince. The literary and epigraphic sources reveal that from the Gupta period onwards the term Sāmanta became increasingly common for a vassal.\(^{159}\)

4. **Mahāsāmanta** - Mahāsāmanta is the title of a feudatory of a higher rank. During the heyday of political feudalism high-sounding titles were not meant to indicate their functions but to emphasise their high rank.

5. **Mahāsāmantādhipati** - This was the title of feudatories who had some subordinate chiefs under them.

6. **Thakkura** - This is a feudal title commonly applied to brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya and kāyastha functionaries of medieval times in northern India.\(^{160}\) However, H.D. Sankalia thinks it to be non-sanskritic in origin and related to *thakka*, meaning a merchant.\(^{161}\)

7. **Mahāmanuṣya** - was probably the headman of a village. It may also be similar to the later sayānā and *thakura* when, both appear to indicate noblemen or landholders.

8. **Mahākārttakrtaka** - He was probably superintendent or manager of state affairs. The office has sometimes been explained as that of a 'royal agent or judge'. This is one of the designations included in the pāṇca-mahāsābdā.
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\(^{159}\) B.N.S. Yadava, Society, p.136.


\(^{161}\) Ibid.
9. **Mahārajapramātāra** - Derived from *pramātā*, he was possibly a counsellor to the king in judicial matters.

10. **Sarabhaṅga** - D.C. Sircar, while translating the text of the Plate of Lalitavistara, takes it to mean a royal surgeon. But in his *Glossary* he explains it as the commander or a military governor.

11. **Duḥṣādhyasādhanika** - Literally meaning the performer of difficult tasks, he was probably the leader of policemen engaged in apprehending robbers or a leader of expeditionary forces requisitioned on occasions of emergency.

12. **Daśāparādhika** - He was probably an officer who dealt with the ten offences, viz. theft, murder, adultery, use of abusive language, untruthfulness, slandering, incoherent conversation, covetousness, desire to do wrong, and tenacity for wrong.

13. **Cauroddharanika** - He was an officer to look after the apprehension of thieves.

14. **Śaulkika** - The Śaulkika seems to have been known since post-Mauryan times. Yājñāvalkya refers to this officer in connection with ownerless property, but does not state his function. The term is derived from Śulka, which was an item of commercial tax. Fleet, therefore, pointed out that the Śaulkika was a superintendent of tolls and customs.

15. **Gaulmika** - He was an officer in charge of a Gulma or outpost or group of guards, soldiers or policemen. Fleet, however, takes it to mean a superintendent of woods and forest.

16. **Tadāyuktaka** - Tadāyuktaka and Viniyuktaka appear to be
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subordinate officers appointed by the governors. Both of them probably worked under the Āyuktaka.

17. Paṭṭakāpācarīka - He was an officer in charge of dealing with paṭṭak-āpacāra, i.e. crime relating to the misuse or fraud concerning grants.

18. Āsedhabaṅgādhikṣa - He was an officer in charge of preventing escape from prison or legal restraint.

19. Hastyavśvatralavyāpṛtaka - He was an officer in charge of elephant, horse and camel troops.

20. Dūta - Similar to dūtaka.

21. Prasṇika - He was an officer in charge of the despatch of messengers.

22. Dāndika - Dāndika may be a judicial functionary, but is most probably a police officer responsible for maintaining law and order.

23. Gamāgamika - He was a police personnel dealing with entrance into and exit from the capital.

24. Khādgika - He was the superintendent of swordsmen.

25. Rājasthānīya - Literally meaning 'an officer acting for the king', Rājasthānīya was generally a viceroy and sometimes also a subordinate ruler.

27. Tarapati - He was an officer in charge of ferries and may be similar to Tarika.

28. Khaṇḍarakaṣa - He was probably in charge of a small territorial unit or the royal engineer looking after buildings falling in rains.
29. **Pratisūrika** - He was possibly a superintendent of gladiatorial combats.

30. **Sīhānādhikṛta** - He was superintendent of police and out-posts.

31. **Vartmapāla** - He looked after the maintenance of the roads.

32. **Kotṭapāla** - He was the chief administrative officer of the fort.

33. **Kṣetrapāla** - **Kṣetrapāla** looked after the land which was the personal holding of the royal family.

34. **Prāntapāla** - This officer has been explained as the warden of the marches by D.C. Sircar. P.V. Kane explained it as the governor of a province or guardian of the frontiers. (Quoted in Glossary, s.v. prāntapāla.)

35. **Ghaṭtapala** - He was the superintendent of landing places on river-banks in order to collect taxes on commercial items.

36. **Kiśoravacjavagomahisvyadhikṛta** - He was the superintendent of colts, mares, cows and she-buffalows which probably belonged to the royal house.

37. **Bhatta** - was a learned brāhmaṇa.

38. **Mahattam** - The mahattams were foremost persons in the villages in terms of wealth, birth etc.

39. **Mahādāṇākṣapatalādhikṛta** - He was the officer in charge of the Department of Gift. In the Pandukesvara Plate of Lalitasuradeva, year 21, Yījaka is the mahādāṇākṣapatalādhikṛta who also acted as the dūtaka, while in another Plate of Lalitasuradeva, year 22, the mahādāṇākṣapatalādhikṛta is Pīluka. In the Plate of Padmaṭadeva this office is held by Śrī Bhatta Dhanasra and in the Plate of Subhikṣarājadeva this office is held by ŚrīĪśvaradatta.

40. **Mahāsāndhivigrahika** - The minister of peace and war appears as
the writers of the grants. In the Paurava-Varman grants *sāndhivegrahika* acted as *dūtakas* but now *mahādānākṣaapātalādhikṛta* had taken over as *dūtaka*. Apparently these two offices were responsible for the writing and execution of the deeds.

41. *Viṣayavyāpṛtaka* - He looked after the administration of a district.

The above study shows a slight modification in the nomenclature of some officers. Thus *daṇḍoparika* becomes *uparika*, *koṭādhikaraṇīka* becomes *koṭṭapāla*. In the Paurava-Varman grants we have the expression *anuvarggam*, i.e. a class of dependants (on the king), whereas in Katyuri grants we have *aśṭādaśapraṇyadhisthānīya*, i.e. head of eighteen kinds of departments. In the Paurava-Varman grants we have only one official related to armed forces, i.e. *balādhyakṣa*. whereas in Katyuri grants we have many offices such as *śarabhaṅga*, *gaulmika*, *hastyaśōstrabalavyāprta*, *khaṇḍarakṣa*, *pratisūrīka*, etc. This shows the growth of armed forces and changes in its organisation largely because of the horizontal growth of the kingdom.

Not only the armed forces but almost all spheres of the administrative system were reorganised by the Katyuris in order to control the widening base of the kingdom. Villages seem to have been brought under active control through the offices of *bhaṭṭa*, *mahattama* and *mahāmanusya*. Improved tax and toll collection is indicated by the new offices of *ghaṭṭapāla*, *tarapati*, *śaulkika*, etc. Creation of the office of *varimapāla* shows that the state was now taking interest in construction and control of roads. An interesting aspect of the Katyuri grants is that in many cases the donated plots had been part of the larger administrative unit. This means that now grants were made of areas that were already settled.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ *Samakālīka visayād - udāra-piṇḍa*, Plate of Padmatadeva, ln.24.
The introduction of the office of mahādānaksapatiādikāya shows growing incidence of landgrants, which required maintenance of proper records. The trend was to invent more and more grandiose titles. Hence, the sāndhivigrāhika of earlier times now became mahāsāndhivigrāhika and a number of feudatory titles emerge such as sāmanta, mahāsāmanta, mahāsāmantādhipati, rāja, rājānaka. Amongst these, rājas and rājānakas played a more important role in the post-Katyuri era.

The region under our study provides an interesting example of the way Brahmanical ideology helped in enhancing the power and prestige of the tribal elite and legitimize their control over land and other erstwhile tribal resources. For this purpose, resort was taken to the invention of origin myths. Thus, Agnivarman is said to have descended from the Moon and the Sun as well as from the legendary king Pururava. The Katyuri kings are also said to have belonged to an illustrious family.

A large number of temples were constructed during the Katyuri rule and landgrants were made for their maintenance. This was another method of gaining legitimacy. Masantanadeva, the first Katyuri ruler is supposed to have constructed several public roads leading to Jayakulabhukti and erected buildings on the side of those roads. Adoption of non-Brahmanical gods into the Brahminical pantheon and donation of land to the temples dedicated to such gods can be seen in this context only. However, all these methods were backed by the growing military strength, which conveyed the message that non-compliance may result in severe punishment.

---

166 Such as Bahārke (Bhaṭaka), Gambīyapinda, Čandālāmūnda Devī etc.