CHAPTER-I

POLITICAL CONDITION OF NORTHERN INDIA (C.AD 800-1450)

The death of Harsha in the later half of the 7th century was an impending gloom in the history of Northern India. Kannauj which remained guarded by the strong arms of Harsha, suddenly turned into a scene of violent upheaval. The later Guptas of Magadha under Adityasena and the Karkotas of Kashmir, who were frightful of Harsha’s power came on an active front to revive their lost glory. Yasovarman, who seated on the throne of Kannauj after a short interval of Harsha’s death could not rule in peace, being disturbed by the mighty monarch of Kashmir, named Lalitaditya, with whom he is known to have indulged in a war. The results of this war were certainly disastrous for Yasovarman and his power was totally uprooted at once during this war. The death of Yasovarman followed by a darkness, though we hear of some of his disreputed successors. There followed the short and temporary rule of Vajrayudha, and Indrayudha as the shadowy figures. It was during such a period of great turmoil that a rifty struggle was ensued among the Rashtrakutas, Gurjara-Pratiharas and Palas; each of them was having a greedy eye over Kannauj for its possession. The tripartite struggle was first induced by the Rashtrakuta ruler Dhruva (c.AD 779-794) by invading the territory of Doab. Subsequently, the Palas of Bengal tried to secure their position by installing their own protege, named

1 That this king of Kashmir might had been possessing some control over the area of Kannauj as a result of this war, appears from Rajtarangini of Kalhana which refers to “the land of Kanyakubja from the bank of the Jumna to that of the Kalika was as much in his (Lalitaditya’s) power as the courtyard of his palace” (Tr. M.A. Stein, IV, p.133, V.145).

2 Baroda grant of Karkaraja, I.A., XII, pp.159, 163, Sanjan Plate, Ei, XVIII, pp.244,252. The name of the ruler is not mentioned in the grants. While, Fleet regards him as Govinda III (IA, XII, pp.159 and 163), Dr. Majumdar has taken out him as Dhruva, father of Govindaraja (Journal of Dept. of Letters, Vol.X, p.35, Ei, XVIII, p.239, fn.4).
Chakrayudha on the throne of Kannauj after defeating Indrayudha. But, the rule of Chakrayudha remained short-lived, for the Pratihara king Nagabhatta at this time appeared on the scene by boldly annexing Kannauj from him. The Pratiharas, thus, gained the supreme power in north after the conquest of Kannauj. The circumstances, which led the Pratihara king to such an usurpation of power were the domestic seditions in the Rashtrakuta family. Then, the Palas, being intolerant to the dethronement of their protege Chakrayudha and the assumption of imperial power by the Pratiharas started a bitter struggle against the latter. Epigraphic evidences clearly prove that in this struggle Nagabhatta attained success with the help of his feudatories. This great success resulted in the increase of the glory of Nagabhatta II and in the extension of his dominion over a vast area, which possibly covered all the regions from the east to the west and from the Himalayas to the Narbada excluding only the north-western part and the Pala state. Thus, it is clear that Kannauj once again entered upon a period of expansion and glory under Nagabhatta after Harsha. This triangular struggle continued during the reign of

---


4 The supremacy of the Pratiharas is gleaned from the Buchkela Inscription issued in AD 815, in which, Nagabhatta is referred with his full imperial titles parambhattaraka, maharajadhiraja, parameshwara (EI, IX, p.199f.).

5 It is evident that Govinda III who is known to have overran the north up to the Himalayas and to whom Chakrayudha of Kannauj and Dharmapala had submitted of their own accord, got engrossed towards the close of his reign with internal affairs in order to secure the succession of his son Amoghvarsha (EI, XVIII, pp.245, 253, V.23) and while Govinda III died, his minor son was not able to assert himself against the serious domestic seditions, as a result of which a sort of anarchy and confusion prevailed in the Rashtrakuta kingdom. This provided an opportunity to Nagabhatta to wage war against Chakrayudha in order to gain possession over Kannauj. (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol.I, pt.II, pp.402, 409, also see A.S. Altekar, Rashtrakutas and their times, pp.69-73.


7 EI, XVIII, pp.96,98, V.24, XII, p.10f.

8 R.S. Tripathi, History of Kannauj, p.234.
Ramabhadra, the son of Nagabhhatta. The successive rule of Ramabhadra’s son, Bhoja I was a period of consolidation of Pratihara power. He re-established the supremacy of his family by restoring his authority over the Gurjaratrabhumi (Jodhpur or Marwar). He is also known to have successfully directed his energies towards the Pala King Devapala, who had acquired a dominant place in Northern India. The results of the struggle with the Palas might had been unfavourable to Bhoja, to some extent, as the Badal pillar inscription refers to Devapala as one who “brought low the arrogance of the lord of Gurjaras”. (kharvikrita gurjananath darpan).

Being entangled with the continuous encroachment of Rashtrakuta power, Bhoja, at last, put a severe reverse to Krishna II, Rashtrakuta (AD 875-911).

Mahendrapala, the successor of Bhoja became successful in occupying the area of Magadha and Northern Bengal after vanquishing the Palas. The Rashtrakuta menace again disturbed the Pratiharas at the beginning of Mahipala’s reign, as the Cambay plate of Govinda IV informs us that Indra III completely devastated the city of Mahodaya, which was famous as

---

10 This area was possibly got disturbed by the feudatory Pratihara family of Mandor (R.S. Tripathi, op.cit., p.239).
11 The Badal pillar inscription accounts of Devapala’s suzerainty as far as the Vindhyas and Himalayas (EI, II, pp.162, 165, V.5), while the Monghyr grant sets out the limits of the boundaries of his dominion up to the Himalayas in the north and the oceans in the east and west (Ibid., XVIII, p.305).
13 IA, XII, pp.184, 189, V.38, EI, XIX, pp.174-177.

The Rashtrakuta epigraph refers to them (Rashtrakutas) as victorious in the above war. The Bagumra plates of Indra III (Saka 836 or AD 915) eulogises Krishna II in his Sanguinary Wars with the roaring Gurjara (IA, XIII, p.66). Similarly, the Bagaura Inscription of Krishna of the feudatory Gujarat family refers to his victories over Gurjara, sometime before Saka AD 810-888 (EI, IX, p.24). From such conflicting evidences it may be concluded that the results of the war might had been indecisive and did not remain advantageous to either party.

14 For the extension of Pala dominion, see JBORS, December, 1928, p.508,
The encroachment certainly proved disastrous to the prosperity of Kannauj and inflicted a severe blow to Pratihara power. Ultimately, the Palas, who had already occupied Bihar took the full advantage of this temporary shock to Pratihara power and regained some of their ancestral territories upto the eastern bank of the river Son. But, Mahipala soon revived the lost glory of Kanyakubja and set out for the numerous military campaigns in distant regions. He also seems to have overrun Ujjain from the Rashtrakutas. Though, his recovery over such a situation and the progress of his arms was facilitated to a great deal by the weak Rashtrakuta power at that time. The Rashtrakuta attack was further renewed at the close of Mahipala’s reign as a result of which Kalanjara and Chitrakuta went under his possession from the


16 Vikramarjuniya or Pampabharata of Pampa, a Kanarese poem refers to Narsimha Chalukya, a feudatory, “to have plucked from the Gurjararaja’s arms the Goddess of victory”. The passage significantly seems to refer to this feudatory’s support to the Rashtrakutas against Gurjara-Pratiharas in this battle. The text, further continues to state that “Mahipala fled as if struck by thunder bolts, staying neither to eat nor rest, nor pick himself up, while Narsimha pursuing bathed his horses at the junction of the Ganges” (R.S. Tripathi, op.cit., p.260).

17 The possession of the Palas over their lost territories is proved by the finds of two Pala inscriptions referring to the time of Gopala, first of which is found in the ruins of Nalanda and Patna districts (ASI, I, 1862-65, p.36) and the other in the ruins of Mahabodhi temple at Bodhgaya (IA, XXXVIII, p.237).

18 Prachanda Pandava or Bala Bharata refers to Mahipala’s victory over the Mekalas, Kalingas, Keralas, Kulutas, Kuntalas and Ramathas (C.F. R.S. Tripathi, op.cit., p.263). His penetration of the remote regions extended from the upper course of the river Beas in the North-west to Kalinga or Orissa in South-east and from the Himalayas to Kerala or Chera country in the far south (Journal of Deptt. Of Letters, X, p.64, R.S. Tripathi, p.264).

19 The Kahla Plate refers to one Bhamana, who was possibly a feudatory of Mahipala, as famous for his conquest of Dhara (EI, VII, pp.89-90, V.13).

20 The Karhad Plates inform us that Indra III’s successor, Govinda IV was indulged in ‘vicious courses’ and thus “with his intelligence caught in the noose of the eyes of women displeased all beings”, which undoubtedly proves that he was not in a position to ably look after the state affairs. (EI, IV, pp.283, 288, V.20). The reference in Vikramarjumanijaya of Kanarese poet Pampa to the defeat of Govinda IV by Arikesarin II of Puligere lends support to his weak position (Ibid., XVIII, pp.328-29). It appears that the power and prestige of Govinda IV declined soon after Saka AD 851-930, the date of Kalas Plate, which eulogises him conventionally (Ibid.).
Pratiharas.\textsuperscript{21} The next ruler Mahendrapala II is referred in the epigraphs only as the shadowy figure whose Kingdom was extended so far south as Ujjain.\textsuperscript{22}

The three successors of Mahendrapala II, namely Devapala, Vijayapala, Rajyapala were only the nominal monarchs during whose reign disintegration and the decline of the empire was completed. The decline of the Pratihara Empire opened the way for their own feudatory chiefs to declare themselves as independent powers. Hence, the Chalukyas, Chandellas, Chahmanas, Gahadawalas, Paramaras, Kalachuris and Guhils appeared on the scene. Then, the history once again repeated itself in northern India as while each one of these powers was trying to establish its hold over Kannauj during the 11\textsuperscript{th} century, a person of the noble lineage of the Gahadawalas\textsuperscript{23} named Chandradeva, suddenly acquired sovereignty over Kannauj.\textsuperscript{24} He was in good terms with the Pala King Madanapala and it was perhaps as his ally that he had taken repressive action against Vijaisena, who is said to have attacked the king of Gauda.\textsuperscript{25} We do not have any information about any military adventure of Chandradeva’s successor, Madanapala. The next ruler Govindachandra succeeded his father Madanapala around AH 1166/AD 1109. Govindachandra had already acquired fame by defeating some bands of Muslim invaders around

---

\textsuperscript{21} Kahla Plate, EI, IV, pp.284, 289, V.30, p.194, V.25.

\textsuperscript{22} JBORS, December, 1928, p.486.

\textsuperscript{23} The Origin of the Gahadawalas like those of other powers in northern India is shrouded in mystery. The genealogical lists traced their descent from one Yasovigraha belonging to the noble rank, whose identification is not clear (IA, XVIII, pp.11-12, lines 1-2). The next person born in the Gahadawala lineage was Mahichandra who is known to have defeated the host of his enemies (DHNI, I, p.506). The other such references in the grants to his credit undoubtedly suggest that he was a petty chief of the Gaurjara-Pratiharas. But, Chandradeva was certainly a real founder of the fortunes of the Gahadawalas. Most of the Gahadawala grants acclaim that he had acquired sovereignty over Kanyakubja ‘by the prowess of his arms’. (Ibid.)

\textsuperscript{24} The epigraphic evidences testify that the important areas of Kasi (Benares), Kusika (Kannauj), Uttarakosala (Ayodhya) and Indraprastha (Delhi) comprised within his empire (IA, XV, pp.7-8, XVIII, pp.16,18).

AD 1109, while he was *yuvaraj* during his father’s reign. He also provided a tariff defeat to the Palas and occupied the region of Magadha from them. Vijayachandra, the son of Govindachandra ably defended the limits of the empire, inherited from his father. But, the loss of Delhi, during his reign to the Chahmana King Vigraharaja, Visaladeva of Sakambhari in V.S.1220/AD 1164, was a stunning blow to the Gahadawala power.

The hostilities between the Chahanas and the Gahadawalas grew fast during the reign of Jayachandra. Chandbardai informs us that Jayachandra lost his conquest over the Yadava king of Devagiri and had to withdraw his troops, while Prithviraja III sent his feudatory Chamundaraya to support the Yadava king. Jayachandra is also known to have bestowed a special praise in Chauhan chronicles for overcoming the kings of north, for imprisoning the eight tributary kings, and twice defeating Siddharaja, the king of Anhilavada and thus extending his

---

26 *Rahan Grant* informs us that Govindachandra, “again and again by play of his matchless fighting compelled the Hammir (i.e. Amir)” to lay aside his enmity”. (*IA*, XVIII, pp.16, 18, L.9). Again in *Sarnath inscription* of his queen Karmadevi, he is equalled with an incarnation of Hari “who had been commissioned by Hara to protect Banarasi from the wicked Turushka Warrior, as the only one, who was able to protect the earth.” (*EI*, IX, pp.324-327, V.16).

27 *IA*, XVIII, pp.16, 18, L.9.

28 The Chahanas also came in to prominence after the decline of the Gurjara – Pratiharas. There were numerous branches of the Chahanas but some of them were unquestionably the feudatories of Pratiharas of Avanti and Kannauj. The Hansot Plates of the Chachnama Bhatrvraddha (VS 813-AD 756). (*EI*, XII, pp.197-204) indicates that he owed allegiance to Nagavaloka identified as Nagabhatta II (c.AD.815), (*IA*, 1911, XL, pp.239-40, *IA*, 1913, p.58). In *Pratapgarh Inscription* the Chachmana *mahasamanta* Indraraja is mentioned as a feudatory of Mahendrapala II (VS 1003/AD 946, *EI*, XIV, pp.180-181). It also remains a fact that during AD 750-950, most of the regions ruled by the Chachmanas formed part of Pratihara dominion. It was possibly Vigraharaja II (AD 973) of Sakambhari branch, the sixth in descent to Guvaka I, who declared independence against his Pratihara overlord (*IA*, 1913, pp.58 & 62, V.19). Visaladeva, who is also known as Vigraharaja IV was the successor of Amoraja.

29 An inscription engraved on the *Delhi Siwalik Pillar or Firoz Shah Kotla’s Lat* (VS 1220/AD 1164) refers that Vigraharaja “made tributary the land between the Himalaya and Vindhya” (*I.A.*, pt.I, 1886, p.29). *Bijolia Inscription* also refers to Vigraharaja as the conqueror of Delhi. (*JASB*, LV, pt.I, 1886, p.42, V.22) and the *Delhi Museum Inscription* mentions to Delhi as the residence of the Chachmanas until its conquest by the Muslims (*EI*, I, pp.93, 94, V.4).

dominions to the south of Narbada. Besides, this, *Purushpariksha* of Vidyapati states that *Yavanesvara Shahavadin* (Shihabuddin) fled several times being defeated by him, while *Rambhananjari Katha* credits him as *nikhila yavana kshayakarah* i.e. the destroyer of all the Yavanas. The Muslim historians, too bestow a special praise on him. Unfortunately, his life came to an end in the course of the historic battle of Chandwar, in AH 590/AD 1194, while he strikingly received a deadly wound from an arrow discharged by Qutubuddin. Thus ended the story of one of the important dynasty of Northern India.

The Chahmana dynasty, the rulers of which were indulged in the fratricidal wars with their neighbours also came to an end with the II battle of Tarain; which brought the destruction of the greatest king, Prithviraja III. His son was handed over the rule of Ajmer as a

---

32 R.S. Tripathi, op.cit., p.322.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibn Asir, the author of *Kamil-ut-Tawarikh* says that “the king of Benares was the greatest king in India and possessed the largest territory, extending lengthwise from the borders of China to the province of Malwa, and in breadth from the sea to within ten day’s journey to Lahore (Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.251). Jayachandra is usually styled as the king of Benares by the Muslim historians owing to his intimate connection with that city as the habitual abode perhaps, due to its religious importance and geographically its central location in India.
36 Besides the Gahadawalas, the most bitter enemies of the Chahmanas were their contemporaries, the Chalukyas and the Chandellas. It is known from *Prithvirajvijai* that Prithviraja I, one of the successors of Vigrahraja defeated a body of 700 Chalukyas, who had come to Pushkara to rob the Brahmanas. (Ray, *DHNI*, II, p.1070). The struggle continued during the reign of Ajmoraja (c.AD 1139) as *Dvavarakavya* of Hemachandra refers that Anna of *Sapadalaksha* bent his head before *Chalukya Jayasimha* (c.AD 1094-1144), *JA*, IV, p.268). Further, *Kirtikaumudi* of Somesvara adds to it that after the war, a matrimonial alliance was formed between the two parties, according to which Jayasimha gave his daughter to Ajmoraja (*JRS*, 1913, p.274). But, the hostilities again renewed with the accession of Kumarakala to the throne (c.AD 1144-73). That he was not in good terms with the Tomaras is clear from the *Bijolia Inscription*, which refers to his conquest of Delhi and Asika from the Tomara king. (*JASB*, 1886, Part I, pp.31-32, Ibid., XLIII, I, pp.104-10, *EI*, I, p.93, *JRSA*, 1913, p.276). Prithviraja III was also in hostile terms with the Chandellas and the Chalukyas. From the Chandella king Parmardi he had occupied Mahoba and the other fortresses in Bundelkhand. (Prithvirajraso, op.cit., also see *Madanapur Inscriptions of Prithiraja* for his hostility with the Chandellas. (*A.S.R.*, XX, plate XXXII, Nos.9-11, Ibid., XXI, pp.173-74, Nos.9-11). His antagonism to the Chalukya King, Bhima II is also widely known (Ray, *DHNI*, II, pp.1086-1088).
tributary chief of the Muslims. Later on, owing to the mischievous activities of his uncle, Hariraja, he had to retire to Ranthambhor. The territory after sometime was annexed by the Muslims.\(^{37}\)

The other subsidiary branches of the Chahmanas ruled at Nadola, Javalipur, Ranthambhor and Satyapura (mod. Sanchor). The Chahmanas of Ranthambhor persisted till its capture by Alauddin in July, AD 1301 from Hammir (AD 1283-1301).\(^{38}\) The end of the Nadola branch was around AD 1152; thereafter, its members began to serve the Chalukyas as their feudatories.\(^{39}\) Jalor, ultimately fell to Alauddin Khalji (AD 1296-1316). The last ruler of this branch, named Kanhadade was reduced to the status of the feudatory chief of Alauddin.\(^{40}\) Sanchors, who were the feudatories of the Sonigara branch during c.AD 1206-1280 also came to an end sometime after AD 1387.\(^{41}\)

Another contemporary political power was of the Chandellas, the feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratiharas, who rose into prominence in the hour of great crises to their lords, while they were struggling with their Rashtrakuta adversaries.\(^{42}\) They received a vague praise in the

\(^{37}\) \textit{DHNI}, II, p.1093.


\(^{39}\) \textit{Kiradu stone inscription} of VS 1209/AD.1152 of Alhanadeva confirms the rule of Chalukya Kumarpala and the title \textit{maharaja} to the former, a general title of the feudatory chiefs of our period. (\textit{EI}, Vol.XI, pp.43-46)

\(^{40}\) \textit{DHNI}, II, p.1134.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p.1137.

\(^{42}\) The Chandella Nannuka was the first feudatory of Nagabhatta II (c.AD 815-833) and in such capacity, he is known to have ruled over a small principality round about Khajuraho. Nannuka's name occurs in two \textit{Khajuraho inscriptions} of Chandella ruler Dhanga with the titles as \textit{nripa} and \textit{mahipati} respectively. (\textit{EI}, I, p.125, V.10, Ibid., p.141, VV.14-15).

The territory acquired its name as \textit{Jijabhukti} after the name of Chandella feudatory Jeja (Jayasakti), (\textit{EI}, I, p.221, also see \textit{DHNI}, II, pp.669-670, S.K. Mitra, \textit{The Early Rulers of Khajuraho}, pp.3-4). This \textit{Jijabhukti} is generally regarded as the old name of Bundelkhand. The term was originally sprung from the vernacular form \textit{Jijahuti} or \textit{Jijahoti} etc.
inscriptions of their overlords for their bravery and fighting spirit, but continued to receive the formal treatment of feudatory chiefs. Harsha was the first to rise in power by assisting the Gurjara-Pratihara king Kshitipaladeva to regain the throne of Kannauj after its devastation by the invasion of the Rashtrakuta ruler, Indra III. Harsha further increased his strength by forming the matrimonial alliances with the Chahmanas and the Kalachuris. Yasovarman, the successor of Harsha, further empowered himself by capturing the fort of Kalanjara, sometimes before c.AD 940, during the renewed Rashtrakuta attack under Krishna III. He is also said to have compelled Devapala Pratihara to surrender him the celebrated image of Vaikuntha, which was subsequently set up by him in a stately shrine of Khajuraho.

The Chandella dominion extended over a vast area during Dhanga’s reign. The sudden stoppage of the names of Gurjara-Pratihara rulers after c.AD 954-55 and the reference to the defeat of a Kanyakubja narendra by Dhanga are indicative of the fact that the Chandellas by this time assumed the exalted sovereign power.

The last vestige of the Pratihara power was ultimately removed by Vidyadhara and the whole of the Ganga-Jamuna Doab, thus, passed into the hands of the Chandellas. However, the

44 The family records of the Chandellas do not refer any case of Harsha’s hostility to the imperial power but clearly prove his increased power. (DHNI, I, p.672).
46 DHNI, II, p.674.
47 EI, I, pp.124, 134, (VV.43,45).
48 Besides Kalanjara, the occupation of the fort of Gwalior was, indeed, a splendid achievement of Dhanga (EI, I, pp.197, 203, V.3). Regarding the exertion of his Kingdom the Khajuraho epigraph refers that he playfully acquired the land as far as Kalanjara. (EI, I, pp.124, 134, V.45). The same epigraph further reports that the “wives of the kings of Kanchi, Andhra, Radha, and Anga lingered in his prison” (Ibid., p.139 and 146, V.55) and again, he was so powerful that the rulers of Kosala, Kratha, Simhala and Kuntala humbly listened to his commands. Kratha was a country in peninsular portion of India, possibly near modern Berar (DHNI, II, p.680, fn.3). The latter statement seems to suggest his influence in peninsular India.
loss of the fort of Gwalior and Kalanjar to Mahmud was a serious blow to Chandella power under Ganda. Then, the Chandella history under Kirtivarman was a history of the bitter strife with the Kalachuri King Laxmi Karna, resulting in an era of confusion and chaos, which provoked the Gahadawalas to capture the imperial throne of Kanyakubja between AD 1094-1104.

The power of the dynasty was again revived under Madanavarman (AD 1129-1163) who is said to have defeated the lord of Gurjaras generally identified as Siddharaj Jayasimha of Gujarat (c.AD 1095-1143), to overcome the Chedi ruler Gayakarna, to exterminate his Paramara contemporary and to have forced the King of Kasi (probably Vijayachandara Gahadawala) to pass his time in friendly behaviour. The Chandellas received the final blow, which sustained a reverse at the hand of Prithwiraja III of the Chahmana dynasty, who captured Mahoba and other fortresses in Bundelkhand from King Parmardi. The latter's son, Trailokyavarmana, though, regained a considerable portion of his ancestral dominion and is also known to have reoccupied the fort of Kalanjara. The other rulers of this dynasty ruled like a mere apostle without any significant achievement. The Chandellas were finally overwhelmed by the invasion of Alauddin in AD 1308.

49 DHNI, II, p.692.
50 Ibid., pp.697-700.
52 EI, I, p.198, V.15.
53 Ibid., p.198.
54 Ibid., p.198, V.15.
57 DHNI, II, (Sati Record), p.735.
Another contemporary political power, the Paramaras, emerged in the region of Gujarat, Malwa and Southern Rajputana out of the bitter struggle between the Gurjara-Pratiharas and the Rashtrakutas during the 9th and the 1st half of the 10th centuries;\(^58\) The earliest members of the Paramara feudatory line could acquire firm grounds and in Malwa and the adjoining region account of the ongoing struggle of the Rashtrakutas and the Gurjara-Pratiharas. The earliest member of this family who is known to have increased his power and adopted the glorious titles like *maharajadhirajpati* and *mahamandalikachudamani* was Harsha alias Siyakadeva II.

With the disappearance of the Rashtrakutas and the Gurjara-Pratiharas from the scene, the Paramara Munja also known as Vakpati II became free to establish his power in Malwa. For this purpose, he took to the heels Yuvaraj II, the Kalachuri King of Tripuri by defeating him\(^59\) and brought the Latas, Karnatas, Cholas and Keralas under submission.\(^60\) His ambitious pursuits and the rise to the power brought him in hostile war with the Chalukyas of Anhilwada, the

---

H.C. Ray assumes the survival of the Chandella rule till the 16th century (AD 1564) inspite of the continuous onrushing Muslim invasions over the territory between AD 1240-1540. The absence of any firm evidence for the removal of the Chandellas from their ancestral region and the existence of a *raja* of Kalanjar, named Kirat Singh in AD 1544 at the time of the attack of Shershah, are specifically cited by him to prove the existence of the dynasty. The Chandella princess Rani Durgawati who married to Raja Dalpatsa of Garrha Mandala and killed fighting bravely against Akbar was probably a daughter of Kirat Singh, in his view. (Ibid)

\(^58\) It is evident that before the conquest of Kanyakubja, the original seat of power of the Gurjara-Pratiharas was Ujjaini. The region of Ujjaini including that of Mandor and Gujarat remained a bone of contention for long between the Gurjara-Pratiharas and the Rashtrakutas. (*DHNI*, II, pp.837-39ff., Pratipal Bhatia, the *Paramaras*, p.202, for the details of the struggle see Ibid., I, pp.580, 582-83, 585-87, 588-90).

The actual identification of the Paramaras, who were governing the above area under such circumstances remains suspectable in the light of the contradictory statements of Pratihara and Rashtrakuta records. The *Pratapgarh Inscription of Mahendrapala II* of VS 1003/AD 946 refers that he stationed one Madhava as his feudatory lord and governor at Ujjaini. (*EI*, XIV, pp.176-88). While, the *Harsola plate of Krishna III* (AD 949) reveals the existence of a family of feudatories under him. (*EI*, XIX, p.236 ff.).

\(^59\) *EI*, I, pp.235 & 237.

\(^60\) *EI*, I, pp.235, 237, V.12.
Chahmanas of Nadol, Guhilas of Mewar and the Rashtrakutas of Hastikund. Sindhuraja, the successor of Munjaraja again known to have acquired success in war against the Kings of Kosala, Dakshinakosala (Kalachuris of Tumna, Chalukyas of Lata and other neighbouring dynasties).

The most outstanding and versatile king of this dynasty was the next ruler Bhoja (c.AD 1011-1055). He first gained victory over the Karnatas (The Chalukyas of Kalyani). But it could not be sustained for long owing to the successive defeat of Bhoja himself at the hand of Jayasimha II. (c.AD 1016-42). Bhoja was also in hostile terms with the Chandellas and their allies Kacchapagatas of Gwalior. He also maintained a good pressure on the Chahmanas of Nadol and the Guhilas of Mewar. But, finally, lost his life fighting against the league of

---

61 Merutunga tells us that Munja had conquered Tailapa II, Chalukya six times. (Prabandhcintamani ed. Jinavijaya Muni, Singhi Jain Granthmala, No.1, pp.22-23).


64 The Kadamba Inscription of Jayasimha II, refers to him as "moon to the Lotus", who, "having searched out, beset, pursued, ground down, put to flight the confederacy of Malwa" (IA, V, p.17). Similarly, the Kulenur Inscription of the same king dated AD 1028 also states that Jayasimha routed the combined forces of the Cholas, Gangeya (Chedi) and Bhojaraja (EI, XV, pp.330-36). Probably, the Chola and Chedi Kings were allies of Bhoja in this war against the Chalukyas.

65 The unfriendly relations of the Paramaras and the Chandellas are clearly reflected from the Mahoba Inscription of Vidyadhara which informs us that 'Bhojadeya together with Kalachuri Chandra worshipped this master of warfare full of fear like a pupil (EI, I, p.219, 222, V.22).

The defeat of the Paramara king by Kacchapaghati ruler Kirtiraja during such situation is evident from the Sasbahu temple inscription of Mahipala (IA, XV, p.36, V.10).

66 The Chirawa Inscription of Guhila Samarasimha (VS 1330) indicates that Bhoja was in possession of the fort of Chitrakuta (Chittor) and built there a temple of Tribhuvana Narayana (EI, XXII, pp.288, 290, V.31).
The Chalukya Bhima, the Kalachuri Laxmi Karna and Chalukya Somesvara. The imperial Paramara line, then, continued to rule till the middle of the 12th century, but its importance and influence had already lost with the death of Bhoja. Soon, the Paramara dominion was overwhelmed by the Chalukyas and it was during the domination of the latter that a junior branch of Paramara family evolved out, the members of which styled themselves as *samadhigata-panchmahasabdalankara-virajamanamahakumara*. This branch continued to exist till c.AD 1239 in the regions of modern Bhilsa, Bhopal, Hoshangabad and the southernmost portion of former Paramara dominion. The semi independent families of the Paramaras of Abu, Bhinmal or Kiradu, Jalor and Vagada continued to rule in their respective areas, besides the imperial Paramara line.

The region of Gujarat and Kathiawad was possessed by the Chalukyas around AD 950 as the feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratiharas. Taking advantage of the disturbance and anarchy in the Pratihara kingdom following the invasion of Indra III and then the rapid decline of the Rashtrakutas during c.AD 956-973, after the death of Krishna III, they became successful in carving out the independent principality of their own in Saraswati valley. The person, who is credited for declaring his independency was Mularaja. He soon came into conflict with the

---

67 DHNI, II, p.869 and also see, the Chapters on the Haihayas and the Chaulukyas, Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit., pp.91-93.
68 Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit., p.127.
69 Ibid.
70 The rule of the Paramaras of Abu came to an end around AD 1300, while the other branches ceased to exist around the end of the 12th Century AD (Ibid., pp.162-194).
71 That the occupation of the whole of this region upto the southernmost peninsula was under Mahendrapala I (c.AD 893-907) is evident from the Una Grants of Chalukya feudatory Avanivarmana dated in AD 893 and 899 (EI, IX, pp.1-10). Similarly, Mahipala’s hold over Gujarat at least upto AD 914 is indicated by the Haddala grant of Chapa feudatory, Dharanivaraha (IA, XII, pp.190-95, Ibid., XVIII, p.90).
72 Raji, the father of Mularaja is designated as *maharajadhiraja* in the Rajor Stone Inscription (EI, III, pp.263-67).
contemporary King of Sakambhari and the King of Lata. His defeat at the hand of the Chahmana King is also evident from both the Chalukya and the Chahmana chronicles. He is also known to have defeated and killed king Lakha (Laksharaja) of Kaccha (Cutch) and captured Griharipu, a chieftain of Saurashtra.

The next substantial figure of the dynasty was Bhima, whose reign is marked by a conspiring struggle with the Paramara Bhoja and by the invasion of Mahmud of Ghazni on Somnath. Karna, the successor of Bhima ruled for about thirty-one years without any significant achievement. His successor, Jayasimha Siddharaja (AD 1093-1143) was a striking personality. During his reign a protracted war with the Paramara potentates Naravarman and Yasovarman was carried on resulting in an eventual victory of Siddharaja, which led him to bear the title of Avantinath. However, his further struggle with the Chandella King Madanavarmana was not successful. His successor was Kumarapal, who vaingloriously also attacked Arnoraja Chahmana of Sakambhari and completely overwhelmed his forces. He is also known to have quelled the revolt of the Paramara prince of Abu and re-asserted the Chalukya authority in Malwa. A successful war was also ensued by him against Mallikarjuna of Konkana.

---

73 Mularaja's contemporary kings of Sakambhari and Lata were Vigrararaja and Barappa, respectively (DHNI, II, p.937).
74 Ibid., pp.930-39.
75 Ibid., pp.940f, also see Bombay Gazetteer, I, p.160.
76 DHNI, II, pp.969-70.
77 IA, 1098, p.144.
80 Mt Abu Inscription of Tejapala (VS 1287), EI, VIII, p.216, V.36, JRAS, 1913, pp.274-75, also see Prabandhacintamani, S.J.G.,No.1, pp.80-81.
The rule of the later monarchs is marked by a period of the decline of Chalukya power on account of persistence of court intrigues and the global animosity with the neighbours. The rest of the power of the dynasty was lost by the invasion of Mohd. Ghori soon after the accession of Bhima II in 1178 AD. The next attack was directed by Qutubuddin Aibak, which resulted in the temporary occupation of Anhilwada. Besides, Bhima II had also to suffer with the invasion of the Malwa King Sohada and subsequently by the latter’s son Arjunadesa, of which both the literary and the epigraphic records of the Chalukyas and Paramaras bear testimony. This traditional hostility with the Paramaras continued up to the last quarter of the 13th century AD and finally, it was during such weak hours of the dynasty, that the Vaghelas having their descent from the sister of Kumar occupied Anhilawada extending their sway over the whole of Gujarat. But the invasion of Gujarat under Nusrat Khan and Ulugh Khan in AD 1297 ended the Vaghela rule and the whole area passed to the Muslims.

The Kalachuris, who were in the service of the Gurjara-Pratiharas as the feudatories did also not hesitate to declare their independence. However, they lost some of their power owing to the rise of the Gahadawalas in the east. Another branch of the Kalachuris which was driven to

---

83 DHNI, II, pp.1021-22.
84 The Kalachuris were generally regarded as the descendents of the Haihaya race. Their emergence as a clan in the Avanti-Mandhata region may be traced back to the 6th century AD (DHNI, II, p.739). They were driven out from Malwa sometime around the 7th or 8th century AD by the Gurjara-Pratiharas. Being driven across the Bhanrer and Kaimur hills into the northern districts of the central provinces, they dispersed in to various regions. (DHNI, II, p.741). Some of them joined the services under the Deccani and north Indian Kings (Ibid.). One branch accepted the subordination of the Gurjara-Pratiharas as a serviceable class under them. (Ibid.)
85 In east, the centre of Kalachuri power was Gorakhpur; where one of the members of this branch named Gunambodhideva is known to have received some land (bhumi) from the Pratihara King Bhojadeva. He is also credited for taking away the fortunes of Gauda by a warlike expedition (DHNI, II, p.745).
the central provinces by the pressure of the Gurjara-Pratiharas strengthened itself by forming the matrimonial relations with the Rashtrakutas and the Chandellas. Thus, having consolidated themselves, they brought a large area of northern and southern India under their control. Later on, the central Indian dominions of the Kalachuris had extended far up to the districts of Prayag (Allahabad) and Varanasi (Benaras). In their efforts of extension, they came in to conflict with the Paramaras and the Palas. It was during the efficient regime of Laxmi Karna that they succeeded in asserting their influence to some extent on the Cholas, Pandyas and the Kalingas etc.

The downfall of this branch of the Kalachuris occurred during the period of Yasah Karna, the son and successor of Laxmi Karna (c.AD 1073-1120), on account of the reverses faced from

The evidence may plausibly be concluded in the sense that this person had fought in the capacity of the feudatory lord of the Pratihara Bhoja with the Pala rulers of Bengal, in return of which he received some land from the former. (Ibid., p.746 & 747, also see Journal of Department of Letters, X, p.52).

86 DHNI, II, p.755.

87 Ibid. In South, their dominion was certainly extended to the Pandya Kingdom, as it is amicably known that one of the rulers, named Laxmanaraja became able to conquer that kingdom. (Ibid., p.766).

88 The credit of annexing these regions goes to Gangeyadeva, whose known dates range from AD 1019-1141. It was possibly owing to these splendid achievements that in one of the Chandelia inscriptions, he is referred as the conqueror of the world. (DHNI, II, p.773). Baihaqui also reports to the area of Benares under the occupation of this ruler, at the time of the attack of Ahmad Niyaltigin, the general of Yamini King Masud I (c.AD 1030-40) (Tarih-i-Bhaihaqui, tr., Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.123, Cambridge History of India, Vol.III, pp.29-30).

89 According to one of the traditions recorded by Forbes in Rasmala, Laxmi Karma defeated Bhoja of Ujjain (c.AD 1019-21) and destroyed Dhar, forming a league with the Chalukya Bhima of Anhilwad (AD 1029-64) (Rasmala, pp.89-90). Prabandhacintamani of Merutunga also supports such a joint attack on Bhoja (Prabandhacintamani, S.J.G., p.50-51, DHNI, II, p.778). The conflict of Karma with the Pala King, Vigrahapala III is substantially referred in Ramcharita (DHNI, II, p.779). H.C. Ray suggests that the victory of Karma over the Gauda King seems to be plausible on the ground of the discovery of the Decorative pillar inscription of Karma at Paikora in Birbhum district of Bengal (Ibid., I, pp.326-27 and 330, 335, Ibid., II, 698-779).

the Paramara King Laxmadeva, who attacked and stormed the capital at Tripuri and the establishment of the Gahadawala power in Kanyakubja and Benares in c.AD 1090.

The Guhilas, who earlier served the Pratiharas as feudatories also succeeded in declaring themselves as independent in Mewar during the second half of the 12th century. The last vestige of the Guhila power was maharana Hammir, who recovered Chittor from the Muslims after it had been lost by raval Ramasimha in AD 1303 and thus revived the lost glory of the Guhialas of Mewar for sometime. Hammir occupied Chittor, ousted the Chauhans and laid down the foundation of Sisodia rule there. His influence was recognised by the rulers of Mewar, Amber and others as far as Gwalior, Raisen Chanderi and Kalpi.

The Kacchapagatas, who were at first the feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratiharas, made themselves masters of the fort of Gwalior after defeating the ruler of Kannauj. During the 10th and 11th centuries, the region of eastern Rajaputana and Gwalior residency was overruled by

92 Ibid., p.788.
93 The dynasty was named after its first prince named Guhila or Guhadatta. Bappa, one of the ancestors of Guhila, who was in service of his uncle, the Mori Prince of Chittor seized the crown after dethroning the latter (Tod., op.cit., Vol.1, p.266, DHNI, II, pp.1154-56). They remained the feudatories of the Mauryas in the 8th century AD (Ibid., II, p.1161). But, subsequently in the 9th century they came into service of the Pratiharas. The Chatsu Inscription of Guhila Baladitya refers to one of his ancestors Harsaraja as a feudatory of the Pratihara King Bhoja (c.AD 836-82), (EI, XII, pp.10ff., V.19). During the 11th and 12th centuries, there prevailed confusion over the areas occupied by them, owing to the emergence of the Chahmanas of Sakambhari, Paramaras of Malwa and Chalukyas of Anhilwada. It was in such an atmosphere that some of the branches of the Guhilas ruling in Asika and Saurashtra acknowledged the sovereignty of the Chalukyas and Chahmanas, respectively. However, the Guhilas of Medapata (Mewar), taking advantage of the decline of the Chalukya and Paramara power succeeded in establishing their sovereignty; during the second half of the 12th century. (DHNI, II, pp.1200ff.).
94 H.C. Ray assumes that Hammir (AD 1326-1364) might had got opportunity to capture the fort of Chittor, sometime after the reign of Ghiyas-ud-Din-Tughlaq (c.1320-25), for whose reign a Persian inscription in Chittor is available (G.H. Ojha, History of Rajputana, II, p.501, fn.2, also see Cambridge History of India, Vol.III, p.526, DHNI, II, p.1205).
95 The Kannauj ruler defeated by the Kacchapagata was probably one of the successors of Mahipala I (AD 914-43), as one of the records of the Kacchapagata prince is found dated in AD 977 (JASB, XXXI, p.393, pl.1, No.6).
three independent branches of Kacchapagatas i.e., the Kacchapagatas of Gwalior, Dubkund, and Narwar. It was during the reign of Dhanga that they acknowledged the suzerainty of the Chandellas. As the feudatories of the Chandellas, they fought contestant wars with the Paramaras of Malwa and lastly conquered Bhoja (AD 1021). The prince, who defeated Bhoja was Kirtiraja. But the successor of Kirtiraja, named Muladeva, ultimately, declared himself as independent taking advantage of the defeat of the Chandellas at the hand of Laxmi Karna Kalachuri. Tejsingh was the last Kacchawaha King of Gwalior, who migrated to eastern Rajasthan. One of his successors wrested Amber from the Minas and shifted the capital there.

The Kacchawahas of Dubkund were also subordinate to the Chandellas, as we do not find imperial titles for the rulers of this line. The Kacchapagatas of Narwar were alone to bear the imperial title in Narwar grant, which proves their independent existence. Nothing is known about their political history.

The above survey of the political condition of northern India reveals the picture of a very haphazard and disunited India, in which each one of the powers was struggling with another for its narrow self interest and aggrandisement. The areas of territories held by them were ill-defined and unbalanced. The fratricidal wars resulted with no more gains than the great expenditure of money and power as well as the weakening of the internal autonomy and administration of the

96 IA, XV, pp.36, 42-43, V.10.
97 DHNI, II, pp.825-26, also see A Fragmentary Gwalior Inscription which refers to Muladeva's officers (IA, XV, p.202).
98 DHNI, II, pp.828ff.
99 Ibid., pp.829-35.
100 JAOS, VI, pp.542-47.
ruling powers. It is very clear that the decline of the Chandellas was the result of the internal weakness of their Kingdom, which was owed to their struggle with the Chahmanas of Delhi and Ajmer and the Gahadawalas of Kannauj and Kashmir in the late 12th Century. The bitter hostilities of the Chahmana King Prithviraja III with the Chandella Parmal and the Gahadawala Jayachandra, undoubtedly, resulted in the end of the Chahmanas in the IIInd battle of Tarain. Formerly, the Pratiharas, too, failed to secure their power on account of their indulgence in the fratricidal wars with the Rashtrakutas and the Palas. It was the feeling of jealousy and enmity which prevented the Indian rulers to create a common front against the Turkish invaders. Otherwise, there was no dearth of the great military leaders in northern India at the time of the Ghaznavide invasion of India. All the existing heroes, the Kalachuri Karna, Bhoja Paramara, Govindachandra Gahadawala, Jayasimha Siddharaja, Kumarapala, Vigraharaj Chahmana were fully empowered to resist to the Muslim invasion, if they were not plunged into mutual hostilities and fratricidal wars, which failed them to realise a common danger for the country. In the whole period of Muslim perversion, there is only a single instance of a confederate action against the Ghaznavides, when the Paramara Bhoja, Kalachuri Karna and the Chahmana Anahilla under the leadership of the Tomara King of Delhi united themselves to fight against the enemy on the common front.101

The political condition of northern India was further reduced to the worse at the time of Mohd. Ghori’s invasion, as all the three powerful dynasties of India i.e. the Chahmanas, Chalukyas and Gahadawalas, even on having the heroic figures like Prithviraja III (AD 1178-

who were in a position to drive back the Turkish invader could not confine themselves against the common enemy. It is evident that Mularaja II and Prithviraja III drove Mohd. Ghori back in 1178 and 1191, respectively but not finally. Even the capable ruler and a great warrior like Jayachandra (AD 1170-1194) has fatally wrong done to waste his energies while quarreling with the Chahmanas of Delhi and Ajmer and also to remain as a passive spectator at a crucial time when the fortune of Delhi was in danger owing to Mohd. Ghori's invasion. Instead of raising a hand of help and co-operation towards the neighbouring Chahmanas, he was actually rejoiced at Prithviraja's defeat at Tarain. It is generally believed that the jealousies of Jayachandra with Pritviraja had reached to such an extent that the former planned a conspiracy to invite Mohd. Ghori in order to bring about the ruin of the latter. The similar treatment was aparted to him from the neighbouring Chalukyas. Pritviraja also was no less responsible for such a behavior of the Chalukyas, as while Gujarat needed help in AD 1178 being attacked by the Ghorian forces, he kept himself aloof from the whole affair. He had to pay a high price for such behaviour with his neighbours, when his own security was in danger in AD 1192 and when it was his own turn to fight against the Muslims, the Chalukyas did also react in the same manner.

Thus, the 12th century witnessed the disappearance and decline of all the important ruling dynasties of Northern India. The Chandellas, who were the last defenders of the Hindu rule against the invasion of the Muslims were finally overwhelmed during a prolonged struggle against the Turks in the beginning of the 14th Century.\(^{102}\)

---

102 See Supra, p.10. For the geographical location of the dynastic establishments see the map attached with this page.
RAJPUT DYNASTIES OF NORTHERN INDIA c. AD 1300-1450
The extinction of these powers from their respective territories led them to seek refuge in a protected land to live peacefully for sometime. The area of Rajasthan fitted well to their hopeful designs. Being full of the hilly regions and the desert areas it could well provide the abundant security to its immigrants. Thus, considering the geographical importance of this region the princes belonging to the Guhila, Panwar, Chauhan, Sonigara, Solanki, Parmara and Deora clans carved out their small principalities at several places in western Rajasthan like, Khed, Barmer, Sojat, Mandor, Jalor, Bhinmal, Mahewa, Sirohi and Abu. However, the fratricidal struggle and the conspiring jealousies of their neighbours did not allow them to live peacefully for a while. The Mer tribesmen had becoming powerful after the decline of ruling principalities of Ranthambhor and Khed. Then, the Rathor Sardar at the instigation of the local members and the village headmen restrained the area from the prevailing disturbance. In doing so, the Rathors were not inspired by the feeling of nationality, rather, it was all on the basis of a contract of them with the village headmen and the local people, according to which the latter had to pay them a cess (gughari), landgifts and the right to collect revenue for the aforesaid task. These Rathors later on emerged as a political power by having possession of a number of villages in that area and ultimately annexing Khed from Raja Pratapsi of the Guhila Clan (AD 1398-1423). Later on, their rule was extended over a large area of Pali, Khed, Bhadrajan, Kodana, Mahewa (Mallani), Barmer, Pokharan, Jaitaran, Siwana, and a large part of Nagpur district and

103 G.D. Sharma, Rajput Polity, p.1.
104 Ibid., p.2.
105 Like other Rajput clans, the origin of the Rathors is also a matter of controversy. Generally, they are regarded as the descendents of the historic Rajputs. According to traditions, they belonged to the Gahadawalas or the Rathors of Badaun, who were the contemporaries of the Gahadawalas. (Habib & Nizami, Comprehensive History of India, Vol.V, pt.2, p.810). The founder of this dynasty named Siha was an immigrant in western Rajasthan and established the Rajput principality there in 1243, having conquered the area around Pali (Ibid. p.810, also see the map attached with this page).
106 The Guhilot ruler Samantsimha of Mewar circumstially migrated to Vagad (the modern districts of Dungarpur and Banswara) and carved out his independent principality with their capital at Baroda in the first half of the 12th century. Rana Pratapsi was one of the rulers belonging to this line. The successor of Pratapsi could rule over Vagada only as the tributary chiefs of the Muslims and not independently. (Habib & Nizami, op.cit., pp.805-807).
some areas of Bikaner. The Rathor rule continued over these territories upto AD 1529, the date of the death of Rao Ganga.

The north eastern Rajasthan was, then overruled by the Rajput tribe of Bhattis. During the 12th century, the main centre of their activities was Jaisalmer. Their rule was however, shortlived, as the area of Jaisalmer was occupied by Alauddin from maharaval Jaitrasingh around the beginning of the 14th century. The extension of their power was limited to a large area of southern Punjab and north-western Rajasthan, which included Jaisalmer, Bahawalpur, Bhatnir, Nariana and Bayana.

Like the Bhattis, the region of Sirohi was ruled by the Deora Sept of Chauhan clan. The foundation was laid over the Paramara territory of Abu and Chandravati in AD 1321. Later on, the territories of the Solanki Rajputs were also annexed by them. The Chauhan rule was also established over Bundi and Kota (Haroti) by a Chief of Mewar belonging to Hada sept of Chauhans in 1241.

One branch of the Kacchapaghatas established their estate at Dhundhar (Amber and later on Jaipur or Sawaijaipur including Shekhawati) ousting the Minas from that area. They carried several raids against the Chauhans, Minas, and Yadavas to become independent in that area.

107 The credit of occupying a large number of these areas goes to Rao Jodha (AD 1438-89). See Jodhpur Rajya Ki Khyat, I, pp.41-46 etc., also see Habib & Nizami, p.813.
108 The Bhattis are generally considered the descendents of Yadava dynasty. Their original kingdom was in Punjab, from where they had migrated to north-eastern Rajasthan on account of the pressure of the Arab invasion (Tod, op.cit., Vo.I, p.1206).
109 Ibid. p.1201.
111 Achaleshwar Inscipion, VS 1397, CF. Habib & Nizami, p.832, also see Sirohi Rajya Ka Itihasa, p.155).
112 Tod, op.cit., Vol.III.
113 Habib & Nizami, op.cit., p.837.
The area of Deeg, Bharatpur, Rewari and Alwar (Mewat area) was occupied by Mewatis, who continued to create a menace for the Delhi Sultans.114

Thus, a short account of the Political history of the Rajputs (AD 800-1450) reveals that the first phase of the Rajput ascendancy (AD 800-1200), though, characterised with confusion and chaos, may be considered a period of great political aggrandisement, turning points and events, the informations of which are fully evidenced by our literary and epigraphic texts. However, the second phase (AD 1200-1450) may technically be termed as the dark age, owing to the occupation of almost whole of the Rajput belt by the Turks, resulting in the homelessness of the descendents of great Kings of northern India and thenceforward their migration to the Mewar area of Rajasthan where they could not re-establish their lost glory. Rather, they again turned back to the position of petty landholders or bhomias, who ruled hesitantly over their small territorial units. However, in Mewar, the periods of Hammir and Rana Mukul remained eventful, who had extended their power in Rajputana through arms and matrimonial alliances. The power was further consolidated under maharana Kumbha (AD 1433-68) and rana Sanga. The latter had been a contemporary of the Mughal ruler Babur. By the second half of the 1st century, the houses of Mewar and Jodhpur became prominent in Rajasthan and both of them kept alive feudal system as they administered their newly acquired territories through clan based bhaibani system, which essentially outgrown through feudal polity.