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ABSTRACT

The period from c. AD 800 to 1450 is broadly marked by political instability resulting from the bitter mutual frights, rivalries and intermittent wars among the existing political powers. The era of the 8th century opened with a fratricidal struggle among the Gurjara-Pratiharas, the Rashtrakutas and the Palas, all of whom were trying to have a permanent occupation of Kannauj and the neighbouring region of central India, which was earlier under Harsha's suzerainty. Though, the Gurjara-Pratiharas were the commanding political adventurers of the time, they, too, remained unable in establishing a firm rule over the successive estate of Harsha on account of their indulgence in wars with their neighbours. The political situation further came to the worse after the emergence of the feudatory dynasties of the Chandellas, Chalukyas, Paramaras, Chauhans, Kalachuris, Gahadawalas and Guhilas on the political front. The political instability further accelerated during this age, which created the situation of confusion and chaos all over northern India. The reciprocal adversities and hostilities of the Gahadawalas and the Chahmanas on the one hand and those of the Chandellas with the Chahmanas and Kalachuris, of the Paramaras with the Chalukyas, Chahmanas of Nadol, Guhilas of Mewat, Kalachuris of Tripuri and Rastrakutas of Hastikund, of the Chalukyas with the contemporary kings of Sakambhari, Lata and Paramaras of Malwa, of the Kalachuris with the Paramaras and the Palas on the other hand tend to create a strong enigma for national security. It strengthened the power and endurance of the Turks to overcome these Rajputs and thereby to establish themselves in India, permanently. The absence of the united opposition and the aligned and narrow perceptions of the Indian rulers, ultimately, paved the establishment of the Turkish rule in India in a successful manner. Such an entrenchment of the Turks over most parts of the Rajput estates led them to seek refuge in a more safer region of western Rajasthan. In the process of their occupation in the
newer territory, some new political powers, such as the Rathors and the Bhattis came in to appearance. But, they were in no position to oppose the consolidated Turkish empire but to create a diplomatic political history of their own.

The administrative and state apparatus of the Rajputs was also not devoid of problems and deficiencies. It was engulfed with highly decentralised feudal tendencies of the age. The personal grievances of the feudal lords like rajaputras, ranakas, rautas, samantas etc. created a consternation in the whole administrative set up. The military dependence of the king on his feudatories and an extensive increase in the number of landgrants with certain important rights over them made the feudatories more powerful to defy the authority of their overlord and to set up the independent principalities of their own. The superstitious notions of the Rajput Kings to grant a large area of land to these officials as Brahmans further strengthened their position as feudal lords by converting them into big landed barons. The sincerity and fidelity of some of them to their masters was ever questioned. The instances are not rare when the samantas and other feudatories did refuse to obey the orders of their overlords and rose in utmost rebellion against them. Sometimes, they betrayed their lords by changing the side in battle to the enemy for their narrow self-interest and prosperity. The assignment of significant official posts to such untrustworthy feudatories led to the disintegration of the whole administration. However, in some cases the positive attitude and loyalty of the feudal lords to their masters could also be noticed, but they could not strengthen the whole system to make it free from the powerful feudal magnates.

The military system of any dynasty is always a direct reflection of its political organisation. The feudalisation of political structure of the Rajputs had also resulted in their military organisation. A hereditary army (maula) provided by the feudatory chiefs formed the
main composition of the Rajput armies. Such forces, as summoned from different directions were heterogeneous in nature, which made their organisation difficult on the battlefield. The soldiers of such army were unreliable either in number or in efficiency. They lacked the feeling of loyalty and sincerity to the ruler, while fighting against the enemy. The uniformity of organisation and the unity of control and command, which are essentials of success in war also required in them to a greater extent. The leadership in the Rajput armies composed of different types of forces (maula, bhrita, mitra, sreni, atavika, aribala) was not under one command. Each type of force was directed and led by a different commander in a different manner. On the other hand, the armies of the Arab and Turkish invaders were never very large. They fought under one unified command and obeyed one order, which in turn inspired every soldier of their army to make a combined effort for success or victory in war.

The Rajput army was comprising of three important wings i.e. elephantry, cavalry and infantry in good number. The valuability and organisation of these troops in battlefield, though, has remained a matter of pursuit. With regard to the cavalry in the Rajput army, it will be right to assume that they invested a huge sum of money on the purchase of foreign breeds of active and passive horses. But, the imported horses here, unfortunately, did not acquire the same treatment, training and exercise as in their original lands. The food provided to them by Indians made them fatigue and inactive. The Indians did never pay a serious attention to learn the technique and mannerism of horse training from Central Asians. They remained quite unaware with the art of cross-breeding of horses, hence, they had to import the newer stock of foreign bred horses in exchange of a great amount of money. The absence of the practice of mounted-archery had further diminished the mobility of Indian horses. Owing to its absense, the Rajputs, unlike the Turks, remained unable to combine their archery with the tactical use of their mobility. The
Indian cavalrymen of our age were incapable to follow the tactic of feigned retreat and thenceforward to impart a forceful attack on the enemy from a mobile horse-back without halting or dismounting. They could not move rapidly during their attack on the enemy's troops.

The qualities of Indian elephants were indeed remarkable. The Turkish sultans were also too fond of them. Their possession was considered a matter of royal grandeur and dignity by the Rajput rulers. Their utility in war can not be disregarded in any case. A single elephant is regarded to have a capacity to fight with thousands, being immovable, even after bearing severe blows and hits from the enemy and each elephant mounted by an expert driver is said to be able of destroying a cavalry force of six hundred. The great Turkish sultan Balban considered one elephant equal to five hundred war horses. The elephant could be easily used to transport the heavy war machines like munjaniqs and arra’das. The leader of forces seated on a high elephant could be proved a good supervisor and commander, however, in another way such a high command resulted disastrous to Indian armies, as it disposed the location of the leader to the enemy, who thence, could easily be the target of the latter’s attack, which led to the discouragement of the rest of the troops and to the ultimate failure of Indian armies. The arrangement of elephants usually on the frontline or the advance-guard had also created a situation of danger for Indian armies, as the animal on being discouraged and dissipated usually smashed the backward forces and created a havoc in the whole army. The Turks did not follow this practice. The elephants in their armies were always kept secure by other forces. The Rajputs of our age had no other alternative than to place the elephants on the advance-guard or frontline, as their horsemen and foot-soldiers, in the absence of technological devices, such as stirrups, crossbows etc, probably, did not feel themselves capable to bear the severe frontal blows of the Turkish mounted archers and cross-bow-men. Thus, such an arrangement of elephants was a
great mindedness of the Rajput leaders and not their foolhardiness. The pilferment of the rear forces by the elephants was the only result of the technological advancement under the Turks and not their mismanagement or misarrangement by the Rajput leaders.

The role of infantry in Indian armies was also invaluable owing to its manifold functions. Though, in comparison to the Turkish foot-soldiers, they are regarded less skilled in tactical wars.

With regards to the war strategy of the Rajputs, it will be worth commenting that they were well aware with the principles of *kutayuddha* (strategic wars) as laid down by the political authors of our age. However, such principles could not be followed by them in practice against the highly expertise Turkish strategists and mounted archers, who adopted the devices of feigned retreat, ambush and shock tactics, including the surprise attack on the enemy, simultaneously from different directions. Besides this, the tactical blunders of the Rajput rulers were no less responsible for their defeat at the hands of the Turks; of which the later had taken every advantage. The best instance of such an error may be noticed after the 1st battle of Tarain, while Prithviraja allowed an uninterrupted return to the Ghorian forces and further wasted his precious thirteen months in the siege of Tabarhindah remaining fully unconscious of the enemy's next attack.

The fortral system of the Rajputs had also made them strategically weak. The structure of these forts was though, insurmountable and unapproachable, there were also some weaknesses in it from military point of view. First of all, they were made from a defensive point of view and therefore their use in an offensive attack was negligible. The Rajput military leaders too believed in defensive wars, which was indeed a great misconception on their part. Owing to the forces of disintegration in the country, the Rajputs failed to utilise these forts as base-camps to strengthen
their efficiency in war. The Rajput forts, on the other hand, stood in extensive isolation. These forts were the great centres of militarism and immense wealth, which also diverted the attention of the Turks to siege them. They felt it easy to concentrate their energies on a single fort and thenceforward to capture the whole territory around it and finally, succeeded in their purpose of conquest. The Rajputs, while attacked and surrounded by the enemy surprisingly, could make no arrangement of the troops from outside for open warfare but to depend on the help of only a number of soldiers existing inside the fort. Even, under such circumstances, sometimes, the Turks felt themselves unsuccessful and discouraged to besiege these massive forts and then considering it difficult and impossible, they ultimately, resorted to treachery and made an alliance with the Indian traitors, who helped them to approach the fort in any manner. The massive fortal structures of Ranthambhor, Jalor and Siwana were thus besieged under a treacherous plan with the help of some traitors.

The arms and weapons used by the Rajputs were not lacked in effectiveness. The Indian weapons of close combat like sword, spear etc. had been famous for quality in whole world. Several cities and towns in India were the great centres of sword manufacturing. Even, the Turkish sultans had preferred them on account of their great pliability and penetrability. The mechanical weapons like munjaniq, arra’das etc., were used likewise the Turks. However, there is not a single evidence for the use of cross-bow in the Rajput army like that of the Turks. The absence of iron stirrup probably did not allow the Indians to practice mounted archery. With the rope stirrup available and used in India, it was not possible for the horseman to stand up firmly and to wield the weapon (arrow, sword etc.) on the target by turning or moving around on a mobile horseback without halting or dismounting. Indian bows and arrows were also regarded quite inferior than the Persian bows and arrows used by the Turks in India. The use of such bows
and arrows imported from Persia and Afghanistan was regarded nothing more than a status symbol for the Indian kings of our age.

Thus, a thorough research on the Rajput Political Systems and Military Organisation (c. AD 800-1450) reveals that the organisational character of these systems was embellished with some unique and unaltered features of its own. However, the above laid shortcomings in it might have been responsible to an extent for the defeat of the Rajputs at the hand of the Turks.
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PREFACE

The present thesis is an attempt to stir on the socio-economic transformation during early medieval period, of which the emergence of the Rajputs was an immediate outcome in northern India. It is known that the Political Systems of these Rajput States were strictly governed by Feudalism, which in turn had strongly been emanated in their military organizations. Senior Scholars and historians have already done much work on Feudalism, with the help of which I have tried to focus on some important aspects of the modus operandi of their political structure. Most of the epigraphic sources including the land-grants in large numbers, though already quoted by earlier scholars, have been consulted by me in original for the purpose of clarification. The details of such land-grants are utilized to prove the authenticity of literary texts. The military part is subjected to much attention and detailed description owing to its uniqueness and specifications. An effort is made in this regard to entreat the weaknesses of the Rajput military system in relation to the superiority of the Turks in certain aspects. The use of Persian sources (translated) is aimed to bring such transparency.

The spellings of Sanskrit and some of the Persian words used by me required diacritical marks upon them, which I would manage at the time of publication. However, to clarify the names of the sources, the regular use of diacritics is made in bibliography. Though, every care has been taken to correct the proofs, the typing error if any may please be subjected to forgiveness.

-Rashmi Upadhyaya

Date: 24th December, 2001
Place: Aligarh.
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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.1 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.AD779-794) by invading the territory of Doab.2 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 gurjaranath 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, EJ, 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,
Kusasthala. 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 (*ASIR*, 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. The next ruler Mahendrapala II is referred in the epigraphs only as the shadowy figure whose Kingdom was extended so far south as Ujjain.

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 Guhilas 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 11th century, a person of the noble lineage of the Gahadawalas named Chandradeva, suddenly acquired sovereignty over Kannauj. 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. 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

22 JBORS, December, 1928, p.486.
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 Gurjara-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.)
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 Sakambhari²⁸ in V.S.1220/AD 1164, was a stunning blow to the Gahadawala power.²⁹

The hostilities between the Chahmanas 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 Chahmanas also came in to prominence after the decline of the Gurjara – Pratiharas. There were numerous branches of the Chahmanas 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 mahasamanant 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.\textsuperscript{31} Besides, this, *Purushpariksha* of Vidyapati states that *Yavanaesvara Shahavadin* (Shihabuddin) fled several times being defeated by him,\textsuperscript{32} while *Rambhamanjarikatha* credits him as *nikhila yavana kshayarakah* i.e. the destroyer of all the Yavanas.\textsuperscript{33} The Muslim historians, too bestow a special praise on him.\textsuperscript{34} 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.\textsuperscript{35} 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\textsuperscript{36} also came to an end with the II\textsuperscript{nd} battle of Tarain; which brought the destruction of the greatest king, Prithviraja III. His son was handed over the rule of Ajmer as a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} R.S. Tripathi, op.cit., p.322.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{35} *Tajul Maasir* in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, Allahabad, p.223.
\item \textsuperscript{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 Vigraha 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 Amoraja (c.AD 1139) as *Dvasrayakavya* 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 Amoraja (*JRAS*, 1913, p.274). But, the hostilities again renewed with the accession of Kumarapala 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, *JRAI*, 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).}
\end{itemize}
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 DHNI, II, p.1093.
39 Kiradu stone inscription of VS 1209/AD.1152 of Alhanadeva confirms the rule of Chalukya Kumarpala and the title maharaja to the former, a general title of the feudatory chiefs of our period. (EI, Vol.XI, pp.43-46)
40 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 Khajuraho inscriptions of Chandella ruler Dhanga with the titles as nripa and mahipati respectively. (EI, I, p.125, V.10, Ibid., p.141, VV.14-15).

The territory acquired its name as Jijabhukti after the name of Chandella feudatory Jeja (Jayasakti), (EI, I, p.221, also see DHNI, II, pp.669-670, S.K. Mitra, The Early Rulers of Khajuraho, pp.3-4). This Jijabhukti is generally regarded as the old name of Bundelkhand. The term was originally sprang from the vernacular form Jijahuti or 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.\textsuperscript{49} 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.\textsuperscript{50}

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),\textsuperscript{51} to overcome the Chedi ruler Gayakarna\textsuperscript{52} to exterminate his Paramara contemporary\textsuperscript{53} and to have forced the King of Kasi (probably Vijayachandara Gahadawala) to pass his time in friendly behaviour.\textsuperscript{54} The Chandellas received the final blow, which sustained a reverse at the hand of Prithviraja III of the Chahmana dynasty, who captured Mahoba and other fortresses in Bundelkhand from King Parmardi.\textsuperscript{55} 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.\textsuperscript{56} 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.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{DHNI}, II, p.692.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., pp.697-700.
\textsuperscript{52} \textit{EI}, I, p.198, V.15.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., p.198.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p.198, V.15.
\textsuperscript{55} \textit{DHNI}, II, pp.719-20.
\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Bombay Gazetteer}, I, pt.II, p.469.
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{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; The earliest members of the Paramara feudatory line could acquire firm grounds and in Malwa and the adjoining region on 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 and brought the Latas, Karnatas, Cholas and Keralas under submission. 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 Garha 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).

The defeat of the army of Munjaraja at the hand of Chahmana Baliraja, a predecessor of Chachiga is evident from Sundha hill inscription (EI, IX, pp.70ff) while, the Bijapur Stone Inscription (VS 1053/AD 997) refers that the Rashtrakuta Dhavala gave “shelter to the armies of a king (whose name is lost) and of the lord of the Gurjaras, when Munjaraja had destroyed Aghata, the pride of Medapata (Mewar) and caused them to flee”. (EI, X, pp.18, 20-21, V.10, DHN1, I, p.561, Ibid., II, p.855. Aghata is being identified with modern Ahar near Udaipur (Ibid., II, p.853, fn.6).

62 DHN1, II, pp.859-860.


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 ‘Bhojadeva 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 Kacchapaghata 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).
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 samadhitgata-panchmahasabdakalanakara-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.\(^{73}\) His defeat at the hand of the Chahmana King is also evident from both the Chalukya and the Chahmana chronicles.\(^{74}\) He is also known to have defeated and killed king Lakha (Laksharaja) of Kaccha (Cutch) and captured Griharipu, a chieftain of Saurashtra.\(^{75}\)

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.\(^{76}\) However, his further struggle with the Chandella King Madanavarmana was not successful.\(^{77}\) His successor was Kumarapal, who vaingloriously also attacked Arnoraja Chahmana of Sakambhari and completely overwhelmed his forces.\(^{78}\) He is also known to have quelled the revolt of the Paramara prince of Abu and re-asserted the Chalukya authority in Malwa.\(^{79}\) A successful war was also ensued by him against Mallikarjuna of Konkana.\(^{80}\)

\(^{73}\) Mularaja's contemporary kings of Sakambhari and Lata were Vigraharaja and Barappa, respectively (\textit{DHNI}, II, p.937).

\(^{74}\) Ibid., pp.930-39.

\(^{75}\) Ibid., pp.940f, also see \textit{Bombay Gazetteer}, I, p.160.

\(^{76}\) \textit{DHNI}, II, pp.969-70.

\(^{77}\) \textit{IA}, 1098, p.144.


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 upto 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.\textsuperscript{86} Thus, having consolidated themselves, they brought a large area of northern and southern India under their control.\textsuperscript{87} Later on, the central Indian dominions of the Kalachuris had extended far up to the districts of Prayag (Allahabad) and Varanasi (Benaras).\textsuperscript{88} In their efforts of extension, they came in to conflict with the Paramaras and the Palas.\textsuperscript{89} 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.\textsuperscript{90}

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

---

\textsuperscript{86} DHNI, II, p.755.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{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 Chandella 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) (Tarikh-i-Bhaihaqui, tr., Elliot & Dowson, Vol.11, p. 123, Cambridge History of India, Vol.III, pp.29-30).

\textsuperscript{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\(^{91}\) and the establishment of the Gahadawala power in Kanyakubja and Benares in c.AD 1090\(^{92}\).

The Guhils, who earlier served the Pratiharas as feudatories also succeeded in declaring themselves as independent in Mewar during the second half of the 12th century.\(^{93}\) 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.\(^{94}\) 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.\(^{95}\) During the 10th and 11th centuries, the region of eastern Rajaputana and Gwalior residency was overruled by

\(^{91}\) *Nagpur Prasasti of Narvaramana, EI, II, p.186, V.38, DHNI, II, p.784.*

\(^{92}\) 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 Guhилас ruling in Asika and Saurashtra acknowledged the sovereignty of the Chalukyas and Chahmanas, respectively. However, the Guhils 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.).


\(^{95}\) 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 Kacchapagata i.e., the Kacchapagata 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 Kacchapagata 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 IInd 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-

1192), Mularaja II (AD 1176-78), Bhima II (AD 1178-1241) and Jayachandra (AD 1170-1194). 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 parted 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, Jalore, 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 Jairas Singh 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., Vol.II, p.1206).
109 Ibid. p.1201.
111 Achaleshwor 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.\textsuperscript{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 bhaibanti system, which essentially outgrown through feudal polity.

CHAPTER-II
FEUDAL COMPLEX

The Post Harsha polity was highly imbued with developed feudal tendencies. The decentralisation of state system resulted in the fragmentation and thereby in the transformation of political power from the uniform monarch to numerous petty chiefs variously entitled as rais, ranas, rajaputras, mahasamantas, samantas, mahamandalesvaras, mandaesvaras, mandalikas, thakkuras etc., equal in status to the feudal barons of Europe. The ambitious designs of some of those who were powerful did not allow them to remain for long under the subordination of their respective overlords. Hence, they succeeded in establishing themselves as independent ruling authorities, taking advantage of some critical circumstances and mis-happenings in the states of their overlords. These newly established clannish monarchies were headed by the king, though maintained by an organisation of feudal chiefs, who in the hour of the weakness of the central authority could also declare themselves independent. Thus, in feudal age the political situations had always been overturned and repeated cyclically. It was against such a background that the Rajputs appeared on the scene as political and military chiefs in various parts of northern India.

1 The king was certainly the supreme head of the state and the conductor of the overall executive, judicial and military administration. To some extent, he was assisted in administrative matters; by the queens, a number of whom figure in the records of different dynasties of our period. However, none of them is possibly found entrusted with any administrative post; their involvement in administration is borne out indirectly in some of the land-grants. They are sometimes, found making land-grants with the formal permission of the King (see the Gahadawala records in EI, II, pp.187-88, Ibid., pp.117-18, Ibid., IV, p.108, Kartalai inscription of Chedi queen Rahada, EI, II, p.177, Bheraghat Inscription of Alhandadevi, (Chedi era 907), EI, II, No.2, p.11). Sometimes, they are found making land-grants conjointly with their sons or permitting them to make grant independently. (see the Gahadawala Records in JASB, LVI, pp.114-16, EI, VI, p.114, EI, II, pp.359-361). The queens were generally endowed with all the royal prerogatives (samasta-rajprakriyopeta), (EI, IX, p.47). Some had also worked unofficially as governors of bhuktis and regents. (D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, pp.138-202). Under the Chahmanas, they were also provided the right to issue coins. (Ibid., p. 41).
with their highly exalted notions of Kshatriyahood and chivalry. The Gurjara-Pratiharas were first to emerge as independent Rajput despots from the status of the feudatory chiefs of Harsha; who once again tried to bring the whole of northern India under one political orbit. But the forces of disintegration soon engulfed the whole region when their own feudatories, the Chandellas, Chalukyas, Chahmanas, Kalachuris, Guhillas, began to rule autonomously in the territories overruled by them in capacity of feudatories. Before we pass on to discuss feudal polity, it would be appropriate to go in some details about the emergence of some of the feudal dignitaries. It appears that during the early medieval period, a large number of titles are mentioned in our inscriptions, therefore it has been attempted in this chapter to collect the data from our sources and then in the light of them to determine the position and status of these feudal lords. I have endeavored to place them in feudal hierarchy. But, the variations from region to region are such that some of the titles either appear to be synonymous or overlapping to each other. In the following pages, I have adopted a methodology to discuss the main titles of important feudal lords, who appeared as a bone of administration and their relations with other feudal lords.

The origin of the Rajputs has remained one of the vexed questions creating dispute amongst historians. There is a consensus of opinion regarding the origin of term rajput from Sanskrit rajputra, meaning literally 'a son of the king', the Prakrit forms of which are variously known as rawat, rauta, raul and rawal. The emergence of them in the form of a class constituting the ruling landed aristocracy as the village chiefs and petty landholding feudatories from the 7th century AD onwards could not be disregarded in the light of the actual evidences.
However, their establishment in the form of clans, governing their independent hierarchical operandi in the political structure of those times remains a matter of controversy and dispute.²

Though, these varied views and arguments seem to be devoid of any practicability as they do not clearly fit down in the actual evidences of the land-grants according to which the various categories of rajputra chiefs constituting the thirty six clan groups³ belonged not to one single caste but to a variety of castes and tribes. Hence, in the light of such evidences B.D. Chattopadhyaya’s contention of mixed caste seems quite appropriate and juxtaposed.⁴ His argument that “the criteria for inclusion in the list of Rajput clans was provided by the

---

² In view of Tod and Crooke, the Rajputs were descended from the Scythic people of Central Asia (Tod, Annals & Antiquities of Rajasthan, ed. Crooke, Vol.1, Ch. 2,3&6). V.A. Smith regards the origin of some of the Rajput clans from Indian stock, while those of others from the Scythic (Smith, Early History of India, 3rd ed., pp.407ff. The term rajput is easily explained by C.V. Vaidya in the sense of the ancient Kshatriya, in order to prove their descent from the race of vedic Aryans (C.V. Vaidya, Medieval Hindu India, Vol.II, Ch.1, p.5). G.H. Ojha had tried to link the two theories of the foreign and the Aryan origin by including the Kusanas, Sakas, Pahlavas etc. together with the various Aryan races such as Ailas and Ikshvakus etc., recognising them as Kshatriyas in Rajput stock (G.H. Ojha, Rajputane Ka Itihasa. Vol.1, Ajmer, 1937, p.49, ff., Madhyakalin Bhartiya Samskriti, Allahabad, 1945, pp.43ff.).

³ Almost all the contemporary texts provided the number of Rajput clans as thirty-six. The whole list is provided by Rajtarangini, Prithvirajraso, Kumarapalacharita, Varnaratnakar and by an ancient work from a Jain temple in Marwar. (B.N.S. Yadav, Society & Culture in Northern India in the Twelfth Century pp.36-37). Tod had studied the clan names of the above sources and prepared his own list removing some vernacular errors. The corrected list prepared by him includes the following clans - Ikshvaka, (Kakustha or Surya), Anwai (Indu, Soma or Chandra), Grahilot or Gohilot, Yadu, Tular, Rathor, Kushwaha or Kachwaha, Pramara, Chahuman or Chauhan, Calukya or Solanki, Parihara, Kawara, Tak (Tak or Takshak), Jat or Geta, Han or Hun, Kathi, Bala, Jhala, Jethwa or Kamari, Gohil, Sarweya, Silar, Dabho, Gaur, Doda, or Dor, Gaharwal, Bargujar, Sengar, Sikarwal, Bais, Dahia, Johya, Mohil, Nikumbha, Rajpali and Dahima. Extra-Hul and Daharya (Tod, Annals and Antiquities, Vol.1).

However, the comparison of the above list with those of original reveals that Tod had also included the Tribal groups of foreign origin and even those Rajput clans which had originated quite later as sub-clans. The general names in the above list could be easily avoided from the point of view of our study, while the clan names, Guhilots, Kakchawaha, Paramara, Chahamanas, Chalukya, Parihara or Pratihar, Gahadawala, Chandellas form a subject of specific study during early medieval period. The origin of Rathor clan, though somewhat later remains a spectrum for the analogy of change in the feudal structure and political system in India.

contemporary status of a clan at least in early stages of the crystallization of Rajput power does not emphasize the role of caste". D.D. Kosambi seems to have directed towards the second stage while propounding his view of "feudalism from above and feudalism from below". Dashrath Sharma had tried to generalize the whole matter while seeking a reasonable argument for all the Rajput clan holders in the social atmosphere.

Whatever the actual origin of these Rajput clans might have been, the transformation of the usage of the term from the 'real son of the king' to the petty landholding chiefs remains an established fact. These landholding chiefs could be the actual sons of some kings, nobles, sons of the nobles, the feudal chiefs or officials holding administrative posts.

**Rajputra:**

Passing to the textual evidences with regard to the connotation of term *rajputra* one should first cite the use of the term *Arthasastra* of Kautilya in its literal sense. In *Harshacharita* (7th century) the same term appears to have been used in the sense of a noble or landowning chief. In *Kadambari* also the term is used for the persons of noble descent, who were appointed by the king as local rulers. Hence in the capacity of local rulers they might have naturally governed a large portion of land under them and thus played an active role in political and administrative system of the state. In *Rajtarangini*, it is used in the sense of a mere landowner,

---

5 Ibid., pp.61-62.
6 D.D. Kosambi, *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Ch. 9&10.
8 *Arthasastra*, Kangle I, text, p.7.
9 V.S. Agarwal, *Harshacharita Ek Sanskritik Adhyayana*, p.93, also see fn.1.

"केसरिका निर्णयः जीविन निविधानाः निविधाविनाय विविधार्थिज्ञानं: प्रतिविधिन्त्रित जाणुः। सह रूपाणां: प्रमभेववीसु सुखभिनन्दित्वमुः।"


Here *rajputra* is meant 'son of a noble'.
acclaiming the birth from the thirty-six clans of the Rajputs. The reference of thirty six clans clearly denotes that by the time of the 12th century these clans had already came into existence. Aparajitprachha of Bhatta Bhuvanadeva, a work of the twelfth century, which describes the composition of a typical feudal order refers to rajaputras as constituting a fairly large section of petty chiefs holding estates, each one of them holding one or more villages. Besides, holding the estates as feudatory chiefs, the territories were also conferred upon the rajputras as governors or proprietors. Tilakmanjari of Dhanapala refers to them as recipients not only of villages but of bhuktis and nagaras also from the royal princes in accordance with their own merit. The efficiency and the trustworthiness of these rajaputras as governors of these territories is reflected from the sentiments of the royal princes feeling themselves free from anxiety after making such a distribution or allotment. Samaraicchakaha, too, states about the similar evidence of the distribution of gramas (villages) akaras (mines), and mandabas (towns) among the rajaputras. Kharataragacchabrihadgurvavali of Jinasena Suri mentions to rajaputras as upholders of several Janapadas, towns and villages. In Prabandhacintamani of Merutunga one Bhuyaraj, a king of Kanyakubja is referred to have become a recluse after appointing a Paramara rajaputra as governor of his territories. The literary evidence is also confirmed by inscriptional records. An instance may be quoted from Larlai Stone Inscription, (VS 1233) in which the two Chahmana rajaputras, Abhayapala and Lakhanapala are referred as proprietors of certain landed

10 Rajitarangini, tr, M.A. Stein, Bk.VII, p.297 (V.360) & 393, (VV.1617-18).
11 Aparajitprachha, p.196, V.34.
12 Tilakmanjari, p.103.
13 Ibid.
14 Samaraicchakaha quoted in S.R. Sharma, Society & Culture in Rajasthan, p.67.
16 Prabandhacintamani, S.J.G. No.1, p.11.
estates. The mode of reference appears to denote that the rajaputras were merely governing the place rather than holding it as an enjoyable property. Instances are not rare when rajaputras received land-grants in remuneration of certain services either military or administrative, which he was bound to perform under all conditions. Military function was certainly the foremost duty of these rajaputras in the capacity of both an administrator and a soldier. Their appearance as mercenary soldiers is proved as early as the 7th century AD from the reference in Bakshali Manuscript in north-west frontier province. and subsequently from Chachnamah in Sindh in the 8th century AD. In all bardic traditions of our period, the Rajputs are always depicted as horsemen. The equestrian ideals of the Rajput dynasties are also clearly reflected in the bull and horsemen type of their coinages. It may not be again ignored that the Pratiharas, one of the clansmen of the Rajput dynasties of early medieval period felt pride to bear the title of hayapati, 'the lord of horses'. The military character of the rajputras also became apparent from the documents of Lekhapaddhati (a collection of the models of documents from Gujarat and Western Marwar region) and from the military grants provided by inscriptive evidences. The assignment of land to rajaputras as feudatory chief on conditions to perform military and other services to the overlord is a foremost prospect to confirm their status in Gujarat according to Lekhapaddhati. Regarding the military obligation, one of the charters of a ranaka (ranakapattala) in the above mentioned text provides us the details that a rajaputra applies to a

17 EI, XI, p.49f.
19 Chahnamah, op.cit., also see Irfan Habib, “Peasant in Indian History,” PIHC., 43rd Session, 1982, p.23.
21 Khajuraho Inscription of Dhanga, dated VS 1011, EI, pp.129&134, V.43.
ranaka for a fief and when, he is granted a village, he is required not only to maintain law and order within it and collect revenues according to the old just practices but also to furnish hundred foot-soldiers and twenty cavalrymen for the service of his ranaka overlord at his headquarter. The fact that he was not allowed to make gift of uncultivated land to temples and Brahmans indicates his right over the land granted to him, which he could sub-infeudate to others. Sometimes, the rajaputras were also provided cash endowment for the supply of military soldiers in the service of the overlord. In some such cases, the rules for the providence of military service were so strict that the amount was required to be given after seeing the number of horses and infantrymen and not on faith. In addition to the military service rendered to his immediate overlord ranaka, the rajaputras were also asked to pay the revenue in both cash and kind on the land assigned to him for cultivation. The revenue was received by him from cultivators in return for providing protection to them from wrongdoers, thieves and rebels by safeguarding the roads within the boundary of the estate maintained by him. The amount of the revenue was strictly to be paid within the specified time limit. If the rajputras failed to do so it was not to be paid without a fixed amount of interest imposed as late payment. None of the literary or inscriptive sources, however, provides the evidences of such a contractual obligation on the part of rajputra.

22 Lekhapaddhati, p.7.
23 Ibid, pp.9-10.
24 Ibid., p.13.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., pp.9-10
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
The position of the rajputras was though, distinct under the Gahadawalas and the Chahmanas as the title was usually applied to the actual sons of the reigning kings. They exercised special powers in administration acting as governors of estates assigned to them by the reigning kings. Under Gahadawalas, they were provided a special privilege of using their own seals with the separate insignia, differentiating them from the Gahadawala royal seal. On account of their keen interest in the affairs of administration some of them were endowed with all the royal prerogatives and were given the charge of all the royal and administrative activities. They could also grant lands and villages with the consent of the reigning king.

Under Chahmanas, the instances are there of the rajputras and maharajaputras serving as governors. The Chahmana king Gajasimha appointed his son maharajaputra Chamundaraja as governor of Mandavyapura in AD 1170. Similarly, king Kelhana appointed his son Vikramasimha to the same post in AD 1180. Again, the governorship of Mandavyapura was assigned by Kelhana to his another son Sotala in AD 1185. The Chahmana princes were also given fiefs (seja) for their personal enjoyment. However, these fiefs were not regarded as their...

29 Roma Niyogi, op.cit., p.145-146.
30 Maharajaputra Govindachandra, son of Madanapala is known to have a powerful influence in the administration. He was empowered to act in all matters like the king himself and was entrusted with the title samastarajapakriyopeta (Royal Asiatic Society Grant, VS 1225, IA, XV, pp.7-13, EI, XIII, p.217). He is also credited with all the victories during his father’s reign. The Rahan grant of Madanpala credited him with the victories over the Gauda elephants and Hammir during his own reign (IA, XVIII, pp.14-19). The high status of Govindachandra as maharajaputra is further indicated by the fact that he had the right to announce the grant of a feudatory ranaka (IA, XIV, pp.101-104).
31 See The Basahi grant of maharajaputra govindachandra (JASB, XLII, I, pp.314 ff., IA, XIV, pp.101-04), Benares Grant of maharajaputra Asphotochandradeva, (EI, VIII, pp.155-56), Benares Grant of maharajaputra Rajyapaldeva, (EI, VIII, p.156-58), Kamauli Grant of maharajaputra yuvaraj jayachandra (EI, IV, pp.117-20), Royal Asiatic Society Grant of Maharajaputra Jayachandra (IA, XV, pp.7-13), Benares College Grant of Rajaputra Harishchandra, (IA, XVIII, 129-34).
32 JASB, XII, p.104.
33 Ibid., X, p.209.
34 JASB, XIV, p.104.
personal property, as sometimes the central government exercised its power of assigning revenues out of these fiefs.\(^3^5\) The right of alienating land out of their fiefs was not usually extended to these Chahmana rajputras. But, often, they appear to have the right of assigning small portion of the income as a gift for charitable purpose without the king’s permission. Thus, the Chahmana prince Kirtipala, who was provided a fief of twelve villages, is known to have granted an yearly sum of two *drammas* from each of the twelve villages to the Jina Mahavira at Naddulai.\(^3^6\) Perhaps, the extention of the fiefs of these *rajputras* depended either on the merit of the prince or on the circumstances. Sometimes, the number of villages were assigned as fief, as was the case with the Chahmana prince Kirtipala, who enjoyed twelve villages as fief,\(^3^7\) while, sometimes only a single village was conferred as a fief to two princes as was the case with *rajputras* Lakhanapala and Abhayapala who had both enjoyed one village as fief in AD 1177.\(^3^9\)

Sometimes, the *rajputras* under the Chahmanas also gave their approval to judicial orders regarding their own estate. Thus, an edict specifying the scale of punishment for brahmans, priests, ministers and others, which was issued by king Allhanadeva, had the approval of *maharajputra* Kelhana and Gajasimha.\(^3^9\) They were also provided with the military generals and probably other such officials for safeguarding their own estates.\(^4^0\)

Among the scions of royal family, apart from the sons of the reigning kings, who held significant position in the Chahmana and Gahadawala states respectively, mention may be made

---

36 *EI*, IX, p.68.
37 *Ibid*.
38 *EI*, XI, p.50.
39 *EI*, XI, pp.43-46.
40 *JASB*, XII, pp.102-3.
to *rajaputra* Jojalla, the maternal uncle of Nadol king Samarsimha and *maharajaputra* Vatsaraja of Singara family. In one of the Chahmana inscriptions, Jojalla is referred as *rajyacintaka* i.e. supervising or pondering over the problems of the administration.\(^{41}\) Similarly, in *Kamauli Copper Plate Inscription*, Vatsaraja is referred as a significant feudatory chief of the Gahadawala ruler Govindachandra, having the exclusive right of donating the village to his own feudatory *thakkura* chief Dalhusarman.\(^{42}\) Another *rajaputra* Sallakshanapala, a scion of the royal family is known to hold the important post of *mahamantrin* under Vigraharaja of Chahmana dynasty.\(^{43}\) Instances are not rare when the scions of royal family went to join the services of the ruling kings of the dynasties other than the Gahadawala and the Chahamanas.\(^{44}\) In the light of such evidences, the assumption of *rajaputras* as the progeny of the kings and chieftains and the continued use of title even in the subservience of other kings, who were served by them after losing their own estates does not seem inappropriate.\(^{45}\) The *rajaputras* and *maharajaputras* had acquired an important position in the political organisation of the Kalachuris. The *Kahla plate* of Sodhdeva Kalachuri, which offers a striking similarity to Gahadawala grants refers to *maharajñi* and *maharajaputra* in the same manner as the *rajan*, *rajñi* and *yuvaraj* are mentioned at the

---

\(^{41}\) *EI*, XI, p.45.
\(^{42}\) *EI*, IV, pp.130-133.
\(^{43}\) Dashrath Sharma, *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, p.198.
\(^{44}\) According to a story recorded by Forbes, Prince Jugdev, son of Udayaditya, the ruler of Malwa, went in the service of Solankee King Sidhraj Jaysingh after leaving his father's estate owing to a family dispute. After a long discourse between Sidhraj and Jugdev, the former agreed to pay him a cash salary of sixty thousand crowns a month. Soon, after testing the fidelity of Jugdev the amount of salary was increased to a hundred thousand crowns everyday (*Rasmala*, I, p.140,145). *Chaturvimsatiprabandh* also refers to the story of the three *rajaputras*, the sons of the king of Jabalpur, who came to offer their services to Virdhaval a Baghela. But on demanding a high amount of salary Virdhaval a disdained them. Then, they joined Bhimasimha, the king of sea coast town of Bhadresvara (identical in all probability to Bhima Chalukya) with whom Virdhavala had already declared a war. Bhima is said to have gained victory in this battle with Virdhavala owing to valourous fighting spirit of these three Rajputs (Kathavate's Introduction to the 1st Edition of *Kirtikaumudi*).

beginning of the list of royal officials, who are to be informed about the grants. The clear evidences regarding the origin of these rajaputras like those of Gahadawalas and Chahmanas are not available but there can be no doubt of them descending from the families of royal personages and the chiefs.

Rautas:

Under the Chandellas, the rautas are found more frequent mention than the rajaputras to whom the lands were granted for their services. Though, the charters of lands may not clearly suggest the conditions of their services but from the general nature of them, most of the Chandella service tenures seem to be of military nature. The preponderance of a military element can also be inferred from the mention of as many as twenty one skandhavars (military and administrative camps) in the Chandella territory.

The military service by them is also confirmed by some other references. The Latakamelaka of Sankhadhara (12th century) reveals that a rautaraja called Sangramavisara enjoyed a gramapatta for military service. The Charkhari Plate of Viravarman also records the grant of a village in the battle of Sondhi. That there was also a system of granting pension (mrtuyuktavrtti) to heirs of rautas killed in battle is confirmed from the Garra plates (VS 1261/AD 1205-06) which record grants of lands to rauta Samanta, son of rauta Pape who was killed at Kakadadaha in a battle with the turushkas. Some of the landgrants to the rajaputras or rautas though, do not clarify the conditions of the services, seem to be of a nature of honorarium.

46 Roma Niyogi, op.cit., p.147, fn.2.
48 B.N.S. Yadav, Society & Culture in Northern India during the 12th century, p.143.
49 EI, XX, p.133.
50 EI, XVI, pp.272-77.
A record from Nadol belonging to rajaputra Kirtipala (VS 1218/AD 1161) states that the two Chahmana rajaputras (sons of the reigning king), rajakula Alhanadeva and kumara Kalhanadeva granted twelve villages appertaining to Nadulai to rajaputra Kirtipala. There are evidences of numerous grants to mahapurohita Praharajsarman, son of Jagusarman in Gahadawala kingdom, who at one place is honorably referred as rauta. The nature of grants does not reveal that a large number of villages were granted to him on various religious occasions as remuneration except one in which he is described specifically as rauta. Kamauli plate inscription dated VS1190 / AD1133) records the gift of a village Umbari to rauta Jatesarman, son of rauta Talhe and grandson of thakkura Uhila. The donee in this case was a Brahmana. Several Gahadawala grants issued from Varanasi and preserved in Asiatic Society of Bengal record the donation of six villages to rauta Rajyadharvarman of Kshatriya caste. The Gahadawala ruler Jayachandra is also known to have granted four villages to rauta Ravidhara in VS 1233/AD 1177. An inscription of the Chandella king Parmardin refers to a grant of one pada of land to three rautas namely, Somaraja, Maharaja and Vatsaraja, the sons of senapati Vatsaraja. The Rewa Inscription of maharanaka Kumarapala, a Chandella king ruling subordinately to king Trailokyavarman (VS 1297/AD 1239) makes reference to the grant of the village Rehi to six Brahmana rautas.

51 EI, IX, pp.66-70.
52 EI, IV, pp.120-124, 126-128, 124-126.
53 EI, IV, pp.116f.
54 EI, IV, J, 11, 19-21.
55 IA, XVIII, pp.135-143.
56 EI, XXXV, pp.215-220.
57 EI, IX, pp.117-120.
58 ASR, XXI, pp.142-48, IA, XVII, pp.224, 230-34.
A study of these grants reveals some important facts regarding the position of rautas, the foremost of them was that the rautas were not only acting as sub-feudatories but also were under the direct service of the state, the ruler of which assigned land to them. Secondly, the donees of most of these grants are Brahmans and the purpose gleaned from the nature and the mannerism of the subject matter seems spiritual rather than obligatory. However, the title of the rautas attached to them reflects their feudal or official status. It appears that the variations in size of the land and in the number of villages caused to the merit and achievements of the rautas which had created an impressive attire of them in the ruler’s mind and hence resulted in the grants of lands to them even in that condition when achievement or contribution of them in any sphere is not known. The spirituality as the purpose of assignment expressed in the grants might had been intended to bring about a feeling of solidarity and satisfaction among the various rautas and rajaputras and thus to prevent a feeling of revolt against the state.

The rautas, maharajaputras, rajaputras took great care to the construction and maintenance of religious and public places in their own capacities.59

The above discussion assures that the person with the title of rajaputra had a great importance in the political, religious, economic and social spheres, though it may have its regional variations. Sometimes, it may appear that rajputras were performing the function of rauta. But our evidences suggest that both of them were ranked lower then ranaka in feudal

59 See the Kalinjar Rock Inscription (VS 1188/AD 1131) of the reign of Chandella king Madanavarman which refers to maharajaputra Selaita and maharajaputra Sri Vacha and rauta Sri Udanah for setting up image of Siva. The three of them are mentioned in the direct service of Madanavarman. (JASB, 1948, XVII, part I, pp.321-22, ASR, XXI, pp.34-35, (EI, IV, p.154). Also see the Ajaigarp Rock Inscriptions of the reign of Madanavarman and Parmardi of VS 1208/AD 1151, VS 1247/AD 1187 respectively for the construction of chautras (public platforms) by rautas inside the Jayapura fort. (ASR, Vol, XXI, p.49 & 50 plates, XII, A & C). Another inscription in the same place dated in VS 1227/AD 1171 records the building of a baoli (step well) on the road during a famine for the use of all people in the same fort by a certain rauta Vira of Kshatriya caste. The inscription, though, does not refer the name of any ruler. (ASR, XXI, pp.49-50, EI V, Appendix, p.23, No.157 and fn.1).
hierarchy. One may, however, raise question if *rajputra* were the sons of the king how they may be ranked lower to *ranaka*. The only solution appears to me is that whenever the *rajputras* appear to be the sons of the reigning king, their position was supreme in their territories but may be deemed as equal or inferior to the *ranakas* in other regions. One thing is sure that all of them (*ranakas*, *rajputras* and *rautas*) were receiving the grants directly from the king and thereafter the process of sub-infeudation begins.

**Ranakas:**

*Ranakas*[^60] were another category of vassal chiefs connected with land. They were delegated a prominent place in the political organisation of the Chalukyas, Chandellas, Chahmanas, and Gahadawalas. Like the other feudatory title holders of our age, they were not confined to any specific caste group and commanded a considerable area of land granted to them as fiefs. In feudal hierarchy, their ranks were certainly a step higher than the other chiefs. In most cases, they were directly subordinated to the king and practiced sub-infeudation by creating a group of their own feudatories. The higher status of them under Somavansi rulers of Orissa becomes clear from their inclusion in the list of the persons of royal household as next to the royal queen or *pattamahisi* and followed by *rajaputra* (*rajni-ranaka-rajputra-rajavallabh-adin*).[^61] The epithet *upajivijana* applied to them under Bhanjas in Orissa further indicates that they lived on the bounties given to them by the king.[^62]

[^60]: The term *ranaka* appears to have derived from the Sanskrit term *rajyanyaka* meaning literally, of royal descent. *Rajanaka*, the correct form of this term, which is identical as *ranaka* evidently figure in the inscriptions of Chamba state ranging from the 10th to 12th centuries, in the sense of feudal chiefs (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.150). In Kashmir, the term *rajanaka* is known from Rajatarangini of Kalhana as a title of high honour adopted by ministers and officials of feudal rank (Rajatarangini, tr. Stein, BK. VI, p.244, V.177, also see fn., and BK. IV, V.489n.)

[^61]: EI, III, Katak Copper Plate Grant of the third year of Mahabhavagupta II, No.47, p. 357, Plate II, VV.33-4. The *rajvallabhas*, who ranked next to the *rajputras* were royal favourites, who were usually rewarded with the grant of villages by the king (R.S. Sharma, op.cit.,p.230).

[^62]: EI, XVIII, p.298, No.29, Antigam Plates of Yasabhajadeva, II, VV.17-18, also see EI, III, No.47, V.V.28-42.
The similar status of *ranakas* is revealed in the Rajput dynasties of northern India. In the records of the Chalukyas, Chandellas, Chahmanas and Gahadawalas, etc they are mentioned in direct service of the kings receiving landgrants from them as remunerations. The Gahadawala kings retained a strict control over them as long as they remained powerful. Such an effective control did not allow these *ranakas* to sub-infeudate land without the permission of the reigning monarch. Thus, a *ranaka* named Lavanaprayaha acting on behalf of his father Mandanapala could become able to make a gift of land out of the village granted to him only with the permission of the *yuvraj* Govindachandra, who was apparently acting on behalf of his father. Another grant of the same *ranaka* was announced by *maharajaputra*, Govindachandra and written with the consent of *mahattaka* Gangeya, an official of the state. *Lekhapaddhati* refers at various places that in Gujarat, *ranakas* received landgrants from the kings and sub-infeuded them to *rajputras*. But, here in the case of sub-infeudation, the consent of the king is not referred. The king’s permission was also probably not necessary in cases of sub-infeudation by *ranakas* to their subordinate *ranakas* or rautas under the Chandellas. Some of the *ranakas* were provided such an important position in the family of the Chahmanas that they are referred as the

63 IA, XVIII, pp.18-19, R.S. Sharma, op.cit., p.141-42.


65 *Lekhapaddhati*, pp. 2 & 7.

66 A Chandella mortgaged landgrant records the mortgaging of field by a *ranaka* to two other *ranakas* in consideration of a loan of 2250 drammas. The field granted was certainly given to that *ranaka* by his overlord but the charter nowhere refers about the latter’s consent to such a grant (*JASB*, XIX, 1850, pp.454-56, Cf. R.S. Sharma, p.138.
Some of the ranaka chiefs were having an independent attitude as if they were following the suzerainty of his overlord. They took no care to mention the names of their overlords, while making a grant or executing a record of something significant in their estates. Thus, the Belkhara Pillar Inscription of ranaka Vijayakarna, a feudatory of Gahadawala king Harishchandra (VS 1253/AD 1197), recording the erection of the pillar by a private individual refers to the kingdom of the aforesaid ranaka, in which the pillar was set up (ranakasrivijayakarnarajye) but makes no mention of the reigning monarch Harishchandra, being dated in the year of the victorious kingdom of Kanyakubja. The Kalavan plates of Yasovarman (11th century) inform us that ranaka Amma of the Ganga family, a petty chief holding 84 villages subordinated to Yasovarman, who in turn was a vassal of Bhoja Paramara granted certain pieces of land of Mahishabaddhika in the holy tirtha of Kalakesvara without taking cognition of his overlord. In these cases, the weak position of the overlord seems to have been the only reason of such carelessness on the part of the feudatory chiefs. The sub-feudatories of the status of ranaka Amma were not powerful enough to defy the authority of their overlords. Instead of it, they were compelled by their powerful overlords to take their permission at the time of issuing charters. The sub-feudatory rana Sankarsimha had to take the permission of mahamandalesvara Vapanadeva, when he wanted to alienate even three ploughs

---

67 Kharataragacchabrihadguravali, p.86.
69 Ei, XIX, p.72.
70 The editor of the grant has rightly conjectured that at the time of the engraving of the record, the political condition of the kingdom of Kannauj was extremely uncertain owing to the Muslim invasion. The feuds of Bhagwat and Bhivli situated between the Ganga and the Karmanasa were conferred upon Mohd. Bakhtiyar only one year earlier c. AD 1196. Under these disturbing circumstances, the negligence of the authority of king by the feudatory does not seem uncommon. Hence, the avoidance of a direct reference to the overlord of the kingdom of Kanyakubja in the inscription is matter of appreciation on the part of ranaka (JASB, I-II, pp.763-65).
of land to meet the expenses of the temple. It seems likely that the *Kalvan Plates* have been issued during the last days of the reign of feudatory chief Yasovarman, when he was unable to hold a strict check over his sub-feudatories. The tendency of the *ranakas* and other feudatory chiefs to become independent can not be denied in the hour of the political unstability and weakness of the strength of the central state. It is evident from *Pabandhacintamani* that the Solanki king Sidhraj Jayasimha had to send an armed force against an Aheer *rana* named Nowghun, who declared himself independent.

Doing military service to his overlord was one of the chief obligations of a *ranaka*.

*Lekhapaddhati* records the case of a *rana* who is instructed by *dandanayaka* of a king to make his presence at the royal army camp along with his horses, foot soldiers, war elephants, various kinds of armours and other ammunitions in times of need of military assistance. In another document of *samvat* 1533, a *ranaka* is called upon to provide for the service of the king, 400 soldiers, 100 riding horses and 100 carriage horses. Non-fulfillment of such obligations sometimes led to the confiscation of the estates held by these *ranakas*.

*Ranakas* were good administrators. They took all care of the inhabitants of the estates ruled by them. The maintenance of the building of religious institutions was well attended by

---

71 *IA*, X, p.156 (Vapanadeva was a feudatory of Jayasimha).
73 *Lekhapaddhati*, p.2.
74 Ibid., p.8
75 Ibid., p.24.
76 *Kharataragacchabrihadgurvavali*, p.82 (Here, a *ranaka* is referred as "नानानिर्धार्यक्रमवादात्सरस्यकसानवरऽनानि:"
 i.e. sustainer of several towns and villages).
them as they considered it a means of attaining spiritual merit. They were also affluent enough to make donations to temples and deities.

Besides, serving as feudatory chiefs, ranakas had also acted in various official capacities. In the epigraphic records of our period, they are referred as the in-charge of royal seal, the ministers of state and the in-charge of forts. A few of them were known for their artistic handiwork and were appointed by the king for performing such works in the royal state. Some were appointed to look after the sanghas etc. by the state. The information collected from various inscriptions suggests that most probably the ranaka stood at the top of feudal hierarchy after king and queen in some regions. He had assumed the title of maharaja during the tenure of weak king and granted land straight away to small ranakas and others. Further, it is also borne out from the evidence that he maintained huge contingent to carry out his orders. Sometimes,

77 Kadi Grant of VS 1287/AD1030, issued under the rule of Bhimadeva Chalukya refers to one rana Anaka thakkura Lunapasaka (The Prakrit form Lanapasaya or Lunapasaja is regarded identical with Sanskrit Lavanaprasada (IA, XVIII, p.346, DHNI, II, pp.999, fn.5, p.1011, fn.7) as the builder of the two temples of Analesvara and Salakhanesvara (IA, VI, pp.201-203) His son rana Virama is again said to have built the temples of Viramesvara in Ghusadi and Sumalesvara (Kadi grant, VS 1295/AD 1238, IA, VI, pp.205-206). He is also known to have built an almshouse (satragraha) in the Maulatalapada territory in Anahillapataka) (IA, Vol.VI, pp.208-210)

78 See Dohad inscription of ranaka Sankarsha (IA, X, 159) and Kalvan Plate of ranaka Amma (EI, XIX, p.72).


80 Ranaka Sri Chachigadeva and ranaka Lavnyaprasada were the ministers under Chalukyas of Gujarat (IA, XI, p.338). Ranaka Maladeva is also known as mahamatiya from the Veraval grant of Arjunadeva (IA, XI, pp.241-45, Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscription, Bhavanagar, pp.224-27).

81 R.S. Sharma traced the existence of a fortress of Vataparvataka in Bhagalpur district belonging to the Palas. This fortress, according to him was under the charge of a ranaka since his seal is found at this place (R.S. Sharma, p.238-39).


83 Prabandhkosh, text, p.132.
they are also found indulged in the cases of mortgaging and money lending.\textsuperscript{84} However, the
instances are not totally missing while some of the ranakas held the position of a sub-vassals.
Hence, one ranaka Sankarasimha was a subordinate of king Vapanadeva, who in turn was a
feudatory of the Chalukya king Jayasimha in AD 1146.\textsuperscript{85} Similarly, Yasovarman, who was a
feudatory of the Paramara king Bhojadeva, has his own sub-feudatory chief ranaka Amma.\textsuperscript{86}
Those, who were in the direct infeudation of the king ruled in their own territories exercising the
powers more or less similar to the king. They exercised not only the right to wage wars but also
to enter into treaties with sovereigns of other states. An actual form of such treaty entered into by
mahanandalesvara ranaka Lavanaprasada with maharajadhiraja Simhadeva of Devagiri of
Yadava family in AD 1232 is referred in \textit{Lekhapaddhati}. According to the terms of the treaty,
high contracting parties agreed to confine up to their own estates, not to attack the territory of
each other and that in case of being attacked by a powerful invader both of them should jointly
oppose the enemy. The last contract of the treaty was the denial of the right of destination to
another rajputra chief, who might flee into the territory of the other party with any valuable
article. In such case, there was an agreement to reinstate the valuables in the possession of that

\textsuperscript{84} The grant of the village in the form of mortgage (vitta bandha) to a ranaka was made by a Jaina
teacher, son of the royal preceptor (rajaguru) in consideration of probably a huge amount of money
under Trailokyavarman in 1212. The revenue derived from this land granted to him was the only
source of income to the aforesaid ranaka (EI, XXV, I, II, 10-14). A similar deed compared to this
mortgaged land grant is found on a special sized brick in Jaunpur in 1217 in which a ranaka is found
mortgaging his field to two other ranakas in consideration of a loan of 2250 drammas (JASB, XIX
(1850), 454-6, Cf. R.S. Sharma, p.138). In such cases, the rights of the mortgaging remained
confined to the collection of taxes or enjoyment of the field till the date of the clearing off the debts
(EI, XXV, I, 1-19). But the mortgaged land certainly passed under the control of the mortgagee in

case the debtor failed to pay off his dues (R.S. Sharma, p.139).

\textsuperscript{85} \textit{IA}, X, 159.

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{EI}, XIX, 73-7.
chief. The contracting of such a treaty settled by Lavanaprasada indicates the possession of a high degree of independence by him. His position was certainly higher than all other chiefs of the state and that he governed the kingdom of his master, Bhima II in the strength of the trust committed to him, becomes clear from the fact that at the time of making land -gifts, he employed the form ordinarily used by tributary princes.

The powerful feudatory ranaka chiefs had also signified their important position by assuming some important composite and high sounding titles. Thus, ranaka Madanapala, who was practically an independent chief in Sena kingdom, styled himself as maharaja mahasamanta to denote his powerful position. Similarly, Lavanaprasada himself felt pride by assuming the specific title sarvesvara, the lord of all through the favour of his master. Besides this, he is also known with his usual title as mahamandalesvara ranaka. Ranaka Madanapala, who was practically an independent chief in the Sena kingdom styled himself as maharaja mahasamanta to denote his powerful position. Such composite titles were also frankly assumed by other ranaka chiefs. Though, all of them without discrimination had the right to make the collection of

87 Lekhapaddhati, p.51.
88 Kathavate's Introduction to the 1st edition of Kirtikaumudi, p.50.ff.
89 B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.28.
91 The title passed on continuously to his next three generations i.e., his son Virdhavala, grandson Samantasimha and great grandson Visaladeva (IA, VI, pp.210-13, Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, Bhavanagar, pp.214-218, DHNI, II, pp.1032-33, 1034-35).
92 B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.22.
93 One such ranaka chief in the Sapadalaksha kingdom was Tiluka, who had his additional title as mahamandalesvara (D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, p.201).
of all types of taxes from the inhabitants of the estates ruled by them, to impose the conditions of payment of land revenue on the peasants\(^{94}\) and to have his own share out of the amount collected.\(^{95}\) Sometimes they could also exempt any specific tax using their own power without having permission of the reigning monarch.\(^{96}\) As the lord of the large territorial areas they needed to hold their own administrative organisation apart from that of the state.\(^{97}\)

**Thakkuras:**

Another class of feudal dignitaries during our age was constituted of *thakkuras*. The usage of this term came in to prevalence around the 9th century AD or somewhat later to it; however, it came to denote a class of ruling landed aristocracy by the 12th and the 13th centuries. The *thakkura* title holders, henceforward began to manage the chiefdom and proprietorship of land practicing warfare and knight-errantry. Being aligned with such a dignified and gallant group, it then came to be used as an honorific title among the highborn aristocrats of the society, belonging not only to the Kshatriya caste group but also to the Brahman,\(^{98}\) Kshatriya, Kayastha\(^{99}\) dignitaries in general.

\(^{94}\) *Lekhapaddhati*, p.18. ff.

\(^{95}\) *Lekhapaddhati*, p.18. ff.

\(^{96}\) The *Nadol Inscription* of VS 1200/AD 1143 refers that Bhamana, a Karnata ranaka exempted the *pramadakula* or dancing girls of the temple of Usapattana from paying *dasabandha*, probably “a kind of tax equal to one-tenth of their income” (*DHNI*, Vol.II, 1113).

\(^{97}\) The appointment of a *mahadandanayaka* by one *maharanaka* Srimandalikdev in his own estate is referred in *Lekhapaddhati* (p.2).

\(^{98}\) A study of land-grants of our period reveals that the number of land-grants in different cases to Brahmana *thakkuras* was much higher than the Kshatriya and Kayastha *thakkuras*. It appears that the Kayastha *thakkuras* scarcely received any land-grant from the state. (See *Kamauli copper plate inscription of Vatsaraj* (*EI*, XVIII, pp.20), *Bangawan pl. of Govindachandra* (*EI*, V. p.1171), *The charter of Vijayachandra Gahadawala* (*EI*, XXXV pp.209ff), *Rewa grant of the reign of Kalachuri king, Jayasimhadeva* (*IA*, XVII, pp.224-27), *Rewa copper pl. of Hariraja* (VS 1298) – (*IA*, XVII, p.236).
The thakkuras as chiefs are clearly reckoned from the Baudha-doha, a Prakrit text of early medieval period, in which citta immersed in ignorance, which is the source of bondage is termed as thakkura. In Upamitibhavaprapanchakaha (10th century) also the bondage of samsara has been conceived in terms of the estate of a chief or a ruler. The status of thakkuras as feudal chiefs in Kashmir in the 12th century is also confirmed from Rajtarangini.

The villages were mostly held by them in the capacity of sub-vassals. Lekhapaddhati alludes an example of such a vassalage in Gujarat under western Chalukyas in one of the copper charters of VS 1288, which describes the case of a ranaka Lavanyaprasad, who has granted a village in his own subdivision (pathaka) to thakkura Somesvaradeva living in Devapattana as the guardian of the subjects. The latter was empowered by his overlord ranaka to collect taxes (bhoga, bhaga, kara, hiranya etc.) from the people of the village granted to him. Similar examples are found under the Chandellas, Gahadawalas and Paramaras.

---

Does the conferment of landgrants to Brahman thakkuras not denote any specific reason for it? Whether the title thakkura was mainly held by a large number of Brahmans or they were granted more lands in capacity of their Brahmanahood? In the latter case, the kings certainly made land-grants to them for attaining spiritual merit. This was probably an additional merit of the Brahmana thakkuras.

The specific mention to the gotras of the Brahman donees, the holy occassions on which the grants were made and the non mention of the conditions of service may probably be an indication of the spiritual nature of the grants made to Brahmana thakkuras.

The Kayasthas came to emerged as a new caste around 9th century AD. But, they seem to have placed in the category of Kshatriyas owing to the title thakkura, which was held by many of them serving the state in various capacities as holders of different offices, feudalised in rank. (D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, p.248.) R.S. Sharma views in the case of Kayastha scribes that they were invested with the title thakkura just to indicate their feudral and social rank and not their functions (R.S. Sharma, op.cit., p.160).

---

99 The Kayasthas came to emerged as a new caste around 9th century AD. But, they seem to have placed in the category of Kshatriyas owing to the title thakkura, which was held by many of them serving the state in various capacities as holders of different offices, feudalised in rank. (D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, p.248.) R.S. Sharma views in the case of Kayastha scribes that they were invested with the title thakkura just to indicate their feudral and social rank and not their functions (R.S. Sharma, op.cit., p.160).

100 B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.167.

101 Ibid.

102 Rajtarangini, VIII, (text), V.548.

103 Lekhapaddhati, p.5
It is evident from the inscriptions that almost all the big feudal lords were served by the sub-vassals of the rank of thakkura under the Chandellas, Paramaras, Chalukyas, Chahmanas and other Rajput dynasties. However, a few of thakkura chiefs could directly receive grants from the state by exerting a good impression on the kings through their good behaviour and valourous deeds. Thus, the villages of Karanda and Karandattala were handed over to thakkura Vasistha by Gahadawala king Govindachandra. Similarly, thakkura Jajuka of the Vastavya Kayastha family, who was appointed to superintend all affairs of the state at all times by the Chandella king Ganda (sarvadhikarakaranesu sadaniyuktah) received the gift of a village from the latter. Gahadawalas are also known to have made land grants to thakkuras, Devapalasarmana, Baladityasarmman, Devavarman, Bhupati, Sridhara, Kulhe and Anantasarmman. The donees were given the right to collect bhagabhogakara, pravanikara and turuskadanda taxes.

In the capacity of the village chiefs the thakkuras acted as a whole in charge and the guardian of the people of the villages held by them. However, even in that strength, their power was owed to a great deal to the general assembly of the villages or to the panchkulas (the

104 A Chandella epigraph refers to a thakkura named Sri Sujana, who was serving under a feudatory chief mahanrpati Indradhavala of Japila (Some East Bank Copper Plate Inscription, EI, XXIII, pp.223-230). Thakkura Udayasimha was subordinated to maharanaka Harirajadeva, a Vassal under the Chandellas (Rewa Inscription, IA, XVII, p.236). Thakkuras Mahaditya and Silhana were under Kirtivarman of Karkkaredika in Kalachuri kingdom (Rewa Inscription, IA, XVIII, p.226). Thakkuras, Vachhuka and Rasala were under mahakumara Harischandra in Malwa (Bhopal plate, EI, XXIV, p.227), thakkura Pethoda under Rayapala of Naddula and thakkura Kheladitya were under Alhanadeva of Nadol (Kiradu Stone Inscription, DHNI, II, p.979-80). Further an inscription of the 12th century refers to a thakkura chief as a sub-vassal of a chief of 84 villages, who was a vassal of maharaja bhupala Rayapala, a ruler of Naddula mandala owing allegiance to Kumarapala of Gujarat (Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscription, p.206, Cf. B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.151).

105 Earlier these villages were granted to Rajguru Rudrasiva by Raja Yasah Karna Kalachuri (JASB, XXI, pp.123-24).


107 See Roma Niyogi, op.cit.
members of the assembly of the village numbering five, a body similar to the village panchayat) in local matters. Thus, a Guhila thakkura Rajadeva of Naduladagika had to take the permission of the local mahajana\(^{108}\) assembly to collect certain cesses for the temple of Jaina Tirthankara Mahavira.\(^{109}\)

As village chiefs the military service was certainly the most important function on the part of the thakkuras to perform to their overlords. In Chachnamah (8th century), they are cited as valiant young warriors, appointed by Rai Dabar, the ruler of Sind to fight with the Arab vanguard.\(^{110}\) Samaraicchakaha also states to the thakkuras engaged in a battle with the Sabara chief and capturing him on the orders of his master.\(^{111}\) Some of the thakkuras were so much proficient in fighting that this spirit could successfully be maintained by them till the old age. One such example is cited in Kuvalayamala, according to which an old thakkura Kshetrabhata having fallen on evil days joined the military service of the ruler of Ujjaini, in return of which, the king bestowed on him the prosperous village of Kupavrinda where he resided.\(^{112}\)

Apart from the military servants, the thakkuras were also appointed on various official and unofficial posts.\(^{113}\)

---

108 Mahajanas probably delegated their services to the panchkulas (Early Chauhan Dynasties, p.204).
109 Ibid., p.203.
110 Chachnamah, p.29.
111 S.R. Sharma, Society and Culture in Rajasthan, p.67.
112 Kuvalayamala, p.50, Cf. S.R. Sharma, loc. cit., p.66.

Mohd. Habib regards these thakkuras as the actual fighters in India like the knights of Europe. In his words, “the thakur could face death, that was easy for him but he could not risk captivity” (Mohd. Habib, Introd. to Elliot & Dowson, Vol. II, p.44).

113 The writers of the inscriptions entitled as thakkuras are also described as the holders of the office of mahaakshapatalika, while the conveyer (dutaka) of the grants usually appear to have holding the office of mahasandhivigrahika (see Kadi grants of VS 1317/AD 1261 (IA, VI, pp.210-213) & VS 1319/AD 1263 (IA, VI, pp.194-96, 205-206, Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, Bhavnagar, pp.214-218), Patan grant of Bhima II, VS 1256 (IA, XI, pp.71-73). In the category of unofficial post holders, the instance of thakkura Narayana entitled as mahakavi chakravarti is traced from Atru Stone Inscription (c. AD 1127-28). The inscription records the grant of a village to this leading poet of the State (Archeological Survey of India Report. 1905-6, pp.56-57).
Sometimes, the title *thakkura* is found allied with other well known feudatory titles like *rauta, rajaputra, ranaka*. In the official and feudal hierarchy some of the *thakkuras* had gained so much repute that the doors of the imperial services were opened to their sons, grandsons, great grandsons and other members of the family also.

**Samantas:**

One of the most substantial groups in the feudal polity of our times was constituted of *samantas*. The term carried with it a great significance and a high antiquity being used in a diversified manner since the ancient times. In *Arthasastra* of Kautilya and the inscriptions of Asoka, it had been applied in the sense of an independent neighbour. The post Mauryan law

---

114 The writer of the *Kiradu Stone Pillar Inscription* of Chalukya king Kumarapala is referred as *maharajaputra sandhivigrahika thakkura* Kheladitya (Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, p.172-73, DHNI, II, p.980). Similarly, the Guhila *thakkura* Rajadeva, the chief of Naduldagika is known to have bear the title of *rauta* (*Nadlai Stone Inscription* (EI, XI, pp.37-43, P.C. Nahar, Jain Inscriptions, I, pp.213-14, DHNI, II, pp.1112 & 1114).

115 *Icchavar grant* of the reign of Chandella king Parmardi refers to the grant of a village to Brahmana *senapati* Madanapalasarmana, who is stated the son of *thakkura* Maheshwara and grandson of *thakkura* Bhanapala. (*IA*, XXV, pp.205-8, JASB, 1895, LXIV, I, pp.155-58). Similarly, *adhiraja* Kumarapala, a feudatory of the Sakambhari king Prithvideva is described in *Dhod Stone Inscription* as the son of *thakkura* Mangalraja (DHNI, II, p.1079). The members of the family of *thakkura* Jajuka, who was the superintendent of all the affairs of the State during the reign of Ganda, were assigned important administrative and military posts. To one of members of his family, Vidana, the king is stated to have entrusted the responsibility of realm (*vinayastarajyam*) - (*EI*, XXX, pp.87-90, I, pp.330-36, V.15). Two other members of his family were appointed as *visisa* of the fort of Kalanjara. His son Mahesvara, who made the *visisa* also received the grant of a village from king Kirtivarmana in return for his efficient services. (Ibid., V.9). The nature of this post (*visisa*) is unexplainable as it is not found mentioned in any other record of our period. Though, it seems that in all probability, it was an administrative post associated with fort. Alternatively, it may also have been used as title conferred on officials in recognition of some meritorious services, which appear to have remunerated by the gift of land to them.

Among the hereditary military chiefs, *Rajim Stone Inscription* tells us about *thakkura* Sahila's son Svamin and his grandsons and great-grandsons, who carried on successful wars for their masters, the Kalachuri kings of Ratanapura in the capacity of feudal chiefs. (*IA*, XVII, pp.135-40). *Thakkura* Sahila's son was an important feudatory chief, on whom the honour of *panchmahasabda* was conferred by his Kalachuri overlord.

books like *Manusmriti* used it as a neighbouring proprietor of land or estate owner,\(^{117}\) entrusted with the duties comprising the collection of the share of produce, taxes, fines etc.\(^{118}\) In the literary and epigraphic records of the post Gupta period the same term is referred in a wide way ranging from the vassal chiefs to official dignitaries.\(^{119}\)

A fairly extensive prevalence of *samanta* system is indicated from the literary sources of the 7th century. *Harshacharita* of Bana refers to the various categories of *samanta* chiefs such as, *samanta, mahasamanta, aptasamanta, pradhanasamanta, satrumahahasamanta* and *pratisamanta*; each one of them distinguished from the other in accordance with his relationship with the overlord.\(^{120}\) That the *satrumahasamantas* or the defeated enemy chiefs comprised a chief section of the *samantas* is reflected from their obligations in *Kadambari* of Bana, a nearly contemporary text of *Harshacharita*, which refers to the defeated kings who were reduced to the position of *samantas*, saluting the king by following the five special modes, which could indicate their subordination and obeisance to him.\(^{121}\) Besides this, they had also to pay a yearly tribute to

---


119 B.N.S. Yadav seeks the earliest reference of *samanta* in the sense of a vassal in *Buddhacharita* of Asvaghosa (1st century AD), a verse of which refers to the kings accompanied by *samantas* along with the *bhudevas* (Brahmans) in the company of their *bandhavas* or kinsmen (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.138). Though this fact was not noticed by R.S. Sharma, who states to the application of this term as extended from defeated chiefs to royal officials by the later half of the 6th century AD (R.S. Sharma, loc.cit., p.20). He quotes the examples from some Kalachuri inscriptions of 597 onwards where the officials like *kumaramatyas* and *uparikas* are found replaced by the *rajas* and the *samantas* (Ibid.).

120 The status of *mahasamanta* was certainly higher than the *samantas*. The *satrumahasamantas* definitely acquired the status of defeated enemy chiefs. *Aptasamantas* were those who reduced themselves to the status of a Vassal, willingly accepting the suzerainty of the overlord. *Pradhansamanta* was one of the highly trusted Vassals or officials of the king, whose advice was regarded complementary to the latter. *Pratisamanta* was probably a hostile Vassal opposed to the king, while *anuraktasamanta* was personally attached to the king owing to his affection and admiration to him (R.S. Sharma, op.cit., pp.23-24, also see B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.139).

121 The five modes included the status of bowing the head, and touching the feet of the king, bowing the head and touching the palm of the feet of the emperor and placing the head on the earth near the feet.
the king and to please him by personal homage.\textsuperscript{122} The king was usually greeted by them by removing crowns and headdresses probably as a token of respect and subordination. Those who were subjected to a humiliating treatment performed certain improper tasks like bearing the fans and holding the \textit{chowries} in the court. Some even felt danger to their lives and prayed for it tying a sword to their necks. Those who were deprived of all their possessions remained eager to salute the king with folded hands probably to please him.\textsuperscript{123} Some had worked as doorkeepers\textsuperscript{124} and reciters of the auspicious words in praise of king.\textsuperscript{125} Their access to the king was so much difficult that they had to approach repeatedly to the gatekeeper in order to have an audience with him.\textsuperscript{126} The wives of such chiefs offered their services to the royal ladies and the chief queen, regarding it as their privilege. Thus, it is known that Yasovati was consecrated with water from golden pitchers by the wives of noble \textit{samantas}, when she was installed as chief queen.\textsuperscript{127} Bana also refers to the defeated \textit{samantas} furnishing their minor sons to the conqueror so that they could be praised as loyal to their overlords after receiving training in the imperial tradition.\textsuperscript{128}

As discriminated from \textit{satrumahasamantas}, the \textit{pradhansamantas} had exerted a great influence on the king so much so that the latter could not disregard his advice even in personal matters. It was on the advice of a \textit{pradhansamanta} that Rajyavardhana took food when he was

\begin{itemize}
\item of the emperor (V.S. Agarwal, \textit{Kadambari – Ek Sanskritik Adhyayana}, p.128, Cf. R.S. Sharma, op.cit., p.21). In \textit{Harshacharita} such \textit{samantas} are described applying the dust from the feet of the king on his heads (Ibid.).
\item \textsuperscript{122} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{123} \textit{Harshacharita}, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.48, ed. P.V. Kane (Text), p.27.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Ibid, p.27.
\item \textsuperscript{125} V.S. Agarwal, \textit{Kadambari}, pp.127-8.
\item \textsuperscript{126} \textit{Harshacharita}, ed. P.V. Kane, p.27.
\item \textsuperscript{127} V.S. Agarwal, \textit{Harshacharita – Ek Sanskritik Adhyayana}, p.218.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Ibid., p.218.
\end{itemize}
afflicted with grief after the loss of his sister. Such samantas might have remained with the king carrying with them the same power as his chief minister. In such a capacity his advice and co-operation in administrative matters was certainly not ignorable.

Bana in his Kadambari gives a picturesque account of thousands of subordinate crowned kings (murdhabhisiktena samanta lokena), seated in the assembly hall of the palace and passing their time in amusements like gambling, singing, dice playing, playing on the flute, drawing portraits of the king, solving puzzles, talking with the courtesans, listening to the songs of birds, praising or appreciating the merits of poets, drawing ornamented decorations on the ground etc. Whether these samantas were obliged to perform any kind of military service to their overlords is not clear but they were probably different from satrumahasamantas, who were assigned humiliating functions and duties to perform in the court. In all probability, they may have been consisting a class of those hereditary military chiefs, who had resided in the king’s palace in order to fight violently in times of any defensive war, while having a luxurious life in peace time. The Chinese traveller, Yuan Chwang most possibly meant this class while referring to the national guards of Harsha as the heroes of choice valour, hereditary in profession and skilled in military tactics, who guarded the sovereigns residence in peace and fought valiantly in wartime.

The performance of military service to the king or the overlord was certainly one of the most important obligations of the samantas. Rajyavardhana was accompanied with his devoted

129 V.S. Agarwal, Harshacharita – Ek Sanskritik Adhyayana, p.117.
130 V.S. Agarwal, Kadambari p.100.
*samantas*, when he went to meet the Hunas.\(^{132}\) *The Aihole inscription of Pulkesin II*, while providing an eulogical account of him in relation to Harsha’s defeat at his own hands, describes the latter’s feet as arrayed with the rays of the jewels of the diadems of hosts of *samantas* prosperous with unmeasured might.\(^{133}\) Bana on his first meeting with Harsha at the camp in the village at Manitara found a large number of *samantas* of the enemy kings, who fighting for their overlords were defeated and captured.\(^{134}\) The number of Harsha’s troops as stated by Bana, while on march was so huge that he felt amazed after having a sight over them.\(^{135}\) In the record of Yuan Chhwang, the army, managed by Harsha was huger than that of the Mauryans, who quite efficiently managed a centralized control over all parts of empire unlike Harsha whose kingdom was much smaller in extent.\(^{136}\) The probable explanation was that this was the feudal militia mustered in times of war. *Kadambari* refers that the *samantas* in the army of king Chandrapida viewed with one another to help the overload in times of war with whatever was possessed by them.\(^{137}\) The king during the course of his meeting with them, distributed among them the tokens of his favour such as quarter glances, side glances, full glances.\(^{138}\) Kamandaka in his *Nitisara* also states about the collective march undertaken by the king consolidating the forces of his *samantas*, known for their valour and integrity.\(^{139}\) In *Agni Purana*, the military assistance to the

132 *EI*, VI., No.1.

133 "अविनिति-चंद्रेश्वरः यस्मिन् साक्षात् जननोदकोबुधग्रामका जनयीनीज्ञात:। विधि पतिगतः (अ) महाकीर्तिको (भो) भास्यवल्लकायां नेन जाकारं हर्षाचारिः।"

\(^{134}\) *Harshacharita*, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.48.

135 Canto VII, V.S. Agarwal, p.159.

136 Beal, II.

137 *Kadambari*, tr. C.M. Ridding, p.86.

138 *Harshacharita*, V.S. Agarwal, p.158.

139 *Nitisara* tr. Sisir Kumar Mitra.
paramount sovereign is included in the list of the duties of samantas. In Tilakmanjari of Dhanapala (10th century), samantas are referred to as having accompanied their lords in military expeditions at numerous places. The participation of feudal chiefs including samantas, mandalapatis, and rautas is referred in the description of war given by Salibhadra Suri in his Bahubalirasa (AD 1148). According to Medhatithi samantas were the chief element in the composition of army. Prabandhacintamani contains many references of samantas who participated in war for their overlord. In Rajatarangini damaras and samantas are referred as important constituents of army. Prithvirajvijaya informs us that the great Chahmana king Prithviraja succeeded in carrying of Samyogita, the daughter of Jayachandra Gahadawala from the svyamvara ceremony with the military assistance of his samantas who fell fighting to the last for his beloved master and not many of them could return to the Chahmana capital to attend the marriage. In this case Dashrath Sharma regards to the samantas of Prithviraja “not as individual warriors like the knight errants of European romances but as leaders of units or regiments of Prithviraja’s cavalry which swooped almost unexpectedly on the Gahadawala capital, while Jayachandra was engaged in certain religious rites and carried of the princess as desired by their master and commander Prithviraja of Delhi and Ajmer. The same ruler,

140 Agni Purana, II, p.865.
141 See Tilakmanjari, pp.86,114,123.
143 Medhatithi on Manu, VII, V.97.
145 Rajatarangini, ed. M.A. Stein, Vol.1 (Text), Bk.V, VV.145-47, VII, V.1072 “मन्त्रिद्वारा प्रथमतः संहारलीलास लाइलात्” (Bk.VII, V.48)°अष्टुर्व महामायावस्तवलदितिनित्य । सैन्य तपस्या गर्ज्युपि भृगवशोभानाम् ।” (Ibid., V.360)
146 Dashrath Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, p.79.
147 Ibid.
according to Firishtha was assisted in the IInd battle of Tarain by 150 tributary chiefs, who were apparently his *samantas*. The praiseworthy note ascribed to Gopala, the minister and head *samanta* of the Chandella king Kirtivarman in *Prabodhchandrodaya* of Krishna Mishra for his successful military expeditions and capricious fighting spirit on the basis of which he could safeguard the fortunes of the Chandella dynasty in the hour of great crises, when it was barely attacked by the hedi King Laxmi Karna clearly suggests the immense contribution of a *samanta* chief as a warrior. *Ramacharita* of Sandhyakarnandini refers how the Pala King, Ramapala could consolidate his position during the early years of his reign with the help of his faithful *samantas* and how he could ably crush the *kaivartta* rebellion and recover his ancestral dominion with the assistance of his *samanta-chakra*. A 15th century source, *Kanhadade*

---


149 Gopala is described as *sakala samanta chakra chudamani* (crest jewel of the whole circle of *samantas*) and is equalled with Parusrama who, extirpated the race of tyrannical kings and also with the man lion incarnation (*nrsimharupa*) and the primeval boar (*mahavaraha*), who raised up the earth when it had sunk in the waters of destruction, poured down upon its sovereigns (H.C. Ray, *DHNI*, II, pp.695-97).


Besides the above two references, the term *samanta-chakra* is also found a prominent place in other contemporary sources. In *Tilakmanjari*, the presence of *samanta-chakra* on the battle-field is evidently referred (*Tilakmanjari*, p.86). *The Bhavisyatkaaha* also mention about an entire chakra of the *samantas* (*aseto-samanta-chakra*) (*IA*, XIV, pp.45f). The reference to the *samanta-chakra* is also made by some *samantas*, who claimed their superiority over the *chakra*: however, they do not make any reference to their overlord (*JIH*, V.42, p.246).

Some scholars have taken to these references as an assembly of the *samantas* (K.K. Gopal, “The Assembly of the *samantas*”, *JIH*, V.42, p.247) while, R.S. Sharma clearly states about the absence of any organisation of the *samantas* in India in the form of group or council as in England. The term *samanta-chakra* in his view does not appear just as a cliche, indicating the absence of any corporate body. He applied to it as a general meaning just like the *kavichakra* or the circle of the poets and says that the institution of courtship constituting the *samantas* presided over by the overlord may not be ruled out but the constitution of a deliberate assembly through which the organised voice of *samantas* was expressed does not seem possible. Finally to him, the *samanta-chakra* “seems like a prototype of *darbar* which developed in Muslim times and not the mother of Parliament which developed in England.” The main argument formed by him in support of his view is that the *samantas* performed the various types of obligations i.e. judicial, legislative, administrative etc, in their own individuality and not in the form of a body (R.S. Sharma, op.cit., p.159).
Prabandh refers to Kanhadade's samantas, who sacrificed their lives fighting bravely and devotedly to dislodge the enemy, while Jalor was attacked by the Turkish forces.\textsuperscript{151}

Epigraphic records also furnish the similar information. A copper plate inscription of Avaniman II, Yoga, a mahasamanta of Chalukya race under the Gurjara-Pratihara king of VS 956 (AD 899) refers to the aforesaid chief as a router of the armies of certain Yakshadasa and other kings whose countries were invaded by him.\textsuperscript{152} He is also credited with for putting to flight one Dharanivaraha.\textsuperscript{153}

The dependence of Kings or samantas for seeking military assistance was responsible for their growing importance and popularity during our age. The institution undoubtedly developed together with the unceasing development of feudalism and their number in a kingdom increased to a considerable extent.\textsuperscript{154} The sources of our period apply the normal epithets to a prosperous king as samanta-nivaha-nata-charana,\textsuperscript{155} samanta pranata charana\textsuperscript{156} and aneka-samanta-pranipatita-charana,\textsuperscript{157} i.e. one at whose feet bowed numerous samantas. The Kings of our age felt pride in having a number of sub-ordinate samantas under them. That the subordinate status of a number of samantas was a source of great pleasure to the king is apparent from the simile

\begin{itemize}
\item[151] Kanhadade Prabandh, Canto III, p.49,51,53, also see Canto IV.
\item[152] E.I., IX, pp.6-10.
\item[153] Avanivarman II's Una Inscription, EI, IX, Lines, 39-40.
\item[154] The number of samantas in the kingdom of Kalachuri Karna has been considerably noted as 136 in the 11th century (Prabandhacintamani, tr. Tawney, p.73, cf. B.N.S. Yadav, p.156). The Chalukya king Kumarapal had 72 big samantas under him (Ibid). In Aparajitapraccha of Bhatta Bhuvanadeva, the number of samantas and laghusamantas is referred as 32 and more than 60 respectively (Aparajitapraccha, p.196, VV.32-34). Ramcharita of Sandhyakarman also refers to numerous samantas in the Pala kingdom (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.156).
\item[156] Ibid., p.73.
\end{itemize}
provided by Uddyotana Suri between the bending low of trees full of flowers and the bowing of samantas.\textsuperscript{158}

Merchant Sulaiman who visited Gujarat in the 9th century might had been indicating the presence of defeated kings, who were probably reduced to the status of samanta chiefs by the Balaharas, which according to him was one of their great prerogatives that added to them the highest prestige and glory. He writes the Balabara is the most illustrative prince in all the Indies and all other kings there though each is master and independent in his kingdom, acknowledge in him this prerogative and pre-eminence. When he sends ambassadors to them, they receive them with extraordinary honours, because of the respect they bear for him.\textsuperscript{159}

It was perhaps owing to the increased power and growing importance of samantas that the chief officials of the state were also conferred with this title. The title samanta was though unusually bore by some of the important officials of Harsha. In this land-grants, the terms samantamaharaja and mahasamanta appear as titles of great imperial officers. The office bearer of mahaakshapatadaladikrta is referred as mahasamanta maharaja Bhana in one of the land-grants.\textsuperscript{160} According to Banskhera Plate mahasamanta Skandagupta was mahapramatara\textsuperscript{161} while in Madhuban plate samanta Maharaja Isvaragupta is referred as mahaakshapatadikrta\textsuperscript{162} The Pratapgarh inscription of Gurjara-Pratihara King Mahendrapala II mentions the title of one Madhava who was nominated by baladikrta Kokkata for transacting business at mandapika as tantrapala mahasamanta dandanayaka\textsuperscript{163} Under Gurjara-Pratiharas

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{158} Kuvalayamala, text, p.51.
  \item \textsuperscript{159} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, p.3.
  \item \textsuperscript{160} EI, IV, No.27, p.208.
  \item \textsuperscript{161} Ibid., No.29, pp.208-11.
  \item \textsuperscript{162} EI, I, No.11, p.67.
  \item \textsuperscript{163} EI, I, p.20.
\end{itemize}
mahasamanta Undabhatta\textsuperscript{164}, the mahapratihara in the reign of Mahendrapala I and mahasamanta Vishnusena\textsuperscript{165} in the reign of Bhoja are referred as the governors of Luachagiri. Similarly, samanta Sri Mandalla is also known to held the office of the mahasandhivigrahika during the reign of Rashtrakuta Dhruba.\textsuperscript{166} Samantas as administrators are also referred in contemporary literary sources. In Udayasundarikatha (11th century) of Soddhala samanta counsellors are referred as distinguished from common ministers.\textsuperscript{167} The former were specially consulted by the king in matters of war, while with the others of the common category he generally discussed the ideal code of royal conduct.\textsuperscript{168} Kumarapalacharita also refers to a council of samantas and other high dignitaries in which the matters of foreign policy and war were discussed by the king.\textsuperscript{169} Manasollasa (12th century) states about the samanta counsellors (samanta-amatyakas) together with the kumaras (princes) and mandalesvaras, sitting before the king in the right and left sides in the meetings of royal court.\textsuperscript{170} In Brihat-Kathakosa samanta counsellors, (samanta mantrinah) are found mentioned, deliberating after the death of the king.\textsuperscript{171} The expression samantamantrin is also found in a colophon of a manuscript from Pattan belonging to AD 1170 in which a samanta minister (samanta mantrin) is referred to have ruled over an administrative division called pathaka\textsuperscript{172} In Sringarmanjarikatha of Bhoja a samanta is

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid., I, p.173.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid., IV, pp.309-310.
\textsuperscript{166} EI, X, No.19, 11, 65-66.
\textsuperscript{167} B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.158.
\textsuperscript{168} Ibid., p.158.
\textsuperscript{169} Kumarapalacharita, Cf. B.N.S. Yadav, p.158.
\textsuperscript{171} K.K. Gopal, "Assembly of the Samantas in Early Medieval India", op.cit., p.248.
referred as an incharge of a *visaya*. The evidence is further supported by an 11th century inscription belonging to the reign of Bhoja Paramara of Dhar which refers to a *samanta* as a holder of a *visaya* comprising 1500 villages. The holding of another *samanta* comprised of 84 villages is also referred as *visaya* in another inscription.

The official titles attached to the *samantas* however, could be interpreted in two ways, either the *samantas* or *mahasamantas* were appointed to different official posts or the officials were provided the feudal status. The second option is regarded as more plausible by R.S. Sharma as he thinks to the officials posts certainly older than the feudal ranks. The process of feudalism, in his view, had engrossed the whole administrative and social order to such an extent that the officials were not regarded as significant without bearing feudal recognition. Though, the practicability of the former explanation may not be ruled out explicitly one such inference is drawn out from *Ratanpur stone inscription*, which refers to a *samanta* named Brahmadeva, who was appointed as minister by King Prithvideva III in reward for his military exploits and was entrusted with the government of the whole kingdom. The reference of *samantas* as one of the seven limbs of the state and as pillars of kingdom in an Apabhramsha writing of Lakkhana (13th century) is a reflection of the official or ministerial status of *samantas*.

---

173 *Sringarmanjarikatha*, Introd., p.72.
175 Ibid.

A section of chiefs holding the 84 villages was known as *chaturasitikas* during the 12th century. *Aparajitpraccha* refers to 400 of them, as the feudal chiefs in the court (p.196, VV.32-34) higher than the *rajaputras*. Later on, this system of *chaurasi* became widely prevalent in Rajasthan and the Rajput kingdoms of medieval Chattisgarh (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.145), where the group of 84 villages formed the estate of some members of ruling families (R.S. Sharma, op.cit., p.146). A cluster of 84 villages is also referred in a Paramara record of the second half of the 11th century AD (*EI*, XIX, 10, II, 8-17).

178 Ibid., p.157.
The **samantas** unequivocally formed an important element of body politic. They constituted a prominent place in the royal courts. *Kharataragacchappattavali* gives a picturesque account of Prithviraja’s court as mainly composed of the **samantas** including ministers, **mahamandalesvaras**, brave warriors, **pundits**, poets, bards, musicians and courtesans.  

*Kharataragacchabrihadguruvavali* also refers to a court scene of the reign of Chahmana king, Prithviraja, wherein the king is shown sitting on a decorated and jewelled throne, being attended by his **samantas**.  

*Kanhadade-Prabandh*, providing a true picture of the Jalore court during the age when the Chauhan power had already declined refers to the Chahmana assembly being attended by **amatyas, pradhanas, samantas, mandalika**, etc. They greatly prevailed in matters of accession of the kings and the consecration of **yuvarajas**. *Harshacharita* describes the **samantas** after the death of Prabhakarvardhana as prevailing on Rajyavardhana to accept the throne.  

In the same manner *Samaraicchakaha* imparts the credit for placing prince Jaya on the throne after the death of his father to **samantamandala** (body of **samantas**). An important place was usually assigned to them in **yuvarajyabhishek** ceremonies. *Kuvalayamala* of Uddyotana Suri (12th century) describes the **samantas**, led by the king in the ceremony of **yuvarajyabhishek**, shouting victory to **yuvaraj** and pouring on him scented water from golden pitchers interspersed with auspicious articles. *Samaraicchakaha* also refers to a similar besprinkling ceremony whence the erstwhile monarch expressly called upon the assembled **samantas** to recognise his successor as king after him. It seems that the king probably wanted...

---

180 B.N.S Yadav, op.cit., p127.
181 *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, p.197.
182 *Harshacharita* ed. P.V. Kane, p.38 f. (text).
184 *Kuvalayamala*, p.200 (text).
185 *Samaraicchakaha*, Cf. S.R. Sharma, p.64.
to gain the cooperation of *samantas* by entangling them in such ceremonies so that the future monarch could make his hand strong with the support of powerful *samantas*.

Besides the administrative ceremonies, *samantas* also participated in various social and religious activities of his overlord. A mixed picture of *samantas* assembled on the occasion of Nala's marriage is provided in *Naisadhiyacharita*. "They offered their homage to Nala and bowed to him and covered the passage with wreaths of their heads. The king honourably looked upon them and then they quickly offered to the king the present of marvelous jewels. Like a father, Nala sent them away after they had been gratified by his increasing queries about their welfare".186 The king had also accompanied *samantas* in his personal accomplishments. *Samaraicchakaha* of Haribhadra Suri refers to the king appended by his *samantas* when he went to pay his respects to Jaina Saints.187 Similarly, in *Kuvalayamala*, the king is referred in the company of *samantas* when he went for initiation into the Jaina order of monks.188 This further adds to the pre-eminence of *samantas* in the mind of the king. It was in all probability on account of their militaristic usefulness. The king had undoubtedly become most dependent on the armies provided by his *samantas* and other feudatories. In such conditions, his efforts to appease them through various means were not ingenious. Our literary sources are full of such examples of appeasement before going out for expedition. The author of *Manasollasa* advises the king to satisfy his *samantas*, princes, *mandaladhishas* and soldiers with presents of gold, garments and ornaments on the day preceding the date of starting out on an expedition.189 The *Agni Purana* lays down to a king to bring under his sway the leader of his own army, the warriors, the rural

---

186 B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.152.
188 *Kuvalayamala*, pp.209, 211 (text).
population (janapadadikas), his samantas and forest people, who are not well disposed towards him by means of gifts of money. Prabandhacintamani refers to king Mularaja, who summoned his samantas, rajaputras and foot soldiers and honoured them duly by making presents to them before going out on the expedition of Sapadalaksha. The goodwill of samantas was regarded such essential that the author of Samaraicchakaha refers to the disregard of them as one of the signs, which indicated the loss of one’s kingdom. He regards the prosperity of a kingdom depended on the devoted and loyal samantas. The state governed by such samantas is described by him as free from all sources of nuisance.

The high titles conferred on samantas also reflect their important status. Some of them, who were highly effective and powerful acquired the honour of panchmahasabda from their overlords. Thus, Bhartrvaddha II of Broach held the significant titles like paramesvara-samadhigatapanchmahasabda-mahasamantadhipati. Similarly, Undabhatta of Siyodani inscription is known to have bear the eloquent title of mahapratihara samadhigatasesamahasabda mahasamantadhipati. The Chalukya samantas, Bappabhatti and

---

190 Agni Purana, Ch.CCXLI, p.870.
192 Cf S.R. Sharma, op.cit., p.64.
193 Ibid.
194 Ibid.
195 The term panchmahasabda usually denoted the sounds of five great musical instruments (panchmahavadya), the use of which was allowed as a special mark of distinction to persons of high rank or authority (El, XII, pp.254-55, IA, I, p.81, IV, pp.166, 180, 204, XIII, p.134 etc.) These five instruments are enumerated by a Lingayat writer as sringa (horn), tammata (tambour), sankha (conch), bheri (drum) and jayaghantta (bell of victory). Earlier, this privilege was exclusively upheld by royal person-ages or imperial monarch while later on it was extended by the latter to the feudatory chiefs and important administrative officials. Sometimes this privilege was extended by the samantas to their own vassals. Hence, it is evident from the Kiradu Inscription, (VS 1235) of Bhima II of Gujarat that his samanta at Kirata Kupa (mod. Kiradu) conferred it on his vassal, general Mehettra Tejapala. (Poona Orientalist, Vol.I, 1936-37, p.44, Cf. B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.154).
Mandalla used the title *panchmahasabda* in their records, belonging to AD 739 and 775 respectively.\(^1\) Dharanivarah and Balavarman of Saurashtra,\(^2\) Gunaraja of *Terai inscription* had their titles as *samadhigata-panchmahasabda, mahasamandhipati*.\(^3\) Besides this, *mahasamanta* Buddha-varsha,\(^4\) a vassal of Gujarat Rashtrakutas and *mahasamanta* Vishnurama,\(^5\) known from *Deogadh Pillar Inscription* of Bhojadeva of Kannauj (VS 919/AD 862) are again known to have acquired *panchmahasabda*. *Samantas* were assigned lands or estates by their overlords in remuneration to their services. Sukra states to a *samanta* as a feudatory ruler over 100 villages having the income of one lakh *karshas*.\(^6\) While *Krityakalpataru (Rajdharmakanada)*\(^7\) and *Rajnitiratnakar* prescribe the status of *samanta* to the persons holding 10,20,100 or 1000 villages.\(^8\) That the *mahasamantas* were the holders of estates in Gujarat is evident from epigraphs. The *Torkhede copper plate grant of Govindaraja* (AD 812) refers to *Siharaki* 12, a cluster of villages as an estate belonging to Salukika *mahasamanta Buddhavarsha*.\(^9\) Sometimes the king appears to have endowed his personal estates on his *samantas* to look after them only as governors.\(^10\)

\(^1\) *EI*, IX, pp.1-2.
\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) R.S. Sharma, op.cit., p.81.
\(^5\) *EI*, IV, pp.309-10.
\(^6\) *Sukraniti, op. cit.*
\(^8\) *Rajnitiratnakar*, p.60.
\(^9\) *EI*, III, pp.53-55.
\(^10\) The *Kapadavanaj grant of the Rashtrakuta king Krishna* (AD 832) records the gift of the village Vyaghrasa or Vallurika, which belonged to a cluster of 750 villages called Harshapura in general and *chaturasitika*, a group of 84 villages in particular, to a Brahman. The inscription in itself refers to that village as a personal belonging of the king, though governed by a certain Chandragupta, described as *andanayaka, mahasamanta prachanda* (*EI*, I, pp.52-58).
The *samantas* holding the larger estates maintained their own officials and sub-
*samantas*.²⁰⁷ It was owing to the fissiparous attitude of some *samantas* that the author of *Agni Purana* advises the king first to satisfy the discontented subordinate *samantas* and his *amatyas* and again instructs him to destroy those disloyal.²⁰⁸ Mitra Mishra while quoting the *Matsyapurana* regarded such *samantas* as the enemies of the state.²⁰⁹

Sometimes the king had to undertake war against the disgruntled and rebellious *samantas*. Thus, Dommanapala or (Ma)dommanpala of Khadi *mandala* (Sunderbans) made the neighbouring *samantas* helpless by waging war against them.²¹⁰ *Sringarmanjarikatha* refers to a king of Ahicchatra named Vajramukuta to have defeated the circle of neighbouring *samantas* with the support of his ministers in their service.²¹¹ Sometimes, the rebel *samantas* after being defeated were dethroned. Kumarapala (AD 1150 century) defeated and dethroned a rebel *samanta* chief Vikramasinha and placed the latter’s nephew on the throne.²¹²

---

²⁰⁷ A Gujarat inscription (AD 541) conveys the order of *mahasamanta maharaja* Sangamsimha regarding the grant of a land to his subordinate officials including *rajasthaniya*, *uparikas* and *kumaramatyas* (R.S. Sharma, p.16, CII, 11, II, 1-3). Similarly, the charter of the Vishnusena (6th century AD) found in the Gujarat region refers to his officials entitled as *rajan*, *rajaputra*, *rajasthaniya*, *ayuktaka*, *viniyuktaka*, *saulkika* etc. However, it is to be noted that in this charter Vishnugupta is holding various titles such as *mahadandanayaka*, *mahakritakritak*, *mahapratihara*, *mahasamanta*, *maharaja* etc. (D.C. Sircar, *Studies in Political and Administrative Systems*, pp.176-178). This trend of the sustention of officials by big *samantas* also continued during our age, as we learn of a *dandanayaka* of *mahasamanta* Pranchanda, a feudatory of the Rashtrakuta king, Karkka II, serving in the unit of 750 villages (*EI*, I, pp.52-58).

In an eleventh century inscription of the time of Bhoja, Paramara *samanta* Amma of the Ganga family, a chief holding 84 villages refers to his *sandhivigrahika* and other officers having the titles of *gramtaka*, *desilaka*, *gokulika*, *caurika*, *saulkika*, *dandapasika* and *pratirajyika* (*EI*, XIX, No.10, Cf. B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.152). *Ratanpur stone inscription* also refers to a *samanta* chief of 84 villages, addressing *mahamatya* and *sandhivigrahika* (*A collection of Prakrit & Sanskrit Inscriptions*. Bhavnagar, p.206).

²⁰⁸ *Agni Purana*, p.865.


²¹¹ *Sringarmanjarikatha*, op.cit.

However, in all cases the nature of relations between the kings and his samantas and other feudatories depended on the relative strength and expansion of their states. It was the power of the suzerain that maintained the subordinate status of samantas by exerting a strict control over them. The samantas were always looking for the opportunities to declare their independence and the power of the ruler had to bring them to submission. Thus, their subservience was only subjected to the fear of the might of his overlord. The Sanjan plate of Amoghavarsha throws an important light on the relative power and position of the king and his samantas. A similar expression is found in Upamitibhavaprapnchakaha. In Gujarat, the samantas declared independence after the death of Siddharaja. Though, Kumarapala had succeeded in restoring a control over them for sometime, but soon they came into prominence under his successors. Similarly, in Bengal when the central power became weak at the end of the 11th century, the powerful samantas rose into revolt and declared themselves independent.

Though the domination of some of the powerful kings over his samantas is clear from some instances.

In some cases, the samantas had to approach to the king or his officials for the approval of the grant. Thus, the grants of both mahasamanta Balavarman of Nakshipura and his son Avanivarman were countersigned and approved respectively by Dhika, tantrapala of  

213 The above plate refers "the soul is the king, the samantas, according to Political Science and speech etc. are the servants conforming to the prescribed rules. Presiding over his place, namely the body, he (the soul) is able to enjoy independently his own vishaya (kingdom, worldly objects), when that enjoyer is subject to sannipata (a kind of fever, collision), they all perish" (EI, XVIII, No.26, cf. B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.160).  
214 Ibid., p.160.  
215 Rasmala, Cf. B.N.S. Yadav, p.159.  
216 Ibid., p.159.  
217 Ibid.
Mahendrapala I.\textsuperscript{218} It is also evident that \textit{mahasamanta} Indraraja of Chahmana dynasty had to apply to \textit{tantrapala mahasamanta mahadandanayaka} Madhava at Ujjaini for securing a permanent endowment for a temple built by him.\textsuperscript{219} In another case Naravarman, the \textit{samantadhipati} of Dharamapala appealed to the latter for ensuring the grant of four villages to a temple built by him, as he himself was not empowered to make such endowments.\textsuperscript{220} Sometimes, the overlord exerted his power over \textit{samanta} chiefs by appropriating villages for himself in the latter’s territory. This was objectively done to have vigilance over \textit{samanta}’s activities. The Rashtrakuta ruler of the Gujarat branch, Krishna II allotted a village within the jurisdiction of his \textit{mahasamanta} Prachanda.\textsuperscript{221} The most trusted and influential officials and the \textit{samantas} were also appointed by the king to deal with the matters of disturbing \textit{samantas}.\textsuperscript{222}

As the heads of their own estates the \textit{samantas} had taken all initiative to construct and manage the religious buildings and institutions within them. The \textit{Pratapgarh inscriptions} states that a Chauhan \textit{mahasamanta} Indraraja had built the temple of Sun god, Indradityaraja at a village, seven miles to the east of Pratapgarh and applied to the provincial governor Madana of Ujjain to make an endowment for its upkeep.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{218} \textit{EI}, IX B, No.11, pp.32-58.
\item \textsuperscript{219} \textit{EI}, XIV, No.13, VV.20-29.
\item \textsuperscript{220} \textit{EI}, IV, No.34, VV.30-52.
\item \textsuperscript{221} \textit{EI}, Vol.1, No.8, Plate II, VV. 33-35.
\item \textsuperscript{222} \textit{Manasollasa}, written in AD 1131 by Someswara III of Chalukya dynasty of Kalyani, which had supplanted the Rashtrakutas in AD 973, referring to the merits of a person, who should be appointed as \textit{sandhivigahika} requires him to be an expert to summon, dismiss, and install the \textit{samantas} and \textit{mandalesas} (see \textit{Manasollasa}, Vol.II).
\end{itemize}

The Kolhapur inscription of Silahara chief Gangaraditya refers to his \textit{mahasamanta} Nimbadeverasa as “a breaker of hair parting of the dames of hostile barons......” (\textit{EI}, XIX, 4a,11, 5-8, tr. L.D. Barnett, Ibid, p.34, Cf R.S. Sharma, pp.82-83). Though the evidence does not directly come from the region of northern India but it may clearly indicate one of the obligations of a \textit{mahasamanta} in general to suppress the inimical and protect the friendly \textit{samantas}, during our period.
The *samantas* had met a venerable treatment as long as they loyally performed their obligations towards the king. But, some of them are often found to divulge their overlords by their disdainful and perfidious deeds. Disloyalty on the battlefield by them had become such a common phenomenon that it was regarded by Jayanaka in his *Prithvira-vijaya* as the natural effect of *kali* age. Sometimes they exposed their conscientious disposition by transferring their allegiance in a battle from one side to the other. *Dvasrayakavya* refers to the twin *samantas*, Vijaya and Krishna to have changed their side towards the enemy king Vollala, the usurper of the throne of Malwa, while they were sent to oppose the latter. *Prabandhacintamani* informs us that the *samantas* of Kumarapala Chalukya became rebellions by obeying the chief of the Chalukya army, whence it was encountering the invasion of Chahada, who was accompanied by the Chahmana king, as they were already bribed by the former. *Tilakmanjari* of Dhanapala refers to many wicked (*dustasamantas*), whose end became necessary for the Paramara kingdom. Again, it is evident that in Bengal, the *samantas* of Mahipala II were highly responsible for the end of his rule. The difficulties of Paramara dynasty appear to have increased after the death of Bhoja owing to the selfish motives of *samantas*. Sometimes, the *samantas* were so filled with the feeling of revenge towards their sovereign that they wrongly advised them with bad intentions, where their co-operation and suggestions were required. Instantly, the Chandella king Parmardideva (Parmal) was ever misguided by his *samanta* in

225 *Prabandhacintamani*, S.J.G., op. cit., 79.
226 *Tilakmanjari*, p.63.
relation to his enemy king Prithviraja and helped the latter by secret advices, being nourished by a secret feeling of revenge against the Chandellas.\textsuperscript{229}

A perusal of the above discussion leads to the conclusion that in the institution of feudalism, \textit{samantas} played an important role in maintaining army and assisting the king. He was an important part of the administration and may be a minister of the king. Sometimes, it was difficult for a king to ignore them. However, a strong king like Harsha could manage their allegiance to him and many of them certainly played their game during the time of a week ruler, shifting their loyalty to another ruler, who served their purpose more effectively.

\textbf{Other Feudatories with High Sounded Titles:}

Apart from the above mentioned feudatory chiefs, the numerous grades of vassals referred in our sources are \textit{raja}, \textit{maharaja}, \textit{maharajadhira\textit{ja}}, \textit{adhiraja}, \textit{maharajadhira\textit{ja}} \textit{paramesvara}, \textit{nripa}, \textit{narendra}, \textit{mahipati}, \textit{kshitipa}, \textit{mandalesvara}, \textit{mahamandalesvara}, \textit{mahamandalika}, \textit{mandalika}, \textit{maharajakula}, \textit{rajakul} etc. The chiefs bearing the titles of \textit{raja}, \textit{nripa}, \textit{narendra}, \textit{nripati}, \textit{mahipati}, \textit{kshitipa} are to be placed in one and the same category.\textsuperscript{230}

\textsuperscript{229} S.K. Mitra, \textit{The Early Rulers of Khajuraho}, p. 121.

\textsuperscript{230} The titles \textit{nripa} and \textit{raja} were adopted by the Chapa feudatory princes Vikramarka and his son Addaka respectively. (\textit{Haddala grant} of the Gurjara Pratihara king Mahipala, (IA, Vol.XII, pp.190-95). Prithvideva, the ruler of Tumanna branch of the Kalachuris is known to have bearing the title \textit{rajasrimat Prithvidevah}, (IHQ, Sept. 1925, pp.409-11) in one of his records (samvat, 900). That he was no more than a feudatory chief of his relatives, the Kalachuris of Dahala, is indicated by his other titles such as \textit{samadhigata panchmahasabda}, \textit{mahamandalesvara maharajadhira\textit{ja}}, etc. (see \textit{Amoda grant}, (Chedi era 831) and the \textit{Lapha grant} of the same samvat – 806 in H.C. Ray, DHNI, II, p.805). In the \textit{Khajuraho stone inscription} (VS 1173/AD 1117), the Chandella feudatory king Jayavarmadeva is described as \textit{nripati} (EI, Vol.I, p.147, L.33-34) Yasovigraha’s son Mahichandra of the Ghadawala dynasty, who was feudatory of the Gurjara-Pratiharas also held the title \textit{nripa} (IA, XXIII, pp.14-19). Similarly, one Sallakshana, who was serving as a feudatory chief under the Parmara king Arjunavarmadeva is found referred as \textit{mahasandhivigrahika raja} (Bhopal grant of Arjunavarmadeva, VS 1272/AD 1215, JASB, Vol.VII, pp.25-31, also see H.C. Ray, II, p.897).

In \textit{Harsacharita}, the title \textit{raja} is used for the feudatories of Harsa who supplied him the contingents of armed forces (\textit{Harsacharita}, ed. P.V. Kane, op.cit., pp.956-57). In \textit{Kuvalayamala}, (12th century), too, the titles \textit{narendra} and \textit{raja} are applied to the feudatory chiefs (S.R. Sharma, op.cit., pp.62 & 67).
However, the status and the category of feudal chiefs may not be reckoned on the basis of the titles adopted by them, as the variety of titles bore by a single chief creates a complexity in recognising his true affinity. Though, it appears that the prefix \textit{maha} was added to titles to make them eloquent in order to denote the high status and the greatness of the feudatories. A survey of our sources reveal that the titles \textit{maharaja}\textsuperscript{231} \textit{maharajadhiraja}\textsuperscript{232} were assumed by significant feudatories vested with some political powers. The holders of the titles of \textit{mahamandalesvara},\textsuperscript{233}

\textsuperscript{231} It is known that the title \textit{maharaja} was widely adopted by the feudatories of Gupta and later Gupta period (B.P. Mazumdar, \textit{Socio-Economic History of Northern India}, pp.8-9). During our age, this title was abundantly used by the persons belonging to the rank of feudatory chiefs or vassals of high status. Thus, the title was preponderantly assumed by Alhanadeva of Naddula Chahmana branch, who was a feudatory of the Chalukya Kumaraapala. (\textit{Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions}, Bhavanagar, pp.172-73. Cf. \textit{DHNI}, II, pp.979-80). It was also adopted by the feudatories of Ucchakalpa under the Kalachuri kings of Malwa, (\textit{Bombay Gazetteer}, Part II, p.293 & CII, III, ed. John Fleet, Calcutta, 1888, pp.117-35), Guhila feudatory rulers and the Chahanmas of Jalor (\textit{DHNI}, II, 1125, 1180 & 91, also see \textit{IA}, III, p.100 fn.2) and by Vakpati I of Sakambhari branch of the Chahanmas in the capacity of the feudatory chief of Vinayakapala (\textit{DHNI}, II). Chandesvara, the author of \textit{Rajnitiratnakar} was also a feudatory holding the title of \textit{maharaja} and serving as the Prime-Minister of Harisimhadeva of Karnataka Brahmin family (B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.23).

\textsuperscript{232} The title \textit{maharajadhiraja} requires some attention as it was used by some more powerful feudatory rulers than those of the status of \textit{maharaja}. It was significantly held by Bhattipatta, a feudatory of the Kannauj emperor Mahendrapala II, who was rightly been identified by G.H. Ojha with Bhattipatta II of Guhila family (\textit{DHNI}, I, pp.587-595). The Chandella Yasovarmana, the nominal feudatory of the Gurjara-Pratiharas is also known to have held the title of \textit{maharajadhiraja} (\textit{ASR}, X, pp.94-95, \textit{IA}, XVIII, pp.236-37). In the inscriptions of Mularaja Chalukya, his father Raja who was possibly a Vassal of the Gurjara-Pratiharas is designated as \textit{maharajadhiraja} (\textit{IA}, VI, pp.191ff.). Simharaja, a feudatory chief belonging to the line of Sakambharis, who is eulogized in \textit{Harsha Stone Inscription} for his military conquest over the Tomara chief (nayaka) Salvana is again referred with the title \textit{maharajadhiraja} (\textit{IA}, 1912, pp.57 ff., \textit{EI}, Vol II, pp.116 ff.) The title was also adopted by Prithvideva, a feudatory of the Kalachuris of Dahala (\textit{EI}, XIX, pp.75-81). Vajradamana, the Kacchapagata feudatory prince of Gwalior (\textit{JASB}, XXXII, p.393 plate, VI & pp.399 \textit{CF. DHNI}, II, p.823) and Rayapala of Naddula Chahmana branch (\textit{DHNI}, II, pp.1111-1113). The feudatory chiefs of Siyodani, under the Pratiharas are also known to have assumed the above title (Dashrath Sharma, \textit{Rajasthan through the Ages}, p.200).

\textsuperscript{233} The title was adopted by \textit{maharajaputra} Jayatrasimhadeva, a feudatory of Balhana, the Chahmana king of Ranastambhapur (\textit{Manglana Stone Inscription}, VS 1272/C. AD 1215, \textit{IA}, 1912, pp.85-88) and the feudatory \textit{rajakula} Somasimha of Chahmana dynasty (\textit{Abu Stone Inscription}, II, \textit{DHNI}, II, p.1012), \textit{ranaka} Lavanyaprasada (\textit{Ibid.}) his son Virdhavala (\textit{Ibid.}) and grandson Visaladeva (\textit{Ibid.}, p.1032). Sangramraja of the branch of Chahanmas of Pratapgarh (\textit{Ibid.}, p.1057) and Vajjalladeva, a feudatory of Ajayapala Chalukya, who has attained \textit{panchmahasabda} by the grace of the latter and governed the area of Narmada tata Mandala (\textit{Bombay Secretariat Grant of the time of Ajayapala}, ed. fleet, \textit{IA}, Vol.XVIII, pp.80-85). Besides this, \textit{mahamandalesvara} was also one of the various titles of Prithvideva (\textit{Amoda Grant}, ed. Hiralal, \textit{EI}, Vol. XIX, pp.75-81). The strong feudatory
mandalesvara, mahamandalika and mandalika appear to have incorporated themselves in one single category being the heads or the executives of the mandalas (administrative division).

The power of some of these mahamandalesvaras and mandalikas is indicated by the fact that they could make landgrants in their own rights out of the territories allotted to them without getting the formal consent of the king. Thus, one mahamandalesvara Vaijalladeva, who was a feudatory of the king Ajayapaladeva in AD 1173 and a ruler of Narmada tata Mandala needs to refer to a number of officials like dandanayaka, desathakkura etc., while making a landgrant but does make no mention of king’s permission to the grant. Similarly, mahamandalesvara maharajakula Somasimhadeva, the lord of Chandravati and the feudatory of Bhimadeva Chalukya did not take the permission of the king, while granting a village for the worship of Paramara rulers of Abu were also known as mahamandalesvaras (DHNI, II, pp.914-19, also see Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit.). It is also known that the whole administration of the capital was looked after by one Vijayaraja who was a noble of the rank of mahamandalesvara during the reign of mahakumara Visala (IHQ, II, pp.8-9). The high status of mahamandalesvara further becomes clear from Dohad Stone Inscription of the reign of Kumarapala (VS 1202) which refers to one mahamandalesvara Vapanadeva as the overlord of rana Samkarsihadeva (ed. Dhruva, IA, Vol. X, pp.159-60).

234 The title mandalesvara was also not held by insignificant chiefs. Prithviraja III’s chief advisor and minister Kaimbasa is known to have held this title (D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, pp.198, 201). One Ahavamalla Bhuteyadeva in Dharwar district is said to have received the rank of mandalesvara from his overlord Bhima II for killing his enemy Panchala sometime before AD 1187 (B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.16).

235 The titles mahamandalikas and mandalikas were mostly applied to the governors of mandalas. However, their functions as feudatory chiefs, officials and ministers may not be denied in the light of contemporary evidences. Manasollasa refers to them and the other feudatory chiefs along with the ministers to have attending the meetings of the court sitting on the right and left sides in front of the king (EI, XXV, p.2) and another mahamandalika Udayaraja is said to be a minister of south Bihar (Sone East Bank Copper Plate, EI, XXIII, pp.227-28).

236 IA, VIII, pp.80-85.

The tradition of addressing the grant to the officials was prevalent in other parts of India also. We find one such address of mahamandalika Isvaraghosh, a feudatory of the Palas to more than four dozen officials (Inscriptions of Bengal, III, pp.156-57, JBORS, II, pp.6-8). Similar examples are also available in south Indian inscriptions. The omission of the king’s name in these grants most possibly indicates that the officials in a feudal administrative structure had became more powerful and the power of the king was curtailed by them to a considerable extent.
Neminatha. Some of the feudatories did also dare to declare themselves as maharajadhiraja paramesvara, the title, which indicates the imperial power. Though, the effete cause of the assumption of such titles is not properly known, it appears certainly a sign of the declaration of independence by the feudatories at the time of the decline of central authority. Thus, during the decline of the Pratihara empire, a number of its feudatories quietly assumed such imperial titles. \textit{Rajor inscription} clearly states that when Vijayapaladeva was unable to strictly look after the administration, his feudatory Mathanadeva declared himself independent by assuming the aforesaid title.\textsuperscript{238} Rajyadeva, a feudatory of the Paramara king Narvarman is known to have made a landgrant out of the village enjoyed by him without the permission of the king.\textsuperscript{239} These feudatories also seem to have a control over the revenues of their estates as they are sometimes stated to have making cash endowments out of the revenues for religious purpose. \textit{Nadol grant} (VS 1213/AD 1156), thus, records the case of mahamandalika Pratapsimha of Vadana clan of feudatory of Kumarapala Chalukya, who made a grant of one rupaka per day from the custom house of Badari to some Jaina temple at Nadduladagika (mod. Nadlai and Lavamdali); The inscriptions starts with the introductory note to Kumarapala but makes no reference to his permission to the grant.\textsuperscript{240}

\textsuperscript{237} EI, VIII, pp.204-7.

\textsuperscript{238} EI, III, pp.266-67.

\textsuperscript{239} In this case, the charter refers to two land endowments one by Rajadeva himself and another by his wife. The donation made by the wife undoubtedly indicates that she may have given some land for her own maintenance by her husband. (EI, XX, No.11, Lines, 14-15).

\textsuperscript{240} IA, XLI, 1912, pp.202-3.
The evidences of the landgrants to *nayakas* by kings\(^{241}\) indicated to their incorporation in the list of feudatories.\(^{242}\) The military functions of these *nayakas* like those of other feudatories may also not be disregarded.\(^{243}\)

**King and the Feudatories:**

Besides these usual titles, the feudatories of our age are also known to have assumed some unusual titles like, *mahakumara, kumara,\(^{244}\) maharajakula, rajakula\(^{245}\)* etc. Sometimes, The king being pleased by the valour of the feudatory chief granted them some unwanted titles. Thus, it is known that once Kumarapala Chalukya conferred the title of *rajpitamah* upon feudatory Ambada for defeating the king of Konkana named Mallikarjuna, who was also the bearer of that title.\(^{246}\)

---

\(^{241}\) See landgrants to *nayakas*, *EI*, XXXI, pp.70-73, XXX, pp.150-152.

\(^{242}\) *Mahanayaka* Pratapdhavala of Japila was a feudatory official of Vijayachandra Gahadawala. The charter of this *nayaka* found incised on the *Tarachandi rock* (Shahabad district) refers to the declaration of a forged grant by him regarding the gift of two villages, which the Brahmins of that place received by bribing an officer of the overlord of Kanyakubja named Deu (*JAS*, VI, pp.547-49).

Roma Niyogi, who had done an extended work on the Gahadawalas regards this *nayaka* as a feudatory chief, basing on the fact that the charter was specially issued for his successors, his sons and grandsons. They are so evidently referred by his successors as if their appointment did not depend on any superior authority. This could not be a case other than of a feudatory chief. The state officials like provincial governors etc. were undoubtedly hereditary in our age, but their appointment was formally made by the king and not by the official himself (Roma Niyogi, op.cit., pp.163-64).

\(^{243}\) *Nayaka* Kulasarma, son of a *nayaka*, grandson of a *rauta* and great grandson of a *ranaka* was an important military dignitary of the age of Trailokyavarman. To him a village was granted in 1205 by Trailokyavarmana himself on the condition to performed military service (*EI*, XXI, 11, II, pp.12-18). It is important to note that the *nayaka* was belonging to a family of military dignitaries as the three generations of him seem to have performed the military services in the capacity of feudal lords.

\(^{244}\) *Mahakumara* was the title of Paramara feudatory rulers, who received the honour of *panchmahasabda* from their lords. They made land grants with out referring to their overlords and could also create their own feudatories and appoint their own officers. They had the full right to assign their taxes, alinate villages, exempt certain people from taxation without making any reference to the imperial power (Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit.).

\(^{245}\) *Rajakula* and *maharajakula* titles were assumed by the Guhilas, Chahmanas and the Pramaras of Abu.

However, the hierarchy of the feudatories described above in different regions is far from clear in our sources. The evidences from Lekhapaddhati denote the ranakas were subordinated to the king and were the overlords of the rajaputras.\textsuperscript{247} Aparajitpraccha, thus, classifies the feudatories and vassals in hierarchical order on the basis of the number of villages held by them.\textsuperscript{248}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feudatory</th>
<th>No of Villages held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahamandalesvara</td>
<td>10,0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalika</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahasamanta</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samanta</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghusamanta</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaturasitika</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lowest category of feudatory chiefs below chaturasitika was rajaputras in it,\textsuperscript{249} which is again a rare evidence determining the position of rajaputras. Manasara, a text of the post Gupta period classified the feudal chiefs in nine different categories with special characteristics of their own in a hierarchical order. They are described as chakravartin, maharaja or adhiraja, mahendra or narendra, parshnika, pattadhara, mandaesa, pattabhaja, praharaka and ashtagrahin.\textsuperscript{250} The status of these chiefs, though very clearly differentiated by the author, the hierarchy proves to be unvalid, since most of the chiefs described in the contemporary sources do not get any place in the above list.

\textsuperscript{247} Lekhapaddhati.
\textsuperscript{248} Aparajitpraccha, p.203, VV.4-10.
\textsuperscript{249} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{250} Ibid.
The position of feudatories vis-a-vis their kings or overlords and the mutual relations of both form an important aspect of the composite feudal structure of our age. It seems that the relations between the king and the feudatories were regulated both by the power and strength of the king and accordingly the services and sincerity of the feudatory chiefs. Thus, we have an example of the friendly relations of the powerful Chandella king Kirtivarman with his feudatory sakala samantachakra chudamani, Gopala. The military achievements of Gopala were indeed no less creditable to enhance the power and prestige of Kirtivarmana owing to which the king used to regard him his sahaja suhrt (natural friend).

The Prakrit work Samaraicchakaha also quotes such examples of close association and mutual dependence between the king and feudatories. In one story, the frontier chief, Vigraha is referred to have rebelled against the state. But the prince, who marched to crush the rebellion restrains his followers to take stringent measures, saying, “This Vigraha is an insignificant chief, but he has been paying tribute to my father and therefore, is our kinsman. Therefore, no precipitate military action is to be taken against him.” While the defeated Vigraha offers to serve the prince the latter said to him, “Do not say so, as the bhritya (liegeman) of my father, you are my elder brother. So, if you like, go and see my father.” The overlords felt it obligatory to help his vassal in his troublous times, even if the latter was not quite justifiable.

Samaraicchakaha refers that while Sabara chief, the vassal of prince Kumarasena was attacked by soldiers, who came to punish him for his previous misdeeds, the prince raised a helping hand towards him and said, “He has become my liegeman. Hence, even, though he was

doing reprehensible things and cannot be indifferent when he engages in fight."^254 The relations among the feudatories themselves are also found permeated with the feeling of kinship. The same text further refers in this context to a Sabara chief, who just a moment ago had been plundering the caravan of a Vaishya named Sanudeva, after having been defeated by the prince, who accompanied the caravan and accepted the latter’s overlordship, addressed the same Vaishya thus: “O noble one, we did not know that this great man accompanied you. We have been vanquished by him and recognise him as our overlord. Hence, you are our kinsman (sambandhin) and we can not loot your property.” Sanudeva also recognised the new relationship and said “with the aryaputra (the prince) as my svamin and you as my kinsman, what is there that I do not have?”^255 The acceptance to an aboriginal Sabara chief in the form of kinsman by a prosperous Vaishya chief as they both were belonging to the common overlord clearly indicate that the kinship ties among the feudatories were not guided by caste and other distinctions. However, such feeling of closeness would have been found in the regions, where the central authority might had been remained strong. Otherwise, the mutual rivalries of the feudatories have been a usual feature of the political superstructure of our age.

Our study thus suggest that in a decentralised state, ruled by a large number of feudatories, the power now slowly and gradually have shifted to powerful feudatories who were directly under the king. The king acted no more than the tax collector of the powerful feudatories and the tributary chiefs under him. The feudatories and the tributary rulers lost no opportunity to declare themselves as independent in the hour of weak position of the king as stated earlier. The evidences are not scanty when the feudatories withheld to pay the obligations and tribute and then the king had to march against them.^256

---

^256 Naishadhiyacharita, Cf. B.N.S. Yadav, p.159.
The pride and power of these chiefs had increased to such an extent that they felt no hesitation in openly defying the authority of the king and declaring a hostile attitude towards him. Such relations of the king with his feudatories are proved by two sets of Chalukya copper plates (AD 1074), which refer to a grant of a village issued by king Karnal of Gujarat (AD 1064-94); but the grant was withheld by his feudatory mandalesvara, under whom the village was administered. The apparent reason of the withelding of the king was probably the one that originally the name of mandalesvara was not mentioned in the copper plates; hence, the order was issued by him to prepare another set with the inclusion of his own name therein.

The example of the open hostility of feudatory to the king may be gleaned from a copper plate grant from Sundarban (AD 1196), where a feudatory is found to declare with pride that he was hostile to maharajadhiraja. The expression of the real feeling between king and his feudatory further becomes clear from the epithet samjvaro Gurjaranam (scorching fire to Gurjaras) adopted by Yasovarmana in respect to his effete overlord. The expression clearly suggests that Yasovarmana may have come into violent conflict with his nominal Gurjara-Pratihara overlord. Likewise, the Pratihara rulers could not put a strict check on their powerful Chahmana feudatories, since it is known from the Harsha inscription that when the Chahmana feudatory Simharaja subdued the Tomara chief and captured the hosts gathered under his command, the Pratihara overlord had to march in person to the house of his feudatory in order to

---
258 IHQ, X, pp.322-23.
259 EI, I, p.129, V.23.

The independent Chandella ruler Vidyadhara is also known to have caused the destruction of the Pratihara king Rajyapal (EI, I, pp.219 & 222, V.22) after rebuking him for his flight and surrender of his territories to Musalmans.
make the release of some princes who were imprisoned after their capture in this war.\textsuperscript{260} Though, the Pratihara monarch is not named in the whole episode, he must be in all probability either Mahendrapala II (AD 946) or one of his weak successors. But, the coming of the overlord personally to the house of his feudatory for the release of the prisoners of war is a clear evidence of the increased power and importance of the Chahmana feudatory rulers of Sakambhari at the time of the decline of imperial Pratiharas. However, with the decline in the power of the king and the increased power of the feudatories, there was an immense rise of vainglorious royal titles\textsuperscript{261} and the glorification of the King; which is substantiated from the evidences of literary texts of our period.

However, these high sounding titles indicated nothing more than a mere show of dignity and greatness against the feudatories, who were not leg behind in the assumption of the imperial titles like \textit{parambhattaraka maharajadhiraja parameshwar} besides, the simple royal titles like \textit{maharaja, adhiraja, raja, nripa, etc.}\textsuperscript{262}

\textsuperscript{260} \textit{IA}, 1913, pp.58-62, V.19.

\textsuperscript{261} The Paramaras in the 11th century remained confined to the general imperial titles \textit{parambhattarakamaharajadhirajaparameshwara} (\textit{Grant of Raja Bhoja in Hindustani}, 1931, pp.495-515). The titles of the Gahadawala rulers were most high sounding and grandiloquent. Govindachandra assumed the long and glorious titles, \textit{parambhattarakamaiharajadhiraja, parameshwar, parammaheswar, maharajadhiraja, narapati, gajapati, rajrayadhipati, vividhavidyavicharavachaspati} (\textit{JASB}, LVI, p.108, V.1180). The same title was also adopted by the Kalachuri rulers. That the title does not reflect the power and prestige of the monarch is clear from the fact that even the powerless king Harishchandra also assumed the similar title born by his ancestors. (\textit{Grant of Harishchandra}, VS 1253, \textit{EI}, X, p.95, \textit{JASB}, VII, p.762). The Chandella king Parmardi adopted the arrogant titles like \textit{kopakalagni, rudra, avandhya kopa-prasada, raidrabhola, nissimavidyanidhi} (\textit{Puratanaprabandhasangrah}, S.J.G., No.2, p.90). Bhimadeva of Chalukya dynasty (11th century) is also known to have assumed the high sounding titles \textit{samastarajavalivirajita, maharajadhiraja umapativaralabdha prasada, jangama-panarkanpraptachaturbhuj} (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.114). The title assumed by Kumarapala was \textit{parameshwar parambhattaraka, praudhapataprijahyajirakram-pananaraprabhavak, mahasravaka, parmartha} (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{262} See \textit{Supra}, pp.\textbf{67-70}.
The above mentioned feudal political structure, however, had taken a turn in the beginning of the 13th century, with the establishment of several north Indian Rajput principalities in different parts of western Marwar after facing an onrushing defeat from the Turks. Then, the lack of central control over the feudatories led to the division of territories among the clansmen. This practice was called *bhai-bant* as it was believed by the members of the same clan as their share in the co-operative effort of the clan. Under this system, the bonds of political and moral obligation to render military service to the overlord had become quite loose. Another particular development was the rise of a class of *bhomias* who being the members of the dislodged ruling families claimed their mastery over their respective lands, on the ground of the argument that they were the early conquerors of the land there and its first colonisers. The state did not extract revenue from such *bhomias*, though, they had every right to collect land revenue from the peasants and to allot the uncultivated land to cultivators. Their chief obligations to the state were to render service (either military or administrative) and pay a tax for the expenses of the army (*nalbandi* and *peshkash*).

During 13th and 14th centuries, the rise of Rajput states was clan based. The organisation of these clans and sub-clans in reality were responsible for the power of the king and in the beginning the position of the ruler was ‘Primus Inter Pares’ but during the course of time, the rulers asserted their power and bestowed favours particularly to their kins and kiths and also outside their clan. Later on, they emerged as king’s feudatories or *sardars*. With the passage of time earlier feudal chiefs like *rautas*, *rajaputras*, and *samanta* had almost disappeared at once.

264 Ibid., p.20, fn.30.
265 Ibid.
266 The usual surviving titles of that age were *rais*, *rawats* and *ranakas* see Mohd. Habib’s, Introd. to *Elliot & Dowson*, Vol.II.
and the term *thakur* began to be used in the sense of a mere landholder rather than a feudatory chief. The territory conferred on such chief, henceforward began to be termed as *thakurai*.²⁶⁷

Thus, the above survey of the Rajput political organisation reveals that it should be broadly characterised with the considerable decline in the power of the king and an effective rule of the number of feudatories in a state. One of the important factors which led to an increase in the power of the feudatories was certainly the military dependence of the king over them. Besides the economic as well as the religious perceptions of the king were no less responsible for creating a class of powerful feudatories.

²⁶⁷ G.D. Sharma, op.cit., p.18, fn.18.
CHAPTER-III
NATURE AND COMPOSITION OF ARMY

It has been suggested in the earlier two Chapters that the period beginning with the 8th century is generally marked as a period of intermittent struggles and internecine wars, through which numerous powerful Rajput clannish monarchies, along with their forts and fortresses were trying to establish their superiority in various parts of northern India by practicing chivalry and warfare. As the boundaries of their newly emerged territorial units had not yet been defined and balanced, they felt insecurity from their neighbours. Under such circumstances, the maintenance of an organised army was a prime requisite on their part in order to defend and extend the boundary lines of their respective territories.

Thus, realising the practical importance and an urgent necessity of an efficient armed unit, the Rajput rulers provided great attention on the regular training and physical exercises of the troops, to make them expert and alert for successful fights. The writers of the period under review should be given a due credit for laying down a special emphasis on this aspect, as one of the important duties of the king in the interest of his own army. Attaching great importance to the daily exercises, Kamandaka opines that “by constant exercises one becomes adept in the use of chariots, horses, elephants, boats and a past master in archery.” Again, he advises a king not to discontinue the daily drill even when the army is in camp. Somadeva Suri, the author of *Nitivakyamrita* imparts much value to the fitness and training of soldiers for facing the enemy in battle, combining with their bodily strength and valour, rather than their species or races. The

---

2 Ibid., XVI, V.18.
3 “ज्याति: वृद्धं वनं तत्वाचारणं न हतिनां प्रवर्तनां,
किन्तु शरीरं वलं शौर्यं विहा च ।” (*Nitivakyamrita*, Ch.22, V.4, p.182).
author of *Agni Purana*, too, advises the king to arrange fighting matches among men of equal strength and prowess to train the warriors.\(^4\) It is also stated by Sukra that a king should try to expertise his warriors through the hunts of lions and practice in discharging arrow and wielding *astras* and *sastras*.\(^5\) He further lays upon the king to arrange the daily military parades both in morning and evening for activising his soldiers and troops, “as the untrained, inefficient and raw recruits” are regarded by him like “the bails of cotton”.\(^6\) According to him, the soldiers, who had acquired complete training should be awarded full payment, while those under-trained and half trained only half of the former.\(^7\)

There are ample evidences of the keen interest of the kings to mobilise their forces by constant drills and exercises probably on the advice of such writers. Regarding the practical interest of the kings in the training and exercise of their troops, the example of Chalukya king Somesvara may be clearly cited, who felt himself so eager to observe the performance of soldiers that he regularly organised the fights, displaying their expertise in handling different kinds of weapons.\(^8\)

However, the importance of regular drills and exercises to mobilise the army was also recognised by the earlier writers like Kautilya, who states that a feeling of spirit and enthusiasm may also be infused even in the timid by regular training and discipline. Therefore, the king, in his view, should arrange daily exercises of soldiers and also watch and encourage them.\(^9\) The king carefully observed the qualities and behavior of the ranks of army and deployed them to

\(^4\) *Agni Purana*, Ch. CCX, LIX, p.894.

\(^5\) *Sukraniti*, p.157, VV.79-80.

\(^6\) Ibid.

\(^7\) Ibid., p.183, V.9.


their respective duties.\textsuperscript{10} The military campaigns were personally led and directed by him.\textsuperscript{11} Good efforts were also made to discipline the soldiers. For this purpose, they were communicated military orders on every eighth day.\textsuperscript{12}

The attempts of the Rajputs to organise and train their soldiers are far from suspicion. But, it remains a fact that their cavalrmen were not provided a perfect training in mounted archery and free discharge of weapons in hitting the target in action of rapid mobility like those of the Turkish horse riders and cavalrmen, who received a special training in such skills through a game of Polo.\textsuperscript{13}

Again with the arrival of the Turkish invaders in India and bearing the severe blows of their ravaging onslaughts, the Rajputs further tried to improve their capacious forces by emfitting them with some newly introduced technical arms and weapons, so that they could not easily face the defeat at the hand of their powerful adversaries.\textsuperscript{14}

The stupendous armed forces of the Rajputs are known for their innumerability and strength. The king usually spent a huge sum of money on the maintenance of such gigantic forces.\textsuperscript{10,11,12,13}

\textsuperscript{10} *Nitisara*, Ch.20, p.416, V.8.
\textsuperscript{11} *EI*, I, p.197-98, VV.3-4, 8-10, *IA*, XVI, p.201, V.3.
\textsuperscript{12} Soldiers were also ordered to keep their arms, weapons and uniforms quite bright and clean. They could not enter a village without royal permit and were advised not to harass the villagers. According to royal order they were permitted to encamp themselves near the village but outside it. (*Sukraniti*, Ch.IV, section.VII)
\textsuperscript{13} *Islamic Arms and Armour*, pp.79-82, 86-87).
armies. Our sources throw a good deal of light on the numerical strength of army. At the time of Vigrahara\'s advance against Hammir, the Chahmana army is said to have consisted of 10,000 elephants, 100,000 horsemen, 10,000 infantry. Similarly, Jayapal Shahi opposed Mahmud with 12,000 cavalry, 30,000 foot soldiers and 300 elephants. Unsuri, the court poet of Mahmud described his army as "more numerous than the stars on the sky or the pebbles on the earth". The army of Prithviraja Chahmana, in the 1st battle of Tarain (AD 1191) is said to have comprised of 200,000 horsemen and 3,000 elephants and uncountable foot soldiers. While, on the eve of the II battle in the next year (AD 1192), he fought with 30,000 horses, 3,000

15 The strength of army differed according to the status of a ruler and his annual income. Sukra states that a nripati with an income of one lakh karshas should devote 53% of his income on the army, by maintaining 100 reserve troops, 300 infantry, 80 horses, 1 chariot, 2 cannons, and 2 elephants. (Ch.IV, Section 7, VV.83-89, Ch.I, VV.183-84). A mandalika, with an income of 3 to 10 lakhs is required to possess 300 reserve, 900 infantry, 240 horses, 3 chariots, 6 cannons. A raja with income of 10 to 50 lakhs - 1000 reserve troops, 3000 infantry, 800 horses, 10 chariots, 20 cannons and 20 elephants. A svarat with an income of 10 to 50 crore - 50,000 reserve, 15,000 infantry, 4000 horses, 50 chariots, 100 cannons, and 100 elephants. A samrat with income of 50 to 1 crore karshas - 10,000 reserve, 30,000 infantry, 8000 horses, 100 chariots, 200 cannons, 2000 elephants. The highest grade of king, according to Sukra, entitled as virat with 10 to 50 crore karshas should maintain a force consisting of 10,000 reserves, 300,000 infantry, 80,000 horses, 1,000 chariots, 2,000 cannons, 2,000 elephants. (Sukraniti, Ch.I, VV.183.).

However, the account appears to be quite exaggerative and highly unreliable. The mention of cannons in the quota of troops and corpses undoubtedly proves that the above account might had been a later addition to the original text. Though, it is worthwhile to assume that a major portion of king's income was expended on the maintenance of army.

elephants and a considerable number of infantry, as stated by Firishta. Nizamuddin Ahmed writes that in AD 1019, the Chandella king Ganda was ready to face Mahmud with an army comprising of 36,000 horses, 145,000 foot and 390 elephants. The number of troops in the army of Vidyadhara Chandella (AD 1010-1025) is variously ascertained by Firishta comprising of 45,000 infantry, 36,000 cavalry and 64 elephants, by Nizamuddin of 145,000 infantry, 36,000 cavalry and 340 elephants, by Ibn-al-Asir of 1,44,000 infantry, 56,000 cavalry and 746 elephants and finally by Gardizi of 1,45000 infantry, 36,000 cavalry, and 640 elephants. Al Utbi testifies that the Pratiharas of Kannauj had maintained four gigantic armies according to the four quarters of the wind, each numbering seven to nine lakhs. The Paramara rulers even on the verge of their extinction are said to have possessed 30,000 to 40,000 cavalry and a huge infantry force. Nyayachandra Suri in his Rambhamanjarinatika refers to Jayachandra Gahadawala as dalapangula burdening with his immobile and stupendous forces. According to Kamil-ut Tawarikh, the forces of Jayachandra were consisting of 700 elephants and a million of men. Taj-ul Maasir also informs us that he felt pride on the number of his forces and elephants and

The number of cavalrymen revealed from Kharataragacchapattavali, on this occasion is stated as 70,000 (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.208).
21 Ibid.
23 Al-Utbi, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.I, p.25.
24 D.C. Ganguly, The History of Paramara Dynasty, p.245, S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.34.
25 B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.209, also see Political History of Northern India from Jaina Sources, p.49.
had an army countless as the particles of sand. In *Prithviraj Raso* too, the army of Jayachandra is referred as so vast that during the march “the van had reached their ground before the rear had moved off”. Not only this, but several of the Rajput rulers took grandiloquent militaristic titles in order to eulogise themselves as the upholder of extensive armed unit. The Gahadawala king, Govindachandra and his successors adopted the title *asvapati-gajapati-narapati-rajtrayadhipati*, possibly to denote their lordship over cavalry, elephantry and infantry and three distinct worlds (earth, heaven and downtrodden world). Though, the very titles can not reveal a clear picture, as they are usually stereotyped and present an exaggerated account. Their validity can be testified by their co-relation with other evidences. Apparently, these gallant Rajputs of our age might had been inspired by the writers, who had stated a great deal about the valuability of army.

It is a notable fact that such stupendous forces had not been directly maintained by the king. The whole army, instead, was a corpus of a variety of units of distinct characters. The corporeities constituting the Rajput army are generally stated as six in number as borne out from our sources, e.g. (1) *maula* (hereditary troops) (2) *bhrita* (regular forces or mercenaries) (3) *sreni* (troops occasionally supplied by corporations of guilds) (4) *mitra* or *suhrd* (forces of allied

27 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.221.
30 Sukra opines that “the army is the chief means of overpowering the enemy, the king should therefore maintain a formidable force.” In his view “what mind is to human body, the army is to state”. The prosperity of treasury, kingdom and upsurgance of enemy, according to him, depend on army alone. (*Sukraniti*, Ch.I, V.62). Following Sukra, Kamandaka also states that a “king with a strong fighting force rules the earth unhampered and even the forces of a king, possessing an efficient army are turned into friends” (*Nitisara*, Ch.XIII, V.37).
powers) (5) dwisad or ari (soldiers alienated from the enemy camp) (5) atavika (forces of forest tribes like Bhils, Ghakkars etc.) Each of the preceding is said to be more important than the succeeding one.

Maulabala was regarded most loyal and reliable, during military campaigns owing to the close association with the king through generations. Though, the authors of literary texts while referring to the maula army do not explain the sense in which this army was regarded hereditary. Manasollasa explains maula as vamsakramanugata, while in Rajnitiratnakara, it is termed as pitrapitamahadikramunagata. Adipurana of Jinasena advises, if a soldier dies in battle, the king should appoint his son or brother in his place. But these implications are far from clarifying the actual position whether the son of a soldier succeeded his father, irrespective of his mental and physical aptitude and in case a single soldier had many sons, whether all of them were recruited for the post of their father or the eldest one? Scholars have a difference of opinion in this regard. Whatever had been the policy regarding the succession, it is quite clear that the king highly relied on such troops. Owing to their unvarying trustworthiness, the king always discussed matters and shared thoughts with them. The former was usually advised to proceed

31 Nitisara, p.389, Ch.19, V.4.
33 JAHS, p.37.
34 Ibid.
35 P.V. Kane thinks that the maula army was consisting of such persons, who and whose ancestors got tax free lands in return for military service. (P.V. Kane, History of Dharmasastras, Vol.III, p.200). P.W. Thomas on the other hand provides it a status of an army of men connected by caste or race with the king (Cambridge History of India, Vol.I, ed. Rapson, p.489, Cf. B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.207).
36 "सतकारार्युपासक शह संकेताता भवतः ।
निजसत्प्रभोमितस्तामीले भूति (भूति) वल्लादुः।"

(Nitisara, p.389, Ch.19, V.4)
against the enemy king with such troops in distant campaigns and in protracted wars due to their capability of enduring loss and destruction.\textsuperscript{37} The author of \textit{Nitivakyamrita} also states that the hereditary army surely follows in distress, does not revolt even when punished and can not be run over by the enemy.\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Udaipur inscription} of the Paramaras of Malwa also put special praise on the hereditary (\textit{maula}) warriors of Bhoja for their capability and strength of arms.\textsuperscript{39} Some of the hereditary personages including probably the king’s friends and his trustworthy soldiers had such a close attachment with the king that they did not hesitate even to immolate themselves at the death of their master.\textsuperscript{40} Yuan Chwang, the Chinese traveller (7th century AD) probably meant the \textit{maula} troops of Harsha of Kannauj, while referring to the national guards as the heroes of choice valour, hereditary in profession, who guarded the sovereign’s residence in peace and fought valiantly in wartime.\textsuperscript{41}

It was probably owing to great faithfulness of hereditary troops that they enjoyed a high respect and reputation, even under the Muslim Sultans of Delhi. Barani writes that only that person was enrolled as a cavalier, whose forefathers were outstanding horsemen and had never

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Nitisara}, p.392, Ch.19, VV.11-13.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Nitivakyamrita}, op.cit., p.186, V.16.
\textsuperscript{39} The whole passage runs as follows, “Seeing the Karnatas, the lord of Lata, the king of Gurjara, the \textit{Turshkas}, the chief among whom were the lord of Chedi, Indraratha, Toggala and Bhima, conquered by his mercenaries alone, his hereditary warriors (\textit{maula}) thought only of the strength of their arms, not of the number of fighters”.
\textsuperscript{41} Thomas Watters, \textit{On Yuan Chwang’s Travel in India}, II, p.161, S. Beal, \textit{Buddhist Records of the Western World}, II, p.82.
\end{flushleft}
been accused of rebellion against the state.\textsuperscript{42} Fakhr-i-Mudabbir, while imparting a great weightage on the hereditary claims of prospective incumbents for the armed forces states to the large body of troops without hereditary background as equal to two or three hereditary soldiers.\textsuperscript{43}

Regarding the position and status of \textit{maula} army, earlier \textit{Arthasastra} of Kautilya revealed that it had depended on the king for the maintenance and being constantly drilled received favour from him.\textsuperscript{44} While a somewhat contradictory statement is found in \textit{Manasollasa}, which refers to the king having no direct control over the \textit{maula} army and being advised by the author himself to maintain friendly relations with the chiefs of that army by making gifts of precious stones, ornaments and garments and to provide their maintenance by granting them two or more villages or by payment in gold.\textsuperscript{45} Hence, from the comparison of the evidences of both the texts, it may be concluded that the nature of \textit{maula} army had been constantly changing. It appears that with the gradual development of feudalism, the place of hereditary troops of Kautilya had been taken by the feudal levies supplied by the feudal lords entitled as \textit{rais, rajputras rankas, rautas} etc.

There are numerous evidences of the participation of feudatories in wars at the behest of their overlords in contemporary literary and epigraphic sources. As a usual practice, the king, at the time of march against the enemy or facing attack from his side, passed general order to his feudatories to join the state army along with their own independent forces to fight valiantly in war.\textsuperscript{46} The origin of this practice of seeking assistance of feudatories at the time of war is to be

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Ziauddin Barani, in A.A. Rizvi’s \textit{Khalji Kalin Bharat}, p.144.
\item \textsuperscript{43} \textit{Adab-ul-Harb-wa-Shujjat} in A.A. Rizvi, \textit{Adi Turk Kalin Bharat}, p.254.
\item \textsuperscript{44} \textit{Arthasastra}, Kangle, II, p.315.
\item \textsuperscript{46} The feudal lords had maintained their own independent armies. Sukra marks a clear distinction between \textit{gulmibhuta} and \textit{agulmibhuta} army. The former was the state army, while the latter was directly maintained by the feudal chiefs. (\textit{Sukraniti}, Ch.IV, p.156, VV.72-76). A special type of expedition is also stated by
\end{itemize}
traced from Gupta period. However, it gained popularity by the 7th century AD, the period of Harshvardhan of Kannauj which witnessed the full grown feudal structure. Chachnamah refers to Rai Dahar, the ruler of Sind, vigourously fighting with the Arabs with 1,000 horsemen most of whom were the rajputras probably of the status of feudatories, who proceeded in front of the former during the march. The instances of the actual performance of this important obligation by the feudatory chiefs like ranakas, rautas, rajaputras, samantas, and thakkuras have already been cited in our second chapter.

Our Epigraphs furnish a much clear picture with particular details than the literary sources regarding the support of feudatory chiefs to their ruling king. In the light of such evidence, Kakka, a feudatory of king Nagabhattacha is stated to have fought with the army of his

him, termed as sambhya, in which the king got assistance from his feudatories (Ibid., p.173, V.90, Cf. B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.12).

Kalidasa in his Raghuvamsa refers that one of the obligations of samanta to his overlord was to accompany him in the military expeditions. (Raghuvamsa, Canto V). Though, the term samanta is not found mentioned in Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta, his policy towards the conquered tribal states and frontier kings, (who gratified the emperor by paying all kinds of taxes, obeying his orders and coming to do homage, after getting their conquered territories back) indicates that some seeds of feudalism had been sown by him in the state (Allahabad Prasasti, CII, Vol.III, No.1, p.6).

It is evident that Rajyavardhan, the father of Harsha at the time of his campaign against the Hunas was attended by his devoted samantas (EI, VI, No.1). Bana refers in a picturesque manner how the feudal chiefs arrive at the residence of Harsha, mounting upon female elephants from every side before the march and how the king distributed to them the tokens of his favour, according to their respective position and prestige. (Harshacharita, V.S. Agarwal, p.158). It is referred by Bana in Kadambari that when Chandrapida began the march against the enemy king, a host of the feudatory kings, with their thousand elephants came to his help (Kadambari tr. C.M. Ridding, p.86). Aihole Inscription, while referring to the victory of Pulkesin over Harsha, describes the feet of the latter as arrayed with the rays of the jewel of diadems of hosts of feudatories, prosperous with unmeasured might (EI, VI, p.1).

Chachnamah in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, pp.461, & 446ff. It is notable that the Arabs even after conquering Sind were not able to discontinue the practice of feudatory troops as they had provided a particular place to the hereditary Sindhian
overlord against the Gaudas at Mudgagiri. Similarly, Bahukadhavala referred in *Una plate* caused the flight of Dharmapala at the instance of Gurjara-Pratihara ruler Nagabhatta, his master. Gunambodhideva, a feudatory of king Bhoja is referred to have fought from the side of the latter against the Palas. The *Kahla plates* inform us, how the same person had taken away the fortunes of Gaudas in his successful expeditions. The Kalachuri prince Sodhadeva is also mentioned in one of the inscriptions as a participant in Bengal campaign of Bhoja in capacity of his feudatory chief. Both Kumarapal and Vatsaraj are also known to have accompanied their lord Govindachandra in his military campaigns. *Dabhoi inscription* refers how Lavanyaprasada of Vaghela dynasty, a feudatory of the Chalukya king Bhima II (AD 1178-1241), fought valiantly against the Turks and inflicted a crushing defeat on them. The Paramara king Jayasimha was also assisted by his feudatory named Manadalika in vanquishing the opposing forces led by Kanha. Likewisely, Yasodhavala, the Paramara feudatory of Kumarapal is also referred to have assisted his master in the campaigns against Mallikarjuna, the ruler of Konkan.

---

50 *EI*, XVIII, p.95ff.
52 *Kahla plates*, *EI*, VII, 85-93.
53 Ibid.
54 *EI*, XII, p.15, V.23.
55 *EI*, IV, p.130-33.
57 *EI*, XXI, p.47.
58 *EI*, VIII, p.216.
and in the war against the Malwa king.\textsuperscript{59} In \textit{Chatsu inscription of Baladitya}, one of the feudatories of the Pratihara king of Bhoja is referred as the conquerer of the kings of north.\textsuperscript{60} It is also stated in the same line that he also presented horses to his lord, king Bhoja.\textsuperscript{61} The inscription further eulogises the Guhila prince Bhatta for defeating the armies of south, at the behest of his overlord.\textsuperscript{62}

The Muslim historians also took a standing note to such an army managed by the Indian kings in crucial circumstances of war. The Rai of Ranthambhor had advanced against the Turks with 10,000 rawats, many of whom were captured after the defeat at the enemy's hand.\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Malfuzat-i-Timuri} significantly refers that "The Raja of Bhatner, when attacked, prepared himself for a defensive battle with a body of the Rajputs, probably feudatories, who supplied the most renowned soldiers of India."\textsuperscript{64} Minhaj states that Rai Kolah Pithora, in the battle of Tarain fought against Mahmud, along with the whole of ranas of Hind.\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{EI}, VIII, p.216.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{EI}, XII, pp.12 & 16, V.26.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{63} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, Appendix, pp.540-41.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., p.422.

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Tabakat-i-Nasiri}, tr. Raverty, p.458.
Regarding the system of payment to these feudatory soldiers much has been said in Chapter II. It remains a fact that they were usually provided with land-grants in lieu of salaries, with the obligation to furnish a certain number of troops, either to the king or to his immediate overlord. Several documents of *Lekhapaddhāti* text directly provide evidences to the prevalence of such a system for paying the feudatory soldiers. There are ample evidences of military grants from other literary and epigraphic sources as well.  

As the king was in no direct contact with the soldiers maintained by his feudatories, the grants made to them did not necessarily pass from the king. Instead, the villages were granted to the army chief, who in turn might had bestowed the lands on individual soldiers.  

*Lekhapaddhāti* states to the assignment of fiefs to the higher grade of feudatories, entitled as *ranaka* and their distribution to the immediate subordinates, *rajputras*, at the hand of the former.  

The nature and size of the attributed grants differed either, according to the status of the feudatories or according to the personal favour of the king dispensed on them. The partial attitude of the king might had also been resulted from the material gain brought to the state by

---

66 See Chapter II of this thesis.
68 *Lekhapaddhāti*, p.20.
69 There were various categories of grants, including desya (grant of a principality – rashtra), karaja (grant of usufruct over of a principality – rashtra) gramaja (grant of a village) sasana (permanent assignments), (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.143). It is notable that regarding the nature of lands possessed by these chiefs, Laxmidhara in his *Krityakalpataru* explains the term despati as warrior. (Ibid., p.143). Sometimes, the feudatories also reunited the lordship of visaya, mandala and group of villages in remuneration of their services. The titles like desathakkura mandalika, mahamandalika, mandalesavara, probably denote to such type of lordship.
some of the feudatories. The practice of granting land in lieu of the military service continued till a very late date. As said in earlier chapter, in some rare cases the cash allowances were also provided to the feudatories for the maintenance of troops, offered by them to their overlords. Sometimes, the king also distributed horses, precious jewels, gold and money to feudatory soldiers, as a reward of their bravery in a delighted mood.

It may undoubtedly be claimed on the basis of the available data that the maulas were the great commanders of the Rajput forces. The Arab traveller, Merchant Sulaiman (9th century AD) most probably refers to such levies, while writing about the troops of Indian kings, who "came out to fight for their king, though they received no pay from him".

Bhrita troops, who were regarded next to maulas in order of preference and recruited from various quarters and distant lands were in direct service of the king. Being in regular

---

70 One of the charters of the 18th century, collected by Tod, records the grant of a patta of a pargana by maharaja Jagat Singh to rawat Lal Singh on the condition of the performance of military service with 200 horses and 200 foot, whenever required. (Tod, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, Vol.1, Appendix, grant No.V, p.234). A similar grant was made by maharana Sangram Singh of Mewar to his nephew prince Madho Singh, who was required to perform service with 1,000 horse and 2000 foot, during six months annually and with 3000 foot and 3000 horse, when foreign service was required. (Ibid., Grant VI, p.235). It is also found mentioned that the lands will be retained by the vassals so long as they would perform their services. One of the records refers to the warranting order of a chief of Bijolli to his subordinate chief to serve him by one good horse and one matchlock, with other appurtenances at home and abroad (Ibid., pp.234-35).

71 Lekhapaddhati, p.10.

72 The great king Prithviraja Chauhan usually rewarded his vassals with precious gifts, including jewels, gold, horses, elephants etc. to encourage them for further fight. (Prithvirajraso, op.cit., p.516, V.108).

73 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.1, p.7.

74 There are references in Pala and Sena inscriptions to the recruitment of such troops from Malava, Khasa, Huna, Kulika, Karnataka and Lat countries (B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.47). Kalhana refers to the recruitment of mercenaries from Rajputana, Sind and Rajgriha in Magadha. (Rajtarangini, VII, 979, 1302, VIII, 2007, VII, 1149, 1501, 1868). Chandesvara specially refers to the soldiers from Kurukshetra, Matsya, Panchal, Sursena and speaks them to be placed at the
service such troops were always found ready in service of the king, in return to which they were regularly paid by him in cash, unlike the *maula* troops.\(^75\)

Our sources also provide information regarding the salary paid to the regular soldiers. *Manasollasa* refers that the king should pay regularly and without delay the salaries to the hired soldiers. The salaries were to be paid daily, three monthly, half yearly or yearly in accordance with their work.\(^76\) Medhatihi makes mention that the soldiers under the feudatory chiefs did not fight like their masters for their own interest but received regular wages for their services (*bhritiparikritas*).\(^77\) *Agni Purana* also advises the king to make regular payment to the troops as it could be a contributory factor in enhancing the strength of army.\(^78\) Kamandaka states that a force, which is paid without any delay fight with greater enthusiasm, than that, which is not

---

\(^{75}\) Literary sources of our period may well prove the fact that the salaries to these troops were provided in cash instead of kind. Both *Sankhalikhita* quoted alike in *Krityakalpataru* (*Rajdharma Kanda*, pp.82ff.) and *Rajnitiprakash* (p.252, Cf. K.K. Gopal, "Feudal Composition of Army", op.cit., Vol.28, pp.30-31) lay down that a soldier should be paid monthly by two *suvarnas* (gold coins). *Ganitīsarsamgraha*, a mathematical text provides rules about the calculations of cash salaries, received by mounted soldiers (*arohaka*), (Ibid.) *Chaturvimsatiprabandha* also reveals a story of three Rajputs, coming to the service of the Chalukya king Virdhavala, who even on being pleased with their bravery and address denied to admit them, for they demanded a *lakh* coins (*drammas*) as their salaries (Kathavate’s Introd. to the 1st ed. of *Kirtikaumudi*, pp.56-57). *Rasmala* too in connection of a story refers that once prince Jugdev, son of the Paramara king Udayajit joined the services of a Solunkee king Sidhraj Jayasingh owing to a family dispute, demanding an amount of 1,000 crowns per day. But the king, surprisingly, ordered to pay him 2000 crowns, per day from the royal treasury. After sometime, testing the fidelity of this Rajput, the king decided to increase the salary to 100,000 everyday (*Rasmala*, Vol.I, p.140). However, the amount mentioned herein seems to be exaggerated there is no doubt on the sincerity of Indian kings to pay their soldiers.


\(^{78}\) *Agni Purana*, Cf. P.B. Udgaonkar, op.cit., p.140.
properly paid. Merchant Sulaiman also speaks of the mode of regular payment by Balharas in such a manner. He states, "The Balahara is the most eminent of the princes of India and the Indians acknowledge his superiority. Every prince in India is master in his own state but all pay homage to the supremacy of the Balahara..."80 "He gives regular pay to his troops, as the practice is among the Arabs."81

In addition to the regular wages the soldiers were provided with remunerations including presents (dana), reward (paritosika) for service, valour etc.82 There was also a provision of pensions and other concessions for the sons and the dependents of soldiers, who sacrificed their lives during the course of their duties.83

Though, the reliability of these troops was often a matter of suspicion. Kautilya84 while praising them for their readiness to march at any time on the order of the king suspects their vulnerability by stating that such troops rallied round the banner of the king, expecting for the gain of a large amount of booty.85 He further states that having no hereditary attachment with the king, they feel no hesitation even in deserting the cause of their master, in case the fortunes turned against him.86 Following Kautilya, Kamandaka, not imparting a high reliance on the service of bhrita troops advises the king to employ them in nearby campaigns of short duration, which are not likely to involve heavy losses or destruction, when his forces are most united, so much so that the enemy could not be successful to create disaffection among them and when the

79 Nitisara, XIII.
80 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.1, p.3.
81 Ibid.
82 Sukraniti, p.181, V.85, p.183 (V.8).
83 Ibid.
84 Arthasastra, IX, Chapter II.
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
king does not possess sufficient equipment of war.\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Rajnitiratnakar} also refers that these troops had the tendency to fight for their wages and therefore in case of danger of their lives, there is every likelihood of their desertion.\textsuperscript{88}

It appears that the \textit{mitra} troops were usefully employed by the sovereign kings to bring about the defeat or humiliation of a common enemy to themselves and the allied powers. The Rajput policy was based on clan hierarchy. The summons were usually issued by the kings to the kings of other Rajput clans, with whom the friendly relations were maintained, to assist militarily. In other words, several Rajput clans had the tradition to face the enemy unitedly. Thus, in order to face the invasion of Mahmud, both Jaipal and Anandpal issued orders to invite the assistance of the \textit{rajas} of Ujjain, Gwalior, Kannauj, Delhi, Ajmer and Kalanjar. It is known that these kings entered into a confederacy and collecting their forces advanced towards Punjab with a huge army.\textsuperscript{89} The Gahadawala king Jayachandra is said to have allied with the Chandella king Parmardi and helped him in his wars against Prithviraja.\textsuperscript{90} The Chandella king Kirtivarman is also known to have entered into an alliance with the Chalukyas, Paramaras and Palas in order to defeat a common enemy, named Jayasimha of Chalukya dynasty.\textsuperscript{91} But the kings were most dependent on the strength of \textit{maula} troops. R.S. Sharma seems to be right in suggesting that the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Nitisar}, p.393, Ch.19, VV.15-17.
\item \textit{Rajnitiratnakar}, I, p.80, VV.568-70.
\item \textit{Prithvirajraso}, op.cit.
\item Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit., p.224.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
kings during this period relied more on the troops supplied by the feudatories than their own standing forces.\(^92\)

*Srenibala* was incorporated either from the tribal bands of mercenaries or from the corporations of soldiers or the economic guilds, which maintained their own independent armies in order to protect their wealth, property, centres and caravans from the ravages of frequent wars and foreign invasions.\(^93\) *Arthasastra* refers to *srenis*, who resorted to trade and industry in addition to the practice of arms as a means of livelihood.\(^94\) The source prescribes some significance to *srenibala* by exposing that such troops belonged to the king's land and had the same expectations of loss and gain.\(^95\) While, *Manasollasa* states to the *maula, bhriya* and *mitra* troops as the only three good armies and to the *sreni* troops as unreliable.\(^96\) The unreliability of *srenibala* is further commented by Chandeswar, a fourteenth century statesman, that such troops were paid for their services but flee from the battlefield, whenever they find their lives in danger.\(^97\) Sukra had neglected these troops perhaps on account of their questionable fidelity or loyalty, while mentioning to the other categories of troops.\(^98\) It appears that the *sreni* troops were credited for their trustworthiness during the time of Kautilya. But during our period, the constant

---

93 Shamasasya regards *srenibala* to mean the corporation of soldiers. (*Arthasastra*, tr. Shamasasya, Bk.IX, Ch.II) D.R. Bhandarkar thinks it to be tribal band of mercenaries (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.5). While, according to R.C. Majumdar, it meant a class of guilds, which followed some industrial occupation but maintained military force, probably for their own protection (R.C. Majumdar, *Corporate Life in Ancient India*, pp.30-31).
94 *Arthasastra*, Bk.IX, Ch.II.
95 Ibid., p.316.
98 *Sukraniti*, Ch.IV, op.cit., p.156.
decline of trade and commerce as a consequence of feudalism resulted in the gradual decrease of such troops in the composition of armies. However, some rural people engaged in other occupations were recruited in the royal army in times of emergency.\textsuperscript{99}

It was usual for the Indian kings to have alliances against the common enemy. For example, the Chahmana king Prithviraja III got assistance of Chandraraja, the governor of Delhi, who was the son of Govindaraja, the Chahmana king of some other line.\textsuperscript{100} Once Bhoja Paramara, Gangeyadeva Kalachuri and Rajendra Chola, also formed a confederacy to fight against Jayasimha of Chalukya dynasty.\textsuperscript{101} Earlier, the king of Gujarat, Pulkesin and the Rashtrakuta Dantidurga are known to have joining hands in order to repulse the Arab invasion in AD 738.\textsuperscript{102}

Kamandaka declaring *mitras*, as superior to *aribala* advises their employment in the situation of common interest of the ally and the king in different campaigns of shorter duration in diplomatic wars without any consideration to place and time.\textsuperscript{103} However, the unreliability of these troops is being proved from many instances during our period.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{99} S.P. Narang, *Dvasrayakavya, A Literary and Cultural Study*, pp. 177-78.
\textsuperscript{100} R.C. Majumdar, *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 109-110.
\textsuperscript{101} Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit., p. 224.
\textsuperscript{103} *Nitisara*, p. 394, Ch. 19, V. 20.
\textsuperscript{104} It is a well known fact that soon after the death of Bhoja Paramara, the allied powers separated themselves by withdrawing their support. (see Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit., Ch. VII). Both Merutunga and Hemchandra refer to an intense feud between the Chalukya king Bhima and the Kalachuri king Karna. According to him the feeling between the allies ran so high, after the fall of Dhara, that once the ambassador of Bhima entered the royal pavilion in a great fury with thirty-two foot soldiers and took Karna prisoner, when he was asleep in the middle of the day (H.C. Ray, *DHNI*, II, pp. 950-51, also see B.P. Mazumdar, p. 46). Similarly, the Paramara kings Bhoja and Gangeyadeva were the friends of Vidyadhara Chandella but a few years later, Gangeyadeva was known to have attacked the Chandella kingdom (N.S. Bose, *History of the Chandellas*, p. 144). Kirtivarman, one of the Chandella kings is also referred to had formed a confederacy with the Chalukyas, Paramaras and Palas in order
The next in order of preference was *aribala*. These troops were somehow related to the enemy king and therefore they must have naturally been the subject of great suspicion with regard to their own reliability and faithfulness. Even then, their employment is laid down by the lawgivers of our period. Sukra states that a king should include the ablest persons abandoned by the enemy in his own army by paying them to his best. But, he makes the king alert that such an army subdued by a king are the weakest and can not perform any task independently. Kamandaka advises the king to employ them, if under complete domination and sufficient strength in plundering the enemy’s territory and in weeding out the thorns (obstacles and difficulties) in the forest-forts of frontier stations. Chandesvara observes that a king accepts such troops only with a view to enfeeble the power of the enemy and as such no confidence should be placed on them, in his view. However, the practical use of these troops is reflected from some of our sources. *Chachnamah* states that at the time of the Arab invasion of Sind, Rai Dahar, the ruler of Sind had five hundred Arab troops in his service. Similarly, king Harsha of

---

105 *Manasollasa* considers *amitra* or *ari* troops consisting of soldiers, who once belonged to an enemy king but taken captive and made slaves after his defeat (Vol.1, *Vismsati II*, 6.557-60). *Rajnitiratnakar* (ed. Jayaswal, p.35) defines *aribala* as troops, which came to a king after leaving his enemy.

106 *Sukraniti*, op.cit., p.156.

107 *Nitisara*, p.395, V.22.


Kashmir is also known to have incorporated a number of Turushka soldiers in his army.\(^{110}\) Possibly, some of the Rajput rulers following such examples might have included some such troops in their armies, either for the operation of technical weapons like war machines (variously termed as manjaniqs, arra'das, maghrabis etc.), to which the Hindus were not so much familiar. Mohd. Habib seems to be correct in assuming that such siege engines were originally constructed by skilled Musalmans in the service of Hindu rais.\(^{111}\)

The practice of the recruitment of enemy soldiers was also adopted by the Turks. Rehla informs us that a large number of Hindu swordsmen were recruited in the state army and very often in the private levies of rebel princes.\(^{112}\) It is also stated that the honour provided to them was so great that they were allowed to keep drums and flags.\(^{113}\) The army of Mahmud of Ghazna also included the Hindus as soldiers and is said to have been commanded by a Hindu general at one stage.\(^{114}\) Razia recruited several Hindu soldiers in her army.\(^{115}\) It is, then, evident that the army of Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq was also comprised of different racial and tribal elements including the Hindus. Isami informs us that when the news of Mongol invasion reached to him, he sent an army commanded by some Hindu and Muslim officers.\(^{116}\) The army of Muhammad-

---

\(^{110}\) \textit{Rajtarangini}, VII, 1149.

\(^{111}\) Elliot \& Dowson, Vol.II, Introd., p.47.

\(^{112}\) Rehla tr. Mahdi Husain, Introduction.

\(^{113}\) Ibid., tr. p.8.


\(^{116}\) Mahdi Husain, \textit{Tughlaq Dynasty}, p.73.
Bin Tughlaq is also stated to have composed of Turks, Khitamis, Persians and Indians. The incorporation of the Hindus in the Turkish army during the times of Nasiruddin Khusrau increased to such an extent that the army in itself was regarded as “half Muslim and half Hindu”.

These Hindus serving the Muslims were undoubtedly those subdued rais and ranas, who after accepting the suzerainty of the Muslims, had got the status of tributary chiefs. Sometimes, such tributary chiefs helped the Sultans by making arrangement of provisions for their armies.

---


Praising the liberality of Sultan Muhammad-bin Tughlaq for conferring upon high posts to lowborn Hindus, Barani states that he assigned the post of diwan-i-wizarat to Pera Mali (the gardener) (*Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi*, Hindi tr. A.A. Rizvi, *Tughlaq Kalin Bharat*, Part I, p.68) Rehla also informs us that the high posts were held by the Hindus under Muh. Bin Tughlaq. It also refers to one Ratan, who was appointed as the governor of Sind with the title of Azim-us-Sind (*Rehla*, tr. p.8.).

118 *Tughlaqnamah* tr. A.A. Rizvi, *Khalji Kalin Bharat*, p. 190.

119 *Chachnamah* presents a list of several ranas of Sind as tributaries to Multan in the days of Nasiruddin Qubacha. (*Chachnamah*, op.cit., also see H.C. Ray, *DHNI*, I, p.37). Tod is his *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* refers to some princes of Rajasthan, who surrendered themselves to the Muslims and in return received gifts and mansabs, offering their presence to Sultan, whenever required (Vol.I, p.177). Barani states that when Malik Chajju raised the banner of revolt against Firuz Shah “*The rawats and paiks* of Hindustan flocked around him like ants and locusts and the most noted of them received betel from him and promised to fight against the standards of Sultan”. (Elliot & Dowson, III, p.138). Hasan Nizami states that the son of Rai Pithora, after the death of his father also received the same status (*DHNI*, II, p.1091). There are numerous other examples of this type in the contemporary history.

120 For details see *Tarikh-i-Firishta*, tr. Briggs, Vol.I, p.212, which refers to Rai Ramdev for providing all facilities to the army of Malik Kafur, while at march towards Warangal and *Tabakat-i-Nasiri* mentioning about the order of the Rai of Kamrud for the provision of grains to the army of Malik Yuz Bak, when he was trapped at Kamrud. (tr. Raverty, Vol.II, p.765).
The forest troops (*atatikas*) composed of the wild tribesmen and forest dwellers were regarded as worst type. *Nitisara* condemning them as dishonest, greedy, uncultured and faithless;\(^{121}\) entrusts them in weeding out the thorns (*kantakasodhana*) in fortified areas of enemy's dominion like those of enemy troops.\(^{122}\) While, at one place, the author of the above text advises the king to place them wisely at the forefront while entering the enemy's territory.\(^{123}\) The king sought his assistance in critical circumstances or when their own archers appeared unable to hold the situation. *Kiratarjuniya* of Vatsaraj denotes that the existence of the high notion of chivalrous ideals led to the restricted incorporation of forest troops in the army.\(^{124}\) However, they performed well in some critical circumstances as formidable archers and warriors.

It is stated by Firishta in commendable terms, how Mahmud of Ghazna, while fighting against Anandpala, the king of Lahore was opposed by Ghakkars, "The archers were opposed by the Gukkurs, who inspite of the king's efforts and presence repulsed his light troops and followed them so closely that no less than 30,000 Gukkars with their heads and feet bare and armed with various weapons penetrated into the Mohmedan lines, where a dreadful battle ensued and 5,000 Mohmedans in a few minutes were slain."\(^{125}\) *Rasmala* also refers that when Sidhraj Jay Singh Solunkee prepared to go to Ujjain with his army, some Bhil chieftains with their followers joined him in order to fight from his side.\(^{126}\) They also played laudable roles during night attacks.

\(^{121}\) *Nitisara*, op.cit., Ch.19, p.390, VV.6-8.  
\(^{122}\) Ibid., Ch.19, p.395, V.22.  
\(^{123}\) Ibid.  
\(^{124}\) B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.207.  
(nisavaskandin) and deceitful warfare (chala or maya). It is again evident that the Chalukya king, Kumarapala of Gujarat, while marching against the Chahmana king, was assisted by the forest tribes and mountaineers clad in the skins of deer.

Besides the above mentioned six-fold composite units of army, several subsidiary corps, consisting of labourers, fullers, washers, miners, sapers etc. were also accompanied with the main army. Nitisara of Kamandaka refers to labour force (visti) entrusted with the task of purification or repair, rebuilding etc. of pits and marshes (on the track), construction of roads, pitching up of tents and performing other miscellaneous duties whatever they could possibly do. Rajdharma kanda, a section of Krityakalpataru of Laxmidhara, quoting a verse from Mahabharata refers to the employment of labour forces (visti) in the army. Kamhadadeprabandha makes reference to men, carrying pick-axes (kudala), at some distance ahead of army to make the route passable. Rajtarangini mentions that the Kashmir forces were also accompanied by numerous camp followers such as cooks, washermen, sweepers, watermen, cartsmen etc. Prabandhcin tamani, too, refers to the commissariat department in the army of

127 They attacked the back portion of army in the guise of a Brahmana or saint. Sometimes, underground mines or pits were dug to solve the object or to equip the arms and weapons or other material used in war. (S.P. Narang, opcit., pp.177-78).
129 “शोधने जूड़ीबाणीं मार्गमिश्र शिविरस्त्र च।
वफसादी च यत्सकिन्हद्व विस्त्तेन विरंचकमंत्तु (विरंचकमंत्तु) ।”
(Nitisara, Ch.20, p.415, V.32).

Kautilya also refers to the employment of labour forces for clearing out the camps, roads, waterworks, mills and ponds, carrying machines, weapons, armour, implements, food and removing out weapons, armour and wounded men from the battlefield (Arthasastra, Kangle II, p.444).
131 Kanhadadeprabandh, p.5.
132 Rajtarangini, V.11, 1457, VIII, 808 etc.
Prithviraja Chauhan\textsuperscript{133} whereas, in \textit{Sisupalvadh}\textsuperscript{134} and \textit{Tilakmanjari},\textsuperscript{135} together, we get the mention of private merchants in the army.

References are also there to the availability of ambulance corps including the physicians, surgeons, nurses etc. along with the main army. Special appointments were made to garrison the experienced physicians with surgical instruments, apparatus, medicines, oils and bandages etc. near the battlefield, so that they might tend the sick and wounded.\textsuperscript{136}

An analytical study of the above components justifiably alludes that the armies were mainly composed of feudal levies as a resultant of a developed feudal system, characterised by increasing number of land-grants together with an impoverished economy, which led to the dependency of king on feudatories for the providence of military and other services. But there were also certain basic disadvantages of this system. First of all, the king became too heavily dependent on the forces of his feudatories that he could not undertook even a single minor military campaign without their personal attendance and assistance. The position of the king was again miserable, in case his discontented feudatories were not ready to assist him in wars. There are numerous instances of the outrageous attitude of discontented vassals, owing to the weak

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Prabandhcintamani}, tr. Tawney, p.190.

\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Sisupalvadh}, XII, V.26.


\textsuperscript{136} See \textit{Mahabharata, Santipurva}, XCV.13, 12, also see V.R.R. Dikshitar, op.cit., p.186.

\textit{Rajtarangini} also makes references to an ambulance corp which was responsible for carrying the dead and wounded to a place of safety, dispensing the dead and treating the wounded (op.cit., VIII, 740-41). This might had also been true of the other armies of northern India. The Turkish army also consisted of such corps. \textit{Adab-ul-Harb-Wa-Shujjat} has mentioned the existence of doctors, physicians etc. in the armies of the Turks (A.A. Rizvi, \textit{Adi Turk Kalin Bharat}, p.264).
position of the king. Sometimes, in case of weak kings, the feudatories raised the banner of revolt and took back their allegiance. \textit{Agni Purana} also speaks of such rebellious and discontented vassals. Medhatithi, vehemently, discusses the policy that should be pursued by a lonely and helpless king, whose feudatories had gone against him and who was incapable of taking stand against them. But, surprisingly none of the supporters of royalty in northern India had taken any interest to advice the king for lessening the amount of dependence on feudatory forces.

The appeasement of feudatories by the king or the overlord before marching for the military campaigns had been a general practice of those times. \textit{Manasollasa} counseled the king to convene an assembly of the princes, feudatories, rulers of \textit{mandalas} and soldiers, on the day preceding the date of laying out on an expedition and to satisfy them with the presents of gold, dresses and ornaments and encourage them by singing their praises. \textit{Sukranitisara} also lays

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textcite{Dashrath Sharma} states that "even the most well laid out plans of the Chauhans, sometimes, miscarried, because feudal levies were after all feudal levies quick to muster, quick at times also to strike but incapable of sustained and concerted action for any long period" (\textit{Early Chauhan Dynasties}, p.215). Such circumstances might had been faced by the Chauhan kings of post-Prithviraja period, due to their weak position.
  \item Eventually, the feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratihara, Bhoja and Mahendrapala were under control, while those of Rambhadra, whose position was weak, had taken over their allegiance from him. \textcite{B.N. Puri} Similarly, in the dispelled reighn of Mahipala, the Paramaras of Malwa had tried to become independent. \textcite{Dashrath Sharma, \textit{Rajasthan Through the Ages}, p.356}.
  \item \textit{Agni Purana}, Ch.CCXLI, op.cit., p.865.
  \item \textit{Medhatithi on Manu}, VII, p.106.
  \item The two south Indian statesmen, Baddena and Pratapprudradev of Kakatiya kingdom of Warangal pioneered in this direction, providing some attention to this matter. Baddena advises the king to maintain his independent strong military force and not to inculcate any of his feudatories in it. Likewisely, Pratapprudradeva also urges the king to assign only small villages to \textit{samantas}, reserving the big ones for the replenishment of treasury and the maintenance of his personal army. \textcite{Yazdani, \textit{Early History of the Deccan}, Vol.II, p.668}.
\end{itemize}
down that a king should make peace with his own feudatories before going out to conquer his enemies. In *Agni Purana*, too, the king is advised to attain the favour of the leader of his own army, the warriors, the rural population (*janapadadikas*), *samantäs* and forest people, who are not well disposed towards him by means of the gifts of money. *Prabandhacintamani* refers that king Mularaja before marching for the conquest of Sapadlaksha issued summons to his *samantas* and foot soldiers and bestowed honour to them by making presents.

The second major weakness was that the army composed of a number of feudatories was not unitary but heterogeneous in nature. They are often found indulged in private wars. Thus, Dammanapala of Khadi *mandala* made his neighbouring *samantas* of Sundarban helpless after waging war against them. Kirtipala, a brother of Kelhana of Naddula and a feudatory of the Chalukyas, both are known to had fought against the feudatory Paramara line of Jalor and deprived them of their territories. Further, the *Rajim stone inscription* informs us that the *mandalesvaras* of Maryurika and Savanta were terrorised by Jagapala, a feudatory of Jajalladeva I of Kalachuri family of Ratanpur. It is also mentioned in the same inscription that owing to this

143 *Sukraniti*, Ch.IV, Sect.VII.
144 *Agni Purana*, op.cit., Ch.CCXLI, p.870.

Chandesvara (14th C. AD) speaks a lot about the legal status of feudatories. He in the capacity of a feudatory describes himself as *maharaja* (B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.23). His father's younger brother, Ganeswar is described in his son, Ramadatta's *Chandogyamantrodhara* as *maharajadhiraja mahasamantapalitam mahamahattakesa*, while his another son Govindatta describes him in *govindamanasollasa* as *srimanesa mahamahataka maharajadhiraja mahasamantadhipatir vikasvara-yasah-pusparya janmadrumah* (Ibid., p.23).

Such grandiloquent titles of feudatories are indicators of the weak position of the king in respect to his feudatories.

145 *Prabandhacintamani*, S.J.G., p.17.
146 *IHQ*, X, p.326.
147 *DHNI*, II, pp.919 & 925.
terror, the *mandalesvaras* of Savanta had to flee to the mountains. The period of the Gurjara-Pratiharas, which was characterised with greater political stability than those of their successors was, too, engulfed with the mutual rivalries of the feudatories. Thus, Avanivarmana II, a feudatory of Gurjara-Pratihara king, Nagabhatta and the great grandson of Bahukadhavala had intermittent struggle with the feudatories named Dharanivaraha and Yakshadasa. Similarly, the feudatories of Mahendrapala I, Undabhatta and Gunaraja I are noted for an instant fight between them. The feudatories coming from different regions were not guided by patriotism but by mutual rivalries among themselves. Owing to such rivalries and internecine feuds they did never try to create a unitary strength of their own, but cared only for their personal gains and benefits.

The loyalties of the soldiers of such heterogeneous forces were never ensued with certainty, as they were interested in their personal gains and just welcomed the ambitious designs of a powerful king because they had to be appeased with land and weapons before going out for campaigns. The loyalty from such soldiers could hardly be expected. The disloyalty of such feudatory forces to their master may certainly be proved from the accounts of contemporary literary sources. Medhatithi extolls the ideal of personal loyalty for a soldier and states that one, who deserts his master in battle goes to hell, while one valiantly fighting for his lord, attains heaven. *Sisupalvadh* also lays down a code of morality for a soldier by stating that a warrior should not give up his life in a battle unless he is paid of his obligation by his loyalty.

---

148 IA, XVI, p.135 ff.
151 Medhatithi on Manu, VII, p.89.
152 Sisupalvadh, XIX, VV.38, 57.
In actual practice, too, the ideal of loyalty to the overlord was weak and sacrificed to a great extent. Numerous cases of defection have already been cited in Chapter II. We find in *Tilakmanjari* that the turbulent feudal chiefs were forced by the orders of the overlord to join him, while unwilling to fight.\(^\text{153}\) The disloyalty of the feudatories to their masters on the battlefield had become such a common practice that Jayanaka in his *Prithvirajavijaya* views it as one of the natural effects of *kali* age.\(^\text{154}\) The kings often acquired victory over their neighbours by winning over their feudatories.\(^\text{155}\) It is also evident that Kumarapal had to face a great trouble owing to the defection of his feudatory, the Paramara chief of Chandravati against the Chahmana king Arnoraja.\(^\text{156}\) Again, the minister of king Kumarapala is known to have betrayed by a feudatory ruler of Godraha at a critical juncture during his operation against the king of Bharoch.\(^\text{157}\) *Hammirmahakavya* also presents the cases of military leader, who deserted their masters by turning to the sides of the enemies and participating in treacherous plans with them against their masters.\(^\text{158}\) *Rajtarangini* also refers to numerous such cases of disloyalty, treachery and desertion of the feudatory and military chiefs.\(^\text{159}\) In such an atmosphere, the individual soldiers, too, did not feel themselves personally attached to their master. The ideal of loyalty was regarded as supreme in theory but not followed in practice. The soldiers had no hesitation in running away from the battlefield. Hemachandra in his *Prakrit Vyakarana* took specific notice to the fear of a wife, supposing the fleeing of her husband from the battleground, which could bring

\(^{153}\) *Tilakmanjari*, pp.82, 114  
\(^{155}\) *Agni Purana* also advises the invading king to weaken his adversary by bringing about a quarrel among his sons and feudatories. (op.cit., CCXXVI, p.809).  
\(^{156}\) *IA*, 1925 (supplement), p.23.  
\(^{157}\) Ibid.  
\(^{158}\) *Hammirmahakavya*, XII.  
\(^{159}\) *Rajtarangini*, VIII, VV.923, 927, 2816ff., 2822ff.
an unbearable shame and infame to her.\textsuperscript{160} The individualistic approach of the soldiers, in general, may also not be ignored. Undoubtedly, they provided much attention in maintaining their personal valour, rather than arising the spirit of unity and loyalty among their fellowmen. The disloyalty of them in the army had increased to such an extent that, often, they did not regard themselves as inferior to the commander and disobeyed him relishly. *Tripurdaha* of Vatsaraja refers that the fighting chiefs outrageously coveted the honour of the commander, as they were jealous of his position.\textsuperscript{161}

Apart from the above drawbacks of the armies of our period, the clannish rivalries and dissentions were no less responsible for the disintegration of forces. The vanity of the clan and family among the Kshatriya chiefs of this time is strictly criticised by Kshemendra in his *Darpadalana*.\textsuperscript{162} It was owing to a false sense of pride that they always tried to maintain their separate entity, which further led to the feeling of jealousy and intermittent struggles among themselves. We learn from *Hammirmadmardana* that it was owing to baneful effect of the all-pervasive and ruinous discord among the Kshatriyas that ruling families of India vanished.\textsuperscript{163} The individuality of soldiers of our age is also indicated to a great deal in *Agni Purana*, the author of which advises to the commander to call them in the battle-array by their personal name and to remind them the glory of the heroic traditions of their respective clans or families, so that they could feel excited to fight the battle.\textsuperscript{164}

In some cases, the members belonging to the king’s own clans obstructed him to organise an effective army. Medhatithi refers that some of the members of the royal family, who desired

\textsuperscript{160} B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.214.  
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., p.208.  
\textsuperscript{163} B.N.S. Yadav,op.cit., p.206  
\textsuperscript{164} *Agni Purana*, CCXXXVI, p.846, VV.49-51.
to obtain the kingdom, alleviated themselves from him and began to act enemically.\textsuperscript{165}

\textit{Puratanaprabandhasangraha} also informs us that Pratapsimha, a relative of Prithviraja conspired with the Muslims against him.\textsuperscript{166} Bilhana also remarks that the members of royal families do not realise the position of the king as ordained by fate, to be enjoyed by only one of them but greedy of having it for themselves, they destroy the family itself.\textsuperscript{167}

The supervision, scrutiny, management and the arrangement of armed contingents and forces had not been possible without the existence of some higher grade of military officials like, \textit{mahasenadhipati} (the chief military officer), \textit{senapati},\textsuperscript{168} \textit{senadhipa} (suprintendent of infantry under the Chahmanas), \textit{baladhikrita}\textsuperscript{169} (commandant), \textit{baladhyaksha} (superintendent of forces), \textit{dandanayaka}\textsuperscript{170} (chief Judge), \textit{mahasandhivigrahika}\textsuperscript{171} (minister of peace and war). In order to

\textsuperscript{165} K.K. Gopal, \textit{JAHRS}, p.49.

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{Puratanaprabandhasangraha}, SJG No.2, see \textit{Prithvirajprabandh}.

\textsuperscript{167} Cf. K.K. Gopal, \textit{JAHRS}, XXVIII, p.49.

\textsuperscript{168} According to Laxmidhara, a man of good family, valiant, hardy, conversant in the use of different weapons and possessing some knowledge of elephants and other animals used in war, well versed in military strategy and formations of the army should be appointed as \textit{senapati} (Rajdharmakanda, p.23). Sukra also prescribes the same qualification for a \textit{senapti} (Sukraniti, Ch.IV, Sec.VII). The main duties of this important officer of war were to organise the fighting forces and to maintain their efficiency (see the use of the term in Gahadawala and Paramara records, \textit{EI}, IV, p.21, IA, XXV, pp.205-8).

\textsuperscript{169} In \textit{Harshacharita}; \textit{Baladhikrita} is referred as different from \textit{Senapati} and very much his junior (Harsacharita, V.S. Agarwal, pp.140-141). \textit{Upamitibhavaprapanchaka}ha mentioned him in the sense of a military officer (Dashrath Sharma, \textit{Rajasthan through the Ages}, p.333,34. Antaroli Charali Copper plate of Karkka II refers him next to the \textit{senapati} (Ibid., p.333). The title had been in common use in the records of the Chauhans, Malvakas and Kalachuris of Apranta area as an officer of army (Ibid.).

\textsuperscript{170} \textit{EI}, VI, p.92, CII, Vol.III, p.10.

Though, the actual meaning and significance of the term is yet to be determined, he was certainly an army officer. Often, he was also appointed as incharge of newly conquered territories and was entrusted with both civil and military functions. (Dashrath Sharma, \textit{Rajasthan through the Ages}, pp.331-32).

Prinsep has translated the term as "Trying magistrate" while Aurel Stein & R.S. Pandit regarded him as the Commissioner of Police (Ibid., p.332, fn.1). A.S. Altekar identified him as an officer of the status of colonel, stationed in different districts or villages as incharge of local army-units to help the local authorities in maintaining law and order. (A.S. Altekar, \textit{State and Government in Ancient India}, 3rd edition, Delhi, 1958, pp.195-96). In \textit{Tilakamanjari} of Dhanapala, (10th century) the designations, \textit{dandanayaka}, \textit{mahadandanayka}, \textit{mahadandadhipati}, \textit{vahinipati},\textit{ sainyapati} and
assist these officials, there were some others, lower in rank. These may be counted as *pattipala*\(^{172}\) (incharge of five or six foot soldiers), *gaulmika*\(^{173}\) (an Incharge of 30 foot soldiers), *satanika*\(^{174}\) (head of 100 foot soldiers) *sahasrika*\(^{175}\) and *ayuktika*\(^{176}\) (incharge of a thousand and ten thousand foot soldiers respectively) *vahinipatin, asvapati*\(^{177}\) (superintendent of cavalry), *mahasadhanika*\(^{179}\) (cavalry officer working under *asvapati*), *gajapati*\(^{180}\) (superintendent of

---

\(^{172}\) *senapati* are applied to one and the same officer; though it is not clear, whether he was holding these various offices, at one time or the offices were identical to one another (*Tilakmanjari*, op.cit.). *Pratapgarh inscription* of Mahendrapala II refers to one *mahadandanayaka* named Madhava, who stationed at Ujjaini and governed that part of the Pratihara empire (*EI*, XIV, pp.182ff.).

\(^{171}\) Laxmidhara, the author of *Krityakalpataru*, who was himself holding the office of *mahasandhivigrahika* in Gahadawala administration refers to the qualities of the latter as adept in six-fold policy, a judge of what was expedient and a diplomat (see *Rajdharmakanda*). His important duties were to receive envoys of friendly courts and usher them into the king’s presence, dealing with the envoys of the hostile army and drafting threatening letters to the enemy. (K.K. Handiqui, *Yasastilaka & Indian Culture*, p.107).

Some of the powerful feudatories had their own officers of war and peace, headed by *sandhivigrahika* (*Lekhapaddhati*, p.26, *EI*, XIX, p.73, II, 44-45, Ibid., XXI, p.54, V.29).


\(^{174}\) *Satanika* was expected to be well-versed in field-warfare and tactical methods. The duties like the training of soldiers and the supervision of military parades were assigned to him (*Sukraniti*. Ch.II, op. cit., p.43, V.42).

\(^{175}\) Ibid., V.41.

\(^{176}\) Ibid.

\(^{177}\) R.C. Majumdar takes it to mean the commander of armies, while in *Tilakmanjari*, the designations of *dandadhipati, mahadandadhipati* and *vahinipati* are referred of one and the same officer (D. Sharma, *Rajasthan through the Ages*, p. 331).

\(^{178}\) *Kuvalayamala*, p.23.

\(^{179}\) *Tilakamanjari*, op.cit., also see *EI*, XXXII, p.152.

elephants), *dussadhyas* or *dussadhasdanikas* (cavalry commander under senapati),
*mahyuddhapati* (officer incharge of armoury), *maryadadhurya* (warden of marches) etc.

These generals and officials were mostly paid through the landgrants. Besides, the land
endowments, the soldiers and officials were also provided with honorariums and gifts, on special
occasions, in accordance with the nature of their deeds. Emphasising the importance of this
point, Sukra lays down that the army well rewarded by gifts and honours and well supplied with
war provisions leads to victory and remains loyal even to an unrighteous and low born king.

181 *Harsha Inscription* (VS 1030) IA, 1913, p.58 and *Sevadi Plate of Ratnapala*, EI,


183 *Bailabhattaswamin inscription* (line 2, EI, I, 154). Dashrath Sharma compared his
duties with modern antapala and suggests that he might had been operating his
function from a frontier fort (*Rajasthan Through the Ages*, p.336). The important
duties assigned to him were to watch over the frontier and to prevent undesirable
or hostile persons to enter the kingdom. He was closely co-operated by the
superintendent of forts (Ibid.). Sometimes, the two officials were found combined
in one and the same person (Ibid).

184 Land-grants of officials is a most distinguished feature of a developed feudal age.
In the 7th century, Yuan Chwang refers to Harsha's ministers and officials,
maintaining themselves by the lands assigned to them from state. (*Beal, Buddhist
Records of the Western World*, Bk.II, p.88). The epigraphic evidences of our age,
too, clearly refer to the prevalence of this practice. Thus, *Icchawar grant of the
Chandella king Parmardideva* refers to the grant of a village by the king in
Nandakanan *visaya* to his General Madanapalasarmana. (*IA*, XXV, p. 205).
Likewise, a rock inscription of the period of Bhojavarmana informs us of an
endowment of the grant of village to one Maheshwara, who was appointed as the
commander of Kalanjar fort by the Chandella king Kirttivarmana (*EI*, I, p.336). A
commander of the Chandella king, Trailokyavarman is also referred to have
received the revenue of the village probably as its lord. There is no evidence to a
cash salary provided to him by the king himself. (*EI*, I, p.337). Similarly,*thakkura*
Jajjuka of the Vastavya Kayastha family, who was appointed to
superintend at all times, all the affairs of the state during the reign of Ganda was
granted a fief of the village of Dugauda by the latter, possibly in remuneration of
his service (*EI*, I, pp.330-36, V.9). There are many other instances of such
payment in the landgrants of our period.

185 *Sukraniti*, Ch.IV, Sect.VII.
Kamandaka also states that the soldiers should be rewarded after their success in the ventures.\textsuperscript{186} Rajtarangini refers that the soldiers and officials were given special allowances on the eve of the military expedition.\textsuperscript{187} The statement of Kalhana is being substantiated by Sukra, who recommends an increase of 24\% in pay on the eve of expedition.\textsuperscript{188} Though, the epigraph of our period do not appear to present any such evidence, it appears that such a practice of sanctioning higher emoluments during an expedition might had been followed by the Rajput rulers of our period.

The role of \textit{dutas} (envoys or emissaries), who were quite active in observing the proper and improper happenings in his own estate and in that of his enemy’s, secretly in the guise of merchants, physicians, astrologer, religious mendicants etc. was also not less important and valuable.\textsuperscript{189} Owing to their significant secret services offered to the king, they were regarded as a sort of second sight for him.\textsuperscript{190} The king was expected to look after through their eyes as well, otherwise there were chances of his being tumbled down.\textsuperscript{191} They are also compared by the Smriti writers to the sun in the energy and the wind in the movements\textsuperscript{192} According to Sukra a king disregarding the services of a spy was a Mleccha, while one who remained unmindful towards them was inimical to intelligence and one’s own destroyer.\textsuperscript{193} Owing to their important

\begin{itemize}
  \item 186 Cf. Udgaonkar, op.cit., p.141.
  \item 187 \textit{Rajtarangini}, VII, 1457, VIII, V.808 etc.
  \item 188 “यानेल्लारभ्रूम्भरुस्त्व भूषणवर्धनान्म:”
  \hspace{1cm} \textit{(Sukraniti, Ch.IV, Sect.VII, op.cit., p.180, V.72)}.
  \item 189 \textit{Agni Purana} op.cit., pp.790-91.
  \item 190 Ibid., also see K.K. Handiqui, op. cit., p.109.
  \item 191 \textit{Nitivakyamrita}, Ch.14, V.1, p.118, also see \textit{Nitisara} of Kamandaka.
  \item 192 V.B. Mishra, \textit{The Gurjara – Pratiharas and their Times}, p.78.
  \item 193 \textit{Sukraniti}, Ch.1, VV.29-30, 33, op.cit., p.12.
\end{itemize}
position in the state, some of the spies had raised their powers in the presence of weak kings. *Nitisara* refers to such an extent that some of them were powerful enough to take the important decisions of war and peace.\(^{194}\) Though, during our period the services of spies were often suspected, as some of them were not sincere and conveyed false reports to the kings. *Lalitvigraraharajanataka* informs us that a long awaited spy of the Chahmana prince came back with an almost nil report regarding the army of the enemy.\(^{195}\)

However, there are some instances of the important role of spies also. For instance, the spy of Hammir, in the guise of a beggar is known to have conveyed detailed reports of the army to the king, with the specific number of troops, prepared for fight.\(^{196}\) In another instance, king Vastupala of Gujarat is also known to have gained a supreme advantage over the neighbouring kings through an effective and efficient espionage.\(^{197}\) Kalhana writes that the spies in the Kashmir army were such firebrands that they often destroyed the fortified enemies by means of weapons, poisons and other things.\(^{198}\)

It was owing to the real importance of this institution that the Turks were also remained quite attentive to maintain the trained and efficient spies and scouts, as secret agents.\(^{199}\) However, the Rajput rulers of our period totally failed to maintain such agents in their armies.

---

\(^{194}\) *Nitisara*, tr. Mitra, p.259.

\(^{195}\) B.N.S. Yadav, op cit., p. 215.


\(^{197}\) Ibid.

\(^{198}\) *Rajtarangini*, VIII, V.2200.

\(^{199}\) Scouts called *talaya* or *muqaddam-i-paish* instigated for relevant informations, warring much ahead of the army. *Fakhr-i-Mudabbir* after praising them for their intelligence and experience, states that they warred in groups and in condition of conveying any information to the commander-in-chief, only one of them returned to the camp, while others kept themselves engaged in their duties. (*Adab-ul-Harb*, in A.A. Rizvi, *Adi Turk Kalin Bharat*, p.260). It was the force of scouts, which conveyed the useful information regarding the disunity between the Pandyan
Women's participation in war is also evident from our sources though the instances of such participation are few.\(^{200}\) The role of queens, though was certainly quite significant as an aide of the king. In some cases she might be regarded as a source of inspiration to her husband, while in some have specifically shown their awesome fighting spirit and real courage lied in the Kshatriya blood. The instances are not lacking in the latter case. *Chachnamah* states that after the death of king Dahar, his queen took a bold step to resist the enemy and made preparations for war in the fort of Raor with the assistance of some princes.\(^{201}\) There are also references to Kashmir ladies such as Chudda and Silla, who fought as the heads of their armies.\(^{202}\) *Prabandhacintamani* also refers that after the accession of Muharaja II, his mother Naiki fought at Gadadarghatta and conquered the king of Mlecchas by the aid of the mass of rain clouds that came out of season attacked by her virtue\(^{203}\) Mingled with a patriotic feeling and the instinct of bravery and courage the Rajput queen Karmadavi also fought against Qutbuddin Aibek.\(^{204}\)
The recruitment of soldiers and officials in the army was never bounded by caste rules.\(^{205}\) The qualification as well as the hereditary background of the person might have been a sole factor in the recruitment of the army-men. The lawgivers of our period also do not pay any importance to the caste in this sphere.\(^{206}\)

The adoption of military service by castes other than the Kshatriya has also been proved from the epigraphic evidences of the contemporary age. Inscriptions of the Chandellas,

\(^{205}\) Even in Vedic period, there are references to Vaishyas recruited as foot soldiers, while the bulk of the army was formed of Kshatriya leaders (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.76). The epic literature on the other hand refers to Brahman warriors. (B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.43). The training of a Brahman lad in archery has also been a subject of a Jataka story. (B.K. Majumdar, op.cit., p.29). The statement of Kautilya that the Brahmana and Kshatriya soldiers were superior than those who were recruited from two lower castes, is a clear indication of the inclusion of Vaishyas and Sudras, in the army as soldiers (Arthasastra, Bk.IX, Ch.2). Epigraphic records of the Gupta and post Gupta period also reveal the names of Brahmana generals (see B.P Mazumdar, p.43). However, in those days a person belonging the mixed caste could also be appointed on the post of army general. (Tipperah copper plate of Lokanath (AD 650) (EI, Vol.X, No.15, p.72).

Similar references of caste unconsciousness in the recruitment also noticed in earlier South Indian records. (G.P. Sinha, op.cit., p. 138).

\(^{206}\) Sukra regards to caste not as a determinant factor to judge the quality or ability of a soldier. He considers that the Sudras, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, Mlecchas and the persons of mixed castes, should be incorporated in the army on the condition of their bravery, self-discipline, good physique and sincerity to the master and hatredness towards the enemy. He also states that the Brahmana, who fights bravely in this world gets fame, for the virtue of Kshatriya is also derived from a Brahmana (Sukraniti, Ch.II, VV.137-39). Both Agni and Matsya Puranas lay down that even the commander-in-chief must be selected either from Kshatriya or Brahmana caste (B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., pp.43-44). Agni Purana specifically reserves the military profession for Brahmanas and Kshatriyas and for a Sudra, only in times of peril or while in case he had acquired a proficiency in the art of warfare by regular training and practice (Agni Purana, Ch.CCXLIX, p.894). The same work invites the people of mixed castes to help the sovereign by serving as soldiers in times of war (Ibid.). Sukra, on the other hand states that a valiant Kshatriya should be preferred as a commander-in-chief or senapati, but in condition of the non availability of him, a valiant Brahmana could be appointed. The Vaishyas and the Sudras are totally disregarded by him to get entry on this post.(Sukraniti, Ch.IV, Section VII).
Kalachuris and the Chalukyas clearly refer to the Brahmanas as military officers. Pala epigraphs refer to the cases of Brahmana ministers, who fought valiantly for their masters.

The literary sources, too, contemplate such references. Thus, the credit of the expansion of the Chahmana dynasty is given to Nagara Brahmana named Skanda, in a work entitled as Viruddhaviddhamsa. Hemchandra refers to the army of raja Ana of Sapadalaksha, led by a Brahmana general, Raka. The Brahmanas also took an active part in war as feudatory lords or as the assignees of the large number of grants. The names of a number of Brahmana soldiers are also noticed in the contemporary records of South India.

Sometimes, the Kayasthas were also found entrusted with military services. The Chandella records reveal the example of two brothers, Jaunadhara and Maladhara, belonging to

---

207 See senapati Kilhana and his son senapati Ajayapala in Semra pl. (EI, IV, p.158) and senapati Madanapalasarmana in Ichchavar grant under Chandella king Parmardi (IA, XXV, 205ff.). For other's see the epigraphic evidence in IHQ, 1928, p.35, lines 44-45 and Dvasrayakavya, XVI, Cf. B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., pp.85-86.

208 Vaidyadeva, a Brahman minister of the Pala king Kumarapaladeva is known to have won two battles for his master, one in the east and another in the southern part of Vanga (EI, I, p.348). Similarly, in one of the inscriptions a Brahman minister of Narayanapala named Gauravasimha is referred to have shown his bravery in battlefield for his master (EI, II, p.106).

209 B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.86.

210 Ibid., p.44.

211 A Brahmana named Garamamma is said to have laid down his life valiantly, while defending his village under the Rashtrakuta king, Krishna III (EI, XIII, p.334). Further, the two Brahmana generals named Ravidasa Dixit and Visottara Dixit, are glorified for their achievements in Kalas inscription of Rashtrakuta king Govinda IV (Ibid., XIII, p.189). A Brahman general Mandapika Vanapati of Ganga king, Raja-Raja is also described to have led an expedition against the Chola king Rajendra Chola and winning over the latter. (Ibid., IV, p.314). Khalisvar, a Brahmana minister and general of Yadava king Singhana is also known for humbling the Gurjaras and Malavas and destroying the race of Abhira king. (ASIWC, III, p.86). The commander in chief of the Chola kings, Rajaraja and Rajendra, named Krishna is evidently referred as a Brahmana. (South Indian Inscriptions, II, pt.1, p.139).
the Vastavya Kayastha family, as illustrious administrators and warriors.\(^{212}\) Further, the *Ajayagadh inscription of Chandella Bhoja*, provides clear testimony of the Kayasthas, being well versed in the use of weapons.\(^{213}\)

Some of the Vaishyas are also assessed as good generals. One Randeva, a courtier of Prithviraja III is counted as an efficient wrestler.\(^{214}\)

In spite of such an indiscriminate mode of recruitment in army, the rigidity of caste system probably reflected in the personal relation of the soldiers on the battlefield. One of the modern scholars commenting on such a rigidity writes, "the rigidity of caste system did not allow the soldiers of a single army to have their food together. They could not be readily refreshed with food and drink in the battlefront. If the battle continued till late in the afternoon, the Hindu soldiers were often found to be famishing for food".\(^{215}\)

Now, we pass on to the outward formation of Rajput armies, which applaudably, composed of the four wings i.e. infantry, cavalry, elephants and chariots. The two important wings i.e. elephantry and cavalry have been dealt in Chapters Nos. IV & V.

Infantry formed the bulk of Indian armies. Yuan Chwang put special praise on infantrymen for their special contribution to defense by quick movements as well as for their courage and strength.\(^{216}\) Bhoja also writes that the foot soldiers are the main source of strength


\(^{214}\) Dashrath Sharma, *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, p.247, also see the article of the same author on *Kharatargacchhapattavali* of Jinapala in *IHQ*, 1950, p.223ff.

\(^{215}\) B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.49.

\(^{216}\) Beal, BK.II, p.83.
on all occasions.\footnote{Yuktikalpataru, p.7.} Indeed, the role of infantry had been of uncountable value, owing to its manifold functions. Kautilya speaks of them as able to bear arms in all places and seasons.\footnote{Arthasastra, Kangle, II, Bk.X, Ch.IV, p.442.}

It was undoubtedly best suited for the close combat and contesting battles in the regions, intersected by marshy hills, rivers, swamps and canals.\footnote{Elliot & Dowson, Vol.1, p.435.} It was the only arm to reduce the strategic hill positions and to defend the hill fortresses, while the cavalry and elephantry was of no avail in such situations. "They surrounded the forts, plugged the routes of enemy ingress and egress and reduced the besieged garrison to unlimited extremities."\footnote{S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.72.} The fact that this wing of army was most suitable in rugged and hilly terrain is also rightly acclaimed by the Indian writers on polity.\footnote{Arthasastra, Bk.X, Ch.IV.} and the practical example of which is being put forward by Al Masudi, who writes that the troops of "Balhara sovereign of the city of Mankir were mostly infantry, because the seat of his government is among the mountains."\footnote{Elliot & Dowson, Vol.1, p.21.} 

Apart from it, the effectiveness of these troops can not be questioned even in field-war. The Indian heavy archers were unmatchable in pitched battles and many of them fired their arms from the back of elephants.\footnote{S.K. Bhakari, p.72.} They are noted for neutralising the target before the general assault, helping river crossings, breaking up the phalanxes of the enemy's army by terrible fire and blinding the enemy's horses and elephants.\footnote{Ibid., also see Journal of Indian History, Golden Jubilee, 1973, p.464.} Besides this, the foot soldiers might had also been of great utility in performing the tasks of digging entrenchments and securing the men and material of war as well as in operating the technical weapons and machines like munjaniqs,
catapults etc. However, it is surprising that in spite of such a deft performance of infantry, the ancient Indian literary writers did never highlight its significance in their theoretical writings. Rather, they prescribe such unimportant and subsidiary roles for it, like, carrying away the dead and wounded from the field to a place of safety, procuring water for the use of the army and carrying arms and weapons to the fighting line, protecting the granaries, arsenals and treasuries etc.²²⁶

The use of chariots which was the important apparatus of war during early times, had already become obsolete during the 7th century AD. Though, these are continued to be mentioned in literature as a traditional component of army without any practical purpose. The story of its befalling importance had already started in Gupta period, probably with the increased use of mobile cavalry forces.²²⁷ Both Beal and Watters in the translation to Yuan Chwang’s testimony, while referring to the armed troops of Harsha, did not make any mention of chariots except the infantry, cavalry and elephantry.²²⁸ Bana, too, omits the employment of war chariots in various campaigns of Harsha.²²⁹ Again, he narrates that Harsha inspected his troops riding on

²²⁶ "कौशागाव युधगतांधान्यामागान्तविभाजितकारण।
यथार्थप्रायः धारण विषयविवरण।"
*(Nitiprakasika ed. Gustav Oppert, p.61, Ch.VI, VV.66-67).*

²²⁷ *The Gaya copper plate* (7th century AD) of Samudragupta and *Deobarnak inscription of Jevitagupta II* refer to foot soldiers (pattih), cavalry (asva), elephants (hastii), camels (ostra) and navy (naw) as the arms of war but are silent on the use of chariots. (R.N. Saletore, *Life in Gupta Age*, 1943, p.262).


²²⁹ *Harshacharita*. 
an elephant and not on a chariot, which was otherwise specifically used for this purpose.\textsuperscript{230} The disappearance of chariots as an army wing is also testified by Madhuban copper plate of Harsha, which refers to the foot soldiers, cavalry and elephants but makes no reference to chariots.\textsuperscript{231} Similar evidences for the exclusion of chariots are available in post Harsha period. Gaudavaho of Vakpati, which provides interesting details about the military organisation of Yasovarmana, remains silent of his war chariots.\textsuperscript{232} Chachnamah, too, does not make any mention to chariots in the army of the Hindus of those times.\textsuperscript{233} Further, the absence of chariots has also been confirmed during early medieval period. Manasollasa (12th century) does not mention it as a constituent of war.\textsuperscript{234} That the Paramaras of Malwa provided no place to such a wing in their army is evident from Anjuvarman's inscription, which provides the information to the presence of only three important wings.\textsuperscript{235} The Muslim historians too left a graphic account of the kings of Hindustan, fighting from the back of elephants and not from over chariots. This decline of chariotry did not limit to northern India only. In south India, too, there are evidences of it declination.\textsuperscript{236}

\textsuperscript{230} Ibid., Ch.VII, V.S. Agarwal, pp.164 etc.
\textsuperscript{231} EI, Vol.I, No.11, p.72.
\textsuperscript{232} Gaudavaho, op.cit.
\textsuperscript{233} Chachnamah, op.cit.
\textsuperscript{234} B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.53.
\textsuperscript{236} Samnad copper plate grant of Dantidurga (AD 753) which refers to the conquest of this Rashtrakuta ruler over Karnataka army with a force of chariots and horses, claims to the former kind of troops as unquerable. It shows that the use of chariots in south India was not a general practice owing to their
However, the existence of an important official designated as *gaulmika*, who was traditionally an incharge of a military squadron called *gulma*, which consisted of 9 elephants, 9 chariots, 27 horses and 45 foot soldiers, remains notable and unexplainable.\textsuperscript{237} Some of the illustrations of chariots and fighting warriors in *Paharpur plate* are further striking.\textsuperscript{238} Though, it appears that during our age, the functionary character of *gaulmika* might have not been quite traditional but somewhat renewed or modified. The illustrious representation, too, may highly be regarded as imaginative and unrealistic, based on the traditions of past.

The factors responsible for the disappearance of chariots as a wing of army may be counted as numerous. First of all, the efficient use of cavalry as an imitation of the *Scythian* tribes, who were expert horsemen, discharged the functions of chariots to a considerable extent in Gupta period. Secondly, the elements of decentralisation persisted in post Gupta age paved the way for the rise of several petty states with strong forts and strongholds as embodiment of their powers. With the appearance of forts and fortresses, the use of chariots automatically diminished as these were of no use in fortual warfare. Besides, the chariots can hardly be used in the pitched battles and static wars, which the Hindus had fought against the highly mobile Turkish forces. The Indian rulers of our age fighting from chariots could be of no match to the mounted Turkish horsemen. It was possibly owing to the realisation and actual capacity of their horses, in improperties in wars of those times. (*IA*, XIII, p.140). The armies of Pulkesin II, the Chalukya king of South are not referred by Yuan Chwang consisting of chariots. (Watters, II, p.239).

\textsuperscript{237} The designation often occur in Pala and Sena inscriptions (B.K. Majumdar, *Military System in Ancient India*, p.139). The epigraphs though do not throw any light on his functions. The above explanation of his duties or character as an incharge of a military squadron is owed to R.C. Majumdar (*History of Bengal*, Vol.I, p.285).

\textsuperscript{238} *Paharpur Plate*, No.LVIII, *History of Bengal*, Vol.I.
comparison to those of the Turks that they used elephant as a leading animal in war, thinking that by this way they could be able to create fear in the hearts of their adversaries and to lead their armies in a best manner.

The use of camels and oxen as loading animals for transporting the material and the provisions of war is also being attested during our age. *Sisupalvadh* of Magh specifically refers to such use of camels. 239 *Prabandhcintamani* of Merutunga, notifying the presence of this animal in the Chahmana army states that while it was on march, the officer in charge of kitchen pleaded Prithviraja III to allot him more she camels, as only 700 camels already allotted to him were not sufficient enough for carrying on the kitchen services upto the battlefield. 240 *Prithvirajvijaya* also describes them in the army of Prithviraja III, while he marched against Gudapura. 241 *Kanhadade Prabandha* also refers to the camels with pack saddles used for loading the tents, canopies, pavillions, enclosures, armorial devices and paraphernalia of army. 242 The Arab geographer Al Masudi also offers a special praise to the ruler of Juzr (Gujarat) for having numerous camels in his army, probably for loading purposes. 243 Sukra’s suggestion to the king to possess camels, 1/8 of the whole army 244 is also important to note regarding their utility. Thus, camels had practically proved their excellence as a loading animal. Its use as a transporting vehicle in the desert areas of Rajasthan remained as unparalleled. Probably the breed of camel used for this purpose by the

\[\text{References:}\]

240 *Prabandhcintamani* tr. Tawney, p.190.
242 *Kanhadade Prabandh*, p.4.
244 *Sukraniti*, p.157, V.84.
Rajputs was a single humped dromedary as the animal with double hump was useless for such tasks.  

The region of Sind in India was probably a breeding ground for such pedigree of camels. The Indian camels are generally regarded as exceptional on account of their immense capacity of loading and travelling. Its usefulness in desert lies in its special quality of storing water in paunch, that could be used by the riders, too, in a waterless area. The warriors used to drink water from the camel’s paunch during the time of emergency, either by killing the animal or thrusting a stick down into the throat to make it vomit water. It is said that if the animal has been watered within a day or two, the water remained tolerable to drink.

The Turkish invaders of India also realised the importance of camels as reflected in Persian sources. *Fakhr-i Mudabbir* suggests their inclusion in forces for loading purpose. Ibn-al Asir accounts that Mahmud of Ghazna, when started for his campaign to Anahilwad, loaded 30,000 camels with water and corn, as the road from Multan to Gujarat Passed through a barren desert. Firishta also narrates that Mohd. Ghori, after his conquest of Benares, carried thousands of camels for loading the spoils of war. Minhaj writes that during the course of a

---

245 The dromedary made its first presence in India only in the 7th century AD, as mentioned by Yuan Chwang, who says that “the camels are small in size and have only on hump”. The archaeological data leads to conclude that this breed of camel was domesticated in central Asia in late Neolithic times. It was tamed and bred in Arabia at that time or even before it from a different specie of wild camel. Ancient Mesopotamians were familiar with dromedary for desert traffic around 7th century B.C. (R.J. Forbes, *Studies in Indian Technology*, Vol.II, p.208).


250 Elliot and Dowson, II, p.475.

battle between the Sultans of ghor and Ghazni, when the former was routed by Sultan Muizuddin’s men, Qutubuddin saved his master riding on the back of a camel. The Arabs also realised the vulnerability of camels. It was the camel that gave the Arab armies their maneuverability which was strategic rather than tactical. Chachnamah reveals that at once Hajjaj said in a letter to Mohd-bin-Qasim, “Let every four horsemen take one camel with them. I give you strong loading camels to carry (each) a heavy load (of provisions)”.

Al Umari writes that the camels owing to their smallness in number could be possessed by rich persons like khans, amirs, vazirs, and other high officials, who lived with the Sultan or assisted him.

Like camels, oxen were also used as a means of transportation and the carriers of men and material of war to the battleground. Bana in context to the march of Harsha’s army provides a picturesque description of oxen laden with utensils. He also refers to the poor and unattended nobles, marching on fainting oxen supplied by the village householders. Sisupalvadh of Magha refers to oxen tired with the burden of the supply of war. Sukra also provides a graphic account of the qualities and features of a good oxen and advises the king to their maintenance in a good number. Alberuni praises them for their capacity to bear a heavy burden over them. Sometimes, the use of mules had also been prevalent for such purposes.

253 Islamic Arms and Armour, p.163.
254 Chachnamah, op.cit., p.76.
256 Harshacharita Ch. VII, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.201.
257 Ibid., Ch.VII, p.207.
258 Sisupalvadh, op.cit., p. 216.
259 According to Sukra, one who can travel for 30 yajanas a day, should be regarded as a good oxen (Sukraniti, p.165).
260 The number of both bulls and oxen in the army is suggested by him as 1/5th of the whole armed contingent (Ibid., p.157).
Besides, these living beasts, the use of carts as a means of transporting the material of war is found mentioned in *Harshacharita*. Sukra regarded them the best means to the transference of loading in the rainy season.

The utility of boats and ships to carry out men and material through waterways can never be underestimated. That the Mauryas had built and commanded a navy is testified by Megasthenes's references to the board of admiralty, though we do not find any reference to naval warfare during this age. The Gupta and the post Gupta rulers too, might have maintained good navy. The writers like Manu and Kautilya freely prescribe its use. Kamandaka, too,

---

261 Alberuni writes, "The Hindus frequently estimate the burden an ox could bear at 2000 and 3000 mana" (*Alberuni's India*, p.199).
262 *Sisupalavadh* refers to the use of mules in the army as carriages (p.453, V.24). Bana also refers to them as ridden by throngs of boys in the marching army of Harsha. (*Harshacharita*, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.201 (Ch.VII).
263 *Harshacharita*, V.S. Agarwal, p.145.
265 Boats and ships are known in India since the times of Vedic Aryans. (B.K. Majumdar, op. cit., p.21, Also see Dikshitar, *War in Ancient India*, pp. 191, 278. *Jatakas* refers to the use of ships for carrying on the trading voyages. (*Baveru Jataka* (No.339), *Valahasa Jat* (No.196), *Sankha Jat* (No.422), *Mahajanaka Jat* (No.539), Cf. B.K. Majumdar, op. cit., p.20).
266 The conquest of Samudragupta over the dwellers of all Islands and Simhala would not have been possible without the maintenance of a strong naval force by him (*CII*, Vol.III, No.1, p.6). Kalidasa also mentions to the naval force of the country, while referring to Rahgu's conquest of the Vanga chiefs (Cf. G.P. Sinha, op.cit., p.148). The use of ships is further referred in *Gunaighar copper plate inscription* as a part of the army of Vainyagupta (AD 507) (*Select inscriptions* No.37, p.331). Again, *Deobarnak Inscription* refers to the presence of navy in the victorious camp of the later Gupta ruler, Jivitgupta. (*CII*, Vol.III, No.46, p.217). A ship building harbour is also known from a copper plate grant of Dharmaditya (AD 531), without its exact location. (*IA*, XIX, p.198). In *Apsad Inscription of Adityasena*, a naval victory of Mahasenagupta over the king of Kamarupa named Sushisthavarman is referred (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.60).

The use of ships favourably continued in the 7th century. The *Manjushri-Mul-Kalpa*, referring to the military organisation of Rajyavardhana and his successors makes a reference to the naval forces. (*nauyanavā*) (Indra, *Ideologies of war and peace in Ancient India*, p.72, Cf. G.P. Sinha, *Post Gupta Polity*, p.148) Yuan Chwang also states that Bhaskarvarmana met his ally, Harsha with 30,000 ships, and 20,000 elephants, while he marched against Sasanka. (G.P. Sinha, *loc. cit*, p.148).
indirectly alludes to naval warfare, while stating that through regular use of boats one becomes adept in fighting from Chariots, elephants, horses and boats.\textsuperscript{269} It is evident that the \textit{rais} of Sind in the 8th century had made an apparent use of the boats for carrying a large number of men and instruments of war and weapons by small rivers.\textsuperscript{270} \textit{Upamitibhava prapanchakahaha}, significantly refers to the ships belonging to a royal prince, loaded with a huge quantity of material including his treasures, stores etc.; at the time of his migration to some other country.\textsuperscript{271} The great Paramara king Bhoja had attached so much importance to the maintenance of boats, that he states, “a king who has boats wins the war and the king who through ignorance does not keep boats loses his prestige, vigour and treasury”.\textsuperscript{272} Dhanapala vividly, describes the sea voyage of a rajaputra Samaratetu in context to his conquest over the people of some Island, who defied the royal authority by the non-payment of tax at regular intervals.\textsuperscript{273} However, despite all the metaphysical references, it is not very much clear that the naval fleet utilised by the Paramaras was their own possession or of some of their allies. One of the modern scholars views that they

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Madhuban copper plate inscription of Harsha} significantly refers to his great navy and other army corps. (\textit{EI}, Vol.I, No.11, pp.63-68). Similarly, \textit{Nidhanpur copper plate inscription of Bhaskarvarman} (AD 600) while, referring about his splendid camp at Karnasurvarna took note of his mighty ships. (Ibid., Vol.XII, No. 13, p.76) directly alludes to naval warfare, while stating that through regular practice becomes adept in fighting from chariots, elephants, horses and boats (\textit{Nitisara}).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushleft}
267 Manu advises the king to wage war in water with manned boats. (\textit{Manusmriti}, tr. M.M. Gahganath Jha, Ch.VII, Section 185).
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
268 Kautilya regards the use of boats in army to cross over the high waters (Kangle, II, p.436).
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
269 \textit{Nitisara}.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
270 \textit{Chachnamah}, p.117.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
271 \textit{Upamitibhavaprapanchakahaha}, Introd., p.IXXVII, text, p.901.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
272 \textit{Yuktikalpataru}, p.228, VV.30-31.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
273 \textit{Tilakmanjari}, pp.131-141, 223.
\end{flushleft}
did not possess any such fleet of their own, instead of it they temporarily borrowed it from the friendly Silaharas, while in need.\textsuperscript{274}

The early Turkish invaders like their Rajput adversaries also made an extensive use of boats. Mahmud of Ghazna in his incursions against Jats of Jud hills mobilised a naval fleet of 1400 boats, each having 20 archers.\textsuperscript{275} However, the veteran troops of Mahmud were more effective on land than on water, but they successfully overturned the boats of their adversaries, with the projected spikes of their own boats.\textsuperscript{276}

Besides, the subsidiary armed contingents, the exact proportion of the three fundamental wings i.e., infantry, cavalry and elephantry in the Rajput armies is not known with certainty. However, the ancient literary accounts reveal that the organisation of different constituents in proportionate order was based on a unitary division.\textsuperscript{277} We see that the number of troops in each unit underwent a change with a gradual advancement of time.\textsuperscript{278} There might had been a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{274} Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit., p.225.
\item \textsuperscript{275} Elliot & Dowson, II, p.483.
\item \textsuperscript{276} Muhammad Nazim, \textit{Life and Times of Sultan Mahmood of Ghazna}, pp.121, 122 fn.2.
\item \textsuperscript{277} \textit{Mahabharata} informs that each unit had its commander with a corresponding rank. The lowest unit was \textit{patti} which, primarily consisted of 1 chariot, 1 elephant, 3 horses and five infantry men. (See \textit{Shantiparva} and \textit{Adiparva} of \textit{Mahabharata}. Also see \textit{Arthasastra}, Bk.X, Ch.VI).
\item \textsuperscript{278} \textit{Nitiprakasika} (10th century) states the strength and imposition of each unit in extremely high figures. According to it an \textit{akshauni} should consist of 21,870 Chariots, 218,700 elephants, 21,870,000 horses and 21,187,000,000 foot soldiers.(Oppert Gustav, \textit{On Weapons, Army Organisation etc}, pp.5-6). The account, though undoubtedly seems quite exaggerative and untrustworthy. Sukra refers to the aggregate strength of an armed unit as including 5 chariots, 10 elephants, 40 camels, 64 bulls, 320 horses, 1,280 men (\textit{Sukraniti}, p.157, VV.83-84, 86). Emphasising on the necessity of division for the proper organisation of army Alberuni states that a \textit{ratha} comprehends, besides one elephant, three riders and five footmen. Giving further details Alberuni proceeds:

Each \textit{akshauni} has 10 \textit{Anikini}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Anikini} \quad \textit{3 Chamu}
\item \textit{Chamu} \quad \textit{3 Pritana}.
\item \textit{Pritana} \quad \textit{3 Vahini}
\end{itemize}
noticeable change in the strength and composition of armed units during early medieval period. Owing to the disappearance of chariots as the fighting arm in practical warfare. We get some indications of the evaporation of the ancient system of unitary division in both Alberuni's account\(^{279}\) and Kalhana's *Rajtarangini*.\(^{280}\)

\begin{verbatim}
"Vahini"  " 3 Gana
" Gana "  " 3 Gulma
" Gulma "  " 3 Senamukha
" Senamukh "  " 3 Patti
" Patti "  " 1 Ratha
\end{verbatim}

(E. Sachuae, *Alberuni's India*, Ch.XLVIII, p.408).

\(^{279}\) Ibid.

\(^{280}\) *Rajtarangini*, Ch.V, VV.140,141,143.
CHAPTER-IV

CAVALRY

Cavalry had always been an important wing of army not only among the Muslims but also among the Hindu kings of India. The Rajput rulers did not neglect the mobile capacity of horses and took great care to maintain a huge cavalry force. Earlier in the 7th century AD there are references to saddled horses in northern India in Harsacharita and Kadambari and in Sind in Chachnamah. The use of saddle on horseback is indicative of the fact that they were made more suitable for the purpose of war.

Horse had a distinct place in four wings of army for certain functions in the war-field could only be well performed by cavalry troops. Nitivakyamrita states cavalry “The moving protection line, the rampart of the army (अष्टवलं सैन्यस्य जंगमः प्राकार:) and advises that the task of making advance, retreat, attack, penetration and destroying the enemy’s rank could only be accomplished by cavalry. In Nitisara of Kamandaka (8th century AD) horses are stated useful in capturing the defeated enemy soldiers and to find out the directions and routes through forest tracts, to protect the supply line for provisions and for the support of allies, to follow the routed troops (of the enemy), and to perform swiftly other duties (of carrying messages and errands), to penetrate into the enemy formations and to strike down soldiers in front wing (koti) and at the

---

1 The presence of horse in Indus valley civilisation is suspected, but the references to horse drawn chariots and horse sacrifices of Rigvedic Aryans clearly indicate that they used horse for domestic as well as for military purpose (P.L. Bhargava, India in the Vedic Age, p.256,260,261, R.C. Majumdar, Vedic Age, pp.18,27,356, 42.
2 Harsacharita, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.200.
3 Kadambari, tr. C.M. Ridding, pp.94, 167, 172.
4 Chachnamah, p.160.
5 “सरसा अपसामसु अस्लकन्द प्राणीक-भंदनु चेत्यत तुरांतैणकसाध्यम्।”
(Nitivakyamitra, pp.182, V.7, p.183, V.9)
rear (jaghana). In other words, due to their mobile capacity horses were able to make a swift advance and retreat in the army. *Manasollasa*, an encyclopedic work of Western Chalukya King Somesvara states “The cavalry is the key to fame, a king in possession of a strong cavalry need entertain no apprehension regarding his territory”.

Contemporary literary sources, epigraphic records and foreign accounts give picturesque statements about the position of cavalry maintained by the Rajput rulers of northern India. While praising the Gurjara-Pratiharas in this context, Arab traveller Sulaiman accounts, “The King of Juzr (Gurjara) maintained numerous forces and no other Indian king had so fine a cavalry.”

Again, the king Jayachandra of Kannauj and Prithviraja Chauhan of Ajmer are said to have a cavalry amounted to 80,000 and 70,000 respectively. While advancing against Hammir, the Chahmana King Vigraharaaja is stated to have 1,00,000 horsemen. Similarly, the army of the

6 “वनिष्क कार्य-प्रयोगो विश्वासरक्षणम्।
अनुवादसमस्ते शूर्क कार्यप्रकाशयति।।
दीननुसरणैव: क्रोणान्त साधनयः।।
इत्यर्थ कर्म परेव सर्वं हर्षत्वाधरायम्।।

(Nitisara, p.414, Ch.20, Pr.32, V.4-5)
also see p.419, V.15, Horses are stated useful in capturing the defeated enemy soldiers (तुर्गनादीनि भिन्नानि प्रतिप्रहारति यद्वत्तम्।।) and particularly capable of encircling captives of war (pratigraha).


*Agni Purana* also makes a similar statement that “horses should be purchased and collected for the purpose of virtue, enjoyment and furtherance of earthly possessions.” (*Agni Purana*, Ch.CCLXXXVIII, p.1060).

8 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.1, p.4.

9 *Prithvirajraso*, p.873.

10 *Kharataragacchabrihadgurvavali*, p.31.

Chandella King, Vidyadhar (AD 1010-1025), resisting Mahmud’s invasion is stated by the Muslim historians to have included 36,000 cavalry troops.\textsuperscript{12}

The title \textit{hayapati} mentioned in the Chandella inscription\textsuperscript{13} for Devapala Pratihara most probably meant “lord of horses” and therefore signifies the maintenance of strong and excellent cavalry by him. \textit{Vadnagar Prasasti} of the Chalukya King Kumarapala refers that Bhima of Gujarat occupied Dhara, the capital of the Paramaras by a cavalry force, which was “supremely skilled in accomplishing the five paces (\textit{dhara}).\textsuperscript{14} The Paramaras even on the verge of their extinction had thirty to forty thousand cavalry and a large infantry force.\textsuperscript{15} In \textit{Yasastilaka}, the army of a king of Ujjaini named Yasodhara is praised for having speedy horses.\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Saptasatabhumi}, the kingdom of Nadol was also regarded a mine of horses.\textsuperscript{17}

In order to investigate the types and breeds of horses we must glean into the references from contemporary Indian literary texts, which provide an account of horse nomenclature mainly by places of their origin and colours. \textit{Harsacharita} of Bana speaks of King’s favorite horses, came from Vanayu, Aratta, Kamboja, Bhardvaja, Sind and Persia. In colour they are stated, red, dark, white, bay and chestnut, dappled like part ridges.\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Nitivakyamrita} of Somadeva Suri (10\textsuperscript{th}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Ibn-al-asir accounts 56,000 as the number of horses in the Vidyadharas army while Gardizi, Nizamuddin and Firishta agree on the number 36,000. (See Yogendra Mishra, \textit{The Hindu Shahis of Afghanistan and Punjab}, (AD 865-1026), p.201).
\item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p.77.
\item \textsuperscript{15} D.C. Ganguly, \textit{History of the Paramara Dynasty}, p.245 cf. S.K. Bhakari, p.34.
\item \textsuperscript{16} K.K. Handiqui, \textit{Yasastilaka and Indian Culture}, p.68.
\item \textsuperscript{17} S.K. Bhakhari, p.57.
\item \textsuperscript{18} \textit{Harsacharita}, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.50. Previously, \textit{Arthasastra} of Kautilya also mentions the horses from Kamboja, Sindhu, Aratta, Vanayu as of best breeds while the Bahlika, Papeya, Sauvira and Taitala breeds of middle quality (Ch.30, Section 47, Kangle II, V.29, p.172).
\end{itemize}
century AD) refers nine places named Tarjika, (Sva), Sthalana, Karokhara, Gajigana, Kekana, Pushtahara, Gahvara, Saduyara and Sindhuara as the birth places of the horses of special breed.  

**Yuktikalpataru,** a work ascribed to the great Paramara king Bhoja (10th century AD) mentions to Tajita, Khurshala, Tushara horses as best and to Gojikana, Kekana, Pronahara of middle quality and to those of Sindh (Sindhudara) of low quality (कणीयस). The horses born in other countries are described of worse quality (नीच).

In **Manasollasa** (1130 AD) in a separate chapter on "काौृजवायणस्यावस्यनिवान्द" (the game of Indian Polo), the King is advised to examine the different kinds of horses of different breeds and

---

*Amarkosa (AD 500-800) also refers to Vanayuja, Parsika, Kamboja, Valhika and Saindhav (Sindh) horses. (Kanda II of Amarakosa ed. N.G. Sardesai and H.D. Sharma, p.185, V.46.)*


20 "सांजाता: तुरुसंशारः तुर्षारच्छोजयता हयाः।
गोविकाषारः कंकाणः: प्रोष्टारसरः मध्यमः।
तांतजः उत्तमाः रजः गुणारः मध्यमः।
गारः: सांत्रः विसुष्टः: कणीयसः।
अन्यदेशानुसारः ये च ते वै नीचः: प्रकृतिततः।"

(Yuktikalpataru, p.182, V.26-27)

The terms Tajita = Tarjita, Gojikana = Gajigana, Pronahara = Pushtahara, Kekana, Sindhudara are identical in both the sources. It indicates that this terminology was highly used in the 10th century AD.


22 "काम्ब्रोज यमनासाूजी यात्रीकार कार्यात्मकः।
तोडङ्गाक्रमः सर्जकात्मकः एते स्वस्ततः।
पोडङ्गाक्रमः कार्यात्मकः यीश्व यात्रीकारः।
वन्ययुक्तः: पालीकेः चोत्तः हयाः।
शैलिकः वसलकान्तः वासलेयः स्वस्तः।
साहित्यः: पृष्टियासरः कार्यात्मकः: साम्बतीकः।
देवीसुलब्धीर नारसब्रतुकः।
चुंबत्तीूः ताहुः मध्यमः: परिवर्तितः।
मेतकः आदिनिधेयः नुटाति गुर्जरतः।"
colours brought before him by the officer in-charge of the horses. The King was to understand their kind by the places of their origin. In this context, the names of different places from where they had their origin are described in a categorised manner.

Best Horses:


Middle Breeds:


Inferior/low Breeds:


Somesvara in the same work also mentions to some separate horse names giving a particular description of their colours and castes (वर्ष & जाति). They are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. गक्क (गक्क)</td>
<td>श्वेत</td>
<td>चिप्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. कलाल</td>
<td>शुरुल्ल अथवा श्वेत</td>
<td>''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. कल</td>
<td>कृष्ण</td>
<td>शूर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. कपाल</td>
<td>रोहित</td>
<td>क्षत्र जाति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. सेत्य</td>
<td>का्ष्ठमक्षेत्य</td>
<td>वैशय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. चोर</td>
<td>सिर्व+रोहित</td>
<td>वैशय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. नील</td>
<td>सिर्व+कृष्ण</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Somesvara, in the same work also mentions to some separate horse names giving a particular description of their colours and castes (वर्ष & जाति). They are:

Salihotra, a treatise on horses by Bhoja Paramara of Ujjain similarly describes the various colours of horses and different names by which they are called.\(^{24}\)

1. *Chakravaka*, having white feet and white eyes.

2. *Syamkarna*, which is white all over its body and had one of its ears black.

3. *Astamangala*, whose feet, tail, chest, head and forehead are white.

4. *Kalyanapanchak*, a horse whose feet are white and which has a white spot resembling the moon on its forehead.

Before describing the distinctive horse names on the basis of colours, Bhoja stated that the horses are generally found in seven colours white (सिर), red (रक्त), yellow (पीत), साँता (♀), निर (♀), मलिन (♀), बहुव (♀).  

\(^{24}\) “सिरोरक्तसिरा पीत: सांताः: निर च रक्त।
निरत: कृष्णाश्रवन्ध स्वेत: श्रेष्ठवर्ण: स्वरूपः ॥”

*(Salihotra of Bhoja ed. Chanath Dattaraya Kulkarni, p.1)*
Blue (नील), black (कृष्ण). Among all these the horse of white colour is regarded as best.\(^{25}\)

*Asvasastra* of Nakula reveals twenty-five varieties of horses, in a detailed manner.\(^{26}\)

They are:

1. Kamboja  
2. Vahlika  
3. Vanayuja  
4. Gandhara  
5. Arattaja  
6. Saindhav  
7. Tai Ja  
8. Kulaja  
9. Upkulaja  
10. Mechaka  
11. Upamehaka  
12. Traigartta  
13. Yaudheya

This work gives out a clear picture of horse lore current in the Paramara kingdom of Ujjain.

\(^{25}\) Ibid., p.1, V.1.

Also see *Prithvirajraso*, p.195-96, V.5.

The horse of white colour was probably also regarded best among the Turks and the Mangols. Chengiz Khan is also mentioned to maintain more than 10,000 pure white horses without a speck. (*Book of Ser Morco Polo I*, p.300). *Prithvirajraso* refers that the Kacchawaha king, Virbhadra had also possessed white horses (p.53, also see pp.195-96. V.5).

\(^{26}\) Nakula, the author of *Asvasastra* was one of the five Pandavas of *Mahabharata* period. But the references to Arabian and Persian breeds of horses like Tajika, (Tajik is the name of a republic of Russia formed in 1924 out of the former regions of Bukhara and Turkistan), Khurasana (Khurasan is a province of north east Persia) and Kamboja etc. undoubtedly reveal the fact that the work must had been compiled after the tradition of the import of Arabian and Persian horses introduced in India (See P.K. Gode’s article on History of Canaka (gram) etc. in *Studies in Indian Cultural History*, Vol.I, pp.218-231). *Amarakosa* (AD 500-800) presents the earliest reference to Persian horses. Ibid., p.227). *Bombay Gazetteer* mentions the period (AD 250-640), as the period of Persian alliances and Persian settlements in India (probably on the Thana coast) and the period between AD 700-1200 of Musalman trade relations and settlements from Arabia and Persia. The gazetteer also mentions that during the reign of Nosherman (AD 531-578) Persia had close relations with western India. But there is no mention of the importation of horses in the list of articles of trade imported to India from Persia before AD 819-1260, the period during which Silaharas of Konkan ruled (*Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol.XIII (Thana), Part II, p.403). The Gazetteer observes that “the chief trade in animals was towards the close of the period (1290),” and the great demand for horses seems to have risen from the scare among the Hindu rulers of the Deccan caused by the Musalman cavalry” (Ibid., p.431).

From this latter statement P.K. Gode had to observe that horse trade from Persia and Arabia must have been started sometime after the conquest of Sind by the Arabs in AD 712 (P.K. Gode *op.cit.*, p.231-32). The King Pulkesin II of Deccan also sent an embassy to Khusrau II of Persia in AD 625. Ajanta Fresco painting also has the picture of the return embassy sent by Khusrau to Pulkesin. These good relations between Persia and India must also had developed into some trade relations (P.K. Gode, *op.cit.*, fn., p.223, Smith, *History of India*, p.426).

The references quoted from Indian literary sources like that of *Harsacharita* clearly indicate that import of horses from Arabia and Persian had already started in the 7th century AD in Northern India.
Savitreya (15) Yavana (16) Tarjita (17) Arjuna (18) Hrisvayavarana (19) Tusararas (20)

Nakula in chapter II of his another work Asvachikitsit mentions the Tajika (Arabian) Khushana (Khurasan), Uttara (variant Tushara) as the best breeds. The other breeds mentioned by him are Gojikana, Kekana, Prodhahara, Bhandaja, Rajshula Gohvara, Shavara, Sindhupara.27

Kuvalayamala, a Prakrit text of AD 1200 makes mention of eighteen varieties of horses, namely, mala, hayana, kalaya, khasa, tanka, tankana, sarira, sahajana, huna, saindhava, chittachala, cancala, para, paravaya, hansagama and vatthayya.28 Further there is a reference to three kinds of horses named vollaha,29 kayatha and seraha. Kanhadade Prabandha (15th century AD) enumerates mainly thirty six kinds of horses among which the following were stated available at Jalor (Marwar) at the time of the invasion of Alauddin Khalji:

Khurasani, Turki, Tezi, Kekana, Bharija (Turki pack horses), Sindhuya (of Sindhu), Panithana (of Maharashtra), Undiras (of Uttaradesh), Kulatha (Kannauj), Mahuyada

27 The author of Asvasastra mainly named the horses on the basis of the places from where they were brought as twenty one names in this list are identical with those mentioned by Somesvara in the twelfth century AD (See the list of horses in Manasollasa, Vol.II, pp.211ff., VV.69-74).

In this list of eleven names eight names are identical with those referred by Bhoja Paramara in his Yuktikalpataru (see the list of horses mentioned in the latter source, Supra, p.132). Bhoja in the Asvayukti section of Yuktikalpataru also mentions the name of Nakula. Therefore, the former seems to have quoted in his work from Nakula's work. If Asvayukti section is regarded real work of king Bhoja, the date of Nakula's work should be regarded earlier to Bhoja (AD 1050). (P.K. Gode in Studies in Indian Literary History, Vol.II, SJG, No.38, p.166).

28 Kuvalayamala, text, p.23. In this list only the Tankana (also mentioned in Harshacharita), Saindhava, Paravaya (Paraya of other sources is also known from other sources. (See the foregoing lists of horses). The horses named Huna makes its first appearance in this source (AD 1200). The author must have mentioned the other names owing to the prevalence of common nomenclature during 10th century AD in Gujarat either on the basis of colour or some physical characteristic features.

29 The first mention of vollaha is found in Samaraicchakaha of Haribhadra Suri (8th century AD) (Kuvalayamala, II, Notes and Explanation, p.119).
(Madhyadesh), Devagira (?) Tunkakana (Tankana), Gangetiya (originated in the region of Ganga river). A careful study of horse nomenclature from the foregoing passages reveals that the serviceable war horses were obtained from some places in India as well as from outside the main find places of horses were Sind, Kashmir, Kandhar (Gandhar north-west frontier), Avanti, Traigarta (the region of Kangra) Saurashtra and Vatsa. Besides these horses were also brought from some forest and mountainous regions (vanayuj and parvateya) and also from the places located in the neighbourhood of Savitri and Sarvasvati river beds. Horses from Sind which find a foremost place in the list of Harsha’s favourite horses were famous for their strength. Sind had been a centre of trade in horses. Sind horses valued high even amongst the Arabs. Chachnamah refers that when “Muawiya appointed Abdu-lla-din Swariya to the government of Sindh, he informed him that in the country of Sindh there is a mountain which they call Kaikanan. There the horses stand very high and are well made in all their proportions. They have before this time been received among the spoils taken from that tract”. Being a trade centre Sindh also provided horses of Arabian breed in a large number such as Barachi and Tatari. Harshacharita (7th century AD) and Nilivakyamrita (10th Century AD) place the Sindh horses as best while Manasollasa of Somesvara (AD 1130) and Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja (10th century AD) referred

30 Kanhadade Prabandha, pp.19-20.
31 Gandhara horses are mentioned best in Vayupurana, Cf. B.C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, p.17.
32 Harshacharita, Cowell & Thomas, p.50, S.P. Narang, Dvasrayakavya, A Literary and Cultural Study, pp.34-35.
33 Rehla, tr. Mehdi Hussain, p.5.
34 Elliot & Dowson, op.cit., p.21, Chachnamah, tr. op.cit., p.61.
35 Barani’s Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi in A.A. Rizvi’s Adi Turk Kalin Bharat, p.161.
them respectively of middle quality and of low category in comparison to the Arabian and Persian bred horses.\(^{36}\)

Sind horses were famous for their special breed from as early as the Buddhist period. *Jatakas* refer that “the thorough bred Sind horses sheathed in mail were used for war purposes”.\(^{37}\) Again they are referred “milk white, thorough bred, white as lilies, swift as the wind and well trained.”\(^{38}\) while referring about the high prices paid for *vollaha* and Sindh horses *Jataka* No.4 and 5 accounted that “A high bred foal (probably Sind or Volah) was sold at Benares at a high price, separate price was paid for the foal’s four feet, for its tail, for its head…. This horse could run at such a high speed that nobody could see it at all.”\(^{39}\)

The references from *Jatakas* clearly reveal that the horses from Sindh were considered best during Buddhist period. At that early period the tradition of the importation of foreign breeds such as *Kamboja* etc. was quite unknown and hence they were highly praised among other breeds of Indian horses. Owing to their old status and fame, they continued to find a place even among fine Arabian and Persian horses. But with the passage of time, when the import of Arabian and Persian horses became a common practice, this breed began to lose its place in the category of fine horses and came to be considered of middle and of low category (*kaneeyas*).

*Gaudvaho*, a Prakrit *kavya* written about the 8th century refers to the war horses of king Yasovarman produced from the region of Himalaya.\(^{40}\) The authors of *Manasollasa* and

---

\(^{36}\) *Jatakas* also refer that Sindh horses were available in Benares and were used as the royal horses of ceremony (*Jataka*, II, p.287). (B.C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, p.17, P.K. Gode, *History of Canaka*, op.cit., p.238, fn.4).


\(^{38}\) Ibid.

\(^{39}\) *Jatakas* Nos. 4,5,23,254 &547, Bharhut III, Pl.XXVI, Fig.136. Cf. B.C. Law, loc. cit.

\(^{40}\) *Gaudvaho*, p.78, V.261.
Asavasastra while referring to parvateya (mountainous) horses would undoubtedly meant the horses from the region of Himalayas.\footnote{Manasollasa, II, p.69-74, Asvasastra, pp.77-78.} The horses bred in this region were specially termed as kohi.\footnote{Amir Khusrau refers that horses surrendered by the Rai of Aarangal (Warangal) to Alauddin Khalji included kohi breed. Simon Digby opines that these horses must have been from the region around Himalays or beyond them or from the north-east of the subcontinent because, afterwards, some centuries later south India befall to be recognised as the good breeding ground. (Simon Digby, op.cit., p.42).} The region of Himalaya continued to provide a good breed of horses till the 16th century AD for the imperial Mughal stable.\footnote{Abul Fazl, who wrote at the close of the 16th century writes that “in northern mountainous district of Hindustan (i.e. in the Himalayas), a kind of small but strong horse is bred, which is called gur” (See Simon Digby, op.cit., pp.46-47).}

Soreth (a place in Gujarat) is also said to be famous for valuable horses.\footnote{Rasmala, I, p.39.} The great Rajput ruler Prithviraja Chauhan had horses in his stable from Kachh.\footnote{Pritavirajraso, p.436, V.32.}

Although good breeds of horses were available in the region of Sivalik, around Sanam, Samana, Tabarhind, Thanesvar and the camps of the Khokkhars, in the territories of Jats and Mandahirs but these places of north-western India were providing horses to the rulers of Delhi Sultanat in the 13th century AD and there is no evidence of the importation of such horses by the Rajput rulers of India.\footnote{Simon Dibgy, op.cit, pp.26-27, Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi in A.A. Rivi’s, Adi Turk Kalin Bharat, p.161. K.S. Lal, Early Muslims in India, p.78.} These places must have remained a good source for supplying war-horses before the Muslim conquest of India for Indian Kings. Lakhnauti\footnote{Minhaj-us-Siraj in his Tabakat-i-Nasiri refers that in the cattle market of Lakhnauti there was an average of the sale of one thousand five hundred horses per day. (Tabakat-i-Nasiri, tr. Raverty, Vol.1, p.567).} and Nadiah\footnote{Muhammad-i-Bakhtiyar came to invade this place with a few horsemen without molesting anyone in such a manner that the residents of that place thought them a party of merchants who had brought horses for sale (Ibid., p.557).} in
eastern India were the well known markets where the merchants from different places came to sell their commodities.

A popular breed of horses known as tangana had remained a centre of attraction for the court poets and historians. This breed of horses got special praise in Bana’s Harsacharita.\textsuperscript{49} Again Kuvalayamala while mentioning the eighteen varieties of horses also states about tankana horses.\textsuperscript{50} Even the Muslim chronicler Mihaj-us-Siraj referring to the importance of Lakhnauti, as a market place for horses states that the tangana horses were brought for sale in large numbers at the cattle market of that place.\textsuperscript{51} Again he comments “From the territory of Kamrud to that of Tirhut are thirty five mountain passes by which they bring the tanganan horses in to the territory of Lakhpanawati”.\textsuperscript{52} Indians too, judged the quality of horses from their speed\textsuperscript{53} and mobility therefore the thorough bred\textsuperscript{54} foreign horses were regarded excellent. Such thorough bred horses were largely brought from Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, Torkomania (Central Asia) and the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{49} Bana States “old people sang the praises of tangana horses which by the steady motion of their quick footballs provided a comfortable seat” (Harshacharita, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.201).
  \item \textsuperscript{50} Kuvalayamala, text, p.23.
  \item \textsuperscript{51} Tabakat-i-Nasiri, op.cit., Vol.I, p.567.
  \item \textsuperscript{52} Ibid, p.547.
  \item \textsuperscript{53} Salihotra of Bhoja remarks that the speed of a horse should primarily be considered than anything else and that an unsteady or slow horse should be regarded useless, even endowed with other five characteristic features like high breed, complex etc. (p.6, V.V.35-40).
  \item \textsuperscript{54} Horses were of six kinds: (1) Thorough — bred (2) Charger (3) Horse of Colour (4) Roadster (5) Hunter (6) Common bred (P.K. Gode, “History of Canaka”, op.cit., p.230).
\end{itemize}
steppe lands of southern Russia known as Tatars. Thus, Arabian and Persian bred horses were regarded the best.

About the import of Persian horses to India Morco Polo writes “In this country of Persia there is a great supply of fine horses, and people take them to India for sale”. Horses from Persia were carried through all the islands of Persia known as Katif, Lahsa, Bahrein, Hurmuz, Kulhatu. Dealers carried these horses up to the important Indian coasts where an agency was established by an Arab chieftain, Malikèe-i-Islam-Jamal-ud-din, ruler of Kis and later the former general of Persia, where they were purchased by merchants who directly carried them for sale to Indian markets.

Rashiduddin and Wassaf stated that in the reign of Atabek Abu Bakr of Persia 10,000 horses were annually exported from these islands to Ma’bar, Kambayat (Cambay in Gujarat) and other ports in their neighbourhood. In South India at the mouth of Tamrapani in the gulf of Manar near Korkai, Kayal was a port of great importance.

---

55 K.S. Lal, *Early Muslims in India*, p.78, also see the foregoing list of horses mentioned earlier.
56 *Prithviraj Raso*, mentions to the presence of big Iraqi and quick Arabian horses, (pp.415, (V.49), 452, (V.11). *Kadambari* (7th AD) refers to a horse imported from Persia which was swift as Garuda or mind. (tr. C.M. Ridding, p.62). .. *Chachnamah* refers to Arabian horses as best (p.136, also see Mohd. Habib’s Introduction to *Elliot & Dowson*, Vol.II, p.46). Hemchandra in his *Dvāsraya Kavya* mentions the horses from Samanid or Persia as *nihsamanads* (S.P. Narang, op.cit., pp.34).
58 Elliot & Dowson, III, pp.34,93. The ports mentioned by Morco Polo are Kais, Hurmuz, Dofar, Aden, Soer (Sohar, the former capital of Oman) ref op.cit., p.341.
60 *The Book of Ser Morco Polo*, p.158.
Horses from Kamboja are praised in the literary texts of our period for their excellent breed. Having high forehead, broad hips, shoulders and chest, long neck and face, big and strong feet, long legs, strong hoofs, circular knees and thighs, big body, hairy tail, big eyes and spiked ears, these horses were very swift in speed. They were mostly found in white and bay colours. Among Persian horses Morco Polo brings special praise to the Kataghan breed of horses from Badakshan and Kunduz but he continued to say that they were not imported to India because of the liking of the Afghans to them.

Horses bred in Karain (north-western part of Yunan) and Karazan (a province of Yunan) were also brought to India. Morco-Polo referring Turkomania for the excellent breed of horses, states that the fine mules of this breed were sold at high prices. Turki bred horses were famous for their spirit and hardiness in eastern India. They were regarded noblest in the whole of Central Asia and surpassed all other breeds in speed and endurance. These horses were tall with a long narrow body, large thin legs and neck. It is said that the Turkomans often cover 650 miles

---

62 The region of Hindukush mountain separates the Giljit valley from Balkh and probably upto the little Tibet and Ladak was known as Kamboja (see V.S. Apte, Practical Sanskrit - English Dictionary: Appendix-III).

63 Kamboja horses are specially praised in Harsacharita (tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.200). In Manasollasa the horses from Kamboja are stated divya (दिव्य), (Manasollasa, Vol.II,p.220).

64 Asvasastra, p.68, VV.14-19.

65 Ibid., p.68, V.15, K.K. Handiqui, Yasastilala and Indian Culture, pp.26. Indian literary texts also describe the horses of white colour as best among the horses of all other varnas, which might have been the horse of Kamboja stock (see Salihotra of Bhoja).


68 Ibid., p.223.

69 Ibid.

Dhanapala in his Bhavisyatkaha (10th century AD) refers to Turki horses. See Devendra Kumar Sastri, Bhavisyatkaha Tatha Apbhrams Kathakavya, Varanasi, 1960, p.104.
in the waterless desert in five days. Arabian horses were brought from Bahrain, Yaman and Iraq.

Indian monarchs spent a huge sum on the import of foreign-bred horses. Morco Polo comments on the import of Persian horses in Ma'bar while stating, “Here no horses are bred, and thus the great part of the wealth of this country is wasted in purchasing horses.” About the value of these horses he continued to state that one such horse will fetch 500 saggi of gold, worth more than 100 marks of silver.” Nearabout 2000 Persian horses were imported every year to Ma'bar. Wassaf states that the price for each horse was 220 dinars of red gold and the value of those died in the voyage was also extracted from the royal treasury. Though Wassaf had written this account for the Pandyan kingdom, the Rajput rulers should also be supposed to follow the same medium and they must have been familiar with this sea borne trade. Al Umri also writes about the high prices paid for Arabian horses.

Foreign travellers put blame on the Indians for being ignorant of the art of cross-breeding, and for rearing the foreign bred horses quite improperly without providing any training

---

71 Shihabuddin al-Umri in A.A. Rizvi, Tughlaq Kalin Bharat, Vol.I, p.313, Amir Khusrau states, “among the horses from Ma'bar there were Yamini and Shahini horses”.
73 Ibid., Ch.XVII, p.341.
74 Ibid., p.341.
75 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.34,93, The Book of Ser Morco Polo, pp.348-49.
77 Ibid., p.31.
Malcolm in History of Persia, (Vol.II, p.516), refers that the Persian horses were sold in India for 1500 to 2000 rupees. (P.K. Gode’s “History of Canaka”, p.233). Rehla of Ibn Battuta mentions the name of two saddled horses, which were sent by the author himself to sadr-i-jahan, one of the value of six hundred dinars and the other of 800 dinars together with their saddles (Rehla, tr. A. Mahdi Hussain, p.147).
and exercise. Wassaf comments about the manner in which Indians treat a foreign bred horse, "They bind them for forty days in a stable with ropes and pegs, in order that they may get fat, and afterwards, without taking measures for training and without stirrups and other appurtenances of riding, the Indian soldiers ride upon them like demons... In a short time, the most strong, swift, fresh and active horses become weak, slow, useless and stupid. In short they all became wretched and good for nothing... there is, therefore, a constant necessity of getting new horses annually". Al Umri also writes that if horses stay for long in India, their feet become wretched. But, these remarks may not be regarded true in the light of the study of contemporary dynasties and the kings belonging to them, who were quite alert in providing good training and daily physical exercises in order to keep them fit and swift. Even, so much care was imparted to horses that separate dispensaries were provided for ill horses and they were not allowed to be kept even for a moment in the company of normally healthy horses.

78 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.34,93. Morco Polo also writes about the mismanagement of horses and the faulty way of Indians for treating a horse (see Book of Ser Morco Polo, Vol.II, Ch.XVII, p.341).


80 In Kuvalayamala, there are references to Asvasiksha or (horse training (Kuvalayamala, p.22).

81 Salihotra of Bhoja prescribes that the owner of a horse should ride it everyday and make all the efforts to keep it quite alert and to maintain a high standard of speed:

"आतोरहे हृद बलमः तरिकोभिः प्रतिविधिः तथा |
आतोरहे विहोङर्यमस्य चापक्षएतम् ।

(Introd.XIV, text, p.6, V.38, see also Manasollasa, Vol.I, p.81)

82 "न च भायमि: क्षणांपि रोगमि: कल्याणांन्तरोत्मिष्ट्यां ।
कल्याणांपि रोगमि: स्वप्नोऽरूपिणस्मानाब्राह्मणम् ।

(Samaranganasutradya, Vol.I, p.195)

Agnipurana also mentions to various diseases of horses and their treatment through different Indian medicines (Asvaayurveda), (Agni Purana, pp.1066-1071).

"रेतम् विभक्तिनां कार्यार्थायां तत्कालिनिः तु |
अविवलाम्बति राज्यविनं रेतशास्त्रे ।


(Medicines should be provided immediately to an ill horse and their treatment should be taken up by the experts in that field).
In fact, it will be right to observe that the Indians had taken as much care to the rearing of horses as they could. Possibly, their manner to treat a horse must had been quite different from that in which they were treated in their birth-lands and to what they were habitual of. The mode of riding them by Indians must have also been somewhat different.\(^{83}\)

The climatic factors also must have played quite an important role. Secondly, the changed Indian diet could have been resulting to get them fat. Morco Polo states that the horses of Tartars (Tatari horses from Central Asia) were fed upon grass above and do not require barley or other grain.\(^{84}\) In contrast to this Indian diet comprised barley (राश) , chick pea (चण) and meat broth (मोघु).\(^{85}\) The statement of Morco Polo that “there is no possibility of breeding horses in Ma’bar” does not appear exactly true for horse breeding was so much well known in south India that the poet Chandraraja after studying scientifically (c.AD 1079) the subject of horse breeding wrote a treatise on it in Kannada.\(^{86}\) Thus it may be said that although our texts do not present any direct reference to the prevalence of the method of cross-breeding, horse breeding in India was quite well known.

---

83 Alberuni states about the mode of riding by the Indians’ “They ride without a saddle, but if they put on a saddle, they mount the horse from its right side” (Alberuni’s India, Vol.I, p.181). Here Alberuni seems to have been commenting on the habits of a very few Indians to whom he must had seen riding in that way.


86 See Mahamandalesvaras under the Chaulukyas of Kalyani, p.379.

Rasmala also mentions the name of a horse-breeder, Bhaud, who made valuable additions to the stud of a king named Vikramaditya and the latter gifted him the city of Mudhoomawati (in Soreth, Gujarat district) (Rasmala, Vol.I, p.9). Simon Digby remarks north-western India as the best Indian breeding ground. He also suggests that “the horse breeds with difficulty or feebly in extreme south of Indian peninsula” (Simon Digby, op.cit., p.26).
The above discussion results in the observation that in spite of being an important wing of army of the Rajputs cavalry did not attain such a high standard of performance as under the Turks and the Muslim rulers of India partly owing to a shortage of the foreign breeds as they were more expensive and partly to the manner of rearing them.
CHAPTER-V

ELEPHANTRY

The elephant had made its first appearance in the middle Pleistocene age as a wild and nomadic animal.\(^1\) By the period of Harappan civilisation it had probably maintained the same character, though some sacred value appears to have been attached to it as shown by the representation on seals. The first ever known reference to the domestication of elephant and its use by the king to ride is found in Rigveda.\(^2\) Mahabharata is first to refer to the employment of elephants in war as one of the constituents of the fourfold army, i.e., infantry, cavalry, elephantry and chariots.\(^3\) This unwieldy wing of army was provided utmost care and attention by royalty during Mauryan period.\(^4\)

The reliance on elephants in war in the mind of Indian kings never shattered but gained further strength till the 7\(^{th}\) century AD, while the Arabs were knocking at the door of India and in the 8\(^{th}\) century AD at the time of Arab invasion of Sind, the Hindus faced them riding the backs of huge and marshy elephants. A study of Chachnamah reveals that the Arabs had mainly used cavalry as a fighting force against the Hindus, who relied much on elephantry than any other wing of army and their horses were quite unaware of the sight of elephants in war.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) H.D. Sankalia, *Pre History and Proto History of India and Pakistan*, p.4.

\(^2\) A particular hymn of Rigveda in connection of the invocation of Agni refers. “O agni thou goest with fearless power (majesty), just as the king goes with his minister on the elephant”. (A.C. Das, *Rgvedic India*, pp.85-86; also see P.L. Bhargava, *India in the Vedic Age*, p.83).


\(^4\) During Mauryan period so much importance was given to elephantry that Kautilya advises the superintendent of forests to establish a separate forest, guarded by foresters for the upkeep of elephants. He also guides the superintendent of elephant -forests to protect them with the help guards, who were again advised to kill anyone slaying an elephant, to ascertain the size of the herds of elephants by means of indications provided by sleeping places, foot-prints, dung and damage caused to riverbanks and to maintain elephants (Kangle, *Arthasastra*, Kangle II, p.60).

\(^5\) Chachnamah, tr. Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg.
The similar evidences of the unawareness of the Turks to the elephants provided by a statement of Muhammad bin Sam once made to Qutbuddin Aibak in course of a discussion with him, runs thus: “the horses of our army have never seen the features of elephants. Our cavalrymen suffer defeat because our horses fight shy of the elephants. You should order that some elephants of mud and wood – mountain like and steady – be made and installed in the midst of the field – all wearing arms and clad in armour”.\(^6\) *Zafar-namah* also accounts that the soldiers of Timur’s army had never encountered elephants before invading India.\(^7\) A story in *Tarikh-i-Sistan* refers to the refusal of Ya’qub b. Laith to the use of elephants in warfare, even though he had captured several of them from the Zunbil at ar-Rukkhraj on the grounds that the fate of the Ashab al-Fil in the Qur’an showed them inauspicious.\(^8\) The existence of the words for elephant (*Mgl. Ja’an, Tkish. Yaghan*) and their frequent use in Onomastic (Cf. The *yaghantigin* ‘elephant-prince’, found amongst the Qarakhanids) indicates that the Turks and the Mangols of Central Asia were not unfamiliar with elephants. But their use in battle against horses in war before Ghaznavides is not known from our sources. Ghaznavides were the first to use elephants for battle in a large number, which was learnt by them from India.\(^9\)

The Rajput rulers of India had possessed big war elephants in a large number. The number of elephants commanded by a Hindu king must have been a providing factor for the consideration of the magnitude of his royal dignity and grandeur. The Gahadavala king Jaichand is said to have had elephants in large numbers like mount Alburr.\(^10\) It is known that while

\(^7\) Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, pp.498-94.
\(^9\) Ibid., p.115f.
\(^10\) *Futuh-us-Salatin*, I, p.148.
advancing against Hammir, the Chahmana king Vigraharaja IV included 1,000 elephants in his army\textsuperscript{11} and the army of Vidyadhara Chandella, which resisted the invasion of Mahmud of Ghazni is variously reckoned by the Muslim historians to possess 640, 746 and 390 elephantry corps.\textsuperscript{12} Prithviraja Chauhan, the greatest among the Rajputs, marched to capture Bhatinda, the garrison of Muhammad Ghori, with an elephant force of 3000.\textsuperscript{13} Similarly, Jayachandra, the king of Benares, is stated to have brought 700 elephants to the battlefield, out of which 300 are said to have been captured by the victor.\textsuperscript{14} Ganda, the king of Kalanjar is also referred to possess 640 war-elephants.\textsuperscript{15}

The Arab travellers to India also drew a particular attention towards the number of elephants possessed by the Indian kings of their times. Merchant Sulaiman speaks about the king of Ruhmi, who were indulged in war with the Balhara, to had followed by 50,000 elephants, whenever going out to battle.\textsuperscript{16} Al Idrisi, writing in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century had taken note to Balhara king for having numerous elephants, which constituted the chief strength of his army.\textsuperscript{17} He had also heard about the lust of the kings of Hind to possess great and tall elephants upon which they spent great sums of money paying for them according to their height.\textsuperscript{18} Ibn Khurdadba also comments that “the kings of Hind took great delight in mounting elephants and paid for them largely in gold”.\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} S.K. Bhakari, \textit{Indian Warfare}, p.23.
\item \textsuperscript{12} The number is given differently by Gardizi-640, Ibn-al-asir-746, Nizamuddin 319 and Firishta-640. (Yogendra Mishra, \textit{The Hindu Shahis of Afghanistan and Punjab}, AD 865-1026, p.201).
\item \textsuperscript{13} \textit{Tarikh-i-Firishta} tr. Briggs, Vol.I, p.171.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.619.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Merchant Sulaiman in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, p.5.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, p.88.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Simon Digby, \textit{War Horses and Elephants in Delhi Sultanate}, p.67.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, p.13.
\end{itemize}
India had been a variable ground of forests. Our sources impart a good deal of information about the forest grounds from where a large number of elephants were trapped by the Indian kings, in order to train them for their utilisation in different ways. Elephants were generally named by the place of their origin. *Yuktikalpatau* has named eight distinct categories brought form different quarters. Both *Manasollasa* and *Aparajitprachcha* (12th century AD) also provide a picturesque description of 8 kinds of forests as the birth-ground of elephants.

The forestry regions referred in *Manasollasa* and *Aparajitprachcha* continued to provide elephants for the Mughal army. Abul Fazl, writing in the 16th century refers to the elephants brought from the forests of Bayana, Narwar (Agra region), Pannah, Ghora (Allahabad), Nandapur, Sirguja Chanderi, Santwas, and Bijagarh, Raisen, Hoshangabad, Garha, Hariagarh, (Malwa region), Rohtas and Jharkhand (Bihar), Orissa and Satgan (Bengal).

---

20 *Arthasastra* of Kautilya refers to four distinct categories of elephants, i.e. one in training, one used in war, one for riding and the rogue elephants. (*Arthasastra*, Kangle, II, p.177).

21 The types of elephants referred in *Yuktikalpatau* are: (i) *airavat* (elephant of the eastern quarter) (ii) *pundrika* (elephant of south-eastern quarter), (iii) *vamana* (of southern quarter), (iv) *kumuda* (of south-western quarter) (v) *anjana* (elephant of western quarter) (vi) *pushpadanta* (of north-western quarter), (vii) *sarvabhauma* (of northern quarter), (viii) *supratika* (of north eastern quarter).

> एवानवंतः: पुष्पदंतोऽवतः:-*kumudavat*; ।
> पुष्पदन्तः: सार्वभूमी:-*sarvabhaumam* हिंगलः: ।

(see *Yuktikalpatau*, p.199, VV.61-62), also see *Sringarmanjarikatha*, p.52, For the above identifications see V.S. Apte, *Sanskrit English Dictionary*.

22 *Aparajitprachcha*, p.199, VV.41-48. Somesvara in his *Manasollasa* has also categorised the eight kinds of forests into good, middling and bad, from where the elephants were brought by the Rajput rulers.

> “कालिङ्गः वेदिकानम् दाशीर्ष च वनम् चः ।
> आकेष्ठितस्य तथा प्रश्यम् मध्यमं वनाधिकाः: ।
> अष्टादशः प्राणार्द्धोऽसर्गाभिः काथ्यम् वनम्: ।
> अन्वक्षणं वानान्यपुरुषाः जनम: परम्: ।”


Kathakosa of Jinesvara refers to the trapping of elephants from the northern forest regions.\textsuperscript{24} Gaudvaho, a Prakrit poem of about the 8\textsuperscript{th} century AD refers to the deserts of Marudesa (Marwar), which contained big elephants.\textsuperscript{25} Kathasaritsagar of Somadeva Suri (12\textsuperscript{th} century AD) refers to Asitgiri (the black mountainous region), as the wonderful ground of many mountain like elephants.\textsuperscript{26} The wild tract of Himalayan mountains had remained an amenable source for supplying wild elephants throughout the ages till our period.\textsuperscript{27} The thick jungles of eastern Bengal had been an important source of wild elephants. Vakpati refers to the Vangas (inhabitants of eastern Bengal) defeated by Yasovarman, possessing a large number of warlike elephants.\textsuperscript{28} Aparajitpraccha also refers to the dense forests of Bang country as the finding ground of wild elephants.\textsuperscript{29} After the Turkish hold over this region, the Hindus must have lost every right to acquire elephants from there. The Bengal elephants were regarded of such a good quality that even Balban is said to have derived elephants from there.\textsuperscript{30} He established Bughra

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Kathakosa, tr. Tawney, p.140-41.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Gaudvaho, p.121, V.119-20)
\item \textsuperscript{26} Hemchandra in his Dvasrayakavya refers to elephants from Vindhya mountain as best (S.P. Narang, op.cit., p.35). Sringarmanjarikatha also tells us that the Vindhya forests were full of large number of elephant’s herds (p.55-56).
\item \textsuperscript{27} A verse in Rigveda indirectly, refers to the presence of elephants in mountainous region (A.C. Das, op.cit., p.85-86). Similarly, White Yajurveda appears to have alluded the Himalaya as the home of elephants. (The text of White Yajurveda, tr. R.T.H. Griffith, Bk.24, p.262, V.30, also see Vajasaneyi Samhita, XXX, V.11, Taittiriya Samhita, III, VV.1,4,9).
\item \textsuperscript{28} (Gaudvaho, p.121, VV.119-20)
\item \textsuperscript{29} Aparajitpraccha, p.199.
\item \textsuperscript{30} A.A. Rizvi, Adi Turk Kalin Bharat, p.161.
\end{itemize}
Khan in Bengal on the condition that he would regularly sent elephants to Delhi from that place.\textsuperscript{31} The king of Bengal is also referred to had sent a number of elephants with some other rich presents under Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, in return for which he sent a number of Arabian and Persian horses.\textsuperscript{32} Besides this, Barani refers to the presence of elephants in the forests, neighbouring Jajnagar (Orissa). Yuan Chwang, while making a special reference to the great greenish blue elephants of the mountainous region within the limits of a country named \textit{Kong-u-T’o (Konyodha)} possibly refers to the Orissan elephants.\textsuperscript{33} The Turkish Sultans of Delhi, specially, Firuz Shah Tughlaq had also acquired elephants from Padmavati, probably the region of south Bihar.\textsuperscript{34}

The Rajput rulers of south obtained elephants from Ma’bar, which were considered better in quality while compared with the elephants of Bengal.\textsuperscript{35} In India, the prevalence of the importation of elephants from Ceylon is attested by the testimony of Megasthenes, who noted their presence at the Mauryan capital Pataliputra in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.\textsuperscript{36} Again, Cosmos, writing in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD refers to the holdings of elephants of distant Indian monarchs at Ceylon and their export to India.\textsuperscript{37} The north Indian Rajput rulers of India, in all probability must also

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{31} Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi, Cf. Lal, \textit{Early Muslims in India}, p.80.
\bibitem{32} Tarikh-i-Firishta, tr. Briggs, I, p.260.
\bibitem{33} Beal, \textit{Buddhist Records of the Western World}, pp.206-7.
\bibitem{34} Mahabharata\ refers to the elephants of \textit{Kanyakasara}, which had now been identified with the Chilka lake situated in the south-east corner of Puri district of Orissa and in the extreme south extending into Ganjan district. (Moti Chandra, \textit{Geographical and Economic Studies in the Mahabharata}, pp.140-41).
\bibitem{36} Amir Khusrau’s assertion that “a hundred of elephants (won as a booty) from A’arangal as the mad elephants of Ma’bar and not the vegetarian elephants of Bengal”, gives some idea of the superiority of elephants of Ma’bar, in the Turkish domain. (\textit{Khaza’inul Futuh} tr. M. Habib, p.72).
\bibitem{38} Simon Digby, p.244.
\end{thebibliography}
had possessed some Simhalese elephants.\(^{38}\) Utbi records that the Thanesar expedition of Mahmud of Ghazni (405/AD 1014-25) was undertaken to acquire large elephants of the *Sailaman* (Ceylonese) breed, celebrated for military purposes.\(^{39}\) This tradition of importing elephants from Ceylon had lingered on in India till a later date. Barbosa, writing before 1518 AD refers to the transport of Simhalese elephants to Gujarat.\(^{40}\) These elephants had acquired such a fame till the early 16th century that the poet Jaisi, writing in a rural environment of Gangetic plain constantly refers to their excellence.\(^{41}\) *Prithvirajraso* mentions that “Simhalese elephants were so faster in speed that they could pass four *yajanasa* during one *pala*”.\(^{42}\) Though, it appears to be an exaggeration, it gives some idea of their speed. Though smaller in size than the greatest of the Indian elephants, they were considered best due to their courage, faster speed, mobility and greater sagacity in the battlefield.\(^{43}\) Abdur Razzaq (13th century AD) gives an account of the elephants from Ceylon being sold according to their height.\(^{44}\) The qualities of Simhalese elephants had attracted the Muslim rulers of India. Ibn Battuta, describing the elephants in Ceylon says that some of them are transported to the capital city of the Sultan of Delhi.\(^{45}\) Afif in this connection refers to a Royal *farman*, which had been issued to the effect that if any merchant

\(^{38}\) *Prithvirajraso* refers to the Simhalese elephants, possibly possessed by Prithviraja Chahmana. But this reference might be supposed a later one, as the compilation of the text belongs to a later date i.e. to the 16th or 17th century AD (*Prithvirajraso*, p.80-81, VV.1-2.)


Scholars have tried to read out the term differently. Dr Bird calls: “Elephants of *Sulaiman, De Sacy, Sailaman*, while Wilken, *Moslam*. The reading of Yamini Ibn Asir is *Sailaman*. (Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.455). Again, this had been a question of much refute that whether the term *Sailaman*, generally applies to Ceylonese elephants or to some other local breed found in the forest areas in the neighbourhood of Thanesar. For further details see Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, pp.455, 616-17.

\(^{40}\) Simon Digby, op.cit., p.245

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p.69.

\(^{42}\) *Prithvirajraso*, pp.80-81, VV.1-2, p.69.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., p.69.

\(^{44}\) Ibid.

\(^{45}\) Ibid., p.72.
should bring elephants from Jaza’ir-i rod-i-nil, (Island of the river of Nile), the price of any elephant which had perished on the journey would be paid by the royal treasury.\textsuperscript{46} Travernier also refers to the import of the Ceylonese elephants to India due to the fame for their courage.\textsuperscript{47}

Some of the Hindu kings of India had also rarely possessed white elephants. Megasthenes, as early as the Mauryan rule refers to the greed of the king of India to such an elephant.\textsuperscript{48} Chachnamah refers to Rai Dahar, the ruler of Sind, fighting with the Arabs, riding the back of a white elephant.\textsuperscript{49} Somesvara (12\textsuperscript{th} century AD) also refers to brahmansak elephant, which is described as completely white.\textsuperscript{50} The Muslim historian, Ibn Asir in his Kamil-ut Tawarikh praises one such elephant captured from the raja of Benares.\textsuperscript{51} Firishta states to this elephant as the only one which he had heard in Hindustan.\textsuperscript{52} These white elephants were found in the forests of lower Burma (Pegu) and Siam.\textsuperscript{53} The only white elephant seen by Ibn Batuta, possessed by the king of Kunakar (Ceylon) must also had been brought from that country.\textsuperscript{54} Barbosa, too refers to the import of elephants in the kingdom of Narsyngua (i.e. Vijayanagar, Malabar and Cambay (Gujarat) from the land of the king of Pegu (lower Burma near Rangoon).\textsuperscript{55} Simon Digby has observed, relying on some Simhalese sources, that in the mid 12\textsuperscript{th} century Simhalese merchants had purchased elephants from Burma, in order to carry them to their own

\textsuperscript{46} Prithvirajraso, pp.80-81, VV.1-2, p.69.
\textsuperscript{47} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.616-17.
\textsuperscript{48} MeCrindle, Megasthenes, p.119.
\textsuperscript{49} Chachnamah, pp.137, 141.
\textsuperscript{50} Manasollasa, Vol.I (section on elephants)
\textsuperscript{51} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.251.
\textsuperscript{52} Briggs, I, pp.108-9.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{54} Rehla, tr., p.219.
\textsuperscript{55} Simon Digby, op.cit., pp.71, 73.
country and therefore concludes to the prevalence of a well established sea borne trade across
the bay of Bengal before the 14th century AD.\(^5^6\)

The elephants traped\(^5^7\) from the forests were imparted a particular care and attention. *Yasastilaka* refers that the king himself took part in the training and arming of elephants and one of his favourite recreations was to witness elephant races in the race courses (*pradhavadharni*).\(^5^8\) Hemchandra refers to the elephant-keepers called *mahamatras*, who trained and controlled them by an iron hook called *picchika*.\(^5^9\) King Somesvara was so conscious of the training and exercise of the elephants that he took great interest in organising the fights and sports of elephants in arena and declared that good care should be taken to the elephants in order to make them able to fight with the Yavanas or Turks.\(^6^0\)

The diet by which the elephants were fed was generally rich in content. *Agni Purana* mentions to *yaksha, vrihi, shali* rice as the best food for an elephant, while wheat and barley was ranked in the second category. Barley and Sugarcane were given to form the best strength. The

\(^5^6\) Ibid., p.73.

\(^5^7\) *Manasollasa* refers to no less than five methods by which elephants were traped. Among them one of the most practised mode of capturing the male elephant was by making them attract towards female elephants. (*Manasollasa*, Vol.I, Introd.XII, also see MecCrindle, *Megassthenes and Arrian*, pp.90, 218-221, *Arthasastra*, II, p.59, 2.2.5. *Nitisara*, p.22, *V.44, Agni Purana*, p.1057).

\(^5^8\) K.K. Handiqui, *Yasastilaka and Indian Culture*, p.90.

\(^5^9\) S.P. Narang, *Dvasrayakavya, A Literary and Cultural Study*, p.35.

The position of the trainer, as described in *Arthasastra* was of such an importance that the tying equipments and implements for elephants were prescribed by him. Even, the wild elephants were trapped after the judgement of their outward marks and behavior by these trainers. (Kangle, II, p.60, 178, 2.32.8, 2.2.6). Kautilya prescribes the separate timings to be fixed for the catchment, bath, feeding, exercise, drink, sleep, lying down and getting up to the elephants Kangle II tr., p. 175, 2.31.12). Besides, the superintendent of elephants was advised to make them exercise in accordance with the season (Ibid., 176, 2.81.18).

\(^6^0\) "सुमभार्यः भूमलोकं कार्यं कस्य्यो नवे ।"

elephants were also given milk for the maintenance of spirit in them. Besides, the diet also consisted the extract of meat mixed with an essence of stimulating drugs and the essence of the flesh of ravens, owls, dogs, mixed with honey during the time of famine, war and scarcity.\footnote{Agni Purana, tr., p.1059.}

Elephants were also made intoxicated in order to excite their anger and exceed strength. \textit{Manasollasa} refers to such an extent that only those elephants which are in rut can run and fight. Medicines were usually given to make them strong, healthy and furious after taking into consideration, the variety, constitution and temperament of each one.\footnote{Manasollasa, Vol. II, p.181, V.6. The author refers to twelve stages of intoxication (madavasthas), five of which are internal and seven external. The elephants should attain the first five stages (external) of anger. Medicines should not be used to lead them to the 6th or the 7th stage, because in these stages the elephants lost control on themselves and became mad (Ibid., p.31, VV.384-403). Further, the \textit{kopadipana} medicines are referred to be used for exciting anger in elephants. The author recommends that these should be administered to the elephants, the day previous to the fight to make them able to run and fight furiously. (Ibid., p.114, V.66). This practice was also prevailed even under the Mauryas, for Megasthenes states that the elephants were allowed wine instead of war, prepared from rice, when undergoing the fatigues of war. (Mecrindle, \textit{Megasthenes}, pp.117-18)\footnote{Tarikh-i-Firishta, tr. Briggs, Vol.I, p.35.}}

The elephants possessed by the Hindu kings of India had acquired so much fame for their excellence that even the Turks were filled with the feeling of greed to snatch these animals from them. It is said that Chandar Ray, a Rajput king of Delhi had such a courageous and docile elephant that Mahmud of Ghazni hearing the praise of that animal offered peace to him and sent a great amount of money for that animal.\footnote{The same account is found mentioned in \textit{Manasollasa}, Vol.I, p.86.} The great Turkish invader to India, Timur had become too impressed by the performance and qualities of Indian elephants that he ordered a number of them to be sent to Turan and Iran and to Fars, Azur Rum, Samarkand, Tabrir, Shiraz,
Hirat, Sharwan and Azurbaijan, so that the princes and nobles throughout his dominion might see their excellence.\(^{64}\)

The elephants maintained by the rulers with such a care and attention in large numbers had their own utility. Certain functions in battlefield could only be performed by elephantry. While on the one hand, horse was used for its quick motion; on the other, elephant was utilised for the forward command and to assert the proceedings in war. *Prithvirajraso* refers that once Shihabuddin Ghori had rode an elephant leaving his horse just to encourage and command his soldiers, while in another situation, realising defeat, he used horse in place of elephant just to fly away from the war-field.\(^{65}\) Owing to its big size and great bodily strength, elephant was of great use in performing ponderous and burdensome tasks, such as dashing into the forest forts, opening up of tracts (by clearing road blocks etc.), negotiating waterlogged areas, crossing rivers by swimming, breaking through and dispersing the enemy’s ranks, gathering the scattered troops of the enemy, terrorising and tramphling upon them, putting down the gates of the ramparts (of the enemy’s forts) and protecting the treasury carried with the army for meeting the expenditure during campaign.\(^{66}\) *Chachnamah* refers that when the son of Rai Dahar, the king of Sind preferred retreat from the battlefield in order to save his life, the foot soldiers and horsemen of the Arab army remained unable to check the attack of his elephant and their dispersion cleared the path for his escape.\(^{67}\) Barani, while giving details of the battle of Kili in AD 1299, describing

---

\(^{64}\) The elephants in *Malfuzat-i-Timuri* are not directly referred to as Indian but those possessed by the Sultan Mahmud of Delhi and abandoned by him, when he fled and later which were captured by Timur (Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.441). But, these in all probability were Indian in origin because the chief source for supplying of elephants to the Turkish Sultans of Delhi had been the Indian forests. The elephants from Ceylon have only an occasional mention in the contemporary sources.


the perish of Zafar Khan’s army goes on to state that about the six or seven elephants, which were infront of Zafar Khan after suffering severe wounds had been able to come back safely, breaking through the ranks of the enemy’s army. Timur, who invaded India in the 14th century AD himself writes thus about the fear of his soldiers to the elephants of Indian armies, “It had been constantly drilled into the ears of my soldiers that the chief reliance of the armies of Hindustan was on their mighty elephants, that these animals in complete armour marched into battle in front of their forces, and that arrows and swords were of no use against them, that in height and bulk they were like small mountains, and their strength was such that at a given signal they could tear and knock down the strongly built walls, that in the battlefield they could take up the horse and his rider with their trunks and hurl them into the air”.  

Besides, the elephants are regarded of such a might and capacity that only a single elephant is said to have fight with thousands, being stable, even after bearing with thousands of blows and hits. The number of elephants used to die in the battle had been certainly much less than the horses and foot-soldiers. The largest number of those died is quoted by Isami in the battle of Kili as thirty amongst the two hundreds of the Sultan’s army. Each elephant mounted by an expert driver is said to be able of destroying a cavalry force of six hundred. An army consisting of elephants was considered liable to get success in waterlogged field or on hilly area, in a forested defile or in an uneven region even without a passable path.

However, the account may be exaggerated but the early Turks could visualise the utility of elephants. They used them in battlefield in a respective manner. Even the great Turkish Sultan

68 Barani’s Tarikh-i-Firuzhahi, Cf. Simon Dibgy, op.cit., p.54.
70 Nitsivayamrita, p.81, V.3.
71 Futuh-us-Salatin, Cf. Simon Digby, op.cit., p.54.
72 Nitisara, p.328, V.11, also see Hastyayurveda, p.40.
73 Ibid.
Balban had considered one elephant equal to five hundred war horses. The number of elephants in Ghaznavide army must have been great, for at the time of Shabahar review of 414/1023-4, Mahmud is stated to have inspected 1300 of them, while the number of elephants reviewed by Masud at Kabul is stated as 1670, which has an accordance with the number given by Farrukhi (1700). A Pilkhana at Ghazni had also been reported to accommodate 1000 elephants, and for tending them there was a staff of the Hindus under a muqaddam-i-pilbana. Subuktigin is also said to have used 200 Indian elephants against Fa’iq and Abu Ali Simjuri. Similarly, Mahmud is referred possessing a force of 400, while going to battle with Altigin. These elephants were acquired by the Turks by means of undertaking great hunting expeditions and as a spoil of war and tribute from the subdued Indian monarchs. True, it is that they were less mobile as compared to the Turkish horses, but the presence of elephants was always treated an asset as an important army wing throughout medieval period.

Our sources do not help us to determine if the elephants are being used to carry war machines etc. However, it appears that the elephants might have also proved useful in hauling the heavy war machines like catapults and ballistas in the battlefield and in the arrangement of soldiers fighting from a high place, for a single elephant was able to carry more than one or two persons. Manasollasa speaks of a crew of only two warriors, Agni Purana refers to nearly seven warriors fighting from the backs of an elephant holding weapons.

74 Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.103.
76 Ibid.
77 Ibid.
78 There was no certain rule about the number of warriors or men placed on the elephants back. Megasthenes informs us that a war elephant carried three fighting men and one who conducts it. McCrindle. Megasthenes, p.90. Alberuni also gives the number of men sitting on the elephant’s
Sometimes, the armed units of foot-soldiers and cavalrymen were also made to cross the rivers or waterlogged areas.\(^8\) Afif accounts that in course of one of the campaigns of Firuz Shah Tughlaq an intense need had arisen to cross the river and the horses and foot soldiers had crossed it by the deployment of elephants in two chains, attached to one another by ropes, who were made to stand firmly upstream and downstream of the river in such a manner that the chain upstream provided way to cross while the downstream served as net. The elephants also had been certainly utilised in accomplishing such tasks by the Hindus.\(^9\)

Unlike the Muslims, the Rajput rulers of India generally kept the phalanxes of elephants on the advance guard or frontline of their armies.\(^10\) The king commanded the centre riding the back of an elephant, so that he might be able to provide a good leadership and supervision to his own troops. Remaining of the king in the centre on the elephants back was not at all too advantageous for the Rajput armies for in such a situation he could easily become the target of enemy’s attack. Seeing their leader in danger, the troops of army had usually lost their vigour to fight boldly. The Turkish sultans of Delhi, unlike them, did not always allow the elephants to be

back as six including one master and his two spear throwing companions (Alberuni’s India, tr. E. Sachau, London, 1914, p.408). Ibn Battuta refers that each elephant could carry more or less twenty warriors in accordance with its size and proportions, in a litter placed on the back (Rehla, tr. A. Mehdi Hussain, Baroda, 1976, p.58).

Morco Polo, writing about the elephants of Zanghibar (a ward for an Indian Island) specially refers to the wooden castles, fixed on the back of elephant, which carried from ten to sixteen persons, armed with lances, swords and stones (Henri Yule, The Book of Ser Morco Polo, p.422).

79 Manasollasa, p.135, V.1182.
80 Agni Purana, p.902.
81 Nitivakyamrita, p.182.
82 The similar utilisation of elephants is also confirmed by Sanskrit source. Also see Afif, Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi. Cf. Simon Digby, op.cit., p.51, Nitivakyamrita, p.182.
given a frontal place in the organisation of army not to make them the subject of enemy’s attack at a very premature stage of war. Instead, they generally kept them guarded by a small number of foot soldiers, advised to clear the path for their march and to resist the attack of enemy’s troops. These foot soldiers were in turn, guarded by the cross-bowmen and naphtha fire-throwers from the backs of the elephants seated in towers.84

Scholars generally criticise this arrangement by arguing that keeping the elephants in front was a blunder on the part of the Rajputs against the blows of the Turkish mounted archers, which made them discouraged and led to smash their own armies. But, indeed, keeping the elephants in front should not be regarded the folly of the Rajputs but a proof of their mindedness because the Hindu cavalrymen and foot soldiers in the absence of any technological device might had not been able to bear the blows of the Muslim mounted archers and cross-bowmen, hence, there was no suitable way to the Hindus other than the placement of elephants in front for the protection of the rest of the army in the battlefield. It was only the result of the technological advancement under the Turks that the elephants in spite of being the most strong and mighty animal could not retain their courage, intellect and docility in war-field and ransacked the whole army behind them. But to say that the Rajput army was partly defeated by the Turks due to elephants is not digestive, since the Rajputs were not in a position to had an alternative arrangements. Moreover, the Turks did make proper use of elephants assisting them through cavalry bow-men and other wings of army.

Besides the above utilisation of elephants, there were also certain drawbacks, prevailed on their part. First the maintenance of this huge animal was one of the tedious and expensive

84 For details see Chapter on Military Strategy, Supra, pp.216-17.
tasks from the point of view of the diet and care provided to them. Secondly, the temperament of an elephant's body did not allow them to perform well during summer; as during that season they could not bear thirst. Therefore, perhaps all the lawgivers of the period advised to carry out the expedition in winter. Thirdly, while loosing their confidence and courage in critical circumstances, the elephants produced much harm by causing panic and strike in the whole composition of army.

But, inspite of all the above drawbacks, the Hindus did not loose their confidence on the elephantry and it remained the most important wing of the Hindu army in early Medieval India. It might be the impact of the Rajputs that the Turkish Sultans felt the need of elephants as an important part of their army, which later on showed continuity even under the Mughals.
CHAPTER-VI
ARMS AND ARMOUR

The organisation of the military system of the Rajputs may not be visualized without weaponry and implements of warfare. It was owing to the important functions of these weapons and implements that its history goes back to the remotest antiquity. The Rajputs of our period, though, tried to modify them according to their own mode of fighting and combating but they could not keep themselves apart from the traditional Indian weapons.

The contemporary literary sources classify these weapons on the basis of their characteristics and mode of operation. The Agni Purana classifies them on the basis of the mode of their operation into five categories viz.: those thrown by machines (yantra-mukta), those thrown and drawn back (mukta-sandharita), those not thrown (amukta) and the natural weapons such as the fist (bahukayudha). In Nitiprakasika, the arms are divided according to their nature into mukta (thrown) amukta (not thrown), muktamukta (thrown or not thrown), and mantramukta (thrown by means of spells). According to Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja, the whole class of weapons is divided into two broad categories: i.e. deceitful (mayikam) and non-deceitful (nirmayam). The former category is illustrated by combustibles and the second by the weapons of close combat like sword etc. Sukra has divided the weapons into two categories:

1 Agni Purana, Ch. CCXLIX, p.894.
2 "तथा ध्वजायमान बिभृत्तिनाथाय विहीने निम्बोधे वे
पुक्तं च वै व पुक्तेऽवस्तं न मुक्तामुक्तम: परं ।
मन्त्रमुक्तं च चन्द्रिका धनुंशेष्यमादि वे
मुक्तं वाणिर विभोन खंट्ट्षारिक्षमुक्तम्।।" (Nitiprakasika, ed. by Gustav Oppert, p.37, V.V.10-11).
3 Yuktikalpataru, p.170.
astra: The operation of those is conducted through mantra (spells), yantra (machines) and agni (fire)

(ii) sastra: The weapons without any mechanical device like sword, spear etc.4

The modern scholars made a classification in their own way.5

The number of these weapons in all is conventionalized as thirty-six for a full military regalia. A Rajput warrior is generally described as an expert in the use of all these thirty-six kinds of weapons. A list of them is effectively provided by the commentator of Dvasrayakavya as follows: (i) cakra (discus), (2) dhanus (bow), (3) vajra (thunderbolt) (4) khadga (Sword) (5) kshurika (Knife) (6) tomara (javelin) (7) kunta (Lance) (8) trisula (Trident) (9) sakti (spear) (10) parasu (axe) (11) maksika (12) bhalli (a kind of spear or lance) (13) bhindimala (noose) (14) musti (hilt) (15) lunthi (16) sanku (dart) (17) pasa (noose) (18) pattisa (spear with sharp edge or some other weapon with three points.) (19) rsti (spear, lance or sword) (20) kanaya (kanaka, a kind of arrow) (21) kampana (?) (22) hala (ploughshare) (23) musala (share) (24) gulika (a ball as a missile) (25) kartari (knife, hindi katari) (26) karpatra (saw) (27) tarawari

4 Sukraniti, Ch.IV, Section VII, op.cit., p.168, V.V.24-26.
5 P.C. Chakravarti had conveniently divided arms under two heads viz. offensive and defensive. Offensive arms are again subdivided by him into (i) missiles and (ii) short arms, used in close combat (P.C. Chakravarti, The Art of War in Ancient India, p.150). G.N. Pant has divided the weapons on the basis of their functional character as: slashing weapons (swords, axes etc.), weapons of thrust (spears, tridents etc.), projectiles, (arrows etc.) and weapons for smashing (mace etc.) (G.N. Pant, Studies in Indian Weapons and Warfare, p.151). S.K. Bhakari made the following classification of weapons taking into consideration their utility and role in actual battle and the terms by which they should be understood in modern times:

(a) Close combat weapons: used at close range and for hand to hand fights like sword, mace, dagger, trident etc.

(b) Light close support weapons: bows, arrows, naphtha balls, slings etc.

(c) Heavy close support weapons: sarvatobhadra, catapults, munjanigs etc., which were heavy machines and used in defence or attack on the forts and fortifications.

(d) Shields.

(e) Armour (S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.93).
(one-edged sword) (28) kuddala (pick axe) (29) dusphata (a kind of explosive) (30) gophani (sling) (31) daha (probably a fire dart) (32) daccusa (33) mudgara (hammer) (34) gada (club) (35) gama (Iron club, weapon shaped like a hammer or mace), and (36) karavalika (cudgel, sword or one-edged knife). However, such a conventionalisation of weapons indicates nothing more than the stereotyped character of military science during our period.

The weapons like bow, arrow, sword, spear, lance, javelin, mace, and shields are to be regarded as the most important in actual practice as revealed from the numerous references in our sources.

Archery:

The bows and arrows could not be treated as alone but used altogether in warfare, formed a section under archery, the history of which is much old in antiquity and without which the wars of our ages could not be fought by the Hindus. In Harshacharita, (7th century AD), the bow is said to be "the chief wealth in battle". The elephant warriors using bows and arrows

8 The history of the origin of archery is to be traced back to the pre-historic times (G.N. Pant, Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.92). Excavations in the Indus valley further attest to the prevalence of archery (Ibid., p.35, also see Studies in Indian Weapons, pp.20,36). By the Rigvedic period, bow and arrow had become the chief weapons of royalty, so much so that a king was required to be of stiff command and wielder of a terrible bow (Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.62). The two great epics, Ramayana and Mahabharata provide a graphic description of Indian archery (Ibid., pp.64-65, also see Studies in Indian Weapons, p.41). The Greek accounts brought a special praise to Indian archer’s shots (Ibid., p.67). Both Megasthenes and Kautilya substantiate to the prominent use of bows and arrows during Mauryan period (Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.68, also see Studies in Indian Weapons, p.41). That the Gupta emperors had attached much significance to archery not in their armies only but in spiritual and daily lives also, is being confirmed by the literary as well as the numismatic evidences (Kalidasa, Ritusamhara, III, Cf. Studies in Indian Weapons, pp.43-44, also see Indian Arms and Armour, I, pp.68, 90, A.S. Altekar, The Gupta Gold Coins in the Bayana Hoard, plates, V.15, VI.2, VI.9.10, VII.12, XII.5, XXXIV.21).
9 B.N.S. Yadav, Society and Culture in Northern India, p.216
figure in Sisupalvadh (10th century AD)\(^{10}\) Tilakmanjari of Dhanpala,\(^{11}\) (10th century AD), Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja\(^{12}\) (11th century AD) and Manasollasa of Somesvara\(^{13}\) (12th century AD) clearly refer to bows and arrows amongst other weapons of war.

The traditional list of the thirty-six kinds of weapons in the Rajput sources assigned a particular place to bow and arrow.\(^{14}\) The Gurjaras are known to have excelled in archery\(^{15}\) and the greatest Rajput ruler Prithviraja Chauhan possessed a great skill to command the range and direction of his arrow in response to the sound. (sabdabhed\(^{16}\)) A Khajuraho inscription of Chandella period refers to bowmen riding elephants.\(^{17}\) Similarly, the sculptures at Khajuraho depict bows and arrows.\(^{18}\) The Rajput rulers and their pikemen had so much confidence in wielding a bow that they did never hesitate to counter even to the Turkish and Arabian mounted archers and sometimes placed them in difficult situations. During the course of the IInd battle of Tarain, Govind Rai, brother of Pithor Rai created a difficult situation for Muhammad Ghori by showering arrows upon him from his howdah.\(^{19}\)

**Bows:** Regarding, the types of bows used by the Rajput archers, it is clear that the self or simple,\(^{20}\) compound and composite forms of bows might had been in common practice.\(^{21}\) Earlier

---

11 Ibid., p.216.
12 Yuktikalpataru, p.139, VV.28-29.
13 Manasollasa, Vol.II, p.221, V.V.86-89
14 See the list of weapons in Dvasrayakavya (S.P. Narang, op.cit., pp.180-81) and Aparajitpraccha (pp.598-600, op.cit., pp.180-81).
16 G.N. Pant, Studies in Indian Weapons, pp.47, 78, also see Prithvirajraso.
18 G.N. Pant, Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.91.
19 Ibid., p.70, also see Minhaj-us Siraj, Tabakat-i-Nasiri, Vol.I, p.56.
20 A single piece of wood is called a self or simple bow. This type of bow had been used in India from earliest times till today (Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.117).
21 Compound bow was made of two pieces of the same material joined together, whereas the composite bow was made of a combination of three different materials namely horn, wood and sinew (P.K. Gode, "Mounted Bowman on Indian Battle-fields", SICH, Vol.II, p.57, fn.2). It consisted of an inner core of wood with a reinforcement of horn on the side facing the archer (Ahmad Y. Al-Hasan
to our period Kautilya refers to both self and composite bows. Further, Kalidasa also refers to a composite bow, which is praised by him to shoot the arrows forcefully and pierce the bodies of the enemies so sharply that the latter could not move from their places. But in comparison to the Indian composite bow, the Turkish bow was regarded much superior, being short, light and highly elastic. Having an excellent range of 500 meters or more and power to penetrate mail body armour at 150 meters, if fitted with an arrowhead of triangular cross-section.

Long bow, either in the form of simple or compound with far greater rate as well as the range of discharge but equally tough to be drawn even by a skilled infantryman, had been customarily used in Indian army till our period. The defeat of the Indian king Porus is being partly explained to the incapacibilities of their archers in commanding their long and heavy bows, which were drawn after resting one end upon the earth and pressing it with left foot on slippery ground. One of the bas-relief's of the Sanchi stupa represents bows of the same length with the infantry archers. Such bows are also found to be depicted on the railings of the stupas of

---

22 Arthasastra refers to four kinds of bows namely, karmuka, kodanda, druna and dhanusha. Among them one druna is defined by Pant as a self bow, while the three others as the composite. (Arthasastra, pangle, II, p.132, V.8, also see G.N. Pant, Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.118-119, Studies in Indian Weapons, p.56).


26 Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.123, also see Cunningham, Bhilsa Topes, p.216.
Amaravati and Nagarjunikonda and continued to be used in Mauryan army. A particularly mentioned strong, stiff and large bow, with which Rai Dahar, ruler of Sind fought against the Arabs, so heavy that only he himself could string that upon, could undoubtedly fall under this category. Minhaj-us-Siraj specially refers to the usual practice of long bows by untrained Indian archers. Sculptures at Khajuraho depicting bows, slightly less than the height of the wielders, kept slung on the left shoulders attest to the continuous use of such bows till our period.

But it appears that unlike the Turks, the Indians were quite unfamiliar with the use of crossbow, which with far greater velocity and accuracy of direction proved the most deadly weapon for sieges and defensive loophole shooting.

27 Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.123, also see Cunningham, Bhilsa Topes, p. 90.
29 Chachnamah, tr. Fredunbeg, p.115.
30 Ibid., p.75.
31 Indian Arms and Armour, I, p.91.
32 The use of cross-bow first invented in China before the birth of Christ, defused thereby to Rome and later to Europe, had not become widespread in Islamic world until the middle of the 12th century AD (Lynn white, Medieval Technology and Social Change, p.35, p.151-152, fn.3, Ahmad Y. Al Hasan, Donald R. Hill, op.cit. p.99. Later with its widespread adoption, it began to be variously named as qaws-al-rejl (foot-bow) in Arabic and jamburak in Arabic, Persian and Turkish (Ibid.) Prof. Irfan Habib takes the term nawak to mean the cross-bow, while Lynn white declares to mean it a blow-gun, the concept of which had existed in India right from the period of Mahabharata (Irfan Habib, “Changes in Technology”, op.cit., Lynn White pp.93-94). G.N. Pant states that nawak was a small arrow used with a cross-bow, several examples of which, though of later period are found in National Museum, New Delhi, Indian Weapons, p.48).
33 The use of cross-bow was advantageous in several ways. Though, unlike the composite bow could only shoot up to 100 years only, the tube or barrel attached to it provided it the ability to hit forcibly in accurate direction. Ancient Art of Warfare, p.390, and Montgomery of Almein, A History of Warfare, p.185), also see Irfan Habib, “Changes in Technology”, op.cit.). The second important advantage was that it could be strung even by an untrained and unstrong man, who would have been mobile to draw a long bow (Montgomery of Almein, loc. cit., p.184, Fredrick Wilkinson, op.cit., p.52). But there were also certain disqualifications on its part, the foremost was the relatively slow rate of discharge. It could only discharge two bolts a minute, while a trained longbow is said to have shot ten to twelve arrows per minute. Another disqualification was its heavy weight, nearly twenty
The question arises in case we accept that cross-bows could be used by an unskilled archer how it was that Indian archers could not make use of it. The plausible answer may be that of the unawareness of its technology.

**Arrows:**

Like the bows, the arrows used were also of varying types such as barbed-arrows,\textsuperscript{34} inscribed arrows\textsuperscript{35} poisonous-arrows,\textsuperscript{36} fire-arrows\textsuperscript{37} etc. The Paramara ruler Sindhuraja (AD 994-1020), while hunting is reported to had wounded by an engraved arrow, on which was inscribed \textit{navina sahasanka sindhuraja}.\textsuperscript{38} The aim of inscribing arrows would had been to glorify the archer. Such arrows continued in use till the 16th and 17th century, as preserved in the armoury of Tanjore and displayed in the government museum Madras (Tamil Nadu).\textsuperscript{39}

---

\textsuperscript{34} Barbed arrows were quite popular in ancient India and were most likely to continue in use till our period. It was a barbed arrow of the Mallois, which had wounded Alexander (S.K. Bhakari, p.93, J.W. McCrindle, op.cit., p.207). Curtius particularly refers to barbed arrows discharged by the archers of Porus's army as 'difficult to extract' (G.N. Pant, \textit{Indian Arms and Armour}, I, p.67; also see Quintus Curtius, VIII, 14, \textit{Megalusthenes Frg.XXXV}). The barbs could be of different types, incipient, straight, curved and very artistically curved (S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.93, also see G.N. Pant, \textit{Weapons in Ancient India}, p.170). Such arrows have been discovered from a number of Proto-historic sites (S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.93).

\textsuperscript{35} The practice of inscribing the name of the archer is as old as the time of \textit{Mahabharata} (G.N. Pant, \textit{Indian Arms and Armour}, Vol.I, p.110, \textit{Mahabharata, Dronaparva}. Also see P.K. Gode, \textit{SICH}, Vol.II, p.65, fn.15). Kalidasa refers that Raghu shot several arrows with his name inscribed at the \textit{asuras} (G.N. Pant, also see \textit{Raghuwamsa}, p.111,V.35, VII, V.38). The practice continued till our period, as such arrows are also found to be mentioned in \textit{Rajtarangini}, VIII, V.1678).

\textsuperscript{36} The technique of making an arrow poisonous is referred in Ancient works like \textit{Dhanurveda} and \textit{Arthasastra} (Bk., XIV, Ch.I). Manu condemns the use of such arrows in civilized warfare (\textit{Indian Arms and Armour}, I, p.110). Such a practice would had been continued till the early medieval period.

\textsuperscript{37} The two great epics, \textit{Ramayana} and \textit{Mahabharata} make reference to fire-arrows (Ibid., p.111). \textit{Arthasastra} of Kautilya refers to three different recipes for preparation of fire-arrows (Ibid.). The \textit{Aitereya Brahman} describes an arrow with fire on its tips (Ibid.). This practice of using fire-arrows continuously survived till medieval period.

\textsuperscript{38} D.C. Ganguly \textit{The History of The Paramara Dynasty}, p.66.

\textsuperscript{39} G.N. Pant, \textit{Indian Arms and Armour}, Vol.I, p.110.
Rajtarangini records the actual instance of the use of burning arrows smeared over the vegetable oil struck by which the enemies caught fire.\(^{40}\) Manasollasa has recommended the use of such arrows against elephants.\(^{41}\) During early medieval period some arrows were headed with hollow brass-balls, which were filled with inflammable composition like naphtha. This practice was certainly followed from the Arab invaders, who used naphtha as an inflammable material on their arrows.\(^{42}\)

The most preferred material of which the shaft of these arrows were made was reed.\(^{43}\) Reed arrows were also given preference by the Muslims. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir writing in the early part of the 13th century said that no arrow travels farther and is lighter and works better (than one) of reed".\(^{44}\) Sometimes the arrows were made of cane-wood fitted with iron points.\(^{45}\) Metal-shafted arrows were known as naracha.\(^{46}\) But it is true that these Indian bows and arrows were far inferior to the Persian and Afghani bows which were popularly used by the Turks in India.\(^{47}\)

---


\(^{42}\) Ibid.

\(^{43}\) An arrow had three parts (i) point (ii) shaft (iii) feathers (G.N. Pant, *Horse and Elephant Armour* p.125). Dr. Elmy observes that most of the shafts in India in all ages were made of reed, which was a specie of bamboo (*Indian Arms and Armour*, p.108). For the arrows made of reed, see *Indian Arms and Armour*, I, p.108, Ahmad.Y.Al. Hasan, Donald.R. Hill, op.cit., p.99, Robert Elgod, op.cit., p.94).

\(^{44}\) Fakhr-i-Mudabbir quoted by Robert Elgood in *Islamic Arms and Armour*, p.94.

\(^{45}\) Herodotus writes that the Indians in the Persian army in the 4th century BC were armed with cane-arrows tipped with iron (G.N. Pant, *Indian Arms and Armour*, p.67, also see fn.55, H.C. Bhardwaj, *Aspects of Ancient Indian Technology*, p.143).

\(^{46}\) Naracha is mentioned at several places in *Mahabharata* (*Indian Arms and Armour*, I, p.103,104). Such arrows might had been used with metallic bows. G.N. Pant finds one such naracha arrow of the 18th century, preserved in the Arms Gallery, National Museum, New Delhi and another at the Government Museum, Madras (Ibid.)

\(^{47}\) Persian and Afghanistan specialized in the production of weapons of all kinds including bows and arrows and exported them to India together with other chief articles, such as horses, coats of mail etc (C.E. Bosworth, "The Early Islamic History of Ghur", *Central Asiatic Journal*, Vol.VI, 1961, p.1181, Habib & Nizami, op.cit., p.144, Cf. *Indian Arms and Armour*, I, p.69). The popularity of these bows and arrows as indicated by the fact that their possession was regarded a status symbol in
Mounted Horse - Archery:

In relation to archery, it becomes important to state briefly on mounted horse-archery, the prevalence and practice of which is generally regarded the base of superiority of the Muslims over the Hindus, who are ever charged to recede the concept far back into the back-ground.

Scholars have tried to put forward the presence of horse-archery in ancient India, basing on the references gleaned from the accounts of Mahabharata and a respective treatise on archery entitled Dhanurveda.\(^48\) It appears that Dhanurveda is quoted in Agni Purana which prescribed the use of bow from horseback.\(^49\) Again, attempts have also been made to prove the prevalence of horse archery during Gupta and post-Gupta period on the basis of the numismatic and other evidences.\(^50\)

But, as regards to the truthfulness of the account of Dhanurveda, there are two things, first, the date of the treatise, which furnish the account is not clear; secondly, the reference in it of the use of bow on horseback by one, who has neither chariots nor elephants, shows that the Indians did not attach much significance to horse-archery.\(^51\) Regarding the references of mounted horse-archery in Mahabharata, it may be stated that in all probability this text might had been inserted around AD 300, when the foreign races like Scythians and Parthians were practicing it in India.\(^52\) It is probable to conclude from such references that the art of horse-archery might had not been known to the Indians but somehow they provided some formal place to it in their

---

49 Agni Purana, II, p.894).
50 G.N. Pant, Studies in Indian Weapons, p.74.
armies, either in imitation or at the hand of the foreigners; by incorporating some of them in their armies. The representation of mounted archers on the coins of Gupta and post Gupta period and one of the paintings at Ajanta must probably mean to reflect not the practical use of horse archery but only the imitation of some Central Asian tribe like the Hunas, who in all probability might had practiced it, while invading the Gupta empire. It is a question of some importance if the Indians of Gupta and post Gupta period had the practical use of archery from horseback, why did they not utilize their skill to defend themselves from the onslaughs of the Arabian and Turkish mounted archers? Thus, it should be regarded as an important fact, if one sees the non-prevalence of horse-archery in Indian army.

This absence of horse-archery is regarded as one of the causes of the defeat of Rajputs against their Turkish adversaries, who were skilled with the tactical use of bow from horseback, shooting without halting and dismounting. Minhaj -us-Siraj states that the Turkish mounted archers created a havoc in the army of Prithviraja Chauhan. The battle of Chandwar was fought on the part of the Turks with 50,000 mounted men and it was certainly an arrow of a mounted horse-archer, which struck king Jayachandra of Kannauj in the eye, with the result that he died and his advancing army was routed.

The Turks were quicker in maneuver owing to the pace and agility of their horses and to the lightness of their weapons. Being mobile, it was possible for them to remain at a distance

---

56 B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.217.
57 The principal weapon of the Turks was bow but they also used shield, lance, sword, club, which were lighter in weight (R.C. Smail, op.cit., p.77, Robert Elgood, op.cit., p.169). The Turkish lance was lighter even than that of the Arabs (Ibid. p.170).
from their enemy and to choose the moment at which they could close with him. Whenever the situation did not appear in their favour, they always preferred retreat and if the enemy’s attempt was given up they themselves attacked once more. In the words of R.C. Smail “The Turks might be scattered but always, they returned to the fight, now they faced the enemy, now they turned away. They thought it no less creditable to retreat than to pursue, they were like flies, who could be beaten of but not driven away”. Thus, according to Smail, the Turks had the ability “to combine their archery with the tactical uses of their mobility.” With this combination, they could ably destroy the cohesion of the enemy by inflicting upon him the loss of his men and animals.

Saddle:

The riding and combat efficiency of a mounted archer was increased by the successful use of saddles equipped with stirrups. The use of saddle to provide a comfortable seat to a horseman was not a new one. But with the origin of stirrup, revolutionary changes occurred not

58 R.C. Smail, op.cit., pp.77-78.
59 Ibid. p.78.
60 Ibid., also see Robert Elgood, op.cit., pp.169-70.
61 R.C. Smail, op.cit., p.78.
62 Ibid., pp.80-81. Such skill of the Turks with a bow was achieved by sound basic training during boyhood the regular practice in saddle and by the highly disciplined drill and exercises (Robert Elgood, op.cit. p.82).
63 The concept of a rudimentary form of saddle, probably as a blanket sheet, explained by the terms pithaka, pithamarda, khalina, paristoma, rankava, is clearly found in Mahabharata. But the true saddle is only clearly visible on some of the horses figured at Sanchi and Bharhut (G.N. Pant, Horse and Elephant Armour, p.69). The processional scenes of the first cave at Ajanta represent saddles on the back of horses (Ibid.) Besides, asvamedha type of coins of Kumaragupta I (5th century AD) figures horses with saddles (Ibid.) Further very clear references of saddles continued to be found in Harshacharita and Kadambari of Bana (7th century AD) and Sisupalvadh of Magh (10th century AD). The use of saddle had become so common by the 8th century AD that it began to be regarded a mark of dishonour and disgust not to put saddle on horses (see Chachnamah in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, pp.187-151).
only in the field of mounted archery but in overall mounted warfare, as by tucking his feet into the stirrup a rider would had been able to make full use of his height, in a standing position, combining his full weight and energy with horse's strength and mobility. Thus, by providing full support and balance to the rider, the use of stirrup welded the horse and rider into a single fighting unit. The rider in such a position, certainly would had been much able to damage his enemy.64

There has been much discussion on the origin of stirrup and its diffusion. Here one should feel much concern with the origin of stirrup in India and to the question that whether it was an introduction at the hand of the Turks or it diffused to India from anywhere else?. Lynn White, who made extensive study on the subject seeks a rudimentary idea of stirrup in the form of loose sursingle of rope, as represented by the sculptural relieves at Sanchi, Bhaja, Mathura and Pathaora.65 Prof. Irfan Habib, in a notable paper entitled 'Technological changes”, credits to Muslim conquerors of Delhi Sultanate, the direct cultural heirs of the Persians and Central Asian people, for the introduction of stirrup in India.66 But the contention of Habib had been criticised

---

64 Commenting on the position of horseman before the invention of stirrup Lynn White states, "Before the invention of stirrup the seat of the archer was precarious. Bit and spur might help him to control his mount, the simple saddle might confirm his seat, nevertheless, he was much restricted in his methods of fighting. He was primarily a rapidly mobile bow-man and hurler of javelins, swordplay was limited because without stirrup your slashing horseman taking a good broad handed swipe at his foe had only to miss to find himself on the ground. As for spear before the invention of stirrup, it was wielded at the end of the arm and the blow was delivered with the strength of shoulder and biceps.” (Lynn White, op.cit., pp.1-2, also see Fredrick Wilkinson, Arms and Armour, p.75).

65 Lynn White, op.cit., p.14, also see C. Singer, op.cit., II, p.556. The same kind of stirrup is found to be represented on a lota in the Indian Museum, discovered by Major Hay in 1857 at Kundah in Kulu. Here is also a depiction of a procession, which includes musicians, a chariot, two horseman and an elephant (V.A. Smith, A Jainu Stupa of Mathura, p.22).

66 The absence of any representative sculptural evidence of toe stirrup after 2nd century AD and its sudden reappearance after the Muslim conquest in 10th century AD at Khajuraho, is being seriously tackled by Habib in support of his theory (Irfan Habib, “Technological Changes”, op.cit., p.158). He
by Simon Digby, stating that the stirrup must had not been introduced at such a later stage in India, as its northern region, where the rope stirrup was known earlier had maintained close trade relations with Central Asia, specially in terms of the importation of horses from an early date.\textsuperscript{67} This argument is raised in support of his view, which somehow attests the presence of stirrup in India before its use by Delhi Sultans through the sculptural evidences of the early medieval period.\textsuperscript{68} Citing to the representations of stirrups at Konark in Orissa (12th century AD), Khajuraho in Central India on frezies of Lakshman temple (c. AD 950 ) and Channakesava temples at Belur (Southern Deccan), built by a Hoyasala ruler in the first half of the 12th century, he suggests that the use of stirrup was widespread in India, even in extreme south before its conquest by the Muslims.\textsuperscript{69} Further, Prof. Habib in another likewise article approves his point by contesting that the stirrups appeared at Lakshman temple of Khajuraho and Konark, being so large and broad in size could not have been of iron but of leather or woven-rope or even of wood, and the stirrups, hanging from the saddles of two horses at Konark are regarded of no use by him, owing to be fully circular in shape, so much so that it was not possible for a rider to stand or even tuck his feet fully in them.\textsuperscript{70}

P.K. Gode, an eminent Sanskritist explains to the absence of any original term for stirrup in Prakrit and Sanskrit dictionaries to mean its foreign origin.\textsuperscript{71} He remains unable to find out quotes to \textit{Adab-ul-Harb-wa-Shujjat} of \textit{Fakhr-i-Mudabbir}, which attest the use of stirrup in India (\textit{rikab}) by the Delhi Sultans of 13th century AD (Ibid.). To the use of Arabian term \textit{rikab} in Persian source, he states that in original it meant a camel carrying travellers but by the 11th century AD, it began to be used to mean stirrup (Ibid.)

---

\textsuperscript{67} Simon Digby, op.cit., pp.13-14.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{70} Irfan Habib, "Changes in Technology", op.cit.
any literary evidence about the use of stirrup by the Indians except the one, mentioned in a section on the game of *polo* (पुलो) in *Manasollasa* of Somesvara (AD 1130), which refers to the stirrups of gold. This reference to the metallic stirrup is a later one and the Chalukyan king Somesvara, in all probability had adopted it in imitation to the Mohammedans, as the game of *polo* (Persian, chaugan), indianised under the name of त्वत्रि was originally a game, popular to courts and Kings, overall Central Asia, which might have been introduced in India after the Muslim conquest of Sind. However, the use of gold here, instead of iron, is quite strange, which may only be explained in terms of the glorification of the pomp and prosperity at the royal court of Chalukyan king. It may also be presumed that in all probability the iron stirrups were known to the Indians and the stirrups of gold were certainly imitated from them.

The use of stirrups in south India has also been attested by a passage from Amir Khusrau describing the conquest of Ma’bar by Alauddin Khalji, in which he says that the Rai of that place, named Rayan, being embarrassed by the enemy’s attack had broken his own stirrup. But the breaking of stirrup by Rai so easily, does not prove its iron form but more often of wood or rope.

After examining the varying views and evidences concerning the use of stirrup, it may easily be stated that the Hindus, though, familiar with the use of stirrups, did not use them in their original iron forms. The scarce reference of metallic stirrup in *Manasollasa* indicates its use

---

72 Among two verses quoted by Gode, one refers to त्रस्त्रि: and another to त्रस्त्रियाँ (pairs of stirrups). These according to Gode are coined words like त्रस्त्रियाँ & त्रस्त्रियाँ mentioned by Apte in his dictionary as equivalents to stirrups (Ibid., Apte’s *Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Manasollasa*, Vol.II, p.221, V.V. 83-84, p.224, V.V.I8-19).

73 P.K. Gode, op.cit., p.72.

only limited to king’s court and there was no such tradition to equip the war-horses with them. The use of rope or wooden stirrup on the other hand must had been a common practice as a direct response to the iron stirrup of the north-west. Unlike their Hindu counterparts, the Turkish sultans of Delhi were commonly using iron stirrups, extant evidence of which is found from *Adab-ul-harb-wa-shujj’at*.75

**Horse-Shoe:**

Another device, the introduction of which increased the overall efficiency of a horse to gallop over hard and rocky surface; acting as a protective sheath for the horse and providing a firm grip of ground, was horse-shoe76 of iron; the usual type of which had nail-holes stamped through from one side, resulting in a wavy outline to the outrage. The free ends were turned over to form a calkin, which together with the nail-holes, when they projected, gave a good grip on the ground. The Muslims had gone far ahead even in this respect. The contemporary evidence of the use of such horseshoe by Delhi sultans may be gleaned from a passage of Fakhr-i-Mudabbir’s work on warfare.77 Unfortunately, there is not even a single evidence of its use by the contemporary Hindus including the Rajput rulers of India.

75 See Irfan Habib, “Technological Changes”, op.cit.

76 According to Lynn White, the earliest definite excavated evidence of horse-shoe comes from the nomadic rider’s grave in Siberia in 9th-10th centuries and the first recorded evidence of nailed horse-shoe is found to be mentioned in the Byzantine Tactica of Leo VI, who reigned from 886-991. He further states that horse-shoe probably appeared in Europe at the end of the 9th century and by the time of the 4th century its use had become common (Lynn White, op.cit., pp.58-59). C. Singer’s contention that the horse-shoes were common enough on the Roman sites from the first century BC has totally been refuted by Lynn White, stating that the references taken out by Singer are to solace attached with thongs or wires either for ornamentation or to help the healing of a broken hoof. He tries to explain to the absence of any literary or sculptural evidence, proving the use of horse-shoe by the Greeks, Romans and Franks, till the latter half of the 9th century AD (Lynn White, p.58, C. Singer, op.cit., p.561, also see Montgomery of Alamein, op.cit., p.68).

77 The passage tells, “an expert upon selecting a horse for the ruler of Bukhara first rested the horse and then shod it (na’l bast) and went and told the ruler that he would show him the horse next day.” Again the author put the insistence on the besieged garrison for the ever inclusion of na’l band or smith to shoe the garrison (Irfan Habib, “Technological Changes”, op.cit.).
Swords:

The Rajputs rulers of India had used different varieties of swords such as khadga\textsuperscript{78} (multi-edged sword), karvala\textsuperscript{79} (single-edged sword), maustika or vasi (dagger),\textsuperscript{80} katar\textsuperscript{81} (punch dagger, a sword called talwar these days), asi\textsuperscript{82} (long sword) risti.\textsuperscript{83} That the most popular and commonly used weapon of the Rajput rulers was sword can be easily proved by the literary as well as by the sculptural pieces from the contemporary architectural remains.

Beginning with the literary texts, the sword was given so much preference in relation to bow and arrow by the Rajput King Bhoja Paramara (11th century AD) that in his work, he

---


80 Ibid., Dagger was the projectile hand weapon mostly used for thrusting at close quarters and was a personal weapon of the rank and file of infantry (Pant, Weapons in Ancient India, p.422). It was a straight bladed sword with a reinforced blade, the extension of which to knob in the form of a bar made it possible to have a two handed grip on the hilt by the soldier (Fredrick Wilkinson, Arms and Armour, p.151). Indian paintings, sculptures and coins of our period depict it on the waists of the kings, princes, feudal lords and beneath the cloth of the assassins (G.N. Pant, Indian Arms and Armour, Vol.II, p.135). The Manasollasa of Somesvara describes twenty kinds of sports played with this weapon. The same also advises the king to at first do a practice in wielding a dagger in his arena and thereafter to take a regular sword (Manasollasa, Vol.II, p.149). According to Somesvara, the best dagger to be used by a king should be of four vitastis (or the distance between the extended thumb and the little finger), (Ibid., p.149, Vol.50).

Earlier to our period, the soldiers of Harsha's army and the king himself used this close combat weapon (Indian Arms and Armour, Vol.II, p.135). V.S. Agarwal also refers to the clay figurines of the soldiers of tall stature, found at Ahicchatra belonging to 6th and 7th centuries AD, with a girdle and dagger (Studies in Indian Art, p.149, fn.188).

81 Kanhadade Prabandh, p.75, VV.46-74, 48.

Having a hilt with two bars which were gripped in the fist, it delivered the blow like a punch (Fredrick, op.cit., p.151)


83 Aparajitpraccha, p.498.
devoted 123 verses in description of sword, while the bow and arrow being described only in 8 verses.\textsuperscript{84} Similarly, Dhanika, the commentator of \textit{Dasarupaka}, in a verse depicts the sentiments of a warrior, who gives preference to the sword over the bow.\textsuperscript{85} Stressing on the use of sword Somesvara, giving description of different types of swords, advises the king to make a practice in sword-wielding in different strategic positions; by taking the sword in the right hand and the shield in the left.\textsuperscript{86} The Hindus had acquired so much skill in wielding a sword that even Ibn Batuta refers some Hindu swordsmen recruited in the state army and in the private levies of the rebel princes of Sultan Muhammad-Bin-Tughlaq. On the other hand, in the realm of archaeology, the processional fighting scenes of warriors at Khajuraho are living proof of the popularity of this weapon\textsuperscript{87} and that the sword accompanied by the shield was the most popular weapon of the Chandella foot soldier is proved by the frescoes of Lakshman temple.\textsuperscript{88} The sculptures of Nilakanthesvara temple (Kekind in Rajasthan) and Hasanath temple (Sikar in Rajasthan) also reveal the representation of swords in the hands of the Rajput warriors.\textsuperscript{89} Besides, the procession of warriors depicted at Dilwara temple (12th century AD) on Mt. Abu, a figure of warrior

\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Yuktikalpataru}, pp.140ff., 175-76.

\textsuperscript{85} B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.216. While looking into the details, the functions of these two cadres of armaments differ. Hence, the point is emphasized that this may be one of the reasons for the decline of archery during our times.

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Manasollasa}, Vol.II, Introd., p.26

\textsuperscript{87} G.N. Pant, \textit{Indian Arms and Armour}, Vol.II, p.24-25. In the military procession sculptured at Khajuraho, most of the soldiers are seen carrying sword. A few sculptures depict a cavalryman attended by a man with umbrella (\textit{chatra}) and accompanied by other soldiers with swords and shields. The horse riders are seen with the sword hung on their left side together with spear and shield (G.N. Pant, loc.cit, p.25).

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., Vol.II, p.25.

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid.
recovered from Bhilsa, a relief sculpture at Chittor, depicting war scenes clearly show the representation of swords and lances.\(^\text{90}\)

India already acquiring an unparalleled excellence in the field of iron technology\(^\text{91}\) itself had several manufacturing centres of swords. Bhoja, the great Paramara ruler himself refers to Varanasi, Magadh, Ceylon, Nepal, Anga, Saurashtra and Kalinga as the centres of sword manufacturing.\(^\text{92}\) Further, *Agni Purana* mentions to the swords manufactured at Khat, Suparaka, Bang (Bengal) Anga respectively celebrated for their elegant appearance, strength and endurance, power of standing blows and keenness.\(^\text{93}\) Debal had also become famous as a centre of manufacturing swords.\(^\text{94}\) Bhoja referring to the relative value of swords produced in different countries states to those manufactured at Benares and Saurashtra as the best, while those at

---

\(^{90}\) B.N.S. Yadav basing on the literary and archeological evidences, which show the predominating use of sword instead of bow and arrow, seeks the decline of archery during early medieval period. Proving his point, he states that the bow and arrow, which was the chief weapon during the previous ages has given its place to the sword from 10th century AD onwards. In his opinion, the sword in the 12th century AD, as described in the *Rukminiharana and Kiratarjuniya* came to be closely associated with the ideal chivalry (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.216-217).

\(^{91}\) Indians were familiar with the smelting of iron as early as BC 1100 The art was learnt by them perhaps through some skilled iron-smiths of Asia minor, where it was known from the 3rd millenium BC. The 100 talents Indian steel presented to Alexander in BC 326 by the tribes of Malli and Oxydrakae in order to please him, which he had carried to Greece, must had been in all possibility of excelled value, for a mere piece of iron considered worthy of presentation to the conqueror of the world itself, undoubtedly, appears a clear proof of that excellence (*Indian Arms and Armour*, II, p.89). Due to its fineness, Indian steel and iron remained one of the important articles of trade, imported by Romans from India. In the field of technology, the famous iron pillar at Mehrauli near Qutub-Minar, New Delhi, the largest and heaviest single piece of iron, weighing about 8 tons and the huge iron beams (one of them over 25 feet large, 11 inches broad and weighing 48 tons) used in the Sun temple at Konark remind us the expertise workmanship of the highly skilled iron-smiths (Ibid., p.89).

\(^{92}\) *Yuktikalpataru*, p.147, VV.47-54, p.170, VV.25-28.

\(^{93}\) *Agni Purana*, II, Ch. CCXLV, p.886.

Magadha, Anga and Kalinga as worst. The swords manufactured at Ceylon are described by him as of middling.95

Indian sword blade had ever been a subject of praise owing to its quality. Mallal, an early Arabic poet describes the flight of Hemyarites as chased by an stock of hailing arrows, “whilst hard Indian swords were punctuating them”. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir, who gives a long list of famous swords such as Chini, Firangi, Yamini, Bilamni, (sayalamani?) Shahi, Alai, Hindi and Khurasani, mentions to Hindi sword as the best and most lustrous (gawahardartar). To a special variety of Hindi sword, mawz-i-darya (waves of the sea probably on account of the watering on the blade), he states as the most costly and choice of all. Further he continues by stating that in the army, treasury or armoury of a king there was not likely to be more than one of them.96 While comparing the Hindu sword with those of Kuras&n and Iraq, he says that “They (Indians) have the hardest blades of all the swords... the swords known as Bakhari(?), used in Khurasan and Iraq are soft and not of well tempered steel: but in inflicting wounds they break less (than the Indian swords).”97 True it is that the swords made of soft steel could not break easily but those made of hard steel were very effective. The same author further states describing a special variety of sword “made of soft iron to which silver and copper was added and thus more pliable on account of the silver,” most possibly referred to a blade prepared by welded method. He also says that if a person is wounded with such a sword, it does not heal easily. The sword blades and other articles manufactured by the former technique were too little tenacious and very hard.98

95 Yuktikalpataru, p.147 (V.V.47-54), 170 (V.V. 25-28).
96 Simon Digby, op.cit., p.18.
97 Ibid.
98 Simon Digby, op.cit., p.18, also see Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1960.
The only way into the procurement of such a fineness was the quality of Indian steel of which the swords were the ultimate production and which was in great demand in the contemporary world of Arabia, Persia and Syria, so much so that the steel used in the production of the so called damascene work was not Syrian but imported from India. The Arab traveller Idrisi brings equal praise to both the Indian steel and the sword blades produced of it by stating: The Hindus excel in the manufacture of irons and in the preparation of those ingredients with which it is fused to obtain that kind of soft iron, which is usually styled Indian steel. They also have workshops wherein are forged the most famous sabres in the world. Indian sword blades (finished or half finished and steel continued to be imported to Persia till the 16th century AD and also afterwards.

2. Spear:

The use of spear had been popular right from the time of Rigveda. In ancient India, it was known through various names like rsti, sakti, bhindivala and pasa.

---

99 The steel ingots were carried from the Nirmal district of Hyderabad via Cutch, a maritime region on the North-Western coast of India and thereby exported to Persia, Syria and east African ports from where they find their way to Europe (G.N. Pant, Studies in Indian Weapons, p.128, also see Indian Arms and Armour, Vol.II, p.208).

The sword prepared of Indian steel had such a dazzling brightness that a person could look at his/her face like a mirror in its reflections (Indian Arms and Armour, II, p.89). Colonel Yule quotes Ramusio who states that, “Ondanique or Hundwaniy (Indian steel) was of such surpassing value and excellence that in the days of Yore, a man, who possessed a mirror or sword of Ondanique regarded it as he would some precious jewel” (Colonel Yule, Marco Polo, Vol.I, p.93.).

100 G.N. Pant, Studies in Indian Weapons, p.128, Indian Arms and Armour, II, p.90.

101 W. Egerton, A Description of Indian and Oriental Armour, p.56.


103 In Rigveda, rsti is referred as a weapon carried by Maruts on their shoulders (A.A. Macdonell and A.B. Keith, Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, I, p.118). Sakti, another kind of spear is referred in Mahabharata as a sharp weapon made of iron (Mahabharata, Adiparva, Cf. S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.102) and defined as two cubits in length, having a sharp tongue and a horrible claw. The text further refers that “it is as broad as a fist and goes very far. It must be taken up and thrown with two hands (Oppert Gustav, On Weapons Army, Organisation, etc., p.13). The commentator of
The spears were freely used by the warriors of our age. It is evident that when Mahmud marched towards Waihind in order to meet Anandapala, he first joined the latter's son, Brahmanapala, at the head of a valiant army equipped with blue spears and other weapons.\textsuperscript{104}

Spears also find specific mention in \textit{Khaira plates of Yasakharna} of AD 1076.\textsuperscript{105}

The Muslim Sultans of Delhi had also made frequent use of this weapon.\textit{Tarikh-i-Yamini} states that the troops of Jaipala had fought against those of Mahmud for several days, drawing blood from wounds inflicted from swords and spears\textsuperscript{106} and the fight was so fierce that "the spears were tired of penetrating the rings of the coats of mail."\textsuperscript{107} It is also evident that the spears were openly used in Mahmud's fight against Kulchand in close conflict.\textsuperscript{108}

\textbf{Lance:}

Another principal weapon of our age was lance known by various names such as \textit{kunta},\textsuperscript{109} \textit{kasuari},\textsuperscript{110} \textit{srka}.\textsuperscript{111} It was one of the most important weapons of Harsha's soldiery.\textsuperscript{112}

\textit{Arthasastra} refers to it as a metallic weapon four cubits in length, shaped like the leaf of \textit{karavira} and provided with a handle like a cow's nipple (\textit{Arthasastra}, Book II, Ch.XVIII). It is described by Magha as made of iron (\textit{lohaja}) and provided with a sharp blade at the end (\textit{abhyargra-phala-salini}) (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.166).

\textit{Bhindivala} is described in \textit{Nitiprakasika} with a crooked body and with a head, broad and bent in shape, one cubit in length and a hand in circumference. It was thrown against the foot of the enemy, whirling thrice and placing the left foot in front (Oppert Gustav, \textit{On Weapons}, etc., p.13).

\textit{Prasa} belonged to the class of weapons with edges like ploughshare (\textit{Arthasastra}, Book II, Ch.XVIII). \textit{Nitiprakasika} explains it as a spear, seven cubits long with its handle made of bamboo and a metal head, having a sharp foot-end (Ibid., p.19).

104 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.33.
107 Ibid., p.31.
108 Ibid., p.43.
109 \textit{Arthasastra} refers to \textit{kunta} as a weapon with its 'edges like ploughshares', while the commentator of it describes it as a 'wooden rod', 7,6 or 5 hands in length (\textit{Arthasastra}, Book II, Ch.XVIII). \textit{Nitiprakasika} states that it had an iron body with a sharp top and six edges, from six to ten cubits in length and round at the foot end (Oppert Gustav, p.19, G.N. Pant, \textit{Weapons in Ancient India}, p.293).
Its use in the 12th century in northern India is also attested by a coin of Ratnadeva carved with a rude sketch of a horseman charging with lance. In the 9th and 10th centuries the use of this weapon was popular with the Shahis of Afghanistan and Punjab. Again, the Chahmanas had known to have provided a due importance to it.

The Muslim chroniclers describe, how in the first battle of Tarain (AD 1191) Muhammad Ghori, on a horseback led a furious charge against the Hindu centre and shattered the teeth of Govind Rai with his lance. The significance and use of lance in Sultanate army is illustrated by Fakhr-i Mudabbir’s statement that no other person than a lanceman is able to fight 1,000 horsemen all alone. He also praises it for its lightness owing to which it can be easily handled.

According to him the Indians used a heavy lance called bhallah, the point of which is often

---

The length of the best, the medium and the inferior kuntas is suggested by Sukra as 16, 14 and 12 angulas respectively and the breadth of its head from two to three angulas (Sukraniti, Ch.IV, Sec.VII, op.cit, p.170, V.48).

110 Kuswari was a short lance.

111 Shrka has been translated as a lance or wooden shafts of metal spikes (S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.103). Though, it may not be doubted as ordinary bamboo sticks used by common soldiers (Journal of American Oriental Society, II, 1898, p.289).

112 Yuan Chwang, Beal, Bk.II, p.83.


115 The creation of Sambhar lake is described by the author of Prithvirajvijaya by planting the lance of Vasudeva (ancestor of the Chahmanas) on the suggestion and blessing of Vidyadhar, whose magic-pill he had returned (Prithvirajvijaya, tr. and summary by Harbilas Sarda, Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, 1913, pp.263-64).


poisoned to make the attack more effective.\textsuperscript{118} No other \textit{bhalla}h was better than the Indian \textit{bhalla}h in his view.\textsuperscript{119}

\textbf{Mace:}

Another important weapon, the use of which was most prominent in close combat was mace (club).\textsuperscript{120} Being of heavy weight, it could be wielded by a man of good strength and stamina. It could also be hurled on the enemy from a distance and smite in front revolving about in the midst of foes.\textsuperscript{121} The use of mace in our period is clearly attested by the contemporary evidences. While describing the march of Harsha's troops, Bana refers to "furiously running crowds armed with club."\textsuperscript{122} The irreplaceable position of the wielder of the mace is further attested by the epithet \textit{gada}hasta, which was adopted by a number of kings including Bhima (AD 921-60) of the Chalukya dynasty.\textsuperscript{123}

\textbf{Javelin:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{119} A.A. Rizvi, \textit{Adi Turk Kalin Bharat}, p.258.
  \item \textsuperscript{120} There were three independent varieties of clubs namely, \textit{musala} (pointed rod made of \textit{khadira}), \textit{yashti} (similar to \textit{musala}), and \textit{gada} (a long and heavy rod) (S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.105). Besides, these common terms, G.N. Pant also puts \textit{parigha}, \textit{mudgara}, \textit{sthuna}, \textit{laguda}, \textit{musundi (bhusundi) and drughana} in the general category of maces (G.N. Pant, \textit{Indian Arms and Armour}, Vol.I, Glossary of Weapons). It was made of hard iron, fitted with spikes. \textit{Nitiprakasika} referred it as a formidable weapon, four cubits long and its body equal to a carriage axle in measurement. Its head is adorned with a crest, it is covered with a golden belt and is able to crush elephants and mountains (Oppert Gustav, op.cit., p.20). According to Suksra, it is octagonal in shape, with breast's height having strong handle (\textit{Sukraniti}, Ch.IV, sec VII). In \textit{Ausanasa-Dhanurveda}, it is stated as pear shaped, quadrilateral and like the palmyra root. The fifty, forty and thirty \textit{angulas} length are prescribed for the best, middling and worst mace by the author of \textit{Ausanasa-Dhanurveda} (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit, p.169).
  \item \textsuperscript{121} S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.105.
  \item \textsuperscript{122} \textit{Harshcharita}, tr. Cowell and Thomas.
  \item \textsuperscript{123} S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.106.
\end{itemize}
Javelin (*kanya* or *karpana*) was also an important Indian weapon used by the soldiers of our age. Yuan Chwang refers it as a weapon of Indian soldiery. In the 1st battle of Tarain Govind Rai had imparted a terrible blow on Mohd. Ghori by his javelin, which led him to return back to his own home post-haste; without thinking of a next attack on the Rajput forces. It is also evident that during the course of a war between Mahipala and Masud, Gopala, the son of Mahipala provided a severe blow to the former with his mace, resulting which two of his teeth were lost.

The early Muslim invaders had also made a projecting use of this weapon at close quarters.

**Shield:**

The shields and the armour which are placed in the class of defensive arms were also of greater use for the brave fighting soldiers. The shield had been used by Indian soldiers as a protective or defensive arm since very ancient period. The contemporary sources like

---

124 *Kanya* is described by the commentator of *Arthasastra* as a metallic rod both ends of which are triangular and having 20, 22, or 24 inche's length (S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.104, P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.168), while *karpana* appears to him as an arrow or a dart, to be thrown with hand. Its edges weighed 7, 8, or 9 *karshas* and a skilled person could hurl it as far as the length of hundred bows (Ibid. p.168).


128 During the hour of Somnath conquest Mahmud being prayed by the priests of the temple to spare the deity struck the image “with his own hand and with the mace which is the counterpart of excalibur in oriental legend, he smote the face of the idol and a torrent of precious stones gushed out” (*IA*, X, 1881, p.22).

129 We are informed by the classical writers that during the days of Alexander’s invasion, the Indians used bucklers made of undressed ox- hide, which were equal to the height of these wielders (McCrimble, *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*, p.221). The construction of shields formed a matter in *Mahabharata* and *Arthasastra* of Kaulilya. The latter source refers that the construction was done through a variety of materials such as creepers, bamboo, wood and leather (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.175). In *Mahabharata* occurs a frequent mention of the term *charma* for the shield, which were sometimes prepared from the skin of tigers and more frequently from that of bulls (*arsabha*), (Ibid.).
Manasollasa and Yuktikalpataru provide a detailed description of shields. It is recommended by Somesvara that the shield should be round in shape (vartulani) and made of canes, bamboo, wood and hide;\(^\text{130}\) while in Yuktikalpataru, shield is described of two kinds viz. of wood and hide.\(^\text{131}\) According to its author, "it should protect the body, and be firm, light and tough. That which is insufficient to cover the body or is heavy, soft, easily penetrable or made of offensive material is defective."\(^\text{132}\)

In Turkish army, the infantrymen commanding the frontline of the army usually armed themselves with strong shields.\(^\text{133}\) The lighter shields were also used by the cavalryman to wage off the attack.\(^\text{134}\)

Siege-Machines:

One of the most significant features of the military systems of the Turks and the Rajputs is the prominent use of mechanical devices in siege operations to hurl heavy stones and projectile weapons on enemy's ranks and fortifications. The origin and development of these devices is a

\(^{130}\) Yuktikalpataru, p.174-75, V.V. 62-65.
\(^{131}\) Manasollasa, Vol.II, p.80, V.V.564-65.
\(^{132}\) P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.176.

The representation of rectangular, round, bell-shaped, irregular-shaped, oblong, wheel like and hemispherical shields are also revealed from ancient sculptural relieves and frescoes. The Khajuraho sculptures of the Chandella period depict shields carried by all the foot soldiers without exception (Vidya Prakash, Khajuraho, A study in the cultural conditions of Chandella society, pp.102-03, Cf. G.N. Pant, loc.cit, p.81). Round shields are noticed from the Gandhara sculptures of early Christian era; which according to G.N. Pant were made of the hides of rhinoceros or buffalo (G.N. Pant, Indian Arms and Armour, Vol.III, p.80.). The Gupta and post-Gupta sculptures, too, reveal the cavalry-shields of criss-cross design (Ibid., p.81). G.N. Pant regards the use of hemispherical shields by the infantrymen of post Gupta age (Ibid.). The oblong shields are noticed in the depiction of war procession in a freeze at Bhubaneshwar (Ibid.). The soldiers with Konark horse are depicted with circular shields in their hands (Ibid.). The shields of round, curved, oblong and parrying type could be seen in Ajanta frescoes (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.176-77, also see IA, 1930, p.170).

\(^{133}\) Ali Athar, "Military Technology of Delhi Sultanate (13th-14th century)", op.cit., p.174.

\(^{134}\) Fakhr-i-Mudabbir refers to different types of shields named as sipar chobin (wooden), sipar shushak, sipar-neza, sipar-chakh, sipar karg, sipar khadang (made of white popular tree), Cf. Ibid., p.174.
curious subject of the military history of India in the world context. The only people to credit with the successful construction and accomplishment of these machines were Greeks, whose technique was adopted by the Romans without important modifications.\textsuperscript{135}

As regards the introduction of these devices on Indian land Habib’s inquiry reveals that it was brought to India by the Arabs in the 8th century AD, to which they had learnt from the Romans.\textsuperscript{136} Since then, it had been persisted and used simultaneously by both the Hindus and the Muslims. The first definite evidence of the simultaneous use of siege-machines is furnished by the account of \textit{Chachnamah} (8th century AD).\textsuperscript{137} The Hindus including the Rajputs of our period are known to use these machines in order to bombard enemy’s troops from the ramparts of their forts. At the time of Alauddin’s invasion the bastion-guards of the fort of Siwana have been described as equipped with a large number of stone throwing machines.\textsuperscript{138} Amir Khusrau also refers to their use from both sides during the course of the conquest of Telang.\textsuperscript{139} Similar references are found of the conquest of Ranthambhor.\textsuperscript{140} Kalhana reports that in the siege of Bansala, the royal troops used them with success.\textsuperscript{141} Afif, too, reports that during the siege of Nagarkot both sides were in possession of \textit{munjaniqs} and \textit{arradas}. (Persian names of siege machines).\textsuperscript{142} It is said that by the end of the 12th century AD, the device had been practiced by

\textsuperscript{135} C. Singer, op.cit., Vol.II, p.699, also see Derry & Williams, pp.17,127.
\textsuperscript{137} \textit{Chachnamah} tr. Kalichbeg Fredunbeg.
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Kanhadade Prabandh}, p.39,40.
\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Khazainul Futuh} in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.81.
\textsuperscript{141} \textit{Rajtarangini}, VIII, 1677, B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.114.
\textsuperscript{142} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.308.
the Hindus on such an extensive scale that the fort of every rai was plentifully supplied with siege machines.\(^{143}\)

But Mohd. Habib, while imparting the only credit to the Arabs for providing such mechanical weapons to India did not bring any note to the accounts of ancient Indian literary texts which clearly point out to the use of some kinds of stone throwing devices earlier to the arrival of Arabs. A particular term in *Arthasastra*, *yantrapasana* (stones thrown by a machine) is of much significance in this connection.\(^{144}\) The *Adiparva* of *Mahabharata* too refers to *chakrasma*, which, according to its commentator Nilkantha, was a wooden machine for hurling stones.\(^{145}\) The Magadhan King, Ajatshatru is also known to have had a war engine, which could hurl stones and the use of which resulted in his victory over the Vajjian republic.\(^{146}\)

Based on these evidences, it appears that the Indians were quite familiar with the mechanical devices for throwing stones much before the arrival of the Arabs. One may presume that the Greeks, who ruled India in ancient times, expertise in these machines, must had probably introduced them in India and thereafter as a result of Greek contacts, the technique was possibly transferred to the Indians. But the only hurdle, which prevents to make such a presumption is the absence of any definite evidence in order to prove the similarity of Indian technique or

143 Mohd. Habib, op.cit., p.47.
144 "चन्द्रमाण्यमुदित पापाण रेतनी दृष्टव्याप्तानि ।"
(Arthasastra, Bk.II, Chap.XVIII, R. Shamasasty, p.114)
145 "अय: कर्मचारम पुण्यपुरुष: नाह: ।
कुञ्जपायो वियोजनम: क्रोधसंपूर्वकं चित्रजयस: ॥"
(Mahabharata, B.O.R. Institute, Ch.218, V.24, P.K. Gode, loc.cit., p.86.)
Also see Adiparva, Chitrashala, ed., Poona, 1929, p.357 (for commentary).
mechanical device with that used by the Greeks and the Arabs. Another point, which strikes one’s mind is that while India during ancient times had maintained good relationship with the Roman world, why did the Indians not learn the technique directly from the Romans? Owing to the lack of any firm ground regarding the use of machines of Roman types before the Arab invasion of Sind, the question remains open. Further research, however, may throw some more light on this aspect. The evidence of the simultaneous use of siege-machines for hurling stones by both the Hindus and the Muslims presented by the account of Chachnamah and the lingering on of the device afterwards remains the only base of argument in support that it was introduced in India by the Arabs.  

In order to investigate into the nature of siege-machines used by the Muslims and their Hindu counterparts, it is important to begin with the original Greek forms, from which the idea was diffused to the Islamic world and other nations.

Now we pass on to discuss in brief the variety of machines used in our period in the context of the Greeks. The first and foremost mention is subjected in this realm to catapult, meant pike hurler in Greek language, was previously a giant cross-bow, placed on a pedestal having a composite elastic element made of horn, wood and sinew. From these simple cross-bow type catapults later on developed the torsion catapult, operated by the torsion of twisted ropes; known in Greek as euthytonon and palintonon, respectively the names for simple and

147 Chachnamah.

148 It appears that the art of siege-engines was learnt by the Sassanids of Persia from the Greeks. Since then, such engines began to be called as maghribi or Western (Lynn White, op.cit., p.102, Maurice Daumas, A History of Technology and Inventions, p.368).

149 Such types of catapults were invented at Syracuse for Dionysus I in BC 400, who successfully used them in his wars against Carthage. Alexander carried these arrow-shooting catapults in his Asian campaigns. The Romans had used them in unsuccessful sieges of Perinthus in BC 341 and in the attack of Byzantium in BC 339 (Montgomery, op.cit., p.68, also see Ancient War of Warfare, Vol.I, p.84, C. Singer II, p.699, Derry & Williams, op.cit., p.246).
composite bow (double curved). Euthytonon was used for shooting arrows and the palintonon for projecting stones. Regarding, the structure and operation of the first one C. Singer states that in it, “the power was derived from a pair of skeins of twisted cords, (of sinew or hair) mounted in a stout wooden frame flitted together with dovetails. Each skein was bounded over two flat iron pins, carried on collars of bronze or hard wood. Two long arms of wood were inserted into the middle of skein, which were then twisted in opposite directions so that the arms were forced outwards by the torsion, until they pressed strongly against the uprights of the timber frame”.

Euthytonon (petrobolos and lithobolos) was not much more different than the palintonon. In it the skeins of sinew were placed farther apart in a square form and the bowstring was replaced by a broad strap to bear the burden of missile. The arms of the bow faced inwards and in a strained position the arms and the cord assumed the shape like a compound bow. Virtruvius (c. BC 27/AD 14), the greatest Roman authority on this subject advised great caution to assume that the size of the projectile, discharged should, always be in a direct proportion to the size of the machine.

Perhaps, the second category of catapults, with some variations in design but more or less similar in the technique were termed as ballistas, stone hurling engines. These ballistas may have been modelled in varied forms but the most popular and the latest of all in antiquity was the

---

150 C. Singer, op.cit., p.710.
151 Ibid.
152 Ibid.
153 Ibid., p.711.
154 Ibid., p.711.

Owing to certain disadvantages of sinew-strings, Philo of Byzantium replaced them by bronze-strings and thus presented a new form, chalcotenon, which was free from the changes effected by lamp in the sinews (Ibid., p.712).
single armed stone throwing onager or scorpion, fitted with a sling in order to increase the velocity of the stone or projectile.\textsuperscript{155} It was powered by a single massive skein of cord, usually made of hemp and on occasions of women’s hair,\textsuperscript{156} placed horizontally between the two side members of the frame of the machine acting on a single arm, which was lengthened by a sling. The arm was pulled by a winch or lever and than the stone discharged. Such engines were used to hurl heavy weights with a low velocity and high trajectory.\textsuperscript{157} The overall efficiency of this weapon depended on the strength of cable by which it was operated.\textsuperscript{158}

After referring to the main types of classical siege machines, it is necessary to throw a glance at the information gleaned from the Islamic sources in this context. The most authentic treatise on war, \textit{Adab-ul Harb-wa-Shujj’at} signifies the use of numerous types of munjaniqs, (stone throwing machines in Persian), such as munjaniq-i-dev, (a heavy munjaniq) munjaniq-e-ghuriwar (a particular type, not specified), munjaniq-i-khan (a munjaniq on wheels).\textsuperscript{159} The same

\textsuperscript{155} C. Singer has referred to three distinct types of ballistic models, (i) the two armed arrow-shooting ballista (ii) the two armed stone-shooting petrobolos (iii) single armed stone-throwing onager (C. Singer, op.cit., p.700).

The author of \textit{Ancient Art of Warfare} on the other hand states that the ballistas were only used for throwing stones and not arrows. The latter task was accomplished by catapults. He blames the authors of historical texts for making the confused statements being unable to differentiate the functions of the two (see Vol.I).

\textsuperscript{156} C. Singer, op.cit., II, pp.701, 713, also see \textit{Ancient Art of Warfare}, I, pp.84,121, Lynn White, op.cit., p.101.

\textsuperscript{157} C. Singer, II, 713. The classical writer Pliny credits Phoenicians of Syria to invent a sling and ballista; which might had plausibly been a weapon of such type. Such a remark of Pliny does not appear as fully untrustworthy, as Alexander is known to have employed some Phoenician engineers under his service (Ibid. p.700). The mechanism of hurling stones was also known to the Assyrians, who included units of sling-men in their armies in order to throw fixed stones and particularly effective in making assaults on cities and up-steep slopes (Montgomery of Alamein, p.54, \textit{Ancient Art of Warfare}, I, p.396, C. Singer, II, p.714).

\textsuperscript{158} In medieval Europe such type of engines were known as trubuchets with the capability to throw 200-300 pound’s stone upto 300 yards (Lynn White, op.cit., p.102, also see C. Singer II, p.724, Maurice Daumas, op.cit., p.515).

\textsuperscript{159} S.K. Bhakari, op.cit., p.113. \textit{Adab-ul-Harb-Wa-Shujj’at}, op.cit, p.271.
work also refers to the use of arradas (probably ballistas of Greece) of numerous types as arrada-e-ekrui, arrada-i-garda, arrada-i-kuftay and arrada-i-khan without specifying them.\(^{160}\)

Though, Islamic texts prescribe several names to siege-machines like munjaniqs, arradas, gazrak, maghribi etc., all of them appear as variants of torsion catapults or ballistas of Greek antiquity. The use of torsion catapults, (ballistas) operated by ropes or cables are much more apparent from the Muslim accounts. Amir Khusrau praises them for working efficiently owing to the strength of their cables. The machines of the Hindus on the other hand are referred by him, having no such efficiency on account of their weak cables.\(^{161}\) An Arabic treatise written in Syria (AD 1187-1192) refers to the Arab, Turkish, Frankish and Persian forms of it.\(^{162}\)

In personal view of Lynn white such type of missile-throwers entered Islam from China by way of Central-Asia about the close of the 7th century AD.\(^{163}\) The arrival of onager type of engine occurred somewhat later during the second half of the sixth AH/12th century AD. It was known for its widespread use in Islam during 7th AH/13th century AD. An Islamic manuscript of 14th century AD clearly features such type of machines.\(^{164}\)

---

\(^{160}\) Adab-ul-Harb-wa-Shujj’at, op.cit., p.271.


\(^{162}\) Lynn White, op.cit., p.102, also see Maurice Daumas, op.cit., p.51. For details see Islam, I, pp.218-222.

\(^{163}\) Lynn White, p.102.

If the theory of the introduction of these machines by the Arabs in India is to be accepted, then the machines used by the Hindus might have been similar to those of former.

Like the Greeks and the Romans, the Hindus and the Muslims had the ability to utilize the remarkable propensity of such arms used not only for throwing missiles and stones but also for discharging pyrotechnic liquids like naphtha (Greek-fire) in siege warfare owing to their far range of discharging heavy weights with great strength. The Hindus had mostly used these machines from the top of their fortifications. On the other hand, the Muslims, while using them to bombard the enemy's fortifications from outside had practiced the classical siege method in erecting siege towers and mounds (pashebs) with sandbags of the height of the fort.

Like the Greeks, the Muslim Sultans had usually ordered for the construction of siege machines like munjins, arradas at the battle sites; as their transportation might have been a difficult task. It appears that the Muslims might have made more subservient use of siege-

---

165 The range of all the machines was not equal. A catapult could hurl weights of 110 to 220 pounds a quarter of a mile or more (Ancient Art and Warfare, Vol.1, see chart on Roman Siege Machinery). A ballista transported by wagon had the capacity of hurling weights of 250 pounds to a distance of approximately 150 yards (Maurice Daumas, op.cit., p.251). It is said that some of the heaviest ballistas were capable of launching stones weighing 175 pounds over a distance of 800 yards. But it seems quite an exaggeration (Ancient Art of Warfare, I, p.121). In fact, there is not a consensus of opinion on this subject, among the writers on technology. C. Singer, who regards the effect of projectile in proportion to mass and velocity, claims the normal effective range of any of the machines not beyond 500 yards. But this range was extendable half of it with a light projectile and heavy engine, he says (C. Singer, II, p.714). The range and height of the projectile was subjected to many other things, such as the standing position of the operator and the flexibility or dryness of the shaft. If the operator stood close to the side of the projectile, the range was short but high, but if he moved towards the end of the shaft by about a span, the range would have been too far (Islam, I, p.218). Similarly, a flexible shaft had a longer range and greater force and the dry one less so (Ibid.). In shaftless machines, a similar role was played by strap. The tightening and close position to the point of attachment of the sling resulted in more horizontal path taken by the projectile (Maurice Daumas, op.cit., p.516).

166 Khazainul Futuh, p.38-39, also see Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, pp.82, 172.

machines than the Hindus, as they deployed the persons who were expert in their operation.\textsuperscript{168} Such expertise persons might have not been available for the Hindus in the land dominated by the Muslims. Mohd. Habib imagines the manufacturing of these machines by skilled Musalmans in the service of the Indian kings.\textsuperscript{169} Even then the use of these machines was there on a limited scale caused to their massive structure, clumsy proportion, want of skilled men for operation\textsuperscript{170} and the inefficiency to work in wet weather.\textsuperscript{171}

\textbf{Armoury:}

Besides the usual weapons, armoury has a significant place in the army. Sukra prescribes a firm and metallic armour for the body of a soldier, which could provide protection to the neck and is ornamented on the upper part.\textsuperscript{172} The author of \textit{Yuktikalpataru} also refers to a metal armour.\textsuperscript{173} The dark coloured armour referred in \textit{Sisupalvad} must also be of hard iron.\textsuperscript{174} \textit{Manasollasa} mentions to the coats of mail (\textit{sannadah}), made of iron, hide, cotton and bark.\textsuperscript{175}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[169] Introd. to Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.47.
\item[170] Al-Biladuri states that Muhammad, son of Kasim, when arrived at Debal with ships loaded with arms and \textit{munjanjis}, one of which was required 500 men to work with it (Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, p.120).
\item[171] Lynn White, op. cit., p.102.
\item[172] “गोष्ठमालिम्भस्य स्थूलं परं लोहस्य दुःस्वम्”
कवचं सहिष्णुजाणम् मूर्त्त्वकायिनौ शोभनम्।
(Sukraniti, p.170, V.50).
\item[173] “ब्रजन्ति ते मूर्त्तादिः: परम्पर भवति मयादिः
ये न माविनः। प्रविष्ट हि हरिनिः शादास्वयविचान संज्वलस्याविशिषता हथेवित्॥”
(Yuktikalpataru, p.140, V.37)
\item[175] \textit{Manasollasa}, Vol.II, .80, V.562.
\end{enumerate}
Kanhadade Prabandh different varieties of metal armour named as jirahajina, jivanasala, jivarakhi, angarkhi, karangi, vajrangi (cover for hands) lohapaddhagudi (steel plated armour) and topa (helmet) are mentioned. In Aparajitpraccha too the reference to some varieties of kavachas (armours), made of steel and iron (one or two angulas in thickness) occurs, among which the helmet formed the chief part of a warrior's dress. Earlier, in Arthasastra different varieties of iron armour are referred, such as lohajala (Iron net), lohajallika (little iron net), lohapatta (iron-plated garment) kavacha (iron coat made of detached pieces to cover the head, the trunk and the arms), sutraka (cover to the waist and hips). Regarding the use of armour, Bana refers to the hard strokes of swords, falling on the enemy's breast. The helmet like armour for the protection of head are also mentioned by him.

Armours were fabricated from hides, hooves, and horns of certain animals like tortoise, rhinoceros, bison, elephant and cow. Different varieties of armours were also required to protect the animals. The war elephants and horses were generally provided with trappings and ornaments to shield them from attack of enemy's forces. Yuan Chwang also refers to the tusks of

176 Kanhadade Prabandh, pp.21-22,51.
177 Aparajitpraccha, p.598, V.V.4-8.

However, regarding the use of metal armour P.C. Chakravarti remarks that these might had not been in common use on account of their expensiveness only the wealthy class of people could have been able to purchase them (P.C. Chakravarti, op.cit., p.179).


The lohajjala or lohajallika, probably a hauberk of inter-linked chain-mail, which could cover the whole body including the head and arms is also found specific mention in Mahabharata (Cf. P.C. Chakravarti, p.179, fn.3).

179 Harshacharita, tr. Cowell and Thomas, p.184.
180 Ibid., p.188.
181 Arthasastra, Bk.II, Ch.XVIII.
elephants of Harsha’s army provided with sharp barbs as a means of protection. Magh mentions bowmen discharging their arrows from the backs of armoured elephants. *Manasollasa* recommends different kinds of armours for the separate parts of body of a horse, i.e., head, tail, feet and neck and Chandbardai, while describing Visaladeva Chauhan’s fight against Baluk Rao Chalukya refers to warriors, their horses and elephants protected with armours. *Kanhadade Prabandha*, too, makes references to horses and elephants covered with armours (*pakhara*) entirely made of iron.

The contemporary Muslim Sultans including the Arabs and the Turks are also known to have utilised the protective device of armoury. It is evident from *Chachnamah* that the Arab horsemen, who advanced against Dahir were all clad in iron armours. Hasan Nizami, while providing a description of the army of Mohd. Ghori refers to soldiers “clad in armours and coats of mails”. Minhaj-us-Siraj states to Alauddin Husain’s infantry force as protected with karuah (an armour made of raw hide and covered thickly with straw or hay, while ready to take offensive against Yamin-ud-Daula’s forces. Regarding the qualities of this armour the same chronicler further writes, when the man put it on, they are “covered from head to foot and when

---

182 Watters, I, p.171.
183 *Sisupalvadh*, XVIII, V.20.
184 “सतक्रसन पद्तेन कुरापिण्डिव वर्धकः।
रेवय निम्न लालिं (ल) नं बद्वनलाभिभिन्योः।
रत्नकासन पुडङ्केर युक्तानालिके वर्धे।।
निम्नभिन्ये पर्वती ्वायुलाः। (हूः) ल शोभिना।।
पेल्लाक पुडङ्के पिच्छवक लोहठतैघंतिला पूर्णे।।
शर्ष्ममंतिप्रसूतेः। कू (कू) नकृत्त अंशिले।।
पद्ये: पादविभिन्ये हेमकिन्द्रे निकालिते।
ग्रीष्मसम्मी मणितस्माने कू (कू) मन्युनानेविवात।।”

185 Extracts from 1st Book of *Prithvirajraso* reproduced in *IA*, 1872, p.276.
187 *Chachnamah*, pp.76, 126.
they close their ranks, they appear Uke into a wall, and no missile or arm can take any effect on it, on account of the quantity of cotton with which it is stuffed.\textsuperscript{190} \textit{Adab-ul Harb wa-Shujj'at} refers to an armour called \textit{begtultak}, which was most probably an iron robe or \textit{kurta}.\textsuperscript{191}

The armours of the Muslims were also divided into separate parts like those of the Hindus. According to Afif, an armour used by Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq consisted of 44 pieces.\textsuperscript{192} Their animals were also protected with armours. For horses, there was a special kind of armour named \textit{burgustawan}.\textsuperscript{193} The elephants were covered by a heavy iron armour.\textsuperscript{194}

**Gun Powder:**

The Gun powder had directly formed a link with the history of Indian arms and weapons. Much debate has been made on its use and invention in India. The Indians, who worked on the literary texts of ancient period tried to prove its use and work ability in wars of the age of Kautilya\textsuperscript{195} and the authors of \textit{Ramayana}, \textit{Mahabharata} and \textit{Sukraniti} etc. The references in these texts tended to form a view in the minds of some that India was the land for the origin of Gun powder.\textsuperscript{196} According to them, the primitive firework mixtures were known in the remotest

---

\textsuperscript{189} \textit{Tabakat-i-Nasiri}, tr. Raverty, Vol.I, p.352, also see fn.3.

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., p.352.

\textsuperscript{191} Ali Athar, op.cit., p.174.

\textsuperscript{192} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{193} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{194} Ibid., \textit{Rehla}, tr., p.165

\textsuperscript{195} Regarding the use of fire in besieging a fortress Kautilya accounts, “having captured the birds such as vulture, crow, napt, bhasa, parrot, maina, and pigeon, which have their nests in the fort-walls, and having tied to their tails inflammable powder (agniyoga), one may let them fly to the forts” (\textit{Arthasastra}, tr. Shamasastry, Bk.XI, Ch.IV, V.14). Further, the author writes that the spies living as watchman of the fort may tie inflammable powder to the tails of mangooses, monkeys, cats and dogs and let them go over the thatched roofs of the houses (Ibid., V.16ff.).

\textsuperscript{196} The scholars like Oppert Gustav, Elliot, Wilson, Sri Ram Gopal Sen, Alan St. H. Brock. V.R.R. Dikshitar etc. are the staunch advocates of the above theory.
past\textsuperscript{197} and the use of Gun powder was known in India since long. Some of them even believed to such an extent that the Arabs learnt the manufacturing device of gun powder from India and that the Persians imported an abundant quantity of saltpeter from India for this purpose.\textsuperscript{198} It is also argued that the Turkish word 
\textit{topy} and Persian \textit{tupang or tufang} have been derived from the Sanskrit term \textit{dhupa}, which probably, meant as a rocket in \textit{Agni Purana} and used as corruption of the term \textit{naladipika} mentioned in Kautilya's \textit{Arthasastra}.

In opposition to the above views, a number of historians believed that the portions relating to the references of firearms in the ancient texts were probably the results of later

\textsuperscript{197} Kautilya prescribes the three kinds of recipes, named as \textit{agnidharana}, \textit{kshepyoagniyoga} and \textit{visvasghati} to make the arrows fiery. The first of these, according to him consisted of small balls made of dung of ass, camel, goat, sheep, mixed with the wood of \textit{sarala} (\textit{penuslangifolia}), \textit{devadar} (\textit{deodar}), the leaf of \textit{putitma} (\textit{lemon grass}), \textit{guggula}, \textit{srivestaka} (turpentine) and lac. The second, named \textit{kshepyoagniyoga} consisted of 'the dung of horse, ass, camel, mixed with \textit{sriyalachurna} (\textit{buchmania latffalia}), \textit{avalguja} (\textit{vernonia authelmintica}), lamp black and bess-max. The third, \textit{visvasghati} was prepared from the powder of all metals as red as fire or the mixture of \textit{kumbhi}, lead, zinc, mixed with the charcoal powder of the flowers of \textit{paribhadraka}, \textit{palasa}, and hair with oil-wax and turpentine (Dikshitar, op.cit., p.105).

Sukra provides the following formulae for the manufacture of gun powder, "mix 5 parts of saltpeter with 1 part of sulphur and 1 part of charcoal. The charcoal is to be prepared from \textit{arka}, \textit{snuhi} and other similar plants in such a manner that during the process the plants are so covered that the smoke can not escape. The charcoal thus obtained, must be cleaned, reduced to powder and the powder of the different charcoals is then to be mixed. After this has been done, the juice of the \textit{arka}, \textit{snuhi}, and \textit{rasona} must be poured over the powder which is to be thoroughly mixed with this juice. This mixture is to be exposed and dried in the sun. It is then finally ground like sugar and the whole mixture thus obtained is Gun powder... The three principal ingredients are mixed in different proportions and reelgar, orpiment, graphite, vermilion, the powder of magnetic iron-oxide, camphor, lac, indigo, and pure gum are added to the compound, accordingly as they are required" (Oppert Gustav, \textit{On Weapons} etc., pp.62-63).

All the above ingredients used in the manufacture of fire recipes are of Indian origin. But, here the question arises, whether these are necessarily the ingredients to be used in the formulae or any other kind of device, which could produce fire?

\textsuperscript{198} Oppert Gustav, \textit{On Weapons} etc., op.cit., p.48. Also see Elliot & Dowson, "On Early use of Gun powder in India", Vol.VI, pp.455-482, wherein by many of the arguments he has tried to conclude that "fire arms of some kind were used in the early stages of Indian history..." but these fell into disuse somehow, during the later age. After this, the technology of gunpowder and firearms was introduced by the natives of southern India most possibly before the arrival of the Portuguese (Ibid., V.R.R. Dikshitar, p.103, also see Jogesh Chandra Ray, "Fire Arms in Ancient India", \textit{IHQ}, VIII, pp.586-88.
additions and compilations of these texts. Thus, the description of Gun powder and firearms in Sukraniti seems to them nothing more than an interpolation or addition after their introduction in Indian warfare during medieval ages.  

Although primitive firework mixtures must have been known in India and used by the Hindus for many centuries, it was not until almost the beginning of the present century that any advance was made. The cracker is used in India in different forms known as gola, pataka, vengagvedi, karoo, adirvedi etc., Chinese fire mixture is used by Hindu pyrotechnists burnt in paper, bamboo containers and earthenware pots..."  

P.K. Gode, basing on many references concludes that the Chinese formulas for the manufacture of fireworks were brought to India about AD 1400, which was modified by the Indian substitutes for the Chinese ingredients, not all of which may have been then available in India. The main pyrotechnic ingredients, like sulphur, saltpeter, charcoal, powder of iron etc. in his view, had to be retained in the Indian formulas on account of being the very basis of pyrotechny. These were available in India from early times.

Gode's point of view is almost followed very recently by Iqtidar Alam Khan with the argument that the improved varieties of Gun powder had been prominently used in sieges from the 13th century onwards through various kinds of projectile weapons and devices. However, the

199 In order to assign a late date to the passages of Sukraniti, referring to Gun powder and firearms, P.K. Gode cites a work, Yavanaripatianukrama composed by Dalpatiraya under his patron, Madhavasimha about 1764, in which the skt. Term gulikangara churna is used as an equivalent of agnishurna mentioned in Sukraniti. He says that the further references to the terms ustranalika (portable guns, carried on camel's back), nayanalika (those carried on horseback) and gajanalika (carried on the back of elephant), remarked a close similarity with the terminology used by the author of Sukraniti (P.K. Gode, "The History of Fire Works in India", SICH, Vol.II, p.3-4).

Dr A.S. Altekar and U.N. Ghoshal regarded the addition of these passages into the main text of Sukraniti, sometimes after the 13th century (Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, p.494, B.P. Mazumdar, "Date & Concordance of Sukranta", in JBRS, Vol.XVIII, Jan-Dec., 1961, p.226.


201 P.K. Gode, Ibid., p.44.
more forceful Gun powder devices in the form of cannons or muskets in his view were introduced in India through Seno-Mongol channels.²⁰²

Though, in spite of all the proposed views, the history of Gun powder and firearms in India still remains uncertain. However, it remains very clear that not even a single reference is found regarding its practical use in Indian wars of our age, either from the side of the Rajputs or the Turks. Instead, there are firm evidences for the use of naphtha in wars from the side of the Arabs and the Turks in India against the Hindus. Thus, it is evident from Chachnamah that while Dahir was fighting seated on a lofty howdah, "Mohammad Bin Kasim told the naphtha throwers that the opportunity was theirs and a powerful man in obedience to this direction shot his naphtha arrow into dahir’s howdah and set it on fire. This produced immediate confusion in the Hindu army and decided the day."²⁰³ Similarly, while Anada Pal was fighting against Mahmud of Ghazni in AD 1008 with utmost vigour and unexplained courage and the Hindus were going to win over the battle, suddenly the elephant upon which Anandapal was seated being unruly from the effects of naphtha balls turned and fled. This circumstance produced a panic among the Hindus, who seeing themselves deserted gave way and fled from the battleground.²⁰⁴ In the 12th century, the king of Benares is said to have met the same end, when his howdah caught fire by naphtha shots of the enemy.²⁰⁵ The use of this pyrotechnic liquor by the Hindus in contemporary wars is not attested from our sources.


²⁰⁵ Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.221.
Thus, our scrutiny of the account related to the Indian Arms and weapons attest the superiority of the Indians in weapons of close-combat rather than in distant ranged weapons and devices which were not of Indian origin.

The words *naphtha* or *naphthaline* is derived from the Arabic word *nift* or *napt*. It was an inflammable liquor with which thin glass-bottles or balls were filled, to be thrown against the enemy as incendiary bombs like the modern hand grenade. The container used to get easily broken and let loose the content being struck down against any hard substance generally known as *Greek-Fire* owing to its first use and manufacture by the Greeks (possibly as early as the siege of Deluin in BC 424), (Montgomery, op.cit., p.139). The device seems to have been borrowed by the Arabs at an early date (Ibid., p.138). It is evident that the Arabs had faced ongoing defeats at the hands of the Byzantines, chiefly owing to the latter's position of "Greek-fire" (Ibid., p.139). It was probably during the course of these wars that the Arabs realised their weakness in this sphere and learnt the use of *naphtha* or Greek fire from their adversaries. K.A. Nizami & Mohd. Habib used the term *naphtha-i-siyah* or black *naphtha* and more possibly meant it as Gun powder, owing to its burning quality (see *Comprehensive History of India*, Vol.V).

Though, the formulae for preparing this incendiary mixture was firmly known, which contained probably bitumen, pitch, sulphur, resin oil, quick-line (Montgomery, op.cit., p.139).
CHAPTER-VII

MILITARY STRATEGY

It has unassuredly been remarked that war was a passion with the Rajputs. But as these passionate wars were the results of an organised effort, the stratagem cannot be ignored as their essential feature. Their strategy emphatically formed one of the important subjects of the contemporary Indian (Sanskrit) sources, though, they speak of it in a retrospective manner. The eyewitnessed narrations of the Muslim historians, even if, sometimes, safeguarding their patrons and race, also provide some clues relating to it. Thus, a combined explanation of both Indigenous and foreign (Persian) accounts will expectedly reveal a much transparent illustration of various aspects of military strategy of the Rajputs, such as the modes and tactics to deal with the enemy’s forces, creating harm to their troops with appliance of some unlawful apprehensions, arrangement of troops in a wisely manner on the battlefield and various other maneuverable devices, practiced for winning over the enemy in course of a war.

Anyhow, the idea of strategic wars did not evolve out at once. It may exactly be traced back to the period of Mahabharata War. An astute politician like Kautilya could assess the significance of a strategic device, while passing the eloquent statement that “an arrow discharged by an archer may kill one person or may not kill (even one) but the intellect operated by a wise man could kill even children in the womb.” He advises the king with great force to adopt

1 Mahabharata for the first time gives a bewildering account of different battle-arrays (vyuhas) like suchi (needle shaped), krauncha (in the shape of a heron), syena (hawk array) makara (crocodile shaped), mandala (circular) vajra (thunderbolt) etc., (See the formation of vyuhas in Udyoga, Virata and Bhishma parvas), which facilitated all the possible kinds of movements of the armies. The references of war music for rousing the spirit of combatants, striking terrors and wishing victories are also found extant in it. (Samkshipta Mahabharatam (with text and tr.) Part-II, ed. Prabhunath Dwivedi, pp.365 (V.35) and 390 (V.204).

strategical devices against the enemy during the course of war.\(^3\) Focussing on the strategic means, he advises the king “to strike terror in the enemy with the machines, by the employment of occult practices, through assassins, slaying those engaged in something else, by magical arts, by (a show of) association with divinities, through carts, by frightening with elephants, by rousing the treasonable, through herds of cattle, by setting fire to camps, by attacks on tips and in the rear, by creating dissensions through agents appearing as messengers (saying), “your fort has been burnt down or captured, a revolt by a member of your family has broken out; or; your enemy or a forest chieftain has risen (against you)”.

Kamandaka, a political writer of c. 8th century was again a great believer of trickery in war. He lays down to the destruction of enemy even by unfair and immoral means and instructs the king to adopt *mantra-yuddha* (secret war), avoiding open warfare and to conduct nocturnal raids against the enemy, as it will require limited efforts for success.\(^4\) Somdeva Suri (10th century), the author of *Nitivakyamrita*, believes in winning over the relatives of enemy for vanquishing him as a greatest secret formulae.\(^5\) These checkmated relatives should also be inspired to rebel against their king, in his view.\(^6\) *Tilakmanjari* of Dhanpala (10th century) also refers about *sauptikayuddha* (secret war).\(^7\) *Agni Purana* lays down that a king should always endeavour to achieve success through all possible means, i.e., *sama* (the use of friendly

---

3 Ibid., p.458, VV.48-50.
4 *Nitisara*, tr. Sisir Kumar Mitra, pp.393, (VV.15-17) and 409 (VV.66-67).
5 “न दयादायसरः पर्वतस्याकर्षणमन्दलोगसिता।”

(*Nitivakyamrita*, p.305, Ch.30, V.65.)

6 “समथिम्यश्वेतस्यायस्य दयादातुम्मलले।”

(Ibid., V.66.)
measures), danam (the payment of money), bheda (creating dissensions among the allies of an adversary), danda (war), maya (stratagem or treachery), upeksha (indifference) and indrajalam (deceit). Vishnudharmottara Purana, too, provides instructions for waging a treacherous battle to punish the sinful. In view of Sukra, stratagem is that tool by which even a strong enemy could easily be subdued. In his words, “a king whose arrangements are not certain, looking out for the opportune time, should practise duplicity. Like the concealed eye of a crow, he should pretend one thing and seize another.” Like Kamandaka, he also tries to animate the king to distract the enemy’s ministers, generals, subjects and women from his side by sowing seeds of contrivance among them. A king, according to him, should aim victory by means of creating dissensions in hostile army through expensive gifts and deceiving the rest of army at night, while asleep and tired by watches.

However, almost all these authorities besides referring about such tactics of kutayuddha did not forget to state a few words on the patrimonial wars of India (dharmayuddha) as described earlier in Mahabharata. But it must be remembered that these and similar other references are

9 G.P. Sinha, Post Gupta Polity, p.163.
10 Sukraniti, p.176, V.28.
11 Ibid., p.176, V.23.
12 Ibid., p.177, V.30.
13 Ibid., p.181, VV.86-88.
14 The ethical code relates to the non killing of a person, who is alighted on the ground, who is emasculated, who has joined his hands as suppliants, one who sits with dishevelled hair or one who submits by saying, “I am thine”, one who is asleep, one without a coat of mail, a naked, an unarmed, a combatant who is looking on, one who is fighting with another, one who is drinking or eating, one engaged in another matter, one who is frightened, or one who is running away, an old man, a child, a woman and a king (Mahabharata, Ganti Parva, Skt. text with Hindi tr.), ed. by Pt. Sri Damodar Satvalekar, I, pp.510 (VV.12 & 13) and 533, (VV.24-26), Part-II of the same 1980, p.700, VV.13 and 14. Also see Sukraniti, op.cit., pp.180 (VV.76-79) and the quotations of Manu in Laxmidhar’s Rajdharmakanda of Kritya Kalpataru, p.132).
just runningly quoted by them from the earlier texts in context to *dharmayuddha*, which was practically never followed by the Indian kings.

However, taking such references as literally, scholars generally remark\(^\text{15}\) that the Indian kings including the Rajputs of our age staunchly believed in righteous wars instead of strategical devices, which led to their ultimate defeat against their Arab and Turkish adversaries. Besides this, the omission of *Kutayuddha* by Laxmidhara (12\(^{th}\) century AD), the minister of war and peace of the Gahadawala king Govindachandra in his *Rajharamakanda of Krityakalpataru* and his emphasis on righteous war led to the opinion of scholars that the Rajput rulers in general and the Gahadawalas in particular were followers of *dharmayuddha*. Instead of the king, he prescribes, the full knowledge of military strategy to *senapati* or commander in chief and totally forbids a secret and unrighteous war to the former.\(^\text{16}\)

But it seems that strikingly they failed to draw their attention to the fact that Laxmidhara was writing on *rajdharma, "the righteousness of the king"* and therefore, it was totally irrelevant to mention its reverse. It, therefore, does not imply that they did never follow the policy of *kutayuddha*. (unrighteous war). Secondly, the account of Laxmidhara is not of original nature but just a compilation of quotations of many ancient authorities like Manu, Yajnyavalkya, Narada etc. Again, in an age of internecine wars, imbued with personal hatred and jealousy among the Indian kings, it was not possible to follow the age old maxims of *dharmayuddha*. There is no dearth of instances in historical sources when treachery was not used in wars. It is for example well known that Prithviraja III led a night attack on Dharavarsha Paramara of Abu, the description of which is found in *Parthaparakramavyayoga* of Dharavarsha’s younger brother


\(^{16}\) Pratipal Bhatia, op.cit., p.299, and fn.1 on the same page, B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., pp.64-65.
Prahaladana. Jayasimha Siddharaja, being unsuccessful after the continuous fight of twelve years against the Paramara kings, Yasovarman and Naravarman ultimately resorted to treachery and won the victory by breaking the southern gateway of Dhara city, which was the weakest point, avoiding an open warfare. Nitivakyamrita of Somdeva Suri, too, refers to one Bhadra, who captured the city of Kanchi with the help of warriors holding swords in the guise of hunters. It is further evident that Narasimha Chalukya, the commander of Rastrakuta king, Indra III, in course of his battle against the Pratihara king, Mahipala secured the victory by capturing his champion elephants, which marched in front and putting to flight the rest of troops.

In some rare cases, they also tried to play the treacherous game with the Muslims. Firishta accounts that when Mahmud of Ghazni set out on expedition in order to conquer the fort of Kalanjar, which was under the control of the Chandella king, Vidyadhara, the latter “in order to put the bravery of the Sultan’s troops to the test, intoxicated the elephants with drugs and let them loose without riders in to the camp.” It seems quite appropriate to assume that what Firishta had called the object of Vidyadhara, ‘to test the bravery of the Sultan’s troops’ was certainly a treachery planned by him to create a cohesion in enemy’s camp, the failure of which as proved by the same account is another matter. Gardizi points out to the indecisiveness of Mahmud’s battle with Vidyadhara on account of latter’s retreat under cover of night taking

---

19 *Nitivakyamrita*, *op.cit.*, p.174, V.27.
away the horses and elephants. Mahmud, thereafter gave up all idea of further advance into Chandella’s territory and promptly returned back to Ghaznin. Treachery was also not unknown throughout ancient India prior to our age. Such events are well known to us.

Coming to the arrangement of troops on the battlefield, it may rightly be asserted that the old ideology of *vyuha* persisted as a tradition but certainly was not followed in practice. Though, their various formations are mentioned by almost all the writers dealing with political history of the period. The practical existence of a complexed *vyuha* strategy during early medieval period remains suspectable. The period of the Rajputs is generally marked with such defensive

---


23 Ibid., R.G. Mishra, op.cit., p.47.

24 It was also adopted by our ideal heroes, Rama, Krishna, Indra and others and Bali and Vaman were killed by unfair fights. It is widely known that Bhima killed his enemy Duryodhana in a dwell, violating the rules of *Dharmasastra*, at the instance of lord Krishna. That this trend continued throughout Mauryan period can be proved by many examples. Even, further, Chandragupta II is known to have disguised himself as Dhruvadevi, the queen of his elder brother Ramagupta, to get entry into the Saka camp in order to kill the Saka monarch. Similarly, Sasanka of Bengal, acting as an ally of Malava king enticed Rajyavardhan, the king of Thanesar, by fair promise to a conference and assassinated him by treachery.

25 A detailed description of battle -arrays is found for the first time in *Mahabharata* (See the *Udyoga, Virata and Bhishma Parvas*). Further Kautilya’s treatment to the division of these battle arrays seems more rational and fuller (*Arthasastra*, op.cit., Book 10, concerning war). Their validity is also confirmed by Kamandaka in his *Nitisar* (*Vyuhavikalpa*, p.423, V.24). Regarding the exigencies of situation necessitating the formations of different *vyuhas*, Sukra states that if the alarm rises in the front, the *senapati* should march in an array resembling a crocodile, a double winged hawk or a needle with a strong point, if alarm rises in the rear, what is called a cart, if on the flanks, a thunderbolt, if on all sides, a wheel. (*Sukraniti*, op.cit., p.174, VV.96-97). A vivid description of these *vyuhas* is also found in *Manasollasa* of Somevara, (Vol.I, *Vimsati II*, VV.1184-89), *Agni Purana*, (pp.844, 876-79) and *Nitiprakasika* (B.P. Mazumdar, op.cit., p.64).

wars, while the invaded king could not get a suitable opportunity for the efficient organisation of their composite forces.

Besides the references of *vyuha* formations, some other implicit details about the battle formations are also furnished by our sources. It relation to it, Kamandaka advices the placement of commander in chief in the midst of expert warriors (*pravira purusha*) fighting bravely and guarding one another. Ordinary soldiers, according to him, should be placed in the middle or central division of a formation and the war machines in the rear part. He views that in case of a fierce confusion in the formation of an array, mighty elephants should be placed in the front, meaningby, the infantry and cavalry should take place behind the war elephants. His advisement to the separate arrangement of infantry, cavalry and elephant forces, with a sufficient gap in between to avoid a clash or obstruction at the time of their movement or retreat, most probably suggests the system of phalanaxes of different wings of army.

The author of *Agni Purana* lays down the adjustment of swordsmen in front of the army followed by the bowmen then cavalry, car warriors and lastly, the elephant-men. The bravest of the footmen elephant-men, car warriors and cavalry soldiers, according to him, should command the front of their respective lines.

27 *Nitisara*, op.cit., p.426, VV.32-34.
29 The particular distance, according to Kamandaka between each of the foot soldier should be one *sama* (14 angulas), with horses each at an interval of three *samas* and elephants and chariots at an interval of five *samas* each. (Ibid., pp.423, V.23).
30 *Agni Purana*, op.cit., p.845.
31 Ibid., Kautilya also suggests to the placement of best troops in the front, the next best at the ends, the third best in the rear and the weak troops in the centre (*Arthasastra*, op.cit., p.448, V.46). In a mixed composition of horses, elephants and chariots, he prescribes the stationing of elephants at the end of army, horses on the flanks, chariots in the centre or front and foot-soldiers in the wings or sides (Ibid., p.448, VV.38-46).
Manasollasa, giving an enumerative account of the arraying of soldiers on the battleground states that in the rear, centre and flanks should be stationed men with swords, in prapaksha (extremity of a wing), those armed with kodanda (rodbearers) in paksha (wings), those armoured men and cavalry in puratah (vanguard), cavalry, infantry and in front, elephants.\textsuperscript{32} Chandesvara, however, provides for the placement of horses on flanks, those of chariots by the side of the horses and then of elephants followed by infantry.\textsuperscript{33} The author of Nitivakyamrita, on the other hand, highly recognises the significance of pratigraha (rear forces) in an army\textsuperscript{34} and requires the place of the king in the rear of it with the royal emblem in the front.\textsuperscript{35}

The above details revealed from various sources suggest that there was an absence of uniformity in adoption of strategy and the organisation of troops in general. Different dynastic clans probably had the tendency to organise the various components of their army in war, in accordance with their own convenience.

However, it is important to know that to what extent the above laid down rules were being followed in practice. Therefore, in order to find out the real situation, one must go into the details of some important battles of the age, provided by the Persian sources.

\textsuperscript{32} Manasollasa, op.cit., vol.I, p.135, Vim\textsuperscript{ati} II, VV.1184-89.

\textsuperscript{33} Rajnitiratnakara, Text, p.40.

A study of our sources in general reveals that the use of chariots had become obsolete in the contemporary wars. The account of chariots within the formation of troops provided by Chandesvara and the author of Agni Purana, thus, appears traditional (For details see Chapter 3).

\textsuperscript{34} Nitivakyamrita, op.cit., pp.297, (V.19) and 298 (V.21).

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p.298, V.20. Agni Purana also advises the king to remain in the rear for the safety of his life (op.cit., p.844).
Chachnamah (8th century) portrays a very clear picture that Dahar, the ruler of Sind, while arranging his troops to fight with the Arabs, “led out the whole of his army. Some elephants, he sent with the advance column. The central forces he collected round himself. He placed in his front armed foot-soldiers and archers and on his left, armed horsemen with naked swords”. The same work also quotes the case of king Maharat of Chittor, who divided his army in to the centre, the right wing, the left wing and the advance guard, while fighting against Rai Chach of Sind. Prithvirajraso refers that once Prithviraj III made five divisions of his army after receiving the news of Mohd. Ghori’s army with five divisions. Though, the authenticity of Raso is not far from question as none of our sources adds any information regarding the maintenance of reserve forces (the 5th division) by the Rajputs like the Turks. Such a division of army in to four wings was probably made in order to set tunes with the Arab and the Turkish forces, which usually had these four divisions on the ground of fighting, while a fifth division of reserve forces was kept secure for the surprised attack on the harassed enemy or to assist the four fighting wings in critical circumstances.

Generally, the elephants were placed on the advanced guard or frontline, while the king commanded the centre or front of the army, sitting on a lofty howdah with royal emblem.

---

37 Ibid., p.21.
40 In the battle of Waihind (AD 1008), the course of the battle had ultimately changed in the side of Mohmmedans, when the elephant of Anandpala due to the naphtha balls and flights of arrows directed against it, came to fury and created a havoc in Hindu army (Tarikh-i-Firishta, op.cit., p.27). Similarly, in the battle of Chandwar, the face of victory had turned, while Jayachandra seated on a lofty howdah received a deadly wound from an arrow and fell from his exalted seat to the earth (Tajul Maasir in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, Allahabad, p.223).
Nevertheless, such a display of the king heavily costed his life as it helped the adversaries to pinpoint their target on the leader of the forces and thus dishearten the rest of the army. The Indian kings also committed a blunder by stacking at the lives of themselves and their best generals, while placing them on front to counteract the frontal attack on enemy's forces. The Paramara king Rai Mahlak Deo was not going apart from this tradition, while fighting against the forces of Ain-ul-Mulk by rendering his dear son in front with enormous multitude of forces, which in words of Amir Khusrau, contributed to his fall.  

Still, it appears that the Hindus had not revived the old system of their military organisation. That they greatly renewed it after the arrival of the Muslims is very much clear from the following remarks of the Chinese traveller, Yuan Chwang on the Indian military organisation in the first half of the 7th century. He states: “A leader in car warrior gives the command... The general of the forces remains in the chariot, he is surrounded by a file of guards, who keeps close to his chariot wheels. The cavalry spread themselves in front to resist an attack... The infantry by their quick movement contributed to defence. They carry a long spear and advance to the front with impetuosity”.

Such a reorganisation of forces was an intense necessity probably to keep a pace with the Muslim forces. It seems quite relevant that in absence of practised mounted archery, owing to the technological reluctantness, the Hindus did never allow their cavalry charges to command the front of the army, nor to their barest armed foot soldiers. Instead of it, they liked to place their unwieldly, cumbersome and hardest elephants on the front in order to bear the smashing blows

of expert Turkish mounted archers. No other option was open to them in case of their hamperedness in mounted archery.

In Indian context, the commencement of war had taken place in such a manner that foot soldiers dashed against foot soldiers, horsemen against horsemen, elephants against elephants. Under some circumstances, the soldiers were found to take recourse of hand to hand fight avoiding the weaponry war.

The military camp was also established at a site taking into consideration its strategic importance. There was a provision regarding the encampment of an area with defensive height which is as high as the height of a man, with scarce habitation, having entrance and exit of a very few persons only and provided with a front space for a large tent. Besides, the river banks were usually regarded as good camping grounds owing to the easy availability of water and the safety of the site against the enemy’s attack from at least one or two sides. Such a site would have


44 At once Visaldev Chauhan and Baluk Rao Chalukya are recorded to have fought a terrible dwell. (IA, 1872, p.276). Naisadhiyacharita refers that “the army of Nala, the repository of many a sword, both indeed, thrive with hand to hand fights” (B.N.S. Yadav, op.cit., p.213). The similar references of hand to hand fight are found in Sisupalvadh of Magha, Tilakmanjari, Kathasaritsagar and Dvasrayakavya (Ibid.). Prabandhacintamani also accounts of the combats of dwells and push. (Ibid.). P.C. Chakravarti also notices the prevalence of this mode of fight throughout the ancient and early medieval period. (Ibid., p.214).

That the hand to hand fight was also prevalent among the Turks is known from Fakhr-i-Mudabbir, who lays down a guideline for fighting such combats. (Adab-ul-Harb-wa’sh-Shujja’at in A.A. Rizvi’s Adi Turk Kalin Bharat (Hindi), p.272).

45 “पुष्प युद्धमात्रहवम् अवहंजनीवेशं जयित्वमीरत्नम्।
अन्यत्रददायकक्षा च ततैनमहायत्स्व स्वर्या स्थाने स्थानात्।”
(Nitivakyamrita, p.315, Ch.30, V.118).

46 S.K. Bhakhari, Indian Warfare, p.148, also see P.C. Chakravarti, The Art of War in Ancient India.
required a lesser number of men to guard the camp at night. Simultaneously, it would have also led to the saving of a considerable labour-force for digging entrenchment. The river also provided sufficient water for filling the ditches of moats around the camp.

A sudden attack on enemy taking advantage of his weak position was also a part of strategy. Significantly, our sources did not neglect such an important aspect. Throwing an immense light on it, Kamandaka advises the king “to assail upon the enemy, when his troops are found to be affected by the scorching rays of the sun or by cyclonic storms. He further continues to state that the enemy’s troops wounded or exhausted (in serious combats) in the first half of the day should be attacked for annihilation in the second half (i.e. before they could recuperate), so also those troops compelled to keep awake due to nocturnal raids”. Sukra also lays down for a king to subdue in time the enemy, whose various provisions are scattered, whose corn and fuel is destroyed and whose subjects are incensed.

Rest of the above specialties, the chief military weakness of the Rajput armies was the slowness of their movement, in contrast to the lightning speed of the Turkish militias led by the expert mounted archers. It is true that the Rajput military strategy gave greater importance to weight than to mobility. The absence of practised mounted archery did not allow their horsemen to move rapidly during their attack on the enemy’s troops. Rather, the Rajput cavalrymen used to fight with the weapons of close combat like swords, daggers and spears. Their armies aimed to

48 Ibid.
49 *Nitisara*, Ch.XIX, Prak 31, p.410, V.68.
crush the adversary's forces by making a frontal attack, which effected the alertness of enemy and hence a more conspicuous attack from his side. The great Turkish mounted horsemen, on the other hand, could easily, disperse the adversary's rank by repeated attacks on their flanks. They employed the device of feigned retreat to destroy the cohesion of enemy's forces. They first harassed the enemy from all sides by light mounted archers, who pretended defeat and flight. This followed by a charge of heavy armoured cavalry. A visible example of such a tactical maneuver may be noticed in the IIInd battle of Tarain. In the words of Minhaj-us-Siraj, the sultan left "the centre division of the army, the baggage, the standards and banners, his canopy of state and elephants several miles in the rear". He then advanced in a leisurely manner with the more mobile section of his troops "The light armed and unencumbered horsemen, he had directed, should be divided in to four divisions and had appointed them to act against the infidels on four sides and the Sultan had commanded saying: "It is necessary that on the right and left and front and rear, 10,000 mounted archers should keep the infidel host in play and when their elephants, horsemen and foot advance to the attack, you are to face about and keep a distance of a horse's course in front of them". Remaining at such a narrow distance they could effectively beat the direct breach of the enemy's blows. The strategy of feigned retreat was also adopted by Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq during his campaign of Lakhnauti. It is evident that Haji Ilyas, the ruler of Bengal took shelter in the fort of Ekdala to avoid an open engagement with the Sultan's forces. He was probably waiting for the rains to come down after which he thought that Firuz Shah will choose retreat. At this moment, Firuz applied the strategy of feigned retreat. He spread the rumour that his army had retreated; hearing which Haji Ilyas came out of the fort to attack the

rear of Firuz’s forces but was surprised to see the whole army of the enemy in battle formation and ultimately met the defeat.\textsuperscript{52}

Their strong reliance in mobility of arms and troops, besides their remarkable skill in planning a campaign with strategic and tactical modes was indeed a great steward in their success. Unlike, the Rajputs they could shot arrows meticulously on the target from a mobile horseback without halting or dismounting. Their horsemen were highly celebrated for their softness and speed in both attack and retreat.\textsuperscript{53} Their mobile capacity did not provide any opportunity to the enemy to neutralise a forceful attack on their forces. They did not believe in a concerted action and an united march, instead they often like to get scattered and then to return to the fights and face the enemy by turning away.\textsuperscript{54} They thought it less creditable to retreat than to pursue.\textsuperscript{55} They utilised their speed in attacking the flanks and rear of the enemy and surrounding him from all sides.\textsuperscript{56} Their forces were generally arranged in to five sections i.e. right wing, left wing, centre, advance guard and reserve forces, on the battlefield.\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Masalikul Absar fi Mamalikul Amsar} of Shihabudin-al-Umri accounts thus about the disposition of Mohd. Bin Tuglaq’s army on the battlefield, “the Sultan stands in the centre and round him the religious men and men of letters. The archers are in the front and in the rear; the right and left wings were

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi}, in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, pp.294-296.

\textsuperscript{53} Alluding to the significance of mobility as an adamant feature of the Turkish armed forces. R.C. Smail Writes, “ It enables them to remain at a distance from their enemy and to choose the moment at which they could close with him..... If a change essayed against them, they were ready to retreat, if the attempts were given up, they themselves attacked once more” (R.C. Smail, \textit{Crusading Warfare}, Ch.IV, p.78).

\textsuperscript{54} R.C. Smail, op.cit., p.78.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p.79.

stretched so that the two wings of the army are joined. Before him are elephants covered with iron harness and carrying towers in which the soldiers are hidden. In front of the elephants are slaves, who march in light armour with swords and weapons. They make way for the elephants, while the horsemen are on the right and left wing. The flank of the army surround the enemies and fight round the elephants and behind them a fleeing man does not find a cave or an entrance. And, hardly can one escape from them because encircling troops surround them and arrows and naphtha come from the above, and the footmen snatch them from below. So death comes to them from every place and the misfortune surrounds them from every side”. The arrangement of these forces was further altered in accordance with the strategical disposition to be followed in the ground. In case of an offensive action the cavalry was placed in the front. For breaking the enemy’s line of defense and for protecting the armies from enemy’s attack, the elephants were placed in vanguard. Circumstantially, the elephants were also placed in front of the centre. Alauddin Khalji had placed them in front of every division. Sultan Mohd. Bin Tughlaq also kept the elephants covered with iron harnesses with howdahs on their backs carrying warriors in front of himself. Brave vainglorious soldiers in most cases were posted on the right wing and the expert archers on the left. The king rested in the centre surrounded by senior generals and other officials. The reserve forces were kept away from the main army to be entered in battle at a suitable moment for providing a final blow to enemy’s forces or to assist

59 Ibid.
63 Ibid.
any particular wing at a critical moment. Though, the ancient Hindus were not unaware with the methods of retreating attacks, they felt themselves handicapped in the field of mounted archery, which hindered them to mobilise their forces like their adversaries.

The wisdom of the Turks in the tactical war was indeed far ahead than the Rajput's who believed in the open field warfare in most cases. The Rajputs violated the principals of strategy and made tactical blunders; while not trying to take the advantage of the enemy’s weakness. For example, after the 1st battle of Tarain Prithviraja III allowed the defeated Muslim army to return unmolested to Ghor. “Mohd Ghori on his return to Ghor made sleep and rest unlawful to him and prepared with his whole strength for a second war”. Prithviraja’s forces on the other hand lost thirteen months in siege of Tabarhindah, remaining unalert to the enemy’s second attack. Again, he had committed a great blunder by promising a safe excuse to Ghori on the condition that he will return to his own country. Firishta inform us that on reaching Lahore, Muizuddin sent an officer calling upon Prithviraja to embrace the Muslaman faith and acknowledge his supremacy. Prithviraja who was already on the battlefield of Tarain with a force of “300,000 horses, 3,000 elephants and considerable infantry”, wrote back to Sultan, offering to do him no harm if he chose to return to Ghor, but threatening him with a complete ruin otherwise. According to Firishta, the letter of Prithviraja contained the following matter, “to the bravery of our soldiers we know you are no stranger, and to our great superiority in number, which daily increases, your eyes bear testimony... It were better then, you would repent in time of the rash resolution you have taken, and we shall permit you to retreat in safety; but if you have

67 Ibid., p.98.
determined to brave your evil destiny, we have sworn by our Gods to advance upon you with our rank breaking elephants, our plain-trampling horses, and blood thirsting soldiers, early in the morning, to crush the army which your ambition has let to ruin”. 68 At this Sultan sent a strategic reply by writing back, “I have marched into India at the command of my brother whose general I am. Both honour and duty bind me to exert myself to the utmost... but I shall be glad to obtain a truce till he is informed of the situation and I have received his answer”. 69 The conditional proposal for piece was replied positively by Ghori in a strategic manner, which relaxed the Rajputs, ultimately, relinquishing all the fresh preparations for war. But the revelrous night became an eternal gloom for them as at the same night “the Sultan made preparations for battle.... and when the Rajputs had left their camp for the purpose of obeying calls of nature, and for the purpose of performing ablutions, he entered the plain with his ranks marshalled”. 70 The defeat of Prithviraja in a state of sudden night attack by Ghori’s forces is also confirmed by both the contemporary Muslim and Hindu sources. 71 Jami-ul-Hikayat of Mohd. Ufi states that the Ghori Sultan in order to prevent any suspicion kept “fires burning all the night, so that the enemy might suppose it to be their camping ground. The Sultan then marched off in another direction with the main body of his army. The infidels saw the fires and felt assured of their adversaries being encamped there. The Sultan marched all night and got in the rear of Kola. At dawn he made his onslaught....” 72 The stratagem played by Mohd. Ghori on Prithvaraja is also confirmed by Prithviraja Prabhandha which refers, “Prithviraja had been asleep.... In the meantime, the

69 Ibid.
72 Ibid., p.198.
Prime Minister had the Sultan sent for”. Prabandhcintamani of Merutunga also affirms that “Prithviraja was asleep at that time after breaking his Ekadasi fast”. The sudden night attack on the enemy was certainly a part of the strategy of Turks as Fakhr-i-Mudabbir refers to the attack on an enemy in a state of unawareness, as one of the artful methods of war. He suggests the afternoon in the summer and early hours of morning in the winter as ideal time for surprise attack, during which period the guards are usually asleep and the security is disturbed and neglected. Ibn Battuta accounts of a surprise attack on the Hindus of Ma’bar when their soldiers were taking rest after lunch and their horses were left for feeding grass. Remaining unconscious of the enemy’s attack at that time, they guessed them as thieves and came outside of the fort unprepared for war. Thus, the Hindus met a terrible defeat at the hands of Turks.

The fortreal system of the Rajputs was also a severe pitfall in their strategy. They could use the forts for the purpose of defence and not for an offensive attack. The forts built by the Sultans of Delhi on the other hand were offensive in nature. Unlike the Rajput fortresses constructed on the top of hillock, they were built at ground level to facilitate the movement of cavalry. The expansionist policy of Delhi Sultans was greatly served by their forts, which were utilised by them as base-camps. They succeeded to a great extent in their distant campaigns on account of the established chains of the fortreal settlements from where the expeditions were organised and the communications were maintained. The offensive nature of the Turkish forts

---

73 Prithviraj prabandh in Puratanaprabandhsangraha, S.J.G., p.87.
74 Prabandhcintamani, S.J.G., p.144.
75 Adab-ul-Harb-Wash-Shujjat, A.A. Rizvi, p.262.
76 Rehla, A.A. Rizvi, Tughlaq Kalin Bharat, I, p.296.
77 When Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din Tughlaq sent his son Ulugh Khan for the conquest of Telingana AD 1321, the fort of Devagiri was utilised by the latter as base-camp from where he carried out the campaign. (Futuh-us-Salatin, pp.603-606). Mohd. Bin Tughlaq made Lahore his base camp for the campaigns of Kalanaur and Peshawar. (Ibid., pp.649-650). He had also made Daulatabad as his base for suppressing the rebellion of Sayid Ahsan Shah. (Rehla, Eng. tr. Mahdi Husain, pp.100-102).
may clearly be seen in their gateways, which are found built at quick intervals to facilitate the movement of the troops.\footnote{78 See Supra, the Chapter on Fort and Fortresses.}

The Rajput fortresses, even on being insurmountable became the targets of the enemy’s attack and ultimately conquered by his forces on account of their extensive isolation and dislinkage from the neighbouring fortresses. Hence, the enemy felt it easy to concentrate his target on one fort and to capture it by all possible means. It was the result of the maintained self-sufficiency of the Rajput forts that during an investment, the enemy could easily capture the whole fort by cutting of the convoy. When, the provisions stored in the fort came to last, the fort was ultimately surrendered to the enemy. The mighty fort of Ranthambhor could be captured by the enemy owing to the famine prevailed inside.\footnote{79 Amir Khusrau who was probably an eyewitness to the capitulation of the fort informs us that, “Famine prevailed to such an extent within the fort that they would have purchased a grain of rice for two grains of gold but could not get it. The fire of hunger had roasted their hearts within their earthen bosoms and they wished to open their bosoms and eat up their roasted hearts. Man can bear all afflictions except that of a starving stomach” (Khazainul Futuh, tr. M. Habib, p.40).}

Further, the great indiscretion of the Rajputs could be noted during the hour of a forceful attack on Jalor by Alauddin’s forces. As \textit{Kahhadade Prabandha} accounts that when the combined forces of the Rajputs marched into action and encountered the enemy at the order of Kanhadade and when the Rajputs got the upper hand in the initial stage of the battle with the Muslims, the two Generals, Jaita and Mahipa, who were commanding the war, left the detachment of 4000 Rajput and rushed to Jalor to inform their overlord the news of victory.\footnote{80 \textit{Kahhadade Prabandh}, Canto, III, p.53.}

The Muslims at last, opened the siege of the fort through a stratagem.\footnote{81 Ibid., Canto IV, p.89.}
It has been observed after the above survey that in most cases the war stratagem of the Turks was more practical and tactical. The Turks made strategic use of forts as long it was required. They had also taken the step to wage open field war too, whenever it suited them. Though, it may be remarked that the Rajputs of our age were fully conversant with the principles of strategy. They accomplished it to a great extent on their Indian adversaries. Yet, in lack of effective cavalry and mounted archery, they failed to apply it successfully on the highly expertised Turkish strategists.
CHAPTER-VIII

FORTS AND FORTRESSES

The term ‘fort’ in itself ordinarily implies a stronghold, which offered protection and security to its dwellers. The Sanskrit term *durga* for it literally meant unapproachable or untenable, denotes its strong and massive character. Hence, it is correct to assume defence as the prominent characteristic of a fort and it is owing to this fundamental character that the fortified settlements had always been remained as an important asset to the military system of every strong-holding dynastic order. Though, the history of the origin of such a defensive structure is to be traced back to the prehistoric times, with the development in polity and the beginning of fratricidal wars as resultant to the desire of territorial expansion, there occurred a rapid increase in the number of forts and fortresses, as these are the most advanced manifestations of the art of war and defence. During early medieval period, the importance of forts as a politico-military institute came to be

---

realised on a wider scale. Now, it had become the chief centre of warfare attracting the 
attention of the invaders to besiege for long periods. The development of feudalism 
played an important role in the erection of a large number of forts and fortresses. Both 
the autonomous feudal chiefs and independent Rajput rulers possessed them for carrying 
on military activities with concern. As this period was the period of political upheaval in 
Indian history, the rulers and chieftains had internecine wars among them for supremacy. 
Hence, realising the strategic and militaristic importance of forts, they paved a special 
attention to possess them and erecting several new ones in order to strengthen their 
military power.

Among the Rajputs, the Chandellas were the great builders of a number of strong 
forts and fortresses. Viravarman’s Ajaigarh Stone Inscription praises the Chandella king 
Trailokyavarman for building forts and fortresses and terms him as ‘a very creator in 
providing strong places’. The Gurjara Pratiharas too, did not neglect this aspect of 
national security. The Chauhans and Paramaras, both, were outstanding builders of forts 
in Rajasthan. Almost all the big forts had either been constructed or renovated by them. A few forts were also raised by the Rajput rulers belonging to the Bhatti clan.

---

2 That the institution of fort had attained an inevitable importance during early medieval 
period is testifiable by the manner in which it is dealt with in the enormous contemporary 
literature on polity and military science (See the chapters on forts in Nitisara of 
Kamandaka, Nitivakyamrita of Somadeva Suri, Manasollasa of Somesvara, Sukraniti 
etc.). The structural fortresses of this period were larger in size and complex and much stronger being supplied with up to date material, mechanical instruments and weapons as comparative to the earlier fortresses.

3 EI, I, p.327.

4 The fort of Mandor is regarded to have originally constructed by the Pratiharas around the 
7th century AD, (R.L. Mishra, The Forts of Rajasthan, p.111)

5 The fort of Mandalgarh is believed to have been built by Chauhan king of Ajmer probably 
around the 13th century AD (R.L. Mishra, p.40; L.P. Mathur, Forts and Strongholds of 
Rajasthan, p.93). The fort of Nagaur situated in the north-east of Jodhpur is supposed to be
The literary texts of our period also throw a flood of light on the importance of forts and refer to them as the prime necessity for a king to accomplish the military activities. Earlier, Kautilya, realising the importance of a fort stated it as a defensive instrument to a king in times of danger and advises him to erect forts not only around his capital but also on all the frontiers of the kingdom, in the four quarters.\(^7\) Army and treasury, according to him remain fully secure in a fort.\(^8\) So much attention was provided by him to the significance of forts that he included fortification among the seven elements of sovereignty of state providing it a fourth place next in order of importance to the king, minister and country.\(^9\) Following Kautilya, Somadeva Suri, the author of *Nitivakyaamrita* stresses that a king without a fort has no place for refuge in case of calamity like a bird strayed from a ship in an ocean.\(^10\) He remarks that a country without a fort is easy to conquer and to be humiliated by the enemy king.\(^11\) Commenting on this aspect Sukra built by one of the feudatories of the Chauhan king Somesvara, the father of Prithviraja III (R.L. Mishra, loc.cit., p.65). The forts constructed by the Paramaras were large in number. The fort of Jalore was probably built by one of them around the 10th century AD (Ibid., p.27). Similarly, the fort of Achalgarh is believed to be erected by the Paramara chiefs in AD 900 and rebuilt by Mahrana Kumbha in AD 1442 (Ibid, p.53, also see L.P. Mathur, op.cit., p.51). The fort of Shahabad situated in the east of Kota was also originally built by the Paramaras (R.L. Mishra, op.cit., p.86). The fort of Siwana in Rajasthan was founded by Veer Narayan, son of the Paramara Raja Bhoj in AD 954 to which the present name Siwana is given by Alauddin Khalji after besieging it in AD 1308 (Ibid, p.93). The fort of Dabhoi in Gujarat is also ascribed to Sidhraj of the Paramara dynasty, who ruled Patan during AD 1093-1142 (Amrit Verma, *Forts of India*, p.39).

6 One of the forts at Jaisalmer was erected by Rawal Jaisal, a Bhatti Rajput ruler in AD 1155 (R.L. Mishra, op.cit., p.32, also see, L.P. Mathur, op.cit., p.57).

7 *Arthasastra*, Kangle, II, p.61, Book 2, Chap.3, Section 21, V.1.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid., Book VI, Ch.1.

10 "अरुणिन्य रत्नः परोथिंन्यं पोजयुपस्थित्यं आपि न नस्याश्रयः ।"

    (*Nitivakyaamrita*, Ch.20, p.176, V.6)

11 "अरुणिन्यं रत्नं न परिभाषापद्द्यः ।"

    (Ibid., V.5)
opines that a single soldier from the fort could successfully battle with hundred soldiers outside and the hundred in turn with one thousand.¹²

True, it is that the utility of forts was unnegligible in military sphere. They were of great use both in offensive and defensive warfare and served as an excellent means of retarding, embarrassing and annoying a victorious army. In fact, it was from behind the walls of these forts that the Rajputs continued their resistance against the Muslims even after sustaining some heavy defeats in the open battle.

The functions of the forts were too manifold indeed. Besides, providing protection from enemy, the rampart of a fort served as a means to have an eye on the activities of the invader’s army. The enemy’s movement could be easily watched from these ramparts. Not only this, the provisions, stores, water, ammunitions etc. inside the fort helped the army to face the assaults and carry out the struggle for a long time. However, it appears that the martial rulers might have been inspired to build a variety of fortresses for serving their practical purpose, by the contemporary writers and lawgivers.

Regarding the true nature of these forts, it is notable that none of the forts could be strictly termed as Hindu or Muslim, as they did not retain their original features intact. They were the chief targets of attack and destruction of the invaders and were frequently repaired or renovated. Thus, they present such a blend of both Hindu and Islamic features that sometimes it becomes difficult to differentiate them. Thus, all forts built or occupied by the Rajputs could not be placed under one single category but under varying types.

The authors of the literary texts had made a classification of forts according to their own ways keeping in mind a variety of things like, the nature of site upon which the

¹² Sukraniti, p.155.
forts were built, the nature of functioning, the shape of forts etc. Thus, there is not a
consensus of opinion among them on this subject.

Kautilya has divided them into four classes as: (i) *Audak*: water fort such as in the
midst of an island, river or plain surrounded by water (ii) *Parvata*: built in a mountainous
area such as on a rocky tract or cave. (iii) *Dhanva*: desert fort, situated in a wild tract
devoid of water (iv) *Vana*: a fort in forest full of wagtail water and thickets.\(^\text{13}\) Of these,
he recommends water and hill forts as the best suited to defend inhabited centres, while
the other two as useful to defend uninhabited regions.\(^\text{14}\)

The classification of Kautilya is followed by Kamandaka in his *Nitisara*, except
with the addition of one more kind, namely *airina*, to that of Kautilya.\(^\text{15}\) The Paramara
King Bhoja in his famous work on architecture, *Samaranganasutradhara* has added one
more category while describing the six kinds of forts viz. *abdurg* (water fort), *pankdurg*
(clay or mud fort), *vana* (forest), *airina* (desert), *parvatiya* (hill) and *mahidurg* (a fort
useful for the purpose of war, provided with entrance gates, spacious courtyards and
surrounded by high ramparts).\(^\text{16}\)

Sukra has classified forts basing on the nature of site and functioning of fort
itself, into the following eightfold categories:

(i) *Parikh durg*: a fort surrounded by great ditches or moats on all sides.

(ii) *Parigh durg*: a fort protected by high walls of stone, brick or mud.

(iii) *Vana durg*: fort situated in a forest area.

---

13 *Arthasastra*, Book 2, Ch.3, V.1; Kangle II, p.61.
14 Ibid.
15 *Nitisara*, Ch. IV, V.59. op.cit., p.87.
16 *Samaranganarutradhara*, p.240.
(iv) **Dhanva durg**: a fort situated in a waterless area.

(v) **Jala durg**: a fort surrounded by great sheets of water.

(vi) **Giridurg**: a fort situated on a high hill and provided with plenty of water.

(vii) **Sainya durg**: a fort defended by marshy troops on all sides.

(viii) **Sahaya durg**: a helping fort belonging to friendly folk.¹⁷

The classification of Somadeva Suri in *Nitivakyamrita* is altogether of a different nature. According to him, the forts are of two kinds viz. *svabhavika* (natural) and *acharya* (man made).¹⁸ *Yuktikalpataru* of Bhoja also has a similar classification into *kritrima* (artificial) and *akritrima* (natural).¹⁹

In *Mansara*, a treatise on architecture, three distinct classifications are given. The first classification included the following eight types:

(i) **Dandaka** (resembling an staff): quadrangular in shape, surrounded by square walls, having four gates at each angle and several smaller ones at intervals.

(ii) **Sarvatobhadra** (strong from all sides): quadrangular in form surrounded by a ditch having four large and many smaller gates in the middle at angular points.

---

¹⁷ *Sukraniti*, p.154-55. Before Sukra, Manu has referred to the six types of fortresses namely, *dhanva*, *mahi*, *ab.*, *varksha* (a fort surrounded by high trees), *nri* (troop fort) and *giri* (G. Buhler, *Laws of Manu*, Sacred Books of the East, XXV, pp.227-228 V.70. Puranas, including *Agni*, *Vayu*, *Matsya* and *Visnudharmottara* also mention about the six kinds already referred by Manu. (*Agni-Puranam*, op.cit., chapter on fort, also see M.S. Ramachandramurthy, op.cit.,p.68). Sukra adds four new kinds as *parikha*, *parigha* *sainya* and *sahaya*, in addition to the traditional four kinds mentioned by Manu (*Sukraniti*, Ch.IV, Section VI).

¹⁸ *Nitivakyamrita*, Ch. 20 p.175, V.3.

¹⁹ See the Section on forts in *Yuktikalpataru*. 
(iii) *Nandyavarta* (abode of happiness): square or oblong in shape with the interior dividing into four quadrants having three to seven streets in each.

(iv) *Padmaka* (resembling a lotus flower): built for laying a town with a strong fortress all around with a ditch and rampart. It is usually square or circular in form with four gateways at each angle.

(v) *Svastika* (resembling a *svastik*): surrounded with a moat and rampart and provided with two entrance gateways, one in each face in the outer wall thus making eight in all.

(vi) *Prastara* (protruding shape): either square or rectangular in form having four central gateways.

(vii) *Karmuka* (bow type): semicircular in form.

(viii) *Chaturmukha*: having four gates, either square or rectangular oriented from east to west.\(^{20}\)

The second classification, which is probably based on the functions or nature of fort, included eight varieties, as follows:

(i) *Sibira*: royal camp.

(ii) *Vahinimukha*: military station or base away from the battlefield.

(iii) *Sthaniya*: capital city or local fortress.

(iv) *Dronaka*: a fort which is nearer to water.

(v) *Sarnviddha*: nature of this type of fort is not clear.

(vi) *Kolaka*: situated in a hilly or wild tract.

---

(vii) *Nigama*: an outpost for vigilance.

(viii) *Skandhavara*: military encampment.\(^{21}\)

The third classification included seven varieties, namely, *giri, vana, jala, pank, rath* (chariot fort on the battlefield), *dev* (divine fort protected by gods through chanting of hymns and artificial contrivances) and *misra* (mixed fort, situated at a place connected with various mountains and forests).\(^{22}\)

Another treatise on architecture entitled as *Visvakarma Vastusastra* described twelve types of forts with the four varieties (*giri, van, salila* (water), *airina* as common, other than *daivata* (divine fort), *ekamukha, dvimukha and chaturmukha* (having one, two and four gateways in respective order and built on the bank of river or at sea-coast), *karmuka, prabhu* (king’s fort) and *yuddha* (war fort).\(^{23}\)

In the above list of forts given by the author of *Visvakarma Vastusastra*, the last two namely *prabhu* and *yuddhadurga* appear to be of much military value. The former one is said to be built in an inaccessible area surrounded by deep moats and twelve ramparts and provided with four gates equipped with siege-machines. It is also required to possess structures to sound alarm called *karanas* with gates for maintaining its inaccessibility.\(^{24}\)

\(^{21}\) *Manasara*, ed. & tr. P.K. Acharya, p.73.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.

\(^{23}\) *Visvakarma Vastu*, compiled by Vasudeva K. Shastri, and N.B. Gadre, Ch.X, p.188.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.
The *yuddhadurga* was meant for attacking an enemy from a safe place. It was well equipped with all structures and weapons necessary for offence and defence purposes.\(^25\)

While going through the above sources, it comes into light that the four broad categories of forts namely, *sthala* (land fort), *giri* (hill fort) *jala* (water fort) and *vana* (forest fort) were the most popular ones and even among these four, the hill fort was regarded not only the far superior but the best one of all from the strategic point of view. Both Manu and Sukra consider *giridurga* as the best on account of its superior qualities.\(^26\) *Agni Purana* also refers to the hill fort as the best as it can be made easily invincible and affords the best means of beating an invading army.\(^27\)

The validity of literary sources is proved, while co-relating the literature with factual evidences of surviving structures of hill forts in India, which clearly denote that there was an increasing tendency of erecting the hill forts under the Rajputs. Most of forts of the Rajputs are built on the hill tops, as these are thought to be invincible. A dense forest full of bushes and trees was around them to arrest the smooth progress of besiegers. The flowing rivers created an impassable barrier around these forts, while hilly tract surrounding the fort had its own invincibility.\(^28\)

\(^25\) *Visvakarma Vastu*, compiled by Vasudeva K. Shastri, and N.B. Gadre, Ch.X, p.188. Differed from a permanent fortification which protected or enclose a centre of population, it might had been a type of field fortification occupied by soldiery serving primarily the strategic purpose.


\(^27\) *Agni Purana*, chapter CCXXII, p.794.

\(^28\) See the layout of the hill forts in India which are naturally defended by surrounding rivers and forests.
The forts of Ajaigarh, Kalanjar, Gwalior, Narwar, Mandu, Dhar, Chanderi, Raisen, Chittorgarh, Ajayameru (Ajmer), Kumbhalgarh, Ranthambhor, Mandor, Asirgarh, Ginnorgarh, Jalor, Nagaur, Bhainsrorgarh, Siwana and Mandalgarh were some of the important hill forts of our period.29

The Muslim historians speak in admirable terms of these forts. The fort of Kalanjar, according to Hasan Nizami was “celebrated throughout the world for being as strong as the wall of Alexander”.30 Nizami describes the fort of Gwalior as “the Pearl of the necklace of the castles of Hind, the summit of which the nimble footed wind from below can reach and on the bastion of which the rapid clouds have never cast their shade.31 To the fort of Mandu Amir Khusrau refers, “as an edifice of such a height that the eye was unable to see its summit”.32 Minhaj-us-Siraj writes about the fort of Ranthambhor, “It is celebrated in all parts of Hindustan for its great strength and security”.33 Amir Khusrau describes Ranthambhor as a “towering fort which talked with the stars through its lofty pinnacles”.34 About the invincibility of this fort Yahiya also writes, “this citadel with an entrenchment all round, was situated on the summit of the hills, where even the eagles could not fly”.35 It is related in Hindu histories that it has been invaded by more than seventy kings and no one had been able to take it.36

29 For details see Appendix to this Chapter. Also see the Map attached with the Appendix.
32 *Khazai'nul Futuh*, p.38.
34 *Khazai'nul Futuh*, p.38.
35 *Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi* tr. K.K. Basu, p.76.
According to Barani, this great stronghold was so much formidable that Jalaluddin Khalji after being determined and making all arrangements by ordering for the construction of war- machines like maghrabi, sabat, gargach could not dare even for laying down the siege of the fort for he feared of the invincibility of the fort, the conquest of which was not an easy task and would cost the lives of many Musalmans. The Sultan abandoned the idea of undertaking the siege of the fort even after a great deal of incentive from Malik Ahmad Chap. However, Alauddin Khalji succeeded in reducing the fort with much bloodshed and difficulty.

Likewise, the fort of Siwana as stated by Amir Khusrau was stronger than iron to which the army of Alauddin Khalji failed to injure half a brick of the edifice even after investigating it for five or six years till the Sultan personally marched with his own forces. According to him it was “so high that the eagle could not reach its summit in ten flights.” The same author made a similar statement about the impregnability of the fort of Chittor, which was faced hardly by the Musalmans during its siege at the time of Alauddin Khalji. The passage containing such statements runs as follows, “For two months the flood of the swords went up to the “waist” of the hill but could not rise any higher. Wonderful was the fort, which even hailstones were unable to strike! For if the

37 Maghrabi was a war engine for throwing stones and missiles.
38 Sabat was a platform raised in order to reach the top of the fort, during an assault.
39 Gargach was a covered platform on wheels for reaching the base of the fort under protection.
40 Barani in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.146.
41 Ibid., p.147.
42 Ibid., pp.178-179.
43 Dewal Rani Khizra Khan as quoted in Khazai’nal Futuh, p.55, fn.2.
44 Khazai’nal Futuh, p.53.
flood itself rushes from the summit it will take a full day to reach the fort of the hill". The fort of Mandu, according to Amir Khusrau was, too, a strong fort, four farsangs in circumference and high enough to touch the mirror of the sky. The fort of Jalor is described by Nizami as exceedingly strong “the gates of which had never been opened by any conqueror”. Similarly, in praise of the impregnability of the fort of Bhatia Utbi writes “the wall (of which), even the wing of an eagle could not surmount and it was surrounded as by the ocean with a ditch of exceeding depth and breadth.

Besides, some minor forts of other varieties like jala and atavika (forest) forts might had also been existed. There was also a common practice of constructing defensive works around cities in plain (sthaladurgas). A number of fortified cities are referred by the Muslim chroniclers, as Delhi, Kannauj, Jalor, Asni, Thangarh, Multan, Meerut, etc. Delhi is described as “one among the chief (mother) cities of Hind, consisting of a fortress, which in height and breadth had not its equal throughout the length and breadth of the climes”. Kannauj is said to have seven detached forts. The fort of Multan had a large city commanded by citadel, which had four gates and was

45 Khazai ‘nul Futuh, p.47.
46 Dewal Rani as quoted in Khazai ‘nul Futuh, p.46-47, fn.4.
47 Ta’jul Ma’asir in Elliot and Dowson, Vol.II, p.235.
48 Elliot & Dowson, Vol.II, p.29.
49 Al Utbi describes the forest fort of Asi (Asni) which was invaded by Mahmud in AD 1018. He states, “Around this fort there was an impenetrable and dence jungle, full of snakes, which no enchanters could tame and so dark that even the rays of full moon could not discern in it. There were broad and deep ditches all around”. (Tarikh-i-Yamini, in Elliot & Dowson, II, p.47).
50 B.N.S. Yadav, Society and Culture in Northern India, p.211.
52 Ibid., pp.46, 458.
surrounded by a moat.\textsuperscript{53} While praising it Kazwini refers to the city as large, fortified and impregnable.\textsuperscript{54} The city of Jalor is referred to as a strong fort with gates and bastions\textsuperscript{55} and Thangarh as a fortress which resembled the hill of iron.\textsuperscript{56}

The architectural features of all these forts were more or less similar, being circular, square, rectangular, oblong or semicircular in form\textsuperscript{57} and built of huge masonry stones subsided by bricks and mud.\textsuperscript{58} All were outlined on the same plan, suitably built at the sites of strategic and general importance\textsuperscript{59} surrounded by an outer wall fitted with bastions running around with high towers and huge gateways and defended by a deep moat or ditch.

\textsuperscript{53} Elliot & Dowson, Vol.I, p.82.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p.96.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., Vol.II, p.238.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., Vol.II, p.226.
\textsuperscript{57} Regarding the form or shape of the fort, it is worth notable that it was to be determined in the case of sthaladurgas and not in the case of hill forts or giridurgas. In such forts, the shape was primarily based on the form of the site chosen for the building of fort, though the prescribed shapes are circular, square, rectangular, oblong and semi-circular. Kautilya prescribes either circular (vritta), rectangular (dirgha chaturasra), square (chaturasra). (\textit{Arthasastra}, Kangle, II, p.62. ). \textit{Visnudharmottara Purana} speaks on the shapes of the forts in a distinct manner, placing ayata (rectangular), chaturasra (square) and vritta (circular) as the normal, while triangular and oval as useless and to semi-circular and vajrakar (resembling a discus or a wheel) as avoidable. (\textit{Visnudharamottara Purana}, IInd Khanda, Vv.12-13).
\textsuperscript{58} The primitive fortresses were built largely of mud or clay. But during the early medieval period, there developed a new technique termed as cyclopean, in which large blocks of stones were piled up, one above the other, tightly fitted with each other without the use of any binding or joining material as mortar. (See G. Yazdani, \textit{Early History of Deccan}).
\textsuperscript{59} The first and foremost criteria for the selection of site for erecting a fort was its strategical importance. Generally, the forts were built on such places which had maximum political advantage and capability of protecting frontiers and borders of kingdoms and other political, commercial and military centres. The availability of building materials and natural potentialities like water and fodder resources in the proximity of site were other important criterions for ascertaining the suitability of a site. (See the layout of the important forts and the instructions regarding the selection of a site in \textit{Agni Purana}, p.794, and \textit{Nitisara}, (Ch.IV, pp.87, V.58), p.88, V.60).
In case of sthaladurgas, the area of the site chosen for the fort's building was given the form of an elevated mound or terrain just to raise the height of the fort's structure so that it could be strategically important for commanding the surrounding territory. The process of the formation of this mound architecturally termed as vapra in Silpasastras was a joint operation, raising the height of mound as well as digging up of moats.60

The moats were dug out all round the selected site of the fort, the main concern behind the formation of which was to make the access of the enemy difficult.61 These moats were generally of two kinds viz., a dry and a wet moat. The former is also known as ditch which was filled up with haystock, wild thorns and creepers concealing underneath poisonous weapons,62 while a wet moat was filled up with deep waters upto the mouth and contained crocodiles and other dangerous animals.63 Such type of moats were sometimes connected with rivers, reservoirs and tanks through which water can be regulated at will.64 Often the drains of city or town were also made connected to drain of the stagnant water.65 As an additional defensive measure thorny bushes, plants ladden with creepers and shrubs were made grown outside the glacis area of moats.66 The area beyond the moat was kept clear, so that the invading forces could be viewed from a

61 Nitisara, Ch.17, p.356; Agni Purana, p.794.
62 A.P. Singh, p.171.
63 Ibid.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
66 Ibid.
distance and immediately attacked by the expert soldiers. Thus the space left beyond
the moat also provided a sufficient space for the movement of troops while attacking the
enemy. Though, such moats were the prime requirements of sthaladurgas, some hill forts
like Gwalior, Mandu, Narwar, Ginnorgarh etc. also have such arrangements.

It is notable that the moats are found close to the main or secondary fortification in Sthaladurgas, while in hill forts these are found situated far away from the main
citadel fortification in accordance to the strategic importance of the site such as in the
case of Gwalior and Narwar forts.

The formation of glacis or kagar is another defensive arrangement in the
architecture of fort building. Such type of arrangement could still be noticed in the
dilapidated structures of several sthala and giridurgas of India. The main function of
these glacis was to retard the charges of attacking weapons and to prevent the sudden
entry of enemy into the moat through a vertically sharp highly elevated ridge.

The next most important architectural feature of a fort is prakara or fortification
wall without which a fort can not be truly termed as fort. These walls were usually made
of great height and thickness on account of being the chief and foremost target of
enemy's attack. The thickness of the walls was wider at the base, while the upward

---
67 Nitisara, p.356, Ch.17, V.16.
68 A.P. Singh, op.cit., p.172.
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid., p.172.
71 Kautilya prescribes the height of the moat about 6 dandas i.e. 36 ft and twice as much
broad, i.e. 72 feet. He also says that the height and thickness could vary according to the
contours of the ground. (Arthasastra, Kangle, II, Bk 2, p.62, Chapter 3, V. 4). The
battlemented wall of Kumbhalgarh fort was having such a wide thickness that eight
horsemen could ride abreast at a time over it. (Amrit Verma, op.cit.).
portion was slanting with the apex thinner in form.\textsuperscript{72} Such type of architectural design provided strength and stability to the outer wall. The fortresses of our period are famous for the formidability and imposing appearance of such ramparts as Sidney Toy remarked "are of great extent, forming circuits many miles round, with concentric walls, one behind the other".\textsuperscript{73} The fort of Asirgarh was itself preserved by three such walls while that of Nagaur by two in number.\textsuperscript{74} It seems that a real strength of a fort was determined by the number of its ramparts together with their height and thickness. But in case of more than one wall, the outer wall was made higher by $\frac{1}{4}$ of the inner ones.\textsuperscript{75} For the defensive purpose, these ramparts were fitted with knee-breakers, tridents, earth-pits and thorny bushes etc. over and around them.\textsuperscript{76}

The ramparts or surrounding walls are found intercepted by huge gateways, bastions of smaller and larger sizes and other defensive arrangements like provisions of barbicans, machiculations, oriel windows, watch towers, fighting platforms, loopholes, crenellations, embrasures, walk walls and battlemented parapets with merlons and peep holes.

Gateways were generally from four to seven in number having exceeding height in order to provide a way for an elephant rider with great vigour and fury. In height, they were far beyond the Roman and middle town gates of the west.\textsuperscript{77} These gateways are

\textsuperscript{72} Kautilya also states that the ramparts should be square at the bottom and oval at the centre. \textit{(Arthasastra,} Kangle, II, pp.62-63, VV.5-7.\textsuperscript{73} Sidney Toy, \textit{Strongholds of India,} p.2.\textsuperscript{74} A.P. Singh, op.cit., p.156, R.L. Mishra, op.cit., p.66.\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Visvakarma Vastu,} Cf. A.P. Singh, p.173.\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Arthasastra,} Kangle II, p.62, Bk.II, Ch.3, V.5; also see \textit{Nitisara,} Ch.17, p.356, VV.16 & 17.\textsuperscript{77} Sidney Toy, \textit{op.cit.,} p.5.
defended with barbicans, which sometimes are found in the form of two powerful walls extending out beyond the gates having towers at the end and sinuous road in between, defended with machicolations jutting out from the parapets. These gateways were plated and studded with numerous sharp iron spikes to protect them from being butted into and forced open by elephants. Often iron chains were drawn across infront of the door. Sometimes, when closed, the doors were also secured by heavy timber bars, which are drawn out from the socket in one jamb passed behind the door and fitted into a corresponding socket in other jamb. The gateways were provided with slightly curved pathways flanked by a semicircular interior wall on the exterior, which entirely devoted to defence and the massive and huge entrance in the interior separated by barbicans and approached by turns towards left and right alternatively at right angles.

Another significant feature of fortal architecture is the arrangement of bastions, either square, rectangular, semicircular or circular in form, running for long distances at regular intervals at corners as a means of providing strength to the fort wall. Besides, providing protection to the surrounding wall and withstanding the lateral thrust, these

---

78 The machicolations were unknown in Western Europe till the end of the 12th century but known in Syria before Islam. They made their appearance in Islamic fortresses in AD 727 over the gateway of Hisham’s palace, known as Qasral-Hair-al-Gharbi and must had been transferred to India sometime later. (K.A.C. Creswell, “Fortifications in Islam before A.D.1250”, Aspects of Art Lecture, p.91, Sidney Toy,op.cit., p.5).

79 Ibid., also see L.P. Mathur, op.cit., p.6.

80 Ibid.

81 Sidney Toy, op.cit., p.5.

82 N.S. Ramchandramurthy,op.cit., p.111.

83 The old Hindu bastions were generally square, as prescribed by Kautilya, but with the arrival of Muslims, squareness and roundedness of forms began. (Ibid.)
bastions also served as watch towers, residences and stores for grain and the arms and ammunitions. Some of the bastions were also connected by secret passages through fortification. Sometimes, these were provided with staircases and loopholes.

The battlements or parapets are no less important than the bastions. They provided additional security to the fort, appearing in the chain of arched hood stones, horizontally built along the entire length of the wall with a narrow space between each other. They are often surmounted with merlons, which are in turn provided with vertical loopholes. The holes within the parapets opened out in the back and were often parallel and straight. Their size varied from place to place. Generally, there were two tiers of such loopholes, the upper tier piercing the merlons and the lower dipped down rapidly from the walk wall to appear on the outerface far below the parapet. The chief function of these holes was to provide suitable space for peeping through them on the activities of the enemy and discharging weapons like dart, arrows, spears, cannons etc. from a hidden place. These loopholes were designed for both short and long ranges projecting either as horizontal, inclined on one side or dipping downwards, though the horizontal range is mostly found.

---

84 A.P. Singh, op.cit., p.111.
85 Ibid., pp.128, 130.
86 Ibid., p.117.
87 Ibid., p.150 (Mandsaur Fort).
88 A.P. Singh, op.cit., p.111 (Fort of Ajaigarh).
90 A.P. Singh, p.175, N.S. Ramchandramurthy, p.124.

At Chittor, some of the upper loopholes are divided into sections by transoms, while the lower ones divided into two sections, open out widely at the foot to provide for lateral fire. Sidney Toy, (op.cit., pp.3-4) from his personal photographs has produced, a photograph of Chittor fort with the crenellations on its western.
The crenellations were made to pour hot water and oil over the soldiers standing close to the wall of the bastion or the fortification wall. The machicolations also served the same purpose. These were mostly constructed as holes over the façade of the top of entrance gates in the roofs of the passages through the gateways or projected out as corbels from the parapets of walls and gateways, through which boiling pitch, stones, darts and other missiles were thrown down on the enemy below. While built over the entrance gateway, it provided an opportunity for the defenders to quench fire lighted by the besiegers to burn down the gates. Similar were the embrasures, which were designed over the battlemented wall and could be seen in almost all the forts of northern India including those of Gwalior, Narwar, Asirgarh, Mandu, Chanderi, etc. The oriel windows also served as a means of protection to the defenders of the fort.

Apart from the above architectural components, there were several apartments, magazines or underground cellars for storing military equipments, jails, granaries, barracks for soldiers; quarters for the civilians; treasury, citadel or palace complex of the ruler or commander of the fort; stables for horses and elephants and temples of the worshipping deities in each fort.

An intensive care was taken to maintain the supply line within the fort in abundant quantity, as to be sufficient during a prolonged war. Of all the things required for the survival of the inhabitants of a fort, water was the most prime and therefore a

91 A.P. Singh, op.cit., p.175.
92 Sidney Toy, p.4, also see A.P. Singh, op.cit., p.175 and N.S. Ramchandramurthy, op.cit., p.124.
93 Sidney Toy, op.cit., p.4.
94 A.P. Singh, op.cit., p.175.
95 Ibid.
great care was provided to the supply of water in a fort, both through natural and artificial
sources. Natural springs and ponds, within the vicinity of a fort were the chief sources of
water supply.96 Such arrangement through natural sources could easily be noticed in the
fort of Gwalior, Ajaigarh, Asirgarh, Mandu, Ranthambhor etc.97 The artificial sources of
supply were the deep wells, baolis, reservoirs, shallow water ponds (kupa), deep ponds
(tadaga or tanks), lakes etc.98 In reservoirs, water was carried by two means i.e. by the
manual labour in pots from different sources and through the earthen pipes or channels by
the appliance of some mechanical device for lifting water upto a high level.99 The latter
device was applied in the Gwalior and Narwar forts.100

Due care was also provided to the plentiful supplies of fodder and other necessary
things. The forts were required to be well stocked at all times with necessities of life in
war, such as grains, oils, salts, medicines, vegetables, dried meat, haystock, firewood,
metals, skins, charcoal, timber, garments of fibre, weapons and armour of sorts including
stones, poisons, and so on.101 Old articles were replaced by the new ones, so as to be
sufficient for a long siege.102 But, even then sometimes the defenders faced difficulty in

97 Ibid.
98 Ibid.
99 Ibid., p.199.
100 Ibid.
101 Arthasastra, Kangle II, Ch.4, p.71, V.27; also see Nitivakyamrita, Ch.20, p.176, V.4; Nitisara, Ch.IV, p.88, V.60; Agni Purana, p.794.

Regarding the provisions of the fort Rajtarangini refers that the supplies should be
procured from outlying villages as long as the situation of war permitted (Rajtarangini
VIII, V.2541). Thereafter the besieged should depend on the stored articles within the fort.
In case of cutting down of water supply by the invaders, the available snow in the stores
could be melted to get water (Ibid., VII, V.1175).

102 Arthasastra, Bk.II, Ch.IV, V.27.
protecting their forts and themselves owing to the shortage of provisions resulted as a prolonged siege. Such was the condition arisen during the siege of Ranthambhor fort for which Amir Khusrau states, “No provisions remained in the fort and famine prevailed to such an extent that a grain of rice was purchased for two grains of gold”. The treasury inside the fort remained full of currency and other articles. The armoury was kept replete with arms and weapons of different varieties. Referring to such arrangements in the fort of Siwana, Padmanabh writes “there were stores from which they (Hindus) might draw grains for sixty years. In the, fort there, were reservoirs full of water never emptying a bit. The fort itself perched on the hill, had a difficult access with its formidable portals and ramparts running around with high towers and a large number of stone throwing machines (faraki), deadly and effective on every bastion-guards were posted. Large stones were taken up to the ramparts.... On all sides, the Chauhan king positioned on the walls good stone throwing machines”. During the period of war, special arrangements were made to equip the battlements and bastions with different kinds of projectile weapons, variously termed as manjaniqs, arra’das, mughrabis etc. for throwing heavy stones and vessels filled with naptha, on the enemy’s camp.

The forts of the Rajputs could be surmised quite formidable and unparalleled with such an equipage and defensive arrangements including the placement of strong guards on all the approaches, the plantation of inflammable material under the earth on

103 Khazain ‘ul Futuh in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.75.
104 Agni Purana, op.cit., p.856.
105 Kanhadade Prabandh, p.39.
106 It is significant to note that during the siege of Ranthambhor fort by Alauddin Khalji, his general Nusrat Khan died of the wound received from a fierce munjaniq stone, projected by the Rajputs from within the fort (Tarikh-i-Firuzsha in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.72).
the important places, appointment of spies all around the fort for day and night, fixing a beam across the entrance, filling the moats with water, making the arrangements to lighten, strengthening the gateways by means of heavy door frames fitted with sharp and pointed iron spikes and by setting up barracks at appropriate places etc. But it is a matter of great surprise that even such a formidable and carefully defended forts suffered from unformidable sieges of enemies, which resulted in their final capture. The reason was that the methods applied by the enemy (Turks) in siege operations were quite unfamiliar and tactical and sometimes treacherous too. The enemy often employed the methods of assailing by emptying the ditch and making use of underground tunnels, destroying the gates by means of machines and rushing elephants and horses, burning out fortifications, storming and hemming, suddenly assaulting by means of scaling or climbing on the fort with the help of ropes, nooses etc. and mining by means of digging approaches and producing a breach in the walls of the fort. The Muslims

107 The method of siege warfare had been prevalent in India since the Rigvedic age and continued through the whole of epic period. But by the early medieval period it gained popularity and became the most common method of attack as gleaned from the story of the capture of several fortresses by both Hindus and Muslims. The rulers and their feudatories felt great pride and honour in taking as many forts by seizure. (See Rigveda, tr. Griffith, Book VII, hymn, VI, p.8, line 2; Mahabharata, V.S. Sukthankar, Poona, Bk.2, pp.54, V.10).

108 In this method the besieger, first, pretended retreat, but when the enemy came out of the fort, he returned with forces, enclosing him from both front and rear (Arthasastra, Bk.13, Ch.IV, Kangle II, p.488, VV.28ff.).

109 During the battle of Somnath, when the defenders were forced to abandon the walls of the citadel "The Musalmans planted their ladders against the walls and gained summit". (Elliot and Dowson, Vol.11, p.476).

110 During the siege of Ranthambhor fort, the Muslims realising defeat, after the death of Nusrat Khan, attempted to blast a part of ditch situated on one side of the fort by constructing underground mines and succeeded in opening a temporary bridge over it but the bridge was destroyed by the Rajputs (L.P. Mathur, op.cit., pp.38-39).

111 Adab-ul-Harb-Wa-Shujjat, op.cit., p.269.
also approached the fort by means of constructing *pasheb* of sand and mudbags, equal to the height of fortal structure.\(^{112}\) Regarding the appliance of this method in the siege of Ranthambhor by Alauddin Khalji, Isami refers, "He commanded his troops to make bags of worn out clothes and hides and to fill them with earth and continued throwing the same into the moat, day and night. When the moat was filled, the royal army put in a stiff and ceaseless fight. Many were killed at the foot of the fortress and pools of blood flowed on all sides".\(^{113}\) Firishta narrates the account in a slightly different manner. He says, "Alla-ood-Deen, after trying all other means adopted the following expedient to reduce it. Having collected a multitude of people and provided each with a bag filled with sand, they began, at some distance from the fort, to form an ascent to the top of the walls, by which means the troops eventually obtained possession of the palace".\(^{114}\) The Muslims had also reached to the summit of Siwana fort by the *pasheb*.\(^{115}\)

Investment of fort by cutting of all supplies and communication to it and thus storming the defender was another known method. Lastly, treachery was applied, when all the known and applied methods received failure. The Muslims often succeeded in capturing the fort by winning over the people of the enemy's side through bribery or some other means, who disclosed some secrets relating to the water supply channel or sometimes opened the doors of forts at night for them. Thus, during the siege of the fort of Siwana, Alauddin, worrying of the impregnability of the fort, settled the terms with a traitor, who advised the enemy to pollute the chief water supplying pond inside the fort;

\(^{112}\) *Khazai' nul Futuh*, pp.39,54; *Tarikh-i-Firuzshahi* in Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.174.


\(^{115}\) *Khaza' inul Futuh*, p.54.
being convinced with which, the Turks discharged a cow’s head into the pond through a munjaniq. The Musalmans finally succeeded in this treacherous plan and the garrison immediately stopped taking water to drink from that pond.116 Similarly, the Jalor fort was also conquered through treacherous means, for which Padmanabh writes that one Sejawal was made agree to tell the way of secret entry into the fort.117 In the same way, Alauddin, while raising the siege of Ranthambhor fort, feeling the success quite difficult, resorted at last to treachery by negotiating with the Rajput general Ratipal118 and the king’s minister Ranmalla against Hammir, who became ready to open the gates of the fort for him.119

Besides the accounts of the Persian sources, treachery as one of the methods to capture the fort is also referred by Kautilya120 and the author of Nitivakyamrita.121

Almost, all the above techniques and methods, usually adopted by the Turkish Sultans for undertaking a fortified structure formed a subject matter of Adab-ul-Harb-Wa-Shujj’at, which refers in terms that “in order to capture a fort one should try to win over the heart of the people holding a fort. Such persons should be handled tactfully. Even some temptation of money may be offered to them. The defenders should be discouraged by extension of variety of rumours regarding the conquest of the fort and also by placing the munjaniqs and kharaks122 into the base of the wall, mining the walls, erecting towers and putting fire to them, making holes in the wall adjoining the ditch, throwing fire into the fort by munjaniqs and other devices. The defenders should again

117 Ibid., Canto IV, p.89.
118 See Hammirmahakavya.
120 Arthasastra. Kangle II, p.485ff. (Bk.13, Ch.I, Section 175).
121 Nitivakyamrita, p.177.
122 Kharak was a kind of wooden sheet used as an equipment in order to approach and attack the fort.
be made harassed by informing them of the arrival of some more forces at particular points, beating the drum and holding flags outside the fortral structure, by declaring war on a certain day and shouting loudly that the fodder and provisions inside the fort would not be sufficient for a long time siege but would finish within a few days. Besides, the besiegers should keep themselves well informed of the activities of the defenders and should distract the defending forces sowing the seeds of disintegration among them".  

The author also suggests that the equipments such as ladder, rope, kharak, matars, munjaniq, arradas, dakhura, (unidentified), araada-e-khasta (a special type of arrada), diwarkan (an instrument used in mining a wall, atishkash (a kind of spade of iron for throwing fire), spears, etc., are necessary in order to capture a fort. Emphasizing on the alertness of the besieger at every time from the side of enemy, Fakhr-i-Mudabbir, further refers that the besieger should take stand, realising the nature of the fort. He advises, that the forts, which are above the earth, should be exploded by means of constructing a tunnel into the fort. In addition to it, the author also instructed the Sultan not to lay siege of such forts, which could not be captured by means of constructing a tunnel, or built on high hills or in an inaccessible area or well equipped with a large number of soldiers and ammunitions of war; but to form an alliance with the masters of the forts. However, in the light of the conquest of impregnable and inaccessible forts of the Rajputs by Muslims, the statement seems quite inappropriate and much more of an advisory nature not followed in practice.

123 Adab-ul-Harb-Wa-Shuj'at in A.A. Rizvi’s in Adi Turk Kalin Bharat, pp.269-271.  
124 Ibid.  
125 Ibid.
APPENDIX

AN INTRODUCTORY OUTLINE OF SOME IMPORTANT FORTS OF THE RAJPUTS

1. Chittor:

Laying on strategic route from Delhi and Agra to Malwa, Gujarat and Deccan, the fort of Chittor was a Hindu stronghold of Rajputana in the 8th century AD. Traditions ascribe its foundation to Chitrangad, a ruler of Mauryan dynasty in the 7th century AD from whom it was wrested by Bappa Rawal, the founder of Guhilol dynasty of Mewar in AD 738. The fort remained under the control of the Pariharas of Gujarat and Malwa during the 9th and 10th centuries. It was occupied by Kumarpal, the Chalukya ruler of Gujarat in AD 1150. After sometime Vigraharaaj IV of Ajmer became its master. Soon after Guhilol King Jaitra Singh recaptured it in AD 1207, thereafter it was attacked by Alauddin Khalji in the 14th century. The fort also remained the centre of attraction to the Mughal rulers.

2. Ranthambhor:

The historic fort of Ranthambhor, situated in the Sawai Madhopur district of Rajasthan was erected during the 8th century AD, probably by some early Chauhan rulers. During the 12th century AD, it remained the chief stronghold of the greatest Chauhan ruler Prithviraj III. It was attacked by Qutubuddin Aibak in 1209 but without success, from whom it was captured by Iltutmish in 1226, but through treachery and not valour. The Rajputs regained it during the reign of Raziya. The fort was attacked by Balban in AD 1248; but he remained unsuccessful. The defences of the fort were strengthened by Jaitra Singh Chauhan. Jalaluddin Khalji had attacked the fort in 1292,
during the time of Hammir, the successor of Jaitra whose gallant character is found to be depicted in *Hammir-Mahakavya* but he successfully retrieved from the attack. Then, the fort was captured by Alauddin Khalji in 1300. Thereafter, it continued to be in Muslim hands under the successors of Alauddin Khalji, Tughlaqs and Saiyyeds.

3. Kumbhalgarh:

Situated on one of the high hills of Aravallis on the borders of Mewar and Marwar, this fort, according to traditions was built by a Jain king Samprati, centuries ago. Mahmud Khalji laid its siege in 1442. After this it was reconstructed by Maharana Kumbha in 1443, which was completed in AD 1458.

4. Jalor:

The outstanding fort of Jalor in Marwar area of Rajasthan was probably built by the Paramara rulers in the 10th century AD. But it was surrendered to the Chauhan king Kirtipala by the last Paramara King Kumarpal. It was captured by Iltutmish between AD 1211 and 1216, when the Chauhan king Udaisimha was ruling over it and in 1309 by Alauddin Khalji, who was bravely resisted by the Chauhan king Kanhadade but in spite of it, the fort fell in to the hands of the Muslims. Though, later on, the fort was occupied by Maldeo and suffered under the heavy pressure of the Mughals.

5. Siwana:

Siwana, an outstanding and glorious fort of Marwar desert was founded by Veer Narayan, son of Paramara Bhoja in AD 954. The present name Siwana is said to have been given by Alauddin Khalji, when he attacked the fort in AD 1308. It bore the burden of the constant attacks of Alauddin Khalji, until it was finally conquered by him from
Sataldeo in AD 1308, who was killed by the enemy during the course of the fight. After that, it was also attacked by Firuz Shah Tughlaq.

6. Bhansrorgarh:

The fort is located at a distance of 120 miles from Udaipur on the banks of Chambal. Though the founder of it is not known, it appears that the Parmara chiefs of this area constructed the fort for their defense in 9th and 10th centuries. It was reconstructed by maharana Kumbha in the 15th century AD. Alauddin Khalji was the only Muslim ruler, who was able to conquer it after facing a stiff resistance from the side of the Rajputs.

7. Bhatner:

Probably built by Bhatti sardars, this fort remained under the possession of various clans such as Bhattis, Sohias, Rathors etc. It was attacked and captured by Mahmud Ghazni and later on by Timur from Bhatti governors, who after being defeated embraced Islam.

8. Gwalior:

Founded by a Rajput chief named Suraj Sen, the fort of Gwalior remained under the control of Raja Bhoja of Kannauj in the mid 10th century and thereafter its possession passed on to the Kacchawahas; who were again ousted by the Parihars in AD 1128. The fort continued in their possession till AD 1196. Mahmud of Ghazni attacked it in AD 1022. After that, it was conquered by Qutubuddin Aibak but Parihars recovered it in 1210. Again, the fort was besieged by Iltutmish in AD 1232. Undergoing the disturbances of the invasion of Timur in 1398, it came under the control of the Tomar Rajputs, who beheld it till 1518.
9. Kalanjar:

Kalanjar, one of the most strategically located forts of India is said to have been founded by Kedar Raja in the 7th century. The fort was besieged by Mahmud of Ghazni in AD 1022, when the Parmaras were ruling over it. Mahmud again besieged the fort in 1023 but this time an alliance was formed with the Chandella king, who shifted his capital from Mahoba to Kalanjar. It was taken over by Qutubuddin Aibak in 1202, when ruling by the Parmaras. Soon it was retaken by the Chandellas, who continued to possess it for next three centuries. The fort had also been the victim of regular attacks of Sher Shah and the Mughal rulers.

10. Ajaigarh:

The hill fort of Ajaigarh, situated in district Panna in eastern Madhya Pradesh is believed to be founded by a legendary sage Ajaipal. It came into prominence under the Gurjara - Pratiharas, who ruled this region till AD 954. Then it passed on to the Chandellas, who were defeated by Iltutmish between AD 1211-1236. Though, the siege of Ajaigarh fort is not mentioned by any Muslim historian, it is known that Ulugh Khan, the wazir of Nasiruddin Mahmud had captured this fort in AH 644 (AD 1246). According to the epigraphic records of the Chandella rulers, Virvarman II, the great grandson of Bhojavarman was the last occupant of this fort, from whom it was occupied by the Muslims. But, it appears that after sometime the fort was reoccupied by the Chandellas, who continued to hold it till the 16th century AD; as revealed from the scientific analysis of the epigraphic records of the Chandellas.
II. Asirgarh:

Located in district Khandwa of western Madhya Pradesh, Asirgarh fort, according to Firishta was built by Asha Ahir in AD 1370. The Tak family of Rajputs is associated with this fort, who held it contemporaneously with the Paramaras of Dhar. It was captured by Alauddin Khalji in AD 1295, probably from some Chauhan rulers. The later history of this fort had been connected with the Farukkhi rulers of Burhanpur for about 200 years.

12. Narwar:

Narwar fort is situated in district Shivapuri in northern Madhya Pradesh. Politically and historically, this fort had always remained associated with the fort of Gwalior. The earliest rulers of this region were the Kacchapagatas, who were expelled by the Gurjara - Pratiharas of Kannauj in the 13th century. But the Gurjara-Pratiharas too could not rule peacefully, as they were supplanted by Chahad Deo also of the dynasty of Yajapalas of Narwar. The fort was besieged by Alauddin Khalji after AD 1298. With this, the territory of Narwar had been in continuous possession of Delhi Sultans till the end of the 14th century AD. Then, it was held by the Tomar dynasty of Narwar till AD 1506. Again, it was assaulted by Sikandar Lodi and Akbar. The Kacchapagatas held Narwar as feudatories of Delhi rulers till the 19th century AD.

13. Chanderi:

Chanderi is situated in district Guna of Northern Madhya Pradesh. Nothing definite is known about the foundation of this fort. No reference of the Muslim historians about Chanderi is known before the 11th century AD. It remained under the occupation of the Pratiharas during the 11th and 12th centuries as known from one of their
inscriptions, which provides a list of the Pratihara rulers ruling over this fort. Repulsing the attack of Nasiruddin Mahmud under Balban in AD 1251, the fort had been possessed by the Hindus till the 13th century AD. It was taken over by Ainul Mulk, the general of Alauddin Khalji in AD 1304. Since then, the fort remained under the Muslims. It was only in the 16th century that the Khangar Rajputs captured it for a very short period.

14. Raisen:

The fort of Raisen situated in district Raisen of Madhya Pradesh acquired importance under the Paramaras. Iltutmish captured Raisen from the Paramaras as proved from the sculptural and the architectural remains of this fort. Next, Alauddin Khalji besieged it in AD 1293, after that, it was captured by Muhammad Bin Tughlaq. The Silahadi Rajputs were ruling over it in the first half of the 16th century AD, from whom it was taken over by Muhammad Shah of Gujarat. The fort had also underwent the attacks of the Afghans and the Mughals.

15. Ginnorgarh:

Situated in district Sehore in northern Madhya Pradesh, the fort of Ginnorgarh was the chief stronghold of the Paramaras, from whom it was captured by Gond kings and retained by them till the period of Aurangzeb.

16. Dabhoi:

Dabhoi, 16 miles south-east of Baroda is an ancient city of Gujarat. The fort was founded by Sidhraj, who ruled Patan from 1093 to 1143 and remained under the direct control of the Solanki Kings until it was overrun by Alauddin Khalji in the 13th century. From that time Dabhoi had been in the Muslim possession till 1725, while it was taken by the Marathas.
17. Champanir:

Champanir was situated at a distance of 25 miles from Baroda. By whom the foundation of this fort was laid down is not clear but it was taken by the Chauhans in the 13th century and remained in their possession for about two centuries. It withstood the attacks of Ahmad Shah and Muhammad Shah.

18. Mandu:

The hill fort of Mandu (district Dhar of Malwa), according to Firishta was built by a Tribal king named Ananddeo. The fort was passed into the hands of Gurjara-Pratiharas of Kannauj, who strengthened it in the 10th century, as mentioned in the Pratapgarh inscription of VS 1003/AD 948. By the end of the 10th century, it was taken over by the Paramara kings of Malwa. In 1227, Malwa was invaded by Shamsuddin Iltutmish but this time a treaty was formed with the Paramar king Deopal. The fort remained under the successors of Deopal till 1269, when it was captured by Jaitra Singh, a Chahmana king. Jalauddin Khalji invaded the fort in AD 1283, when it was ruled by Bhoja II and returned with a huge booty. Alauddin Khalji had besieged this fort during the time of Mahalak Deo, the last Hindu ruler of it. Since then, it was held directly by the Delhi Sultans.

19. Dhar:

Dhar was the capital of the Paramara rulers of Malwa. The city became politically eminent only during the later half of the 10th century, when the Paramara king Bhoja I made it his capital. It remained under the possession of the Paramaras till the 13th century AD. Muhammad Tughlaq occupied it (AD 1325-57) by defeating the Paramara chief. Again, it had been occupied by the Mughals and then by the Marathas.
CONCLUSION

The period from c. AD 800 to 1450 is broadly marked by political instability resulting from the bitter mutual frights, rivalries and intermittent wars among the existing political powers. The era of the 8th century opened with a fratricidal struggle among the Gurjara-Pratiharas, the Rashtrakutas and the Palas, all of whom were trying to have a permanent occupation of Kannauj and the neighbouring region of central India, which was earlier under Harsha’s suzerainty. Though, the Gurjara-Pratiharas were the commanding political adventurers of the time, they, too, remained unable in establishing a firm rule over the successive estate of Harsha on account of their indulgence in wars with their neighbours. The political situation further came to the worse after the emergence of the feudatory dynasties of the Chandellas, Chalukyas, Paramaras, Chauhans, Kalachuris, Gahadawalas and Guhilas on the political front. The political instability further accelerated during this age, which created the situation of confusion and chaos all over northern India. The reciprocal adversities and hostilities of the Gahadawalas and the Chahmanas on the one hand and those of the Chandellas with the Chahmanas and Kalachuris, of the Paramaras with the Chalukyas, Chahmanas of Nadol, Guhilas of Mewat, Kalachuris of Tripuri and Rastrakutas of Hastikund, of the Chalukyas with the contemporary kings of Sakambhari, Lata and Paramaras of Malwa, of the Kalachuris with the Paramaras and the Palas on the other hand tend to create a strong enigma for national security. It strengthened the power and endurance of the Turks to overcome these Rajputs and thereby to establish themselves in India, permanently. The absence of the united opposition and the aligned and narrow perceptions of the Indian rulers, ultimately, paved the establishment of the Turkish rule in India in a successful manner. Such an entrenchment of the Turks over most parts of the Rajput estates led them to seek refuge in a more safer region of western Rajasthan. In the process of their occupation in the
newer territory, some new political powers, such as the Rathors and the Bhattis came in to appearance. But, they were in no position to oppose the consolidated Turkish empire but to create a diplomatic political history of their own.

The administrative and state apparatus of the Rajputs was also not devoid of problems and deficiencies. It was engulfed with highly decentralised feudal tendencies of the age. The personal grievances of the feudal lords like rajaputras, ranakas, rautas, samantas etc. created a consternation in the whole administrative set up. The military dependence of the king on his feudatories and an extensive increase in the number of landgrants with certain important rights over them made the feudatories more powerful to defy the authority of their overlord and to set up the independent principalities of their own. The superstitious notions of the Rajput Kings to grant a large area of land to these officials as Brahmans further strengthened their position as feudal lords by converting them into big landed barons. The sincerity and fidelity of some of them to their masters was ever questioned. The instances are not rare when the samantas and other feudatories did refuse to obey the orders of their overlords and rose in utmost rebellion against them. Sometimes, they betrayed their lords by changing the side in battle to the enemy for their narrow self-interest and prosperity. The assignment of significant official posts to such untrustworthy feudatories led to the disintegration of the whole administration. However, in some cases the positive attitude and loyalty of the feudal lords to their masters could also be noticed, but they could not strengthen the whole system to make it free from the powerful feudal magnates.

The military system of any dynasty is always a direct reflection of its political organisation. The feudalisation of political structure of the Rajputs had also resulted in their military organisation. A hereditary army (maula) provided by the feudatory chiefs formed the
main composition of the Rajput armies. Such forces, as summoned from different directions were heterogeneous in nature, which made their organisation difficult on the battlefield. The soldiers of such army were unreliable either in number or in efficiency. They lacked the feeling of loyalty and sincerity to the ruler, while fighting against the enemy. The uniformity of organisation and the unity of control and command, which are essentials of success in war also required in them to a greater extent. The leadership in the Rajput armies composed of different types of forces (maula, bhrita, mitra, sreni, atavika, aribala) was not under one command. Each type of force was directed and led by a different commander in a different manner. On the other hand, the armies of the Arab and Turkish invaders were never very large. They fought under one unified command and obeyed one order, which in turn inspired every soldier of their army to make a combined effort for success or victory in war.

The Rajput army was comprising of three important wings i.e. elephantry, cavalry and infantry in good number. The valuability and organisation of these troops in battlefield, though, has remained a matter of pursuit. With regard to the cavalry in the Rajput army, it will be right to assume that they invested a huge sum of money on the purchase of foreign breeds of active and passive horses. But, the imported horses here, unfortunately, did not acquire the same treatment, training and exercise as in their original lands. The food provided to them by Indians made them fatigue and inactive. The Indians did never pay a serious attention to learn the technique and mannerism of horse training from Central Asians. They remained quite unaware with the art of cross-breeding of horses, hence, they had to import the newer stock of foreign bred horses in exchange of a great amount of money. The absence of the practice of mounted-archery had further diminished the mobility of Indian horses. Owing to its absense, the Rajputs, unlike the Turks, remained unable to combine their archery with the tactical use of their mobility. The
Indian cavalrymen of our age were incapable to follow the tactic of feigned retreat and thenceforward to impart a forceful attack on the enemy from a mobile horse-back without halting or dismounting. They could not move rapidly during their attack on the enemy’s troops.

The qualities of Indian elephants were indeed remarkable. The Turkish sultans were also too fond of them. Their possession was considered a matter of royal grandeur and dignity by the Rajput rulers. Their utility in war can not be disregarded in any case. A single elephant is regarded to have a capacity to fight with thousands, being immovable, even after bearing severe blows and hits from the enemy and each elephant mounted by an expert driver is said to be able of destroying a cavalry force of six hundred. The great Turkish sultan Balban considered one elephant equal to five hundred war horses. The elephant could be easily used to transport the heavy war machines like munjaniqs and arra’das. The leader of forces seated on a high elephant could be proved a good supervisor and commander, however, in another way such a high command resulted disastrous to Indian armies, as it disposed the location of the leader to the enemy, who thence, could easily be the target of the latter’s attack, which led to the discouragement of the rest of the troops and to the ultimate failure of Indian armies. The arrangement of elephants usually on the frontline or the advance-guard had also created a situation of danger for Indian armies, as the animal on being discouraged and dissipated usually smashed the backward forces and created a havoc in the whole army. The Turks did not follow this practice. The elephants in their armies were always kept secure by other forces. The Rajputs of our age had no other alternative than to place the elephants on the advance-guard or frontline, as their horsemen and foot-soldiers, in the absence of technological devices, such as stirrups, crossbows etc, probably, did not feel themselves capable to bear the severe frontal blows of the Turkish mounted archers and cross-bow-men. Thus, such an arrangement of elephants was a
great mindedness of the Rajput leaders and not their foolhardiness. The pilferment of the rear forces by the elephants was the only result of the technological advancement under the Turks and not their mismanagement or misarrangement by the Rajput leaders.

The role of infantry in Indian armies was also invaluable owing to its manifold functions. Though, in comparison to the Turkish foot-soldiers, they are regarded less skilled in tactical wars.

With regards to the war strategy of the Rajputs, it will be worth commenting that they were well aware with the principles of *kutayuddha* (strategic wars) as laid down by the political authors of our age. However, such principles could not be followed by them in practice against the highly expertise Turkish strategists and mounted archers, who adopted the devices of feigned retreat, ambush and shock tactics, including the surprise attack on the enemy, simultaneously from different directions. Besides this, the tactical blunders of the Rajput rulers were no less responsible for their defeat at the hands of the Turks, of which the later had taken every advantage. The best instance of such an error may be noticed after the 1st battle of Tarain, while Prithviraja allowed an uninterrupted return to the Ghorian forces and further wasted his precious thirteen months in the siege of Tabarhindah remaining fully unconscious of the enemy's next attack.

The fortal system of the Rajputs had also made them strategically weak. The structure of these forts was though, insurmountable and unapproachable, there were also some weaknesses in it from military point of view. First of all, they were made from a defensive point of view and therefore their use in an offensive attack was negligible. The Rajput military leaders too believed in defensive wars, which was indeed a great misconception on their part. Owing to the forces of disintegration in the country, the Rajputs failed to utilise these forts as base-camps to strengthen
their efficiency in war. The Rajput forts, on the other hand, stood in extensive isolation. These forts were the great centres of militarism and immense wealth, which also diverted the attention of the Turks to siege them. They felt it easy to concentrate their energies on a single fort and thenceforward to capture the whole territory around it and finally, succeeded in their purpose of conquest. The Rajputs, while attacked and surrounded by the enemy surprisingly, could make no arrangement of the troops from outside for open warfare but to depend on the help of only a number of soldiers existing inside the fort. Even, under such circumstances, sometimes, the Turks felt themselves unsuccessful and discouraged to besiege these massive forts and then considering it difficult and impossible, they ultimately, resorted to treachery and made an alliance with the Indian traitors, who helped them to approach the fort in any manner. The massive fortal structures of Ranthambhor, Jalor and Siwana were thus besieged under a treacherous plan with the help of some traitors.

The arms and weapons used by the Rajputs were not lacked in effectiveness. The Indian weapons of close combat like sword, spear etc. had been famous for quality in whole world. Several cities and towns in India were the great centres of sword manufacturing. Even, the Turkish sultans had preferred them on account of their great pliability and penetrability. The mechanical weapons like munjaniqs, arra’das etc., were used likewise the Turks. However, there is not a single evidence for the use of cross-bow in the Rajput army like that of the Turks. The absence of iron stirrup probably did not allow the Indians to practice mounted archery. With the rope stirrup available and used in India, it was not possible for the horseman to stand up firmly and to wield the weapon (arrow, sword etc.) on the target by turning or moving around on a mobile horseback without halting or dismounting. Indian bows and arrows were also regarded quite inferior than the Persian bows and arrows used by the Turks in India. The use of such bows
and arrows imported from Persia and Afghanistan was regarded nothing more than a status symbol for the Indian kings of our age.

Thus, a thorough research on the Rajput Political Systems and Military Organisation (c. AD 800-1450) reveals that the organisational character of these systems was embellished with some unique and unaltered features of its own. However, the above laid shortcomings in it might have been responsible to an extent for the defeat of the Rajputs at the hand of the Turks.
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