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Appendix III (Māṇagrha and Kailāsakūṭa), because the theory there proposed cannot be defended any longer;

Appendix VI (A portion of the Bendall vamśāvalī), because in the meantime the whole of that text has been published elsewhere (although a proper critical edition is still lacking).
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INTRODUCTION

The history of Nepal can be roughly divided into four main periods:

1) Licchavi and cognate dynasties (c. 386–750 AD)
2) Transitional period and Karnāṭa–Malla dynasty (c. 750–1482)
3) The three Malla kingdoms (1482–1768)
4) The Gorkha dynasty (after 1768)

During the first three periods Nepalese history developed itself in a limited area, the Nepāla-manḍala of the documents, consisting of the Valley of Nepal proper, i.e. the upper basin of the Bagmati river, with some extensions towards the east (Banepa and Palamchok, sometimes as far as Dolkha), the south (Pharping) and the west (Nuvakoth). Being surrounded on all sides by mountain barriers, broken only to the south by the narrow and impassable gorges of the Bagmati, the country was well protected and easily defendable. In the middle ages the Valley was almost exclusively inhabited by the industrious and intelligent Newar people, particularly able as cultivators and artisans. The Valley was comparatively thickly inhabited, well cultivated, and thus fit to afford an economically sufficient basis upon which to build a state.

These simple geographical facts determine some of the essential features of Nepalese history. Its theatre was strictly limited, and from the point of view of a purely political history Nepal has never conditioned nor even influenced the events unrolling themselves in the vast territories north of the Himalayan range and in the Indian plains. The Nepalese state was politically passive. It defended itself with more or less success against foreign invaders, but never attacked, nor even counter-attacked (with a single exception in the 15th century). Foreign pressure was only intermittent; raids and invasions from the outside were comparatively few during the six centuries covered by our study. They came either from the west (Khasa) or from the south (Tirhut). With the sole exception of the disastrous Muslim
invasion of 1349, they never came from the great neighbouring powers of the Indian plains. Not one of these invasions resulted in foreign domination; the independence of the country was never in serious danger.

Trade was always an important consideration, and the part it played in Nepalese economy was gradually increasing. Whether commercial and economic conflicts resulted at any time in armed clashes, is beyond our knowledge, as documentation on this subject is totally lacking for this period. Looking at things from a higher, continental angle, it cannot be gainsaid that Nepalese history down to 1768 never overstepped the purely local interest.

As a complete contrast, Nepal played a most important role in the cultural field. The historical task of the Valley (if such a concept can still be allowed) consisted in the preservation of the treasures of thought and of literature exposed to unavoidable destruction in the plains of Northern India. This task was carried on with admirable constance and success; and thus it should rank at a place not lower than the creative activity itself, in which Nepal was not particularly outstanding. This is true for the conservation of the oral tradition (chiefly that of Buddhism which died out in India), but even more so for the preservation of the written monuments, first on palm-leaf, then on paper. The success was due not only to favourable climatic conditions and to a high degree of security from foreign destructive invasions. A factor even more decisive was the spirit of reverent piety with which each Newar family preserved their precious heirlooms of manuscripts throughout the centuries. Without them, a large body of religious, philosophical and other literature would have been lost forever.

In other fields Nepal showed a true original genius; Nepalese architecture and sculpture are a proof in instance. Their influence penetrated extensively in the world of the mountains, chiefly toward Tibet, and to a lesser extent to other Himalayan valleys.

The history of the second main period of Nepalese history forms the subject of the present volume. Before the publication of its first edition in 1958, a fair volume of spade-work had already been carried out by several scholars. Foremost among them is the account of Nepalese history in that magnificent pioneer work, S. Lévi's Le Népal, II, Paris 1905, 172–239. Lévi gave a very sober and reliable
outline of this period, as far as he was able to reconstruct it from the sources available in his time. Although its chronological and historical frame is by now obsolete, still *Le Népal* can be utilized with great profit.

Together with Lévi, honourable mention should be made of a paper by C. Bendall, "A history of Nepal and surrounding kingdoms (1000–1600)", in *JASB*, 62 (1903), 1–32, reprinted as "Historical Introduction" in the first volume of H. P. Shastri's *Catalogue ... of the Durbar Library*. It was Bendall who revealed for the first time the existence of the all-important *Gopāla-vamśāvalī* (or Bendall *vamśāvalī*; VBd), then in the Darbar Library, and now in the National Archives at Kathmandu.

Looking back to the last quarter of a century, I am under the impression that the first edition of the present book has fulfilled its task and has played a useful role, if nothing else as a provoking factor; many later workers in this field have discussed its findings, accepting or rejecting or criticizing them.

The most ambitious work after 1958 was D. R. Regmi's *Medieval Nepal*, 4 vols., Patna and Calcutta 1965–1966. It is a rather prolix and repetitive piece of historiography, which, however, has to its credit the collection of a considerable body of fresh materials, such as inscriptions and colophons. It is also fitting to acknowledge the more unassuming but extremely useful work of the editors of the periodical *Pūrṇimā* and of the epigraphical collection *Abhilekh-saṅgraha*, and also the active research work going on in the Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies of the Tribhuvan University.

As I had already cautioned the reader in 1958, it is a rather old-fashioned history-writing which is offered in the following pages: dynasties, kings, wars, chronological problems etc. In my opinion however, side by side with the intensive research work that is being carried on by Nepalese and Western scholars on the religious, social and economic aspects of medieval and modern Nepalese culture, there is still scope for a work intended to place on a secure footing the chronological and political framework of Nepalese medieval history.
CHAPTER I

SOURCES

The sources for this period of Nepalese history can be classified as follows: A) vanāsāvalis; B) colophons; C) inscriptions; D) foreign documents.

A) A vanāsāvali is primarily what its title indicates: a string of generations, i.e. a genealogical list, which in its simplest form gives merely the names of the rulers with the duration of their reigns in years and months. This elementary scheme is then variated by the addition of dates and of short entries relating the chief events of the reign. These additions may become more and more elaborate, till the whole assumes the shape of a chronicle, or even of annals; this development occurs quite early. The events narrated are chiefly and above all of a religious nature: construction of temples, dedication of images, pecuniary gifts to shrines etc. This is because the writers of the chronicles were either Brahmans or Vajrācāryas, according as the tendency of the work was Hindu or Buddhist. In some cases (e.g. in V3) the lists of donations are so careful and detailed, as to lead us to suppose that their source were the archives of some holy place (Paśupati Nāth in the case of V3).

The extant vanāsāvalīs can be divided into two groups: an earlier one, comprising works written about 1400; and the later vanāsāvalīs, mainly compiled during the first decades of the Gorkha rule, i.e. around 1800.

In the first group we notice before all the ancient vanāsāvalī, which Bendall found in the Darbar Library (now National Archives; I.1583.7), and of which he published some extracts in his article A history of Nepal quoted above. VBd is a palm-leaf ms. of small size, fairly well preserved with the exception of several leaves in which the ink has nearly faded away. It is incomplete, beginning with f. 17 and remaining interrupted with f. 63, after which we find an additional leaf marked f. 50 and being a sort of rider to f. 50 in the text,
and three blank leafs. As already recognized by Bendall, the ms. consists of three originally separate works. The first (Bendall's V1; down to f. 30 a) is a royal list of a simple pattern; only after f. 26 a (reign of Anantamalla) it begins to include additional dates and richer materials. Its language is a very ungrammatical and debased Sanskrit, revealing a poor knowledge of the sacred language. At the very end (f. 29 a), i.e. with the first years of Jayasthitimalla, the narrative assumes an annalistic character and at the same time the language changes into old Newari; this portion is clearly a later addition, and the cleavage is quite perceptible. The last entry is for the year 507 NS. The second chronicle (V2; from f. 30 b to f. 36 a) is a chronological-genealogical list of the birth-dates of princes of the royal family and other important persons. After a preliminary short account of the foundation of Caṅgu Nārāyan by king Viṣṇugupta, its first entry bears the date of 177 NS; the last one is for 396. The language is old Newari mixed with Sanskrit. The third text (V3; from f. 36 b to the end) is a real chronicle, chiefly concerned with religious donations. Its form is annalistic, but without regularity in the sequence of years. The first entry is for 379 and the last (in order of time but not in sequence) is for 509 (f. 58 a). The language is old Newari. V3, as well as the concluding portion of V1, was apparently written late in the reign of Jayasthitimalla, i.e. about 510 NS (A.D. 1390). Although the last leafs are missing, the tale cannot have been carried much farther than the extant portion, because at the end the pace is very slow and entries follow each other at the distance of months or even of days; besides, Jayasthitimalla is eulogized is such a way, that he clearly was the reigning king at the time of the compilation of the work. A consequence of this is that V3 pays closest attention to the Tripura (Bhatgaon) line of the Nepalese rulers, which ended with Jayasthitimalla's wife Rājalladevi, and often overlooks the main line reigning in Patan, at least theoretically. This fact tends to present a distorted picture, were it not for the colophons, which supply the necessary redressement of balance by consistently ignoring the Bhatgaon princes and recognizing only the legitimate kings, however powerless.

V2 and V3 offer great difficulties. First of all, in some leafs the ink has faded to a large extent. An even greater obstacle is represented by the archaic language in which they are written; it often
baffles even the best Newari scholars. The ms. being of the highest historical and philological interest, a thorough study, based on a scientifically correct edition and translation, remains at present the foremost desideratum in the field of medieval Nepalese history and linguistics. At the end of 1983 only imperfect editions were available. They are: 1) A small portion (ff. 22b–29a) printed as Appendix VI (pp. 219–224) of the first edition of the present work; 2) Complete edition in Himavatsamskṛti, I/1 (2016 VS), 9–25, followed by a Nepali summary and list of names; reprinted in Yogi Naraharinath, Itihās-prakāś mā sandhipatra-saṅgraha, Kathmandu 2022 VS, 254–270; 3) Complete edition in D. R. Regmi, Medieval Nepal, III, Calcutta 1966, 112–157. My understanding of the Chronicle was much facilitated when during my stay in Nepal in 1982 Mr. Dhanbajra Bajracharya generously allowed me to utilize his unpublished Nepali translation of the Gopāla-vamśāvalī; by its help most if not all the difficulties were overcome.

According to a well-known law in historiography, the highly authoritative V Bd soon gave origin to abridgments or compendia, of which at least two are extant. The more important of the two was at the basis of the information collected in 1793 by the British envoy Kirkpatrick and embodied in his Account of the kingdom of Nepaul. It has been recognized at all hands and for a long time that Kirkpatrick’s royal lists diverge strongly from the modern vamśāvalīs and bear all the marks of antiquity and trustworthiness. They widely agree with V Bd; and in the few cases where they diverge, internal evidence shows that the tradition of VK is in some cases more dependable. In 1956 I was lucky enough to discover an incomplete ms. of this abridgment in the (then private) library of Field-Marshal Kaisher Shamsher, which after his demise is now owned by the State. The ms. (Kaisher Library, n. 171) is a mere fragment, written in Sanskrit on Nepalese paper in concertina form. The outer leaf bears some dates scribbled by different later hands: 859 Caitra śukla 4, 859 Śrāvaṇa śukla 3, 855 Āṣāḍha śukla 2; which means that the ms. was in existence in the years 1735–1739 A.D. The beginning is missing, and the first name of the royal list is × × deva, corresponding to the Condur Deo of Kirkpatrick. The identity of names and regnal years with Kirkpatrick’s list is absolute. Toward the end the ms. gives some dates and other additional material, which is mostly abrid-
ged from V₁ but is often badly corrupted; the text, however, can be restored with the help of V₁. The original abridgment stops with the Muslim invasion of 470 NS, the last words being iti vamśāvali. After this the 18th century copyist started to add a summary of the chronological material of the vamśāvalis of the modern group, beginning with the genealogies of the kings of Mithilā and giving the traditional chronogram for the arrival of Harisimha in Nepal; the text remains interrupted in the middle of the chronogram. VK is reprinted here as Appendix III.

Another abridgment of VBd belongs to the collection of Dhanbajra Bajracharya and has been published by him in CNS, V/1 (1977), 116–122. The ms. (here quoted as VD) is complete. The abridgment of VBd starts with the earliest kings and leaves off where VK does. Then, as in VK, the compiler added a compact chronicle of the modern group, which carries the chronological frame down to 1775. Normally the regnal years in VD are exactly the same as in VK with some rare exceptions. However, the historical content is more reduced and often badly truncated. Thus the practical usefulness of VD is inferior to that of VK, as in no case it supplies new material, with the exception of course of the period for which the pages of VK are lost.

The vamśāvalis of the later group are written in Gorkhali, the language of the conquerors. They may be divided into two sub-sections. One is of Buddhist persuasion, and its main representative is the one written about 1800 at Patan by a monk of the Mahābodhi-vihāra, freely translated into English by the Pandits of the British Residency and edited by D. Wright, History of Nepal translated from the Parbatiya, Cambridge 1877. I have perused the photostatic copy of a ms. of this work and have noted the substantial correctness of the translation, at least in the most important points. The other sub-section is of Hindu persuasion, and its foremost representative is the vamśāvali written in 1834 by Siddhi Nārāyan of Deo Patan The ms. is described at length in Lévi, I, 193–194, and the same author gives numerous extraxts of the text. The vamśāvali used by Bhagvanlal Indraji in preparing his paper Some considerations on the History of Nepal, in Ind. Ant., 13 (1884), pp. 411–428, must have been a cognate work. Other texts apparently belonging to this sub-section are the mss. Hodgson 29bis/4, 29bis/5 b and 29bis/4 b in the India
Office Library, and Add. 1652 a in the Cambridge University Library.

The list and chronology of both sub-sections are substantially one and the same. But they are far less correct and trustworthy than those of the older vanśāvalīs; this was noticed already by Lévi, who gives several instances of this basic fact.

The worst defects are two. These chronicles always give the succession as from father to son; and they quit the tale of the Malla dynasty with Jayadeva in 1258 to resume it only with Jayasthiti-malla about 1380. They fill the gap with the Karnaṭa kings of Tirhut, viz. with Nānyadeva, his descendants, Harisimha and the latter's supposed descendants, all of whom never reigned in Nepal. And since for this period they are completely divorced from reality, and since they are unreliable also for the early generations, we can say in all conscience that the tradition preserved in the later chronicles is corrupted and distorted (at least for the period under consideration), and therefore can be safely disregarded. There are of course exceptions which will be noticed in their proper places.

B) The most copious and reliable material for the chronology of this period is represented by the colophons of Nepalese mss. The scribes of Nepal used to add at the end of their work a brief statement mentioning the date of copying, and often also the name of the reigning king, the place of writing, the name of the scribe, the name of the sponsor of the work and other indications. Of course only those colophons which mention date and name of the king are useful for our purpose, and only these I have collected and utilized for my work. To those already known, my researches in the libraries of Kathmandu in 1956 had added a substantial amount of new unpublished colophons, a sufficient description of which will be given under the heading of each reigning king; but many more have been published during these last years. The colophons form the mainstay of our chronology of this period, supplementing and checking the dates of the chronicles. But very seldom they supply us with information on political and other events; for this we must still rely on the vanśāvalīs.

1) CSPMIO, nn. 8185-8188, pp. 1549-1550. Of these, the Hindu vanśāvalī of Padmagiri was published by B. J. Hasrat, History of Nepal, Hoshiarpur 1970, 1-98.
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C) The Nepalese inscriptions fall naturally into two groups. One is composed of the early inscriptions of the Licchavi and "Thākurī" dynasties (5th–8th centuries); they are all of them on stone (śiḷāpattra) and are written in Sanskrit with a rather archaic alphabet which is essentially that of the Gupta dynasty 1). The second group starts with Gunakāmadeva at the end of the 10th century. Its bulk increases sharply with Jayasthitimalla at the end of the 14th century and with his successors. Most of the inscriptions are on stone, but from the 12th century on the documents on copperplates (tāmrapattra) are also coming forth, although they are less numerous than the stone inscriptions. For the 17th and 18th centuries the abundance of epigraphic material is simply bewildering; the great cities of the Valley literally teem with inscriptions. The script is usually old Newari. The language is at first Sanskrit only, but the technical portions (land measurements etc.) tend more and more to be written in Newari, and after the 16th century the body itself of the inscriptions is often couched in Newari.

D) Foreign documents are scanty for this period. They practically consist only of some entries in the "Veritable Records" of the Ming dynasty, and of the chapter on Nepal and other scattered references in the official history of the Ming 2). The account of Nepal in the Ming history has been summarized in English by Bretschneider 3) and translated into French by Imbault–Huart and by Lévi 4). Another Chinese text, which concerns the history of Nepalese artistic influence abroad but not political history, is the account of the Nepalese artist A–ni–ko and his activity at the court of Qubilai Khan 5).

Other sources are practically non-existent. Numismatic is of little help, as few coins of this period seem to be extant.

1) Published by R. Gnoli, Nepalese inscription in Gupta characters (Serie Orientale Roma, X, 2), Rome 1956. A more up-to-date collection is that by Dh. Bajracharya, Licchavikā-ābhilekh, Kathmandu 2030 VS; it lacks, however, the facsimiles supplied by Gnoli.


CHAPTER II

CHRONOLOGY

The era commonly used in the period under consideration was the Newari Samvat, which starts with Kārttika südi pratipad of Śaka 801 expired (October 20th, 879).

The origin of the Newari Samvat is obscure. The later vamśā-valis tell us a rather commonplace tale, which attributes the foundation of the era to one Sakhvā, a merchant of Bhatgaon; there is nothing historical in this legend, as shown by Lévi 1). On the other side, Kirkpatrick, 262, attributes to king Rāghavadeva the introduction of the Tambul era, i.e. of the Vikrama Samvat of 57 B.C. 2). Prinsep corrected this account to mean that Rāghavadeva was the founder of the Newari Samvat. Cunningham, Bendall and Lévi accepted his “adjustment”, which is now certain beyond any doubt. The statement of Kirkpatrick was based on VK (the Kaisher ms.), which tells us that “Rāghavadeva introduced the era of Śrī-Paśupati-bhaṭṭaraka”; this is of course the Newari Samvat, although the name of the chief god of Hindu Nepal is nowhere else connected with the Nepalese era. The informant of Kirkpatrick misunderstood this text, in which the word samvatsara is used, as it normally is, in the general sense of era and not in the special meaning of Vikrama Samvat.

What was the event which gave occasion to the founding of the Newari Samvat? Here we are groping in darkness. Lévi put forward a very seducing theory, according to which the Newari Samvat is simply the Śaka era with eight centuries omitted, and this was due to the common belief in Nepal that eight was an unlucky number; so

1) Le Népal, II, 179–180.
2) Kirkpatrick, p. 262.
the dread of living one whole century under the threat of that inauspicious number caused the figure of the century to be dropped, starting thus a new era. This sounds very plausible, and yet we are compelled to abandon this line of thought, for the simple reason that Newari Samvat 1 expired began in Śaka 802 expired, and not in 801. The main objection, however, rests on the fact that the reckoning employed in Nepal before the Newari Samvat was not the Śaka era, but the so-called "Mānadeva" (practically: Amśūvarman) era, which began in the month of Kārttika (c. October) of 576 A.D. And this is decisive against Lévi's suggestion.

Another theory on the origin of the Newari era was advanced by D.R. Regmi and discussed by him repeatedly. According to this scholar, the foundation of the era marked the accession of a new

2) This is correct only on the supposition that in Nepal the Śaka era was Kārttikādī amānta, i.e. began with the new moon of the month of Kārttika, as was the rule in Nepal after Amśūvarman. In Northern India the Śaka era was, and still is, Caitrādī pūranimānta, i.e. it began with the full moon of the month of Caitra; if this was the case in Nepal too (which is unlikely), then the difference would be even larger, of 18½ months.
3) L. Petech, "The chronology of the early inscriptions of Nepal", in East and West, 12 (1961), 227-232. To the Nepalese evidence (the Sumatitantra, in its main portion compiled not after 850 A.D.) utilized in that article we can add now the colophon of a ms. Harivamśa published by Nayaraj Pant et al., "VS 633 deki Nepālmā nayām saṃvat caleko thiyo bhanne kurākā pramān Nepālmā ra Bhōmā gari jammā 4-vaijā pājekā chan", in Pūrṇimā, 39 (2035 VS), 97-98, which gives the following set of dates: Kāliyuga 4756 = Vikrama Samvat 1712 = Śaka Samvat 1577 = Mānadeva era 1079 = Newari Samvat 775, all of them corresponding to 1655 A.D. The era of 576 was confirmed by Dineshraj Pant, "Mānadeva Samvat", in Pūrṇimā, 36 (2034 VS), 269-273, and "Cāṃguko Amśūvarmāko abhilekhako tithimitiko gaṇanā", ibid., 273-275, and above all by the chronological verifications carried out on the documents by Nayaraj Pant et al., "Amśūvarmāharūle vyavahār gareko saṃvat VS 633 deki uṭheko ho bhani sakārdā abhilekhakā sabai miti ṭvākka milchan", in Pūrṇimā, 39 (2035 VS), 100-118. Recently the problem was tackled again by Professor Z. Yamaguchi, "The connections between T'u-fan in the first half of the seventh century and Nepal" (in Japanese), in Tōkyō Daigaku bungaku-bu bunka kyōdō kenkyū 2-3 (1978), 34-37, and now To-ban ōkoku seirisu-shi kenkyū (A study on the establishment of the T'u-fan kingdom), Tokyo 1983, 749-766. Working on the Tibetan materials only, he concluded for an epoch of 572 A.D. This, however, represents merely the theoretical calculations of the Tibetan authors of the 13th and 14th century, which cannot stand against the direct Nepalese evidence.

ruling dynasty. However, in V1, VK and VD Rāghavadeva, the founder of the era is merely a member of a long series of kings commencing long before him and continuing after him; there is nothing about him to mark a break in the genealogy. In this particular case I feel that the argumentum ex silentio is decisive; until new evidence turns up, we are not justified in admitting a change of dynasty.

All this is purely negative criticism, and I am in the awkward position to have nothing positive to suggest. We can, at any rate, suppose that the expression Śrī-Paśupati-bhāṭṭāraka-samvatsara implies that the foundation of the era was due to some religious event connected with the national shrine of Paśupati Nāth. Nothing more can be hazarded at present on this subject.

As pointed out above, the calendar followed in medieval Nepal was Kārttikādi amānta, i.e. the year began with the month Kārttika (c. October) and the months ended with the new moon. This is quite normal. But the Nepalese calendar presents striking peculiarities, which may be summarized in two points. Firstly, only two months could be intercalated, viz. Āśāḍha and Pauṣa. Secondly, most of the dates in medieval documents containing an intercalary month cannot be verified by the Śurya- or Ārya-Siddhānta, whether by true (spaṣṭa) or mean (madhyama) reckoning. This goes to show that these Siddhāntas were not followed in the valley, as far as intercalations are concerned.

The theory of the Āśāḍha-or-Pauṣa intercalation 1) is expounded in a passage of the Dharmanirnaye Tithisāraṁgraha, ms. in the National Archives, I.1634.11; it forms a small section by itself (ff. 21b–22a), without immediate connection with what precedes and follows. A parallel text is found in the Sumatitantra, ms. in the Kaisher Library, no. 82, and this I shall give in the foot-notes.

Caitrādihādārapadāntāni yaḍā saṅkrānti udyate |
āśāḍhamāsa-ṛṛddhiḥ syān-Nāradasya vaco yathā |

1) This archaic form of intercalation is essentially that of the Jyotisha Vedāṅga, based on a cycle (yuga) of five years beginning with Māgha sukla 1, in the course of which two months were intercalated. The Kautiliya Arthaśāstra, II.20.38, explains that this was done after 2½ years (Āśāḍha) and at the end of the fifth year (Pauṣa). See e.g. H. K. Deb, "Hindu calendar and earlier Siddhāntas", in JASB, 27 (1931), 271–283 (chiefly 282–283); Nayaraj Pant, "Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa anusār Āśāḍha-mā Pauṣa-mā mātra adhimāsd pancham", in Pūrṇīmā, 34 (2033 VS), 94–102, 135–136.
When a saṅkrānti is raised (i.e. is missing) as to the months beginning with Caitra and ending with Bhādrapada, let there be an additional Asidiha month according to the precept of Nārada. When a saṅkrānti is raised (i.e. is missing) as to the months beginning with Āsvina and ending with Phālguna, they increase (i.e. duplicate) Pausa, and thus the addition of a month is prescribed.”

“Now, how stands the addition of a month in relation with the half-years (ayana, the interval between two solstices)? – When the passage of the sun in Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio or Sagittarius is non-existent [in a lunar month], an additional Āśāḍha is prescribed. When the passage of the sun in Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces, Aries and Taurus, or Gemini is non-existent [in a lunar month], wise men make it an intercalary Pausa. The intercalary months, if they consider well the two half-years of the non-existent [saṅkrānti, are] a second Āśāḍha and a second Pausa according to the

1) These four verses are as follows in the Sumatitantra:
Caitrādi–bhādrapadāṃtaḥ yadā saṅkrama udyate
dvīrāṣāḍhaṣyāpi vrddhyamte Nāradasya prakīrtitā (?)|
āśvinyādi phālgunāṃtaḥ yadā saṅkrama udyate
dvipauṣasyāpi vrddhyamte Nāradasya prakīrtitā (?)||

Then the text goes on:
āja-gopati–yugmaś–ca karki–simhasya kaṃmnyayāḥ
bhāno saṃkramane naṣṭe dvīrāṣāḍha vrddhiyate |
tul–āli–dhanū–makare ghaṭa–minaś ca naṣṭake
Nāradena prakīrttante (?) dvipauṣam kurute miti ||

This is simply the same rule stated in terms of solar months, instead of lunar months. But the text is corrupted.

2) There is no counterpart for this in the Sumatitantra.
Thus the chapter on the intercalary months in the *Dharmannāye Tīthísāraṅgaḥ*.

The text quotes two authorities: Nārada and Bhāradvāja. The first one I thought to refer to the astrological work *Nāradasamhitā*, which is one of the traditional 18 *saṃhitās* (a number chosen to match the 18 Purāṇas)\(^1\); some mss. of the *Nāradasamhitā* are extant in the National Archives and elsewhere, and it has been printed by the Sri Venkateshvar Press, Bombay, 1994 VS. But the quotation is not found in the printed text. Kern, however, has pointed out that the original *Nāradasāṃhitā* is lost and that the present work of this name is “a cento of older *saṃhitās*, not genuine and worthless in the bargain”\(^2\); it has nothing to do with the ancient astronomer Nārada, who is cited by Varāhamihira and seems in his turn to be a different person from the author of the *Nāradiya Dharmāśāstra*. In all likelihood, our quotation is a valuable remnant of this ancient and now lost astronomical work.

The astronomer Bhāradvāja too is mentioned in the *Brhatsamhitā*\(^3\), but little else is known about him.

The two rules here laid down are correlated and start from the same basis. They concern the place and name of the intercalary month (*adhikamāsa*), of which there are six in a cycle of 19 years. The rule followed in India, and in modern Nepal too, is the one laid down by the Śūrya Siddhānta, the Ārya Siddhānta and cognate systems. When a lunar month does not contain a *saṅkrānti* (passage of the sun from one of the zodiac signs to the next; i.e. beginning of a solar month), that lunar month is treated as duplicated or intercalary and takes the name of the lunar month containing the next *saṅkrānti*, but with a prefix indicating its quality of intercalated month, viz. *prathama* (today *adhika*). The month from which the name was taken is then given the prefix *dvir* (today *nija*). Now, according to both Nārada and Bhāradvāja, when one of the first six lunar months of a year contains no *saṅkrānti*, whichever that month may

---


be, it is always Āśādha which is duplicated as an intercalary month; when one of the last six lunar months contains no saṅkrānti, whichever that month may be, it is always Pauṣa which is duplicated as an intercalary month.

From this common basis, the two rules diverge. Nārada looks at the matter from the point of view of the lunar months and for him the starting point of the two (purely calendrical) half-years are the lunar months Caitra (1st) and Āśvini (7th) respectively. Bhāradvāja on the other side looks at the matter from the point of view of the signs of the zodiac, or solar months, and the starting points of the (astronomical) half-years are of course Karkaṭa (Cancer), corresponding to the lunar month Āśādha (4th), and Makara (Capricornus), corresponding to the lunar month Pauṣa (10th). In other words, for Nārada the half-years begin with the equinoxes and for Bhāradvāja with the solstices. Nārada’s year is the normal, Caitrādi one, Bhāradvāja’s is a special, Āśādhādi one.

It is clear that a similar system was followed in Nepal. But neither Nārada nor Bhāradvāja fulfil all the requirements of the case, because neither of them allows for the possibility of a year beginning with Kārttiṅka. This possibility is provided for in a passage of the work of Jīmūtavāhana, an author of the 11th–12th century:

\[
\text{Vaiśākhādi–tulānteṣu yadi pūṛṇadvayam bhavet} \mid \text{dvirāśādhaḥ sa vijñeyah śayanāvarttanādiṣu} \mid \]

“When there are two full moons in the [solar] months from Vaiśākha to Tula, this must be known as a duplicated Āśādha, with [Viṣṇu] going to sleep etc.”

And again:

\[
\text{Mādhavādiṣu śaṣkeṣu māsi darśadvayam yadā} \mid \text{dvirāśādhaḥ sa vijñeyo viṣṇuh svapiti karkaṭe} \mid \]

“When there is a double appearance of the moon in the six [solar] months beginning with Mādhava (i.e. Vaiśākha), this is to be reckoned as a duplicated Āśādha and Viṣṇu sleeps in Cancer”.

The half-year alluded to by Jimūtavahana is the second one in a Kārttikādi year, including the lunar months from Vaiśākha to Āsvina. The first half-year obviously would include the months from Kārttika to Caitra and give rise to an intercalation in Pauṣa. It is not expressly treated by the author, perhaps for the practical reason that an adhika-Pauṣa occurs far less frequently than an adhika-Āśādha.

We have now three systems of intercalation available: Nārada (year beginning with Caitra), Bhāradvāja (year beginning with Āśādha), Jimūtavahana (year beginning with Kārttika). The question arises: does any of these coincide with the one followed in Nepal?

To give a satisfactory answer to this question, the safest way is to proceed empirically by a statistical method, for which ample material is available. The following table shows all the adhikamāsa documented in the sources available to me for the period 1–600 Newari Samvat. The inclusion of an item between square brackets indicates that the adhikamāsa is not actually given in the document, but that the intercalation causes a shift in the names of the preceding or following months and that the date can be verified only if Āśādha or Pauṣa are assumed to be intercalary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS</th>
<th>sāṅkranti</th>
<th>adhikamāsa</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Jyeṣṭha</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. 5 of Rudradeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>[Caitra]</td>
<td>Pauṣa]</td>
<td>Doc. 6 of the three kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>[Vaiśākha</td>
<td>Pauṣa]</td>
<td>V², 31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. 3 of Śivadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>[Śravaṇa]</td>
<td>Āśādha]</td>
<td>ms. Padmaputrikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. in the Rudravarṇa-mahāvihāra, n. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>Doc. 8 of Narendradeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. 1 of Ānandadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. 3 of Ānandadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Phālguna</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>Doc. 8 of Ānandadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>colophon, ms. Yogāmbarasādhana, Nat. Arch. III.366.6, published in CPMDN, II, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>V³, 32b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>[Jyeṣṭha]</td>
<td>Āśādha]</td>
<td>Doc. 8 of Rudradeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. 2 of Guṇakāmādeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Āśvina</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. 2 of Laṅgsmikāmādeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Śravaṇa</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>Doc. 3 of Vijayakāmādeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>V³, 38b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Jyeṣṭha</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 39a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 1 of Jayabhīmadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>[Jyeṣṭha]</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 1 of Anantamalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 12 of Anantamalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>[Vaiśākha]</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>Doc. 17 of Anantamalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>[Bhādrapada]</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 42a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Phālguna</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>V3, 44a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Śrāvaṇa</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 5 of Jayānandadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>V3, 45b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 46b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Āśvina</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 47a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>colophon, ms. Navagrhadāsāvīcāra, Nat. Arch., IV.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Śrāvaṇa</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 53b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 54b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Śrāvaṇa</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 56a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>[Jyeṣṭha]</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 57b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>V3, 62b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>[Jyeṣṭha]</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>Doc. 22 and 23 of Jayasthitimalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 26 of Jayasthitimalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Śrāvaṇa</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 33 of Jayasthitimalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>[Bhādrapada]</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 13 of Jayadharmamalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. of Śaktisimha Rāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>[Vaiśākha]</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>Doc. 22 of Jayajyotirmalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Śrāvaṇa</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>colophon, ms. Uṣmabheda, Nat. Arch., I.1076.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 28 of Jayajyotirmalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Doc. 4 of Jayayakṣamalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>Jyeṣṭha</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td>Doc. 30 of Jayayakṣamalla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final result may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanākranti</th>
<th>adhikamāsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>missing in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṛttika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārgaśiṃṣa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māgha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phālguna</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitra</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>Pauṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyeṣṭha</td>
<td>till c. 500: Āṣāḍha; after c. 500: Pauṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrāvaṇa</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āśvina</td>
<td>Āṣāḍha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table calls for some remarks. We have no evidence for Kārītika. As for the following three months, no saṅkrānti can be missing in the short months of Pauṣa and Māgha; and instances of a Mārgaśīrṣa without saṅkrānti are exceedingly rare, only two such cases occurring during the whole of the first six centuries of the Newari era 1).

The result of our enquiry are rather startling. For the period before c. 500 NS the intercalation system follows neither Nārada nor Bhāradvāja nor Jīmūtavāhana, but works with a year beginning with Mārgaśīrṣa. In other words, the Newari Samvat was Kārītikādi, but for the purposes of intercalation it functioned as if it were Mārgaśīrṣādi. Such a system does not occur in any of the historical eras current in India; but it was not unknown in earlier times, as shown, if by nothing else, by an alternative name of that month: Agrahāyana, meaning "beginning of the year"; other pieces of evidence can be added 2). Nepal had maintained this archaic reckoning even when had long been abandoned elsewhere.

At some date after 498 and before 509 NS a change took place by which henceforward a saṅkrānti missing in the month of Jyeṣṭha resulted into an adhika-Pauṣa and no longer an adhika-Āṣāḍha. This caused the Nepalese calendar to fall into line with the Bhāradvāja system as sketched above. The chronicle is silent about this reform; but we might find an allusion in a passage which relates as an extraordinary fact that in the month Mārgaśīrṣa of 501 NS two saṅkrāntis were included (which would have caused an expunged [kṣaya] month in the Sūrya-Siddhānta). It attributes to this calendrical event the loss of half the harvest of the country; both the east and to the west of the Valley it was impossible to plant the rice, and the crops were also damaged by hailstorms 3).

Some further remarks are called for, in order to complete our discussion. The theory of the Nepalese system did not permit expunged (kṣaya) months. This is shown in practice by Doc. 4 of

1) All the chronological calculations in the present work are based on Swamikkan- nu Pillai, Indian Ephemeris, 7 vols., Madras 1922.


3) V3, 59b. The text has actually 500, an obvious slip of the pen.
Baladeva, in which the month Pauṣa of 173 NS, which was *kṣaya* according to the Sūrya–Siddhānta, corresponded to Māgha in Nepal. Even more instructive is the case of 501 NS, when several entries in the old chronicles show that Kārttika was not intercalary and that the following Mārgaśīrṣa was not *kṣaya*, as they were bound to be in the Sūrya–Siddhānta.

As far as I know, the Āṣāḍha–or–Pauṣa intercalation was employed in Nepal and nowhere else. It was used since the earliest beginnings, because it occurs already in the Licchavi inscriptions 1), and was abandoned only after the end of the medieval period: the first instance of an *adhika* (*nāśta* as it was called in Nepal) month different from Āṣāḍha and Pauṣa is found in the Thaība inscription of 644 NS *nāśta–Bhādrapada* 2). We infer that this change, which amounted to a second radical reform, was introduced at some time after the death of Jayayakṣamalla. It brought the Nepalese calendar in line with the normal Indian usage.

Other eras are scarcely used in this period. In two instances, both of them from inscriptions (doc. 27 of Jayasthitimalla and doc. 18 of Jayadharma Malla), the author, probably the same man in both cases, wished to show off his chronological knowledge and gave the date according to no less than four eras: Kaliyuga, Vikrama, Śaka and Newari. The Kali era is found nowhere else. The Vikrama occurs only once, in doc. 15 of Arimalla, which is dated in Vikrama and Newari Samvat; but the scribe was a foreigner from Gujarat, and it is but natural that he should use the era current in his native country along with the local one. Of the Śaka era only two other instances are known: doc. 13 of Jayārjunadeva (Ś. 1297) and doc. 1 of Jayayakṣamalla (Ś. 1350). We may remark that the Śaka era was the one most frequently used in the mountains outside the valley. Prthivī Nārāyaṇ introduced it as the official reckoning of Nepal, and it was used on the coins till it gave place to the Vikrama Samvat 3). The latter is now the official era of Nepal.

1) The dates with intercalary months found in the Licchavi inscriptions hitherto published have only Āṣāḍha and Pauṣa. But they cannot be verified by any known system, the medieval Nepalese not excluded. The question ought to be the subject of a special study.

2) Regmi, IV, 1–2.

CHAPTER III

THE LATE LICCHAVI PERIOD

The ancient history of Nepal, i.e. the so-called Licchavi period from the late 4th to the 8th century, is known to us from a comparatively large body of evidence; its mainstay is a rich epigraphy, supported by the bare royal lists of the early vaṃśāvalīs and by scanty Chinese and Tibetan sources. After the second quarter of the 8th century, i.e. after the Paśupati Nāth prāśāsti of Jayadeva (157 Aṃśuvarman era, 733 A.D.), inscriptions are few, unimportant and badly preserved. The most recent epigraphical collection lists ten dated inscriptions ranging from 170 to 250 Aṃś. Era ¹; but only three of them bear the name of a ruler:

1) Inscription in the Yanga Bahal, Patan, dated 180 Māgha krṣṇa 2 in the reign of śrī-Śrīnadeva (no. 172); the date corresponds to December 27th, 756 A.D.

2) Fragmentary inscription in the Tana Bahal, Kathmandu, dated Āśāḍha krṣṇa 7 of a year which cannot be read any more, in the reign of ...rāja-parameśvara-śrī-Śrīnadeva (no. 173).

3) Motitar (near Patan) inscription dated 250 prathama-Āśāḍha 2 on a fountain made by one Balirāja, who may be not a ruler, but a private person. There was no Kanyā saṅkrānti in Āśvina, which gives an intercalary Āśāḍha in the Nepalese calendar. The date corresponds to May 31st, 827.

The Śrīnadeva of 756 A.D. cannot be placed with any degree of certainty in the series of the Nepalese kings. And thus the second

¹) Dh. Bajracharya, Licchavikal-kā abhilekh, Kirtipur 2030 VS, nos. 170-179. To these we may add a fragmentary ms. of the Parameśvaratantra, Cambridge University Library, Add.1049, in transitional Gupta characters, bearing the date 252; CBMC, pp. xxxix-xlili and 28. No name of king is given.
half of the 8th and the first half of the 9th century of our era remain an almost complete blank, as far as the epigraphical evidence is concerned.

We are reduced to the information supplied by the *vamsāvalīs*. This material consist of lists of kings and regnal years, with some scattered mentions of events concerning the religious history of the country: pious foundations, gifts to temples etc. These lists are palpably untrustworthy. The regnal years attributed to each king are in many instances too high and in all cases beyond any possibility of control. The order of the lists has been disturbed by four factors.

1) Omissions; this is particularly the case in the later *vamsāvalīs*, but Jayadeva himself, the king of the great Paśupati Nāth inscription, is omitted even in the older lists.

2) Repetitions; e.g. the famous Śivadeva, who was a contemporary of Āṃśuvarman, occurs twice, as nn. 7 and 12 of the following table.

3) Misplacements; e.g. Mānadeva (Licchavi) is placed by *V₁* before Śaṅkaradeva, who on the evidence of the inscriptions was his grandfather.

4) Dynasties who ruled at the same time are placed in succession; thus the Gupta group (Jiṣṇugupta etc.) occurs in *V₁* as nn. 4–6 before the kings (Dhruvadeva/Dhruvavarman and Mānadeva/Mānavarman) whose suzerainty the Guptas themselves in their inscriptions professed to recognize. The result is that, in the words of S. Lévi, “the dynastic lists for this period embarrass the critics rather than aid them”.

The following table shows the royal lists and regnal years according to *V₁*, *VK* (usually followed by *VD*) and *VW* (with which *VL* mostly agrees). Double figures in the regnal periods refer of course to years and months. In the second column the names and years are taken from *VD*, with the variant dates of Kirkpatrick between brackets, down to no. 17. Starting from no. 18 the years are those of *VK*, with the occasional variants of *VD* between brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>V₁</em></th>
<th><em>VK/VD</em></th>
<th><em>VW</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Śivadeva, 41–6</td>
<td>Śivadeva, 41–6</td>
<td>Śivadevavarman, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>Campādeva, 41–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Narendradeva, 34</td>
<td>Narendradeva, 34</td>
<td>Narendradevavarman, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Bhāmadeva, 14
4. Jīvagupta, 74
5. Viśnugupta, 71
6. Bhūmigupta, 45
7. Śivadeva, 41
8. Aṃśuvarman, 43
9. Kṛtavarman, 56
9a. Mahīpāla, n.y.
9b. Devaladeva, 10
9c. Dhruvavarman, 108
10. Bhūmārjunadeva, 35
11. Candradeva, 13
12. Śivadeva, 16
12a. —
13. Narendradeva, 35
14. Baladeva, 17
14a. —
15. Vardhamānadeva, 16
16. Śaṅkaradeva, 12
16a. —
17. Vasantadeva, 21
17a. —
17b. domination of the Bhoṭa Rājā
18. Rudradeva, 27
20. Baladeva, 11
22. Mānadeva, 31
23. Rāghavadeva, 43-6
24. Jayadeva, 10
24a. —
24b. —
25. Vikramadeva, 8-9
26. Narendradeva, 1-6
27. Guṇakāmadeva, 85-6

Bhāmādevadeva, 16
Viṣṇu(Jiṣṇu)gupta, 74
Viṣṇugupta, 61
Bhūmigupta, 45
(Κικ.: 40)
Śivadeva, 41
Aṃśuvarman, 53
(Κικ.: 42)
Kṛtavarman, 18
Devaladeva, 10
Bhūmārjunadeva, 37
(Κικ.: 39)
Nandadeva, 13
Śivadeva, 16
Narīndradeva, 33
Baladeva, 17
Śaṃsaradeva(sic), 12
(Κικ.: deest)
Vardhamānadeva, 16
Śaṅkaradeva, 12
Bhūmārjunadeva, 16
Jayadeva, 19
Baladeva, 16
Jayadeva, 42-7
(Κικ.: 42-11)
Baladeva, 11
Balārjunadeva, 21-7
(Κικ.: 36-7)
Mānadeva, 36
Rāghavadeva, 63-6
(Κικ.: 63-8)
Jayadeva, 15
Baladeva, 11
Balārjunadeva, 17
Vikramadeva, 12
Narendradeva, 1-6

(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(Κικ.: deest)
(VL: Viśvaguptadeva, n.y.)
Of course there is no question of seeking a correlation between these lists and the almost non-existing epigraphical evidence; the Mānadeva of 180 Aṃś. Era (756 A.D.) finds no counterpart at all in the lists, where the only Mānadeva available (n. 22) belongs definitely to the third quarter of the 9th century.

It remains to turn to the foreign sources, in the hope to find some faint gleam of light in these dark centuries. The most vexing and complicated problem in this field is that of the relations between Tibet and Nepal. We must take our start from the Chinese official account of Nepal, which is practically identical in all the Chinese texts dealing with the T'ang period 1). In 643 or 644 the Tibetans helped the pretender Narendradeva, then a refugee in Tibet, to overthrow the usurper Viṣṇugupta, restoring the Licchavi dynasty to the throne. After this the king remained a protegee of Tibet. In 648 the Tibetans requested and obtained Nepalese collaboration in their support for the imperial ambassador Wang Hsüan-ts'ē, who had been robbed and whose escort had been massacred in Tirhut. The account closes with the mission despatched by Narendradeva to the Chinese court in 651, as a mere diplomatic gesture. In a fragment possibly going back to Wang Hsüan-ts'ē 2) Nepal is described as a state subordinate (shu) to Tibet.

To the same period belongs the well-known tale of the marriage of the Tibetan king Sroñ-btsan-sgam-po with a daughter of a Nepalese king usually called 'Od-zer-go-c'a (translating Aṃśuvarman). This is unlikely for chronological reasons and it has been rightly suggested that her father was Dhruvadeva or Narendradeva 3). According to Professor Tucci she is simply a mythical figure 4). In any

1) T'ung-tien (of 801), ch.190; Chiu T'ang-shu (of 945), ch.198; T'ung-hui-yao (of 961), ch.100; T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi (of c.980), ch. 85; T'ai-p'ing yü-lan (of 983), ch.795.
2) Shih-chia fang-chih (T.2088), vol. 51, 961b.
case the tale, which cannot be discussed here, implies relations as between equals.

The evidence for a continuation of Tibetan ascendancy after 651 is flimsy and highly controversial. The Chinese official account ends with 651. But another text is available, which is usually taken to show that the Tibetan paramountcy lasted until in 704 a revolt put an end to it. It reads: [Shortly after 702] "the kingdoms subjected to the Tibetans on the southern frontier, viz. Ni-p’o-lo-men etc., all of them revolted. The Tibetan ruler went personally to fight them, but died in camp ... In 705 the Tibetans sent ambassadors [to China] to announce the demise [of their ruler]" 1).

Ni-p’o-lo-men is usually supposed to be a contraction of Ni-po-lo P’o-lo-men, meaning Nepal and the Brahmans (i.e. the Hindus) or the Brahmans of Nepal. A comparison with the contemporary version of the same events found in our oldest Tibetan source, the so-called Annals of Tun-huang 2), shows, however, that Ni-p’o-lo-men (a name which is corrupted in any case) ought to be located in or near the region called 'Jan by the Tibetans, i.e. the Mo-so country on the northern border of the modern Chinese province of Yün-nan, where the Tibetan ruler met his end 3). Shortly after (c. 728) it was to be merged into the newly-formed independent kingdom of Nan Chao 4). We are far away from Nepal.

Summing up, both the silence (betraying lack of information) in the Chinese standard account of Nepal and the confuse information on the events of 704 seem to imply that the Tibetan ascendancy in Nepal had waned during the decades after 651.

---

1 Chiu T'ang-shu, 196-A, 5b; translated by P. Pelliot, Histoire ancienne du Tibet, Paris 1961, 12. Practically the same information is conveyed by the biography of general Kuo Yuan-chen in Chiu T'ang-shu, 97, 5a, translated by E. Chavannes, Documents sur l's Tou-kuie (Turcs) Occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1900, 186. All the remaining Chinese texts omit this account and limit themselves to the bare statement that the king of Tibet died (i.e. the news was received at court) in 705.

2) J. Bacot, F. W. Thomas, Ch. Toussaint, Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet, Paris 1940, 19.

3) The demonstration of this identification will be given in a study on the succession to the Tibetan throne in 704/5, due to appear in the forthcoming Memorial Volume for Professor G. Tucci.

As for the 8th and 9th centuries, let us first clear the ground from two irrelevant pieces of information which have been the source of some confusion. One is the name Bal-po, often occurring in the Annals of Tun-huang as that of a place or district used by the Tibetan kings as their summer residence 1). Today Bal-po or Bal-yul is the normal Tibetan name for Nepal. But it was certainly not so during the 7th–9th centuries, chiefly because the Chinese texts prove this identification to be untenable. The itinerary preserved in the New History of the T'ang dynasty and describing the route from Shan-chou (near modern Hsining) to Lhasa and beyond, crosses the Tsangpo and terminates at the royal camp, to the southwest of which there is a great lake (hai, literally "sea") called Pa-pu 拔布 2). According to the transcription rules prevailing in the T'ang period, Pa-pu (ancient pronon. b'uât puo) is a perfect transcription of Balpo. Elsewhere we are told that the Tibetan ruler resided either in the valley of Lhasa or in the valley of Pa-pu 跋布 (b'uât puo) 3). Most probably this region is to be looked for in the highlands to the north–east of the great Palti lake (or Yamdrok-tso) 4). Besides, it has been aptly pointed out long ago that no highland Tibetan would go willingly to spend the summer in the comparatively warm climate of Nepal 5).

The other item of evidence to be discussed is the word lho bal. It repeatedly occurs in a document found at Tun-huang (ms. Pelliot Tibétain no. 1089), dated in a Mouse year (probably 820 or perhaps 832); it designates an outer dependency of Tibet and the seat of Tibetan officers, such as a to-dog (local administrator), a dmag-dpon c'uñ-ñu (junior army chief) and a k'ri-dpon (chief of an one-thousand district) 6). The term occurs also in the second edict of the Tibetan

---

2) T'ang-shu, 40.8a–b; translated by P. Pelliot, Histoire ancienne du Tibet, 142.
4) H. Sato, “The route from Kokonor to Lhasa during the T'ang period”, in Acta Asiatica, 29 (1975), 16, located Bal-po in the level strip along the Lhasa river (sKyid-c'u), which seems less probable.
6) M. Lalou, “Revendications des fonctionnaires du Grand Tibet”, in J.As. 1955, 181, 183, 185. The document has been studied afresh by Z. Yamaguchi, “Foundation of two military settlements of the Tibetan army consisting of Chinese at Sha-cu and
king K'ri–srón–lde–brtṣan (755–797)\(^1\), in 1.19 of the East face of the Lhasa pillar containing the Tibetan–Chinese treaty of 821/2 and in the Tibetan adaptation of the *Shu–ching*. Taking at its face value, *lho bal* could mean Bal[-po], i.e. Nepal, of the south (*lho*), and so it has been understood by Western scholars till recent times. However, the context in all these documents, as well as in Pelliot Tibetain no. 1071 and no. 1085), shows quite clearly that *lho bal* was a disparaging term by which the Tibetans of the 8th–9th centuries indicated the «foreigners» or «barbarians», including the Chinese in general and the Chinese inhabitants of Tibetan-dominated Sha–chou (Tun–huang) in particular\(^2\). The origin of the term is obscure; but certainly it has nothing to do with Nepal.

The only item which may be relevant to the problem of Tibeto–Nepalese relations is a puzzling passage in V1, 23a, inserted after the reign of Vasantadeva (no. 17 of the list): *tatpaścād Bhoṭarājenamāyaṭih Nepālamandale rājyaṃ karoti*. This barbarous Sanskrit tinged with Newari can only be translated: “After him the king of Bhoṭa came and established his rule in the Nepal valley”. VD gives a corrupt version of the same text: *paścāt Bhoṭa–mandale svarājyaṃ karoti*. Then V1 tells us that the next king Rudradeva (no. 18) “established again his rule unimpeded as far as the frontier of Cākum–Bhoṭa” (tena Cākum–Bhoṭata prajyanta niśkanṭaka rājya karoti); more or less the same text is found in VK and VD. Of course it is impossible to suggest an even approximate datation for these events.

Two interpretations are possible: either Bhoṭa is Tibet, or it is the same as Bhonta, the medieval name of the Banepa region to the east of the Valley. Arguments can be put forward in favour of both theories.

---

\(^1\) G. Tucci, *The tombs of the Tibetan kings*, Rome 1950, 47.

It is an established fact that Bhōta (from Tibetan Bod) is the Sanskrit name for Tibet, as shown e.g. by the Rājatarāṅgini of Kashmir. It is also a fact that in the whole of the old chronicle (VBd) and in all the colophons (with one late exception) the name of the Banepa region is spelt Bhonta or Bhvanta or Bhuvanta, but usually with the dental mute, seldom if ever with the cerebral t.

In favour of the second possibility stands the geographical and historical setting. It seems rather difficult to conceive an expedition led personally by a Tibetan king so far south, while the Bhonta district is a next-door neighbour, being simply an annexe of the Valley of Nepal. Moreover, the tradition which identifies this Bhōta with Banepa is not only generally accepted today by the Nepalese scholars, but was current also at the end of the 18th century, when Kirkpatrick, following the corrupt version of VD (which was presumably found in VK as well), stated that under Sree Bull Deo (n. 17a) the Banepa valley was annexed to Nepal 1).

The balance is almost even and I am not prepared to decide the question either way, although it must be conceded that the graphical difference between Bhōta and Bhonta scores a little point in favour of Tibet; but it seems insufficient for weighing down the scales 2.

Another doubtful item concerns that mysterious ruler Aramuḍi, chief of Nepal, who opposed, defeated and took prisoner king Jayapiḍa (c. 770–800) of Kashmir on the banks of a river near its mouth in the ocean (which is a patent geographical absurdity); later Aramuḍi was defeated in his turn and compelled to release his prisoner and to make peace with him 3). The mention of the Kāla-Gaṇḍikā river, where Aramuḍi’s final defeat took place, shows that he ruled the country on the Kāli-Gaṇḍakī river, possibly around Palpa. In any case no name like Aramuḍi is found in the lists of the Nepalese kings, nor can it be a Tibetan name as S. Lévi suggested 4).

Even more open to doubt is the possibility of an invasion from Bengal. It arises from a vague piece of information supplied by the Monghyr copper-plate inscription of Devapāla of Bengal. It tells

1) W. Kirkpatrick, An account of the kingdom of Nepaul, 267.
2) M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 34b, too gives a doubtful preference to Tibet.
3) Rājatarāṅgini, IV.531–581.
us that Dharmapāla (c. 770–810) in the course of his expeditions “bathed according to precept at Kedāra and at Gaṅgā-sametāṁbudhi (= Gaṅgāsāgara) and performed holy rites at Gokarna and other sacred shrines” 1). There is some possibility that Gokarna may be the shrine of that name west of Bhatgaon 2); the more so, as Nepalese tradition, as embodied in the Svayambhū-māhātmya, knows of Dharmapāla, a Gauḍa king who ruled over Nepal (although this is placed in the hoariest antiquity). Of course this would have been a passing raid. But there were other Gokarna shrines in India and we cannot be sure that the Nepalese Gokarna is intended 3).

Resuming our investigation of the royal list, the next king Jaya-deva (no. 19) is a mere name for us. His successor Baladeva (no. 20) is known from a fragmentary inscription at Changu Narayan, dated *Samvat 271 Vaiśākha-śukla-diva-paṁcamyāṁ ... rāja-śrī-Baladeva-rājye* 4). The date corresponds to April 8th, 848 A.D., and seems to fit well into the list of kings; it represents the first chronological prop available for the traditional genealogies of the late Licchavi period.

The next king Balārjunadeva (no. 21) gave his crown to Bugma Lokeśvara, later identified with Matsyendranāth (V1, 23a; VK).

Mānadeva (no. 22) is evidenced by an early palm-leaf manuscript.


The date is verified for Sunday, April 13th, 878 6), except for the Siddhi yoga, which ended on April 19th.

---

1) *Epigraphia Indica*, XVIII, 305.


3) For a negative opinion, supported by fairly strong arguments, see Regmi, I, 88–100.


6) The date was elaborately verified by Nayaraj Pant et al., in *Pūrṇimā*, 39 (2035 VS), 111–117; they did not calculate the *yoga*. 
According to the old chronicle (V¹, 23a), Mānadeva built the Hnol (VD: Balbanādaṃ; VK: Bahulanādaṃ) palace (tavanimam) in Patan. The vihāra attached to this New Palace (hnol = new) will appear later in the documents; it is the modern Nhu Baha (or Na-vavihāra).
CHAPTER IV
THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

The heading of this chapter requires some justification. The modern *vamsāvalis*, followed by Western and Nepalese authors, list for this period three dynasties, to whom they give the name Thākurī: a first one from Aṃśuvarman till c. 1039, the Thākurīs of Nuvakoth c. 1039–1082, and the Thākurīs of Patan c. 1082–1200. As everybody agrees, the authority of these texts is almost nil. Moreover, the term *thākurī*, which in Nepal is equivalent to *kṣatriya*, is not found in the early *vamsāvalis* (*V*1, *VK*), which use exclusively the name Sūryavamṣī. But Sūryavamṣī (solar dynasty) is a very general term, and it applies to the Mallas as well. Therefore, I adopt now the non-committal heading Transitional Period.

As we have seen, Rāghavadeva (n. 23 of the list of kings) started the Śrī-Paśupati-bhaṭṭāraka-samvatsara, i.e. the Newari Samvat of Kārttika 879.

Concerning the following reigns, *V*1 and *VK* (which *VD*) differ widely. According to *V*1, Rāghavadeva reigned for 43 years and 6 months and was succeeded by Jayadeva (10 years) and Vikramadeva (8 years and 9 months); according to *VK* and *VD* Rāghavadeva reigned for 63 years and 6 months and was followed by Śaṅkaradeva (18 years and 6 months), Sahadeva (33 years and 9 months) and Vikramadeva (1 year). A choice between the two lists is made possible by the following documents:

1) Ms. Prajñāpāramitā, Mahābuddha Vihāra in Patan. Colophon: *Samvat 40 bhaftapada-śukla-diva purṇamāṣyāṃ Ph.-M.-P.-śrī-Śaṅkaradeva-rājye śrī-Lalitabrumāḥ*

---

1) The term was first proposed by M. S. Slusser, "Indreśvara Mahādeva, a thirteenth-century Nepalese shrine", in *Artibus Asiae*, 41 (1979), 186, and again in *Nepal Mandala*, 42b.

2) First published in *AS*, 9 (2020 VS), 15n; then again in Regmi, I, 109–110.
śrī-Mahāvīṣṇu-viśād-bhūmīśvarā Akṣayamatiya ... śrī-
Gaṅga-viśād-bhūmīśvarā Divakārasīmha likhitvā iti. Written at Patan; the Gaṅgavaliṭtara Tola was probably the ward in which the present-day Gvamgāh Bahal was situated. The date corresponds to September 1st, 920.

2) Inscription on the pedestal of an image of Maṇjuśri (the earliest found in Nepal) in a temple near the Jaisi Bahal, Kathmandu 1). Dated Jyeṣṭha-pūrṇamāsyaṃ etc. The inscription is almost obliterated, but according to Gautamabaja Bajracharya "the abraded space for the year date between the expected salutation Om and the visible month date is so small that is could only accommodate a single sign, which, however, can render two digits such as 20, 30, 40. There are enough letters remaining of the ruler’s name to reconstruct it as Śaṅkara-deva" 2), The paleography points to the 10th century, so the record cannot refer to Śaṅkara-deva of c. 1069–1082.

These documents prove that the list of VK and VD is the correct one, although its regnal years are impossibly long. Taking into account the average length of generations, we may place Śaṅkara-deva in c. 905–930. Nothing is known of the events of his reing.

His two successors Sahadeva and Vikramadeva, among whom the kings of the parallel list in V1 should perhaps be inserted, are mere names to us. After Vikramadeva the order of succession and the chronology of the rulers can be substantiated from colophons and inscriptions, which means that we are entering the realm of positive history, even if it is at first a merely dynastic one. The available sources do not allow us to go beyond this.

Gunakāmadeva (c. 980–998)

According to both V1 and VK/VD the successor of Vikramadeva was Narendradeva, followed by Gunakāmadeva. But the actual order is the reverse, as shown beyond doubt by our materials. Three documents of Gunakāmadeva are extant:

1) Inscription on the socle of the image in the Umā–Maheśvara temple in the Kwa Bahal Tol, Patan 3). Dated rājya śrī-Gunakāmadeva-nṛpatē saptottare 'bde šate

---

1) Published, as far as he could read it, by Regmi, III, 2.
2) Cited by M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 286b.
3) Published in AS, 9 (2020 VS), 34. Another (incomplete) edition is found in Regmi, III, 9, where the date is read as 307 (saptottare trišate). The reading was repeatedly discussed. Since titki and pakṣa are not given, a verification cannot decide the issue, as the elements available fit for January 21st, 1187, as well. P. Pal, The arts of Nepal, I: Sculpture, Leiden 1974, 32–33, prefers the reading 307. But several other scholars uphold 107, mainly on stylistical grounds; Dh. Bajracharya in CNS 5, 103–104;
Māghe māsi ca Rohini budhā[ne] śrī–Māṇiglāke surālāye. The date is verified for Wednesday, January 12th, 987.

2) Fragmentary inscription outside the Macchindra Bahal in Patan. Begins: . . . . saaptamyām bhautāraka–mahārājādhirāja. . . . śrīnāma[deva]rayam || Samvat 109 valiśākha–śukla–diva dvitiyā... The name of the king is lost, but the restitution is practically certain, because of chronological reasons. The date corresponds to April 1st or 2nd, 989.


This king ruled for 85 years and 6 months according to V1 and VK/VD, and 51 years according to the modern chronicles; provisionally I would allot him at least 18 years (c. 980–998). He plays a great role in V1 and VK/VD which relate his lavish donations to the shrine of Paśupati. In the later chronicles he is credited with the foundation of Kathmandu, although the date they give for this event (Kaliyuga 3824, A.D. 723/4) is much earlier than his reign. Judging solely by the accounts of the chronicles, S. Lévi was right in remarking that Guṇakāmādeva can be reckoned as a forceful personality in this long row of shadowy kings.

The expression svasyaikaratye in Doc. 3 is interesting and should not be overlooked. The fact that by 990 Guṇakāmādeva “had established his own sole rule” implies that before that date he had shared it with somebody else. This could happen because he had a colleague on the throne or because the kingdom was divided into two halves. Both possibilities are covered by an institution which seems to have flourished in Nepal in the early medieval period (10th–12th centuries), reappearing later with different features: the dvairājya (or dvirājyaka in the Nepalese documents).

The term dvairājya in Indian polity has two distinct meanings. It could apply to the joint rule of two kings, equal in rank or with a mere precedence of seniority, each ruling over one half of the kingdom which however continues to be formally considered as a whole.
Without recalling the well-known instances of this institution among the Hsiung-nu and the Orkhon Turks, examples are not lacking in India itself; the *locus classicus* is the *dvairājya* established in the kingdom of Vidarbha by king Agnimitra, in the play *Mālavikāgnimitra*, act V 1). The *dvairājya* could be carried one step farther, and one of the half-kings could in its turn be ruled by two joint kings. This is the situation witnessed by a ms. of 135 NS (see below).

On the other side the *dvairājya* described in the *Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra*, VIII.2, is something different; it denotes a co-rulership by two kings on the throne and “does not involve partition of the kingdom by two rulers such as father and son or two brothers” 2). This situation is more specially indicated in Nepal by the term *ubhayarājya*. In the present case it is difficult to decide to which type belonged the situation prevailing before Guṇakāmadeva put an end to it 3).

**Narendradeva (c. 998–999) and Udayadeva (c. 998–1004)**

The double rule was revived after Guṇakāmadeva’s death, for a span of one or two years only. This situation is evidenced by two documents:

1) Ms. Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā, in the Sa-skya monastery in Tibet. Colophon 4):

Samvat 100–10–9 Mārgaśīra–sukla–divā pūrṇamāsyaṁ pratiṣṭhāpitaṁ śrī-Gandigulmaka–nivāsina–svaṁrṇakāra–śrī–Rānakasya . . . . || M.–P.–śrī-Narendradeva–bhaṭṭārakasya śrī–Udayadevayo bhaṭṭārakayo ubhayarājye likhitam–iti. The place Gandigulmaka is mentioned as Gaṅgulmako in an inscription of the year 95 of the Amśuvarman era at Patan 5); it also occurs in doc. 4 of Harṣadeva as the name of a district (viṣaya) and in doc. 20 of Ānandadeva as a religious building (ālaya). The term *gulma* designates a military outpost 6). Its location is unknown 7). The date corresponds to December 6th, 998.

---


4) Published by RS, XXIII, 29.


7) Its mention in the Amś. Era inscriptions as well as in Doc. 20 of Ānandadeva,
2) Inscription on a gilt bronze plaque of Viṣṇu in garuḍāsana, in the Jack Zimmermann collection in New York 1). Dated Samvatāre śatatame caturvimsatikādhike [Caitra]ākhyāṣita-dvādaśyāṃ šaśiṣutra-dine śubhaṃ śrimadUdayadevasya rāje Nepāla-maṇḍale śri–Jiglodgama–viṣaye vidvatsādhujaṃāṃvite | koṣam pradadyād garuḍadhva-jāya śraddhānvitaḥ śri–Lṛpa ma... etc. There was no sankrānti in Vaiśākha and this caused an additional Pauṣa; as a consequence, this Caitra corresponds to adhika–Vaiśākha in the Sūrya–Siddhānta. The date is accordingly verified for Wednesday, April 19th, 1004. Neither the outlying district (viṣaya) Jiglodgama nor the donor Lṛpa are known; both names look definitely non–Nepalese.

Both V1 and VK/VD give to Narendra Deva a reign of one year and 6 months. Udayadeva is allowed 5 years and 5 months by V1 and 6 years by VK/VD. Of course these numbers should be taken concurrently and not in succession; the wording of Doc. 1 proves the existence of a joint rule (ubhayarājya), i.e. of a dvairājya of the Kauṭilyan type. Both kings are unknown to the later vaṃśāvaliś and no event of their reign is related.

**Nirbhayadeva (c. 1004–1009) Rudradeva (c. 1007–1028) and Bhojadeva (c. 1009–1020)**

According to VK/VD, Udayadeva was followed by Nirbhayadeva, who reigned 5 years; he is ignored by V1 and the later vaṃśāvalis. Then VK/VD lists the double rule of Bhojadeva and Rudradeva for 9 years and 7 months. They are unknown to V1; the later chronicles mention Bhojadeva only, with a reign of 8 years.

The reigns of these three rulers are covered by seven documents:


seem to refer to a place within the Valley. On the other side its character as an outlying district (viṣaya) in Doc. 4 of Harṣadeva would place it outside the Valley. The latter theory is supported by Mahesh Raj Pant and Aishvarya Dhar Sharma, *The two earliest copper-plate inscriptions from Nepal* (Nepal Research Centre, Miscellaneous Papers, n. 12), Katmandu 1977, 19–20; and by Dh. Bajracharya, “Madhyakāl–ka sūru–kā kehi abhilekh ,”, in CNS, 5/1 (1977), 99–100.


2) Published in *AS*, 2 (2018 VS), 9. Re-edited by Regmi, III, 2–3; by Dinesh Raj Pant, in *Pūrṇimā*, 30 (2030 VS), 116; and Dh. Bajracharya, in CNS, 5/1, 111.
2) Ms. Āstisāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā Cambridge University Library, Add. 866, Colophon 1: Abde śate sāṣṭakavimśayute māse śubhe Phālgunī-śukla-pakṣe somavāre naksatra-ramyottarabhādha-saṁjhe śrī-Nirbhayasya nṛpatē surasannibhasya śrī-Rudrādeva-vasudhādhipatesa ca ramye evam dvirāyakam-atoḍyata (?) pātravargre rājye pari × × kavitavairi saṅge śrī-Hlāṃvihāra (?) iti kirttita-kirttipaṇja | The date is irregular. It may correspond either to Monday, February 16th, or to Monday, February 23rd, 1008; but in neither of those days the naksatra was Uttara-bhadra. If, by exception, the year is taken as current, then the date would be verified for Monday, January 31st, 1009.

3) Ms. Āstasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, Cambridge University Library, Add. 2191.1. Colophon 2: x x x Sukla-trayodśiyam śrīmatBhojadeva-rāje śrī-Yambukramayōm kulaputra-Mādhavajiva etc. The year and month are completely lost. Written at Yambu, which was the Newari name of the Northern section of Kathmandu, the Koligrāma of the Licchavi inscriptions 3).


5) Inscription on an Umā—Maheśvara image in Tyagal Tol, Patan 5). It mentions rājye punyamālāṅkṛta-yaśanidhiḥ śrī-Rudrādevo nṛpah | sādhu-bhratyaputra-dharmanirvati śrī—Bhojadevo ‘pi rāt | tāvetu śaśibhāskaropama. Written śrī—Lalitākhye pure | aha Tegvalasthānasya ... samvat 100—30—2 Prathamāśaṅgha—sūkla—dvī śrayodāyam brhaspati—dīne Maitra (= Anurādhā) naksatre. The Mithuna sakrānti did not fall in Jyeṣṭha, and this caused an intercalary Āṣāḍha. This prathama—Āṣāḍha corresponds to njia—Jyeṣṭha in the Śrīya—Siddhānta, and the date is verified for the first two hours of Thursday, June 5th, 1012.

6) Ms. Āstasāhasrikā—Prajñāpāramitā, Cambridge University Library, Add. 1643. Colophon 6: Pañcatrīṃśādhike 'bde śatatama—praṣate (sic. for pragate) Caitra—māse hi-mābhē | vikhyāte’smin dasamyn—diṭṭijaripuguror—vāsare samprasaste || rājī śrī—Bhojadeve ‘py—amitaṇganunāgalād[h]a—śrī—Rudrādeva śrī—Lakṣmīkāmadēvair—arjīnagar[k]uliśair—ardharājye ‘pabhukte || ... ... Nepālamandala—svalāṅkāraṇāya samyak śrī—Hlāṃvihāra iti etc. Foucher, followed by Lévi and Barnett, understood the two verses to mean that Bhojadeva was the successor of Rudrādeva, after having gained him by his infinite merits to appoint him as such; and that Lakṣmīkāmaṃdeva reigned in the other half of the kingdom 7). But the similar text of the Patan inscrip-

1) Published in CBMC, 3–4.


4) Published in ‘Sakya—Vaidya, 2.


6) Published in CBMC, 151–152.

tion (doc. 5) shows that Rudradeva was king and Bhojadeva was "also" (api) king, i.e. associate ruler. I would translate: "Under śrī-Bhojadeva the associate king (rajñi...py = api rāṭ of doc. 2) and Rudradeva who had been gained [by Bhojadeva to appoint him as colleague] through the infinite multitude of his merits; and while Lakṣmīkāmādeva, a thunderbolt to a world of enemies, was enjoying half the kingdom". The name Hlām, perhaps misread for Hlom, is perhaps connected with present-day Lhom Hit in Tangal Tol, Patan. There was no Mīna saṃ-kṛānti in Caitra, which caused an intercalary Pauṣa. This Caitra corresponding to niṇa-Caitra in the Sūrya-Siddhānta, the date is verified for the last hours of Thursday, March 31st, 1015.


The complicated situation revealed by these documents may be sketched as follows. Nirbhayadeva succeeded Udayadeva. In 1005 he was alone on the throne: then about 1008 he took as colleague Rudradeva. Nirbhayadeva died a few years later. Rudradeva's grand-nephew Bhojadeva proclaimed himself king at Kathmandu at some time before 1011; but in 1012 and 1015 he recognized again Rudradeva as his senior partner. Both reigned at Patan, while in 1015 Lakṣmīkāmādeva ruled the other half of the kingdom (perhaps from Kathmandu). Then Bhojadeva disappeared, and in 1028 Rudradeva was reigning alone in his share of the kingdom, which after his death was taken over by Lakṣmīkāmādeva. This reconstruction may look rather complicated, but it is the only possible, unless the dates of Doc. 4 and Doc. 7, which I did not see personally, were misread by their respective editors; but this is rather unlikely.

Lakṣmīkāmādeva (c. 1010–1041)

Lakṣmīkāmādeva may have been a descendant of Guṇakāmādeva, as indicated by the form of his name. Besides his mention in the above quoted colophon of 135 NS, we have four documents of his reign:


1) Published (partially?) by S. K. Saraswati, "Nepal in the first half of the 11th century A.D.", in Proceedings of the 17th Indian History Congress (Ahmedabad 1954), Calcutta 1956, 189.
2) Published in CPMDN, II, 5, and in Pāñimā, 30 (2030 VS), 125.
According to V1 and VK/VD he reigned 21 years, according to the later chronicles 22 years. If we count from the colophon of 135 NS, in which he appears as partner in the dvairāya, down to the colophon of 159 NS, his regnal period is of at least 24 years, i.e. longer than the span allotted to him by the chronicles. But since the last colophon of Rudradeva is dated 1028 and Lakṣmikāmadeva’s colophon of 1038 expressly mentions his unimpeded (niṣkanṭakā) rule, which seems to hint at the elimination of a rival, we may put the beginning of his co-rulership at about 1010 and of his sole rule at about 1030. And thus I would date his reign, tentatively and with all reserves, in 150–161 N.S., i.e. 1030–1041 A.D. His centre of power during this period seems to have been Kathmandu.

V1 and VK/VD supply the following item of information on Lakṣmikāmadeva:

V1, 23b: tena campaṭapaścāt sahite samvaccharsate dvāmte rāṣṭra-śānti kṛtavān

VK/VD: tena hi campaṭapaścāt sahite samvatsare nidhāne rāṣṭra-śānti kṛta

The word campaṭa is unknown, but I tale the meaning to be that the

1) Published in CSMASB, V, no. 4084, p. 721.
2) Gnoli, no. LXXXIII; Dh. Bajracharya, Licchavikāl-kā abhilekh, no. 139.
3) Published by Regmi, I, 119; better by Dinesh Raj Pant, in Pārṣimā, 30 (2030 VS), 128.
4) Published in CBMC, 172; the date in the Devanagari text is printed by mistake as 157.
king, after a struggle (?), at the end of two centuries (of turmoil) gave peace to the country. It the meaning is correct, then this quotation indicates the unification of the twin kingdoms.

But Lakṣmīkāmadeva’s success was not lasting. Only three weeks after his last colophon (doc. 3), a ms. tells another tale:


Khrṃprṃ–brumā is identical with Khṛpuṇ and (Mā)khopṛm of two inscriptions of Śivadeva (6th century) 2); it is the old Newari name of Bhatgaon, nowadays written as Khopva or similar spellings. The manuscript was copied “for the sake of bringing peace to an unhappy world, at the time when a great war was raging in Bhatgaon”. Whether this great war was a rebellion against Lakṣmīkāmadeva or a struggle for the succession after his death, is more than we can tell.

Vijayadeva (c. 1030–1037)

The next king is called Vijayadeva in V1, Jayadeva in VK/VD and Jayakāmadeva in the later chronicles. No document of his reign is extant.

According to V1 Vijayadeva reigned for 31 years and enjoyed the half-kingdom (ardharājya) of Patan. VK/VD give more information: Jayadeva reigned for 20 (VD: 70) years and enjoyed for 10 years the half-kingdom of Patan. The only way to explain this text is that the ardharājya ranked below full kingship and that the dvairājya consisted of a superior and a subordinate king, only the regnal years of the former being counted. We suggest that at some time (c. 1030) Lakṣmīkāmadeva appointed Vijayadeva as a junior king of Patan, perhaps as successor of Rudradeva. About 1037–38 Vijayadeva was deposed and Lakṣmīkāmadeva ruled for a short time over the whole kingdom, as shown above. After the end of his reign and the civil war of 1039 Vijayadeva reappeared, this time as the colleague of a new king, Bhāskaradeva.

1) First published 1958; re-edited in Pūrṇimā, 30 (2030 VS), 129.
2) Gnoli, nos. XXIV and XXV.
Bhāskaradeva (c. 1039–1048)

According to VK/VD, Bhāskaradeva and Jayadeva reigned together for 7 years and 4 months 1). V1 ignores this period of joint rule (of which there is no trace in the colophons) and gives to Bhāskaradeva a reign of three years (13 years according to the later chronicles). Three documents of this reign are extant:


2) Inscription on a bronze Śivalītiya Caturmukha, in the Samuel Eilenberg collection, New York 3). Composed in the year 166 (1045/6) in the reign of Bhāskaradeva.


It is difficult to draw a clear picture of the situation depicted in the older chronicles, the more so as a co-rulership of Vijayadeva and Bhāskaradeva is not evidenced by colophons or inscriptions. As to the later chronicles, they inform us that Bhāskaradeva was a powerful vassal of Jayadeva; when the latter died childless, the Thākuri clan of Nuvakot elected Bhāskaradeva as his successor 5). This means a change of dynasty; but there is no trace of such a break in V1 and VK/VD, who still had registered carefully the advent of new dynasties in the time of Amśuvarman. Moreover, Bhāskaradeva was certainly not elected to the throne after Vijayadeva's childless demise, because VK/VD positively prove a period of joint rule. Besides, Bhā-

1) Bhāskaradeva–Jayadeva–ubhaya–rājavarṣa 7 māsa 4. Here Kirkpatrick, p. 263, misunderstood his source. Out of the word ubhaya (both) in the Kaisher ms. he made a king Oodey Deo and inserted him in his royal list, allowing him 7 years and 1 month. This figure was apparently taken away from Bhāskaradeva. The whole passage in Kirkpatrick is rather a mess.

2) Published in CPMDN, II, p. 7.


4) Published in CPMDN, I, 29–30.

skaradeva was the son of a king, because V1 and VK narrate that “he sold the crown of his father (pitrmālī vikṛitaṁ) 1) and destroyed the gold statue of the god Manohara; for this crime he became blind ”. In any case, the reasons for admitting a change of dynasty are very weak.

As the three documents of Bhāskaradeva seem to exclude a co-rulership in 1045–1047, I would suggest that Vijayadeva and Bhāskaradeva ruled together for some years after Lakṣmīkāmadeva’s end and the civil war, viz. c. 1039–1045. Then Bhāskaradeva remained alone on the throne for about three years (1045–1048).

During this reign Nepal was visited by Dipamkaraśrīrijñāna, usually called Atiśa, a great teacher of the Buddhist monastic university of Vikramaśilā, who was invited by the king of Gu-ge to come to Western Tibet in order to rejuvenate the Buddhist faith and learning there. His journey from Vikramaśilā to Nepal and hence to mNa’-ris (Western Tibet) is usually known to modern historians through an old article by S.Ch.Das. 2). His narrative consists of excerpta from three different Tibetan texts 3). He pieced this material together without marking clearly the passages from each work; as usual with him, the translations are very free and sometimes unreliable. It is therefore advisable to go back to the original texts. The evidence they supply can be summarized as follows.

Atiśa left Vikramaśilā almost certainly in 1040 4). He arrived at the Nepalese frontier, where he found support by the local chiefs and where he received a letter of invitation from the king of Li (Khotan?); but he did not comply with the summons 5). Then he arrived in ’Ol-k’a of Nepal (it is not clear which part of the country is allu-

1) VD has only the words pitrimali kṛta and omits the rest.
2) S. Ch. Das, “Indian Pandits in Tibet”, in Journal of the Buddhist Texts Society, I (1893), 7–31; also S. Ch. Das, Indian Pandits in the Land of Snows, Calcutta 1893, 50–76.
3) These are (abridged titles): rNam t’ar yoṅs grags, in the bKa’ gdams glegs bam (dGa’-Idan P’un-ts’ogs-glin edition), 28a–144b; rNam t’ar lam yig, ibid., 144b–182a; dPag bsam ljon bzaṅ (ed. S. Ch. Das), Calcutta 1908. On these works see H. Eimer, Berichte über das Leben des Atiśa (Dīpaṃkaraśrīrijñāna), Wiesbaden 1977, 105–108, 159–176; criticism on the article of S. Ch. Das, ibid., 26–27.
4) Not all the Tibetan sources agree on the dates of Atiśa’s journey; I follow those given in the Deb t’er sñon po: G. Roerich (transl.), The Blue Annals, Calcutta 1949–1953, 247.
5) rNam t’ar lam yig, 159b–161b.
ded to), where he stayed for one month and where a deaf ('on-pa) sthavira acted as his dānapati 1). Then he took up his residence at the Śiñ-kun shrine (Svayambhū Nāth), where he found waiting for him the envoys of the royal monk of Gu–ge with the means necessary for his journey, and where he was received with the utmost reverence by the local Pandits and by his own brother Viryacandra; they seated him on the throne usually reserved for the mahārāja (rgyal-po c'en-po). He was supplied with every kind of necessities by the rāja (rgyal-po) of Śiñ-kun 2). The K'ri–šoṇ Bhāro of Nepal too came to visit him and invited him to his home 3).

After the demise of his companion rGya brTson-'grus-seṅ-ge, Atiśa spent most of his time at Bal–po rdzoṅ 4). Then he shifted to Bal–po'i-T'aṅ 5), where he presided over the funeral ceremonies for his dead friend. He was received there by the mahārāja (rgyal-po c'en-po) of Nepal Grags–pa–mt‘a’-yas 6). The Master presented him with the elephant that had carried him up from India and asked for permission to build a vihāra at T'aṅ. The king agreed and furnished him with the means for the undertaking. He also entrusted to him his own son Padma-'od, to whom Atiśa imparted the vows of a novice. Then he returned to Bal–po rdzoṅ along with the Gu–ge envoys 7).

1) rNam t'ar rgyas pa, 56b; rNam t'ar yoṅs grags, 84b. These texts, which represent the earliest and main body of the traditions on Atiśa, have been critically studied by H. Eimer, rNam thar rgyas pa: Materialien zu einer Biographie des Atiśa (Dipamkara-srijñāna), 2 vols., Wiesbaden 1979.

2) I wonder whether this rāja, evidently subordinated to the mahārāja of Nepal, would have been Vijayadeva.

3) rNam t'ar lam yig, 161b–164b; Padma–dkar–po, C'os–'byun (ed. Lokesh Chandra), 185b.

4) The name means “castle of Nepal”. It appears also in the biography of Mi-la–ras–pa, as the place where the Master met Dharmabodhi. It is the Tibetan name of Nuvakoth. P. Aufschnaiter, “Land and places of Milarepa”, in East and West, 26 (1976), 179.

5) The literal meaning of this name is “plain of Nepal”. But t'aṅ seems to be here a Newari place–name. – The mention of Palpa in this connection by S. Ch. Das. is due to a misunderstanding.

6) The Sanskrit equivalent of this name would be Anantakīrti or Anantayaśas or the like. It is impossible to find a connection with Bhāskaradeva or with any other royal name in Nepal. Grags–pa–mt‘a’-yas occurs only in the rNam t'ar lam yig, but not in the main tradition preserved by the rNam t'ar rgyas pa and the rNam t'ar yoṅs grags; and thus the name stands a chance to be a later invention.

7) rNam t'ar lam yig, 164b–167a.
The T’an vihāra was built as a double convent, of which the one section was called Rāja vihāra and the other, although no name is given, was apparently the T’an vihāra proper. Atiśa’s foundation is to be identified with the Than Bahil or Vikramaśilā mahāvihāra, on the northern outskirts of Kathmandu. It seems that at present no local tradition connects it with Dīpankaraśrijñāna; however, the name of Atiśa’s mother- convent Vikramaśilā supports the identification. About 1200 the monastery had as its abbot the famous scholar Vibhūticandra from Jagaddala, a disciple of K’a-c’e Paṇ-ć’en (Śākyāśribhadra). One generation later it was visited by C’ag Lotsawa C’os-rje-dpal; see later, p. 88.

During his stay in Nepal, which lasted one whole year, Atiśa wrote the Vimalaratnalekha, a religious epistle addressed to king Naya-pala of the Pāla dynasty of Bihar and Bengal. Early in 1042 he left for Western Tibet. On the whole the “Nepalese” section of his biographies contributes little that is useful to our knowledge of Nepalese events and life in the forties of the 11th century.

Baladeva (c. 1048–1060) and Yišadeva (c. 1048–1049)

According to the chronicles Bhāskaradeva’s successor was Baladeva, called Balavantadeva in V¹, who reigned for 12 years. Seven colophons of his reign have come down to us:

1) Ms. Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā, Tokyo University Library, n. 49. Colophon ⁵):

1) In the Deb t’er sion po and in Dpa’-bo gTus-lag, mK’a’i dga’ ston, vol. DA, 12a, the name of the monastery is spelt as sT’a or sTəm; both spellings run against Tibetan orthographical rules. In many Tibetan names m occurs at an earlier period where we find n in later times; see such examples as ‘Broh’/Brom, ‘C’ińs-pu/mC’ims-pu, mTs’o Ma-p’a’/mTs’o Ma-p’am. H. Eimer, rNam thar rgyas pa, 105.

2) See Purnaharsha Bajaracharya, “Than Bahil, an ancient centre for Sanskrit studies”, in Indologica Taurinensia, 7 (1979), 61-64. The vihāra seems to go back to the palatial dwellings of some noble family; M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 363.


4) rNam t’ar rgyas pa, 56b-57a; rNam t’ar yois grags, 84b-85b.

5) Unpublished. The manuscript is registered in CSMTUL.
Samvat 100-60-9 Vaiśākha-kṛṣṇa-dīvā saptamīṃ grāhavaye rāja-śrī-Baladeva- Yiśadeva ubhau kāle likhita-samāptam-itī. Th: date corresponds to Wednesday, April 26th, 1049.


3) Ms. Aṣṭāsāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā, National Archives, V.76. Colophon 2): Samvatsare śate khyāte trayah saptatī samyute Pause suklaādine saṣṭe Revatī budha samyute | dipete śrī-Baladeva-rājavijaye Lakṣmīprabhamāndale etc. Pausu being kaśaya in the Śurya Siddhānta, our Pausu corresponds to Māgha. The date is accordingly verified for Wednesday, December 30th, 1053. The place of copying cannot be identified.


5) Ms. Saddharmapundarika, Sa-skya monastery in Tibet. Colophon 4): Pūrṇe vedma (or sadga?) yuto (?) varṣe śate śāradasangate | māse mṛṣṭāṅkite (?) ramye mṛgāṅka-karamandane navamāyām Rohine rṣe prabhātārkadine śubhe | kṛtāṅ-Baladevākhye kṣitiṃ rakṣati kṣmadhipe | vārṭta-Kalyāṇaguptena kārite sugatālaye | Māhendratativikhyātā buddhadharmanikadhārini || It is a pity that the editor could not make out the year and month more clearly and that the reading is so uncertain. The chronological details, however, are sufficient to reach a definite result. During the years from 1048 (last known date of Bhāskaradeva) to 1063 (first known date of Pradyumnakāmādeva) the combination sukla-pakṣa - 9th tithi - Rohini naksatra - Sunday can be verified only for two dates: 176 Māgha sukla 9; and 179 Māgha jukla 9, second half of the day. I prefer the first alternative, because of the tentative reading sadga in the number of the year. Accordingly, the date is verified for Sunday, January 28th, 1056. - The place of copying cannot be identified.


Surprisingly, Doc. 1 reveals that at the beginning of his reign Baladeva had a colleague called Yiśadeva, a name which I take to

1) Published in CPMDN, II, 60.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 129.
3) Published by Sakya-Vaidya, 4.
4) Published by RS, XXIII, 29.
5) Unpublished. The manuscript is registered in CSMTUL.
6) Published in CPMDN, I, 11. I did not see this ms. which seems to be no longer extant. I may note here that the alleged second ms. of 180 NS (Upākarmavidhi) mentioned in CPMDN, I, 56, and Le Népal, II, 194 is found in the National Archives, I.1473.4, but is dated 480 NS and contains no name of a king.
be equivalent to Isadeva; he is completely unknown to all the chronicles. Apparently he enjoyed a very short reign, and soon Baladeva remained sole ruler. The twelve years allowed him by the chronicles seem to be correct and he may have ruled c. 1048–1060. Incidentally, this was the last instance of a dvairājya for some centuries to come.

According to V1 and VK, Baladeva kept the kingdom in abundance and founded the town of Haripur.

Pradyumnakāmadeva (c. 1060–1066)

Baladeva was succeeded by Pradyumnakāmadeva (V1) or Padmadeva (VK/VD and modern chronicles). The first name is the correct one, as shown by the four colophons belonging to the period of his rule.


1) First published 1958.
2) Published in CBMC, 173.
3) Published in AS, 2 (2018 VS), 10; also by Regmi, I, 132.
4) First published 1958. Mentioned by Bendall, History, 22. For the other colophon in Add. 2197, probably coming from another manuscript of the same work, see later p. 49.
The regnal years of Pradyumnañakāmadeva in V¹ cannot be read any more; VK/VD gives him 6 years; the later vamśāvalīs 11 years. The chronicles merely tell us that “he re-established [the custom of wearing] a crown”. On the other side, Doc. 1 affords us an interesting glimpse of the political situation. It features Śaṅkaradeva, not yet as king, but as a very powerful man, a sort of Commander-in-Chief or regent, victorious in war against the enemies and pacifier of the country. His exact connection with king Pradyumnañakāmadeva remains mysterious, and we do not know whether he was a relation of his or not.

Nāgārjunadeva (c. 1066–1069)

The next king in the royal list is Nāgārjunadeva, who ruled for three years, probably 1066–1069. One document of his reign has come down to us:


Absolutely nothing is known of his short rule.

Śaṅkaradeva (c. 1069–1082)

We have five colophons of the next king Śaṅkaradeva:


1) Published by Regmi, I, 133.
2) Partly published in CPMDN, I, 92; revised and completed in CPMDN, II, 87; re-edited by Yogi Narahari Nath in Itihās Prakāś, I, Kathmandu 2012 VS, 159a.
4) Published by RS, XXI, 33 (with date wrongly transcribed). Checked on a hand-copy made by Professor G. Tucci in 1939.
almost certainly Lamjung, in the hills between Kathmandu and Pokhra. The date corresponds to August–September 1069.

3) Ms. Aṣṭāśāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, A.15. Colophon: Ekādhika–navatikāngate prayāte samvacchare Tapasi (= Māgha) māse tithau daśāmyām samvardhamānasāstaddayānihitvāyām vacaspatau × × Šobhana–yoge yuke śrī-bhūṣaṇe Śaṅkaradeva–samjñē vikhyātaikṛttau jītavairvṛtde sūryānyāpāpravaradāva-devasamrajjasamrakṣite sarvaloke . . . . śreya 'stu | Samvat 100–90–I Phāl(ā)guna–śukla–daśāmyāṃ tithau Rohini nakṣatre Šobhana–yoge bhṛhaspati–vāsare. There is conflict between the first and the second description of the same date. The solution comes from the chronological calculation: the date cannot be verified for Phālguna, while it is possible for Māgha. It corresponds to Thursday, January 13th, 1071, except for the yoga, which ended on January 19th.


The chronicles give to Śaṅkaradeva 17 (VK/VD), 15 (V1) or 11 (later vaṃśāvalis) years. Actually he reigned for about 13 years (1069–1082). He must have been a ruler of some relief. VK tells us that he made an image of Śaṅkeśvara at Nandi Śāli (Naksal, on the south–eastern outskirts of Kathmandu), and completed a temple there. Above all, he kept the country at peace.

Vāmadeva (1082–1085)

The quiet enjoyed by Nepal was not very long. According to

1) The identification is due to G. Bajracharya, “Nevāri bhāṣāko Tāmāṅ bhāṣā tathā Limbu bhāṣāsamgagako sādvṛṣya”, in Pārṇimā, 2 (2021 VS), 44.
3) Published in CSMASB, I, n. 49, pp. 49–50.
4) Published in RS, XXIII, 28.
5) All these indications are taken up and expanded in the later vaṃśāvalis, which for once seem to be based on reliable materials. Wright, pp. 158–160.
the later vaṃśāvalis Vāmadeva, a descendant of Amśuvarman through a side-line, supported by the Thakurs of Patan and Kathmandu, expelled Śaṅkaradeva and made himself king. No trace of these events is found in VK and V¹, which merely register the reign of Vāmadeva (3 years) without a break in the list. One document of this king is extant.

ms. Sekanirdeśapañjikā, Leningrad Public Library. It is a modern copy made on a decayed ancient palm-leaf ms. ². Colophon ³:

Caturmāśādhika-śata-dvaye samvatsare šūbhe | rājñāḥ śrī-Śāṃkara-vardhaṇa | śrī-Udayapura-ramye mahāśāvanta śrī-Nāgā- rjjunajīvasya raksīte | tatra sthitāḥ Saugatatvavedi paramopāsaka-śrī-Vajrākara-raja- samjñakaiḥ | sulikhyate śāsvata sekanirṣṇayaiḥ | kṛṣṇa-Bhādrapade māse vāre bhara- spati-prasamśīte | śubham-astu sarvadā ||

The site of Udayapura (cf. p. 45) is unknown. The date is impossible as it stands. It says “200 years plus 4 months... in Bhādrapada”; beside the fact that this way of indicating the date is never used in Nepalese colophons, Bhādrapada is not the 4th, but the 11th month of the year (6th in the Caitrādi years). Thus it is certain that the modern copyist misunderstood the samvat of his original. The obvious correction would be caturdasādhika-śata-dvaye, i.e. 214; but this is much too late in comparison with the known dates of the next king Harṣadeva. Thus I suggest tentatively the correction caturvarsādhika, which would give 204. The date would thus correspond to Thursday 22nd or Thursday 29th August, 1084.

It seems noteworthy that Vāmadeva does not wear the full royal titles. On the other side, we meet here for the second time a powerful feudal family, that of the Jivas, mahāsāmantas of Udayāpura, a frontier district the location of which remains obscure to this day; we are going to find them again in the troubled period that follows. We may suppose that Vāmadeva was a claimant set up by the Jivas, but not yet fully established on the throne. His dates may have been c. 1082–1085.

The later chronicles claim that Vāmadeva founded a dynasty. This contention can be so far accepted, as during the following years his descendants alternated on the throne with those of Śaṅkaradeva.

About this period a inscription in the Saugali Tol, Patan ⁴, relates the dedication of an image of the Sun god by śrī-Yaśodevabhūnātha-tanayo dharmatatparaḥ śrī-Bānadevaḥ. It is dated tribhir

¹) Wright, p. 160.
²) Says the scribe: jirebhūta-pracīna-tālapatra-pustake drśtvā 'bhīsa-rīteyam pustake.
³) Published by N. Mironov, Katalog indijskikh rukopisej rossijskoj publitnoj biblioteki, I, Petrograd 1918, n. 283, pp. 264–265.
⁴) Published by C. Bendall, Journey, 80 (no. V).
varsaiḥ samāyukte samvatṣara-śatadvayā Vai[śākha śu]kla-saptamyāṁ budhe Pūṣyodaye śubhe, which is verified for Wednesday, April 26th, 1083. There is nearness of date and similarity of name with Vāmadeva, and Bendall accepted the identity of the two. But Lévi remarked that Bāna is quite different in meaning from Vāma and that there is not a single word in the inscription hinting at a royal status of Bāṇadeva; he concluded that this is a private inscription and that Bāṇadeva must have been a local nobleman. One cannot but agree with Lévi’s findings.

_Harṣadeva (c. 1085–1098)_

The next king was Harṣadeva, of whom five colophons are extant.


3) Ms. Saddharmapuṇḍarika, Cambridge University Library, Add. 2197, already mentioned on p. 44. Another colophon 4): Varṣāṇam dviṣate trayodaśādhigate Caitramāse kṛṣṇapakṣe trayodasi | śrimad-rājā-Harṣadeva āśina (?) | śri-Lalitakramāṇagvala–Yacchufolknāvasate kulaputri yadatra punyam etc. Written in the Yachu Tol (south-eastern section of Patan), which conserves this name to the present day. The date corresponds to March 27th, 1093.

4) Ms. Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāraṁśī, formerly in the Sa-skya monastery in Tibet, now in the Institute of Tibetology at Gangtok, Sikkim. Colophon 5): Samvat 200–10–3 rājāḥ śri-Harṣadeva–rāje śri-Gaṇḍīgulma–viṣaye | kulaputra-kāyaṣṭha-panḍita śri-Jiva-dharadimhaṁ pustako ‘yam–iti | Gaṇḍīgulma occurs also in the colophon of 119 NS (see p. 34); in the present instance it is the headquarters of an outlying district (viṣaya). According to M. R. Pant and A. Sharma, p. 20, it should be sought for in the modern Gulmi sub-district. The year corresponds to 1092/3.

5) Ms. Tatvasadbhāvatāntra, National Archives, V.445. Colophon 6): Dviṣate samvatsare ‘tite saptadaśa-prapuritaḥ | Phālgunaṁ sūklasya uttameṣu trayodaśi || tārakā Pūrvwa-

---

1) S. Lévi, _Le Népal_, II, 196–197.
2) First published in 1958, although the ms. is listed in _CPMDN_, I, 30. Mentioned in Bendall, _History_, 22.
4) First published 1958, Mentioned by Bendall, _Journey_, 46, and _History_, 22.
5) Published by _RS_, XXIII, 25.
6) Published in _CPMDN_, II, 113; re-edited by Regmi, I, 142.
The chronicles give Harṣadeva 16 (VK/VD), 13 (V1) or 15 (later vaṃśāvalīs) years. VK and V1 enter his name in the following way: Rāja śrī-Harṣadeva varṣa 16 (13), unāvimśati samvacchare šatadvaye pravartamāne; and not a word more. This date 219 current cannot refer to the accession, because it is later than all of Harṣadeva’s colophons. Most probably it refers to his death; we shall have occasion to find in V2 several dates, in which the number of the regnal years is followed by the month and day (but not the year) of death. This case is rather different, but still no other interpretation seems plausible.

The chronological data of V1 are: 219 current = 218 expired; and 218 — 13 = 205; the latter is probably the year in which Vāma-deva’s rule ended. Harṣadeva’s dates therefore are 1085-1098. As in the case of his predecessor, none of his documents gives him the full royal title; and as our materials seem statistically sufficient, we are justified in supposing that he did not assume it. The reason for this is not apparent, unless we are to assume that these two kings recognized the formal overlordship of some foreign ruler (perhaps of the Pālas of Bengal and Bihar?).

It is clear that Harṣadeva’s was a weak reign; and indeed it was followed by a period of troubles, during which some feudatories tried to stand forth as independent rulers. This was the case for Rāmadeva of Dhavalašrotṛi, as shown by the following document:

Ms. Aryoṣnīsavijaya-nāma-dhāraṇi, private ownership in Kathmandu. Colophon 1): Mahāsāmanta-dhipati-mahāsāmanta-śrī-Rāmadevasya vijayarājye | samvat 220 Kārttika-dine 24 Dhavalasrotṛiyāṃ likhiteyam | lekhaka-Kamalapāninā | Written at Dha- valašrotṛi, which was probably in the foothills of the Dhaulagiri range to the west of the Valley 2). The date corresponds to November 9th, 1099.

The expression vijayarājye is typical of independent rule. It seems that after the death of Harṣadeva and during the ensuing troubles Rāmadeva claimed for a moment absolute independence in his do-

---

1) First published 1958; re-edited in Sakya-Vaidya, 8.
2) This was suggested by M. R. Pant and A. D. Sharma, The two earliest copper-plate inscription from Nepal, Kathmandu 1977, 22-24. Dhavalašrotṛi cannot be equated with Dhaukel or Dhulikhel south-east of Banepa, as usually accepted; this was shown by Dh. Bajracharya, in CNS, 5/1 (1977), 101.
main). It should also be remarked that he assumed the same title mahāsāmantādhipati which was borne by Nānyadeva of Tirhut before he set up as independent ruler. However, Rāmadeva climbed down from this usurpation soon after, as we shall see presently.

Śivadeva (1098–1126) and/alias Simhadeva (c. 1100–1122)

After the death of Harṣadeva the old dynasty was revived in the person of Śivadeva. The old chronicles recognize only him as the rightful ruler. Four documents of his reign are extant:

1) Copper-plate inscription of unknown provenience, in private possession in Nepal 2).


According to V2, f. 31a, Śivadeva was the son of Śaṅka[raka]-deva, was born in 177 Āṣāḍha krṣṇa pratipad, Uttarāṣāḍha nakṣatra, Sudhi yoga, Bṛhaspati (the date is verified for the last hours of Thursday, June 19th, 1057) and lived 69 years. This fixes his death at 246 NS. According to both V1 and VK/VD he reigned 27 years and 7 months (later vamśāvalis: 21 years), and this would place his

---

1) The hypothesis of a Pāla suzerainty over Rāmadeva, suggested in 1958, must be abandoned; see Regmi, I, 144–148, 156–158.
2) Published by M. T. Pant and A. D. Sharma, The two earliest copper-plate inscriptions from Nepal, 1–12.
4) Published in CSPMIO, II, 1502, no. 8049.
accession about 218 (expired), exactly the year given by V\textsuperscript{1} for the end of Harṣadeva's reign. The chronology fits perfectly in all its niceties.

VK tells us that Śivadeva made donations to Paśupati and built a palace at Kīrti-Bhaktapur, i.e. modern Kirtipur; practically, he founded the town. He coined silver damma with his image as a lion (śrī-Simha); he also struck gold śivakānika with the legend śrī-Śivasya\textsuperscript{1}).

Doc. I shows that the powerful feudatory Rāmadeva gave up his almost sovereign title and recognized the suzerainty of Śivadeva, although he maintained full autonomy (vijayarājye) at Dhavalāśrotī in the Magar district.

According to the early chronicles, the heir-apparent of Śivadeva was jaurāja (= yuvarāja) Mahendradeva, who in 239 Vaiṣākha śukla pūrṇimā (April 26th, 1119) inaugurated the large tank Mahendrasāra\textsuperscript{1}). According to V\textsuperscript{2} he was born in 199 Vaiṣākha pūrṇimā, Viśākha nakṣatra, Dhruva yoga, Bṛhaspati; the date is verified for Thursday, April 18th, 1079. He was nominated heir-apparent and used to give away one dām every day in charity. Mahendradeva died at the age of 65, i.e. in 264 NS (= 1144 A.D.). But nowhere we are told that he became king.

At this point a serious problem arises. No less than six documents bear evidence to the reign of a ruler called Simhadeva, contemporary with Śivadeva. They are:


\textsuperscript{1}) V\textsuperscript{1}, 24b. This coinage will be discussed later in ch. 000.


\textsuperscript{3}) First published in 1958 from a hand-copy made by Professor G. Tucci in 1939; it seems to be listed in RS, XXI, 38 (n. 114).
As it can be seen, the years covered by the colophons of Simhadeva (1105–1122) are completely included within the reign of Śivadeva. And this raises the problem whether the two rulers were one and the same, or whether they should be kept apart as two rivals (there is no hint of a dvāra-jyā in the documents).

Against the identification there is the weighty argument that we cannot see any reason why a king should choose to appear in the documents under two names; there is no other instance of this sort in the whole of Nepalese history. Another negative element (of no great import) is a statement in the chronicle according to which on 219 Māgha kṛṣṇa 8 Mūla–nākṣatra (the date seems to be January 17th, 1099; but the nākṣatra ended on the 20th) an influential nobleman called Varapāla Bhāro of the Yetha Bahar in Patan brought about an agreement between the two royal families (mahāprabhutah ubhaya-rājakula udharaṇa samārthah); he died at the age of 87 (V₂,

1) First published 1958.
2) Published in CSMASB, I, 4–5, no. 4. Simhadeva is, as far as I know, the only Nepalese king who openly proclaimed his faith in the Buddhist religion (paramasauga). I wonder whether this had any political significance.
3) CSMASB: Yiṣū.
4) CSMASB: Yiṣākara.
5) First published 1958; then by Regmi, I, 359.
6) Published by RS, XXIII, 41. Checked on a hand-copy made by Professor G. Tucci in 1939.
It is not clear whether the date refers to his arbitration or to his death. In any case this piece of information fits better in the frame of an agreement between the rivals Śivadeva and Śimhadeva.

On the other side of the balance sheet we may note some peculiar facts. Although the old chronicle absolutely ignores a reign of Śimhadeva, four princes, viz. Mahendradeva (the yuvarāja of Śivadeva), Ānandadeva, Rudradeva and Amṛtadeva (who reigned in succession between 1147 and 1178), were the sons of Śihadeva–parameśvara 1), while no son of Śivadeva is mentioned. In the second place, Śivadeva employed on his coins both his (sva) device of a lion (simha) and the device (or legend) of Śiva, and this would be difficult to explain in the case of two different rulers: why should Śivadeva employ the device of this rival? Lastly, local tradition at Kirtipur, as well as an inscription of 707 NS (1587 A.D.), praise śri–Śimhadeva as the founder of the town, a feat which the chronicle attributes, as we have seen, to Śivadeva 2).

Although the fundamental objection of a lack of motive must stand, the balance of evidence seems to be rather in favour of the identification. Until further proofs to the contrary are forthcoming, I am inclined to accept Śivadeva and Śimhadeva as two names of the same ruler.

Śivadeva/Śimhadeva apparently had some measure of success in restoring internal peace and the authority of the throne. And yet the position of his feudatories shows the narrow limits of this success. Not only Rāmadeva of Dhavaḷaśrotī was half-independent, but the Jiva chiefs of Udayāpura wielded considerable power. They bore the old title of mahāsāmanta going back to the times of Aṃśuvarman; but the position of Piṣu Jiva must have been a half-royal one, as shown by the term vijayarājye employed by a scribe writing in the royal capital Patan itself. Probably Piṣu Jiva was for some years the real power behind the throne, much as Aṃśuvarman had been in his early years.

1) The date of Mahendradeva’s birth raises a small difficulty; he was born in 1079, while the other three sons of Śihadeva were born in 1099, 1108 and 1113 respectively. An interval of 34 years between the first and the last son is somewhat disturbing, even if we assume that the three kings were issued from a second marriage of Śimhadeva.

2) The case for the identification has been ably argued by Dh. Bajracharya, "Maḍhyakālika Nepal–kā ek prakhyāt rāja Śivadeva ", in CNS, 8, 1 (1980), 207–222.
Besides, a difficult situation had developed on the southern frontier of the kingdom, where a new and dangerous power was building up. Tirhut (Sanskrit: Mithilā) had come under the sway of the mahāsāmantādhipati 1) Nānyadeva. He was a native of Karṇāṭaka (Karṇāṭakula bhūṣana), like his contemporary Vijayasena, the founder of the Sena dynasty of Bengal. It seems that this sudden emergence of rulers of southern extraction in Northern India was due to the expeditions of the Cālukya kings Someśvara I (1046–1068) and Vikramāditya VI (1076–1126), of which we know very little. In 1097 2) Nānyadeva proclaimed himself king, founding the new capital of Simraongarh (in the Nepalese Tarai), which remained the seat of his dynasty till its downfall in 1325 3).

At some unknown date he invaded Nepal. The later vaṃśāvalīs speak of him as a prince of the Karṇāṭaka, who came to the North and in Saka 811 and NS 9 (889 A.D.) entered Nepal; he defeated the kings Jayadeva Malla of Patan and Ānanda Malla of Bhatgaon and compelled them to flee to Tirhut, whereupon he established his court at Bhatgaon. He introduced the Śaka era into Nepal 4). All this is a tissue of chronological absurdities (including the names of non-existing kings), which prevent us to take this tale seriously.

1) This is the title he gives himself in the colophon of a work composed by him: the Bhāratavārttika, a commentary on Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra; M. R. K. Kavi, “King Nānyadeva on music”, in J. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., 1 (1926), 56.

2) This date is given in a traditional chronogram, occuring in most of the Nepalese chronicles (see Lévi, Le Népal, II, 197–199 n), but in its correct form found only in VK/VD, in the Mudita–Kuvalayāśva (R. Pischel, Katalog der Bibliothek der Deutschen Mongolischen Gesellschaft, II, 8) and in the Mithilā tradition as recorded by Pandita Chanda Jha in his edition of Vidyāpati’s Puruṣaparikṣā, Darbhanga 1810 Śaka, 19. There is a great number of minor variants, but the gist is always that Nānyadeva disposed of kingship (or of the country) in Śaka 1019, Śrāvana śudi 7, Svāti nakṣatra, a Saturday; the date is verified for Saturday, July 18th, 1097.


4) Wright, 167.
However, his attacks against Nepal belong to the realm of sober history. A short and much effaced entry in the old chronicle indicates that in 231 Bhādrapada kṛṣṇa 7 (August 27th, 1111) one śrī-Nāramalladeva cut to pieces the Doya, i.e. the people of Tirhut \(^1\). Nāramalla is otherwise unknown; he may have been a local baron.

It is not difficult to find a balance between these conflicting accounts. Nānyadeva did raid Nepal and probably succeeded in entering for a moment the Valley; but in the end (or on another occasion) he was defeated and thrown back to Tirhut. The evidence of all the contemporary sources is against any of establishment of a lasting suzerainty, not to speak of sovereignty, in Nepal.

And yet these raids made their effects felt during the following centuries. First of all, they seem to have supplied some sort of foundation to the claims by Cālukya rulers of conquests and domination in Nepal. Some inscriptions of Someśvara I, much earlier than the rise of Nānyadeva, put forward these claims. They are repeated by Vikramādiṭiya VI and by Someśvara III (1126–1138). Even successors of the Cālukyas took them up. So did the Kalacuri Bijjala (1156–1168) and the Yādava Bhillama (1185–1191) and Śiṅghana (1200–1247); by then it had been reduced to a heraldic device with no contact with the political realities of the time \(^2\). Possibly Nānyadeva had maintained some kind of formal subordination to the Cālukya, and this supplied a kind of justification for the Cālukya boasts. Still, these claims remind us of the curious fact that the quite isolated name Someśvara (not normally used in Nepal) suddenly appears in the series of the Nepalese kings in the 12th century and seems to speak somehow an influence from the Deccan.

Another consequence made itself felt as late as the 17th century. When in 1354 the Karṇāṭa family of Tirhut gained the throne of

---

\(^1\) V², 32b–33a. The identity of the Doya with the inhabitants of Tirhut has been established once for all by Dh. Bajracharya, “Doyaharu ko hun?”, in Pūrṇimā, 4 (2021 VS), 20–31.

\(^2\) On the problem of the Cālukya claims of suzerainty over Nepal see Lévi, Le Népāl, II, 198–205, and H. C. Ray, Dynastic History of Northern India, I, Calcutta 1931, 203–204. Also S. L. Katare, The Cālukyas of Kalyāṇi and their political relations with the contemporary northern states, in Indian Culture, 4 (1937–38), 49, who, however, lays too much stress on the Shikarpur inscription n. 118 of 1054 A.D. (Epigraphia Carnatica, vol. VII, Bangalore 1902, p. 157), where the mention of Nepal is a mere piece of boasting.
Bhatgaon through the marriage of its last scion with the heiress of that principality, Nānyadeva was remembered as the founder of the dynasty. And thus the later chronicles, as well as the inscriptions of the Malla kings of the 17th century, turned this purely genealogical accident into a conquest and rule by Nānyadeva in the Valley, for which there is no historical foundation.

**Indradeva** (c. 1126–1136)

According to V1 and VK/VD, Śivadeva’s successor was Indradeva, who reigned for 12 years; he is unknown to the later chronicles. Six colophons of his are extant:


---

1) Published by Regmi, I, 167.
2) Published in *CPSMIIO*, II, 1506, n. 8062; cf. p. 831, n. 6414.
3) Published by Regmi, I, 167.
5) Published by *RS*, XXIII, 43. Checked on a hand-copy made by Professor G. Tucci in 1939.
6) Published by Regmi, I, 167.
Ratnaguptena likhitam. The ms. was written by a monk native of Jumla, but almost certainly not in Jumla. The date corresponds to October 13th, 1135.

S. Lévi took Indradeva to be the same person as Mahendradeva (Mahā-Indradeva). But the evidence against the identification is overwhelming. V1 lists in immediate succession jaurāja Mahendradeva and his tank, and king Indradeva with his regnal years, as two different persons. V2 knows of Mahendradeva only as the heir apparent and not as ruler, and we fail to see how it could give full biographical data for him without mentioning the all-important fact that he was king. Also, Indradeva certainly ceased to reign much earlier than NS 264, the date of the death of Mahendradeva. Therefore, Sīhadeva's son Mahendradeva did not reign, and Indradeva was an usurper from another family. We can place his reign in NS 246-256, i.e. in 1126-1136 A.D.

Indradeva was supported by the Jīva chieftains of Udayāpura, who seem therefore to have switched their allegiance to another dynasty, abandoning the descendants of Simhadeva; and the latter indeed did not reign for the next twenty years. The position of Paiśānanda Jīva, in any case, is not so exalted as that of Piṣu Jīva eight years before; Doc. 1 is dated in his time (kāle) and not in his reign (vijayārājye). And after this we hear nothing further about the Jīva chiefs.

Mānadeva (c. 1136–1140)

The next king was Mānadeva, who reigned 4 years and 7 months according to V1 and VK/VD and 10 years according to the later vamśāvalis. Three documents of his reign are extant:


2) additional note to the Astasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā ms. of NS 135, mentioned above (see p. 36). It contains the following data 2): Samvatsare gatavati dvitiye sātasya pāñcāsatā parigate navamāṇicitena śrī- Kaśṭikāriṣuvarcapiṇam bhi śrī-Mānadeva-nṛpatirvijaye ca rājye || The date is verified for Monday, October 10th, 1138.

1) Published by RS, XXIII, 29.
2) Published in CBMC, p. 152.

Mānadeva’s relationship with earlier and later rulers is unknown, but probably he belonged to the line of Indradeva. V1 and VK have nothing to say about him. The later vamsāvalis maintain that he abdicated in favour of his eldest son and retired to the Cakravihāra (Caka Baha-bahi in Patan). We may place his reign in c. NS 256-260, i.e. 1136-1140 A.D.

Narendradeva (1140-1147).

Mānadeva’s successor was Narendradeva, called Narasimhadeva by the later chronicles. His position in the genealogy of the dynasty is unknown. Eight colophons of his reign are extant:


3) Ms. Mitapadapājikā, National Archives, III.366.4. Colophon 4): Samvat 200-60-1 Caitra-krṣṇāśtaṃyaṃ-aṅgāradine śrī-Narendradeva-vijayarājye | Dakṣinavaihārika-bhikṣūrācārya-Svārṇabhadrena svāpārāthṛyāya likhitum-iti | The Dakṣinavaihāra is the southern section of Patan. The date is verified for Tuesday, April Ist, 1141.


1) Published with facsimile by Bendall, Journey, 81, n. VI.
2) Published with some mistakes in CPMDN, I, 62.
3) Published by J. Filliozat, Catalogue du fonds sanscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale, I, Paris 1941, 60.
4) Published in CPMDN, I, 62, with the wrong date of 271.
5) Published by Regmi, I, 172.
6) Published by RS, XXIII, 39, where the second digit of the date is printed as cū (= 70; but 273 is impossible) and the false equivalent 253 is given.


The first of these colophons is not only earlier that all the documents of Mānadeva; it is even earlier than the last colophon of Indradeva. The explanation is found in the wording of the colophon itself. The title (“Narendradeva, head of kings, in a position similar to that of a king of kings”) seems to designate a governor with full powers, governing Bhatgaon on behalf of another ruler, probably Indradeva. As far as we know, this the first appearance of an autonomous administration of Bhatgaon.

Henceforward, when the royal authority is weakened and the unity of Nepal crumbles, it is always Bhatgaon which leads the movement of secession.

VK/VD gives to Narendradeva 6 years and 4 months, V1 6 years and 5 months, the later vamsāvalis 22 years. Since his successor ascended the throne in Māgha 267, this would place the accession of Narendradeva at the end of 260 NS, i.e. in the autumn of 1140 A.D. Summing up: Narendradeva governed Bhatgaon since at least

---

1) Published by Regmi, I, 172.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 172.
1133 and in the period 260–267 NS (1140–1147 A.D.) he ruled the whole country as king. Nothing else is known about him.

Ānandadeva (1147–1167).

Narendradeva was succeeded by Ānandadeva. This is the name given by V1, V2 and the colophons; VK/VD and the later vaṃśāvalīs call him Nandadeva.

No less than twenty-four documents of his reign are extant:


2) Ms. Aṣṭasāhasrikā–Prajanāpāramitā, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, n. 4203. Colophon 2): Ṛg-ṛtu–bhujanga–yuksa vātsare Pausamāseśaśakrikāraṇavāre paurnamāsāyaṃ npendre bhuvanasvati–samastāṃ śrimad–Ānandadeve nikhiṣa–sagatamātuh kārītasyāḥ prayātiṣṭhā || The year must be read (against the rule) from left to right and is 268. The date is irregular; it corresponds to January 7th, 1148, which day however was not a Monday, but a Wednesday.

3) Ms. Aṣṭasāhasrikā–Prajanāpāramitā, National Archives, V. 3. Colophon 3): Samvat 200–70 dvīr–Āśāḍha–kṛṣṇaśaṅkadaśāyāṃ śrī–Ānandadevasya vijayarājye. Āsāḍha was intercalary according to all systems and the date corresponds to July 22nd, 1150.


7) Ms. Pañcarakṣā (final leaf only), Cambridge University Library, Or. 130. Colophon 7):

1) First published 1958.
2) Published in CSMASB, I, 3–4, no. 3.
3) Published by Regmi, I, 177.
5) Published by RS, XXI, 27; also Dharmakiri’s Vādanyāya, ed. by Rahula Sanākṣayana (Appendix to JBORS, XXI and XXII), 143.
Samvat 200-70-5 Caitra-krṣṇa-paṇḍamaṁ brhaspati-dīne | śrīmad-R.-P.-Pb.-śri Ānandadevasya vijayarāje likhitam varamahāyāināḥ śrī-Łalitabrumāyāṁ śrī-Hnogala-ˈdhivāsina || Hnogal Tol is the same as the Nogalsthāna of Doc. 18 of Jaya-
dharmamalla, in the Sundhara ward in Patan. The date is verified for the second 
half of Thursday, March 24th, 1155.

8) Ms. Cāndrayākaṇa, National Archives, III.679. Colophon 1): Samvat 276 pratha-
mapauṣa-krṣṇa-dīva caturthyim I Srimad-R.-P.-Pb.-hi Anandadrvasya 
vijayarije likhitam-idam pustakam || There was no Mīna sankrānti in Phālguna, and this causes an intercalary Pauṣa. 
The date corresponds to December 14th, 1155.

Samvat 200-70-8 Bhāḍrapada-māse | śrīmācchri-Nepālābhhyantare | śrī-Bhaktapure | śrī-Ānandadevasya rājye | Bhaṭṭa-paṇḍitācārya-śrī-Udayasomasarmākhāyāsa sarva-
sattvopakāra-kāmasyedam prāyaścittasamuccaya-pustakam kulaputra-śrī-Rājapālaśīk, likhitam-iti || Written at Bhatgaon. The date corresponds to August-September 1158.

Kārttika-māse | śrī-Ānandadevasya rājye | śrī-Nepalamandale antare śrī-Bhaktapu-
rādhivāsino etc. Written at Bhatgaon. The date corresponds to October-November 1158.

11) Ms. Pratisthātantra, National Archives, I.84. Colophon 4): Samvat 200-70-9 Kārt-
tika-ṣukla-aṣṭamaṁ śukradine R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Ānandadeva-ṃrpatau likhitam. The 
date is verified for Friday, October 31st, 1158.

Pauṣa-krṣṇa-caturdaśaṁ śrī-Kvapvarpaṁruśi~i Śrī-Canagalaśūlaka śrī Ānandadeva-
sya rājye. Written at Bhatgaon. The date corresponds to January 9th, 1160.

14) Inscription on the outer wall of Batuka Bhairava in Tundi Khel, Patan 7). Dated: 
Samvacakrayuge yāte candra-va[su] 8)-samanvite | Vaiśākha-ṣukle Rohinyām tṛśīyāṁ 
guror dine || rājye śrī-Ānandadevasya etc. The date, if correctly read, is verified for 
Thursday, March 30th, 1161.

15) Ms. Saptāṣati, National Archives, III.360.2. Colophon 9): Samvat 282 Phālguna-
ṣukla-caturthīṁ somavare | śrīman-M.-P.-Pb.-śrī-Ānandadeva-vijayarāje likhitam || 
The date is verified for Monday, February 19th, 1162.

obtained by Dr. Gimlette", in JRAS, 1888, 551, n. 111. Cf. Bendall, History, 23.
4) Published by Regmi, I, 177.
5) First published 1958.
6) Published by Regmi, I, 177.
7) Published in AS, 2 (2018 VS), 15, and re-edited with some omissions by Regmi, 
III, 6.
8) This damaged aksara was restorad as hni both in AS and by Debiprasad Bhandari, in Pūrṇimā, 1 (2021 VS), 8n; but this is impossible for chronological reasons.
9) Published in CPMDN, II, 19.
16) Copper-plate inscription in private possession in Nepal

   Dated: Samvat 200-80-2 Mārgaśira-ṣukla-pūrṇamasyāṃ Rohiṇyaṅgāra-dine || R.-P.-Pb.-sīrī-Nepalādhipati-

   śrīmadĀnandadevasya vijayarājye | sīrī-Panumga-विशायधिपति-महासामान्ता-śrīmadRa-

   ḥasyadivasya pravartamānākāle.......

   sīrī-Jhomṭeśvara-bhāṭārakasya chattake. Since in 1100 the temple of Jhomṭeśvara was included in the Maṃgvara vīṣaya, the Panumга vīṣaya was either synonimous or contiguous with Maṃgvara, and therefore it was situated in the Magar country. The date can be verified only if the year is taken (exceptionally) as a current one; it is Tuesday, November 15th, 1160.

17) Pillar inscription on the gate of the Tilamādhava temple in Taumadhi Tol, Bhat-

   gaon. Written in verse during the reign of Anandadeva, who is given a long string of poetical titles, and dated samdiatadvaye pripte vahni-samciyute kṛṣṇi-

   $\text{V} \text{sm}$ ydm

   kṛtd Jyesthe praiaste somavcisare. The date is verified for Monday 27th, 1163.

18) Ms. Aṣṭāsahasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā, National Archives, III.713. Colophon 4): Śrī-

   M.-P.-Pb.-śrīmad-Ānandadevasya vijayarājye | samvat 200-80-4 Māgha-ṣukla-divā

   'śṭamayām ādítya-dine likhita-samāpti-krta-iti || There was no Vṛṣabha sāṅkrānti in Vaisākha, and this causes an intercalary Pousa. Therefore, the Māgha of this colophon corresponds to Phalgunī in the Sūrya Siddhānta, and the date is verified for Sunday, February 2nd, 1164.


   sīrī-Gandigulmālaye buddhopāsaka-saṃjñānanānanilaye laksyālaye dharminā etc. Written at Gandigulma, on which see above pp. 33 and 50. The date is verified for Friday, February 19th, 1165.


   vīhārāhivāsina-sākyabhikṣu-Mañjuśreyeneti || sīrī-Phānapinga 7)-vishāyādhivāsina Vu-

   daubhravāi-nāmachevasya etc. Mambukrayām is of course misspelt for Yambukra-

   msyam, then the usual name for Kathmandu North. The Dharmacakra-vihāra seems to be the modern Yoikh Baha. Phānapiṅga is Pharping. The date is verified for Sunday, July 18th, 1165.

21) Ms. Aṣṭāsahasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā, National Archives, III.803.23. Colophon 8): Sam-

   1) Published by M. R. Pant and A. D. Sharma, The two earliest copper-plate inscriptions from Nepal, 26–31.


   4) Partly published by Bendall, History, 23.


   6) Published in CMBC, 182.

   7) CBMC has wrongly: Dhānapinga.

The date corresponds to February 9th, 1166.

The date is irregular; the tīthi ended on February 12th, 1166, which was, however, a Saturday and not a Sunday.


23) Ms. Kurukullākalpa, Cambridge University Library Add. 1691.2. Colophon 3): Samvat 2 × × Kārttika–sukla–pañcamyāṁ śānīścoradine śryĀ[anandadevasya] pravardhamāṇa–vijayarājye likhitam–iti || The last two figures for the years are now lost; but the original owner, Dr. Wright, read them as 299. This is doubly impossible, because the date cannot be verified for that year and because it falls outside the limits of the reign of Ānandadeva (the restoration of the royal name is certain). The date may be verified for any of the following years: 270, 273, 277, 280, 287 NS, and may therefore correspond to Saturday, October 8th, 1149; October 4th, 1152; October 20th, 1156; October 17th, 1159; November 5th, 1166.

Ānandadeva was born in 219 Vāsiśkha kṛṣṇa 5th, Uttarāśaṅga nakṣatra, as the son of Sihadeva (i.e. Sīmhaḍeva)4). There was no Vṛṣabha sanskrānti in Vāsiśkha, and this gives an intercalary Pauṣa. This Vāsiśkha corresponds therefore to nīja–Vāsiśkha of the Sūrya Siddhānta, and the date is verified for May 11th, 1099. Ānandadeva lived for 68 years, i.e. till 1167.

The accession of Ānandadeva meant the triumph of the claims of the family of Sīmhaḍeva, which had been ousted from the throne 20 years before. Sīmhaḍeva’s rightful heir Mahendradeva never reigned. His rights were inherited by the eldest of his three brothers (or rather: half-brothers). It seems that Ānandadeva’s position during the reign of Narendradeva was comparatively secure and that he occupied a respected place at court. This is implied by the text of a long inscription on a stele preserved in the Nepal Museum, Kathmandu 5).

It is a praśasti on the spiritual activity of some Śaiva masters of the


2) Published by Regmi, I, 178.

3) Published in CBMC, 179.

4) V2, 31b.

5) Published by Regmi, III, 13–16.
Śaṅkara school who had migrated from South India to Nepal and had settled at Paśupatī Nath. Relevant for our purpose are ll. 25–28:

assyam śri-Raghuvamsšaṃuktikāmaṇi .... nandana sāmdra-sāmdra huvāṅvitorī madhurarājānandadevāḥ karaḥ | uccaiḥ saktidharah kumārapadavi prāpto 'pi tair diksiṭo .... riyaṃmahimā prāya .... tmeśvarin | śive dārjunasapah prekṣa .... gunītesu guṇapriyāh | bhaktimaranadam va .... śvīva | Vasantadevo vijñānīdhīmān Someśvaras-tathā | Yaśomallaś-ca tair-eva kumāra dīksiṭā ami.

On l.40 a fragment of the date seems to be preserved: haste śād dvi, i.e. 262 (1142 A.D.).

This means that Ānandadeva and yuvarāja Mahendradeva’s two sons Vasantadeva and Someśvaradeva were initiated by the Śaṅkara teachers; all of them are given the title of princes (kumāra). As this happened under the reign of Narendradeva (although the name of the king does not appear in the undamaged portions of the inscription), it stands to reason that they enjoyed an exalted status; we may suppose that the accession of Ānandadeva some years later took place peacefully.

Incidentally, the modern chronicles have preserved a tradition to the effect that Śaṅkara had come to Nepal to suppress the impious practices of the Buddhist monks and to convert them by force to Hinduism; the event is placed in the hoariest times, under king Vṛkṣadeva who is supposed to have lived in the pre–Licchavi period 1). The Śaṅkara of this tradition is said to have been the last of seven incarnation of masters bearing this name. If we take is to mean that he actually was the seventh successor of the historical Śaṅkara (788–820), we could even hazard the supposition that one of the Śaṅkarācārya of Śrīṅgerī Māth in Mysore, the main seat of the Śaṅkara school, paid a visit to Nepal. But the tradition is too late and devoid of authority to support such a hypothesis.

That the coronation of Ānandadeva meant something special, the beginning of a new regime, is hinted at by the old chronicle: “On the first day of the dark half of Māgha in the year 267 (i.e. January 19th, 1147), on a lucky day, the supreme kingship was obtained. In all the territory of Nepal, the guardian of the earth, he who opposes

the destruction of the subjects and who is perfectly virtuous according to the śāstras and the tantras (i.e. the law–books) the lord (prabhu) Śri Nandadeva. King Ānandadeva, 20 years” 1).

Still, not everything was plain sailing during the first years of his rule. It appears that he did not fully control his feudatories, some of whom chose to ignore his sovereign rights. This is what appears from the following document:

Ms. Kubjikāmata, National Archives, n. ?? Colophon 2): Samvat 200–70 Śrāvaṇa-krṣṇa–daśāmyam śukradine śri–Pannagaviśayādhipati śri–mahāśāmanta–Hamsadevasya vijayarājye Yupaṭolakādhīvāsi śiro śri–kulaputrasya Phulana Nāyakasya dharmārthena likhitam. The date is verified for the last hours of Friday, August 18th, 1150. Pannaga is clearly identical with the Panumga–viṣaya of Doc. 16 3) and Haṃsadeva was apparently the predecessor of Rahasyadeva of that inscription.

The term vijayarājye indicates independent rule, at least locally in that out–of–the–way district. However, this case remains isolated, and soon the king re–asserted his paramountcy over the whole country.

Ānandadeva, who ascended the throne in 267 and died in 287, is said to have reigned for 20 years according to VK/VD and V1 (31 years according to the later vamsāvalīs). This number agrees perfectly with the dates of the colophons, which range from 267 to 286. And thus it is certain that Ānandadeva reigned from Māgha 267 to 287, i.e. from January 1147 to 1167.

The old chronicles credit this king with the foundation of the temple and of two god images in the Śivagal To1 at Bhatgaon. Even more important, he laid the foundations of the Bhatgaon royal palace 4). In the early chronicles this building is usually called Tipura, a name apparently connected with the goddess Tripurasundari, whose temple in the Tibukche Tol is now considered as the religious centre of the town 5). According to a recent theory, the first Tipura palace was

1) V1, 24b–25a. Practically the same text in VK.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 178.
4) V1, 25a; VK, 6.
5) B. Kölver, “A ritual map from Nepal”, in Folia Rara (Festschrift Wolfgang Voigt), Wiesbaden 1976, 69 and 78–79; A. W. Macdonald and A. Vergati Stahl, Newar Art, Warminster 1979, 83. On the goddess Tripurasundari see G. Tucci, “Note indolo-
situated in Tacapol Tol, in the eastern portion of the town, until Jayayakṣamalla built the present palace in Taumadhi Tol. 1) This is possible, but no actual proof has been brought forward up to now. Henceforward Bhatgaon became a secondary residence of the kings, although the capital remained at Patan for many years to come.

The chronicles also say that the king built the golden praṇālī (water place) near the palace (rājakula; of Bhatgaon?), and that he allowed freedom of buying and selling real estates to the great feudalities (mahāmaṇḍalika), the great officers (mahāpātra), the chiefs (pra-mukha), all the subjects etc. of Nepal, with their sons and grandsons etc.

Ānandadeva, accepted with such great expectations by his subjects, had indeed a long, peaceful and prosperous reign. It was, however, only an interval of respite in an age of turmoil and of disunity. The crown remained in his family, but the glory of the “Thākurīs” vanished and flickered out after him. Kings followed each other on the throne in rapid succession, and soon civil war broke out and ushered in a long period of strife, which ended only with the downfall of the old dynasty and the rise of the Mallas.

Rudradeva (1167–1175).

Ānandadeva was not succeeded by one of his sons (Vasantadeva and Someśvaradeva), but by his younger brother Rudradeva. Eleven documents of his reign are known:


2) Published in AS, 2 (2018 VS), 12; re-edited in Regmi, III, 7.

dhivāsina etc. Written at Kathmandu North. The date is verified for Wednesday, December 11th, 1168.


9) Ms. Dharmasamuccaya, National Archives, V.153. Colophon 7): Samvat 293 Vaiśā-kha—krṣṇa—caturthāyām rājīnāḥ śrimad-Rudradevasya vijayarājye | svaparārthahetoh śri—macCitiravīhravasthitā—bhiṣku Ajitaśriyānena svayam—eva lekša Dharmasamuccaya-pustakam-īdām—iti. As shown by Doc. 12 of Jayirjunadeva, the Citravīhāra was in Patan. The date corresponds to May 3rd, 1173.

10) Ms. Pingalāmata, National Archives, III.376.A. Colophon 8): Samvat 200-90-4 Cai-tra—śukla—pūrṇimāṣāyām somadine Uttarāhalpaṇa-nakṣatre | śri—P.—Pb.—M.—śrimad-Rudradevasya vijayarājye. The date is completely irregular; the full moon of Cai tra ended on March 20th, 1174, the Uttarāhalpaṇa—nakṣatra ended on March 17th, and Monday was on the 19th.

According to VK/VD the coronation (puṣyābhīṣeka) of Rudradeva took place in 267 Pauṣa krṣṇa 13, śukra. The date is impossible, as it is too early. So 267 must be a mistake for 287 and the date is verified for Friday, January 20th, 1167. The chronicle remarks that during the ceremony there was cold and rain.

The word puṣyābhīṣeka, of fairly frequent occurrence during the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries, refers to an old custom, according to which the coronation of a king designated as such by his predecessor should be performed in a period dominated by the Puṣya nakṣaṭra. Later it became independent of any fixed period; it was, however, understood that the ceremony was to be carried out one year after the death of the predecessor. Apparently not even this second limitation was observed in Nepal. Moreover, puṣyābhīṣeka is often confused, both graphically and semantically, with the similar term puspābhīṣeka, used with the same meaning 1). In medieval Nepal the word assumed a somewhat technical connotation; it has been rightly remarked that it is pointedly used in VBd when the new ruler was not the son of the deceased 2). This characterizes the rule of succession followed during this period, which will be discussed later (see Chapter VIII, B).

Rudradeva was born as the son of Sihadeva (and therefore brother of Ānandadeva) in 228 Phālguna śukla 13, Revaṭi nakṣaṭra 3). The date is irregular; the tithi ended on February 26th, 1108, while the nakṣaṭra ended on the 16th. The same text also says that Rudradeva lived 67 years, which would place his death in 295. V1 and VD allow him 8 years and 1 month of reign, VK 80 years (a peculiar mistake!) and 1 month, VW 7 years and VV 19 years. The figures of the early chronicles agree with the dates of birth, accession and death, as well as with the dates in the colophons. We may thus be certain that Rudradeva reigned 287–295 NS, i.e. 1167–1175 A.D.

3) V2, 31b, The text is nearly illegible.
The older chronicles have nothing to say about Rudradeva. According to the modern vamśāvalīs he entrusted the government to his son, became a Buddhist monk and dedicated himself to “acquiring a knowledge of the elements”\(^1\). This may or may not be historically true; but in any case it must be remarked that Rudradeva was not succeeded by his son Viśākhadeva (b. 1156 d. 1182) \(^2\).

The king had ascended the throne at an advanced age. There is nothing to show that his accession was contested or that his rule was troubled, and thus we may suppose that his was a comparatively peaceful reign.

Amṛtadeva (1175–1178)

Six documents belong to the reign of the next king Amṛtadeva (Mitradeva for the later chronicles):

1) Ms. Kulālikāmnīya, Kaisher Library, n. 33. Colophon \(^3\): Samvat 200–90 Māgha-śukla-dvitiyāyām rvaidīne, R.–P.–śrī–Amṛtadevasya vijayarājiye. The date, although perfectly legible and clear, seems to be wrong; it is too early and cannot be verified. It appears that the scribe has inadvertently left out the last digit. The only day in the years after 295 NS for which this date be verified is 298 Magha śukla 2, i.e., Sunday, January 22nd, 1178.

2) Inscription at Khauma Tol, Bhatgaon; coming from Mṛgasthali \(^4\). Dated Samvat 200–90–5 Vaiśākha-śukla-trtiyāyām R.–śrī Amṛtadevasya vijayarājiye. The date corresponds to April 15th, 1175.


5) Inscription on a Ganeśa image at Changu Narayan \(^7\). Dated rtu–graha–samayukte samvatsara–satadvaye (= 296) Jyeṣṭhamāsāsitāstamyāṁ rājye śrī Amṛtabhūpateh | bhṝ

\(^1\) Wright, p. 162.
\(^2\) For these dates see V\(^2\), 32a.
\(^3\) First published 1958.
\(^4\) Published by Yogi Naraharinath in Itihās Prakāś, II, 3, Kathmandu 1956, 542-543, with the wrong date of 285. It was corrected by Bholanath Paudel in Pūrṇimā, 3 (2021 VS), 28–29. Re-edited by Regmi, III, 9.
\(^6\) First published 1958.
\(^7\) Published in AS, 2 (2018 VS), 13. Re-edited by Regmi, III, 9, and in Bhaktapur šilalekh šuci, 5.
turVijayadevasya svargga-samprâpti hetave | śrî-Viśåkhâdevena jananyâ Madhuka-
śriyah etc. Dedicated by the widow of Rudradeva and by her son Viśåkhadeva as
a propitiation to the soul of her other son Vijayadeva, deceased. The date corre-
sponds to May 17th, 1176.

6) Ms. Pañcaraksâ, Jyeṣṭhavârṇa Mahâvihâra, Caka Bahal Tol, Patan. Colophon 1)
Aṣṭâdhikâranavatî-satadvaya-samvatsare mäse Mâgha-pûrûmamasyâm śaniścara-dine R.-
P.-kulatilak.Âmrâtadevasya vijayarâjye | śrî-Kâśthamaṇḍapa-dakṣîna-ḵholakâdhivâsîna
Râsapâlasya pustako 'yam. Copied at Kathmandu. The date is verified for Satur-
day, February 4th, 1178.

Âmrâtadeva was born as the son of Sihadeva in 133 Āśvini śukla 3, Viśåka nakṣatra; the date is verified for September 25th, 1113. He lived 66 years and died in Bhâdrapada krṣṇa 9. This would place his death in August 27th–28th, 1179. According to V1 and VK/VD he reigned for 3 years and 11 months. The later chronicles give him 21 years. He should have reigned NS 295–299; but actually he ab-
dicated or was deposed, because his death happened ten months
after the coronation of his successor. Thus his rule lasted from 1175
to 1178.

This was an unlucky reign. The old chronicle registers a dis-
aastrous famine during the rule of Âmrâtadeva; the price of grain rose
high and food became very scarce. With him the old kingdom began
to break apart.

Someśvaradeva (1178–1183/5)

The next king was Someśvaradeva, a name which at once points
to a connection with the Câlukyas of the Deccan. As already remar-
ked above (p. 56), the last Câlukyas and their successors boasted of
conquests in, or suzerainty over, Nepal. Nothing of the sort can
have any basis in reality, but the fact remains that there was some
amount of religious, it not political, influence from the South, and
that the close association of Southern Brahmans with Nepalese shrines
dates probably from this time.

We have three colophons of Someśvaradeva:

1) Ms. Prâyaścitopadesâ, Kaiser Library n. 522. Colophon 2): Samvatsare navâdhi-
kanavatî-satadsaye mäsa-Mârggaśira-śukla-ṣaṣṭame R.-P.-râghukulatilaka-śrî-Someś-
varadevasya vijayarâjê likhitam-ídâm. The date corresponds to November 14th,
1178.

1) Published by Sakya-Vaidya, 16.
2) First published 1958.
Someśvaradeva was a son of the yuvarāja Mahendradeva and was born in 242 Phalguna śukla 13, Magha nakṣatra; the date is verified for the last hours of February 20th, 1122. He lived 63 years, which would put his death at the beginning of 1185. According to VK/VD, his puṣyābhiseka was performed in 299 Kārttika kṛṣṇa 6, ṛgkravāra; the date is verified for the early hours of Friday, November 3rd, 1178, i.e. shortly before the date of his first colophon. V1 allows him 4 years and 3 months, and VK/VD 6 years and 3 months; the later chronicles ignore his name altogether. Apparently V1 refers to the period in which he exerted real authority, i.e. till 1183, while VK/VD extend his purely nominal reign down to his death early in 1185.

His accession had been in accordance with the prevailing law of succession by seniority; but with him the system broke down. Inspite of the increasing weakness of his rule, the king found the time and possibility to erect a beautiful wooden structure on the great temple of Yogha, a vihāra which was situated near the modern Kumbheshvar temple in Patan. He built also the noteworthy southern Vidya-pitha and a hospice nearby (V1, 25b).

The nominal reign of Someśvaradeva ended in utter chaos. No documents are extant for his last four years; and in this period we find a great nobleman, the mahāśāmanta Ratnadeva asserting a measure of independence. He is unknown to all the vamsāvalīs, and the only evidence of his existence and rule is given by two colophons:


1) First published 1958.
2) First published 1958.
3) V2, 32a. In 1958 I read the year as 239. But a careful inspection of the original ms. has convinced me that the correct reading is 242, as maintained by Dhanbajra Bajracharya.

We have met already with the family of the sāmantas of Dhavalaśrotī, who in 1100 had claimed independence for a short period. The attempt was repeated now. Of course there is no reason for assuming that this frontier sāmanda ruled over the Valley. But his bold assertion of independence throws a flash of light upon the real conditions of the country at the end of Someśvaradeva's nominal reign.

The mounting chaos is reflected in the chronicles. The modern ones jump straight over to the early Mallas. Of the two earlier ones, the text of VK seems to be in disorder. It first inserts here the foundation of the Mahendrasarovara tank by yuvāraja Mahendradeva in 239 NS. Then it gives the date of the coronation of Gunakāmadeva, without the regnal years. Lastly it mentions the name of Vijayakāmadeva, leaving a blank where the figures for the regnal years should be. VI merely gives the names and regnal years of these two kings. I shall try to unravel this jumble with the help of the colophons.

*Guṇakāmadeva* (1184–1187)

The coronation (read pūṣyābhīṣeka for puspābhīṣeka) of Guṇakāmadeva took place in 305 Pauṣa śūdi 7, anāgāra (VK/VD), when Someśvaradeva was possibly still alive. The date is verified for Tuesday, December 11th, 1184. According to VI he reigned for three years, and this span of time agrees with the dates of his five colophons:


kāmadevasya rājye likhitam. There was no Sinha saṅkrānti in Bhādrapada, and this caused an intercalary Āśādha. The date is verified for Sunday, June 2nd, 1185.


5) Ms. Aṭsāhāsarikā-Prajñāpāramitā, Woku Bahal, Patan. Colophon 3°: Śaradi triśate... dhigate dasami guru-vāsare yogavare prthupunyayayoḥ dhārtvati vāmakare | rājya-śrī-Guṇakāmadeva-jayino rājye etc. Only a portion of the date (300) can be read.

Guṇakāmadeva’s rule seems to have lasted from 1184 to 1187 or 1188. It is perhaps significant that only one of his colophons (Doc. 2) gives him the full royal style.

Lakṣmikāmadeva (c. 1192–1197) and Vijayakāmadeva (c. 1192–1200)

If we accept a rule of three years only for Guṇakāmadeva, we are groping in absolute obscurity for the four years following 1187. When the curtain rises again, we find ourselves confronted with two rulers fighting for the crown. To judge from the form of their names, they may have been the sons or at any rate relatives of Guṇakāmadeva.

One of them is Lakṣmikāmadeva, who is passed under silence by all the vāṃśāvalis, but is known from four colophons:

1°) Ms. Nāgānandanāṭaka, National Archives, III.363.7. Colophon 4°: Samvat 313 Kārtti-ka-kṛṣṇa adityavare | R.-P.-śrī-Lakṣmikāmadevasya vijayarājye... Then, in a later hand, Svasti śrī-Lalitaapātanātī etc. The date corresponds either to Sunday, October 25th, or to Sunday, November 1st, 1192. The mention of the place (Patan) cannot be relied upon.

2°) Ms. Piṅgalāmata, British Museum, Or. 2279. Colophon 5°: Samvat 313 dvirāṣṭha-pāṃnamāṣyāṁ | Sravana-nakṣatraṁ | bhṛhaspavāsare || Śrī-Nepālamanḍale R.-P.-śrī-ūrdhvaapatekhe śrimat-śrī-Lakṣmikāmadevasya vijayarājye śrī-Yambukramāyāṁ Mahā-
natollakādhivāsinah dvijavaryāḥ śrī-Ānando śramanasya Pingalamate āgama etc. Written in Kathmandu North. The Makhaṇa Tol has preserved its name to the present day (Makhaṃ Bahal). There was no Tūla sankrānti in Āsvini and this caused an intercalary Āśādha, which corresponds to Śrāvana in the Sūrya Siddhānta; the date is verified in all its elements for Thursday, July 15th, 1193.

3) Ms. Sarvalakṣaṇavivaranaṇaṅkikā, Kaisher Library, n. 27. Colophon 1): Samvat 300–10–5 × × × somadine Punarvasu–nakṣatre | R.–P.–Pb.–śrī–Lakṣmikāmadevasya vijayarājye | Month and tithi are not legible. But the coincidence of the Punarvasu nakṣatra with Monday is most complete in Caitra; less full is the coincidence in Vaiśākha, and there is also a very slight possibility for Phālguna. Thus the date corresponds most likely to Monday, March 20th, 1195.


Of course almost nothing can be said about this obscure ruler. The only certain thing is that for some time Kathmandu was included in his dominion, and that he reigned c. 1192–1197.

The other pretender was Vijayakāmadeva, of whose reign six documents are extant:


3) Ms. Saptabti, National Archives, III.96.2. Colophon 5): Samvat 316 prathamākādha–śuklaiṣādasyāṃ somavāre | rāje śrī–Vijayakāmadevasya | bhaṭṭa–śrī–Haricandraśarmanasya pungavīvṛddhitārtheṇa śrimadDevayāstava–daiṭajña–śrī–Ratnacandrenā likhitam || In that year there was no Simha sankrānti in Śrāvana, and therefore Āśādha was intercalated. The date is irregular; the tithi ended on June 8th, 1196, which day, however, was a Saturday and not a Monday.


5) Ms. Nityāhnikatilaka, National Archives, I.1320.9. Colophon 7): ŚrimadVijayakāma-

---

1) First published 1958.
2) First published 1958.
4) Published in CPMDN, II, p. 77.
5) First published 1958.
6) Published in CSBM, 230, n. 542.
7) Published in CPMDN, I, 113.
devasya rājye samvat 317 Vaiśākha pūrṇamāṣṭam etc. The date corresponds to May 3rd, 1197.

6) Stone inscription at Icaṅgu Nāvāyaṇ, in the hills at a short distance to the North-West of Kathmandu 1). It is dated ākāśa–nayana–dahane yā[te] (= 320) Nepālavatsare rājye Āśādha–site śvauri–divase rājñāh śrī–Vijayakāmadevasya. This corresponds either to Saturday, January 22nd, or to Saturday, January 29th, 1200.

Vijayakāmadeva is given 7 years by the old chronicle 2), 50 years and 7 months by VD; no figures are given by VK 3). Seven years is in any case too short a span of time, because the period covered by documents is of eight years. Nor can it refer to a period of sole rule, because Lakṣmīkāmadeva was still reigning in 1197 and because Arimalla was on the throne in the autumn of 1200. The figure is therefore wrong, but we have no means to tell the exact duration of this reign, of whose events nothing is known. The minimum period is from 1192 (or earlier) to 1200.

With the three Kāmadevas an epoch came to an end amidst utter anarchy and confusion. The civil war ushered in the rule of a new and more virile dynasty, which gave back to the country its unity and prosperity, at least for a period.

---


2) VI, f. 25b; wrong read as 17 by Bendall, History, p. 24.
3) The Kaisher ms. writes varṣa māsa, leaving blank spaces for the figures. Kirkpatrick, p. 264, too gives the regnal period as unknown, and this close concordance goes to show that the Kaisher ms. and the informant of Kirkpatrick got their information from the same defective ms., – unless, by a curious coincidence, Kirkpatrick’s source is the very Kaisher ms., which in his times was not yet mutilated as it is now.
We have no means of ascertaining the conditions in which power passed from the old dynasty to the Mallas.

The Mallas were not absolute newcomers on the scene of Nepalese history, or, for that matter, of Indian history. They are mentioned in the earliest Buddhist texts as a feudal confederation, whose territory was adjacent to that of the Licchavi. Their name occur in the Mahābhārata along with Kosala, in Varāhamihira, the Mārkan-deyapurāṇa, the list of the Yakṣas in the Mahāmāyūrī, the Mānava-dharmaśāstra. Their chief cities were Kusinārā and Pāvā in the Tarai. The Mallas in Nepalese history seem, however, to have had no direct connection with the Indian Mallas. The very earliest Nepalese inscription, the Caṅgu Nārāyan pillar of Mānadeva, mentions a campaign of that king against the Malla city to the west of Nepal. And this principality, nesting in the Western hills and thus different from the Mallas of the Tarai, continued to be a nuisance to the Licchavi and to the Thākuris after them, till far in the 7th century. An inscription of Śivadeva and one of Jiśnugupta allude to the "Malla tax" (mallakara) imposed on their subjects, either for defence or for tribute purposes. After the 7th century the Mallas lapsed into obscurity, although of course this might be merely a consequence of the lack of documents. We have no information at all on them for about five centuries.

At this point, it is better to pause in order to clear the ground

---


2) Gnoli, nn. XXX and LVI.
from some misconceptions. Lévi had collected three pieces of evidence which he thought could establish the existence of Malla princes in Nepal about 700–1200 A.D. 1). Fairly enough, he presented two of them as very doubtful. But I am afraid none of them has any historical basis, as we are going to see.

A. – The Buddhist vaṃśāvālī 2) relates the foundation of Cāmpapuri (modern Chapagaon) by Rāja Malla Deva and Kathya Malla of Patan in 111 NS Phālguna śukla 6 (February 23rd, 991). But the event is placed in the reign of Narasimhadeva, the second successor of Nānyadeva who ascended the throne of Mithilā in 1097. This chronological absurdity invalidates the evidence, which cannot be taken seriously.

B. – A ms. of the Devimāhātmya is said to be dated 118 NS, in the reign of one Dharma Malla. At least this is the reading given by the catalogue 3). I have checked the original ms. in the National Archives, I.1534.2, and the result is that the reading of H. P. Shastri, accepted by Lévi, must be discarded. The date is really 518 and the ruler is of course Jayadharma Malla; see p. 147.

C. – It has been known for a long time that Aśoka’s pillar at Niglihava in the Nepalese Tarai bears a graffito, which its first discoverer 4) read as Sri Tapu Malla jayastu Samvat 1234. Lévi took this to be Vikrama Samvat, and suggested that it the proved the existence of Malla princes in the Tarai about 1177 A.D. However, it is now agreed on every side that the graffito actually reads: śrī-Rapumallaś–cīraṁ jayatu 1234. The correct spelling of the name is Ripumalla. The record therefore refers to the Khasiyā kings of Western Nepal; the date is expressed in the Śaka era that was normally employed by those rulers, and corresponds to 1312 A.D. Another graffito found on the Aśoka pillar at Lumbini reads: Śrī–Ripumalla cirañ–jayatu Saṃgrā[na]malla mahārāja–jayah (?). Saṅgrāmamalla was the son and successor of Ripumalla. Thus these graffitoes have nothing to do with the early Mallas od Nepal. It should also be noted

2) Wright, p. 167.
3) CPMDN, I, p. 64.
4) P. C. Mukherjea, A report...on the antiquities in Tarai, Nepal, Calcutta 1901, p. 34.
that among the Khasiyā kings the ending Malla appears only in the last quarter of the 13th century, and is therefore later than the Mallas of the Nepal Valley.

The name Malla has been hitherto conventionally used for the kings who ruled the Valley from 1200 to 1768/9. I think, however, that the time has come to give up this convention, as the name is incorrectly employed to cover at least three different dynasties.

1. – The Early Malla dynasty founded by Arimalla in 1200. Their main branch ceased to reign with his grandson Jayadeva in 1258. The branches of Aganakamalla and Jagadanekamalla (perhaps one and the same person?), which ascended the throne in 1274 and 1271 (see Genealogical Table B), may have belonged to the same family, although the chronicles are silent on this point. They died out with Jayārimalla in 1344 and with Nāyakadevi in 1347 respectively.

2. – The Bhonta family of Jayabhīmadeva, which began to rule in 1258 and alternated on the throne with the secondary Malla branch till it became extinct with Jayārjunadeva in 1382.

3. – Jayasthitimalla and his issue. He became chief of Bhatgaon by his marriage with Nāyakadevi’s daughter Rājalladevi in 1354, and king of Patan after Jayārjunadeva’s death in 1382. His descendants ruled in Nepal till the Gorkha conquest in 1768–9. The ancestors of whom they boasted were not the paternal ones, i.e. the nearly unknown forefathers of Jayasthitimalla, but those on the maternal side, i.e. the Tirhut rulers from whom Rājalladevi’s father Jagatsimha was descended. They did not claim descent from the Early Malla rulers.

Accordingly, I shall deal with these dynasties in three separate chapters.

The ending Malla appears for the first time in medieval Nepal in 1111, when Naramalla repelled an attack of Nānyadeva of Tirhut (see p. 56). One generation later we find in 1142 one Yaśomalla, who obtained dikṣa from Śaiva teachers along with the royal princes Ānandadeva, Vasantadeva and Someśvaradeva (see p. 65); his son Anaṅgamalla, born in 1152, died in 1171 ¹). Other persons with the ending Malla appear slightly later. One of them was Jayāśimalla, whose son Arimalla founded the Early Malla dynasty.

¹) For these dates see V², 32b, and Doc. 6 of Rudrādeva.
Arimalla (1200–1216)

None of the vamsāvalīs supply information on the circumstances of Arimalla’s accession to the throne, and we are left in the dark whether he obtained it through conquest, election or relationship with the old ruling family on the distaff side. The date of the event can be established with a fair degree of certainty. Vijayakāmadeva’s last document is of January 1200 and Arimalla’s first colophon belongs to October of the same year (or even of the preceding year). Thus the new dynasty became established on the throne in 1200.

Fifteen documents of the times of Arimalla are extant:

1) Ms. Aṣṭasāhasrikā–Prajñāpāramitā, National Archives, V.181. Colophon 1): ...... śrī–Padmapāḥu–mahāvihāra–vāstavyah etc. | rājaḥo śrimadArimalla–vijayarājye | Samvat 321 Kārttika–ṣukla–daśamīyāṁ | saniṣcara–vāre | Pūrvvabhadra–naksatre | bodhau yena kṛtamānasā jinasutāstrabhu samāpta. The monastery seems to be the Padmocchārī–mahāvihāra (Newari: Guita Bahal), in Patan. The date cannot be verified. The tithi ended on October 19th, 1200, which day was a Thursday and not a Saturday, and the naksatra ended on the 20th. If the year be taken (exceptionally) as current, the date would be verified for October 30th, 1199.


4) Ms. Bṛhajjātaka, Kaisher Library, n. 40. Colophon 5): Samvat 322 Mārggaśira–krṣṇa–caturthiyāṁ śukradine Punarvasu–naksatre rājye śrimadArimalladevasya śubhalage likhanom samāptam–iti || The date is irregular; the 4th tithi and the Punarvasu naksatra ended an November 15th, 1201, which day however was a Thursday and not a Friday.


1) Published by Regmi, I, 207.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 207.
4) First published 1958.
5) First published 1958.
6) Published in CPMDN, I, 83.
6) Ms. Āṣṭāsāhasrikā–Prajñāpāramitā, Ñor monastery in Tibet. Colophon 1): Sikhi–netra–yute vahna (= 322) gate Nepalavatsare | rājye hy Arimonladevasya khyāte sukirtti–mālinaḥ | māse Dusthiti sitepaksye dašamyaṁ budhavāsare || The “unstable, bad” (dusthiti) month is Pausa, because no rites are performed in it 2). The date is verified for Wednesday, December 25th, 1202.

7) Ms. Kriyākāndakramāvali, National Archives, I.1361.15. Colophon 3): Yate 'bde tri–sate sa ca śaśāhite bhuyo vīmaṭya × Śrāvane māsi–tīthau śri Arimonladeva–nrpe × ×. The date corresponds either to July 18th or to August 3rd, 1206.

8) Ms. Āṣṭāsāhasrikā–Prajñāpāramitā, National Archives, III.682. Colophon 4): Saptaviyiati–saṅkhyaṇi samyucte 'bde śatatraye Aṣādhasya dine phūrne likhyate 'sau jina–prasūḥ | deyadharmo 'yam pravara–mahāyānayāyinaḥ paṇḍita–Kirtiśrīṇānasya yat punyam .... likhite 'yam bhagavatyaAṣṭasāhasri[ka] śri–RaghuvāṃsjajānmaRrimonladevasya vi–jayārājye. The date corresponds to July 10th, 1207; but something must be wrong here, because Aṣādha was intercalary in that year and the fact is not in dicated.


12) Ms. of a commentary of Harihara on the Malatimādhava, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, n. 4805. Colophon 8): śaṅvahnrirame (= 336) varse Pauṣa–suklesa (= 11)–vāsare bhṛguje vāṃṭe (= Śiva) yoge rājye Harimalladeviye. The date is verified for Friday, January 1st, 1216.


15) Ms. Amṛteśvarapūjā, National Archives, I.1365.5. Colophon 11): Svasti | ŚrīmanNepā-
It is curious to note the highflown and bombastic style of this Gujarati scribe (who also employs his native Vikrama Samvat) in contrast with the rather plain royal titles used by his Nepalese colleagues. The date is verified for Wednesday, June 8th, 1216.

Arimalla was born in 274 Mārgaśīra (pakṣa and tīthi cannot be read any more; November–December 1153), occupied the throne for 15 years and died at the age of 62 years and 10 months (V², 32b) which brings us to Āśvini 336 (September–October 1216); this must be correct, because the span of time covered by the colophons is of almost 16 years and because his last date is Jyeṣṭha 336 and the first of his successor is Jyeṣṭha 337. According to other texts, he reigned for 31 years and 9 months (VK/VD) or 25 years and 10 months (V¹, 25b). We may suppose that these higher figures refer to the period between his first laying claim to the crown and his death. This would place the beginning of his rise in 305 according to VK and in 311 according to V¹. There would be nothing surprising in this, keeping in view the state of turmoil betrayed by the contemporary rule of Lākṣmīkāmadeva and Vijayakāmadeva.

It is also noteworthy that our Doc. 2, written under the protection of rāṇaka Śrīdharasimha, apparently a powerful feudatory, gives to Arimalla the full royal titles; this looks as if Śrīdharasimha was the chief supporter of the new ruler in the struggle for the crown. But after this, we have to wait till 1209 (Doc. 9) before the full royal style appears again, to be consistently employed till the end of Arimalla's rule. This leads us to suppose that only after eight years or so did the new regime feel itself firmly established. Be it as it may, Arimalla reigned from 1200 to the autumn of 1216.

Nothing is known of his reign beyond a severe famine which desolated the kingdom (VK, V¹).
Arimalla's son and successor Abhayamalla seems to have ascended the throne without difficulty. He enjoyed a long rule, and 25 documents of his reign are extant:


5) Ms. Vajrāvalināmamāṇḍalopāyika (last leaf only), National Archives, III.803.12.7. Colophon 5): Śunyābdhi × 40 cāṅgadhātusāhite yatavatsare | Caitrāśiṃakalānīmaṇḍita-śāśiṇāśasasankhyā-tītthau bhūpāla 'bhayamalladeva-nrpate candrabhe 'vārayūte | The date seems to be Monday, March 9th, 1220.


king of the same name, who was born in NS 366. The date is verified for Thursday, November 9th, 1223.


17) Ms. Padmanābhāsangraha, National Archives, III.360.9. Colophon 9): Nayapaḷadeśiyābhiliṅgamāna samvat 366 Vaiśākha–śukla 3 ravau ramye dinottame...... rājā–śrī–Adbhayamalladevasya rājye Bhakta puryūṃ bhāro–śrī Amokasya etc. The date is irregular; the tithi ended on April 20th, 1246, which day was a Friday and not a Sunday.


1) First published 1958.
2) Published by Sakya–Vaidya, 20.
4) Published in AS, 2 (2018 VS), 14.
5) This colophon was kindly communicated to me by Purnaharsha Bajracharya.
6) Published in CPMDN, I, 69.
7) Published by Regmi, I, 217. It is a modern copy of the original.
9) Published in CPMDN, II, 19.
10) Published in CSMB, 227, no. 536.

20) Inscription on the base of an inset Aksobhya image on the eastern side of the Aśoka caitya in Guita Bahal, Patan 2). Dated Samvat 368 Māgha-krṣṇa-navamiyāṃ tithau samadine R.-P.-Pb.-Sri-Sri Abhuyamalladesya etc. The date is verified for Monday, January 20th, 1248.

21) Ms. Pan'caritramahālakṣmisamhitāvasudevakalpa, Kaisher Library, n. 420. Colophon 3): Samvat 372 Caitra-krṣṇa-dvādaśi somavāsare | śrīmat R.-P.-śrī-śrī Abhayamalladesya vijayarājye śrī-Śrīmāṅgala Yoghakośādhibhivai . . . . rasena likhitam. Written in the Yogha monastery at Patan. The date is irregular: the tithi ended on April 7th, 1252, which day was a Sunday and not a Monday.

22) Ms. Kriyāsāṅgrahapañjikā, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, B.23. Colophon 4): R.-P.-śrīmadAbhayamalladevasya vijayarājye likhana-sāmaṭṭikṛtam-iti | Samvat 373 Mārgaśira-śukla-dvitiyaśyaṃ śukla-vāsare Svātī-nakṣatre śrī-Nagallake vaisya-śrī-Divākara-varmaṃ-mahāvihāra-bhiksu-vajrācāryena Viramatina śvaḥastenā likhitam-iti || Written at Patan. The date is completely irregular. The tithi ended on November 5th 1252, which day, however, was a Tuesday and not a Friday; and the Svātī nakṣatra ended on November 2nd.

23) Ms. Ṭastasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā, Cambridge University Library, Add. 1465. Colophon 5): Samvat tri - hr - 4 Kārttiṅa-śukla-tritiyaśyaṃ adita-vāsare R.-P.-śrīmad-Abhayamalladevasya rājye likhitam-iti || The second figure of the years is expressed by a complicated sign; Bendall read it as 6, although he thought that 5 would also be possible (Regmi accepted the reading 5). A date 384 could be verified for Sunday, October 7th, 1264; but historically it is impossible, as Abhayamalla had died nine years before that. A date of 354 is historically possible, but cannot be verified: the tithi would end on October 7th, 1233, a Friday. Perhaps the second digit is really meant for 7; and then the date can be verified for Sunday, October 26th, 1253.


25) Ms. Vāsudevakalpa, National Archives, V.1963 (a modern copy). Colophon of the

1) Published in CPMDN, II, 59.
4) Published by Regmi, I, 217. A modern copy of this manuscript is found in the Leningrad Public Library; N. Mironov, Katalog indijskich rukopisej Rossijskoj Publīčnoj Biblioteki, I, Petrograd 1918, 270–271, no. 287.
5) Published in CBMC, 101–102.
6) First published 1958. CPMDN, I, p. 70, lists this work under the alternative title of Devimāhātmya; it gives the name and titles of the king, but not the date.
original: Samvat 375 Caitra-krṣṇa-dvādaśi somavāsare śrī-R.-P.-śrī-śrī Abhaya-malladevasya vijayarājye likhitam-idam. The date is verified for Monday, April 5th, 1255.

According to Ṿ2, Abhayamalla was born in 303, lived 72 years and 7 months and died after 39 years of reign in Āśāḍha sukla 8, evidently of 375 (Ṿ2, 32b and 35b); the date corresponds to June 13th, 1255. The other early chronicles give him 42 years and 6 months (Ṿ1, 25b) or 48 years and 2 months (VK/VD). VL gives him 19 years only. Since his colophons cover a period of 38 years (337-375), the exact dates must be those of Ṿ2; and Abhayamalla reigned from 336 to Āśāḍha 375, i.e. from 1216 to June 1255.

In his early years he seems to have been a studious young man, because, while still heir to the throne (yuva-rāja), he wrote a portion of the devotional work Amṛteśvarapūjā, which is still extant and has been listed above (see pp. 81-82) 2).

His reign seems to have been not without challenge at first, because of the following document:


Raṇaśūra is unknown from any other source and may have been a claimant to the throne of Nepal, unless we prefer to see in him one of the lesser Rajas of the Western hills.

But even after this episode, Nepal experienced serious trouble on her frontiers. On May 24th, 1244, the Doya invaded Nepal through the Khandādhāra forest, but were checked with heavy losses. The Doya army was led by king Rāmaśimha. Foremost among the Nepalese leaders was Jagatbrahma, the lord of Cochem (a ward in Bhatgaon); but the nominal commander-in-chief seems to have been Rāja Śrī Anarghamalladeva, who defeated the invaders and upon his return to the Valley was carried in triumph through the city to cele-

1) Published by Regmi, I, 217.
2) This manuscript has the following statement, preceding the colophon published above: Śrī-Devabhayamallena sadācāryopadesinā śrī-Mṛtyuḥjayadevasya nityapūjāvidhiḥ kṛtah || ity Amṛteśvarapūjānaṁ samāptaṁ.
3) Published in CSMB, p. 214 n. 512.
brate the victory\(^1\). On September 30th of the same year Amaru Mahātha issued from Palamchok to fight some unnamed invaders, routed them and came back in triumphant procession\(^2\). Possibly this second invasion too was launched by the Ṑoya. Rāja Anarghamalla was apparently a member of the royal family; but both he and Amaru Mahātha are otherwise unknown. Two years later (November 27th, 1245) the Ṑoya penetrated the Valley through Kapan and advanced as far as Bhoyothali (Bhumthali in the neighbourhood of Gokarna), where they were surrounded and a part of them was massacred; the remnant could escape\(^3\).

As already shown above (see p. 56), the Ṑoya were the people of Tirhut; Rāmasimha, king of Tirhut of the Karnāta dynasty, reigned c. 1205–1245 (see Appendix I). With him the Tirhutiya menace on the southern border revived, more than a century after the half-legendary beginnings with Nānyadeva.

Apart from the external danger, internal tensions were not lacking. On July 21st, 1242, Gundekvāth (Kirtipur) was attacked and stormed, and Kīrtipāla Bhāro of Kvāchem (a ward in Bhatgaon) was taken prisoner; but he was liberated already on July 30th\(^4\).

In the course of these petty squabbles a new man came to the fore; this was Jayasimalla or Jayasimhamalla. On November 10th, 1249, Anantamalla (perhaps the prince mentioned in Abhayamalla’s Doc. 8) expelled the wife and son of the Jo Bhāro (i.e. perhaps the yuvarāja Jayadeva) from the Yuthonimam palace (in Bhatgaon); on the same occasion (but apparently without connection) Jayasimhamalla took prisoner the Phu Bhāro of Bhonta (Banepa)\(^5\). On July 7th, 1250, a gang surrounded Yuthonimam aiming to loot it; it was chased away by Jayasimhamalla\(^6\).

Besides internal strife and foreign raids, Nepal was visited by natural calamities. There were several famines and epidemics of smallpox. A particularly severe famine happened on April 1232 and

\(^1\) 364, Jyeṣṭha krṣṇa pratipad; V\(^3\), 36b.
\(^2\) Āśvini krṣṇa 12; V\(^3\), 33b.
\(^3\) 366 Mārgaśīra śukla 7; V\(^3\), 38b.
\(^4\) 362 dvīr-Āṣāgha (= Śrāvaṇa according to the Sūrya Siddhānta) krṣṇa 8, and Śrāvaṇa (adhika–Bhadrapada according to the Sūrya Siddhanta) śukla pratipad; V\(^3\), 38b.
\(^5\) 370 Mārgaśīra śukla 4; V\(^3\), 38b.
\(^6\) 370 Śrāvaṇa śukla 7; V\(^3\), 39a.
the following months with an appalling loss of human life; the calamity lasted a whole year 1). Other outbreaks of famine and plague happened on January 2nd, 1242, and July 6th, 1244; as a consequence the people were greatly impoverished 2).

The chronicles register also serious earthquakes, a kind of disaster to which Nepal is often exposed. The worst tremor happened at the end of Abhayamalla’s rule, on Monday, June 7th, 1255. One third of the population perished; the king himself was fatally injured and died six days later, ending thus a long but not happy reign.

During this period Nepal was twice visited by C’ag Lotsawa C’os–rje–dpal (1197–1264), a Tibetan scholar who travelled to Magadha to visit the holy places of Buddhism and to study in the university of Nālandā, although it was already decayed and half-deserted on account of the Muslim raids. He first went to Nepal, where he stayed for eight full years, probably from 1226 to 1234 (but the chronology of his voyage is hypothetical and open to doubt). His biography supplies some interesting details on Buddhist religious life in the Valley; its main centre seems to have been Svayambhū Nāth, where Guru Ratnarakṣita was a scholar of high reputation. Also the Tham vihāra founded by Aṭiśa and called Dharmadhātu vihāra by the Indians, was still flourishing. The Tibetan traveller gives a graphic account of the Bugama Matsyendranāth procession, but supplies no information at all on political and social conditions in the Valley. Then he left for India, visited Bodh Gaya, Rājagṛha and Nālandā, and started on his way back, via Tirhut. His second stay in Nepal, where he arrived probably in 1241, was short. Some ’ba’–ro (Bhāro; noblemen) acted as his dānapatis and presented him with gold and food. In 1242 he finally departed for the Yañ–dog monastery in Tibet 3).

1) 352 Caitra; V3, 39b.
2) 362 Māgha kṛṣṇa 5, and 364 Āśāḍha kṛṣṇa amāvasya; V3, 38a–b.
Jayadeva (1255–1258)

Abhayamalla was succeeded by his son Jayadeva, of whose reign two documents are extant:

2) Ms. once the property of Bhagvanlal Indraj. The colophon 2) is said to be dated 377 Bhāḍrapada, corresponding to August–September 1257.

Jayadeva was born in 324 Kārtika krṣṇa 11 (= November 1st, 1203) as the son of Abhayamalla; he died at the age of 54 in Māgha śukla 5 (evidently of 378 NS; = January 11th, 1258) (V2, 34a–b). VK and VD allow him a reign of 2 years and 7 months, and V1, f. 25b, one of 2 years and 8 months, which is approximately exact. Thus Jayadeva reigned from Āṣāḍha śukla 8, 375, to Māgha śukla 5, 378, i.e. from June 7th, 1255, to January 11th, 1258.

This was an unfortunate reign, during which Nepal suffered repeatedly from earthquake and famine (V1, 25b). The modern chronicles (VL, VW, VBh) build up around him a story, in which Jayadeva appears together with a younger brother called Ānandamalla who reigned in Bhatgaon, Banepa, Panaoti, Nala, Dhulikhel etc., and is connected with events that happened respectively four and two centuries earlier. It may be a distorted recollection of prince Anantamalla and of his conflict with the yuvarāja in 1249.

This reign ushered in once more a gradual weakening of the monarchy, heralded in by the struggle between the two most powerful noblemen of the realm. One was Jayaśimalla, whom we have seen as active during the reign of Abhayamalla. Against him rose a rival called Jayabhīmadeva. They were based on two separate centres of power. Jayabhīmadeva was the lord of Bhonta, the region of Banepa to the east of the Valley. Jayaśihamalla was slowly building up an extensive fief around Bhatgaon. A late inscription calls his descendants the Tipura royal family (rājakula), this being the name of the royal palace in Bhatgaon; and for practical purposes we may accept this denomination.

The struggle between Bhonta and Tipura was enlivened by the

---

1) First published 1958.
2) Mentioned by Bendall, History, 8n and 25. This manuscript is no longer available.
fact that the royal family was dying out. Jayadeva had two sons, of whom the elder Yakṣamalla, born in 1238, died at 19, i.e. in 1257; the younger Jatakeśadeva, born in 1244 (V², 35a), is never mentioned again and probably died young. The contest for the succession was open.

On Tuesday, July 27th, 1255, soon after the tragic death of Abhayamalla, Jayaśimhamalla chased away the robber baron Praha Bhāro and his son, who were looting in the Valley ¹). On the other side, on January 16th, 1256, Jayabhīmadeva of Bhonta recovered Nipikvāth, which had been seized by a chief (pvaha) called Jayadeva (not identical with the king) ²). With a sudden return of energy, king Jayadeva, who hitherto had concerned himself mostly with rituals and religious festivals, tried to buttress his position by the establishment of several military posts. Inspite of this, on April 28th, 1256, Jayaśimalla was able to enter Bhatgaon ³), where he set up his residence. This date seems to mark the loss of direct control by the Nepalese monarchy over Bhatgaon; the masters of that town grew more and more autonomous, founding a principality which in 1381 was to unite the whole of the Valley under its sway.

On the night of July 31st, 1256, Jayabhīmadeva together with the Jurā Bhāro (the yuvarāja; possibly the prince Yakṣamalla above mentioned?) entered the state treasury, ejected the officials in charge and began to empty it systematically. On this occasion the two allies are designated as the leaders of one of the two struggling factions, the other centering upon the Bhatgaon family (Tipura rājakula) and the officials of Patan (Mānigal) ⁴). On September 24th there was a revolt at Bahar Kṛṣṭha and Jayabhīmadeva and the yuvarāja were expelled. Three days later Jayaśihamalla sacked Handigaon ⁵); no connection is apparent between the two events. On October 17th Jayaśihamalla entered Pīṃkvāth (the fortified Pīṃ Bahal in Patan), but Jayabhīmadeva and the yuvarāja recovered it at once ⁶).

¹) 375 Śrāvaṇa kṛṣṇa 7, maṅgala, Bhaṇaśi-nakṣatra; V¹, 38a.
²) 376 Māgha kṛṣṇa 3; V¹, 38a.
³) 376 Vaiśākha kṛṣṇa 2; V¹, 37a–b.
⁴) 376 Śrāvaṇa śukla 8; V¹, 37b.
⁵) 376 Āśvini śukla 4 and 7; V¹, 37a.
⁶) 376 Āśvini kṛṣṇa 12; V¹, 37a.
It seems that this inconclusive struggle abated and remained dormant during the last two years of Jayadeva. In this period we may perhaps insert a doubtful item of information concerning one "Jayantamalla, son of Jagatamalladeva, born on 374 Jyeṣṭha krṣṇa 4 (June 6th, 1254); he was yuvarāja; 5 years" (V3, 36a). It is not clear whether the span of five years refers to his yuvarāja-ship, to his life or both. This may have been either a last desperate attempt by Jayadeva to save the succession for a member of his family; or the child was a puppet under whose cover the struggle for the crown was waged.

To complete this tale of woe of a disastrous reign, a modern scholar places in 1258 the invasion of king Mukundasena of Palpa in the Valley 1). But as we are going to show later (see p. 210), this is an anticipation by about three centuries of an event which in any case is surrounded by the mist of legend.

1) Regmi, I, 239.
About two months after the demise of Jayadeva, on March 19th or 20th, 1258, rāja Jayabhīmadeva and yuvarāja Jayaśimalla were encamped in the region of Palamchok. It is not clear what happened there, as the text is very obscure 1). But the result seems to have been an agreement between the two contending parties to the effect that the Bhonta and Tripura families were to alternate on the throne, one of them by turn supplying the king and the other the yuvarāja. Whether this agreement was embodied in a formal act, is more than we can tell; the sources spend not a single word about it. But the existence of the pact seems to be assured, as it conditioned the whole dynastic history after 1258; it is a fact that the alternance was more or less regularly observed for about one century 2).

After 1258 there is a modification in our sources. If down to that date there is a tolerable concordance between VBd and VK and the later vamsāvalīs, from now on the divorce is complete. The two earlier works give a royal list which is clear enough and is supported in toto by the colophons and inscriptions. The modern chronicles ignore it altogether and substitute for it the list of the kings of Tirhut descended from Nānyadeva and then from Harisimha, who certainly did not reign in the valley or in any part of it. This is a deliberate falsification of history, promoted by the descendants of Jayasthitimalla, who wished to make out their direct ancestors to have been kings of Nepal; this official version appears already in the xvii century in an inscription of Pratāpa Malla and in the drama Mudita–

---

1) 378 Caitra śukla 13, Hasta naksātra, budha; V2, 36b. The date is irregular; naksātra and day of the week point to the 20th, while the tithi ended on the 19th.

2) The credit for this suggestion goes to Th. Manandhar, “Nepal in early medieval period: gleanings from the Bendall vamsāvalī”, in JNRC, 1 (1977), 84.
Kuvalayāśva. Down to the reign of Jayṣhitimalla we shall not have occasion to refer again to the modern vaṃśāvalīs.

Seven documents of Jayabhīmadeva have come down to us:

samvatsara-śatatraye | māsi Caitre 'site pakṣe pāñcamaṃ bhṛguvāsare || Mahāmatā-
cchilpiyūṣam śrīmal-Lakṣmimataṃ hitam | dhimataḥ Sankhyapālaśya punyajñānaviś-
dhaye | kāyasthodayaharṣeṇa hastena likhitam drutam | . . . . M.-P.-Paramaṁheśvara-
Ph.-śrimaj-Jayabhīmadeva-rāje || The date is verified for Friday, April 2nd, 1260.

2) Inscription on a fountain in Ikhapokhi at Pharping 2). Dated: *Samvat 381 Pauṣa-
āśukla-dīvā aṣṭamīṃḥ śrī-śrī-P.-paramaśri-śrī-Jayabhīmadevaya vijayārāje || śrī-Pha-
napinga-visayādhipati-mahāśamanta-śrī-Jaittarāmājivasya nāgarā etc. The date cor-
responds to December 11th, 1260.

Śrāvana-krṣṇa-ekādaśāṃ Pūṣya-nakṣatre Vaiṇīṇa-yoge somadine . . . . . || R.-P.-
śrīmad-rājā-Jayabhāmadevaya vijaya-rāje || In this year there was no Kanyā sa-
krānti in Bhādrapada, which gives an intercalary Āśādha. The month of Śrāvana-
from our colophon corresponds, therefore, to adhika-Bhādrapada in the Sūrya Siddhānta. On this basis, the date is verified for the last hours of Monday, August 22nd, 1261.

4) Ms. Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā, Tokyo University Library, n. 117. Colophon 4): *Samvat
385 Aśvin-badvi-trayodashāṃ R.-śrī-Jayabhīmadevaya vijaya-rāje. The date corre-
responds to October 8th, 1265.

5) Ms. Mahākharavirāyāga, National Archives, V.186. Colophon 5): Yaddā Nepāla-bhū-
piḷa-Jayabhūmī tīdhāvati | rasa-maṅgala-samuyukta-vahī (= 386) samvannadāpiyoh |
Kārttika-māse 'site pakṣe pāñcamaṃ gūra-vāsare | Kāyasthodayaharṣeṇa ha[ste]a
likhitam etc. The date is verified for the last hours of Thursday, October 15th, 1263.

6) Ms. Kriyāsaṅgrahaka, Kyoto University. Colophon 6): *Samvat 386 Kārttika-āśukla-pūr-
namasyāṃ R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jayabhīmadevaya vijayarāje likhitam | danapati Ḍhāpati
Amaracandrasya . . . . . The date corresponds to October 25th, 1265.

7) Ms. Pañcarakṣā, Tokyo University Library, n. 230. Colophon 7): *P.-Pb.-Paramasau-
gata-M.-śrī-Jayabhīmadevaya-pravardhhamāṇa-vijayarāje | *Samvat 390 Pauṣa-āśukla-
dvādaśāṃ āditya-vāsare yogānukūla likhitam. The date is verified for Sunday, Ja-
ruary 4th, 1270.

VK/VD does not mention Jayabhīmadeva at all. According to V1, 26a, he reigned for 13 years and 3 months, which seems quite

1) Published in *CPMDN*, I, 124.
2) Published by Regmi, III, 12–13.
4) Unpublished. The manuscript is listed in *CSMTUL*.
5) Published by Regmi, I, 227.
6) Unpublished. The manuscript is listed in K. Goshima and K. Noguchi, *A succin-
cent catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the possession of the Faculty of Letters, 
Kyoto University*, Kyoto 1983, 7, n. 25.
7) Unpublished. The manuscript is listed in *CSMTUL*. The colophon is followed by a second date (Thursday, May 1st, 1505), which is apparently that of the copying.
possible. He may thus have ruled from Māgha 378 to Caitra 391, i.e. from January 1258 to March–April 1271.

Very little is known of the events of his reign. On October 16th, 1258, Jayaśihamalla yuvarāja, loyally seconding his sovereign, stormed Yaukgatha in a night assault 1). After this event he is mentioned only once, in connection with the birth of a son of his in 1261 (V2, 36a). For the rest the years between 1258 and 1271 are utterly obscure to us.

**Jayaśihamalla (c. 1271–1274)**

In accordance with the pact of succession, the yuvarāja Jayaśihamalla ascended the throne. He was born on April 19th, 1229, as the son of one Jagatanekamalla 2), whose relationship (if any) with the royal family is unknown. His rule was short and he is ignored by all the chronicles, with the single exception of V1, 26a, which gives him the royal title and allows him a reign of 2 years and 7 months. There is a single colophon that may belong to his reign:

Ms. Khadgopājāvidhi, Cambridge University Library, Add. 1706.1. Colophon 3): Samvat 391 Āśvini × × [da]sāmmyām tithau anāgāra-dine likhitam–iti | R.–P.–śrī– × × × hamāladeva-kāritaṃ | Śvakve–vēhāra–śrī–bhikṣu–Devamanā likhitam || Śvakve is perhaps the same as Saka Vihāra, the Newari name of the Jayamanohara Vihāra in Patan, on which see p. 83. It seems evident that the name of the king must be restored as Jayaśihamalla, since it is the only royal name of this period containing the letter ha. The date has been wrongly restored by Bendall as 381; it can be read fairly clearly as 391. The date can be verified either for Tuesday 15th or (less completely) for Tuesday 29th September, 1271.

The wording of the colophon is odd. It does not contain the words “in the victorious reign” (vijayarājye), which is the usual formula, but merely alludes to a vihāra built by his order. However, he is given the full royal titles; and therefore we feel justified in placing this short reign in c. 391–394 (1271–1274 A.D.). Although brief, it must have been a fairly happy one; at least V1 seems much impressed by its memory: “He did not oppress the subjects and the land was happy”; the chronicle also mentions gifts to Paśupati and other gods.

1) 379 Kārttika krṣṇa 2; V2, 36a.
2) 349 Vaiśākha krṣṇa 9; V2, 35a.
3) Published in *CBMC*, 199, with some wrong readings.
Jayaśihamalla either abdicated or was deposed, but otherwise left unharmed, because we find his successor reigning in 1275, while Jayaśihamalla did not die until November 8th, 1287 1).

Anantamalla (c. 1274–1308)

After Jayaśihamalla, the throne was occupied by Anantamalla, belonging probably to another line of the family. His long reign is commemorated by twenty-four colophons (but no inscriptions):

1) Ms. Divyaśuddhiprakarana, National Archives, V.806. Colophon 2): Ḡuṇaṃ gatā satī mahā Caitra-śīrye pakṣe navamīyāṃ budha-vāśare | M.-P.-Pb.-śri-śrimadAnantamalladevasya vijayarāje | dvijavara-śri-dharmādhikārā-Jasabrahmasya pustakam. The date cannot be verified; the tiḥi ended on March 22nd, 1275, which day was a Friday and not a Wednesday.


4) Ms. Ekadaśimāhāmya, National Archives, I.1231.6. Colophon 5): Samva[r] 400 Phālguṇa-kṛṣṇa-ekāḍasyāṃ tithau soma-vāsare śri-Nēpladeśe śri-Paśupati-sthāne śri-Anantamallade[va]sya vijayarāje likhitam || Written at Paśupati Nāṭh. The date is irregular; the tiḥi ended at the beginning of February 26th, 1280, and the preceding day was a Tuesday and not a Monday.


6) Ms. Narapatiyācaryāsvarodaya, National Archives, I.1537.3. Colophon 7): Samvat-sare khaṅkha[ḥ]e (= 400) carabhāsa śītapakṣaṃ caturthīyāṃ bhṛguvāre sampārṇa-likhitam-idaṃ | śrimatPaśupatisthāne daksīṇasyādiśāsrita | Daivajñā-Jaitasihāna likhitam svātīmbhava | Samvat 400 Bhādrapada-suṅka-caturthīyāṃ sukravāsare śri-Paśupatisthāne | śrimadAnantamalladevasya vijayarāje śri-Rājamandalyāṃ daivajñāsyā etc. Written at Paśupati Nāṭh. The date is verified for Friday, August 30th, 1280.

7) Ms. Mahālakṣmivrata, National Archives, I.1320.13. Colophon 8): Samvat 401 Kārti-
ka-krṣṇa-saptamāyāṁtīthau bhṛhaspati-vāsare R.-śrimadAnantamalladāvasya vijarārāye | Pāṇgārāmnādhivāsino dvija-Śrīrotpatikasya pustakam. The place of writing and the owner of the manuscript are the same as in Doc. 2 and 3. The date is verified for November 14th, 1280.


12) Ms. Śatāsāhasrikā-Prajñāprāmātimā (vol. IV), Sa-skya monastery in Tibet. Colophon 5): Samvat 403 prathamāśadhā-śukla-pūrṇamāsya śānisci-vāsare | M.-P.-Pb.-śrimad-[d]-A-nantamalladevavajrayājī | śrī-Nepālamāṇḍalā-Kāśṭhamāṇḍapa-nāmāndānvāsina upāsaka-Nārāyanena likhitam | || Written at Kathmandu. There was no Karkaṭa sankrānti in Āśāgha, and this gives an intercalary Āśāgha according to all systems. The date is irregular; the tirhi corresponds to June 11th, 1283, which day, however, was a Friday and not a Saturday.

13) Ms. Śatāsāhasrikā-Prajñāprāmātimā (vol. III), Sa-skya monastery in Tibet. Colophon 6): Śrī-Lalitapurīyāṁ mahānagarāyāṁ śrī-NavamālāśrimadEndriyadevarājına-śaṃskārtā śrī-Yayamanaharavarna-mahāvīrādhīvāśī grhāśrama-bhikṣvācāryakāyasthā-Sugatura-khitena likhitam-idaṁ ... || śrī-Nepāla-hāyana 404 Phālguṇi-śuklapakṣe triyodāśāṁ-tīthau Mahā-nakṣatre Dhrī-yoge bhṛhaspatidine likhitetī | śrimataḥ R.-Raghuvanśavatārā-śrī-śrīma(dA)namentallarāje likhitam-iti. The Jayamanohara-mahāvīhāra is the modern Su Bahal in Patan. The date is irregular; tirhi, nakṣatra and yoga ended on March 1st, 1284, which day, however, was a Wednesday and not a Thursday.


1) Published by RS, XXI, 29. Checked on a hand-copy made by Professor G. Tucci in 1939.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 232.
3) Published by RS, XXIII, 28.
4) Published by RS, XXIII, 30.
5) Published by RS, XXIII, 30.
6) Published by RS, XXIII, 30.
7) Partly published in CPMDN, I, 46, and then in 1958. The date was correctly read by Regmi, I, 234.


17) Ms. Saravāli, British Museum Or. 1439. Colophon 3): Samvat 406 Caitra-śula-trītiyāyāṁ sukravāsare Kṛtika-nakṣatre | R.—P.—sīrī-śrī-Anantamalladevasya vijayārājye likhitam etc. There was no Vṛṣabha sankṛanti in Vaisākha, and this gives an intercalary Pauṣa. The Caitra of the colophon corresponds therefore to adhika-Vaisākha of the Śūrya Siddhaṇtā, and the date is verified for Friday, March 29th, 1286.


21) Ms. Caṇḍamahārōsaṇatantrapāṇiñjā, National Archives, III.402.3. Colophon 7): Samvat 417 Phāḷguṇa-kṛṣṇa-daśamīyāṁ aṅgāra-vāsare likhanam saṃāptam-idam-iti rājye śrīmadAnantamalladevasyeti. There was no sankṛanti in Phāḷguṇa, which gives an intercalary Pauṣa. The Phāḷguṇa of this colophon is nīja-Phāḷguṇa in the Śūrya Siddhaṇtā, and the date is verified for Tuesday, March 19th, 1297.

22) Ms. Avadānakalpalatā, Cambridge University Library, Add. 1306. Colophon 8): Netrākṣyayabdihitadbake (= 422) ca samaye Radhe šite pakṣake | āśāyāica tithau divākaradine vāhadvipaddakṣake || . . . . . . . . rājye śrīmadAnantamallā-ṇpater etc. The date is verified for Sunday, April 8th, 1302.

23) Ms. of Prajñākaramati’s commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra, Nor monastery in Tibet. Colophon 9): Śrīmad[ā-Ā]nantamalladeva-vijayarājye | Samvat 423 Māgha-

1) Published in CPMDN, I, 78.
2) First published 1958. A modern copy, under the title Tribhūṃikavidyā, is in the National Archives, V.2231, and its colophon (identical to the present one) was published by Regmi, I, 232.
3) Published in CSBM, 182 n. 440.
4) Partly published in CPMDN, I, 46, and then in 1958. The reading of the date was corrected by Regmi, I, 235.
5) Published in Brhaisūcicatram, IV, Kathmandu 2025 VS, 63.
6) Published by Regmi, I, 232.
7) Published in CPMDN, II, 94.
8) Published in CBMC, 43.
9) First published in 1958, although the ms. seems to be listed in RS, XXI, no. 110. From a hand-copy made by Professor G. Tucci in 1939.
Anantamalla was born in 366 Vaisākha śukla 5 (= April 21st, 1246, as the son of Rājadeva (b. 348 d. 369). The latter was the son of one Aganakamal[l]adeva, of whom nothing is known and whose name seems to be misspelt. Of course we cannot say whether this family was connected in any degree with the dynasty of Arimalla, although the ending Malla seems to point in that direction. Anantamalla reigned for 35 years and 11 months, dying in Śrāvana kṛṣṇa 13, one year later than his retreat to Bhonta in 427 (V2, 35a). This places his death on August 14th, 1308. Thus a regnal period of almost 36 years is definitely too long; the 32 years and 10 months allowed to him by other chronicles (V1, 26a; VK/VD) seem nearer to the truth. Anantamalla ruled from c. 394 to 427 NS, i.e. 1274–1308 A.D.

During the first part of his reign Anantamalla was a contemporary of Qubilai Khan, the great ruler of China and suzerain of the Mongol states and of Tibet. It is a curious fact that most of Anantamalla’s documents belong to this period, and that they seem to reveal a particularly close connection with Tibet, where the Sa-skya-pa had just consolidated their rule by the favour and under the protection of Qubilai. As far as we can tell, there was no direct intercourse between the king of Nepal and the Mongol court during this period 2). But Nepalese art, then at its height, penetrated in the

---

1) Published in CSMASB, XIV, 38-41, no. 61.
2) P. Pelliot, Les grands voyages maritimes chinois au début du XVe siècle, in T'oung Pao, 30 (1933), drew attention to the biography of the Uighur Yiğmiş (I-hei-mi-shih 亦黑迷失), one of the three generals who in 1292 led the expedition to Java. In this text (Yiian-shih, 131, 19b–20a) we are told that in 1272 Yiğmiş was sent to the country of Pa-lo-po 八羅, beyond the seas (hai-wai 海外), whence he came back in 1274 with some men of that country bearing jewels as a gift to the emperor. In 1275 he was again sent to Pa-lo-po, and he brought from there a Buddhist master
Tibetan monasteries and temples 1). Besides the colophons, we have also Chinese evidence on this score. In 1260 Qubilai had ordered the Sa-skya abbot 'P'ags-pa, his spiritual teacher, to erect a golden stupa in T'u-fan, a term which in the official usage of the Yuan (Mongol) dynasty designated Amdo, i.e. north-easterst Tibat. 'P'ags-pa summoned artists from Nepal for this purpose. The king of that country (at that time Jayabhimadeva) collected 80 artisans and selected to lead them A-ni-ko 阿尼哥 (1245–1306) 2), a descendant (chou 藩) of the royal family of Nepal. In spite of his youth, he was al-

of the realm” (kuo-shih 國師). Pelliot suggested that Pa-lo-po is Bal-po, the Tibetan name for Nepal (spelt as Pa-lu-po 八臘布 in the biography of A-ni-ko), and that Yiğmiş came there by sea, i.e. through South-East Asia and Bengal. But I fail to see how and why Yiğmiş should call Nepal by its Tibetan name, if he came there by the route of Bengal and Bihar and thus did not come into contact with Tibetans at all. Besides, the expression hai-wai is normally used in connection with countries in South-East Asia; and this is where we should look for Pa-lo-po, the more so as it appears that Yiğmiş was exclusively employed in that quarter.


2) The chief source for A-ni-ko and his family is his funeral inscription, which was engraved on a stele and erected on the pathway to his tomb near the village of Hsiang-shan 香山 in the district of Yüan-p'ing 宛平, West of Peking. It was composed by Ch'êng Chü-fu 程鉅夫 (tsu: Wên-hai 文海; 1249–1318) and is reproduced in his Hsüeh-lou-chi 學樓集 (Ming edition, 7, 10a–11b). It is summarized, with many serious omissions, in A-ni-ko's official biography in the Yüan-shih, 203, 11b–12b, translated (except for the ending portion) by S. Lévi, Le Népal, III, 187–189. The standard study on A-ni-ko is that by M. Ishida, Gendai no kögeika Nepāru no dzoku Anika no den ni tsuite (On the biography of A-ni-ko, artist and member of the Nepalese royal family during the Yüan dynasty), originally published in Mōko Gakuhō, 2 (1941), reprinted in M. Ishida, Tōa bunkashi sōkō (Studies in the cultural history of Eastern Asia), Tokyo 1973, 371–394. A-ni-ko is the correct form of the name, as attested by the funeral inscription and by the early editions of the Yüan-shih. For the erroneous forms A-érh-ni-ko (late editions of the Yüan-shih and other works of the 18th century; also S. Lévi) and A-ni-ko-ni (Hsin Yüan-shih and Chiang Liang-fu's Li-tai-ming-jén-li-pei-ch'uan-tsung-piao, Shanghai 1937, 242) see P. Pelliot, Les statues en "laque sèche" dans l'ancien art chinois, in J.As., 1923, I, 194n. The Indian (not Sanskrit) equivalent seems to be Anigo, which occurs as the name of one of the Eighty-four Siddhas: P. Pelliot, loc. cit. Another name of that Siddha is Anāṅga (G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, 228), of which Anigo may be only a dialectal form. A-ni-ko's funeral inscription gives the name of his father as La-k'o-na 臘可納 and of his grandfather as Mi-ti-érh 密迪逻; I am unable to trace their Indian originals.
ready an accomplished bronze-caster. He carried out his task with such a success, that 'P'ags-pa persuaded him to follow him to China, where he entered the employ of Qubilai. A-ni-ko cast many statues for the Buddhist monasteries of Shang-tu (Dolon-nor) and Ta-tu (Peking). In 1274 he became general director of all the workers in bronze, and in 1278 he was appointed controller of the imperial manufactures 1). His favour continued and increased till his death, which happened in the 10th year of Ta-te, intercalary 1st month, day ting-you (= March 11th, 1306) 2). He was cremated in the Nepalese style and was granted the posthumous name of Min-hui 敏慧 and several titles, foremost among which that of duke of Liang 凉. A-ni-ko had married first a Nepalese lady called Tsai-yeh-ta-la-ch'i-mei 宰葉苔臘奇美 (Jayadalakṣmī); but then he followed the custom of the court at which he lived and took a Mongol lady as another chief wife, and seven secondary wives. Besides eight daughters, he had six sons, two of whom followed in the official footsteps of their father 3); but none of them achieved fame. The real continuator of his school and his chief pupil was the Chinese Liu Yuan 劉元 4). The tradition of A-ni-ko lasted for a long time among the Buddhist sculptors in China, and is still upheld in the introduc-

1) For a possible seal of A-ni-ko see S. Hasumi, in Tôhôgaku, 35 (January 1968), 83–97. A work of A-ni-ko is still extant in the Jo-bo-k'arì, the so-called cathedral of Lhasa; A. Grünwedel, Die Tempel von Lhasa, Heidelberg 1919, 56. In the rGya-Bod ye-tsa'-an (Gangtok ms.) of 1434 A-ni-ko appears under the name E-ner-dga' (f. 171a).

2) At the date of his death he is expressly stated to have been 62 years old; this places his birth (counting in the Chinese fashion) in 1245. Ishida, op. cit., 375–378, maintains that this is a mistake, because he was 17 when he met 'P'ags-pa in 1260, which means that he was born in 1244. But 1260 is not the date of the meeting; it is that of the imperial mandate to 'P'ags-pa for the construction of the stūpa. What with 'P'ags-pa receiving the mandate and informing the king of Nepal, with the latter collecting the 80 artisans and sending them to Tibet, with A-ni-ko at last arriving in T'u-fan, we may be fairly certain that another year had passed and that A-ni-ko came to the presence of 'P'ags-pa in 1261.

3) The first-born was A-seng-ko 阿僧哥 (Asaṅga), who maintained the salary of a Controller; he is mentioned under the dates of 1310 and 1313; F. W. Cleaves, in HJAS 17, 15–16. His brothers were A-shu-la 阿末臘, who became Director General of the artisans of all classes, and daruğaći; A-ch'u-ko 阿出哥; A-p'o-ko 阿珀哥; A-k'ai-ya 阿凱牙; and A-ch'i-la 阿起臘.

tion to a late iconometric treatise, the *Tsao-hsiang-tu-liang-ching* 造像度量經 1).

A-ni-ko was in the main a contemporary of Anantamalla; but it is vain to expect him to be mentioned in Nepalese chronicles, inscriptions or colophons. In any case, his story helps to reveal the existence of fairly close relations between Nepal and the great monasteries of Tibet during the late 13th century.

As hinted above, 18 out of Anantamalla’s 24 documents are crowded in the seven years between 1279 and 1286, after which only six isolated colophons fill the last twenty-four years of his reign. This statistically remarkable fact is possibly connected with the severe invasions from the West and South which Nepal was just then enduring; the troubled times were not propitious to the work of the pious scribes. The facts concerning these foreign invasions are as follows.

In December 1287 or January 1288 the Khasiyā king Jayatāri entered Nepal and paid his respects to Svayambhū Nāth. All the country people fled to the forests; because of this the Khasiyā withdrew and the inhabitants returned happily to their homes 2). On March 6th, 1289, Jayatāri came for a second time. He burnt several villages, then he went to Svayambhū Nāth, visited the Lokeśvara shrine of Buñmati and propitiated Paśupati Nāth 3). On February 26th, 1290 the Khasiyā king entered Nepal for the third time, taking Nuvakoth on his march. He offered rich presents in the Buñmati shrine and entered Gwanla (Deo Patan) from the West by way of Dhākā. After this he put some villages to the torch. He stayed for one month at the castle of Patan, which he destroyed before decamping 4).

The invading king belonged to the Khasa dynasty, who ruled over Western Nepal from its capital Semjja and claimed also some sort of suzerainty over Western Tibet. They are fairly well known

1) Taishō, n. 1419; vol. XXI, 939a.
2) 408 Pauṣa; VI, 26b.
3) 409 Phālguna śukla 13; VI, 26b. VK gives the date 414 for the second invasion, which is a palpable mistake for 410.
from the Dullu inscription of Prthivimalla dated 1357 and from various Tibetan texts 1). Our Jayatiiri appears as Jitārimalla in the Dullu inscription and as Dzi-dar-smal or 'Ji-t’ar-smal in the Tibetan texts, and was the first of these rulers to bear the name-ending Malla.

After Jitārimalla and his mountaineers from the West, another enemy appeared from the South. In December 1291 the Tirhutiyii (i.e. the people from Tirhut or Mithilâ, the kingdom of the descendants of Nānyadeva and Rāmasimha) entered Nepal and penetrated as far as Bhatgaon 2). This was apparently a passing raid. Much more serious was the expedition they launched nine years later, once more against Bhatgaon. On January 22nd, 1300, "the Doya attacked Asanimam (unknown) and built around it some stockades. On February 18th the Doya were victorious in combat and approached Tipura and Asanimaṃ. On Thursday, February 25th, starting from a place called Khiipimthali and Mitili (unknown) and attacked the town of Bhatgaon. On the following day they attempted to enter the Canigal ward, which in the end they occupied. In Bādyāṃnimimam and (?) the Bakhuri Bahi seven Doya were killed, and three more in Tyamkhadol (Tehaco Tol, in the south-western portion of Bhatgaon). After this, they took Balumkha Jaladhuni (?) and entered Brahmapur (southern outskirts of the town) as well. They inflicted a fine upon Tipura; Ma[he]ndrapāla (unknown) exacted from the subjects three dām for each ropni of land and four dām for each house; and the Doya were satisfied. On March 27th the Doya departed for their country. The summons and invitation to the Doya had been the work of Pandita Jayaju of Salche (a ward in Bhatgaon), of Jayaśaktideva of Banepa and of Anantamalladeva 3).

The last sentence sounds like a stern accusation by the chronicler, who was closely connected with the Tipura family. It means that the house of Bhonta and their puppet-king Anantamalla, with the traitorous support of a Brahman from Bhatgaon, had called in

2) 411 Māgha; V1, 26b; VK.
3) The dates are: 420 Pauṣa amāvasya; Māgha kṛṣṇa 12; Phālguṇa śukla 5, Bharaṇi-naksara, bhṛhaspati (verified); Caitra śukla 7; V3, 40b–41a. Cf. Dh. Bajracharya, "Doyaharu ko hun?", in Pūrṇimā, 4 (2021 VS), 21–22.
the foreigners to contrive the ruin of the rival family. This requires some discussion, in order to explain a situation which allowed repeated foreign invasions to devastate the country, without the Nepalese being able to offer a concerted opposition.

Of the two contending families, that of Tipura, headed by Jayasihamalla’s son Jayatungamalla (b. 1265 d. 1312) 1), was for the moment out of power. The house of Bhonta was represented at first by Jayādityadeva (b. 1238 d. 1293), the elder son of king Jaya-bhimadeva. It is highly probable that he had engineered the deposition or abdication of Jayasihamalla and the accession of Anantamalla as a puppet ruler, because upon the coronation of the latter in 1275 Jayādityadeva was appointed *yuvarāja* and thus became the second man in the realm. But his family was not without its internal problems. Almost at once, Jayādityadeva found himself at loggerheads with his younger half-brother Jayānandadeva, whom he imprisoned at Palamchok (V1, 26b). It was only after the death of Jayādityadeva that the prisoner could free himself “by his own power” (August 1st, 1293), only to be imprisoned once more by his nephew, who came to Palamchok for this purpose 2).

Jayāditya’s widow Virammbādevi did much to foster Nepalese art. In January 1294 she founded the Aindrakūta, i.e. the beatiful Indreśvara temple at Panaoti, one of the earliest existing structures of Nepal 3). At some time after 1297 she “had the image of the bull and the flagstaff of the shrine of Paśupati Nāth plated with gold; it had been erected by Kāpatiya Gaṇapati, who had come from Gauḍa”; V1, 27a. It has been suggested that this referred to a visit by king Gaṇapati (1198–1257) of the Kākatiya dynasty of South India, travelling through Gauḍa (North Bengal), and that Virammbādevi belonged to the Kākatiya family 4. Of course this is a mere hy-

---

1) According to V2, 36a, Jayatungamalla was born in 386 Mārgaśīra *krṣṇa* 6, Pūrvaśāḍha–nakṣatra, Pṛti–yoga, candravāra; this date can be verified only if we correct Pūrvaśāḍha into Pūrvapahalgunā; it is Monday, November 30th, 1265. He died at the age of 46 years and 5 months in Jyeṣṭha *śukla* 6, ādiyavāra, in the morning. The year should be 1312, but the date cannot be verified, as the *tīthi* ended in the morning of Saturday, May 13th, and not on Sunday.

2) 413 Śrāvana *śukla* 13; V3, 40a.


pothesis, although it would fit very well in the frame of the unmistakable South Indian influence that developed in that period.

Jayāditya’s son Jayāśaktideva was still a young lad at the time of his father’s demise. He was born on May 5th, 1276 and died at the age of 39 years and 5 months on October 5th, 1315. It seems that at first there was some amount of concord between Bhatgaon and Banepa, because in 1297 Jayāśaktideva of Bhonta and Jayatunganamalla of Yuthonimam (apparently at that time the seat of his house in or near Bhatgaon) together attacked Svāṃkhā (Sankhu?); it was taken after five days (V3, 40b). This is the last mention we find of Jayatunganamalla, and for the moment the house of Tipura sunk again into obscurity. Its worst moment was probably the Doja conquest of Bhatgaon prompted by the Bhonta faction. After the withdrawal of the Tirhutia it appears that the Tipura palace was again occupied by the family, but the country was not at peace. On April 20th, 1303, there was fighting at Dyamagu (unknown), Tipura and Mānigal (i.e. Patan). On March 31st, 1304, there was a rebellion centered in the castle of Bakhācem. On March 24th, 1305, the Banepa forces apparently attempted to take Bhatgaon, because on that day “there was an expedition from Asanimam against Tipura; Jayāśaktideva took part in it and fifty men were killed.” We are not told what was the final result. On July 6th of the same year it was Bhatgaon which took the initiative; the town of Phanpiň (Pharping) was taken and put to the torch. In retaliation, on July 24th the Banepa men attacked Cochem (a ward of Bhatgaon); but the fighting men of Bhatgaon carried out a sally through Vidyapīṭha. When on December 13th, 1306, a rebellion broke out in the castle of Bāmpyāchem, within one day Jayāśaktideva took the castle and repressed the outbreak.

This long series of clashes seemed to usher in a slow recovery

---

1) Born 396 kṛṣṇa 6 and died [436] Kārttika śukla 6 (this month is adhika–Kārttika in the Sūrya Siddhānta); V2, 36a.
2) 423 Vaiśākha śukla 3; V3, 41a.
3) 424 Caitra badi 10; V3, 41a.
4) 425 Caitra kṛṣṇa 14; V3, 42a.
5) 425 Āśādha śukla 14; V3, 41b.
6) 425 Śrāvāṇa śukla 2; V3, 41b. From a document (see p. 161) we learn that the Vidyapīṭha–dvāra was one of the entrances of the Tripura palace.
7) 427 Pauṣa śukla 8; V3, 41b.
of the power of Tipura. At a certain point either Anantamalla grew sick of his position as powerless figurehead, or else the old puppet king had become useless for his protector, who discarded him. Whatever the reason, on August 6th, 1307, Anantamalla spontaneously took out all the contents of his treasury chest and offered them to Paśupati Nāth, did the same with the temple treasures of Bhatgaon, and departed for Bhonta. This flight had the consequence that Bhonta was deprived of her share of income derived from Gwanla (Deo Patan, and Central Nepal in general) ¹). Still, Anantamalla continued to be recognized as the rightful ruler, as shown by his Doc. 24. One year later, on August 14th, 1308, he died at Banepa; during four days it was impossible to perform his funeral ceremony, until they were carried out at the Rājadipa in Deo Patan ²).

The retreat and death of Anantamalla meant the disappearance of a powerless, but still respected figurehead, and ushered in a serious and long-protracted crisis, soon to be complicated by foreign intervention. The reaction of the Tipura house was immediate, energetic and successful. On April 19th, 1308, and in the following months Jayatuṅgamalla of Tipura took Hripyakvāth, Navaliṅgakvāth and Nuva-kvāth to the West of the valley. Banepa itself was conquered, at least for a moment ³). Jayaśaktideva did not dare, in his weakened position, to usurp the vacant throne, and in the following months he felt himself so insecure, that he took a fateful step: he called in again the Tirhutias. Their intervention marked the climax in the ruinous struggle between the two rival houses.

On March 4th, 1311, ‘‘the Doya occupied a part of Patan, from Ṭhamṭhibīṁ (?) to Mānigal. They destroyed the image of the deity at the Gajuhri fountain and made prisoners the Brahmans and all the local noblemen (pātra); they also destroyed the castle. After this, they recovered from the Nepalese subjects the war expenses in the form of a fine. Several building were set on fire. Vetanadeva, Jayāśaktideva, Meghacandra and the Dhvākā Rāut were summoned (i.e. were given protection) by the Doya. The calling-in of the Doya had

¹) 427 Śrāvana sukla 7; V³, 42a. There was no Simha sankrānti in Bhādrapada and Āṣāṅga was intercalary; this Śrāvana corresponds to adhika-Bhādrapada in the Śūrya Siddhānta.

²) (428) Śrāvana kṛṣṇa 13; V³, 42a.

³) 428 Caitra kṛṣṇa, 13; V³, 42b.
been the work of Jayaśaktideva” 1). But if the invasion had met with little resistance, it was not so easy to get rid of these selfish helpers. On Sunday, October 24th, 1311, “all the temples were burnt and destroyed. At that time Jayaśaktideva gave over (?) text obscure) all the subjects to the Đoya (?). In November the whole treasury of Deo Patan began to be taken off in twenty-one instalments. After this they started (?) in the direction of Sāṅgā. Some men from Banepa as far as Tari (?) were killed. On March 1st, 1312, the Đoya commanders ceased to exercise their rule and started back for home” 2).

In this account of the invasion the name of the leader of the Tirhut army does not appear. However, it is known that Caṇḍeśvara, a minister of king Harasimha of Tirhut, claimed to have conquered Nepal, to have uprooted the kings of the Raghu lineage and to have touched the image of Paśupati 3). In another text he claims to have vanquished the ruler of Nepal and to have performed the tulāpuruṣa sacrifice on the banks of the Vāgyatī (Bagmati) in November 1314 4). This seems to imply that it was Caṇḍeśvara who ruled a portion of Central Nepal in 1311–1312, as Tirhutia governor of Patan. Apparently the tulāpuruṣa sacrifice was performed outside the Valley somewhere in the Tarai, after his retreat from Patan.

Anyhow, the foreign occupation of the old capital and perhaps of other parts of the Valley had lasted one full year and left the country exhausted and impoverished. At least, the sorely tried land was spared another trial soon after, because the arrival of another foreign king in the wake of the Tirhutia invasion was more in the nature of a peaceful pilgrimage. In 1312 the Khasa king Ripumalla had visited Buddha’s birthplace Lumbini in the Tarai, where he and his son and heir Saṅgrāmamalla eternized their names in two graffitoes

1) 431 Māgha krṣṇa 14; V3, 42b–43a; VK.
2) The dates are: 432 Kārttiika śukla 12, Uttarabhādra–naksatras, ādiyā (verified); Kārttiika krṣṇa ? (the digit for the day cannot be read); Phālguṇa śukla 8; V3, 43a. On this invasion see Dh. Bajracharya, “Doyaharu ko hun?”, 25–28.
3) Verses in the Kṛtyaratnākara: CSMASB, III, 698–699. A list of the conquests by king Harasimha, which includes Nepal, is given by Caṇḍeśvara in his introduction to the Kṛtyacintāmani.
on the Aśoka pillar. On February 22nd, 1313, “Ripumalla entered Nepal. He took a ceremonial bath at the Buṅga shrine of Matsyendra Niṃth, to which he made some presents. He propitiated the Lord of Deo Patan (i.e. Paśupati Niṃth) and offered pūjā at Svayambhū Niṃth. After eighteen days he departed” 1). It has been suggested that Ripumalla had been called in by the Tipura faction as a counterbalance to the Tirhutia 2). It is nothing more than a brilliant hypothesis; in any case, the help arrived one full year too late.

At that time one fact was quite evident: the complete collapse of the central power in Nepal. The monarchy still supplied a nominal head of the state, whose authority, however, was almost nil. The agreement for alternance on the throne had broken down and actual power was disputed between the two houses of Tipura and Bhonta. The local feudatories too enjoyed a large amount of autonomy, foremost among them the mahārāvut of Pharping and the chief of Nuvakoth. But even at Patan royal authority had almost vanished; the religious (or rather sacral) capital Deo Patan carried no political weight. The future belonged to whoever would prove the strongest.

After the Tirhutia occupation new figures came to the fore in the two main families. Jayāśaktideva, weakened and probably diminished in prestige after his repeated dealings with the Tirhutia, is no longer mentioned in the chronicles and is supposed to have died in October 1315. Jayatūṅgamalla of Tipura had died in 1312, being succeeded by his young son Jayarudramalla. The latter was born in 416 Mārgaśīra kṛṣṇa 13, Anurādhā-naḵśatra, Śula-yoga, aṅgāra 3); the date is verified for the early hours of Tuesday, December 6th, 1295, except for the yoga, which ended on December 10th. He died on 446 prathama-Āśāṅha pūrṇimā (June 16th, 1326), without leaving

2) Dh. Bajracharya and T. B. Srestha, Nuvākoṭ ko aitihāsik rūprekha, Kathmandu 2032 VS, 32–33.
3) V3, 40a. The ms. has Mārgaśīra śukla, but the verification shows that śukla must be a mistake for kṛṣṇa. On the whole problem see the chronological study by Deviprasad Bhandari, “Rudramalla ra unko janmatithi”, in Pūrṇimā, 1 (2021 VS), 8–13.
male issue 1). The old chronicle (V³) gives him quite correctly a life-span of 30 years and 8 months.

On November 14th, 1311, an expedition started from Banepa by way of Nala towards Tipura (perhaps in collusion with the Tirhutia commanders of Patan), and the Bhatgaon people fled away; this is said to have happened during the reign (vijayarājya) of Jayarudramalla and of his mother Padumalladevi 2); the latter, an iron-willed lady, proved herself a tower of strength for the still unripe young prince. The term vijayarājya, usually the mark of an independent ruler, implies that during the Tirhutia occupation of Patan Jayarudramalla was recognized as the de-facto king, at least at Bhatgaon. After the retreat of the Tirhutia and after the short visit by the Khasa king, on Friday, April 20th, 1313, Jayarudramalla went to Patan and performed regularly the procession of Matsyendra Nath to Canigal; he stayed in the town for ten days and put to death five leading noblemen 3). In other words, he took possession of the old capital Patan and eliminated the heads of the opposition. This was indeed the turning point; henceforward actual power in the Valley belonged to the Tipura house, under whichever form they chose to wield it.

Jayānandadeva (c. 1313–1320)

At this moment Nepal had been for five years without a legitimate ruler and it was necessary to put an end to this long interregnum. Although the chronicle says not a single word about it, we may suppose that, inspite of his success, Jayarudramalla preferred to restore peace by entering into a compact with the rival house of Bhonta. The head of the latter, Jayaśaktideva, was possibly still alive, but perhaps in bad health or utterly disqualified by his dealing with the Tirhutia. Anyhow, it was not he, but his aged uncle Jayānandadeva who was nominated as the new king. As we have seen, he had been imprisoned by his brother in 1275, had freed himself in 1293 and was imprisoned again almost immediately at Palamchok, where he continued to reside even after he ascended the throne. At

1) V¹, 27b; V³, 46b. A child born to him shortly before his death survived him for a few days only.
2) 432 Margaśira sukla 13; V³, 43b.
3) 433 Vaśākha sukla 9, sukra (verified); V³, 43a.
that time he must have been at least 50-55 years old. There was no question of a puṣyābhiṣeka and it seems that Jayarudramalla just tolerated him. The chronicles limit themselves to the dry remark "in the meantime Jayānandadeva was king" 1).

We have four documents of his reign:

1) Inscription at the Sarasvati temple, east of the temple of the Bālakumāri in Sasukhel near Patan 2). Damaged on the right side. It contains the following elements: Dated [Vaiśā]kha-krṣṇa aṣṭaṇyām ghaṭi 3 ve navanyām .... [Satābhisa-j-nakṣatre ghaṭi 14 pra Pūrvaḥadra-nakṣatraḥ vai ghaṭi .... Niśkambha-yogaḥ budhavāsa etc.; Vaiśākha-māse samite tithi šate catuḥ caturtiṃśakāle etc.; rāja .... takāmamūrtti śri-śrimat Jayānanda-nṛpa-prabhṛte etc.; śri-Jotakarāma śri-Jagarāma... The date is verified for Wednesday, May 8th, 1314.


4) Ms. Śānaiścarastotra, National Archives, III.96.1. Colophon 5): Samvat 438 Śrāvaṇa-9) sukla-pratipadyaṃ tithau Asileśa-nakṣatre Vairavanyogya ūkṛavāsare Simhṛṣā-gate sāvitarī Karkkaṭarāsi-gate condramasi | R.-P.-śri-śri-Jayānandadevasya vijayaḥrājye | .... likhitaṃ Kesabrahma-Mālakṣaṇena svārtha-parārtha-hetunā .... | likhitam dvija-śri-Jetarāmasūra-sramena (= sarmanā) || In this year there was no Simha sankrānti in Śrāvaṇa, and this caused an intercalary Āśādha. Thus the month here intended corresponds to ni+j-Śrāvaṇa of the Sūrya Siddhānta. The date is verified in all its numerous elements for the morning of Friday, July 28th, 1318.

These documents show that Jayānandadeva was recognized as legitimate king in Patan, at Deo Patan and probably in the rest of the country. This pale figure, a non-entity on the throne, continued to reside at Palamchok, and his son Jayarājadeva was born there. While the Bhonta house enjoyed the empty title of royalty, real power was vested for moment in the Tipura family. Their mutual relation is best expressed in Doc. 2, which evidences the sacrāl hingship (dharma-

---

1) VI, 27a; VK.
3) Published in Saṃskṛta Saṇdeśa, 2 (2019 VS), fasc. 1–3; in Pūrṇimā, I (2021 VS), 11n and 2 (2021 VS), 9; in Sandhipara-saṅgroha, 204; and in Regmi, III, 17–18.
4) Partially published in CPMDN, I, 73; also in Saṃskṛta Saṇdeśa 2. 1–3.
5) First published 1958.
6) Śrāvaṇa was preceded by the word prathama, which had been deleted.
vijaya) of Jayānandadeva and the actual rule (rājya) of Jayarudramalla. Doc. 3 too, with its titles paramadhārmika and aīśvara indicates that Jayānanda’s role was limited to religion and the ritual sphere.

During the following few years as well the old chronicle knows only Jayarudramalla as the effective head of the state. Thus on April 9th, 1315, he besieged the castle of Gokarna, which resisted for a month and was not taken until Friday, May 9th 1). In a year and month which cannot be read any more because the figures have faded away, Jayarudramalla drove out Tejapāla Bhāro of Kvāchem; V3, 44a–b. In November 1317 he led an expedition against the rebel feudatory of Nuvakoth (see later). In October 6th, 1319, he caused the castle of Rājagrāma to be built, calling upon the help of the three mahāpātra (town headmen) of Patan 2).

Having thus consolidated his grasp over the whole of Nepal, Jayarudramalla apparently saw no further reason for keeping the compact with the family of Bhonta; and in 1320 he withdrew his recognition from Jayānandadeva. The deposed king remained unmolested in Bhonta; we do not know whether he still kept the empty royal title. In the chronicle he is mentioned only once again, when on April 22nd, 1328, he came to the Valley to partecipate in some religious ceremonies at Deo Patan and Mānigal (Patan) 3). He may have died soon after.

Jayārimalla (1320–1344)

The new king too was a mere puppet in the hands of the Tipura kingmaker. As the chronicle says: “Immediately after, by the authority (prabhutena) of Jayarudramalla his own relative (sva–kuṭum-ba) Jayārimalla was crowned ” 4).

Three colophons of this reign are extant:


---

1) Dates: 435 Vaiśākha śukla 5 and Jyeṣṭha śukla 5 śukra (verified); V3, 43b.
2) Āśvini krṣṇa 7; V3, 43b–44a.
3) 448 Vaiśākha śukla 13; V3, 45b.
4) V1, 27a–b; VK. The term sva–kuṭumba gives some support to the identification of Aganakarnamalla and Jagatanekamalla, the forefathers of these rulers. In this case, Jayārimalla and Jayarudramalla would have been second cousins.
5) Published in CPMDN, II, p. 25.
The new king was born in 396 Māgha sukla 12, Punarvasu nakṣatra, Priti yoga, budhavāra; the date is completely verified for Wednesday, January 29th, 1276. He was the son of Anantamalla, and thus fully entitled to the throne. The coronation ceremony (puṣṭyabhiṣeka) was performed on 440 Caitra kṛṣṇa 12 (= April 5th, 1320). He died at the age of 69 in 464 Aśvini sukla 7 (= September 14th, 1344), and the throne remained vacant for some time 5).

The position of the new king was one of dignity without power. The chronicles explain in the clearest terms that Jayārimalla was allowed merely the royal domain (rājabhūtika) 6), and that the whole of Nepal was Jayarudramalla’s own (V1, 27b; VK/VD). This rājabhūtika

1) This same man, kutumbaja-mahāpātra Śri Jayaśīhamalladevavarman, wrote with his own hand a ms. of the Khaṇḍakāhyaka (National Archives III.394; colophon partly published in CPMDN, I, p. 90) dated 470 NS Bhādrapada kṛṣṇa 2–3, Uttarabhadra-Revati nakṣatra, Gānda yoga, śukravāra; the date is verified for Friday, August 20th, 1350. Still later he (pradhānāṅga-mahāpātra Śri Jayaśīhamallavarman) wrote with his hand a ms. of the Hariścandravākhyāna (National Archives, III. 362. 4; colophon published in CPMDN, II, p. 29) dated 496 Māgha kṛṣṇa 5, Śvāti nakṣatra, Dhruva yoga, somavāra; the date is verified for Monday, February 11th, 1376.

2) Published in CSMASB, V, p. 438 n. 3747.


5) V2, 35b; V3, 44a and 51a.

6) V1 reads bhakti for bhukti, and the meaning would be that Jayaśīrimalla was
comprised apparently Gwanla, i.e. Deo Patan and the surrounding tract; the name of Jayārimalla in V° is consistently preceeded by the word Gwanla 1). Although he did not bear the royal title nor any other, Jayarudramalla was supreme, and his authority was recognized as far (prajanta for pratyanta) the fief (bhūtī) of Nuvakoth; and he "changed greatly (i.e. he enlarged) the dominion of Bhatgaon" (Bhaktagrāma-kṣatra bahutara vikṛtaṁ; V°, 27b; VK).

The first sixteen years of Jayārimalla's reign show no inscriptions nor colophons. Possibly conditions were too unstable, or the scribes preferred not to mention the date and the name of the ruling king as long as Jayānandadeva was still alive. Whatever the reason, we are confronted with a gap of twenty years in our documentation, and this fact is at least statistically worthy of notice.

Indeed the times were anything but peaceful. On March 1st, 1321, the Khasiyā raided Nepal, and on the same date the royal residence (rājavāsa) of Tipura collapsed 2); it is not clear whether the two facts were connected. Anyhow, the walls of the palace were rebuilt by Jayarudramalla in 1324 3).

About this time an event took place to which the later chronicles attribute great importance. It concerns king Harisimha (or Harasimha) of Tirhut, a notable ruler and a patron of Sanskrit literature 4). According to the Muslim sources, at the end of 724 A.H. (1324 A.D.) Ghiyās ud-dīn Tughlaq, the king of Delhi, marching back to his capital after his invasion of Bengal, entered Tirhut, captured its capital Simraongarh, took prisoner the king and carried him to Delhi. Soon after reaching the city, in February or March 1325, the king fell victim of a mysterious accident. His successor Muham-

---

1) It has been suggested with plausibility that in those years the term Gwanla indicated Central Nepal as opposed to Bhonta; Th. Manandhar, "A leaf from the Bendall VamŚāvali", in CNS, 1/2 (1974), 100.

2) 441 Caitra śukla 2; V°, 44b.

3) 444 Māgha śukla 7; V°, 45b.

4) His minister Candēśvara, besides being a successful leader of the Tirhut army, was a literary figure of some relief, being the author of the drama Kṛtyaratnakāra and of some smṛti works. See M. Chakravarti, "Contributions to the history of Smṛti in Bengal and Mithila ", in JASB, 1915, 385; id., "History of Mithila during the pre-Mughal period ", ibid., 410-431; K. P. Jayaswal. Preface to his edition of the Rājanītiratnakāra, Patna 1936, 11-16. For other authors see also R. K. Choudhary, "Sanskrit Drama in Mithila ", in JBRS, 43 (1957), 34-40.
mad Tughlaq released Harisimha and reinstated him on the throne upon a promise of tribute. But at the end of that year Muhammad decided to annex Tirhut to his dominions. Upon hearing of the intentions of the Sultan, Harisimha left his country and fled toward the hills; this is said to have happened in Muharram 726 A. H. (December 8th – January 6th, 1326).

Thus far the Muslim sources. The entry in the old Nepalese chronicle bearing upon this event took time to be properly understood, owing to the difficulties of the archaic language. At present I would take the meaning to be as follows: “On 446 Magha sukla 3 (January 7th, 1326) Rāja Harasimha of Tirhut, collecting his subjects (?) and taking the lead himself, started from Mithilā [being defeated] by the Turks of Delhi. Śimarāvana (Simraongarh) was destroyed. The Tirhut Rāja, his minister (mahātha) etc., all of them escaped. After some time they came back. After some time they went to Rājagrāma [and] Dholakha. Rāja Harasimha died at Tipāṭa. Both his son and the minister were treacherously arrested and carried off as prisoners, [although] they had asked for refuge; and Majhi Bhāro of Rājagrāma seized all their wealth.”

Another parallel but much shorter text, said to be taken from a manuscript of that period obtained in Dolkha, says: “The Tirhut Raja along with his following, being expelled by the Turks, entered the forests together with his ministers. His wife Devalaksmidevi and his son with their relatives entered Nepal asking for [refuge].”

1) The main sources are Ferishta, Isami’s Futūh us-salātīn, the Basatin ul-uns written in 1326 by an eye-witness, and the Bayāz of Mulla Taqiya, a Muslim mystic of the 16th–17th century, partly published in 1946 in an Urdu magazine of Patna, after which the unique manuscript was lost. Mulla Taqiya is a late writer, but he is the only Muslim author who supplies us with exact dates. See R. C. Majumdar, The Delhi Sultanate (History and culture of the Indian People, VI), Bombay 1960, 399–402; R. K. Choudhary, “Early Muslim invasions of Tirhut “, in JIH, 40 (1962), 392–396; id., History of Muslim rule in Tirhut, Varanasi 1970, 48–54; H. N. Ansari, “Tirhut (North Bihar) and Bihar (South Bihar) under Muhammad ibn–Tughlaq. A.D. 1325–1351 “, in JBRaS, 50 (1964), 61–62; C. P. N. Singh, Mithila under the Karnatas, Patna 1979, 112–117.

2) V3, 46a–b. My translation follows that published by the editors in Pāṃnimā, 26 (2029), 219.

3) M. P. Khanal, “Itihās sāṃsodhana ko kehi sāṃsodhana “, in Ancient Nepal, 13 (October 1970), 46. This text is very interesting, as it gives the name of Harisimha’s widow; but it is not beyond doubt. It strikes me that no Nepalese scholar studied or even quoted it after it was first published.
Rājagrāma (Rajgaon) was the castle built by Jayarudramalla in 1319; it lies in the Dolkha district. Īmpāṭana lies between the Churṣa and Sindhuli streams, about 100 km. to the south-east of Kathmandu. The date given in V3 is in complete agreement with Mulla Taqiyā’s Bayāz. We may therefore accept it as established that Harīsimha fled from Tirhut at the end of 1325 and died at Ūmpāṭana at the beginning of 1326.

As to the facts themselves, it is clear that the Tirhut Rāja entered the Nepalese hills not as a conqueror, but as a refugee. He died outside the Valley and his relatives were looted of their belongings and kept as prisoners, at least for some time. This conclusion cannot be challenged any longer 1).

No direct information on the end of Harīsimha is forthcoming from Maithili texts, with the exception of a traditional stanza, found also in VK, VL and VW, giving the date of the event:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bānābdhī-yugma-śaśi} & \ (= 1245) \ \text{samvat śāka-varṣe} \\
\text{pausyasya} & \ \text{sukla-navami ravisūnu-vāre} \\
\text{tyaktvā} & \ \text{svapaṭṭanapurim Harisimhadevo} \\
\text{durgeva} & \ \text{daivaviparita-girिम praveśa} \ \\
\end{align*}
\]

1) A revival of interest in Harīsimha, tinted with nationalistic feelings, took place in the fifties and sixties of this century. Indian scholars, chiefly from Bihar, upheld (and on the whole still uphold) the late tradition of a conquest of Nepal by Harīsimha and a rule of his descendants in that country, as it was thought to be described in VW and in the inscriptions of Pratāpamalla and of Siddhinarasimhamalla (17th century); Nepalese scholars negated any form of Tirhutia rule and considered Harīsimha as a simple refugee. The relevant literature, not all of it on scientific level, is listed as follows. Choudhary, “The Karnāṭs of Mithilā”, in ABORI, 35 (1954), 91-121 (chiefly 113-118); id., History of Bihar, Patna 1958, 110-1120 id., “Nepal and the Karnāṭs of Mithilā”, in JIH, 36 (1958), 123-130; id., “The Later Karnāṭs of Mithilā and Nepal”, in JBRs, 46 (1960), 16-26; id., “Harīsimhadeva of Mithilā”, in ABORI, 42 (1961), 123-140; Upendra Thakur, History of Mithilā, Darbhanga 1956, 284-289; id., “A note on king Harīsimha of Mithilā”, in JBRs, 43 (1957), 386-391; Kamalanarain Jha, “Karnāṭa rulers of Mithilā”, in JBRs, 43 (1957), 61-63; R. C. Majumdar, “King Harīsimha of Mithilā”, in JBRs, 43 (1957), 1-6; id., The Delhi Sultanate (History and Culture of the Indian People, VI), Bombay 1960, 399-402; Dh. Bajracharya, Itiḥās-saṁśodhāna ko pramāṇ-prameyā, Lalitpur 2019 VS, 232-236; L. Petech, “Mithilā and Nepal”, in JBRs, 48 (1962), part 3, 13-18; Regmi, I, 271-294 (most verbose); C. P. N. Sinha, Mithilā under the Karnāṭas, Patna 1979, 271-294; and the studies on the Muslim sources quotes above (p. 114).

2) Minor variants occur. Several Maithili text read the date as Pausyasya sukla-daśami kṣitisūnu-vāre, i.e. one day later. Jayakantha Mishra, A history of Maithili lite-
In this form, the date is incorrect. It cannot be verified, because the *tithi* ended on December 7th, 1323, which day was a Wednesday and not a Saturday (*ravisunu = śanaiscara*). Moreover, it cannot be reconciled with the Muslim historians, according to whom Tughlaq passed through Tirhut in the winter 1324–25 and Hariszima fled from Simraongarh at the end of 1325. But if the year intended were Śaka 1247, the date could be verified for Saturday, December 14th, 1325, which would fit perfectly in the chronological frame. A correction of the first word–numeral seems necessary. But in any case the mistake is very old, as no ms. gives variants for *bāṇa* (= 5).

What happened to the family of Hariszima? Here we are groping in darkness. There is, however, an entry in the chronicle, which seems to purport that on November 12th, 1331, Candana Aiśvara took Rājagā 2). The general consensus is that the man here mentioned is identical with Hariszima’s minister Čandaśvara; and if Rājagā is Rājagrāma (Rajgaon), we may suppose that the Tirhut refugees seized that place, perhaps dispossessing Majhi Bhāro who had treated them so basely six years before. In this way they gained an estate, from which Hariszima’s family soon after started on its new fortunes in Nepal. However, the hypothetical components of this reconstruction are perhaps too many.

The Hariszima episode played no role in Nepalese history of the 14th century. But it assumed a posthumous relevance in the 17th century, when rulers such as Pratāpamalla and Siddhinarasimhamalla, being proud of their Karnāṭa (i.e. Maithili) lineage, chose to ignore their ancestor, the great Jayasthitimalla and traced their descent from Nānyadeva to Hariszima and then straight on to Jayayakṣamalla (1428–1482). Of course these late genealogical and heraldic

---

1) VT, IV.4, has the same date, but the year is given as Śaka 1380, which is of course a mistake for Vikrama Samvat.

2) 452 Mārgaśīrṣa, śukla 12; V3, 47a. Cf. Regmi, I, 188.
fancies have no *locus standi* in a serious study of the medieval history of Nepal.

Soon after the flight and death of Harisimha, the strong man of Nepal disappeared at the young age of thirty. Jayarudramalla died in 446 prathama-Āśāḍha pūrmimā (June 16th, 1326). He left no male heirs, as his sons Jayaviramalla (441–442) and Tribhūvanamalla (443–444) died as infants before him (V3, 45a). The rights and political position of the Tipura house were inherited by his daughter Nāyakadevi, who was brought up by her grandmother Padumalladevi (d. 1332) (V3, 47b; VK). Ladies ruled at Bhatgaon for two generations; and during the next years the struggle around the persons of the daughter and grand-daughter of Jayarudramalla looms very large in the chequered history of this period.

Padumalladevi had no easy time as regent. On February 18th, 1328, the Khasa king Ādityamalla, the son of Jitārimalla, took Nuvakoth; he marched on and five days later he conquered Śekharakvātha (Pharping); three castles were burnt. After having settled in the Pul Bahal of Patan, he besieged [the castle] for twenty-two days; but the fortress was not taken 1). Other chronicles confirm that Ādityamalla entered Patan and imposed a fine on the citizens on 448 Caitra śukla pūrmamī, Uttaraphalguni–nakṣatra, śukradina (V1, 27b; VK); the date is irregular, *tithi* and day of the week corresponding to Friday, March 25th, 1328, while the *nakṣatra* ended on March 24th. I wonder whether the passing reappearance of the old king Jayāṇandadeva in Patan one month later (see p. 111) had any political significance; did he try to stage a return profiting of the commotion caused by Jayarudramalla’s death and by the Khasa invasion? Another sign of unrest was the rebellion staged by Abhaya Rāma Mulami at Majhi Baharkvāth in the district of Banepa on April 14th, 1330 2).

But Nepal had not yet seen the last of the Khasa. On September 6th, 1334, "Thayita Bhā[ro] entered Patan. The Sakhupati Raja came [to Patan] to measure [the fine], but was killed by the Khasa. Forty men were killed. On March 11th [of the following year] the Khasa departed, after having realized their fine. The Khasa put San-

---

1) 448 Phālguṇa śukla 7: V3, 46a.
2) 450 Caitra *krṣṇa* 11; V3, 46b.
khu to the torch” 1). The name of the Khasa king is not mentioned, but was almost certainly Puṇyamalla (1336–1339) 2). Anyhow, this five-months occupation closed the long series of the Khasiyā predatory raids.

In the meantime Nāyakadevi was approaching marriageable age and this question became of foremost importance for the future of the Tipura house. In those years the two brothers Hariścandra and Gopālacandra or Gopāladeva had migrated to Nepal. According to the chronicle, they were descendants of the king of Kāśī, which simply means that they belonged to the lunar race (the Mallas were of the solar race). In January 10th, 1330, Hariścandra married Nāyakadevi, while his brother took as wife Kāmadevi, possibly another daughter of Jayarudramalla 3).

The prince-consort was not popular with the local aristocracy. Padumalladevi tried to bolster up his position by enlisting the help of three nobles of the Bhatgaon region (February 15th, 1332) 4). Force was also resorted to; some partisans of Hariścandra killed two prominent nobles and expelled the influential Thayita Bhāro (V3, 47b). Although these high-handed means may have secured Hariścandra's position for a moment, it received a mortal blow by the demise of the old energetic Padumalladevi at the age of 67 years and 2 months, on September 22nd, 1332 5). Still, prince Hariścandra tried to maintain himself in the Yuthanimam, the palace founded by Jayarudramalla; but Thayita Bhāro, who had returned, gathered around him the opposition and rose in arms against the prince, who had to flee to Kathmandu (May 2nd, 1333) 6). Even this refuge did not save him in the end; on May 28th, 1335, he died of poison; some noblemen openly boasted of this deed 7).

Of course Nāyakadevi could not become satī, as her life was

1) Dates: 454 Bhādrapada śukla 7 (there was no sankṛanti in Āśvini, which caused an intercalary Āsādha; this Bhādrapada correspond to adhika-Āśvini in the Sūrya Siddhānta); [455] Phālguna kṛṣṇa pratīpad (Pausa being kṣaya, this Phālguna corresponds to nija-Phālguna in the Sūrya Siddhānta); V3, 48a.
3) 450 Paṭa kṛṣṇa 13; V3, 46b.
4) 452 Phālguna śukla, 3; V3, 49b.
5) 452 Āśvini śukla 2; V3, 47a–b.
6) 453 Vaiśākhā kṛṣṇa 3; V3, 47b.
7) 455 Jyeṣṭha śukla 6; V1, 27b; V3, 47a.
all-important for the partisans of the Tipura house; besides, widow-burning was not yet in agreement with the ideas of the Newars about marriage. Thus she remained under the guardianship of her brother-in-law Gopiladeva. The latter soon grew tired of his powerless position in Bhatgaon and retired to Patan 1), without, however, giving up formally his authority.

The situation became even more complicated when prince Jagatsimha of Tirhut became the lover of the widow Nāyakadevī and started intriguing against her guardian; actually the moving force behind young Jagatsimha was his mother Devaladevi 2). Things came to a head on November 5th, 1336, when Devaladevi secured the support of Abhe (Abhaya) Rāma Mulami, apparently the foremost nobleman in Bhatgaon. They took their seat in Yuthaniman, and 16 days later Abhe Rāma and Thayita Bhāro together with Anekha Rāma Mahātha, the prime minister of Bhonta, swore fealty to Devaladevi and her son 3). The result of this shift in the political balance soon became apparent; on May 16th, 1337, Jagatsimha entered the Mānigal palace in Patan, and on the next day he expelled Gopāladeva; the event had been prepared and arranged by Abhe Rāma Mulami and Thayita Bhāro 4). Their success was completed when Devaladevi, acting again in concert with her two supporters, seized the lands of Pyako Rāja, who apparently was one of the main partisans of Gopāladeva (January 13th, 1338) 5). The latter remained quiet for some time, but on December 24th, 1339, having obtained the support of Jog Rāma Mulami of Bihārkvāth, he entrenched himself in the castle of Ṭhākhā (Tokha) and offered open defiance. On the following day the castle was attacked and taken by the Bhatgaon forces; Jog Rāma fled and Gopāladeva, being left alone, was seized and decapitated by the men of Jagatsimha. Later Jog Rāma too was made prisoner 6). Jagatsimha had succeeded in eliminating the main obstacle to his career.

1) V1, 27b–28a.
2) The relationship between Devaladevi and Jagatsimha is nowhere attested directly, but is placed beyond doubt by the fact that Devaladevi was the paternal grandmother (pitāmahī) of Jagatsimha’s daughter.
3) 457 Mārgaśira śukla pratipad; V3, 48b–49a.
4) 457 Jyeṣṭha kṛṣṇa pratipad; V3, 49a–b.
5) 458 Pauṣa badi 7; V3, 49b–50a.
6) 460 Pauṣa badi 8; V1, 28a; V3, 50a.
Who was this man, who never contracted a legal marriage with the widow Nāyakadevi 1)? In my opinion Jagatsimha, prince of Tir-hut, was a son of Harisimha. The time, the title and the form of the name strongly suggest such a probability. This explains why the later chronicles made of Harisimha an ancestor of the royal family and a king of Bhatgaon, although he never ruled there; indeed, the link between the Later Mallas and Harisimha can be sought only here, and nowhere else. And if this reconstruction is correct, then Devaladevi must have been the widow of Harisimha 2). A corroborating piece of evidence may be supplied (it authentic) by the Dolkha text cited above (p. 114), giving the name of Harisimha’s wife as Devalakṣmīdevi, of which Devaladevi would be an abridgment.

Not much is known of the short period of Jagatsimha’s ascendency. Apparently he succeeded in re-affirming the paramountcy of the Tipura house over the chiefs of Nuvakoth, who had asserted their independance (see later, pp. 195–197).

On the other side, his authority did not remain without challenge. On March 17th, 1344, the old mischief-maker Jog Rāma Mulami and Sahaj Mulami made a compact with Paṣupatimalla, a rather mysterious figure whose origin and background are utterly obscure; starting from the castle of Kapan, they raised a rebellion in Bhatgaon itself 3). But apparently the whole affair fizzled out; on September 16th, 1346, Paṣupatimalla was quietly staying at Tokha 4).

Late on Saturday 6th or early on Sunday 7th January, 1347, a daughter was born to Jagatsimha and Nāyakadevi; she was given the name Rājalladevi 5). Ten days later her mother died. The baby had thus lost both her parents; for Jagatsimha had already vanished from the scene. His end is obscure. During some days after the death of Gopiladeva he had been recognized as king by his faction; but apparently he was unable to press his claim. Later, possibly immediately after the birth of his daughter, he was thrown into pri-

1) According to V1, 28a, and VK he simple co-habited with her (saṅghrya-krta).
2) This opinion was accepted also by Dh. Bajracharya, in Pūrṇimā 7 (2022 VS), 14–16; by T. R. Vaidya, “Devaladevi, the wife of Harisimhadeva”; in Nepal Review, 4 (1968), 159–161; and by M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 55b.
3) 464 Caitra śukla 3; V3, 51b.
4) 466 Āsvini śukla pratipad; V3, additional leaf (51 bis).
5) 467 Pauṣa krṣṇa 10, Anurādha-ñakṣatra; VK; V1, 28a; V3, 51b.
son ¹), where he seems to have met his end. We ignore the names of the enemies who contrived his ruin.

The little orphaned princess was entrusted to the care of her maternal grandmother Devaladevi, who proved herself an able and devoted regent. She kept firmly the reins in her hands, as she had done since the times of Padumalladevi. As first thing, she made short work of the potential danger represented by Paśupatimalla. On May 20th, 1348, he came out of Patan and was arrested and imprisoned in the castle of Bhuṅgulachem, where he died on December 3rd of the same year ²). Devaladevi's consummate skill enabled the Bhatgaon principality to weather without mishap the stormy times that confronted it.

All these colourful events are known from V³ and VK only, since the colophons, which had grown rare during these times of strife, continued to recognize the legitimacy of the Gwanla kings only. Actually the monarchy had suffered a nearly complete eclipse; real power in the old capital Patan and in most of the Valley rested in the hands of the aristocracy. It is the names of outstanding noblemen that occur most frequently in VBd during these years, to the almost complete exclusion of the kings. We have already encountered Abhe Rāma Mulami, apparently the most influential man in Tipura. The same position was held in Bhonta by Jyoti Rāma's son Anekha Rāma Mahātha, with whom the Rāma[vardhana] family rose to lasting power in that part of the country. He first appears on August 1st, 1332, when the mahātha Anekha Rāma Bhāro surrounded the castle of Banepa where Jayarāja of Bhonta was residing, until an agreement was patched up between the contending parties ³). On October 13th, 1336, he joined Abhe Rāma Mulami at Gokarna, and together they undertook a campaign against some feudal strongholds ⁴). Then Anekha Rāma's name disappears from the chronicles for some years. Perhaps his place was taken by a relative of his (?), called Ajaya Rāma; on February 12th, 1345, the "lesser minister" (choṭa mahātha) Ajaya Rāma left Palamchok and repaired

¹) V¹, 28a.
²) 469 Mārgašīra śukla 12; V³, 52a.
³) 452 Śrāvana śukla 9; V³, 47a.
⁴) 457 Kārttikeya śukla 8; V³, 48b.
to Bhatgaon 1). Whether he was deposed or he went over to the enemy, is difficult to tell. Then Anekha Rāma Mahātha appears again; on January 28th, 1346, he confronted two nobles who had occupied the castle of Kusān and blocked the route to Bhonta, causing thereby a great scarcity of food; he succeeded in getting the blockade raised 2). By that time he had become the right-hand man of Jayarāja of Bhonta, on whose accession to the throne he became the chief minister. His family was the mainstay of the dynasty; after its extinction the Rāmas tried, and for a time succeeded in maintaining the separate individuality and independence of Bhonta.

Jayarājadeva (1347–1361)

Jayārimalla had been raised to the throne as a puppet of the Tipura chiefs, and we have no reason to doubt that this remained his position till the end. After his death there followed an interregnum of three years. Two reasons may have concurred to produce this effect. Firstly, it appears that Jayārimalla had died without a heir 3). Secondly, the Tipura family was going through the stormy period during the last years of Jagatsimha’s ascendancy and before the birth of Rājalladevi. And after all, the claims of the Bhonta family, evinced from the throne by Jayarudramalla, had also to be considered. There must have been a good deal of wrangling, but as soon as the energetic Devaladevi reasserted her power in January 1347, a solution was soon found. It consisted in an agreement with the Bhonta family, by which the latter was to supply again the nominal king while the whole of Central Nepal remained under the de facto rule of the Bhatgaon princesses. And thus on July 27th, 1347, upon the agreement of both the royal families (ubhaya-rājakula-sānumatena) and with the approval of the whole of the country, Jayarāja was elected king of Nepal 4). On September 6th, 1348, De-

1) 465 Phālguṇa śukla 10; V3, 51a.
2) 466 Māgha śukla 5; V3, additional leaf (51 bis).
3) It has been suggested that Paśupatimalla was the son and heir of Jayārimalla; Th. Manandhar, "Nepal in the early medieval period; gleanings from the Bendall varāśāvali", in JNRC, 1 (1977), 85. But there is no evidence whatsoever in support of this contention.
4) 467 Śrāvana krṣṇa 4; V1, 28a. VK gives the same month and day, but the year
valadevi crowned him in the religious capital Deo Patan; and after this formal act Bhonta recovered its share of the revenue from the Gwan-la region.

Four colophons of this reign are extrant:

1) Ms. Vāmaśevarimahātandtre Tripurāhomavidhi, National Archives, I.1559.6. Colophon

2) Nirvādham parirakṣati kṣititalam kṣmāpālaçūdāmanau | vīra-śrī-Jayarājadeva-nṛpatau Nepāla-sumanḍalām | saiva-cāryavarasya vikhyāta-kirtteḥ kṛte | savyākhyām ca catuh-śatim samalikhan-Nārāyaṇākhyāh kaviḥ || Samvat 474 | The date corresponds to 1353–54.

2) Ms. Cāndrayākaraṇa, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 3823. Colophon

3) Ms. Cindravasikarana, Library, n. 49.1. Colophon

4) Ms. Ratnakarandikci (Smṛtisamuccaya), National Archives, I.111.376.2. Colophon

Jayarājadeva was born at Palarnchok on March 9th, 1317, as the illegitimate son of Jayānandadeva and of his concubine (sarigranāhī bharyā), a daughter of Pātra Rājendrapāla of the Uttaravihāra of Patan. Not much is known of his life before his accession to the throne. On August 7th, 1323, when his father was still alive and he himself was only six years old, he left Banepa and, accompanied by Jyoti Rāma Mahātha, he made a journey to Pharping, Mānigal

464; the date corresponds to July 29th, 1344, two months before the death of Jayārimalla. The date of V1 seems more credible. At the end of the sentence both V1 and VK add a date 467 Vaiśākha śudī 7 (April 18th, 1347); it is difficult to see to which event it could refer.

1) 468 Bhādrapada śudī 13; V3, 52a.
2) Published in CPMDN, I, 71.
3) Published in CSMASB, VI, 115 n. 4411.
4) Published with some mistakes in CPMDN, II, 105.
5) Published in CPMDN, II, 68.
6) 437 Phālguna krṣṇa 10; V3, 45a–b; VK.
and Tipura 1). We ignore their purpose; perhaps it was an attempt to reach an agreement with Jayarudramalla. On April 13th, 1332, Jayarāja of Palamchok met Gaja, the feudatory of Nuvakoth, at Brahmakā 2), possibly with the aim of getting support from that quarter. On August 1st of the same year he was besieged by Anekha Rāma Mahātha at Banepa and had to come to terms with his powerful minister (see back, p. 121). These scanty bits of informations merely indicate some weak attempts at obtaining support; otherwise, Jayarāja played no conspicuous role during his early years.

During Jayarāja’s reign, which lasted from 1347 to 1361, Anekha Rāma continued to hold the position of prime minister (mahātha), while his son Jayasimha Rāma was the attendant of the yuvarāja Jayārjunadeva (born 1338) 3). The agreement between the two ruling houses of Bhonta and Tipura worked well, at least at the beginning, and this sort of dyarchy restored some measure of unity to the Valley. Immediately after the election of Jayarājadeva, on September 8th, 1347, Devaladevi and Anekha Rāma, acting in concert, obtained the control over Patan and conquered Muhrikhā, Kirtipur, Balambu and Yitokvāth 4). After having established the authority of the new regime in Central Nepal, the new rulers took steps to replenish the treasure of Paśupati Nāth, which seems to have functioned as a national reserve treasury. First Devaladevi on October 30th, 1347, then Tipura and Bhonta together on February 22nd, 1348, and lastly Jayarājadeva alone on May 3rd, 1349, made substantial gifts to Paśupati 5).

The moment was most unfortunately chosen, considering the catastrophe which befell the Paśupati Nāth shrine and the whole Valley immediately afterwards, in the shape of the first and only Muslim

1) 443 Bhādrapada śudi 1; V3) 44b.
2) 452 Vaisākha kṛṣṇa 2; V3, 46b.
3) In the opening lines of the drama Madālasājātismaranaṇājaka, National Archives, V.787, there is a statement to this effect: Śrīmaṇnarin jayati nityamAnekarāma mantrāvalambi Jayarājanaṇādhirājah | NepālacakravilasajJayasimharāma sādgunavartti yuvarāja Jayārjunasa-c.a. Quoted by Dh. Bajracharya, “Śaktisāli bhārādār Rāmavarddhanaharu ra tātkālika Nepāl”, in Pūrṇimā, 7 (2022 VS), 22–23; cf. Regmi. 1, 321.
4) 467 Āśvini śukla 3; V3, 51b.
5) Dates: 468 Kārttika pūrṇimā; 468 Phālguna śukla 8; 469 Vaisākha pūrṇimā; VK; V1, 28b; V3, 51b.
invasion in Nepalese history \(^1\)). It was a national disaster of the first magnitude. In the terse words of the chronicle, “\(\text{in the meantime the Eastern Suratāna Samasadina (Sultān Shams ud-dīn) came to Nepal and broke into three pieces the image of Paśupati; the whole of Nepal was ravaged by fire and the people were unhappy. On November 19th, 1349, the great misfortune befell Bhatgaon}” \(^2\). The third part of the chronicle confirms the date and adds that the raid lasted for seven days (\(V^3, 52a\)). This invasion is of course passed under silence in the modern vamsāvalis. It receives, however, full confirmation from two inscriptions.

The first, dated 492 NS, is found behind the great stūpa of Sva-yambhū Nāth \(^3\). It commemorates the restoration of the stūpa, after Śūratrāṇa Samasdina (Sultān Shams ud-dīn) with a numerous army from Bengal had come to Nepal and had broken and burnt the Dharmadhātu–stūpa. This happened in 470 Mārgaśīra śukla 10, guru \(^2\); the date is verified for Thursday, November 19th, 1349, the same date as in the chronicle.

The second inscription is found in the quadrangle of Cilamdyo Bahal (or Pimtha Bahal) in Patan \(^4\). It is a private document, with no royal name mentioned. Its first part commemorates the repairs to the Pimtha Bahāra (Pim Bahal) and the statue of the god made by Śrī-Meghapālavaranman, who is given the title of mahāpātra and is praised because of his victories (\(\text{vijayi sarvvaśatrunihantā} \)) \(^5\).

---

\(^1\) On the Muslim invasion see the obsolete study by Baburam Acharya, “\(\text{Nepal mā bhaye ko Musulmāni ākramaṇ}”\), reprinted in \(\text{Pūrṇimā, 27 (2029 VS), 145–163. Much better is Dh. Bajracharya, }\), “\(\text{Samsuddin ko ākramaṇ} \)” in \(\text{Pūrṇimā, 8 (2022 VS), 6–13.}\)

\(^2\) 470 Mārgaśīra śudi 9; \(V^1, 28b\). This passage was quoted with some mistakes by K.P. Jayaswal, in \(\text{JBORS, 22 (1936), 95. VK reduces it to four words: }\) \(\text{tadantare pūrvaśutānāgata.}\)

\(^3\) This inscription is Doc. 7 of Jayārjunadeva; see below p. 130. The relevant passage reads: \(\text{Saptatayabhāyahādike śrīmanNepālāhā–catuhśate | Mārgaśīrṣe sīte pakṣe dāsa–myām guru–vāsare || Śūratrāṇa–Samasdina Baṅgāla–bahulair–balaḥ sahāgayta ca Nepāle bhagno dagdhas–tu sarvaśah. Published by K.P. Jayaswal, in }\) \(\text{JBORS, 22 (1936), 93, with the date misread as saptaśatāhādike. The correct reading was given by Dh. Bajra- charya in Itihās–Samśodhana, 3 (2010 VS), 4; Yogi Naraharinath, in Itihās Prakās, 1, Kathmandu 2012 VS, 15a; and by P.C. Saraswati, “\(\text{Shams ud-dīn Iyās Shāh’s inva-}\)\(\text{sion of Nepal },\) in \(\text{PIHC 19 (1956) 206.}\)

\(^4\) First published in \(\text{Saṃskṛta Sandeṣa, 1, 10–12 (2019 VS), 10–13.}\)

\(^5\) Meghapālavaranman is possibly the same person mentioned in a ms. \(\text{Marmmaka-}\)\(\text{nīkā–nāma Tattvajhānasiddhipañjikā, National Archives, III.364.5. Colophon (published} \)
pairs were made after “Śrutāṇa Sāmasadino (Sultān Shams ud-dīn), king of the Yavana, had burnt down the whole of Nepal. On that occasion he (Meghapāla), having seen this caitya destroyed, built it anew.” 1). This part of the inscription is dated 477 Caitra śukla 6, Puṣya nakṣatra, Dhṛti yoga, brhaspati. The date is irregular; nakṣa-tra, yoga and day of the week indicate Thursday, March 30th, 1357, while the titti ended on March 27th.

The Muslim ruler mentioned in these documents is Sultan Shams ud-dīn Ilyās of Bengal (1342–1357). His invasion of Nepal is not registered in the Muslim chronicles, but the background of the event is fairly well known. Sultan Tughlaq of Delhi had dispossessed Harisimha and his Karnāṭa dynasty, giving Tirhut to Kāmeśvara, the founder of the Oinwara dynasty. Ilyās, at first a tributary of Muhammad Tughlaq and then an independent ruler, overran Tirhut in 1345–46 and divided it into two parts, both of which acknowledged his suzerainty. From this base he struck into Nepal. Then after this raid Bengal dropped out of Nepalese politics, because about 1353–55 Ilyās lost Tirhut to Fīrūz Shāh of Delhi, who gave back the country to Kāmeśvara’s son Bhogīśvara. And since Fīrūz Shāh was too weak to be able to interfere with Nepal, the Muslim menace faded away, never to be renewed 2).

The effect of the raid by the iconoclastic Muslims must have been appalling, far worse than the inroads by the Hindu chieftains of the hills, who usually at least respected the temples. The invasion by Shams ud-dīn Ilyās may have contributed, along with the perishability of the building material (timber), to the disparition of all the monuments of ancient Nepalese architecture; none of the extant buildings in the Valley proper, however ancient their foundation, seems to be

in CPMDN, II, p. 46): Śaśānka-bindu-viṣaya–gate (= 501) ’bde Māghe ’śīte bhūmisute daśamyām | Āśādhaḥpyave Varṣiṣyā–yoge śrutam tādā śrī–Raṇameghapāḷah || . . . . śrutam–pāṭrādirājena Meghaḥpāḷena dhimata || There was no Vṛṣabhah sāṅkrānti in Vaiguṣa, which gives an intercalary Pauṣa. The Māgha of this colophon corresponds therefore to Phālguna in the Sūrya Siddhānta; and the date is verified in all its elements for Tuesday, February 19th, 1381.


2) See e.g. R. K. Choudhary, “The Oinwaras of Mithila”, in JBRs, 40 (1954), 100–102.
earlier than the 15th century. Reconstruction work was slow. The broken image of Paśupati was re-erected by Jayasiṁha Rāma on April 17th, 1360 ¹), and that of Svayambhū Nāth as late as 1372, as we have seen above.

After the depart of the Bengal army, several events of the year 1349/50 are registered in the chronicle (V³, 52b–53a); but that passage is badly faded and hardly anything can be made out. We merely remark that under the date of January 1350 we find for the first time a mention of the nobleman Jayata Mulami, who was destined to a brilliant career.

Although Nepalese unity was formally preserved, strong forces continued to work against it. People in Bhatgaon seemed to consider Devaladēvi as an independent queen, as shown by the following document:

Ms. Nityāniṅkatilaka, National Archives, I.1361. Colophon ²): Samvat 473 Asuni-śu-kla-trayodasyōyāṁ tithau bhāragava-dine śrī-śrī-R.-P.-Pb.-rājābhidhāvati śrī-śrī-De-valadevyā vijayarājye śrī-śrī- Bhavabhutesvara-śaivācārya-śrī-Narendrapālajīvena likhā-pitam. The date cannot be verified; the tīthi ended on October 5th, 1353, which day was a Thursday and not a Friday.

This piece of evidence remains isolated, and it is likely that the claim was disallowed or at least not pressed by the princess-regent. Anyhow, in a most important matter she acted quite on her own. She arranged personally the marriage of her grand-daughter, still only seven years old, with Jayasthitimalla. The betrothal took place on September 26th, 1354, and five months later the bridegroom entered Bhatgaon and the wedding ceremonies were performed ³).

With Jayasthitimalla a masterful personally enters the history of Nepal. His lineage is surprisingly obscure. The later official account, as found in Kirkpatrick, the Mudita-Kuvalayāśva, VL, VW, VBh, makes him a descendant of Harisimha in the female line, in the fifth or seventh generation; and this is palpably absurd from the chronological point of view. Another version is found in Tucci’s Sanskrit vamsāvali. It gives to his five ancestors more or less the same names as the other

¹) 480 Vaiśākha śukla 2; V³, 54a.
²) Published by Dh. Bajracharya in Pūrṇimā, 7 (2022 VS), 20, and by Regmi, I, 309.
³) 474 Āśvini śukla 9; V³, 53b.
chronicles, but makes the first of them, Nāgamalla, a son of Jayadeva (1255–1258), the third Malla ruler ¹. Thus Jayasthiti would be the representative of the first and earliest branch of the reigning house. But there are some difficulties in accepting this. In the first place it is difficult to cram five generations between 1258 (last known date of Jayadeva) and 1354 (first mention of Jayasthitimalla, possibly still a minor). Secondly, the only two sons of Jayadeva known from the early chronicles are Yakṣamalla (born in 1238) and Jatakeśadeva (born in 1244) ²; Nāgamalla is not among them. Above all, the descendants of Jayasthitimalla never claimed a descendant from the early Malla stock, but chose to connect their line with the Tirhut family of Harisimha. Thus grave doubts must be entertained about the version of the Sanskrit vamśāvali. Other guesses are possible. Jayasthitimalla may have been a son of Pašupatimalla. Or else he, the son of Aśokamalla, may have been an obscure scion of the Khasiyā royal family of Western Nepal, in which the rare name Aśoka appears at least once, of course long before this period ³. But all these suppositions rest on no solid basis ⁴.

If we turn from the late chronicles and from the guesses of modern authors to positive evidence, the only tiny fragment of trustworthy information is supplied by the Gopālavamśāvali, which informs us that Jayasthitimalla came to Nepal from the South (kobana bijyānā; V³, 53b). This sound rather vague, but there is the possibility that Jayasthitimalla came from Tirhut; this would help to explain why he was selected, or at least supported by Devaladevi ⁵. It is also remarkable that the political career of Jayasthitimalla was accompanied by a certain measure of immigration from Tirhut; in the years after 1380 we find repeated mention in the chronicle of Doya (Maithili) residents in Nepal ⁶. And the rule of Jayasthitimalla certainly mar-

---

¹) VT, IV.11–12.
²) V², 34b–35a.
³) This hypothesis is put forward by Suryaman Adhikari, in Nepalko itihāsā vi-vādaspada–viṣayaharu, Kirtipur 2037 VS, 55–59; but his grounds seems hardly sufficient.
⁴) The whole question was examined by Dh. Bajracharya, “Jayasthimallako vamśa”, in Nepalko itihāsā vivāskā vivādaspada viṣayaharu, 48–53. without reaching any definite conclusion.
⁵) See M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 58a.
⁶) V³, 57a, 62b. One Doya (Maithili) Mulami occurs repeatedly in the text: V¹, 56b, 59a, 63b.
ked a strong revival of that sort of rigid brahmanical orthodoxy, which was always typical of Mithilā.

The years following the wedding were surprisingly peaceful; at least no important events are registered in the chronicle. Jayasthiti-malla played no outstanding role as yet; possibly he was still too young, and in any case the reins of the Bhatgaon principality remained firmly in the experienced hands of Devaladevi. In Bhonta, Anekha Rāma maintained himself at the head of the government until his death on July 24th, 1356 1); he was succeeded without difficulty as prime minister (mahātha) by his equally able son Jayasimha Rāma.

The exact date of Jayarājadeva’s death is not known; but basing ourselves on the colophon, we may safely conclude that it happened in February or March or April 1361. The Svayambhū Nath inscription of 492 NS tells us that he died as the result of having been burnt while asleep.

Jayārjunadeva (1361–1382) and the rise of Jayasthitimalla

The new king was Jayārjunadeva, son of Jayarājadeva and of Rudrammadevi, a lady from the Karnaṭa (i.e. Tirhut) family; in the words of the chronicle, “in his person the two royal houses (Bhonta and Tipura–Tirhut) became united” (VK; V1, 28b). He was born on Monday, February 2nd, 1338 2). Before he ascended the throne, he is mentioned as heir-apparent (yuvarāja) in the colophon of a ms. which was written for him:


.... || Samvat 479 Śrāvana–krṣṇa–daśami || The date corresponds to August 18th, 1359.

On April 18th, 1360 he, together with his wife Śaṅkaradevi, was proclaimed king, i.e. associated to the throne in the lifetime of his father, who died only one year later.

---

1) 476 dvīr–Aṣadhā krṣṇa 11: V3, 53b.
2) 458 Māgha śukla 12, Punarvasu, Āyuṣman–yoga, somadina (the date is verified in all its elements); V3, 50a.
3) Published in CPMDN, II, 24.
4) 480 Vaiṣākhā śukla 2; V3, 53a.
Apart from the above-mentioned ms. of the *Rudrayāmala*, sixteen documents of his reign are extant:


7) Inscription behind the central stūpa of Svayambhū Nāth, near Kathmandu. A most important document 7), written in Nepāla–samvat 492 Aśuni–śukla–pūrṇamāṣyāṁ tītahau Aśvini–nakṣatre Sukarma–yoge buddha–vāsare to commemorate a restoration undertaken by Rājaharṣamalla Bhalloka in the reign of Jayārjunadeva, when śrī-

---

1) First published 1958.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 330.
3) Published in *CPMDN*, I, 31.
4) Published in *CPMDN*, I, 105.
5) Published by Regmi, I, 330.
Jayasthitimalla, kṣatraratnākarendu, was protecting Nepal; the two are described in another passage as dvayo-raññor-indropendrasamānayoḥ, which apparently indicates a dvairāja. The date is verified for Wednesday, October 13th, 1372, except for the yoga, which ended on October 4th.

8) Ms. Hitopadesa, Cambridge University Library Add. 2564. Colophon 1): Samvat 493 Pausā-badi-ṛṣṭiyōyām tithau | Magha-naksatre | Āyuṣmāṇa-yoge | sancara-vāsare | samāṭpam-iti | śrimato Nepalamandale M.-P.-Pb.-samastaprakriyābhārājāmāna-śri-śī-Śayārjunadevasya vijayarājye likhitam-idaṃ | parārthena | Lalitāpuri Māṅgalatara Sothānnumapāṭṛtādhiṁ vishāhstena likhitam | Written at Patan. The date is completely irregular. The tīthi ended on January 12th, 1373, which day however was a Wednesday and not a Saturday; the naksatra ended on January 1th and the yoga on January 11th and the yoga on January 10th.


12) Ms. Ratnakaranāḍaka, National Archives, Modern copy (949 NS) of an old ms. Colophon of the original 5): śri-Lalitāpure mahānagaravare śri-Kāraṇḍa-vihāra-livigrhādhivāstitaḥ paramasaugata-dānapatikā-Nātha-Bhārakasya yad-aṭra punyam || Written at Patan. The date is verified in all its elements for Sunday, December 2nd, 1375.


2) Published in CPMDN, II, 18.
3) Partly published in CBMC, 176.
4) Partly published in CBMC, 176.
5) First published 1958.
6) Published by A. Gargano, “Una nuova leggenda di Śūdraka nel Ratnakarāṇḍaka”, in RSO, 26 (1951), 78-79.
Phalguna-śukla-dvitiyāṁ Revati-nakṣatre śubhalagne likhitam-īdam puṣṭakam | rājye ēri-ēri-Jayārjunadevasya etc. The date is verified for Friday, February 22nd, 1376.


16) Ms. Amarakoṣa, Cambridge University Library, Add. 1488. Colophon 3): Śrīmat-Nepālika-samvatsare “Samvat 500 Mārgga” (these words are written over in quite modern ink) śukla-śri-pāñcamyāṁ tithau Revati-nakṣatre Sādhyā-yoge soma-vāsare śrīmat-Lalitāpūri-nīvāsita-mahāpātra-Campusimhadevānām-adhyayanārthāṁ puṣṭakam Amarasimhena likhapitaḥ vajrācārya-śri-Jayācandrena likhitamiti. On the back: śrī-Nepāla-samadhi-bindu-vikhaye Māghāsite māse śrī-pāñcamyāṁ tithi Citarā-śasidāne yata Ganda-yogatīta | Nepāla-bhuvamandalēśvara prabhūpate .. kalpadruma... Jayār(a)jana ... lokāṁrāta (ʔ for ta) bhūpatir-astalokavana... Written at Patan. The dates are badly misspelt, tampered with, and difficult to read. The first one is quite evidently wrongly corrected by the later hand who wrote the year and month. Jayārjunadeva died in 502, so the only years we have to consider are 500, 501 and 502, as it is impossible that the figure of the hundreds can be wrong. We can also assume with a fair degree of certainty that Mārgga is either an abbreviation for Mārggasirā or a mistake for Māgha. Now, the only year and month, within these limits, for which the date can be completely verified (pakṣa, tithi, nakṣatra, yoga, day of the week) is 502 Māgha; it is Monday, January 20th, 1382. – The second date is hardly intelligible, but it apparently refers to the death of Jayārjunadeva (deva...lokāṁrāta...), which we know from V.3, f. 60 b to have happened in 502 Magha kṛṣṇa 5. Thus the date in the colophon must be read as follows: Nepāla-sam[va]-dvi-bindu-viṣaye (= 502) Māghāsite māse śrī-pāñcamyāṁ tithau Citarā-nakṣatre] śasidāne yate Ganda-yogatīte; it is verified for Monday, February 3rd, 1382.

From all these elements we can gather with certain that Jayārjunadeva reigned from February or March or April 1361 till February 3rd, 1382.

His position was always rather weak. He ruled directly over

1) Published in CSMASB, I, 45-46, n. 45.
2) Published in Brhatsucipatra, IX (2026 V.S.), 1011-.
3) Published with some misunderstandings in CBMC, 119.
Bhonta and his sovereignty was recognized also in Patan, where, however, power was in the hands of the *mahāpātras*. His suzerainty over Bhatgaon was absolutely nominal, and soon it was completely rejected. Characteristically, the Tipura regent had profited of the illness and death of Jayarājadeva for sending a force against Nuvakoth (March 17th, 1361); that outlying district, upto then autonomous, was completely subdued 1). In practice, this meant an increase in the power and resources of Tipura, not of the titular king.

And yet, as far as we know, the uneasy arrangement concluded in 1347 worked more or less smoothly as long as Devaladevi lived. After having dominated Nepalese politics for almost forty years, that wily old lady died on April 18th, 1366 2). After her demise Jayasthitimalla, who may have chafed under her control, became the sole master in Bhatgaon, although formally he was only the husband of the rightful ruler. At first the tolerable relations with Bhonta continued, but then peace broke down and a long tussle began between the two rival families, i.e. practically between Jayasthitimalla and Jayasimha Rāma, the all-powerful minister of Jayarjunadeva.

On March 30th, 1369, Jayarjunadeva and Jayasimha Rāma Maḥātha entered Tipura and stayed there for some time(?) 3). This visit, if such it was (the translation of the passage is doubtful), would purport a moment of almost cordial relations between the two houses. This collaboration continued for some time; on January 3rd, 1370, the two kings (*ubhaya-rāja*) together took Sankhu, looted it completely and put it to the torch 4). In 1372 the Svayambhū Nāth inscription (Doc. 7 above) still shows the "two kings ruling together like Indra and Viṣṇu (Upendra)".

By that time, however, the balance of power had already shifted, and the turning point was reached when Jayasthitimalla won over the notables of the old capital Patan. We may have expected them to support Jayarjunadeva, who was their kinsman; we recall that his paternal grandmother was the daughter of Rājendrapāla, a *mahāpātra*

---

2) 486 Vaiśākha *sukla* 7; V3, 54a.
3) 489 Kārttika *sukla* 10; V3, 54b.
4) 490 Māgha *sukla* 5; V3, 54b–55a.
of Patan. Thanks to heavy bribing by Jayasthitimalla, the aristocracy of Patan went over to his side. On April 28th, 1370, “Jayasthitimalla betook himself to the procession (yātra) [of Matsyendranāth] in Mānigal of Patan. He entered Mānigal through [a gate of] gilt copper covered with cloth. He gratified many leaders and chiefs (pramukha–nāyaka) presenting them with pieces of gold. Foremost among them was Jayata Mulami”. The latter became soon after the prime minister (mahātha) of the Bhatgaon ruler. Jayasthitimalla restored order by strong means, putting to death some Patan robbers who had committed theft in the treasure of Paśupati Nāth 1).

The feud between Tipura and Bhonta flared out in the open when Jayasimha Rāma tried to recover the lost ground. He plotted to raise a rebellion against Jayasthitimalla, but on May 3rd, 1372, he was clapped in prison. This act roused strong discontent among the aristocracy of Patan, and two months later (June 9th) they rebelled and marched to Thimi. Jayasthitimalla himself took the field against them and a battle was fought; the rebels were defeated and fifty-three of their leaders (pradhāna, nāmadhārī, pātra etc.) were killed 3). After this lesson the rebels submitted; but Jayasthitimalla did not carry matters to an extreme, and on July 30th Jayasimha Rāma was liberated 4).

Still the stubborn Bhonta minister was loath to acknowledge defeat. Three months later he was again intriguing, and at last he took the field against the Tipura leader. On Tuesday, September 12th, 1374, Jayasthitimalla met and defeated the united forces of his opponents near the Pim Bahal in Patan; the mahātha and the nobles (Bhāro) of Pharping were taken prisoners 5). This battle was decisive, and for some time Jayasimha Rāma Mahātha ceased to oppose Jayasthitimalla, by then the unquestioned master, but by name, of the Nepal Valley.

The remaining years of Jayārjunadeva’s nominal reign were eventless. We only read that Jayasthitimalla consolidated his grasp of the

---

1) 490 Vaiśākha śukla 3; V3, 56b.
2) 492 Vaiśākha badi āmāvasya ;V3, 55a.
3) 492 Āśādha śukla 9; V3, 55a.
4) 492 Śrāvana āmāvasya; V3, 55b.
5) Āśvini śukla 6–7, aṅgāra, Jyeṣṭha–naksatra (verified); V3, 56a.
Valley by the construction or restoration of several castles: at Baharkoth in 1375, at Thakha and Piiiri (?) in 1378 (V3, 55b, 57b). Of course we must remember that these accounts are heavily biased; the chronicle was written at the court of Jayasthitimalla and is therefore mostly dedicated to glowing tales of his building activities, donations to temples etc.

As was inevitable in the course of events, in the end the de-facto ruler saw no reason why he should not become the de-jure sovereign as well. The action he took was characteristically cautious and respectful of the aura of legitimacy still clinging to Jayārjunadeva, and above all of the feelings of the nobles and peoples of Bhonta. His main counsellor and helper was his prime minister Jayata Mulami. On Friday, November 23rd, 1380, Jayasthitimalla and Jayata Mahātha, with the consent of the chief nobles (pramukha), sent Jayārjunadeva to Banepa, ostensibly on pilgrimage (yātra) 1). This implied his exclusion from any activity in the Valley; it was tantamount to deposition and exile.

Jayārjunadeva made a last feeble attempt to vindicate his authority. Twenty-two days after his arrival, he left Banepa and betook himself to the castle of Gokarna; shortly after he proceeded to Bhatgaon (V3, 59b). This is apparently the situation depicted in an undated colophon, which I now refer to this period:

Ms. Daśakarma, National Archives, I.1179.1. Colophon 2): Svasti śri-R.-śri-śri-Jayasthitirājamalladevasya vijayarājye likhita-pustakam | tasmin samaye apa[ra]-rājasya rājā-śri-śri-Jayārjunaw-nāma-rājā Tripura-rājasacivena pravāhitena mahāsaṁkatabena praviṣati || "In the reign of king Jayasthitimalla; in this time the king of the other kingdom, by name Jayārjunadeva, entered (the Valley?) with a great danger caused by the royal counsellor of Tipura".

The text is not clear, and other interpretations are possible. Accepting my translation, it would mean that a Tipura minister had gone over to Jayārjunadeva, and had induced him to advance on Bhatgaon 3). In any case, there was widespread unrest. Jayasthitimalla, who for the first time is given the royal title, made short

---

1) 501 Mārgaśira kṛṣṇa 12, Svāti-nakṣatra, śukradina (verified); V3, 59b.
2) Published in CPMDN, I, 39, where several words are omitted and the colophon is wrongly attributed to a ms. of the Mayāracitra, I.1179.5. Again published in Itihās Samādhana, 2 (2011 VS), 5.
3) The interpretation of Regmi, I, 338, is more of less on the same lines.
work of his rival, arresting him and confining him in Bhatgaon. And in his forced residence in Tipura Kvāchem (an annexe to the royal palace) Jayārjunadeva died on February 3rd, 1382. With his death, apparently without male issue, the Bhonta royal family came to an end.

Jayasiṃha Rāma’s role in these proceedings is unknown. We can hardly assume that he approved of the change. Apparently he tried for a moment to set himself up as regent for the vacant throne; on June 21st, 1382, the Itham Bahal inscription shows him as Lord-Protector of the Realm (pratipālika-vijayarājye) (see later, p. 151). But the attempt was doomed from the start, as he lacked the formal cover of a legitimate pretendent to the throne; and almost at once he must have resigned himself to the inevitable. In the following years he participated peacefully in the religious life of the country.

1) 502 Māgha kṛṣṇa 5; V3, 60b. Cf. V1, 30a: bhagnadevaḥ vaśāj-Jayārjunadeva-nrpo.
CHAPTER VII

JAYASTHITIMALLA AND THE KARṆĀṬA–MALLAS

Jayasthitimalla (1382–1395)

The date of the exile of Jayārjunadeva (November 23rd, 1381) was considered as the beginning of Jayasthitimalla’s reign, as expressly stated by the final stanza in the first part of the old chronicle (V1, 30a). The formal proclamation took place on September 15th, 1382, when Jayasthitimalla gathered all the noblemen (bhāro) and accepted their homage and offerings (prasāda) ¹).

Beside the Svayambhū Nāṭh inscription of 1360 and the undated colophon quoted above (p. 135), no less than thirty–three documents of this reign are extant:

¹) Ms. Yuddhajayirnava, National Archives, I.1624.4. Colophon ²): Samvat pta (= 4) × × [Ā]śāḍha–śukla–saptamī–tīthau Hasta–naksatre Śiva–yoge ādityavare Šri– śri–Jayasthirājamalladevasya vijayarāje likhitam || The second and third figures of the year are illegible and H. P. Shastri’s date of 426 is absurd. Having applied the necessary tests, we find that only the year 493 fits all the elements of the date, which is verified for Sunday, June 26th, 1373, between 20 h. 45 m. and 24 h.

2) Copper–plate inscription on the wall of the Gorakṣanāṭha temple³); dated 499 deva Gorakṣo dvitiya udvatithi ..... śri–śri–Jayasthirājamalladeva pratisvāmī sa ādeśa... The year corresponds to 1378/9.


¹) 502 Āśvini śukla 8; V3, 60b.
²) Published in CPMDN, I, 84, with the year wrongly read and all the rest of the date omitted.
³) Published in Samskṛta Sandeśa, 1/6, 5–6; cited by Regmi, I, 358.
⁴) Published in CPMDN, I, 43.
varmananāḥ pustakam-īdam. . . śrīman-āmātya-Jayato ripumantripraudhavuda prasara-visphuranoruvāyuh | svasvāmikaryā-paripalana | vāyusunu pātyāt praṇāi nījasutānīva sarrvadevāḥ. Written at Bhātgaon. The date is verified for Thursday, February 9th, 1380.


9) Ms. Tripurasundaripijāpadaddhati, National Archives, I.1584.4. Colophon 6): Samvat śukra-śaunya-vaktre (= 5067) Kārttika-śukla-paṇcamiyām tithau Jaiṣṭha-nakṣatre sūraguru-vāsare | śrī-Bhaktapuri-nīvāsināḥ śrī-Jayasthitirājamalladevaḥ vijaya (sic) Yubilacche-tołakastha-Jantardmaṇa likhitam-īti. Written at Bhatgaon. The tithi and nakṣatra indicate October 8th, 1385, which day, however, was a Sunday and not a Thursday.


1) Published by Regmi, I, 358.
2) Published in Sanskrita Sandeśa, 1/10–12, 84–85; cited in Regmi, I, 359.
3) Published in CBMC, 84.
4) Published in CPMDN, I, 84.
5) Published by Regmi, I, 358–359.
6) First published 1958. The reading of the date was corrected by Regmi, I, 353.


16) Stone inscription in the compound of Sundhārā at Deo Patan 6). It is mainly a poetical praśasti in honour of the deceased queen Rājalladevi. It mentions with high praise her three sons Jayadhama, Jayaiyotir and Jayakirtimalla. In her honour her husband Jayasthitimalamall built a pranāli (fountain). The date is given twice, first in the body of the poem, and then in prose at the end. The king is mentioned as śrīman-Māneśvari-vaśalabdhakṛpāya saṣāṃtya mahiḍāla-śrī-Śrī-Jayasthitīrajamalladevena. The date is Nepalika Samvat 508 Marggāśira-śukla-dāśamyāṃ bhṛhaspati-vaṣare Revati-nakṣatre Vāryāna-yoge Gara-karane Bicchā-rāṣi; it is verified in all its particulars for Thursday, November 21st, 1387.


1) Published in CBMC, 187-188.
2) Published in CPMDN, II, 78-79.
3) Published in CSMASB, VII, 252-253, n. 5316.
4) First published 1958.

18) Ms. Itihāsamucucayya, National Archives, IV.52. Colophon 1): .... linarpārākīt sumanasām nāthāyudhe vopamā seym śrī-Bhaktāpule ....... yuvanāpabha || astādhi-ke athā pañcaṣate Nepāla- hāyane Caibre-śukla-dvitiyāyām āsvini-ṛksye kuge hani || śrī-Jayasthirājīvaṇa raksīte rājaṁuttamam || Bhūdevāvaiyajātā liṅkhaṭam || Written at Bhatgaon. The date is verified for Tuesday, March 10th, 1388.

19) Copper plate in the main shrine at Nhaikan Bahil in Kathmandu 2). Dated Sriman-Śthitirijamallatiyo lokārṇīttrākṣāvṛati ....... aṣṭottāre pañcaṣate gate 'bde Nepaliye Jyeṣṭha site daṣāmīyām || tithittare Pāṅgūna saṃjñake 'bhe Śuddhyākṣa-yoge bhṛgu-vaṣare ca .... And again: śreya 'stu samvat 508 Jyeṣṭha-śukla-daṣāmīyām Uttarapalga-ṇaṇa-viṣare Śuddhi-joge śukra-vaṣare R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jayasthirājamalladevasya viyāvarājye. The date is verified for Friday, May 15th, 1388.


21) Ms. Mahālakṣmiṇīvṛata, Kaisher Library, n. 559.3. Colophon 4): Samvat 509 Vaiśāgha-krṣṇa-navaṇyām pra-daṣāmīyāṃ tithau Uttarabhadra-nakaṣṭre Āyuṣmāna-yoge bhṛosphati-viṣare | ....... | śrī-R.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jayasthirājamalladevasya rāja-viṣvārājye liṅkhaṭit-iti | ....... śrī-Māṅgiḷake śrī-Dakṣināvihāre etc. Written at Patan. There was no Mithuna sarikrinti in Jyeṣṭha, and this gives an intercalary Pauṣa. The Vaiśākha of this colophon corresponds therefore to adhika-Jyeṣṭha in the Sūrya Siddhānta, and the date is verified in all its elements for Thursday, May 20th, 1389.


1) First partly published 1958; more fully by Regmi, I, 355.
2) First published by Sh. Rajbamshi in Pūrṇinā, 4 (2021 VS), 54-57; and again by Regmi, III, 30-31.
3) Published by Regmi, I, 359.
4) First published 1958.
5) Published in CBMC, 191.
is irregular. *Titith* and day of the week correspond to Thursday, December 1st, 1390; but the *nakṣatra* ended on December 6th, and the *yoga* on December 3rd.

24) Stone inscription on the steps of the temple of Gorakṣanātha in the jungle of Pharping.\(^1\) Dated Samvat 511 Māgha-śukla-śri-pañcamiṃṇī-tīṭhā Uttarābhadrā-nakṣatre Siddhi-yoge budha-vāsare R.-P.-taragunatara-śri-śri-Jayasthirājāmalladevasya vijayarājye | śri-Śikharāpūrā-nagaryāṃ (= Pharping) śri-Jayajuthasimhadevaḥ sa-bhrāṛbhiḥ pratipaṭitayāṃ. The date is verified in all its details for Wednesday, January 11th, 1391.

25) Copper-plate inscription over the main gate of the Woku-baha Bahi, i.e. the subsidiary court of the Rudravarna-mahāvihara in Patan.\(^2\) Very elaborately dated: Athā Kali-rājavarṣe 4492 Vikrama-rājavarṣe 1448 Śāka-rājavarṣe 1313 śrimatNepālika śreyostu samvat 511 prathamāṣaḍāḥ-śukla-ḍaśamīyaṇāṃ ghaṭī 25 velā ekādaśayaṃ tīṭhāv karataṇe ṣaśiḍhāre 51 Svāti-nakṣatra ghaṭī 49 tasmāt nava-nakṣatra pratisthāpitam Śiva-yoge ghaṭī 15 pra-Siddhi-yoge soma-vāsare Mithuna-rāśi-gate savitari Tula-rāśi-gate candramasi. There was no Kanyā saṅkraṇti in Bhāḍrapada, which gives an intercalary Āṣāṅga. The date is verified in all its numerous elements for Monday, June 12th, 1391. It was made R.-P.-Pb.-syā śri-Jayasthitirājāmalladevasya vijayarājye.

26) Ms. Aghorapājā, National Archives, I.135.9. Colophon\(^3\): Samvat 511 Śrāvana-śukla-ḍaśamīyaṃ śrī-śrī-Pb.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jayasthirājāṃ vijayā (sic) likhitam || Āṣāṅga being intercalary, the Śrāvana of this colophon corresponds to adhīka-Bhāḍrapada of the Śrīya Sīdhāntā. The date corresponds to August 9th, 1319.

27) Ms. Āryā-Kāraṇḍavyūha, Kaisher Library, n. 5. Colophon\(^4\): Śrī-Lalitabrūmāyaṃ śrī-Śrī-Vairajā-samkṣita-vijayāṃ śrī-Śrī-Pb-Śrī-Śrī-Jayasthirājāṃ māvānā-sūtra-vijyaṃ || Śrīya being intercalary, the Śrīvaṇa of this colophon corresponds to adhīka-Bhāḍrapada of the Śrīya Sīdhāntā. The date corresponds to August 9th, 1319. with the exception of the Citra-nakṣatra, which ended on the 5th and apparently had been referred to the 5th of the same month.

28) Ms. Paḥcaraṅaṣā, in private possession in Bhatgaon. Colophon\(^5\): Samvat 512 Citra-śukla-ḍaśamīyaṃ tīṭhau Maṅgā-nakṣatre Śūla-yoge jina-vāsare sampūrhādine | R.-P.-Pb.-Śrī-Jayasthirājāmalladevasya vijayarājye || śreyo 'stu || Samvat 511 Śrāvana-śrīaṅgā-krṣṇa-pañcamiṃṇi Citra-nakṣatre Dhruva-yoge śāhācāra-vāsare likhitasaṃpurṇam-iti subhāṃ || Written in the Pinta Bahi (Gopicandra mahāvihāra) in Patan. Āṣāṅga being intercalary, this Śrāvana corresponds to adhīka-Bhāḍrapada of the Śrīya Sīdhāntā. The date is verified for the late hours of Saturday, August 19th, 1391. with the exception of the Citra-nakṣatra, which ended on the 5th and apparently had been referred to the 5th of the same month.

29) Stone inscription in the compound of the temple of Kumbheśvara at Patan.\(^6\) It

---

4) First published 1958.
5) Published by Regmi, I, 359.


32) Ms. Guhyasiddhikrama, National Archives, I.1692.6. Colophon 3): Samvat 514 dur-Akhādha-mā[sa]-suklapāsa-pancamī-ṛ[a]-khaṣṭyāyāṃ tithau Utraraphalgunī-nākṣatre Parigha-joge śanaścara-vāsare Kraḍharaśi gate śāvīrī Śimharāśi pra-Kanyārāśi gate candramāśi | śrī-śrī-Bhaktagrāme śrī-śrī-Jayasthitirājamaladevasya vijayarāīye etc. There was no Simha sarikānti in Śrāvana and this gives an intercalary Asidha. The date is verified in all its elements for Saturday, July 4th, 1394.


Another date of Jayasthitimalla is 515 Māgha śukla 10 (= February 15th, 1395), when he performed a kōṭyāhutiyaṭjaṇa 5).

The date of his death is given in a note on the last leaf of a ms.

1) First published 1958 and then again by Dh. Bajracharya in Purnima, 7 (2022 VS), 28.
2) First published 1958.
3) Partly published in CPMND, I, 87.
4) Published in CSMASB, I, 29, n. 31.
5) Wright, 187.
of the Bhāratīya–Nātyaśāstra, National Archives, V.323, in the following terms 5): Yāte kāmaśaraikabhūtāsahite (= 515) Naipālike hāya-ne sāṣṭhyāṁ Bhādrapade `site ravidine ṛkṣe tathā Sraṣṭāri (= Rohini) | madyāhne Sthitirājamalla–nrpatiḥ svarggavirōhaṁ gato hāhākāraraśvah sa- sōkvacana vyāptāṁ prajānān mukhaṁ. The date is verified for Sunday, September 5th, 1395.

Jayasthitimalla’s title to the throne was not inherited from his obscure father Aśokamalla, but reposed only on the rights of his wife Rājalladevi. In most of the ms. copied at Bhatgaon (the seat of his wife’s family) he is consistently denied the royal title, being simply styled sṛi and sometimes nrpati. His status as the husband of Rājalladevi is stressed at least thrice: in doc. 3, doc. 16 and in the ms. of the Abhinava–Rāghavānanda–Nāṭaka to be cited further on.

Rājalladevi died in 506 Kārttika śukla 2, Svāti nakṣatra, Priti yoga, brhaspati (V3, 67a); the date is verified for the last hours of Thursday, October 5th, 1385. But even after this, he is never given the royal titles in the Bhatgaon mss. (with the exception of doc. 12), nor in the Deo Patan inscription. It is only at Patan that he is granted the full royal style of R.–P.–Pb. His constitutional position was apparently as follows. He joined in a personal union the kingdom of Patan and the principality of Bhatgaon, which, however, maintained their separate individualities. At Bhatgaon, to which no royal style was attached, he ruled as the prince-consort of Rājalladevi; shortly before her demise, he is even given the title of heir-apparent (yuva-rāja) (Doc. 8). After this event he became the titular prince of Bhatgaon, and as such he did not use locally the royal style. In the nominal capital Patan he was recognized as the successor of Jayārjuna-deva, and as such he was entitled to the full royal title. This situation is clearly reflected in Doc. 15 with its quaint style of “rāja who is also rājādhirāja”. Jayasimha Rāma Mahātha, who considered himself as the heir of the rights of the extinct Bhonta dynasty, punctiliously underscores the fact that Jayasthitimalla was reigning paṭṭa-vad–dharmya, which I take to mean “by the right [of his coronation] with an infula” (Doc. 30 and 31). In a way, Jayasthitimalla was king only in a limited sense.

5) The note was first published by Dh. Bajracharya, Itihās Pramāṇ Prameya, 38, and in Itihās Samśodhana (2010 VS), 7.
This reign marks on the whole the end of a period of division and the restoration of order. Jayasthitimalla did not abolish the feudal structure of the country, nor the growing autonomy of Patan; but he curbed, at least for a moment, the lawlessness of most of the turbulent aristocracy. Even Jayasimha Rāma accepted for a while his paramountcy. But during the last years of his rule Jayasthitimalla seems to have lost his grip of the situation. Not only Bhonta emphasized again its autonomous status, but other border feudatories tried to break away from the central power, as shown by the following colophon:


This claim to absolute independence shows a serious weakening of the Nepalese government. But before this happened, Jayasthitimall's reign meant the end of a long period of troubles and restoration of order. A significant symptom of this is the quite large number of colophons and inscriptions belonging to the fifteen years or so of his sole rule.

All the modern chronicles present him as a legislator who left his mark in many fields. Some of his enactments were of purely ceremonial or ritual character. Such were the regulations for the cremation ceremony of the deceased king, which was to be attended by his subjects of all castes. He even laid down the rules for the music to be played at the funerals both of the king and of private persons; he gave also minute descriptions of the dress and footgear for each caste. More relevant was his intervention in the field of penal law; he prescribed that henceforward criminal offences (apparently of minor character) were to be punished by fines, and not by beating and

1) Published in *CBMC*, 30.
abuse, as it has been the rough-and-ready method before him 1). He introduced new regulations concerning the classification of the cultivated fields (in four classes); a similar one applied to the houses and to the building estates. In both cases the measures expressed the value and not the surface of the terrain or house. The result was a real ground survey of lasting value, which in the 19th century excited the admiration of Hodgson 2). He granted, or rather renewed, the permission to his subjects to sell or mortgage freely their hereditary landed property 3), which seems to be a duplication of the old law of Ānandadeva. Most important of all, he attempted to reduce the whole structure of Nepalese society into an orthodox Hindu frame; this reform will be discussed in a later chapter (see pp. 205–206).

Jayasthitimalla’s legislative activity is passed under silence by the contemporary sources 4), and we ignore how far he can be held responsible for it. But according to tradition his re-organization of the caste structure remained theoretically valid till recent times, although deeply modified through the centuries.

From the religious point of view, he shared the devotion of most of his contemporaries for Rāma. At the birth of his first son Jayadharmamalla in 487 he caused a drama on Rāma’s deeds to be played (V1, 29a). Another play, the Bāla–Rāmāyaṇa (of Rājašekhara?) was performed on the occasion of Jayadharmamalla’s initiation ceremony in 497. Again in 503 a drama on the story of Rāma and Vibhīṣana was represented at the court of Bhatgaon (V1, 30a). This was the Abhinava–Rāghavānanda–Nāṭaka by Mānīka, which is preserved in a ms. of the Cambridge University Library, Add. 1658 5). At Jayadharmamalla’s wedding the Bhairavānanda–Nāṭaka by the same author was performed 6). Jayasthitimalla was a devotee of Vi-

---

1) These rules are given both in Wright’s Buddhist chronicle, 183–184, and in Padmagiri’s Hindu chronicle in B. J. Hasrat, History of Nepal, 55–56.
2) These items are given only in Wright, 110. See the remarks and comments by S. Lévi, Le Népal, I, 298–299.
3) This enactment is found only in Hasrat, 55.
4) The only hint seems to be supplied by the title Nepāla–rāṣṭra–śāstra given to the king in his Doc. 11.
ṣnu, as witnessed by the title of Daitya-Nārāyaṇa, which he is given in the preface to the Abhinava-Rāghavānanda-Nāṭaka, and of Asura-Nārāyaṇa in the inscription of 521. He took as his protecting deity (iṣṭadevatā) the ancient goddess Māneśvari, who filled that position as long as the Malla dynasty reigned. But he was also a devotee of Śiva, as he had to be in a country where Paśupati was the national god. Two Śaiva svāmi played a great role at his court. One was Śivadāsa Upādhyāya, who on May 5th, 1380 bestowed the religious initiation on the king and his queen ¹; he died on June 25th, 1387 ². The other was Dvijāra Upādhyāya, who is mentioned in 1379, 1383 and 1388 ³.

Most of the old-style aristocracy rallied to Jayasthiti Malla. Foremost among them was Jayata Mulami. We have already followed his career down to 1380. In that year he is mentioned in the chronicle (V₃, 59a) and sponsored the copying of Doc. 3, where he is given the titles of amātya and mantrindra and the full name Jayatavarman. In 1381 he seconded Jayasthitimalla in engineering the exile of king Jayārjunadeva; at that time his title was changed to Jayata Mahāthā, becoming thus the prime minister of Nepal. If he is identical with the amātya Jayatabrahmā mentioned in 1386 and 1388 (Doc. 10, 11, 20), then he died after the latter year.

Jayadharmamalla (1395–1408).

The succession of Jayasthitimalla devolved on his three sons Jayadharmamalla (b. 1367), Jayaiyotirmalla (b. 1373) and Jayākirtimalla (b. 1377). They did not divide the kingdom among themselves, but reigned for some years collegiately, with the eldest, Jayadharmamalla, acting in some respects as their representative. Twenty-two documents of this period are extant:


²) V₁, 29a; V₃, 62b, 63b. 507 Aśādha śukla 9; V₃, 63b.
³) V₁, 29a; V₃, 62b, 63b.
⁴) Published in CSMASB, VII, 405, n. 5486.
bdhaprasađa-mahāpratāpavān jaurāja-śrī-śrī-Jayadharmamalladevasya vijayarājye tasyānuja-śrī-śrī-Jayajyotirmalla kaneṣṭha-Jayakirtimalla traya mahānubhāva-pritiyuktānena śṛ-Neulpāmanḍala samasta dharmārtge putravat pratipālītā. The date is verified for May 14th, 1396.

2) Ms. Šyāḍantakośa, National Archives, V.418. Colophon 1): Samvat 516 Āśādha-śudī-pratipadyāyām tithau budha-vāsare Punarvasu-nakṣatre yuvarāja-śrī-śrī-Dhamma-
lalladevasya vijayarājye samaye | śṛ-Byanappāṇa-deśe Naḥyapatanavare brahmakū-
-lendra-vipra-śrī-Jīvasārmanāsya yathābhiliḥkhitamorathā pustakam idam etc. Written
in the district of Byanappāṇa, which may be Banepa. The date is verified for Wed-
nesday, June 7th, 1396.

3) Ms. Śivadharmaśāstra, Cambridge University Library, Add. 2836. Colophon 2): Svasti śṛ-Śrī-Khāramimāṃ-janmasthānādhivāśino vipra-śrī-Hakojusāpatī-kṛtena || likhitam pu-
stakam Śāntikādhīyāyam || tasmin samaye śṛ-Śrī-R.-jeṣṭhaḥ jorāya-Dharmmedava madhya-
śṛ-Jayajyotimaladeva-kanēṣṭha-Jayakirtimaladeva traya-saṃmata rājye kṛtām | śreya 'stu samvat 516 Śrāvana-krṣṇa-sapti śubham | The place is not known. The
date corresponds to July 27th, 1396.

4) Ms. Pañcarakṣā, National Archives, n. ?. Colophon 3): R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jayadharmamalladevasya vijayarājye || Samvat 516 Bhādrava-śukla-dvādasāyām tithau Uttrā-
sādha-nakṣatre Saubhāgya-yoge budha-vāsare likhitam-idam śṛ-Humudādhivāsa-va-
jrācārya-śrī-Manikarājaacandrena svahastena lekhitam || The place is verified for Wed-
nesday, August 16th, 1396.

5) Ms. Âśvavaidyakasāstra, in private possession at Patan. Colophon 4): Svasti śrī-Nai-
pālika-vatsara muni-mahi-kandarpā-bāne yute māse Bhādrapade site guna-tithau 
somātmaja-vāsare śrimat-śrī-Jayajyotirmalla-nrapeṭh rājñānukartalikhat lekhi lekha-
dambaro Jasapati śrī-Vājīśastrotātaṃ || sakalagunānīdhāno dharmikirteḥ nidāna-
samaravānavihārī vairidarppahārī aṃtikakaranibhāṅga kāminīnām anango jayati nrpr-
timallo śrī-Jayajyotirmalla || Oṃ śreya 'stu samvat 517 Bhādrapada-śukla-ṣaṣṭhyām 
tithau Anurādha-nakṣatre Viśkambha-yoge budha-vāsare R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jayadharmam-
alla)devasvya vijayarājye śrī-śrī-Jyotirmalladevasya prabho Jayaddita pustakam Ko-
ligrāma-samavasthitā Jasapati-nāṃmā likhitamiti. Written at Koligrāma, the archaic
name of Lichchavi times for Yambu, i.e. Kathmandu North. The date is verified for Wed-
nesday, August 16th, 1396, with the exception of the yoga which ended
on September 2nd.

6) Ms. Saptāśati, National Archives, I.1534.2. Colophon 5): Yuvarājādhirāja-Pb.-śrī-
śrī-Dharmamalladevasya vijayarājye | Samvat 518 Māgha-krṣṇa-daśamāṁ tithau 
Uttarāśādha-nakṣatre Śukla-yoge budha-vāsare likhitam-idam pustakaṃ || The date
is irregular. The nakṣatra and the day of the week indicate Wednesday, February
13th, 1398; but the 10th tithi ended on the morning of the 13th, and the Śukla
yoga on the 29th.

1) Published by Regmi, I, 373.
2) First published 1958. Mentioned by C. Bendall, "Notes on a collection of
mss. obtained by Dr. Gimlette ", in JRAS 1888, 551, n. VI.
3) Published by Regmi, I, 373.
4) Published by Regmi, I, 373-374.
5) Published with some omissions in CPMDN, I, 64. The date of this ms., mis-
read by H. P. Shastri as 118, misled S. Lévi to postulate a Malla kingdom in the Valley
about 1000 A.D.
indus- ca bhutābdā (= 519) prathamam Kārttika-sucih | Āyuṣmān- sukra-Svatiś- ca
samāpta- pustakā- subham | sa- tikkā brhajjētaka likhitā svalpabuddhinām | daivajjā-Ga-
jaraējena svātmārtham etc. | Bhaktāpurī- nagaryām ca traylorāja virājate | Dharmma-
Jotiś- ca Kirttīs- ca jeśṭha- madhya- kaniṣṭhake | Written at Bhatgaon. The date is
verified in all its elements for Friday, October 11th, 1398.

sukla- trayoyādayām tithau Dhanīṣṭhā Śukramāni (= Sukarmani) yoge buda-
vāsare (sic!) | subham- astu | śri- yuvārājādhirāja- P.- Pb.- śri- śri- Jayadharmanamalladevasya
vijayarājye likhitam- iti | The date is verified in all its particulars for Wednesday,
September 1st, 1400.

tathā khyātam muninām daśanaṁ drikitam rākām samayombhīrōntām navami ca śuklāsinā |
śukra meravottri-vātī samcīpta pustaki iubham | . . . . . . | Bhaktāpurī- nagaryām ca traylorāja virājate | Dharmma- Jotiś- ca
Kirttīs- ca jeśṭha- madhya- kaniṣṭhake | Written at Bhatgaon. The date is irregular. The
tithi and nakjatra point to September 26th, 1400, which day, however, was a Sunday and not a Friday.

10) Ms. Galavokta- Mahālakṣimāhāmya, National Archives, V. 366. Colophon 4): Sam-
vat 521 Kārttika- kṛṣṇa śukra- vāsare Hasta- nakṣatre R.- P. - P b.- Jayadharmanamalladevasa
vijaya rājye. The date is verified for Friday, November 12th, 1400.

11) Ms. Durgāsaptāsati, National Archives, V. 681. Colophon 5): Samvat 521 Vaśākha-
sukla- pańcamāmyām tithau Mūla- nakṣatre Śiva- yoge āditya- vāsare śri- śri- Pāsupati- ca-
raṇa- kamala- sevita- śri- śri- Māṇeśvarīstādevatā- varalabhaprasāda- Vīra- Nārāyana-
juvarāja- śri- śri- Jayadharmanamalladevasya vijayarājye | Nepāle 'smin mahipatīvaro
dātā gunagrahako dinānāṁ sakalārthinān- ca mahato saikalpa-vr̥ṣopamajātāḥ sūrya-
kalavatamatiilake sarvān ripun nirjito vira- śri- śri- Jayakīrttimalla- nṛpati- śri- Rūpa- Nā-
rāyana- bhūpottamu sakalanītiśvām varito nātyāṅga- sāstragraha- gitamahāpūra-vīna- satt-
sundari- hṛdayamphanamamathā śri- śri- Kīrttimalla- nṛpati ripucokramalla tasyājān
śirasādharitvā lipikareṇa mahātmanā Jasapatinā samalikā Gandimāhāmyam pustakaṁ.
The date is wholly irregular; the tithi corresponds to April 18th, 1401, which day
was a Monday and not a Sunday; the nakṣatra ended on May 1st and the yoga
on April 29th.

12) Ms. Vivāhakhaṇḍa and Ratnakoa, National Archives, III. 391. Colophon 6): Saśi-
padā- bhūtājānāt (= 521) kṛṣṇāsvini pratipadā bhṛgu Revati Vyāghatām subhalaṅge ca
samāptam daivajjā- Gajaraējena svārtī- parartha hetunā | Bhaktāpurī- nagaryām ca
traylorāja virājate | Dharmma- Jotiś- ca Kirttīs- ca jeśṭhamadhikaniṣṭhake || pustakaṁ
cādaivajjā- Gajaraējasya || Written at Bhatgaon, by the same scribe who wrote doc.
7 and 9. The date is verified in all its details for the beginning of Friday, Sep-
tember 23rd, 1401.

1) First published 1958. Summarized by C. Bendall, "Notes" etc., in JRAS 1888,
551, n. IV; cf. also C. Bendall, History, 48.
2) First published 1958.
4) Published by Regmi, I, 374.
5) Published by Regmi, I, 374.
6) First published 1958, although the ms. is listed in CPMDN, II, 85.
13) Ms. Narapatijayacaryāsvarodaya, National Archives, I.1179.3. Colophon 1): Bhaktāpuri-nagaryām ca trayorājā virājate | Dharmma-Jotiiś-ca Kirttīś-ca ješthamadhyakanishtake || śreyo 'stu | Samvat 522 Bhādrapada-śukla-dvādaśī Śravana-pra-Dhanistā-nakṣatre Śukrāma (= Sukarman)-pra-Dhṛty-yoge śukra-vāsare subhālagne saṃpattam-iti || Written at Bhatgaon. There was no Kanyā sankrānti in Bhādrapada, and Āśāgha was intercalary. The month here indicated, therefore, corresponds in the Siṣyā Siddhānta to nija-Bhādrapada. The date is verified in all its elements for Friday, September 8th, 1402.


15) Stone inscription at the base of the back side of the Canḍeśvarī temple at Paśupati Nāth 3). Dated Samvatsara 523 Māgha-śukla-pūrṇimāyāṃ candra-grīha-madhayanuṣṭaṇa-śrī-śrī-Jayajyotimalladevasya teṣām vijarājye śrī-Damodarabhaltasya putra dātā śrī-Śrī-Śrī-Juvārija-Sri-Jayajyotimalladevasya-vijayarijye. The date is verified for the second half of Wednesday, February 7th, 1403, when there was a lunar eclipse.


1) First published 1958.
4) First published 1958.
5) The date only published by C. Bendall, History, 15. Fully edited in Regmi, III, 40.
6) Date published 1958. Edited (with some mistakes) by Narahari Nath, Itihās Prakāś, I, 59, and (correctly) in Regmi, III, 40-41. The date has been discussed by Sh. Rajbamshi, "Paṭan Sundhārāko abhilekhmā raheko rājā ra samvat viṣayako vicār" in Pūrṇimā, 5 (2022 VS), 9-16.
Ms. Dharmanirnaye Tithisarasangraha, National Archives, I.1634.11. Colophon 1); Nepilika-samvat 525 Mārgasīra-क्र्ष्ण-त्रित्याः-परा-सतुर्थ्यां तिथयुनकरसात्रे शुक्रयोगे ब्रह्मस्पर्याः-वसारे बिच्छा (=व्रज्ञिका)-राशिः-गते सवितारी मिथुनारूढी-गते चन्द्रमास्वालेवस्या विजयराजे लिखितम-िदानि। ॥ The date is verified in all its elements for Thursday, November 20th, 1404.

20) Long stone inscription on the wall of the image of Bhagavati in the Kochu Tol at Pharping 2). It begins: Svasti Nepalabhupende khyātā śrī-Śīkharāpurī (= Pharping) . . . . . . . . . | tatākṣāṇe cāsti nṛpaṭīr-Nepālamanḍalādhipāḥ | yuvārājādhirāja-śrī-Śīkharāpuramālakāḥ | Sūrā[ki ×]kula candro 'saú śrī-Śīkharāprasaṃśāhakah | śrī-Śīkharādhisāṁsahās-ca śrī-Rāmasāṁsahās-tatha | śrī-Devasimha ityete Śīkharāpattanādhipāḥ | Viśvārātavānta-śa nītijñājītavātirṇāḥ | prajānuraktādhammaṇājñāḥ kalpavyākṣo svārthināṃ | etair-bhūpatibhiḥ sampālātī Śīkharāpurī etc. The date is given twice; it is (second one): Samvat 527 Phālguṇa-शुक्ल-त्रित्याम् तिथयु Revati-नक्षत्रे Śūkla-योगे Śūkla-वसारे | samastapraṃkṛtyāsamalāṅkṛta-yuvārājādhirāja-śrī-śrīmaja-Śīkharādharmsālamadevasya vijayarājye ॥ śrī-śrī-Śīkharāpurī samastaprakṛtyāsamalāṅkṛta-yuvarajah trītāyām tithayu vajayarājye. The date is verified in all its elements for Friday, February 11th, 1407.

21) Inscription on the Garuḍa pillar before the temple of Bakupati Nāriyana in the Śūryaṇāḍhi Tol in Bhatgaon 3). It begins: Namo Nāriyājanṇāya | svasti śrīmanNaipālika-samvatsare 528 Māghe-शुक्ल-पार्वती-समालक्षण-तिथयु Śūkṛa-वसारे | sapunyakirnā skṛta-kasindhu narottamate | narottama-śrī-Śīkharādharmsālamadeva | sajjanānandakā- kalpavyākṣaḥ | tasyānūjaḥ śrī-Śīkharājottimallāḥ | tayarājye etc. The date is verified for Friday, January 13th, 1408.

22) Inscription on a slab of stone by the door of the Rājēśvarī temple to the south of the temple of Paṣupati Nāth 4). Dated śrīmanNaipākila-samvatsare 528 Māghe-क्र्ष्ण-अष्टमयम् तिथयु आदित्य-वारे Jeṣṭha-नक्षत्रे śrī-śrī-Śīkharāpurī-Śīkharādharmsālamadeva tadanaujā śrī-śrī-Śīkharājottimalladeva tad-ubhayaśa vijayarājye. There was no Vṛṣabhā sankrānti in Vaisākha, which gives an intercalary Pauṣa. This Māghe corresponds to Phālguṇa in the Śūra Siddhantā and the date is verified for Sunday, February 19th, 1408.

Jayadharmamalla is ignored by the later chronicles, which telescope his rule together with that of his father. And since we have no longer the help of V3 and VK, we remain completely in the dark about the events of this reign.

His position, as revealed by the available documents, is peculiar. All the colophons and inscriptions from Bhatgaon present us with the
joint reign of the three rulers (trayorājya); the only change occurred at some time between 1403 and 1408 when Jayakīrtimalla died and his brothers continued to rule jointly. The bulk of the remaining documents, mostly from Patan, Kathmandu and neighbouring places, mention Jayadharmalla as the sole ruler, but give him the title yuvarāja, sometimes coupled rather awkwardly with the usual elements of the royal title (R.-P.-Pb.). Four documents, nn. 3 (place unknown), 5 (from Kathmandu), 10 and 19 (place unknown), allow to Jayadharmamalla the full royal title.

This shows that the old political organization of Nepal still survived under the sons of Jayasthitimalla. At Bhatgaon they ruled jointly, each of them with the same status and authority, without wearing the royal title. At Patan and in the rest of Central Nepal they were represented by the eldest brother Jayadharmamalla as yuvarāja, although some documents loosely but incorrectly apply to him the full royal style.

Of course one aspect of this situation sticks in the eyes and urgently requires some explanation; this is the title yuvarāja. We can anticipate that this problem is somehow connected with the developments in Bhonta.

**Bhonta under the rule of the Rāma family**

We have followed the career of Jayāsimha Rāma down to the moment of the exile and death of Jayārjunadeva, whose chief minister (mahāátha) he was. A flash of ligh upon the following developments is thrown by the following document.

Inscription on a stele in the quadrangle of Itham Bahal, Kathmandu 1). Written mahāmantryadhirājatilaka–Gopi–Nārāyaṇa–mahāmantri–śri–Jayasimhārāmavardhavasya praptālita–vijayarājye. He is stated to be mahāmantri–śrimadAnekarāmavardhānātmaja. Mention is made of his uterine brother (ekodarāṇuja) mahāmantri–śri–Madanarāmavardhāna, the latter’s wife Jaitralakṣmidevi and their son śri–Śaktisimhārāma. The date is Netrākāśe prapūrtme saradiśu gate (= 502) yatra Nepāladesē māse cāśādha–sukle daśami tithivare Śvātiye Sādhya–yoge vāre mārtanaḍaputre. It is verified for Saturday, June 21st, 1382.

With the help of this inscriptions, of a passage at the beginning of the ms. of the Gadāparvan above mentioned (Doc. 32 of Jayasthiti-

1) Published in Samskṛta-Sandesā, 1/10–12, 41–43; in SPS, 245; by Dh. Bajracharya in Pūrṇimā, 7 (2022 VS), 33–35; and by Regmi, III, 24–27.
malla), of the chronicles, colophons, inscriptions and Chinese texts, we can reconstruct the family tree of the Rāma family as follows.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jaitra Rāma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jyoti Rāma (fl. 1323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aneka Rāma (first mention 1332, d. 1356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasiṃha Rāma (first ment. 1360, d. 1400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madana Rāma (fl. 1382–1399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaktisiṃha Rāma (fl. 1382–1427)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

What is more important, the Itham Bahal inscription shows that in the interval between Jayārjunadeva’s death (February 3rd) and Jayasthitimalla’s general recognition (September 15th, 1382) the old minister of Bhonta tried, in association with his brother Madana Rāma, to set himself up in the Valley as lord–protector of the realm.

This attempt at vindicating the rights of the vacant throne of Bhonta was doomed from the start, and in the following years Jayasiṃha Rāma had to bow to the inevitable and to patch up a working agreement with the new king. The old chronicle shows him participating in some religious acts with Jayasthitimalla. On May 19th, 1385, both went to worship at the shrine of Paśupati and Jayasiṃha Rāma was the yajamāna of the rite. On December 27th, 1386, Jayasthitimalla and Bhvanta Jayasimha Mahātha made the gift of a tilāpatra. On April 22nd, 1387, Bhvanta Jayasimha Mahātha accompanied the king and his three sons in the Bugam (Bugmati Lokeśvara) pilgrimage.

Upon the slow decay of Jayasthitimalla’s authority after the death of Rājalladevī and with his increasing old age, Jayasiṃha Rāma started to re-assert gradually his autonomy in Bhonta and his influence in the Valley. Already in 1388 the Doc. 19 of Jayasthitimalla, recognizing the authority of the king but playing upon his name in the form Jayathitirāma, Jayasiṃha Rāma is given a string of high-sounding titles, such as parameśvara mahāmātyya. Even more significant is the re-appearance of the term śrī–śrī–Bhoṭarājyādhirāja, although this is not applied to the minister.

Three years later another document is more outspoken:

1) Dates: 505 Jyeṣṭha sukla 10, 507 Pauṣa sukla 6, 507 Vaiśākha sukla 8; V3, 62b, 63b, 63a–b.
The position is fairly clear. The formal overlordship of king Jayasthitimalla is acknowledged. So it also the formal unity of the two parts of the kingdom (ubhaya-rājakula ekatva) as symbolized by the State Sword. On a lower level, Jayasimha Rāma is the Prime Minister (mahāmātya) governing the Bhonta principality, while his younger brother, bearing the same title, is residing at Palamchok in the same Bhonta principality. Thus the separate identity of the former domain of Jayārjunadeva is affirmed.

Jayasimha Rāma tried to make his name renowned by a great and costly undertaking: the copying of the Mahābhārata. In the prāṣāsti which opens the first volume of the work he is praised for his piety and zeal in this enterprise, is credited with the foundation of Paśupati (Paśupatisthāpanenāmāreṇdram, i.e. either repairs to the main temple or building of some secondary chapel) and is given the title of śrīmān-bhūmahendra 2). As far as I know, only three volumes are still extant, viz. those containing the Ādiparvan, the first section of the Salyaparvan and the Gadāparvanika, i.e. the Gadāyuddhaparvan, a sub-section of the Salyaparvan. Considering them from the political point of view, the colophons of these volumes (Docs. 30 and 31 of Jayasthitimalla) show more or less the same position. Jayasthitimalla is recognized as king and Jayasimha Rāma is given the poetical title aśeṣa-sāmanta-śiromani, acting for the protection of Nepal (Nepāla-bhūmanḍala-rākṣanāya). The autonomy of Bhonta is only slightly adumbrated in the title sāmanta (border feudatory). This may seem

1) Published by Th. Manandhar, "A leaf from the Bendall vamśāvali", in CNS, 1/2 (1974), 101.

2) Ms. Ādiparvan, once in possession of the late Hemraj Sharman, rājaguru of Nepal. The prāṣāsti is reproduced in the critical edition of the Mahābhārata, vol. I, Poona 1933, pp. xiii-xiv. The editor does not tell us whether the ms. has a colophon.
a step down; but it is explained by the fact that the Mahābhārata undertaking was regarded as an all-Nepalese affair.

During the last years of Jayasthitimalla any acknowledgement of his formal rule was silently dropped, at least locally in Bhonta, as shown by the following:

Stone inscription on the pedestal of an image of the Sun god near a water conduit outside the entrance of Banepa 1):

Stone inscription on the pedestal of an image of the Sun god near a water conduit outside the entrance of Banepa 1):

Sri-irimatiri-~asimhardma-rdjia~~inuja-
Srirnat-Sri-Madotiardmayi
Sri-Banikdpuri-sthdne
I
I
samsthcipitd
ddityamur//i

devati

dvija-Sri-RijaSramena

caturdasottare gate 'bde Nepālike tapa-
saptamyām tithau guru-vāsare Revati-naksatre Sidhiyogge etc. With the quite easy correction of Siddhi into Siddha-yoga, the date is verified in all its elements for Thursday, January 8th, 1394. The Brahman Rājaśarman in the same as Rājapatiśar-
man of the colophon of Jayasimha Rāma to be mentioned farther on.

Of course this is a half–private inscription, as no titles are given except the curious rājña attributed to Jayasimha Rāma. Still, the absence of the name of the reigning king is indicative.

After the death of Jayasthitimalla the powerful Bhonta chief tried to assume royal status as well as the regency of the kingdom, as it appears from the following document.

Ms. Daśakarmapaddhati, National Archives, I.1076.4. Colophon 2): Samvat 516 Kārtti-
matideše śri–śri–Indesira–bhāṭārika–sthāne lekhitam idam śāstraṃ || The shrine of Indrēśvara near Panaoti (Pūrnamati), south of Banepa, is an artistically outstanding monument 3). In the first date, Dhrī–para–Ganḍa is an obvious mistake for Dhrī–para–Śula. Nakṣatra, yoga and day of the week are verified for Wednesday, October 20th, 1395; but the corresponding tithi is 6 and not 8. The second date was perhaps intended to be a repetition of the first; but it reads, against the rule, from left to right, and in any case the numeral word corresponding to the second digit means 30.

We notice in passing this Brahman Rājapatiśarman, chief upā-
dhyāya of the Bhonta principality; we shall return to him presently.

The titles given to Jayasimha Rāma are somewhat contradictory; he bears the full royal style, and yet the word pratipālikarājye, already

met with in 1382, indicates not a reign, but a regency. The only possible explanation is that Jayasimha Rāma assumed (or was given by the scribe) royal status locally in Bhonta, while claiming the regency in the rest of the country. It is interesting to note that this did not pass without opposition even in Bhonta; about the same time a scribe writing in an obscure corner of the Banepa district recognized Jayadharmamalla as ruler, without even mentioning the Rāma brothers (Doc. 2 of Jayadharmamalla).

This seems the proper place for introducing a rather doubtful piece of evidence.

Inscription on a Sūrya image in the courtyard of a water-conduit at Nala near Banepa 1).

Dated Samvat 517 Māgha-śukla | saptaṁ-tītāhu | Āśvini-naksatre | Śubha-yoga | ācāraya upādhyā vipra śrī-śrī-Śivājus | śrī-śrī-Śivaśīngarāma-rāyas ekachattra | kanēṣṭa amātya śrī-śrī-Śaktiśīngarāmasya ubhayasya vijayarāje | Visakramārāja Mulamis Jayata Mulamis ubhayasya krani | śrī-Śīrām uparimastāne | jojamāna Gopati Mulamis samucaya nānā-loka eka-cetana etc. The date is verified in all its details for January 6th, 1397.

This inscription, badly spelt and obscure, offers serious difficulties. Śivaśīnga Rāma may be another name for Jayasimha Rāma; but it appears nowhere else. The title rāja has been met with already. The term ekachattra seems to indicate Śivaśīnga’s sole rule in Bhonta. It is rather unexpected to find here Śaktisimha Rāma with the title of junior minister (kaniṣṭa amātya) while his father Madana Rāma was still alive. A way out of the difficulties seems to be offered by Regmi’s reading of the date: Samvat 527 2), the date being verified for January 17th, 1407. In this case Jayasimha Rāma would be out of the picture, having died seven years before; Śivaśīnga Rāma would be a brother or cousin of Śaktisimha Rāma and the successor of Jayasimha Rāma as the head of the family. However, his name does not appear in any of the documents mentioning the members of the Rāma family. On the whole, it seems safer to accept the date 1397, notwithstanding its difficulties.

Jayasimha’s new position, as it developed after the demise of

1) Partly published by Dh. Bajracharya in Pūrṇimā, 7 (2022 VS), 31; fully edited but with a different date, in Regmi, III, 41-42.

2) Regmi reads the month as Mārgga[ṣira]; but the verification shows that this is impossible both for 517 and 527.
Jayasthitimalla, is fully confirmed by an important document, the date of which, however, is nearly obliterated.

Inscription in the quadrangle of Tyagal Tol, Deo Patan, near the western gate of Paśupati Nāth 1): . . . . || svasti || R.-P.-Pb.-yuvarāja-śrī-śrī-Jayadharma-malladevasya vijayarājye || śrī-śrī-Bhuvanatārāja-rajakula-mahāmantrēśvara . . . ., mahāmantryādhirāja-śrī-Jayasiṃharāma-varddhanaṇena tadanuja . . . paramamāheśvara-mahāmātya-śrī-Madanarāma-varddhanaṇena saha pratipālita-rājye. The inscription gives then the genealogy of śrī-Rājapati-ārādhyā-śarman, who is the youngest of the three sons of [śrī-Nā]-rājanapati-ārādhyā-śarman, son of śrī-Śripati-ārādhyā-śarman, son of śrī-Lakṣmipati-ārādhyā-śarman, all of whom are given, among other laudatory epithets, the title of Rāghuvamśodbhava-rājapurohita. The lower part of the stone, mostly broken away, contained the date, of which the following fragments remains . . . dvitiya-Pauṣa-māse . . . . vāsare || rājadhirāja . . . bhuga vijayarājye sāra . . . . In the period between the beginning of the rule of Jayadharmanalla and the death of Jayasimha Rāma, Pauṣa was intercalary in one year only: 520 NS. The date must correspond to December 1399.

This inscription, set up in the very centre of the Valley and in its religious capital of orthodox Hinduism, helps us to understand the situation that developed after the death of Jayasthitimalla. In the Valley Jayadharmanalla reigned on behalf of his younger brothers, but Jayasimha Rāma and Madana Rāma acted as senior and junior regents. It is doubtful whether their authority (or their claim) extended to Bhatgaon; possibly it did not. At the same time the Rāmas tried to build up a sort of continuity with the extinct Bhonta dynasty of Jayārjunadeva by pushing to the fore, as the chief religious authority of the principality, the Brahman Rājapatiśarman, whose forefathers had been the hereditary household-priests (purohita) of the Bhonta family. This emphatical assertion of the Bhonta legitimacy, coupled with a sustained effort at exerting political influence in the Valley, helps (at least partly) to explain why the Bhonta ministers attempted and succeeded in being recognized as the rulers of Nepal by the faraway emperor of China, to the detriment of the Malla kings (see Appendix II).

Jayasimha Rāma was by then an old man and his paramount position was brought to an end by his death, the exact date of which is supplied by what we may call his funeral epitaph.

1) Published in Sanskrita Sandeśa, 1/10–12, 46–48, in SPS, 246, and in Regmi, III, 36–39.
Copper-plate in the Indrēsvara temple near Panaoti 1): ... svasti | eṣa Pūrṇnavati ramyā khyātā Nepāla-mandaṇā | yatrāste bhagavān-devaṃ śrīmanIndreśvaraḥ Śivaḥ | atrāśīḷayaśayinharāmā-ṇṛpatiḥ prakhyāta-bhūmaṇḍale śrī-Bhagavān Śivaḥ Paśupatir- 

ejna pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ | yenaivaṃpi Jayāryjūno narapatih puspābhisekāḥ kṛto yenaśāu Sthi- 


tirājamalla-ṇṛpatiḥ paṭṭābhisekikṛtaḥ | kṛtvā yena tulārecaṇam-madhuripum saṃsthā-

-pya ēndreśvare dattan-tarta svadehatulyalanakaṃ grāse rave rāhunā | bhūyāścāpi 

hiranya-nirmitaratham sāśvān-tathā hāstināṃ ramyān kalpatarum ca vipyavaide 

-dānam-pradattam-mahat | sāṣṭādaśam-Bhārata-pārvvapuṇyaṃ śāstrāṃ samalekhayati 

-sma dhīraḥ | Āranyaparvavāhkyam-idaṃ hi śrutvā jagāma svargam Jayasimharāmaḥ | Nepāle śaśi-netra-paṇcagate (= 521) māśe site Kārttikeya cāśvinyāṃ sacaturdaśī-ti-

-thi-vidhau sūrye Vyatiṅpāta -rājyāngīni nidhāya bāndhavajane lokānukampākarō 

durāśīḷa-Jayasimharāmā-ṇṛpatīḥ śrī-Visṇulokam yaya - (great grief of the Brahman 

s and of the people; donation of images) | samvat 521 Kārttikeya-śukla-caturdaśī- 

-tithau Aśvini-nakṣatreye Vyatiṅpāta -yoge ādityā-vāsare thwo dina kunhum mahāmantriśvara 

Jayasimharāmā baḍa mahāṭhā bhāroṣ śrī-Visṇuloka-śamprāpta juṣā din jurom | thwo udēsānān śrī-Gopi-Nārāyaṇa-paramaḥbhṛṭārakaś śrī-Parameśvarī sahitā yānān 

-suvarṇa-pratimā-dvayakam Javasimharāmā baḍa mahāṭhā bhāroṣ pratirūpa līn yānān pra-

-tiṣṭhā yānān thwo pālas samān yānā din kuhnuṁ thāparapā jurom | etc. The date is 

verified for Sunday, October 31st, 1400.

Thus according to his funeral record, which lays emphasis on 

his religious deeds, the main feats of Jayasimha Ṛama were the 

renovation of the image of Paśupati, the anointing (puṣyābhiseka) 

of Jayārjunadeva, the coronation with an infula (paṭṭābhiseka) of Ja-

yasthitimalla, the gift of a tulārcana and the gold-weighing of his 

body at Indreśvara on the occasion of the sun eclipse of 1390, the 

gift of gilt chariots, horses and elephants to the Brahmans, the co-

pying of the eighteen cantos of the Mahābhārata. He died while 

listening to the Vanaparvan of the great poem. The image of Gopi-

Nārāyaṇa erected on the occasion of his death at Panaoti was a 

portrait of the deceased.

As no name of donor is found in the Panaoti inscription, we 

cannot tell whether Madana Ṛama was still alive in 1400. But it is 

likely that he died about that time. With the demise of the two bro-

thers the position of the Ṛama family collapsed.

From the Chinese texts we known that the heir of Madana Ṛa-

ma was his son Śaktisimha Ṛama. His residence was Palamchok 

and his power was now limited to Bhonta. The following document 

give evidence to this effect.

1) Published by Dh. Bajracharya, "Jayasimharāmako samjhanāmā rākhieko Pa-

nautī Indreśvara-mandirko tāmrāpatra", in Pūrṇimā, 14 (2024 VS), 130–133.
Ms. Guhyakālitāntra, National Archives, III.377. Colophon 1): "Samvat 525 durĀśādha-śukla-pūrṇāmāsāyāṃ tithau Śrāvana-nakṣatre Priti-yoge ādityā-vāsare śrī-Pilakha-cosṭhāne śrī-Śaktiśīgarāmāsya vijayarājye. Written at Palamchok. The Karkaṇa sankrānti did not fall in Āśādha, and this month was intercalary according to all systems. The date is verified in all its elements for Sunday, July 12th, 1405.

In the same way, the edict by which the emperor of China granted to Śaktiśimha Rāma the title of king, and of which we have a translation into bad Sanskrit dated June 17th, 1415 2), calls him simply "Śaktiśimha Rāma who dwells in the town of Pallakhaco in Nepal".

His last document, and at the same time the last one of the Rāma family, is slightly later:

Inscription on the base of a Gaṇēśa image in the Dachu Tol at Banepa 3): Dated śrī-śrī-Paśupati-pādāravinda paraga pijamrita muttamān śrī-Śaktiśīgarājaśya vijayarājye | aśvasāciśera śrāṅko Nepālikiyā vinirgge | pakṣo ma dharjune saṣṭhyam ūbha-yoge rair chine. The date (537 Māgha śukla 6, ravi) is verified for Sunday, January 24th, 1417.

These documents show that Śaktiśimha gave up any pretence of authority in the valley, since he dropped any title like āmātya or mahāthā or the like. On the other side he set up as a petty, but wholly independent ruler (rāja) in Bhonta, as shown by the term vijayarājye and the omission of the name of the king ruling in Nepal.

Apart from the Chinese connection, we know nothing of the reign of Śaktiśimha. His last mention from the Chinese texts is in 1427, and we have no documentary evidence of any successor of his.

We have travelled thus far with the help of the contemporary documents alone. It is now time to turn to the modern Nepalese chronicles and see what they have to tell us about this problem. As already said, the Malla rulers from Anantamalla to Jayārjunadeva, whose existence is proved beyond doubt by the numerous colophons and inscriptions, are ignored by the late vamśavaliṇis. In their place, they insert Harisimha of Tirhut and his descendants, who are known as the Sūryavāṃśi dynasty of Bhatgaon:

The kings of this dynasty were:
2. His son Matisimha-deva reigned 15 years.

1) Published with same mistakes in CPMDN, II, 70.
2) See Appendix II.
3) Unpublished. Kindly communicated to me by Mr. Dh. Bajracharya.
3. His son Śaktisimha-deva reigned 22 years (VL: 27; VBh: 33). This Raja abdicated in favour of his son Śyāmasimha-deva and took up his residence at Palamchok, whence he sent presents to China, which so pleased the Emperor that he sent in return a seal with the name Śaktisimha engraved on it, and in addition the title of Rāma, with a royal despatch, in the Chinese year 535.

4. His son Śyāmasimha reigned 15 years. In this reign a tremendous earthquake was felt in Nepal. The temple of Matsyendranātha and all other buildings fell down, and innumerable human beings perished. This took place on the 12th of Bhādra śudī, in Nepal Samvat 528. This Śyāmasimha-deva had no male issue, but only a daughter, whom he gave in marriage to [Jayabhadra Malla, the ancestor in the sixth generation of Jayasthiti Malla]. He then made his son-in-law Raja 1).

This seems to be a patchwork made up of reminiscences of sundry ruling families. Harisimha we know already; as far as we can see there was no connection between him and the Rāma ministers of Bhonta.

As to Matisimha, there is no reason at all for connecting him with the quite different name Madana Rāma, as Lévi and many scholars after him have done 2). On the other side, it is hardly necessary to point out that Matisimha is a different person from Madanasimha-deva, son of one Śaktisimha, ruler of Champaran and author of the Madanaratnapradipa, who lived much later (mentioned in 1454 and 1457) 3).

Śaktisimha is the only name of the series who is certainly taken from the Rāma family. The vamśāvalis took over also the faithfully preserved tradition of his intercourse with China. The “Chinese year (cinābda) 535” is of course no outlandish reckoning, but simply “Newari Samvat 535 of the Chinese [embassy]”, i.e. 1415 A.D. 4). The author of the vamśāvali apparently knew the Sanskrit translation of the imperial edict, where exactly the same terms (Mahācinābda 535) are employed. As to Śaktisimha’s abdication, if it is a historical fact at all, it must refer to Bhonta proper and not to the Valley; and his withdrawal to Palamchok has no meaning because that town was always his residence, as shown by the colophon of 1405 and by the Chinese edict.

The last ruler of the list, Śyāmasimha, is a mere name to us.

1) Wright, 179–180.
4) This was shown long ago by S. Lévi, Le Nepal, II, 229.
We may suppose that he was the son of Śaktiśimha, as stated by the modern chronicles, and that he clung for some years to the remnants of the Rāma domain around Palamchok. As to the date given by VW for the great earthquake which took place during his "reign", it is reproduced in a more complete form in the ms. of the vaṁśāvalī in the Cambridge University Library, Add. 1652: adhi-Bhādra [pada] śudi 12 Uttarā[śādha]-nakṣatra somavāra; two lines later it is said that the year was 528. The date cannot be verified for 528 (1408 A.D.) and the presence of an intercalary (adhika) Bhādrapada shows that this date belongs to a period when the old Nepalese calendar was no longer in use. It also looks suspiciously identical with adhika–Bhādrapada śudi 12, VS 1890 (= Monday, August 26th. 1833; even the nakṣatra is verified!), when a disastrous earthquake ravaged Nepal 1). It may be that the authors of the vaṁśāvalī simply projected back in the past the date (but the date only) of an event of their own days. The more so, as they themselves take care to point out that "such a catastrophe had once before occurred in the reign of Śyāmasimha".

The purpose of the later chronicles in piecing together this "Śimha" dynasty with one name from the Karnāṭa dynasty of Tirhut, one from the Rāmas of Banepa and two of uncertain origin, and in substituting it for the legitimate Malla rulers, seems to have been to create a continuity between Harisimha and Jayasthitimalla. The later Mallas claimed to be descended from the Tirhut rulers; and their court chroniclers took up the cue and fabricated a dynasty with whatever scraps of historical tradition, independent of the early Mallas, were available, at the same time quietly dropping the real but rather commonplace story of Jagatsimha and Nāyakadevi. This deliberate falsification of history was not very clever. It is above all the chronological absurdity of the construction that betrays it. We are told that Śyāmasimha had no male successor and that therefore he gave his daughter to Jayabhadramalla, the ancestor in the sixth generation of Jayasthitimalla; but Jayasthitimalla lived before Śyāmasimha!

Having cleared the ground from the ghost of the "Śimhas", let us return to the Rāmas of Banepa. How do they fit in the picture of Nepalese history? They were recognized by the Chinese as

1) Wright, 269-270.
kings of Nepal; but it is quite evident that this they never were. The complete silence of the early chronicle (V³) and above all of the colophons and inscriptions is conclusive evidence to this effect. Not even at Palamchok, where he ruled in his own right (vijayarājye), Śaktisinha dared to assume the royal title. During the last years of the 14th century the Rāma tried to preserve the existence of the principality of Bhonta after the extinction of its royal house, and to play at the same time a role in the chequered events in the Valley, striving without success to check the rise of the house of Bhatgaon. We do not know how the family ended. The only certain fact is that Jayayaksamalla at the end of his long reign was master of Banepa, where one of his sons set himself up as independent king; the Rāmas had ceased to rule long before that date.

Jayajyotirmalla (1408–1428).

After the eclipse of the dynasty under Jayadharmamalla, the only survivor of the three brothers, Jayajyotirmalla, took up the rule of Nepal and assumed at once that royal style which had remained in abeyance for some years. Thirty-five documents of his reign are extant:


3) Half-obiterated stone inscription on a small caitya in front of the main gate of the Kumbhēsvara temple in Patan 3). The following portions of the date can be read: Samvat 530 Vaiśākha–ṣukla .... daśyāṃ .......... naksatre Vajrā–yoge; it seems


2) Published by Regmi, III, 46–47.

3) Date first published 1958. Fully edited by Regmi, III, 47.
to correspond to April 16th, 1410. Written ... rāja ... sīrī–sīrī–Jayajyotimalladevasya vijarājīye sīrī–Mānigalottara–vihāra–sīrī–Yakha etc.


8) Stone inscription in the compound of Paśupati Nāth 5). Dated śrī–Jyotimallaḥ prabhu sarvālankārabhaṅgiṣṭa–Mahāgauri sthāpiṭa ... Samvat 533 Vaisākha–śukla–pūrṇimāyāṃ Svātī–naksatre Śuddhi–yoge āditya–vāsare. The date is verified for Sunday, April 16th, 1413, with the exception of the Śuddhi (= Siddhi) yoga, which ended on April 15th.


1) Published by S. Lévi, Mahākarmavibhaṅga et Karmavibhangopadesa, Paris 1932, 167.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 419–420.
3) Published in CBMC, 155.
4) Published by Bh. Indraji and G. Bühler, “Inscriptions from Nepal”, in Ind. Ant. 9 (1880), 183–184; re-edited in Saṃskṛta Sandeśa, 1/10–12, 69–72, and in Regmi, III, 47–50.
5) Published in Saṃskṛta Sandeśa, 1/10–12, 72.
6) Published by Regmi, III, 50–51.


15) Stone inscription to the left of the Buddha statue in the Saptapura mahāvihāra (Ci-kam Bahī), Patan 6): Dated Samvat 536 Aśvīna-śukla-pūrṇamāsyaṃ-ṛṇa-ṇaṣṭau Revati ghāṭī 21 Aśvīna-nakṣatre Harṣaṇa jo ghāṭī 19 Vajra-yoge aṅgāra-vāsare . . . . . . śrī-Śrī-Jyotimalladevasa thākurasya vijayarāja bhavatu. The date is verified in all its elements for Tuesday, October 6th, 1416.

16) Ms. Ākhyāta rāmakośā, National Archives, III.685. Colophon 7): Śrī-Raghuvamsāra-
vinda-jñāndraprākāśânekmārttaṇḍasa y R.-P.-sya paramamāheśvara-Pb.sya... śrī-Jayajyotimalladevasya vijarāyāje | Cāturbrahmavihāra-cāranapaduḥ... || abhe śaila-krṣṇa-bāṇa-sahite (= 537) māśāśite Māghake caturthi-tithi-samjñāke bhṛgu-dine Arḍda ca varhīštite yoge Gaṇḍe vare ghaṭe ravi-gate candre ca Kanyasthitē etasmin samaye samāpta etc. The ms. was written for Jayabhairavamaṇḍala, the husband of Jayajyotirmallā's daughter Jivarakṣā. The Cāturbrahma Vihāra is in Bhatgaon. The date is verified in all elements for Friday, February 5th, 1417.


18) Ms. Divyavāṣadhīnānāmālā, National Archives, V.7243. Colophon 2): Śrīman Cā-Viha-re śākyabhikṣu śrī-Madanabhadrēṇa svayam pāṭāḥrāhahetunā likhitam-īḍam Rāmoda-tenavaiḥ | śreyo 'stu samvat 538 Magha-krṣṇa-aṣṭamīṃ Viśāṣa-pra-Ānurādhana-kṣatre Dhruva-yoge śānasīcara-vāsare sampūrṇa-ādī śrī-śrī-Jayajyotimalladevasya vijarāyāje Nepāla-mandale. The Cā Bahil (Carumati mahāvihāra) is to the north of Deo Patan; see above p. 132. The date is verified for Saturday, January 29th, 1418.


21) Ms. Subantaratnākara, Cambridge University Library, Or. 148. Colophon 5): Nepāla-hāyana samvat 540 Bhāḍrapada-śukla-pancamiyāṃ-tīthau budha-vāsare Svati-nakṣatre Brahma-yoge, R.-P.-Pb.-śrīmat Māṇesvari-varalabdha-prasāda-śrī-śrī-Jayajyotimalladevasya vijarāyāje | śrīmad-Gaṅgālapatanaṇe śrī-Yatradevi-mahāvihāre śrī-śrī-Lokeśvaraṇe svita bhikṣunā Dharmmārādhikena svapustakam likhitam śubham-astu || Gāgūla seems to be a name of Kathmandu; see above Doc. 4. The date is verified in all its elements for Wednesday, August 14th, 1420.

22) Ms. Jyotirājayakaronasa Nepālabhaśā, National Archives, I.440. Colophon 6): Samvat...

23) Ms. Haramekhalā, National Archives, I.1076.5. Colophon 1): Samvat 541 Bhāḍrapada–sūkla–tritiyāyāṁ tithau Hasta–nakṣatre Śubha–joge bhṛhaspati–vāsare sāmpūrṇam–iti | śubham–astu | śrī–śrī–R.–P.–Pb.–śrī–Jayajyotirmalladeva–prabhuḥkārūryasya–vijārāye || The date is completely irregular; the tithi points to August 31st, 1421, which day, however, was a Sunday and not a Thursday; the nakṣatra ended on August 30th and the yoga on August 29th.


25) Inscription on the base of a Sūrya image in the Sun temple near the pond in Kva-thanu Tol, Bhatgaon 3). Dated rājye tasya ca Jotimallapāteh Samsiradevi-pateh padyana kapūritavare Bhaktapuripāṭṭante ....Nepāla–hāyana–gate dvaya–veda–bhūte (= 542) Śukre (= Jyeṣṭha) ca sūkla–tithike ravi (= 12) sajihake ca .... Samvat 542 .... budhavāra. The date is irregular, as the tithi ended not on Wednesday, but on Tuesday, June 2nd, 1422.


1) Published in CPMDN, I, 36–37.
2) Published by Regmi, I, 412.
3) Published in Bhaktapur–silalekh–śūci, 6; also in Regmi, III, 53–54.
4) First published 1958.
5) Published by Regmi, III, 54–55.
6) Published by Regmi, I, 421.
7) First published 1958, although the title and the beginning of the ms. were given in CPMDN, I, 32.
Sri-Sri-rājarājendra-Sri-Sri-Jayajyotimalladevasya vijayarājye || There was no Karkata sankrānti in Āsāḍha, which month was therefore intercalary according to all systems. That date is verified for Thursday, July 13th, 1424.

30) Ms. Ārya–Tārā-sragdharāstotra, National Archives, V.134. Colophon 1): Samvat 544 Āsāḍha–krṣṇa–pañcayāṁ tithau Svātī–nakṣatre Dhrṣṭi–yoge somavāsare . . . . Jayajyotimalladevasya vijayarājye likhitam. The date is completely irregular. The fact of Āsāḍha being intercalary is not indicated. The tithi ended on June 17th, 1424 for adhika–Āsāḍha and on July 16th for nīja–Āsāḍha. The nakṣatra ended respectively on June 6th and July 5th. Not a single one of these four days was a Monday.


32) Copper-plate inscription over the main gate of the Ibā–bahī in Patan 4). Written srī–srī–Māneśvari–varalabdhaprasādita–Ph.–P.–M.–srī–srīmahājyotimalladevasya vijaya' rājye. It mentions kuṭumbaja pradhāna mahāpātra Daiva–Nārāyaṇa Śrī Rājasimhamallavarman (who is the same as in doc. 31), pradhāna mahāpātra Cakra–Nārāyaṇa Śrī Udayasimhamallavarman, pradhāna mahāpātra Acuka–Nārāyaṇa Śrī Dharmisimhamallavarman, who are said to be the chief personages; lesser ones are pradhāna mahāpātra Asura Nārāyaṇa Śrī Rudrasimhamallavarman and pradhāna mahāpātra Pāla Nārāyaṇa Śrī Jayabhīmamallavarman. There are three dates. A) Samvat × × × Pāhlugna–śukla–caturthi–para–pañcamī Aśvini–nakṣatre Śukra–yoge bhṛpasati–vāsare. Although the figures for the year have disappeared, the other elements are sufficient for verifying the date for Thursday, February 10th, 1418; the year is therefore NS 538. B) Samvat × × × Vaiśākha–krṣṇa–ekāḍasi Uttarabhadra–nakṣatre Viśkambha–para–Pṛiti–yoge uditya–vāre. Here too the figures for the year cannot be read, but the other elements are sufficient for verifying the date for the year 538, i.e. for Sunday, May 1st, 1418. C) Samvat 547 Jyeṣṭha–śukla–trītyāyām Punarvasu–para–Pūṣya–nakṣatre Dhruva yoge bhṛpasati–vāre Kanyā–lagna. The date is verified in all its elements for Thursday, May 79th, 1427.

1) Published by Regmi, I, 421.
2) Published in CPM DN, II, 50.
3) Published in AS, 10 (2020 VS), 4; also in Regmi, III, 55–56.
The modern chronicles have telescoped Jayajyotirmalla, along with his brothers, into the reign of Jayasthitimalla. But this very fact allows us to settle at least the precise date of his death. According to VW, Jayasthiti malla died in 549 Kārttika kṛṣṇa 5 4), and this date, corresponding to Thursday, October 28th, 1428, must be really that of the death of Jayajyotirmalla. Accordingly, this king reigned from 1408 to October 1428.

Once again because of the telescoping we are left without information about events of his reign. What Kirkpatrick, p. 266, has to say about “Jeit Mull” is only a part of the feats usually attributed to his father: distribution of soil to the farmers, tax reductions, determination of weights and measures, embellishment of his capital Bhatgaon.

Whatever we can glean from the available sources is this. Jayajyotirmalla did away with the influence of the Rāmas, who disappear from Nepalese history. From the distribution of his colophons (a rather unsafe criterium) we are led to infer that after the first years he shifted the capital back to Patan; Bhatgaon became for the moment a provincial town, but its peculiar status as the cradle of the royal family was underscored by the heir-apparent being made its governor (saukhyakāra). The inscriptions show that the king made substantial offerings to Paśupati on the one side and to Svayambhū

---

1) Published (partly?) by S. D’Oldenburg, “Short notice on three dated Nepalese mss.”, in *JRAS* 1891, 688, n. 3.
2) First published 1958.
3) Published in Regmi, I, 422.
4) Wright, p. 183. The forty–three regnal years attributed (ibid., p. 182) to Jayasthitimalla (*cum* his sons) are evidently reckoned from the death of Rājalladevi in 506 to the death of Jayajyotirmalla in 549.
Nāth on the other. Like all the Mallas, he was a Śaiva; but he offered cult also to Viṣṇu, as shown by his name of Daitya–Nārāyaṇa, and protected the other great religion of the country as well, in the best of old Indian and Nepalese tradition. Another pleasant feature of this king is his love of learning, for which he is praised in the Paśupati Nath inscription (doc. 7), and which is witnessed by his authorship of an astrological work, the Siddhisāra (doc. 6).

Jayayakṣamalla (1428–1482).

Jayajyotirmalla was succeeded by his eldest son Jayayakṣamalla, with whom the Malla kingdom reached its zenith. He enjoyed an unusually long reign, and thus a great quantity of material has been preserved: no less than fifty documents 1):


---

1) The numerous documents of Jayayakṣamalla, of which a first list was given in 1958, were then collected by Regmi, I, 426–436, and by Shankarman Rajbamshi, “Yakṣamallakā samayakā niścit samvatt ra tithimitiharu”, in Pūrṇimā, 7 (2022 VS), 36–43; 8 (id.), 14–20; 9 (2023 VS), 10–17; 10 (id.), 17–22. To simplify quotations, these two lists will be cited by the name of the author followed by the number of the document.

2) Published in CPMDN, I, 23. Regmi, unnumbered; Rajbamshi, n. 4.

3) Regmi, n. 25 (fully published in Regmi, III, 58); Rajbamshi, deest.

4) First published 1958. Regmi, n. 4; Rajbamshi, n. 5.

5) Published in CBMC, 197. Regmi, n. 5; Rajbamshi, n. 6.
pada corresponds to nija–Bhādrapada of the Śurya Siddhānta, and the date is verified for Saturday, September 3rd, 1429.


6) Copy of a Pharping inscription in the National Archives 2). Dated Pb.–P.–M.–śri–śrīmājayajākaṃalladevasya vijayarāje ...


11) Long, but badly preserved stone inscription on the water–conduit of Talmadhi Tōl,}

---

1) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 6; Rajbamshi, n. 7.
2) Regmi, deest; Rajbamshi, n. 8.
3) Partly published in CPMDN, I, 30; more fully, but with a wrong date, in 1958.
4) Mentioned by C. Bendall in JRAS 1888, 551. First published 1968; Regmi, n. 7; Rajbamshi, n. 7.
5) Published in CSMASB, VII, 76, n. 5086; Regmi, n. 26; Rajbamshi, n. 10.
6) Regmi, n. 29a (with a wrong date?); Rajbamshi, n. 12.
Bhatgaon 1). It mentions several times Jayayaksamalla and his younger brother Jayajivamalla. The date at the end is first expressed in Sanskrit: Sonye skandamukhen- drisanikhyākāsate Nepālasamvatsare Jeṣṭha pāṇḍarapakšakāntaka tithau nakṣatre ... yoge Suddhimate divā vidhusute bhāṣavadyaṃ samsthite Kanye candramasiti tata kṛtavān pūrṇaṃ pratiṣṭhāvidhīḥ; then in Newari: śrī-śrī-Yaksamalla prabhu ṭhākurasaṃ pāḍasthāpanaya dinaṃ gajuhiṃ chāse pul dayakā luyitinaṁ dayakā ... samvat 560 Jyeṣṭha sudhi 10 budhavāra. The date is verified for Wednesday, May 11th, 1440.


16) Ms. Subantarātapīkara (single final leaf only), India Office Library, Hodgson 35/2 (vol. 29). "Copied by Abhayarāja in the month Phālguna of Samvat 565 (pāṭca- rasa-bāna), during the reign of Jayayaksamalladeva." The date corresponds to February–March 1445.

17) Copper-plate inscription in the collection of Paṣupati Nāth 7). Dated Nāde skanda- mukhe hyanangaviśihekha (= 567?) Nepālasamvatsare māsādau (= Kārttika?) śita-saptamī Varuṇabhe (= Śatabhisaj-nakṣatra) yoge Śanau (= Śiva?) gispatau (= bhṛhaspa- ti). It gives an account of offerings and grants of land in the memory of the queen-mother Samsrādevi, deceased on that day, by śrī-śrī-Jayayaksamalladeva prabhu ṭhākurasaṃ śrī-śrī-Jayajivamalladeva prabhu mu ṭhākurasaṃ ubhayasyam dūntā juro. The date is difficult to understand. I take nāda = svara = 7; so also Regmi, I.

---

1) First published 1958, with a wrong date; Regmi, n. 9 (fully edited in Regmi, III, 63–67); Rajbamshi, n. 13.
2) Regmi, n. 28; Rajbamshi, deest.
3) Regmi, n. 30; Rajbamshi, deest.
4) Partly published by S. Lévi, Le Népal, II, 398; Regmi, n. 29 (and I, 440); Raj- bamshi, n. 14.
5) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 10; Rajbamshi, n. 15.
6) Thus listed in CPSMIO, 1443, n. 7877; Regmi, n. 11; Rajbamshi, n. 16.
7) Regmi, n. 27 (fully edited in III, 58–61); Rajbamshi, deest.
432, 439, 440. But Dh. Bajracharya, and also Regmi, III, 58, understand nāda = 1. As to the month, māsādi ("the first month") should be Kārttika, and thus it has been understood by Regmi; Dh. Bajracharya take it to mean Vaiśākha. Accepting the equivalences given above, the date would be quite irregular, as the titi ended on October 26th, 1446, which day was a Wednesday and not a Thursday; the nakṣatra ended on the 28th and the yoga on November 9th. Verification for 561 Kārttika or 561 Vaiśākha is also impossible.


21) Additional note at the end of ms. Sumatisiddhānta-grahagañita, Kaisher Library, n. 82 4. Dated Samvat 567 Bhādrapada śudi 3 śrī-śrī-Jayajacāksamalladeva-ḥākurasya Śivaluti (= Gosainthan) bijyāyā prastāvana yānā divasa Bhādrapada-śukla-dvādasī Śravana-nākṣatra budhavāra. The note gives details on Jayayakṣamalla’s pilgrimage to Gosainthan. The second date is verified for the first hours of Wednesday, August 23rd, 1447.

22) Ms. Ekādivahāmeta, National Archives, I.1559. Colophon 5: Eke haskaravāhanendriyavidhe (= 571) Nepālasamvatsare | māse Kārttika-śukla-viśvatīthite (?) ’bhe Pārvavahadrāhyay | vare bhāskari-sangame gatavati . . . . | so 'yam śrī-Jayajacāksamalla-nṛpatir Nepālabhūmanḍale | rājye tasya mahodaye janapade Bhaktapuripattanē. The titi seems to be 15; but otherwise the date is verified for Saturday, October 17th, 1450.


1) Regmi, n. 31 (fully edited in III, 67-68); Rajbamshi, n. 17.
2) First published 1958, with a wrong reading of the date; Regmi, n. 2 (and III, 68-69); Rajbamshi, n. 18.
3) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 12; Rajbamshi, n. 19.
4) Regmi, n. 32; Rajbamshi, n. 44.
5) Regmi, deest; Rajbamshi, n. 20.
6) Regmi, n. 33 (fully edited in III, 69-71); Rajbamshi, n. 21.
24) Inscription on the sockle of an image of Ganesa at Sanga 1). Dated śrī-Nepālaman-

sanom li kham sārasem ma jasem conāya sthāwō jurasano Koke kham tham tham dhanpko mudrān gānān dhāyo anān tham tham yarjute wum wōmānanam mūdrān gānān dhāyo anān tham tham yarjute wum wōmānanam ṭhāpaka thāna pānana ṭhākana khas li sālan helikayaṇah ma wone pānana hiaphe ṭhāyas dūrga wōnate ṭhāya su dūrga wōnataśem tham conn ṭhāya ma stū tham cogayasta tham conn ṭhā-
pastha tham connan arthasāmarthan colayam bālayam deda jwō sosēm pāne pānana jadi kaḍācīt pimpmātyānā dīkwo ṭwom tāvakāle dūwonān dīkwośem dūmwoñayame māwvo thwote aṭhi bhāṣā samanist cayo tāvakāl śrī–śrī–śrī–Pāsupti ṭwom phoñarāpā mahā-
pātaka lākwo juro nisāṁ jaya ādā thwote tāmwo sāsanas coṣēm taka aṭhi bhāṣā ni-
starapakās jan dhan Lakṣmī santati santān putrapaurā vrddhi āyurārīgya thwote wum jumya māl jadi kaḍācīt Koke kham ḍānanalaṁ tāsēm hawo tāvakāle Koka kha mām dēkwo dukhām ājēm Koke kham ḍāṇhānanase hawo sakhe biseṃ nodraya drābya juko thāya jwō juro thwote tāmwo sāsanas coṣēm thirāra pāko bhāṣāyā dṛṣṭāsā-
ksi śrī–śrī–śrī–Candapitāmahatwom | śreyo 'stu samvat 573 Jyeṣṭha–kṛṣṇa–daśāmyām

sanom li kham sārasem ma jasem conāya sthāwō jurasano Koke kham tham tham dhanpko mudrān gānān dhāyo anān tham tham yarjute wum wōmānanam mūdrān gānān dhāyo anān tham tham yarjute wum wōmānanam ṭhāpaka thāna pānana ṭhākana khas li sālan helikayaṇah ma wone pānana hiaphe ṭhāyas dūrga wōnate ṭhāya su dūrga wōnataśem tham conn ṭhāya ma stū tham cogayasta tham conn ṭhā-
pastha tham connan arthasāmarthan colayam bālayam deda jwō sosēm pāne pānana jadi kaḍācīt pimpmātyānā dīkwo ṭwom tāvakāle dūwonān dīkwośem dūmwoñayame māwvo thwote aṭhi bhāṣā samanist cayo tāvakāl śrī–śrī–śrī–Pāsupti ṭwom phoñarāpā mahā-
pātaka lākwo juro nisāṁ jaya ādā thwote tāmwo sāsanas coṣēm taka aṭhi bhāṣā ni-
starapakās jan dhan Lakṣmī santati santān putrapaurā vrddhi āyurārīgya thwote wum jumya māl jadi kaḍācīt Koke kham ḍānanalaṁ tāsēm hawo tāvakāle Koka kha mām dēkwo dukhām ājēm Koke kham ḍāṇhānanase hawo sakhe biseṃ nodraya drābya juko thāya jwō juro thwote tāmwo sāsanas coṣēm thirāra pāko bhāṣāyā dṛṣṭāsā-
ksi śrī–śrī–śrī–Candapitāmahatwom | śreyo 'stu samvat 573 Jyeṣṭha–kṛṣṇa–daśāmyām

27) Ms. Nityānākatiālaka, National Archives, III.384. Colophon 4): ŚrīmatBrahmapury-
yādhinātikā–dvijakulottama–śrī–dvija–Bradhhasomaśarmano 'yam śrī–śrī–Jayayakṣam-
ladevaṣya vijayarāje Dhāḍomiskoghe vāsita–daivaśikā–Abhayasimhena likhitam-itī || ŚrīmanNepālikā śreyo 'stu samvat 573 Āsūdra–kṛṣṇa–caturdaśāyāṃ bhāspati–vāsare

The date is verified for Friday, March 16th, 1453, except for the yoge which ended on the 15th.

1) Regmi, n. 34 (fully edited in III, 71–72); Rajbamshi, n. 22.
2) Regmi, deest; Rajbamshi, n. 23.
3) Regmi, n. 35 (fully edited in III, 72–73); Rajbamshi, deest.
4) Published in CPMDN, II, 82; Regmi, n. 13; Rajbamshi, n. 24.
28) Copper-plate inscription at the Golden Gate of the royal palace in Bhatgaon ¹). It concerns the construction of the walls in and around the palace; dated Samvat 573 Śrāvana–ṣukla–pūrṇimāsāyāṃ Śrāvana–naksatre Āyuśmān–yoge śukra–vāsare śrī–śrī–Jayayakṣamalladeva prabhu thākurasa etc. The date is verified for Friday, July 29th, 1453.


33) Inscription on an image of Viṣṇu in front of the Dattātreya temple in Bhatgaon ⁶): Dated R.–Jaksamalladevasya vijayarājye | śreyo ‘stu | Samvat 582 dvi–Pauṣa–māsa–pūrṇimāsāyāṃ tithau | Priti–yoge śukra–vāsare. In that year there was no Karkaṭa saṅkrānti in Ṭaṣāṅgha, and this could not give an intercalary Pauṣa in any system. Some mistake has crept in. If the year has been read correctly and if this dvi–Pauṣa corresponds to Māgha, then the date is verified for Friday, January 15th, 1462.


²) Regmi, n. 36 (fully edited III, 76 ); Rajbamshi, n. 26.

³) Mentioned in CBMC, 177; Regmi, n. 15; Rajbamshi, n. 27.

⁴) Barely mentioned in CMBC, xiii; first published 1958. Regmi, n. 16; Rajbamshi, n. 28.

⁵) Regmi, deest; Rajbamshi, n. 29.

⁶) Regmi, n. 39 (fully edited in III, 78); Rajbamshi, n. 31.

⁷) Regmi, n. 40 (fully edited III, 78); Rajbamshi, deest.

36) Inscription outside the temple of the Nairṛtya-pāṭṭi at Paṣupati Nath 2). Dated Samvat-śūkla-tīhau daśasyām..... śrī-śrī-Jayayakṣamalladeva-vijayarāje. The date corresponds to January 29th, 1463.

37) Ms. Rgviniścayāmādhavanidāna, National Archives, V.402. Colophon 3): Deva-jri-kamala-sarojaniyana Śrī-Śrī-Jayajyoti Siha ṛvutasya (and four other ṛvutasya) | R.-P.-Pb.-arvikula. The whole inscription is dedicated to increasing the merits of Jayarijamalla, the pre-deceased son of the king. The date at the end is Samvat 588 Kārttika-krṣṇa-dvitiyām tīhau Mrghāśira-nakṣatre Śādhyā-yoge śukra-vāsare. It is verified in all its elements for Friday, November 13th, 1467.

38) Copper-plate attached to the front wall of the Kāsthamaṇḍapa in Kathmandu 4). Dated śrī-Yakṣamallah prabhu rājate 'sau | śrī-Gauḍadeśāgatadār ṛṭi yogy Cai- tvanyāṇāḥ varaḍānasaṇḍaḥ | śrī-Nepālavār∴ haravadana-vasu-kaṁbānerdhā kṛṣṇa Āsādhe cendudarśe ahipati varabhe bhaumāvare prayukte ... And again at the end: Samvat 585 Āsādha-kṛṣṇa-amāvāsyā kohu juro. The date is verified for Tuesday, July 23rd, 1465.


40) Stone inscription on a stele to the left of the temple of Dhvāna in the Tulacchi Tol at Bhatgaon 6). It begins: Namo Nārāyaṇaya | svasti śrīmat-śrī-R.-P.-Pb.-ena śrīmatā śrī-Nepālēsvāra-cakra-cudāmaninā śrī-Lakṣmi-Nārāyanavatāra-śrī-śrī-Jayajyotisīhā-ravikula śrī-Lakṣmi-Nārāyaṇa-mukāvari sūkravāre. The whole inscription is dedicated to increasing the merits of Jayarājamalla, the pre-deceased son of the king. The date at the end is Samvat 588 Kārttika-krṣṇa-dvitiyām tīhau Mrghāśira-nakṣatre Śādhyā-yoge śukra-vāsare. It is verified in all its elements for Friday, November 13th, 1467.


42) Ms. Paṃcarakṣā, National Archives, I.1113.5. Colophon 8): R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jaya- jakṣamalladevasya vijayarāje | śubham-astu | Samvat 590 Śrīvane-śūkla-pratipadyā-

---

1) Regmi, n. 41 (fully edited III, 78-79); Rajbamshi, n. 32.
2) Regmi, deest; Rajbamshi, n. 33.
3) Regmi, n. 42; Rajbamshi, deest.
4) Published in Samskrta Sandesa, I/6, 7-8; Regmi, n. 43 (fully edited III, 79-80); Rajbamshi, deest.
5) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 17; Rajbamshi, n. 34.
6) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 18 (fully edited III, 80-82); Rajbamshi, n. 35.
7) Regmi, deest; Rajbamshi, n. 36.
8) Published in CPMDN, I, 36; Regmi, n. 19; Rajbamshi, n. 37.
The date is verified in all its elements for the second half of July 28th, 1470.

43) Stone inscription on a statue of Bhairava on a house to the South of Paṣupati Nath 1). It is written in the reign of śrī-sūryavāmśa-nṛpati-Jayayakṣamalla and mentions all of his living sons: śrī-Jayarāyamalla-nṛpatiḥ śrī-Ratnamallah prabhuh śrīmat śrī-Ratnamalla-devavunavān śrī-Rāmamalllo nṛpaḥ khyāta-śrī-Arimallal-devasukṛt śrī-Pūrṇamallo varāḥ. There are two dates: A) Nāge vasau NANDANAVAR-gate (= 588) ca varṣe Caitre tama-hare (= ??) tithau Śravane ca rķe yoge Šūbhe bhrgude; this is verified for Friday, April 15th, 1468. B) Nepalāhāyane gate vidhu-randhra-bine (= 591) Māghe śite tithivare navamī-praṣaṭe rķe Vidheḥ šāśi-suteni Aindra-yoge; this is verified for Wednesday, January 30th, 1471.

44) Ms. Śrī-Patrindrāristotra, India Office Library, 2723 H. Colophon 2): Śrī-Kāśṭhamandaṇḍapa-mahānāgare Cyekanamagungitolake Baṃ-viḥārādhivāsi ... || Samvat 594 Caitra-ḵrṣṇa-dvādaśi Utrabhadra-naksatre buddhadinē | R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-Jayayakṣamalladevasya vijayairāye etc. Written at Kathmandu. The date is verified for Wednesday, April 3rd, 1474.


48) Incription commemorating the building and inauguration of the Pujari Math in Bhatgaon 6): It is dated Samvat 600 Phālguṇa śukla 12, in the reign of Jayayakṣamalla. The date corresponds to February 22nd, 1480.

49) Ms. Pańcarakṣa, Tokyo University Library, n. 232. Colophon 7): R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Jayayakṣamalladevasya vijayairāye | ... | Samvat 600 Caitra-ḵrṣṇa-dvādaśi-pra-trayodāṣyāṇ-tithau Uttarabhadra-nakṣatre Siddhi-pra-Vyātipāṭa-yoge śukradine. The date is verified for Friday, April 7th, 1480, except for the two yoga which correspond to March 31st.

1) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 20 (fully edited III, 82-85); Rajbamshi, n. 38.

2) Published in CSPMIO, 1427, n. 7280; Regmi, n. 21; Rajbamshi, n. 29.

3) Published in CPMDN, I, 75, and by Bendall, History, 29; Regmi, n. 22; Rajbamshi, n. 40.

4) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 23; Rajbamshi, n. 41.

5) First published 1958; Regmi, n. 24; Rajbamshi, n. 42.


7) Unpublished; registered in CSMTUL.
To these documents we could add a fragmentary inscription on the socle of an image of Śūrya near the western gate of Banepa\(^2\), dated Samvat 579 Māgha-māsa-śuklapakṣa ... Bharuṇī-nakṣatre 39 Siddhi-yoge ... vāsare ... R. -śrī-śrī ... jajamāna-jinarājāḥ. Probably the king, whose name has peeled off, was Jayayaksamalla; but we cannot be sure, as a very slight possibility remains that the donor was a last scion of the Rāma family. The date is verified for Friday, January 12th, 1459.

Jayayaksamalla was born in 528 NS (1408 A.D.)\(^3\) and died in 602 Phālguna śukla 11, corresponding to March 1st, 1482\(^4\). The modern vamsāvalis allow him a reign of 43 years, but his documents show that the reigned from 1428 to 1482, and this represents a long reign of 54 years. He had formally begun his career at the age of five as the nominal governor of Bhatgaon, being mentioned as such in Doc. 7 of Jayajyotirmalla.

According to the precedent set by his father and his uncles, he shared the throne with his younger brother Jayajivamalla; but the position of the latter was always a subordinate one. Jayajīvamalla died in or shortly after 1447, the year of the demise of the queen-mother Saṃsgradevi, whose position was one of great prestige and apparently of some influence; in this aspect too the traditions of the Tipura family were followed.

Since we lack trustworthy contemporary evidence, it is difficult to assess the achievements of this long reign. On the whole there was peace in the country, but not always so on the border. In 1453 the king called upon two prominent nobles, Udaya Bhāro of the Yetha

---

2) Regmi, n. 37 (fully edited in III, 77-78); Rajbamshi, n. 30.
3) According to a thyasaphu (family chronicle) in possession of Chandraman Joshi, quoted by Sh. Rajbamshi, in Pūrṇimā, 7 (2022 VS), 36; cf. Regmi, I, 450.
4) Same thyasaphu as above, quoted by Sh. Rajbamshi in Pūrṇimā, 10 (2023 VS), 19; cf. Regmi, loc. cit., Also a thyasaphu of the family purohita of the Malla kings in Bhatgaon, published by Yogi Narahari Nath, in Itihās Prakāś, III, 3, 569.
Baha in Patan and Śaktisimha Rāvut, the feudatory of Pharping, to give guarantees of their loyalty and support against an apprehended attack from the Koki (or Koke)\(^1\) rulers of Champaran, Lohavar etc. (Doc. 26). One of these enemies was almost certainly Madanaśīmhadēva, ruler of Champaran, mentioned in 1454 and 1457 with high-sounding titles; he was the author of the *Madanaratnapradīpa*, but nothing is known of his warlike activities\(^2\). Doc. 26 reveals that the loyalty of aristocracy was rather shaky. The nobles had to swear a pledge not to listen to the words of the enemy, not to conceal the communications received from him, not to take the side of the Koki who intended to attack Nepal from the East and from the West, to reject their offers without taking heed of them; in short, to stand faithfully at the side of the king. In other words, the king endeavoured to obtain security and tranquillity inside the Valley while he gathered an army to throw back the intended invaders. In the following years also Kīrtisimha, the feudatory or governor of Dolkha, tendered his support to the king (Doc. 30)\(^3\).

It seems that for once the Nepalese not only repelled the attack, but also carried the war down to the plains. This campaign is alluded to in high-flown and bombastic terms in a later work, the commentary (*tikā*) to the astrological text *Narapatijayacāryā* composed by king Jagajjyotirmalla of Bhatgaon (1613–1637), of which a manuscript exists in the National Archives, I.1186. At the beginning it gives the genealogical list of its royal author, and Jayayakṣamalla is spoken of as follows:

\[
āśīd–viśvaviśobhinīrmalayaśorāśau raghonvaye \\
vikhyāto Jayayakṣamalla–nrpatir–dātāvadātāśayah \\
yo rājyaṃ Mithilāṃ vijitya Magadham gatvā Gayāṃ pauruṣād \\
yo Nepālaṃ–akaṇṭakaṃ vyaracayajjītvā nrpaṇ–pārvvatāṃ || \\
prācyaṃ yo Vaṅgadeśaṃ tad–anu Suranadinaṃ dakṣine digvibhāge
\]

\(^1\) This family or clan name seems unknown, I can only recall that the Bhagalpur plates of Nārāyaṇapāla of Bengal (9th century) refer to a village in the Kaśa–viṣaya in Tirhut.


\(^3\) For the interpretation of these inscriptions see Dh. Bajrajacharya and T. B. Sreṣṭhi, *Dolkhāko aitihāsik rūprekha*, Kathmandu 2031 VS, 21–22.
According to the royal poet, Jayayakṣamalla conquered Mithilā and marched as far as Gayā in Magadha. Of course the Nepalese king may have profited of the utter confusion that reigned in Muslim India during the period before Bahlol Lodi’s reconquest of Jaunpur (1479) made the Sultanate of Delhi again the chief power of Northern India. Only such particular conditions can explain how the small Nepalese kingdom was able for a moment to make his arm felt in the foothills. After having dealt with Champaran and Lohavar (but the ṭīkā is silent on this score), Jayayakṣamalla may have invaded Tirhut proper (Mithilā), although it is difficult to see in this anything more substantial than a raid. As to his claim concerning Gayā, this is clearly an empty boast.

The ṭīkā also states that Jayayakṣamalla made Nepal secure by defeating the hill Rajas; in the east he marched to Bengal and to the southern shores of the Ganges. Of course this claim too cannot have any basis in reality. The king also “contrived the ruin of the prince of Gorkha”; in this case, a successful expedition against a potentially dangerous neighbour, who three centuries later brought to the end the Malla kingdoms, is quite within possibility. Then we are told that to the north he extended his dominions by a distance of seven day’s march. The sources of Kirkpatrick tells more or less the same tale, but adds that the king conquered “Sikarjoong of Tibet to the northward” 2). Šel–dkar–rdzon was then as now an important trade mart on the Nepal–Lhasa route, and as such much coveted by the Nepalese rulers; a passing occupation by Jayayakṣamalla is not unlikely; but no trace of it is found in the Tibetan texts, as far as I am aware.

On the whole, this aggressive policy, even if we reduce it to modest proportions, was a fleeting interlude which left no trace; the Valley was neither fit nor strong not traditionally inclined to support warlike adventures.

1) Published in CPMDN, I, 107.
2) Kirkpatrick, 266.
Jayayakṣamalla’s most important action in the field of religion was his entrusting the guardianship of the national shrine of Paśupati Nāth to the Bhaṭṭa Brahmans from Southern India, with whom it has remained to this day. He was also a builder. In 1455 he built the Mul Chok, which today represents the oldest part of the palace complex of Bhatgaon. Slightly later the king caused a little mandapa (public rest-house) to be radically re-constructed and enlarged; in the 16th or 17th century it was converted into the magnificent temple of Dattātreya. In 1480 he built near it the Pūjāri Māth, whose splendid lattice windows are perhaps the finest in the Valley 1). Nepalese artists and craftsmen continued to be highly appreciated and sought for in Tibet; the Sa–skya–pa teacher Kun–dga’–bzaṅ–po summoned Nepalese artists to work at the decoration of the monastery of Nor, of which he laid the foundations in 1429 2). Generally speaking, Indian influence, as mediated by Nepal, continued to make itself felt in Tibetan art; a special Nepalese style (Bal–ris) developed in Southern Tibet in the 14th and 15th centuries and formed the mainstay of Tibetan painting in that period 3).

The national language was fostered and cherished. Already in the 14th century Newari had made its first entrance in the inscriptions and colophons, as well as in the chronicles, upto then dominated by Sanskrit. Under Jayayakṣamalla the shift in the balance between the living and the sacred dead languages was rapid; henceforward the inscriptions and colophons were mostly couched in Newari, except for the formal portions containing the praise to the gods and the titles of the ruling king.

With the death of Jayayakṣamalla we have reached the limit set to our study. It is not advisable, however, to cut the matter short at this point and to pass under silence the complicated developments

1) A. W. MacDonald and A. Vergati Stahl, Newar Art, Warminster 1979, 111.


3) G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, Rome 1949, 277. See the Tibetan texts translated by E. Gene Smith in his introduction to Kongtrul’s Encyclopaedia of Indo-Tibetan culture (ed. by Lokesh Chandra), I–III, New Delhi 1907, 38–42.
after that event. A short summary is in order, and that is what I am proceeding to do, basing myself on the documents collected by Dh. Bajracharya and by Regmi 1).

Jayayakṣamalla’s reign had been on the whole a period of internal peace and of cultural achievement. However, it was under his sway that the structure of the state deteriorated steadily, until it reached the breaking point. One disruptive influence was the trend toward local autonomy in the towns which were not usually royal residences, i.e. Patan and Kathmandu. The aristocratic municipal board of Patan was slowly progressing toward independence de facto, and after the death of the old king Patan became to all intents and purposes a city state, maintaining this position till the end of the 16th century. A similar process had started in Kathmandu, but it did not develop very far, being nipped in the bud after 1484. As a matter of fact Jayayakṣamalla at first kept this development within bonds; the source of Kirkpatrick states that he completely subdued the refractory Rajahs of Patan and Kathmandu 2). But in the long run the king could not stop the trend toward autonomy.

Another element of disruption was the all too numerous progeny of the king. In 1452 we find three sons mentioned: the elder Jayarāyamalla, the middle Jayaratnamalla and the youngest Jayaraṇamalla (Doc. 23). The terms employed in this list are exactly the same as in the documents of Jayadharmamalla and his brothers; possibly the formula adumbrated already a future trayorājya. There had been another son, Jayarājamalla, apparently issued from a secondary wife or a concubine; he died in 1467 (Doc. 40). In 1471 we get another list including, besides the three senior princes, other three names, viz. Rāmamalla, Arimalla and Pūrṇamalla; they too, like Jayarājamalla, seem to have enjoyed a lesser status (Doc. 42). Of these, Pūrṇamalla is not heard of any more, and probably died before his father.

In 1462 the eldest son Jayarāyamalla apparently tried to usurp royal status, because in that year a colophon shows him ruling with full royal titles.

---

2) Kirkpatrick, 266.
Ms. Svarodayadasa, National Archives, III.364.3. Colophon 1): Samvat 582 Vaiśākhā-
sukla-caturthī-pra-pañcamāśīyām tihau Mrgaśīra-nakṣatre Šobhana-yoge ādityavāre | 
śrī-śrī-R.-P.-Pb.-śrī-śrī-Rāyamalladevasya vijayarājye || No place is mentioned. The 
date is verified in all its particulars for Sunday, April 5th, 1462.

Either Rāyamalla (or the people behind him) failed in his attempt, or else he found it advisable to give up his claim; probably he had found himself confronted with the united opposition of his father and his brothers 2). As a matter of fact, according to the tradition of their family all the brothers, or at least the seniormost three, held an equal title to the succession. And when the old king died, events followed exactly the same pattern as in the succession of Jayasthitimalla; that is, the three senior brothers ascended the throne of Nepal, ruling jointly.

But while after 1395 the trayaṃjaya had succeeded in maintaining the unity of the country and eventually led to the restoration of sole rule, this time the system broke down in the course of one generation. Bhatgaon continued to be the capital of the kingdom, and most of the documents issued from there were in the name of the three kings, who about 1487 took as their associate their nephew (sister's son) Jayabhīmamalla (Regmi's Doc. 2–13). But almost at once a process of localization set in and grew apace, each of the three brothers asserting his authority in a portion of the kingdom, although maintaining the fiction of joint rule. Already in 1484 Jayarātmanalla established his rule in Kathmandu, or even occupied the town by force. A whole series of documents shows him as the ruler of the town, at first with a subordinate colleague; this was his younger-

1) First published 1958, although the ms. was listed with the wrong date of 482 in CPMDN, II, 46.
2) There was no other attempt at usurpation, although this has been claimed on the basis of a ms. of the Pañcarakṣa in private possession, shown to Dr. L. D. Barnett in the British Museum, said to be dated M.–Rājārajendra–sakalarājacakrādhīśvarāśrī–
śrī-Jayaṃpendramalla–Pb.–devanām.–vijayarājye ……Samvat 596 Jyeṣṭha–māse śukla–pakṣa pūrnamāṣīyām tihau Anūrādha–nakṣatre Siddhi–yoge …… Kāṣṭamandapā-
Because of the date, Dr. Ray took Jayanarendra for another name of Ratnamalla, 
the third son of Jayayakṣamalla. But there is no need for it. A king Jayanarendra-
malla existed and reigned in Kathmandu from 1674 to 1680. It is thus a-priori probable that 596 is but a misreading for 796. The proof that this is indeed the case is given by the chronological verification. The date cannot be verified for 1476, while, if we admit that Siddhi yoga is a quite likely mistake for Siddha yoga, it is verified in all its particulars for Wednesday, May 17th, 1676.
brother Arimalla (d. 1504), followed by his son Indramalla; after 1511 Jayaratnamalla remained alone on the throne (Regmi’s Doc. 22-32) 1). As a reaction to Jayaratnamalla’s high-handed action, Jayarāyamalla too caused himself to be recognized as the sole local ruler of Bhatgaon (Regmi’s Doc. 17-21). The third brother Jayarāṇāmalla took hold of the former Bhonta principality with its chief town Banepa.

Jayarāyamalla died in December 1509 2), and at the same time Jaya-bhīmamalla disappears from the documents; after that date even the pretence of unity and joint rule was dropped 3). Jayarāṇāmalla, of whom very few documents are extant, acted for a time as regent or co-ruler with Jayarāyamalla’s sons in Bhatgaon (Regmi’s Doc. 37, dated 1523). Most probably he shifted his residence there; and thus quite naturally, when Jayarāṇāmalla died in 1529 without leaving male issue, the kingdom of Banepa was merged into that of Bhatgaon. Jayaratnamalla of Kathmandu died in 1520 and was succeeded by his son.

As to the third great town, Patan, the mahāpātras governing that city–state recognized the formal overlordship of the three kings in general, and of Kathmandu in particular, till about 1520. Then Patan rejected Malla suzerainty and became even formally independent under the dynasty founded by Viṣṇusimha, one of the three chief mahāpātras who had eliminated his colleagues. In about 1600–1604 the city–state was conquered by Śivasimha of Kathmandu, after whose death Patan became a separate kingdom under one of his sons.

After the end of the trayorājya, for more that a century and a half the history of Nepal was that of an unprofitable and barren struggle among the three kingdoms, whose capitals lay at an average of 7–8 miles from each other. And this long–protracted storm in a tea–cup so weakened the Nepal of the Newars, that it fell a prey to the Gorkha conquerors in 1768/9. Thus, because of their own fault, the Newars ceded forever to be the masters in the fertile and happy valley of Nepal.

3) An inscription from Kirtipur (Regmi’s Doc. 15) shows that in 1515 the mahāpātras of Patan still recognized the suzerainty of a trayorājya formed by Jayaratnamalla Jayarāṇāmalla and Rāmamalla. But after Rāmamalla’s death in 1516, Patan made no further attempt to utilize a ghost trayorājya as a cover for her total independence.
CHAPTER VIII

SOCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITIONS

A.

The cities of Nepal.

It is difficult to gain an even moderate idea of the medieval structure of the Nepalese state, because our sources are particularly uninformative on this subject.

The kingdom of Nepal normally included the Valley proper (Nepāla-maṇḍala) and some outlying portions, of which the most important were Bhonta (the Banepa/Palamchok region) to the East, Nuvakoth to the West and Pharping to the South-West; all of these were ruled by feudal chiefs acknowledging the suzerainty of the king. When the central power grew stronger, some of these principalities could be brought under direct royal rule. Farther east, the Dolkha district too was under the political influence of the Nepalese monarchy in a varying measure, according to the times.

One of the main changes that characterize the medieval period in the Valley is the rise of the towns and of urban life. This was in contrast with the Licchavi period, when the usual form of human settlement was the village (grāma), a combination of which formed a tala. Some of the larger grāma and tala could receive by royal charter the name draṅga, which indicated also the basic administrative unity; but none of these seems to have approached the size of a town 1). There were two royal residences and seats of the government, both formed probably by little more than a palace with a cluster of houses around it. The older of the two was Mānagṛha, founded by the

1) See Dh. Bajracharya, Licchavikālkā abhilekh, 218–221.
Licchavis. For a long time it has been identified with the compound of the royal palace at Patan, where the modern name Mangal Bazar seems to perpetuate the old appellation. The present trend of research points with an increasing certainty toward Maligaon or Magal, a locality included in modern Harigaon (or Handigaon) to the north-east of old Kathmandu, where the local conditions seem to suit best the vague evidence supplied by epigraphy. Unluckily, we cannot expect confirmation of this theory from archaeological excavations, as the site has been heavily built upon in quite recent times 1).

The other ancient capital was Kailāsakūṭa, a creation of Aṃśuvarman and the seat of the de-facto Gupta rulers as well as of the restored Licchavis. It has been usually equated with the hillock near Deo Patan still called Kailāsa. Another theory would look for it at Tagal, quite close to Maligaon 2). The most recent study on this subject would locate Kailāsakūṭa in Yaṅgal (South Kathmandu), and more precisely in the place called in the middle ages Kelācheṃ (the name is attested from 1143 to 1385) and now Kelay Chok 3). However, I think that the time is not yet ripe for a final choice.

The rise of actual towns and of urban life was a later development 4). It was due, as suggested already by S. Lévi, to a shift in the economy of Nepal from a purely agricultural to a mixed one, in which trade and crafts played an increasing role; the beginning of this process was roughly contemporary with the beginning of the period treated in the present work.

The three main cities arose as the result of the consolidation of pre-existing villages and scattered settlements is a restricted area; the city plans were strongly influenced also by their position on the main routes followed by commerce.

2) Th. Manandhar, loc. cit.
3) M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 118b–123a.
One of the earliest centres was the village of Deo Patan, hallowed by the nearness of the national shrine of Paṣupati. It was probably the place of coronation of the kings, although two instances only are documented. Inspite of its religious importance, Deo Patan never developed into a real town, nor was it ever the residence of the kings and of the government. Its Newari name Gwanla designated also the core of the Valley as contrasted with Bhonta and Tipura (Bhatgaon); being the symbol of royal legitimacy, Gwanla was a pawn fought for in the long struggle between the two families, to which Jayasthitimalla put an end.

If we were to judge by the number of the preserved colophons and inscriptions, we would at once conclude that Patan was the most important of the three cities in the medieval period. It rose around a nucleus represented by a hamlet called Yūpagrāma in Licchavi times, through the usual process of coagulation and incorporation of the surrounding villages. The city is called Ėla (Yala) in Newari, and Lalitapūrī, Lalitakrama, Lalitabrumā or Lalitapattana in Sanskrit. The pivot of the town was and is the royal palace of Mānigal, on the emplacement of old Yūpagrāma. The name seems to be modelled upon that of Mānagṛha; when Patan became the capital (or one of the capitals) in the Transitional Period, the local people may have built in the centre of the city a new Mānagṛha intended to replace the original one, much as Byzantium, the new Rome, was intended to replace the old Rome ¹). Even today the complex of buildings on the Darbar Square before the royal palace is called Mangal Bazar, a vulgar pronunciation of Mānigal, partly under the influence of the Sanskrit maṅgala, good luck. The town seems to have been divided, at least theoretically, into two main sections, north and south of the palace, called respectively Uttaravihāra and Daksinavihāra. Each of them in its turn was subdivided into tolı (wards), which reproduced, at least in part, the former division into hamlets. They usually took the name from the main Buddhist vihāra included in the ward, so that in this context vihāra was synonimous with ward ²).

¹) M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 109b–112b, would rather explain Mānigal as an old Newari term meaning "central place". The same author denies also the role of Patan as a capital even in the late Transitional and Early Malla period, on grounds which, however are not wholly convincing.

²) For the identification of the vihāras in Patan see the list by N. Gutschow and
but a consequence of the fact that Patan was from the beginning, and still is, a dominantly Buddhist city 1). Bhatgaon (Khopva, Khvopa or Khṛmpṛm in Newari, Bhaktapur or Bhaktagrāma in Sanskrit) is said to have been founded about in the same period as the Newari Samvat, i.e. in the 9th century, although VW gives the credit for both achievements to one Ānandamalla, younger son of Abhayamalla 2). Of course Ānandamalla is a mistake for Ānandadeva, and the legend alludes to the foundation of the Tipura palace and not of the town, which had come into being much earlier. According to a recent study, the town originated from the merger of two separate settlements, which existed already in Licchavi times; the one, called Khṛprī-grāma, in modern Tulachi Tol, and the other, called Makhodul, in Lakulache Tol; to these was added an outpost of Makhodul, called Makhopṛm, situated in Golmadhi Tol 3). The name Bhaktagrāma appears for the first time as early as 924 4). In the 12th century Ānandadeva elevated the town to the rank of secondary royal residence, laying thus the foundations for its ever rising importance. The town flourished and became a thriving commercial centre, thanks to its situation on the trade route to Banepa and thence to Tibet; then after a less brilliant period the Tipura princes renewed Bhatgaon’s political importance, overcame their rivals and united the Valley under their sway; under Jayasthitimalla Bhatgaon replaced even formally Patan as the capital of Nepal, and when the old kingdom broke apart, it was Bhatgaon which became the seat of the senior branch of the Malla dynasty. Following the lead of its ruling family, Bhatgaon shared its zealous support for Hinduism, mostly of the Śaiva persuasion, and to this day


1) On Patan in general see M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 95b-100b.

2) Wright, 163.


it remains a predominantly Hindu city, the seat of orthodoxy, in contrast with Buddhist Patan and mixed Kathmandu ¹).

In a similar way Kathmandu, later called also Kāntipura, came into being through the merger of two adjacent settlements, known in early Licchavi times as Koligrāma and Dakṣinakoligramā, straddling to the north and south the old trade route to Banepa; in medieval times they came to be known by the Newari names Yambu and Yaṅgal respectively ²). According to one modern chronicle, Kāntipura was founded in 3824 Kaliyuga, i.e. 724 A.D.; according to another, the founder was Guṇakāmādeva in the last quarter of the 10th century ³). The second date seems nearer to the truth because, differently from Patan and Bhatgaon, the fusion started late and was a long-drawn process. In the early middle ages the colophons employ the two Newari names only, Yambu being the more important of the two halves of the growing town. In the course of time the city thus formed came to be known by the name of a building, the Kāṭhamaṇḍapa, which was, and still is, a maṇḍapa or sattal (public rest-house) and not a temple. According to an unpublished manuscript account, it existed already in 1090, in the reign of Harsadeva; its first published mention belongs to 1143 (Doc. 5 of Narendradeva). In 1379 Jayasthitimalla donated it to the Śaiva Nāṭhayogins (or Kāṁphaṭa), and since that time the name of the building came to designate the new city ⁴). Although the two Licchavi capitals seem to have been situated within what is now Great Kathmandu, and although the religions centre Deo Patan was situated in its district, during the middle ages Kathmandu played a secondary role in comparison with her sister-cities; it became a royal capital only with Jayaratnamalla in 1484 ⁵).

We have no significant evidence to show which was the capital of Nepal in the period before Jayasthitimalla. It has been maintai-

¹) The best monograph on ancient Bhatgaon is N. Gutschow and B. Kölver, Orde-red space and functions in a town of Nepal, Wiesbaden 1975. See also M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 100b–104a.


³) Wright, 154; B. J. Hasrat, History of Nepal, 46.


⁵) On Kathmandu see M. S. Slusser, Nepal Mandala, 87b–95b.
ned that "the number of manuscripts emanating from Patan has no bearing on its political role. These manuscripts were not political documents, but largely Buddhist text that were naturally numerous in Buddhist Patan" 1). This assertion is too sweeping. There were many non-Buddhist manuscripts copied in Patan. Above all, if the material is sufficient, a statistical approach may have some bearing on the question, if only an indicative one. A list of the manuscripts and inscriptions belonging expressly to one or the other of the three cities would afford some slight clues. There is a continuous flow of manuscripts from Patan from the end of the tenth century to 1382, with a decrease during the reign of Anantamalla (1274–1308). Kathmandu yields a substantial amount of documents during the Transitional Period, but only five during the long period from 1200 to 1382. Bhatgaon is definitely less productive: only three documents from 1005 to 1147, then a body of five ranging from 1158 to 1171, the years that correspond to the reigns of Ānandadeva and Rudradeva, after which there is practically nothing until 1380.

Working upon this basis, narrow and unsafe as it is, I would sketch the following development. Kathmandu and Patan both represented centres of power during the Transitional Period. Patan seems to have been the capital of Nepal during the Early Malla and the Tipura/Bhonta periods, except for the few years when under Ānandadeva Bhatgaon was the royal residence. Lastly, Bhatgaon became the capital with Jayasthitimalla and played that role till the tripartite division of the kingdom early in the 16th century. Until better evidence is available, I think it advisable to pay some attention, for what it is worth, to the possibilities sketched out above.

B

The Monarchy

The Nepalese monarchy was theoretically absolute and by divine right. The king reigned by the favour of Paśupati; but after Jayasthitimalla, although Paśupati retained the first place, the king is expressly said to rule by the favour of Māneśvarī.

The rules of succession to the throne are an interesting and somewhat complicated subject. Leaving apart the *dvairājya* in its meaning of double kingdom, which strictly speaking cannot come under this heading, we can distinguish five modes of succession.

1) Primogeniture, i.e. succession from the father to the eldest son. This is the normal system in India and in many other countries; it was also the most common one in Nepal.

1) Fratrilineal succession, from the elder to the younger brother(s); after the death of the last brother the throne passed to the eldest son of the first brother. This system, for which there is hardly any example in India, was followed for some time in the 12th century (Ānandadeva–Rudradeva–Amṛtadeva–Someśvaradeva), but was never repeated later.

3) Co-rulership by two rulers, who may or may not be brothers (*ubhayarājya*). This was an early mode, followed at intervals during the 11th century (Narendradeva – Udayadeva, Bhāskaradeva – Jayadeva, Baladeva – Yiśadeva). Possibly a recollection of it helped to originate the next one.

4) Co-rulership of three brothers (*trayorājya* or *tribhayarājya*). This seems to have been the rule followed by the Karnāṭa–Malla dynasty after the death of Jayasthitimalla, till the system broke down after 1520.

5) Alternance between two dynasties, regulated by a sort of family compact. This mode was agreed upon in 1258 and was followed more or less regularly for a century or so.

Whether this oscillation between different systems was connected with some peculiarity of the Newar social order, is a problem that would deserve a closer investigation.

In practice, the royal power was often conditioned by the aristocracy, who in times of disorder had their say in the election of the king (*Nepāla–samasta–saṃmatena; sarve–saṃmatena*). But the fact remains that however anarchical, however divided, the country always recognized one (or more) kings as the head of state. The monarchy,

---

*1) J. W. Spellman, A study of kingship from the earliest times to circa A. D. 300, Oxford UP 1964, 57:* "There can be no doubt that the normal method of succession was by primogeniture "."
however weakened, never resolved itself into a feudal confederacy, like the Marathas at the end of the 18th century.

C

The Nobility

We have to distinguish the aristocracy of the Valley and its three chief cities from the feudatories in the outlying district (viṣaya). The nobility of the Valley in part descended from court officials and in part rose from the level of local notables.

Some court official of Licchavi times still lingered on: such was the vārta, a title that occurs for the last time in 1052 (Doc. 6 of Baladeva). The highest title of office was later that of mahātha (Sanskrit mahattaka) 1), prime minister, for which the literary forms amātya and mantrin are used in poetry or in highly formal portions of the documents. The use of mahātha as a purely honorary title was exceptional; one such case happened when on Wednesday, May 13th, 1377, the heir-apparent Jayadharmamalla, then ten years old, was formally appointed mahātha by his father 2).

By far the most common title for the average nobleman was bhāro, or bhāroka or bhalloka, which came into use in the early 11th century. Ga-su Bhāro appears in c. 1022, and his son Dho-ga Bhāro in c. 1053 invited to Nepal the Paṇḍita Jñānākara, a disciple of Nāropā; to the same period belonged a Bāro P'yang-rdum, who collaborated in the translation of Indian Buddhist texts into Tibetan 3).

In the 14th the term mulami came into use. It was a higher title than bhāro; in 1377 we find Teja Rām bhāro being promoted to mulami (V3, 57a). In the following century most of the leading

---

1) Doc. 3 of Jayārjunadeva. This title was used also in Tirhut, in the Khasa kingdom of Western Nepal (Āsokacalla’s Bodh Gaya inscription of the year 74, Epigraphia Indica, XII, 30), and elsewhere.

2) 497 Jyeṣṭha ṣukla 5, Pusya-nakṣatra, Dhruva-yoga, budha-vāra (verified); V1, 57a.

nobles held this title. Both bhāro and mulami were titles peculiar of the landed aristocracy.

Some of the nobles holding estates on the fringe of the Valley, but still within it, enjoyed higher titles; such was the Sakhupati Rāja, lord of Sankhu, mentioned in 1343 (V3, 48a).

The city nobility (pradhānā) had a different character and used different titles. It developed chiefly at Patan when the monarchical institutions weakened in the 13th century. The typical title of the nobleman was pātra or mahāpātra, usually coupled with the term pradhānānga, i.e. member of the patriciate. They were the heads of the single wards (tol; in Patan, vihāra), and may be considered (at least partly) as descended from the headmen of the villages which were merged to form the city. They were Kṣatriya by caste, as shown by the ending -varman attached to their names. The first mention of a pradhānānga pātra goes back to 1283 1). A prominent figure was Jayasihamalladeva varman, who appears in 1337 as pradhānānga mahāpātra of the Hnol vihāra, being issued (kuṭumbodbhava) from the family of the Uttaravihāra of Patan (Doc. 1 of Jayārimalla). He was very long-lived, and we find him again as kuṭumbaja–mahāpātra in 1350 and as pradhānānga mahāpātra in 1376 (see back p. 112). Another prominent nobleman was the mūryaṅga mahāpātra Meghapālavarman of 1357–1359 (Piṃtha Bahal inscription; see above p. 125).

In the course of the 14th century these families gained an ever increasing power, so that the modern chronicles tell us that at one time Kathmandu was divided between twelve “kings” while Patan had as many “kings” as there were wards, although the situation thus depicted is wrongly placed in connection with Nānyadeva and Harisimha 2).

Among the pātras of Patan seven families became prominent, and step by step their heads (the saptakuṭumbaja) became a sort of town council with wide powers. The beginnings of this development go back to the early 12th century, the term kuṭumbaja appearing for the

---


2) Wright, 172.
first time in 1125 and 1131 1). Then we find a kutumbaja pātra in 1142 2) and a kutumbaja nara-pātra in 1147 (Doc. 1 of Ānandadeva). The board of the saptakutumbaja was presided over by three chairmen, styled pradhānāṅga—mūrtyaṅga—mahāpātra—pramukha (V1, 25a) or more simply tribhayapātra—pramukha (Doc. 29 of Jayasthiti-malla; cf. Doc. 33 of Jayajyotirmalla). It is not clear whether their charges were hereditary or they were chosen in turn among the seven families.

This town council seems to have been kept within due bonds by Jayasthiti-malla and his immediate successors, as it is very seldom mentioned during their reign; but with Jayajyotirmalla and with Jayayakṣamalla it took definitely the character of the collective presidency of an autonomous city-state. One of the leading figures in this development seems to have been Udayasimhamallavarman, mentioned in 1418 and 1427 as mahāmahāpātra of the Dakṣinavihāra (Doc. 33 of Jayajyotirmalla). He was one of the three mahāpātras appointed to stage the performance of the Caturaṅka—Mahābharatanāṭaka on the occasion of prince Jayarıyamalla performing a tulāpurusamahādāna of gold 3). Somewhat later Jayasimhamalla, bearing the same titles as Udayasimhamalla and perhaps a relative of his, appears in a colophon without any mention of a king 4). As we have seen, the city-state was practically independent by the time of Jayayakṣamalla’s demise; in 1520 it even ceased to recognize the formal suzerainty of the Malla kings. In 1530 Viṣṇusimha, a descendant of Jayasimhamalla, abolished the council of the seven families and turned the aristocratic republic into a monarchy of the traditional type 5).

In Kathmandu a similar development had started under the local Vaiśya mahāpātra; but it was cut short by Jayaratnamalla’s seizure of power in 1484.

2) Doc. 19 from the Rudravarṇa—mahāvihāra.
In contrast with the nobility, the religious leaders seem to have played little or no political role. Plenty of names and titles are known from the colophons, but none of the rājaguru or of the court vajrācārya ever became a Richelieu of mediaeval Nepal. The only time in which the “clergy” (if this name can be employed in a Hindu society) were allowed any say in the social reorganization, but not in the actual working, of the government of the country, was under Jayasthitimalla.

D

Outlying districts and feudatories

On the outskirts of the Valley, geographically speaking outside it, lay some tracts which were organized either as outlying districts (viṣaya) governed by royal officials (viṣayādhipati), or as feudatory chiefships. The dividing line between the two types cannot be drawn exactly; sometimes the viṣaya grew gradually so autonomous as to become a semi-independent chiefship, while in other cases (more rarely) the royal control tightened and a principality could be reduced to little more than a district. In the early period the feudatories usually bore the old title sāmanta or mahāsāmanta, which had also been worn by Nānyadeva of Mithilā at the beginning of his career 1).

Our sources do not allow us to obtain a consistent picture of the cluster of chiefships that surrounded the valley. We can only collect here the scattered information available from the documents published in the preceeding pages.

Ganḍigulma in 1093 and Pañcāvata in 1101 appear only once as districts (viṣaya).

Pannaga or Panumga is mentioned in 1150 and 1160 as a district ruled by a viṣayādhipati with the title of mahāsāmanta, which means that it was well on the way of becoming a feudatory chiefship.

Udayāpura appears in 1066, 1104, 1120 and 1128 as a full-fledged-

---

ed feudal principality, which from the beginning to the end was ruled by a mahāsāṃanta. The Udayāpura chiefs played a not inconsiderable political role.

Dhavalaśrotī or Mangvara is mentioned in 1100, 1101, 1183 and 1184. It was the most unruly of the lot, and its mahāsāṃantas tried on all these occasions to vindicate their independence.

With the advent of the Mallas the title sāṃanta tends to disappear; also, there is no further mention of the principalities and districts of the preceding period. This was probably due to the extension of the renewed royal authority to all the frontier tracts, and possibly also to some change in the official toponymy. New names appear, and in the 13th to 15th centuries the most important feudatories were those of Pharping and of Nuvakoth.

Pharping first appear in our sources in 1092 and 1165 as a simple viṣaya. When we meet it again in 1260, it was going through a transitional stage, being governed by a viṣayādhipati with the title of mahāsāṃanta. We do not know what was its status when in 1305 it was taken and burnt by the Tipura troops. One generation later we find the feudal state not only existing, but even claiming independence.

**Ms. Agastyaśamhitā, National Archives, IV.325. Colophon 1), first part:** Śrī-Nepālikasamvat 455 Phālguna-śukla-trayodāśyām budhavāre Phanapimagā-mahānagare paraṃbhaṭṭārake ityādirājāvalī adiyaḥ śrimat-praudha-pratāpa-cakravartti Nepāla-sakalabhūvāndhāpatis asapati gajapati narapati rāyātrowādhipati mahāhaṃmira cauhathama-stakaiäkeśaro mahāmāyā-śhankeśvari-varalabḍhāraṇay akaroti . . . . . . . Śulankiṇaṃ-sāndhipati śarpakā mahārāutta śrī-Jaitasimhadevānāṃ viṣayāraṇāmaṃ karoti | tasmin kāle varttamāne kumārā-śiromani rāuta śrī-Jivasimhadevānāṃ tadā ādesāṃ diyate Ratanparikṣā-nāma-pustakāṃ svātyēn prasādaṃ kriyate tad-āsā pustakāṃ svān prasūtānaṃ sampaurṇāṃ bhaviṣyati | tetavavāstavya Vaṇikasiha nāyaka-suta Jayaśīha Bharokasya pustakāṃ Vārāṇasiśīpīṇā nāgarākṣaraṃ vividha-ratnāśāstra-pustakāṃ likhyate yathā Mahārāṣṭrasam Pundita śrī-Damodara pustaka likhitam-īdam . . . . . . . In its second part the colophon mentions again Śulakīya-vamśa Jaitasimhadeva Rāmāṃ bānānte galābde dvādaśam, māyā mṛgānāṃ muńcē sitayāmi . . . . nandantu loka Śikharāpūriyaṃ | abhedā rājyaṃ Jaitasimhadeva | | Jaihbhārātānāṃ sa ca yudhyakāle | | darpahito paṇcara- pātnāṇi | | jītvā Gajoyāṃ Navakota-raṇyaṃ Nepāla-stambhām ranaargaṇḍhārin | | tam eva koṭau acame sadaivaṃ Meru-samāno sarva-raṇaḥ | | Śīrāṃśevānāṃ anādidaive | | vamśa-prasanno Śulanki-narendrā | | Śīrāpūraṇāṃ koṭeru rājyaṃ. According to the Sūrya Siddhānta, in that year Pauśa was kuśaya and Phālguna was intercalary. The month here mentioned corresponds to niśa-Phālguna, and the date is verified for the first hours of March 8th, 1355.

1) Published in Regmi, I, 409–410.
According to this document, Jaitasimha of the Śulaṅkī family claimed absolute independence (*vijayarājyaṁ*) by the grace of the goddess Jhankeśvari (a local form of the Grand Mother), with the title *mahārāut* or *mahārāvut*, which the princes of Śikharapuri (i.e. Pharpping) alone bore in this territory, and which reminds us of the *rāvat* of Rajasthan and Gujarat. We may even suppose that the family name Śulaṅkī (also spelt Śurakī) is cognate with the Solaṅkī of Anhivaḍa in Gujarat; in that case the Pharpping family had immigrated from Western India. The colophon mentions also the prince (son?) Jivasimha and records Jaitasimha’s participation in the expedition to Nuvakoth after the deposition of its prince Gaja (see later).

The *mahārāvutta* of Pharpping (almost certainly Jaitasimha) died on August 11th, 1337 ¹). No further information is forthcoming until 1372, when the great Svayambhū Nāth inscription (Doc. 7 of Jayārjunadeva) shows *mahārāvutta* Jūṭasimha of Śikharapuri recognizing the suzerainty of Jayārjunadeva and Jayasthitimalla and collaborating in the work of restoration after the destruction wrought by the Muslims. In 1391 Yuthasimha was still ruling at Pharpping together with some of his brothers under the suzerainty of the Nepalese king (Doc. 24 of Jayasthitimalla). The names of the brothers are found in the undated introduction to the play *Rāmāyaṇanāṭaka*, National Archives, I. 1418 ²); they were Jayajaitrasimha, Jayarājasimha, Jayaruddhasimha and Yakṣasimha. In 1407 Jayayuthasimha was dead, but four of his brothers were still ruling, except that Rāmasimha and Devasimha had taken the place of Jayarājasimha and Yakṣasimha (Doc. 20 of Jayadharmamalla).

This collective rule may have weakened the principality, which remained subservient to the central government. In 1453 we find *rāvutta* Śaktisimha giving pledges of loyalty to the king (Doc. 26 of Jayakṣamalla). Then the princes of Pharpping fade into obscurity, although this tiny feudatory state lasted till the middle of the 16th century.

The other major feudatory was Nuvakoth, a fortress which held a strategically and commercially important position on the border towards the Khasa kingdom of Western Nepal. We know little of its

¹) 457 Śrāvana *sūdi* 15; V 3, 49b.
²) Published by Regmi, I, 411–412 and 635; also by Mahesh Raj Pant, in *Pūrṇimā* 36 (2034 VS), 296.
early history. The local chiefs entered the stage when after the Tirhutia invasion of 1311 they rebelled against the weak government of Patan; however, they were defeated in 1315 by Jayarudramalla. The latter was again charged (in 1317-18) with repressing their turbulence, but proved unable to take the fortress. The Nuvakoth chief kept quiet for some time, but then, taking profit of the difficulties caused by the famine and pestilence of 1328-29, made a bid for independence. In 1332-33 sāmanta Gaja entered into an agreement with Jayarājadēva of Palamchok and took arms against Tipura, without much success. In 1334 Jayasimha revolted against Gaja and seized power with the help of Gaja's own son Rohidāsa. The deposed chief requested the help of Tipura, Bhonta, Patan and Pharping; their united forces besieged Nuvakoth, but had to retire. After this Jayasimha remained independent for some years, until his subjects revolted, and in 462 Maṅga kna 13 (= 1342, February 4th) he was killed.

He was succeeded by his son Jaga sāmanta. Till then the two rival families of the Valley, fully occupied in their eternal squabbles, had not taken notice of this little centre of dissidence at their door. Relations were peaceful, and during the interregnum that followed the death of Jayārimalla on 465 Kārttika kṛṣṇa 5 (= October 26th, 1344) Jaga even paid a visit to Tipura, we do not know with which results. Soon after Tipura and Bhonta agreed upon the enthronement of Jayarājadēva and became free to tackle the Nuvakoth affair. After some discussions, an all-Nepalese expedition was set upon foot in 1353. It marched in two prongs, one division taking the north-western route through the Nagarjunī hills, while another moved by a devious route from Lele towards the west and north. The result of the undertaking is unknown, but apparently it met with some amount of success. Jaga sāmanta is heard of no more, and instead we read of one Jetapāla mahātha driven out of Nuvakoth in 1358, taking refuge in Tokha. This mahātha was apparently a representative of the central power in Nuvakoth, or perhaps among the outer feudatories at large. In 1361 a royal general (jodhapati), who had conquered Sālamkoth of Nuvakoth, visited Tipura and gave advice on how to rebuild the fortress of Nuvakoth.

During the reign of Jayasthitimalla the situation in Nuvakoth was not clear; we know only that in the autumn of 1383 the people there besieged Sākhakvāth. Then there is utter silence and Nuvakoth may
have been fully incorporated into Nepal. The last piece of evidence is an inscription of 1441 in the Nārāyaṇa temple at Nuvakoth; one śrī-Ripumalla was making costly offerings to the god. He bore no titles and his position is not clear; perhaps he was merely a prominent citizen of the town 1).

The case of Nuvakoth differs from that of Pharping; it was not the seat of a feudal family of ancient origin, but was an unruly border district, whose chieftains attempted during a comparatively short period to achieve independence.

E

Economy and coinage

It is but inherent in the nature of our sources that we do not get from them any information about the common people, and chiefly about the peasantry. Still, it is remarkable that the colophons have so little to say about the wealthy merchant class, which must have been one of the cornerstones of Nepalese economy. An exception might be made for the goldsmiths (suvarṇakāra, kanakakāra), who are mentioned a couple of times as donors; theirs was in the middle ages, as it is today, one of the principal crafts among the Newars.

Some glimpses of the working of rent (usually for a five-years period) and of sales of land are afforded by the interesting old palm-leaf documents in the collection of the Rudravarna-mahāvihāra in Patan. They are thirty-seven pieces, ranging from 103 to 349 NS (983 to 1229 A.D.), plus another from the Woku Baha dated 481 NS (1361 A.D.) 2). All of them are in the form of contracts for transactions (rent or sales) in land, and as such they are very instructive for the medieval topography of Patan, specifying as they to the names and the limits of the fields dealt with. They would deserve a special study, which I cannot undertake here.

1) The above sketch of the history of Nuvakoth follows Dh. Bajracharya and T. B. Srethi, Nuvākothko aitihāsik rūprekhā, Kathmandu 2032 VS, chiefly 32–44, based almost exclusively upon V3.

The ancient chronicle informs us that Ānandadeva (1147-1167) "made [permissible] the sale and purchase of houses and fields in Nepal to all the chief officials (mahāmaṇḍalika), to the mahāpātra-
pramukha, and to all the subjects down to their sons and grandsons" (V1, 25a). In this form the enactment cannot be correct, or else it is only a recognition of the already prevailing practice, because the Rudravarna documents show that such sales took place "according to the law of non-revertibility, after having accepted the price" since 158 NS (1038 A.D.) at least 1).

Turning now to the coinage antecedent to the Gorkhali conquest, it can be divided into three periods. The first includes the coins of the Licchavi period (5th-8th centuries; copper only) and their imitations in the following centuries; the second period covers the medieval coinage (12th-15th centuries), while the third includes the issues of the three Malla kingdoms (16th century to 1768) 2).

It is now almost certain that no new coins were struck in the post-Licchavi period (8th-12th centuries), although the old types continued to be imitated for a long time. The names of the coins of Licchavi times too continued in usage, and the Rudravarna documents show prices expressed in terms of pāṇa, purāṇa and pāṇa-purāṇa (the latter often abridged into pāṇapu) without interruption from 103 to 194 NS (983-1074 A.D.), with two further isolated instances in 239 and 261 NS (1119 and 1141 A.D.).

For the second period, with which alone we are concerned here, materials are scanty. Nevertheless, our knowledge in this field has been completely renovated by a fairly recent study 3), which affords a convenient basis for the following account.

The period was ushered in by a mint reform carried out by Śi-
vadeva (1098-1126); we are told that he "issued a coinage of silver damma with his image as a lion; he also struck gold śivakāṇka with

1) mūlayaigrhitvā anivarttaka-nyāyena vikritam; Doc. 3. This is almost the same formula employed in the land deeds of the Gupta dynasty.
2) See in general E. H. C. Walsh, "The coinage of Nepal", in JRAS 1908, 669-
757 and 1132-1136. For the Licchavi coins: D. W. Macdowall, "The coinage of ancient Nepal", in Journal of the Numismatic Society of India, 21 (1959), 39-54; J. C. Regmi, Lic-
chavi Samskṛti, Kathmandu 2026 NS, 232-238.
3) N. G. Rhodes and C. Valdettaro, "Coins in medieval Nepal", in Numismatic
Chronicle, 16 (1976), 158-166.
the legend śrī-Śivasya” (sva-śrī-sīṁhākṛti-rūpya-damma-vyavahārā kṛtā | suvāraṇamai śrī-Śivasyākṛti śivakānika kṛtyaḥ) 1). The term śivakānika is evidently patterned on mānānika and guṇānika of Licchavi times. Still, it is disturbing to note that before Śivadeva the word śivakā was used in connection with grain and measures (mānīka; one half kuḍava) of grain 2).

The short statement of the chronicle has received a welcome confirmation from coins corresponding exactly to the above specifications, which have come to light in Nepal and neighbouring countries. They are gold coins with the legend śrī-Śivasya (diam. 8.5 mm, weight 0.9 gms), and silver pieces with the image of a sitting lion (diam. 7.5 mm, weight 0.4 gms) 3). They may be the actual śivakā and damma described in the chronicle, or they may be fractions of them. The second alternative seems to be supported by the weight of the gold coins corresponding to one-tenth of the dināra minted by the last rulers of the Gupta dynasty according to the ancient Indian suvarṇa standard of 9.33 g.s. The silver piece, on the other hand, seems unconnected with the Gupta standard and to represent rather one-tenth of the ancient Indian silver purāṇa.

The literary sources (chronicles, colophons, inscriptions) supply us with some examples of the actual employ of these coins. In 1119 yuvarāja Mahendradeva built a tank and paid his labourers one damma per day (V2, 31α). In 1172 king Rudradeva paid four śivakā for building the roof of a patti, an one-room annexe for religious travellers 4). During the great famine of 1232 in the reign of Abhayamalla prices soared to the following levels (V3, 39b; cf. V1, 25b):

one kuḍava (today kuruwa, c. 8.9 kg) of husked rice 1] damma

---

1) V1, 24b; VK. Śrī-Śivasyākṛti may mean “image of Śiva”, but the actual coin proves that ākṛti refers to the legend and not to an image.

2) Ms. Hevajraṭīkā, Žva-.lu monastery in Tibet. The colophon (published in RS, XXI, 36) is dated Śamvat 210 and lists a series of yearly endowments for the cult made by the saṅgha-bhaṭṭārakas, of which dvitiyavārse śivakā taṇḍuladhānaye paṇcāsan-mānikāh | ankato ‘pi dhāndayamāni 50.

3) N. G. Rhodes and C. Valdettaro, Op. cit., 158 and Plate 15, 1–4. Three specimens of these śrī Śivasya gold coins were found in Champaran in 1913, but were wrongly attributed to Śivasimha of the Oinwara dynasty. R. D. Banerji, in ASI Ann. Rep. 1913/4, 248.

4) Doc. 7 of Rudradeva, in Regmi, III, 8.
[one kuḍawa of] oil and/or salt 1 pla
one gold pla cost 2\(\tfrac{3}{4}\) damma–pla
one karṣa of silver (woha) 20 damma
[one karṣa of] padtipā (pahripo?) 72 damma
[one karṣa of] khaṣṭakhaṇḍā 24 damma

Some of the commodities mentioned here cannot be identified. As to weights and prices, the karṣa is a well-known measure of weight (c. 23,33 gms); later it became also a name of the damma. The coin name damma appears in Indian inscriptions as dramma and goes ultimately back to the Greek silver drachme. Pla is an abbreviation for pala, a weight (c. 93,31 gms) equal to four karṣa; but already in the present context it is also a name of the śivakā. As to the damma–pala, it seems to indicate an unit of account based on the current damma, exactly as in Licchavi times the pāṇapūrāṇa was a purāṇa calculated in terms of pāṇas. If our reading of this difficult passage of the chronicle is correct, it implies that in terms of purchasing power the current pala had undergone a devaluation down to 31 p.c. of the gold pala, while a damma was now worth only 5 p.c. of the karṣa, the weight of the original silver damma. But both coins must have recovered at least a portion if not most of their purchasing value once the emergency had passed.

It is curious to note that the Rudaṇvarṇa documents take no notice of Śivadeva’s reform. After the middle of the 12th century they give up using pāṇa and purāṇa, and mostly refer to payments in terms of delivery of produce, except for a solitary mention of the damma in 294 NS (1174 A.D.) (Doc. 28).

Later there was apparently a sort of reform of the Śivadeva coinage, in connection with a measure taken by king Anantamalla (1274–1308), of whom we are told that “the people suffered because of a damma issue made by him” (V1, 26a). This may mean that the

1) In the ms. of V3 the digit 2 is followed by three tiny vertical strokes; Rhodes and Valdettaro understand the whole as 2111. But the form of the vertical strokes is quite different from that of the number 1, and even today they are employed to indicate the fraction 3/4.
2) This abbreviation is found in several inscription from Orissa; Epigraphia Indica, 28 (1949), 47.
king struck debased coins, causing thereby an inflation with the consequent rise of prices. It is certain, at any rate, that about that time a new monetary system was introduced and the coins were given slightly different names: \textit{nava-damma–śivakā} and \textit{dāma}. The meaning of the first term is not clear. It can mean either a new (\textit{nava}) nominal śivakā calculated in terms of current \textit{dammas}; or (less likely) a śivakā equated to nine (\textit{nava}) \textit{dammas} $^1$.

The following documents may serve to illustrate its uses.

A. – The Pimtha Baha inscription quoted above (p. 125) mentions the donation for cult purposes of \textit{nava-damma–śivakā dāma traya karśānika karśa trayam}. I would translate: “Three \textit{dām} of the \textit{nava-damma–śivakā} [currency]; or, by karśa reckoning, three \textit{karśa}”.

B. – Further below the same inscription $^2$) mentions the donation of \textit{nava-damma–śivakā trayānika pla 3}, which I translate as “three \textit{nava-damma–śivakā}; in figures, 3 \textit{pala}”.

Two large copper coins published by Rhodes and Valdettaro (type 3; diam. 19 mm, weight 4 gms; type 4, rectangular $13.6 \times 11.7$ mm, weight 2,3 gms) may be connected with this currency. However, I would not apply to them name \textit{dām}, which in Nepal always referred to a silver coin.

Clearly by that time the term \textit{karśa} had become synonymous with \textit{dām}, and \textit{pala} continued to be another name for the śivakā; both terms had ceased indicating the weight of the coin. It may be noted that in the 18th century the \textit{dām} had become a tiny silver coin, of which 120 went to the \textit{mohar} of 554 gms; this gave an average weight of 0,04 gms. Several specimens of this coin have been published $^3$).

About the middle of the 15th century the word \textit{nava} was dropped. This is shown by the following documents:

\begin{itemize}
\item[$^1$] On the whole problem see also J. C. Regmi, \textit{Licchavi Sanskriti}, 244–252, with whose conclusions I do not quite agree.
\item[$^2$] This portion of the inscription is dated 479 \textit{Āśvina–śukla-trayodaśyām tithau šāura–vāsare}. The date is irregular; the \textit{tithi} ended on October 19th, 1359, which day was a Saturday and not a Sunday.
\end{itemize}
C. – Under the date of 496 NS (1376 A.D.) an obscure passage of the chronicle mentions on separate occasions fines of the following amounts: dāma–pla 10, pla 3, pla 2, damma–pla 4 (V3, 57a).

D. – A ms. of the Āśvāyurvedaśāstra, Cambridge University Library, Add. 2832, dated 484 NS, has an endorsement by a later hand dated 561 (?) Jyeṣṭha śūkla 13 (= June 2nd, 1441), to the effect that the ms. was purchased for damma–śivakā dvaya dāmādhika paṇca plāṅkataḥ pla 5 damma 2. I translate this as “five pala plus two dām of the damma–śivakā [currency]; in figures, 5 pala and 2 damma”.

E. – Doc. 17 of Jayayaksamalla, dated 1447 (?), mentions on ll. 15–18 one dānīma (five times), 11 dāma, four dāma–śivakā.

F. – Doc. 29 of Jayayakṣamalla, of 1453, mentions fines of 12 dām, 1 dām, 9 damma and 1 damma respectively.

G. – Somewhat different is the case of an inscription of Jayaratnamalla dated 1512 1). It mentions suvarṇa dvaya karsādhika catuh palāṅkita cūrṇa kālā lum pla 4 karsa 2; that is, “four pala plus two karsa of gold; in figures, 4 pala and 2 karsa of gold dust”. Here we are concerned with quantities of gold dust and not with coins.

The later vamśāvalis attribute to Jayaratnamalla the introduction of the copper paisā 2). After him, the old names went out of use, except for the dām. As to the gold coins, they must have disappeared long before.

F

The state and religion

The title of this sub-section is self-explanatory: it means that we are concerned here only with the political aspects of religion, i.e. its relationship with the monarchy.

Since the early Licchavi times the political position of religion may be defined as the rule of Hindu kings over a mixed Hindu and
Buddhist society. This general frame never changed during the whole course of Nepalese history. The king could offer respect and protection to the Buddhist bhikṣus and vajrācāryas and to their vihāras and temples; personally he may even have leaned toward the Buddhist creed. However, during the whole of the medieval period we find only two documents attributing to a king the quality of a believer in Buddhism (paramasaugata); they are Doc. 4 of Simhadeva, dated 1120, and Doc. 7 of Jayabhīmadeva, dated 1270. These solitary exceptions strongly underline the general principle that the king in his public capacity was bound to follow the Hindu rites and to uphold the Hindu social order.

At a lower level, during the middle ages the Buddhist community under the influence of Vajrayāna underwent a gradual but deep transformation, which resulted in the practical disappearance of the saṅgha as monastic order. This development contributed to toning down religious differences, so that the people became accustomed to worship both Hindu and Buddhist deities, in a spirit of toleration and in many cases of syncretism. Still, it has been remarked that some degree of pressure was applied from above upon Buddhism. Of course we cannot take seriously the tale, found in the modern vaṃśāvalīs, of a digvijaya by Śaṅkara to Nepal, with the aim of suppressing Buddhism and imposing Hinduism upon the people by violent persecution (see above p. 65); it is difficult to discern a historical kernel in this legend. But it is a fact that votive stūpas were often converted into linga. "The present state of these stūpas is not the result of general neglect over a long period, but an once–for–all and conscious act of a revision... All the votive stūpas were systematically revised" ¹). How far this trend extended in the middle ages, and to what extent it influenced the position of Buddhism, is a question that has still to be determined.

Within the general Hindu frame, Śaivism was the official creed of the monarchy. Paśupati, a form of Śiva, appears as the tutelary deity (iṣṭadevatā) of the kings already in the time of Amśuvarman, and soon he became the national god, this position being consecra-

ted by the introduction of the śrī-Paśupati-bhaṭṭāraka era of 879/880. To underline the paramount position of Śaivism, the title paramaśaiva is employed now and then in the manuscripts. From a doctrinal point of view, Śaivism must have received a fillip from the arrival of Śaṅkarācarya teachers, such as those who form the subject of the inscription of 1142 (see above p. 65).

Starting with Jayasthitimalla, while Paśupati retained an unquestioned paramount position, the documents introduce as a protecting deity the ancient goddess Māṇeśvarī, a form of Durgā, known already in Licchavi times. Another, but later, name of Māṇeśvarī is Taleju, who was more specially the house goddess (kuladevatā) of the Karna dynasty 1). She is popularly supposed to have been introduced into Nepal by Harisimha; but she was known and worshipped in Nepal before that date 2). Of course the immigration of numerous refugees from Mithilā gave a new impetus to her cult. Although no longer a popular deity, she is still highly revered by the royal house. Her first temple, inaccessible not only to Westerners but also to most classes of Hindus, was built in the precincts of the Bhatgaon palace, as if to underscore the city’s new status as capital. Only later similar temples were built in or near the royal palaces of Kathmandu (1576) and of Patan (17th century) 3).

Broadly connected with Śaivism is the Nāthayogin or Kānphaṭa sect, founded by Gorakhnāth in the 12th century; very soon it penetrated into Nepal, where it flourished chiefly in the Karna-Malla period 4). The festival dedicated to Gorakhnāth’s mythical preceptor Matsyendranāth merged with the procession in honour of the old Newar deity Buṅga-dyo, assimilated in its turn to the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara or Lokeśvara; the Nepalese of all persuasions worship this composite deity, and the Bugma-Lokeśvara yātra is one of the


most popular festivals of Nepal; the old kings always took part in it).

While Śaivism maintained throughout its official position, in the late 14th century there was an upsurge of Vaiṣṇavism, which was also very popular in the country. The Karṇāṭa–Malla dynasty showed its respect to the Viṣṇu cult by adopting a standardized pattern of bye-names (biruda): Jayasthitimalla took the surname Asura–Nārāyaṇa, Jayadharmamalla was known as Vīra–Nārāyaṇa, Jayajotirmalla as Daitya–Nārāyaṇa, Jayayakṣamalla as Lakṣmi–Nārāyaṇa. But the distinction between family and state creed was evidenced by the fact that during this very period the official protocol at the head of the documents was consolidated in the typically Śaiva formula Paśupati- caraṇa–kamala–sevita Māneśvariṣṭadevata–vara–labdha–prasādita (or similar texts), which was employed till the end of the Malla kingdoms.

Apart from these sectarian distinctions, we are justified in assuming that the troubled 14th century witnessed a rising general aspiration to a reform intended to bring Nepalese society in line with the theoretical rules laid down by the dharmaśāstras. According to some of the modern chronicles 2), the new regime founded by Jayasthitimalla took up this trend and initiated measures intended to tighten the social system of Hindu Nepal. He is reported to have enforced again the observance of the old, almost forgotten dharma rules, of which a compilation was made with the help of an advisory body of five Indian pāṇḍits (Kirtinātha Upādhyāya Kānyakubja, Rāghunātha Jhā Maithili, Rāmanātha Jhā [Maithili], Śrīnātha Bhaṭṭa, Mahinātha Bhaṭṭa) 3). In this way he re-defined the status and duties of the castes, brought some order in the rather confuse social situation and re-organized the ruling classes and the common people according to a scheme that closely followed the orthodox rules, although it paid regard to at least some of the peculiarities of Newar society. Whether the account of Jayasthitimalla’s alleged reformatory activity belongs in the realm of sober history is not quite certain, because we find almost no hint to it in the sources of the 14th–15th centuries. But

2) The Buddhist chronicle of Wright and the vamsāvali B2 of Regmi; not so Padmagiri’s vamsāvali published by Hasrat.
3) Wright, 183.
it is a fact that after the waxing of Maithili influence in the lifetime of Jayasthitimalla there was a noticeable tightening-up of orthodox rules.

As to the details, the case is different. The list of castes supplied by the Buddhist chronicle 1) is a confused hotch-potch of castes, sub-castes, occupational groups, official ranks (mantrin, sacīva, amātya) and even royal titles (bhūpa, rāja, narendra) and names of peoples external to Newar society, like the Kirāta. In vain S. Lévi (and myself in 1958) tried to bring some order and rationality in this ill-assorted bazaar; the devastating criticism by D. R. Regmi is largely justified 2). The picture presented by his vamśāvalī B2 is perhaps less distorted. But it seems a profitless exercise to try and reconstruct the real content and scope of Jayasthitimalla's reform starting from such an unsatisfactory basis. Of course we could take into consideration the caste system as it exists today, and then extrapolate it in the past. There is something to be said in favour of this method (which was followed e.g. by D. R. Regmi), considering the great stability of the castal order all over the Indian subcontinent. Still, it would be impossible to individuate any modification that happened between Jayasthitimalla's and our own time; and above all it is impossible to check the results from trustworthy medieval sources. Thus I refrain from making the attempt.

1) Wright, 185-186; re-arranged and commented upon by S. Lévi, Le Népal, II, 232-236.

THE SUCCESSORS OF NÄNYADEVA

Nänyadeva’s descendants continued to rule in Tirhut. According to Vidyāpati’s Puruṣaparikṣā, his son Malladeva lived at the court of Jayacandra (1170-1193), the Gahaḍavāla king of Kanauj. He may have been a historical person, because an image of Lakṣmi Nārāyaṇa at Bhīt-Bhagvanpur in Darbhanga district bears the (unpublished) inscription Oṁ śrī-Malladevasya ¹). R. K. Choudhary suggested that Nānyadeva’s dominions were partitioned after his death, with Gaṅgadeva ruling in Tirhut proper and Malladeva in Nepal and a portion of Eastern Tirhut ²); but there is no trace of Malladeva in Nepalese tradition, chronicles, colophons and inscriptions. Besides, Vidyāpati’s chronological set–up is contradictory; Malladeva cannot be at the same time the son of Nānyadeva (1097–1145) and have lived in the times of Jayacandra (1170–1193). Either the one or the other item of information is incorrect; it seems impossible to choose between the two alternatives.

The list of Nānyadeva’s actual successors is found in the following texts:

1) A traditional verse found with substantial variants in VK and in K. P. Jayaswal’s introduction to the Rājanītiratnākara, inJBORS, 10 (1924).

2) Pratāpa Malla’s inscription of 1649 (Ind. Ant., 10, 188).

3) The drama Mudita–Kuvalayāśva (see back p. 55 n.).


5) All the modern *vamsaavalis*.

6) Mithilā traditions, as recorded by Rashbehari Das, Parameshvar Jha and J. K. Misra 1).

According to all these sources, Nānyadeva’s son was Gaṅgadeva or Gaṅgadeva. He is probably identical with the king Gaṅgeyadeva mentioned in the following document:


Bendall referred the year 1076 to the Vikrama era (A.D. 1019) and identified the king with the Kalacuri Gaṅgeyadeva. But Lévi 3) showed the impossibility of this interpretation. Afterwards Majumdar proposed to refer the date to the Śaka era (June 1st, 1154) and to identify the king with Nānyadeva’s son Gaṅgadeva 4). Mirashi discussed the whole question afresh, passing in review the precedent theories; he accepted the date in Vikrama Samvat and suggested the existence of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty in Tirhut in that period 5). The problem has been repeatedly discussed by R. K. Choudhary; in some of his articles he is non-committal 6), while in others he definitely supports Majumdar, without however, contributing any fresh element to the problem 7).

In my opinion too, Mirashi’s objections to Majumdar’s theory are not decisive. The strongest is that Gaṅgeyadeva of the colophon belongs to the lunar race, while Nānyadeva and Gaṅgadeva are sta-

4) R. C. Majumdar, *King Nānyadeva of Mithilā*, in *IHQ*, 7 (1931), 681.
ted to be Sūryavamśi by the Pratāpa Malla inscription of 1649. But no record of the Karṇāṭa dynasty says anything on this score, and the inscription is too late to be authoritative. On the whole, we may accept that Gāṇgeyadeva is the same person as Gāṅgadeva and that he lived in Śāka 1076, i.e. 1154 A.D.

As to his capital Pāṭaka, it is usually identified with Simraongarh on the assumption that the later town could have been called Sīmārāvāna–paṭṭana. But Pāṭaka, mentioned also in later documents, could as well correspond to the modern Patahi or to Pataura, both in Champaran district.

Gāṅgadeva was not the only son of Nānyadeva. According to an entry in the old Nepalese chronicle, on September 5th, 1132, "śrī–Arjunadeva, son of the Đōya (= Tirhutia) Nānedeva, was born". No other reference on him is forthcoming.

Gāṅgadeva was followed by Narasimha or Nṛsimha, who was the first Tirhut ruler to be confronted with the Muslim menace. He was followed by Rāmasimha, well known for his patronage of Sanskrit literature. Information on this king is less sketchy than usual. We know his birth-date: on March 8th, 1183, "Rāmasimha, the son of Narasimha, was born; [he was] king of Đōya (Tirhut)". In 1236 he was visited by C'ag Lotsawa C'os-rje-dpal in his capital Pa-ta, clearly the same as Pāṭaka of Gāṅgeyadeva's colophon. On May 24th, 1244, king Rāmasimha invaded Nepal at the head of the Đōya army, but was compelled to retreat. In between these two events he had to deal with the Muslim menace; he was apparently the unnamed Tirhut Raja who was defeated and made prisoner by Tughril Tughan, the Muslim governor of Bihar (1236–1245), to be then

1) The doubts voiced by H. N. Ansari, "Historical geography of Bihar on the eve of the early Turkish invasion", in JBRS, 49 (1963), 255 n. 2, seem excessive.
2) 352 (sic for 252) bhādrapada kṛṣṇa 9 Đōya Nānedevas putra jāto śrī–Arjunadeva; V2, 34b.
4) Samvat 303 Caitra śukla 13 śrī–Narasimhadevasya putra śrī–Rāmasimhadevas jāta; Đō Thākura; V2, 35a.
6) V3, 36b; see above, p. 86.
reinstated by king Ala ud-din Mas‘ūd of Delhi (1242–1246) 1). But our information from Muslim sources in very uncertain.

To these reliable items of evidence we may add a highly suspect one supplied by a vamśāvali in Sanskrit verse, of which a photo is in possession of Professor G. Tucci (VT). It gives the list of the Karnāṭas (in their supposed capacity as rulers of Nepal) as in the modern chronicles down to Rāmasimha, but stops with him. Then it relates how Rāmasimha was dethroned by Mukundasena, a king of Palpa in Western Nepal, who invaded and looted the valley, but incurred thereby the wrath of Paśupati; his army was destroyed by a pestilence and he himself died on the flight 2). Mukundasena is thus dated in the chronicle: Dvi-rāma-śunyendu 1032 suśāke mahidhra-ṣaṭ-rudra mite 1167 samvat | somendu-cakṣur-yuga 4211 māna varṣe kale tadābhun- nrpatir–Mukundaḥ 2). These dates would correspond to 1110 A.D.; but this is impossible, because they would fall in the time of Nāṇya-deva and not of his great-grandson.

The invasion of Mukundasena is a sort of wreath that spooks through centuries of Nepalese history. As we have seen (see back p. 91), a vamśāvali utilized by D. R. Regmi places his invasion in 1258. A better substantiated claim, based on a manuscript of the Nāradasmrī, has been discussed recently, and it appears that Mukundasena’s raid happened, if ever, in NS 646 Caitra śukla 7 maṅgala (verified for Tuesday, March 20th, 1526) 3). The fact is not confirmed from any other source in the Valley itself and its historicity is still subject to doubt. In any case, it cannot be connected with the Mithilā kings of the 13th century.

The succession of Rāmasimha is not clear. The traditions oscillate between Śakrasimha (Mithilā tradition), Śaktisimha (Hamilton, the Kathmandu inscription of Pratāpa Malla), Bhavasimha (VK and Muddita–Kuvalayāśva). The documents tell another tale.

2) The same story is told in Wright, 170–172, where the event is referred to the times of Harisimha.
Ms. Kāśikāvivaranaṇapañjikā, Nor monastery in Tibet. Colophon 1): Lakṣmanadeva-ṣaṭ-pancāśatābdiya rājye ........ 56 śrimad-Virāsimhadevas-tanyāmāndyaṁ Tirabhuktau Śāmalipāṭake sthitvā likhitam-idaṁ chātra-śrī-śubhankāśena .... mārga śudī 14 etc. Śāmalipāṭaka is the same as Pāṭaka in the colophon of Gaṅgeya deva (see above). The date belongs to the same type as those of Aśokacalla of the two Bodhgaya inscriptions 2) and must be understood “after the rule of Lakṣmanasena had ceased” (abdiya for atīta). It seems therefore to correspond to November 18th, 1260.

Virāsimha is completely unknown to tradition. Perhaps we may attribute to this king a gold coin found in the Gorakhpur district, bearing the legend śrimad-Virāsimharāya 3); but this is highly hypothetical.

Eleven years later another king reigned in the same place.

Ms. Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajnāpāramitā, National Archives, V.? Colophon 4): R.-Gaṇa-Lakṣmanasenadevasya samvat 67 mārga badi 5 ravau Pb. etyādi rājāvali pūrva śrimad-Rāmasimhadeva-bhuṣyaṃ āne Tirabhuktau Śāmalivanapāṭake likhitā etc. The date seems to be Sunday, November 22nd, 1271.

The colophon employs more or less the same terms as the preceding one and clearly belongs to the same royal family; Rāmasimha (II) was in all likelihood the successor of Virāsimha.

After Rāmasimha II we may place Śakrasimha/Śaktisimha, who according to the Mithilā tradition and to Mulla Taqiya was contemporary with and fought against Ala ud-din Khalji, was defeated (1297/8), became his vassal or ally and participated in the conquest of Rantambhor in Rajasthan 5).

Harisimha was Śakrasimha’s son, or at least his successor. We must discard the names supplied by the later Nepalese tradition: Bhūpālasimha (Hamilton, the Pratāpa Malla inscription, modern vaṃ-śāvaliś; also K. P. Jayaswal’s verse) and Karmasimha (VK, Mudita-Kuvalayāśva). They are unknown to the Mithilā tradition.

The chronology of the Karnaṭa dynasty of Tirhut is highly un-
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1) Published in RS, XXI, 37.
3) First published by V. Smith, “Numismatic notes and novelties”, in JASB, 66 (1897), 308, and then studied by V. V. Mirashi, “Some old coins re-discussed”, in IHQ, 18 (1942), 71–72, who attributes this coin to king Virāsimha of the Kachapaghāta dynasty of Nalapura, who lived around 1120.
4) Published by Regmi, I, 269.
certain. With all reserve, I would suggest the following table, in which the dates are only tentative and approximate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ramaśimha</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nānyadeva</td>
<td>c. 1097–1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaṅgadeva</td>
<td>c. 1145–1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasiṃha</td>
<td>c. 1175–1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmasimha</td>
<td>c. 1205–1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīraśimha</td>
<td>c. 1245–1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmasimha</td>
<td>c. 1265–1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śakrasiṃha</td>
<td>c. 1285–1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harismha</td>
<td>c. 1305–1326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Rāmasimha enjoyed a very long reign according to all traditions: 58, 86, 92, 62 years; R. K. Choudhary, "The Karnaṭs of Mithilā", 93. But the regnal years 1227–1285 proposed by R. K. Choudhary and accepted by R. C. Majumdar and C. P. N. Sinha are of course impossible, knowing as we do that he was born in 1183.

2) Harismha earliest date is given by a ms. Bhāṭṭikāvyaṭikā, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, n. 4795. Colophon (published in CSMASB, VII, 66 n. 5067): Śrimaddharasimha-deva-rājye LaSam 159 Phālguṇa badi i ṣanau Herambāya namah. In the early period the starting point of the Laksmanasena era (not of the Laksmanasena-attitarājye) was 1120 A.D. The titi would end on March 1st, 1279, which day, however, was a Wednesday and not a Saturday. Besides the date would be much too early for Harismha. So either this is one of the many vagaries of the Laksmanasena era, or (if we take the date as attitarājye) this was another Harismha who reigned in c. 1363 A.D., not in Tirhut, but in some adjoining district.
APPENDIX II

CHINA AND THE NEPALESE RULERS

It is necessary to discuss the relations between China and Nepal at the beginning of the Ming dynasty, and the political situation underlying them. Some glimpses of them we had already during our reconstruction of the role played by the Rāma family.

The beginning of China's intercourse with Nepal 1) was due to the initiative of the imperial government, which was not in that period an exceptional move. The chapter on Nepal in the official history of the Ming dynasty, published in 1739, describes it as follows.

In the 17th year of the Hung-wu period (1384) the emperor T'ai-tsu ordered the monk Chih-kuang 2) to carry [to Nepal] a letter with the imperial seal and some pieces of coloured silk, and to go at the same time to the kingdom of Ti-yung-t'a 3), which borders with it. Chih-kuang, with his knowledge of the Buddhist texts, showed ta-

---

1) For a long time the only texts known in Western translations were those from the chapter on Nepal in the Ming-shih; they had been translated by C. Imbault-Huart, Histoire de la conquête du Népal, in J.As., 1878, 2, p. 357n; and by E. Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic sources, London s. d., II, pp. 222–223. The rest is translated here for the first time. Let me remark that there seems to be no mention of Nepal in a text where we would expect it, in the “Collected Statutes of the Ming Dynasty”, Ta Ming hui-tien 大明會典.

2) This monk Chih-kuang is rather a well-known figure. He was one of the tools in the clever policy of the early Ming emperors, which enabled them by sheer diplomacy and without the use of force to maintain a sort of moral suzerainty over the various Tibetan sects. Most important was his mission of 1403 to the Karma-pa abbots. Later he was sent also to the P'ag-mo-gru-pa. See the various texts of the Ming-shih translated by G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, Rome 1949, pp. 682 and 689.

3) I have no suggestion to offer about the phonetical equivalence of Ti-yung-t’a. For its geographical identification see later, p. 222.
lent and descrimination and made manifest the virtuous thought of the Son of Heaven. Its king Ma-ta-na Lo-mo 马达
納羅摩 then sent ambassadors to court, to bring as tribute golden stūpas, Buddhist texts, famous horses and other local produce. In the 20th year (1387–8) they arrived at Court. The Emperor was pleased and granted [to the king] a silver seal, a signet of jade, letters patent, a control document in two parts [fu–yen 符 驗 ] 1), and pennants and coloured silk 2).

Now let us go back from the standard dynastic history to the contemporary documents, as preserved in the “Veritable Records” (Shih–lu 史 錄 ) of the Ming dynasty 3). There the above event is mentioned in a few words:

[Hung–wu, 17th year, 2nd month, day chi–ssū (= February 22nd, 1384)]. The monk Chih–kuang and others were sent to the kingdom of Hsi–t’ien Ni–pa–lo (Nepal of India) 4).

The same source registers the reciprocating embassy sent by the Nepalese king:

[Hung–wu, 20th year, 12th month, day keng–wu (= February 2nd, 1388)] The king of Nepal (Ni–pa–la 尼八剌 ) in the Western countries, Ma–ta–na Lo [大]–mo, and the two indigenous chiefs (tu–tu–hui 都賢 拂 ) of dBus–gTsañ (Wu–szū–tsang 鳥思藏 ; Central Tibet) and of mDo–K‘ams (To– kan 朵甘 ; North–Eastern Tibet) had sent envoys... They arrived at court and offered to the emperor produce of the country, such as horses, steel swords and various kinds of golden stūpas and Buddhist texts. The monk Chih–kuang and others came as messengers from the kingdom of Nepal and offered eight horses 5).

These presents were acknowledged with the usual return gifts to

3) I have used the good Taiwan reprint.
4) Ta Ming Shih–lu, Hung–wu, 159.5b.
5) Ta Ming Shih–lu, Hung–wu, 187.6a.
the chiefs of Nepal and dBus-gTsañ, under the date of Hung-wu, 21st year, 1st month, chi-hai, i.e. March 2nd, 1388 1).

The exchange of civilities was repeated three years later. Under the date of Hung-wu, 23rd year, 12th month, day keng–ch‘en (= January 27th, 1391), the “Veritable Records” register, among the arrival of missions from many other states for the New Year imperial audience, also the envoys of Nepal 2). This is the only mission about which we find a vague reference in the Nepalese sources. According to the Sumatisiddhānta-ṭīkā (Kaisher Library, n. 82), there was an eclipse in 510 Āśvini krṣṇa amavāsyā (= Sunday, October 9th, 1390). “On this day the Śākya (Sa-skya) and the Chinese made connection [with Nepal]; on the occasion of this eclipse the jeta of Palamchok laid the foundation of the mahāvihāra”.

Some details on this mission are given under another date: [Hung-wu, 24th year, 1st month, chi-ch‘ou (= February 5th, 1391; New Year’s day)] Cha-chê-pa-lu 扎撤巴魯 3) and others, fourteen messengers in all from the king of Nepal in the Western Countries and of the kuan-ting kuo-shih 灌頂國師 4) in dBus-gTsañ, were granted a piece of printed silk and a silken robe each, and documents to every one of them. A further imperial mandate was issued by which the king of Nepal in the Western countries Ma-ta-na Lo-mo and the others were granted six pieces each. Again, the Ministry of Rites was commanded to grant to Ma-ta-na Lo-mo and the others, in addition, a private jade seal and an umbrella of red gauze each 5).

The dynastic history summarizes the above in a few words 6).

---

1) Ta Ming Shih–lu, Hung-wu, 188.3a–b.
2) Ta Ming Shih–lu, Hung-wu, 206.4b.
3) 撤 sa should be corrected into ṭa ch‘ê. The last two syllables may transcribe the Nepalese title bhāro.
4) “The master of the State who has received the initiatic baptism”; a title first granted by Qubilai to ‘P’ags-pa, and later by the Ming emperors to several Tibetan abbots. See G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, 680.
5) Ta Ming Shih–lu, Hung-wu, 207, 1a.
6) Ming–shih, ch. 331, f. 16a. The same text, only somewhat abridged, is given in a later work, the (Ch‘ing–ting) Hsü Wên–hsien–t‘ung–k’iao, of 1747. Here the name of the ruler is given as Ma-t‘ê-na–k‘o–lo Lé-mo 马特纳克多勒摩; Shih–t‘ung edition of the Commercial Press, ch. 248, p. 482b–c. This form might go
Ma-ta-na Lo-mo quite evidently transcribes the name Madana Rāma 1). It appears, therefore, that the Chinese recognized as legitimate ruler of Nepal the minister (amātya) Madana Rāma, the younger brother of Jayasimha Rāma. On both the brothers we have had occasion to discuss at length above (pp. 151-157).

The intercourse was kept up in the following years. The text of the Ming-shih quoted above says that

During the latter part of the Hung-wu period there came only one ambassador for several years.

The date of this single embassy was Hung-wu, 30th year, 1st month, hsin-wei, i.e. February 15th, 1397 2). On this occasion the Ming government laid down that the tribute embassies from Nepal should come to court every third year (3rd month, kuei-hai = April 8th) 3).

No intercourse took place during the short and stormy reign of the second Ming sovereign. But one of the first actions of the Yung-lo emperor (1402-1424), on Hung-wu 35th year, 8th month, wu-wu (= September 4th, 1402), was to send once more Chih-kuang to Tibet and Nepal to carry the presents of the new Son of Heaven 4).

The dynastic history records this mission without giving a definite date. It then adds:

In the 7th year of Yung-lo, [Nepal] sent an envoy to bring tribute 5).

As usual, the “Veritable Records” register this Nepalese embassy in greater detail:

[Yung-lo, 7th year, 12th month, hsin-hai (= January 18th, 1410)] the kuo-shih Don-grub-rgyal-mts’an (Tuan-chu-chien-tsang 端竹監藏) of ‘Bri-guñ (Pi-li-kung 必力工) in

back to a Sanskrit Madanākara Rāma; but more probably it is a freak of the revisors of the Ch’ien-lung period, for which there are many other instances. The Hsiu T’ung-tien of 1767 has Ma-t’a (馬達)–na Lo-mo; same edition, ch. 148, p. 2000c.
1) But the Chinese, whose language has no r and renders it with l, were apparently under the impression that the Nepalese ruler was a Lama (Tib. bla-ma), a title well known to them from their dealings with the Tibetan hierarchy.
2) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Hung-wu, 249.3a-b. Cf. Ming-shih, 3.15a.
3) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Hung-wu, 251.1b.
4) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Yung-lo, 11.2a.
5) Ming-shih, 331.16a.
dBus-gTsan, as well as [the ruler of] Nepal, sent as their ambassador bSod-nams-rgyal-mts’an (So-nan-chieh-tsan 銷南監藏) and others to offer horses as tribute; they were given [presents of] printed silk for each of them 1).

It appears from this document that sometimes the Nepalese ruler sent his presents through the envoys despatched by the 'Bri-guṇ-pa abbots. The name of the king is not given on this occasion, but it is likely that he was already the one mentioned in the following document.

[Yung-lo, 11th year, 2nd month, day chi-wei (= March 11th, 1413)] The emperor sent the chief eunuch (t’ai-chien 太監) Hou-hsien 候顯 2), to present Sha-ti-hsin-ko 沙的新葛, king of Nepal, and K’o-pan 可般, king of Ti-yung-t’a, with brocade and thin silk. The eunuch (chung-kuan 中官) Yang San-pao 楊三保 3), was sent to dBus-gTsan and other places, to stay there and return 4).

The dynastic history of the Ming tells the same tale, but with a small difference:

---

1) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Yung-lo, 99.1b. On the 'Bri-guṇ-pa abbots in general and on this mission in particular see G. Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, 630–631, 689.

2) Hou-hsien’s biography is found in the Ming-shih, 304, 4b–5b. He first went to Tibet with Chih-kuang in 1403. Afterwards he was sent to 'Bri-guṇ, and in 1427 again to the P’ag-mo-gru-pa rulers of Central Tibet and to Nepal. See the texts translated by Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, 682, 689, 693. His other field of activity lay on the shores of Southern Asia. He accompanied the admiral Chêng Ho in some of his famous voyages, and in 1415 he himself was placed in charge of a Chinese embassy to Bengal. P. Pelliot, « Les grands voyages maritimes chinois », in T’oung Pao, 30 (1933), 314–329; J. J. L. Duyvendak, « The true dates of the Chinese maritime expeditions » in T’oung Pao, 34 (1938), 303–304.

3) Yang San-pao was one of the eunuchs whom the Ming emperors often employed in delicate missions abroad. He was repeatedly sent to Tibet to carry presents to the Sa-skya-pa abbots and rulers, and was despatched on the same errand also to the 'Bri-guṇ-pa. About 1411 he was in Central Tibet, whence he came back in 1413, only to be sent out again on this mission. He went to Tibet once more in 1419. See the several texts of the Ming-shih translated by Tucci, Tibetan Painted Scrolls, pp. 686, 689, 693. Yang San-pao seems to be otherwise unknown, and therefore P. Pelliot (T’oung Pao, 31, 311–312) suggested that this might be a surname of Yang Ch’ing. Later on (T’oung Pao, 32, 214) he inclined rather to take it as a surname of Yang Min. Both these eunuchs played a certain role in the maritime voyages of that period.

4) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Yung-lo, 137, 3a.
In the 11th year the emperor ordered Yang San-pao to carry an imperial letter, silver and silk, to be bestowed on the new king Sha-ko-hsin-ti 1) and to K‘o-pan, king of Ti-yung-t‘a 2).

The Ming history has shortened the text, giving therefore the wrong impression that Yang San-pao was sent to both Central Tibet and Nepal; and this is how Lévi understood it. The text of the “Vereitable Records”, being contemporary, is decisive: Hou-hsien was sent to Nepal and Yang San-pao to Tibet. Besides, the above-cited biography of Hou-hsien 3) supports the version of the Shih-lu, which may be taken now as well established.

This mission of goodwill was reciprocated at once. The “Vereitable Records” say that

[Yung-lo, 12th year, 8th month, day i-mao (= August 29th, 1414)] Sha-ti-hsin-ko of Nepal sent ambassadors to bring tribute. Sha-ti-hsin-ko was appointed king of Nepal and was granted a seal of gilt silver and a patent 4).

The “basic annals” (pen-chi), the biography of Hou-hsien and the chapter on Nepal in the Ming history all record in about the same words the appointment and give the same name of the king 5):

According to the age-old practice of Chinese intercourse with foreign countries, the grant of the royal title simply meant that the emperor officially took notice of the foreign ruler’s succession to the throne and recognized him as the legitimate sovereign of his country. The text of this edict is not reproduced in the Chinese sources; but by an incredible stroke of luck a translation in bad Sanskrit has come down to us 6). The edict, couched in the usual stereotyped form of

1) Sha-ko-hsin-ti is of course but a mistake for Sha-ti-hsin-ko, due to the inversion of the 2nd and 4th characters. This incorrect form was the only one current among Western scholars, until (and even after) Pelliot in T’oung Pao, 30, 314–315, pointed out the correct one.

2) Ming-shih, 331.16a–b.

3) Ming-shih, 304.5a.

4) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Yung-lo, 154.2a.

5) Ming-shih, 7.2a, 304.5a, 331.16b.

such documents, begins with a long praise of the majesty, virtue and might of the emperor. Then it addresses itself to Śaktisimha Rāya, “who dwells at Palamchok of Nepal in Āryavarta of the Western Countries” (1.9: Śaktisimharāyah paścimasiśaśāvividdāryavartta Nepāla Pallakhaco-nagare sthitah), praising him for his submission to the imperial orders and for the mild and compassionate ways of his rule. Therefore the Imperial Majesty grants him the title of wang (king) and bestows on him some gifts. The name of the bearer of the edict is given (1.20) as Tiṅ Tāsi Rijinaḥ. The document ends with the date mahācīnābda 535 Āśādhā–śukla–daśamāṁ likhitam–iti (= June 16th, 1415).

The name of the imperial messenger is not Chinese but Tibetan: Tiṅ (?) bKra-sis-rig-'dzin. It appears that the Chinese official deputed by the emperor had preferred not to complete his long and arduous journey and had remained in Tibet, entrusting a Tibetan (apparently a Lama) with the task of carrying document and gifts to Śaktisimha. As to the date, the words “Chinese year” (mahācīnābda) should be followed by the transcription of the Chinese date: Yung-lo 14th year, 5th month, jen-tzū. This was apparently too much for the translator, who preferred to give outright the Nepalese equivalent.

The intimate relations between China and Nepal continued in the following years. The “Veritable Records”, the “basic annals” and the chapter on Nepal in the Ming history under the date of 1418 give the same piece of information in the same words:

The king of Nepal Sha-ti-hsin-ko sent envoys to offer produce of the country as tribute 1).

Then the “Veritable Records” alone go on to relate that [Yung-lo, 16th year, 8th month, day mou-yin (= August 31st, 1418)] the emperor sent the eunuch Tēng-ch’ēng 鄧誠 2) with an imperial order to carry to the king of Nepal silk thread and open silk. He travelled together with the returning Nepa-

---

1) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Yung-lo, 203, 1a. Ming-shih, 7.3b; 331.16b.

lesse tribute-bearers, and all the countries through which they passed, viz. Han-tung 罕東, Ling-tsang 霊藏, Pi-li-kung-wa 必力工瓦, Wu-szū-tsang 鳥思藏, Yeh-lan 野藍 1), K‘o-pan 可般, Pu-na 卜納, etc., had gifts bestowed on them 2).

The Chapter on Nepal in the Ming history refers to Têng-ch‘eng’s mission in the same words, the only difference being that K‘o-pan is omitted from the list 3). The Hsü Wen-hsien t‘ung-k‘ao has some different spellings: Pa-lê-kun-ko 巴勒哀哄 for Pi-li-kung-wa, Ya-érh-la 雅爾喇 for Yeh-lan, Pu-nai 卜鼐 for Pu-na 4); it omits K‘o-pan. These places may be identified as follows. Han-tung was a frontier fortress to the South-East of Tun-huang in Western Kansu; it was abandoned in the 16th century, when the Mongols occupied that region 5). Ling-tsang is the Tibetan Glin-ts‘an, i.e. the principality of Glin, south-east of sKyer-dgu-mdo (Jyekundo) on the uppermost reaches of the Yangtze-chiang. Its ruler was a monk, the succession being from uncle to nephew. The Ming dynasty gave him the title Tsan-shan-wang 6). Pi-li-kung-wa are the ‘Bri-guñ-pa abbots, and Pa-lê-kun-ko is ‘Bri-guñ, north-east of Lhasa. Yeh-lan or Ya-èrh-la is Yala (or Éla), the Newari name of Patan 7). K‘o-pan is Khopva, the Newari name of Bhatgaon 8). Pu-na or Pu-nai may perhaps transcribe Pûrna[mati], the Sanskrit name of modern Panaoti.

It is at any rate certain that the Chinese envoys travelled from the Western frontier of Kansu to Central Tibet and thence to Patan.

1) The Nanking edition has wrongly Yeh-chien (葉謹).
2) Ta Ming Shih-lu, Yung-lo, 203.1a.
3) Ming-shih, 331.16b.
4) Hsü Wên-hsien t‘ung-k‘ao, ch. 248, p. 4828c. The Hsü T‘ung-tien, ch. 14d, p. 2004c, has the same spellings as the Ta Ming Shih-lu, with the exception of Pa-lê-kun-ko. Both these works of the 18th century omit K‘o-pan.
6) See R. A. Stein, Recherches sur l’épopée et le barde au Tibet, 211-212.
7) The final nasal occurs also in the Tibetan transcription Ye-raň.
8) Both in earlier and later texts K‘o-pan is wrongly taken for the name of the king of Ti-yung-t‘a. See pp. 213 and 217. In this case too the final nasal occurs also in the Tibetan transcription K‘o-bom. Apparently the Chinese envoys heard these names from their Tibetan interpreters.
This means that they followed the old route via the Thung-la, Kuti (Tib. gNyams-lam) and the Chautaria pass to Sankhu and Kathmandu. From Patan they went to Bhatgaon (K'o-pan), which was the capital of Ti-yung-t'a (the latter name is as yet unexplained). From there they may have gone to Banepa and to Palamchok, the residence of the chieftains whom the imperial government recognized as the legitimate kings of Nepal.

This intercourse drew to an end with a last exchange of missions. The "Veritable Documents" tell us that

[The emperor had sent the chief eunuch Hou-hsien to dBus-gTsān, Nepal and other countries... [Then follows an account of his journey through Tibet and how he was received there] The Tsan-shan wang 賛善王 Nan-ko-chien-tsang 喃葛監藏 ¹; the king of Nepal, Sha-ti-hsin-ko; the prince (wang-tzū 王子) of Ti-yung-t'a, K'o-pan; the Fu-chiao wang 輔教王 Nan-ko-lieh-szū-pa-lo-ko-lo-chien-tsang-pa-tsang-pu 喃葛列思巴羅葛囉監藏巴藏卜 ², etc., every one of them was granted brocade velvet ³, hemp cloth and silk for each of them ⁴.

The chapter on Nepal in the Ming history summarized the above in the following terms:

In the 2nd year [the emperor] again sent the eunuch Hou-hsien to bring some brocade velvet and silk stuffs to its (Nepal's) king; and the same to the king of Ti-yung-t'a. After this no tributary envoy arrived again [at court] ⁵.

¹ Tsan-shan wang was the title granted in 1407 to the Tibetan abbot of Ling-tsang; Nan-ko-chien-tsang had succeeded to the see in 1425; Ming-shih, 331.12b. The name transcribes a Tibetan Nam-mk'a'-rgyal-mts'an. Cf. R. A. Stein, Op. cit., 212.

² The title Fu-chiao-wang was granted in 1413 to the abbot of sTag-ts'ān, head of the Dus-mc'od branch of the Sa-skya-pa sect. This identification was correctly established by H. Sato, "On the Eight Kings of the Law in Tibet during the Ming dynasty" in Japanese), III, in Tōyōshi kenkyū, 22 (1963), chiefly 83-88. The first holder of the title, whose name is here perfectly transcribed into Chinese, was Nam-mk'a'-legs-pa-blo-gros-mts'an-dpal-bzaṅ-po (1399-1444).

³ On this term see P. Pelliot, in T'oung Pao, 30 (1933), 318.

⁴ Ta Ming Shih-lu, Hsüan-tê, 27.2b.

⁵ Ming-shih, 331.16b.
And this was indeed the end of the relations between China and Nepal; they were resumed only after the Gorkha–Chinese war of 1793.

Sha-ti-hsin-ko transcribes the name of Śaktisimha Rāma, the son and successor of Madana Rāna. Of his position in Nepalese history we have spoken above. At the time of the last Chinese embassies this "king of Nepal" was a broken reed, clinging to his pretensions in his mountain lair of Palamchok, while the whole of Nepal recognized the sovereignty of Jayajyotirmalla.

Summing up the results of our enquiry, the position may be stated as follows. For the Chinese the Rāmas were the rulers of Nepal and the princes (wang-tzū) of Ti–yung–t’a were their vassals. The name Ti–yung–t’a, which indicated the principality of Bhatgaon, remains unexplained; we can only point out that t’a is the Chines word for stūpa. The "prince" of Ti–yung–t’a must have been Jayasthitimalla and his sons. Khopva, the Newari name for Bhatgaon, transcribed by the Chinese as K‘o–pan, was sometimes taken for the name of the ruler of Ti–yung–t’a, and sometimes correctly understood as a town or its district.

Taking all elements into account, the only possible explanation is that after the demise of the last king of the Bhonta dynasty (1382) his minister Jayasimha Rāma, casting about for support to the claims of the crown of Bhonta, came into contact with some of the Tibetan ecclesiastical principalities which at the same time were receiving the attention of the first Ming emperor. Through Tibet the mahātha arranged a so-called "tributary" mission to China. Jayārjunadeva was no more, and the Chinese government would not accept the idea of a kingdom without a king. And thus Jayasimha Rāma, who was still fully occupied in his losing struggle in the Valley, pushed to the fore his younger brother Madana Rāma, who, as known from the docu-

1) This may help to explain the rather puzzling statement of the chapter on Nepal in the Ming history, that "all the rulers of Nepal are Buddhist monks (sēng)"; Ming-shih, ch. 331, f. 16a. Rāma was transcribed as Lo–mo; but Lo–mo stands also for the Tibetan word Lama (bla–ma). And the Chinese must have drawn the conclusion that Nepalese rulers were all of them Lamas, i.e. Buddhist monks.

2) Wang–tzū may be a translation of yuvarāja. Perhaps the Rāmas insisted in giving this lower title to the Karnāta–Mallas, although Jayajyotirmalla had resumed the full royal style long before 1427.
ments, was governing the Rāma family's dominion of Bhonta. Jayasimha Rāma presented him to the Chinese as the bearer of the rights of Bhonta, and therefore as the legitimate claimant to the throne of Nepal. It should be stressed that relations with China began in 1383–84, one or two years after the death of Jayārjunadeva; a connection between the events seems plausible.

For some reason, the Chinese government accepted the situation as it was presented to them by the Rāmas, without taking the trouble to ascertain the real position and the strength of the power of the Karnāṭa–Malla house. Things continued on this line even after Jayasimha's death and the collapse of the Bhonta positions, when Chinese relations with Śaktisimha, by then a mere local chieftain, had lost whatever meaning they possessed at the beginning. The exchange of embassies continued until Śaktisimha was unable or unwilling to continue it, and until the Hsūn-ťe emperor (1425–1435) demobilised the ambitious but expensive diplomacy practised by Yung-lo. Still, the able policy of the Rāmas not only procured for them Chinese recognition as "kings of Nepal" as long as the intercourse lasted and until they lost all shreds of power; but it contributed also to their success with the Nepalese chroniclers of the 18th century, who, under the impression of the Gorkha–Chinese war of 1793, were dazzled with the importance of Imperial Chinese recognition.

And this is, I believe, the only way to explain the very real conflict, which so deeply embarrassed Lévi, between the modern vamsāvali and Chinese texts on one side, and the colophons and inscriptions on the other. At least I can rest content with having reclaimed from oblivion the interesting figures of the two brothers Jayasimha Rāma and Madana Rāma, who played such an outstanding role in the history of Nepal.

1) That such a thing could happen is shown by a parallel case in exactly the same period. In 1370 the Hung-wu emperor sent a mission to prince Kanenaga, the loyalist commander-in-chief in Western Japan, supposing him to be the "king" of Japan. See G. Sansom, History of Japan, II, 167–168.
APPENDIX III

THE KAISHER FRAGMENT OF "VAMŚĀVALĪ"
(Kaisher Library, n. 171)

(p. 1) 1) [rājā śrī rudradeva]2)va varṣa 26 || tena pvuna[r]bhōṭānta prayanta niṣkaṇṭakam rāṣṭram karoti || rājā śrī jayadeva varṣa 42 māsa 7 || rājā śrī baladeva varṣa 11 || rājā śrī bālārjunadeva varṣa 21 māsa 7 || bhrāṭṛbhāryyā sambhavatena hi durgabhaṭṭārakāya svamuktaṁ pradattam || rājā śrī mānadeva varṣa 36 || tena bahulanādaṁtavanīṁ pratiṣṭhitam | rājā śrī rāghavadeva deva varṣa 63 māsa 6 3) || śrī paśupatiḥbhāṭṭārake samvatsarapravṛtthīṁ kṛtā || rājā śrī śaṁkaradeva varṣa 18 māsa 6 || rājā śrī sahadeva varṣa 33 māsa 9 || rājā śrī vikramadeva varṣa 1 || rājā śrī narendradeva varṣa 1 māsa 6 4) || rājā śrī guṇakāmādeva varṣa 85 māsa 6 || tena paśupatiḥbhāṭṭārakāya ekādaśakoṣam pradattam tatraiva iśānesvarasya vāsukībhaṭṭārakasya ūppramraśaṃśalī chādanṁ kṛtya tatraiva dirghacopātri-kā kṛtya | suvarṇāpanalī koṭihomam kṛtaśceti || rājā śrī udayadeva varṣa 6 || rājā śrī nibhayeova varṣa 5 || [rājā] śrī bhojadeva-rudrdeva varṣa 9 māsa 7 | tena bhojadevena śrī (p. 2)va varṣa 33 māsa 9 || rājā śrī lakṣmikāmādeva varṣa 21 | tena hi campa[tapaścāt sa]5)hi-te samvatsaranidhāne rāṣṭram śāntikṛtya | rājā śrī [Jayadeva va]7)rṣa 20 | tena hi lalitapura arddharājyaṁ kṛtyaṁ varṣa 10 || rājā śrī bhāskaradeva jayadeva ubhayarājā varṣa 7 mā 4 | tena hi bhāskaradevena

1) The pages are unnumbered in the ms.
2) Reconstructed from VD.
3) Newari footnote in the ms.; samvat daya ku.
4) Reconstructed from VD.
5) Reconstructed from VD.
6) Reconstructed from VD. Newari note in the ms.: samvat daya kunā.
7) Reconstructed from VD.

1) I transcribe with a semicolon a sign which the scribe of the ms. writes as the number 10; he must have misunderstood some sign or mark in the original from which be copied.
2) Read suvarṇa.
3) See n. 1.
4) Read śi–.
5) Read –dhi–.
6) Reconstructed according to V1.
7) Reconstructed according to V1.
8) Read praṭānām.

1) Reconstructed according to VD.
2) Reconstructed according to V1.
3) Reconstructed according to VD.
4) Reconstructed according to V1.
5) Reconstructed according to V1.


1) Reconstructed according to VI.
2) Reconstructed according to VI.
### GENEALOGICAL TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth - Death</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŚANKARADEVA</td>
<td>c. 1082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚIVADEVA, b.1057</td>
<td>d. 1126</td>
<td>Identical (??) with SIMHADEVA, fl. c. 1100-1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendradeva, b.1079</td>
<td>d. 1163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀNANDADEVA, b.1099</td>
<td>d. 1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUDRADEVA, b.1108</td>
<td>d. 1175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMRTADEVA, b.1113</td>
<td>d. 1179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasantadeva, b.1112</td>
<td>d. 1163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEŚVARADEVA, b.1122</td>
<td>d. 1185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśākhadeva, b.1156</td>
<td>d. 1183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayadeva, b. ?</td>
<td>d. 1176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visihadeva, b.1166</td>
<td>d. 1192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aṃśuśekharadeva, b.1151</td>
<td>d. 1189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) The elements of the Genealogical Tables are drawn from V2. Dates between brackets are not found in the text, but calculated from the years of life attributed by V2 to each person. The name of the persons who reigned are printed in CAPITALS.
## GENEALOGICAL TABLE B

### I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jayaśimalla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ARIMALLA, b. 1153 [d. 1216]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ABHAYAMALLA, b.1183 [d. 1255]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) JAYADEVA, b.1203 [d. 1258]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yakṣamalla, b.1238 [d.1257]  
Jatakeśadeva, b.1244 d. ?

### II. (Bhonta family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) JAYABHĪMADEVA, [b.? d.1271]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jayādityadeva, b. 1238 d.1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaśaktideva, b.1276 [d.1315]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) JAYĀNANDADEVĀ, b.? d. after 1328  
9) JAYARĀJADEVA, b. 1317 [d.1360]  
10) JAYĀRJUNADEVĀ, b. 1338 d.1382

### III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aganakamalla</th>
<th>Rājadeva, b.1228 [d.1249]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6) ANANTAMALLA, b.1246 [d.1308]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) JAYĀRIMALLA, b.1276 d.1344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. (Tipura family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jagatanekamalla</th>
<th>Jayaśīhamalla, b.1229 d.1287</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jayatuṅgamalla, b.1265 d.1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(princes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) JAYARUDRAMALLA, b.1295 d.1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) NĀYAKADEVI, b.? d. 1347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

united with Jagatsimha of the Karnāṭa family

---

1) Aganakamalla and Jagatanekamalla could be perhaps one and the same person.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harisimha</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jagatsimha</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(marries Nāyakadevi</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>of Tipura)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jayadharmamalla</td>
<td>b.1367</td>
<td>d.c.1408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jayajyotirmalla</td>
<td>b.1373</td>
<td>d.1428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jayakirtimalla</td>
<td>b.1377</td>
<td>d.c.1405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jayayakṣamalla</td>
<td>b.1395</td>
<td>d.1482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jayarayamalla</td>
<td>b.1395</td>
<td>d.1509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jayaranamalla</td>
<td>b.1395</td>
<td>d.1529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jayaratnamalla</td>
<td>b.1395</td>
<td>d.1529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Jayajivamalla, b. ? d.c.1447**
- **Jayaratnamalla, b. ? d. 1520**
- **Jayarāyamalla, b. ? d. 1509**
- **Jayarānāmalla, b. ? d. 1529**

- kings of Bhatgaon
- king of Banepa
- kings of Kathmandu and of Patan
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105, 109, 117, 123, 134, 141, 149, 169,
174, 177, 183, 194–197.
Phāsi 135.
Phu Bhāro 87.
Pilī-kung 216, 220.
Pim Bahal, Pim Bahal, Phīṅkvaṭh 90,
125, 134, 141, 191, 201.
Pīṅgalāmata 68, 74.
Piṣujiva 53, 54, 58.
Piṭhāvatārastotra 167.
Pla, pala 200, 202.
Pokhra 47.
Pradhiiana 134, 191.
Pradhiiana-mahāpātra 112n., 166, 191,
192.
Pradyumnakāmadeva 44–46.
Pradhiivanā-dāmasūta 85.
Pāṇcavāta 80, 193.
Pāṇga 96, 97.
Sakhva 11.
Śakrasimha 210–212.
Śaktisimha (of Phar uping) 169, 177, 195.
Śaktisimha Rāma 18, 151, 152, 157–161, 169, 219, 222, 223.
Śaktisimha (of Tirhut) 210, 211.
Salamkoth 196.
Salche 103.
Śālmalūpaka 211.
Śalyaparvan 142, 153.
Samājatantrānuṣārīṇaṃca kārakriyā 83.
sāmanta 73, 153, 193, 194, 196.
Sāṃśārādevī 162, 170, 176.
Śanāśčurasotra 110.
Sāngā 107, 172.
Sānūmāsāgara 99.
Sāṭāramalla 78, 107.
Śāṅkara 65, 203.
Śāṅkaraśārīra 204.
Śāṅkaradeva (10th century) 31, 32.
Śāṅkaradeva (11th century) 46–48.
Śāṅkaradevi 129.
sāṅkraṇī 14, 15, 18, 19, 35–37, 51, 60–64, 74, 75, 75, 94, 97, 98, 106n., 110, 138, 140, 141, 149, 150, 158, 168, 173.
saptakūṭumbaja 191, 192.
Saptapura Mahāvihāra 163.
Saptāśati (Candi) 60, 62, 72, 75, 84, 85, 112, 147.
Sarasvatī temple 110, 171.
Saraswati, S. K., collection 37.
Saravāli 98.
Sarvalakṣaṇavivaranaṇapañjikā 75.
Sarvaprakaraṇasanāgraha 61.
Sā-sāmya monastery and sect 34, 44, 47, 58, 59, 97, 99, 100, 179, 215, 221n.
Sasukkel 110.
Sātasthāsaśrīkā-Prajñāpāramitā 96.
sattal 187.
Sattvavādāpranāmana 80.
Satya-Nārāyaṇa temple 162.
Saugali Tol 48, 173.
Sauṣūrūtaṃhitā Sahottaratantra 29.
Sekanirdeśaṃpañjikā 48.
Śekharakvāth 117.
Sema 102.
Sena dynasty 55.
Sha–chou 27.
Shams ud–din Ilyās 125, 126.
Shang–tu 101.
Si Baha 140.
Siddhi Narayan 8.
Śiddhisārasamhitā 53, 167, 168.
Sikarjoong, Śel–dkar–rdzoṅ 178.
Śikharāpūrī 141, 150, 174, 195.
śilapattra 10.
Simarāvāna–paṭṭana 209.
Śīmha deva, Śīhadeva 51–54, 58, 64, 69, 71, 203.
Simraongarh 55, 113, 114, 116, 209.
Sindhuji 115.
Śīṅghana 56.
Śīṅ–kun 42.
Śiva 54, 146, 203.
Śivadāsa Upādhyāya 146.
Śivadeva (6th–7th century) 22, 77.
Śivadharmāśāstra 38, 68.
Śivagali Tol 66.
śivakā 199–201.
śivakānka 52, 198, 199.
Śivalīṅga 40.
Śivaśīṅga Rāma 155.
sKyer–dgu–mdo 220.
Smrtimañjari 62.
Solaṅkī dynasty 195.
Someśvara I (Cālukya) 55, 56.
Someśvara III (Cālukya) 56.
spaṣṭa 13.
Sphoṭikāvidya 51.
Sragdharāstotra 175.
Śrīcakravarṇa–mahāvihāra 45.
Śrīdharasimha 81, 82.
Śrīnātha Bhaṭṭa 205.
Śrīnāthasimha 166.
Śrīvatsa Mahāvihāra 140.
Śrīṅgeri Māṭh 65.
Śrutāna Sāmasadino 126.
sTag–tsaṅ 221n.
śthavira 41.
stūpa 203, 222.
Su Bahal 83, 97.
Subantaratnākara 164, 170.
Sugrivasāstra 130.
Śuklayājurvedasamhitā 168.
Śulaṅkī family 195.
Sumatipañjikā 33.
Sumatiśītra, Sumatisiddhānta 13, 14, 161, 164, 171, 215.
Sundhārā Tol 62, 139, 149.
Suratāna Samasadīna, Sūratrāṇa Sama-
sādīna 125.
Sūryamādhi Tol 150.
Sūrya Siddhānta 10, 13, 20, 35–37, 44, 60, 63, 64, 75, 87n., 94, 98, 105n., 106n., 110, 126n., 138, 140, 141, 149, 150, 169, 194.
Sūryavamsī 31, 158.
svarna 199.
Svachandañalalitabhairava 46.
Śvakīya 95.
Svamalasāstra 62.
Svamkāśa 105.
Svarodayāmaṇḍalopāyikā etc. 44, 181.
Svayambhā–māhāmya 29.
Śyādāntakosa 147.
Śyāmasimha 159, 160.
Tacapol Tol 67.
Tagal 184.
t’ai–chien 217.
T’ai–tsu 213.
tala 183.
Taleju 116n., 204.
Talmadhi Tol 169.
tāμrapattra 10.
Tana Bahal 21.
T’ang dynasty 24, 26.
Tangal Tol 37, 47.
T’aṅ Vihāra 42, 43.
Tapāche Tol 173.
Tarai 55, 77, 78, 107.
Taran Bahal 40.
Tari 107.
Tattvasadbhāvatrantra 49.
Ta–tu 101.
Taumadhi Tol 35, 63, 67, 161.
tavanimam 30.
Te Baha 173, 174.

Tejapāla Bhāro 111.
Teja Rām Bhāro 190.
Tėng–ch’ēng 219, 220.
Thabu Tol 149.
Thākkhā 119, 135.
Thākuri 10, 31, 40, 67, 77.
Thamthhibim 106.
Than Bahil, Tham Vihāra 43, 88.
Thapa Hiti 45.
Thayita Bhāro 117–119.
Thimi 134, 169.
Thung-la 221.
thyasaphu 1676n.
Tibet, Tibetan 21, 24–28, 34, 41, 43, 44, 52, 53, 58, 59, 61, 81, 88, 97, 99, 100, 102, 103, 178, 179, 199n., 211, 213n., 214–222.
Tibukche Tol 66.
Tilamādhava 63.
tilāpattra 152.
Tīṃpāṭana 114, 115.
Tiṅ Tāsi Rijinah, Tiṅ bKra–śis–rig–’dzin 219.
Tīthiśārasangrahā 140.
Ti–yung–t’a 213, 217, 218, 221, 222.
to–dog 26.
To–kan 214.
Tokha 119, 120, 173, 196.
trayorājiya, tribhayarājiya 151, 180–182, 189.
tribhayapātra–pramukha 192.
Tribhūvanamallā 117.
Tripurasundart 66.
Tripurasundarijapaddhati 138.
Triyakalagunottara 73.
Tsangpo river 26.
Tsän–shan–wang 220, 221.
Tuan–chu–chien–tsang 216.
Tu-fan 100, 101n.
Tughril Tughan 209.
Tulachi 157.
Turks 114.
Tu-tu-hui 214.
Tulircana 174, 186.
Tulipura-mahādāna 107, 192.
Tyagol Tol 36, 156.
Udaya Bhīro 176.
Vāsudevakalpa 85.
Vāsudhāradhāraṇī 51, 132.
[Ārya-]Vasudhārayāḥ Śoḍaṣakalpa 83.
Vasantadeva (king) 27.
Vasantadeva (prince) 65, 67, 79.
Vāsudeva 106.
Vibhūticandra 43.
Vidagdhamukhamāṇḍana 140.
Vidarbhā 34.
Vidyāpati 207.
Vidyāpīṭha 72, 105.
Vidyāvalī 86.
Vijayadeva (11th century) 39–42.
Vijayadeva (prince) 71.
Vijayakāmdeva 17, 73–76, 80, 82.
vijayarājya 109, 158, 161, 195.
Vijayasena 55.
Vikramadeva 31, 32.
Vikramādiya VI (Cālukya) 55.
Vikrama Samvat 11, 20, 78, 82, 116n, 208.
Vikramaśilā 41, 43.
Vikramaśilā mahāviḥāra 43.
Vimalaratnalekha 43.
Vināyakastavarāja 112.
Viramūdevi 104.
Vira–Nārāyaṇa 205.
Virasimha 211, 212.
Viryacandra 42.
Viśākhadeva 70, 71.
viṣāya 34, 35, 49, 190, 193.
viṣayaḥādihipati 193.
Viṣṇudharma 40, 49.
Viṣṇudharmottara 83.
Viṣṇugupta 6, 24.
Viṣṇusimha 182, 192.
Viśvakarman Mahāviḥāra 168.
Viśvākhaṇḍa 148.
Vṛṣarāja Viḥāra 57.
Vṛttasārasaṅgrahadharmaśāstra 80.
wang-tṣū 221, 222.
Woku Bahal 74, 141, 197.
Wu–szū–tsang 214, 220.
Yachu Tol 49.
Yakṣamalla 90, 128.
Yakṣasimha 195.
Yala, Ela 185, 220.
Yamārtiranmandaṇḍalopāyikā 57.
Yambu, Yambukramā 36, 63, 99, 147, 187.
Yan–dog monastery 88.
Yanga Bahal 21.
Yañgal 46, 184, 187.
Yang San-pao 217, 218.
Yangtzechiang 220.
Yaśomalla 79.
yātra 134, 135, 204.
Yaukvātha 95.
Yavana 126.
Yeh-lan 220.
Ye-rañ 220n.
Yetho Bahar 53, 176.
Yitokvāth 124.
Yogāmbarasādhanā 17.
Yīgniś 99n, 100n.
Yiśadeva (Īśadeva ?) 43, 44, 189.
Yogasārasamuccaya. 68

Yogha Vihāra, Yokhāccha 72, 84, 85, 123, 130, 132.
Yotha Bahi 110, 163, 164.
Yotkha Baha 63.
Yüan dynasty 100.
Yuddhajayārṇava 137.
Yūnnan 25.
Yūpagrāma 185.
Yuthonimāṃ, Yuthanimaṃ 87, 105, 118, 119.
Yuvarāja 52, 54, 86, 87, 90, 91, 93, 95, 104, 124, 129, 143, 151, 164, 199.

Zimmermann, J., collection 35.
Žva-lu monastery 53, 57, 97, 199n.